

**ARCHIVISTS AND HISTORIANS:
PERSPECTIVES ON THE PLACE OF
HISTORICAL RESEARCH IN
ARCHIVAL PRACTICE**

BY

ROBERT E. STANSFIELD

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
M.Sc.Econ. in Archive Administration
UNDER ALTERNATIVE REGULATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF ABERYSTWYTH

2015

SUMMARY

C.H. Jenkinson's assertion that 'the archivist is not and ought not to be a historian' is the focus of this study of perspectives on the place of historical research in archival practice. It explores the archivist's role by pursuing two objectives: contextualisation of Jenkinson's views within contemporaneous developments in archives and historical scholarship during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; and examination of historical research's centrality to contemporary archival practice. In Introduction (Chapter 1), the study's objectives, methodology, literature, and the nature of the 'historical enterprise' are outlined. Chapter 2 begins with Jenkinson's observations on the archivist's role (which requires contextualisation within wider contemporaneous developments in History and historiography) before considering the whig approach, the professionalisation of History, and the 'archival turn'. The advance of other historical approaches during the twentieth century, such as prosopography, county studies, the scientific study of society, and social history is also examined. Chapter 3 discusses the pertinence of historical research in the contemporary application of archival principles by examining those aspects regularly utilised in archival practice. It considers how historical methods, approaches, and historiography are relevant to diplomatic and description (concerning exploration of sources and contextual narratives); arrangement and appraisal (detailing arrangement and judgement); and education and engagement (encompassing publication and other activities). In conclusion (Chapter 4), the study's themes are evaluated with reference to the 'historical enterprise' and the cultural contributions of historical and archival professions. Examination of historiography prior to Jenkinson's publication of 1922 facilitates appreciation of his views and their evolution over subsequent years hence his prohibition of archivists to be historians has become inappropriate since archivists are active as historians because of their engagement in the wider 'historical enterprise'.

DECLARATION AND STATEMENTS

DECLARATION

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed (Candidate): *R. E. Stansfield*

Date: *22 May 2015*

STATEMENT 1

This work is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Where **correction services*** have been used, the extent and nature of the correction is clearly marked in a footnote(s). Other sources are acknowledged (e.g. by footnotes giving explicit references). A bibliography is appended.

Signed (Candidate): *R. E. Stansfield*

Date: *22 May 2015*

[*this refers to the extent to which the text has been corrected by others].

STATEMENT 2

I hereby give consent for my work, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed (Candidate): *R. E. Stansfield*

Date: *22 May 2015*

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 ARCHIVES AND HISTORY	2
1.2 DESIGN AND RATIONALE	5
2. ARCHIVISTS AND HISTORICAL RESEARCH	9
2.1 ARCHIVAL PERSPECTIVES	9
2.2 HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES	13
2.3 EVALUATION	21
3. HISTORICAL RESEARCH AND ARCHIVISTS	25
3.1 DIPLOMATIC AND DESCRIPTION	27
3.2 ARRANGEMENT AND APPRAISAL	32
3.3 ENGAGEMENT AND EDUCATION	35
3.4 EVALUATION	40
4. CONCLUSIONS	41
4.1 SUMMARY	42
4.2 CONTEXTS	45
BIBLIOGRAPHY	50

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to acknowledge the support that I have received during my studies: I am grateful to the staff of the Department of Information Studies at the University of Aberystwyth for their support, and especially to Dr Jennie Hill for her supervision, advice, and guidance. In addition, my use of the University of Aberystwyth Library was both extensive and essential, and I extend my thanks to the staff for their helpful assistance. I should like to apologise for any remaining weaknesses or errors which are, of course, completely my own responsibility, and also for the fact that my work is not more extensively researched and more eloquently articulated. Finally, my family and friends have been immeasurably supportive, and I would like to dedicate my research to my parents.

R. E. Stansfield

13 April 2015

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

‘The archivist is not and ought not to be a historian’: C.H. Jenkinson’s stricture of 1922 has resonated throughout the archival (and historical) profession(s) in the British Isles and beyond for almost a century because of the significance of his role in the development of the archival profession (Jenkinson, 1937, p. 125). Initially, Jenkinson’s phrase appears unmistakably unambiguous and unequivocal in meaning; but – on further contemplation – is this bold (yet bald) statement truly to be adopted as an unquestioned (and unquestionable) tenet of the archival faith? In turns, this principle has been both accepted and rejected by numerous archivists and authors with various views being propounded as to whether historians deserve a place in archival work (for example, Hull, 1980, 253; cf. Bolotenko, 1983).

Whilst many valuable sources of knowledge may inform archival theory and practice, it has been asserted that historical knowledge is a ‘key component of an archivist’s expertise and professional identity’ (Nesmith, 2004, 1). Indeed, archival work’s entire *raison d’être* is History – through serving the identification, description, and preservation of records of long-term value. However, historical knowledge and understanding of the past stemming solely from academic sources should not assume a favoured form in archival minds, since insights derived from research by archivists, records managers, and other professions may prove of parallel pertinence: collectively, it is upon just such research that all practitioners may draw to meet archival challenges and responsibilities (Nesmith, 2004, 4, 5, 8).

1.1 ARCHIVES AND HISTORY

If History is crucial to archival work then – despite Jenkinson’s statement – should archivists be historians? It has been reasoned that the

chief attribute of an historian ... is his interest in man and society, in beginnings and evolution, in historical truth gleaned by the arduous process of subjection of all possible historical sources to the critical faculty in search of knowledge. It seems to me that such a person will make a better archivist than someone who does not have such an interest (Bolotenko, 1984, 244).

Others have pursued this idea further to suggest that whilst ‘higher degrees do not necessarily make for better archivists ... they often do and this should be recognized’ (Taylor, 1977, 396, cited in Bolotenko, 1983, 25). Graduate training in History can be argued to benefit archivists by equipping them with enhanced awareness of deposits; past personalities, events, and developments; scholarship and the nature of research; the requisite perception and perspective for appraisal, acquisition, and description purposes; and cognisance of users’ scholarly requirements and interests (Burke, 1981, 40–6; Spencer, 1983, 296–7; Russell, 1983, 282–3).

Realisation of these advantages has led some to conclude that ‘there is no substitute for history as a background for an archival career’ and therefore that ‘archivists should first be historians’ (Russell, 1983, 283). However, this implies that only those blessed with extensive educational experience in historical research or training can make good archivists (Taylor, 1984, 31); when, in counterbalance, it is possible that

specialization [*sic*] arising from excessively specialized [*sic*] historical research may blind the prospective archivist to potentials in archives which those with a broader educational base may perceive (Taylor, 1977, 397).

Consideration of training for aspiring archivists, archival curricula, and professional programmes (concerning teaching of historical research, methods, or contextual topics) are valid subjects of investigation but these are issues which should be posed and answered by archival teaching professionals so do not occasion further attention

in this study. Instead, it is hoped that it may prove possible to examine the role of historical research in archival practice without suggesting that only History masters or doctoral graduates should be eligible for archival training, claiming special qualities for such graduates, or elevating aspiring or current archivists in possession of historical qualifications to a divine plane of godliness. Articulation of such notions would not recognise the advantages – and necessity – of a diversity of academic backgrounds for the profession as a whole.

By concentrating on historical research – at a time when archival academic interests have been increasingly inclined towards a social-science agenda – this study also in no way suggests that such an approach is inappropriate or that Archivistics is an invalid subject of study. The application of scientific methods and systematic analysis combined with employment of skills and knowledge silhouettes the intrinsic science-art polarity which compels utilisation – throughout this study – of the neutral term, Archivistics, to refer to the totality of the archival discipline (Ketelaar, 2010, 351; Ketelaar, 2011, p. 95). Whilst disciplinary refinement of identities and discernment of boundaries may be unnecessary for the expansion of Archivistics' academic horizons, it proves necessary to consider further the question of defining this totality: it has been suggested that archival education should encompass the teaching of essential concepts including

the nature of archives, records, and papers, and archival functions (archival theory); the techniques for performing archival functions (archival methodology); and the implementation of theory and method in archival institutions (archival practice). Instruction should cover the history of archival theory and methods and their articulation in the professional literature (archival scholarship), (SAA, 2002, cited in Ketelaar, 2011, p. 90).

Whilst the implementation of theory and method in institutions (and 'Archive Administration' itself) can be appreciated as also encompassing, necessarily, consideration of archival programmes – from aims and the securing of resources, through implementation and management, to delivery and evaluation (Ketelaar, 2011, p. 93) – for the purposes of this small-scale study, archival practice (constituting that

body of practical and theoretical principles which informs theory, approach, and application: Duranti, 1996, p. 1; Mortensen, 1999, 2–3), has been judged specifically to include those practical issues ranging from palaeography, diplomatic, and description, arrangement and appraisal, to education and engagement activities. Since all disciplines are artificial constructs, the validity of Archivistics as a subject (with historical research as one component) remains unchallenged, whilst History itself may be described as a composite field comprising a range of multi-disciplinary strands (Buchanan, 2011, p. 39). Accordingly, how might we define ‘historical research’?

* * *

In defining historical research in 1910, the American historian J. Franklin Jameson emphasised the ‘larger tapestry of historical work’ describing History as ‘a vast panorama of activity’ (Townsend, 2013, p. 1, 2). His conceptualisation was designed to embrace not merely academic scholarship but ‘a much larger array of historical practices, encompassing popular history making, school teaching, and the work of historical societies’ as well as production of research aids and other resources (Townsend, 2013, p. 1). During subsequent decades, academic historical research and researchers came to be perceived as superior to other historically-orientated practitioners, products, and the public. However, as R.B. Townsend has observed:

what constitutes a discipline as an organised body of knowledge and what constitutes a profession as an organised form of work are actually quite different (Townsend, 2013, p. 3).

In aiming at reconciling academic, educational, and public practitioners – and notions – of historical research, Townsend employed the term ‘historical enterprise’ to represent

the broad range of activities where such knowledge about the past is produced and used in an organised or systematic way (Townsend, 2013, pp. 3–4, 5).

In this definition, then, this enterprise comprises

history work taking place in a wide variety of forms and settings by a

diverse group of people, including the writers of academic monographs, the staff at historical societies and public archives who collect and organise historical materials, the public historians who shape history for various audiences, and the teachers who impart history in a variety of classrooms (Townsend, 2013, pp. 4–5).

In developing this purposefully broad definition of historical research, the title of ‘historian’ becomes one that can be applied to all practicing historical skills and research methods, ranging from professional historians to amateur historians, genealogists, and others. Hence, archivists – as one such group of ‘history workers’ – are actively engaged in contributing towards the broader ‘historical enterprise’.

Simply by undertaking research and developing knowledge and understanding of archives, archival context, and historical context, archivists themselves become historical researchers thereby reflecting the fundamental ‘indivisibility of the joint mission of archivists and historians to preserve and disseminate historical knowledge’ (Russell, 1983, 278; cf. Cox, 1984–5, 188). Indeed, discussions of defining who is or is not a ‘historian’ based entirely on attainment of educational heights or qualifications overlooks the crucial part played by historical research in archival practice: instead of questioning whether an archivist should be a historian, it may be more apt and appropriate to investigate the extent to which an archivist engages in historical research, utilises historical knowledge, and applies historical understanding (cf. James, 1983-4; Spadoni, 1984–5, 193–4).

1.2 DESIGN AND RATIONALE

The aim of this study is to survey perspectives on the role of historical research in archival practice and – given recent inclinations in Archivistics towards a social-science agenda – to highlight the enduring pertinence of History and historical methods, approaches, and perceptions to many archival responsibilities as well as to archival cultural contributions. Its two related objectives are to explore perspectives on the place of historical research during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; and

to examine how historical research is necessary for delivery of archival priorities and practices. Firstly, given archivists' opposing views on the role and relevance of historical research, Jenkinson's perspective is explored within the context of contemporaneous developments in archives and historical scholarship during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Secondly, the importance of archives to History, the place of archives in historical research – its (re-)construction, (re-)interpretation, and (re-)writing – is obvious and uncontested yet what is the continuing pertinence of historical research in the contemporary application of archival principles? The centrality of historical methods and techniques has often remained a tacit assumption rather than an acknowledged feature of archival practice; hence, it is necessary to consider those primary attributes, qualities, and characteristics of historical research (such as knowledge of methods, approaches, and historiography) as they apply to description, arrangement, appraisal, and engagement. Collectively, these objectives facilitate an appreciation of the centrality of historical research to archival practice and evaluation of the wider 'historical enterprise' and archivists' cultural contribution.

* * *

Since this study derives from questions pertaining to Jenkinson's perspective on historical research, the most appropriate research design and methodology to consider these issues – in order to fulfil the aims and objectives comprehensively and ensure research validity – was deemed to be one which attempted to contextualise Jenkinson's views within the contemporaneous historiography whilst also assessing the extent to which historical research methods and skills pervade archival activities. Hence, this investigation requires the assessment of the broader discursive landscape and the review, appraisal, and synthesis of relevant studies and archival literature (Pickard, 2007, pp. 25–8). Consequently, the central aspect of this method is the process and completion of the literature search.

From amongst the wider population of archival literature, a sample of works was identified as being of importance to this research topic and further evaluation (judged

on the criteria of relevance) revealed that a smaller sample of these were of particular pertinence to this study and therefore warranted systematic examination, critical analysis, and synthesis. Consequently, this study does not purport to be an exhaustive survey of the extant archival literature exploring historical research and archival practice but merely a representative and purposive review of the works of some of the more influential and pertinent authors. Moreover, the sheer scale of published material of potential relevance impressed the necessity of further restricting literature searches to concentrate on works published in the English language in Britain, Canada, and the United States of America (Pickard, 2007, pp. 25–8).

The literature search process utilised a number of appropriate bibliographic sources in order to identify works for this research: the Library catalogue of the University of Aberystwyth was searched, along with the E-Journals (providing access to numerous databases, including Swetswise, JSTOR, and others), and the Brepols Bibliography of British and Irish History was also utilised for the location of specific historiographical works. During these searches, a number of subject- and title-based keywords were employed in various combinations (including archivist(s), historian(s), archives, history, historical research, archival practice, and other synonyms) as well as author-based keywords derived from leading figures in the discipline (including Jenkinson, and others). As a result of surveying the relevant literature, the tracing of related citations also led to the discovery of further relevant papers in the Canadian journal *Archivaria* (including several successive papers exploring the pertinence of historical research to archival practice from 1983 to 1985).

* * *

During the process of searching and appraising the literature, the emergence of certain specific themes dictated that the most apposite arrangement of materials is the ensuing sequential structure. The second chapter examines Jenkinson's writings on archivists and historians and the context in which his views were formulated. Exploring whether Jenkinson's views changed over time and the possible reasons for his composition of

that infamous phrase in 1922, the question is raised of whether his perspective was coloured by awareness of the nature of the historical profession during the early-twentieth century? Thus, it is necessary to consider the development of History as a discipline during the late-nineteenth century, and the nature of the prevailing whig approach (as epitomised in the works of leading medievalist scholars, such as William Stubbs, with which Jenkinson would have been familiar). The ‘archival turn’ in nineteenth-century historiography and the professionalisation of History led to the advance of other historical approaches during the twentieth century, such as prosopography and county studies (as advocated by the medievalist scholar K.B. McFarlane), and the scientific study of society (as inspired by the *Annales* school) and social history.

The third chapter focuses on those features of historical research utilised in archival practice in order to demonstrate its centrality to the archivist’s role. Moving from the specific to the general – from the micro- to the macro-scale – the analysis is divided into three functional categories: diplomatic and description (concerning scientific exploration of documentary sources, and the perspective required to compile contextual narratives); arrangement and appraisal (detailing the organisation, arrangement, classification and judgement of archival materials); and engagement and education (encompassing publications, exhibitions, teaching, and other activities). In conclusion (Chapter 4), a summary of the study’s investigations leads into exploration of the broader context of the ‘historical enterprise’ and the cultural contribution made by both historical and archival professions.

CHAPTER TWO

ARCHIVISTS AND HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Post-Modernism's recognition of subjectivity and repudiation of metanarratives has – in recent decades – stimulated the renaissance of certain Jenkinsonian principles: the values and concepts of integrity, impartiality, and reliability have proved particularly relevant considerations for professionals ministering to records management concerns, attending to electronic and digital records, and aiding accountability (Cook, 1997, 39–40; Cook, 2001b, 15–18). Since Jenkinson's principles have proved pertinent for contemporary records management issues, is it also appropriate to ascertain whether his views on historical research are similarly applicable to contemporary archival practice?

2.1 ARCHIVAL PERSPECTIVES

Jenkinson's remonstrance that 'the archivist is not and ought not to be a historian' certainly merits further exploration and explanation (Jenkinson, 1937, p. 123). This significant and censorious phrase was followed by specific qualifications: he accepted that an archivist requires some historical knowledge and may even possess a personal interest in History, but also stated that

his duty is to his Archives, independently of any of the Research subjects (of which at present History is the most prominent) which make use of Archives for their own ends; and therefore an interest in any of these subjects since it might give him a prepossession in favour not only of a subject but also perhaps of a school of opinion within that subject, might be more than inconvenient or inappropriate, it might be positively dangerous (Jenkinson, 1937, p. 123).

Whilst we may disagree with Jenkinson's unnecessarily provocative expression, his reasoning for this opinion appears to arise from his view that

most of the bad and dangerous work done in the past, may be traced to external enthusiasms resulting in *a failure on the part of the Archivist to treat Archives as a separate subject* (Jenkinson, 1937, p. 122).

This image of the archivist-historian who – entranced in a delirium of History – allows his historical fervour to impair his archives' impartiality, obliterate their natural arrangement, and thereby mutilate their evidential basis is surely hyperbole. But was this the sole meaning that Jenkinson intended to be derived from his words?

It has been stated that Jenkinson 'was not as intolerant of the historian as is often suggested'; instead, his phrases were largely intended merely to demarcate and delineate the role and activities of the archival profession. Indeed, it seems probable that Jenkinson sought to define Archivistics as an academic discipline thereby creating a definite distinction between History and the emergent subject which he later labelled as a '“Jack-of-all-trades” profession' (Jenkinson, 1947, p. 253; Stapleton, 1983, 83). Alternatively, rather than suggesting that archivists should spurn the study of History as part of their professional preparation, Jenkinson may have been highlighting the 'profound difference of outlook which does not turn on techniques, but on the relationship to the record' between professional archivists and professional historical researchers (Taylor, 1984, 35).

It is within the context of this 'difference of outlook' that Jenkinson's ideal archivist is required to ignore all 'external enthusiasms' (deriving from personal prejudices, historical influences, or schools of thought) which may translate into disregard for provenance, application of subjectivism, or bias in materials' selection and organisation. He emphasised the necessity of archivists' impartiality thereby ensuring that records' internal evidence (nature, order, and context) are preserved without distortion, manipulation, or destruction, and are allowed and enabled to deliver meaning and truth to future consultants of the archival record. For Jenkinson, it should not be the place of the archivist to consider the value of the records for

researchers:

the final scrutiny before they pass into Archives is the only point at which the consideration of historic interest might possibly intrude, and for this reason is to be employed only with due precaution: in most cases it would probably be best to omit it (Jenkinson, 1937, p. 184).

With archivists ill-equipped to judge matters historical – equally – historians were ill-equipped to judge matters archival. Whilst this tidy delineation of disciplinary spheres may have been one of Jenkinson’s intentions, such strict and severe demarcation does raise questions concerning Jenkinson’s perspective. Even if we accept that he wished merely to highlight archivists’ and historians’ differences in outlook, did Jenkinson really view *all* historians as potentially divisive, destructive, and partisan? Did Jenkinson’s impression of the historical profession alter and adjust during his career and may we find further qualification – or more nuanced expression – of his views in his later published works?

By examining Jenkinson’s later writings, it appears that he provided some further qualifications: in 1947 – some twenty-five years after the publication of his *Manual* – Jenkinson had, apparently, undertaken a *volte face* on this issue, he declared that the archivist – after all – may

upon occasion turn Historian and it is in this branch of the Historical services (which is crying for recruits) that he may most properly enlist (Jenkinson, 1947, pp. 252–3),

and he recommended that this will be beneficial because

elucidation of the Administrative History which lies behind a series of Records previously unworked not only adds to the stock of known facts but provides a piece of indispensable equipment for the researches of others who, in whatever interests, may desire later to exploit the same documents (Jenkinson, 1947, pp. 252–3).

Jenkinson posited that the archivist’s study of administrative history was a necessity – not merely a choice – and was essential not simply

as a background but must from time to time engage himself actively in

extending it for the immediate purposes of his own work (Jenkinson, 1960, p. 373).

Jenkinson admitted and accepted that ‘the needs of research constitute the *raison d’être* of the Archivist’ and that ‘the idea (which has sometimes been suggested) of a fundamental antagonism between the two is absurd’, and he continued to explain that

to a certain extent, as we have seen, the Archivist must himself turn Historian in at least one field – that of Administrative History – and it would be hard if he were cut off from occasional excursions into others. He will almost certainly make from time to time interesting discoveries and must sometimes be allowed the pleasure of following them up, in off hours, himself (Jenkinson, 1947, p. 258).

Evidently, the views evinced in Jenkinson’s *Manual* should not be interpreted as the *only* exposition of his views on distinctions between historians and archivists. Did Jenkinson’s views change or did he merely qualify them further? Jenkinson may have merely clarified his earlier statements upon further reflection or in response to criticism; however – whatever the particular evolution of his thoughts on the subject – what were those initial influences which had spurred him to write that ‘the archivist is not and ought not to be a historian’ in 1922? Why did he entertain such a depreciative view of historians and perceive their research interests as contrary to archival needs? Did Jenkinson’s views derive from his educational experiences, therefore should they be interpreted as the mere articulation of his opinion of contemporaneous historical research?

The appointment of C.H. Jenkinson (1882–1961) as Deputy Keeper of the Public Record Office from 1947 to 1954 marked the culmination of his productive and successful career as an archivist, educator, and scholar. After studying Classics at Pembroke College, Cambridge, he had entered the civil service in 1906 (Davies, 1957, pp. xiii–xxx; Johnson, 2004; Stapleton, 1983, 81). His interest in medieval history may be demonstrated by his writings on several subjects and in his concentration on the study, research, and teaching of palaeography and diplomatic. It was through his work on these two ‘auxiliary sciences’ that Jenkinson appears to have cultivated an

affinity with various historians and researchers of medieval England: his accumulated expertise, familiarity with documents of medieval administration and their related diplomatic and legal aspects and attributes may have proved especially beneficial to these researchers (Stapleton, 1983, p. 76). His affinity with historians and knowledge of their research interests dictates consideration of the broader background of the historical and archival professions during the later-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries: locating and appreciating Jenkinson's educational environment and formative years prior to 1922 within the context of the predominant historical methods and approaches widely employed and advocated at that time.

2.2 HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

During the later nineteenth century, it was widely perceived that History comprised constitutional and political history: the former was regarded largely as the study of government, law, and parliamentary institutions whilst the latter was deemed to concern primarily monarchs' reigns, diplomacy and foreign policy, and ecclesiastical relations and evolution. However, the predominant focus of the 'whig' approach was constitutional history: concentrating on monarchs, ministers, central government, and the macro-scale evolution of law and constitution (thereby excluding politics, local government, minor variances, and personalities). Framed by such a long-term emphasis, the enduring themes of English history were refined and decanted with the principal sediments presented as liberty and the representation of the people. Hence, whig expatiations – concerning themselves with a limited array of issues that were thought to be particularly important to the Victorian world – were inordinately subjective. Indeed, such an approach tended to be circumscribed, Anglo-centric, and egocentric in its exposition of past events anachronistically and entirely within the context of the later nineteenth-century British cultural and political climate (Carpenter, 1995, p. 175; Slee, 1986, pp. 56–121; Levine, 1986, p. 23).

Whig historians 'coloured their works with a nationalistic hue' and a particular

religious sensibility: by representing past events as evidence of the unassailable primacy of English liberty and by emphasising our native and natural antipathy to absolutism and the antiquity of our Parliamentary system, History – itself – became the ‘tangible proof of English glory, a monument to the power of tradition and stability, a metaphor of pious belief’ and ‘a central weapon in the armoury’ in a universe judged by English standards by Christian (Anglican) scholars (Pocock, 1961–2, 219–46; Levine, 1986, pp. 80, 82, 84–5). Some of the religious views exhibited and expounded in such historical research sponsored the notion of a ‘pre-ordained historical process reaching its pinnacle in Victorian England’ (Levine, 1986, p. 74). Thus, historical writing entailed not merely exploration of past events as a means of understanding our historical evolution but celebration of our islands’ story as a religiously-inspired justification of global supremacy at a time when the British Empire was advancing towards its apogee.

The archetype of the whig approach (and one of the monumental works of this period) was the *Constitutional History of England* by the English Anglican Bishop of Oxford, William Stubbs (1825–1901). This opus proved especially notable for its combining of constitutional with political history, and its portrayal of the later Middle Ages as riven with disorder and violence (resulting largely from his interpretation of parliamentary sources). Hence Stubbs believed that the fifteenth century – in particular – witnessed few evolutionary parliamentary and institutional developments and characterised the era as a transitory age (Stubbs, 1873–8, iii, pp. 274–94, 520–1, 632–8; Campbell, 2004). This whig emphasis – primarily concentrated upon administrators and not upon elites or other aspects – was not the preserve of Stubbs. At the same time, for instance, the concept of the ‘new monarchy’ (founded by Henry VII), advocated by Stubbs’s Oxford colleague, John Richard Green (1837–83), supported his interpretation and endorsed notions of Yorkist and Tudor absolutism (Green, 1874, pp. 282–97; Carpenter, 1995, pp. 178–9).

Alongside the development of whig constitutionalism, the evolution of History as a discipline being deemed worthy of study at the nation’s leading universities also

occurred: for instance, History's acceptance as a subject at the University of Cambridge came with the adoption of a separate Historical Tripos in 1873. Its acceptance at the University of Oxford came during the course of the 1870s and 1880s, with the School of History being led – at that time – by influential figures such as Stubbs, Green, and Edward Augustus Freeman (1823–92). A significant staging post on History's journey to acceptance was also the foundation of its premier journal, the *English Historical Review*, in 1886 (Levine, 1986, p. 24–30, 135–6, 164). These landmarks in History's development had arisen from foundations laid in earlier decades – principally the establishment of the Public Record Office (1838), the publication programme of the Calendars of State Papers (from 1856–7 onwards), and the creation of the Historical Manuscripts Commission (1869) – each of which inherently acknowledged the necessity and utility of the subject of History. Simultaneously, the expanding governmental apparatus in Britain's industrialising society also ensured the increasing pertinence of administrative history (Blaas, 1978, p. xv; Slee, 1986, pp. 56–121; Levine, 1986, pp. 78, 101–34; Taylor, 1984, 26–7).

From the mid-nineteenth century onwards, historians' concentration on political history had largely resulted from their exploitation of state papers but, by 1900, archival research had become 'the *sine qua non* of the professional' (Levine, 1986, pp. 75–8, 87). This development in later nineteenth-century European historiography – characterised as an 'archival turn' – represented a movement towards perceiving archives as 'privileged sites of historical knowledge production' (Eskildsen, 2008, 425–53; Huistra, Paul, and Tollebeeke, 2013, 4). This inclination to view professional scholarship, study, and knowledge as contingent upon data collected and collated through archival research, using unpublished primary-source materials, became markedly apparent in historians' works during this period and derived from principles advocated by the German historian, Leopold von Ranke (1795–1886), that through

critical study of the authentic sources, impartial interpretation, objective representation, the goal is to bring the complete truth into the present (Eskildsen, 2008, 19 (quotation); Paul, 2013, 68; Huistra, Paul, and

Tollebeeke, 2013, 4).

This archival reorientation influenced not only the historical profession's epistemological approach but prompted examination of the historian's persona and those attributes and abilities which the ideal practitioner should (and should not) exhibit. Excessive devotion to archival research might lead to historians' disproportionate concentration on issues of relatively minor importance whilst an inattention to archival excavation might lead others to veer towards generalisation and subjectivity. Some historians, by prioritising accuracy of information and parading their attentiveness, diligence, and industry, emphasised only the objective of factual knowledge which might prove detrimental to their scholarly creativity, empathy, and synthetic power as well as their aesthetic judgement and broader understanding (Paul, 2013, 69, 76).

Examination of the historian's persona was also accompanied by changes in perceptions of the archivist, which entailed a greater understanding of the archivist's historically-oriented role: for instance, by 1900, the staff of the Public Record Office were regarded as providing archival access more for 'literary' than for legal reasons. Unfortunately, however, archivists' 'literary' expertise were soon eclipsed by those of the professional historian: the hitherto indistinct division between archivists and historians – which emerged largely following the professionalisation of History by 1920 – subsequently led to the perception of archivists as relatively insignificant elements within the greater 'historical enterprise' (Procter, 2010, 18, 20, 23).

By the turn of the twentieth century, the potency of whig constitutional history had been vitiated by further – more nuanced and more meticulous – research which exposed its schematic, subjective, and superficial nature (for instance, Maitland and Tout undermined Stubbs's notion of a representative Parliament: Maitland, 1893; Tout, 1920–33, i, pp. 4–5). The whig emphasis on the constitution and central administration failed to acknowledge that governance was inherently reciprocal in nature and was therefore reliant upon its acceptance in the localities; thus the portrait of medieval society painted by whig history did not appreciate the practicalities of

governance. Whereas whig historians had assembled their narratives largely from parliamentary records and chronicles, a new generation of historians – influenced by the ‘archival turn’ – exploited a greater range of governmental records and subjected them to systematic study. For instance, F.W. Maitland utilised a variegated selection of manorial, honorial, ecclesiastical, and common-law records enabling him to establish that the operation and use of the law was fundamental to the functioning of political, governmental, and societal structures as well as to elite culture (Maitland and Pollock, 1968; Milsom, 2004; Carpenter, 1995, p. 180).

Whilst some historians’ research exposed certain deficiencies in particulars, the general conclusions of whig historians (such as Stubbs and Green) were still generally accepted during the early twentieth century. For instance, although Maitland had advocated utilisation of a greater range of source materials – in essence – his work continued to advocate the validity of the whig interpretation. The study of subjects of whig focus – governmental institutions and the constitution – continued during the first half of the twentieth century, reaching its zenith with studies such as T.F. Tout’s work on the royal household and secretariat (Tout, 1920–33; Galbraith (rev. Slee), 2004). By the 1930s, however, there remained no alternative to the whig synthesis and, consequently, many historians were drifting towards neglecting political and constitutional history in order to study ideas, religion, and culture (McFarlane, 1973a, pp. x, xi).

Evidently, the lengthy shadow of the whig approach and Stubbsian Constitutionalism was cast over successive generations of students and historians, hence it does not seem unreasonable to accept that Jenkinson’s educational experiences in Classics, historical methods, and research at Cambridge during the first years of the twentieth century (combined with his later employment at the Public Record Office) would have encompassed consideration of the whig opinions and approaches of historians such as Stubbs, Green, and others (and perhaps even interaction with leading proponents of these views). Consequently, if we re-consider Jenkinson’s views – within this context – and recognise his understanding of the

inherent limitations of the whig approach (its subjectivity, and enduring and exclusive focus on only certain sources and themes), it may be possible to comprehend the intended meaning of Jenkinson's phrases. Given all the clear faults, flaws, and failings of the whig approach, it seems understandable that Jenkinson would be reluctant to endorse (and ready to question) such whig historians' capacity for objectivity and impartiality in their dealings with archives and administration. Whig historians' subjectivity and desire to compose over-arching and nationalistic narratives therefore proves irreconcilable to archival principles: thus, for Jenkinson, whig historians' ability to represent archival realities would indeed be severely limited, perhaps even to the point of being 'dangerous' to archival integrity.

Viewed through this prism, then, Jenkinson's desire to draw a distinction between Archivistics and the perceived evils of whig History is more readily understandable and justifiable, as may be his stricture concerning an archivist not being a historian – or not being a *whig* historian at least: thus it might be acknowledged that he was not opposed to historians *per se* but only a certain type of historian. By 1947, Jenkinson recognised that the vistas of historical research had greatly altered; he argued that

History in our time is apt to concern itself with people rather than with individuals and with conditions rather than things. It is the faring of ordinary people, our opposite numbers in the past, that we need to study for the enlightenment of our own conduct today (Jenkinson, 1947, p. 243).

Indeed, Jenkinson's embracing of a broader interpretation of History than that advocated by the nineteenth-century whig historians is apparent and was reflective of wider developments in historical scholarship since the 1930s (despite his strictures concerning archivists' need to remain aloof from such developments).

* * *

The tide of nineteenth-century whig orthodoxy – with its unequal emphasis on constitutional history – subsided, in the mid-twentieth century, to reveal new approaches to History. In the Stubbsian realm of later-medieval political history, for

instance, this tide's retreat enabled the advance of waters which emphasised personalities and the importance of political connections and patronage networks. The historian of medieval England, Kenneth Bruce McFarlane (1903–66), provides an excellent example of how historical research developed during the early- to mid-twentieth century in succession to Stubbs' interpretation.

McFarlane discarded the whig distinction between political and constitutional history and, recognising that his generation had produced 'utter confusion' by failing to re-evaluate the era, he lamented that 'the attempt to interpret the period as a whole ... begins and has ended with Stubbs' (McFarlane, 1973b, pp. 279–80; Harriss, 2004). McFarlane also criticised contemporaries for focussing exclusively upon mechanisms of government and administration because he believed that it was undesirable to separate institutional history from the 'activities, opinions and passions of the men who made and used them' (a quotation from McFarlane's unpublished papers, cited in Carpenter, 1995, p. 188). Consequently, McFarlane was one of the first medieval English historians to advocate prosopography – the collective study of individuals' lives, careers, personal and familial relationships, and patronage connections – in order to sketch a more comprehensive depiction of the times.

This prosopographical approach had been pioneered and promoted by the historian of the eighteenth century, Lewis Bernstein Namier (1888–1960), whose work on George III's reign had challenged the whig perspective by recognising that eighteenth-century political society was influenced and determined by patronage connections and thereby revealing the realities of electoral and parliamentary politics (Namier, 1929; Namier, 1930; Carpenter, 1995, p. 188; Cannon, 2004). Inspired by Namier, McFarlane advocated the study of medieval political society, focusing on integrating the political and social dimensions of ruling elites and understanding their contemporaneous context. McFarlane sought to accomplish an integrated political history – based on diligent research – which studied monarchs, elites, and politics but he acknowledged that the preparatory stage was the completion of prosopographical surveys in order to examine gentry, peerage, and their patron-client networks

(McFarlane, 1973b, pp. 279–98; McFarlane, 1973c, pp. 1–141; McFarlane, 1981b, pp. 1–21). Fulfilling this stage, a succession of studies sought to investigate landholding, office-holding, politics, and governance in the localities, and the county study became popular during the later-twentieth century through the work of Alan Milner Everitt (1926–2009) and others (Everitt, 1966; Morill, 1974; Stansfield, 2009, pp. 12–13). McFarlane’s example serves to demonstrate the transformation of historical research – compared to whig history not only in terms of approach but also in terms of archival sources, subjects, and scale – evidently rendered continued application of Jenkinson’s strictures to historians and historical research problematic by the mid-twentieth century.

As modern historical methodology had developed during the later nineteenth century, both historical and archival practices had largely concentrated upon the study of formal political and economic institutions and prominent figures. Whilst political and governmental themes continued to receive treatment through prosopographical and county studies, the emphasis of other professional historians shifted – during the twentieth century – from studying the activities of monarchs and ministers to examining the experiences of the general populace. The French *Annales* School of History (deriving its name from the journal, *Annales d’Histoire Economique et Sociale*, founded in 1929) advocated a total scientific history of society in terms of analysing geographies, ethnicities, economies, cultures, and transformations over the *longue durée*, as demonstrated in the works of Marc Bloch (1886–1944), Fernand Braudel (1902–85), and others. Accordingly, researchers were no longer permitted to assume that History’s primary causal forces were initiated by social and political leaders but were to recognise the responsive, reciprocal, and multifaceted nature of interactions, transitions, and processes (Braudel, 1973; Miller, 1981, 114).

In order to expose and explore norms, patterns, and developments within past societies, historians’ employment of comparative studies of specific classes, communities, and groups became increasingly desirable. In many cases, the questions posed, methods employed, and evidence surviving necessitated historians’ focus on

localities and regions as the preferable units of analysis in order to reveal local, regional, and national variances. Such an alteration in the accent of historical research facilitated a systematic approach to the study of data, methodical examination of large quantities of data, and utilisation of quantitative techniques, thereby enabling the advocacy of comparative and generalised conclusions concerning the characteristics of past societies (Baskerville and Gaffield, 1983–4, 174–5).

Social history and socio-historical research – being concerned with social structures, attitudes, activities, and the daily lives of the public – succeeded in both broadening the scope of historical research and altering the ‘former historiographical base of the alliance between historians and archivists’ (Nesmith, 1982, 5; Miller, 1981, 113). Many historians’ shift in emphasis – and modification in their archival demands – remained largely unrecognised in archival priorities and practices for some time, and this instance demonstrates not only the significance of archives for all varieties of research but the relevance of the relationship with the historian and the pertinence of the role of the archivist. The nature and extent of extant archival sources, understanding of historical techniques, and awareness of research topics combine to suggest and demand the need for synchronicity between historical and archival practices (Cook, 1977–8, 198–9; Nesmith, 1982, 8–9; Baskerville and Gaffield, 1983–4, 176; Buchanan, 2011, pp. 38–9).

2.3 EVALUATION

Modern historical approaches – in reaction to the grand and generalised narratives of whig history – understandably adopted a more analytical temper which was more critical of sources. The broadening of historical approaches in political history (prosopographical and county studies) and social history (the *Annales* School) also naturally entailed the broadening of historians’ archival needs. Thus, as historical approaches evolved, Jenkinson’s stricture of 1922 became increasingly obsolete, and his recorded thoughts of 1947 (as above) reveal this altered outlook. Hence, it may be

the case that – as has been suggested with other of Jenkinson’s precepts – that the trick is to ‘follow the spirit, not the letter’ of such tenets (Cook, 1997, 25).

Jenkinson’s statement that an ‘archivist is not and ought not to be a historian’ proves problematic primarily, of course, because repositories – by their very purpose of preserving documents for future utilisation – are ‘irrefutably entwined with historical research’ (Bolotenko, 1983, 13). Jenkinson’s suggestion that indulgence, or awareness of trends, in historical research may taint the archivist’s perspective does not appear to appreciate the possibility that an archivist may prove to be partial and partisan precisely because their perspective has been tainted by other considerations (such as political affiliations or religious beliefs), (Hull, 1980, 253–4). Alternatively, a historian with an acute appreciation of historical context (gained through education and experience) would be tempted neither to compromise an archive’s provenance nor to impair its historical context (Bolotenko, 1983, 10). Such a figure – conscious and cognisant of historical thought and research, and of *all* potentialities for bias and weakness – would be more likely to be sceptical and objective and therefore more inclined to serve the historical record having arrived at a state of ‘conscious impartiality’ (Bolotenko, 1983, 10; Dunae, 1983–4, 290). Thus, it may be argued – perhaps more convincingly – that a historian ought to be an archivist.

Indeed, some have averred that ‘the best preliminary training that an archivist can have is advanced training in history’ because it provides him with ‘a knowledge of the development of his country’ and ‘training in research methodology’ both of which are required ‘in all the work he does rationalizing [*sic*] public records’ (Schellenberg, 1956a, p. 131). Historical training is undoubtedly relevant because the archivist ‘must know how records came into being if he is to judge their value for any purpose’ (Schellenberg, 1956b, p. 8). Therefore, as an ‘agent for future research interests’ (Schellenberg, 1956a), archivists’ primary purpose should be as a ‘representative of the research community’ continually maintaining and expanding their knowledge of current historiographical and methodological trends (Brichford, 1977, pp. 12–13; Cook, 1977–8, 199). Hence it remains essential for archivists to maintain their

research interests and sustain their contacts with research communities. In order to represent researchers' perspectives in archival and administrative realms, it is also necessary for the archivist to be a researcher: familiar with relevant techniques and trends, cognisant of schools of thought, and acquainted with pertinent personalities (Cook, 1978–9, 34). Appreciation of scholarship, therefore, remains vital for the archivist's anticipation of research interests (in so far as this may be possible), and for efficacious service to academic researchers, scholars, and public (cf. Blooms, 1991, 26). Indeed, it might even be posited that without familiarity with historical research and a keen sense of historical perspective, the true significance of many archives may remain unrecognised and unrealised (Dunae, 1983–4, 287; Bolotenko, 1983, 20).

Familiarity – and fostering of contacts – with research communities should enhance archivists' historical knowledge and awareness of historical methodologies therefore should not be interpreted, critically, as 'pandering to an elite clientele at the expense of other users' (cf. Cook, 1984–5, 35–6). Other archival users – such as genealogists, local historians, heritage managers, and others engaged in the broader 'historical enterprise' – should not be relegated to a level of insignificance whilst pursuing an agenda of primacy and priority for professional historians because there is a requirement for archives' engagement with all people and all communities and – simultaneously – in the business of archival practice there remains the necessity of connecting with historical knowledge, approaches, and methodologies which may be achieved most successfully through engagement with the wider historical community (Nesmith, 1982, 14; Taylor-Vaizey, 1983, 306).

Naturally, there are valuable skills, tools, and techniques which can be gathered, garnered, and learned from a variety of other professions ranging from librarianship, information governance, records management, information technology, conservation, and administration to any other discipline whether literary, artistic, scientific, or humanity; however, 'archival work should be cross-fertilized [*sic*] by these other professions' expertise, not dominated by them' (Cook, 1984–5, 35–6). Within such an inter-disciplinary context, it should be acknowledged that historians and archivists are

engaged upon the same task which is to discover and convey the truth about events and personalities and issues of the past, to isolate and arrest from the flow of time some point or area of human experience, to learn what it meant to those who took part in it, and to distil and pass on what it can mean to us now (Ellis, 1966, 159–60).

These ‘organic, generic links’ between the archival and historical professions therefore should not be repudiated or remain unrecognised but must be understood and incorporated into both professions, and this is particularly necessary with regard to the professions’ commonalities of historical knowledge and methodology (Cook, 1984–5, 38). Having considered perspectives on historical research, it is necessary to examine how historical research may contribute to archival practice and towards the wider ‘historical enterprise’.

CHAPTER THREE

HISTORICAL RESEARCH AND ARCHIVISTS

It has been proposed that ‘the historian does not bring a special insight to treatment of organisation of records’: whilst some historians may prove to be exemplary archivists, others may not, and the relevant measurement, as has been acknowledged, must be their individual – rather than their collective – fulfilment and performance of duties (Spadoni, 1983, 295). Hence, the notion that a historian’s respect for historical context is indicative of his natural understanding of provenance remains debateable because the identification (and management) of archival resources relies on the understanding and application of more than merely historical disposition, preparation, and abilities: there are numerous tasks which are undertaken within the archival sphere which are unrelated to History or historical research (Spadoni, 1983, 295; Taylor-Vaizey, 1983, 305). Moreover, records’ legal, fiscal, operational, and institutional values may not be represented or interpreted solely and entirely through the filter of historical training since an awareness of functions and institutional priorities and direction are also important requisites to understanding. Indeed, an archivist’s need for a functional understanding of all records and their potential uses is merely one aspect amidst the multifarious needs for the balancing of identification, acquisition, preservation, and accessibility agendas, addressing of questions of legal admissibility and acceptability, creation of information systems, purveyance of information to researchers, provision of service responsibilities, and cognisance of management techniques (Taylor-Vaizey, 1983, 307).

Concentration on the historical research element of archival practice does not question the disciplinary identity of Archivistics (above, pp. 3–4), or negate or deny its validity as a subject of study, or as a necessary preparation for all aspiring

archivists but merely highlights the relevance of History, historical research, and historical perspective in the daily undertakings of the profession. Various archivists have pronounced on the relevance and irrelevance of historical research to archives but to what extent are historical skills, knowledge, and research regularly employed and utilised in archival activities? What are the significant elements of archival practice and how is historical research essential to their fulfilment?

The posing of such questions also – equally – does not seek to deny the necessity for archivists’ orientation towards records management and information governance: indeed,

the task is to integrate elements of our traditional perspective into our work with contemporary records and expand that perspective for the benefit of all those who would use archives now and in the future (Eastwood, 1984–5, 5).

At a time of technological advance, historical research is not an irrelevance for archivists but a pivot upon which the profession hinges:

only archivists today can extract the record of enduring value and place it in the context in which future historians will use it (Eastwood, 1984–5, 5).

Consequently, only archivists – whose education should, ideally, be oriented to include records management, information governance, historical research, and various other aspects – are sufficiently enlightened and acquainted with both traditional and technological demands to be able to serve the present and future needs of the public, researchers, government, and wider society.

Following George Bolotenko’s fervent exposition of his views on the archivist-historian dichotomy, Terry Eastwood lamented that

Bolotenko actually undersells the role of historical study in the making of archivists because he does not identify and *illustrate* the ways in which historical study inform the daily work of the archivist (Eastwood, 1984–5, 4).

Hence it seems not merely appropriate – but essential – to explore some aspects of the daily application of historical research in archival environments: to demonstrate the

archivist's cultural contribution to society, and illustrate how historical knowledge, methodology, research, and perspective are essential to the successful fulfilment of this contribution (Cook, 1984–5, 40). Such an exploration of the ways in which historical methods, knowledge, and research are employed in archival activities needs to consider the full spectrum of activities: ranging from the micro-scale (documentary analysis, diplomatic, and palaeography utilised in the appraisal, description, and understanding of informational values found at item level) and meso-scale (the study of records in the aggregate), to the macro-scale (public engagement and education).

3.1 DIPLOMATIC AND DESCRIPTION

Records' informational value often transcends their original (and continuing) official value, and the archivist – through his knowledge and expertise – provides the means for identification of these values. Yet discernment of informational and research values requires historical knowledge, methodology, and perspective (Cook, 1984–5, 33). In addition, it has been appreciated that

Archives are not collected ... they came together, and reached their final arrangement, by a natural process: are a growth; almost, you might say, as much an organism as a tree or an animal (Jenkinson, 1947, p. 238).

Hence the study of records to determine and discern their origins, evolution, contexts and contemporary usages – reconstructing the realities of this inheritance – may be defined as 'history' and the advanced study of any historical event or issue requires 'the tools, perspectives, methodologies, interpretive power' of, and familiarity with, 'historical literature and historiography' (Cook, 1984–5, 41).

At the micro-scale of all archival activities lies documentary analysis and interpretation, and it might appear to 'belabour the obvious' to stress that 'archivists ought to study, understand, and appreciate the records in their care' (Hives, 1984–5, 6); however, this was not evident to Jenkinson – in 1944 – when he suggested that

it is not, primarily at any rate, [the Archivist's] business to use or interpret his charges; he need not be interested in their contents – indeed

it is in some ways an advantage if he is not, for that detachment preserves him from the temptation to *ex parte* procedure. His training, methods, and rules of conduct are in fact, or should be, such that he can at a pinch make shift to perform his functions faithfully without even understanding the meaning of the document entrusted to him. His part is simply to conserve intact every scrap of evidence which not only the contents of the documents but their form, makeup, provenance, and position in relation to other documents have to offer (Jenkinson, 1944, pp. 230–1).

Whilst archivists may make a personal choice not to utilise or exploit their records for research purposes, their understanding of the records remains crucial for their fulfilment of archival work. Understandably, three years later – in 1947 – Jenkinson’s opinion had apparently altered and he averred that ‘to do all that is necessary for his Archives’ the archivist ‘must be able to read and understand them’ (Jenkinson, 1947, p. 247), and that the ability

to read and understand his documents is an essential preliminary to any practical work the Archivist may have to undertake (Jenkinson, 1947, p. 253).

Clearly, archivists’ comprehension and interpretation of documents is a requisite skill, and necessitates utilisation of certain other tools: Jenkinson described the

apparent complexity of our jack-of-all-trades, with its jumbled elements of History, Palaeography and Mycology, Heraldry and Photography, Medieval Latin, Law and Architecture, Book-keeping by Double Entry and Book-binding by reputable methods, and an increasing number of other and stranger Crafts and Sciences (Jenkinson, 1960, p. 368).

Indeed, the ‘complete archivist’ requires a multiplicity of expertise drawn from several different arenas: a combination of general and specialised knowledge and various skills are a desirable foundation on which to build for the purposes of engaging in diplomatic analysis.

Jenkinson recommended that the aspiring archivist should possess adequate general knowledge of History, and certainly ‘a trifle more of the outlines of English History than generally remains after an average education’ in order to inform his

perspective (Jenkinson, 1928, p. 120; Jenkinson, 1947, p. 249). He advised some understanding of legal history ‘especially that of real property, if (as they almost certainly will in a collection of any size) his documents are to include deeds’ (Jenkinson, 1928, p. 120). More generally, however, he endorsed ‘a specially good bibliographical knowledge of the authorities upon Family History and Topography’ with a more refined awareness of those titles likely to be of particular relevance to his locale (Jenkinson, 1928, p. 120). Later, in 1947, Jenkinson also valued an archivist’s ‘close and up-to-date acquaintance with the trend of all the more important Studies which depend for their progress upon documentary work’ therefore – clearly – the archivist needs to remain ‘well up in what has been done and is doing’ and ‘particularly knowledgeable in the matter of Reference Books of every kind’ (Jenkinson, 1947, p. 256).

More specifically – in terms of skills – the archivist needs ‘more than a little knowledge of *Palaeography*’ in order to read the various hands exhibited in medieval and post-medieval documents (Jenkinson, 1947, pp. 247, 249; also Jenkinson, 1915, p. 26; Jenkinson, 1928, p. 120). In terms of languages, ‘he will need three: medieval Latin, French, English’ (Jenkinson, 1947, pp. 248, 249): since some knowledge of Latin proves necessary for older and larger collections, and knowledge of French may prove useful for medieval collections, as well as awareness of some of the ‘medieval modifications of those languages’ (Jenkinson, 1928, p. 120). Jenkinson had contended, in 1915, that ‘the importance of Palaeographical Science is at present overrated’ whilst the pertinence of administrative history remains ‘dangerously undervalued’; he lamented that palaeography was unnecessarily accorded a great emphasis which, unfortunately, might lead to the student being ‘cut off from that knowledge of Administrative History which is really vital to his work’ (Jenkinson, 1915, p. 26). Indeed, Jenkinson also asserted that linguistic skills and palaeography should be interpreted as ‘only sections of the larger subject now known as *Administrative History*’ (Jenkinson, 1947, p. 249).

Whilst Jenkinson recommended – in 1928 – that an archivist should possess ‘a

familiarity with the actual scripts employed in the period and variety of documents with which he is concerned' (Jenkinson, 1928, p. 120), later – by 1947 – his opinion had strengthened to command and commend 'the fullest possible acquaintance with the structure, machinery, and development of English Administration and Archives in all grades and at all periods' (Jenkinson, 1947, p. 249). Indeed, archivists may require sufficient knowledge of general (as well as specific) historical, institutional, and governmental settings in order to undertake diplomatic analysis to identify documentary forms, formulae, functions, and origins, and to locate documents within their appropriate contexts of creation, usage, and administration (Duranti, 1989b, 7–27). Whilst consideration of protocols, eschatocols, and wider palaeographical, sigillographical, or chronological analysis may illuminate understanding of documents, without 'scholarly and historical insights' such analysis 'rapidly degenerates into arid formulation, analogous to elementary philology'; in addition, there is also a need – as has been noted – to 'understand the people who created and used the documents before we can really understand their research value and their limitations of documentary survival, bias, and incompleteness' (Brooke, 1970, 3–4, 8–9; Nesmith, 1982, 16). Perpetual specialisation may risk obscuring the place of historical knowledge 'at the core of archival scholarship' but knowledge of historical, administrative, and wider contexts benefits diplomatic analysis by enabling documentary and historical contextualisation within collections thereby aiding archival description and facilitating broader understanding of archives (Nesmith, 1982, 24).

* * *

Ultimately, documentary perception and diplomatic analysis cannot be undertaken without reference to the broader framework which comprises documents' provenance, function, and administrative context. Development of understanding of such contexts – necessarily – requires discernment of informational values which is keenly desirable for the purposes of archival description. Description may require the study of

individual documents which thereby stimulates examination of informational value: those actors, factors, or features populating the documentary landscape. But it is precisely these aspects which exemplify how ‘historical knowledge and historiography have a major impact on archival work’ (Cook, 1984–5, 42; also Nesmith, 2004, 11). It is the locations, events, individuals, families, and dates specified in letters, papers, and registers that provide archivists with an abundance of data with which to discern a spectrum of values, whether institutional, historical, or local in nature. In many cases, references to certain local or national events or prominent figures may not be immediately perceptible or appreciable. Whilst not suggesting that all archivists should be possessed of an armoury comprising either or both an interest in historical miscellanea and a retentive memory of fathomless proportions, nevertheless an extensive historical knowledge and appreciation of chronologies and contexts relevant to a collection, institution, or region may prove beneficial in aiding elements of descriptive practice. Fulfilment of the archival duties of description, appraisal, and consultation cannot be accomplished without detailed knowledge of administrative creations, contexts, usages, survivals, and destructions, which thus marks as especially significant the archivist’s need to conduct research into archival, societal, and political contexts (Cook, 1984–5, 42; Nesmith, 2004, 22).

In an institutional context, descriptive catalogues’ provision of summaries of organisations’ administrative structures, practices, developments, and identification of individuals and officials pertinent to processes of governance, becomes a necessity to understanding an institution’s historical context and how the archive’s original purpose may affect its contemporary or potential research usage. Thus it is the descriptive process which encapsulates and frames the relationship between source and sourcing activity (Nesmith, 1982, 25; Robyns, 2001, 377). Moreover, recognition of the importance or pertinence of items, series, or collections also requires not only awareness of the archive’s wider context in terms of interaction of intrinsic and extrinsic agents, agencies, and developments, but cognisance of other similar or comparable collections at local, regional, national or international levels. Indeed,

without such an appreciation of historical and archival relevance, it would not be possible to prepare finding aids of sufficient detail or to provide researchers with advice of adequate quality (International Council on Archives, 2000).

The daily application of archival scholarship – in terms of descriptive practice and preparation of comprehensive catalogues, indexes, and reference tools – clearly relies upon archivists’ historical knowledge, perspective, and research skills (Nesmith, 1982, 9, 26). Archivists’ need to contextualise the individual record within broader institutional, local, and national chronologies was also recognised in Hans Bloom’s proposal of a Documentation Plan, requiring reconstruction of contemporaneous historical scenes and enumeration of relevant dates, debates, and events: as he asserted, if archivists wish to serve the record as effectively and as completely as they desire, then they should ‘orient themselves to the values of the time in which the record was created’ (Blooms, 1991, 28 (quotation), 32–3). Indeed, it is this requirement to relate the individual – to the collective – to the context that represents the archivists’ broader conceptualisation and contextualisation of the documentation of administrative activities.

3.2 ARRANGEMENT AND APPRAISAL

Once the scientific study of documents and archival description has been observed at the micro-scale then the arrangement and appraisal of materials, at the meso-scale, may prove necessary. As has been observed, ‘the eye and mind of the historian, the training in historical methodology, the immersion in history in general cultivates in [the archivist] the historicist approach, the awareness of historical context’ (Bolotenko, 1983, 25), and it is precisely such perspective which is of crucial import for the intellectual undertakings of arrangement and appraisal.

In the studied organisation and classification of archival material, preservation of records’ integrity and evidential value may be achieved through awareness of provenance and observance of the crucial principle of *respect des fonds*. These aspects

– combined with description and arrangement – therefore permit archivists’ institution of ‘intellectual control’ and also serve to inform archivists’ comprehension and perception of an institution’s (or an individual’s) records in terms of the manner and milieu of their origin, their continuing and complex nature, and their historical and societal contexts (Jenkinson, 1947, p. 247; Berner, 1978, 176–81; Baskerville and Gaffield, 1983–4, 180; Bolotenko, 1983, 18; Bolotenko, 1984, 246). Whilst an archivist ‘must be skilled in Sorting, Arranging, and Listing and in the mechanical processes connected with them’ and cognisant of relevant conservation requirements, it is – according to Jenkinson – such ‘knowledge of the History and Machinery of Administration’ that is of truly vital importance (Jenkinson, 1943, p. 199; Jenkinson, 1947, p. 253; Jenkinson, 1960, pp. 372–3; and for the relationship with conservation, see Bigelow, 1989, 51–6).

Logically, then, the archivist’s promotion of the study of institutional archives means that he becomes ‘an advocate of institutional history’ (Brichford, 1977, 9–10; Miller, 1981, 119–20). Though archivists’ natural and necessary orientation towards biographical, prosopographical, and organisational narratives does not (and cannot) mirror the subject-focussed research undertaken by scholars, this does not prescribe that archivists’ work is prohibited from being (and remaining) inter-disciplinary in essence: for instance, archive-sourced neo-institutionalist history connects history, archives, organisational theory, and also management studies through the undertaking of organisational studies of history (Miller, 1981, 121; Rowlinson and Hassard, 2013).

Institutional records necessitate appreciation of the worlds of creators and creations, users and usage, and individuals’ interactions and inter-connections within organisational structures which may encapsulate formal (or ideal) processes but not explain more informal (or realistic) relationships or decision-making practices. Typically, understanding of the breadth and depth of such structures and processes may be facilitated by the institutional historian: his knowledge of an agency’s records is transmitted to the archivist whose understanding of organisational changes, developments, and evolution and broader perspective enables this knowledge to be

translated – in a comprehensive (and comprehensible) way – for researchers’ benefit (Page, 1983, 162–3, 172). Irrespective of the nature of the particular collection – whether individual or institutional – ‘archivists must understand records in the aggregate’ by discerning provenance, determining integrity, ascertaining original order, perceiving activities, structures, processes, and functions, as well as considering intra- and inter-*fond* connections (Cook, 1984–5, 40).

Archival scholarship – ranging from consideration of an item in the individual to a *fond* in the general – therefore informs archivists’ decision-making concerning not merely acquisition, description, and arrangement, but also concerning conservation, service, and appraisal. The perspective required for, and gained from, the aggregated study of records facilitates identification of evidential, official, and informational value which – combined with awareness of the necessity of contextualisation achieved through historical research – remains pertinent not only for arrangement but also for appraisal (Cook, 1984–5, 42; Nesmith, 1984–5, 17).

* * *

As archival collections have expanded immensely during the twentieth century, appraisal has become an increasingly important (and inescapable) component of archival practice. Whereas in 1922, Jenkinson could not license archivists’ destruction of any documents save duplicates yet could assign responsibilities for such duties to administrators, later archivists have acknowledged some deficiencies in such a source-centric approach (Jenkinson, 1937, p. 149). Micro-scale documentary analysis for the purposes of appraisal proves appropriate in certain circumstances (especially for older collections) and its application for more modern collections – despite accelerating rates of archival accruals, archives’ expanding scopes and scales, concurrence and correspondence with records management interests, and the development and evolution of electronic documents and digital media – has also been advocated (Duranti, 2011, 65–8). Moreover, a macro-scale approach – considerate of contexts – may also be deemed capable of appreciating agencies’ governance and practical

processes, and suitable for encompassing the varying complexities of creation, purpose, and function. Examination of provenance and function thereby permits an inclusive appreciation of documentary contexts in terms of activities, operations, and transactions (Cook, 1997, 22–37; Cook, 2001, 30–4).

Any withdrawal from documentary analysis towards embracing aggregate analysis and concentration on organisational functions may be perceived, initially, as threatening the centrality of historical research to archival practice because of the propinquity of institutional records with records management interests but this close kinship does not render historical knowledge or research as an irrelevance; on the contrary, it ensures its abiding indispensability precisely because of the necessity of comprehending institutional histories and contexts. The value of historical research to archival appraisal is therefore often a silent but not an insignificant one. As appraisal's parameters may be extended to incorporate acquisition and inter-institutional documentation strategies, archivists' cognisance of historical research and historiography enables the preservation and prediction of those items which are discerned to be of some cultural import and also allows appreciation of extra-repository contexts (Cook, 1977–8, 200; Brichford, 1977, p. 19; Hackman and Warnow-Blewett, 1987).

3.3 ENGAGEMENT AND EDUCATION

The importance of History and historical understanding to description, arrangement, and appraisal is also reflected in its centrality to the fulfilment of an archivist's other role – at the macro-scale of archival activities – as facilitator. Jenkinson suggested that the word 'archivist' can be

properly applied not to the research-worker who takes from archives what interests him or helps his work, but to the man who, armed with the necessary special knowledge, undertakes the task of preserving them and of producing them when required – of doing for them, in fact, what the Librarian does for his books (Jenkinson, 1928, p. 116).

According to Jenkinson, the ideal archivist acts therefore, primarily, as a facilitator for researchers' interests and requirements by ensuring that users' access to records 'is made as easy as possible' (Jenkinson, 1947, p. 255). Likewise, others have accepted that

the servicing activity is doubtless the most important of all activities performed by an archivist. It means furnishing archives, reproductions of archives, or information from or about archives to the government and to the public (Schellenberg, 1956a, p. 119).

However, the archivist's role as facilitator – which necessitates the archival description and development of resources for assisting researchers' understanding of archives – is not constrained to encompass merely the facilitation of access for researchers, but may also be considered as extending to include public engagement and education.

The archivist's role as facilitator possesses indefinite frontiers: where does facilitation of access end, and encouragement of public engagement, promotion, outreach, or education begin? Archivists' intimate and specialised knowledge and understanding of their sources gained from years of experience working with specific collections (conceptualised as 'social capital') is of immense value to researchers to whom archivists may proffer their advice and guidance (Johnson and Duff, 2005, 119–21; cf. Nesmith, 1982, 15). Whether an archivist engages in historical research and publication of that research is dependent upon the individual but many have argued that archivists may become the best historians as a result of their comprehensive knowledge of their records, archives' evolution, contexts, and accompanying biographical and prosopographical dimensions. Hence, logically, it is beneficial for such knowledge to be communicated widely to researchers and public (Bolotenko, 1985, 154–5; Dick, 1983–4, 304; Jenkinson, 1958, 206–10; Nesmith, 1982, 5–26; Gelting, 1990, 151; Stephenson, 1991).

Research affords two opportunities: communication and promotion. Whilst archivists' assembled knowledge of collections can be successfully communicated

through descriptive catalogues, indexes, and finding aids, it may also be advantageous to prepare certain texts or calendars for publication. An archivist's research utilising his own collections may illuminate discoveries, acquisitions, and infrequently-used sources and may also highlight other research topics or avenues which could prove valuable for other researchers' work. Citation of collections in scholarly publications and presentation of research to academic audiences can achieve a degree of promotion and may stimulate further scholarly research. The second opportunity which publication affords is that of publicising an archivist's repository and holdings (Jenkinson, 1947, p. 256).

Whilst articles or books aimed primarily at a scholarly reception will achieve a certain level of promotion, it is engagement with non-academic communities through more popular means (such as publication in local organisations' newspapers, newsletters, and magazines, presentations to local civic groups and historical societies, and contributions to social media, digitisation, and other online activities) which may prove more worthwhile by engaging with larger audiences and initiating more individuals' general interest in history and archives. In addition, provision and production of exhibitions for local community groups also addresses both communication and promotion agendas by encouraging public awareness and appreciation of History and local history. By undertaking such activities, archivists may be deemed as valid participants within local communities thereby aiding the publicisation of archives to wider domestic and digital audiences (Spencer, 1983, 297, 299; Dunae, 1983-4, 289).

Archivists' capacity for engaging in academic, promotional, and popular publication as well as their specialised knowledge of collections may mean that their advice and service is also sought as an officer or trustee of local historical and record societies, charities, or other organisations. Such avenues may prove suitable for exhibiting both repositories' collections and personal expertise through presentation of lectures, publication of edited texts or research, and promotion of local events and conferences. As archivists' promotional activities advance access to, and use of,

repositories, they also – as a consequence – facilitate public engagement and social inclusion.

Publication can enhance both archives' and archivists' professional standing and may attract recognition from the academic community – both of which may prove useful for the attraction of acquisitions, the development of funding applications, and for facilitating general promotion. Moreover, engagement with research also enables archivists to appreciate their researchers' perspectives: facing and tackling research issues and problems including concerns regarding evidence and relating to documentary accuracy. It also enables archivists to experience repositories from their researchers' perspective: viewing other institutions' arrangements and techniques, utilising others' descriptive catalogues, and observing and studying different collections thereby facilitating appreciation of alternative viewpoints on management, process, and arrangement (Spencer, 1983, 298). Whilst archivists may possess a broader perspective through such education, what of their own provision of education to their users?

* * *

Education may be facilitated not merely by publication but also by teaching. Archivists may guide researchers' attentions towards their desired areas of enquiry, but their primary teaching role lies in describing sources' limitations and lacunae as well as general organisation and arrangement (Rollins, 1969, 370). The archivist's supervision of students' critique of primary sources may transform the archival arena into a 'challenging centre of critical enquiry' thereby enhancing students' powers of cognition, critical analysis, and perspective, and improving students' and archivists' research quality. Selection of appropriate materials for engaging students' interest, for demonstration of particular arguments or trends, and for illustration of specific methods or techniques (or for historiographical purposes) requires not merely comprehensive knowledge of collections but also an appreciation of a broad spectrum of historical, methodological, and historiographical dimensions (Robyns, 2001, 364–5,

367–8, 373; Gregory, 2002, 79–93).

Archivists' guidance on the critical analysis and interpretation of primary sources facilitates students' examination of the processes of validating authorship, authenticity, and provenance, of verifying authors' veracity and capability, and of evaluating contents' credibility and reliability. In addition, archivists' expertise in selecting, describing, and interpreting records may prove beneficial in the direction of students' studies on the processes of discerning arguments' validity through identifying and questioning assumptions, ambiguities, and inconsistencies presented in the evidence, in considering methodologies, and in broader spatial and temporal contextualisation of events and evolutions (Cox, 1983, 31–41; Spencer, 1983, 297; Kuhn, 1996, 313; Robyns, 2001, 367–8, 370–1; Tosey, 2002, 108–22).

Clearly, there is a place for archives in the teaching of historical practice and the advancement of students' experiential learning. Their cumulative understanding of all such facets of History and historical research identifies archivists as educators, especially given repositories' educational, outreach, and social-inclusion programmes which require development of both onsite and online resources and encompass a range of scholarship from schools to life-long learning. Archivists' prime role in unfolding communities' stories and in advising local groups therefore utilises their accumulated expertise in the contextualisation of custodial (and post-custodial) collections.

Such educational and engagement roles are predicated upon archivists' historical understanding and knowledge of research, methodologies, and historiography: in order to produce and promulgate educational or exhibition materials of suitable and sufficient standard, it is necessary for archivists to possess a rigorous understanding of all issues, events, and subjects involved. Archivists' cognisance of histories of localities and institutions, skills ranges, and public-service ethos mark the profession as one which is central to achieving the promotion of lifelong learning, and wider educational, employability, and cultural agendas (Flinn, 2007, 154, 159; National Council on Archives, 2001, p. 14; National Council on Archives, 2002; Museums, Libraries, and Archives Council, 2013).

3.4 EVALUATION

Evidently, historical research pervades many aspects of archival practice, ranging from the micro-scale activities of documentary analysis (employing palaeographical and diplomatic skills), and the meso-scale activities of arrangement, appraisal, and contextualisation, to the macro-scale educational and engagement activities of publication and outreach. The notion that historical research is irrelevant to archival practice or that Archivistics, as a discipline, should not be favourably or amiably allied with the historical sciences appears to require some revision and reconsideration. Knowledge, perception, and perspective arising from awareness of historical contexts, methods, and historiography are valuable qualities which inform archival practice and develop and ameliorate archivists' abilities because of the manifold and multifarious ways in which historical understanding and research permeate so many archival activities.

It is precisely the comprehensive understanding of historical research, of the academic environment, and the realisation of archival potentials which enables an archivist to recognise potential uses, potential audiences, and compile (using historical research methods) relevant and accurate biographical, administrative, and other reference resources which will inspire research and survive rigorous scrutiny (Cook, 1977–8, 199). An archivist is a historian through being a facilitator for the research community because the processes and requirements of facilitation depend upon historical research and methods. This close reciprocity between archival work and historical research therefore unites archivists and historians upon their broader 'historical enterprise'.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSIONS

The sphere of ‘historical research’ does not readily or exactly correspond with that of ‘archival practice’ but the notion that even if a single component of the latter is omitted from the former that that then validates the profession’s collective defenestration of all issues historical fails to appreciate the complexity of all arguments. The many issues with which archivists contend – and which now comprise indivisible components of their role – should not be interpreted as ‘more important than our historical research role’ but merely as ‘another dimension of that role’ (Nesmith, 1982, 8). It is a truism that training and experience in historical research may ‘cast little light’ on several aspects which are now regarded as fundamental to archival practice, such as records management, information technology, conservation, as well as concerns in addressing data protection and freedom of information legislation. Indeed, it has been noted that

records managers and archivists share the specialised body of theory, if not of practices, on which their work is grounded

and constitute ‘branches of a single profession’ (Duranti, 1989a, 3–11 (10)). Whilst archivists need to acquire a future-facing orientation despite the historical nature of their deposits, this Janus-faced nature – divided between looking at both past and future – need not be mutually exclusive. Moreover, the idea that archivists suffer from an inherent conflict of loyalties in choosing between *either* historical research *or* records and information governance overlooks the similarities, interactions, and necessities of *both* activities: it is only through the historian’s eye of perspective that the archivist can survey, plan, and project for an institution’s records management needs and future requirements (Baskerville and Gaffield, 1985, 169, 179).

Balancing competing priorities and concerns is – by no means – a novel occurrence for the archivist since professionalism itself depends upon the maintenance of the equilibrium between specialist issues and an academic framework (whether in History, humanity, art, or science) which ‘best illuminates the records for which he is responsible’ (Cook, 1977–8, 198). However, perhaps it is more apposite to perceive aspects such as palaeography, records management, and information technology, merely as implements which archivists utilise: ‘they are literally instrumental, but they are not the substance or goal of archivy’ (Cook, 1984–5, 35). Indeed, whilst there may be no exact concurrence between historical research and archival practice, there *is* such correspondence in the collective ‘historical enterprise’ in which both professions are engaged in order to achieve a greater understanding of the past, appreciation of the present, and preparation for the future within broader cultural outlines.

4.1 SUMMARY

This study’s aim was to explore perspectives on the place of historical research in archival practice and to highlight the relevance of historical knowledge, methods, approaches, and perspective to archival responsibilities and cultural contributions. The starting point was Jenkinson’s statement that ‘the archivist is not and ought not to be a historian’, and in introducing consideration of this phrase, its implications, and debates surrounding pertinent issues, it proved necessary to outline the nature of the ‘historical enterprise’, define terms, specify objectives, describe methodology, and survey the relevant literature.

In Chapter 2, Jenkinson’s views were located within the context of nineteenth- and twentieth-century historical approaches: by examining the state of historical research prior to Jenkinson’s writing in 1922 (during the formative years of his education and early career) it proved possible to understand his outlook and how his views were modified during subsequent decades. Consideration of the whig approach to History (as typified in the example of William Stubbs), and exploration of the

development of History as a discipline and the changing nature of perceptions of archivists, was a requisite to understanding Jenkinson's perspective. With whig constitutionalism progressively eroded by further advances in knowledge arising from the 'archival turn', McFarlane's advocacy of prosopographical and county studies exemplified how approaches to late-medieval History altered during the early-twentieth century. Moreover, the *Annales* school's promotion of the scientific study of society and the development of social history proved challenging during the late-twentieth century whilst archival and historical approaches remained asynchronous. Jenkinson's view of the archivist-historian issue was therefore superseded by others' perspectives which acknowledged the relevance of archivists' historical training and knowledge. Having examined archivists' views on historical research, Chapter 3 considered its centrality to most aspects of archival practice: from application of diplomatic analysis and descriptive practice, and the wider appreciation of arrangement and appraisal, to activities of educational and external engagement; hence denial of the applicability of historical research to archival practice proves problematic.

In conclusion, it appears that application of Jenkinson's 1922 dictum cannot 'and ought not to be' used to describe the relationship between archivists and historians at any other time than in 1922: application of this maxim to the worlds of the 1950s, 1980s, or even 2010s is completely inappropriate given both the contemporaneous influences which had spurred Jenkinson's original statement and the complete transformation of both historical research, approaches, and methods as well as archival practices, priorities, and issues since that time. Instead, archivists *can* and *should* be historians but – most importantly – archivists already *are* active historians because of the nature of the 'historical enterprise' upon which they are engaged.

This study has surveyed only a select sample of the literature, hence it is possible that a broader sample than that described (above, pp. 5–6) – by making the survey more comprehensive – could facilitate inclusion of a wider range of perspectives. As a modest study, its parameters of investigation were, necessarily, set

intently to encompass only certain elements of archival practice (above, pp. 3–4), and the most noteworthy issue remaining unaddressed – and therefore warranting investigation – is archival administration: an examination of how archivists’ implementation, management, and evaluation of archival programmes utilises historical research, knowledge, and perspective. Such investigation may recognise that many skills necessary for management, delivery, and evaluation are similarly integral to historical research, such as appreciation of multi-causality, prioritisation, strategic and conceptual thinking, and synthesis. Incorporation of both an expanded literature survey and issues of administration into a broader study may also serve to enhance research reliability and amplify the wider applicability of conclusions.

This study of perspectives, ultimately – as awareness of a post-modernist outlook prescribes – offers only the author’s synthesis, only the author’s perspective, and only a qualitative account of past views. In counterbalance, it may prove desirable to expand these vistas of opinion by considering others’ views on archival practice and historical research. By adopting a ‘Mixed Methods’ approach (and a triangulation of techniques) this qualitative analysis could be balanced with quantitative inquiry through the undertaking of appropriate interviews and questionnaires: elicitation of the opinions of a range of subjects, including professional archivists, academics, and historians, would shift emphasis from past perspectives towards current views and thoughts on future trends in archival and historical arenas (Pickard, 2007, pp. 171–82, 183–200).

Of course, even such pairing of qualitative and quantitative analyses producing a similarly theoretical overview exhorting the (ir-)relevance of historical research to archival practice would not provide practical suggestions on the assimilation of theory into practice. Hence one agenda which future research may wish to follow focusses on exploration of the composition and constituents of the archival curriculum: answering the perennial questions of whether – and in what quantity – historical research methods and historiography should feature; on the sustained value of diplomatic to archives from medieval to modern; on the value of historical insight for description,

arrangement, appraisal, and educational and engagement activities. Equally, this also obliges consideration of the historical curriculum, namely how – and to what extent – Archivistics should feature as a necessary preparation for prospective users; on the value of teaching archival functions (theory), techniques (methodology), and their implementation (practice) as well social science and inter-disciplinary approaches; and what place should be sought for palaeography, diplomatic, and educational and engagement agendas. Such questions concerning the historical curriculum prompts wider consideration of how both curricula, disciplines, and professions may cooperate and cross-pollinate, and thereby develop a wider appreciation of their individual – and combined – cultural contributions.

4.2 CONTEXTS

Archivists' contributions to local, regional, and national culture and society are realised through their processing of historical data, their advancement of understanding as well as their engagement with diversity, social inclusion, and employability agendas. In addition, archivists' role in the 'assessment and protection of the integrity of the record as evidence' entails their necessary discernment of archives' authenticity, reliability, and utility, and their contextualisation of collections thereby facilitates research usage, interpretation, and accountability (Nesmith, 2004, 26).

It is apparent that during the last few decades, historical and archival professions have been traversing differing trails: one consequence appears to have been that archivists possess a clearer appreciation of their cultural contribution than historians as a consequence of their active and sustained engagement with a wider range of issues (ranging from legislation to outreach activities). Whilst traditional historical interpretations have been challenged, the diversification of History's collective story through inclusion of marginalised actors, sensibilities, and perspectives, has had some impact upon archival priorities: inter-disciplinary hybridisation of ideas, approaches,

and methodologies has led historians to widen their sources of data, re-appraise sources' values, appreciate their own and others' subjectivity, apply textual criticism, and accommodate post-modernist contentions; thus, it has proved impossible to 'rely on old ways of collecting and understanding the content and voices of the past' (Bridges, *et al.*, 1993, 180–1).

Diversification of source materials, documentation strategies, concerns on preservation, management of resources and service provision are unfamiliar issues for the historical profession; yet their own enduring preoccupations with documentary data collection and evidence interpretation may mean that they are readily capable of providing some insights into the discernment of historical value and development of documentation strategies (Bridges, *et al.*, 1993, 181, 183). Despite this fact, historians remain – as mentioned – largely uneducated in, and unaware of, Archivistics, and History graduate schools rarely contemplate students' education in archival tradition, methods, theory, or practice; thus historians might continue their insular survival almost entirely isolated from all considerations of archival tradition, approaches, priorities, and management (Baskerville and Gaffield, 1985, 179, 180). Hence recognition of archivists' and historians' inter-connected interests, common 'enterprise', and collective cultural contribution – the creation, preservation, and interpretation of documentation – may spur consideration of further cooperation between these closely-associated roles whose mutual collaboration and 'shared analyses' may prove beneficial for both professions and professionals (Bridges, *et al.*, 1993, 179, 186).

A view of archivists as historians' handmaidens accepts subservience, infers disciplinary subordination, and implies professional inferiority, which does not realise the scale and extent of archivists' true accumulated expertise. Consequently, if we invert the proposition to pose not whether historians make better archivists but whether archivists make better historians, it is possible to consider not whether archivists should be scholars and engage in historical research but whether the realm of historical scholarship should incorporate archivists and archival activities.

Necessarily, researchers' requirements for catalogues, guides, indexes, and inventories, dictate priorities; but how can archival priorities be reflective of research realities if finding aids are created without cognisance of research trends and requirements (Cook, 1977–8, 199)? Again, this dichotomy faces the archivist: production of *either* research *or* researchers' aids; but need these be mutually exclusive aims? It has been argued that archivists should not advocate that part of their archival work actively 'involves the writing of scholarly, academic history in the same sense that engages professional historians' (Cook, 1984–5, 36); yet the shades of distinction between historians, archivists, and scholars mean that definitions of what constitutes historical research, archival practice, or scholarship prove indistinct and indeterminate. Of course, measuring archivists and historians on identical criteria – the typical exemplar being publication – is a comparison of the incomparable. After all, does a peer-reviewed article published in a leading academic journal concerning an institutional history, derived from source-centred archival research, qualify to be categorised as a historical, archival, scholarly, or cultural contribution? Likewise, can production of an assiduously-researched itemised descriptive catalogue facilitating researchers' comprehensive usage of an archive qualify as historical research (cf. James, 1983–4, 303)?

Evidently, exploration of common ground subsisting between archival practice and historical research must encompass consideration of the place, nature, and role of scholarship in the archival profession as well as archives' cultural role. Despite archives' elevated profile, repositories may often be eclipsed by other educational and artistic institutions which may provide a more aesthetic, active, or performance-based milieu, such as museums, galleries, and theatres (Nesmith, 1982, 5–6). Whilst repositories' cultural centrality may be assured, what particular fruits do archivists yield? Of course, these harvests may range from publications, lectures, and conferences to membership of editorial boards and management of learned, historical, or civic organisations, associations, and charities as well as broader professional development and educational activities (Gelting, 1990, 152; Cook, 1977–8, 199).

Primarily, though, archivists' contributions are their catalogues, guides, and finding aids, and products of their engagement with issues of service provision, advocacy, outreach, and digitisation agendas. As historians' cultural contributions may risk becoming increasingly confined to the arena of publication within particular disciplinary spheres and within series of preferred outputs, archivists' relative freedom may permit their contributions – in the form of descriptive catalogues, digitisation projects, and other works – to assume a more multi-disciplinary, multi-institutional, and multi-faceted complexion.

There are also a further variety of means by which historical and archival communities may cooperate both formally and informally, as some have advocated, such as the leading of conferences and undertaking of studies considering archival, inter-, and joint-disciplinary themes (and inclusive of historical professionals), and also incorporation of historians into discussions and decisions regarding appraisal. Most importantly, however, there appears to be a clear and definite need – as suggested earlier – to consider the education of archival graduate students in historical research methods alongside integration of theoretical and practical understanding of Archivistics into graduate History teaching. Collectively, these possibilities may encourage more nuanced interaction: inspiring archivists to conduct research and spurring historians to contemplate wider application of their expertise at a cultural level (Bridges, *et al.*, 1993, 183–4, 186). With the historical profession increasingly embracing a social-science perspective, and just beginning to pursue activities and opera which are demonstrative of external engagement, such as digitisation projects, the twenty-first century may yet observe both professions following not dissimilar agendas and both roles – like tributaries – forming a coherent and cogent confluence.

Irrespective of the question of whether historical research should be incorporated within training programmes for aspiring archivists, as increasing demands and desires for accountability proceed apace, archives' historical, cultural, and heritage roles and responsibilities may assume a greater prominence and compatibility (Spragge, 1995, 173–71; Dirks, 2004, 32, 35, 37). After all, let us not

forget ‘the historical basis upon which so many archival functions must always rest’ (Cook, 1977–8, 203). Indeed, some have expounded further on the centrality of historical research to archives:

for when all is said and done, without the training in history, without the eye of the historian, without the desire of the historian to serve the record of the past, there can be no archivist (Bolotenko, 1983, 7).

Whilst this may be presenting a view in somewhat uncompromising terms, it can certainly be acknowledged that archival practice is reliant upon historical research skills, knowledge, and expertise:

without the historian’s ‘imagination and art’ these facts can remain, as we all know, a valley of dry bones; but without the archivist’s ‘science and research’ the historian will not know either what the facts are or where they are to be found (Ellis, 1966, 159–60).

With historians and archivists acting in symbiosis in the wider ‘historical enterprise’ it seems possible to accept that ‘archivist and historian are obverse sides of the same coin which has currency in the same realm’ (Bolotenko, 1983, 20). Whilst some may find such an assertion objectionable, this and other contentions at the very least contribute towards presenting and providing a range of perspectives on the place of historical research in archival practice.

Total Word Count (excluding references and bibliography): 14,729.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1.1 REFERENCE SOURCES

Campbell, J. (2004). Stubbs, William. In *ODNB*.

Cannon, J. (2004). Namier, Sir Lewis Bernstein. In *ODNB*.

Galbraith, V.H. (2004). Tout, Thomas Frederick. P.R.H. Slee (Rev.). In *ODNB*.

Harriss, G.L. (2004). McFarlane, Kenneth Bruce. In *ODNB*.

Johnson, H.C. (2004). Jenkinson, Sir (Charles) Hilary. In *ODNB*.

Milsom, S.F.C. (2004). Maitland, Frederic William. In *ODNB*.

The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Also available at www.odnb.com (accessed 23 February 2015).

1.2 REPORTS

Society of American Archivists (SAA). (2002). *Guidelines for a Graduate Programme in Archival Studies*, Society of American Archivists.

International Council on Archives (ICA). (2000). *General International Standard Archival Description (ISAD(G))*. 2nd edn. Ottawa: International Council on Archives.

National Council on Archives (NCA). (2001). *Taking part: An audit of social inclusion work in Archives*. London: National Council on Archives.

National Council on Archives (NCA). (2002): *Changing the future of our past*. London: National Council on Archives.

1.3 BOOKS AND MONOGRAPHS

Blaas, P.B.M. (1978). *Continuity and Anachronism: Parliamentary and Constitutional Development in Whig Historiography and Anti-Whig Reaction, 1890–1930*.

- Boston: The Hague.
- Braudel, F. (1973). *Capitalism and Material Life, 1400–1800*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Brichford, M.J. (1977). *Archives and Manuscripts: Appraisal and Accessioning*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists.
- Britnell, R.H., & Pollard, A.J., (Eds). (1995). *The McFarlane Legacy: Studies in Late-Medieval Politics and Society*. Stroud: Alan Sutton.
- Cox, R.J. (2000). *Closing an Era: Historical Perspectives on Archives and Records Management*. London: Greenwood Press.
- Davies, J.C., (Ed.). (1957). *Studies presented to Sir Hilary Jenkinson* (London: Oxford University Press).
- Everitt, A.M. (1966). *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640–60*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Green, J.R. (1874). *A Short History of the English People*. London: Macmillan.
- Ham, F.G. (1993). *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists.
- Hill, J. (Ed.). (2011). *The Future of Archives and Recordkeeping: A Reader*. London: Facet.
- Hughes, A. (1987). *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620–60*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jarvis, P. (Ed.). (2002). *The Theory and Practice of Teaching*. London: Kogan Page.
- Jenkinson, C.H. (1937). *A Manual of Archive Administration*. Rev. edn, London: Lund, Humphries, and Co.
- Jenkinson, C.H. (1980a). *Selected Writings of Sir Hilary Jenkinson*. R.H. Ellis & P. Walne (Eds). Gloucester: Alan Sutton.
- Kent, A. (1996). *Encyclopaedia of Library and Information Science*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Levine, P. (1986). *The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians, and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838–86*. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Maitland, F.W. (Ed.). (1893). *Records of the Parliament Holden at Westminster 28th Feb. 1305*, Rolls Series.

Maitland, F.W., & Pollock, F. (1968). *History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I*. 2nd edn, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

McFarlane, K.B. (1973a). *The Nobility of Later Medieval England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McFarlane, K.B. (1981a). *England in the Fifteenth Century*, G.L. Harriss (Ed.). London: Hambledon Press.

Morrill, J.S. (1974). *Cheshire, 1630–60: County Government and Society during the English Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Namier, L.B. (1929). *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*. London: Macmillan.

Namier, L.B. (1930). *England in the Age of the American Revolution*. London: Macmillan.

Peace, N.E., (Ed.). (1984a). *Archival Choices: Managing the Historical Record in an Age of Abundance*. Lexington: D.C. Heath.

Pickard, A.J. (2007), *Research Methods in Information*, London: Facet Publishing.

Schellenberg, T.R. (1956a). *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques*. Melbourne: F.W. Cheshire.

Schellenberg, T.R. (1956b). *The Appraisal of Modern Public Records*. Washington: *Bulletins of the National Archives*, 8.

Slee, P.R.H. (1986). *Learning and a Liberal Education: The Study of History in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Manchester, 1800–1914*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Stansfield, R.E. (2009). *Political Elites in South-West England, 1450–1500: Politics, Governance, and the Wars of the Roses*. Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press.

Stubbs, W. (1873–8). *Constitutional History of England*, Oxford: Clarendon Press; 5th edn, 1903.

- Tout, T.F. (1920–33). *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Townsend, R.B. (2013). *History's Babel: Scholarship, Professionalism, and the Historical Enterprise in the United States, 1880–1940*. London: University of Chicago Press.

1.4 CHAPTERS IN COLLECTIONS

- Buchanan, A. (2011). Strangely Unfamiliar: Ideas of the Archive from Outside the Discipline. In Hill (2011), pp. 37–62.
- Carpenter, M.C. (1995). Political and Constitutional History: Before and After McFarlane. In Britnell and Pollard (Eds). (1995), pp. 175–206.
- Davies, J.C. (1957). Memoir of Sir Hilary Jenkinson. In Davies (Ed.). (1957), pp. xiii–xxx.
- Duranti, A.L. (1996). Archival Science. In Kent (1996), pp. 1–19.
- Duranti, A.L. (2011). Structural and Formal Analysis: The Contribution of Diplomatics to Archival Appraisal in the Digital Environment. In Hill (2011), pp. 65–88.
- Gregory, J. (2002). Facilitation and Facilitator Style. In Jarvis (2002), pp. 79–93.
- Jenkinson, C.H. (1915). Palaeography and the Practical Study of Court Hand. In Jenkinson (1980a).
- Jenkinson, C.H. (1928). The Librarian as Archivist. In Jenkinson (1980a).
- Jenkinson, C.H. (1943). The Classification and Survey of English Archives. In Jenkinson (1980a).
- Jenkinson, C.H. (1944). British Archives and the War. In Jenkinson (1980a).
- Jenkinson, C.H. (1947). The English Archivist: A New Profession. In Jenkinson (1980a).
- Jenkinson, C.H. (1960). Roots. In Jenkinson (1980a).
- Jenkinson, C.H. (1980b). Modern archives: Some reflections. In Jenkinson (1980a),

pp. 339–42.

Ketelaar, E., (2011). Archivistis: science or art?. In Hill (2011), pp. 89–100.

McFarlane, K.B. (1973b). An Early Paper on Crown and Parliament in the Later Middle Ages. In McFarlane (1973a), pp. 279–98.

McFarlane, K.B. (1973c). The English Nobility 1290–1536. In McFarlane (1973a), pp. 1–141.

McFarlane, K.B., (1973d). Extinction and Recruitment. In McFarlane (1973a), pp. 142–76.

McFarlane, K.B. (1981b). Parliament and “Bastard Feudalism”. In McFarlane (1981a), pp. 1–21.

McFarlane, K.B. (1981c). “Bastard Feudalism”. In McFarlane (1981a), pp. 23–43.

Peace, N.E. (1984b). Deciding what to save: Fifty years of theory and practice. In Peace (1984a), pp. 1–18.

Tosey, P. (2002). Experiential Methods of Teaching and Learning. In Jarvis (2002), pp. 108–22.

1.5 ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

Baskerville, P.A., and Gaffield, C.M. (1983–4). The Vancouver Island Project: Historical Research and Archival Practice. *Archivaria*, 17, 173–87.

Baskerville, P.A., and Gaffield, C.M. (1985). The Automated Archivist: Interdisciplinarity and Historical Research. *Social Science History*, 9(2), 167–84.

Berner, R.C. (1978). Arrangement and Description: Some Historical Observations. *American Archivist*, 41, 176–81.

Berner, R.C. (1984). Vancouver Island Project fails to grasp the significance of Provenance. *Archivaria*, 18, 7–8.

Bigelow, S. (1989). Duels or dialogues? The relationship between archivists and conservators. *Archivaria*, 29, 51–6.

- Blooms, H. (1987). Society and the formation of a documentary heritage: Issues in the appraisal of Archival Science. *Archivaria*, 24, 69–107.
- Blooms, H. (1991). Überlieferungsbildung: Keeping archives as a social and political activity. *Archivaria*, 33, 25–33.
- Bolotenko, G. (1983). Archivists and Historians: Keepers of the Well. *Archivaria*, 16, 5–25.
- Bolotenko, G. (1984). Of Ends and Means: In Defence of the Archival Ideal. *Archivaria*, 18, 241–7.
- Bolotenko, G. (1985). Instant Professionalism: To the Shiny New Men of the Future. *Archivaria*, 20, 149–57.
- Bridges, E., Hunter, G., Miller, P.P., Thelen, D., and Weinberg, G. (1993). Historians and Archivists: A Rationale for Cooperation. *Journal of American History*, 80(1), 179–86.
- Brooke, C.N.L. (1970). The Teaching of Diplomatic. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 4(1), 1–9.
- Brothman, B. (1999). Declining Derrida: Integrity, tensegrity, and the preservation of archives from deconstruction. *Archivaria*, 48, 64–88.
- Brothman, B. (2001). The past that Archives keep: Memory, history, and preservation. *Archivaria*, 51, 48–80.
- Burke, F. (1981). The Future Course of Archival Theory in the United States. *American Archivist*, 44,
- Cook, T. (1977–8). Clio: The Archivist's Muse? *Archivaria*, 5, 198–203.
- Cook, T. (1978–9). Professional Training: International Perspectives. *Archivaria*, 7, 28–40.
- Cook, T. (1984–5). From Information to Knowledge: An Intellectual Paradigm for Archives. *Archivaria*, 19, 28–49.
- Cook, T. (1997). What is past is prologue: A history of archival ideas since 1898, and the future paradigm shift. *Archivaria*, 43, 17–63.
- Cook, T. (2001a). Archival science and postmodernism: New formulations for old

- concepts. *Archival Science*, 1(1), 3–24.
- Cook, T. (2001b). Fashionable nonsense or professional rebirth: Postmodernism and the practice of archives. *Archivaria*, 51, 14–35.
- Cox, R.J. (1983). American Archival History: Its Development, Needs, and Opportunities. *American Archivist*, 46, 31–41.
- Cox, R.J. (1984–5). Archivists and Historians: A View from the United States. *Archivaria*, 19, 185–90.
- Currall, J. & Moss, M. (2008). We are archivists, but are we OK?. *Records Management Journal*, 18(1), 69–91.
- Dick, E.J. (1983–4). A Challenge to Archivists and the ACA. *Archivaria*, 17, 304–5.
- Dirks, J.M. (2004). Accountability, history, and archives: Conflicting priorities or synthesised strands?. *Archivaria*, 57, 29–49.
- Dunae, P.A. (1983–4). Archives and the Spectre of 1984: Bolotenko Applauded. *Archivaria*, 17, 286–90.
- Duranti, A.L. (1989a). The Odyssey of the Records Manager. Part II from the Middle Ages to Modern Times. *Records Management Quarterly*, 23(4), 3–11.
- Duranti, A.L. (1989b). Diplomats: New uses for an old science (Part I). *Archivaria*, 28, 7–27.
- Duranti, A.L. (1989c). Diplomats: New uses for an old science (Part II). *Archivaria*, 29, 4–17.
- Duranti, A.L. (1990a). Diplomats: New uses for an old science (Part III). *Archivaria*, 30, 4–20.
- Duranti, A.L. (1990b). Diplomats: New uses for an old science (Part IV). *Archivaria*, 31, 10–25.
- Duranti, A.L. (1991a). Diplomats: New uses for an old science (Part V). *Archivaria*, 32, 6–24.
- Duranti, A.L. (1991b). Diplomats: New uses for an old science (Part VI). *Archivaria*, 33, 6–24.
- Duranti, A.L. (1993). Origin and development of the concept of archival description.

- Archivaria*, 35, 47–54.
- Duranti, A.L. (1994). The concept of appraisal and archival theory. *American Archivist*, 57, 328–44.
- Eastwood, T. (1984–5). Two Solitudes' in Archives?. *Archivaria*, 19, 4–5.
- Ellis, R.H. (1966). 'The British Archivist and History', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 3(4).
- Eskildsen, K.R. (2008). Leopold Ranke's Archival Turn: Location and Evidence in Modern Historiography. *Modern Intellectual History*, 5, 425–53.
- Eskildsen, K.R. (2013). Inventing the archive: Testimony and virtue in modern historiography. *History of the Human Sciences*, 26(4), 8–26.
- Flinn, A. (2007). Community histories, community archives: Some opportunities and challenges. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 28(2), 151–76.
- Gelting, M.H. (1990). The archivist as historical researcher: Research and archivistics at the Danish State Archives. *American Archivist*, 53(1), 148–56.
- Hackman, L.J., & Warnow-Blewett, J., (1987). The Documentation Strategy Process: A model and a case study'. *American Archivist*, 50(1), 12–47.
- Ham, F.G. (1975). The Archival Edge, *American Archivist*, 38, 5–13.
- Hives, C.L. (1984–5). Bolotenko, the Debate, and the Future. *Archivaria*, 19, 5–7.
- Huistra, P., Paul, H., and Tollebeek, J. (2013). Historians in the archive: An introduction. *History of the Human Sciences*, 26(4), 3–7.
- Hull, F. (1980). The Archivist should not be a Historian. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 6(5), 253–9.
- James, R.S. (1983–4). A Wearisome Issue. *Archivaria*, 7, 302–4.
- Jenkinson, C.H. (1958). Archives and the Science and Study of Diplomatic. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 1(8), 206–10.
- Johnson, C.A., and Duff, W.M. (2005). Chatting up the archivist: Social capital and the archival researcher. *American Archivist*, 68(1), 113–29.
- Ketelaar, E. (2002). Archival Temples, Archival Prisons: Modes of Power and Protection. *Archival Science*, 2, 221–38.

- Ketelaar, E. (2010). Ten Years of Archival Science. *Archival Science*, 10(4), 345–52.
- Kuhn, C.M. (1996). A historian's perspective on archives and the documentary process. *American Archivist*, 59(3), 312–20.
- Menne-Haritz, A., (1994). Appraisal or documentation: Can we appraise archives by selecting content. *American Archivist*, 57(3), 528–42.
- Miller, F.M. (1981). Social history and archival practice. *American Archivist*, 44(2), 113–24.
- Mortensen, P. (1999). The place of theory in archival practice. *Archivaria*, 47, 1–26.
- Müller, P. (2013). Archives and history: Towards a history of 'the use of state archives' in the nineteenth century. *History of the Human Sciences*, 26(4), 27–49.
- Nesmith, T. (1982). Archives from the bottom up: Social history and archival scholarship. *Archivaria*, 14, 5–26.
- Nesmith, T. (1984–5). Toward the discipline of Archives. *Archivaria*, 19, 16–20.
- Nesmith, T. (2004). What's History got to do with it?: Reconsidering the place of historical knowledge in archival work. *Archivaria*, 57, 1–27.
- O'Toole, J. (2004). Archives and historical accountability: Toward a moral theology of archives. *Archivaria*, 58, 3–19.
- Page, D. (1983). Whose handmaiden?: The archivist and the institutional historian. *Archivaria*, 17, 162–72.
- Paul, H. (2013). The heroic study of records: The contested persona of the archival historian. *History of the Human Sciences*, 26(4), 67–83.
- Pocock, J.G.A. (1961–2). 'The Origins of the Study of the Past: A Comparative Approach', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 4, 219–46.
- Procter, M. (2010). What's an "archivist"? Some nineteenth-century perspectives. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 31(1), 15–27.
- Robyns, M.C. (2001). The archivist as educator: Integrating critical thinking skills into historical research methods instruction. *American Archivist*, 64(2), 363–84.
- Rollins, A.B., Jnr (1969). The historian and the archivist. *American Archivist*, 32(4),

369–74.

- Rowlinson, M., and Hassard, J.S. (2013). Historical neo-institutionalism or neo-institutionalist history? Historical research in management and organization studies. *Management and Organizational History*, 8(2), 111–26.
- Russell, M.U. (1983). The influence of historians on the archival profession in the United States. *American Archivist*, 46(3), 277–85.
- Spadoni, C. (1983). No monopoly for ‘archivist-historians’: Bolotenko assailed. *Archivaria*, 17, 291–5.
- Spadoni, C. (1984–5). In Defence of the New Professionalism: A Rejoinder to George Bolotenko. *Archivaria*, 19, 191–5.
- Spencer, T.T. (1983). The archivist as historian: Towards a broader definition. *Archivaria*, 17, 296–300.
- Spragge, S. (1995). The Abdication Crisis: Are Archivists giving up their cultural responsibilities. *Archivaria*, 40, 173–81.
- Stapleton, R. (1983). Jenkinson and Schellenberg: A Comparison. *Archivaria*, 17 (1983), 75–85.
- Stephenson, M.S. (1991). Deciding not to build the wall: Research and the archival profession. *Archivaria*, 32, 145–51.
- Taylor, H.A. (1977). The Discipline of History and the Education of the Archivist. *American Archivist*, 40(4), 395–402.
- Taylor, H.A. (1984). Information Ecology and the Archives of the 1980s. *Archivaria*, 18, 30–2.
- Taylor, H.A. (1995). Heritage Revisited: Documents as artefacts in the context of Museums and Material Culture. *Archivaria*, 40, 8–20.
- Taylor-Vaisey, R. (1983). Archivist-Historians ignore information revolution. *Archivaria*, 17, 305–8.

1.6 WEBSITES

Museums, Libraries, and Archives Council. (2013). *Inspiring learning for all*.

Available at www.inspiringlearningforall.co.uk (accessed: 23 February 2015).