



The European Legacy: Toward New Paradigms

Publication details, including instructions for authors and
subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cele20>

'Back Room' Pedagogies in University Museums in Britain

Penelope Dransart

Version of record first published: 23 Jan 2013.

To cite this article: Penelope Dransart (2013): 'Back Room' Pedagogies in University Museums in Britain, *The European Legacy: Toward New Paradigms*, DOI:10.1080/10848770.2013.748120

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10848770.2013.748120>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

‘Back Room’ Pedagogies in University Museums in Britain

~ PENELOPE DRANSART ~

ABSTRACT *The stage-like “exhibitionary space,” which members of the public visit, has received more scholarly scrutiny than the pedagogical and curatorial activities that take place in the back rooms of museums. This essay draws attention to the behind-the-scenes places in university museums as a pedagogic site where students learn through the close examination of artefacts. It addresses the social context of learning through the study of incomplete objects, which may involve handling them. This process of using artefacts to engage with different groups of people (collectors, curators, teaching staff and students) contributes to the physical and intellectual development of academic disciplines. It enhances the museum’s institutional mission and survival as an incorporated body that is embedded in a greater whole, the university itself. The Ashmolean Museum, in the University of Oxford, and the Balfourian and Sibbaldian Museums, in the University of Edinburgh, were founded in the seventeenth century. But whereas the Ashmolean survived as an institution, the first Edinburgh collections did not. These historical antecedents serve as a backdrop to a discussion of how one particular example, the Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (CUMAA), trains new generations of learners to evaluate empirical evidence and by working with different communities of users—students and the wider public—it ensures its survival.*

The users of museums housed in British universities include staff and students as well as members of the public. These peopled subsets frequently overlap and interact with the museums’ curatorial and teaching staff in all sorts of complex ways. My purpose is to explore the social arena in which learning takes place through the handling of artefacts from university museum collections in teaching spaces that are normally restricted to public access.¹ Of particular interest here is the training in empirical engagement that takes place between staff, students and the artefacts they study. This pedagogy of tactile knowing takes place in specific spatial contexts.

In Colin Dexter’s murder mystery *The Jewel That Was Ours*, a curator cuts across what otherwise might appear to be a divide between the domain of university museum insiders and that of members of the public. In the novel a group of North American tourists arrives at the Randolph Hotel, opposite the Ashmolean Museum in the



School of Archaeology, History and Anthropology, University of Wales, Trinity St David, Lampeter, Wales, SA48 7ED, UK. Email: p.dransart@tsd.ac.uk

University of Oxford. One of them carries in her handbag a piece of ancient metalwork, called the “Wolvercote tongue,” which her first husband, now deceased, had left in his will to the museum’s trustees to be reunited with one of the items of its collections, a gold buckle, excavated in Wolvercote. Dexter presented a word picture of this fictitious artefact, through one of the characters: “Of triangular shape, some 3 inches long, and 2 inches wide at the base; of a dull dirtyish brown colour (gold!), with (originally) three ruby-stones, one on each corner of the triangle—but now reduced to just the one, and that at the narrower end of things.”² While the attention of the tourists is drawn to the public spaces, the galleries where precious things are exposed to the public gaze, the curator emerges from the back rooms of the museum expecting to present to the newly arrived tour group his findings on the art of pre-Conquest England. Instead, he, along with other characters of the plot, is scrutinized by Inspector Morse and his colleagues.

In the novel’s denouement, the museum features as a public front, a sort of stage, which gives leading roles to the two fragments of the buckle as though they were actors. Apart from the curator, on whom suspicion falls, the authors of the scripts (university lecturers, curators and research students) are the shadowy stage hands among the staff who cannot be distinguished from the shadows in the wings.

In museum studies much attention has been given to what Tony Bennett called the stage-like “exhibitionary space” in many different kinds of museums. He explored the manner in which people move through this space and how museums “regulate the performative aspects of their visitors’ conduct.”³ By adopting the metaphor of the museum as a theatre with a “front” and a “behind the scenes,” I want to draw attention to certain pedagogical practices that take place in its “back rooms,” for what goes on in these back rooms has not received as much scholarly attention as the museum’s exhibitionary space. In particular I wish to explore what happens in this pedagogic locale where students learn through the handling of artefacts. Learning takes place on both sides of this divide, but in the back rooms it assumes a greater variety in the experiencing of artefacts than is afforded to the audience by the display in the front of the museum. In back room pedagogic practices, touching and feeling may complement the visual inspection of objects. The surrounding space of this haptic experience is one that permits the learner to experience the artefact at close quarters. Learning through multi-sensorial practices is thus one of the concerns of this essay, especially through the combination of touch and sight, although other senses including smell and hearing are also involved.

That individuals present a “public” front to others in the performance of their daily activities was one of the main insights explored by Erving Goffman.⁴ However, if the presentation of the self as on a stage presupposes a back stage, which is out of sight, in the back rooms of university museums a further “fronting” is implied, whether the teaching of a class of undergraduates or the close supervision of research students is involved. It would probably be more accurate to think of a nesting of activities from those that are fully public to those that are never fully private, depending on the ratio between teaching staff and students and the arena in which the teaching takes place.

Thus my focus will be on the social context of the training undertaken in the back rooms of museums in British universities. In particular I address the social arena in a field of learning which is primarily related to the study of material culture. Many higher education students work with lecturing staff while pursuing research for undergraduate dissertations or doctoral theses, but it is also important to recognise that the museum staff

also engage in less formal activities that bring in members of the public to the relatively “enclosed” laboratories, offices and other back room spaces. Both students and members of the public may come into these back rooms on an individual basis, for the purpose of research they are doing or through their own private initiatives. Another route of access for members of the public is through their membership of specialist societies as part of an organized visit, which provides them with a group experience and gives them access they might not have as individuals.

The fragmentary condition of many of the artefacts housed in museums (especially in archaeology collections) sometimes makes it difficult for curators to consider putting them on public display, but these artefacts make good subjects as a teaching resource. It can be easier to study incomplete specimens than complete ones, where the traces of manufacture have been carefully hidden. Incomplete artefacts are attractive because they have potential for being reconstructed. The incompleteness of the object can therefore exert a pull on future specialists, introducing newcomers to the study of artefacts.

Because the survival of university museum collections as a teaching resource is tied up with the survival of the university museum itself, it is necessary to take into account the social contexts in which learners acquire specialist knowledge through the handling of incomplete objects. As an institution, one of the purposes of a museum is to serve future generations of users. Practically all museums, of course, have educational aims, not only those located in universities.⁵ To cite but one Victorian example, in the Liverpool Museum (today the National Museums Liverpool) the staff developed the display of its collections with the aim of enhancing the educational experience of the visitors. This museum was one of a number of municipal museums under the oversight of an urban elite, who, motivated by civic pride, espoused “a rhetoric of service and improvement.”⁶ In the twenty-first century, many university museums combine this nineteenth-century legacy with the remit of teaching and conducting research. The educational endeavours of their staff encompass the education of future specialists and, in their outreach activities, that of members of the general public as well.

In the ever increasing number of publications on museums, however, those housed in universities have received little focused attention as a group.⁷ An otherwise comprehensive edited volume on the educational role of museums focused on enabling museum professionals to improve the knowledge of their audiences and on the investigation of how people learn in museums.⁸ Contributors to the volume exhorted museum staff to educate their visitors more effectively. Although they recognised the contribution of staff to the production of knowledge in the research carried out at university museums, only one of the authors gave a passing nod to students as “repeat users” of museum collections.⁹

In contrast, Suzanne Keene used her experience of working in the conservation and management of large collections to draw attention to university museums as a “type,” commenting that many were set up in the past “when collections constituted a foundation for understanding and knowledge, particularly of the natural world.”¹⁰ Citing the 2004 University Museums Group report, Keene observed that by displaying knowledge through the exhibition of artefacts, such institutions are engaged in one of the core purposes as envisaged by their staff. The report identified about 400 university museums and collections, ranging from institutions with “high street” entrances to collections housed within departments or other university complexes.¹¹ It cited findings

that 10% have what is described as “dependable core revenue funding,” while 25% are open to the public on a regular basis. Not all of these museums and collections necessarily have the readily accessible public “front” or a dedicated “exhibitionary space” that has so frequently been analysed in museum studies. According to the report, the purpose of 75% of university collections is to serve the teaching and research needs of the staff and students, while also providing public outreach activities.¹² University museums, therefore, are only a “type” of a heterogeneous sort embracing disciplinary categories from anthropology to zoology. What they have in common, Marcia Lord argued, is that “unlike most museums, they are part and parcel of another entity that is undergoing far-reaching scrutiny and soul-searching, that is to say, the university itself.”¹³

A corollary of the teaching activities conducted in a university museum is that it enables people with different disciplinary interests to congregate because such activities are not necessarily tied to one department or school within the host institution. Thus the social processes involved in working with artefacts bring together collectors, curators, teaching staff and students, both undergraduate and postgraduate, all of whom contribute to the physical and intellectual processes in the development of academic disciplines.¹⁴

Although one might assume that the primary objective of the museum staff is to curate artefacts for present-day visitors while also preserving them for future generations, the cultural anthropologist Richard Handler argued that the “purpose of the museum is to survive.”¹⁵ He acknowledged that his statement is characteristic of a modernist perspective, which conceives of a social institution as both an ideological and a legal entity. Museums are but one example of an incorporated body possessing an institutional mission to survive. Such bodies are intended to exist in perpetuity, but because this aim is so self-evident those who work there may overlook it. Given that university museums are embedded in larger institutions, the conceptual basis of what survival means for these museums, and not just for their collections, is one of the challenges of the future university museum. Lest we should forget, Handler warned us “that our habit of personifying human institutions, our practice of incorporating them and our dedication to their survival are not cultural universals.”¹⁶ This warning is particularly pertinent given the economic recession that set in at the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century.

An account of artefact collecting for educational and research purposes is presented here. The two university museum collections, to which I now turn, were both established in the seventeenth century: the Ashmolean at the University of Oxford, which has survived, and the Balfourian and Sibbaldian museums at the University of Edinburgh, which did not. Survival, in this case, refers to the institution and not necessarily to the fate of individual items in its collections. This account forms a kind of “back story” to the discussion of present-day activities with communities of users at the Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology.

THE ALLURE OF FRAGMENTS

The preservation and curation of incomplete objects in museums enables a process of recasting to take place. Fragments have potential for reconstruction, which can be imaginative, figurative, or three-dimensional. Archaeological excavations, especially in

media accounts, are frequently associated with the excitement of discovery, in contrast to the post-excavation work on artefacts, which is conducted in the laboratory or is desk-based. While this labour of research does not have the high visibility of excavations, it still has a resonance that has appealed to journalists, novelists and script writers.¹⁷ It also contributes to attracting students to university courses in archaeology. Although undergraduates are no longer taught typologies of artefacts in a formal manner, increasing numbers choose archaeology courses with a science rather than an arts base.¹⁸ The handling of artefacts and of faunal and plant remains enables students to learn haptically, through the practical acquisition of skills and knowledge, to apply a range of analytical methods.

In an earlier age, such training might only be acquired through a process of self-improvement. When Goethe set out on his journey to Italy in the years 1786–88, he was driven by a desire to enhance his awareness of the external world by paying close attention to it. He trained himself to appreciate the sculpture and architecture of the classical world by taking drawing lessons from expatriate Germans in Rome. In addition to drawing what he observed, he also commissioned casts of the sculptures he wished to continue to examine after his return home.¹⁹

Today, large numbers of volunteers, including many archaeology students, take part in archaeological excavations where they can experience the discovery of artefacts. The thrill of uncovering objects that have not been handled for hundreds or thousands of years encourages people to volunteer their labour on a dig. By participating in the work of excavation, they have the opportunity to handle artefacts directly before the finds go through the formal processes of being claimed by or awarded to museums. Once housed in a museum, access to these artefacts is controlled in order to preserve them, as much for future as for the present generation of visitors.

A study by Macdonald Critchley of blind people's "tactile thought" suggests an analogy to the experience of handling artefacts in museum back room spaces in contrast to the handling of artefacts in other places. Critchley argued that there is a continuum between the "pure haptics" characterising the tactile experiences of a blind person and the "optohaptics" exemplifying those of a sighted person.²⁰ Both blind and sighted people tend to construct forms of visual imagery but, among the former, visual experiences may be remote and cease to be renewed because their mental images are not based on repeated sightings.²¹ Tactile awareness, however, contributes to a person's knowledge of an artefact in its spatial context. Critchley referred to what he called "haptic space" in the use of one's hands, to connect "personal with extrapersonal space." He considered sensory perception to involve changes in the appreciation of states, claiming that "a moving stimulus is more readily appreciated than one which is stationary." Thus, a finger, for example, serves as a "participatory organ over an immobile object." He reasoned that space for blind individuals is "more compressed" and that vertical dimensions pose particular problems for them.²² If his argument is applied to students' experiences of handling artefacts, it would follow that there is a qualitative difference in the experience of handling objects in the field or in a laboratory. The students would experience a different kind of haptic space when learning about artefacts on site (where the focus is largely on the object's stratigraphic context and the chronological sequence which helps date the layer in which it was found), and when examining finds in a

museum back room (where the focus is on the close-grained properties of the artefact itself).

It has been claimed, however, that the distinction between disembodied knowledge, acquired through optic means, and embodied knowledge, gained through haptic experience, oversimplifies matters.²³ Given that people differ in their sightedness, being fully sighted, colour blind, partially sighted, or blind, it is important to consider how sensorial experiences vary according to context. According to Michael Taussig, tactility and tactile knowing have a “great underground of knowledges locked therein,” despite the fact that Euroamerican cultural vocabularies do not have a corresponding abundance of verbal expressions.²⁴ Hence my emphasis is on practical knowledge and the skills that depend on, and develop from, the handling of often incomplete objects.

Richard Sennett similarly argued that among craftworkers “touch delivers invasive, ‘unbounded’ data, whereas the eye supplies images that are contained in a frame.”²⁵ This explanation is particularly significant in the light of theories on how museums frame the experiences of their users. Commenting that such framing appears to be an intractable habit in contemporary museum practices, Donald Preziosi observed that the museum supplies both the master pieces (the artefacts) and the technology that enable viewers to refashion their own subject positions in a socially sanctioned manner, depending on their station in life. These object lessons are the outcome of apprehending artefacts as subjects, in that the museum staff, almost invisible, make them display an “agency” in which they become the “simulacra of the subjects of which they are the symptoms.”²⁶ It is, however, important to remember that there is a disciplinary basis to the teaching offered through university museums; archaeology departments provide students with different domains of experience for handling artefacts, with both a wide angle (on site) and close up (as framed in the museum’s back rooms).

THE SOCIAL ARENA

At the beginning of my essay, I introduced a fictitious situation in which “the Wolvercote tongue” was handed from one social arena to another. This incomplete artefact was described by a character in the novel, who, the reader was told, had applied her training in tactile thought by drawing a reconstruction which united the artefact’s two known parts. Because the object must be measured, the task of drawing it to scale (as is expected for specialist publication) involves a different sort of scrutiny than merely viewing it in a display case.

Knowledge of having handled museum artefacts might well lead the reader of *The Jewel That Was Ours* to question the identity of the fictitious artefact. Apparently, it evokes a real type of Anglo-Saxon buckle with characteristic burnished bosses. It calls to mind a massive, ornately worked example with an intricate zoomorphic interlace that was excavated from the ship burial in Mound 1 at Sutton Hoo in 1939 (now in the British Museum).²⁷ Less elaborate examples formed part of the collections made by the Revd James Douglas, who conducted excavations in Kent in the 1770s and 1780s. In 1828 Sir Richard Colt Hoare donated these collections to the Ashmolean. According to Arthur MacGregor, they “represent the first coherent body of artefacts of Anglo-Saxon date ever placed on public display.”²⁸

Dexter's use of the term "jewel" in the novel's title, however, brings to mind another Anglo-Saxon artefact in the Ashmolean's archaeological collections: the Alfred Jewel, which was listed and illustrated in the Founder's Book in 1718.²⁹ Dexter borrowed the Old English inscription, wrought in gold, which appears on the frame of the jewel: AELFRED MEC HEHT GEWYRCAN ("Alfred ordered me to be worked [made]"),³⁰ and applied it to the "Wolvercote buckle." The potential for reconstruction of the two fragments, for them to be made whole again, is a source of tension in the novel, with the plot hinging on the frustration of this ever happening. Dexter's fiction plays with tropes of incompleteness and rupture caused by death, for which some of the characters seek revenge. The failed attempt to reunite the fractured pieces therefore serves as an allegory for the rending asunder of the social relationships of the actors, whose attempt to reunite the two parts is frustrated.

In the social arenas of real-life university museums, artefacts gain meaningful roles that connect different generations of students and researchers. Through the social productions of these scholars, it appears that the "tongue" of the fictitious Wolvercote metalwork might have belonged not to a buckle but to an *aestel*, which served as a pointer, a hand-held tool used as an aid in reading. In a visual reconstruction, David Hinton superimposed a photographic image of the Alfred Jewel, with a conjectural pointer added to it, on top of a manuscript. The tip of the pointer ends just below the term *aestel* as it appears in the preface to King Alfred's translation of the sixth-century *Regula Pastoralis* by Pope Gregory.³¹ That the Jewel might have been presented by King Alfred to a bishop and that it was in fact an *aestel* was suggested in 1711 by the Oxford academic Thomas Hearne. It seems he did not have a clear idea of its function, however, for he regarded it as a stylus.³²

The discovery in 1653 of a magnificent Merovingian grave of a man at Tournai, in the Spanish Netherlands, had brought to light an artefact that has continued to defy easy categorisation. Jean-Jacques Chifflet identified its owner, by the presence of a seal-ring, as Childeric, father of Clovis.³³ He published a study of the artefacts in his book *Anastasis Childerici I Francorum Regis* (1655), the title of which claimed to "resurrect" Childeric since *anastasis* means "resurrection". According to Peter Burke, Chifflet interpreted these artefacts through a close visual inspection, with drawings complementing the verbal descriptions in the book. However, as demonstrated in a plate containing drawings of the enigmatic object, both Chifflet and the artist must also have handled it in an attempt to understand it.³⁴ Unlike the Alfred jewel, this object retained a detachable pointer. It was drawn in three views, with its component parts arrayed side by side, in its closed aspect and with the artefact set up for use. A fourth image on the plate presented a reconstruction with a disembodied hand using it. There is, however, a discrepancy between the gesture that is depicted in the reconstruction and the naming of the artefact. While the plate is labelled *Graphiarum Regis aureum*, which indicates that Chifflet, like Hearne, thought of the object as a stylus for writing, the action depicted in the plate shows the hand using the tool as a pointer. Through handling and drawing the artefacts, the seventeenth-century artist therefore recreated a usage that was more fitting for an *aestel*.³⁵

Between the Renaissance and the development of "scientific" approaches of the early nineteenth century, the cultural practices of European antiquarians included reporting their findings in text and complementing them with studies of the material

remains in images. Burke defined this new interest in images as a “visual turn.”³⁶ This close attention to the measuring and evaluating of artefacts is an important part of present day practices, too, and indicates continuity from the work of earlier generations of archaeologists.

Another case of the value of objects experienced in the round is documented by Emilio Marin. He described how the carved stone head of Livia, wife of Augustus, was finally reunited with its torso. The story began with Arthur Evans, at the time a freelance journalist for the *Guardian*, who returned from Croatia with two carved stone heads, broken off from classical sculptures. He was reported to have obtained them in exchange for a top hat in 1878/9, in the small town of Vid, near Metković.³⁷ A desire to make one of these pieces whole again was fulfilled when the Visitors of the Ashmolean decided to return the head of Livia to Croatia, so as reunite the two parts of the statue. A decade-long excavation, which began in 1995 at the site of Narona (precursor of Vid), uncovered the Augusteum on the west side of the forum of the Roman town. The imperial shrine was found to contain the toppled, headless torsos of a series of statues.³⁸ Two other headless statues had been found in the nearby village of Opuzen, although it was thought that they had probably been taken from Narona.³⁹ In 2001, Emilio Marin took a cast of the Oxford head of Livia and demonstrated that it belonged to the female torso that stood at the time in the court of the townhouse of Opuzen.⁴⁰ On 18 December 2000, the Visitors of the Ashmolean Museum agreed to make a long-term loan of the head to the Archaeological Museum of Split.⁴¹ That the trustees actually released one of the artefacts for an indefinite period of time might seem to contradict the expectation to maintain in perpetuity the integrity of the museum’s collection. What the Visitors envisaged, however, was an enhanced form of institutional survival—one that can enrich another institution through programmes of mutual cooperation. The reunited Livia statue has since made a visit to the Ashmolean where it was put on display from 7 July to 17 October 2004.

The fictional and the real life narratives recounted here illustrate the central role played by incomplete artefacts in an unfolding sequence of events. Yet in Richard Handler’s anthropological definition of what constitutes a museum, the ownership and location of artefacts play only a secondary role. It is of primary significance to him that the museum serves as a “social arena.”⁴² He regarded the people who staff museums as “museum natives” whose activities and duties are enacted within a social frame. In maintaining a social milieu within which the “natives” fulfil their roles, museums conduct what they probably see as their core activities: the curating of objects and the educating of visitors. Curators become, in other words, the gatekeepers: they both grant and restrict access to the artefacts in their care.

It is worth recalling that in Dexter’s novel not all of the characters had the same kind of access to the “Wolvercote buckle.” Privileged access to ancient artefacts takes place in an educational arena in which curators and teaching staff take charge in constructing the social frames for appropriate behaviour that the visitors will be expected to observe.⁴³ The touching and caressing of sculptures and other artefacts formed part of the aesthetic appreciation enjoyed by seventeenth- and eighteenth-century visitors to collections, whether private or public. Similarly, visits to countries such as Italy provided opportunities for wealthy travellers such as Goethe to gain access to a great many stimulating experiences.

Constance Classen and David Howes argued that, in the course of the nineteenth century, Europeans began to privilege the sense of sight as a more “civilized” mode of appreciating works of art than handling them as museum exhibits.⁴⁴ When museum visitors touched an artefact, they displayed their own insubordination and vulgarity and, as in other modern institutions, they were increasingly subjected to visual surveillance. According to Fiona Candlin, however, there has not been “a wholesale transition from pre-modern multi-sensory forms of learning to modern visually oriented learning.”⁴⁵ The handling of objects mostly takes place behind the scenes, since the injunction placed on visitors not to touch them was directed at the increasing number of working-class visitors who were being admitted to museums.⁴⁶ In Candlin’s account, the training of art critics and curators has combined practical skills of handling with the enhancement of the intellectual and creative activities associated with curatorship. It is therefore art critics and curators who enjoy an exclusive status in identifying and authenticating works of art and in otherwise learning about artefacts.⁴⁷ If the fragility of the artefact inhibits the sort of handling that objects in teaching collections might receive, the back room view enables the student or specialist visitor to experience it from different angles that are not mediated through a display cabinet.

Despite such changes, the 2004 report of the University Museums UK Group signalled that nineteenth-century collecting habits amassed resources that do not appear to have the central importance in teaching and handling that they once had.⁴⁸ Many undergraduate courses in subjects as diverse as the natural sciences, medicine, social anthropology and archaeology do not give due importance to teaching collections.⁴⁹ The handling of objects, however, continues to play a role in teaching the fine and applied arts, as well as in the biosciences and in the history of medicine and science. The report identified areas of teaching in which the engagement with three-dimensional artefacts in museum collections contributes to students developing crucial disciplinary skills in medicine and taxonomic identification and as related to the study of biodiversity and the environment.

BACK TO THE FUTURE

According to Marcia Lord, the Mouseion of Alexandria was a “museum-cum-library,” which enabled scholars to engage in data collection and analysis in already established disciplines (mathematics, medicine, astronomy, and geometry) and in emergent disciplines (including manuscript preservation, grammar, and trigonometry). Although Lord drew attention to the overlap between the university’s origins and those of the museum, she observed that the primary aim of the Mouseion was the systematization of knowledge and that the “preservation and interpretation of material aspects of the heritage” were not its original aim. By invoking the Mouseion she highlighted the drastic changes universities and museums underwent in the latter part of the twentieth century, commenting on the “stresses and strains brought about by rapidly changing concepts and expectations.”⁵⁰

From a twenty-first-century perspective, the Mouseion may seem to be a chronologically situated outlier, dating from the distant past, whose standards and expectations differed from those of today. Today the conservation and preservation of

collections for future generations of users is based on practices developed through time by curatorial and conservation staff, based on appropriate decisions when to make collections available in order to train students in the handling of artefacts. The development of appropriate frameworks has contributed to what Mary Bouquet characterized as a renewal of interest in museum anthropology as a form of cultural production that challenges the academic teaching staff and researchers. She argued that chronological categories denoting boundaries between past, present, and future are no longer “neat” and that in educating future cultural anthropologists, chronological and disciplinary categories alike “seem thoroughly confused by contemporary museum frames.”⁵¹

The curatorial procedures contemporary museum staff have devised for handling of artefacts are relatively recent. In the University of Edinburgh, the original collections were used for teaching, with no provision being made for preserving them for future use. In 1696 the University accepted a bequest from the private cabinet of Sir Andrew Balfour, to which Sir Robert Sibbald added further gifts as well as preparing a catalogue.⁵² As a physician, Sibbald had received his training in Leyden, Paris, and Angers. His interests in botany and chemistry were holistic because they formed part of the acquisition of empirically based knowledge, which he sought to promote in the University. He described his education in Paris in these terms:

I had learned at Paris that the simplest method of Physick was the best, and that these that the country afforded came nearest to our temper and agreed best with us, so I resolved to make it part of my studie to know what animalls vegetables mineralls metalls and substances cast up by the sea were found in this country yt might be of use in medicine or other artes usefull to Human lyfe, and I began to be curious of searching after y^m & collecting y^m, which I continued to do ever since.⁵³

The range of his interests was extensive. His practical approach to mining, for example, was informed by antiquarian, geographical and other scientific pursuits that brought him into contact with others who were fascinated by a knowledge of natural history and the uses to which such knowledge could be put.⁵⁴

As Roger Emerson explained, Sibbald and the virtuosi with whom he worked and corresponded “were Baconians for whom a rather naïve empiricism and a more complex critical method in historiography seemed to promise great improvements.” He contrasted their approach to that of Dr Archibald Pitcairne and his associates, who, by the last decade of the seventeenth century, had adopted “Newtonian beliefs about methods and metaphysics.”⁵⁵ Nevertheless Sibbald’s concern for empirically grounded evidence belonged to a tradition shared by antiquarians working elsewhere in Europe. Material remains provided evidence that was not always recorded in documents. Peter Burke cited the Venetian Sebastiano Erizzo who, in 1559, thought that ancient Roman medals provided a more complete historical record than that available in literary sources, and the 1587 statement of the Spaniard Antonio Agustín that “medals, tablets and stones” were more trustworthy “than in anything written.” Burke defined their procedures as the “materialist method.”⁵⁶

Whereas Edinburgh’s Balfourian and Sibbaldian museums were accidentally dispersed, Oxford’s Ashmolean Museum was accidentally preserved for posterity. Even though the Ashmolean has a long-term history of survival, as a social institution its collections, and indeed the buildings in which it was and is now housed, have undergone

considerable change. John Tradescant and his son (also named John) were keepers of the royal gardens, and both acquired collections of plants and curiosities during their travels that formed part of their employment. Their collection in Lambeth, London, was known as "Tradescant's Ark," to which visitors were granted access for sixpence.⁵⁷ The collection attracted the attention of the lawyer Elias Ashmole, himself a collector of books, coins and manuscripts, who seems to have contributed financially to the publication of a catalogue, the *Musæum Tradescantianum*, issued in 1656 and again in 1660. The younger John Tradescant intended in his will that the "Closet of Rarities" should remain with his wife Hester after his death, and on her death she was to bequeath it to the University of Oxford or of Cambridge, to whichever she thought most appropriate.⁵⁸ In 1659, however, Ashmole had persuaded the Tradescants to sign the collection in a deed of gift in his favour. Following John the younger's death in 1662, Ashmole initiated legal action to gain control over the collection. His case "to have and enjoy all and singular the said books, coins, medals, stones, pictures, mechanics and antiquities" was upheld, and he proceeded to a suit of libel, accusing Hester of defaming him. She formally relinquished her claim and, in April 1678, was found drowned in a pond in her garden.⁵⁹

Ashmole resolved to donate the collection along with his own to Oxford. In 1683 he wrote to the Vice-Chancellor of the University saying, "when Mr. Tradescant's Collection of Rarities came to my hands, tho I was tempted to part with them for a very considerable Sum of money... I firmly resolv'd to deposite them no where but with you."⁶⁰ In that year, the combined collections were transferred to a new building situated between the Sheldonian Theatre and Exeter College. The decision made to invest in a building, the upper storey of which housed the collection, provided this novel educational institution with an air of confidence about its ability to endure. According to Ken Arnold, "here was a bold statement about a new type of space in which, under Baconian strictures, objects were to be inspected and manipulated in order to produce knowledge."⁶¹

Despite this initial confidence, some of the University's scholars referred to the Ashmolean Museum as "the Knick-Knackatory" and, in time, the staff were unable to maintain the strict standards of stock control that Ashmole had stipulated in the statutes for the fledgling institution.⁶² Early in the eighteenth century, Zacharius von Uffenbach commented that country people visited the Museum on market day: "even the women are allowed up here for sixpence; they run here and there, grabbing at everything and taking no rebuff from the Sub-Custos."⁶³ Visitors insisted on handling the items and they were accused of filching souvenirs. One example of damage is perhaps provided by the so-called "robe of the king of Virginia," which Georg Christoph Stirn had seen in Tradescant's Ark in 1638. Today it is on display in the Ashmolean Museum.⁶⁴ It consists of four tanned pieces of deer hide to which *Marginella roscida* shells were sewn using a sinew thread. Some of the white discs formed by the attached shells are missing or are now incomplete; according to the museum's online catalogue this situation is "probably largely the result of post-collection vandalism, resulting from the greater accessibility of the lower part when the piece was hung up on display."⁶⁵

During the nineteenth century, the natural history collections and ethnographic artefacts were transferred to a new building, the University Museum, a large complex in Parks Road, which also included the Pitt Rivers Museum. The Ashmolean Museum is now housed in a building designed by Charles Robert Cockerell, where from the late

nineteenth-century onwards it acquired its focus on art and archaeology.⁶⁶ Today publicly accessible university museums exude a certain confidence in their architectural housing. This confidence conveys not only the idea of riches inherited from benefactors but that the museum is also the custodian of the individual artefacts of the collections for the benefit of future generations of students and other visitors.

ANIMAL, VEGETABLE, OR MINERAL?

The Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (CUMAA) came into being in 1884, a year after Alfred Maudslay and Sir Arthur Gordon donated collections of artefacts to the University. These collections were combined with the artefacts of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society to constitute what was known as the Museum of General and Local Archaeology. One of the expressed aims of the new institution was to “explain the uses of those prehistoric objects which can only be rightly understood when placed in such a juxtaposition.”⁶⁷ Starting with teaching interests in physical anthropology, the disciplines of both archaeology and anthropology were to develop from these beginnings, supported by the Haddon Library, which was housed in the same complex of buildings as the Museum.

The study of artefacts therefore formed the foundation for the emergence of disciplinary inquiry at Cambridge. Like developments elsewhere, CUMAA staff have consciously used the museum as a site “where anthropological knowledge is produced.”⁶⁸ In so doing, they use their collections to foster apprenticeships in the materialist method, which has the effect of bridging the divide between the “exhibitionary space” and “back room” activities.

To exemplify this argument I will briefly discuss two events at CUMAA. During Michaelmas term (October–December) 2009, archaeology staff and students were invited to screenings of the BBC television quiz *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral?* in a back room of the museum. Originally broadcast in the 1950s, it was produced by David Attenborough and introduced by Glyn Daniel with panel members including Sir Mortimer Wheeler, Jacquetta Hawkes, and Geoffrey Bushnell, curator of CUMAA from 1949 to 1970.⁶⁹ The task of the panel members was to identify the archaeological or ethnographic artefacts in the absence of any labels. The name of the programme indicated the Enlightenment taxonomic principles underlying the game; it relied, in other words, on taking artefacts out of juxtaposition and challenging the “experts” to restore their identifications. An overall-clad assistant placed a solitary object on a stand. Since the camera was focused on the as yet unidentified artefact, little more was visible of this person than his hands and arms. The panel members then picked it up and examined it from different angles, scoring marks for correct identifications. At this point of the game, the camera focused on the face of the panel member as if to draw attention to the optohaptic moment as he turned the object round in his hands.⁷⁰ This was the reciprocal moment in which he registered the artefact in his hands and at which he began the active response in attempting to name it.

During the same term, CUMAA staff also organized a game to which the public was invited. This event was held in one of the galleries, that is, in the museum’s “exhibitionary space,” with staff members competing against research students, who were

evidently well taught as they won by a margin of one point. This public display of recognition and recall through the handling of objects (from a mammoth tooth to an Andean carved stone camelid used in libations) provided an insight into the way in which museum professionals interact not only with each other but also with museum collections. For this game, there was a good gender balance in the panel members, in contrast with the 1950s version.

A political aim of successive governments in Britain has been to promote social inclusion by offering financial support to non-university museums on the basis of their educational provision, normally characterized as “informal.” University museums, in contrast, depend for their support on their parent institution and receive part of their recurrent core costs from the relevant UK funding council’s allocation for teaching and research. Those university museums that can cater to two different communities—students and the wider public—can attract funding from various sources.⁷¹ At the time of writing, the Coalition’s *Programme for Government* specifies in its university policies the “need to increase social mobility” and to “attract a higher proportion of students from disadvantaged backgrounds.”⁷² CUMAA’s revisiting of the BBC’s *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral?* programme can therefore be said to respond to the needs of both sectors. It serves to demonstrate how university museums can play an important role in developing coherent strategies to bridge the divide between the two communities of users.

Despite the political developments of the past few years accompanied by economic recession, there are strong reasons for a serious consideration of the history of museums and how to develop them for the future. That Edinburgh’s Balfourian and Sibbaldian museums did not survive does not necessarily mean that they were unsuccessful: it is possible their teaching collections served the needs of staff and students very well. Perhaps, however, these collections failed to sustain their long-term continuity because the staff did not reach out to a wider public. In contrast, there is evidence that there was a great deal of public interest in Tradescant’s Ark thanks to the realization of the potential for developing the collection through its dual educational role when transferred to a university context.

CONCLUSION

As Handler commented, “the purpose of the museum is to survive,” because it is only by ensuring its survival that a museum, an incorporated body, can realize its institutional functions of teaching, research, outreach, and collaboration. These activities involve making artefacts available to generations of repeat users in the present and in the future. Yet certain issues continue to raise concerns. Fiona Candlin has emphasized the need to conserve expertise as well as to preserve artefacts for posterity.⁷³ University museums are therefore clearly responsible for equipping specialists with that kind of expertise, notwithstanding current government policies, which have been accused of having utilitarian contexts of application.

Several derogatory comments—as, for example, the eighteenth-century jibe that the Ashmolean collection of rarities was a “Knick-Knackatory” —surfaced in the foregoing discussion. In the twentieth century, Emerson accused Sibbald and his associates for practising “a rather naïve empiricism.”⁷⁴ It may be useful to recall, I believe, that for

Francis Bacon, the widely acknowledged empiricist, the scientific pursuit of knowledge was an egalitarian, dedicated collaborative endeavour for the benefit of the public at large.⁷⁵ The evaluation of empirical evidence is, after all, fundamental to a range of academic disciplines: including archaeology, anthropology, art history and museum studies, as well as crime detection and journalism. It is curious to note that when objects of value—“treasures”—are presented in the media to public view, the focus, as a kind of visual tic, is often on the gloved hands of staff in museums and auction houses. These gloved hands stand for the privileged quality of expert knowledge, which is necessarily communicated through many different channels and locations; in other words, academic investigation is heterogeneous.⁷⁶ It is in this wider context that I have attempted to show how social actors deploy artefacts as an extension of the hand, whether it is a ruler’s *aestel*, or an ancient sculpted head that a proficient individual can reunite with its body. In the hands of students and other researchers working in university museums, they become the focus of optohaptic attention not only for the production of practical knowledge and expertise, but also for continuing to provide a basis for learning in the future university.

NOTES

1. The term *artefact* refers here to objects made by human skill, but can on occasion also refer to “found” objects. The accessioning of this latter category and the study accorded to them in museums impart an artefact-like quality. Most of the examples explored in this essay are of a size that can be held in the hand.
2. Colin Dexter, *The Jewel That Was Ours* (London: Pan, 1992), 47.
3. Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics* (London: Routledge, 1995), 26.
4. Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1971).
5. David Anderson, *A Common Wealth: Museums in the Learning Age* (United Kingdom Stationery Office: A Report to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 1999), 8–10.
6. K. Hill, *Culture and Class in English Public Museums, 1850–1914* (Aldershot: Ashgate), 65 and 105.
7. Exceptions for university museums in Britain are provided by Marcia Lord, “Editorial,” *Museum International* 52.2 (2000): 3; Melanie Kelly, ed., *Managing University Museums: Education and Skills* (Paris: OECD, 2001); and University Museums Group, *University Museums in the United Kingdom* (2004). For literature relevant to Japan and Australia, see Suzanne Keene, *Fragments of the World: Uses of Museum Collections* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, Butterman, Heinemann, 2005), 23 note 6.
8. Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, ed., *The Educational Role of the Museum*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 1999).
9. Tony Bennett, “That Those Who Run May Read,” in Hooper-Greenhill, *The Educational Role of the Museum*, 252.
10. Keene, *Fragments of the World*, 17.
11. University Museums UK Group, *University Museums in the United Kingdom* (2004), iii.
12. University Museums UK Group, *University Museums in the United Kingdom* (2004), iii.
13. Marcia Lord, “Editorial,” *Museum International* 52.3 (2000): 3.
14. William Ryan Chapman, “Arranging Ethnology: A. H. L. F. Pitt Rivers and the Typological Tradition,” in *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*, ed. George W. Stocking Jr (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 15–48; Frances Larson, “Anthropological Landscaping: General Pitt Rivers, the Ashmolean, the University

- Museum and the Shaping of an Oxford Discipline," *Journal of the History of Collections* 20.1 (2008): 85–100.
15. Richard Handler, "An Anthropological Definition of the Museum and Its Purpose," *Museum Anthropology* 17.1 (1993): 33–36.
 16. Handler, "An Anthropological Definition of the Museum," 35.
 17. An example considered below is provided by the sculpture of Livia's head which is owned by the Ashmolean Museum.
 18. James Doesner, "University Archaeology: A Thing of the Past?" *British Archaeology* (May–June 2010): 18–25.
 19. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Italian Journey* (London: Penguin, 1970), 152, 242.
 20. Macdonald Critchley, "Tactile Thought, with Special Reference to the Blind," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* 46 (1952): 27–30.
 21. For a discussion of interviews with blind people and their use of touch in handling museum artefacts, see Fiona Candlin, "Don't Touch! Hands Off! Art, Blindness and the Conservation of Expertise," *Body & Society* 10.1 (2004): 71–90.
 22. Critchley, "Tactile Thought," 30, 28, 30.
 23. Fiona Candlin, "Don't Touch! Hands Off!" 85.
 24. Michael Taussig, *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 26.
 25. Richard Sennett, *The Craftsman* (London, Allen Lane, 2008), 152.
 26. Donald Preziosi, "Brain of the Earth's Body: Museums and the Framing of Modernity," in *The Rhetoric of the Frame: Essays on the Boundaries of the Artwork*, ed. Paul Duro (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 96–110. Reprinted in Bettina Messias Carbonell, ed., *Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004), 79.
 27. Rupert Bruce-Mitford, *The Sutton Hoo Ship-Burial Vol 2: Arms, Armour and Regalia* (London: British Museum Publications, 1978), 536–64. The buckle has three large burnished bosses in a triangular arrangement rather than inset with rubies as in the novel. Had the fictitious buckle been from the Early Medieval period, it would more likely have been set with garnets.
 28. Arthur MacGregor, *The Ashmolean Museum: A Brief History of the Museum and Its Collections* (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 2001), 39.
 29. David A. Hinton, *A Catalogue of the Anglo-Saxon Ornamental Metalwork 700–1100 in the Department of Antiquities, Ashmolean Museum* (Oxford, 1974), 29–48; David A. Hinton, *The Alfred Jewel and Other Late Anglo-Saxon Decorated Metalwork* (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 2008), 12; Simon Keynes "The Discovery and First Publication of the Alfred Jewel," *The Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society for 1992* 136 (1993): 1–8.
 30. Hinton, *The Alfred Jewel*, 12.
 31. Hinton, *The Alfred Jewel*, 28.
 32. Hinton, *The Alfred Jewel*, 27. According to Hinton, it was W. J. H. Clifford, Bishop of Bath and Wells, who in 1877 identified the function of an *aestel* by noting that the words *festuca* ("rod") and *indicatorium* had been inserted in a thirteenth-century hand above the term *aestel* in the preface to the *Regula Pastoralis*.
 33. The ring entered the collection of the Cabinet des Médailles in Paris but in 1831 it was stolen as well as most of the other items studied by Chifflet; Edward James, *The Franks* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), 61. A wax impression taken before the theft forms part of the collections in the Ashmolean Museum (accession number AN2009.9.B).
 34. Peter Burke, "Images as Evidence in Seventeenth-Century Europe," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64.2 (2003): 286, 288.
 35. As drawn, the "closed" aspect of the artefact casts a P-shaped shadow that throws the object into relief. Recent commentators consider the mystery object to have been a crossbow brooch, which is a Roman type with a characteristic cross bar decorated with knobs; the profile of the complete brooch forms a letter 'P', like a crossbow. See James, *The Franks*, 61. However, the artist who drew the items from Childeric's grave depicted an object with two detachable parts: a long pointer which was housed in the main shaft (convex on one side and flat on the other), and a short pointer which the user drew out from one of the knobs at the

- end of the cross bar. The hand using the object is shown with the artefact resting on the bow of the 'P' and the flat side of the shaft downwards and the convex face resting under the index finger. James commented that the presence of a seal ring implied letter writing, a Roman rather than a Frankish custom. The presence of a pointer for reading documents would be in keeping in such a context if, indeed, the artefacts came from the same grave. Since these items are now missing (see note 33), there is some uncertainty regarding their interpretation.
36. Burke, "Images as Evidence," 273.
 37. Maev Kennedy, "Caesar's Wife Statue Made Whole Again," *The Guardian*, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2004/jul/13/artsandhumanities.arts?INTCMP=SRCH>, 13 July 2004 (accessed 9 January 2011).
 38. Emilio Marin, "Livie à Narona," *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'année – Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 147e année, N.2 (2003): 957–74.
 39. Marin, "Livie à Narona," 964.
 40. Marin, "Livie à Narona," 965.
 41. Marin, "Livie à Narona," 964 note 18.
 42. Handler, "An Anthropological Definition of the Museum," 33.
 43. The institutional status of who is allowed to touch artefacts in national museums is considered by Candlin, "Don't Touch! Hands Off!" 77–81.
 44. Constance Classen and David Howes, "The Museum as Sensescape: Western Sensibilities and Indigenous Artefacts," in *Sensible Objects: Colonialism, Museums and Material Culture*, ed. Elizabeth Edwards, Chris Gosden, and Ruth B. Phillips (Oxford: Berg, 2006), 199–22, and esp. 207.
 45. Fiona Candlin, "Museums, Modernity and the Class Politics of Touching Objects," in *Touch in Museums: Policy and Practice in Object Handling*, ed. Helen J. Chatterjee (Oxford: Berg, 2008), 18.
 46. Nowadays, some museums do make less vulnerable artefacts available to visitors, especially children, to provide opportunities for handling.
 47. Candlin, "Museums, Modernity and the Class Politics of Touching Objects," 17.
 48. University Museums UK Group, *University Museums in the United Kingdom* (2004), 5.
 49. For an example of a student project in the three-dimensional digital recording of ethnographic artefacts and an enquiry into the extent to which digital images were understood by the students to retain the sensory attributes of the original artefacts, see Graeme Were, "Out of Touch? Digital Technologies, Ethnographic Objects and Sensory Orders," in Chatterjee, *Touch in Museums: Policy and Practice in Object Handling*, 121–34.
 50. Marcia Lord, "Editorial," *Museum International* 52.2 (2000): 3.
 51. Mary Bouquet, "Introduction: Academic Anthropology and the Museum. Back to the Future," in *Academic Anthropology and the Museum: Back to the Future*, ed. Mary Bouquet (New York: Berghahn Books, 2001), 2.
 52. Roger L. Emerson, "Sir Robbert Sibbald, Kt, The Royal Society of Scotland and the Origins of the Scottish Enlightenment," *Annals of Science* 45.1 (1988): 41–72.
 53. Sir Robbert Sibbald, *The Memoirs of Sir Robert Sibbald (1641–1722)*, ed. Francis Paget Hett (London, 1932), 64–65, cited by Emerson, "Sir Robbert Sibbald, Kt," 44 note 12.
 54. Emerson, "Sir Robbert Sibbald, Kt," 55.
 55. Emerson, "Sir Robbert Sibbald, Kt," 64.
 56. Burke, "Images as Evidence," 276, 277.
 57. MacGregor, *Ashmolean Museum*, 12.
 58. Philipp Blom, *To Have and to Hold: An Intimate History of Collectors and Collecting* (Woodstock, NY: The Overlook Press, 2004), 57; Mea Allan, *The Tradescants, Their Plants, Gardens and Museum, 1570–1662* (London: Michel Joseph, 1964), 192.
 59. Blom, *To Have and to Hold*, 57–59; MacGregor, *Ashmolean Museum*, 16–18.
 60. Cited by MacGregor, *Ashmolean Museum*, 16.
 61. Ken Arnold, *Cabinets for the Curious: Looking Back at Early English Museums* (Farnham: Ashgate: 2006), 26. Apparently the university made an expenditure of £4540 to establish the new venture; Mordechai Feingold, "The Mathematical Sciences and the New Philosophy," in

- Seventeenth-Century Oxford: The History of Oxford University*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), vol. 4, 435–38.
62. MacGregor, *Ashmolean Museum*, 20–23.
63. Cited by MacGregor, *Ashmolean Museum*, 24.
64. MacGregor, *Ashmolean Museum*, 10.
65. Ashmolean Museum, *The Tradescant Collection Catalogue: "Powhatan's Mantle"*, <http://www.ashmolean.org/ash/amulets/tradescant/tradescant07-13.html>, 2002 (accessed 9 January 2011).
66. David Watkin, *The Life and Work of C. R. Cockerell* (London: Zwemmer, 1974).
67. Cambridge University Reporter 27 May 1884, cited by V. Ebin and D. A. Swallow in "The Proper Study of Mankind..." – *Great Anthropological Collections in Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 1984), 4.
68. Nélia Dias, "'Does Anthropology Need Museums?' Teaching Ethnographic Museology in Portugal Thirty Years Later," in Bouquet, *Academic Anthropology and the Museum*, 92–104.
69. Warwick Bray, "Obituary: Geoffrey Hext Sutherland Bushnell, 1903–1978," *American Antiquity* 45.4 (1980): 787–90.
70. Although Jacquetta Hawkes was sometimes a panel member, the programme seems from a twenty-first-century point of view to have been based on a show of male expertise, therefore the male pronoun is used here.
71. University Museums Group, *University Museums in the United Kingdom* (2004), 24–25.
72. HM Government, *The Coalition: Our Programme for Government* (London: Cabinet Office, 2010), 31–32.
73. Fiona Candlin, "Don't Touch! Hands Off! Art, Blindness and the Conservation of Expertise," 71–90.
74. For a discussion of touch as an early stage prior to the use of vision in the gaining of knowledge in the work of the art historians Riegl, Berenson, and Panofsky, see Fiona Candlin, "The Dubious Inheritance of Touch: Art History and Museum Access," *Journal of Visual Culture* 5.2 (2006), 137–54.
75. Benoît Godin, "Writing Performative History: The New New Atlantis?" *Social Studies of Science* 28.3 (1998): 465–83.
76. Godin, "Writing Performative History," 466.