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Different Collections, Different Values? The Role of Provenance in Gifts From the Ancestors: Ancient Ivories of Bering Strait

by NICOLE T. DEAUGUSTINE

Thesis Director:
Archer St. Clair Harvey

The purpose of this paper is to understand why some of the objects that were part of the Princeton University Art Museum’s exhibition Gifts From the Ancestors: Ancient Ivories of Bering Strait have a provenance, while others do not. Because the objects are from the same general area, one would assume that provenance information for the ivory objects would be site specific and similar from collection to collection. This assumption, however, falls apart when considering the exhibition collection checklist because many objects have unidentified, unidentified/”said to be,” and “said to be” provenances, with much fewer objects showing a provenance related to a specific site, island/peninsula, or even region. The unidentified provenance objects alone make up more than half of the questionably provenanced objects in entire exhibition, leading to questions about the collecting practices of the museum and their benefactors. Using the exhibition as a case study, this analysis will address the politics of displaying and collecting objects of uncertain provenance, to determine whether different types of institutions and collections, aesthetic or ethnologic and private or public, value an object’s provenance differently and the effect this has on scholarship.
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Introduction

In recent years, archaeologists, art historians, and museum curators have given considerable attention to the issue of “provenance.” The purpose of this thesis is to consider the value and meaning of provenance on an institutional level. Using the Princeton University Art Museum’s exhibition Gifts From the Ancestors: Ancient Ivories of Bering Strait (2009), I demonstrate that specific institutions influence the type of provenance information ultimately attached to an artifact. The objects included in Gifts From the Ancestors are all similar in terms of appearance and region, leading one to assume, in theory, that provenance should be a controlled factor. However, the exhibition catalogue reveals vast differences in the recording, presentation, and value of provenance information among the ancient ivory objects included in the exhibition. The varying level of provenance in Gifts From the Ancestors suggests that the different contributing institutions, whether museums, private collectors, or Native corporations, value an object’s provenance differently, resulting in a collection of objects that range from having a site specific provenance to one that is completely unknown.

Defining Provenance

Depending on one’s academic field, the definition of an object’s provenance changes. Art historians tend to focus on the object itself and its physical components, prioritizing aesthetics. For this community, an object’s provenance, “may include the original source [of the object], but is primarily concerned with a history of ownership,” meaning who owned it prior and what dealers sold the object, establishing a pedigree for
the object. This type of provenance gives an object context in terms of history, significance, and most importantly value.

By contrast, anthropologists and archaeologists define provenance as derived from an object’s in-situ findspot. Christopher Chippindale and David Gill (2000) emphasize the value of provenance in terms of findspot as part of an object’s lifecycle:

A defined object [that] has some place of origin where it was made that begins its story. The first part of the story is its life in the ancient world, its making and subsequent transport, use, transformation, reuse, repair, and so on until it went out of human circulation by being buried in the ground. The information, thenceforth conveyed for the future by the object resides in the object itself and in the information conveyed by its sedimentary context and artifactual associations, that is, its documented archaeological context.

Individuals like Chippindale and Gill favor the context driven definition of provenance because this information can relay the exact location and excavation that initially discovered and subsequently removed the object from the ground, as the result of a controlled excavation using trained archaeologists. Archaeologists argue that in-situ archaeological information provides an object with irreplaceable context and helps piece together the pre-historic and historic record of an area, preserving the past for future generations. For purposes of my analysis, I employ the archaeological definition of provenance for the objects included in Gifts From the Ancestors to establish how this information varies from collection to collection. Focusing on an object’s provenance in terms of findspot will reveal how archaeological materials are treated in different

---

institutions, to establish that the value of provenance directly relates to the collecting institutions and their patronage.

**Prior Studies of Provenance**

Earlier studies of provenance focused upon the problems associated with unprovenanced materials and the art market, highlighting the issues of undocumented digging and the illicit antiquities trade. The main thrust of these studies focused on how a lack of provenance information could be a proxy for the illicit trade, posing problems for authentication, as well as reflecting an incomplete and even missing archaeological record. For example, Chippindale and Gill were the first to explore the issue of provenance, analyzing the availability of this information for Cycladic figurines dating to the third millennia BCE. In their classic 1993 study, they revealed the “material and intellectual consequences” of collecting Cycladic figurines through quantifying the available provenance information for the entire corpus of these objects. Their study showed that ninety percent of all known Cycladic figures did not have an attributable provenance, emphasizing the impact that site looting has on accurately authenticating these materials. A similar study by Ricardo Elia, which looked at unprovenanced

---


6 Ibid., 603.

7 Ibid., 630.
Apulian red vases from southern Italy, demonstrated the art market’s influence on site looting, resulting in a cache of unprovenanced materials. His study showed that of the 13,631 known Apulian vases in circulation, over eighty-eight percent did not have a recorded provenance, while only a little over five percent could be associated with a specific archaeological excavation. Although these studies establish the negative impact of looting on provenance, they do not take into account the institutions responsible for acquiring and displaying these materials. Looking beyond the problems of site looting, this study seeks to evaluate whether the institutional culture of academic disciplines and the various kinds of art, anthropological, and archaeological museums involved in the display and exchange of objects impact the loss of contextual information.

The following analysis considers the ancient ivories included in the exhibition catalogue of Gifts From the Ancestors, charting the different provenances that the contributing museums, private collectors, and Native corporations provided. The term “ancient” is distinguished here because four modern day carvings were included in the exhibition, but for purposes of this study are not included in the 189 objects under consideration. The ancient objects included in the exhibition date to one of the five chronological decorative styles that scholars distinguished for the ivories, spanning from 100 CE to 1200 CE. Focusing primarily on Bering Strait ivories from museum and private collections, I will quantify the provenance provided to ascertain whether conclusions can be drawn about collecting on an institution-wide level and if patterns

---

8 Elia, “Analysis of Looting,” 147.
9 The five chronological artistic styles for the ancient ivories are as follows: Okvik/Old Bering Strait (OBS) I, 100-400 CE; OBS II 400-800 CE; OBS III 400-800 CE; Ipiutak 400-900 CE; and Punuk 800-1200 CE. William W. Fitzhugh and Aron L. Crowell, “Ancestors and Ivories: Ancient Art of Bering Strait,” in Gifts from the Ancestors: Ancient Ivories of Bering Strait, ed. William W. Fitzhugh, Julie Hollowell, and Aron L. Crowell (New Haven: Yale UP, 2009), 33.
arise among different types of museums, such as art and ethnologic focused collections. Before delving into the issue of provenance in *Gifts From the Ancestors*, an overview of the Bering Strait and the role of ivory objects in the area will follow, giving background on how these materials came to circulate on the art market.

**Gifts From the Ancestors: A Case Study**

The inspiration for the exhibition *Gifts From the Ancestors: Ancient Ivories of Bering Strait* (hereafter, *GFA*) was the donation of over 300 ivory carvings by Princeton alumnus, Lloyd E. Cotsen, Class of 1950, to the Princeton University Art Museum in 1999, resulting in a significant increase in the number of Bering Strait materials in the museum’s collection. Cotsen acquired this collection of ancient ivories from the art dealer Jonathan Holstein, who introduced these materials to museums and collectors throughout much of the late twentieth century. As a result of Holstein’s efforts, many of the objects included in Cotsen’s were also included in a handful of exhibitions dedicated to exhibiting the artistic qualities of these pieces of Native American material culture, such as *Sacred Circles: Two Thousand Years of North American Indian Art* (1976).\(^{10}\) Holstein can be credited with “establishing the first direct link between diggers on St. Lawrence Island and the New York art market in the early 1970s,” and stimulating a demand for these objects among collectors, dealers, and museums.\(^{11}\)


\(^{11}\) Julie Hollowell, “Planning an Exhibition of Ancient Ivory Art from the Bering Strait: Dealing with the Legacy of Undocumented Digging and Other Challenges” (panel, American Association of Museums, New Orleans, LA, May 8, 2004 and Museums Alaska Conference, Anchorage, AK, September 18, 2004).
GFA is one in a succession of exhibitions dedicated to Native Alaskan art, which gained popularity quite quickly in the 1970s and has continued to be a subject of interest ever since. Formal planning for GFA began in 2001, under the auspices of then director Susan M. Taylor and then faculty curator of Pre-Columbian and Ancient Art of the Americas, Gillett G. Griffin. The museum learned of anthropologist Julie Hollowell from another alumnus, Perry J. Lewis, who was familiar with her scholarship on Bering Strait ivories and suggested her involvement in the exhibition. Subsequently, the exhibition quickly moved into the planning stages and an advisory committee was assigned to the project. The receipt of a planning grant from the National Endowment of the Humanities for 2004-2005 helped significantly in the planning stages as the funds allowed Hollowell to visit numerous private and public collections from all over the world to secure objects for the exhibition. The collaboration resulted in a 193-piece exhibition with objects coming from twenty-four different types of institutions and collectors.

The main individuals responsible for the exhibition were William Fitzhugh, Aron Crowell, Julie Hollowell, and Bryan Just. The three editors of the catalogue, William Fitzhugh, Aron Crowell, and Julie Hollowell come from an anthropological background, with Fitzhugh and Crowell as archaeologists and Hollowell as a cultural anthropologist. Both William Fitzhugh and Aron Crowell are part of the National Museum of Natural History’s Arctic Studies Center, Fitzhugh working as director and Crowell as Alaska director. Bryan Just holds the position of the Peter J. Sharp, Class of 1952 Curator and Lecturer in the Art of Ancient Americas at Princeton and worked in a curatorial capacity for the exhibition, representing the Princeton University Art Museum.
By bringing together scholars from the fields of art history, archaeology and cultural anthropology, GFA sought to examine not only the artistic stylization of the objects, but also their cultural meaning and significance. The exhibition also focused on the “social history” of the carved ivories, considering the role they played in lives of Native peoples, from their ancient production to today. In order to understand why GFA is an appropriate case study for evaluating the institutional value of provenance, an overview of the ivory objects and the history of collecting in the region is necessary to give a sense of what the objects mean not only to indigenous groups, but also the anthropologists and archaeologists working in the area. By doing so, there will be a better understanding of the complicated issue of provenance for ancient ivories from this region of the world and how these materials came to circulate on the art market.

**Ancient Ivories; Modern Subsistence Strategies**

The Bering Strait has attracted the research interests of cultural anthropologists and archaeologists alike, from the early work of Henry Elliott in the Punuk Islands in the late nineteenth century to the more contemporary work of Catherine Jolles and Julie Hollowell on St. Lawrence Island during the late 1990s and early 2000s. Since the passing of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) in 1971, ancient ivories from this part of the world have been the focus of much of the scholarly research in the area, specifically with the goal of preserving the area’s archaeological integrity. While

---

the purpose of ANCSA was to extinguish indigenous land claims in Alaska, the terms of the law also impacted the preservation of cultural resources in the area, creating what many refer to as a “legal antiquities market.”\textsuperscript{14} The provisions of ANCSA allowed former reservations, like St. Lawrence Island, to opt out of the Act’s $962.5 million and forty-million acre settlement in order to receive full title to their land.\textsuperscript{15} The former St. Lawrence Island reserve became the private property of those occupying the land, making it legal and permissible for St. Lawrence Islanders to dig for and sell ancient carved ivory objects to interested parties for personal financial gain. The subsequent circulation of these ivory objects on the art market quickly caught the attention of concerned academics, raising concerns about the preservation of the area’s archaeological record and cultural heritage.

Although ANCSA offered many advantages for indigenous groups in terms of land ownership, the terms of the act alarmed archaeologists because it legalized the unsystematic and undocumented excavation of ivory objects. In effect, it legalized a practice David Staley coined as “subsistence digging.”\textsuperscript{16} Much like other subsistence practices, subsistence digging involves the “excavation” of archaeological material for sale to interested parties as a way to generate cash needed for financial stability and material goods. Subsistence digging raises a number of ethical issues for both archaeologists and Native Alaskans. The 1989 \emph{Federal Archaeology Report} exemplifies

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14} Julie Hollowell, “Ancient Ivories from the Bering Strait,” \emph{Athena Review} 4, no. 3 (2007): 55.
\item \textsuperscript{16} David Staley, “St. Lawrence Island’s Subsistence Diggers: A New Perspective on Human Effects on Archaeological Sites” \textit{Journal of Field Archaeology} 20, no. 3 (Autumn 1993): 348.
\end{itemize}
how subsistence digging can negatively impact the preservation of an area’s cultural resources. The report noted that the five sites designated as National Historic Landmarks (NHLs) on St. Lawrence Island lost their NHL status in 1989 as a result to the effects of “subsistence mining” in the area for cultural resources. The five sites- Hillside, Mayughaaq, Ayveghyaget, Old Gambell, and Seklowaghyag, all in the vicinity of Gambell- had been designated as NHLs in 1962 because the National Park Service:

[R]ecognized [the sites’] importance in establishing a chronological sequence of cultures on Saint Lawrence Island and in regional prehistory. Additionally, the sites are important to the discipline of archaeology, as the first in the greater Bering Strait region to be scientifically investigated and reported.

While scholars realize why subsistence digging takes place, their main concern is about the future of archaeology on the island and the protection of the area’s remaining ivory resources. For the archaeological community, the ancient carved ivories, much like anything discovered through excavation (whether scientific or not) are “nonrenewable cultural resources,” that cannot be replaced once the supply is depleted. Unlike other subsistence practices, such as hunting and gathering, digging for ivory objects is not sustainable, leading scholars like David Staley and Julie Hollowell to wonder what will happen to subsistence diggers once this resource is exhausted.

On St. Lawrence Island, Native villagers are similarly aware of the effects of subsistence digging and acknowledge its impact on the island’s cultural heritage.

However, subsistence digging helps support St. Lawrence Islanders survive financially in the island’s mixed market economy of subsistence whale hunting and gathering and involvement in the American cash economy. As scholars David Staley and Catherine Jolles both note, high rates of unemployment and the high cost of living for St. Lawrence Islanders puts a strain on survival in the island’s mixed economy, making subsistence digging a viable means of bringing much needed cash for one’s family. While the St. Lawrence Island villages of Gambell and Savoonga allow subsistence digging and its financial contributions, it is widely recognized that the practice is problematic not only for archaeology, but also for the preservation of Native Alaskan ancestral heritage:

In one sense, artifacts are like an inheritance…anyone who finds a beautiful artifact is torn about selling it. Most people have a deep sense of loss and concern about the dispersal of ancestral objects to unknown places and hands. Many people refuse to dig…[o]thers see it as another expression of the long history of exploitation by white traders. Some elders blame the digging for all the social problems in the village today.

While these issues reveal the conflicting views Natives have regarding the practice, the issue of financial stability remains paramount within these communities.

On St. Lawrence Island, archaeologists, art dealers, and local communities clash when it comes to the circulation of these materials on the art market and subsistence digging’s impact on the area’s archaeological integrity. The differences that arise among the key players listed above illustrates that provenance is not universally valued. *GFA* is a particularly effective case study to understand and evaluate the conflicting value of provenance because although the ivories are all from the same general region, the

---

20 Jolles, “Qayuutat and Angyapiget,” 27.
provenance provided in the exhibition catalogue drastically differs, ranging from specific excavations to completely unknown findspots.

**Contributing Museums to GFA**

Of the 189 ancient objects included in *GFA*, the vast majority came from museums, which lent some 142 objects, or seventy-five percent of the ancient ivories exhibited (see Table 1). These objects represent the fifteen different museum collections (Table 2). The State Museum of Oriental Art, Moscow and the Princeton University Art Museum, including both the Cotsen and Elliot collections, contributed 107 ivories, making up more than half of the 142 objects from museum collections. The State Museum contributed sixty-three objects, or approximately thirty-three percent of the total exhibition (Table 2). Forty-four came from the two Princeton University Art Museum (PUAM) collections, thirty-five from the Lloyd E. Cotsen collection and nine from the John B. Elliot collection, comprising approximately twenty-three percent of the total ivories on display (Table 2). Before moving forward with the provenance analysis, background is needed about the contributing museums to give a sense of what types of institutions were involved in *GFA*. The following section introduces the exhibition’s fifteen contributing museum collections, giving a brief overview of their history, key players involved, and how each respective collection classifies ancient ivories from the Bering Strait region.

*Princeton University Art Museum, Princeton, New Jersey*

Collections:

Lloyd E. Cotsen Collection, Princeton, New Jersey

Bequest of John B. Elliot, Princeton, New Jersey
Princeton University President James McCosh established the Princeton University Art Museum (PUAM) in 1882 to create an institution that would enrich the Princeton curriculum and support the then new Department of Art History. At the ground breaking ceremony for the art museum Henry van Dyke, an English professor at Princeton, emphasized the role that the art museum would play for the university’s overall curriculum: “The erection of this museum asserts the definite value of the study of art in a complete system of education.”

From this point forward, the museum quickly grew in size thanks to donations from University professors and alumni. Today, the University has significant holdings, not only in Greek and Roman antiquities, but also in works of art from areas around the world, including Western Europe, China, Latin America, and the United States. The University also participates in exhibitions across the globe. At present, the museum’s strongest collections are in Chinese and Pre-Columbian art, as well as collections of old master prints and photographs. African art and Northwest Coast Indian art are growing areas within PUAM’s encyclopedic collection.

A main part of museum’s mission is to make art a significant part of a Princeton education, encouraging students to interact with materials and frequent the galleries. Another significant component of the museum’s mission is to promote the advancement of knowledge in art and archaeology, acting as a “public gateway” for the outside community. Through education programs, exhibitions, and affiliated programs, the museum enables Princeton’s resources to be accessible to the public, whether being local, regional, national, or international, thus encouraging and developing their intellectual

---

concerns and inquiries. Lloyd E. Cotsen donated his ivories to the museum in 1997. The ivory objects included in the exhibition are part of the Art of the Ancient Americas collection.

The Smithsonian Institution

Founded in 1864, the Smithsonian Institution (SI) dedicated much time and effort to developing the field of American anthropology. As Curtis Hinsley notes, “the Smithsonian Institution dominated American anthropology from its founding…until the emergence of university departments after the turn of the century.”25 As the SI grew over time, different departments and museums were developed to house the variety of cultural artifacts, specimens, and other objects collected by the institution. Despite the evolution and growth of the institution over time, the SI’s mission has remained the same, “for the increase and diffusion of knowledge,” promoting the education and enlightenment of the public.26 Two of the SI’s nineteen museums contributed objects to GFA, the National Museum of Natural History (NMNH) and the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI). Much like the SI, both the NMNH and NMAI evolved from other institutions and collections.

National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

The National Museum of Natural History (NMNH) began as part of the United States National Museum (USNM) and became its own museum in 1957 after the USNM split into the Museum of Natural History and the Museum of History and Technology.

26 Ibid., 17.
The NMNH has a collection that ranges from natural science specimens to cultural artifacts and houses the Smithsonian’s Department of Anthropology. NMNH has been dedicated to educating the public about the natural world, encouraging visitors to access their collections both on site and via offsite programs, such as interactive websites. Today, the museum is considered “one of the great repositories of scientific and cultural heritage,” and is a site valued for its commitment to the advancement of knowledge for not only the American people, but also those from other nations. The combination of on-site and off-site opportunities to research the collection, from scheduling an appointment to accessing the museums collection records through the web, reveals an effort from the museum to make their collections known and available for public consumption.

The NMNH emphasizes their role as a research institution. As a resource for the public, the museum’s mission is to “inspire curiosity, discovery, and learning about nature, and culture through outstanding research, collections, exhibitions, and education.” While both cultural artifacts and natural science specimens make up the collection, the majority of the collection is dedicated to natural science, with the large amounts of flora and fauna preserved. Cultural artifacts, on the other hand, make up two

27 Michele Austin and others, “The Legacy of Anthropology Collections Care at the National Museum of Natural History,” *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation* 44, no. 3 (Fall-Winter 2005): 186.
million of the over 126-million items in the museum’s collection.\textsuperscript{30} The ivory objects included in \textit{GFA} come from the Department of Anthropology of the NMNH and are classified as part of the collection of archaeology, ethnology, and physical anthropology.


While the National Museum of the American Indian was established in 1989, and today has locations in both New York and Washington, DC, the museum began as a private institution located in New York.\textsuperscript{31} This museum, then known as the Museum of the American Indian (MAI), opened to the public in 1922 due to the efforts and avid collecting of George Gustav Heye.\textsuperscript{32} The collection of the MAI, which initially stemmed from Heye’s private collection, focused on the past of Native Americans, with little interest in contemporary tribes and community members.\textsuperscript{33} Heye’s collection, which began with a Navajo shirt purchased on a business trip to Arizona in 1897, grew to over 700,000 objects at the time of his death in 1957.\textsuperscript{34} After Heye’s death and over the next couple of decades, the MAI faced many financial problems, eventually leading to the Smithsonian’s acquisition of the museum in the late 1980s and the development of the NMAI. Despite the museum’s early beginnings, today the NMAI is considered “the first national museum dedicated to the preservation, study, and exhibition of the life,

\textsuperscript{32} Ira Jacknis, “A New Thing?” \textit{American Indian Quarterly} 30, nos. 3 and 4 (Summer and Fall 2006): 511.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 532.
\textsuperscript{34} Anne McMullen, “Reinventing George Heye,” in \textit{Contesting Knowledge}, ed. Susan Sleeper Smith (Nebraska: Nebraska UP, 2009), 71.
languages, literature, history, and arts of Native Americans." The assemblage of materials included in the NMAI’s collection range from objects of high aesthetic, religious, and historical value to those that were cultural artifacts from everyday life. The museum works together with Native American groups in learning more about their cultures and representing the Native point of view when it comes to cultural objects and contemporary art production.

As part of the museum’s mission, the NMAI made a strong commitment to learning more about Native groups, encouraging their participation in examining parts of the collection, and respecting the religious and spiritual nature of many of the artifacts. The museum uses Native techniques for handling and caring for many pieces in their collection, respecting the inherent significance many Native groups see in material culture. Unlike the other museums that are part of the Smithsonian, the NMAI dedicates itself to the groups represented in their collection, allowing Native Americans to come back into contact with materials related to their ancestors and history. The museum classifies their materials, such as Bering Strait ivories, according to the culture and people who created the objects, rather than material type.

*American Museum of Natural History, New York, New York*

Albert S. Bickmore founded the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH) in 1869 with the goal of opening, “the country’s greatest museum of natural history.”

Although the first museum building opened to the public in 1877, the appointment of Morris K. Jesup as museum director in 1880 transformed the museum to what it is today.


Jesup, who was one of the original founders, emphasized the importance of quality research and active collecting for successful exhibitions and is responsible for the early development of the museum’s extensive collection. From its founding, the AMNH made a direct link to anthropological concerns, hiring scholars like Franz Boas, known today as the founder of the American school of Anthropology, as key members of the staff. Boas, who worked for the AMNH from 1895 to 1905, helped shape the collection through the different expeditions he led, especially those in the arctic regions of the Pacific Northwest. Today, the collection includes a broad range of subjects from paleontology, anthropological artifacts, meteorites, and gems and minerals. The AMNH continues to partake in anthropological expeditions across the world, with projects in areas such as China.

The ivory artifacts from the AMNH’s collection included in GFA come from the museum’s Department of Anthropology. Significantly, the Department of Anthropology has been a part of the museum since 1873, four years after the museum’s founding. The department’s collection of over 500,000 objects covers areas such as Africa, Europe, Asia, the Pacific Islands, and the Americas and is dedicated to the study of both biology and human culture through material culture, cultural artifacts, and remains. The cultural artifacts, as described by David Preston, are displayed to convey their cultural significance and context, “so the visitor can understand how they were used and what they meant.” The emphasis on context and what this means for the viewing audience relates back to the original conception of the museum, which was to “recogniz[e] the

---

37 Ibid., 23.
39 Preston, Dinosaurs in the Attic, 183.
necessity of such as Museum as a means of education and recreation … which, while affording amusement and instruction to the public, will be the means of teaching our youth to appreciate the wonderful works of the Creator.”

The values that established the AMNH continue to reverberate in the museum’s current mission statement, focusing on the dissemination of knowledge through scholarly research and education.

Robert and Lisa Sainsbury Collection, University of East Anglia, Norwich, Norwich, England

The Robert and Lisa Sainsbury Collection is a significant part of the University of East Anglia’s museum, the Sainsbury Centre for Visual. Sir Robert and Lady Lisa Sainsbury donated their private collection to the university in 1973 and the center opened in 1978. The Sainsbury’s interest in modern sculpture and the human figure, like the work of Alberto Giacometti, inspired their art collecting practices, as well as the advice they received from different art dealers. Their collection includes not only the work of modern masters from Europe and the Americas, but also ancient objects from around the world. The Sainsbury’s donated their artwork to the University because they wanted to give both those in academia and the general public the opportunity to encounter great works of art. Their collections are also used as teaching aids for the different university departments, as well as other local schools and colleges.

Ancient Bering Strait ivories are represented in the Sainsbury’s North American collection, which includes objects from Alaska and the Northwest Coast and areas throughout the United States. The ancient ivories are some of the oldest works in their collection and include harpoon heads, combs, and carved human and animal figurines.

*State Museum of Oriental Art, Moscow, Russia*

Located in Moscow, Russia, the State Museum of Oriental Art is a public institution that has evolved since its 1918 founding and is the only specialized museum in all of the Russian Federation. Over the course of the twentieth century, the museum changed names several times. Initially, the museum was called Ars Asiatica. It evolved into the State Museum of Oriental Culture in 1925, then into the State Museum of Oriental People in 1962, to finally the State Museum of Oriental Art in 1992. The collections are organized according to region and include the Far East, the Near and the Middle East, South Eastern, South Central and Central Asia, the Caucasus and the Far North, and Tropical Africa, to name a few. While the collection focuses on objects of art and culture, both from archaeology and ethnology, the museum also has a large science research library. From the museum’s founding to today, archaeological expeditions helped build the collection and continue as a significant part of the museum’s research efforts. Notably, since January 1981, the museum has led permanent archaeological expeditions in the Northern Caucus, Central Asia, and Chukotka. The expedition at the Ekven burial site at Chukotka, where many of the objects included in *GFA* were discovered, began in 1987 with the intention of learning more about ancient Eskimo

---


45 Ibid.
lifeways in this area, and continues today.\textsuperscript{46} The State Museum of Oriental Art brings together the concerns of art history, archaeology, and science and encourages the fostering and development of knowledge through objects and analysis.

\textit{Alaska Heritage Museum at Wells Fargo, Anchorage, Alaska}

The Alaska Heritage Museum at Wells Fargo is a private institution located in Anchorage, Alaska. The Anchorage location is one of nine museums owned and operated by Wells Fargo, an investment company and bank. The other eight museums are located throughout the US in the following cities: San Francisco, Los Angeles, Sacramento, Old Sacramento, San Diego, Minneapolis, Portland, OR, and Phoenix, AZ. The museums are classified as “Wells Fargo History Museums,” and focus on exhibiting the role that Wells Fargo played throughout American history, as well as the evolution of the business to what it is today. The different history museums display both materials from Wells Fargo’s past, like historical documents and coins, and objects related to the specific museum’s location.

The Anchorage museum came to existence in 1968, as a result of the National Bank of Alaska. The collection includes Alaska Native artifacts, artwork of Alaskan artists, an extensive reference library focused on Alaska and its history, and the role Wells Fargo played in the Alaska gold rush era. The museum “celebrates the diverse cultural heritage of the many indigenous peoples of Alaska…[and] is the largest private

collection of its kind in Alaska." Native artifacts and ivory carvings make up a significant part of the museum’s collection; over 900 of these materials are a part of the collection.

*Alaska State Museum, Juneau, Juneau, Alaska*

Founded in 1900, the Alaska State Museum is a public institution dedicated to the collection, exhibition, and preservation of objects related to the human and natural history of Alaska. The museum came into existence at this time because Congress created the Historical Library and Museum for the Territory of Alaska. Despite the initial struggles the museum faced in finding adequate space for the collections and its inability to accommodate the public, the museum is presently a great resource for the outside community. Today the institution also includes the Sheldon Jackson Museum, founded in 1888, dedicated to the ethnographic work Reverend Dr. Sheldon Jackson did among Native Alaskans. The museum’s mission indicates that their primary focus is to, “interpret and disseminate knowledge of the history of the state, its people, its resources, and support others in these efforts,” in addition to giving the public access to the various collections and services that the individual museums have to offer.  

The Alaska State Museum’s collection includes items from both the Russian colonial era and the American period, sacred and secular Alaska Native material, fine art, and natural history materials. The Sheldon Jackson Museum’s collection focuses on Native Alaskan materials and offers objects from each of the Alaskan Native groups,
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such as the Tlingit, Yup’ik, and Inupiat. These two museums bring together the past and present material culture and art objects of Alaska and its evolution as a government entity. Ivory objects, like those included in the GFA are classified as Alaska Native material at this museum.

Fenimore Art Museum, Cooperstown, New York
Collections:
Eugene and Clare Thaw Collection

The Fenimore Art Museum is the site for exhibiting the objects and projects of the New York State Historical Association (NYSHA), which was founded in 1899. As the institution evolved over time, with interest coming in from different art collectors and those interested in the arts, the collection of the NYSHA grew from a small local association to the museum that it is today. The 1944 donation of the Fenimore house allowed the association to have a place where their collections could be highlighted. The NYSHA is a “private, non-governmental educational association,” thus making the Fenimore Art Museum a private entity.\(^49\) The museum describes their collections as a way for people to interact with cultural heritage, not only engaging discussion, but also inspiring the viewing audience.

Eugene and Clare Thaw donated a significant number of American Indian art objects to the organization in 1995, which facilitated the construction of the museum’s American Indian wing to house these materials.\(^50\) Since the donation of these materials, the museum has acquired other pieces of American Indian art from other donors and
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purchases, following in line with the ideals present in the Thaw’s collection. The museum describes these ideals as a “commitment to the beauty and artistry of American Indian art…[and] that the aesthetic power of American Indian art is equivalent to that from any culture.”  

The ivory objects at this museum are part of the American Indian Art collection.

_Anchorage Museum at Rasmuson Center, Anchorage, Alaska_  
Collections:  
Anchorage Municipal Acquisition Fund  
Gift of Rasmuson Foundation

The Anchorage Museum at Rasmuson Center is dedicated to the art and cultural production of Native Alaskans. Opened in 1968, the museum resulted from a joint public-private venture to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of Alaska’s purchase from Russia. Since 1992, the museum became home to the first regional office of the Smithsonian’s Arctic Studies Center. The museum grew tremendously since its founding in the mid-twentieth century, from a collection that began with 2,500 objects and sixty borrowed paintings to the current 17,500 objects in the permanent collection, a 2,000-piece educational artifact assemblage and over 350,000 historical photographs that make up the collection today. The museum is dedicated to Native Alaskan community members, promoting their respective cultures, practices, and beliefs. The museum brings together topics related to Alaskan art, history, anthropology, and science in their different exhibitions, programs, and education initiatives.  

At the Anchorage Museum, the ivory

---

51 Ibid.  
objects are part of the Alaska and circumpolar Native prehistoric and ethnographic materials collection.

*University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania*

Founded in 1887 on the principle of “occupying the space between science and art,” the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (hereafter, Penn Museum) has dedicated itself to research, exhibitions, collections, and education. The museum opened to the public in 1899 as the Free Museum of Science and Art. The exhibitions focused primarily on anthropological materials and cultural artifacts, and negotiated the difficulties associated with objects that did not neatly fit into the strict categories of art or science. To date, the museum has sponsored over four hundred anthropological expeditions to many different parts of the world, including places like Egypt, Africa, and Native American lands throughout much of North America. Today, the museum’s collection includes material culture and archaeological artifacts from all over the world, with sections representing each of these different areas of interest. The ivory objects included in *GFA* are part of the museum’s Americas section.

As a leader in issues related to cultural heritage, the institution passed the 1970 Pennsylvania Declaration, which condemned the exchange and trafficking of looted and illegally excavated cultural property, stressing the role museums should play in

---

preventing these activities from taking place.\textsuperscript{56} This declaration changed the way museums looked at objects with questionable provenance, discouraging museums from encouraging the illicit trade in antiquities. An important step towards the protection of international cultural property, the 1970 declaration impacted and shaped early ideas concerning cultural heritage and preservation.

\textit{Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, New York}

Collections:
Museum purchase, the Houghton Foundation gift
Michael C. Rockefeller Collection

The Metropolitan Museum of Art (hereafter, Met), located on Museum Mile in New York City, began in 1870 as a fine arts institution dedicated to the study and application of art. From its inception, the museum was described as being “comprehensive in its scope and purpose,”\textsuperscript{57} with the intention of “affording our whole people free and ample means for innocent and refined enjoyment… and for the cultivation of pure taste in all matters connected with the fine arts.”\textsuperscript{58} Today the museum is considered “one of the world’s largest and finest art museums,” with an encyclopedic art collection dating from prehistory to today.\textsuperscript{59} The collection includes over two million art works from all around the globe. The Met is an institution dedicated to art and aesthetics, whether it is eighteenth century furniture, Pre-Columbian art, or ancient

\textsuperscript{57} Winifred Eva Howe, \textit{A History of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Volume 1} (New York: Metropolitan Museum, 1913), 121.
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 122.
ivories from the Bering Strait. The ivory artifacts from GFA are included in the museum’s collection of art from Africa, Oceania, and the Americas.

The museum’s mission is to “collect, preserve, study, exhibit, and stimulate appreciation for and advance knowledge of works of art,” emphasizing its role as a public service for those interested in their collections. The Museum’s Trustees and the City of New York are both responsible for the Museum. The City owns the building and contributes to the maintenance and upkeep of the buildings, while the Trustees hold the responsibility of maintaining and supporting the collections.

Other Sources in GFA

Other sources for the material displayed in GFA include private collectors and one Native corporation. Eight private collectors contributed forty objects, or twenty-one percent, of all the ivories (Tables 1 and 3). The Amy and Elliot Lawrence collection contributed ten of the forty objects, making their collection the highest represented in this category (Table 3). One Native corporation, the Native village of Point Hope, the AMNH, and the US Bureau of Land Management contributed seven, or four percent, of the total objects displayed (Tables 1 and 4).

GFA Object Provenance

Based upon Chippindale and Gill’s (1993) analysis of Cycladic figures, I organize the exhibition’s ancient ivory objects based on their “security of provenance,” from specific to unidentified sites. In determining the scalar of provenance types, the
information provided in the exhibition catalogue served as the sole source of this analysis. The provenance types that emerged, from specific to non-specific, are: site specific, island/peninsula specific, regional attribution, “said to be,” unidentified/“said to be,” and unidentified. The provenance scale reveals how the objects in GFA fluctuate in terms of available contextual information. The site specific category means that the objects can be traced to a specific burial, archaeological site, or town among the different locales of the Bering Strait, such as “Burial 319, Ekven cemetery Chukota,” or “Mayuhaaq site at Gambell.”

The island/peninsula specific category refers to a provenance that lists either the island or peninsula from where the object originated, such as “St. Lawrence Island” or “Seward Peninsula.”

A regionally attributed provenance means that an object is noted as coming from or near an area in the Bering Strait. Two examples that best demonstrate this type of provenance are “Siberian coast of Bering Strait” and “collected near St. Michael,” which give a regional context for the object.

Unlike the provenances listed above, the language used for the remaining three on the provenance scale explicitly states the objects’ uncertain provenance. A “said to be” provenance appears as, “Said to be from Punuk Island,” while unidentifiable/”said to be” appears in the catalogue as, “provenance unknown, said to be from St. Lawrence Island,” and an unidentified provenance as “provenance unknown.” In moving from the more to less specific provenances, the amount of contextual information for each
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example drastically decreases. While an island or regional specific provenance does provide more information about where an object was found, this information is relatively worthless because it is devoid of any contextual details. In addition, this analysis shows the amount of varying information available for the objects included in the exhibition, emphasizing the values that different types of museums hold regarding objects of ancient origin.

*Lending Institutions and the Provenance Scale*

The ivories from museums, private collectors, and the Native corporation fall on different parts of the provenance spectrum. Of the seventy-seven site specific objects, sixty-nine are from museums, seven from the one Native corporation, and one from private collectors (Table 5). Although these numbers reveal a significant difference in available site specific provenance between museums and private collectors, both contributed a significant number of unidentified provenance objects to *GFA*, fifty-one from museums and twenty from private collectors (Table 5). When looking more closely at the specific museum collections listed, however, the majority of objects with an unidentified provenance come from the two PUAM collections, thirty from the Cotsen collection and eight from the Elliot collection. Despite the similarities and differences between museums and private collectors, the data reveals that museums proportionately contributed more objects with a site specific provenance than private collectors.

It is possible to further distill the provenance into two types: “specific” (i.e. site specific, island/peninsula specific, regional attribution) and “non-specific” (i.e. “said to be,” unidentified/”said to be,” and unidentified). As an object moves down the provenance scale from “specific” to “non-specific,” less information accompanies the
object in the collection concerning where and how the object was originally found. Breaking down the provenance information into “specific” and “non-specific” types reveals a marked difference between the information available for these ivory objects from both museum and private collections. Despite the fact that an equal number of objects are represented in both the “specific” versus “non-specific” provenance categories, ninety-one in each, museums contributed more “specific” objects than private collections (Table 6). Of the 142 museum objects, eighty-two have a “specific” provenance, with the remaining sixty as “non-specific.” The reverse is true for the private collectors because of the forty objects from private collectors, thirty-one fall into the “non-specific” provenance category, meaning only nine have a “specific” provenance, showing that museums are more likely to acquire objects with provenance than private collectors.

*Museum Sponsorship and Ivory Provenance*

Because museums contributed a large amount of ivories with both site specific and unidentified provenances, it is important to look at the specific contributing institutions to see if patterns arise on the institutional level. In order to assess this difference, the fifteen museum collections that contributed to GFA are further divided into two subtypes: “state” and “other public/university” sponsored (Table 7). The six “state” sponsored museum collections are the State Museum of Oriental Art, NMNH, Anchorage Museum Anchorage Fund, Alaska State Museum, Anchorage Museum Rasmuson Foundation, and NMAI. The nine “other public/university” sponsored museum collections are the PUAM Cotsen, East Anglia Sainsbury, PUAM Elliot,
Fenimore Art Museum Thaw, AMNH, Penn Museum, Met Museum Houghton, Met Museum Rockefeller, and Alaska Heritage Museum Wells Fargo. Out of the 142 ivories from museum collections, seventy-five ivories are from “state” collections with the remaining sixty-seven from “other public/university” collections (Table 8). Sixty-seven of the “state” sponsored objects, however, have a site specific provenance, with only two objects citing an unidentified provenance. Of the “other public/university” sponsored objects, on the other hand, only two have a site specific provenance, while an overwhelming forty-one citing an unidentified provenance. Although this information reveals a marked difference between the two museum subtypes, two museums contributed the majority of objects in each category. The State Museum of Oriental Art contributed sixty-three of the total “state” sponsored objects, all of which had a site specific provenance. Similarly, the Cotsen collection from the PUAM contributed thirty-five objects to the exhibition, thirty of which had an unidentified provenance.

Much like the information presented above showing the difference between museum and private collections, the objects from the two museum subtypes can be further distilled into “specific” versus “non-specific” provenance. Despite the fact that two museums made up the majority of the objects in both the site specific and unidentified provenance categories, “state” sponsored museums contributed more objects with a “specific” provenance than “other public/university” museums, and the reverse is true for objects with a “non-specific” provenance (Table 9). Seventy-two of the seventy-five objects from “state” sponsored museums had a “specific” provenance, while only ten out of the sixty-seven objects from “other public/university” museums fell into this category. The difference in information here demonstrates that “state” sponsored
museums are more inclined to acquire objects with “specific” provenances than “other public/university” sponsored museums, suggesting a relationship between the institution and the type of provenance valued.

Limitations

While the data establishes a difference in provenance for both museum versus private collections and the “state” versus “other public/university” museums, there are potential limitations to quantifying provenance through the use of an exhibition catalogue rather than the individual accession records from the specific museums. While archaeological field notes are commonly viewed as providing a detailed account of what was found during an excavation, the quality of these notes depends on who was doing the fieldwork and when the excavation took place. For example, the State Museum of Oriental Art has actively participated in the ongoing excavation at the Ekven, Chukota burial site since the 1980s; therefore, their field notes are more current than the AMNH expeditions led by Edward Nelson to St. Lawrence Island in the 1890s. The systematic documentation of archaeological sites has changed dramatically since the beginning of the twentieth century, with improvements in methodology, technological advances, and attention paid to the protection and preservation of the archaeological record. As noted in the GFA exhibition catalogue, any object that did not have this “official” excavation status could not be given a definite findspot, even if a Native community member documented its removal from the ground.

70 In the “Notes to the Reader” section of the catalogue, a note is made regarding the issue of provenance: “Objects included in this volume are presumed to be from the Bering Strait region; an object’s provenance, however, is given as “unknown” unless the
These limitations, however, also suggest the value and importance of “state” sponsored excavations, as well as the role of the academic archaeologist in preserving a site’s integrity and record. The State Museum’s ongoing excavation may in turn end up preserving the area’s archaeology, preventing subsistence digging from taking place. In addition, it may be a worthwhile project for more arctic archaeologists to go into the communities where subsistence digging is common, to establish public archaeology programs. Rather than critiquing what Native Alaskans are doing to their cultural heritage, the concerned Arctic anthropologists and archaeologists could become engaged with local community members to help document and preserve the area’s remaining ivory resources.

**Conclusion**

The *Gifts From the Ancestors* exhibition catalogue demonstrates that different institutions present varying amounts of information regarding provenance for the ancient ivories included in the exhibition. While the objects come from the same part of the world, the amount of contextual information regarding how, when, and where the objects were found varies drastically among the different contributing institutions. The Alaskan ivories are caught in what is known as the art versus artifact debate because some museums view them as works of art, while others see them as a document of an ancient culture. Because the objects come from a culture often classified as non-Western and indigenous, the materials do not neatly fit in a category such as painting, sculpture or

---


mixed media. Instead, the objects waver between being either a “(scientific) cultural artifact or a[n] aesthetic work of art,” with different scholars, such as art historians and anthropologists, aligning themselves with the classification that fits best with their discipline’s ideology.\textsuperscript{72}

Although aesthetes, art historians, and anthropologists clash when it comes to an artifact’s context, pitting the value of aesthetics against archaeological data, an object’s findspot provides an irreplaceable level of understanding about an object’s past.\textsuperscript{73} As legal scholar Patty Gerstenblith rightfully indicates:

\begin{quote}
The market’s appreciation for decontextualized objects and its emphasis on private ownership mire in a one-dimensional view of the value of objects as exclusively aesthetic. While scientific excavation does not impede this aesthetic value….the unregulated (antiquities) market certainly impedes scientific study.\textsuperscript{74}
\end{quote}

Context is lost when an artifact is improperly removed from the ground and cannot be reconstructed through the combination of studying an object’s aesthetic attributes and scholarly research. This is why an object’s provenance is a crucial factor to consider, especially for a similar body of objects like the ancient ivories in GFA.

As illustrated throughout my analysis, the issues of provenance go beyond the problems of looting and illegal excavation, calling attention to the disparities that occur on an institutional level. While it has often been assumed that different types of

\textsuperscript{72} James Clifford, \textit{The Predicament of Culture} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1988), 222.
institutions value different information when it comes to their respective collections, the
data presented here clearly quantifies how these assumptions directly correlate with an
object’s available provenance. The information presented in the GFA catalogue
reinforces that private collectors are concerned with an object’s physical appearance and
monetary value, while museums pay more attention to the history of an object.

Despite the fact that art and ethnographic museums tend to value different
information when it comes to an object straddling the art versus artifact divide, this study
suggests an alternate factor to consider: sponsorship. The sponsoring organizations for a
museum, in terms of donations and overall funding, may play a larger role than many
would believe, revealing the impact of patronage on the development of a museum’s
collection, through both donations and purchased acquisitions. When comparing the
“state” and “other public/university” museums, “state” sponsored museums contributed
seventy-two out of the eighty-two ivories with a “specific” provenance. In terms of
objects with a “non-specific” provenance, the “other public/university” museums
contributed fifty-seven of the sixty ivories in this category. The marked difference in
attributable provenance for objects from these two museum subtypes suggests the role of
the private donor for “other public/university” museums, reiterating that private
collectors focus more on aesthetics than context when acquiring objects, and revealing
how this impacts the information available in a specific museum’s collection.

Conversely, the data suggests that “state” sponsored institutions are more likely to
receive materials with more complete background information, like provenance, due to
the use of governmental agencies in archaeological excavations and the sources of
funding.
Using *GFA* as a case study to demonstrate where provenance stands in terms of information valued, the purpose of this paper is to introduce the role of the institution in acquiring and displaying archaeological materials. Calling attention to the role of the institution and its patrons moves the provenance argument beyond the problems and concerns of looting and undocumented digging, shifting the focus on the significant role that collectors play in the acquisition and exchange of antiquities and their impact on museum collections, through donations and bequests of unprovenanced antiquities. The data presented in this study explicitly shows that provenance is not universally valued, but rather contingent upon the collecting institutions and their key stakeholders, resulting in a corpus of materials, ranging in definitive provenance, despite similarities in appearance and regional attribution.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Number of Objects</th>
<th>Percent of Exhibition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Collections</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Corporations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Museums Contributing to Gifts From the Ancestors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Number of Objects</th>
<th>Percent of Exhibition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Museum, Moscow</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUAM, Cotsen Collection</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia, Sainsbury Collection</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUAM, Elliot Collection</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMNH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenimore Art Museum, Thaw Collection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Museum, Anchorage Fund</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska State Museum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMNH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Museum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Heritage Museum, Wells Fargo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Museum, Rasmuson Foundation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Museum, Houghton Foundation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met Museum, Rockefeller Collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Number of Objects</th>
<th>Percent of Exhibition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy and Elliot Lawrence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Collection, NY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Collection, NJ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry J. Lewis and Bachas Lewis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinchas Mendelson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Collection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Collection, VA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen and Sally Wardwell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Native Corporations in *Gifts From the Ancestors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporation</th>
<th>Number of Objects</th>
<th>Percent of Exhibition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Village of Point Hope, AMNH, and US Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Site Specific</th>
<th>Island/ Peninsula Specific</th>
<th>Regional Specific</th>
<th>“Said to be”</th>
<th>Unidentified/ “Said to be”</th>
<th>Unidentified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>State Museum, Moscow</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUAM, Cotsen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Anglia, Sainsbury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUAM, Elliot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NMNH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fenimore Art Museum, Thaw</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anchorage Museum, Anchorage Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alaska State Museum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMNH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Penn Museum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alaska Heritage Museum, Wells Fargo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anchorage Museum, Rasmuson Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Museum, Houghton Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Museum, Rockefeller</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NMAI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Museums | 69 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 51 | 142 |
Table 5. Object Provenance for Museums, Private Collectors, and Native Corporations (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Site Specific</th>
<th>Island/ Peninsula Specific</th>
<th>Regional Specific</th>
<th>“Said to be”</th>
<th>Unidentified/ “Said to be”</th>
<th>Unidentified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Collections</td>
<td>Amy and Elliot Lawrence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Collection, NY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Collection, NJ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perry J. Lewis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pinchas Mendelson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Collection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Collection, VA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allen and Sally Wardwell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Corporations</td>
<td>Native Village of Point Hope, AMNH, US Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Native</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. “Specific” vs. “Non-specific” Provenance in Museums and Private Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Type</th>
<th>“Specific”</th>
<th>“Non-Specific”</th>
<th>Total Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Collections</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. The Two Museum Collection Subtypes- “State” versus “Other Public/University”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum Subtype</th>
<th>Total Museums</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“State” Sponsored</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Other Public/University” Sponsored</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Object Provenance for “State” and “Other Public/University” Museums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>State Museum, Moscow</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NMNH</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anchorage Museum, Anchorage Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alaska State Museum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anchorage Museum, Rasmuson Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NMAI</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public/ University</td>
<td>PUAM, Cotsen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Anglia, Sainsbury</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUAM, Elliot</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fenimore Art Museum, Thaw</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMNH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Penn Museum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Museum, Houghton Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Museum, Rockefeller</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alaska Heritage Museum, Wells Fargo</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. “Specific” versus “Non-specific” Provenance for Contributing Museums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum Type</th>
<th>“Specific”</th>
<th>“Non-Specific”</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“State” Sponsored</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Other Public/University”</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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