The Generic Evolution of Calendars and Inventories at the Public Archives of Canada, 1882–ca. 1975

Jennifer Douglas and Heather MacNeil

ABSTRACT

This article is a historical study of calendars and preliminary and general inventories at the Public Archives of Canada (PAC) from the nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. Using an organizing structure drawn from rhetorical genre studies, the authors examine the calendars and inventories across four dimensions (textual features, composing processes, reading practices, and social roles) to discover the ways in which these finding aids incorporated and expressed, both explicitly and implicitly, institutional, professional, and social values. The examination of the calendars and inventories suggests that they functioned as "forms of cultural knowledge" that shaped and were shaped by PAC's evolving understanding of what it meant to make its holdings accessible to the public and its sense of identity and purpose in relation to that public.

KEY WORDS

Archival History, Arrangement, Description

The Public Archives of Canada (hereafter PAC) was established in 1872 with a mandate to collect and make available the historical records of Canada. The publication of finding aids was one of the means of fulfilling that mandate. This article is a historical study of two specific types of finding aids—calendars and inventories—published by PAC between 1882 and about 1975. The overall purpose of the study is to examine the ways in which the calendars and inventories incorporated and expressed, both explicitly and implicitly, different understandings of what it meant to make records available for use, the relationship between archivists and their imagined users, and the contours of archival professional identity.

Context for the Study

The present study is part of a broader research project examining archival description through the lens of rhetorical genre studies with a particular emphasis on the finding aids that archivists compose in the course of making historical records available for use by the public.[1] The primary objective of that research project has been to identify and analyze the social actions finding aids perform in specific institutional settings and to consider whether and to what extent the generic identity of finding aids is transforming as they are relocated from reading rooms to institutional websites. The project has been carried out in three stages. The first stage established the conceptual framework and organizing structure for the project.[2] The present study is part of the second stage, which has consisted of parallel historical investigations of specific types of finding aids published by the national archives of Great Britain and Canada during the period of time following the establishment of the two institutions in the nineteenth century and preceding the introduction of computers and standardization into descriptive work in the latter part of the twentieth century.[3] The third stage of the project focuses on specific finding aids created by the two institutions in the subsequent period, that is, after the introduction of computers and standardization and as finding aids were moved into Web-based environments.[4]

Where genre was once understood as a conceptual tool useful in the "organizing of texts," it has in recent years and across a variety of disciplines begun to be recognized as a "powerful, ideologically active, and historically changing shaper of texts, meanings, and social actions."[5] Anis S. Bawarshi and Mary Jo Reiff explained that "[f]rom this perspective, genres are understood as forms of cultural knowledge that conceptually frame and mediate how we understand and typically act within various situations. This view recognizes genres as both organizing *and* generating kinds of text and social actions, in complex, dynamic relation to one another."[6] Recently, archivists have begun to look at a

variety of archival functions and processes through the lens of genre theory. In 2012, for example, a special issue of *Archival Science* contained articles exploring the application of genre studies to archival theory and practice. Two of these articles looked specifically at archival description as genre. Ciaran Trace and Andrew Dillon drew on sociological and cognitive perspectives on genre in their examination of the American finding aid,[7] while Heather MacNeil outlined the conceptual framework and organizing structure for a study of description as a rhetorical genre of which the present study forms a part.[8]

Rhetorical genre theorist Amy Devitt described *genre* as "a nexus between an individual's actions and a socially defined context . . . a reciprocal dynamic within which an individual's actions construct and are constructed by recurring context of situation, context of culture, and context of genres."[9] Genres simultaneously shape and are shaped by these recurring contexts of situation, culture, and other genres.[10] Examining archival description (by which we mean the retrospective description of records once they have been transferred to archival custody) as a rhetorical genre using Devitt's terms involves analyzing how it has shaped and been shaped by a recurring situational context—the reciprocal social actions of archivists making information about holdings accessible to users through different types of finding aids and of users accessing these finding aids to locate relevant archival documents; a recurring cultural context—the sociohistorical role of archivists and archival institutions; and a recurring generic context—the antecedent finding aids that have influenced the form and content of contemporary ones.

Anthony Paré and Graham Smart have proposed a useful structural definition of genre based on distinctive regularities across four dimensions: textual features, composing processes, reading practices, and social roles (of writers and readers).[11] This profile of regularities is clearly discernible in archival finding aids, which may be decomposed into their structure and content (textual features); the procedures associated with their production and transmission (composing processes); their use and interpretation by users (reading practices); and the professional and institutional frameworks in which they are prepared and received (social roles of writers and readers). Textual features and composing processes relate to the representation of archival holdings through finding aids of various kinds and the policies, procedures, and activities that underpin those representations; reading practices and social roles relate to the use, interpretation, and wider effects of these representations.

The present study is structured around three of these four dimensions; reading practices are not included because during the time period covered by the study there is little evidence of how the readers approached calendars and inventories, negotiated their way through them, and constructed knowledge from them. Instead, we looked at users through the eyes of PAC, focusing on

how it interpreted their reading practices in relation to the calendars and inventories as part of the discussion of social roles. Reading practices are more prominently featured in the third stage of the project, which looks at contemporary descriptive practices.

During the period of time covered in our study, a variety of types of finding aids were made and used at PAC, including published calendars, inventories, and thematic guides, as well as finding aids available only on-site, such as card indexes, and file and shelf lists. Here, we focus on the calendars that were published as appendixes in the archives' annual reports from 1884 to 1949, and on the series of preliminary and general inventories published from the early 1950s to the 1970s.[12] We chose to focus on these finding aids because they represent PAC's most deliberate and sustained attempts to make its holdings known to the public prior to the introduction of automation and standards to descriptive work. Moreover, since both the calendars and the two series of inventories were produced over a considerable period of time and were published, that is, intended to be made public, our ability to draw inferences about their aims from their textual features and the composing processes and social roles associated with them is more straightforward. By tracing their histories through annual reports, the finding aids themselves,[13] and secondary literature discussing PAC's descriptive practices during this time, we aim to show how the calendars and inventories functioned as "forms of cultural knowledge" that shaped and were shaped by PAC's evolving understanding of what it meant to make its holdings accessible to the public and its sense of identity and purpose in relation to that public.

Setting the Stage: A Brief Account of the Origins of PAC and Its Descriptive Program

The origins of PAC are linked to the activities of the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec. Formed in 1824 and made up of English-speaking elites and intellectuals, the society worked to promote the study of Canadian history and the "recovery and publication" of documents that would help in this regard.[14] In a public circular, the society explained its reasons for such a focus, emphasizing the importance of knowledge of a shared history to the development of a shared national identity:

> It will raise us in the moral and intellectual scale of nations. It will cherish our noblest feelings of honor and patriotism, by showing that the more men become acquainted with the history of their country, the more they prize and respect both their country and themselves.[15]

In 1871, shortly after Confederation, members of the society sought to make the new federal government more aware of the significance of historical documents to the development of the nation by signing their names to identical petitions addressed to the House of Commons and to the governor general of Canada. The petitions argued that

> Authors and literary inquirers in [Canada] are placed in a very disadvantageous position in comparison with persons of the same class in Great Britain, France, and the United States, in consequence of being practically debarred from facilities of access to public records, documents and official papers illustrative of the past history and progress of society in Canada.[16]

The petitioners described the need for a history of Canada to be written based on "facts duly authenticated" and suggested that without access to archival documents, history was based on "mere hearsay or statements only partially correct" and "coloured conformably to the political and religious bias or the special motives which may happen to animate the narrator of alleged facts." They felt that in a country like Canada, made up of "diverse origins, nationalities, religious creeds, and classes of persons," the need for documents on which to base a more objective history was heightened. They drew attention also to the risks associated with having the archives of the nation "dispersed in different localities" due to the "migratory character of former governments" and pointed out how little was known about "the contents of masses of papers" and of "their possible use in historical or other purposes." Accordingly, they called for

> preliminary steps [to] be taken, as early as possible, for carefully examining the Canadian Records, sorting and classifying them, with a view to the preparation of a catalogue indicating their contents, and, ultimately, providing in a permanent manner not only for safe custody but also convenient reference.[17]

The Canadian government responded favorably to the petition, which was referred by the House of Commons to the Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament and then for action to the minister of agriculture, who was responsible at the time for matters relating to "Arts and manufactures." In 1871, the government approved $4,000 for a new archives program to begin the following year, and, in 1872, appointed Douglas Brymner, a "well-known Montreal journalist," as a "Senior Second Class Clerk" in the Department of Agriculture, with responsibility for locating and preserving the archives of the Dominion of Canada.[18]

As Laura Millar pointed out, early archivists in national institutions in "England, France, and Germany could turn to well stocked storerooms of government records and could focus their energies on arrangement and description," but in Canada, such storerooms did not yet exist, and the records of government were "too few and too recent in origins" to attract much interest.

"Canada," Millar wrote, "had to go looking for its history,"[19] and Brymner's initial focus was the acquisition of historical records relating to the pre-Confederation history of the French and British territories that became Canada. In his first two years, Brymner surveyed government records created by earlier British regimes held in various locations in Canada and in England. On his first trip to England, Brymner only managed to survey sources related to Canadian history and to study preservation-, classification-, and description-related practices in various repositories, but, in subsequent years, he was able to initiate and oversee an active copying program both in London and in Paris. For years,[20] teams of copyists transcribed documents identified by Brymner (and later by his successors) as significant to the history of Canada at the Public Record Office of Great Britain, the British Museum, the Archives Nationales in France, and in various government departments in both countries. These transcripts formed the bulk of the growing collection in Ottawa, and the majority of Brymner's efforts and energy were directed toward the copying program and the materials thus procured; all of the calendars compiled by Brymner and many, if not most, of those prepared under the leadership of his successors pertained to these copied records.

The calendars, which were published with the archives' annual reports, were considered the primary means of providing access to historians across the country to the materials held in Ottawa and can be viewed as a first, fledgling attempt to develop a systematic program of description at PAC. While Brymner was an enthusiastic promoter of the calendar as finding aid, his successors, and in particular Arthur G. Doughty (dominion archivist, 1904–1936), expressed reservations about the effectiveness of the calendars. Still, calendars continued to be compiled under Doughty and under his successor, Gustave Lanctôt (dominion archivist, 1937–1948).[21] It was not until W. Kaye Lamb's tenure as dominion archivist (1948–1968) that a more purposeful attempt was made to undertake a systematic descriptive program with the adoption of the record and manuscript group system and the subsequent publication of preliminary and general inventories for the newly formed groups.

Textual Features

Textual features refer to the structure, modes of argument, and style of texts.[22] The textual features we considered for the purposes of this study are the organization and structure of the calendars and inventories, and some of the explicit and implicit arguments contained in them.

The Calendars

In his 1882 annual report, Brymner reported on the status of the Haldimand and Bouquet Collections, two significant collections of papers copied from originals at the British Museum.[23] "With the exception of those which have only lately been sent," Brymner explained, "the volumes have been calendared."[24] To "show the system adopted," Brymner appended the calendar of one volume to the report. From 1884 on, it became his standard practice to include as an appendix to the annual reports substantial installments of these calendars. The 1884 report included what Brymner referred to as the first full "installment"[25] of the calendar for the Haldimand Collection, and subsequent installments were published yearly until 1890 when, the entirety of the Haldimand Collection calendars having been completed and published, Brymner began fresh with the first installment of the calendar of State Papers copied from the Public Record Office in England.[26]

The calendars published with the annual reports often ran to hundreds of pages (for example, the 1887 installment of the calendar for the Haldimand papers was nearly five hundred pages) and included detailed synopses of each single item's content. Typically, materials were listed first by the volume in which they were bound and then chronologically, sometimes under broad subdivisions. For example, correspondence was often listed chronologically under the name of the correspondent. Each single entry—which related to a single document—included a notation of the date the document was written and the place; an abstract of the contents of the document, which could range in detail and length from a few sentences to several pages; and a page number corresponding to the page number of the volume in which the document was bound. At the start of the list for each bound volume, Brymner supplied the volume's pressmark and, when applicable, the number and location of originals in overseas repositories (e.g. at the British Museum or the Public Record Office, etc.).[27]

When Arthur G. Doughty was appointed dominion archivist in 1904 following Brymner's death, he argued for the abandonment of the calendar as a means of making records accessible; in his early reports he identified problems associated with the way that calendars were published before all the materials they described had been received in Ottawa[28] and suggested that historians—spread out across the country and not always able to travel to Ottawa to conduct research—would be better served by series of documents published in full, instead of having to rely on the abstracted information available in the calendars.[29] Doughty initiated a publication program to make documents available in full, but despite his stated dislike for calendars as a means of making records accessible, calendars continued to be produced.[30] Doughty himself was heavily invested in the calendaring of the papers of Lord Durham.[31]

As stated above, the calendars were published in installments as appendixes to the annual reports, and, during Brymner's time, there was a symbiotic relationship between the calendars and the annual reports.[32] In the often lengthy reports, Brymner typically listed and described materials acquired during the previous year, referred to the appended calendar excerpts, and then highlighted particular documents described in those calendars that he felt might introduce new information about a partially or (in his opinion) poorly understood event or person. Brymner would often include in the report transcriptions of complete documents and/or excerpted sections, upon which he would comment on what he considered significant about the content of the document. For example, as he worked on the calendar for the Haldimand papers, Brymner used the reports to refute previous characterizations of Haldimand as an unfair and cruel governor and to show how reference to the original correspondence (or copies of it) provided new evidence of Haldimand's good character and wise leadership.[33] Not surprisingly, given his stated doubts about their efficacy in making materials accessible to Canada's dispersed population, Doughty did not use the reports to publicize the calendars in the same way Brymner did. Doughty's reports tended to be briefer and more focused on listing the accomplishments of each division during the year; in fact, when Doughty did add length and detail to his reports, it was often to disparage the calendar and to promote his idea that the Canadian public would be better served by the publication of historical documents in full in edited volumes.[34]

Calendaring continued at PAC until a new system of arrangement and description was implemented under the direction of W. Kaye Lamb. Terry Cook noted that, by 1949, the second year of Lamb's tenure as dominion archivist, "calendars were scattered across more than 70 annual reports," and the "treatment" of different collections was "uneven." Lamb found the calendaring system "antiquated, cumbersome, and inappropriate for a modern archive"[35] and wished to replace it with a system more capable both of keeping pace with the "increased flow of new accessions" resulting from his "aggressive appraisal and acquisition activities for private and government records"[36] and of providing "a summary account of [the] entire holdings"[37] of PAC. As well, Lamb was concerned about the inherent subjectivity of the calendars; calendars, Lamb argued, were "highly subjective . . . reflecting the special interests and limitations of the compiler." Calendaring, he concluded, "is as much an art of omission as it is of inclusion," as individual compilers determined what details were significant enough to abstract, each no doubt choosing at least partially on the basis of his or her own interests.[38] Lamb was especially concerned when he learned that many historians were relying on the calendars rather than consulting the documents themselves. He determined to provide a new descriptive system that would give historians an idea of what documents were available across all holdings and

then to improve access to the holdings themselves through the use of microfilm copies deposited in libraries across the country.[39]

Preliminary and General Inventories

The new system adopted by PAC during Lamb's tenure involved the identification of record and manuscript groups, which were then described in published inventories.[40] For public records, records of each major government department or agency were brought together as record groups, while private records were "grouped by chronology and function" into manuscript groups.[41] In 1951, PAC began publishing a series of preliminary inventories for its newly created manuscript and record groups. The preliminary inventories were intended to "succinctly describe the documents or series of documents of a department, in the case of a Record Group, or of papers of individuals, companies, organizations concerning a period or a subject, in the case of a Manuscript Group."[42] Preliminary inventories provided an "overview" of each record or manuscript group, "each with introductions, biographical or administrative histories giving context about the records' creator(s), and a description of each distinct series (or fonds) within the broader group."[43] Although there was some variation from inventory to inventory, a preliminary inventory for a manuscript group would typically include at the group level a title, inclusive dates, extent in volumes and linear feet, and an introduction to the group including either biographical information about the creator or information about the arrangement of the papers and about the history of their transmission and custody, as well information about available finding aids (e.g., calendars, indexes, and file or shelf lists). Lower-level descriptions (i.e., for series within groups) included title, dates, volume numbers and extent, a brief description of the contents of the series, and, where necessary, any additional biographical information or information about the records' arrangement that was not included in the introduction at the higher level.

Inventories for record groups followed a similar structure and made use of similar data elements. For record groups, the introduction at the group level provided a detailed administrative history describing how the records creating body was formed, its mandate, any changes made to its structure and functions, and its recordkeeping practices. This introduction also discussed, often in some detail, how and when records were transferred from the department to PAC and how they were subsequently arranged.

Beginning in 1971, PAC began to publish a new series of inventories referred to as the general inventories. These were intended to replace the preliminary inventories but were not enormously different in structure or content. In the general introduction to the first volume of the *General Inventory of Manuscripts*,

Robert S. Gordon explained that the "General Inventory does not differ essentially from [the] preliminary inventories that it replaces. It reworks them, completes them and presents them in a more systematic fashion." According to Gordon, the primary differences between the two sets of inventories were that the general inventories "provide more complete and precise details of the nature, quantity and terminal dates of the documents." General inventory entries also included microfilm reel numbers where records had been copied and more detailed information about the availability of additional finding aids (e.g., shelf and file lists, calendars, etc.) than was typically found in the preliminary inventories.[44]

In most cases, a published volume in the series included inventories for more than one manuscript or record group. Each volume included a general introduction, repeated in each volume and laying out the purpose of the inventories and the differences between them and previous published finding aids; a separate introduction briefly describing the nature of each separate group included in the volume; a table of contents; and the description of the records proper. Descriptive elements in the group-level description of the general inventories included the title; an indication of whether the records were originals, copies, and so on; inclusive dates; extent; the number(s) for any existing finding aid(s); and an introduction that included biographical information about the creator or an administrative history as appropriate, information about the arrangement of the papers and the history of their custody and transmission, and additional information about the nature and whereabouts of other available finding aids. Similar information was provided at the series level.

One of the striking textual features of the preliminary and general inventories is the inclusion in different data elements of archival terminology and concepts. As will be discussed below, the record and manuscript group system more closely resembled arrangement by provenance (i.e., arrangement in groups determined by the context of their creation rather than on their subjects and/or time periods) than previous arrangements had done, and, in the inventories (particularly in the general inventories), an evolving recognition of the significance of provenance makes itself felt in both implicit and explicit ways.

A good example of this evolving recognition is found in the general inventory for MG 11 Colonial Office—London, published in 1976. The general inventory replaced the preliminary inventory published in 1952. While the introduction to the records in the preliminary inventory included a fairly detailed history of the changes in the administration of the Colonial Office over three centuries and of the treatment of records during this time, the general inventory provides a far more comprehensive analysis of the history of both administration and records. The introduction to the inventory noted that "some understanding of the *provenance* [emphasis in original], organization and arrangement of the

records is important to researchers and will lead to a more rewarding investigation than that provided even by very detailed finding aids."[45] An endnote provided users with a definition of the term *provenance*: "Provenance is a fundamental archival principle here meaning a description relating to the office of origin, and the generation and accumulation of its records in the conduct of business."[46] The introduction provided a detailed account of the changing arrangement of Colonial Office records over time and referred to (and provided definitions for) other archival concepts such as *original order* and *evidential* and *informational value*.

The general inventory for MG 11 directed users to approach the records from a particular perspective: that of archival theory and, more specifically, through the lens of provenance. This is a markedly different approach than the one suggested in PAC calendars. It is an approach that views archives not only as carriers of information about the past, but as information objects in their own rights. In an article written a few years after the publication of the general inventory for MG 11, Tom Nesmith, then an archivist at PAC, explained the changing view of what archival description should communicate:

> Archival inventories should reflect an understanding of the historical context in which the institution was established and developed so that the changing perspectives represented in the records it created for the purpose of accomplishing its goals can be appreciated. In other words inventories should enable the researcher to begin to answer the question: how does the original purpose of the record affect what may be done with it? Inventories also ought to provide an overview of the evolving administrative structures of the institution in order to identify the agencies and officials creating and controlling particular classes of information. The history of record-keeping systems the institution employed to control its records will have to be outlined so that researchers can pursue their particular interests through the record group's information maze.[47]

Implicit in Nesmith's discussion of the purpose of an archival inventory were new ideas about what researchers want and/or need and what archivists do.

The language used in the general inventories changed in other ways too. In addition to the inclusion of terms from archival theory, there is a move toward a generally more professional tone. In the general inventories, some common phrases used repeatedly in the preliminary inventories begin to be replaced: for example, "papers" became "documents," "presented by" became "acquired from," and records that were "divided" into sections were said instead to have been "organized or re-arranged." While these changes were not always made consistently, there is an identifiable trend in the general inventories toward the adoption of a more professional—a more archival—discourse.

Composing Processes Associated with the Calendars and Inventories

If textual features are the "surface traces of underlying regularities,"[48] composing processes are where those regularities are codified, either implicitly or explicitly. For Paré and Smart, composing processes included, among other things, gathering and analyzing information, writing and rewriting, and the technological production of generic texts.[49] For the purposes of this study, we interpret composing processes to mean the practices and conventions that informed the production of the calendars and inventories, which were informed, in turn, by currents of thinking "in the air" during the time of their production.

During his overseas trips to survey and acquire records, Brymner also studied the practices employed at a number of libraries and archives in England, Scotland, and France[50] as he contemplated how best to arrange and describe the collection he was busy acquiring. In his report for 1883, he explained that "In the Public Record Office, London, and the General Registry House, Edinburgh, the system is a very simple one, the documents deposited by different Departments of State being arranged separately and in strictly chronological order, the same practice being followed in respect to Court Records."[51] Brymner favored a similar approach. For example, in his 1882 report, Brymner commented on the difficulty of arranging materials on the shelves of the archives' reading and work rooms, which were too small to accommodate the growing volume of records. Explaining what he would do with more space, Brymner proposed a physical arrangement of materials according first to the provinces to which they pertained and then by broad historical periods. For example, for the province of Quebec, records would be arranged on shelves accordingly:

> 1. From the cession of Great Britain down to 1791, when the old Province of Quebec was divided into Upper and Lower Canada; 2. Lower Canada from 1791 to 1841, when the two Provinces were reunited into the Province of Canada; 3. From 1841 to 1867 (the date of Confederation) in as far as relates to the special affairs of Canada East; 4. Since Confederation, when the old name—the Province of Quebec—was resumed.[52]

In a later report, Brymner transcribed a talk he gave to the American Historical Society in 1888, in which he described his approach to and method of arrangement and description. Referring to a large amount of correspondence from the War Office that was transferred from Halifax to Ottawa after he asked that it not be sent to London but kept in Canada, Brymner explained that "being entirely alone" in his work, he "had full scope to adopt any system [he] chose, without let, hindrance, or remonstrance." He adopted, first, a chronological order "so that the records of event might follow naturally, no matter who was the recorder" and then decided to further divide the documents by subject, "breaking them up, as it were, into fragments for mastication." Brymner gave a

detailed account of his work, describing how he physically separated documents into piles and pigeon holes by date and then by subject so that they could be bound together in convenient volumes and indexes prepared. He explained that "as a relaxation from the drudgery of indexing, [he] took to making abstracts" of the bound documents; these became the basis for the calendars that were then published with the annual reports.[53]

It is clear from Brymner's comments that the archival principle of provenance did not play a significant role in the composing processes underpinning the preparation of calendars; nor did it play a significant role in the institution's arrangement and description practices more generally. Brymner's successor, Doughty, is often credited with improving the application of the principle at the Public Archives, under the influence of evolving ideas concerning the treatment of archives in Europe,[54] but based on his dealings with David W. Parker, head of the Manuscript Room from 1912 to 1923, it seems clear that his adoption of the principle was less than wholesale. In a memorandum sent by Parker to Doughty in 1920 on "the classification of the records of government departments (1750–1867) in the Manuscript Room," Parker chastised Doughty for not adequately supporting his efforts to introduce arrangement by provenance. Parker accused Doughty of losing interest in materials once they had been acquired, of showing "indifference to the value and needs of manuscripts," and of ranking "classification of manuscripts" as a low-level priority and a "technical matter," capable of being completed by "any person no matter how ignorant, untrained or otherwise unqualified."[55] Carman V. Carroll, who referred to Parker as the "'father' of arrangement at the Public Archives of Canada," noted that Doughty did not seem to have replied to this memo. Parker's frustration continued until he resigned in 1923,[56] and it was not until many years later that compilers of published finding aids at PAC began to refer with any frequency to archival principles.[57]

Under Lamb's direction, and with the adoption of the group system for government records and private manuscripts, records were arranged with more respect for provenance than they had been at any previous time. The new group system allowed records that "were scattered across the old arrangement" to be "reallocated" with records created in the same government department or agency. Nongovernment records, that is, records from private sources, were grouped together by "chronology and function, which Lamb believed to be 'the proper bases for the classification of archival materials.'"[58] For example, groups were formed for Prime Ministers' Papers (MG 26), Fur Trade and Indian Lands (MG 19), and nineteenth-century manuscripts pre- and post-Confederation (MG 24 and MG 29). While arrangement by record group and manuscript group is not the same as arrangement according to the principle of *respect des fonds*,[59] the group system represented a major shift in approach to the classification of

archives at PAC. In 1972, several years after its implementation, then-dominion archivist Wilfrid I. Smith argued that with the adoption of the group system, the problem of classification that had concerned the archives from the beginning was settled at last.[60]

Social Roles Associated with the Calendars and Inventories

Social roles focus on the roles of writers and readers in the creation and use of texts and the network of relationships that connect them.[61] In this study, we focused on how the calendars and inventories reflect PAC's changing understanding of the needs and interests of its constituent community and of its own evolving sense of identity and purpose in relation to that community.

As has been explained, the impetus for the establishment of PAC came from the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec. The society was founded in 1824 by the Earl of Dalhousie, who was governor-in-chief of British North America from 1820 to 1828, and its members included other distinguished elites and scholars. The members of the society might be seen as the first users of PAC. It was for use by men like themselves that members advocated the collection and care of archives, and it was for scholars in pursuit of the same aims as the society's members that Brymner proclaimed his "noble dream" to turn the archives into "the Mecca to which historical investigators would turn their eyes and direct their steps."[62]

Brymner and his immediate successors, Doughty and Lanctôt, understood historians to be the primary users of the materials they collected and made available; they understood that historians would be using these materials to write the history of the new nation. As Millar explained, the first archivists at PAC "drew their understanding of archival management from the study and love of history and a desire to collect the evidence from which the great stories of Canada would be written."[63]

The calendars they created for the records they collected reflected this understanding and desire. Materials were listed in chronological order so that researchers could see how "events follow[ed] naturally"[64] and the significant—according to the compiler—content of individual records (dates, key names, places, actions) was abstracted. The primary, explicit purposes of the calendars were to make the documents "readily accessible"[65] and (as they were circulated with the archives' annual reports) to provide researchers at a distance and unable to travel easily—as many researchers would have been in Canada in the late nineteenth and early to mid-twentieth centuries—with reliable surrogates with which to begin their studies. An additional, implicit purpose of the calendars was to exhibit the history of the developing nation. As Brymner stated in his report for 1885, he felt certain that "an examination of the contents of

the papers, as shown by the abstract, [would] . . . prove the great value of the [Haldimand] collection in elucidating the events of one of the most important periods of Canadian history, of which so little has hitherto been known."[66] With his calendars, as with the materials he acquired, Brymner understood himself to be providing the "rough material" that, when placed in the hands of historians, could be "formed into structures of exquisite beauty" to tell the "true" story of the development of the colonies and of Canada as a nation.[67]

Doughty had very similar aims, but was not convinced that calendars were the best way to make the true stories of the nation known. In his first annual report, for the year 1904, Doughty asserted that

> The full, true history of men, of their motives, and of their influence on the progress of this great country, which is now beginning to take its proper place amongst the nations of the world, can be fully appreciated only in the light of documents which at present, to the great majority, are unknown.[68]

However, to Doughty's mind, well-edited collections of fully transcribed documents would better serve the historian researcher than calendars. Nevertheless, and as has been discussed, calendars continued to be compiled on a regular basis. The annual reports with which the calendars were published emphasized the archives' essential role in the creation of a Canadian historiography; the first three dominion archivists saw themselves as facilitators of historical discovery. Particularly during Brymner's and Doughty's times, close relationships were fostered between Canadian historians and the Archives. Doughty strove to develop close relations with university historians and fledgling history programs by offering summer courses at PAC. He consciously endeavored to create a "warm, friendly atmosphere conducive to research and discussion," a special "meeting place [for historians] to research, to argue, to discuss, to plan new publications and to renew their enthusiasm before returning to their winter vigils teaching Canadian history, often alone, at scattered universities."[69] Despite their lower profile during Doughty's time, the calendars, such as the one compiled for the papers of Lord Durham, can be seen as part of this endeavor. In this calendar, Doughty aimed to facilitate the study of Durham and his impact on Canadian history by providing historians with the "intimate and particular information" required to better understand the man and his mission.[70]

The emphasis during the first fifty or so years of the archives' history, then, was on the connections between the writing of history, the development of a historical profession, and the archives of the nation. During the subsequent fifty years, however, this emphasis shifted as the institution expanded the size and scope of its operations, initiated a full public records management and acquisition program,[71] and, increasingly, questioned its professional role. Terry Cook

described an "archival revolution" that "occurred in North America in the two decades after 1950":

> The archival profession was transformed, and so too were archival institutions and their collections. The focus shifted from a semi-antiquarian enthusiasm for collecting the personal papers of heroic figures of a distant or pioneering past to a more scholarly, systematic, and professional approach for acquiring the records of contemporary society and especially managing effectively those of their burgeoning government. The role of the archivist also changed in description and services. The passive keeper of old treasures preserved primarily for academic historians, and minutely catalogued or calendared, was transformed into scholar archivist serving a broader range of users.[72]

Cook argued that Lamb was a "chief revolutionary" of this movement and credited him with transforming PAC by carrying out "revolutions" on three axes: one related to archival appraisal, another related to managing government records, and a third related to "serving the modern researcher."[73]

Descriptive practices fall under this third category, and Cook discussed the adoption, under Lamb's tenure, of the record and manuscript group system of arrangement and the compilation of the preliminary and general inventories for the newly formed groups. Cook made clear that Lamb was developing descriptive programs at PAC with more than just historian-researchers in mind. Lamb argued that while "for long enough, the historian was, of course, our chief customer," a "new flood" of researchers was regularly using the archives. These included "economists, sociologists, geographers and all sorts of people," and Lamb insisted that they were "just as important as the historians" and that archivists were "under just as great an obligation to do what we can for them."[74]

Researchers from disciplines other than history required different records than historians and approached these records using different methodologies. They might also require different finding aids. Instead of calendars, with their "curatorial, inward-looking mindset,"[75] these new researchers, Lamb seemed to think, would appreciate a more systematic series of finding aids that would permit users to quickly and "with some precision" determine whether a group of records was likely to interest them and to answer their particular questions.[76] The preliminary and general inventories, with their emphasis on administrative history and their summary listings of series, were understood to provide broader and more objective access than the calendars, which, in Lamb's view, were overly subjective, reflecting the "special interests and limitations of the compiler" and the compiler's ideas of what made history and how history ought to be written.[77]

Changing views of who *used* archives were accompanied by new ideas about who *cared for* archives. During the period when the general inventories were being compiled, and especially as they took on increasing responsibility for the

records of government departments, archivists at PAC—and across Canada—were discussing their professional role. Were they fundamentally historians serving other historians? Or was their role more administrative, with the aim of serving the government that sponsored their programs? From the late 1970s and well into the 1980s, the debate about the role of archivists and their relationships to history and historians, to government and administration, to information, and to culture featured prominently in the pages of *Archivaria*, the journal published by the Association of Canadian Archivists, and elsewhere.[78] At the same time, discussions were occurring within the archival community concerning the need for and nature of formal archival education. Some archivists suggested that instead of an advanced degree in history and "on the job" training in archival methods and techniques, a postsecondary program in archival theory and practice would better prepare new archivists for the kind of work they were now required to do.[79]

These discussions about the role(s) of archivists vis-à-vis both the records and the researchers they served and about the value of archival education were essentially also discussions about the developing *professional identity* of archivists and reflected an ever-increasing sense on the part of the archival community that it existed separate from (though still related to) affiliated communities (e.g., the communities of historians, librarians, etc.). The efforts archivists were making to identify their differences and to explain them were likewise reflected in finding aids like the general inventory to MG 11 (discussed above) as terms like *provenance* and *original order* began to be used and defined and as an increasingly professional language replaced the more collegial tone of earlier finding aids.

The general inventories also referred to the rearrangement of series within groups to conform to evolving ideas concerning the significance of the principle of provenance. For example, the introduction in the general inventory to MG 29—Nineteenth Century Post-Confederation Manuscripts—noted that "As the trends of archival collecting and historical research have changed over time, [. . .] subject classifications became unsatisfactory." The group had been rearranged into "only five sections which are intended to be both comprehensive and permanent" and which correspond more closely to the records' contexts of creation.[80] Overall, and despite the inconsistencies and variations that existed between inventories for different record and manuscript groups, the careful reader can identify, in the shift from the preliminary inventories to the general inventories, a sense of a developing professional identity built on newly accepted ideas about archival theory and on an evolving understanding of the role of the archivist.

Conclusion

As Millar explained, during the early years of archival development in Canada, the "preservation of Canada's documentary heritage" was emphasized as a "public responsibility, to be borne by the Dominion Government" and, more specifically, by PAC. Millar further explained that "this sense of public responsibility" was linked to the government's focus on nation building.[81] Throughout the years, a succession of dominion archivists embraced this responsibility, focusing on the ability of archival documents to foster "a love for the past history of the country," which would likewise lead to a rise in "true patriotism."[82] Under Brymner and Doughty, the primary priority of PAC was the identification, location, and acquisition of the records that could tell Canada's "great stories."[83] In the finding aids these two archivists created, they each in their own way sought to bring to the fore the most significant of these stories. Brymner's calendars, and his discussions in his reports of the materials to which they referred, were written with the development of Canadian historiography in mind. The chronological ordering he adopted would, he believed, permit the clearest picture of how events unfolded, and the abstracts prepared for each document would allow historians to follow this unfolding. By publishing the calendars with PAC's annual reports, Brymner ensured their circulation outside PAC. While Doughty had reservations about the calendaring program and instituted a publishing program as his preferred means of making records accessible, the production of calendars continued at PAC well into the twentieth century. Both Brymner and Doughty (as well as their successor, Lanctôt) worked with the Canadian historian in mind. The patron they envisioned would use the calendars and the records to write the history of the nation. Each archivist felt himself to be a part of the historical community, engaged in a common historical endeavor.

The most significant change to PAC's descriptive program came under the direction of Lamb, with the adoption of the group system and the production of preliminary and general inventories. Cook characterized Lamb's tenure as dominion archivist as a period of "archival revolution" during which the archival profession in Canada and its institutions—especially PAC—were radically altered. In Lamb's view, the role of the archivist and the identity of users were changing in the second half of the twentieth century: "the passive keeper of old treasures preserved primarily for academic historians, and minutely catalogued or calendared, was transformed into a scholar archivist serving a broader range of users." From a "semi-antiquarian" focus on collecting the so-called great stories of Canada's past, PAC moved toward a more "systematic and professional approach" to both the acquisition and management of its holdings.[84] Part of this shift involved the adoption of a new, more objective, more "archival" program of arrangement and description. The preliminary and general inventories reflected

the movement toward a principled, systematic, and professional approach. Embodied in the inventories' increased emphasis on the history of administration and recordkeeping practices, their introduction of archival principles, and their adoption of an increasingly professional tone is evidence of a growing awareness within PAC of the distinctive nature of archives, archival work, and archival professional identity, an awareness that is also observable in the descriptive practices of other archival institutions and jurisdictions during this time period.[85]

In this article, we have traced some of the history of the calendars and inventories published by PAC between 1882 and 1975. Our purpose in tracing this history has been to show how the structure and contents of these finding aids changed over time, how they were underpinned by contemporary currents of thinking about the nature and purpose of archives, and how they were situated within institutional and professional frameworks. Our analysis of the textual features, composing processes, and social roles associated with the calendars and inventories shows that, although the primary social action they undertook—making the holdings of PAC accessible to the public—was relatively straightforward, each of the genres nevertheless works to guide and codify institutional ideas about what it meant to make those holdings accessible, about the relationship between the archivist and his or her imagined user, and about the evolution of the professional identity of the archivist. In this way, our analysis supports Bawarshi's observation that "genres are both functional and epistemological—they help us function within particular situations at the same time they help shape the ways we come to know these situations."[86] Our analysis likewise supports Aviva Freedman and Graham Smart's assertion that genres function as "repositories of communal knowledge," "sites for enculturation," and "forces to be resisted if and when change becomes necessary."[87] The calendars and inventories, each in their own way, embodied and perpetuated the ambitions of PAC as an evolving national institution and the beliefs of its professional staff about the nature of archives, archival research, and archival work. As the values and aspirations of the institution and its professional staff shift over time, one type of finding aid is eventually displaced by another that better reflects the changing sense of purpose and identity. In the third stage of this research project, we will move beyond the production and transmission of finding aids discussed so far to explore how a newer type of finding aid—the Web-based finding aid—both embeds and creates the changing ambitions and aims of archival institutions.

Notes

[1] The project, entitled "Archival Description as Rhetorical Genre in Traditional and Web-based Environments," was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

[2] See Heather MacNeil, "What Finding Aids Do: Archival Description as Rhetorical Genre in Traditional and Web-based Environments," *Archival Science* 12 (2012): 485–500.

[3] The historical study of finding aids at the Public Record Office in Great Britain is explored in a separate article. See Heather MacNeil and Jennifer Douglas, "The Generic Evolution of Calendars and Guides at the Public Record Office of Great Britain, ca. 1838–1968," *Information and Culture* 49, no. 3 (2014).

[4] An article reporting on this stage of the project is currently in progress.

[5] Anis S. Bawarshi and Mary Jo Reiff, *Genre: An Introduction to History, Theory, Research, and Pedagogy* (West Lafayette, In.: Parlor Press, 2010), 4.

[6] Bawarshi and Reiff, *Genre*, 4.

[7] Ciaran B. Trace and Andrew Dillon, "The Evolution of the Finding Aid in the United States: From Physical to Digital Document Genre," *Archival Science* 12 (December 2012): 501–19.

[8] MacNeil, "What Finding Aids Do," 485–500.

[9] Amy Devitt, *Writing Genres* (Southern Illinois University Press: Carbondale, Ill., 2004), 31.

[10] Devitt, *Writing Genres*, 214.

[11] Anthony Paré and Graham Smart, "Observing Genres in Action: Towards a Research Methodology," in *Genre and the New Rhetoric*, ed. Aviva Freedman and Peter Medway (London: Taylor and Francis, 1994), 146–54.

[12] The primary means of making the records described by these finding aids accessible at the current time are the online databases available on the Library and Archives Canada website, http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/index-e.html. The calendars and inventories discussed in this article continue to be available for consultation.

[13] For this study, we examined the calendars appended to PAC annual reports between 1884 and 1949, as well as a selection of the preliminary and general inventories; approximately 75 percent of the published preliminary and general inventories for manuscript groups were consulted, as well as approximately 50 percent of both series of inventories for record groups. Our observations of the textual features of the calendars and inventories in subsequent sections are based on our examinations of these finding aids.

[14] Ian E. Wilson, "'A Noble Dream': The Origins of the Public Archives of Canada," *Archivaria* 15 (Winter 1982–1983): 16.

[15] Quoted in Wilson, "'A Noble Dream,'" 16–17.

[16] [Petition of Literary and Historical Society of Quebec to House of Commons and Governor General], Library and Archives Canada, RG 37, Volume 104, Letters Received 1-120.

[17] [Petition of Literary and Historical Society of Quebec to House of Commons and Governor General].

[18] Wilson, "'A Noble Dream,'" 18.

[19] Laura Millar, "Discharging Our Debt: The Evolution of the Total Archives Concept in English Canada," *Archivaria* 46 (Fall 1998): 108.

[20] The overseas copying program was carried on for more than half a century under the directions of archivists from Brymner to Lamb, who promoted the use of microfilm as a more effective means of procuring copies from other institutions and of sharing them.

[21] The calendars created at PAC during the time period discussed here and appended to the archives' annual reports are all still available to researchers on-site at Library and Archives Canada in Ottawa and in many research libraries across the country and internationally, as are the series of preliminary and general inventories discussed later in this article.

[22] Paré and Smart, "Observing Genres in Action," *Genre and the New Rhetoric*, 147.

[23] Major-General Frederick Haldimand came to British North America with the British Army in 1756 and served as governor of Quebec province from 1777 to 1785; Colonel Henry Bouquet also served with the British Army in North America and was a close friend of Haldimand.

[24] Douglas Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives [1882]* (Ottawa: 1883), 1.

[25] Douglas Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives [1884]* (Ottawa: 1885), xi.

[26] The documents calendared were primarily transcripts of Colonial Office records relating to the old Province of Quebec and its later subdivisions, the provinces of Lower and Upper Canada.

[27] As the Society of American Archivists *Glossary of Archival Terms* notes, the calendar was a common type of finding aid throughout the first half of the twentieth century; the glossary defines it as a "finding aid that is a chronological listing of documents in a collection, which may be comprehensive or selective, and which may include details about the writer, recipient, date, place, summary of content, type of document, and page or leaf count." The calendars compiled by Brymner and his successors are consistent with this more general understanding of calendars.

[28] This is because calendars could be compiled from abstracts made by copyists and sent to Ottawa prior to the full copies of the documents themselves. [Arthur G. Doughty], *Report on Canadian Archives [1904]* (Ottawa: 1905), xli

[29] [Arthur G. Doughty], *Report Concerning Canadian Archives for the Year 1905 in Three Volumes*, vol. 1 (Ottawa: 1906), xvi.

[30] In the report compiled by Acting Dominion Archivist James F. Kennedy for the year 1935, the need for resources to be applied to calendaring is noted, and in his report for 1938, Lanctôt writes of a "general program" having been "drawn up . . . to complete certain calendars unfinished for twenty years [and] to calendar several collections (both old and new)." Calendaring continues to be mentioned in the annual reports until the final calendar is published in 1949. See James F. Kennedy, *Report of the Public Archives for the Year 1935* (Ottawa: 1936), v; and Gustave Lanctôt, *Report of the Public Archives for the Year 1938* (Ottawa: 1939).

[31] For a discussion of Doughty's involvement with the calendar for the Durham papers, see Jarrett Henderson, "'I Am Pleased with the Lambton Loot': Arthur George Doughty and the Making of the Durham Papers," *Archivaria* 70 (Fall 2010): 153–76.

[32] The practice of including calendars as appendixes to annual reports was not unique to the Public Archives of Canada. The same practice was followed by the Public Record Office of Great Britain (PRO) during the first few decades of its existence. The history of calendars and calendaring in the PRO is traced in Heather MacNeil and Jennifer Douglas, "The Generic Evolution of Calendars and Guides at the Public Record Office of Great Britain, ca. 1838–1968."

[33] Douglas Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives [1887]* (Ottawa: 1888), vii. See also Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives [1889]*, xxiv.

[34] Arthur G. Doughty, *Report on Canadian Archives for the Year 1905* (Ottawa: 1906); Arthur G. Doughty, *Report on Canadian Archives for the Year 1933* (Ottawa: 1934).

[35] Terry Cook, "An Archival Revolution: W. Kaye Lamb and the Transformation of the Archival Profession," *Archivaria* 60 (Fall 2005): 219.

[36] Cook, "An Archival Revolution, 219.

[37] W. Kaye Lamb, quoted in Cook, "An Archival Revolution," 221. See also W. Kaye Lamb, *Report of the Public Archives for the Year 1951* (Ottawa: 1952).

[38] Lamb, quoted in Cook, "An Archival Revolution," 220.

[39] Cook, "An Archival Revolution," 220.

[40] The group system adopted at PAC at this time was modeled on the record group system employed at the National Archives of the United States. See William G. Ormsby, "The Public Archives of Canada, 1948–1968," *Archivaria* 15 (Winter 1982–1983): 37–38.

[41] This process is described in more detail in the "Composing Processes" section of this article.

[42] Bernard Weilbrenner, "The Public Archives of Canada, 1871–1958," *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 2 (1960): 113.

[43] Cook, "An Archival Revolution," 222.

[44] Public Archives of Canada Manuscripts Division, *General Inventory of Manuscripts Vol. 1* (Ottawa: 1971), viii.

[45] Public Archives of Canada, Manuscript Division, *General Inventory of Manuscripts MG 11* (Ottawa: 1976), 1.

[46] PAC Manuscript Division, *General Inventory of Manuscripts MG 11*, 16.

[47] Tom Nesmith, "Archives from the Bottom Up: Social History and Archival Scholarship," *Archivaria* 14 (Summer 1982): 25.

[48] Aviva Freedman and Peter Medway, *Learning and Teaching Genre* (Portsmouth, N.H.: Boynton/Cook, 1994), 2.

[49] Paré and Smart, "Observing Genres in Action," 150.

[50] These included the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, the Public Records Office in England, the British Museum, the Corporation of London, Guidhall, the Royal Institution in Edinburgh, and the General Register House, also in Edinburgh. Douglas Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives [1883]* (Ottawa: 1884), 16.

[51] Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives [1883]*, 16.

[52] Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives [1882]*, 14.

[53] Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives [1889]*, xiii.

[54] In 1917, Doughty sent a confidential memorandum to Acting Prime Minister George Foster regarding the need to conduct a thorough survey of records created during the war. In this memorandum, Doughty extolled the virtues of provenance as an archival principle, stating that "It is now the practically universal agreement of archivists throughout the world that what is known as the *principe de la provenance* is the best system of classifying archives, both for the purposes of official reference and for those of historical investigation." Quoted in Weilbrenner, 108. Danielle Lacasse and Antonio Lechasseur credit Doughty with recommending in 1916 and "for the first time in the annals of the Archives, that provenance become the guiding principle for the classification of archival records." Lacasse and Lechasseur, *The National Archives of Canada 1872–1997*, Canadian Historical Association Booklet No. 58 (Ottawa: 1997), 15.

[55] Quoted in Carman V. Carroll, "David W. Parker: The 'Father' of Archival Arrangement at the Public Archives of Canada," *Archivaria* 16 (Summer 1983): 153.

[56] Carroll, "David W. Parker," 153, 151.

[57] It should be noted here that the first English manual on archival administration, Hilary Jenkinson's *A Manual for Archive Administration*, was not published until 1922 and that the first English translation of Dutch archivists' Samuel Muller, J. A. Feith, and R. Fruin's seminal *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives* did not appear until 1940. Efforts were made to introduce the ideas of European archivists into North American practice prior to the publication of these texts (for example, in the United States, New York State Archivist Arnold Johan Ferdinand Van Laer and Waldo G. Leland, head of the Carnegie Institution, both made efforts to introduce the principles codified in the Dutch manual into archival practice, and in 1910, the International Congress in Brussels, the "first world-wide gathering of librarians and archivists," unanimously accepted the Dutch principle of provenance), but the principles of *respect des fonds* and respect for original order were by no means in widespread use during the years Parker and Doughty worked together at the Public Archives. Peter Horsman, "The Last Dance of the Phoenix, or the De-discovery of the Archival Fonds," *Archivaria* 54 (Fall 2002): 10. See Marjorie Rabe Barritt, "Coming to America: Dutch *Archivistiek* and American Archival Practice," *Archival Issues* 18, no. 1 (1993).

[58] Barritt, "Coming to America," 220–21.

[59] For a discussion of how the creation of record groups at PAC frequently involved "the breach of provenance and respect des fonds," see Carl Vincent, "The Record Group: A Concept in Evolution," *Archivaria* 3 (Winter 1976–1977): 3–16. In Vincent's view, while such breaches were lamentable, they also tended to be "more than offset by the ease of identification and access" provided by the group system. "The Record Group," 5.

[60] Wilfrid I. Smith, "'Total Archives:' The Canadian Experience," in *Canadian Archival Studies and the Rediscovery of Provenance*, ed. Tom Nesmith (Metuchen, N.J. and London: Scarecrow Press, 1993), 18. This did not, of course, prove to be the case; in the 1980s and 1990s, PAC embraced the *fonds* concept, and Canadian archivists were associated with a movement to "rediscover" the principle of provenance (see Nesmith, ed., *Canadian Archival Studies and the Rediscovery of Provenance*).

[61] Paré and Smart, "Observing Genres in Action," 149.

[62] Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives [1889]*, xv.

[63] Millar, "Discharging Our Debt," 109.

[64] Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives [1889]*, xii.

[65] Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives [1889]*, xiii.

[66] Douglas Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives [1885]* (Ottawa: 1886), vi.

[67] Brymner, *Report on Canadian Archives [1889]*, x.

[68] [Doughty], *Report on Canadian Archives [1904]*, ix.

[69] Wilson, "Shortt and Doughty," 22.

[70] Henderson, "'I Am Pleased with the Lambton Loot,'" 165.

[71] See Jay Atherton, "The Origins of the Public Archives Records Centre, 1897–1956," *Archivaria* 8 (1979): 35–59; and Cook, "An Archival Revolution."

[72] Cook, "An Archival Revolution," 186.

[73] Cook, "An Archival Revolution," 216.

[74] Quoted in Cook, "An Archival Revolution," 224.

[75] Cook, "An Archival Revolution," 225.

[76] Cook, "An Archival Revolution," 221.

[77] Cook, "An Archival Revolution,", 220.

[78] See, for example, George Bolotenko, "Archivists and Historians: Keepers of the Well," *Archivaria* 16 (Summer 1983): 5–25; Terry Cook, "Clio: The Archival Muse?," *Archivaria* 5 (Winter 1977–1978): 198–203; Terry Cook, "Dead or Alive?," *Archivaria* 16 (Summer 1983): 3–4; Gordon Dodds, "The Compleat Archivist," *Archivaria* 1 (Winter 1975–1976): 80–85; Gordon Dodds, "Provenance Must Remain the Archival 'Bottom Line,'" *Archivaria* 18 (Summer 1984): 4–7; Patrick A. Dunce, "Archives and the Spectre of 1984: Bolotenko Applauded," *Archivaria* 17 (Winter 1983–1984): 286–90; Nesmith, "Archives from the Bottom Up"; Carl Spadoni, "No Monopoly for 'Archivist-Historians': Bolotenko Assailed," *Archivaria* 17 (Winter 1983–1984): 291–95; Thomas T. Spencer, "The Archivist as Historian: Towards a Broader Definition," *Archivaria* 17 (Winter 1983–1984): 296–300. A few years earlier, in the mid-1960s, Lamb published articles reflecting on the role of the archivist vis-à-vis the historian and vice versa. See, for example, W. Kaye Lamb, "The Archivist and the Historian," *The American Historical Review* 68 (January 1963): 385–91; and Lamb, "The Changing Role of the Archivist," *The American Archivist* 29 (January 1966): 3–10.

[79] See, for example, Terry Eastwood, "Education and the Profession," *Archivaria* 1 (Winter 1975–1976): 106–108; W. Kaye Lamb, "The Modern Archivist: Formally Trained or Self-Educated?," *The American Archivist* 31 (April 1968): 175–77; Edwin Welch, "Archival Education," *Archivaria* 4 (Summer 1977): 49–59.

[80] Public Archives of Canada Manuscripts Division, *General Inventory—Inventaire Général MG 29* (Ottawa: 1975), ix.

[81] Millar, "Discharging Our Debt," 110–11.

[82] Doughty, quoted in Wilson, "'A Noble Dream,'" 24.

[83] Millar, "Discharging Our Debt," 109.

[84] Cook, "An Archival Revolution," 186.

[85] In our parallel study of the history of the PRO's calendars and guides, the evolution of this awareness within the PRO is explored in some detail in our discussion of the social roles associated with these finding aids. See MacNeil and Douglas, "Generic Evolution of Calendars and Guides." In the United States, such evolution is inextricably linked to the (apparently) converging trajectories of the historical manuscripts tradition and the public archives tradition. See Luke J. Gilliland-Swetland, "The Provenance of a Profession: The Permanence of the Public Archives and Historical Manuscripts Traditions in American Archival History," *The American Archivist* 54 (Spring 1991): 160–75; see also Trace and Dillon, "Evolution of the Finding Aid in the United States," 505–509; and Elizabeth Yakel, "Archival Representation," *Archival Science* 3 (2003): 1–25.

[86] Anis Bawarshi, "The Genre Function," *College English* 62 (January 2000): 340.

[87] Aviva Freedman and Graham Smart, "Navigating the Current of Economic Policy: Written Genres and the Distribution of Cognitive Work at a Financial Institution," *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 4, no. 4 (1997): 244.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Jennifer Douglas recently completed her doctoral studies at the Faculty of Information, University of Toronto. Her dissertation focused on the analysis and representation of writers' archives and on the relationship between writers' archives and established archival principles. She has published articles on the arrangement and description of writers' archives, on the principles of provenance and original order, and on medieval women's letter writing, and has taught classes on arrangement and description and archival administration at the University of British Columbia and the University of Victoria.

Heather MacNeil is a professor in the Faculty of Information, University of Toronto, where she teaches courses on archival concepts and issues, the history of recordkeeping, and archival representation. Her research and publications focus on the theory and methods of archival arrangement and description and the authenticity of records in analog and digital environments. She is the author of *Without Consent* (1992) and *Trusting Records* (2000) and co-editor, along with Terry Eastwood, of *Currents of Archival Thinking* (2010). She is currently the general editor of *Archivaria*.