

## Introduction: Encountering the Intersectional Archive

Rachel Bryant Davies and Erin Johnson-Williams

Dust is the opposite thing to Waste, or at least, the opposite principle to Waste. It is about circularity, the impossibility of things disappearing, or going away, or being gone. Nothing *can be* destroyed. The fundamental lessons of [nineteenth-century] physiology, of cell-theory, and of neurology were to go with this ceaseless making and unmaking, the movement and transmutation of one thing to another. Nothing goes away.<sup>1</sup>

What does it mean, today, to encounter the nineteenth-century archive? What legacies of power and understanding – racial, institutional, ideological – inform the ways in which archives are curated and read? As Carolyn Steedman evocatively describes in her book *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History*, the nineteenth century was a time when the idea of material ‘debris’ became reified, codified; and, out of compulsion, sometimes hidden.<sup>2</sup> In the epigraph above, Steedman relates the growth of the nineteenth-century archive to an impulse of ‘ordering’ the scientific (and also very imperial) western understandings of the world, where natural matter comprises a circular archive where ‘nothing *can be* destroyed’, and ‘nothing goes away’.<sup>3</sup> When the researcher enters the dusty archive, Steedman, drawing on Derrida’s construction of the Freudian ‘death drive’ in his essay ‘Archive Fever’,<sup>4</sup> describes how the historical researcher literally breathes in the airborne remnants of dead bodies once lived; the dust, emanating from ‘official’ archival documents, revealing its own story about what has been silenced. If nothing *can* go away because silenced ‘waste’ turns into particles that can never truly disappear, then the experience – both real and metaphorical – of breathing in archival dust is also an inherently physical, embodied inhalation of untold stories.<sup>5</sup> As explored vividly by scholars such as Nicola Abram, Christina

Sharpe, Imtiaz Habib, Saidiya Hartman and Sadiah Qureshi, new archival narratives can, indeed, emerge from intersectional enquiries, through asking critical questions and adopting new forms of observing and understanding.<sup>6</sup>

At a time when mortality rates in many countries across the globe are rising, and the lack of access to institutional archives for researchers has coincided with a fresh veneration for what we might call the ‘everyday ephemeral archive’ – pictures of rainbows by children; photos of chalk drawings; collections of diaries in community deposits for Covid-19 archives – it feels timely to be asking questions about what the (hidden) ‘dust’ of the nineteenth-century record can tell us about today’s world.<sup>7</sup> The context of ongoing UK Covid-19 lockdowns, in which we are writing this Introduction in 2021, might on the surface appear to alleviate the historical researcher from the burden of breathing in too much unwarranted, distracting, or uncomfortable archival dust. At the same time, the drive to ‘know’ the archive, even via digital, remote outlets, has perhaps only intensified academic fevers about the ‘archival time’ that Derrida once connected to being under ‘house arrest’,<sup>8</sup> as in reality we find ourselves enmeshed in a germ-conscious research ecosystem despite our disconnect from many material sources.<sup>9</sup>

This context of being ‘away’ from the institutional archive, and yet still under archival ‘house arrest’, offers a particularly crucial moment to examine how legacies of the past have shaped how we read, experience, and critically listen to the ‘debris’ of history. If ‘dust’ is at the core of a relational archive – where material records are bound up with legacies of power and cultural memory – then an interdisciplinary discussion about how history has shaped our perceptions of archival value and access is not only timely, but also vital to understanding the archival ecosystems around us today. From the threat of viral germs, to climate-conscious academics deciding not to travel by air for conferences or research, we face a future where what constitutes an ‘archive’ *must* be intersectional.

The context of Covid-19 lockdowns has therefore created a unique environment for new political discussions about power, historiography, and de/colonial value. Amidst the global rise

of the Black Lives Matter protests in the summer of 2020, and ongoing calls for decolonisation across academic and museum sectors, there has been a growth of conversations that explicitly link institutional power today to histories of nineteenth-century imperialism and bureaucratic control. Indeed, between an initial interdisciplinary workshop on the ‘Nineteenth-Century Archive as a Discourse of Power’ that we organised at Durham University through the Centre for Nineteenth-Century Studies (CNCS) in February 2019,<sup>10</sup> and the publication of this book, public conversations about institutions, ownership and access have reflected a rising sense of urgency around sensitively addressing ethical representation within archival holdings.<sup>11</sup>

Collaborating on this project between the disciplines of Classics and musicology – in which we as editors were respectively trained – we found that the commonalities between our work lay in how nineteenth-century attempts at ‘archiving’ simultaneously curated and silenced new forms of historical power, whether through modes of pedagogy, canon formation, historical writing, or performance. On a deeper structural level, we also found through our own experiences that many archival institutions today are endlessly grappling with their own legacies of how nineteenth-century structures of power – imperial, religious, capitalist – have shaped both their foundation and their legacies.

Such institutional and cultural reassessments have now brought academic discourses about the archive to a pivotal juncture. To a certain extent, the experience of compiling this collection of essays during a pandemic, combined with an increasing recognition of the urgent need to decolonise nineteenth-century history, provided us with an opportunity to examine our archival biases while being *away* from the archive – at least physically. On the one hand, spatial distance from ‘The Archive’ as a physical structure (i.e., as ‘an institution’) has inspired us to embrace a critical (re)assessment of the reification of archival authority as funnelled through a physical establishment. On the other hand, this enforced spatial distance has, to some extent, reinforced a fetishisation of the physical archive, as many researchers now long for an archival experience outside of their homes, and may now view archival institutions through increasingly

nostalgic lenses.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, despite many utopian claims about open-access online sources, the reality is that researchers still often need logins from elite institutions to access material behind paywalls, therefore rendering those without institutional affiliations or the financial means to fully access digital information powerless.<sup>13</sup> Archival inequalities endure through new technologies – but the inequalities themselves are not new.

### **Intersectional Methodologies**

The cover design for this book is intentionally abstract. To a certain extent, the multiplicitous images are (like the nineteenth-century archive itself), fantasies that invite readers to engage with their own preconceptions about the authority and permanence of the archive, as well as their attendant presumptions about access, and who the archive is really for.<sup>14</sup> Our cover does not point to any particular institutions because fantasies of the nineteenth-century archive, of course, do not ‘look like’ a homogenous entity: whether researchers imagine the archive to consist of wooden cabinets, shelves of boxed documents, glass cases, long corridors lined with books, or even no physical institution at all, depends on cultural conditioning. Moreover, many researchers are taught, often within inherently hierarchical systems of learning, that crossing the threshold of a prestigious institutional archive is a measure either of our own professional success – or of social, racial, or gendered privilege.<sup>15</sup>

The fetishisation of ‘accessing’ the archive as the pinnacle of ‘classified order’ has been inherited from the nineteenth century, a time when archival institutions (which had, of course, existed for centuries) were expanded, systematised and reified in unprecedented ways.<sup>16</sup> The standardisation and categorisation of the material world – and its peoples – through the rise of newly-regularised establishments such as prisons, schools, workhouses, museums, libraries, entertainment venues and universities, all came about through a substantial growth of bureaucratic forms of taxonomic systems that reified new hierarchies of classificatory power.<sup>17</sup> As the essays in this volume explore, however, the nineteenth-century archive existed both

within and beyond physical institutions, reflecting a range of overlapping intersectional negotiations of power through attempts at ordering, classifying, and narrating. Since most historical researchers today have, however, inherited many utopian fantasies about what an archive looks like (permanent; authoritative; categorical; ‘clean’, yet also ‘dusty’), it is increasingly imperative to untangle many of our ingrained assumptions about the archive as a space of relational encounter – past and/or present; physical and/or virtual.

These tensions are strongly indicative of what we call here a ‘new archival turn’ for the early 2020s: a time when the nineteenth-century archive is increasingly understood to replicate western institutional hierarchies (imperial, settler colonial, religious or nationalist). The ‘new archival turn’, as embodied by the essays in this volume, envisions the historical archive as a relational site of discourse that is in constant tension with how nineteenth-century legacies are represented, fetishised, and challenged in the present day.

The ‘archive’ more broadly is increasingly receiving critical scholarly attention. After Thomas Richards set the scene with publication of *The Imperial Archive* in 1993, more recent interdisciplinary research by scholars including Kirsty Reid and Fiona Paisley, Ann Laura Stoler, Antoinette Burton, and Tony Ballantyne has engaged with such themes as postcolonialism and the construction of colonial archives as forms of power, which in turn have profound implications for nineteenth-century scholarship.<sup>18</sup> Building on research across the humanities on the ‘archival turn’ as a way to critique how archives have shaped the writing of history,<sup>19</sup> we propose that the intersectional connections across our chapters demonstrate how a ‘new archival turn’ is explicitly – and inescapably – in dialogue with the conversations around decolonisation and institutionalised power that are happening in the present day. As we explore, a ‘new archival turn’ is as much about how the historical archive shapes our understanding of present-day power structures (archival or otherwise), as much as it is a study of the past. We therefore intend *Intersectional Encounters* to open possibilities for collaborative engagement with the nineteenth-century archive in all its various manifestations, examining, through specific case studies, how

snapshots of different sorts of archival production and interpretation influence institutional discourses today. Our chapters broach critical and topical questions about how the complex discourses of power involved in creating nineteenth-century archives have impacted, and continue to influence, constructions of knowledge across disciplinary boundaries – and beyond the confines of academia.

Drawing upon disciplinary fields including – but not limited to, and frequently speaking across – literature, classical reception, musicology, museum studies, biography, visual culture, and colonial history, this volume challenges the power structures that have framed, and continue to inform, the nineteenth-century archive. Written from this wide range of interdisciplinary perspectives, our authors grapple with urgent problems, including how to deal with potentially sensitive nineteenth-century archival items, both within academic scholarship and in present-day public-facing institutions, which often reflect colonial and imperial, racist, sexist, violent, or elitist ideologies and taboos. The interdisciplinary and intersectional connections between the chapters here demonstrate how the legacies of the nineteenth-century archive resonate across contexts both past and present, and are in dialogue with notions of archival authority that are being challenged (and yet, sometimes reinforced) in the present day.

The ‘meeting place’ of the nineteenth-century archive serves as an intersectional focal point across all fifteen chapters. Coming from multiple disciplinary backgrounds in museum curatorship and academia – many of which were established during the period under discussion<sup>20</sup> – our authors consider the nineteenth-century archive to be a site of entrenched *systemic* ways of ordering the world. We suggest, moreover, that the force of the nineteenth-century archive, both then and now, was inherently interdisciplinary and intersectional, and that nineteenth-century archival legacies can be understood most constructively through dialogues across and between different forms of media.

In initiating this interdisciplinary conversation, our questions were: What is a nineteenth-century archive, broadly defined? Do archival holdings today still run the risk of perpetuating the

ideological frameworks within which they were created? What are the discourses that lie behind the institutional collection, preservation, exhibition of, and access to, such material – and what are the ethical implications for the researcher, curator, and public historian? And finally, as we ‘re-encounter’ the physical archive through the lifting of Covid lockdown restrictions, will we critique, reify, or re-appreciate material holdings in productive ways? In developing our intersectional approach, we suggest that the points of connection between these essays fit into the four categories of ‘Archival Ownership’, ‘Colonial Power’, ‘Biographical Silences’ and ‘Layered Archives’. Each of these sections explores how the nineteenth-century archive created and reinforced both explicit and implicit forms of power. We also highlight particular strands that emerge across each section, such as material which illuminates issues of gender, religion, state power, the metropole vs. the provincial, and children’s culture. Together, our authors suggest how such intersectional approaches to archival interpretation are necessary for engagement with the archive, both within and beyond the university and the museum.

Jennifer C. Nash has defined intersectionality as the ‘notion that subjectivity is constituted by mutually reinforcing vectors of race, gender, class, and sexuality’.<sup>21</sup> For more than twenty years, scholars, activists, educators, and lawyers have employed the concept of intersectionality both to describe problems of inequality and to fashion concrete solutions. In particular, as the *Washington Post* reported in 2015, ‘the term has been used by social activists as both a rallying cry for more expansive progressive movements and a chastisement for their limitations’.<sup>22</sup> Drawing on Black feminist and critical legal theory, Kimberlé Crenshaw first coined the concept of intersectionality as a term to reflect the multiple social forces, social identities, and ideological instruments through which power and disadvantage are expressed and legitimised.<sup>23</sup> As Crenshaw argues, an intersectional approach to history can also help to reveal that archival omissions are as powerful as their inclusions:

Black women are sometimes excluded from feminist theory and antiracist policy discourse because both are predicated on a discrete set of experiences that often does not accurately reflect the interaction of race and gender. These problems of exclusion cannot be solved simply by including Black women within an already established analytical structure. Because the intersectional experience is greater than the sum of racism and sexism, any analysis that does not take intersectionality into account cannot sufficiently address the particular manner in which Black women are subordinated.<sup>24</sup>

Crenshaw's idea of intersectionality has been enormously influential across the academic humanities.<sup>25</sup> The 2019 edited volume *Intersectionality and Higher Education* has further shown how an intersectional framework can forge new understandings of the structures of power, race and inequality within the higher education sector.<sup>26</sup> Increasingly, intersectionality has been incorporated as a framework for discussions on gender and decolonisation,<sup>27</sup> and as a tool for examining the historical archive.<sup>28</sup>

This volume offers a sustained examination of how intersectional approaches to the nineteenth-century archive can reveal a more nuanced understanding of what the archive has been – and can be. If the nineteenth-century archive is an inherently relational space, where exhibition and concealment are two sides of the same coin, we consequently hold that it is also an intrinsically intersectional site of encounter. The chapters in this volume therefore comprise complementary approaches to archival subjectivity, revealing the strength and limitations of the archive for historical understanding – as well as a redefinition of what the archive is, whether as a physical document, a visual image, or even a fragmented memory of a song once sung. From the chapters that engage with race and colonisation (Lawrence; Heath; Laing; Johnson-Williams, Morosetti; Lowther), to biographical and communal censorship (Phillips; Burnett; Davis; Short; Laing), to how curating the past was itself an archival curation for the future (Short; Barringer; Bryant Davies), our essays encompass vastly different archival genres and medias. For this



reason, we chose not to focus on only one empire: British, Dutch and French cultures of imperialism are discussed, and chapter case studies touch upon Britain, The Netherlands, South Africa, Canada, India and Australia. We encompass both specific museums, with chapters on the Oriental Museum (Barclay et al), the Tropenmuseum (Lawrence), The Bowes Museum (Phillips), and the V&A (Watson Jones; Barringer), as well as the more abstract idea of the archive as a form of literature (Laing), visual culture (Lowther; Barringer), music (Johnson-Williams), theatre history (David) and biography (Morosetti; Phillips; Burnett).

Our primary intersectional meeting point, therefore, is the broader growth, across western Europe and the post/colonial world, of an intersectional nineteenth-century archive, where issues of race, representation, colonialism, gender, and scientific categorisation are all relevant. These themes, moreover, speak to the sedimentation of – and resistance to – enduring classifications of gender, race, science, class, and highbrow vs. lowbrow art, which (as is seen in Barringer’s vivid image of ‘Albertopolis’) became deeply institutionalised during the long nineteenth century. We ultimately hold that the nineteenth-century archive was a location of persistent value systems that, in and of themselves, systematically omit and censure marginalised voices. As such, we propose that a ‘new archival turn’, as a form of archival ‘encountering’, is an indispensable tool for bringing the silences of history into dialogue with the conversations about equality and repatriation that are happening in the present. We therefore suggest that a critical engagement with nineteenth-century historiographical legacies, today, can be a form of archival activism. In this framework, interdisciplinary and intersectional encounters with a range of sources *as* ‘performances’ of a historical archival imaginary can reimagine and resituate the nineteenth century as a site where that which was once deemed ephemeral, or that which was once silenced, ultimately becomes as (or more) powerful than a written record.<sup>29</sup>

A useful perspective for approaching the idea of an archive as a discourse of power has long been Michel Foucault’s notion of the ‘archaeology’ of knowledge, which enables the historian to describe the discourse of meanings within institutional structures, including archival

formations.<sup>30</sup> Further, as explored in Johnson-Williams' discussion of colonial incarceration, Foucault's discussion of biopower in *The History of Sexuality* as a political rationality concerned with the administration of living bodies is a powerful metaphor for the institutional compulsion to order and categorise.<sup>31</sup> As Foucault maintained, the nineteenth century was an era in which administration, examination, imprisonment and institutional archiving became systematised in unprecedented ways. Yet Foucault does not write about race and colonial contexts, and much of his work, as argued by Alison Howell and Melanie Richter-Montpetit, rests on an unspecified concept of 'the human', which does not account for how nineteenth-century notions of humanity were 'constituted through the savage and slave other'.<sup>32</sup> In approaching the archive with an intersectional mindset, we acknowledge Foucault's influence but also recognise that concepts of power, discourse and control need to be brought into a decolonial dialogue about community, identity, and shared collective memory.

Moving on from strictly Foucauldian and/or Derridean discourses about archives as a form of power and discourse, interdisciplinary conversations over the last several decades have embraced the possibilities of using postcolonial and decolonial approaches to study how social practice, language, and performance have shaped historical narratives. Motivated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's landmark question, 'Can the Subaltern Speak?',<sup>33</sup> studies in agency and decolonisation have explored questions of narrativity and resistance.<sup>34</sup> Understanding the archive, echoing Steedman, as a 'relational' entity creates space for examining how nineteenth-century archives were fundamentally shaped by the mobility of global travel and encounter, rather than simply through the establishment of static institutions. Mary Louise Pratt's concept of the 'contact zone' is useful, here, as a metaphor for the archive as a location of intersectional encountering: Pratt articulates the colonial contact zone as a space where relations between the coloniser and colonised are improvised, co-present, interactive, and interlocking 'within radically asymmetrical relations of power'.<sup>35</sup>

We argue that the various disciplines represented in this volume have significant potential for reframing the archive as a relational, performative and ‘live’ site of encounter that is not tied to a specific institution, geographical remit or canon alone. The challenge, of course, is that nineteenth-century reifications of power through classification and canonisation have created deep-seated legacies of ‘ordering’, which carry contingent value systems. Drawing on our backgrounds in Classics and musicology, we found that the nineteenth century was a time when the content considered ‘worthy’ of preservation for future generations became ‘set’ and canonised according to newly-entrenched elite-versus-popular value judgements. It is, therefore, the critical attention to archival ephemera, archival silences, and the various overlapping archival meanings facilitated in an intersectional archive that will enable more flexible, antiracist and critical narratives to emerge in the future.

There have been various attempts in recent years, within our own respective disciplines, towards re-envisioning a critical approach to the archive. In musicology, a forthcoming special issue of *Postcolonial Studies* on ‘Music, Empire, Colonialism: Sounding Out the Archives’ examines how music and sound were in dialogue with the formation of colonial archival power and authority.<sup>36</sup> While these articles are limited to the British imperial context, this work draws on attempts in musicology over the last couple of decades to relocate empire as an influential part of nineteenth-century music history, in terms of canon formation, reception, and value.<sup>37</sup> There has also been a recent upsurge of publications on music, empire and colonialism outside of the British empire, although not much specifically on the ‘archive’ and nineteenth-century history.<sup>38</sup> Overall, the relative reticence in much ‘mainstream’ historical musicology to engage with the archive might be explained by Kofi Agawu’s comment that ‘unlike political history, with its kingdoms and wars, migrations and inventions, music – an art of sound and a performing art in an oral culture – leaves different, more complex and elusive traces on the historical record’.<sup>39</sup> Notably, where music studies *has* recently turned its attention to the archive, this has often been with regard to ethnomusicological fieldwork,<sup>40</sup> or contexts of digital record-keeping.<sup>41</sup> Exceptions

that do integrate historical questions with the idea of musical archiving include, but are not limited to, Annegret Fauser's reflection on historical archives as 'sites of listening' to histories of violence; Antti-Ville Kärjä's consideration of historiography and the role of the archive for the preservation of popular music heritage; and Lizabé Lambrechts's exploration of the relation between institutional musical archives, decolonisation, and curricular reform.<sup>42</sup> What will be useful, for our purposes, will be to bring these conversations about musical ephemera, constructed communities, and archival 'belonging' into dialogue with nineteenth-century historical memory, asking how a more intersectional approach to archiving can initiate a broader understanding of the past.

In Classics, many nineteenth-century archives have fallen through disciplinary cracks, despite the prevalence of classical allusions and imagery in nineteenth-century elite and popular culture.<sup>43</sup> Since the establishment of the now-burgeoning field of classical reception, controversy has raged over the selection of material to be included in reception histories of Greco-Roman antiquity.<sup>44</sup> The role of Classics as a subject within the British Empire and its colonies has been examined,<sup>45</sup> and the collections, display, and accessibility at institutions such as the British Museum, Crystal Palace, and Berlin's Pergamonmuseum have also been studied, as has the reconstruction of ancient artefacts in museum displays considered as a nineteenth-century colonial enterprise.<sup>46</sup> The role of archaeology, as it became highly visible in museums, newspapers, and popular culture<sup>47</sup> – against the wider backdrop of privileged educational curricula and institutions,<sup>48</sup> and the recent focus on uncovering non-elite, middle-class, and working-class sources,<sup>49</sup> as well as those which illumine women's<sup>50</sup> and children's<sup>51</sup> encounters with Greco-Roman antiquity – demonstrate the increasing variety of the archives used to reconceptualise the field. Within Classics and classical reception, more broadly, an emphasis on 'ethical, diverse, intersectional, and especially feminist' Classics has also been found in digital spaces, such as the online journal *Eidolon* (2015–2020),<sup>52</sup> as well as in printed monographs,<sup>53</sup> a new series on 'Intersectionality in Classical Antiquity' from Edinburgh University Press, and a

renewed surge of studies on Black and decolonising Classics.<sup>54</sup> Across the growing interdisciplinary tendency to draw on a wide range of archives and theorise in different ways, it will be interesting to see how these trends continue to merge from and merge with nineteenth-century classical reception.

### **Towards a ‘New Archival Turn’: Embedded Archival Activism**

We propose that a ‘new archival turn’ envisions the historical archive as a relational site of discourse that is in constant dialogue with how nineteenth-century legacies are played out in the present day. Our essays encompass a variety of understandings of intersectionality to illustrate such a ‘new archival turn’, and to broaden interpretations of ‘archives’ to uncover a range of power dynamics and (im)balances. Our scope deliberately emphasises the people, communities, and relationships inherent in the formation and usage of archives, promoting a human, relational dimension to a concept that can appear impersonal or individual. Shared concerns, across all the essays, are communities of people, constructed and understood in very different ways, and whose relationships to the archives vary: stakeholders, readerships, visitors, viewers listeners/singers/performers; creators and participants; researchers and archivists/curators; historical figures, and biographical subjects. Each essay grapples with the issue of archival gaps and silences, and the subjective metaphorical possibilities of experience. Another commonality is the analysis of challenging case-studies which reshape ‘the archive’ and reflect on different expressions of power and discourse in archival formation.

The essays are arranged in roughly chronological order within four complementary sections: ‘Archival Ownership’, ‘Colonial Power’, ‘Biographical Silences’ and ‘Layered Archives’. The essays also intersect across these categories (as spelled out below), but this structure enables exploration of some key shared concerns, as well as contrasting different disciplinary approaches.

The collection opens with three essays on ‘Archival Ownership’, which explore some of the most visible, familiar examples of nineteenth-century archives: museum displays. Such

outward-facing archives are frequently in the public eye as controversies over repatriation continue to rage, with increased focus on provenance, display narrative, and community engagement. These essays explore specific displays, which all sought community input into arrangement and labelling, across different institutions with significant nineteenth-century collections: a University teaching and research collection from the North-East of England (The Oriental Museum), Amsterdam's Tropenmuseum, a major 'museum of world cultures', and London's Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A). Collections and displays are a constant feature of the book: we return to County Durham, to The Bowes Museum, in Chapter 10, and to the V&A in the Afterword (Chapter 15), while Chapter 14 discusses nineteenth-century perceptions of the British Museum's displays. This section, however, shares a focus on the relationships between individual institutions *as* institutions – their mission statements, their formation, and their collections and displays – and stakeholders: visitors, community focus groups, donors (whether modern and willing or historically-forced), curators, and researchers.

We begin with “‘Found in Store’: Working with Source Communities and Difficult Objects at Durham University's Oriental Museum’, written collaboratively by a team of curators: Rachel Barclay, Lauren Barnes, Gillian Ramsay, Craig Barclay, and Helen Armstrong. Two case-studies drawn from the internationally outstanding collections, which have their origins firmly rooted in the colonial era despite the Museum's 1960s foundation, examine the processes of co-development and co-curation on different scales: an individual object, and an entire gallery. The creation of a permanent gallery for Himalayas, South Asia and Southeast Asia (2013–2015), and the deaccession of an individual object following student-led research into its provenance (2017–2021) centre upon stakeholders, engaged with colonial legacies, and deal with the issue of repatriation. The issues of curatorial decisions, stakeholder feedback, community participation, and sensitivities surrounding repatriation and provenance introduced here are the focus of the following two chapters.

Adiva Lawrence, in her essay on ‘Transforming the Archive of Slavery at the Tropenmuseum’, examines ‘Afterlives of Slavery’, a semi-permanent exhibition (2017–2021) exploring the legacies of transatlantic slavery in contemporary Dutch society. The Tropenmuseum was founded in 1864 as a colonial ethnographic museum, and is now part of the Dutch National Museums of World Cultures. Expanding on Foucauldian metaphors of the archival ordering, Lawrence explains how its innovative curatorial choices aimed at changing the narrative about the impact of slavery on Dutch history. In assessing this attempt to promote new, radical approaches to slavery, she argues for the adoption of methodologies aiming at effectively disrupting the colonial archive from within.

Just as these two studies reflect on curatorial decisions and co-curation with community participants including artists, so the final essay of this section considers the role of contemporary museum practice in both challenging and reinforcing the legacies of colonialism through the example of the V&A’s Ethiopian collections. In ‘Maqdala and the South Kensington Museum: 150 Years Later’, Alexandra Watson Jones reflects on the ‘Maqdala 1868’ anniversary display of around 20 objects connected to the British Expedition to Abyssinia in 1868. The display, which she developed in consultation with the Ethiopian embassy in London and advisory community groups, considered the role of the objects as witnesses to a significant period in Ethiopian and British history, and addressed the ongoing conversations surrounding looted objects in UK museums.

The problematic role of imperial and military power in acquiring loot by force, and in shaping contentious discourses surrounding the ongoing holding and display of these items, is further illuminated by the volume’s second section, which focuses on the role of ‘Colonial Power’ in shaping nineteenth-century archival encounters. Four interdisciplinary essays explore how political and ideological power shaped colonial archives in arenas ranging from scientific artwork, coercive music-making, the rhetoric of children’s literature, and the codification of police records.

David Lowther's essay 'Encountering Colonial Science in the Visual Archive: The Natural History Paintings of Raja Serfoji II of Tanjore (1777–1832)' highlights a collection of paintings depicting southern Indian wildlife which merge South Asian and European practices of knowledge creation. Held for many years in the archives of the East India Company, the paintings are now in the British Library (London). Setting these paintings within the context of the colonial scientific networks in which visual culture played a prominent role, Lowther analyses these paintings as fundamentally distinct from, although drawing upon, contemporary colonial methods and preoccupations.

Moving from visual art to music, and from colonial scientific networks to missionary imperialism, Erin Johnson-Williams examines the role of hymn singing within institutions of biopolitical 'enclosure' in colonial Canada and post/colonial South Africa, in her essay 'Enclosing Archival Sound: Colonial Singing as Discipline and Resistance'. Given that acts of coercive music-making are often absent from official institutional archives, Johnson-Williams challenges Foucauldian discourses of institutional power by exploring how singing in spaces of colonial incarceration both reinforced and resisted imperial narratives of disciplinary containment. She proposes that, while the hymn may have been largely silenced by the archive of empire, its archival traces confirm the potential of singing as a way to negotiate a more resistive sonic 're-archiving' of imperial violence.

Our next essay also juxtaposes canonical genres of colonisation and education (moving here from hymns to children's books) within coercive, supposedly educational, contexts. In 'The Infantilisation of Indigeneity in Colonial Australia', Roisín Laing analyses the rhetorical devices through which a supposedly canonical text, Jeannie Gunn's *The Little Black Princess* (1905), idealises a parent-child model of settler-Indigenous relations. Its rhetoric – and particularly the child reader it implies – obscure some of this text's racism. By contrast, many archived texts – those kept behind physical or, increasingly, digital, walls – articulate quite explicitly both the ideology underlying infantilisation, and its colonial functions. A comparative analysis of these



readings demonstrates that infantilisation is consonant with the ideological construction of a white Australia, and therefore with historical acts of genocide associated with this ideology. Laing then draws on writing by Indigenous authors, systematically neglected in the historiography of colonialism, to complicate the vision of white Australia perpetuated in white archives and literary canons.

Deana Heath's contribution, 'Some Nameless, Dreadful Wrong': Reading the Silencing of Police Rape in the Indian Colonial Archive', similarly examines ways of drawing out and making visible acts of violence in historical sources. Heath investigates how acts of rape committed by the Indian police have been coded in the colonial archive. Focusing on the rape of a subaltern mother and daughter, which culminated in their suicide and the conviction of their rapists – all members of the Indian police – for wrongful confinement rather than rape, she interrogates how the process of making sexual violence visible reveals the limits of such visibility: subaltern women and girls could only enter the colonial archive as a victim of their own act of self-destruction, in light of the colonial state's need to hide the sexually predatory nature of its violence workers.

The prevalence of silences in the colonial archive, and the taboos surrounding sexual health, leads us on to our third section, 'Biographical Silences'. Zooming in on three individual case-studies whose biographies are conditioned by imperialism (from both ends of privilege and exploitation), we see the challenges of constructing individual experiences in the face of archival gaps and silences – and how such intersections play out – when the privileged spaces of nineteenth-century Britain came into contact with various facets of empire, whether this be through theatrical exhibitions or education. Arranged chronologically, these chapters consider subjects ranging from an exhibited person, as seen through the eyes of London's spectators, including theatrical stars such as Kemble; a marriage between aristocratic landowner and a French actress; and a Black student at Oxford University.

In ‘Completing the Mosaic: Sara Baartman and the Archive’, Tiziana Morosetti examines scholarly approaches since the 1980s to the colonial material on Sara Baartman (c.1789–1815), who was exhibited in London as the ‘Hottentot Venus’ from 1810. Morosetti argues that, in pursuing present-day political agendas, scholarship on Baartman has re-inscribed the ‘text’ of her life with *expectations* of what primary sources should contain: employing absolute notions of whiteness and Europeanness have supported the symbolism of Baartman’s Blackness in contemporary debates, while ventriloquising for Baartman has masked the absence of her voice from the archive. Morosetti’s essay suggests the inescapability of archival evidence and a need to respect the silences of both Baartman and the archive in assessing her significance and legacy.

Whereas Morosetti surveys the absence of an exhibited person’s own voice from the archive, our next essay examines how some personal aspects of collectors’ lives, which can be pieced together from archival evidence and which influenced the formation of the collection, have not been included in the narrative of their legacy museum. Judith Phillips, in ‘Mercury, Sulphur Baths, and Fine Art: Censorship and the Sexual Health of John and Joséphine Bowes, Founders of The Bowes Museum’, explains how discussions of the sexual health of John (1811–1885) and his wife Joséphine (1825–1874) are notably missing from displays relating to the museum’s narrative despite archival evidence that was suppressed (sub)consciously in the past. Phillips considers the Bowes’ sexual health within the context of censorship and ‘hidden’ stories found in the shadows of the archives. Their childlessness, moreover, potentially contributed to the decision to collect fine and decorative art and found a public museum. Reasons for their childlessness are largely absent from the museum’s public narrative, raising questions over how, or even whether, to balance the privacy of the founders’ personal lives, a fuller archival narrative, and the market imperative to offer a family-friendly visitor experience.

Continuing the exploration of disconnects between public and private, Philip Burnett’s essay, ‘Empowering the Invisible: The Archival Legacy of Christian Cole’, explores how the life of Christian Frederick Cole (1851/2–1885) is documented. Recognised as the first Black African

to be awarded a BA from the University of Oxford, and to practise law in the English Courts, Cole was educated by Anglican missionaries in Sierra Leone and published seven pamphlets. Burnett examines the disconnect between the institutional recognition of Cole's achievements and his material obscurity, compounded by the scattering of scant information about him in archival repositories around the world. He suggests that focusing on the networks and spaces Cole inhabited is essential to the historiography of his biography, and to understanding broader struggles for the shifting identities of the Black intelligentsia in the nineteenth century.

The shared concern of these three essays with archival, biographical absences, which also highlight tensions between the taboo topics of archival fetishisation and censorship, is continued in our fourth and final section, 'Layered Archives'. Jemima Short explores the archival practices of three religious congregations founded in mid-nineteenth-century France in 'The Power of Invisibility: Nursing Nuns and Archival Gatekeeping'. Catholic women in these congregations cared for the poor and socially marginalised. Despite the scale and importance of their work, the invisibility of nursing nuns in the historical archive of medicine and welfare, and in historical scholarship, is a widely-recognised issue. Short highlights how congregations perpetuate their own invisibility by restricting access to their records, thereby limiting the possibility for histories of their patients to be written. She explores the negotiations between researchers and congregations and the ethical challenges which must be addressed when writing congregational histories.

Jim Davis, in 'The Instability and Ideology of the Archive: Archival Evidence and Nineteenth-Century British Theatre Audiences', also focuses on the instability of archival evidence available for research in nineteenth-century British theatre audiences. Drawing on memoranda, letters, police reports and other theatre-related documents preserved in the Lord Chamberlain's Papers in the Public Record Office, Davis considers the value and limitations of this evidence in relation to the social, political, and cultural factors impacting government oversight of British theatre. In considering the origins of British theatrical collections, and the

ways in which content and preservation choices have been determined (including through digital resourcing), he also explores the archive as a source for creativity and performance, contextualised within the broader discourses pertaining to contemporary notions of the archive.

The challenges of excavating archival evidence for spectatorship are taken up by Rachel Bryant Davies in her essay “‘Our Mind Strives to Restore the Mutilated Forms’: Layered Archives of Virtual Museum Tours in Nineteenth-Century Children’s Periodicals’. Concentrating on another ephemeral popular medium, children’s magazines, she proposes that virtual tours of museum displays represent a crucial resource for understanding how nineteenth-century child consumers were acculturated into idealised interactions with the ‘classical’ past through museum displays and cheap print. Bryant Davies argues that this multi-layered archive of museum curation and spectating formed mediated ‘meta-archives’ which illumine how imaginatively restored sculptural fragments facilitated acculturation into gatekeeping of museum displays, and how debates surrounding the acquisition, significance, and repatriation of ancient artefacts were communicated. Her essay demonstrates that informally didactic explanations of the notoriously controversial display of the Parthenon Sculptures in the British Museum’s Elgin room epitomises wider intersections between preservation, collection, display, and public engagement.

Together, these instances of archival silence and invisibility demonstrate how nineteenth-century hierarchies of power persist into the present. These themes are further explored by Tim Barringer in his concluding essay, ‘Intersectional Albertopolis’. Barringer draws together themes from across the essays as a way of re-examining the institutions at South Kensington, from the Crystal Palace and the South Kensington Museum to the Albert Hall and the Royal College of Music. This cultural state machinery formed a fulcrum for the processes of liberal governmentality in Victorian Britain. The institutions aimed to bring together art, industry, science, horticulture, music, natural history, and imperial commercial knowledge under the patronage of the Crown, a spectacular display of power over objects and ideas, and the very essence of the imperial nineteenth-century archive.

## Summary of Themes

As indicated above, the chapters here overlap in different ways across and within their intersectional themes. While all the essays are in dialogue with intersectionality in their approach to the archive, the four sections emphasise their most constructive congruences. Overall, our authors interrogate key points of contention across the broad themes of: archival silences (Johnson-Williams; Heath); visibility and invisibility (Phillips, Burnett; Short); archival gatekeeping (Barclay et al; Watson Jones; Burnett; Short; Davis; Bryant Davies); decolonial challenges to Foucauldian power systems (Lawrence; Heath; Johnson-Williams); biography as archive (Laing; Morosetti; Phillips; Burnett); archival fragments and ephemera (Lowther; Bryant Davies; Laing); communal memory and education (Burnett; Johnson-Williams); censorship (Davis; Short; Phillips; Heath); racial voyeurism (Morosetti; Lawrence; Watson Jones); religion and control (Johnson-William; Short); children’s literature as archive (Laing; Bryant Davies); visual culture as archive (Lowther; Bryant Davies; Barringer); and the institutionalisation of museums as a metaphor for an archive of empire (Barringer). The chapters focusing on specific museums, moreover, suggest and exemplify strategies for institutions to drive practical change, to incorporate a more diverse and decolonial range of voices, and to engage new audiences.

The ‘new archival turn’ as we understand it is therefore necessarily, and vitally, intersectional, and will help to pave connections between academic research and decolonial conversations happening more broadly in popular media and education sectors. During our compilation of this volume, we have tracked a marked increase in press conversations about archival repatriation, where words such as ‘looted’ – to refer to the bringing of material objects from the rest of the world to Britain, for example – are becoming more common.<sup>55</sup> On 7 May 2021, for example, an article by Dan Hicks in *The Guardian* argued strongly in favour of repatriating material objects from museums, concluding that decolonial actions of returning stolen objects to the cultures that they were taken from ‘are overdue measures to keep Britain’s

global museums in step with an ever-changing world'.<sup>56</sup> A month later, another *Guardian* article described protests over the reopening of the Museum of the Home as part of a 'growing row around controversial statues across the country – including the decision of Oriel College at the University of Oxford to keep a statue of British imperialist Cecil Rhodes, despite an independent commission backing its removal'.<sup>57</sup> The questions then remain: if we view contemporary engagements with the nineteenth-century archive as necessarily intersectional, can conversations about repatriation be extended beyond material objects, to traditions of artistic expression (like music, visual art, theatre, curatorship and literature); and to how the writing and teaching of history, both past and present, persistently constitutes new archival orderings?

The prevalence of conversations about repatriation in the press is a telling reminder that this is, indeed, the start of a potentially very exciting new decade, particularly given enormous upheavals in not only the practicalities of, but also the ideologies informing, how we approach constructions of historical knowledge. What, then, will the remainder of the decade of the 2020s hold for how the nineteenth-century archive is stored, framed, (re)used, and (re)imagined in a digital (post/lockdown) era? With ever-expanding digital resources, will our archival work necessarily rely less on the idea of a permanent, physical structure, and instead embrace a more utopian fantasy of 'open access'? Or will the increase of researchers working from home reinforce a nostalgic fetishisation of the institutional archive, further complicated by the wealth of nineteenth-century material currently flooding the digital humanities, which has pre-empted a revolution in the ways that academics – and public historians – access, understand, define, and negotiate the archival experience?

The saturation of information that accompanies the digitisation of the nineteenth-century archive – sparking many instances of Derridean archival 'fever' in the present day – ultimately returns us, full circle, to the permeation and circulation of archival dust in as laid out by Steedman. For the 'circularity' of dust that infuses the archive, as she maintains, is about 'the impossibility of things disappearing ... Nothing goes away'.<sup>58</sup> In an age of digital saturation we

are, indeed, attuned to the bittersweet possibility that, on the internet, ‘nothing goes away’, while admitting that much can be silenced by corporate decisions. In this way, the utility of an intersectional encounter with the constantly-shifting archive of information around us does stretch usefully – and necessarily – beyond a nineteenth-century frame. In its most productive formulations, then, intersectional openness to the relational possibilities of the archive will help to create sustainable decolonial, equitable, and critical conversations about historiography, ownership and access for a creative future.

## Bibliography

- Abram, Nicola. *Black British Women’s Theatre: Intersectionality, Archives, Aesthetics*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020.
- Agawu, Kofi. *Representing African Music: Postcolonial Notes, Queries, Positions*. New York and London: Routledge, 2003.
- Baker, Geoffrey. *Imposing Harmony: Music and Society in Colonial Cuzco*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.
- Ballantyne, Tony. *Entanglements of Empire: Missionaries, Maori, and the Question of the Body*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015.
- BBC News. ‘US Returns Ancient Stone Carvings to Thailand’. *BBC News* (28 May 2021). <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-57286063>. Accessed 29 August 2021.
- Beate, Peter. ‘Negotiation the Co-Curation of an Online Community Popular Music Archive’. *Popular Music History* 13, no. 1–2 (2020): 58–76.
- Bilsel, Can. *Antiquity on Display: Regimes of the Authentic in Berlin’s Pergamon Museum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Bradley, Mark. *Classics and Imperialism in the British Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Bryant, Miranda. ‘Museum of the Home Reopens to Protests Over Statue of Slave Ship Owner’. *The Guardian* (12 June 2021). <https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2021/jun/12/museum-of-the-home-reopens-to-protests-over-statue-of-slave-ship-owner>. Accessed 29 August 2021.
- Bryant Davies, Rachel. *Troy, Carthage and the Victorians: The Drama of Classical Ruins in the Nineteenth-Century Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Victorian Epic Burlesques: A Critical Anthology of Nineteenth-Century Theatrical Entertainments After Homer*. London: Bloomsbury, 2018.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Barbara Gribling (eds). *Pasts at Play: Childhood Encounters with History in British Culture, 1750–1914*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Greco-Roman Antiquity in British Children’s Culture* (forthcoming, Oxford University Press).
- Burnett, Philip, Erin Johnson-Williams, and Yvonne Liao. ‘Music, Empire, Colonialism: Sounding Out the Archives’. Special Issue of *Postcolonial Studies*, edited by Philip Burnett, Erin Johnson-Williams, and Yvonne Liao (forthcoming, 2022).
- Burton, Antoinette. ‘Introduction: Archive Fever, Archive Stories’. In *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History*, edited by Antoinette Burton, 1–24. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.

- Byrd, W. Carson, Rachele J. Brunn-Bevel, and Sarah M. Ovink (eds). *Intersectionality and Higher Education: Identity and Inequality on College Campuses*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2019.
- Cahana-Blum, Jonathan, and Karmen MacKendrick (eds). *We and They: Decolonizing Greco-Roman and Biblical Antiquities*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2019.
- Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, and Leslie McCall. 'Towards a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Application, and Praxis'. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38, no. 4 (2013): 785–810.
- Coaston, Jane. 'The Intersectionality Wars'. *Vox* (28 May 2019). <https://www.vox.com/the-highlight/2019/5/20/18542843/intersectionality-conservatism-law-race-gender-discrimination>. Accessed 17 May 2021.
- Coltman, Viccy. *Classical Sculpture and the Culture of Collecting in Britain Since 1760*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics'. *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 31 (1989): pp. 139–167.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *On Intersectionality: Essential Writings*. New York: New Press, 2022.
- Cuk, Sarah. 'Do-It-Yourself Music Archives: A Response and Alternative to Mainstream Exclusivity'. *The Serials Librarian* (2021): <https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2021.1910614>.
- Decolonising the Archive. <https://www.decolonisingthearchive.com/>. Accessed 2 December 2021.
- Demeter, Márton, and Ronina Istratii. 'Scrutinising What Open Access Journals Mean for Global Inequities'. *Publishing Research Quarterly* 36 (2020): 505–522.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, translated by Eric Prenowitz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Dorney, Kate. 'The Ordering of Things: Allure, Access, and Archives'. *Shakespeare Bulletin* 28, no. 1 (2010): 19–36.
- Dromi, Shai M. 'Archival Research During COVID-19'. *Footnotes* 48, no. 3 (2020): 6–8.
- Eichhorn, Kate. *The Archival Turn in Feminism: Outrage and Order*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2013.
- Emba, Christine. 'Opinion: Intersectionality'. *The Washington Post* (21 September 2015). <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/21/intersectionality-a-primer/>. Accessed 29 August 2021.
- Farge, Arlette. *The Allure of the Archives*, translated by Thomas Scott-Railton. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Fausser, Annegret. 'Sound, Music, War and Violence: Listening from the Archive'. *Transposition 2* (2020): DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/transposition.4310>.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, Vol. 1, translated by R. Hurley. New York: Random House, 1978.
- Galsworthy, Tim. 'Archival Research in a Time of Coronavirus'. <https://www.blogs.hss.ed.ac.uk/pubs-and-publications/2020/05/10/archival-research-coronavirus/>. Accessed 2 December 2021.
- Gange, David. *Dialogues with the Dead: Egyptology in British Culture and Religion, 1822–1922*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Goldbaum, Christina, and Kimon de Greef. 'Wildfire Deals Hard Blow to South Africa's Archives' (19 April 2021). <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/19/world/africa/cape-town-table-mountain-fire.html>. Accessed 2 December 2021.
- Goldhill, Simon. *Victorian Culture and Classical Antiquity: Art, Opera, Fiction, and the Proclamation of Modernity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.



- Griffin, Paul. 'Making Usable Pasts: Collaboration, Labour and Activism in the Archive'. *Area* 50, no. 4 (2018): 501–508.
- Hall Edith and Henry Stead (eds). *Greek and Roman Classics in the British Struggle for Social Reform*. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A People's History of Classics: Class and Greco-Roman Antiquity in Britain and Ireland 1689 to 1939*. New York: Routledge, 2020.
- Hardwick, Lorna, and Christopher Stray (eds). *A Companion to Classical Receptions*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (eds). *Classics in the Modern World: A Democratic Turn?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Harle, Matthew. *Afterlives of Abandoned Work: Creative Debris in the Archive*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019.
- Harris, Verne. *Ghosts of Archive: Deconstructive Intersectionality and Praxis*. London: Routledge, 2020.
- Hartman, Saidiya. *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Lose Your Mother: A Journey Along the Atlantic Slave Route*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Venus in Two Acts'. *Small Axe* 26 (2008): 1–14.
- Heringman, Noah. *Sciences of Antiquity: Romantic Antiquarianism, Natural History and Knowledge Work*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Herman, Paul. 'The Heroic Study of Records: The Contested Persona of the Archival Historian'. *History of the Human Sciences* 26, no. 4 (2013): 67–83.
- Hicks, Dan. 'Decolonising Museums Isn't Part of a "Culture War". It's about Keeping Them Relevant'. *The Guardian* (7 May 2021).  
<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/may/07/decolonising-museums-isnt-part-of-a-culture-war-its-about-keeping-them-relevant>. Accessed 29 August 2021.
- Hodkinson, Owen, and Helen Lovatt (eds). *Classical Reception and Children's Literature: Greece, Rome and Childhood*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2018.
- Howell, Alison, and Melanie Richter-Montpetit. 'Racism in Foucauldian Security Studies: Biopolitics, Liberal War, and the Whitewashing of Colonial and Racial Violence'. *International Political Sociology* 13 (2019): 2–19.
- Hoyle, Victoria. 'Editorial: Archives and Public History'. *Archives and Records* 38, no. 1 (2017): 1–4.
- Hurst, Isobel. *Victorian Women Writers and the Classics: The Feminine of Homer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Irving, David. *Colonial Counterpoint: Music in Early Modern Manila*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Jenkyns, Richard. *The Victorians and Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1980.
- Johnson-Williams, Erin. 'Online EDI Resources: Towards a Reflexive Archive'. *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* (2021): DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/rrc.2021.3>.
- Jones, Esyllt W., Shelley Sweeney, Ian Milligan, Greg Bak, and Jo-Anne McCutcheon. 'Remembering is a Form of Honouring: Preserving the Covid-19 Archival Record'. *Facets* 6 (2021): <https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2020-0115>.
- Kärjä, Antti-Ville. 'Historiography and the Role of the Archive'. In *The Routledge Companion to Popular Music History and Heritage*, edited by Sarah Baker, Catherine Strong, Lauren Istvandy, and Zelmarie Cantillon, 108–118. London and New York: Routledge, 2018.
- Lambrechts, Lizabé. 'The Becoming of an Archive: Perspectives on a Music Archive and the Limits of Institutionalality'. *Social Dynamics* 46, no. 2 (2020): 310–322.
- Landau, Carolyn, and Janet Topp Fargion. 'We're All Archivists Now: Towards a More Equitable Ethnomusicology'. *Ethnomusicology Forum* 21, no. 2 (2012): 125–140.

- Lecznar, Adam, Heidi Morse, and Ian S. Moyer (eds). *Classicisms in the Black Atlantic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Legg, Stephen, and Deana Heath (eds). *South Asian Governmentalities: Michel Foucault and the Question of Postcolonial Orderings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Lightman, Bernard, and Bennett Zon (eds). *Victorian Culture and the Origin of Disciplines*. New York: Routledge, 2020.
- Lutz, Helma, Maria Vivar, and Linda Supik (eds). *Framing Intersectionality: Debates on a Multi-faceted Concept in Gender Studies*. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Manoff, Marlene. 'Theories of the Archive from Across the Disciplines'. *Libraries and the Academy* 4, no. 1 (2004): 9–25.
- Marciniak, Katarzyna. *Our Mythical Childhood: The Classics and Literature for Children and Young Adults*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Martindale, Charles. *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Martino, Ariel. 'Revisioning the Archival Turn'. *Criticism* 62, no. 4 (2020): 629–633.
- Morreira, Shannon. 'Significant Archives are Under Threat in Cape Town's Fire. Why They Matter So Much'. *The Conversation* (19 April 2021). <https://theconversation.com/significant-archives-are-under-threat-in-cape-towns-fire-why-they-matter-so-much-159299>. Accessed 2 December 2021.
- Murnaghan, Sheila, and Deborah H. Roberts. *Childhood and the Classics: Britain and America, 1850–1965*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Maurice, Lisa (ed). *The Reception of Ancient Greece and Rome in Children's Literature: Heroes and Eagles*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Milthorpe, Naomi. 'Archives, Authority, Aura: Modernism's Archival Turn'. *Papers on Language and Literature* 55, no. 1 (2019): 3–14.
- Mirza, Heidi Safia. 'Decolonizing Higher Education: Black Feminism and the Intersectionality of Race and Gender'. *Journal of Feminist Scholarship* 7, no. 7 (2014–2015): 1–12.
- Monrós-Gaspar, Laura. *Victorian Classical Burlesques: A Critical Anthology*. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- Morales, Helen. *Antigone Rising: The Subversive Power of the Ancient Myths*. New York: Bold Type Books, 2020.
- Morris, Charles E. 'The Archival Turn in Rhetorical Studies; Or, the Archives Rhetorical (Re)turn?'. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9, no. 1 (2006): 113–115.
- Nash, Jennifer C. 'Intersectionality and Its Discontents'. *American Quarterly* 69, no. 1 (2017): 117–129.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Re-Thinking Intersectionality'. *Feminist Review* 89 (2008): 1–15.
- Nelson, Claudia, and Anne Morey. *Topologies of the Classical World in Children's Fiction: Palimpsests, Maps, and Fractals*. Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Nichols, Kate. *Greece and Rome at the Crystal Palace: Classical Sculpture and Modern Britain, 1854–1936*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Paulus, Michael J. 'Reconceptualizing Academic Libraries and Archives in the Digital Age'. *Libraries and the Academy* 11, no. 4 (2011): 939–952.
- Pettan, Svanibor, and Jeff Todd Titon (eds). *Public Ethnomusicology, Education, Archives, & Commerce*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Prins, Yopie. *Ladies' Greek: Victorian Translations of Tragedy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017.
- Quinn, Ben. 'Calls for Full Inventory of World Artefacts Held by Church of England'. *The Guardian* (9 April 2021). <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/apr/09/calls-for-full-inventory-of-world-artefacts-held-by-church-of-england-benin-bronzes>. Accessed 29 August 2021.

- Qureshi, Sadiya. *Peoples on Parade: Exhibitions, Empire, and Anthropology in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2011.
- Reid, Kirsty, and Fiona Paisley. *Sources and Methods in Histories of Colonialism: Approaching the Imperial Archive*. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Reilly, Maura. *Curatorial Activism: Towards an Ethics of Curating*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2018.
- Richards, Jeffrey. *Imperialism and Music: Britain, 1876–1953*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013.
- Richards, Thomas. *The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire*. London: Verso, 1993.
- Richardson, Edmund. *Classical Victorians: Scholars, Scoundrels and Generals in Pursuit of Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Alexandria: The Quest for the Lost City*. London: Bloomsbury, 2021.
- Rijser, David, Maarten De Pourcq, and Nathalie De Haan (eds). *Framing Classical Reception Studies: Different Perspectives on a Developing Field*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2020.
- Roque Ricardo, and Kim A. Wagner (eds). *Engaging Colonial Knowledge: Reading European Archives in World History*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Schwartz Joan M., and Terry Cook. 'Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory'. *Archival Science* 2 (2002): 1–19.
- Sharpe, Christina. *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2016.
- Simon, Cheryl. 'Introduction: Following the Archival Turn'. *Visual Resources* 18, no. 2 (2002): 101–107.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books, 2012.
- Spinney, Laura. 'What are COVID Archivists Keeping for Tomorrow's Historians?'. *Nature* (17 December 2020). <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-03554-0>. Accessed 2 December 2021.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 'Can the Subaltern Speak? Speculations on Widow Sacrifice'. In *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*, edited by Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, 66–111. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Starn, Randolph. 'Truths in the Archives'. *Common Knowledge* 8, no. 2 (2002): 387–401.
- Steedman, Carolyn. *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'After the Archive'. *Comparative Critical Studies* 8, no. 2–3 (2011): 321–340.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Something She Called a Fever: Michelet, Derrida, and Dust'. *The American Historical Review* 106, no. 4 (2001): 1159–1180.
- Steinmetz, Katy. 'She Coined the Term "Intersectionality" Over 30 Years Ago. Here's What It Means to Her Today'. *TIME* (20 February 2020). <https://time.com/5786710/kimberle-crenshaw-intersectionality/>. Accessed 29 August 2021.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Imperial Debris: on Ruins and Ruination*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2013.
- van Straaten, Eva-Maria Alexandra. 'The *White* Ethnomusicologist's Burden: *White* Innocence and the Archive in Music Studies'. *The World of Music* 10, no. 1 (2021): 131–167.
- Stray, Christopher. *Classics Transformed: Schools, Universities, and Society in England, 1830–1960*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Classics in Britain: Scholarship, Education, and Publishing 1800–2000*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Thomas, David Simon Fowler, and Valerie Johnson (eds). *The Silence of the Archive*. Chicago: Neal-Schuman, 2017.
- Tully, Paul, and Neil Carr. 'Obstacles and Possibilities in Archival Research: Archives as a Data Source for Leisure Scholars in Lockdown'. *Leisure Studies* 40, no. 6 (2021): 888–894.
- Turner, Frank M. *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.

- Vallier, John. 'Preserving the Past, Activating the Future: Collaborative Archiving in Ethnomusicology'. In *Ethnomusicology: A Contemporary Reader*, edited by Jennifer C. Post, 307–317. New York: Routledge: 2017.
- Vance, Norman. *The Victorians and Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997.
- Vasunia, Phiroze. *The Classics and Colonial India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Walsham, Alexandra. 'The Social History of the Archive: Record-Keeping in Early Modern Europe'. *Past & Present* 230, no. 11 (2016): 9–48.
- Wosh, Peter J. 'Reflections on Public History and Archives Education'. *Journal of Archival Organization* 15, no. 3 (2018): 95–99.
- Wyles, Rosie, and Edith Hall (eds). *Women Classical Scholars: Unsealing the Fountain from the Renaissance to Jacqueline de Romilly*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Yale, Elizabeth. 'The History of Archives: The State of the Discipline'. *Book History* 18 (2015): 332–359.
- Zon, Bennett. *Representing Non-Western Music in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2007.
- Zuckerberg, Donna. *Not All Dead White Men: Classics and Misogyny in the Digital Age*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press 2018.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'My Classics Will Be Intersectional, Or ...?'. *Eidolon* (4 December 2020). <https://eidolon.pub/my-classics-will-be-intersectional-or-14ed6e0bcd1c>. Accessed 29 August 2021.

<sup>1</sup> Carolyn Steedman, *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), p. 164. Emphasis original.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 116–128. See also Carolyn Steedman, ‘Something She Called a Fever: Michelet, Derrida, and Dust’, *The American Historical Review* 106. 4 (2001): 1159–1180; and Matthew Harle, *Afterlives of Abandoned Work: Creative Debris in the Archive* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019).

<sup>3</sup> Steedman, *Dust*, p. 164.

<sup>4</sup> See Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, translated by Eric Prenowitz (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

<sup>5</sup> On breathing in the dust of the dead, see Steedman, *Dust*, pp. 38, 117, 160.

<sup>6</sup> See Saidiya Hartman, *Lose Your Mother: A Journey Along the Atlantic Slave Route* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007); *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); and ‘Venus in Two Acts’, *Small Axe* 26 (2008): 1–14; Christina Sharpe, *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016); Imtiaz Habib, *Black Lives in the English Archives, 1500–1677* (London: Routledge, 2008); Nicola Abram, *Black British Women’s Theatre: Intersectionality, Archives, Aesthetics* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020). See also the essays in David Thomas, Simon Fowler, and Valerie Johnson (eds), *The Silence of the Archive* (Chicago: Neal-Schuman, 2017); and Sadiya Qureshi, *Peoples on Parade: Exhibitions, Empire, and Anthropology in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2011).

<sup>7</sup> On the ‘new’ kinds of archives that have arisen as a result of the Covid-19 lockdowns, see: Laura Spinney, ‘What are COVID Archivists Keeping for Tomorrow’s Historians?’, *Nature* (17 December 2020):

<https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-03554-0>, accessed 2 December 2021; Tim Galsworthy, ‘Archival Research in a Time of Coronavirus’, <https://www.blogs.hss.ed.ac.uk/pubs-and-publications/2020/05/10/archival-research-coronavirus/>, accessed 2 December 2021; Paul Tully and Neil Carr, ‘Obstacles and Possibilities in Archival Research: Archives as a Data Source for Leisure Scholars in Lockdown’, *Leisure Studies* 40. 6 (2021): 888–894; Esyllt W. Jones, Shelley Sweeney, Ian Milligan, Greg Bak, and Jo-Anne McCutcheon, ‘Remembering is a Form of Honouring: Preserving the Covid-19 Archival Record’, *Facets* 6 (2021): <https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2020-0115>;

and Shai M. Dromi, ‘Archival Research During COVID-19’, *Footnotes* 48. 3 (2020): 6–8.

<sup>8</sup> For a helpful discussion of Derrida’s ‘Archive Fever’, see Steedman, *Dust*, p. 11.

<sup>9</sup> See, for further reading, Michael J. Paulus, ‘Reconceptualizing Academic Libraries and Archives in the Digital Age’, *Libraries and the Academy*, 11. 4 (2011): 939–952.

<sup>10</sup> The workshop was entitled ‘The Nineteenth-Century Archive as a Discourse of Power’, organised by Rachel Bryant Davies and Erin Johnson-Williams (Durham University, 8–9 February 2019), hosted by the Centre for Nineteenth-Century Studies and with financial support from The British Association for Victorian Studies, The Royal Historical Society, and the Durham Centre for Classical Reception Studies.

<sup>11</sup> A rich example of such an initiative to decolonise the historical archive in the pursuit of a ‘Pan-African’ archive that works to find healing through changing historical narratives can be found at: Decolonising the Archive,

<https://www.decolonisingthearchive.com/>, accessed 2 December 2021.

<sup>12</sup> The outpouring of sympathy expressed internationally following the tragic fire that destroyed the collections in the J. W. Jagger Library at the University of Cape Town in April 2021 speaks to an ongoing sense of loss about physical archival access and postcolonial archival ownership. See, for example, Christina Goldbaum and Kimon de Greef, ‘Wildfire Deals Hard Blow to South Africa’s Archives’ (19 April 2021),

<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/19/world/africa/cape-town-table-mountain-fire.html>, accessed 2 December 2021; and Shannon Morreira, ‘Significant Archives are Under Threat in Cape Town’s Fire. Why They Matter So Much’, *The Conversation* (19 April 2021), <https://theconversation.com/significant-archives-are-under-threat-in-cape-towns-fire-why-they-matter-so-much-159299>, accessed 2 December 2021.

<sup>13</sup> On the global complexities and inequalities of archival ‘access’ and open academic publishing, see Márton Demeter and Ronina Istratii, ‘Scrutinising What Open Access Journals Mean for Global Inequities’, *Publishing Research Quarterly* 36 (2020): 505–522.

<sup>14</sup> The use of the word ‘fantasy’ here is a play on the title of Thomas Richards, *The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire* (London: Verso, 1993), where he makes the argument that the nineteenth-century imperial archive was a fantasy, both about the ordering of knowledge and the project of western imperialism.

<sup>15</sup> See, for further reading, Arlette Farge, *The Allure of the Archives*, translated by Thomas Scott-Railton (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013); and Kate Dorney, ‘The Ordering of Things: Allure, Access, and Archives’, *Shakespeare Bulletin* 28. 1 (2010): 19–36.

<sup>16</sup> Indeed, the lack of attention to the history of archival institutions prior to the nineteenth century is partly a result of the nineteenth-century reification of, and control over, the archive itself: see Alexandra Walsham, ‘The Social History of the Archive: Record-Keeping in Early Modern Europe’, *Past & Present* 230. 11 (2016): 9–48.

<sup>17</sup> See Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook, ‘Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory’, *Archival Science* 2 (2002): 1–19; and Richards, *Imperial Archive*.



<sup>18</sup> See Antoinette Burton, 'Introduction: Archive Fever, Archive Stories', in Antoinette Burton (ed), *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), pp. 1–24; Tony Ballantyne, *Entanglements of Empire: Missionaries, Maori, and the Question of the Body* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2015); Kirsty Reid and Fiona Paisley, *Sources and Methods in Histories of Colonialism: Approaching the Imperial Archive* (London: Routledge, 2017); Ricardo Roque and Kim A. Wagner (eds), *Engaging Colonial Knowledge: Reading European Archives in World History* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); and Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009); and *Imperial Debris: on Ruins and Ruination* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2013). For further reading on the archive, accessibility and public history, see Paul Griffin, 'Making Usable Past: Collaboration, Labour and Activism in the Archive', *Area* 50. 4 (2018): 501–508; Victoria Hoyle, 'Editorial: Archives and Public History', *Archives and Records* 38. 1 (2017): 1–4; and Peter J. Wosh, 'Reflections on Public History and Archives Education', *Journal of Archival Organization* 15. 3 (2018): 95–99.

<sup>19</sup> On the 'archival turn', see: Burton, 'Introduction: Archive Fever', pp. 1–24; Ariel Martino, 'Revising the Archival Turn', *Criticism* 62. 4 (2020): 629–633; Kate Eichhorn, *The Archival Turn in Feminism: Outrage and Order* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2013); Naomi Milthorpe, 'Archives, Authority, Aura: Modernism's Archival Turn', *Papers on Language and Literature* 55. 1 (2019): 3–14; Charles E. Morris, 'The Archival Turn in Rhetorical Studies; Or, the Archives Rhetorical (Re)turn', *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9. 1 (2006): 113–115; Paul Herman, 'The Heroic Study of Records: The Contested Persona of the Archival Historian', *History of the Human Sciences* 26. 4 (2013): 67–83; Cheryl Simon, 'Introduction: Following the Archival Turn', *Visual Resources* 18. 2 (2002): 101–107; Randolph Starn, 'Truths in the Archives', *Common Knowledge* 8. 2 (2002): 387–401; Carolyn Steedman, 'After the Archive', *Comparative Critical Studies*, 8 (2–3), 2011, pp. 321–340; and Elizabeth Yale, 'The History of Archives: The State of the Discipline', *Book History* 18 (2015): 332–359.

<sup>20</sup> See Bernard Lightman and Bennett Zon (eds), *Victorian Culture and the Origin of Disciplines* (New York: Routledge, 2020).

<sup>21</sup> Jennifer C. Nash, 'Re-Thinking Intersectionality', *Feminist Review* 89 (2008), p. 2.

<sup>22</sup> Christine Emba, 'Opinion: Intersectionality', *The Washington Post* (21 September 2015), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/21/intersectionality-a-primer/>, accessed 29 August 2021.

<sup>23</sup> Crenshaw has been so influential as to receive coverage about the impact of the term 'intersectionality' in the non-academic press. See, for example, Katy Steinmetz, 'She Coined the Term "Intersectionality" Over 30 Years Ago. Here's What It Means to Her Today', *TIME* (20 February 2020), <https://time.com/5786710/kimberle-crenshaw-intersectionality/>, accessed 29 August 2021.

<sup>24</sup> Kimberlé Crenshaw, 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics', *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 31 (1989), p. 140. See also Jane Coaston, 'The Intersectionality Wars', *Vox* (28 May 2019), <https://www.vox.com/the-highlight/2019/5/20/18542843/intersectionality-conservatism-law-race-gender-discrimination>, accessed 17 May 2021. We also look forward to the forthcoming publication: Kimberlé Crenshaw, *On Intersectionality: Essential Writings* (New York: New Press, 2022).

<sup>25</sup> A field of 'intersectionality studies' has been proposed by Sumi Cho, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, and Leslie McCall, 'Towards a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Application, and Praxis', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38. 4 (2013): 785–810.

<sup>26</sup> See, for example, W. Carson Byrd, Rachele J. Brunn-Bevel, and Sarah M. Ovink (eds), *Intersectionality and Higher Education: Identity and Inequality on College Campuses* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2019).

<sup>27</sup> On gender and intersectionality see Helma Lutz, María Vivar and Linda Supik (eds), *Framing Intersectionality: Debates on a Multi-faceted Concept in Gender Studies* (London: Routledge, 2016). On decolonisation and intersectionality see Heidi Safia Mirza, 'Decolonizing Higher Education: Black Feminism and the Intersectionality of Race and Gender', *Journal of Feminist Scholarship* 7. 7 (2014–2015): 1–12.

<sup>28</sup> See Verne Harris, *Ghosts of Archive: Deconstructive Intersectionality and Praxis* (London: Routledge, 2020); and Jennifer C. Nash, 'Intersectionality and Its Discontents', *American Quarterly* 69. 1 (2017): 117–129.

<sup>29</sup> We use the term 'archival activism' here in relation to the term 'curatorial activism' as used by Maura Reilly, *Curatorial Activism: Towards an Ethics of Curating* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2018). See also Griffin, 'Making Usable Past', pp. 501–508.

<sup>30</sup> Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (London: Tavistock, 1972). For more on Foucault, Derrida and the archive see Marlene Manoff, 'Theories of the Archive from Across the Disciplines', *Libraries and the Academy* 4. 1 (2004): 9–25.

<sup>31</sup> Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, Vol. 1, translated by R. Hurley (New York: Random House, 1978), p. 138.

<sup>32</sup> Alison Howell and Melanie Richter-Montpetit, 'Racism in Foucauldian Security Studies: Biopolitics, Liberal War, and the Whitewashing of Colonial and Racial Violence', *International Political Sociology* 13 (2019), p. 2. See also the essays in Stephen Legg and Deana Heath (eds), *South Asian Governmentalities: Michel Foucault and the Question of Postcolonial Orderings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

- <sup>33</sup> See Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, 'Can the Subaltern Speak? Speculations on Widow Sacrifice', in Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman (eds), *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader* (London: Routledge, 1993), pp. 66–111.
- <sup>34</sup> See, for example, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 2012).
- <sup>35</sup> See Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 2008), p. 8.
- <sup>36</sup> Special Issue of *Postcolonial Studies*, 'Music, Empire, Colonialism: Sounding Out the Archives', edited by Philip Burnett, Erin Johnson-Williams, and Yvonne Liao (forthcoming, 2022).
- <sup>37</sup> See, for example, Jeffrey Richards, *Imperialism and Music: Britain, 1876–1953* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001); and Bennett Zon, *Representing Non-Western Music in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2007).
- <sup>38</sup> See Geoffrey Baker, *Imposing Harmony: Music and Society in Colonial Çuço* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008); and David Irving, *Colonial Counterpoint: Music in Early Modern Manila* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- <sup>39</sup> Kofi Agawu, *Representing African Music: Postcolonial Notes, Queries, Positions* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003), p. 2.
- <sup>40</sup> See Eva-Maria Alexandra van Straaten, 'The White Ethnomusicologist's Burden: White Innocence and the Archive in Music Studies', *The World of Music* 10. 1 (2021): 131–167; Svanibor Pettan and Jeff Todd Titon (eds), *Public Ethnomusicology, Education, Archives, & Commerce* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019); Carolyn Landau and Janet Topp Fargion, 'We're All Archivists Now: Towards a More Equitable Ethnomusicology', *Ethnomusicology Forum* 21. 2 (2012): 125–140; and John Vallier, 'Preserving the Past, Activating the Future: Collaborative Archiving in Ethnomusicology', in Jennifer C. Post (ed), *Ethnomusicology: A Contemporary Reader* (New York: Routledge: 2017), pp. 307–317.
- <sup>41</sup> See, for example, Peter Beate, 'Negotiation the Co-Curation of an Online Community Popular Music Archive', *Popular Music History* 13. 1–2 (2020): 58–76; Sarah Cuk, 'Do-It-Yourself Music Archives: A Response and Alternative to Mainstream Exclusivity', *The Serials Librarian* (2021): <https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2021.1910614>; and Erin Johnson-Williams, 'Online EDI Resources: Towards a Reflexive Archive', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* (2021): DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/rrc.2021.3>.
- <sup>42</sup> See Annegret Fauser, 'Sound, Music, War and Violence: Listening from the Archive', *Transposition* 2 (2020): DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/transposition.4310>; Antti-Ville Kärjälä, 'Historiography and the Role of the Archive', in Sarah Baker, Catherine Strong, Lauren Istvandy, and Zelmarie Cantillon (eds), *The Routledge Companion to Popular Music History and Heritage* (London and New York: Routledge, 2018), pp. 108–118; and Lizabé Lambrechts, 'The Becoming of An Archive: Perspectives on a Music Archive and the Limits of Institutionality', *Social Dynamics: A Journal of African Studies* 46. 2 (2020): 310–322.
- <sup>43</sup> The main works on classical reception and the nineteenth century – even though these sources do not focus on 'the archive' as their main focus – include: Richard Jenkyns, *The Victorians and Ancient Greece* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980); Frank M. Turner, *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981); Norman Vance, *The Victorians and Ancient Rome* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997); and Simon Goldhill, *Victorian Culture and Classical Antiquity: Art, Opera, Fiction, and the Proclamation of Modernity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011).
- <sup>44</sup> See Charles Martindale, *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Lorna Hardwick and Christopher Stray (eds), *A Companion to Classical Receptions* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011); Lorna Hardwick and Stephen Harrison (eds), *Classics in the Modern World: A Democratic Turn?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); and David Rijser, Maarten De Pourcq, and Nathalie De Haan (eds), *Framing Classical Reception Studies: Different Perspectives on a Developing Field* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2020).
- <sup>45</sup> See Mark Bradley, *Classics and Imperialism in the British Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); and Phiroze Vasunia, *The Classics and Colonial India* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- <sup>46</sup> See Vicky Coltman, *Classical Sculpture and the Culture of Collecting in Britain Since 1760* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Can Bilsel, *Antiquity on Display: Regimes of the Authentic in Berlin's Pergamon Museum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); and Kate Nichols, *Greece and Rome at the Crystal Palace: Classical Sculpture and Modern Britain, 1854–1936* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
- <sup>47</sup> See Noah Heringman, *Sciences of Antiquity: Romantic Antiquarianism, Natural History and Knowledge Work* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); David Gange, *Dialogues with the Dead: Egyptology in British Culture and Religion, 1822–1922* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Rachel Bryant Davies, *Troy, Carthage and the Victorians: The Drama of Classical Ruins in the Nineteenth-Century Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018); and Edmund Richardson, *Alexandria: The Quest for the Lost City* (London: Bloomsbury 2021).
- <sup>48</sup> See Christopher Stray, *Classics Transformed: Schools, Universities, and Society in England, 1830–1960* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998); *Classics in Britain: Scholarship, Education, and Publishing 1800–2000* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018); and Edmund Richardson, *Classical Victorians: Scholars, Scoundrels and Generals in Pursuit of Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- <sup>49</sup> See Edith Hall and Henry Stead (eds), *Greek and Roman Classics in the British Struggle for Social Reform* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015); Laura Monrós-Gaspar, *Victorian Classical Burlesques: A Critical Anthology* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015); Rachel Bryant Davies, *Victorian Epic Burlesques: A Critical Anthology of Nineteenth-Century Theatrical Entertainments*

*After Homer* (London: Bloomsbury, 2018); and Edith Hall and Henry Stead, *A People's History of Classics: Class and Greco-Roman Antiquity in Britain and Ireland 1689 to 1939* (New York: Routledge, 2020).

<sup>50</sup> See Isobel Hurst, *Victorian Women Writers and the Classics: The Feminine of Homer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Rosie Wyles and Edith Hall (eds), *Women Classical Scholars: Unsealing the Fountain from the Renaissance to Jacqueline de Romilly* (OUP, 2016); and Yopie Prins, *Ladies' Greek: Victorian Translations of Tragedy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017).

<sup>51</sup> See Lisa Maurice (ed), *The Reception of Ancient Greece and Rome in Children's Literature: Heroes and Eagles* (Leiden: Brill, 2015); Katarzyna Marciniak, *Our Mythical Childhood: The Classics and Literature for Children and Young Adults* (Leiden: Brill, 2016); Sheila Murnaghan and Deborah H. Roberts, *Childhood and the Classics: Britain and America, 1850–1965* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018); Owen Hodkinson and Helen Lovatt (eds), *Classical Reception and Children's Literature: Greece, Rome and Childhood*, (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2018); Claudia Nelson and Anne Morey, *Topologies of the Classical World in Children's Fiction: Palimpsests, Maps, and Fractals* (Oxford University Press, 2020); Rachel Bryant Davies and Barbara Gribling (eds), *Pasts at Play: Childhood Encounters with History in British Culture, 1750–1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020); and Rachel Bryant Davies, *Greco-Roman Antiquity in British Children's Culture* (forthcoming, Oxford University Press).

<sup>52</sup> See, for example, Donna Zuckerberg, 'My Classics Will Be Intersectional, Or ...', *Eidolon* (4 December 2020), <https://eidolon.pub/my-classics-will-be-intersectional-or-14ed6e0bcd1c>, accessed 29 August 2021.

<sup>53</sup> See Donna Zuckerberg, *Not All Dead White Men: Classics and Misogyny in the Digital Age* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press 2018); and Helen Morales, *Antigone Rising: The Subversive Power of the Ancient Myths* (New York: Bold Type Books, 2020).

<sup>54</sup> Zuckerberg, 'My Classics Will Be Intersectional'. See also Adam Lecznar, Heidi Morse, Ian S. Moyer (eds), *Classicisms in the Black Atlantic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020); and Jonathan Cahana-Blum, Karmen MacKendrick (eds), *We and They: Decolonizing Greco-Roman and Biblical Antiquities* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2019).

<sup>55</sup> The word 'looted' is used, for example, in Ben Quinn, 'Calls for Full Inventory of World Artefacts Held by Church of England', *The Guardian* (9 April 2021), <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/apr/09/calls-for-full-inventory-of-world-artefacts-held-by-church-of-england-benin-bronzes>, accessed 29 August 2021. Similar repatriated acts have also happened from the USA; see, for example, BBC News, 'US Returns Ancient Stone Carvings to Thailand', *BBC News* (28 May 2021), <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-57286063>, accessed 29 August 2021.

<sup>56</sup> Dan Hicks, 'Decolonising Museums isn't part of a "Culture War". It's about Keeping Them Relevant', *The Guardian* (7 May 2021), <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/may/07/decolonising-museums-isnt-part-of-a-culture-war-its-about-keeping-them-relevant>, accessed 29 August 2021.

<sup>57</sup> Miranda Bryant, 'Museum of the Home Reopens to Protests Over Statue of Slave Ship Owner', *The Guardian* (12 June 2021), <https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2021/jun/12/museum-of-the-home-reopens-to-protests-over-statue-of-slave-ship-owner>, accessed 29 August 2021.

<sup>58</sup> Steedman, *Dust*, p. 164.