—Tim Berndtsson, Otto Fischer, Annie Mattsson, Ann Öhrberg—From Dust to Dawn—

—Reflections on Reading Archives After the Archival Turn—

"Archive" has been a buzzword for a while, not only as a concept in contemporary cultural theory, but also, to an increasing degree, in contemporary art and literature. This no doubt reflects a growing preoccupation with archival practices both in the cultural and political discourse and in the day-to-day experience of virtually all citizens of the industrialised world. We are all, to varying degrees, collecting, securing, retrieving, storing, and managing data. And we are all becoming increasingly aware that our actions, thoughts, and feelings are being collected, stored and used as data for commercial and political purposes on a hitherto inconceivable global scale.

Given the growing concern about questions of data storage and information management in society overall, it is not surprising that archives and archiving has become a subject of central importance in academic research. Already by the turn to the new millennia there was talk of an "archival turn", and the two decades that has passed since has provided a sufficient number of studies to warrant the use of this term.[1] During the last few years the authors of this chapter have been working with the project "Knowledge, Power and Materiality: Archives in Sweden 1727–1811" (funded by the Swedish Research Council), and in this chapter we reflect on our results from analysing archives from our particular perspective as scholars of rhetoric and literature. We begin by presenting our points of departure, the theoretical framework we have been working within, as well as the methods applied. Thereafter we will summarise the outcome of our projects, and, finally, discuss our conclusions regarding methodological and theoretical possibilities when working with archives as objects of investigation.

Points of departure

For scholars of the humanities who share the experience of living in an age of deconstructed history, it is hard to keep intact the notion of archives as storehouses of memory: places from which knowledge (in a positivist sense) can simply be harvested without regard to the history of the documents themselves. Today it is generally acknowledged that archival institutions and repositories not only stored historical charters and records but were likewise crucial instruments in the historical formation of states, religious congregations, trading houses and civic associations and deserve to be the subject of historical investigation themselves.[2] This was the starting point for our project, where we chose to analyse the processual histories of four archives within a defined period – the eighteenth century – and originating from a specific area – Europe. In the project, three closely connected perspectives met: the idea of archives as sites through which knowledge is produced and re-produced; the insight that archives are material, and therefore have technical and medial dimensions; and the importance of regarding the historically divergent uses of archives. In the project we grappled with questions concerning the evolution of media, the public sphere, and urbanity, as well as the transformation of gender, the family, and religious beliefs. These factors were all regarded as central for processes of modernity that in many ways marked the eighteenth century, especially its second half.

Much as archival practices played a seminal role in the establishment of centralised states in the early modern period, they also lent themselves to the establishment of new social formations and new forms of social and religious organization. The spread of practices that we might recognise as archival, in the early modern period of Europe, coincided, far from arbitrarily, with the spread of a number of practices of collecting – simultaneously giving rise to new ideas of musealisation, philology, etc. The overarching practices of collecting and ordering might be seen as constitutive of the episteme of the early modern period, as has been suggestively shown by Michel Foucault and Jean Baudrillard.[3]

The development of archives was in many ways seminal for these processes, and the archives themselves reflect this importance. However, it is one thing to say that archives are part of power/knowledge regimes and another to show this on an empirical level. By studying historical archives, taking their materiality in consideration and investigating the way they were being formed and used, some of the mechanisms behind these processes can be made visible.

As theoretical precursors of the archival turn, two vastly influential French thinkers are often invoked: Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, both of whom were also important touchstones for our project. Their respective contributions to studies of archives have been vigorously described, interpreted and criticised. As the type of questions they addressed formed points of departure for many consequent studies of archives (or, alternatively, stumbling blocks for others), a brief survey of their thinking about the subject is worthwhile. Foucault's most far-reaching attempt to elaborate "archive" as an analytical concept was made in *L'archéologie du savoir*, 1969 (*An Archaeology of Knowledge*), where the term was used as a tool for explaining how a "statement" (*énoncé*) could be made the primary object of critical investigations. When we try to understand statements found in books or documents, we cannot regard them as floating abstract propositions, Foucault argued. Instead, statements must be considered as localised within a (historically changing) web of other statements, which are all intertwined with institutional codes, everyday practices, and relations of power. What ultimately

holds such a web together is, then, the function Foucault refers to as "the archive". Or in his own words:

> The archive is first the law of what can be said, the system that governs the appearance of statements as unique events. But the archive is also that which determines that all these things said do not accumulate endlessly in an amorphous mass, nor are they inscribed in an unbroken linearity, nor do they disappear at the mercy of chance external accidents; but they are grouped together in distinct figures, composed together in accordance with multiple relations, maintained or blurred in accordance with specific regularities; that which determines that they do not withdraw at the same pace in time, but shine, as it were, like stars, some that seem close to us shining brightly from afar off, while others that are in fact close to us are already growing pale.[4]

This concept of the "archive" as a system for ordering discourses can readily be seen to form a basis for Foucault's nominalist epistemology.[5] In this sense, then, the term "archive" does not primarily refer to the place, the documents or even the organization that maintains them. It refers to the function of ordering; it is a name for a specific system, which distributes and (just as importantly) redistributes discourses, constraining and conditioning both the production and reception of statements. Foucault's concept of the archive is regularly invoked when the term "archive" is to be mustered for a more or less metaphorical usage, but, as Knut Ove Eliassen has convincingly shown, Foucault used the term in several ways and never provided a technical definition of it.[6] Rather, he used the term pragmatically in order to pinpoint different "archival" aspects that pertain to discursive actions, which, in turn, were studied to shed

light on how "knowledge", "power" (and later also "subjectivity") were used, maintained, and related to each other.

When Jacques Derrida placed the concept of "archive" at the centre of a conference lecture held at the Sigmund Freud Museum and Archive, subsequently turned into the work *Mal d'archive*, 1995 (*Archive Fever*), the notion of power was likewise of direct importance.[7] Derrida's initial point was that power (commandments) precedes all sorts of narrative beginnings (commencements); and that, consequently, all references to and reiterations of archival documents in order to prove legitimacy and exert authority are based on this original appropriation of power over the right to, quite literally, keep the origin in a confined place. Using the etymology of the word "archive", which stems from *archaeon*, the name of the place where the rulers, archons, of the ancient Athenian city-state were seated, Derrida argued that power intrinsically permeated the archive as form. The archive was an extension of a "patriarchal function" which the gathering and "consignment" of different forms of documents served to reiterate. Derrida's text is dense and complex, and while its winding argumentation cannot easily be captured in a short summary, suffice it to say that *Archive Fever*, besides its notion about the primacy of power in the "origin" of archives, also brought a lively discussion concerning the unavoidable temporality of archives into play. Derrida connected the casual observation – that archives are themselves subjected to those temporal conditions of changeability, destruction, and oblivion which the mnemotechnical aid it offers tries to overcome – with some thoughts on the psychoanalytic aspects of archival desire. While the accumulation of documents can be regarded as a way to exorcise the passing of time (through allowing reiteration of records of a passed reality), the archive itself is also subjected to the workings of time (and it never

becomes complete, never fully catches up with the reality it tries to fixate). But the very desire to gain a complete and never-changing archive (i.e. the desire Derrida terms "archive fever"), is also a form of "death-drive", since the complete archive would only be totally realizable if it comprised the world that surrounded it. (The problem of the map in scale 1:1.) "There is no archive without a place of consignation, without a technique of repetition, and without a certain exteriority. No archive without outside."[8]

Such ruminations may appear abstract, and far removed from the concrete, and often mundane, nature of actual historical archives, filled, as they regularly are, with bulky files of administrative documents often written by over-worked and business-minded scribes who perhaps had little or no concern for the philosophical aspects of their labours. But this estrangement of the archival concept from the actual archives, has opened up the for a range of new ways to address matters of archiving. Studies that use "the archive" as a general metaphor (often with reference to Derrida or Foucault) – have been criticised for simplifying how actual archives work and neglecting much of the knowledge about archives which has long been established by archivists and researchers in the archival sciences.[9] Yet, even for archival scholars unimpressed by the terms and perspectives developed by post-structuralist philosophers and historians, the texts of the latter have had the benefit of problematizing aspects that earlier was taken more or less for granted and opening new lines of discussions. Many impressive efforts of writing archival histories in new ways have been made during recent decades: we refer to recent works by leading scholars such as Eric Ketelaar, Luciana Duranti, Markus Friedrich, Geoffrey Yeo, and Randolph C. Head for further reference.[10]

A common feature in contemporary research is an emphasis on archiving as a practice. For our purpose, it has been useful to think of archiving as a cultural technique.[11] This concept accentuates the specific material dimension of archives, and this dimension is something that we, as scholars, have found that we cannot fully comprehend without help from archivists. To answer questions concerning the archives themselves (be it the archival collections or the organisations), the mere registers are seldom sufficient. The current-day archivists often possess the necessary tacit knowledge, as they are the ones working on a day-to-day basis with these materials. To make the archive itself the object of study also implies building on the work of the long-gone persons once involved in collecting, storing, ordering, and preserving. One challenge for any such study is to identify and make this work visible.

To acknowledge this is also to acknowledge the fact that archives are results of processes, and not static entities.[12] Our view of processes lies close to what Percy Williams Bridgman termed "operationalism" as early as the 1920s.[13] That is, the view that rather than talking about the physical world as an entity in its own right, the physicist must strictly observe each and every operation performed to make a certain observation, and the knowledge the physicist produces can never be seen in isolation from the set of operations necessary to obtain it. In this sense, we wish to understand archives by a study of the operations which constitute archiving as a process.

The studies of Dutch archivist Eric Ketelaar, which have made a large impact in the field of archival studies, have given us further inspiration in this line of thinking. Ketelaar identifies what he calls processes of archivalization that precede archivization; through these socially and culturally charged processes, selections of what is to be archived are made. An important aspect of archivalization is that the choices are made not only consciously but also un-

consciously.[14] This entails that archives should be contextualised with regard to several aspects: social, historical, cultural, political, geographical, etc. Archives are not, however, merely products of these contexts. They are dynamically and dialectally connected to individuals and organisations which partake in the construction of social meaning. Archives contribute to the fabric of their contexts through their usage.

The considerations presented so far have three methodological consequences. Addressing the crude materiality of the archive, our four investigations can be regarded as archaeological rather than historical, in the sense attributed to these terms in the tradition of material epistemology, investigated by Knut Ebeling. According to Ebeling, to work archeologically implies regarding the past not through its documents, but through material remnants providing "another vision of the past than the one we normally see".[15] Accordingly: "Archaeology makes visible, whereas history narrates what has already been documented. It points to breaks and gaps, whereas history pursues a quick linearity of dates."[16] This also implies that the "wild archaeologist" (Ebeling's notion of those applying the archaeological method outside archaeology proper) is dealing not with what is past and gone, but with what is "effective, unpassed past",[17] i. e. unfinished phenomena still active in the present. As becomes increasingly clear when dealing with the different formations of times past, this is certainly true of "the archive" as a historical phenomenon incessantly mirroring our own current situation.

In an archive, its functions, and thus its history and preconditions, are stored in layers that in turn are the result of different contexts, which are charged with power. Accordingly, archives may be read as palimpsests. The analytical purpose is to make the structure of archiving readable in archives. How can we confront the often-multiple voices and intentions found in the depots of archival institutions, which in turn often might accumulate other archival collections (fonds) as a part of their whole? An important aspect of this un-layering is to consider the individuals – women and men – who in different ways were active in the process of shaping the collections/archives. (Not only the archivists mentioned above, but also clerks, secretaries, etc.)

Furthermore, such an approach to archives invited us to compare and make distinctions at several levels. Three of these methodological implications should be described here, as they pertain to all of our projects. Firstly, the method of comparing multiple sources to elucidate a given event or artefact. This classical source critical method, exercised by historians such as Jules Michelet and Leopold Ranke, could be expected to be an important tool in writing the histories of archival institutions or collections, but surprisingly often it is wanting. The assumption that archives only consist of the documents recounted in the inventory displays as little imagination as treating politics as only that which is found in official treatises and proclamations. Different types of sources need to be compared; the official inventories need to be put alongside the note slips about disappeared materials and letters of complaint about the heaping backlogs stored in the cellar. An archivist's description of a certain repository of which he or she is or was occupied with managing might regularly be taken as a privileged and well-informed source; but this perspective is not neutral. For example, archivists often had an interest of displaying their custody as either more well-ordered (when they wanted a rise in salary) or more chaotic (when they wanted to recruit an assistant) than what an impartial observer would have considered fair.[18] In short, there might be more drama than expected in the formation of records and arrangement of

archives. And processual approaches should attempt to unearth the uncertainties, frictions, and outright conflicts involved in the making, storing, ordering, and presenting of records and document collections, by using multiple and varied sources.

Secondly, apart from comparing sources, one can compare objects of study, the archives and archival practices, with each other, to detect changes and continuities of function, in time and across spaces between objects of similar type. Strong arguments for the use of methodologically informed comparisons of archives and archiving in this sense have lately been made by, for example, Randolph C. Head and Markus Friedrich.[19] In recent time, numerous studies of governance and state administration have used comparative methods to show how forceful the impetus of organised record-keeping became in Europe generally from the sixteenth century and onwards (though there were forerunners and latecomers). In these studies the wide diversity of practices which record-keepers and archivists used to achieve similar ends is striking; something which highlights the need for studying the situated socio-cultural conditions, with their different possibilities and constraints, along with the histories of archives.

Thirdly, one can compare things and practices of different types and from different fields, to explore similarities in function and mindset.[20] The method was notably used in relation to archives in Wolfgang Ernst's study about practices of "storing memories" in nineteenth-century Germany, *Im Namen von Geschichte*.[21] Such modes of comparison can help us to rethink preconceived boundaries, for instance, between the private and the public sphere, by underscoring how much of the records kept for "private" use (diaries, personal letters) in form and practices show affinities with "public" records (minutes of proceedings, business transactions). This does not amount to saying that differences, distinctions, and boundaries do not exist, but rather that they are effects of practices – not least, practices with documents.

Knowledge, Power, and Materiality: Archives in Sweden. A Project Summary

Our project consisted of four different studies, together covering four central aspects of the processes of modernity during the eighteenth century.

In his dissertation Berndtsson studies what he terms the "archival culture" of the Order of Freemasons.[22] At the outset of his project, the idea was to study the administrative archiving of Masonic lodges based on the notion that the lodges, along with many other fraternal association, sociable clubs, and academies, were important agents in the formation of a public sphere in eighteenth-century Europe. The lodge's organisational frame, prescribed by documents, brought about a voluntary bureaucratisation of private life that was of importance for the construction of civic life in the coming centuries. Masons learnt to understand the nature of their polity in new ways through creating their associational network with techniques alike those employed by contemporary state administrations. This followed a track set out by scholars such as Margaret Jacob, Peter Clark, Daniel Roche, and Holger Zaunstück who have all suggested that the self-organisation and the administrative practices of sociable associations were of great importance for European modernisation.[23]

Visits to a number of archives holding Masonic collections, however, resulted in a change of plan. Masonic administrators, it turned out, were not only preoccupied with aggregating organisational

records. The Order was also itself described as an "archive" of secretive "higher knowledge". In this setting, archival documents became objects of desire and sources of anxiety. Within Masonry, there were notions of "secret archives" containing the innermost secrets of the Order. While these core mysteries might only have existed in a wholly idealised archive, this idea, as such, boosted notions and sentiments, hopes and fears.

The Masonic archives were used to construct – and maintain – a distinctive sphere where things were documentarily regulated and followed a specific order, distinguishing the inside from the outside. However, the Masonic preoccupation with documents of different kinds might also be seen as a way to give temporal durability to a collective fantasy of a well-ordered existence, where everything followed a harmonious and symbolically meaningful pattern, as opposed to the chaotic simultaneity of life outside, marked by the emergence of a bustling modernity.

In his project, focusing on the family archive of the eighteenth-century publicist, writer, bookseller and librarian Carl Christofferson Gjörwell, Fischer studied the formation and keeping of a family archive as a central aspect of the establishment of the bourgeois nuclear family as an emotional community. Through the endeavours of the archivist *pater familias*, the members of the family, along with the intimate circle of friends, are constituted as a unique entity, set apart from the outside world, sharing communal feelings of love and devotion. The archive provides this community with a history, consisting of shared moments of joy (although other emotions also make their occasional, albeit remarkably sparse, appearance). The project, accordingly, sought to view the archive simultaneously through the lenses of media archaeology and emotional history.[24] The points put forth by the project were strongly corroborated by

the work of historian Ida Lindblom, published during the final phase of the project.[25]

The archival practices of Gjörwell were instrumental not only in constituting this community, but also in emotionally disciplining its members. Control of the archive and its contents implied control over the emotional expressions that were either commended through being granted entry into the archive, or censored by being omitted. Through this "soft power" Gjörwell admonished his children to adapt to a program of socially and culturally acceptable emotional behaviour. In this reproof of certain emotional attitudes, one also discerns a conflict of generations; between the moderate mid-eighteenth-century sentimentalism of the parental generation and the *Sturm und Drang* attitudes of the Gjörwell children.

The archive as a collection of emotionally charged objects, could profitably be viewed as an example of an emerging material culture in the eighteenth century, extending to furniture, housewares, interior design, works of art, clothes, and jewellery, where objects were invested with emotional significance, and surrounded by particular practices.[26]

Mattsson's study focuses on the archive of the Royal Police Chamber of Stockholm between the years 1776–1791.[27] While the Chamber was a state institution with some traditional and well-established bureaucratic procedures adopted from other parts of the Swedish legal system, it was at the same time based on new concepts of a centralised police force, connected to processes of modernity such as urbanisation, standardisation, and increased surveillance and state control.

Orality played a large part in the creation of the archive. Most of the documents are minutes from sessions, at which plaintiffs, defendants and witnesses gave their version of the events investigated

by the police. At these sessions, it was the role of the notary to write down the important parts of what was being said.[28] From the preserved documents, we can tell that often, especially during the first years of the period, the discrepancies between the memory notes and the rough copies are considerable. A memory note might only consist of a few words, while the rough copy could be several pages long. Thus, it would seem that some notaries preferred to memorise the conversations rather than write them down in session – a practice more related to oral culture. The notary, accordingly, had considerable power over what information went into the archive and in what form. None of the minutes were verbatim but, instead, usually told a story compiled from the information given by a person in what often seems to have been an interaction with questions and answers.

The role of archives in the Swedish state bureaucracy during this period differed considerably from what was the case in other European countries in one crucial aspect: After the Freedom of the Press Act of 1766, Swedish citizens had the right to access and publish almost all documents filed in the archives of the state. This, paradoxically, meant both that the standards for archiving were set higher than before and that state officials had a strong incitement to keep certain things out of the archives. Among other things, the tasks more connected to what could be called the "secret police" are not registered in the archive and that some of the people involved preferred to convey information through speech rather than writing.

The religious sphere was one of the areas where archival changes took place, and we find archival changes in established churches, as well as in different revival moments that broke loose from their commands. In her study, Öhrberg deals with the formation and use of archives within the Moravian movement, one of many Lutheran revivals. As secularism has been considered one of the aspects of modernity, the Moravian movement, and other evangelical revivals in their time, have not been included in the discussions of the processes of modernity until recently. However, the Moravian notions of the self, gender, use of media, and mobility in many ways expand into modernity.

The Moravian movement is known for its archives, which still exist today and contain vast materials. These archives took on their current form at the turn of the eighteenth century, although the collecting and filing of documents began as early as the late 1720s, when the movement was founded. Collecting and filing documents was a practice that became imperative for a network of communication, through which information and documents were constantly circulated to enhance the global ambitions of the movement. Furthermore, religious Moravian beliefs were intimately entangled in, and created through archival practices, as the Moravian believed that some of the texts written by the members could make additions to the Christian canon of holy texts (for example, the Bible, Luther's writings, and so on).[29]

In the project a dual aspect is used, where attention is directed both to how individuals ordered archives and to how documents written by them were ordered and filed. In connection to this, the project focuses on the output of the archives, as well as their importance for historiography. A number of women and men belonging to the international Moravian movement, but mainly connected to Sweden, are traced through Moravian archives situated in three different European countries (UK, Germany, and Sweden). All of these individuals travelled, and were diligent writers of texts such as letters, travel journals, memoires, and religious literature of different sorts, and their mobility is juxtaposed to the constant exchange of texts and communication that are a consequence of

their mobility. Theoretical discussions on temporality and space are used to consider the knowledge created and set in play regarding gender identity in connection with this mobility. One significant result, which also contributes to gender history, concerns Moravian women, as the investigation shows their importance in the shaping of the Moravian collections and archives.

Theoretical and methodological implications

In this final section, we summarise some shared theoretical insights from our respective research projects, starting with the very fundamental question of the convenience of "the archive" as a theoretical concept in historical studies. What, and in what respect, does it matter if a collection is conceived of as an archive?

Rather than searching for the features that distinguish an archive from other types of collections, we find it more fruitful to discern certain *functions* that can be deemed archival. Using the notion of archival functions as a yardstick, it is possible to see how these functions, in varying degree, can be attributed to a number of collections, organizational or personal, which accordingly take on archival qualities. It must then be kept in mind that such "degrees" of "archivality" might not pertain with any stability in relation to a particular set of documents over time. Our point is rather that a number of functions tend to reappear continually in very different kinds of archives as a sort of family resemblance. In what follows we will talk about collections endowed with archival functions as "archives", but it should be borne in mind that the term is then used in the broad sense outlined above.

Let us exemplify by returning to our investigations. In European Masonry, one can for instance see a general tendency for esoteric manuscript collections, which during the eighteenth century were kept in many lodge archives, during the nineteenth century generally to lose their value as texts telling of higher truths. Instead, they were assigned a secondary use, as historical documents, testifying to the beliefs of previous generations. And whereas many engaged eighteenth-century Masons had searched in books and manuscripts for a mythic prehistory of Masonry (whether in the form of the Ancient Egyptians, the Essenes, or the Knight Templars), the nineteenth-century Masons instead turned to the administrative records of eighteenth-century lodges, to produce a "scientific" history of the association.

Gjörwell's collection of family letters was stripped of its initial function at his death when the collection was inherited by his daughter Gustava Lindahl, who held onto it as a treasured family souvenir, but evidently did not feel compelled to keep up the archival practices of her father, thus effectively turning it from an open archive into a closed collection. As the collection was ultimately donated to the Royal Library in Stockholm, it became a historical archive predominantly consulted by literary and cultural historians interested in the eighteenth century (not seldom with a keen eye for the more gossip-worthy contents of the correspondences).[30]

Moravian archival practices changed in approximately the same period, that is in the early nineteenth century. Moravian collections of files were now assembled into purpose-built archive buildings, and ordered by archivists according to the logics characterised by new historiographical ideals.[31] Documental functions connected to practices of religious conversion and belief were gradually replaced by notions of historiography and organisational genealogy. Thus, texts that were earlier seen as loaded with faith and imperative from a religious perspective were now filed and read as source material.

In a similar way, the archives of the Royal Police Chamber of Stockholm during the early years mainly functioned as a collection of records used in daily work. The police commissioner and his employees were to keep track of what had been said and done during the investigations of different crimes and disturbances, and not least monitor of the criminal history of certain citizens. At the same time the unique legislation in Sweden, which prescribed that citizens had the right to be given access to files from official archives in order to have them printed, made it clear that these documents, no matter how insignificant they could seem, took on a larger role in society. They were to be preserved and not only recorded the actions and words of criminals, victims and witnesses, but also had the function of legitimising the government and protecting the rule of law. The law also prescribed that all records must be kept in order and were to be preserved for the future. The fact that the law so clearly emphasised the role of the archives in the governmental and legal institutions must have made it natural for those producing and ordering the documents to be aware of both the contemporary and future functions of the archives they made. When the archive of the Royal Police Chamber later ceased to be used in daily work, and became an archive documenting both the work and procedures of an organisation now much changed, and the fates of people long dead, it underwent a change in the function which, unlike some of the other examples, was precedented and intended. At the same time, it is now hardly preserved in the form first intended. Some things have been culled over the centuries, and others eaten by rats, while in some places we find single slips of paper with just an address on them preserved, and important files missing.

Even if there are some differences, a similar process has been in play in all four separate studies. The primary use of documents

– regulating and instructing, evoking emotions and demanding response – eventually receded, and a secondary form of historical use developed.[32] One can talk of documental "resemiosis", a shift in the way documents meant something.[33] The imperatives of the documents were set in brackets; the archival groups in question no longer operated in the way primarily designated but instead showed, in the mode of "history", how operations had taken place in the past. This transformation of records, charters, and other documents into sources is an effect not only connected to epistemological shifts regarding historiography, but also related to the archival storage function. Archival repositories make media available for retrieval over long periods of time, and documents often outlive the agency of those that created them. The historical benefit could be wholly unforeseen by the primary users, as when latter day historians makes sources out of sketchy administrative memory notes, found among the official records of an office only because no one happened to throw them away. In such a case, the archival function of making sources out of documents is activated only later. But this function could also be employed with intention and strategy. Some wrote to be picked up by historians, in order to control their future reputation. Not only writing but also the caretaking of writings was crucial for promoting a certain ideal of oneself, or one's association or congregation, to the future. The idea of "resemiosis" makes the interplay between primary and secondary usage dynamic – it encourages us to ask how we read documents as sources and why we are able to do so in the first place.

The analytical notion of archival functions can be seen in relation to what we refer to as *archival qualities*, that is, characteristics and properties, which significantly belong to "archives" as conceptual entities. Whereas the term archival functions, refers to what archiv-

ing does, the term archival qualities refers to what the designation of something as "archival" means. These terms are of course much less precise than regular archival terminology, but precisely for that reason they offer the benefit of letting us see how certain "archival" techniques for dealing with documents permeate many forms of communication. Archival qualities are always qualities for someone; all collections with archival qualities serve a purpose (which can be anything from a grand strategy for controlling a transcontinental empire through administrative records to a vague plan for stashing the unsorted papers of a deceased uncle in the attic somewhere where one does not have to think about them). Archives interact with the surrounding world, for example through instilling documents, recording events in the world, as an interface for further interaction. "Quod non est in actis, non est in mundo" (what is not in the documents is not in the world), to quote a Latin saying frequently invoked when the subject of archives is touched upon.[34]

This interaction with the world always implies a possible exertion of power. Any archive is a potential site of power, where humans exert power over one aspect of reality or another, often including other humans. An archive, accordingly, can furnish the basis for strategic acting: as Michel de Certeau has highlighted, strategical action needs a certain "site" to operate from, in spatial as well as conceptual terms.[35] The establishment and maintenance of a collection with archival qualities is a technology of governing, not only when state powers are directly involved. This pertains to archiving at all levels. The keeping of a personal archive might, much like the keeping of a diary, be seen as a technology of self-government, but it could also be, as for instance the well-kept card-index of the influential Swedish literary critic Olof Lagercrantz illustrates, an instrument for ruling others. Lagercrantz famously collected all

sorts of information (often tending towards the scandalous or at least gossipy) about the contemporary Swedish literati of his time, and organised it with a card index.[36]

Individuals can get "caught up" in the archive and made subjects of the power exercised through it. But a consequence of the "liberal" historical archive, the roots of which go back to the aftermath of the French Revolution, is that individuals and groups subjected to offenses can also use the archives built up by the offenders to form a basis of power different from those who produced the archive. If archivization is the prerequisite for entering certain, often positivistic, and dominating forms of history writing, being excluded from the archive also means risking exclusion from this traditional history. Much as there is a "strategic" dimension to the archive, there are also archival "tactics", to use de Certeau's famous dichotomy. When groups hitherto excluded from the dominant historical narratives (be it women, ethnic minorities, or LGBTQ people) have attempted to carve out a history of their own, they have turned to archives with different questions from those the archives were set up to answer. Thus, for instance, the historical experience of being gay can be reconstructed from the judicial archives originally documenting persecution, converting the archive of "shame" into an archive of "pride".[37]

Since what is not in the documents is not in the world, according to the dictum quoted above, leaving behind some sort of trace is a prerequisite for one's existence being historically acknowledged at all. The annotations and sometimes photographs secretly buried in the grounds of the extermination camps of the Nazi regime during the Second World War in the hope of being someday retrieved and added to the historical archive as testimonies to what had happened heroically illustrate this.[38]

Damned if you get caught up in the archive, damned if you are left out. "I'd rather be dead than misread [...] It's because I know history is about representation that I want to control my own", gender historian Joan Wallach Scott drastically formulated it in her book *The Fantasy of Feminist History*, where she discusses how to go about donating her documents to the Feminist Theory Archive Collections in Brown University's John Hay Library. Her concern is that these documents might one day be ideologically misused when taken out of their archival storage.[39] Interestingly, the motive was in principle the same as when, for instance, eighteenth-century monarchs, such as Gustav III, prohibited aspiring historians from accessing the state archives. They, too, had misgivings about being "misrepresented". Concerns about archival effects do not necessarily fade away with changes in archival regimes. The "censorial" archives of the early modern period served, above all, to control the use of texts (which however often made knowledge-generating archival use rather limited). The modern liberal historical archive – which generally wants to serve the needs of its "users" – instead tends to promote the use of textual statements in different contexts and narratives. To accommodate for the fear of losing control of one's statements (and thus one's legacy), a fear which was as real to Wallach Scott as it was to Gustav III, even modern-day archives often allows individuals or agencies to regulate the public use of their documents, e.g. by demanding permission prior to usage. Thus, features of the censorial archive are still active in the liberal archives of today. The lesson to be learnt is that comparisons with historical archival practices help to elucidate paradoxes inherent in the archives of our own time.

A crucial insight that has been the result of the archival vogue in research is that archival orders are marked by notions of gender, colonial repression, ethnicity, and heteronormativity, as shown in recent years by many scholars. These investigations come from different theoretical traditions, and work with a wide range of materials, but nevertheless can be seen as connected through a focus on the intricate power dynamics that marks the archival processes. An important factor is that this research has paid attention to archival practices ignored in earlier research, such as colonial archives, or women as having been active in shaping archives. The notion of the Western world as the epicentre for knowledge and scientific progress is thereby challenged, and new historiographies are created. But the question is how to capture this from a meta-perspective? Our suggestion is that the notion of archival functions makes it possible to observe and pay attention to how archives are embedded in societal and discursive, ideological structures.

This points to a crucial aspect regarding archival structures: they entail a set of rules not just for the accumulation and storage of documents, but also for how these documents can be handled for producing certain kinds of knowledge. Any collection possessing archival qualities, in this analytical sense, will not only have a principle for selecting input, but also a principle for processing the contents of the collection for (potential) output. Archival collections must, to express it somewhat technologically, contain an algorithm for processing data as information.

Let us illustrate the rather abstract passage above by making a comparative example. Take for instance the *Wunderkammer* of early modern Europe, a collection that has some archival qualities; these compilations invited the beholder's imagination to muse upon the possible correspondences between the cultural and the natural world, taking a more or less loosely defined set of associations as a point of departure. A records office (or what in German archi-

val-context is termed a *Registratur*), on the other hand, will supply the user with a more or less strict protocol that allows her or him to perform a set of operations designated to produce a particular outcome according to certain rules and criteria. A contemporary police archive allows its users to produce knowledge on crimes and criminals. Information about criminal activities of particular individuals can be traced, but the serial quality of the files also serves to warrant general statements on for example the frequency of certain criminal acts. This knowledge can then be managed not only chronologically (allowing, for instance, utterances on the rise and decline of certain criminal behaviours) but also geographically (allowing, for instance, utterances on particularly crime-infested areas of a city). In short, archival ordering (in this case temporal, spatial, and "thematic") can facilitate various forms for cross-referencing. The kind of knowledge accordingly produced can be of interest not only to police officers fighting crime, but to researchers, politicians, and citizens as well. Different as they are, both cases illustrate a basic function of archival structures: their forming of relations between singular "documents" and larger conceptual categories.

A final example, to illustrate what we mean by archival qualities, is when one or another author's private book collection is integrated into a research library. In such a case, rules of input and output are (in practice) bestowed upon the collection post factum, i.e. after it has stopped serving as a personal collection. Whereas the original collection might have come about, as such collections normally do, in a more or less haphazard manner, with books being acquired for leisure or learning or sometimes gifted to the proprietor without his or her intention, once the collection enters the archival institution, the books all warrant their place as they testify to the possible literary experience of a particular author. Possibly the only reasons

for including any new entities in it would be if it was proven that other books, found somewhere else, had originally been a part of this collection. It becomes an archived "representation" of a library. Similarly, a principle of output is put into the place, since the collection, refunctioned into a literary archive, henceforth allows for scholarly statements on possible influences on and inspirations for the authorship in question.[40]

A prerequisite for this knowledge production is a certain *uniformity* of the archival records, which allows for operations of the kind depicted above. Two objects or utterances can be effectively compared only if they are found similar to one another in at least some respects. Archival ordering creates connections. Following the principle of pertinence, it is a connection in terms of subjects handled. Following the modern-day principle of provenience, it is connected in terms of sender (although this material in practice, following the *respect des fonds*, often also contain subclasses according to different documental forms and subject areas made by the document producer). In most archives, this implies that the records must be kept in adherence to certain preconceived routines that allow them to enter into series of more or less similar, and hence comparable, objects.

This *seriality* of the records or archival objects is yet another important archival quality. In theory, there can never be a singular object in the archival structure. Of course, there can be many odd, seemingly unclassifiable, documents laying around as a back-log in the repository. But in order to be allowed into the archival structure, each and every object must already be perceived as belonging to a preconceived category of objects. This archival category might be in accordance with the form that the record-producing agent or agency itself designed – as when the minutes of the weekly meetings of a board becomes archived in a chronologically ordered series of

files. But in other cases, the archival category is wholly different from the errand and context of the documents first purpose – the German archivist Striediger exemplified changes of meaning by a set of love letters that had become archived as part of a file with evidential documents relating to a divorce trial.[41] Each and every archived document is in this sense always an instance of a category larger than itself. This means that a prerequisite of archival ordering is abstraction. Only in an abstracted form can information enter the archive as a record, and consequently most archive guidelines can be regarded as manuals for such abstraction,[42] as can, of course, the use of prescribed forms, required by authorities and similar administrative measures.[43] A police report is for instance an account of a singular (more or less disturbing) event, but as a record in the archive it is by necessity a token of an abstract category, be it "theft", "robbery", "speeding", etc. Alternatively, when retrieved within a different seriality, it can be an instance of the criminal career of one particular perpetrator.

To enter an archival structure, an order of some kind, a document must be coded according to a specific scheme. This also implies that the order of any given archive logically, although certainly not always chronologically, precedes the actual contents. A more or less thorough knowledge of this order is a prerequisite for regarding documents as part of an archive and not just as a pile of papers. In fact, what makes Gjörwell's collection of familial letters an archive, rather than just an ordinary collection of letters preserved for personal, sentimental reasons, is precisely this notion of order of which the above-mentioned principles for admission are one strong aspect. But also, the fact that the family archive existed alongside other collections with equally discernible principles and destined for other purposes, strongly underscores its archival functionality.

As the example of Gjörwell's family archive displays, a particular archive is not only required to adhere to a certain order in itself; an archive is also always conceived of in relation to other archives. The family collection fulfils a different function than the collection of learned correspondences, from which it is also strictly separated, organizationally, as well physically. In Gjörwell's case this is illustrated by the three large cupboards in his study, each dedicated to a separate archive and collectively making up the "collectio Gjörwelliana".

In the archives of the Masons, one likewise finds how several types of archiving intersected. Especially the central organs demanded extensive administrative efforts of record-keeping. These organs issued formal documents (warrants for new lodges or certificates of membership for individual members), distributed information (often through circular letters), and collected member lists, minutes and accountings from the lodges adhering to their system; almost as if it were a state. (This was an activity that several contemporary princes and monarchs regarded with a certain anxiety and which Masons often did their best to explain away by saying that it was only "order for the sake of order".[44]) But alongside this, Masonic lodges collected written orations and other forms of texts by their members – and moreover, lodge archives often became depots for collections of esoteric manuscripts, since members engaged in such forms of knowledge often saw a connection between the exclusive order and such secretive types of knowledge. Thus, at the same time as Masonic archives dealt with "typical" state forms of records, they also contained material that modern archivists would likely want to put in a library rather than an archive.

In all archives, the entry and exit of documents, as well as their ordering, is directed by a more or less rigid protocol. Any archival

collection will accordingly reproduce an order, and simultaneously it will impose this order on the world it is set to document. Such an order will have the nature of a "model of the world", where certain possible orders are suppressed for the benefit of others. In its structure, the archive represents and reconstructs possible orders and thus inevitably prioritises certain orders over others. Temporal orders are given priority over spatial ones, or vice versa. Organizations might be ranked over individuals, or the other way around. Documents by or about women might (as was often the case) be inserted as parts of files titled and registered with the names of their husbands or fathers.

Much like the early modern Wunderkammer, the archive thus becomes a microcosm. It will inevitably tend to reproduce a certain temporal, as well as a certain spatial structure. The archive can simultaneously be regarded as a representation of the past, as well as of the present and a possible future, and the archive also tends to reproduce a hierarchic space, organised as centre and periphery (as for instance metropole and colony). And just as the Wunderkammer the archive creates an inside and an outside by allowing certain items, and accordingly certain aspects of reality, entrance into the collection and leaving others out. It also creates insiders and outsiders: those with access to the archive and those without. There are secret archives, secrets in archives, and archiving in secret. In totalitarian regimes, for instance, state surveillance is often accompanied by meticulous record-keeping. The mere suspicion that one's actions and utterances are monitored and recorded by a repressive surveillance apparatus certainly affects the social fabric of any such society.[45]

Thus, just as the knowledge of the existence of an archive will influence the perception and the behaviour of anyone who might be the subject of involuntary archivization, the presence of an archive within an institution will also deeply influence the behaviour of those active within this institution, because an archive will not only mirror an aspect of the world outside itself, it will also mirror the activities bringing forth the archive, as well as the people performing these activities. In this sense one thing that the archive always documents is the very archival practice itself. Thus, whereas a police archive will document the criminal activities of the citizens of a certain place, it will also always document the work of the police officers themselves.[46] Its well-kept ledger is a testimony not only of the deeds of criminals, but also of the efforts and devotion of the criminal investigators.

—— —— —— —— ——

We have argued that the notions of archival functionality and archival qualities can capture archiving as a process. With this lens we discussed how to analyse and understand different aspects of the archives, and collections, at hand in our project, as well as in general. One question remains. Why are some of us drawn into archives? There is a paradox built into our projects, as well as into many other studies pursued after the archival turn, and this paradox is something that we finally would like to bring to the fore. All of us are well aware that the final truth about history is not to be found in the archives – nor by unfolding the processes that formed them and how they operate within complex contexts. However, lingering under the surface of our project, and many others like it, is a somewhat romantic notion of archives, perhaps even an obsession. An obsession quite far removed from the totalizing "archive fever" described by Derrida, and more akin to the musings on the allure of the archive described by Arlette Farge and to the messy materiality

of archives poetically pictured by Carolyn Steedman.[47]

The world, indeed, is a messy place, and history, for certain, is a messy business. There might, after all then, if one is so inclined, be a certain comfort to be had in the acknowledgement that all attempts at ordering this mess, now and in times past, have also ultimately been caught up in this messiness of social life and human existence, bringing forth alternative models of the world that are at times tragically or comically inadequate, at times shockingly cruel and at times endearingly ambitious. Thus, the history of the archives them-selves simultaneously bears testimony to the (for better or worse) inevitable shortcomings of human ambition and to the undying resilience of people trying to make sense of themselves and their world. The study of these phenomena, thus, might be perceived as a labour of love, paying homage to these abortive efforts that make up the fabric of our history. In the end, perhaps, it is time to come of out of the archives, and embrace the fact that we are hopelessly and utterly infatuated archive romantics.

Endnotes

1   For a recent overview of the archival turn, written by one of the foremost profiles of this turn, see Eric Ketelaar, "Archival Turns and Returns" in Anne J Gilliland, Sue McKemmish & Andrew J Lau (eds.), *Research in the Archival Multiverse* (Melbourne: Monash University Publishing, 2017), 228–268.

2   In recent years, the history of archiving, not least early modern archiving, has been a salient subject, see e. g. the recent anthologies: Maria Pia Donato & Anne Saada (eds.), *Pratiques d'archives à l'époque moderne. Europe, mondes coloniaux* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2019);

Kate Peters, Alexandra Walsham & Liesbeth Corens (eds.), *Archives and Information in the Early Modern World*, Proceedings of the British Academy 212 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018) and Alexandra Walsham (ed.), *The Social History of the Archive. Record-Keeping in Early Modern Europe*, Past and Present. Supplements, 11 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016) and the special issue of *European History Quarterly. Archival Transformations in Early Modern Europe*, vol. 46, (2016). For some important monographs see: Randolph C. Head, *Making Archives in Early Modern Europe. Proof, Information and Political Record-Keeping, 1400–1700* (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2019); Markus Friedrich, *Die Geburt des Archivs. Eine Wissensgeschichte* (Munich: De Gruyter, 2013); Kathryn Burns, *Into the Archive. Writing and Power in Colonial Peru* (Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2010); Arndt Brendecke, *Imperium und Empirie. Funktionen des Wissens in der spanischen Kolonialherrschaft* (Cologne & Weimar; Böhlau Verlag, 2009); Jacob S. Soll, *The Information Master: Jean-Baptiste Colbert's Secret State Intelligence System* (Cultures of Knowledge in the Early Modern World)(Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009); Fillipo de Vivo, *Information and Communication in Venice. Rethinking Early Modern Politics* (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2009); Cornelia Vismann, *Akten. Medientechnik und Recht* (Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer Taschenbuch-Verlag, 2000).

3   Michel Foucault, *Les mots et les choses* (Paris: Gallimard, 1966); Jean Baudrillard, *Le système des objets* (Paris 1968: Gallimard), 120–150.

4   Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A. M. Sheri-dan Smith (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972 [1969]), 129.

5   About Foucault's "historical apriori", see the extensive discussion in Knut Ebeling, *Wilde Archäologien I. Theorien der materiellen Kultur von Kant bis Kittler*, (Berlin; Kulturverlag Kadmos, 2012), 589 – 621.

6   Knut Ove Eliassen, "The Archives of Michel Foucault" in, *The Archive in Motion. New Conceptions of the Archive in Contemporary Thought and New Media Practices*, ed. Eivind Røssaak (Oslo: Novus Press, 2010), 29–52.

7   Oddly enough, Derrida never refers to Foucault's works about archives, despite their having been published more than a decade earlier. At this point, Foucault's archival concept had already exerted a

significant influence on other thinkers. It is to some extent possible to explain this with the complicated personal relation between the thinkers (see Didier Eribon, *Michel Foucault* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 119–121), but certain important differences in their conceptions of "archive" have also been identified, see e. g. Antonio Campillo, "Foucault and Derrida. The History of a Debate on History", *Angelaki* 5:2 (2000): 113–135.

8   Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, trans. Eric Prenowitz (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), 11.

9   Ketelaar, "Archival Turns and Returns", 2017, further Michelle Caswells, "'The Archive' is Not an Archives: Acknowledging the Intellectual Contributions of Archival Studies" in *Reconstruction. Studies in Contemporary Culture* 16, link: https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7bn4v1fk (2020-08-13)

10   Some recent works from researchers of archival science that present good overviews, are Ketelaar, "Archival Turns and Returns", 2017, Geoffrey Yeo, *Records, Information and Data: Exploring the Role of Record-Keeping in an Information Culture* (London: Facet Publishing, 2018), Luciana Duranti & Patricia C. Franks (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Archival Writers, 1515–2015* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2019). For some recent historical works, addressing the history of archives from a larger, social and cultural, perspective, see the aforementioned works of Friedrich *Geburt des Archivs*, Head *Making Archives*, Brendecke *Imperium und Empirie*, and Vismann *Akten*. The large number of detailed studies around the archival practices of different cultures in different periods make it increasingly difficult to present a simple chronological line of the development of archival types and functions, an endeavour that is even more tasking on an international level.

11   On the concept of cultural techniques, see e. g. Cornelia Vismann, "Cultural Techniques and Sovereignty" in *Theory, Culture & Society* 30 (2013), 83–93 and Bernhard Siegert, *Cultural Techniques: Grids, Filters, Doors, and Other Articulations of the Real*, trans. Geoffrey Winthrop-Young (Theory, Culture & Society 30) (New York: Fordham University Press, 2015).

12   Significantly, the so-called "Records Continuum Model", which emphasises the changing and processual nature of records, has had a large impact on archival management training globally, see: Sue McKemmish, "Placing Records Continuum Theory and Practice" in *Archival Science*, vol. 1 (2001), 333–359 and Frank Upward, "The Records Continuum" in Sue McKemmish et al. *Archives. Recordkeeping in Society* (Wagga Wagga: Centre for Information Studies, Charles Sturt University, 2005), 197–222.

13   See the discussion on Bridgman's seminal definition, originally made in *The Logic of Modern Physics* (New York: 1927), in Hasok Chang, "Operationalism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2019 Edition), ed. Edward N. Zalta, link: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/operationalism/ (2020-11-05).

14   Eric Ketelaar, "Tacit Narratives: The Meanings of Archives", *Archival Science*, no. 1 (2001), 131–141.

15   Knut Ebeling, "The Art of Searching: On 'Wild Archaeologies' from Kant to Kittler", *The Nordic Journal of Aesthetics*, 51 (2016), 7–18; 9. This text can be regarded as a short introduction to the concept of "wild archeologies", extensively researched in two voluminous tomes by the author, see Ebeling, *Wilde Archäologien I*, 2012; idem. *Wilde Archäologien II. Begriffe der Materialität der Zeit: von Archiv bis Zerstörung*, (Berlin: Kulturverlag Kadmos, 2016).

16   Ebeling, *Wilde Archäologien I*, 2012, 10.

17   Ebeling, *Wilde Archäologien I*, 2012, 10.

18   Descriptions of "chaos in the archive" was a frequent commonplace in writings of archivists, not least when they addressed their employers for increased funding. Many archives were disorganised, no doubt, but such complaints must also be seen through the lens of rhetoric, see: Friedrich, *Geburt des Archivs*, 102–103; Head, *Making Archives*, 152–153.

19   Randolph C. Head, "Historical Case Studies of Pre-Modern European Archives. A Comparative Approach", in Gilliland, Lau & McKemmis (eds.), *Research in the Archival Multiverse* 2017, 433–455; Markus Friedrich, "Epilogue: Archives and Archiving across Cultures—

Towards a Matrix of Analysis" in Alessandro Bausi, Christian Brockmann, Michael Friedrich & Sabine Kienitz (eds.), *Manuscripts and Archives: Comparative Views on Record-Keeping* (Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter, 2018) 421–444. The latter volume presents ample examples of how such archival comparison can be exercised in practice.

20   A template for this type of method is the "archaeology" of Michel Foucault, especially as it was presented in *The Order of Things* (Fr. orig. 1966). See Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London: Tavistock Publ., 1974).

21   Wolfgang Ernst, *Im Namen von Geschichte. Sammeln, Speichern, Er/Zählen: infrastrukturelle Konfigurationen des deutschen Gedächtnisses* (Munich: Fink, 2003).

22   Tim Berndtsson, *The Order and the Archive: Freemasonic Archival Culture in Eighteenth-Century Europe,* Skrifter utgivna av litteraturvetenskapliga institutionen, 50, diss. (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 2020).

23   Margaret C. Jacob, *Living the Enlightenment: Freemasonry and Politics in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Daniel Roche, *Le siècle des lumières en province: Académiciens provinciaux, 1680–1789*, 2 vols. (Paris, & La Haye: Mouton, 1978–1980); Holger Zaunstöck, *Sozietätslandschaft und Mitgliederstrukturen: Die mitteldeutschen Aufklärungsgesellschaften im 18. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1999); Peter Clark, *British Clubs and Societies 1580–1800: The Origin of an Associational World*, Oxford Studies in Social History (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

24   Of particular importance where the works of Frevert, Reddy, Rosenwein and Scheer. See Ute Frevert, *Emotions in History: Lost and Found*, The Natalie Zemon Davis Annual Lectures Series at Central European University (London & Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011); William M. Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2009); Barbara H. Rosenwein, "Worrying about Emotions in History", *The American Historical Review,* 57:3 (2001), 821–845; Monique Scheer, "Are Emotions a Kind of Practice (and Is That What Makes Them Have a History)? A Bourdieuan Approach to Understanding Emotion", *History & Theory*, 51:2 (2012), 193–220.

25   Ina Lindblom, *Känslans patriark: Sensibilitet och känslopraktiker I Carl Christoffer Gjörwells familj och vänskapskrets, ca 1790–1810*, diss. (Umeå: Umeå Universitet, Institutionen för idé- och samhällstudier, 2017).

26   This aspect of the project was strongly influenced by the works of Baudrillard (op. cit.), as well as for instance the works of Hallam and Hockey (Elizabeth Hallam & Jenny Hockey, *Death, Memory and Material Culture*, (Materializing Culture) (Oxford & New York: Berg, 2001)) and Woodward (Ian Woodward, *Understanding Material Culture*, (London et al.: Sage Publications, 2007).

27   The remains of this archive are today located at the Stockholm City Archive, in *Överståthållarämbetet för polisärenden 1, Äldre poliskammaren (0021/01)*.

28   See also Nils Staf, *Polisväsendet i Stockholm 1776–1850*, Monografier utgivna av Stockholms kommunalförvaltning 10 (Stockholm: Stockholms kommunalförvaltning,1950), 485.

29   Regarding the eighteenth-century Moravian archival practices, see Ann Öhrberg's chapter in the present volume.

30   See for instance *En Stockholmskrönika ur C. C. Gjörwells brev 1757–1778*, Otto Sylwan (ed.), (Stockholm; Bonnier, 1920).

31   Nils Jacobsson, "Från en forskningsresa till Herrnhut. Nya bidrag till den svenska herrnhutismens historia", *Kyrkohistorisk årsskrift* (1903), 5–92; 6–8; Rüdiger Kröger, Claudia Mai & Olaf Nippe, *Das Unitätsarchiv: Aus der Geschichte von Archiv, Bibliothek und Beständen* (Herrnhut: Comenius-Buchhandlung, 2014), 10–29; Paul Peucker, "Pietism and the Archives", *A Companion to German Pietism, 1660–1800*, Douglas Shantz (ed.), Brill's Companion to the Christian Tradition, 55 (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2015), 397–399.

32   The distinction between primary use – following the processes of the agency or individual that created a document – and secondary (historical) use was formulated by Theodor Schellenberg, and has become a cornerstone in archival science, at least in North America. See entry "secondary value" in Duranti & Franks 2019, 372–373.

33   Thomas Hildbrand, "Quellenkritik in der Zeitdimension – Vom Umgang mit Schriftgut. Anmerkungen zur theoretischen Grundlegung einer Analyse von prozeßhaft bedeutungsvollem Schriftgut mit zwei Beispielen aus der mittelalterlichen Ostschweiz" in *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 29 (1995), 349–389. Further Head, *Making Archives*, 26.

34   Vismann, *Akten*, 2000, 56.

35   Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life. Vol. 1*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 36 *et passim*.

36   See Olof Lagercrantz, *Vid sidan av. Möten med författare från fyrtiotal till sjuttiotal*, eds Richard Lagercrantz & Stina Otterberg (Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand, 2011).

37   See for instance the discussion in Ann Cvetkovich, *An Archive of Feeling. Trauma, Sexuality and Lesbian Public Cultures* (Durham NC; Duke University Press, 2003).

38   See Georges Didi-Huberman, "Das Archiv brennt", in idem. & Knut Ebeling, *Das Archiv Brennt* (Berlin; Kulturverlag Kadmos, 2007), 7–32: 25–31.

39   Joan Wallach Scott, *The Fantasy of Feminist History* (Durham NC; Duke University Press, 2011), 146

40   See Otto Fischer, "Meaning And Materiality. On the Rise of The Archive of Modern Literary Scholarship", in *Carriages and Computers. Aesthetic Technologies in Literature from the 18th to the 21th Century,* ed. Gunnar Foss & Yngve Sandhei Jacobsen (Trondheim: Tapir 2009), 29–36; Christian Benne, *Die Erfindung des Manuskripts. Zur Erfindung und Geschichte literarischer Gegenständlichkeit* (Berlin: Suhrkamp 2015).

41   Ivo Striedinger, "Was ist Archiv-, was Bibliotheksgut?" in *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 36 (1926), 151–163.

42   See for example the influential Dutch *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives* of 1898, by the trio Muller, Feith, and Fruin, or the Swedish "General Archival Scheme" of Emil Hildebrand from 1903.

43   See Charlie Järpvall, *Pappersarbete. Formandet av och föreställningar om kontorspappret som medium*, Mediehistoriskt arkiv, 34, diss. (Lund: Mediehistoria, Lunds universitet, 2016).

44   The qoute is from a critical exposure of German Templar-Masonry, where a (fictional) apologist of the Order says: "Die ganze Einteilung und Anweisung von Präfecturen und Commenden [in der Orden] sehe ich bloß als Chimäre an, die nur, der Ordnung wegen, da ist." [August Friedrich Cranz], *Stein des Anstosses und Fels der Aergerniss. Allen meinen teutschen Mitbürgern, in und ausser der siebenten Provinz, entdeckt von Ich weiss nicht, von Wem?* ("Teutschland" [Berlin: Decker], 1780), 120. On the relation between state authorities and Masons, see Margaret C. Jacob, *The Origins of Freemasonry: Facts and Fictions* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 47–69.

45   See e. g. Vismann, *Akten*, 151–160.

46   See e. g. André Wakefield, *The Disordered Police State. German Cameralism as Science and Practice* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

47   Arlette Farge, *Le goût de l'archive* (Paris: Seuil, 1989); Carolyn Steedman, *Dust. The Archive and Cultural History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001).