

Studies in Documents

Experimenting with New Tools: Special Diplomats and the Study of Authority in the United Church of Canada

by JANET TURNER*

Luciana Duranti's recent workshops and her current series of articles in *Archivaria* are providing Canadian archivists with a hitherto unavailable opportunity to explore that system of theoretical knowledge called general diplomatics.¹ Professor Duranti's timely arrival in Canada as a resident source of expertise coincides with a longstanding yet latent interest in diplomatics on the part of North American archivists. What then are the sources of our interest in a science traditionally associated with medieval documents which altogether predate our own historical framework?

Non-textual records, particularly electronic records, can often seem as esoteric and difficult of access as any medieval document. The medium of the record, a subject of minor interest since paper superseded clay, papyrus, and parchment, regains significance in the age of celluloid, magnetic tape, and assorted disks.² The proliferation of copying technologies, and the re-emergence, through records management, of formalism in bureaucratic documentation, necessitate a precise understanding of the generation, form, and function of single, particular documents in specific administrations.³ Diplomats, the study of the "elemental archival unit," seems to hold promise as a methodology for gaining this microcosmic perspective.⁴

Should diplomats be as essential to the formation of the complete North American archivist as it is to the complete European archivist?⁵ Clearly an affirmative answer must depend on whether diplomats does have utility in the analysis of the materials in North American archives, which are by definition modern records. The inclusion of diplomats with law and history in the core curriculum of the Master of Archival Studies programme at the University of British Columbia is based on the conviction that "the study of diplomats assists the basic functions of identification, arrangement, description and appraisal."⁶ Canadian archivists' access to the developing theory is much improved, and there is confidence in the future capabilities of diplomats, but the proof remains in the pudding: the task of applying general diplomats to our own situations.

The moment we apply theory to specific cases, we are engaged in the activity of special diplomats.⁷ This article is a sort of copy-book exercise in the grammar of special diplomats; "copy-book" because it is executed by an apprentice, not a master of the technique, and "grammar" because the neophyte must apply the rules literally,

rigourously, and perhaps clumsily, until fluency allows greater flexibility.⁸ The subject of the article is one archival item from the records of the British Columbia Conference of the United Church of Canada, one of many similar documents originating from the Conference's Settlement Committee which governs the placement of ministers with pastoral charges. The intention of the article is simply to explore the ways in which diplomatic analysis can shed light on the administration which generates the "Call to a Minister." We shine a very narrow beam indeed upon the United Church in examining only one of a group of documents; conversely, we explore the capabilities of special diplomatics in an equally narrow way. Nonetheless, medieval diplomatists inferred much about whole bygone administrations from equally limited resources, and it will be instructive to replicate their analytical process.⁹ Despite the cut-and-dried appearance of the "fill-in-the-blank" form which follows, there is much meat for interpretation, discussion, and debate in the practical application of deceptively tidy theory.¹⁰

The diplomatic analysis begins by identifying the physical, or **Extrinsic**, characteristics of the document: the medium on which it is recorded; the preparation of that medium to receive information (in the case of textual documents, borders, ruled lines, and the like); scripts employed; special signs of the originating and/or receiving offices; and the presence of seals or other authenticating marks. The second step in the analysis is the examination of the formal intellectual, or **Intrinsic**, elements of the document. Every document is divided into three major areas or, in modern terms, fields: the **Protocol**, or opening formalities; the **Text**, or body of the document; and the **Eschatocol**, or closing section. Each of these is further subdivided into named elements, as can be observed in this analysis of the "Call to a Minister."

DIPLOMATIC ANALYSIS — EXTRINSIC ELEMENTS¹¹

Medium: paper, 17" × 11", folded to form two 8½" × 11" leaves; text portrait format, all four sides.

Script: typeset form, titles in Gothic style, headings in bold capitals; form blanks completed in typing, or handwriting; signatures — 55 original, 9 transcribed by hand and certified by recording clerk; pages 2 and 3 partially divided into two columns by heavy vertical line.¹²

Other: instructions to users of the form, references to sections of the United Church Manual, and sections of the form not filled out, must also be seen as extrinsic elements, since they are not part of the documentation of the juridical actions in question.

INTRINSIC ELEMENTS — DOCUMENT 1 (FIGURE 1)

PROTOCOL

Entitling: (usually the corporate or physical person generating the document, or the corporate person of which the author is an officer) "The United Church of Canada"

Title: (of the document) "Call to a Minister"

Subject: "Preliminary procedure"

Superscription: (the author of the action) "by Armstrong Pastoral Charge"

TEXT

Datation: Topical — "Zion United Church;" Chronological — "April 21, 1946"

016

UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA

Call to a Minister

(3 copies required)

PRELIMINARY PROCEDURE BY Armstrong PASTORAL CHARGE

Changes desiring to call or invite a Minister must proceed by formal action, according to the terms of the 1938 Manual (Secs. 29, 58, 60).
PROPER NOTICE (AS SET OUT IN SEC. 26) MUST BE GIVEN BEFORE HOLDING A CONGREGATIONAL MEETING

CONGREGATIONAL MEETING of which notice was sent to Church services on April 14 and 21 Place Zion United Church Date April 21, 1946
Chairman Rev. H. J. ... No. present 250

Resolution:—

Let this congregation concur in the recommendation of the Official Board that Rev. J. J. ... be called to his pastoral charge as at July 1st 1946.

VOTE:—For unanimous Against

If the congregation has delegated specific powers to the Official Board or to a special committee, the resolution to this effect must be set out above, and the words "Official Board" or "Special Committee" as the case may be should be inserted here.

MEETING:— Date _____ Chairman _____ No. present _____

Resolution:—

VOTE:—For _____ Against _____

Figure 1: First page of the document "Call to a Minister." Courtesy: United Church of Canada British Columbia Conference Archives.

The Call

We, the undersigned, office bearers and members in full membership of the United Church of Canada in the Armstrong Pastoral Charge, being desirous of promoting the work of God and the good of His Church, and having satisfied ourselves that Rev. F. H. Rummells B.A., B.D. is possessed of qualities and ministerial gifts suitable for the advancement of the Kingdom of God among us, do hereby invite him to undertake the office of Minister in the Armstrong Pastoral Charge, and hereby promise him on his acceptance of this call that we shall render him due respect, encouragement and loyalty. We further undertake to pay him the annual salary of \$ 1600.00 in monthly instalments, together with a furnished parsonage or manse and a vacation of four weeks each year. We agree also to pay his moving expenses (in accordance with Sec. 58 (d) of the Manual). * Pension Assessment

Dated this Twentieth day of April 19 46

In witness whereof we have subscribed our names.

(Officials will state their offices—as Elder, Steward, Treasurer, Clerk—opposite their signatures).

<u>Arthur Marshall</u>	Elder
<u>W. F. Youngblood</u>	"
<u>E. J. Jamieson</u>	"
<u>J. P. Jamieson</u>	"
<u>W. M. McBurnell</u>	"
<u>J. J. Parks</u>	Elder
<u>James Bellis</u>	Steward
<u>E. L. Stephens</u>	"
<u>Harvey Brown</u>	"
<u>Geo. Smith</u>	"
<u>H. A. Fraser</u>	Elder
<u>Mal. Klassen</u>	Steward
<u>Geo. R. Pringle</u>	Elder
<u>D. Workman</u>	Elder
<u>D. G. Bay</u>	Elder
<u>D. Noble</u>	Steward
<u>W. J. Bradley</u>	

Figure 2: Second page of the document "Call to a Minister." Courtesy: United Church of Canada British Columbia Conference Archives.

Mrs. E. Gray
 Mrs. May Miller
 L. Thomson
 Mrs. M. D. Wilson
 Mrs. Barbara Jamieson
 Mrs. W. D. Youngblood
 Hazel Lockhart
 Mrs. L. Carscallan
 F. W. North
 Mrs. F. W. North
 Mrs. J. Patten
 Mrs. Jas. Jamieson
 Mrs. S. Blumenthal
 G. K. Landon
 E. J. Miles
 Mrs. W. E. Landon
 Mrs. H. Brown
 Mrs. J. Macdonald
 Mrs. J. W. Phillips

Norman Macdonald
 Ursula Prouse
 Mrs. E. Webber
 Mrs. Myles Macdonald
 H. Seal
 Mrs. E. Norman
 Mrs. W. F. Seal
 Mrs. J. D. Shepherd
 John Shepherd
 Mrs. Stella Fisher
 Franklin Norman
 Mrs. Stella
 Mrs. J. G. Bingle
 Copied from this list
 J. Jamieson
 Club
 Beat Campbell
 Hilda Gander
 Marie Hoyt
 Mrs. F. Hoyt
 Ruby Wells
 Mrs. G. Kenfield
 Ruth Prouse

(Attach such additional sheets for signatures as may be required).
 It is desirable that Adherents also subscribe to this Call, and for this purpose a sheet may be attached setting out that—"The undersigned adherents of _____ Pastoral Charge concur in the call to Rev. _____ and pledge him their loyalty.
 Dated the _____ day of _____ 19____".
 Rawliffe Boes
 Ralph Ardilbert

Figure 3: Third page of the document "Call to a Minister." Courtesy: United Church of Canada British Columbia Conference Archives.

State here the date _____ two copies of this document are mailed to the Secretary of the
Presbytery in which the Charge calling is located, and the date _____ one copy is mailed
to the Minister called.
(The signatures to the Call on the two copies sent to Presbytery, except those of the officials of the Charge, may be copied or sum-
marised if attested by an official).

REMARKS:—

Signature of the official of the Charge forwarding this document. { Name R. J. Love
Address Greenway, B.C.
Office Cariboo

PRESBYTERY ACTION
(Manual, Sec. 73 (p))

Date April 22nd of receipt by R. J. Love Secretary of Farloops Okanagan Presbytery

Date April 22nd of notification (by mailing one copy of this document) to Cariboo
Presbytery to which the called Minister belongs.

Date April 30th of transmitting this document to the Settlement Committee by the a committee of
Cariboo Presbytery, which recommends to the Settlement Committee that:

Rev. F. E. Rennie, B.A. B.D. of West United
Church Prince George be appointed to its
pastoral charge of Zion United Church, Armstrong
as from July 1, 1946

Signature of Presbytery official transmitting this document to the Settlement Committee:
Name A. W. Henderson Office Secretary

Figure 4: Fourth page of the document "Call to a Minister." Courtesy: United Church of Canada British Columbia Conference Archives.

Attestation: “Rev. R.J. Love”

Narration: “Congregational Meeting . . . 21st” “No. present 250”

Disposition: “Resolution: That . . . July 1st, 1946 . . . Unanimous”

Eschatocol: (empty in this document)

PERSONS

Author: the Congregation of Armstrong Pastoral Charge

Addressees: Kamloops-Okanagan Presbytery and Cariboo Presbytery.¹³

Writer: Chairman, Rev. R.J. Love

TYPE OF JURIDICAL ACT

*Concurrence in decision of designated constitutional representative (which is the Official Board).

*Proof of valid procedure.

TYPE OF DOCUMENT

*Private, but in the context of the United Church, having many characteristics of a public document (parties acting in official rather than personal capacities, and procedure is imposed by the church).

*Probative: the act is oral, but requires written form as evidence that the act was carried out in a valid way.

*Original.

INTRINSIC ELEMENTS — DOCUMENT 2 (FIGURES 2 AND 3)

PROTOCOL

Title: “The Call”

TEXT

Superscription: “We, the undersigned . . . Armstrong Pastoral Charge.”

Preamble: “being desirous . . . Church.”

Narration: “and having . . . God among us.”

Inscription: “Rev. F.E. Runnalls, B.A., B.D.”¹⁴

Disposition: “do hereby . . . Pension Assessment.”¹⁵

ESCHATOCOL

Datation: “Dated this . . . April 1946.”

Corroboration: “In witness . . . our names.”

Attestations: “Arthur Marshall, Elder . . . J.E. Jamieson.”¹⁶

Datation: (topical) Armstrong, B.C.

Qualification of Signatures: Officers of Session, and Clerk of Session.

PERSONS

Author: Armstrong Pastoral Charge.

Addressee: Rev. F.E. Runnalls.

Writer: J.E. Jamieson, Clerk of Session.

Subscribers: Officer bearers and members of Armstrong Pastoral Charge, and J.E. Jamieson, Clerk of Session. The officers and members sign as witnesses, but also as representative authors of the action, since the Pastoral Charge is made up of officers and members.

TYPE OF JURIDICAL ACT

*Call to a Minister

TYPE OF DOCUMENT

*Private, dispositive, an authentic copy.¹⁷

*Document name "The Call."

INTRINSIC ELEMENTS — DOCUMENT 3 (FIGURE 4)

PROTOCOL

Title: "Presbytery Action."

Narration: "Date . . . belongs."

Datation: "April 30."

Inscription: "transmitting this document to the Settlement Committee."

Superscription: "by a committee of Cariboo Presbytery."

TEXT

Disposition: "which recommends . . . July 1, 1946."

ESCHATOCOL

Attestation: "R. W. Henderson."

Qualification of Signature: "Secretary."

PERSONS

Author: Committee of Cariboo Presbytery.

Addressee: Settlement Committee.

Writer: R.W. Henderson, Secretary of Presbytery.

Subscriber: same as writer.

TYPE OF JURIDICAL ACT

*Recommendation of concurrence with the Call as forwarded.

TYPE OF DOCUMENT

*Private, dispositive, original.

*Document name "Presbytery Action."

It can be seen that there are essentially two phases to the process of diplomatic analysis. To extend the analogy of the grammatical exercise, the first is labelling, applying the standard vocabulary of general diplomatics to the "parts of speech" of the document. The second is the continuous extrapolation of further information from the data revealed by the naming process. The purpose motivating this exercise is to employ diplomatics to understand the "generation, form, and function of a particular document" (the Call), and thereby to make useful inferences about the operation of a "specific administration" (the United Church of Canada). The success of the endeavour can best be judged by exploring what has been gained by thus "parsing" the Call to a Minister.

We can now precisely identify a great deal about the document which we could perhaps have initially recognized only vaguely. The specialized vocabulary of diplomatics gives the user a means of thinking and talking about quite minute fragments of the document. Most importantly in this case, an early unsuccessful attempt by this author to force what appeared to be one document into the framework of the diplomatic analysis quickly revealed that physical clues can be misleading: there were in fact three documents, which together comprise one procedure. The pool of labels provided by diplomatics consists of the totality of elements we might expect to find in any document. Since diplomatics leads the user to search for "predicted" elements, it also enables the user to identify information which is missing from the document. Document 1 of the Call provides a good example. It is not possible, using diplomatic analysis alone, to determine the identity of the addressee, because the "inscription" is absent. In the absence of any Eschatocol (concluding portion of the document), the identity of the writer is also debatable. There are two advantages to be gained from knowing what we do not know. The first is that we can ask better questions of alternate sources of information, such as the United Church *Manual* of 1938. The second advantage is that the gaps identified by diplomatics indicate a weakness in the design of the document; records and forms managers can use this information to improve the design of future forms.

Finally, what we are now able to say about the form of the document leads naturally to function; just as the labels of a grammatical system identify the functional parts of a sentence, so the vocabulary of diplomatics identifies the functional fragments of a document. Having thus understood function minutely within the document, the diplomatist is well prepared to understand the function of the document as a whole, and it is at this point that the process of extrapolation begins.

The "disposition" is the core of any document since it states the intended action — the function — of the document.¹⁸ (That said, it must be noted that the disposition is frequently missing from probative documents, because their function is invariably to prove some other oral or written act.) Within the procedure of the Call to a Minister, we find three juridical acts, the first of which gives rise to the other two. The invitation to

F.E. Runnalls sets in motion the process of congregational corroboration and its documentation. Transmission of authorized copies of the document to the concerned Presbyteries results in the third action of the procedure: the recommendation, "with approval, or disapproval, or 'simpliciter'," of Presbytery to the Settlement Committee.¹⁹ Function, clearly, is a complex thing; it operates within the document; the document has a discrete purpose of its own, and it has what might be called an environmental function. That is to say, each act as manifest in a document is at once the result of procedural antecedents and the instigator of consequences. The discrete purpose is given force through compilation of the document, but the consequences cannot be realized until the document is transmitted to, and received by, the addressee.

Other formal elements surrounding the "disposition" couch it manifestly in the proper procedures which generated it, and describe the document's journey to its intended result. We can retrace the generation and transmission of the Call through careful attention to the Protocol, to the "narration" section of the text, and to the Eschatocol, in the following way. On 14 April 1946, the first of two "proper" notices was given of a congregational meeting concerning the call to a new minister. On 20 April, the Official Board of Armstrong Pastoral Charge met and extended an official call by means of a document issued in triplicate and witnessed by officers and members of the charge. On the following day, second notice of the congregational meeting was given, and the meeting took place. By unanimous vote, the congregation concurred in the decision of their board. A document attesting to this concurrence was compiled, again in triplicate. The two documents, originals and copies, were then forwarded by the Clerk of Session to their intended destinations.

Correct identification of the persons participating in the actions is essential in determining which documents are original and which are copies, and here we are not aided by the gaps and uncertainties encountered in Document 1. It is certain that Rev. Runnalls, as addressee, received the original of Document 2, and that the Presbyteries received authentic copies. (In this case, clues are not provided by the obvious use of such copying techniques as carbon paper; each of the three copies was executed by hand.) However, is the addressee of Document 1 the two Presbyteries concerned, Rev. Runnalls, or all three? The United Church *Manual* seems to suggest, although not conclusively, that the purpose of this document is to provide Presbytery with information which that body needs in order to fulfil its supervisory role.²⁰ This author has therefore decided in favour of the document in hand as being one of the two originals, with an authenticated copy being in the hands of Rev. Runnalls.

To continue the trail, Kamloops Presbytery received two copies of the Call (now containing two documents) on 22 April, and on the same day forwarded one of them to the called minister's presbytery. On 30 April, Cariboo Presbytery compiled and forwarded an original document to the Settlement Committee of British Columbia Conference, recommending that the committee appoint Rev. Runnalls to the pastoral charge of Zion United Church. That document, bound together with the copy of the Call and with the original congregational concurrence, remained with the Settlement Committee, becoming part of its archival accumulation.

We have examined form, function, generation, and transmission of the Call to a Minister. What light has the process shed on authority in the United Church of Canada? The words "authority" and "author" both derive from the Greek word "authentēs," which means "one who does a thing himself." In analysing — labelling — the formal

elements of the Call, we isolate the superscription, which identifies the author of the action for us. We thus discover that, in the United Church, it is the congregation which is empowered to “do this thing itself,” first through its designated board, and then through the committee of the whole. Presbytery only “authors” a recommendation, and it is clear from the prescribed narration enforced by the form, that Presbytery’s primary function is inspection and transmission of the documents.²¹ However, we must resort to the content of Document 3 to discover that the Settlement Committee will, at some point, author the appointment of the new minister. An apparent contradiction surfaces; if the congregation can, on its own initiative, issue a call with various attendant commitments, and the minister can, presumably, accept or refuse the invitation on his own account, what is the role of Presbytery and the Settlement Committee in the affair? All that can be inferred from this set of documents in isolation is that, whereas the Congregation has the power to make certain important decisions, its authority is not unchecked by higher courts of the church.

What emerges, therefore, is a minutely precise understanding of the documentation of a single procedure, and a set of well-defined questions. We have not discovered what precedents led to the need to call a minister, or to the decision to call a particular individual. Neither can we discover the procedures consequent upon the Call: how Runnalls would accept or reject the call; by what formalities the Settlement Committee would appoint him, and the like. We do not understand in any precise way the authority of either Presbytery or the Settlement Committee. The present exercise certainly indicates that one means of exploring that wider context would be the application of diplomatic analysis to a wider selection of documents concerning the settlement of ministers. The exercise also makes clear, however, that it will be necessary to employ other tools of the archivist’s trade in order to corroborate the discoveries of diplomatics and to address questions left unanswered by diplomatics.

It will be necessary to make a study of the **Law** which governs the United Church, in order to learn more about the procedures leading up to and following the Call, and more about the powers vested in the various courts of the church. The **History** of church union, and the politics of the United Church’s three founding denominations — Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational — must be explored in order to understand the apparent contradiction between congregational authority and the hierarchical checks on it. Finally, although this document has been encountered in a somewhat artificial context, it is in fact part of a large archival accumulation. It will therefore be possible to corroborate much of what has been said about the documents and about the United Church through the application of **Archival Theory** to the document merged once more with the archives of the British Columbia Conference of the United Church of Canada.

In conclusion, one can state that diplomatics provides a rigorous and precise means of examining the elemental archival unit, and thereby serves to sharpen both our individual perceptions and the other tools in the kit of the compleat Canadian archivist.²²

Notes

- * The author gratefully acknowledges the advice, assistance, and patience of Professor Luciana Duranti, Master of Archival Studies Programme, University of British Columbia, and of Bob Stewart, Archivist of the British Columbia Conference of the United Church of Canada.

- 1 Luciana Duranti, "Diplomatics: New Uses for an Old Science," *Archivaria* 28 (Summer 1989), pp. 7-24, and subsequent articles to be published in following issues. The reader is emphatically referred to Duranti's series for a thorough introduction to the theory and uses of general diplomatics.
- 2 Hugh A. Taylor, "Transformation in the Archives: Technological Adjustment or Paradigm Shift?," *Archivaria* 25 (Winter 1987-88), pp. 16, 18; and Barbara L. Craig, "Meeting the Future by Returning to the Past: A Commentary on Hugh Taylor's Transformations," *ibid.*, p. 9.
- 3 Duranti, *op. cit.*, p. 10, expands on the relationship between records management and diplomatics.
- 4 Paola Carucci, *Il Documento Contemporaneo. Diplomatica e Criteri di Edizione*, (Roma, 1987), p. 11, cited by Duranti, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
- 5 R. Dudley Edwards and Ailsa C. Holland, "Teaching Archival Studies in an Irish University," *Archivaria* 4 (Summer 1977), pp. 25-32; Christopher N.L. Brooke, "The Teaching of Diplomatic," *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (April 1970), pp. 1-9; Luciana Duranti, "Education and the Role of the Archivist in Italy," *The American Archivist* 51 (Summer 1988), pp. 346-355. It becomes clear upon perusal of these articles that diplomatics, although present in most curricula, receives more or less emphasis in different European countries.
- 6 Terry Eastwood, "Nurturing Archival Education in the University," *The American Archivist* 51 (Summer 1988), p. 248.
- 7 Duranti, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
- 8 Brooke, *op. cit.*, p. 2, is critical of the grammatical approach: "The formal exposition of the elements of a document, studied like a grammatical exercise, represents an extreme in the study and teaching of diplomatic with which I have little sympathy." Nevertheless, this author has borrowed the image happily, since it aptly describes what follows; Brooke concedes that sound grammar is essential to diplomatics, if it is to serve the higher ends which he subsequently outlines in his article.
- 9 Luciana Duranti, "Diplomatics: New Uses for an Old Science (Part II)," *Archivaria* 29 (Winter 1989-90), p. 3.
- 10 Archives of the British Columbia Conference, United Church of Canada, "Call to a Minister," Settlement Committee Papers, Box 1, File "1946."
- 11 This document presents itself as a single physical item although, as will be seen, it contains three separate documents, or "actions." However, it is not inappropriate to accept the single item as such for purposes of diplomatic analysis of its extrinsic elements; the presentation of three acts in one inseparable physical unit is not accidental, and reveals much about the United Church's view of the due procedure which surrounds the Call to a Minister. Therefore, one analysis of extrinsic elements is presented, followed by three analyses of intrinsic elements.
- 12 A typical analysis of the extrinsic elements would also include elements such as special signs, and seals. Where certain elements are lacking, however, no reference is made to them in the analysis.
- 13 If this document is examined in isolation, it is not evident from internal evidence who the addressee might be. Instructions about disposition of copies of the document on the last page reveal the necessary information, as does Section 73 of the United Church *Manual*, 1938: "These calls or invitations, which must be in writing, should be examined by Presbytery as to their validity and the circumstances under which they were given." Indeed, it is tempting to view this document (which precedes the actual Call physically, but follows the Call chronologically) as nothing but an extended corroboration of the Call proper. It is interesting to note that, after a period of experimentation with this document, or group of documents through the 1970s, the present-day version of the Call altogether eliminates this page, merely including as Narration that a duly constituted meeting was held on a certain date.
- 14 The superscription and inscription, which identify the author and the addressee respectively, would appear more typically in the Protocol; however, in this case they are clearly inseparable from the text.
- 15 The disposition states the intended action of the document, and the associated material obligations; by contrast, the preamble reiterates the ideal motivations which precede the actions, while the narration states the precedents.
- 16 It should be noted that the last nine lines are transcribed from an "other list," and that transcription is validated by J.E. Jamieson, Clerk of Session. It is required that, on the copies of the documents which are forwarded to Presbytery, only the signatures of the officials of the Charge be originals.
- 17 This is one of the copies which was transferred to Kamloops Presbytery and subsequently, through Cariboo Presbytery, to the Settlement Committee of the British Columbia Conference. The original would be in the possession of the minister called. The physical presentation of this group of documents provides us with a diplomatic curiosity, because we have an original addressed to Presbytery (Document 1), an authentic copy of a document addressed to Rev. Runnalls (Document 2), and an original, as will be seen, addressed to the Settlement Committee, all in the format of a single physical item.

- 18 See "Diplomatics," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th ed., p. 809, for brief definitions of the various parts of a document, as well as for an overview of the history of diplomatics.
- 19 United Church of Canada, *The Manual of the United Church of Canada: Constitution and Government* (Toronto, 1938), Section 73-p, p. 76.
- 20 Ibid. See note 14.
- 21 This is a reference to the fill-in-the-blank narration of the documents' transmission from Presbytery to Presbytery to Settlement Committee, on the fourth page of the document.
- 22 Both Luciana Duranti, "Diplomatics: New Uses for an Old Science," and Terry Eastwood, *op. cit.*, develop well the notion of the archival tool kit.