Articles
Archivalterity: Rethinking Original Order*

HEATHER MACNEIL

RÉSUMÉ Même si leurs objets d'analyse sont dif férents, la critique textuelle tradi-tionnelle et la théorie classique du classement archivistique traitent de questions rela-tives à l'authenticité. La critique textuelle vise à rapprocher le texte littéraire le plus près possible de sa forme originale et authentique, alors que le classement archivis-tique tente de reconstituer l'ordre « authentique » – c'est-à-dire l'ordre original – d'un ensemble de documents. Dans les deux cas, l'originalité et l'authenticité sont intime-ment liées à l'identification et à la détermination de l'intention finale de l'auteur . Au cours des vingt dernières années, on a assisté à l'émer gence de nouveaux courants de théorie textuelle qui ont remis en question la théorie de l'intention finale de l'auteur et qui ont étendu la portée de la critique textuelle au-delà des textes littéraires pour inclure des textes culturels de toute sorte. Ces courants soutiennent que le texte culturel – que ce soit un texte littéraire, artistique ou architectural – n'est pas fixe ou stable à un moment précis dans le temps, mais qu'il est dans un état continuel de devenir, étant réinterprété (« *resituated* ») et « re-contextualisé » selon dif férents envi-ronnements et par dif férents experts. Ce texte explore comment ont été traitées les questions d'authenticité, d'originalité et d'intention dans le contexte de la critique textuelle traditionnelle, il examine certaines façons dont les nouveaux courants de critique textuelle ont contesté cette tradition et il présente les répercussions de cette nouvelle perspective sur la théorie archivistique du classement.

ABSTRACT Although their objects of analysis are dif ferent, traditional textual criti-
cism and the classical archival theory of arrangement deal with issues of authenticity .
Textual criticism aims to restore a literary text as closely as possible to its original,
authentic form, while archival arrangement seeks to reconstruct the "authentic," mean-
ing original, order of a body of records. In both fields, originality and authenticity are
closely tied to the identification and stabilization of final authorial intentions. Over the
last twenty years, new streams of textual scholarship have emer ged, which challenge
the theory of final authorial intentions and extend the scope of textual criticism
beyond literary works to cultural texts of various kinds.   This scholarship ar gues that
cultural texts – whether literary, artistic, or architectural – are not fixed or stabilized at
one moment in time; rather , they are in a continuous state of becoming, as they are
resituated and recontextualized in dif ferent environments and by dif ferent authorities.
This article explores how issues of authenticity , originality, and intentionality have
been discussed in the context of traditional textual criticism, some of the ways in
which new streams of textual scholarship are challenging that tradition, and the impli-
cations of that challenge for the archival theory of arrangement.

Cultural texts, irrespective of their medium or mode of appearance, are continually
being remade … Art is not something that gets finished when it gets signed or exhibit-
ed, just as a work of literature is not finished when it gets published.[1]

The provenance of a given record or body of records consists of the social and techni-
cal processes of the records' inscription, transmission, contextualization, and interpre-
tation which account for its existence, characteristics, and continuing history.[2]

Introduction

In "Many Paths to Partial Truths," Elisabeth Kaplan suggests there are
instructive analogies to be drawn between archival studies and other disci-
plines that are grappling with similar issues and concerns. [3] Cross-disciplinary
comparisons, she maintains, "can help us to view our field in a lar ger context,
shedding new light on familiar thought and practice, reorienting us toward the
broader intellectual climate in which we work." [4] Kaplan's chosen comparison
is between archival studies and anthropology , and their respective approaches
to issues of representation, objectivity, and power. The opening quotations for
the present article – the first by an editorial theorist, the second by an archival
theorist – suggest that there are also useful points of comparison between
archival studies and textual criticism, since both share a concern with the

---

1   Joseph Grigely, *Textualterity: Art, Theory and Textual Criticism* (Ann Arbor, 1995), p. 32.
2   Tom Nesmith, "Still Fuzzy But More Accurate: The Ghosts of Archival Theory," *Archivaria*
     47 (Spring 1999), p. 146.
3   Elisabeth Kaplan, "Many Paths to Partial Truths: Archives, Anthropology, and the Power of
     Representation," *Archival Science* 2 (2002), pp. 209–20.
4   Ibid., p. 211.

transmission, preservation, and ongoing history of "authentic" cultural texts. Although their objects of analysis are dif ferent, traditional textual criticism and the classical archival theory of arrangement deal with issues of authenticity. Textual criticism aims to restore a literary text as closely as possible to its original, authentic form, while archival arrangement seeks to reconstruct the "authentic," meaning original, order of a body of records. In both fields, originality and authenticity are closely tied to the identification and stabilization of final authorial intentions.

Over the last twenty years or so, new streams of textual scholarship have emerged, which challenge the theory of final authorial intentions and, in some cases, redefine the term "text" itself to include "not only … written materials but also … painting, architecture, information systems and … all attempts at representation, whatever form this may take." [5] This scholarship ar gues in various ways that cultural texts – whether literary , artistic, or architectural – are not fixed or stabilized at one moment in time; rather, they are in a continuous state of becoming, as they are resituated and recontextualized in dif ferent environments and by dif ferent authorities. This article explores how authenticity, originality, and intentionality have been discussed in the context of traditional textual criticism, some of the ways in which new streams of textual scholarship are challenging that tradition, [6] and the implications of that challenge for the archival theory of arrangement.

Authenticity and Final Authorial Intentions

For more than seventy-five years, the editing of literary texts within the Anglo-American tradition has been dominated by the "authorial" or "intentionalist" school of textual criticism. According to that school, as literary texts are printed and disseminated they move further and further away from the author's control and, consequently , detached from whatever intentions the

---

5   Stuart Sim, ed., *The Routledge Critical Dictionary of Postmodern Thought* (New York, 1999), s.v. "text."
6   While the present article focuses on the writings of editorial theorists, it is worth noting that a number of the issues these theorists explore have also been studied by literary theorists, cultural critics, and philosophers. Textual scholarship's questioning of authorial intention, its rethinking of the nature of textuality, and its emphasis on the indeterminate and always unfinished meaning of a text, for example, are significant tropes in the post-structuralist writings of Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, and Jacques Derrida, among others. For Barthes, see "The Death of the Author," *Image, Music, Text*, trans. Stephen Heath (New York, 1977), pp. 142–48 and *S/Z*, trans. Richard Miller (Oxford, UK, 1990). For Derrida, see "Signature, Event, Context," trans. Samuel Weber and Jef frey Mehlmann, *Glyph 1* (1977), repr. in *Limited Inc* , ed. Gerald Graf f (Evanston, 1988), pp. 1–24. For Foucault, see "What is an Author," trans. Josué V. Harari, *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*, ed. Josué V. Harari (Ithaca, 1979), repr. in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York, 1984), pp. 101–20.

---

author had.[7] The goal of textual criticism is to "reconstruct as accurately as possible the text finally intended by the author."[8] Under this premise, the task of the editor is to trace the history of a text's transmission in order to establish the "copy-text," meaning the text that carries the greatest authority with regard to the author's intentions. Later versions of the text are then consulted for the purpose of emending the copy-text wherever it can be shown that later, the author had in fact introduced substantive changes. The result of these efforts is an "ideal" or "eclectic" edition, i.e., one that incorporates features from various versions of the text. David Greetham has described the eclectic edition as "the 'text that never was' (but, by implication, *ought* to have been, in the best of all possible worlds, since it construct[s] authorial intention [in spite of] the testimony of individual documents)."[9]

The procedures of modern textual criticism have their roots in classical scholarship and its genealogical approach to the transmission of texts:

Lacking the author's original documents, possessing only a more or less extensive set of later manuscripts, the classical editor developed procedures for tracing the internal history of these late manuscripts. The aim was to work out textual errors by revealing the history of their emergence. Ultimately, the method sought to "clear the text" of its corruptions and, thereby, to produce (or approximate) – by subtraction, as it were – the lost original documents, the "authoritative text."[10]

Textual editors dealing with modern literary works operate under somewhat different circumstances. Instead of being faced with a paucity of authorial texts, modern editors frequently face an overabundance of them, including draft copies, corrected drafts, fair copies, corrected and uncorrected proofs, and so forth. In consequence, the "finally intended" text has replaced the "lost original" as the object of criticism.[11]

Although there is some disagreement on this point, editors of modern eclectic editions generally maintain that the version of the author's text that expresses most clearly the author's final intentions – and should, therefore, serve as the copy-text – is a final authorial manuscript rather than an early print edition.[12] The rationale for preferring the authorial manuscript is that

---

7   Grigely, p. 22.
8   G. Thomas Tanselle, "The Varieties of Scholarly Editing," in *Scholarly Editing: A Guide to Research*, ed. D.C. Greetham (New York, 1995), p. 16.
9   D.C. Greetham, *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction* (New York, 1994), p. 334 (emphasis in the original).
10   Jerome McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Charlottesville [1983], 1992), p. 15.
11   Ibid., pp. 29–30.
12   See, for example, Fredson Bowers, "Some Principles for Scholarly Editions of Nineteenth-Century American Authors," in *Bibliography and Textual Criticism: English and American*

contamination, in the form of printing-house punctuation, begins to creep in as soon as a literary text moves from manuscript to print.   This preference suggests that, although they operate under different circumstances, editors of modern eclectic editions see their task as essentially the same as that of the classical scholar: to clear the text of corruption in order to produce the authentic, now meaning finally intended, text.[13]

The ideology that underlies the theory of final intentions is a Romantic one that imagines a solitary, autonomous author "creating a work in an 'originary moment' of composition."[14] Since the 1980s, that ideology and with it, the theory of final intentions, have come under intense scrutiny by textual critics such as Jerome McGann. McGann points to numerous examples of authors whose work is inextricably linked with a variety of collaborators – editors, publishers, friends, and relations – making it impossible to determine the authors' final intentions or to separate their intentions from those of their collaborators.[15] For McGann, these examples demonstrate that, "the author's final intentions may not exist, may never have existed, and may never exist at any future time."[16] Moreover, by focusing all their attention on revealing the mind of the author who created the literary work, the procedures of eclectic editing isolate the authorial text from its subsequent social distribution, that is, from the institutions that transmitted that text to the public; in so doing, they deprive the literary work of much of its meaning. The goal of eclectic editions is "to make hypothetical texts real." But such editions "also make real texts hypothetical by effacing their presence and, by default, their historical drift."[17]

McGann contends that, "because literary works are fundamentally social rather than personal or psychological products they do not even acquire an artistic form of being until their engagement with an audience has been determined."[18] He proposes an alternative, social theory of textual criticism, in which the entire history of a literary work – from composition to reception and beyond – is accommodated within the scope of textual scholarship. Variant versions of a literary text are not "corruptions" to be eradicated but, rather, valid texts worth studying in their own right, and the task of the textual

---

Literature, 1700 to the Present, eds. O.M. Brack and Warner Barnes (Chicago, 1969), pp. 194–201; G. Thomas Tanselle, "Greg's Theory of Copy-Text and the Editing of American Literature," *Selected Studies in Bibliography* (Charlottesville, 1979), pp. 245–308.

13 McGann, p. 21.
14 Greetham, *Textual Scholarship*, p. 37.
15 For McGann, the prototypical example is Byron. See McGann, pp. 51–54.
16 Ibid., p. 90.
17 Grigely, p. 30.
18 McGann, pp. 43–44.

---

editor is not to reconstruct final authorial intentions through the establishment of a single definitive text but, rather , to preserve a record of dif ferent intentions through the publication of multiple, historically situated, texts.[19]

Authorial Intentions and *Textualterity*

The writings of McGann and other proponents of the so-called "sociological school" of editing, reflect a growing recognition that final authorial intentions are both ambiguous and unstable, and a growing acceptance that a literary text, which has endured over time is, inevitably , a conflation of multiple intentions and competing authorities. Variations on this theme may be found in the writings of textual scholars who are looking to find a theoretical orientation for textual criticism that is relevant not just to literary texts but to other kinds of cultural texts: paintings, architecture, film, and so forth. Rather than focus on the objects themselves, this stream of textual scholarship explores the ways in which the meaning and authenticity of cultural texts of various kinds are shaped by the processes of their production, dissemination, and preservation.

In some studies, a specific analogy is drawn between the eclectic editing of literary texts and the restoration of works of art because in both cases, the search for the "authentic" is, by and lar ge, a search for final authorial intentions. Editorial theorists have suggested, for example, that the controversy over the "radical cleaning" of the Sistine Chapel ceilings from 1984 to 1994, may be read as a debate over final intentions. Proponents of the cleaning maintained that, by removing the "grime of the centuries," the cleaning had restored the colours of the frescoes to their original brightness, revealing the Sistine ceiling as Michelangelo himself saw it and as he intended the spectator to see it.[20] Critics of the cleaning, however, insisted that what the conservators

---

19 Heather MacNeil and Bonnie Mak, "Constructions of Authenticity," *Library Trends*, vol. 56, no. 1 (Summer 2007), p. 36. For cross-disciplinary explorations of the same theme, see George Bornstein and Ralph G. Williams, eds., *Palimpsest: Editorial Theory in the Humanities* (Ann Arbor, 1993); Philip Cohen, ed., *Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory* (Charlottesville, 1991). For variations on this theme in Medieval and Renaissance literary studies, see Mar garet De Grazia, *Shakespeare Verbatim: The Reproduction of Authenticity and the 1790 Apparatus* (Oxford, UK, 1991); Leah Marcus, *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespear e, Marlowe, Milton* (London, 1996); Thomas A. Prendergast and Barbara Kline, eds., *Rewriting Chaucer. Culture, Authority, and the Idea of the Authentic Text, 1400-1602* (Columbus, 1999).

20 See Kathleen Weil-Garris Brandt, "The Grime of the Centuries is a Pigment of the Imagination," *Palimpsest*, pp. 257–70, and "T wenty-Five Questions about Michelangelo' s Sistine Ceiling," *Apollo Magazine* (December 1987), p. 392. For a more detailed discussion of the Sistine restoration in relation to final intentions, see also MacNeil and Mak, "Constructions of Authenticity," pp. 30–33.

---

termed "grime" constituted an essential part of the   frescoes.21 In editorial terms, the radical cleaning had "removed intention by restoring the frescos to a pre-ontological state, before the 'pattern' or 'weave' of the text was complete." 22

The question some textual scholars ask is whether the weave of the text is ever complete. In *Textualterity*, editorial theorist Joseph Grigely , argues that works of art and architecture, like literary texts, are not fixed at one moment in time; rather , they are continually made, unmade, and remade as they are transmitted over time and space. "T extualterity," or textual dif ference, is the term Grigely uses to characterize the ef fects of transmission on works of art and architecture over time. It reveals itself in acts of "continuous and discontinuous transience." Continuous transience is the natural, cumulative ef fects of time on an object and its progression is slow and linear . It occurs as pigments fade, as grime and soot settle on the surface of a painting or seep into the crevices of a sculpture, or as the foundations of a house shift over time. Discontinuous transience, on the other hand, is associated with rupture and violence, and is usually the result of intentional human   involvement.23 The slashing of Rembrandt's *Night Watch*, the dismantling of Richard Serra's public sculpture *Tilted Arc*, the trimming down of Ariel's penis in Eric Gill's sculpture *Prospero and Ariel* (by the artist himself at the request of the British Broadcasting Corporation, which commissioned the work), as well as the repeated acts of vandalism on the statue of *The Little Mermaid*, are all examples of discontinuous transience.24

Restoration, too, is a form of discontinuous transience because, like other such acts, restoration irretrievably alters and reconfigures the work. The "radical cleaning" of the Sistine ceiling frescoes is a case in point. Its ostensible goal was to achieve   "proximity to original intentions." However , even Kathleen Brandt, a staunch defender of the cleaning admits:

[F]or all its textual sensitivity and conservative practice, the   Vatican cleaning has, forever, changed the way we see Michelangelo's painting. Before cleaning, the ceiling's accretion of darkness gave a sense of historical distance and ratified its status as an "old master ." … Through the Sistine murk, spectators were free to recreate the obscured and distant-seeming images through a personal exercise of fantasy   …. The cleaned Ceiling assertively rejects this imaginative contribution by the viewer and requires a new kind of interaction, defined more highly by the image.25

---

21 James Beck with Michael Daley , *Art Restoration: The Cultur e, the Business, the Scandal* (London, 1993), pp. 63–102.
22 D.C. Greetham, *Theories of the Text* (New York, 1999), p. 56.
23 Grigely, pp. 71–74.
24 Grigely discusses the details of the of *Tilted Arc* and the trimming of *Prospero and Ariel* in ibid., pp. 56–70.
25 Weil-Garris Brandt, "The Grime of the Centuries," p. 265.

Conservators view their ef forts as an attempt to eliminate, or at least mini-mize, the effects of transience on a work. The consequence of their interven-tions, however, is to create yet another layer of transience and embed another set of ideologies and intentions into that work. As Grigely points out, "[l]ike editing, restoration draws attention to the act itself, an act that cannot escape its own discontinuous eventhood, its own ideological present."[26]

If we accept that works of art and architecture are subject to dif ferent intentions and shaped by dif ferent ideologies, what then constitutes the "authentic" text? Grigely poses this question, and illustrates the dif ficulty of answering it, in his account of a controversy that erupted over the restoration of a particular architectural text, a house in East Hampton, New York. The house in question was built in a colonial style in the late eighteenth century and a porch was added in the nineteenth century. When Richard and Elizabeth Lear purchased the house in 1986, they restored some of the colonial ambi-ence, adding, for example, thirty-six inch colonial shingles and a colonial front door. They also hired a contractor to remove the rotting Victorian porch, which was now tilting to the side. Robert Hefner, a local architectural heritage advocate, attempted – in the end unsuccessfully – to prevent the dismantling of the porch, which he described as evidence of the "Boardinghouse Era," a time when homeowners expanded their houses and added porches for the convenience of tourists and boarders who came as paying guests.[27]

Grigely observes:

Inasmuch as the ar gument can be reduced to competing authorities, it pits one time frame against another, restoring an eighteenth-century colonial house or preserving a Victorian emendation from the nineteenth century . Any "conservation" at this point would involve constructing a facsimile or replica, and thereupon become an emenda-tion to a lost emendation. … the questions here ask us what constitutes authenticity and what constitutes intentions – questions that even textual criticism with centuries of discussion about these matters, cannot easily answer.[28]

For Grigely, the clash of temporal aesthetics encapsulates the distinction between "restoration" and "preservation." Whereas "restoration involves temporal dislocation … preservation tries to consolidate both continuous and discontinuous transience within a living present." [29] A similar distinction is implicit in the dif fering aims of eclectic and sociological or historical editing. Eclectic editing aims to restore a text to its intended state, whereas sociologi-

---

26   Grigely, p. 87.
27   Ibid., p. 83.
28   Ibid., pp. 83–84.
29   Ibid., p. 84.

cal editing "aims to preserve a record of different intentions that are manifest at different times."[30]

The new textual scholarship, as represented in the writings of theorists like McGann and Grigely, argues persuasively that literary, artistic, and architectural works do not get fixed at a single point in time; their survival and ongoing preservation and dissemination mean that in an important sense they are in a continuous state of becoming as they age, are resituated, recontextualized, reissued, and restored. This scholarship also underlines the point that alterity – textual change and difference – is as integral to the meaning and authenticity of a cultural text as the final intentions of the artist or author. That being the case, the efforts of editors and conservators might be better spent trying to explain what textual differences mean and why they are there, rather than trying to eradicate those differences.

In the next section, another kind of cultural text – a fonds – will be examined in order to demonstrate that the connection between and among authenticity, originality, and final authorial intentions that underpins traditional textual criticism, is also discernable in the archival theory of arrangement. Although the word "text" is not commonly used by archivists in relation to an archival fonds,[31] the term is an apposite one, because, like literary and artistic texts, a fonds is a form of representation.[32] "Text" derives from the Latin *textere*, "to weave," and, as D.F. McKenzie observes, "refers, not to any specific materials as such, but to their woven state, the web or texture of the materials."[33] What constitutes a text, therefore, "is not the presence of linguistic elements but the act of construction." [34] Describing a fonds as a text draws attention both to its constructed nature and to the process of that construction, i.e., the ways in which a web of records and their relationships is formed and re-formed over time.

Original Order, Authenticity, and Authorial Intentions

At the first International Congress of Archivists and Librarians held in Brussels in 1910, delegates unanimously accepted the principle of provenance; the definition accepted was: "the method of archive organization by which each archival document has to be brought to the archive (fonds) to which it belongs, and within that archive to the series to which it belonged at

---

30 Ibid.
31 An exception is Brien Brothman. See his "Declining Derrida: Integrity, Tensegrity, and the Preservation of Records from Deconstruction," *Archivaria* 48 (Fall 1999), pp. 64–88.
32 Ibid., fn. 5.
33 D.F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge, UK, 1999), p. 13.
34 Ibid., p. 43.

the time the archive was still a living or   ganism."[35] This definition extended the earlier French principle of *respect des fonds* because, unlike the French principle, it included respect for the original order of the records. Original order has exercised a powerful influence on the theory and methodology of archival arrangement ever since.

In classical archival theory , keeping the records of a creator together in their original order – meaning the final order in which the records were actively maintained by that creator [36] – is a fundamental means by which archivists protect the relationships that bind the records within a fonds to each other, to the actions in which the records participate, and to the entity that created them. By protecting this weave of relationships, archivists protect the value of the records as evidence, which Terry Eastwood pithily summarizes as the value of the documents, "as record of what occurred and how it occurred in the context in which it occurred." [37] By preserving and, when necessary , reconstructing, the original order of the records, archivists preserve the identity and integrity and, in that sense, the authenticity, of the creator's fonds.

Underlying the principle of respect for original order   , is a concern with final authorial intentions; authorial is used here in the figurative sense of the originator or creator of something. If we understand intention to be synonymous with the creator 's purpose, aim, or design, the records of that creator constitute the tangible remains of the creator   's intentions and the original order of the records, the final shape of those remains. The implicit connection between original order and final intentions draws on a presumed af   finity between records and their creator , in which the arrangement of the records acts as a kind of mirror of the entity that produced them. In their 1898 *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives*, Muller , Feith, and Fruin described that affinity in the following terms:

… an archival collection [i.e., fonds] comes into being as the result of the activities of an administrative body … and it is always the reflection of the functions of that body . … an archival collection is an or ganic whole, a living or ganism, which grows, takes shape, and under goes changes in accordance with fixed rules. If the functions of the

35   Peter Horsman, "The Last Dance of the Phoenix or The De-discovery of the Archival Fonds," *Archivaria* 54 (Fall 2002), p. 10.

36   The end point of original order has been defined as, "the one untouched since the growth of the papers terminated" in J.C. Fitzpatrick, *Notes on the Car e, Cataloguing, Calendaring and Arranging of Manuscripts* (Washington, 1913), p. 9; and as, "the last arrangement the documents had before finishing their usefulness for the last administrative body which actively used them" in Peter Horsman, "Taming the Elephant: An Orthodox Approach to the Principle of Provenance," in *The Principle of Provenance: Report from the First Stockholm Conference on the Archival Principle of Provenance, 2–3 September 1993* (Stockholm, 1994), p. 58.

37   Terry Eastwood, "How Goes it with Appraisal?" *Archivaria* 36 (Autumn 1993), p. 115.

body change, the nature of the collection changes likewise.[38]

Muller, Feith, and Fruin likened the work of the archivist in reconstructing the original order of a body of records to that of a paleontologist in reconstructing a living organism on the basis of fossil remains. In making that comparison, they acknowledged that like any living organism, a body of records would change its state many times. At the same time, however, the Dutch trio insisted that, also like a paleontologist, the archivist was able to restore "only one particular state of the reconstructed organism."[39] The implications of their comparison are, first, that a body of records that endures over time, inevitably, will reflect a range of intentions and, second, that the archivists' reconstruction of original order entails a certain degree of normalization and idealization of those intentions.

Like the eclectic editors who agree that final authorial intentions are paramount, but disagree on where those final intentions will be located, classical archival theorists agree that the system of arrangement should derive from the original order of the fonds but disagree on how original order is (or should be) made manifest. Samuel Muller interpreted original order to mean a "logical" order based on administrative structure[40]; Theodoor van Reimsdijk, a contemporary of Muller and rival theorist, believed that original order resided more broadly in the administrative process and, therefore, should include, "the records administration proper, the procedures, [and] the registry system."[41] English archival theorist Sir Hilary Jenkinson argued that administrative function should be the guiding principle, in conjunction with documentary form[42]; while German theorist Max Lehmann tied original order specifically to registry classification.[43] For Italian theorist Giorgio Cencetti, original order

---

38 S. Muller, J.A. Feith, and R. Fruin, "The Arrangement of Archival Documents," *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives*, 2nd ed., trans. Arthur H. Leavitt, with new introductions by Peter Horsman, Eric Ketelaar, Theo Thomasson, and Marjorie Rabe Barritt (Chicago, 2003), p. 19.

39 Ibid., p. 71.

40 This interpretation is the one embodied in the 1898 Dutch *Manual*. According to section 16, "[t]he system of arrangement must be based on the original organization of the archival collection, which in the main corresponds to the organization of the archival body that produced it." Ibid., sec. 16, 52.

41 Eric Ketelaar, "Archival Theory and the Dutch Manual," *Archivaria* 41 (Spring 1996), p. 33; see also Horsman, "Last Dance of the Phoenix," pp. 9–10; Horsman, Ketelaar, and Thomassen, "Introduction to the 2003 Issue," *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives*, pp. ix–xii.

42 Hilary Jenkinson, "The Evolution of Archives," *A Manual of Archive Administration* (London [1937], 1965), pp. 104–11.

43 Ernst Posner, "Max Lehmann and the Genesis of the Principle of Provenance," in *Archives and the Public Interest: Selected Essays by Ernst Posner*, ed. Ken Munden, with a new introduction by Angelika Menne-Haritz (Chicago, 2006), p. 40.

manifested itself in the "archival bond," which he defined as the "originary   ,
necessary and determined" relationship between and among records that
participate in the same   activity.[44] These local and national variations may
explain Peter Horsman's comment that, even though the principle of prove-
nance was accepted at the 1910 Congress, it did not necessarily mean the
same thing to archivists from different traditions.[45]

Classical archival theory also recognizes that, like works of art and literary
texts, an aggregation of records that survives over time will be subjected to a
range of interventions by subsequent custodial authorities – rearrangements
by family, friends, biographers, and archivists, among others – and that these
interventions may complicate and obscure the order in which the records were
originally maintained by the creator. For Jenkinson, the primary culprits were,
"the hands of former archivists":

Unfortunately the earlier custodians of the Public Records in England (for example)
have not always been as reasonable as we could wish in their treatment of their
charges. To take only one instance the State Papers are known to have had one classi-
fication in 1545 and to have been re-classified by Sir   Thomas Wilson about 1620 and
again by Sir Joseph   Williamson about 1680; they were then "methodized" between
1764 and 1800; and between 1848 and 1862 came under the State Paper Of fice classi-
fication; all this before they reached the Public Record Office, to undergo arrangement
there.[46]

In such cases, the task of the archivist, like that of the eclectic editor   , is to
undo the damage wrought by previous custodians and restore the records to
the order given them by their creator. Muller, Feith, and Fruin made this point
in no uncertain terms: "Our early archival administrators, who in their inven-
tories pursued a dif ferent purpose from ours, produced until far into the eigh-
teenth century work that is entirely inadequate for present needs. Their highly
superficial arrangement of documents, therefore, not only   *may* but positively
must be modified."[47] Moreover, if the original physical order of the records
deviated from the "logical" order , the physical order had to be emended to
ensure that the two orders mirrored each   other.[48] The belief that archivists

---

44 Gior gio Cencetti, *Scritti archivistici* (Roma, 1970), p. 39. See also Luciana Duranti, "The
    Archival Bond," *Archives and Museum Informatics* 11 (1997), pp. 213–18.
45   Horsman, "Last Dance of the Phoenix," p. 11.
46   Jenkinson, p. 32.
47   Muller, Feith, and Fruin, sec. 16, p. 59.
48   "Introduction to the 2003 Reissue,"   *Manual*, p. xxiii; sec. 50, pp. 125–26. Peter Horsman
    illustrates the consequences of altering the existing physical order of a fonds to make it corre-
    spond to the logical order through a case study of the archives of the town of Dordrecht. See
    "Dirty Hands: A New Perspective on the Original Order," *Archives and Manuscripts* 27 (May
    1999), pp. 47–50.

should restore the original order of records continues to be expressed in contemporary manuals of arrangement and description, albeit in less vehement and more qualified terms.[49]

We have seen how the theory of final intentions is underpinned by a particular ideology concerning the nature of artistic creation, i.e., the author as solitary genius. The principle of original order, for its part, is underpinned by particular ideologies concerning the nature of historical inquiry. Lehmann's articulation of the Prussian principle of original order in the latter part of the nineteenth century, for example, resonated with the ideology of "scientific" history. As Posner observes, the principle corresponded to:

The "historical thinking" of a generation of historians that had come to the archives from the classes of Ranke, Droysen, Sybel and other heroes of a great period of German historiography. The new principle was not just a technical knack. It meant the application of respect for historical growth to the sources of historical research that had come into existence in the course of historical events.[50]

Viewed from the perspective of scientific history, the original order of a body of records was a doorway into the past "as it actually was."

Cencetti's articulation of the principle in the post-World War II period, on the other hand, reflected the influence of Idealist historian and philosopher Benedetto Croce.[51] Croce maintained that, "every true history is contemporary history." For him, the word "contemporary" carried with it two distinct meanings: first, that the past only has meaning in relation to present concerns and, second, that the past is recreated in the present through an act of imagination on the part of the historian. That imaginative reenactment is what transforms the dead remains of the past into a living archive.[52] Following Croce, Cencetti believed the archivist could recreate the life of the entity that generated a body of records by recreating the archival bond between and among those records. As Stefano Vitali explains:

In Cencetti's view, the archive reflects its creator or, more exactly, is the creator itself, in the sense that the original order of the archive, the order given to the archive by its

---

49 See for example, Richard Pearce-Moses, *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology* (Chicago, 2005), s.v. "original order" and "restoration of original order." Available at http://www.archivists.org/glossary/ (accessed 31 July 2008).
50 Posner, p. 41.
51 Interview with Stefano Vitali, 21 June 2005; Maurizio Savoja and Stefano Vitali, "Authority Control for Creators in Italy: Theory and Practice," *Journal of Archival Organization*, vol. 5, nos. 1–2 (2007), p. 123.
52 "Contemporary history comes into being immediately after the act which is being accomplished, as consciousness of that act. … The condition of its existence is that the deed of which the history is told must vibrate in the soul of the historian." Benedetto Croce, *Theory and History of Historiography*, trans. Douglas Ainslie (London, 1921), pp. 11–12.

---

creator, is the manifestation of the administrative structure, the history and, in some way, the very "essence" of the records creator. So the major task of the archivist should be not only to defend the original order but, when necessary, to reconstruct it in order to preserve or reconstruct the creator's structure and history incorporated into the archive.[53]

Viewed from the perspective of "idealist" history, the original order of a body of records was not simply a doorway into the past "as it actually was"; it was a window into the very consciousness of the creator.

Like eclectic editors, then, classical archival theorists view the imposition of intentions – other than those of the creator – as a kind of corruption. Eclectic editors seek to restore a literary text to an imagined historical moment before editorial and other interventions degraded the author's final intentions; in a similar way, archivists seek to restore records to the historical order they were in before rearrangements by subsequent custodians obscured the final intentions of the records creator. The restoration of original order restores the primary affinity between the records and the creator, and in so doing protects the records' meaning and authenticity.

On the other hand, if we draw on the insights of the new textual scholarship, it could be argued that original order, like eclecticism, is, "a form of institutionally sanctioned forgetting,"[54] and that the authenticity and meaning of a body of records is shaped not only by its archival bond but, also, by what we might term a *custodial bond*, meaning the relations that exist between a body of records and the various custodial authorities that interact with the records over time, including archivists and archival institutions. From that perspective, the interventions of subsequent custodians are not a contamination to be eradicated but simply part of the history of the records. In the next section, this alternative perspective will be explored a little further through two case studies that illustrate the archival approximation of Grigely's notion of textualterity, which I am calling *archivalterity*. Archivalterity refers to the acts of continuous and discontinuous change that transform the meaning and authenticity of a fonds as it is transmitted over time and space.

Archivalterity (1): The Bakunin Family Archive

The first case study focuses on the complicated history of the Bakunin Family Archive as recounted by historian John Randolph.[55] According to Randolph,

---

53 Savoja and Vitali, p. 123.

54 Grigely, p. 30.

55 The account that follows is based on two articles written about the Bakunin family and its archive by John Randolph, a professor of Russian history at the University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign. The two articles are: "'That Historical Family': The Bakunin Archive and the

the story of the Bakunin family archive poses "an essential biographical question of how an identity forged out of many heterogeneous elements sustains or loses coherence over time." [56] The Bakunins were an influential, Russian noble family. Mikhail Bakunin was a famous anarchist; his brothers led the liberal faction of the Tver nobility and the Bakunin family's serf estate in Tver province known as Priamukhino was widely considered one of the cradles of Russian idealist philosophy.[57]

In its present incarnation, the Bakunin family archive is "fond number 16" in St. Petersburg's Institute of Russian Literature, also known as Pushkin House. The archive comprises thousands of pages of personal documents: diaries, literary and philosophical manuscripts, and letters. The documents have been arranged by the archivists at Pushkin House into 661 "units of preservation" according to author, with each page numbered in pencil according to this system.[58] The papers also bear the markings of earlier generations of custodians. Alongside the pagination provided by Pushkin House, there are two, sometimes three alternate systems of numeration. The papers are marked throughout with underlinings, exclamations, and editorial comments made by previous custodians of the archive; and they are "punctured by thousands of tiny needle-holes, running up and down their folds" that attest to earlier systems of arrangement.[59]

The names by which fond number 16 is most commonly known – the Bakunin archive or the Priamukhino archive – highlight the domestic origins of the fonds and give the impression that its continuity and identity as a family archive has been maintained, even in the face of its radical physical alteration over time. As Randolph observes, this domestic identity is a little misleading because in many senses,

Fond number 16 is demonstrably not the Bakunin family's archive. Not only has the aggregation been reorganized several times since leaving the family's hands in the early twentieth century, but only a part of the Bakunin household's papers actually entered the collection in the first place. … it is not simply a collection of the Bakunin family's papers, but rather a carefully fashioned subset.[60]

The formation of the archive began in the late eighteenth century when

---

Intimate Theater of History in Imperial Russia, 1780–1925," *The Russian Review* 63 (October 2004), pp. 574–93 and "On the Biography of the Bakunin Family Archive," *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History*," ed. Antoinette Burton (Durham, 2005), pp. 209–31.

56 Randolph, "Biography of the Bakunin Family Archive," p. 211.
57 Randolph, "That Historical Family," p. 595.
58 Randolph, "Biography," p. 212.
59 Ibid., pp. 212–13.
60 Ibid., pp. 213–14.

Mikhail Bakunin's grandparents purchased the family estate Priamukhino. By the late nineteenth century , the Bakunin family archive "was a well-defined object, presented to historians as a neatly bound collection that had been numbered, sorted by years, and sewn into notebooks." [61] The form and composition of the archive were substantially shaped by the spiritual vocation and historical vision of the Bakunin women. The women were deeply committed Philosophical Idealists and Randolph speculates that they used their stewardship of the family archive "to project their values into [the social] institutions … that resisted their direct participation."[62]

   In the early part of the twentieth century , the papers were taken from Priamukhino and eventually ended up, with the permission of the family   , in the hands of the liberal historian Aleksandr Kornilov, who served as the custodian of the archive for a decade. Kornilov used the papers to write a history of Russian social thought "through the prism of noble family life." [63] As he constructed his two-volume history of the Bakunin family , Kornilov took the archive apart and annotated it: the attributions, under -linings, and editorial comments scrawled across many of the letters are presumed to be his. Under his custodianship, the archive not only underwent physical alteration, it also suffered physical disintegration. According to Randolph, "the Bakunin women's carefully sewn reliquary seems to have taken on the appearance of a well-thumbed paperback while in Kornilov' s possession. Indeed its spine cracked under the investigation."[64]

   After his death, the archive was transferred by prior arrangement to Pushkin House. By the time it arrived there in the early 1920s, it was in a state of "chaotic disorder ." It was almost immediately put into the hands of Iurii Steklov, a high-ranking Soviet scholar and journalist char ged by the Bolshevik leadership with preparing a complete academic edition of Mikhail Bakunin's works, which was part of a lar ger project to create a new communist history of the revolutionary movement in Russia. As Steklov worked on his publication project, the archive went through yet more re-or ganizations at his hands. His work on the archive ended in the late 1930s when anarchists were denounced as "principled enemies of Bolshevism," which put an end to any further historical study of Mikhail Bakunin.[65] As for the Bakunin archive, it settled into its home at Pushkin House where, according to Randolph, it underwent "decades of slow and largely secret reorganizations."[66]

---

61   Randolph, "That Historical Family," p. 583.
62   Randolph, "Biography," p. 217.
63   Ibid., p. 220.
64 Ibid.
65   Ibid., p. 223.
66   Ibid., p. 224.

So what then constitutes the original order of the Bakunin family archive and what would it mean to restore that order? In theory, to restore the archive to its original order would entail the reconstruction of the archive in accordance with the order it had at an imagined historical moment – i.e., when the Bakunin family last actively used it – since this is the order that best reflects the creator's final intentions. In practice, though, what it entails is the construction of a facsimile or replica of what we might imagine the original order to have been, based on the surviving evidence (which is scanty) and our present understanding and interpretation of the archive and its creator's intentions.

Even supposing we could approximate the original order of the Bakunin archive, intellectually if not physically, would we not want to make some accommodation for other orders? The form and composition of that archive were shaped by the historical vision of several generations of Bakunin women and then reshaped by the respective visions of a liberal historian, a Soviet scholar, and the archival institution in which it now resides. Each order is an embodied argument about the changing meaning of the archive as it was re-territorialized and recontextualized in different custodial environments, and by different authorities. Each order attests to the intentions of these custodians to memorialize, to monumentalize, and to shape the memory of the Bakunin family. The orders given to the records by their various custodians – or at least what survives of these various orders – are as relevant to the present meaning and authenticity of the archive as the order given to the records by its creator.

The life of the Bakunin Family Archive illustrates a few of the acts of transience – decay, variation, rupture – that are visited upon a body of records as it moves through different historical periods, under the jurisdiction of various authorities that operate under distinct rules of engagement.[67] In the case of the Bakunin Family Archive, most of these acts – at least the ones that are known – occurred *before* it entered Pushkin House. The second case study, which focuses on the early history of the State Archive of Florence, illustrates some of the acts of transience that can occur *after* records enter the custody of an archival institution.

Archivalterity (2): The State Archive of Florence

On 20 February 1852, Grand Duke Leopold II of Tuscany issued a decree instituting a centralized state archive in Florence, the mandate of which was to "preserve, upkeep and make [available] the best of many of the archives of the State in the capital that depended on various offices."[68] When it opened,

---

67   Ibid., p. 213.
68   Stefano Vitali, "The Archive at the Time of Its Institution: The Central Archive of Francesco

the new State Archive of Florence inherited the archives of a wide range of Florentine institutions, many of which had existed in one form or another since the medieval period. Over the centuries, these records had been maintained in numerous archives of concentration, and arranged and rearranged in accordance with the political and administrative needs of their creators and owners.

The first Director of the State Archive was Francesco Bonaini, a professor of legal history at the University of Pisa and known today as the person who introduced the principle of historical method in archival arrangement (*metodo storico*), which is the Italian version of the principle of original order. Bonaini's mission as Director was to transform the State Archive into "a truly historical institution."[69] Liberalizing scholarly access to the Archive's holdings, publishing guides to some of those holdings, and creating a school of diplomatics and paleography alongside the State Archive were a few of the means by which this mission was accomplished.[70]

Bonaini viewed the physical arrangement of the Archive's holdings as yet another means of carrying out his mission. He declared:

The most certain criterion for the arrangement of Archives, comes from thinking about how Archives formed themselves and grew across the centuries.

Every institution is born, has changed and has finished its life. We would say better it has given way to another institution, in some sort of social change, of a need of some circumstance. The testimony of the facts, the succession of events remains in the documents which more or less had an order and some denomination. The first rule then is – respect the fact; the second rule is to establish the fact if it is altered. [71]

Bonaini's notion of *metodo storico* was intimately entwined with his conviction that the order of the records the State Archive had inherited should reflect the history of Florence and Tuscany and, more specifically, the various forms of government that had succeeded one another there. This conviction is evident in the first short guide to the Florentine Archive, which contained the following statement: "We wanted all the archives to continue to represent an institution, a magistracy, but the archives in their entirety offer us the history of the Florentine people and subsequently of the Tuscan government: one

Bonaini," in *The Florence State Archive: Thirteen Centuries of Historical Records*, ed. Rosalia Manno Tolu and Anna Bellinazzi (Florence, 2002), p. 20; English translation of "L'Archivio centrale di Francesco Bonaini," in *L'Archivio di Stato di Firenze* (Firenze, 1995), p. 19.

69   Ibid., p. 20.

70 Ibid.

71   Bonaini, "F. Bonaini al R. Ministero dell'Istruzione pubblica, Firenze, 23 marzo 1867," in Antonio Panella, *Scritti Archivistici*, pubblicazioni degli archivi de stato XIX (Roma, 1955), p. 216. I am indebted to Stefano Vitali for the English translation of Bonaini's words.

should therefore seek a rational organization in history."[72] As Vitali explains, this meant that, "the republican archives would be followed by the Medici and Lorraine archives [and] ordered according to a pattern that was to convey immediately the idea of a systematic development of the history which had created them and which they represented."[73]

Bonaini's arrangement criterion emphasized the primacy of the link between records and their creating institutions, and, according to Vitali, "determined the search for, or at times, the 'invention' of such a link whenever it was more frail and less evident." [74] And so, under Bonaini's direction, the previous orders of the records were re-ordered and reshaped to make them cohere with the history of Florentine and Tuscan institutions. For example, Bonaini divided the archive of the *Magistrato dei pupilli* – a tribunal that dealt with orphans and whose period of existence spanned the periods of the Republic and the Principate – into two fonds: *Magistrato dei pupilli avanti il Principato* (1384-1565) and *Magistrato dei pupilli del Principato* (1531–1808). The impression the division of the archive into two parts created was that the *Magistrato dei pupilli* had experienced a major breakdown in the period between the Republic and the Principate. But from the point of view of the history of the institution and history in general, such breakdown did not occur.[75] As Vitali points out, "the practical application of Bonaini's scheme … sometimes radically altered the original structure of the archives and it was, in part, revised and corrected in the following decades."[76]

The re-ordering of the previous structures of the records in accordance with Bonaini's interpretation of *metodo storico* as well as the subsequent (partial) dismantling of Bonaini's arrangement in the following decades as archivists began to question the consequences of his interpretation, are a useful illustration of how archival institutions shape and reshape records – both physically and intellectually – in accordance with their own rules of engagement. The re-ordering(s) also demonstrate that archival arrangement

---

72   Vitali, "The Archive at the Time of Its Institution," p. 20.

73   Ibid.

74   Ibid.

75   Interview with Stefano Vitali, 21 June 2005. For the description of the two fonds see http://www.archiviodistato.firenze.it/nuovosito/index.php?id=282 (accessed 27 July 2008). For a more detailed examination of the early history of the State Archive of Florence see Stefano Vitali, "'L'archivista e l'architetto': Bonaini, Guasti, Bongi e il problema dell'ordinamento degli Archivi di Stato toscani," *Salvatore Bongi nella cultura dell'Ottocento. Archivistica, storiografia, bibliologia*, Atti del convegno nazionale, Lucca 31 gennaio–4 febbraio 2000, a cura di Giorgio Tori, Roma, Ministero per i beni e le attività culturali, Direzione generale per gli archivi, 2003, pp. 519–64; also available on-line at http://www.archiviodistato.firenze.it/nuovosito/fileadmin/template/allegati_media/libri/vitali_bongi/vitali_bongi.pdf (accessed 27 July 2008).

76   Vitali, "The Archive at the Time of Its Institution," pp. 19–20.

can no more escape its own "discontinuous eventhood," its own "ideological present" than editing and restoration can.

Rethinking Original Order

There is a growing body of archival literature, much of it influenced by post-modern currents of thought, that critiques the classical archival theory of arrangement in terms that are reminiscent of the new textual scholarship. This literature reflects, among other things, a recognition that the original order of a fonds is constructed, not found, by the archivist [77]; an emerging awareness that a body of records that survives over time will contain multiple logical and physical orders, each of which is worth studying in its own right [78]; and a growing interest in exploring, through case studies, the various ways in which a body of records is shaped and reshaped over time, initially by its creator and subsequently by its custodians.[79] This literature accepts, if only implicitly, both the inevitability and legitimacy of alterity, and suggests new approaches to archival description that take into better account the open-ended and complex histories of records.[80]

77 See for example, Brien Brothman, "Orders of Value: Probing the Theoretical Terms of Archival Practice," *Archivaria* 32 (Summer 1991), esp. pp. 83–85; Jennifer Meehan, "Everything in its Right Place: Re-Thinking the Idea of Original Order with Regard to Personal Records," *Third International Conference on the History of Records and Archives (I-CHORA) Conference Program and Participants' Papers* (Boston, 2007), pp. 149–58; Tom Nesmith, "Seeing Archives: Postmodernism and the Changing Intellectual Place of Archives," *American Archivist*, vol. 65, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2002), pp. 24–41; Elizabeth Yakel, "Archival Representation," *Archival Science* 3 (2003), pp. 1–25.

78 See for example, Horsman, "Last Dance of the Phoenix," esp. pp. 17–21; Laura Millar, "The Death of the Fonds and the Resurrection of Provenance: Archival Context in Space and Time," *Archivaria* 53 (Spring 2002), pp. 1–15; Nesmith, "Still Fuzzy But More Accurate," pp. 136–50.

79 See for example, Donna Holmes, "Passive Keepers or Active Shapers: A Comparative Case Study of Four Archival Practitioners at the end of the Nineteenth Century," *Archival Science*, vol. 6, nos. 3–4 (2007), pp. 285–98; Peter Horsman, "Documenting the Family: Jacob Vriesendorp and his Family Archive," *Third International Conference on the History of Records and Archives*, pp. 133–38; Geoffrey Yeo, "Where lies the Fonds? Custodial History and the Description of Personal Records," *Third International Conference on the History of Records and Archives*, pp. 186–95.

80 See, for example, Terry Cook, "Fashionable Nonsense or Professional Rebirth: Postmodernism and the Practice of Archives," *Archivaria* 51 (Spring 2001), esp. pp. 32–35; Wendy Duff and Verne Harris, "Stories and Names: Archival Description as Narrating Records and Constructing Meanings," *Archival Science* 2 (2002), pp. 263–85; Peter Horsman, "Dirty Hands"; Michele Light and Tom Hyry, "Colophons and Annotations: New Directions for the Finding Aid," *American Archivist* 65 (Fall/Winter 2002), pp. 216–30; Heather MacNeil, "'Picking Our Text': Archival Description, Authenticity and the Archivist as Editor," *American Archivist*, vol. 68, no. 2 (Fall/Winter 2005), pp. 264–78; Tom Nesmith, "Reopening Archives: Bringing New Contextualities into Archival Theory and Practice," *Archivaria* 60 (Fall 2005), esp. pp. 269–74.

In the context of the present article, an exploration of archivalterity yields three key insights. The first insight is that the arrangement of a body of records is not fixed at a single point in time. The survival and ongoing preservation of the records mean that they are in a continuous state of becoming as their physical and intellectual orders are shaped and reshaped, contextualized and recontextualized, initially by their creators and subsequently by their custodians. These acts of alterity are part of the history and meaning of those records and, therefore, need to be accommodated and documented within archival arrangement and description systems. Vitali underlines this point when he notes that, "the archives of the Florentine Republic … would lose much of their meaning or could, more simply, lend themselves to misleading interpretations if considered with no reference to their strong relationship with the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century contexts of preservation and use in which they were radically reorganized and shaped."[81]

The second insight is that archivists do not preserve or restore the original order of a body of records so much as they construct and reconstruct a so-called "original order" in accordance with their understanding of the nature of records and current conventions for arrangement and description. When records are transferred to the custody of an archival institution they are organized into aggregations that conform to archival schemas of arrangement, and described in finding aids that follow specific representational models. The records may subsequently be rearranged, either physically or logically, and re-described in response to new understandings about the records and in keeping with shifting currents in archival theory and methodology. With each rearrangement and re-description, the relationships between and among bodies of records are altered and reconfigured. As Duff and Harris observe, "[e]ach story we tell about our records, each description we compile, changes the meaning of the records and re-creates them." [82] The numerous cross-outs, cross-references, and annotations peppered throughout archival finding aids are a small but telling reminder of the ever changing discursive framework in which records are arranged and described in archival institutions.[83]

A third insight is that, while an understanding of the functions records fulfilled in their original environment informs our understanding of how to treat them over the long term, such understanding should also remind us that the records no longer fulfill those functions. Records may have been created

---

81   Stefano Vitali, "What Are the Boundaries of Archival Context? The SIASFI Project and the Online Guide to the Florence State Archives, Italy," *Journal of Archival Organization* 3 (2005), p. 247.

82   Duff and Harris, p. 272.

83   See for example, the archival description of the Provincial Secretary's fonds (RG 8) in the Archives of Ontario. According to that description, series RG 8–20, entitled "Despatches," was formerly part of a different series in the same fonds, i.e., RG 8–1, "General

originally to serve personal or administrative purposes, but they are preserved
in archival institutions primarily to serve cultural ones. In the same way that
removing a painting of the Madonna and child from a Renaissance church and
hanging it in an art museum transforms it into an aesthetic object, removing
records from their original environment and placing them in an archival insti-
tution transforms them into "historical objects."   They are no longer simply
records: they are records that have been judged worthy of long-term preserva-
tion. In the course of selecting, preserving, arranging, describing, and digitiz-
ing records, archivists and archival institutions, inevitably , create new frames
of reference and meaning for those records and in so doing predispose users
to certain modes of understanding rather than others.

Support for this assertion may be found in researchers'   accounts of their
encounters with archives and archival institutions. In her analysis of the
creation of the Suf fragette Fellowship Collection housed at the Museum of
London, Laura Mayhall describes how its founders constructed the archive
around a narrative of "authentic suf frage militancy" that privileged the
perspective of one constituency within the suf frage movement, that of the
Women's Social and Political Union. In so doing, the founders promoted a
historical account of British women' s emancipation that excluded the experi-
ences of suf frage women who did not suf fer arrest and imprisonment on
behalf of their cause.[84] Maryanne Dever's description of her experience at the
National Library of Australia reading the (incomplete) love letters of two
Australian writers, shows how a particular narrative has been shaped around
the physical arrangement of these letters. As she puts it, "[p]lacing these scat-
tered letters to various recipients in sequence like this   … imposes an alien
continuity on the letters, forcing an orderly seamless narrative from what were
once scattered and discontinuous fragments." [85] In his account of carrying out

---

Correspondence files." Another series that was formerly part of RG 8, i.e., series I-6, "Of fice
of the Registrar General. District and County Marriage Registers," has been transferred to
another fonds and is now described as part of RG 80, Records of the Of fice of the Registrar
General. See http://www.archives.gov.on.ca/ENGLISH/aborige/rg8pro1.htm and
http://www.archives.gov.on.ca/ENGLISH/aborige/rg80re1.htm (accessed 28 July 2008).   The
effects of the shift from a fonds-based to a series-based descriptive system that has taken
place at the Archives of Ontario, are also evident in the multiple systems of numeration that
are documented in archival descriptions under the heading "Former Codes." See for example,
the list of former codes associated with sub-series RG 95-1-15, "Inspection and valuation
returns on land for the   Western District," http://ao.minisisinc.com/scripts/mwimain.dll/144/
ARCH_DESC_FACT/FACTSDESC/REFD%2BRG%2B1-95-15?SESSIONSEARCH
(accessed 28 July 2008).

84   Laura Mayhall, "Creating the 'Suf fragette Spirit': British Feminism and the Historical
Imagination," *Archive Stories*, pp. 232–50.

85   Maryanne Dever, "Reading Other People's Mail," *Archives and Manuscripts* 24 (May 1996),
p. 121.

research at the Central State Archive of Uzbekistan, Jeff Sahadeo observes that the Soviet-era published guides that are given to new patrons, "work to promote a particular vision of politics and society . … The partition of not simply the guides, but the archive itself, into 'historical' and 'revolutionary' sections divided by 1917 deter any efforts to locate continuities across regimes."[86] Finally, in his analysis of the history of Arnold Lupson's photographs of First Nations peoples, which are held at the Glenbow Archives, James Opp illustrates how the meanings attached to these photographs have been transformed through the cultural processes of digitization.[87]

Archival conservators, for their part, have also noted the transformative effect of conservation procedures on records. Ala Rekrut, for example, argues that the removal of records from their original containers and their rehousing in acid-neutral folders, "actively change the context of the record, as evidence of previous custodians' relationships to the record may be discarded and the archives' values take precedence." [88] The impact of archival processes on the way users understand and interpret a body of records may not be as profound as the impact the radical cleaning of the Sistine ceiling has had on the way viewers now see Michelangelo's work. Nevertheless, as these examples illustrate, users cannot avoid reading the records *through* those processes.

The insights textual scholarship offers into the alterity of cultural texts can serve as a springboard for re-examining and expanding the archival theory of arrangement, and rethinking the way archival descriptions are envisaged and prepared. Tom Nesmith's proposed redefinition of provenance quoted at the start of this article highlights a number of critical moments in the life of records ("inscription, transmission, contextualization, and interpretation") when alterity – dislocation, variation, and rupture – is likely to occur . His redefinition accepts as a given, the complex and always unfinished history of a body of records. It thus offers a promising entry point into a more in-depth exploration of what alterity means in an archival context, its implications for the theory of arrangement, and the means by which it might be accommodated within archival descriptive systems.[89]

---

86   Jeff Sahadeo, "Without the Past There is No Future," *Archive Stories*, p. 55.

87   James Opp, "The Colonial Legacies of the Digital Archive: The Arnold Lupson Photographic Collection," *Archivaria* 65 (Spring 2008), pp. 3–19.

88   Ala Rekrut, "Material Literacy: Reading Records as Material Culture," *Archivaria* 60 (Fall 2005), p. 25.

89   In a previous article I explored in a preliminary way a model of archival description drawing on the example of on-line, scholarly editions and the opportunities of the World Wide Web. See "'Picking Our Text': Archival Description, Authenticity and the Archivist as Editor ," *American Archivist*, vol. 68, no. 2 (Fall/W inter 2005), esp. pp. 271–78. In an article that has been submitted for publication, I examine the General International Standard for Archival Description [ISAD(G)] to assess the extent to which it accommodates the history of records before and after their transfer to an archival institution.

Conclusion

This article has looked at authenticity , originality, and intentionality in rela-
tion to the editing of literary texts, the restoration of works of art and architec-
ture, and the arrangement of a body of records in order to make the case that
there are points of theoretical and methodological conver gence across disci-
plines that share a concern with the transmission, preservation, and represen-
tation of authentic cultural texts. In making that case, I am not suggesting the
principle of respect for original order should be abandoned; however imper-
fectly we understand and represent it, the original order is an essential part of
the records' history. Rather, I am suggesting that "original order" is simply
one of many possible orders a body of records will have over time and, there-
fore, its privileged status needs to be reconsidered.   The meaning and authen-
ticity of a body of records unfold within a time frame that is considerably
broader than the one encompassed by their original creation and use, and this
broader time frame is a worthwhile focus of archival research inquiry   .
Theoretical and empirical investigation into how issues of authenticity , inten-
tionality, and representation play out within the broadened time frame I have
tried to sketch out in this article will, at the very least, invigorate the archival
discourse on arrangement and enrich archival practice in the area of descrip-
tion.