

THE FILM ARCHIVE, THE ARCHIVE AS FILM

Irini Stathi, University of the Aegean

Archive, history, memory

“No memory or testimony is possible without the archive! Or, memory and testimony are possible only without the archive!”¹ Or, the archive is the end and the result of maintaining memory and testimony. Any reflection on testimony, memory, the archive and archivization has to activate all thinking, ethics, writing, tradition, art and culture of humanity and to promote the interpretation of human acts and artifacts.

In our consideration of archives, there are two dimensions we need to examine: the archive of the past (organizing human memory in terms of making historical order and cataloguing) and the archive of the future (interpreting and managing human memory).

Derrida’s *Archive Fever* starts precisely by drawing attention to the first dimension of the archive: the word *ἀρχή* (*arkhe*), which he recalls at the beginning of his book, simultaneously refers to the command to remember, archive and keep, and to the commencement of an institution of archivization. On the other hand, like the task of the translator envisioned by Walter Benjamin² (translation and interpretation go hand in hand as two members of the remembering, archiving agency), the task here marks both the demand to archive and the need to face up to an impossible pressure to forget the archive in order to remember. A way to forget the archive is to transform it in a new form of source and reproduction of history and memory. The archive exists based in the very primordial and structural aberration of memory, because “there is no archive without a place of consignment, without a technique of repetition and without a certain exteriority. No archive without outside.”³

Eric Ketelaar commented that,

*Archives are memory because they are evidence. They are not only evidence of a transaction, but also evidence of some historic fact that is either part of the transaction itself or that may be traced via the transaction, or that which is otherwise embodied in the record, or in the context of the archiving process.*⁴

The memory, in that sense, is made impossible by the very imperative of archivization. “Before *archivization*, however, is another ‘moment of truth’. [...] It is *archivalization*,” meaning, according to Ketelaar, “the conscious or unconscious choice (determined by social and cultural factors) to consider something worth archiving.”⁵ According to Ketelaar *archivalization* precedes archiving. The searchlight of *archivalization* has to sweep the world for something to light up in the archival sense, before we proceed to register, to record, to inscribe it, in short before we archive it. “What the searchlight makes visible,” Karl Popper wrote, “will depend upon its position, upon

our way of directing it, and upon its intensity, colour, etc.; although it will, of course, also depend very largely upon the things illuminated by it.”⁶ It seems that the preparation of a film creation follows the same logic of *archivalization* and by differentiating *archivalization* from the subsequent inscription or archivization, which is then followed by capture and recording, we gain a better comprehension of how the tacit narratives of the archive become explicit narratives within the film. The archive reflects realities as perceived by “archivers;” similarly, the film reflects realities as perceived by the filmmaker. In any case, a notion of *archivalization* in filmmaking is equivalent to the passion for the past⁷ and the excavation of memory.

Derrida will bring the consequences of this aspect of the archive to its aporetic and terrible limit, by saying that “the archive fever” in its most violent consequences and possibilities, “verges on radical evil.”⁸ The radical evil is the destruction of the reality and the destruction of the original archive.⁹ If the destruction of the Archive is possible, then the reconstruction of reality made by another form as film, for example, is a possibility to remake history and to archiving in a new way the reality through the transformation of history within a filmic context.

Traditionally, when historians deal with fiction films, they tend to approach them simply as ways to remember or make reflections of the periods in which they were produced. They see a film as a product of its time and, in that sense, as a different kind of archive that must be considered and not forgotten in order to remember or to maintain in memory.

Today, however, historians and film theorists alike find it increasingly rewarding to approach fiction films as reflections of the past. In the postmodern understanding, the boundaries between film and history are disappearing. The historians have become receptive to narrative strategies and fictive elements in the writing of history, and the film theorists are watching the divide between fiction and documentary disappears. Both fiction and documentary films can be considered as a kind of historical archive. The boundaries between film and archive in this respect are disappearing.

The evidential view of the archive that functions as a “pretext” of the filmic text has been criticized in the last half century by those, including Ketelaar, who consider the archive to be rooted in a positivist and constructivist approach to the past, which they deftly seek to replace in a technological environment with a postmodern perspective that draws ideas from both Foucault and Derrida. In a remarkable rhetorical phrase, Hofman considers that “the archives can be seen as a node [...] clustering records into larger meaningful Whole.”¹⁰

Theo Angelopoulos’ “film-archive”

Anyone who watches *The Traveling Players (O Thiassos [O Θίασος]*, 1975), a film on recent Greek history (1939-1952), which represents a series of historical events through the adventures of a traveling theatrical group, will notice that it unfolds historical events and documentation. The film seems to be a kind of memory-archive, which permits the correlations of the events and objects of the past with the current historical period (filmic time – 1939-1952 – and time of the film’s production). The events themselves are the very documents of the historical past and, at the same time, the collective memory of Greece. The relationship between evidence and memory emerges in the particular film’s discourse. However, the film is a critical meditation around history and the mean that we dispose in order to keep the historical memory alive and inalterable.

Angelopoulos uses the historical archives in order to collect information, but the archival material never appears unrefined in the film. We believe that Angelopoulos’ meditation around history and the archive as evidence of historical past is the very notion of the archive given by Godard, Deleuze, Derrida and Doane and it could be very useful in our discourse. Godard argues that:

*Cinema is the media we use in order to write history and in the same time cinema shapes its one history during its realization. Could also offer to us ways to create history [...]. The archive is the appropriate place which facilitates the realization of such enterprises.*¹¹

Derrida, on the other hand, brings to light a considerable amount of questions concerning the role of archives as depositories of memory:

*The disasters which mark the end of the millennium are also archives of evil: hidden or destroyed, forbidden, misappropriated, "repressed." Their usage is at once clumsy and refined, during civil or international wars, during private or secret intrigues. Because of the unconscious we never demit from the need to appropriate a power on the document its maintenance and its interpretation.*¹²

According to Doane,

*a close examination of Freud's treatment of memory and temporality reveals the continual recurrence of three themes: 1. the insistence upon inscription as a metaphor for the processes of memory, 2. the retention of a notion of storage and the corresponding problem of localization and 3. the close association established between time and protection of the organism from external stimuli.*¹³

Doane continues: "For the unconscious, the site of memory is in a sense a truly ideal space for unlimited storage, a perfect library in which nothing is ever lost."¹⁴

The insistence upon inscription conducted Freud to the so-called artifice of "magic notebook" (film is a type of such artifice), which appears to be the most effective to represent the memory's inscriptions. The unconscious, the place of memory is the ideal *topos* of an immense accumulation of things, thoughts and experiences.

In this light, another film by Angelopoulos, *Ulysses' Gaze* (*To vlemma tou Odyssea* [*To βλέμμα του Οδυσσέα*], 1995) dramatizes the dynamic between memory and history: how they feed each other. The film treats the return journey of a nameless Greek American filmmaker (listed in the film's credits as A.) to Greece, a journey that soon becomes a painful flow of memories (some from the private history of the protagonist, others from the repository of the region's cultural and historical memories).

We notice the importance of history and memory reality in the filmic text, but in a way that clearly refers, unlike the *Traveling players*, to the philosophy itself of the archive: 1. the film's introduction consists of a short documentary film entitled *Weavers* (*Yfantres* [*Υφάντρες*], 1905),¹⁵ by Giannakis and Miltos Manakis,¹⁶ and 2. the reason that pushes A. to traverse the Balkans is to track down three undeveloped reels made by brothers Manakis in the early 20th century.

The reels he is probably looking for is this two-minute-long documentary, which represents a considerable portion of memory in the beginning of the century, saved because of the possibility to record it on film. The protagonist's (A.) voiceover helps to situate the film and facilitates the role of such images within the historical memory:

- *Weavers in Avthela, a Greek village, 1905.*
- *The first film made by brothers Miltos and Yannakis Manakis.*
- *The first film ever made in Greece and the Balkans.*
- *But is this a fact? Is it the first film? The first gaze?*¹⁷

Here, similar to Derrida, there is a reference to an *ἀρχή* (a beginning)¹⁸ of the visual history in a certain territory and a certain period. A.'s question is not meant to raise doubts about the film's authenticity; Former Yugoslavia and War aside, his question signifies at once a concern with and distrust for origins, specifically the ambivalence that characterizes any project aimed at re-installing foundational myths of nation formation.

When viewed from this perspective, *Ulysses' Gaze* (1995) is about more than the historical events that evolved during the war in Former Yugoslavia and the consequent division of the country into more nations. Similarly, the Manakis brothers' documentary is something more than a mere recording of daily life in the early 20th century, it becomes a testimony, a remembering that is trying to create order in the historical chaos of the Balkans.

Ulysses' Gaze forms an itinerary through a geographical territory marked by a considerable number of cultural and historical events that form the status and the particularities of the entire Balkans, as well as an inner itinerary regarding the discovery of an *arkhe* in the individual protagonist's life (he pronounces the T. S. Eliot verse, "In my end is my beginning," underlining his hybrid identity – the importance of his diasporic identity).

In this regard, the third theme mentioned before, in Doane's consideration, is connected with the narrow relationship between the notion of time and the necessity to protect the self from external stimuli, highlighting the problem of memory and temporality, as expressed by Freud. Consciousness and memory in the Freudian thought are incompatible: memories are quite truthful and are situated in the unconscious producing of continuous stimuli.

So, as A. undertakes this journey through the archives in the Balkans, he experiences the past and hence re-lives it; as well as that, the journey offers an anatomy of discursive structure and the role of archives in cultural memory and in the formation of historical continuity. A. experiences the journey as a visit into an archive of history, and he also creates a kind of catalogue of historical "things," inasmuch as by rendering the film itself, he is making an archive of memories, both personal and collective.

A.'s research of the undeveloped reels, which are sent from one country to another and from one city to another, in *Ulysses' Gaze* helps to establish both a genealogy of the War and a genealogy of memory,

*but also calls attention to how history repeats itself in the centuries, as this repetitiveness is one of the ways in which cultural memory is manifested and interpreted through history. If the Manakis' visual archive documents the complex and traumatic record of the Balkan past, it also operates as an anterior narrative in relation to the violence in the present, assuming a proleptic function.*¹⁹

As a record of historical and cultural memory, the Manakis archive "has no theoretical armature. Its method is additive: it offers a mass of facts, in order to fill up a homogenous and empty time,"²⁰ and thus belongs to the syntax that comprises history as historicism, which is about "the present as that of the here-and-now."²¹ Nevertheless, when A. discovers the images of this archive, he sees not some images of the past that "have come to a standstill,"²² but a narrative of the past, hence his desire to locate the lost reels. The complex stratification of visuality characterizing the dramatization of the Manakis' lives and work in *Ulysses' Gaze* reinforces this attitude. In this sense, the archive becomes the film itself or, perhaps, the very root of the film.

This kind of remembering demonstrates that, even when institutionalized, cultural memory is a fluid archive at best (like in Alexander Sokurov's, *The Russian Ark*, 2002, where the order of the

events of the past becomes a play of the present), an archive that has a cumulative structure. Not only must the history it echoes be heard in the plural, but the events individuals are remembering are imperatives, which must also be seen as the result of complex discursive forces. While an attempt to resolve the contradictions of what is being remembered would inevitably end in homogenization, and thus further mystification, the past, the very difficulty of determining what memory entails is also what reveals memory's capacity for myth-making, precisely what constitutes cultural memory. The best way to remember is by interpreting mounds of things, thoughts or events. Angelopoulos' film appears as *cumuli* of events or thoughts, which relate to the historical background – recent or older – and which are organized in a useful way for remembering.

His belief that the probability to discover the first glance ever glimpsed on this region may disclose a gaze that could shake up the “eternal” values and meaning memorialized in national master narratives. In this regard, the Archives themselves (in Athens, Skopje, Sarajevo) become a kind of film. How cultural memory is recorded, interpreted, and practiced has the potential to alter the present state of affairs, and hence the course of history. Thus, the War may not be the immediate focus in *Ulysses' Gaze*, but neither is it simply there as the gratuitous backdrop of the journey. At the film's end, a poem in the form of a catalogue of things from the Greek tradition (the lines A. recites) is another archive: those of a cultivated memory, enclosed in traditional ways to remember things as poetry.

The setting in which Derrida delivered the very first “archive fever” explains to some extent what an archive was doing here in a film: a prolegomenon to a discussion of perditions and efforts to remember those perditions, as well as a return to the questions of memory. *Ulysses' Gaze* is the domiciliation that marks the definitive passage from archive to filmic discourse and from filmic discourse to archive. The women who are weaving in front of their houses and the act of weaving itself is the *arkhe*, the beginning of a new era. It is, thus, in this reels research that the meaning of the archive raises up. In this sense, the film becomes a kind of homeland or a museum, an archive-thought and, in the process, taking place at that moment (the moment of the screening) attempts to find adequate metaphors for representing memory. Angelopoulos sees in this film the very desire that is “archive fever:” the desire to recover moments of inception, to find and possess all sorts of beginnings.

Dusty archives, dusty films

Carolyn Steedman in her book *Dust* (2001) argues: “Nothing starts in the Archive, nothing, ever at all, though things certainly end up there. You find nothing in the Archive but stories caught half way through: the middle of things; discontinuities.”²³ The Archive, so, is made from selected and consciously chosen documentation of the past and also from historical fragments in other forms (not written) that the official history did not intend to preserve by including them in the written sources. The film, instead, uses such documentation and develops it in a new form revealing a new (audiovisual) dimension of the archival material, and using this material it is possible to remove the dust from the past events and the archival objects themselves.

Steedman continues: “The Archive is also a place of dreams.”²⁴ If the Archive is a place of dreams then the Archive is like a film, if we accept the dreamlike nature of film. To enter that place where the past lives, where the ink on a parchment or bunches of light can be made to *speak*, still remains the social historian's dream, of bringing to life those who do not for the main part exist, not even between the lines of state papers and legal documents, who are not really present, not even in the records of Revolutionary bodies and fractions.²⁵

Carolyn Steedman's book appeared as a response to Jacques Derrida's 1994 *Mal d'Archive: une impression freudienne*, which refers to the dust as a metonym for the essence of the archive. We are forced to consider that it was not life that he breathed into "the souls who had suffered so long ago and who were smothered now in the past,"²⁶ but death that he took into himself with each lungful of the past. Or, the dust of the time, like the last Angelopoulos' film *Dust of time (I skoni tou chronou [H skóni tou chrónou]*, 2008) made on the main historical events of the century through the adventures of a "love story" as a pretext.

Angelopoulos went once more into the archive (the archive of time) in order to enact a particular kind of national imagining. The dead and forgotten people he exhumed were by no means a random assemblage of forgotten, anonymous dead. They were those whose sacrifices, throughout History, made possible the survival of an entire population since 1920 and the self-conscious appearance of the Greek nation.

The silence of history and the death of the people in *Dust of Time* are not obstacles to the exhumation of people's deepest desires, as they are registered on the celluloid and the way in which the filmmaker-historian found himself/herself able to speak on behalf of the dead and to interpret the words and the acts that they themselves had not understood. It was not exactly Angelopoulos the historian,²⁷ nor indeed the Historian, who performed this act of interpretation (although it was indeed, precisely, on a particular day, a date, a lived time, that the film entered the portals of the Archives, and breathed in the dust of the dead, and gave breath also to historical people or people who made history). It was, in fact, a magistrate (ἄρχων-archon), also called History, who did the work of resurrection:

*Yes, everyone who dies leaves behind a little something, his memory, and demands that we care for it. For those who have no friends, the magistrate must provide that care. For the law, or justice, is more certain than all our tender forgetfulness, our tears so swiftly dried. This magistracy is History.*²⁸

Media reports frequently refer to new developments in museums and archives sweeping aside their dustiness, almost as though "dust" were a metonym for the essence of the archive. Such an image portrays archives as being of little relevance to the present, as they lie virtually untouched decaying into dust. Angelopoulos as Carolyn Steedman goes far beyond this into an exploration of the nature of history, playing with different varieties of dust; some literal, some literary and some metaphorical.

In the screenplay of the film *Dust of time*, during a scene that is articulated like a kind of valediction, Jacob, the old man and companion of the two protagonists, says: "To the dust of time, which falls over everything, the small and the big... ." ²⁹ The reconciliation between private and public memories is at its most acute in this sentence. Through dust all things can be maintained untouched or as Carolyn Steedman argues:

*Dust is the immutable, obdurate set of beliefs about the material world, past and present, inherited from the 19th century, with which modern history-writing attempts to grapple; Dust is also the narrative principle of history writing.*³⁰

The film emphasizes the selectivity of archives and contrasts this with the complexity of memory. It uses a discussion on history to show how 21st century history creates unambiguous stories of what actually happened. Dust is the symbol of the old historical approaches that persist and

cannot easily be erased. So, given the title of this film, we lose the materiality of the archive, but we gain the poetics of the film as a topos, a place of archive.

This could have led to a discussion on the values of integrating textuality and materiality when interpreting the past through film. Likewise, Angelopoulos does not explore the power of the archive as a collection, but as a repository where all things have the same value. Items that enter an archive collection do not just maintain their meanings as souvenirs of past events. Instead, they continue to accrete meanings as they are catalogued, labelled and conserved as part of a collection. But, they assume a further meaning if they stay under the dust of “time,” which seems to be the main force to interpret the past. The life of an archive is one that creates meanings; the life of the things under the dust of the archive reinforces the possibility to interpret again and again. It is not true that “nothing starts in the Archive,” but it is true that everything finishes in the Archive.

*The Archive then is something that, through the activity of History, becomes Memory's potential space, one of the few realms of the modern imagination where a hard-won and carefully constructed place, can return to boundless, limitless space, and we might be released from the house-arrest that Derrida suggested was its condition.*³¹

Angelopoulos' ideas and some of his greatest insights are liable to be lost on anyone who is not already involved in debates about postmodern historiography. The historical film must be accepted as a vehicle for communicating those aspects of the past that written history cannot.

From a phenomenological point of view, it could be said that it is the feeling of the past, a sense of the past or a poetic speculation on the events of the past that is the main strength of the historical feature film.

Alterations and manipulations in serious historical films should be seen as metaphorical ways of communicating an overall interpretation of the past as the filmmakers see it. How this interpretation can be communicated depends on the narrative mode. The classical film holds advantages in the process-oriented, dramatized and individual way of communicating the past.

The art film has more to offer with regard to complexness and different points of view. In that sense, the film Archive becomes a kind of film, as we can “read” it as a metaphoric way to interpret life, history and private experience.

Conclusion

In all films mentioned above, it is easy to recognize the excitement of unraveling from documents the pieces of a narrative, the “enduring passions that researchers develop with the contents of buff folders”³² or dusty memories. This is perhaps what Derrida had in mind when he described the archive as “a responsibility for tomorrow” whose meaning will only be known “in times to come.”³³

An archive and a film, in this respect, can be and often are a *wunderkammer*, but it is emphatically not a *wunderkammer* “of material which has only been loosely classified, material whose status is as yet indeterminate [...]: material that has not yet been read and researched;”³⁴ and only in this sense a material under the veil of the dust of time.

The question of the archive and the film as historical document is closely connected with memory as a consignment for future artists and filmmakers. Every film has something of a kind of dust, which every archive contains.

This dust provokes probably the aberration of memory, as mentioned before. In that sense, the

conditions of archiv(al)ization correspond closely to the primordial command to translate and interpret reality, history and human condition, as a film itself is doing.

Finally, archive, like film, is a place of dreams, of re-enactment for both the user and the archivist (or the artist as archivist), who together are always engaged, either passively or actively, in the process of re-figuration that is never ending.

- 1 Dragan Kujundzic, "Archigraphia: On the Future of Testimony and the Archive to Come," in *Discourse*, vol. 25, no. 1-2, Winter-Spring 2003, pp. 166-188.
- 2 Walter Benjamin writes: "History is the subject of a structure whose time is not homogeneous, empty time, but time filled by the presence of the now." Walter Benjamin, *Theses on the Philosophy of History*, in *Illuminations*, Knopf Doubleday Publishing, New York 1968, p. 261.
- 3 Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1996, p. 11.
- 4 Eric Ketelaar, *Writing on Archiving Machines*, in Sonja Neef, José van Dijck, Eric Ketelaar (eds.), *Sign Here! Handwriting in the Age of New Media*, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam 2006, p. 188.
- 5 Eric Ketelaar, "Archivalization and Archiving," in *Archives and Manuscripts*, no. 27, 1999, pp. 54-61; Eric Ketelaar, "Archivistics Research Saving the Profession," in *American Archivist*, no. 63, 2000, pp. 328-329; Eric Ketelaar, "Tacit Narratives: The Meanings of Archives," in *Archival Science*, vol. 1, 2001, pp. 131-141.
- 6 Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies; Part Two*, Routledge, London 1995, p. 490.
- 7 Robert R. Vosloo, "Archiving otherwise: some remarks on memory and historical responsibility," in *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, vol. XXXI, no. 2, October 2005, pp. 379-399.
- 8 Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, cit., p. 20.
- 9 Peg Birmingham, *On Deception: Radical Evil and the Destruction of the Archive*, in Shannon Sullivan, Dennis J. Schmidt (eds.), *Difficulties of Ethical Life*, Fordham University Press, New York 2008, pp. 195-212 (p. 209).
- 10 Hans Hofman, *The Archive*, in Sue McKemmish, Michael Piggott, Barbara Reed, Frank Upward (eds.), *Archives. Recordkeeping in Society*, Centre for Information Studies, Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga 2005, p. 154.
- 11 Jean-Luc Godard, "Les Cinémathèques et l'histoire du cinéma," in *Travelling*, no. 56-57, 1980, pp. 119-136 (my translation).
- 12 Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, cit., p. 12.
- 13 Mary Ann Doane, *The Emergence of Cinematic Time: Modernity, Contingency, the Archive*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge 2002, pp. 38-39 and 42.
- 14 *Idem*, p. 42.
- 15 See about *The Weavers* (considered the first film ever made in the Balkans) Christos Christodoulou [Χριστοδούλου, Χρίστος], *The Manakis Brothers' Photogenic Balkans* [Τα Φωτογενή Βαλκάνια των Αδελφών Μανάκη], Paratiritis, Thessaloniki 1989; Giorgis Exarchos [Γιώργης Έξαρχος], *Manakia brothers. Pionners of Cinema in the Balkans* [Αδελφοί Μανάκια. Πρωτοπόροι του κινηματογράφου στα Βαλκάνια], Gavriilides, Athens 1991, p. 57; *Brothers Manakia* [Αδελφοί Μανάκια], (CD-ROM edition), Kastaniotis, Athens 1997. Exarchos dates the film in 1905 or 1907. In *Ulysses' Gaze* Angelopoulos mentions as date of the film 1905.
- 16 The two brothers considered being the Lumière brothers in the Balkans.
- 17 Theo Angelopoulos, *Ulysses' Gaze*, 1995.
- 18 Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, cit., p. 2.
- 19 Smaro Kamboureli, "Memory under Siege: Archive Fever in Theo Angelopoulos," in *Performing Identity/Crossing Borders* (Conference proceedings, Cyprus, May 3-6, 2007), pp. 132-146.
- 20 Walter Benjamin, *Theses on the Philosophy of History*, cit., pp. 38-41.
- 21 *Idem*, p. 261.

- 22 *Idem*, p. 396.
- 23 Carolyn Steedman, *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ 2001, p. 45.
- 24 *Idem*, p. 69.
- 25 *Idem*, p. 68-70.
- 26 See in Carolyn Steedman, *Something She Called a Fever*, in Francis X. Blouin, Francis X. Blouin Jr., William G. Rosenberg (eds.), *Archives, Documentation, and Institutions of Social Memory*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI 2007, pp. 4-19 (p. 11). According to Benedict Anderson, Michelet went into the archive in order to enact a particular kind of national imagining. See also Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin & Spread of Nationalism*, Random House, New York 1983, p. 198.
- 27 Irini Stathi [Ειρήνη Στάθη], *Thodoros Angelopoulos: Journey toward the Frontiers of History* [Θόδωρος Αγγελόπουλος: Ταξίδι στα όρια της Ιστορίας], in Irini Stathi (ed.), *Thodoros Angelopoulos*, Kastaniotis, Athens 2000, pp. 11-15.
- 28 See in Carolyn Steedman, *Something She Called a Fever*, cit., p. 12.
- 29 Theo Angelopoulos, *Dust of Time. The Third Wing*, Militos, Athens 2009, p. 85.
- 30 Carolyn Steedman, *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History*, cit., p. ix.
- 31 *Idem*, p. 83.
- 32 Carolyn Hamilton et al., *Introduction*, in Id., *Refiguring the Archive*, Kluwer, Dordrecht-Boston-London 2002, p. 16.
- 33 Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever. A Freudian Impression*, cit., p. 36.
- 34 Mike Featherstone, "Archive," in Id. et al., *Problematizing Global Knowledge, Theory, Culture & Society*, Special Issue, vol. 23, no. 2-3, May 2006, pp. 591-596 (p. 594).