

Edith Cowan University  
**Research Online**

---

Theses: Doctorates and Masters

Theses

---

2008

## Old company records: The effect of custodial history on the arrangement and description of selected archival collections of business records

Donna Leanne Holmes  
*Edith Cowan University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses>

 Part of the [Business and Corporate Communications Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Holmes, D. L. (2008). *Old company records: The effect of custodial history on the arrangement and description of selected archival collections of business records*. <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses/23>

This Thesis is posted at Research Online.  
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses/23>

OLD COMPANY RECORDS: the effect of custodial history on the  
arrangement and description of selected archival collections of business  
records

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Award of Master of Science  
(Information Science)  
School of Computer and Information Science  
Faculty of Computing, Health and Science  
Edith Cowan University

By Donna Holmes  
B.Sci. (Information Science) Edith Cowan University  
Student Number: 888221

MARCH 2008  
REVISED JULY 2008

# Edith Cowan University

## Copyright Warning

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study.

The University does not authorize you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site.

You are reminded of the following:

- Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright.
- A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. Where the reproduction of such material is done without attribution of authorship, with false attribution of authorship or the authorship is treated in a derogatory manner, this may be a breach of the author's moral rights contained in Part IX of the Copyright Act 1968 (Cth).
- Courts have the power to impose a wide range of civil and criminal sanctions for infringement of copyright, infringement of moral rights and other offences under the Copyright Act 1968 (Cth). Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

## USE OF THESIS

The Use of Thesis statement is not included in this version of the thesis.

## ABSTRACT

This thesis takes up Terry Cook's idea that through their work, archivists are active shapers rather than passive keepers. In taking this idea further, this thesis discusses case studies comparing the custodial history of the records of four companies that were created in the seventeenth century. Consideration is given to how archival practitioners influenced the arrangement and description of the records of the Dutch East India Company (VOC), the English East India Company (EIC), the Royal African Company (RAC) and the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) during critical periods of their custodial history.

Inherent in the custodial history of the records are the custodial phases through which the records pass. This thesis takes up Hilary Jenkinson's notion that records pass through three custodial phases and shows that the second custodial phase (transfer phase) can be a period of intensive archival activity rather than the period of neglect Jenkinson observed.

Consideration is given as to the manner archival practice (good and bad) and professional discussion contributed to understanding the importance of provenance and original order and the need for sound analytical methodology of the records to precede arrangement and description. The work undertaken by the archivists on the VOC Archives in the Netherlands, in particular, took place at a time during the development of the landmark archival standard, the *1898 Dutch Manual*. The VOC Archives were one of the first archival collections of business records to be arranged using this *Manual's* advice. This thesis takes up the idea of the unofficial fourth author of the *1898 Dutch Manual* Theodoor Van Riemsdijk that past record-keeping processes used on the records can be gleaned from the arrangement of those records. At the same time, in England, those working on the EIC Archives in London understood the importance of custodial history and its influence on the arrangement of the EIC Archives.

This study investigates how the arrangement of the VOC and EIC Archives reflects the contemporary theoretical discussions on archival practice that occurred

throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. Consideration is also given to the influence of the *1898 Dutch Manual's* advice on Hilary Jenkinson's archival work on the RAC Archives during the first decade of the twentieth century; and the influence of Jenkinson on Richard Leveson Gower's archival work concerned with the HBC Archives in the 1930s.

This thesis argues that the emergence of fundamental archival principles such as the difference between physical arrangement and intellectual control, and the development of these ideas derived from discussions during the writing of the *1898 Dutch Manual* and their translation into archival practice, can be seen through an analysis of the work of those involved in the arrangement and description of the VOC Archives. Through a further comparative analysis of the work of those involved in the arrangement and description of the EIC, RAC and HBC Archives, this thesis argues for the possibility of viewing the development of a thoughtful archival profession building on the archival principles of their preceding generation of archivists and actively shaping archival practice.

## DECLARATION

I certify that this thesis does not, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

- (i) incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any institution of higher education;
- (ii) contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text; or
- (iii) contain any defamatory material.

I also grant permission for the Library at Edith Cowan University to make duplicate copies of my thesis as required.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Donna Holmes

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank everyone who helped and encouraged me during the course of researching and writing of this thesis. I am grateful to the School of Computer and Information Science for financially supporting my attendance at the ICHORA-2 conference in Amsterdam in September 2005. I am also grateful to White & Case LLP for allowing me extended leave (2003-2006) to pursue this research project and to my work colleagues, particularly Mr. Sek Yong and Ms. Margaret Cole, for their encouragement.

I undertook this research as an external student living in Singapore (2003-2006) and Bribie Island (2007-2008), so I have not actually stepped inside the ECU Libraries in Perth. Therefore, I am very grateful for all the articles obtained for me by the Document Delivery Services staff of ECU Libraries. In Singapore, I was grateful to have been extended borrowing privileges to the libraries of the National University of Singapore (NUS), for it was in the NUS Central Library main collection that I first found Danvers' manuscript (Ray, 1945). I also made extensive use of the NUS Singapore/Malaysia Collection, particularly De Jonge's volumes. I thank all the Reference and Collection staff for their assistance.

In London, I was granted a Readers' Ticket to pursue my research in June-July 2003 at the British Library in the Oriental and India Office Collection (OIOC) Reading Room; for this privilege I am most grateful. During my 5 weeks there I requested (usually up to the daily maximum limit) over 120 volumes from the India Office Records. I thank the Reference Staff for their patience in acquainting me with the library procedures and collections, and also, my special thanks to the Collections Staff who passed all those volumes (in lots of three or six) over the counter to me. I am also grateful to Dr. Penny Brook for her encouragement and assistance.

Via e-mail, I contacted many people, so thank sincerely the following people who responded to my pleas for help in identifying and locating various references and articles: Dr. Jill Geber, Archivist and Mr. Richard Morel, Archivist, India Office Records, British Library, London; Mr. Michael Piggott, University of Melbourne



Archives, Melbourne; Ms. Deidre Simmons, Archives Consultant, Victoria, BC, Canada; Ms. Kimberley Rey, Archives Assistant and Mr. Ian Keenan, Archivist, Hudson's Bay Company Archives, Archives of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada; Prof. Eric Ketelaar, Professor of Archivistics, University of Amsterdam; Dr. Theo Thomassen, Archiefschool, Amsterdam and Dr Pieter Koenders, National Archives, The Hague.

I am grateful to Ms. Theresia Slamet, Jakarta for providing me with an English translation of the 1897 Dutch article by W.R. Bisschop; and Dr. Colin Moyle for proof reading the final version.

My supervisors for this project, Dr. Karen Anderson and Dr. Joanna Sassoon, patiently provided me with guidance and encouragement, keeping me on track and I am very, very grateful to them.

My special thanks go to my family and friends for their encouragement which kept me writing. As always, I thank my husband, Michael for his encouragement and support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Use of Thesis .....	2
Abstract .....	3
Declaration .....	5
Acknowledgements .....	6
Table of Contents.....	8
List of Tables .....	10
Abbreviations.....	11
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	12
1.1 Archival practice during the second half of the nineteenth century.....	16
1.2 Old Company Records.....	18
1.2.1 VOC Archives and EIC Archives .....	19
1.2.2 RAC Archives and HBC Archives.....	20
1.3 Influences of Custodial Phases on the Archival Records.....	22
Chapter 2. Literature Review .....	27
2.1 The relationship between archival description, arrangement and custody.....	28
2.1.1 Archival custody.....	31
2.2 Development of the idea of custodians influencing archival collections.....	33
2.3 Custodial changes and first, second, and third custodial phases .....	37
2.4 Coping with administrative change.....	41
2.5 Documentation of the custodial histories.....	43
2.6 Archival Structure .....	48
2.7 Summary of Literature Review .....	49
Chapter 3. Methodology .....	53
3.1 The Case Study as a research methodology.....	53
3.2 Research Questions .....	54
3.3 Analysis and Development of Finding Aids for Danvers' selection of VOC documents held in the EIC Archives in a series of 106 volumes.....	56
Chapter 4. The Effects of Custodial Phases on the VOC Archives .....	58
4.1 Introduction .....	58
4.2 Records of the VOC moving from the first to second custodial phase .....	58
4.3 The archival work of JKJ de Jonge from 1856-1877 .....	60
4.4 The archival work of JE Heeres from 1877-1898 .....	64
4.5 The archival work of HT Colenbrander from 1898-1912.....	66
4.6 The work of later archivists – from 1912 onwards .....	70
4.7 Summary of the VOC Archives and archival influences .....	73
Chapter 5. The Effects of Custodial Phases on the EIC Archives .....	75
5.1 Introduction .....	75
5.2 The archival work of FC Danvers from 1884-1898 .....	76
5.3 Danvers' visit to the VOC Archives from 1893-1895.....	83
5.4 Summary of Danvers' archival work.....	86
5.5 The work of later archivists – from 1898 onwards .....	87
5.6 Summary of the EIC Archives and archival influences.....	91
Chapter 6. The Effects of Custodial Phases on the RAC and HBC Archives .....	93

6.1 Royal African Company (RAC) Archives.....	93
6.1.1 The archival work of H Jenkinson from 1906-1912.....	94
6.1.2 The work of later archivists.....	100
6.1.3 Summary of the RAC Archives and archival influences.....	101
6.2 Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) Archives .....	104
6.2.1 Records of the HBC moving from the first to second custodial phase..	104
6.2.2 The archival work of RH Leveson Gower from 1931-1950.....	106
6.2.3 The work of later archivists – from 1950 onwards.....	108
6.2.3 Summary of the HBCA and archival influences .....	112
Chapter 7. Discussion.....	114
7.1 Introduction .....	114
7.2 Archival processes and products.....	115
7.3 Custodial phases.....	116
7.4 Documentation of arrangement and description products and processes.....	119
7.4.1 Inventories and finding aids.....	119
7.4.2 Sharing ideas .....	120
7.5 Moving from physical control to intellectual control .....	121
7.6 Investigative archival activities.....	123
7.7 Reflection of custodial history in arrangement and description .....	129
7.7.1 Research Question 1 .....	129
7.7.2 Research Question 2 .....	130
7.7.3 Research Question 3 .....	131
7.7.4 Research Question 4 .....	133
7.7.5 Research Question 5 .....	134
7.7.6 Research Question 6 .....	137
7.7.7 Research Question 7 .....	137
7.8 Questions for Further Research.....	138
Chapter 8. Conclusions: Passive keepers or Active shapers? .....	140
8.1 Introduction .....	140
8.2 Passive Keepers or Active Shapers .....	141
8.2.1 Active Shapers.....	143
Glossary.....	145
References .....	150
Appendices .....	156
Appendix 1: Summary of volumes searched by FC Danvers and WR Bisschop during the years 1893-1894 at the Rijksarchief, The Hague; as per their notes in their “working list” in <i>BL: IOR I/3/86 Dutch Records at The Hague v.86</i> (119 pages). .....	156
Appendix 2: Descriptions from Danvers’ working list that appear to match entries in the <i>1992 Inventory of the VOC Archives</i> .....	166
Appendix 3: Number of documents and pages in volumes <i>BL: IOR I/3/1 – 106 Dutch Records at The Hague v.1-v.106</i> .....	171
Appendix 4: Proposed Descriptive Summary of volumes <i>BL: IOR I/3/1 – 106 Dutch Records at The Hague v.1-v.106</i> .....	173
Appendix 5: Transcription of Document B*****7 in <i>BL: IOR I/3/100 Dutch Records at The Hague v.100</i> .....	176
Appendix 6: Sample pages from the proposed full finding aid for <i>BL: IOR I/3/1 - 106 Dutch Records at The Hague v.1-v.106</i> .....	181

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Custodial Phases of the EIC Archives and VOC Archives .....	23
Table 2: Custodial Phases of the RAC Archives and HBC Archives .....	25
Table 3: First - Third Custodial Phases - documents move from the custody of records managers to the custody of archival managers and usage of the documents move from original use to secondary use.....	38
Table 4: Custodial Phases of the VOC Archives .....	59
Table 5: Table of contents of the Inventory of the VOC Archives (1992).....	70
Table 6: Custodial Phases of the EIC Archives .....	76
Table 7: Records examined by Danvers by 1891 .....	81
Table 8: Description of the India Office Records 1600-1858 (Foster, 1919).....	88
Table 9: List of Classes of India Office Records (2008) .....	90
Table 10: Custodial Phases of the RAC Archives.....	94
Table 11: Jenkinson's Initial Classification of the RAC Archives (1912) .....	96
Table 12: Jenkinson's Hierarchical Classification System (1922) .....	98
Table 13: Custodial Phases of the HBC Archives.....	105
Table 14: Initial description by Leveson Gower (1933).....	107
Table 15: HBCA Record Group categories (1980s).....	110

## ABBREVIATIONS

A2A	Access to Archives (U.K.)
AJCP	Australian Joint Copying Project
AR	Algemeen Rijksarchief, The Hague
ARA	Algemeen Rijksarchief, The Hague
BL	British Library, London
EIC	East India Company
HBC	Hudson's Bay Company
HBCA	HBC Archives
IOLR	India Office Library and Records
IOR	India Office Records
OBP	Overgekomen brieven en papieren [=Letters and Papers received]
PRO	Public Record Office, London (later TNA)
RAC	Royal African Company
TANAp	Towards a New Age Partnership
TNA	The National Archives, London (formerly PRO)
VOC	Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie

## CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

In 1898, The Netherlands Association of Archivists published the *Manual for the arrangement and description of archives* (1898 Dutch Manual). Samuel Muller (1848-1922), Johann Feith (1858-1913) and Robert Fruin (1857-1935) were recognised as the authors of the *1898 Dutch Manual*. However, other people were involved in the discussions surrounding the preparation of the manuscript. Most notable of these was Theodoor Van Riemsdijk (1848-1923), who held the post of General State Archivist of The Netherlands from 1877-1912.

The *1898 Dutch Manual* was a product of a paradigm shift that occurred in archival management in The Netherlands in the late nineteenth century. This shift was to enable the record-keeping processes of arrangement and description to move from being used initially for control of the physical record (record control), to being used for both record control and intellectual control of the record.

In the years prior to the publication of the *1898 Dutch Manual* (the pre-*Manual* period) Muller and Van Riemsdijk had exchanged their ideas and experiences about arranging and describing archives on which they worked (Horsman, Ketelaar, & Thomassen, 2003, p. ix) after they had worked together in 1874-1875 when Van Riemsdijk had assisted Muller in organising and arranging the archives of the Utrecht City Museum. Muller, then City Archivist of the Utrecht Museum, published his archival principles in an annual report on the Utrecht City Archive in 1880, while Van Riemsdijk produced a book about the registry system of the States General in 1885, concluding that the systematic structure of the archives must be matched with the original structure of the archive (Horsman et al., 2003, p. ix). Van Riemsdijk's theoretical approach to investigating the structure of the archives differed from Ketelaar's description of "Muller's impatient approach to apply the methodology in practice", however "Muller was struck with awe by Van Riemsdijk's approach" (Ketelaar, 1996a, p. 33). Monumentally, Van Riemsdijk was identifying what are now recognised as the theoretical concepts behind respect for the original order and archival structure of the records.

Muller and Van Riemsdijk belonged to the generation of archivists from 1874 which started a new era in the history of archival practice in The Netherlands, for in 1874 Muller was appointed City Archivist of Utrecht, and in the previous year Van Riemsdijk was appointed City Archivist of Zwolle (Ketelaar, 1996a, p. 32). Compared with the previous generation of archivists who started work in the 1850s, this new generation conducted fundamental discussions about alternatives to past practices and “had more modern ideas about the study of history, diplomatics, and the arrangement and description of archives” (Horsman et al., 2003, p. ix). Alternatives to past practices were needed because the arrangement activities carried out by earlier nineteenth-century archivists had tampered with the “authentic character” of these archives by replacing their original structure with one of their own choosing (Horsman et al., 2003, p. ix). The arrangement and description activities of some of the archivists who lived through these successive periods (1850s, 1870s) will be explored in chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis.

According to Terry Cook, the most striking key theme to emerge from the archival literature since the *1898 Dutch Manual* has been the shift from archives holding only records of bureaucratic administrations to those embracing an archival collection comprising social and cultural information on the whole community (Cook, 1997a, p. 207). He also argues that, through their collecting activities in which they were historically understood to have the passive role of keeping archives, archivists are now seen to be active shapers of archives, and through their actions, influence the shape of content in the archival collections they pass on to the next generation of archivists and users of archives.

The shift in understanding the influence of archivists from being passive guardians to becoming active facilitators of archives is a key theme throughout the discussion in this thesis. In building on Cook’s discussion of this shift to archivists being understood as active shapers centred on the collecting activities of archivists, this discussion focuses on the archivist’s influential role as active shaper of the contextual environment in which they document the arrangement and description of accumulated records. Thus, this thesis argues that archivists actively shape the records in their care, their influence on a collection of archival records being seen in their arrangement and description activities. However, this influence on arrangement and description

activities has two layers – the first of process and the second of product. The *process* of arrangement and description depends on the archival practices used during the era of the archivist's life; the *product* of arrangement and description is the result of the process, that product becoming fixed as of the year the archivist produced it. These products of arrangement and description then become evidence of the custodial history of the archival records.

However the custodial history of the archival records covers more than the custodial phase in which the archivist has participated. All record-keeping activity relating to arrangement and description of the records, from the time the records were created through their transfer phase and during their archival management phase, contribute to the custodial history of the archival records.

This thesis builds on Jenkinson's observation of three custodial phases during the custodial history of archival records (Jenkinson, 1947, p. 240-241), discussing the influence of each custodial phase on the meaning of the archives themselves. This study is important, since archivists' work of arrangement and description in the VOC Archives in particular was taking place at a time when Dutch archival theory was being developed and during the time when ideas contained in the *1898 Dutch Manual* were being formulated. Horsman et al have written that the *1898 Dutch Manual* contributed to the professionalization of archivists by setting out a code of best practice for the arrangement and description of archives for the first time (Horsman et al., 2003, p. xxv).

In addition, this thesis will also investigate how archivists from The Netherlands and England in the late nineteenth century shaped the meaning of their nation's East India Company Archives (VOC and EIC) through their arrangement and description practices as the records were moved into different kinds of custodial contexts over time. Comparing the activities taking place through the 1880s and 1890s on the VOC Archives in The Hague and on the EIC Archives in London will point up the variation in archival practices occurring in The Netherlands and England during the pre-*Manual* period. The common link between the VOC Archives and EIC Archives is that both are accumulations of 'old company records'. Discussion of two other accumulations of 'old company records', the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) Archives and the Royal



African Company (RAC) Archives will contrast the variations in late nineteenth century archival practices with those of the early twentieth century in England.

Bringing these four case studies together will reveal key personal links and thus a chain of influence between individuals who arranged and described these collections of 'old company records'. This includes the influence the arrangement of the EIC Archives by FC Danvers would have on Hilary Jenkinson when he arranged the RAC Archives in the first decade of his career at the Public Record Office in London. Though Jenkinson never met Danvers (1833-1906), Danvers' work late in the nineteenth century on the arrangement of the EIC Archives would be considered by Jenkinson as an example of a collection similar to the RAC Archives from which would guide the archival work (1906-1912) he would undertake on the RAC Archives. Later, Jenkinson's ground-breaking work would influence the archival investigations from 1931 - 1950 of RH Leveson Gower (1894-1982), and the archival work between 1950 - 1968 of Alice Johnson (1907-1987) on the HBC Archives.

In January 1890, FC Danvers, Superintendent and Registrar of Records of the India Office in London, a contemporary of Van Riemsdijk, presented his paper titled *The India Office Records: a brief account of the results of his examination, during the last six years, of the records relating to India and the East India Company, now in the possession of the Secretary of State for India* to the Society of Arts in London. He remarked:

“The careful custody of public records is ... an unmistakeable sign of an advanced state of civilisation. Measured by this standard, the boasted civilisation of this nineteenth century would seem to be but little in advance of what is now known to have existed in Nineveh thousands of years ago ... It cannot reasonably be claimed that public records are the absolute property of any generation who are, for the time being, only trustees of an entailed estate, and it is their duty carefully to preserve that property, and to hand it down to their successors, not only unimpaired but enriched by the records of their own time” (Danvers, 1890, p. 159-160).

Danvers was articulating the importance of archives and the need for considered and careful custodianship of them, his remarks above indicating he wanted to advocate actively for archives being a source of information that he felt was undervalued by the academic community of his era. Danvers understood the custodial responsibility

would become active necessarily because preservation of archives can only happen when an active interest is taken in their preservation over time. He cited a case in which records had been assessed in 1830 and deemed to be useful for preservation, later to be flagged for destruction when they were reassessed in 1858 (Danvers, 1890, p. 162). By the end of the nineteenth century, Danvers averred that better care should be taken of archival records, the key to which lay in the necessity of archivists understanding the importance of ongoing custody of records by them.

### **1.1 Archival practice during the second half of the nineteenth century**

The nineteenth century in England and The Netherlands was an important period in the development of European archival practices. The *1898 Dutch Manual* was a significant marker of archival practice at the time, as well as laying down principles for the next generation of archivists. The archival activities record-keeping custodians were using before the *Manual* was produced, in what is commonly known as the pre-*Manual* period, can be deduced, in part, from viewing the arrangement and description of the materials themselves – that is, the physical order of the archives was, in itself, a marker for ideas about arrangement and description. Cook (1997) comments that the *1898 Dutch Manual* was based on the pre-*Manual* experience that Muller, Feith and Fruin had “either with limited numbers of medieval documents susceptible to careful diplomatic analysis or with records found in well-organized departmental registries within stable administrations” (Cook, 1997a, p. 194). However, the experience of Van Riemsdijk (discussed in Chapter 4) contributed to the *1898 Dutch Manual* and as will be apparent, the VOC Archives were neither medieval documents nor documents from a stable administration which Cook notes, would be indicative of the pre-*Manual* period. The VOC Archives provided pre-*Manual* Dutch Archivists with quite a challenge to unravel. Similarly the ‘old company records’ of the EIC, HBC and RAC all presented challenges for archivists to disentangle. When archival custodians are not living in the era in which the records were generated, thus not having intimate knowledge of the way the records were created, they will need to analyse the particular collection of records in order to trace the practices used to arrange the records. Tracing and analysing the archival practices applied to a particular collection of records can be a complex task. Chapter 4 and 5

discuss the arrangement and description of the Dutch and English East India Companies' records, in the absence of a single set of principles, with practices being changed between successive custodians and custodial phases. These pre-*Manual* period men used their own investigations, and discussions with their contemporaries, as a guide to the best practices they could use in their archival activities.

Whilst the publication of the *1898 Dutch Manual* (Muller et al., 1898) was a milestone it would take time for practices to change; there being many ways of interpreting the principles the manual outlined. In the absence of specific documentary evidence of how the records were created and used, for example, administrative histories, the description of the records had to be deduced from the arrangement of the records themselves. That is, when archival practitioners had no knowledge about the particular collection in their custody, and no inventory or description to draw details from, the explanation of how the records were generated must be sought solely from the arrangement in which the records survived. Horsman (1999, p. 47) refers to this forensic analysis as “archaeological archivology”, which is a very specialised investigative archival activity requiring the archivist to draw information about the records from the way they are arranged so as to build up a rationale for how the records were created. This specialised methodology is at the core of discussion about the investigative archival activities of the ‘old company records’ relayed in this thesis. It may be that “archaeological archivology” will enter the lexicon of archival literature as research into the history of records and archives broadens to include the history of archival activities by past custodians. However, this thesis demonstrates that archivists performed “archaeological archivology”, though not named as such, in the ‘pre-*Manual*’ period occurring before the publication of the *1898 Dutch Manual*.

This thesis also discusses archival activities of record-keeping custodians on ‘old company records’ rather than the “stable” government, royal or municipal archives Cook associated with pre-*Manual* archivists (Cook, 1997a, p. 194). This thesis accords with the opinion of Nesmith (2005, p. 263) that, during its custodial history “a record has likely been various things to many people” involved in the custodianship of the record over time, showing these ‘old company records’ to influence the archivists who worked on them. Interpretations of what is contained in a collection of

records will occur throughout the records' custodial history. How this interpretation was made and whether the interpretation then becomes embedded in the custodial history of the records will show whether it has influenced future custodians. Any prior interpretations can be particularly influential in the case where a custodian has no prior knowledge of the organisational structure in which the record was created, but read the prior interpretations.

The order in which records survive, and whether or how this order has been altered over time, is instructive for the purposes of "archaeological archivology". The *order* should be analysed so that *relationship* of, and between, the records can be identified. These concepts of original order and relationships between records were explored and expanded in the *1898 Dutch Manual*. Through an "archaeological archivology" of the work of pre-*Manual* custodians including Heeres and Colenbrander (VOC Archives) and Danvers (EIC Archives), this thesis shows that, they not only acknowledged, but they understood the concepts of original order and contextual relationships between records, contributing to the further development of these concepts in the wider profession through the visible product of their work. Their active custodianship of the archives in their care contributed to the shaping of those archives as well as implementing improved strategies for providing intellectual access. More particularly, their activities also become part of the custodial history of those archives.

This thesis conducts case studies on the East India Company (EIC) archives, the Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC) archives, the Royal African Company (RAC) archives and the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) archives. Although the records themselves, and their contents, have been the subject of research by many authors and the general public on a broad range of topics across social history, economic history, marine archaeology and maritime history, this research focuses on the topic of custodial history in, and of, these collections of 'old company records'.

## **1.2 Old Company Records**

Each company discussed herein was created in the seventeenth century for the purpose of trade with other countries in order to bring wealth back to their home

country. Instructions were issued by the management committee of each company in their home country, and sent to the various trading ships or warehouses around the world where each company's representatives were located. In return the various representatives around the world submitted regular reports on company activities occurring in their locations. The records from these outposts were part of the international trading empires of these companies, the 'old company records' containing details of the development of areas around the world destined to become separate countries in the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Of particular interest in terms of influencing the custodial histories of these collections is that many of the activities each company commenced and protected, would later be subsumed by a government department of the independent nation.

### **1.2.1 VOC Archives and EIC Archives**

The effects of archival custodianship of four men on their nation's East India Company's records are discussed in the following case studies of the VOC and EIC Archives. JKJ de Jonge (1856-1877), JE Heeres (1880s-1897) and HT Colenbrander (1899-1912) worked with the Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC) Archives held in the General State Archives, The Hague and FC Danvers (1884-1898) worked with the East India Company (EIC) Archives held in the India Office, London.

The East India Companies of England date from 1599 and the first incorporated company traded under the title *The Governor and Company of the Merchants of London trading into the East Indies* when it received the Royal Assent on 31 December 1600 (Birdwood, 1891, p. 13). *Courten's Association of the Assada [Madagascar] Merchants* was established in 1635 and united with the *London East India Company* in 1650, the union being completed by 1657 (Sutton, 1967). The union of the *London East India Company* and the *English East India Company* (EEIC) to form the *East India Company* (EIC) occurred in 1710. In 1834, the trading operations of the EIC were brought to an end with all real and personal property of the EIC held in trust for the Crown for the service of India. In 1858, the EIC was finally dissolved and all assets, including current records and the previous company's (pre-company's) archives, passed into the hands of the British colonial administrators in the India Office (Danvers, 1890).

The Dutch East India Company – *Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie* (VOC) dates from 1602 when it was incorporated as a company trading into the East Indies. Similar to the EIC, the VOC also had pre-companies – the *Compagnie van Verre* (1598-1910), the Magellan EIC and the *Compagnieën op Oost-Indie* (Pennings, 1992, p. 34). In 1795 the VOC was dissolved and all assets, debts and archives passed into the hands of the States General of The Netherlands.

Of particular interest are the records that documented the business activities of the EIC and VOC during the seventeenth century when they competed with each other for international trade with the East Indies. These ‘old company records’ from the seventeenth century are comprised mostly of ships’ logs, agreements between the two companies, and treaties between each company and local rulers within the East Indies. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the companies ceased as trading companies and their assets were absorbed into government bureaucracies with colonial objectives, and trade and business activities. The surviving original records from the seventeenth century of the EIC Archives are held in London, England, and those of the VOC Archives are held in The Hague. Copies of some of the records have been made available through programmes of transcribing, translation and copying. During the 1960s and 1970s, the *Australian Joint Copying Project* (AJCP<sup>1</sup>) copied documents sourced from the India Office Records, these copies being available on microfilm in Australia. In recent years, many of the records from the VOC Archives have been made available via Internet access as part of the *Towards a New Age of Partnership* (TANAp<sup>2</sup>) program. The VOC Archives were included in the UNESCO Memory of the World Register in 2003, as a joint nomination from five countries (The Netherlands, India, Indonesia, South Africa and Sri Lanka)<sup>3</sup>.

### **1.2.2 RAC Archives and HBC Archives**

The effects of archival custodianship of the ‘old company records’ belonging to the Royal African Company (RAC) and the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) are

---

<sup>1</sup> The AJCP information web page is at <http://www.nla.gov.au/collect/ajcp.html> [accessed Feb 2, 2008]

<sup>2</sup> The TANAp online resource is at <http://www.tanap.net> [accessed February 2, 2008]

<sup>3</sup> Details obtained from <http://portal.unesco.org> [accessed February 2, 2008]

also discussed in the following case studies. Like the EIC, both the RAC and HBC were created as trading companies during the seventeenth century in England.

The RAC trading activities were conducted between Africa, the Americas across the Atlantic Ocean and England, the RAC Archives thus comprising the records of the Company of Royal Adventurers Trading to Africa (1662-1672), the Royal African Company of England (1672-1750) and the Company of Merchants Trading to Africa (1750-1820). After 1820, these records were transferred to the Treasury, Sir Hilary Jenkinson initially arranging then describing these archives in the first decade of the twentieth century, this period coinciding with the beginning of his archival career at the Public Record Office.

The HBC trading activities were conducted between North America (later Canada) and England, its archives comprising the records of the Hudson's Bay Company Empire (1670-1870) as well as the records of a number of related and subsidiary companies. Under the Rupert's Land Act of 1868, the territory administered by the Hudson's Bay Company reverted to the Crown and was transferred to the Government of Canada. HBC continued reduced operations with major offices in London and Winnipeg (established 1860) with Richard Leveson Gower being appointed the Company's first archivist in London in the 1930s. Jenkinson provided recommendations on the arrangement of these archives after Leveson Gower's appointment.

During the 1950s and 1960s these organised HBC archival records were microfilmed in London and made available through the Public Record Office. In 1974, the archives were physically moved from London to Winnipeg, Canada, later, in 1994, they were deposited in the custody of the Provincial Archives of Manitoba in Winnipeg, before their inclusion in the UNESCO Memory of the World Register in 2007.

### **1.3 Influences of Custodial Phases on the Archival Records**

Records move through several custodial phases from their creation to their being arranged and described in an archival institution (Cook, 1997a; Jenkinson, 1947); the influences of different custodial phases through which the records have passed are discussed further in chapter 2, literature review. The records of the VOC, EIC, RAC and HBC have moved through three different custodial contexts. In the first custodial phase, archival material comprised the active business records remaining with the companies whilst they existed. The arrangement and description to which they were subjected was not documented. During the second custodial phase, the archival records were transferred to the successor of the now defunct companies; this successor might have been either another company or a government department. During this phase, particularly in the cases of the VOC and EIC Archives, all of the archives became scattered among different buildings and in several locations, with various custodians working on the records, primarily to become familiar with the records content and context. By the third custodial phase, those EIC and RAC Archives surviving the second custodial phase were transferred to archival custody in London; the VOC Archives were transferred to The Hague; and the HBC Archives to Manitoba, Canada. During this phase, archivists were occupied first, with a period investigating the order of the surviving records, then with arrangement and description activities.

Table 1 lists the different entities which created the business records of the VOC and EIC when those companies existed, the subsequent government departments having custody of the records, and the repositories to which the archival collections were transferred.



**Table 1: Custodial Phases of the EIC Archives and VOC Archives**

EIC Archives	VOC Archives
<p><b>1599-1858 (First custodial phase)</b> London East India Company, English East India Company, East India Company</p>	<p><b>1602-1795 (First custodial phase)</b> Compagnie van Verre (1598-1610), Magellan EIC, Compagnieen op Oost-Indie, Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie (VOC)</p>
<p><b>1858-1981 (Second custodial phase)</b> Board of Control<sup>4</sup>, India Office, Burma Office, Commonwealth Relations Office, later the Commonwealth Office, Dominions Office, Foreign and Commonwealth Office</p>	<p><b>1796-1856 (Second custodial phase)</b> Commission for East Indian Affairs, later Council for East Indian Affairs, Ministry of Colonies</p>
<p><b>1982-current (Third custodial phase)</b> EIC Archives (1599-1858) in the India Office Records deposited with the newly established British Library, London in 1982.</p>	<p><b>1856-current (Third custodial phase)</b> VOC Archives (1602-1795) transferred to the Algemeen Rijksarchief, The Hague in 1856</p>
<p><i>Details in Table 1 for the EIC Archives are drawn from Sutton (1967) and the India Office Records (IOR) web page<sup>5</sup> and the VOC Archives are drawn from Raben (1992).</i></p>	

If an archival collection is kept in poor environmental conditions, for example, open to mould or vermin, kept in a basement or in an attic, or subject to poor record-keeping practices, for example, disorganised and unrecorded, during the first custodial phase, much work must be done in the third custodial phase to improve the archival collection's arrangement to an order reflective of its origin.

The first custodial phase can last for centuries, and as Table 1 shows, the EIC Archives' first custodial phase spanned over two centuries; and for the VOC Archives, this phase lasted just less than two centuries. Where records have been kept in a disorganised state in the first custodial phase, the length of this phase can take on significance in that the separation of time is increased between the initial creator of the record and the custodian trying to bring order to the disorganised archival material.

Table 1 also shows that the length of the second custodial phase for the EIC Archives took over 150 years; and for the VOC Archives it was 60 years. The VOC Archives crossed the archival threshold in 1856, however it was not until 1982 that the EIC

<sup>4</sup> The Board of Control was created in 1834.

<sup>5</sup> Details from the IOR web page at <http://www.bl.uk/collections/iorgenr1.html> [accessed Feb 2, 2008]

Archives finally crossed the archival threshold into the third custodial phase. From that year onwards archivists were able to conduct their investigations into the arrangement and structure of the records.

FC Danvers' work on the second custodial phase of the EIC Archives, and on the India Office Records in its first custodial phase took place through the 1880s and 1890s; it is discussed in chapter 5. The work of JKJ De Jonge, JE Heeres and HT Colenbrander in the VOC Archives, starting its third custodial phase, took place sequentially through the 1860s and 1870s; through the 1880s and 1890s; and through the 1890s respectively; it is discussed in chapter 4. Danvers' work with the EIC records was closer to the record's active stage than was the three Dutchmen's work on the VOC Archives. They were disadvantaged because their efforts occurred at some distance in time from the VOC records when they were active. However, the remedies used by the three Dutchmen, after some false starts, eventually pointed towards their invoking "archaeological archivology" as an investigative archival analysis methodology.

Like the records of the VOC and EIC, the first custodial phase of the records of the RAC and HBC also lasted for more than a century. Table 2 shows that the period of the first custodial phase for the RAC archives was 150 years and 200 years for the HBC archives. The length of the second custodial phase for the RAC archives was relatively short being less than three decades. However, the RAC archives only received archival attention after they had languished in their third custodial phase for over fifty years. Hilary Jenkinson's work on the RAC archives in the first decade of the twentieth century is discussed in chapter 6.

The length of the second custodial phase for the HBC was well over a century and the work of Richard Leveson Gower during the 1930s is discussed in chapter 6.

**Table 2: Custodial Phases of the RAC Archives and HBC Archives**

RAC Archives	HBC Archives
<p><b>1670-1820 (First custodial phase)</b>                      Company of Royal Adventurers Trading to Africa (1662-1672), Royal African Company of England (1672-1750), Company of Merchants Trading to Africa (1750-1820)</p>	<p><b>1670-1870 (First custodial phase)</b>                      Hudson’s Bay Company Empire (1670-1870), North West Company (1786-1851), Russian American Company (1821-1903), Puget’s Sound Agricultural Company (1838-1934), Vancouver Island Steam Sawmill Company (1859-1867)</p>
<p><b>1820-1847 (Second custodial phase)</b>                      Treasury</p>	<p><b>1870-1994 (Second custodial phase)</b>                      Under the Rupert’s Land Act of 1868 HBC land reverted to the Crown and was transferred to the government of Canada. HBC continued reduced operations with major offices in London and Winnipeg (established 1860).</p>
<p><b>1847-current (Third custodial phase)</b>                      The Records of the African Companies (1670-1820) came into the custody of the Public Record Office<sup>6</sup> in London in 1847.</p>	<p><b>1994-current (Third custodial phase)</b>                      The HBC Archives (1670-1994) placed in the custody of the Provincial Archives of Manitoba<sup>7</sup> in Winnipeg in 1994.</p>
<p><i>Details in Table 2 for the RAC Archives are drawn from Jenkinson (1912, p. 197) and the HBC Archives are drawn from Simmon (2003, p. 174, 180) and the Provincial Archives of Manitoba website<sup>8</sup>.</i></p>	

In summary, this thesis combines a discussion of archival practice at the end of the nineteenth century and in the early twentieth century with a discussion of the custodial history of the ‘old company records’ held initially by the VOC, EIC, RAC and HBC. A common thread between all four archives are varying degrees of investigative archival analysis “archaeological archivology” undertaken by successive generations of archivists who have built up a sound body of knowledge about the content and context of these ‘old company records’.

In order to show similarities and differences between the archival practices used on these ‘old company records’, the custodial history has been divided into three custodial phases. Using the three phases of custodial history as the basis for the method is a convenient device for showing the continuing relationship between the

<sup>6</sup> The Public Record Office is now known as The National Archives (TNA).

<sup>7</sup> The Provincial Archives of Manitoba is now known as Archives of Manitoba

<sup>8</sup> From [http://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/archives/hbca/resource/rel\\_rec/index.html](http://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/archives/hbca/resource/rel_rec/index.html) [accessed 31 July 2006]

records management practices in the first custodial phase and the archival management practices in the third custodial phase.

In the following chapter the literature review is presented, the custodial phases are further discussed, and an outline of the relationship between archival description, arrangement and custody using investigative archival analysis, otherwise known as archaeological archivology.

## CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Record-keeping *processes* carried out through successive custodial phases have an effect on the *product* of arrangement and description contained in archival collections of business records. The archival collections of business records selected for discussion in this thesis are the ‘old company records’ of the East India Company (EIC), the Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC), the Royal African Company (RAC) and the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC). The surviving records of these companies date from the seventeenth century, now being managed by archivists of the British Library (EIC Archives), National Archives of The Netherlands (VOC Archives), The National Archives (RAC Archives) and Archives of Manitoba (HBC Archives).

The record-keeping activities of the various custodians who have looked after these historical, ‘old company records’ have spanned more than three centuries. In order to compare these record-keeping activities, the custodial history for each of these collections has been divided into three phases, building on Jenkinson’s (1947, p. 240-241) contention of three phases of custodial history. According to him, the first custodial phase is the records management phase; the second custodial phase is the transfer phase; and the third custodial phase is the archival management phase. Custodial phases are discussed in section 2.3 of the literature review.

The effect of the record-keeping activities of the custodians through each custodial phase becomes embedded in the custodial history, influencing also the content of the surviving archival collection. The manner in which the record-keeping practices of past custodians have become embedded in an archival collection are discussed by;

- 1) exploring the processes used to arrange and describe the collection; and
- 2) exploring the product of the arrangement (on the shelf for a period of time) and the description (documented at a point in time).

Documentation of the custodial histories is discussed in section 2.5 of this literature review.

Several papers in the archival literature outline the custodial history of the specific archival collections discussed herein. In 1912 Hilary Jenkinson presented a paper on his arrangement and description work on the Royal African Company (RAC) Archives held in the Public Record Office (Jenkinson, 1912); a paper on the HBC Archives was presented at the *First International Conference on the History of Records and Archives* (I-CHORA) in 2003 (Simmons, 2003); and a paper on the EIC and VOC Archives was presented at the *Second International Conference on the History of Records and Archives* (I-CHORA 2) in 2005 (Holmes, 2006).

The effects of the activities carried out during the custodial phases of the EIC Archives and VOC Archives are discussed in Chapter 5 and 4 respectively; and a discussion on the custodial phases of the RAC Archives and HBC Archives is included in Chapter 6.

In reviewing the archival literature addressing the topic of how archivists have influenced and been influenced by archives, the following issues are discussed:

- Relationship between archival description, arrangement and archival custody.
- Development of the idea of custodians influencing archival collections.
- Custodial changes and first, second and third custodial phases.
- Coping with administrative change.
- Documentation of the custodial histories.
- Archival structure.

## **2.1 The relationship between archival description, arrangement and custody**

Documenting and providing contextual information about the content of archives is the fundamental role of archivists. Through this contextual information, archivists link the work of the people who created the records with the work of the people who want to use the records. The challenge for archivists lies not only in explaining how they derive their understanding of how, when and why the records were created, but also the manner in which they document the details encountered so

that succeeding generations of archivists and future users of archives can read and understand those details. Hurley (2005, p. 135) encourages archivists to "... identify context that always existed but has not hitherto been documented". The past maintenance of a body of records will affect how the records can be used in the future.

In order to document the details they encounter, archivists use the device of archival description to record the arrangement of the collection. *Archival description*<sup>9</sup> is a term relevant to the process of describing an archival collection as well as the product (the documentation) resulting from the process. Part of the archival description process can also entail analysing how a body of records has been arranged prior to their arrival at the archives. *Arrangement*<sup>10</sup> is the term adopted for the process of arranging as well as the term for the resultant product of arrangement (order and sequence of items) from the process of arranging. When archivists carry out the process of arranging, it is necessary for them to protect the context of the materials by recording the *provenance*<sup>11</sup> and *original order*<sup>12</sup> of the records. Maclean (1962, p. 130) noted that when archivists arrange and present an archival collection they should ensure preservation of the essential quality of the records: "of what actually happened in the course of the affairs which gave rise to them". Archivists can use documentation as well as physical arrangement to provide intellectual control over records. This topic will be further discussed in Section 2.4 of this literature review, paying particular regard to Maclean's work with the Australian Commonwealth Government records in the 1950s and 1960s.

In the case where an accumulation of records has not retained an arrangement from the time of its creation, and the archivist carries out an arrangement process, the principle of provenance<sup>13</sup> and the principle of original order<sup>14</sup>, are observed by attempting to re-establish the provenance and order through archaeological archivology. Provenance and original order are two fundamental principles of archival science. The terms of *archival description*, *arrangement*, *principle of*

---

<sup>9</sup> See the entry for *archival description* in the Glossary section of this thesis.

<sup>10</sup> See the entry for *arrangement* in the Glossary section of this thesis.

<sup>11</sup> See the entry for *provenance* in the Glossary section of this thesis.

<sup>12</sup> See the entry for *original order* in the Glossary of this thesis.

<sup>13</sup> See the entry for *principle of provenance* in the Glossary section of this thesis.

<sup>14</sup> See the entry for *principle of original order* in the Glossary section of this thesis.

*provenance* and *principle of original order* are important, being defined for each generation of archivists so that the result of their work, their product, can be understood in the context of their era. While the process of arranging and describing archives is an archival activity carried out in all archives, how each generation of archivists carries out these archival activities will depend on the definition of the terms used by the archivist during their lifetime. However, the product of their arrangement and description activities will become fixed to the specific year they undertook them, that product then becoming embedded in the documentation of a collection of records. Both the process and product of arrangement and description become part of the custodial history of an archival collection.

MacNeil's (2005, p. 269, 278) exploration of the relationship between archival description and maintaining the authenticity of the records places the "archivist's efforts to identify and represent the original order of a body of records through arrangement". In other words arrangement, as a product fixed at a point in time through archival description, is a representation of the archivist's interpretation of how the principles of arrangement and description should be applied to that specific body of records. This topic is discussed in chapter 7, and together with rearrangement, is also further discussed in chapter 4 on the VOC archives.

The arrangement of a collection of records has significance at the point where they enter archival custody, a pivotal event in the custodial history of a collection of records. When the records cross this archival threshold they enter an intellectual framework that aims to "stabilize and perpetuate the relationships between and among the records" (MacNeil, 2005, p. 272). MacNeil notes the device archivists use to stabilize and perpetuate the relationships is archival description, the purpose being, to document the original order of the records and the history of the records by their creator over time, when they are underpinned by the principles of archival arrangement. That is, archivists' archival activities can provide a framework to stabilize and perpetuate the relationships of the records while they are held in archival custody.

The discussion of arrangement and description in the archival literature in English in recent years has been dominated by a) record control systems; b) international and national descriptive standards; and c) the needs of researchers when using finding aids



(MacNeil, 2005, p. 266-267). The development of arrangement and description practices and the principles on which these practices have drawn has received less attention in the archival literature, MacNeil suggesting that more research is needed on how the relationship between archival description and authenticity is represented in the documentation, particularly documentation such as finding aids. The case studies presented in this thesis will contribute to filling the gap in the current archival literature by discussing the process of arrangement and description as an archival device used by archivists during the second and third custodial phases of accumulations of 'old company records'.

### **2.1.1 Archival custody**

When records enter archival custody they enter an intellectual framework providing a stable environment so that the relationship between and among records in a collection can be analysed and documented. Bastian (2004, p. 93) notes that together with archival description and arrangement, custody should be recognised as a fundamental principle of archival management. One of the central functions of the archival profession is the work done to capture the reasons why and when the records were created. The details about who has kept (had custody of) the records since their creation influences how the records can be used in the future.

An important issue is how arrangement and description processes and products can identify the structure of the record-keeping system in which the records were kept before the records crossed the archival threshold. Implicit in this issue are:

- 1) the effect that the phases of custody have had on the arrangement of the records that have survived to cross the archival threshold;
- 2) the influence each record-keeping custodian have had on the arrangement of the records by their manner of interpretation of the recommended archival practices of their era; and
- 3) the effect of the length of time between the era of the record-keeping practices and the era of the archival practices when the records finally cross the archival threshold.

That a long period of time has elapsed between when the records were created and when the records crossed into archival custody is an important aspect of this discussion. Strategies that archivists use to arrange and describe a collection of records if the archivist knows the organisation that created the records are likely to be different to the strategies used if the organisation that created the records was completely unknown. With no prior knowledge of the organisation the archivist would have to use the analysis of the collection itself as the starting point of reference in building up a picture of the organisation creating the record. This investigative analysis of archives has been described as “archaeological archivology” (Horsman, 1999, p. 47) and as advanced “reconstructive” work (Maclean, 1962, p. 145). Clues about how the records have been kept over time are sought from visual investigation of them, and attributes that were added after the item was created. These may include punched holes and folio numbers, as these can be analysed for indications as to the prior arrangement the records had in earlier custodial phases. Maclean also noted that analysis of the custodial history of a collection of records might first yield the place where the collection was found; and then further analysis might yield the place where the records were raised. In this instance, Maclean suggested that the term *provenience*<sup>15</sup>, borrowing a definition from archaeologists to describe the place where the collection was found. This definition could be used to differentiate from *provenance*, the place of origin of the records (Maclean, 1962, p. 140, footnote 7). The subtlety of this difference, which Maclean identifies, can be seen in the case study of the RAC Archives where the records originated with the company in the seventeenth century; whereas by the early twentieth century, Jenkinson documented the records of the RAC as being located in the Treasury’s accumulation of records. That is, the provenance of the RAC Archives was as records created in the seventeenth century by the Royal African Company; whereas their *provenience* was a part of the accumulation of the Treasury’s records. This topic will be further discussed in Chapter 6 on the RAC Archives.

---

<sup>15</sup> See the entry for *provenience* in the Glossary section of this thesis.

## 2.2 Development of the idea of custodians influencing archival collections

In 1981, Ham wrote that archivists had assumed a passive role in shaping the documentary records during the “custodial era”, declaring his vision for a new era in the history of archival practice which he named the “post-custodial era”. One of the strategies he proposed to be undertaken in the post-custodial era would be for archivists to actively encourage research into the archival craft (Ham, 1981, p. 207). He encouraged archivists to look beyond the product of their archival activities to the study of their process.

This research demonstrates how archivists have performed their archival activities in the past, leading to a greater understanding of the archival activities of their era, rather than being prescriptive about the archival activities to be carried out in the future, thereby providing an understanding of the historical development of archival theory and practice. Ham (1981, p. 209) questioned, “how does the traditional concept of provenance apply to a database management system where information is stored without regard to administrative or functional context?”. An observation of this research is that Van Riemsdijk’s Principle of Archival Structure<sup>16</sup> would have assisted Ham whereby the system that created the records formed part of the custodial history of the records, and therefore the record-creating system is also part of the records’ context. Thus, the relationship of the record-creating system with the records that were created is fixed as the product of the record-keeping process in the first custodial phase of the records. However, Ham was not aware of Van Riemsdijk’s archival theories because they had not been published in the archival literature by 1981.

In his insightful 1997 paper *Archives in the Post-Custodial World: interaction of archival theory and practice since the publication of the Dutch Manual in 1898*, Terry Cook concluded that the most striking key theme to emerge from the archival literature since the 1898 *Dutch Manual* was the shift from archives holding only records of bureaucratic administrations to embracing the collection of archives containing social and cultural information on the whole community (Cook, 1997a, p. 207). In turn, this had led to a more active understanding of the effects of the duties

of archivists, with the change in understanding from their being passive keepers of archives to becoming active collectors of archives. Through this shift in understanding it is apparent the actions, which arise out of record-keeping activities, shape the content of the archival collections passed on to the next generation of archivists. Cook noted this influence includes the choice to which records archivists give either full, partial or zero archival attention; and this choice is dependent on the resources they have available and the standards of the descriptive mechanisms they use to facilitate their archival attention.

Cook used the terms “passive keepers” and “active shapers” to describe the extremes of the range of archivists’ influence over the archival collections they manage. Cook does not specifically define the term “passive keepers” in the paper providing the above quote, nor in his earlier 1997 paper *What is past is prologue: a history of archival ideas since 1898, and the future paradigm shift*; but he notes that archivists in Britain were known as “keepers” and thus indicating a more passive perception of their role in keeping archives (Cook, 1997b, p. 23). Cook infers that Sir Hilary Jenkinson’s (1882-1961) influence as Deputy Keeper of the Public Record Office (Cantwell, 1991, p. 446) in London, reinforced the passive role. Through his published works, particularly the *Manual of Archive Administration*, first published in 1922, he proclaimed that archivists should be unbiased and impartial with regard to the records in their care. However, a reading of Jenkinson’s published works describing the archival processes used in his era, these were implemented to address the issues faced by archivists in the early to mid twentieth century. This included issues such as the use of misinformation and propaganda during the first and second world wars and the effect this negative activity had on the evidential nature of records during Jenkinson’s era.

Several decades before Cook, Ian Maclean observed in 1962 that archivists of his own era recognised the importance of a sound custodial history to ensure that archives were arranged and presented so as to preserve their essential quality as evidence of what had occurred to give rise to their existence (Maclean, 1962, p. 130). Maclean concentrated much of his archival attention on the challenge of what practices to use when processing records through the second custodial phase: the transfer phase of the

---

<sup>16</sup> See the entry for *Principle of Archival Structure* in the Glossary section of thesis

records from active use by their creating agency to becoming records of value for preservation. The transmission of records from the first custodial phase, the records management phase, through the second, transfer phase, to the third, archival management phase, may occur because:

- 1) the records were identified as records for preservation in the first phase; or
- 2) the records survived because they were not discarded in the first phase.

However where the transfer phase lasts for many decades through neglect or abandonment due to cessation of the organisation creating the records, such as with the VOC, EIC and RAC Archives, archivists need to involve themselves in investigative archival activities so as to understand what has happened to the records. In the case of Maclean's record-keeping activities, in which a very short second custodial phase was over viewed, investigative archival analysis was unnecessary in the third custodial phase because the reasons for the records being preserved were documented. This transfer phase of the records is discussed further in Section 2.4 of the literature review on coping with administrative change.

As seen in the descriptions of Jenkinson, Maclean, Ham and Cook above, archivists are influenced by the archival practices of the era in which they live and this influence can be seen either in their writings on archival administration practices and/or becomes embedded as part of the custodial history of the archival collection on which they have carried out their archival administration practices. The contrast in approach that Jenkinson described in the first half of the twentieth century illustrates archivists' slow change in perception from seeing themselves as passive to understanding their active role in shaping meanings through time-bound archival practice. This change in perception of their professional role can be attributed to archivists actively carrying out investigative activities to understand better the record creating processes that had occurred in the first custodial phase, and in doing so, they were building up their knowledge of the archival craft.

In her 2001 paper, Sue McKemmish refers to Cook's "active shapers" to illustrate that the "role of recordkeeping and archiving professionals becomes an active one of participation in record and archive creating processes ... who need to be conscious of their own historicity ... leaving indelible imprints on the records" (McKemmish, 2001,

p. 349). She notes that perception has shifted “away from seeing records managers as passive keepers of documentary detritus ... and archivists as Jenkinson’s neutral, impartial custodians of inherited records” (McKemmish, 2001, p. 355-356). She also notes records managers have been viewed as passive keepers, and archivists have been viewed as neutral, impartial custodians of inherited records. However, their roles are connected through the custodial phases of the records. While McKemmish and Cook both use the term “passive keepers”, McKemmish uses the term in relation to records managers as well as archivists, while Cook confines his use of the term to archivists. However “record-keeping activities” when looked at through the lens of the records themselves is an activity that has occurred seamlessly throughout the three phases: from the records management phase through transfer to archival management phase. Record-keeping activities carried out by people who held positions such as file administrator, records manager, clerk and secretary all contributed to the record-keeping activities of the organisation.

The activities of a records manager, who participates in identifying which records are to become archival, plays a role in influencing the content of the archival collection in the third custodial phase. What emerges through McKemmish’s and Frank Upward’s work on identifying the continuum record-keeping activity (McKemmish, 2001; Upward, 2000) is the idea that there is much benefit to be gained by records managers coordinating their record-keeping activities to complement the record-keeping activities of archivists in later custodial phases. The administrative framework of the organisation that sets out procedures for when records should be produced and schedule how long the records are to be kept also has a role in influencing the content of the archival collection in the third custodial phase. Thus, the influences of the administrative framework of the organisation creating the records, the records management framework and the archival management framework are all part of the custodial history of the records. By looking at the record-keeping activities as occurring in custodial phases gives a perspective of the records’ transmission over time; the connectivity between the records management phase and the archival management phase is linked by the second custodial (transfer) phase.

## 2.3 Custodial changes and first, second, and third custodial phases

Jenkinson's view of archives as evidence is linked to the importance of custody. In his 1947 paper entitled *The English Archivist: a new profession: being an inaugural lecture for a new course in Archive Administration*, Jenkinson (1947, p. 240-241) referred to three custodial phases and the importance of custody. The three custodial phases to which reference was made can be summarised as Phase 1: Records Management - first custodial phase; Phase 2: Limbo/Transfer - second custodial phase; and Phase 3: Archival Management - third custodial phase. The transmission of records from the records management phase through to archival management phase is discussed in the archival literature already mentioned (Maclean, 1962; McKemmish, 2001; Upward, 2000) however the terminology of first, second and third phases seems only to have been used by Jenkinson in 1947.

Discussion of the arrangement for a collection of records produced by a first phase custodian who knew the creator of the record and associated relationships between the record and the organisation, has its own particular tone. The discussion about the arrangement of the collection by a third phase custodian is different; he/she does not know the creator of the record nor the organisation in which the record was raised because both no longer exist in this third phase custodian's life span. Similarly an archival collection in the third custodial phase may revert to the second custodial phase through such trauma as being ravaged by fire, flood, or disintegration of the country's infrastructure through war, oppression or some other catastrophic event.

Table 3 sets out Jenkinson's (1947) three custodial phases populating the phases with the main stages of the documents' survival, and the movement of the documents from original use to secondary use. Original use<sup>17</sup> is the use for which the records were used by their creating agency; secondary use<sup>18</sup> is the use for which the records were used other than original use.

---

<sup>17</sup> See entry for *original use* in the Glossary section of this thesis.

<sup>18</sup> See entry for *secondary use* in the Glossary section of this thesis.

**Table 3: First - Third Custodial Phases - documents move from the custody of records managers to the custody of archival managers and usage of the documents move from original use to secondary use**

First Custodial Phase (records management)	Second Custodial Phase (limbo / transfer)	Third Custodial Phase (archival management)
Document made or received. Document used by creating agency – <b>Original use.</b> Registry, inventory or system recording that the document was made or received.	Document survives by chance or is selected for preservation.	Establish contextual information about how the document was made or received. Document may or may not be used by future researchers – <b>Secondary use.</b>

Livelton (1996, p. 74) discusses the writings of Jenkinson and Schellenberg observing, “Jenkinson’s definition of archives, like Schellenberg’s of records, emphasizes the original use and preservation of documents, whereas Schellenberg emphasizes their selection and secondary use”. Leaving aside which *use* should be emphasized while acknowledging that *use* is an influence; all record-keeping activities by records managers and archivists contribute to the custodial history of a particular archival collection. Though archivists may have different views from records managers on which record-keeping activities should take precedence, documentation of the records’ custodial history must include details of the original use, and why the documents were preserved or selected. The advantage of being able to describe in which custodial phase the records are located can show how much influence the record-keeping activities carried out in the first and second custodial phases have had on the collection surviving to reach the third custodial phase.

These three custodial phases can also be discerned in Bruebach’s (2003, p. 394) description of record-keeping developments in Germany after 1954. In the 1920s archivists in Germany, being involved in the development of new disposition schedules and retention periods, became aware of an emerging gap between the records management phase and the archival management phase. Bruebach noted that after 1954 “in-between” institutions, that is record-centres or “limbos”, were established to bridge the gap. Bruebach used the term “limbos” in his 2003 article though he does not provide a citation for it. However he uses “limbos” as a reference to the second custodial phase or transfer phase. He contended, “new concepts of



appraisal, based on the principle of provenance and analysis of functions became adoptable” because of the initiative the archivists had taken to become responsible for the installation and management of the record-centres as “in-between” institutions. The conclusion from this initiative is that German archivists demonstrated they understood the necessity of providing good custodianship of the records in the second custodial phase, Jenkinson’s transfer/limbo phase; and they would ensure a smooth transfer of the records into the third custodial phase. Conversely, poor custodianship of the records in the second custodial phase meant more analytical work for archivists in the third custodial phase which, in turn, could have been avoided with planning and due care.

Jenkinson (1960, p. 371-373) felt that archivists should “want and need” to include analysis as part of their archival activities so they could understand the “how, why and what” of their archives, and they could pass on the information gathered by notating on each of the series of records with its administrative history. These administrative histories could be used for later archivists to understand the content and context of the records, particularly where the handwriting was difficult to read or decipher. As well, Jenkinson felt that the Archivist must “engage himself actively” in adding to the administrative history as needed. He was quite clear that such analytical activities should only be conducted on archives in their third custodial phase. Discussion of Jenkinson’s analytical activities regarding the RAC Archives early in his archival career, occurs in chapter 6.

The three custodial phases described by Jenkinson in 1947 may appear similar to those of the “three ages of archives” approach in the European version of the life cycle model for the physical relocation of records. McKemmish (2000, p. 6) describes these as “based upon the storage of active, semi-active and inactive records”. In Jenkinson’s (1947) quote above he makes the distinction that documents in the second “limbo/transfer” custodial phase may be needed either by the originating office for purposes of precedent or to show the historical background of work done by the office, which in early twenty-first century terminology, would equate to demonstrating effective governance was carried out by the office. The documents may be needed to show impartial evidence of the transaction work carried out by the office, thereby having a continuing value. Records no longer active (inactive) from

the third stage of the life cycle model may be found moving from the first to second custodial phase, that is, moving from the records management phase to the transfer phase. Thus, while the life cycle model treats the movement of records from the records management phase (active) to the transfer/storage phase (semi-active and inactive), it does not cover records once they have been moved into the archival management phase. Therefore, the life cycle model has a records management perspective whereas Jenkinson's three custodial phases have a perspective from the records themselves as they move from the records management phase through the transfer phase to the archival management phase.

Jenkinson's three custodial phases' model assumes a period of neglect during the second custodial phase is inevitable for "old" records, and that arrangement and description of the records must be undertaken in the third custodial phase. However, for "modern" records, the second custodial phase should be an ordered and managed transfer period, as the records would have been kept in an organised business context from their creation and, upon being identified as archival, move into the third custodial phase with their arrangement and description intact. This process of unbroken management and care of the records is central to the Records Continuum Model, developed by Frank Upward (Upward, 1996, 1997).

The concept of records having a continuing value is the basic premise for the Records Continuum thinking which Sue McKemmish (2000, p. 7) states, "goes back to fundamentals to define the record and the role of record-keeping in society, informed by a unifying concept of records inclusive of records of continuing value, i.e., archives, one that stresses their evidentiary and transactional nature". The Records Continuum Model provides an overview of the processes that set out the multiple purposes that records can have over time; its perspective comes from the records themselves, not being restricted to the record-keeping activities of an individual record-keeping profession. Similarly, Jenkinson's three custodial phases are also grounded in the records themselves.

## 2.4 Coping with administrative change

Coping with administrative change is a challenge addressed by record-keeping professionals. Benefits abound when archivists and records managers in their roles as record-keeping professionals cooperate to coordinate their archival activities (Maclean, 1959, p. 387; McKemmish, 1997). The second custodial phase or transfer phase best illustrates whether their cooperation has been successful. The record-keeping activities FC Danvers introduced for coping with the administrative changes in the India Office during the 1880s and 1890s are discussed as they were applied on the EIC Archives, its predecessor agency, in chapter 5. The India Office was part of the British Government, however India Office Records have always been kept separate and not transferred on to the Public Record Office (Cantwell, 1991, p. 491). Therefore, India Office policy influenced where its records were held, and inevitably, record-keeping professionals are influenced by the administrative goals and objectives of the organisation in which the record-keeping agency is located.

The National Archives of Australia is a record-keeping agency that has influenced the record-keeping activities of its parent organisation, the Australian Commonwealth Government. In the 1950s and 1960s, much energy and innovation was used in establishing processes and procedures which facilitated the transfer of records from Melbourne and Sydney, where Federal Government departments had previously been located, to the newly established departmental offices in the planned capital of Canberra<sup>19</sup>. . Maclean (1959 p. 388) noted the archives and records management programs in place by 1959 provided a “comprehensive public records administration”, and that lessons had been learnt by the successors of the first confident wave of records managers, the former discovered marginal record areas requiring analytical treatment to move the records on or move the records out. This meant that analytical treatment was required which could address the administrative changes affecting the records when a department or agency changed focus or operation.

---

<sup>19</sup> National Capital Development Commission Act (1957) (Cth) <http://www.foundingdocs.gov.au> [accessed 12 Dec 2007]

Until the 1960s, the primary descriptive device used to explain the contents of a group of archival records was the “creating agency record group” – the record group concept, consisting of three levels of description (Scott, 1966, p. 493).

- 1) record or archives group;
- 2) record series; and
- 3) item, either one document or a number of documents fastened or bound together.

Conceptually, the hierarchy of the creating agency record group provided administrative context for the archives, the levels being used as a basis for the description, arrangement and numerical control of the archives. An alternative concept of the “Record Series System” was introduced in 1964 in the Commonwealth Archives Office (later known as Australian Archives, National Archives of Australia) in Canberra (Scott, 1966, p. 497). The Record Series System was primarily introduced in response to the problems encountered with the transfer of records to Canberra and documenting the many administrative changes. He noted the experience gained by archivists during their analysis and interpretation of past original record-keeping systems allowed for a unique insight into developing current systems of record-keeping (Scott, 1966, p. 500). In essence, the record group information could still be found in the series system by viewing listings on paper because the process to control the record was complemented by additional information to control the context of the records within the administrative framework.

In 1973, Fischer (1973, p. 644) challenged Scott’s replacement of the record group concept with the records series system on two main points:

- 1) archivists were too involved in the current records management process; and
- 2) as a scheme of reference and control, it may be imperfectly understood by future generations of archivists and users.

The debate about the record group concept compared with records series concept overshadowed the fundamental point that a *record control system* could be expanded to allow intellectual control as well as record control. Fundamentally, Scott felt that archivists could share their insights gained from analysing records in the second and

third custodial phases so enabling the production of a system which allows for record and intellectual control of the current records in their first custodial phase. Sharing information on the records' content from the record control system used in the first custodial phase with the record control system used in the third custodial phase allows a smoother transition through the second custodial phase. Therefore, *complementary* record control systems rather than *competitive* record control systems make sense. Maclean, Scott and other record-keeping professionals at the Commonwealth Archives Office were at the right place at the right time to gain such insights because of the large volumes of records being transferred to the newly established offices in Canberra. The records managers and archivists had to work together, and in doing so they produced solutions to solve problems as they presented themselves.

## **2.5 Documentation of the custodial histories**

In his 2005 overview entitled *Reopening archives: bringing new contextualities into archival theory and practice*, Nesmith (2005, p. 274) concludes that the considered study of the history of records and archives carried out by archivists in their efforts to glean as much information as they possibly can on the archives in their custody, can allow them to “explore the shape of theoretical positions and professional practices in order to bring the wider contextualities into archival theory and practice”. Understanding the how and why, or lack thereof, of the existence of the archival records in their custody will enable archivists to write an essay on the administrative history of the archives in their care, and to be able to evaluate critically any essay written by the custodian before them.

Nesmith is referring not only to the context of the records themselves, but also to the context of archival practices, and professional practices and ideas of the time the records were arranged and the administrative history was written, as reflected in the previous work on the records. Nesmith (2005, p. 259) discusses the growing interest in the history of records and archives, making the observation, “the intellectual history of the archival profession is the history of the thinking about the nature of contextual knowledge about records”. The importance of the contextual knowledge about records had been previously emphasized by Hedstrom (1998, p. 18) when she wrote,

“What sets archives apart from other types of information is the centrality of context and provenance”. She further observed, “to my mind, solutions will not come from trying to re-establish a romantic ideal of archival absolutes, impartiality, naturalness or objectivity ... [as] ... archivists attempt to translate ideals into affordable and achievable plans of action”. Authors have been discussing what archivists could or should have done, and while archival absolutes are useful as targets to be achieved, it is also useful to have the literature discuss what archivists have done in the past, and what practices have and have not endured. The use of the phrase, “what practices have and have not endured” does not necessarily mean that enduring archival practices were successful, or those not enduring were not successful. Archival practices such as appraisal and description leave an imprint on the records, however, “archivists are not the only force determining what [archival value] survives, and, in many cases they may be minor players among much larger social, technological, cultural, political and budgetary forces that shape the holdings of archives” (Hedstrom, 1998, p. 33). The manner in which the arrangement and descriptive practices utilized on the VOC and EIC archives in the late nineteenth century reflected the professional practices and ideas of that time, this is discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, and, the arrangement and descriptive practices used on the HBC and RAC archives in the early to mid twentieth century are discussed in Chapter 6.

During the investigative archival analysis process, the archivist can establish contextual information about a collection of archival records by identifying:

- “1) relevant information on the person or organization responsible for creating, accumulating, maintaining, or using the records;
  - 2) the function or roles [the] records were created to support;
  - 3) record-keeping practices that may be evidenced in the records; and
  - 4) significant events or developments to which the records relate.”
- (Roe, 2005, p. 46)

In addition to Roe’s four aspects identified above, another aspect of establishing contextual information during the research conducted by archivists on an accumulation of archival records in their care is awareness that the custodial history of archives can be more important, intricate and elusive than previously acknowledged (Nesmith, 2005, p. 267). It is possible that individual archival collections within an archival repository have different custodial histories and these differences need to be

understood to allow for a full understanding of why these archives have endured. For example, the previous custodian may have arranged, or rearranged an archival collection by subject rather than provenance, which may have been a general practice in that era. Whereas, the next custodian can review the work of the previous custodian and restore the arrangement to reflect the way their creator raised the records. An example of rearrangement and restoration activity such as that carried out on the VOC Archives is discussed in Chapter 4.

Interestingly, Nesmith (2005, p. 4) observes that archives are “stable and comprehensive” and “acted upon ... but not acting upon (or influencing) anything much”. In contrast to Nesmith’s opinion, this research explores the possibility that archivists can become influenced by the content and context of the archives in their care. Nesmith also notes that protection of the relationship between the record and its creator forms the basis for the conventional notion of authenticity<sup>20</sup>. In this chain of custody, records pass from the creator to the custodian, relationships between the records and its custodians over time becomes embedded in the history of the records.

The question arises, “how can archivists document the custodial history of the archives in their care?” Light & Hyry (2002, p. 222) advocate the enhancement of finding aids with colophons and annotations so that archivists can “document themselves” as part of the custodial history. By describing their interpretation of the archival collection on which they have arranged and described, archivists can record the decisions they made during the investigative phase of their work. This allows both future custodians and researchers to garner an insight into what the archivist found, and the year in which they executed their research. Archivists can only document their interpretation of the findings made at the time of their investigations, and though how they interpreted (processed) the information may not be considered standard practice by future archivists, what they documented (produced) in their era becomes embedded in the custodial history of the records on which they worked.

The second step noted by Roe (2005, p. 46) during the archivists’ work in establishing contextual information about a collection of archival records is that of identifying the function or roles the records were created to support. Challenges arise when the role the records were created to support, continues over many decades

during which time, the office, whose function it was to create the records, changes. Eastwood (2000, p. 114) has recorded, “A predecessor office should not be deprived of records it created; a successor office should not have records ascribed to it that it did not create”. However, the records may show the archivists, when writing up the record-keeping history of the organisation, that the office whose function it was to create the records was changed. But, as the form of the record stayed the same because the role for which the record was needed did not change, the explanation becomes part of the custodial history of the records. Jenkinson (1955, p. 326) wrote that he preferred the description of the continuity of the role of the records by the successive holders of the chief executive control in England, rather than to describe these officers by their successive duties in The Chancery, the Privy Seal Office, the Secretaries of State and the Modern Departments. While the role of chief executive control for England has endured since 1086 when official records were held at the Royal Treasury in Winchester (Hall, 1908, p. 118), the title of the office held has changed at various times over the last 800 years. The challenge for archivists is to identify the relationship between the archival records and the form and function of their creation to explain fully the context surrounding the records (Cook, 1997b, p. 23; Eastwood, 2000, p. 93; Jenkinson, 1947, p. 250). Documenting both the continuity of the role, the form of the records, and, where instructive, the administrative changes in the office whose function it was to create the records, allows for a more complete understanding of the context of the records. In this regard custodial history of the records may need to be complemented with the administrative history of the organisation.

Documentation or finding aids such as inventories, calendars, list and indexes are the products of the arrangement and description activities that document the archival scheme of arrangement used at a specific point in time. It is useful to define what the term inventory, calendar, list or index meant to the archivists in the era in which they performed their duties as those definitions are fixed, like the product of the actual inventory, calendar, list or index, at the specific point in time when they were produced. For example, Horsman (2003, p. 7) notes that the Calendar was the main form of finding aid produced in The Netherlands in the nineteenth century, and the

---

<sup>20</sup> See the entry for *authenticity* in the Glossary section of this thesis.



Inventory in The Netherlands in the pre-*Manual* period was a simple list which the custodian used as a tool for administrative control only. This contrasts with the post-*Manual* period when the Inventory was expanded to include intellectual control to ensure that the context, structure and contents of the archive were fully represented. Therefore, the definition of the term Inventory must be qualified by the period in which it was produced, such as the pre-*Manual* or post-*Manual* period. The term Inventory as defined was expanded in The Netherlands between the pre-*Manual* period and the post-*Manual* period.

Calendaring was used in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, though by the 1950s the practice was out of style with most archival practitioners (Radoff, 1948a, p. 123). The main aim of calendaring was to précis the contents of a document that could be located through a subject index at the end of the calendar. Calendaring provides characteristics later to be used in abstracting and indexing services. The *product* of calendaring, the calendar, had entries arranged in chronological sequence, however the calendar did not reflect the *product* outlining the arrangement of the documents on the shelf (Radoff, 1948b, p. 203). Calendars allowed only limited intellectual access to a collection of documents in a role of finding aid rather than as a product of description. Calendaring is discussed further in chapter 5 on the EIC Archives.

While archivists in the early twenty-first century are able to communicate their definitions of archival methods, principles and terminology with the presence of an online glossary of archival terms to be accessed by anyone in the world with internet access (Pearce-Moses, 2005), late nineteenth century definitions of key archival terms such as fonds, archives, provenance and custody had different connotations depending on the country of the archivist. For example, as discussed in Chapter 6, Jenkinson (1912, p. 186, footnote 2) when working on the RAC archives in the first decade of the twentieth century, described “fonds” as “collections as they have come down to us from their collectors”. Whereas, by 1922 when writing his *Manual of Archive Administration*, he defined “fonds” as “the chief Archive unit in the Continental system and the basis of all rules as to arrangement”. He rendered the French term “fonds” in English as “archive group”, with the caution that he had chosen the term ‘archive group’ “for lack of better translation” (Jenkinson, 1922, p. 84). Therefore,

as ideas about the archival craft were being developed in various countries the terminology necessarily allowed for several definitions which catered for the developing ideas. This is an important point to keep in mind when carrying out “archaeological archivology” or investigative analysis of archives.

## 2.6 Archival Structure

Discussion in the foregoing sections of this literature review reveals that terms such as archival description, arrangement, principle of provenance, principle of original order, chain of custody, documentation of custodial history, record control and intellectual control of records are important in defining each generation of archivists, in that way, the results of their work, their archival product, can be understood in the context of the eras of the archivists’ lifetimes. The challenge for archivists lies in documenting the context surrounding the documents resting in the third custodial phase on which they have worked. To document this context, the archivist needs to interpret the context surrounding the creation of the documents, the records-creating process, following their analysis of the organisational structure of the creating agency, and the record-keeping activities of the previous custodians.

Through the archival literature of the 1990s, archival writers have exchanged opinions about the influence the authors of the *1898 Dutch Manual*, especially Muller, have had on the archival methodologies used by archivists since the 1960s (Cook, 1997a, 1997b; Horsman, 2002, 2003; Horsman et al., 2003; Ketelaar, 1996b). In 2003 the American Society of Archivists produced a reprint of the *1898 Dutch Manual* to commemorate its centenary anniversary (Muller, Feith, & Fruin, 2003). Then several presentations about the development of the archival ideas set out in the *Manual* were included in the 2003 reissue (Horsman et al., 2003). What has emerged from this literature is a fresh look at the archival ideas of *Manual* authors, Muller, Feith and Fruin as well as introducing to the archival literature the name of the unofficial fourth contributor to the *1898 Dutch Manual*: Theodoor van Riemsdijk (Ketelaar, 1996a, p. 31, abstract). Van Riemsdijk had strong views on the use of scientific methodology to analyse archival structure and produce comprehensive inventories (Ketelaar, 1996a, p. 33). However Van Riemsdijk’s views on archival structure were not included in

the *1898 Dutch Manual* because the lead author, Muller, specifically wanted to set out rules for Dutch archivists to follow when arranging and describing archives (Ketelaar, 1996a, p. 35, footnote 26).

Van Riemsdijk's view was that the original organisation of the records corresponded with the original organisation of the administration. This included the *structure* of the administrative body as well as the records management system as "the interconnection of the documents reveals their nature and mutual context much better than any order which an archivist may introduce later" (Van Riemsdijk, 1885, cited by Ketelaar, 1996a, p. 34). Van Riemsdijk believed the context surrounding the creation of documents should to be researched by the archivist through careful observation and analysis. Moreover, Van Riemsdijk advocated a *Principle of respect for archival structure* at the 1890 Conference of Dutch State Archivists (Ketelaar, 1996a, p. 34). Further discussion on Van Riemsdijk's methodology will follow on the arrangement and description of the VOC Archives in chapter 4, and in the discussion in chapter 7.

## **2.7 Summary of Literature Review**

The foregoing discussion of the archival literature indicates that providing contextual information about the content of archives is a fundamental role for archivists. The review has traced discussion in the literature that shows the development of the idea that context is important. This thesis will support this idea by using selected case studies of the EIC, VOC, HBC and RAC Archives to trace examples of development of practice which have contributed. The micro view of providing contextual information focuses on the arrangement, description and boundaries of archival custody, the macro view of providing contextual information focuses on the influence by the archivist on the archives which they select to produce such contextual information that is, which collections they decide to describe in detail and which they do not. Connecting the two views is the custodial history of the archives and the custodial phases that link the record-keeping activities of past custodians with the archival activities of current custodians. Implicit in this view is the observation that it takes more than one archivist's lifetime to complete the product

of description, because when one archivist hands over the custodianship to the next, they also hand over any ongoing projects of description.

Since the 1960s the archival literature has documented the control of records progressing from physical record control to intellectual control through documentation. Rather than viewing the physical order as the only arrangement of the records, an intellectual arrangement order can be interpreted from the custodial documentation. Intellectual control allows for more than one way of describing the records.

Documentation to provide contextual information about the content of archives reflects the professional practices and ideas of the time when the records were arranged and the documentation was written. Professional practices and ideas of the time became embedded in the level of intellectual control over the records, and changes over time can be studied through investigating this documentation. By comparing the past involvement of archivists when they have arranged and documented an archival collection with the ideal of professional practices of their time, illustrates, not only how they arranged and documented, but also how their solutions became part of the professional archival practice of the times. With the archivist as facilitator of professional archival practice of the era, their archival practices became embedded in the arrangement and description of archives.

The Australian series system allows for the control of the record to be complemented by the control of the record's context through documentation. The series system developed as a record control system solution to the problem of records transfer in the second custodial phase which the Commonwealth Archives Office addressed through their archivists, particularly, Maclean and Scott. The latter's awareness of the need to coordinate the records management procedures with later archival management procedures was also influenced by Maclean's opinion that records should be selected for disposal rather than selected for retention. He in turn was influenced by the American approach to management of modern government records during the 1950s, as well as Jenkinson's view of the evidential nature of archives. In that way, the professional archival practice and records management practice of Maclean and Scott's era as well as the organisational goals of the Commonwealth Archives Office, have influenced the Australian series system.

Describing the records in relation to their custodial phases provides a more comprehensive description of the records custodial history. If the context of the records is compromised in the first custodial phase, the task for the second and third phase custodians is more complex and time-consuming. Correct record-keeping procedures in the first phase provide the best basis for maintaining correct record-keeping procedures through the second and third phases.

The fundamental theme that arises from the archival literature discussed in this review is that records managers and archivists must cooperate to coordinate their record-keeping activities so as to gain the maximum benefit from their combined efforts, as advocated through continuum thinking. Redoing the same record-keeping procedure because initially the procedure was either not completed or not documented, wastes precious resources. It is essential for both records managers and archivists to recognise that sound records management procedures will allow the records to transfer smoothly into archival management procedures.

The distinction between the records management phase and archival management phase of the records is noteworthy when the custodianship of the records as having occurred in three phases is seriously considered. These custodial phases occur with all records surviving over time, regardless of which record control system or primary unit of arrangement has been used in the management of the collection of records.

In the particular scenario in which records have survived to their third custodial phase with only their “shelf arrangement” and no accompanying documentation, the investigative analysis that archivists must undertake needs to be careful and thoughtful. An explanation of how the records were generated must be sought from an analysis of the arrangement in which the records have survived. This analysis has been described as “archaeological archivology” (Horsman, 1999, p. 47) and advanced “reconstructive” work (Maclean, 1962, p. 140-145), the latter opining that a collection of records in this particular scenario might have, borrowing the definitions from archaeologists, both a *provenance*, a place of origin, and a *provenience*, a place where found. In this scenario, the provenance of the records will have an influence on the description of the records and the provenience will provide evidence of the custodial history of the records.

This last scenario, that is records with both provenance and provenience, describes the attributes of the variety of records to be described in chapters 4, 5 and 6. At the outset of this literature review, the ‘old company records’ of the East India Company (EIC), the Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC), the Royal African Company (RAC) and the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) surviving from the seventeenth century are now managed by archivists of the British Library (EIC Archives), National Archives of The Netherlands (VOC Archives), The National Archives [formerly the Public Record Office] (RAC Archives) and Archives of Manitoba (HBC Archives) respectively. These ‘old company records’ are “finite” collections of records having discernable custodial phases in their custodial history, however each collection has not had the same record-keeping treatment over their history. Comparisons of the similarities and differences in record-keeping practices, particularly the archival practices applied in the third custodial phase, yield data that can be used to evaluate the influence these cases have had on the development of archival description.

The following chapters will explore four cases in which archivists have influenced and been influenced by ‘old company records’ through their archival activities of arrangement and description, and the documentation of the custodial history. Archival collections comprised of ‘old company records’ were selected for discussion because of their unique nature and, in particular, that successive organisational, bureaucratic and governmental repositories have kept these records.

Of particular interest in the chapters 4 and 5 will be the discussion on the archival activities of the four archival practitioners who carried out their activities prior to the publication of the *1898 Dutch Manual*; the influence these four men, Danvers (EIC Archives) and De Jonge, Heeres and Colenbrander (on the VOC Archives), may have had on the development of archival practice at the end of the nineteenth century. These pre-*Manual* archivists had experience with records that were not the “stable” records the archival literature (Cook, 1997a) has previously associated with pre-*Manual* archivists.

This thesis, and my paper (Holmes, 2006), presents the first discussion of the work of Danvers, De Jonge, Heeres and Colenbrander in relation to the development of archival practice at the end of the nineteenth century.

## **CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY**

This thesis combines archives and history bringing together historical methods with archival evidence in unusual ways. Using a qualitative research method, the case study approach illustrates the similarities and differences between the archival practices a selected group of archivists have used during consecutive periods through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Some of the research carried out for this thesis could be termed standard historical research through reading theory and documentary / archival evidence, therefore reading the content of the records. However, this thesis also uses other forms of evidence, not usually studied as evidence in their own right in the traditional sense – such as context, and order. These two factors, context and order, are normally seen as preserving the evidential value rather than being studied in their own right. In asking how and why the context and order have changed over time, this thesis brings together historical method and archival theory to move beyond the study of the content of the records, and towards the study of more ephemeral, yet important characteristics. Thus, in bringing together the disciplines of history and archives the methodology used in this thesis is more a material culture approach than a raw historical one.

The information provided in the appendices presents the researcher's own evidence through intimate knowledge of the processes and products of archival theory and practice.

### **3.1 The Case Study as a research methodology**

Using the case study research method reveals the complexities and contradictions that real-life experiences illustrate (Flyvberg, 2006, p. 237). Darke & Shanks (2002, p. 113) note that,

“Areas where there is little understanding of how and why processes or phenomena occur, where the experiences of individuals and the contexts of actions are critical, or where theory and research are at

their early, formative stages can be usefully addressed using case study research”.

The influence of *context* on archives is at the core of the discussion in this thesis, seeking understanding of information from a collection of archival records in the context of the era when the records were created. The context and order of the actual records occurring at the time when they were created does not change over time. What changes is the amount of background information needed for someone totally unfamiliar with the records to gain enough understanding of the context and order of the records to understand how the records were created.

### 3.2 Research Questions

The records of the VOC (1602-1795), the EIC (1599-1858), the RAC (1670-1820) and the HBC (1670-1870<sup>21</sup>) all reflect similar organisational structures when operating as trading companies through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. During that time, all the companies had a management committee in their home country, sending out instructions as to how the company’s activities were to be conducted and in response, their representatives or factors in the various towns along their trading sea-route would send reports on what activities had taken place.

By the first decade of the twenty-first century, both the VOC Archives and the HBC Archives achieved international recognition as unique national resources, by The Netherlands and Canada respectively, and by their inclusion in the UNESCO Memory of the World. However, the EIC Archives and RAC Archives have yet to achieve such international recognition as unique national resources. Is the difference related to the work of arranging and describing the archives that archivists have been able to conduct in these two separate collections? If so, how have archivists made the difference?

Another similarity between the EIC, HBC and RAC is that all three were created as English companies in the seventeenth centuries, and of the three, only the HBC Archives has achieved international recognition as a unique resource, but not in

---

<sup>21</sup> In 1870 all HBC land reverted to the Crown and was transferred to the government of Canada. After 1870 the Hudson’s Bay Company continued with reduced operations.



Britain where the company was originally created, but in Canada where the company operated.

Hilary Jenkinson's archival activities on the RAC Archives provide comparative discussion points between the EIC, VOC and HBC Archives. Another discussion point is about the influence the experience of investigating and arranging the RAC Archives during the first decade of his archival career had on Jenkinson's interpretation of archival practice.

The first four research questions, which follow, are posed to facilitate exploration of the larger questions about the effects of custodial history and archivists' actions on arrangement and description.

1. What effect does its custodial history have on the arrangement and description of archives?
2. What influence have archivists had on the custodial history of an archive through decisions made when arranging and describing that archive?
3. Does the archivist's influence become embedded in the custodial history of the records?
4. What influence does the custodial history of the records have on the archivist, and in turn, on the archivist's contribution to archival practice? Is that contribution reflected in the archival theory of the archivist's era?

Other research questions relate specifically to a comparative analysis between the work of FC Danvers on the EIC Archives and the work of JKJ de Jonge on the VOC Archives.

5. Do references listed in Danvers' manuscript occur in De Jonge's work *Opkomst van het Nederlandsch Gezag in Oost-Indie*? If so, could Danvers have sourced material from the same original records used by De Jonge?
6. Were there similarities between the archiving process used by De Jonge and Danvers? Did both of these archivists, as a result of their own investigations of the documents held in the VOC and EIC Archives respectively, create "artificial collections" to assist future researchers to understand the actions of the Dutch in the East Indies during the seventeenth century?

7. Did Danvers, by sourcing material from the General State Archives in The Hague in 1893-1895, seek to fill a gap he had identified in his India Office Records collection holding the EIC Archives in custody? Did Danvers' subsequent actions of having the Dutch records transcribed, then having them translated and housed in the India Office Records collection, illustrate his altering the records of the events occurring in the East Indies during the years 1609-1700?

### **3.3 Analysis and Development of Finding Aids for Danvers' selection of VOC documents held in the EIC Archives in a series of 106 volumes**

The researcher's initial research investigated a research project conducted between 1893 and 1895 by FC Danvers in the VOC Archives housed in the General State Archives in The Hague. Danvers, who was responsible for the EIC Archives in the India Office, produced a series of 106 volumes of transcribed and translated documents from the VOC Archives which he had bound with the title *Dutch Records at The Hague* and kept in the India Office. Following Danvers' retirement from the India Office in 1898, these volumes of transcribed and translated documents were kept, but received no further archival attention, despite the project being incomplete as a large number of the transcribed Dutch documents had not received an English translation. The finding aid selected by later archivists for these volumes was the working list that Danvers' used when he viewed the volumes in the VOC Archives between 1893 and 1895. The researcher's initial research was to compare the working list with the documents of the 106 volumes, but it was quickly discovered that the working list was not effective as a finding aid because close analysis revealed to comprise far more information than a mere listing of the documents copied. The working list also contained a note by Danvers to the effect that "*Some of the books are in their original state and have not been re-arranged by Mr. De Jonge and others*" (IOR/I/3/86, 1893-1895, p. 30) [see also the researcher's transcription in Appendix 1 page 3]. Thus, it became evident that the working list did not list all the documents copied, but contained a list of the volumes Danvers had viewed in the VOC Archives, thereby providing a snapshot of the order of arrangement of volumes of a section of the VOC Archives. Danvers also wrote the date 1 October 1894

above the note, thus providing a specific date for the snapshot of the order of arrangement of the volumes he had viewed. Later research would reveal that JE Heeres was also working on the VOC Archives in 1894.

Danvers noted that a translator, WR Bisschop, assisted him and he also received assistance from Theodoor Van Riemsdijk, the State Archivist of the Algemeen Rijksarchief (General State Archives) at that time.

Finding aids appear in the appendices to this thesis because they:

1. have been an important tool in this research; and
2. are an important product of this research.

Appendix 1 is a summary record of the VOC volumes of records through which Danvers and Bisschop searched during the years 1893-1894 at the Algemeen Rijksarchief in The Hague. These have been transcribed by the researcher from their 119 page working list (BL: IOR I/3/86). Appendix 3 has been completed to show the number of documents and pages making up the 106 volumes.

A short finding aid (Appendix 4) provides a more complete description, of the numbering used in the VOC documents that make up the 106 volumes, than the one available to the researcher at the British Library in 2003.

From the researcher's investigations at the British Library, an inventory listing the 2,646 documents Danvers had copied was produced, resulting in a 298-page document - too extensive to be included as a print appendix to this thesis. Sample pages from the proposed full finding aid are presented in Appendix 6, the full document being available for publishing at a future date. Appendix 5 includes one document as an example of the content of the documents Danvers selected. Finally, Appendix 2 is a partial match of the documents Danvers' viewed, with the *1992 Inventory of the VOC Archives* (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992). The order of the volumes can be compared and this was a catalyst for the researcher's further investigations into the archival literature of order as a product, fixed in time, describing the arrangement of the VOC Archives. Further, any discussion on the arrangement and description of archives at the end of the nineteenth, particularly in The Netherlands, must include a discussion on the *1898 Dutch Manual*.

## **CHAPTER 4. THE EFFECTS OF CUSTODIAL PHASES ON THE VOC ARCHIVES**

### **4.1 Introduction**

This first case study of the VOC Archives will discuss the records moving from the second custodial phase to third custodial phase. These phases have been set out in Table 4, showing the second custodial phase covered the years 1796-1856, and the third custodial phase extended from the year 1856 to the present. The period in which the third custodial phase began coincides with the dawning of a new era in the history of archival practice in The Netherlands.

The archival activities of JKJ de Jonge, JE Heeres and HT Colenbrander are discussed along with Theodoor Van Riemsdijk's influence for he was State Archivist at the Algemeen Rijksarchief (ARA, General State Archives)<sup>22</sup> in The Hague where the VOC Archives were housed at the end of the nineteenth century. He is also known as the unofficial fourth author of the *1898 Dutch Manual*. Whether De Jonge, Heeres and Colenbrander were active shapers or passive keepers during their tenure as custodians of the VOC Archives is also discussed.

### **4.2 Records of the VOC moving from the first to second custodial phase**

After 193 years of operations, the Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie (VOC) ceased in 1795, after which, the surviving 'old company records' of the VOC were scattered in a number of collections, located in the former VOC offices at Amsterdam, Zeeland, Middleburg, Rotterdam, Delft, Hoorn and Enkhuizen. They were gradually gathered into one central location (Pennings, 1992, p. 35), the records surviving this second custodial phase [outlined in Table 4] becoming the VOC archives, but

Pennings also noted two occasions when some ‘old company records’ were removed. During hostilities in 1809 while occupying the island of Walcheron, the English took seventeenth century documents relating to Ceylon from the Middleburg collection that was located on the island; and in January 1814, the retreating French troops either destroyed or sold as waste paper a considerable quantity of the Middleburg VOC archival records (Pennings, 1992, p. 36). This is a striking example of second custodial phase events and disasters influencing which records survived to be passed on to the third custodial phase.

**Table 4: Custodial Phases of the VOC Archives**

<b>Custodial phases of the Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie (VOC) Archives</b>
<p><b>1602-1795 (First custodial phase)</b> Compagnie van Verre (1598-1610), Magellan EIC, Compagnieën op Oost-Indie, Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie (VOC)</p>
<p><b>1796-1856 (Second custodial phase)</b> Commission for East Indian Affairs, later Council for East Indian Affairs, Ministry of Colonies</p>
<p><b>1856-current (Third custodial phase)</b> VOC Archives (1602-1795) transferred to the Algemeen Rijksarchief, The Hague in 1856</p>
<p><i>Details are drawn from Raben (1992).</i></p>

In 1813, The Netherlands regained its independence and the old records of the VOC were placed under the custodianship of The Netherlands Ministry of Colonies. However, over the next forty years, removals and large-scale destruction of various parts of the VOC archival records occurred. This included the great mass of paper which was sold off in the winter of 1821/1822 and the spring-clean of 1832 (Pennings, 1992, p. 36). The records destroyed during the second custodial phase left significant gaps in the archival material remaining.

Resulting from the chequered custodial history of the archival records since the demise of the VOC in 1795, the structure of the VOC archival records by the 1870s

---

<sup>22</sup> Algemeen Rijksarchief, The Hague (ARA, General State Archives) (established in 1802) changed its name to Nationaal Archief (NA, National Archives of the Netherlands) in 2002. [Source:

could best be described as a collection of records, related in some way, and had survived together. This collection had certainly not been retained in its original organic structure which arose from the Company's business transactions.

### 4.3 The archival work of JKJ de Jonge from 1856-1877

The VOC archival records finally crossed the archival threshold in 1856 when transferred from the Ministry of Colonies to the General State Archives in The Hague. JKJ de Jonge (1828-1880) made his investigations into the VOC Archives over the years 1856-1877. Because the records were then in archival custody his investigations were not restricted or controlled by company or government directives. As the first person to investigate the VOC Archives in their third custodial phase, he did not have any help or documentation from previous custodians so any decisions he made about arrangement had to come from the records themselves, they were the only authoritative reference point available to him.

The accumulation of records worked on by De Jonge contained records from the VOC as well as its predecessor companies – the *Compagnie van Verre* (1598-1610), the *Magellan EIC*, the *Compagnieen op Oost-Indie* as well as records from the Ministry of Colonies (Danvers, 1895a; Pennings, 1992). He used visual assessment of the arrangement of the volumes, however visual assessment alone would not have provided him with the details he needed to discern the discrete groups of predecessor records.

De Jonge found that different volumes in a series were compiled in different ways. When he inspected the volumes of *Overgekomen brieven en papieren (OBP)* [=Letters and Papers received from Asia] prior to 1690, no contents tables were available to guide him through the records. In order to get easier access to them for a particular representative office, he physically pulled apart the volumes up to 1659, and then “rearranged” the documents according to the location of individual factories allowing access to information about a particular factory. However, the series *Letters and Papers received from Asia* had a contents table for each volume for the years after 1690, making it possible for him to identify correspondence originating

---

<http://www.en.nationaalarchief.nl> accessed 10 March 2008.]

from specific towns in the East Indies where the VOC officials had their representative offices. This suggests that, from his visual assessment, De Jonge was able to intuit a grasp of the records relating to the VOC's administrative structure.

Pennings (1992) observed that, by 1856, although, the series *Letters and Papers received from Asia* was kept as one continuous series, no documentation was available to tell how this series was kept in the years up to 1690. Perhaps De Jonge had identified an arrangement practice earlier than the continuous series, for he had carried out his physical rearrangement by subject of the documents in the early volumes during the 1860s and early 1870s. This happened before modern ideas about "the study of history, diplomatics, and the arrangement and description of archives" were being discussed (Horsman et al., 2003, p. ix). However De Jonge's physical rearrangement of the documents by subject in some of the early volumes was a practice performed by other early nineteenth century archival practitioners, including PA Leupe, whose work will be discussed in the next page. Therefore, in the context of his time, it is possible that De Jonge was following a current archival practice. However, because he disturbed the sequence of the documents he had inherited he had altered the evidence of context between the documents, a particular current practice judged undesirable by some of the practitioners immediately following him.

Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that, by arranging the documents by location of factory, De Jonge demonstrated his recognition that documents had originated from specific factories. Although he imposed his own order, he may have seen his rearrangement as preserving their provenance according to where the documents were created, rather than where the documents were sent. As the locations of the factories ranged from Siam (Thailand) to China and Japan, the Cape of Good Hope to Timor, and from Ceylon (Sri Lanka) to Java preserving the provenance of where the documents were created may have been a consideration. However, it does not seem to have occurred to De Jonge that he could have prepared a list which would have provided him with the intellectual arrangement of the documents while retaining their original physical order. If this did enter his thoughts, he must have rejected the idea for some reason he did not record, instead choosing to rearrange the documents physically. By doing so he lost the evidence provided by the continuity of communication between each company representative or Factor, management in The

Netherlands, and possibly evidence of communication between Factors. De Jonge's actions highlight the need for archivists to document the decisions they make when arranging archival records so that future archivists and users of the archival records can understand their decisions. De Jonge's actions may or may not have conformed to current practice, or may have been influenced by his personal research into the VOC Archives. Whatever his reasons were, they are not known now.

As mentioned previously, De Jonge was not the only person to rearrange some of the VOC archival records at that time. A retired naval officer, PA Leupe, also used the collection during the 1870s to compile a catalogue of VOC and other East Indies archival documents. Like De Jonge, Leupe "disturbed the original unit of the volumes by tearing out items and then arranged them according to subject" (Pennings, 1992, p. 40).<sup>23</sup> He also had not worked out the difference between physical and intellectual arrangement – that listings could provide ways of presenting information about records in a manner not disturbing their original order. For his catalogue, Leupe included documents dealing with the subject of the East Indies regardless of whether these were from the VOC archival records, the Ministry of Colonies' records or elsewhere, as long as they contained information about voyages of discovery, ship's logs, instructions and similar (Pennings, 1992, p. 40). However Pennings noted that Leupe went further than De Jonge by removing the maps and drawings from the *Letters and Papers received from Asia*, putting them in a collection of foreign maps (Pennings, 1992, p. 40). These maps and drawings were not reinstated, being retained in a separate maps and drawings section of the Algemeen Rijksarchief (ARA, General State Archives) ever since.

Although it is not appropriate to this research project, an interesting topic for further research would be an investigation to discover whether it was common practice in the early nineteenth century in The Netherlands, and perhaps England too, for documents to be rearranged according to newly assigned subject matter; and whether enclosures such as maps and drawings should be removed from inward correspondence. The answers to these questions may shed light on whether De Jonge and Leupe were

---

<sup>23</sup> Pennings citations for these comments are VROA 12 (1889) 4-5; VROA 21 (1898) 6; VROA 14 (1891) 7; VROA 17 (1894) 6. Verslagen omtrent's Rijks Oude Archieven (VROA) [=Annual report of the Dutch Archive Service]. I have not seen these references.



ignoring accepted professional practice, or whether they were among the last exponents of a common practice since ceasing to be used.

Ketelaar (1986, p. 49) observed, “In the Netherlands, as well as in other countries, archivists had to undo the mistakes of their predecessors who had pulled about ‘organically grown’ archive groups in order to construct chronologically or subject arranged collections”. By way of example, Ketelaar referred to the work of JA Feith, the second author of the *1898 Dutch Manual*, extant in the State Archives in Groningen. In 1894, he had begun restoration of the archives his father and grandfather had arranged by chronological or subject order, spending the final nine year of his life restoring “the archives to their original form and structure, while keeping his father’s chronological and alphabetical inventories as concordances” (Ketelaar, 1986, p. 49). Therefore, De Jonge’s rearrangement activities to suit his own research interests in the 1860s and 1870s may well have been common practice in The Netherlands. However, Ketelaar does not mention whether the original Feith physically dismantled existing volumes, as De Jonge had done, or removed enclosures such as maps and drawings from inward correspondence, as Leupe had done. Further research for other instances of physically dismantling documents from volumes or enclosures from inward correspondence may shed light on whether De Jonge and Leupe were mavericks in their own time.

Pennings (1992, p. 40) wrote of De Jonge’s efforts in taking apart some volumes creating a great deal of work for his successors, Heeres and Colenbrander, who had to rectify De Jonge’s efforts, noting disapprovingly that De Jonge’s actions “meant that the origin of and connection between the documents were no longer readily distinguishable”. De Jonge’s actions in taking apart the papers in many volumes of the *Letters and Papers received from Asia* gave Heeres and Colenbrander, his successor custodians, a great deal of additional work but also much food for thought.

Yet by undertaking the rearrangement in the way that he did, De Jonge provided an excellent evidential basis for later discussions seeking reasons his actions not being best practice for the preservation of the inherited order of the records of *all* the volumes in a single group. His actions thereby became an example of what not to do if an inherited order was to be kept; and, more particularly, the inherited order of records should not be rearranged to facilitate access to *some* of the records. Maybe

the case of records management practices for the volumes after 1690 had included the production of a contents list, whereas the practices prior to 1690 did not generally require production of a contents list. Perhaps the contents lists had been produced in the 1700s, the previous work having traced back as far as 1690 only. Whatever the reason for the volumes prior to 1690 not having a contents list, the better practice for De Jonge would have been to produce contents lists for the volumes prior to 1690, rather than rearranging the actual documents.

Like De Jonge, Leupe's activities of extracting documents and then arranging them according to subject also disturbed the origin of and connection between the documents. Heeres could not repair the resultant disconnect caused by Leupe's actions of separating the maps and drawings from the *Letters and Papers received from Asia*, the connection between the maps and drawings and their original correspondence being irrevocably lost.

#### **4.4 The archival work of JE Heeres from 1877-1898**

JE Heeres (1858-1932) took over the custodianship of the VOC Archives after De Jonge departed in 1877, commencing his work by first making an inventory (Pennings, 1992). Though De Jonge and Heeres were but one generation apart, Heeres belonged to the generation of archivists from 1874 that started a new era in the history of archival practice in The Netherlands, the archival practices of these two men standing in stark contrast.

In their discussion on a new era in the history of archival practice that led up to the *1898 Dutch Manual*, Horsman et al (2003) refer to the damaging arrangement activities of early nineteenth-century archivists. Because of the actions of these early nineteenth-century archivists, alternative arrangement criteria were the first topic addressed. Horsman et al (2003, p. ix) proclaimed, "Progress was first achieved in the discussion about arrangement criterion. It was already apparent that the wayward manner of arrangement used by earlier nineteenth century archivists had caused much damage". They inferred the wayward manner of arrangement as resulting from a lack of set rules and the arrangement used being too dependent on the idiosyncrasies of the archivists. The choices for arrangement could either be by form of material,

alphabetically, according to historical periods, according to some other artificial classification, or according to a natural classification drawn from the organisation of the administration itself (Horsman et al., 2003, p. viii). At the time, the choice of which arrangement style to use depended on the idiosyncratic preferences of the archivist.

Heeres' work demonstrates his recognition of the different provenances between the private and government records interspersed with the VOC archival records. Moreover, he ascertained the VOC to have a definable existence from 1602 to 1795. As such, Heeres had a much more sophisticated understanding of the nature of archival materials and context than either De Jonge or Leupe. He moved from his broad perspective of seeing the VOC archival collection as a whole, to understanding how records of a particular administrative unit formed part of the overall administration process creating them. He demonstrated an understanding of provenance, not only from the crude perspective of a total collection and the now accepted general principle of not mixing records from different sources, but also took into account internal administrative structure and change. This understanding is reflected in Heeres' inventory of documents which also allowed him to separate out VOC documents gradually from documents of private origin and pre-companies<sup>24</sup> as well as documents from the Ministry of Colonies' records.

Heeres completed his provisional inventory of the archives of the Amsterdam Chamber in 1891 and of the Zeeland Chamber in 1893, and then began work on the arrangement of the records formerly kept in an administrative unit of the Amsterdam Chamber (Pennings, 1992, p. 40). During the time he was undertaking this work on the VOC archival records, which were held in the General State Archives of The Netherlands, Theodoor van Riemsdijk had become General State Archivist. Thus, it is very likely Van Riemsdijk influenced Heeres' work because, as General State Archivist, he was in charge of the repository holding the VOC Archives. Much later he would become known as the unofficial fourth author of the *1898 Dutch Manual* (Ketelaar, 1996a, p. 31, abstract). Ketelaar averred that, after becoming General State Archivist, Van Riemsdijk was eager to share his developing methodology of using careful observation and analysing phenomena which would ultimately provide a

---

<sup>24</sup> Compagnie van Verre, Magellan EIC and the Compagnieen op Oost-Indie

basis for archival theory (Ketelaar, 1996b, p. 60). As revealed in the literature review, Van Riemsdijk advocated a *Principle of Respect for Archival Structure* that he had articulated at the 1890 Conference of Dutch State Archivists (Ketelaar, 1996b, p. 34). But, this principle had not been included in the *1898 Dutch Manual*. Possibly Heeres' work in the VOC Archives was a testing ground for Van Riemsdijk's methodologies swirling around the Dutch archival community regarding the pre-*Manual* period. In any event, Van Riemsdijk's *Principle* was not recorded in the *Manual*.

Heeres had demonstrated this methodology during his investigation in the 1880s of the VOC archival records by first separating out the records by their different provenances. Then, by concentrating on the Amsterdam Chamber, he began an analysis of the records filed by one of the administrative units there. As already noted, Heeres completed this compilation of a provisional inventory of the VOC archives of the Amsterdam Chamber in 1891, two years later finishing those of the Zeeland Chamber (Pennings, 1992, p. 40). The inventories produced by Heeres were then passed on to his successor, HT Colenbrander, for the continuing work of arranging the VOC Archives to build on Heeres' endeavours.

#### **4.5 The archival work of HT Colenbrander from 1898-1912**

From 1898 HT Colenbrander (1871-1945) continued the work that Heeres had begun after he had moved on to a new appointment (Pennings, 1992, p. 40). In the volumes of *Letters and Papers received from Asia*, Colenbrander introduced a break at 1614. Before 1614 documents were arranged according to voyage, but after 1614, when a more permanent central administration had been established in Asia and the chambers in the Dutch Republic could count on a more regular stream of papers from Batavia, the documents were arranged chronologically (Pennings, 1992, p. 43). Through his work using both arrangement and description, Colenbrander was able to build on the details of the administrative history recorded by Heeres.

Through the years 1898-1902 Colenbrander maintained a regular discussion with Van Riemsdijk about the manner in which the inventory of the VOC Archives should be compiled (Pennings, 1992, p. 40-41 ; 2007). Colenbrander was Van Riemsdijk's assistant at the General State Archives (Ketelaar, 1986, p. 50), agreeing with him that

“the inventory should reflect as much as possible the working of the administration of the VOC but there were too few documents still extant to really do this justice” (Pennings, 1992, p. 40-41). Colenbrander’s goal remained to return the records, as far as possible, to their original order and to remove those documents not belonging in the VOC Archives. In order to achieve this goal, Colenbrander traced documents from the collections of the East Indian section of the colonial archives to determine whether they belonged to the archives of special VOC committees or to the private archives of the directors (Pennings, 1992, p. 40-41). Significantly, Colenbrander was taking Heeres’ work one-step further, building on the administrative scenario Heeres had delineated by discerning separate organisational units, thereby analysing what documents comprised in the collection, and refining the formerly broad view of the collection now known as the VOC Archives in his custody.

Van Riemsdijk was a crucially important discussion partner for Colenbrander on the methodology of how to return the records to their original order. As part of a new era in the history of archival practice in The Netherlands from 1874, Van Riemsdijk had “placed the intellectual centre of gravity of the inventory process at the level of the organisation of the administration and more particularly in the organisation of the administrative process, which the arrangement of the archive was presumed to mirror (Horsman et al., 2003, p. x). Ketelaar (1996b, p. 60) noted Van Riemsdijk “believed that the basis of archival theory was careful observation and analysis of phenomena and organizations”. In this way, the observation and analysis could be used in conjunction with the rules outlined in the *1898 Dutch Manual* so that best practice of the day was drawing from two sources – a textbook and discussion with colleagues. In essence, the *1898 Dutch Manual* did not go far enough when explaining how to observe and analyse, but the practices of thoughtful archivists like Van Riemsdijk were essential to developing criteria for arrangement and description best practices further.

Colenbrander’s work with the VOC Archives makes them one of the first archival collections of business records to be arranged using, not only the *1898 Dutch Manual*’s advice, but also the pioneering insights of Van Riemsdijk. Ketelaar (1996b) has described Van Riemsdijk’s contribution as “a functional interpretation of the context surrounding the creation of documents in order to understand the integrity of

the fonds and the functions of the archives”. The contextual descriptive information about how the records were created within an administrative framework was exactly what Colenbrander was able to achieve. He did this by drawing on all the sources of information about the archives, as well as the sources of information about archival practices available to him.

Colenbrander would have been assisted by Rules 3 and 4 of the *1898 Dutch Manual* to identify the VOC Archives as being separate from the Ministry of Colonies Archives and the predecessor companies. Rule 4 starts with “A sharp distinction should be made between an archival collection and the contents of an archival depository as a whole. In an archival depository<sup>25</sup> one may find six kinds of archives ...”; and Rule 3 advises “A merchant, as well as a business partnership or company, possess an archival collection<sup>26</sup> consisting of journals, cash books, letters received, copies of letters sent, etc.” (Muller et al., 2003, p. 20-21). However the *1898 Dutch Manual* would not have assisted Colenbrander on the methodology he should use to interpret the context surrounding the creation of the documents.

Why was this so? Though investigative activities into archival collections were occurring at the end of nineteenth century, the details were not articulated in the *1898 Dutch Manual* per se because its lead author, Muller, wanted to set out rules he determined ought to be followed by archivists when carrying out the process of arranging and describing archives. Ketelaar documented Muller’s intent in early 1996 when interest about the upcoming centenary of the publication of the *Manual* occurred, opining,

“The principle of respect for archival structure was discovered by Van Riemsdijk and codified in the Dutch Manual as the basis for arrangement and description however in a *functional archival science* it is also the basis for appraising the *value* of records” (Ketelaar, 1996a, p. 35-37).

The *1898 Dutch Manual* set out 100 of such binding rules to be used by archivists for the process of arrangement and description, whereas Van Riemsdijk wanted to set out guiding principles for a developing archival theory.

---

<sup>25</sup> See the entry for *archival depository* in the Glossary section of this thesis.

<sup>26</sup> See the entry for *archival collection* in the Glossary section of this thesis.

Colenbrander would have accepted the influence of Van Riemsdijk's ideas about functional methodology and respect for archival structure, because those ideas were helpful to him in identifying the original order of the VOC Archives. The *1898 Dutch Manual* did not present a methodology for interpreting the context surrounding the creation of the documents that Colenbrander would need to complete his task. However, though the *1898 Dutch Manual* did not document Van Riemsdijk's methodology, his ideas did influence the archivists around him at that time, particularly Colenbrander, and that influence became embedded in the custodial history of the VOC Archives.

The year 1912 signposted two important events: Colenbrander completed the restoration of the original order of the *Letters and papers received from Asia of the Amsterdam Chamber* formerly disturbed by De Jonge (Pennings, 1992, p. 43); and Theodoor van Riemsdijk retired as General State Archivist of The Netherlands.

Colenbrander's thoughtful implementation of best practices available to him ensured him to be much more than a passive keeper of an archival collection, his role as active shaper being more positive than De Jonge's role as a negative active shaper, Colenbrander rejected practices that lacked thoughtful attention to archival theory. He was one of a succession of archivists, starting with Heeres, who stood on each others' shoulders to:

- a) refine the principles of provenance and original order;
- b) incorporate those principles into best practice through arrangement and description that reflects the original organic structure of the creating body; and in doing so
- c) assist the user to understand that structure in order to access and use the records.

By drawing on a range of influences, especially the solid preparation given to him by Heeres, the sound advice from Van Riemsdijk, the specific rules in the *1898 Dutch Manual*, and his own observation and careful analysis, Colenbrander was able to make the best use of all the resources available to him. Throughout his work in the third custodial phase the big picture of the composition of the VOC Archives became increasingly clearer. He influenced the VOC Archives and conversely, the VOC Archives had an influence on him and his outlook on archives. He developed

practices that demonstrated a refinement of the concept of provenance to include internal administrative function and structure.

#### 4.6 The work of later archivists – from 1912 onwards

After Colenbrander, the work of arranging and describing the remaining components of the VOC Archives was carried out by successive generations of archivists. However, for many years after 1912 a silence fell upon the records while the events before and during the first and second world wars ravaged Europe and many other parts of the world.

In 1937, Mrs M.A.P. Meilink-Roelofs (c1911-1988) began her work on the VOC Archives. Building on the numbering of the documents used in the inventory that had been compiled by Heeres and Colenbrander, Meilink-Roelofs did a re-inventory in order to integrate the details of all the components of the VOC archival records into a complete inventory (Pennings, 1992, p. 43). She completed her task in 1963 and two years later, on the basis of her new inventory, the archives were all numbered consecutively. Pennings proclaimed that the complete inventory, contained in nine typescript volumes, thereafter “facilitated access to the VOC Archives and has stimulated research into the history of the Dutch overseas, as well as Asian history” (Pennings, 1992, p. 43). By building on the work of her predecessors, primarily the inventories they had compiled, Meilink-Roelofs completed an inventory of the VOC Archives. Table 5 depicts the categories of originating offices used in her *1992 Inventory of the VOC Archives*.

**Table 5: Table of contents of the Inventory of the VOC Archives (1992)**

**Part I: The Heren XVII and the Amsterdam Chamber**

- A. Charters
- B. Proceedings
- C. Outgoing documents
- D. Incoming documents from Europe
- E. Incoming documents from Asia
- ...5a. Letters and papers received from Asia by the Heren XVII and the Amsterdam Chamber<sup>27</sup>
- F. Documents from the committees of the Heren XVII and the Amsterdam Chamber
- G. Documents from the advocates of the VOC
- H. Documents kept separately, partly originally miscellaneous documents
- I. Documents from the departments and offices

<sup>27</sup> De Jonge, Heeres and Colenbrander conducted their archival activities on these volumes.



K. Documents from the clerks' office of the Amsterdam Chamber
<p><b>Part II. Zeeland Chamber</b></p> <p>A. Charters  B. Proceedings  C. Outgoing documents  D. Incoming documents from Europe  E. Documents of the Governor-General and Council received by the Heren XVII and the Zeeland Chamber  F. Documents received from the Court of Justice in Batavia by the Heren XVII and the Zeeland Chamber  G. Documents received from the establishments in Asia  H. Documents of the committee for the ten-yearly and four-yearly accounts  I. Documents kept separately, partly originally miscellaneous documents  K. Documents from the departments and offices  I. Old inventories of the chamber</p>
<p><b>Part III. Delft Chamber</b></p> <p>A. Incoming documents  B. Documents originating from the directors Adriaan and Gerard van Vredenburg  C. Documents concerning the commerce PM  D. Documents concerning the equipage PM  E. Documents concerning the salary administration  F. Documents concerning the financial management</p>
<p><b>Part IV. Rotterdam Chamber</b></p> <p>A. General  B. Incoming documents  C. Documents concerning the decline of the VOC PM  D. Documents concerning the equipage and the salary administration  E. Documents concerning the commerce  F. Documents concerning the financial administration</p>
<p><b>Part V. Hoorn Chamber</b></p> <p>A. General  B. Documents concerning and originating from the directors  C. Documents originating from the equipage department  D. Documents originating from the commercial department  E. Documents concerning the financial administration  F. Documents concerning the management of the archive</p>
<p><b>Part VI. Enkhuisen Chamber</b></p> <p>A. General  B. Documents concerning the salary administration  C. Documents concerning the commerce  D. Documents the financial administration</p> <p>Part VII. Documents with no apparent connection with the VOC Archives  Part VIII. Obsolete finding aids to the VOC Archives</p>
<i>Details from the English translation of the main document categories (Raben, 1992, p. 145-151).</i>

The first one hundred years of the third custodial phase of the VOC records encompassed the work of a dedicated group of archivists (notably Heeres,

Colenbrander and Meilink-Roelofs) who guarded, analysed, rebuilt and shaped the collection of records now known as the VOC Archives. The primary device for communication between each generation of archivists was the inventories and descriptive products compiled in them.

Meilink-Roelofs retired from the General State Archives in 1971 to take up a position as extraordinary professor of history, however she continued to occupy herself with the history of the early Dutch East Indies. She had intended to write the general introduction to the inventory of the VOC archives but was not able to do so, having died in 1988. That same year work began on the publication of the inventory under the editorial guidance of Remco Raben, Joyce Pennings supervising the project completed when the inventory was published in 1992 (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992; Raben, 1992).

Following the publication of the VOC inventory in 1992, a new research era for the VOC Archives began, the inventory, having documented the composition of the archives, and thereby opening up the records to potential users.

The TANAP initiative began with a 1997-1998 development of a project *Towards a New Age of Partnership (TANAp); a Dutch/Asian/South African programme of cooperation based on a mutual past*<sup>28</sup>, jointly developed by the National Archives of the Netherlands and the Research School for Asian, African and Amerindian Studies CNWS of Leiden University. From 2000, funds were made available by the Dutch Government and the Netherlands Institute for Scientific Research to create the TANAP website <http://www.tanap.net>. The latter website is a vital communication hub for the TANAP program.

After almost a century and a half of dedicated work by successive archival custodians and researchers, the VOC Archives were jointly nominated for inclusion to the UNESCO Memory of the World Register, the nominees being five countries, The Netherlands, India, Indonesia, South Africa and Sri Lanka. The application was accepted in 2003<sup>29</sup>, this recognition being a crowning achievement for the VOC Archives and the dedicated work of its successive archival custodians.

---

<sup>28</sup> Details from [http://www.tanap.net/content/about/first\\_steps.cfm](http://www.tanap.net/content/about/first_steps.cfm) [accessed 10 March 2008]

<sup>29</sup> Details from [http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=7364&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL_ID=7364&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html) [accessed 10 March 2008]

## 4.7 Summary of the VOC Archives and archival influences

The following issues raised in this chapter are discussed further in chapters 7 and 8.

1. The custodial history of the VOC Archives contains a striking example of second custodial phase events and influential disasters which records survived to be passed on to the third custodial phase. Records destroyed during the second custodial phase left significant gaps in them.
2. De Jonge was the first person to investigate the VOC Archives in their third custodial phase. He received neither help nor documentation from previous custodians so any decisions he made about arrangement had to come from the records themselves, they being the only authoritative reference point available to him.
3. The work of Heeres identified De Jonge's rearrangement had to be corrected.
4. The work of Colenbrander built on the investigative work of Heeres.
5. Colenbrander's role as active shaper played a more positive part than De Jonge's role as a negative active shaper, because Colenbrander rejected practices lacking thoughtful attention to developing archival theory. Colenbrander was part of a succession of archivists, starting with Heeres, who stood on each others' shoulders to:
  - a) refine the principles of provenance and original order;
  - b) incorporate those principles into best practice through arrangement and description that reflects the original organic structure of the creating body; and in doing so
  - c) assist the user to understand that structure in order to access and use the records.
6. Heeres and Colenbrander worked on the VOC Archives during the 1890s, a decade of intense archival discourse prior to the publication of the *1898 Dutch Manual*. Colenbrander's mentor was Theodoor Van Riemsdijk, the unofficial fourth author of the *1898 Dutch Manual*, who at the 1890 Conference of

Dutch State Archivists, advocated a *Principle of respect for archival structure* (Ketelaar, 1996a, p. 34). This principle is instructive when an archivist is rearranging an archival collection to reflect the records management structure maintaining the records in their first custodial phase.

7. When Heeres started to work in 1877, the VOC Archives were not a discrete collection, but part of the accumulation of records from the Ministry of Colonies that included the VOC Archives. However, the VOC Archives were in their third custodial phase. Colenbrander and Meilink-Roelofs continued the work started by Heeres and when this was completed by Meilink-Roelofs in 1963 the VOC Archives were a discrete collection. The physical location of the VOC Archives throughout its entire third custodial phase has been in a purpose built archival repository. The significant arrangement, description and collation of archival details occurred during the third custodial phase of the VOC Archives, taking over ninety-six years to complete.

## CHAPTER 5. THE EFFECTS OF CUSTODIAL PHASES ON THE EIC ARCHIVES

### 5.1 Introduction

This second case study of the East India Company (EIC) Archives will discuss the records moving from the first custodial phase to the second custodial phase. These phases have been set out in Table 6, which shows that the second custodial phase covered the years from 1858-1981, the early years of the period coinciding with the dawning of a new era in the history of archival practice in The Netherlands.

The archival activities of FC Danvers with the EIC Archives and his records management activities with the India Office records are discussed. The contexts of the creation of those records were different, Danvers knowing the two organisations were different because he had worked for both. He had started his working life with the EIC in 1853 and retired from the India Office in 1898; thus, Danvers was in a unique position few archivists would have the opportunity to experience.

Also discussed are Danvers' visits to the General State Archives over the years 1893-1895 to view volumes in the VOC Archives. During his visits to the General State Archives in The Hague he met Theodoor Van Riemsdijk who facilitated Danvers access to the VOC volumes. The former's active participation in the new era in the history of archival practice in The Netherlands has been discussed in chapter 4 which centred on the VOC Archives. Danvers retired in 1898, the year the *1898 Dutch Manual* was published. Although Danvers would not have seen the *Manual* before his retirement the researcher's observation is that he was influenced by ideas of investigative archival analysis. Whether Danvers was an active shaper or passive keeper during his tenure as custodian of the EIC Archives is discussed.

## 5.2 The archival work of FC Danvers from 1884-1898

When FC Danvers (1833-1906) took on the role of Registrar and Superintendent of Records in the India Office in 1884, the EIC Archives were a discrete collection, although they were regarded as predecessor volumes to the India Office Records. Table 6 shows that during the second custodial phase of the EIC Archives, Danvers carried out his work and making a crucial difference between his work with the EIC Archives, and Heeres' and Colenbrander's work with the VOC Archives. This comparison will be further discussed in section 5.4.

**Table 6: Custodial Phases of the EIC Archives**

<b>Custodial phases of the East India Company (EIC) Archives</b>
<b>1599-1858 (First custodial phase)</b> London East India Company, English East India Company, East India Company
<b>1858-1981 (Second custodial phase)</b> Board of Control <sup>30</sup> , India Office, Burma Office, Commonwealth Relations Office, later the Commonwealth Office, Dominions Office, Foreign and Commonwealth Office
<b>1982-current (Third custodial phase)</b> EIC Archives (1599-1858) in the India Office Records deposited with the newly established British Library, London in 1982.
<i>Details are drawn from Sutton (1967) and the India Office Records (IOR) web page<sup>31</sup></i>

The context of the record's creation for the EIC and the India Office were very different. However in the latter part of the nineteenth century Danvers attempted to separate out the EIC Archives from the India Office Records, knowing the two organisations were different because he had worked for both. His knowledge of the records management practices of the EIC stemmed from his joining it in 1853 as a correspondence writer. He had also experienced the transition phase from the EIC to the newly created India Office when the latter was formed in 1858. His work in the Correspondence Department had him make several proposals to improve the

<sup>30</sup> The Board of Control was created in 1834.

<sup>31</sup> Details from the IOR web page at <http://www.bl.uk/collections/iorgenrl.html> [accessed Feb 2, 2008]

workflow and efficient management of incoming and outgoing documents within this newly formed India Office.

Between 1878 and 1883 Danvers identified changes that would reduce the duplication of registration of incoming and outgoing documents (Kaminisky, 1986, p. 19). He also had experience with processing new acquisitions of ‘old company records’. When in 1883, he was sent a large volume of old Marine records, which had been kept by the Military Department, his first request was to have the previous custodian of the records write up a description of the records, writing he wanted:

“to have a proper list of these Records made before handing them over to my custody ... I have no doubt Mr. Mason would willingly aid by his advice and personal supervision as he is, I believe, the only person who has sufficient knowledge of these [old Marine] Records to efficiently perform that duty” (IOR/L/R/4/2, 1879-1885, p. 222-223).

It transpired that Mason was not able to produce the list and Danvers had to process the records as best he could.

In 1883, Danvers drew on his knowledge of the administration of the India Office, garnered from his 30 years of service mainly in the Correspondence Branch, to propose a revised structure for a Registry and Record Department to be overseen by a Registrar and Superintendent of Records (IOR/L/R/4/4, 1880-1889, p. 4). The proposal was approved and Danvers was promoted to the newly created position of Registrar and Superintendent of Records in January 1884. During 1884, he established a Central Registry for all incoming and outgoing documents for all departments in the India Office, except the Secret Department (Kaminisky, 1986, p. 19). Adequate intellectual control was something the previous system had lacked because individual departments, as well as the previous Registry had maintained separate registers, leading to a complex system of double registration for some documents and no registration for others. By proposing a revised structure for a Central Registry, Danvers demonstrated his understanding that a central register of incoming and outgoing documents would allow intellectual and physical control of the documents from a central point.

In October 1884, Danvers presented a preliminary report regarding the records management practices of the Correspondence Branch of the India Office

(IOR/L/R/4/2, 1879-1885, p. 249). One of the points, for which he sought approval to implement, was the centralised custody of the records. To this end he recommended that all departments of the India Office (except Political, Accounts and Stores departments) hand over their records older than 3 years, to the custody of the Registry and Record Department. Council approved his proposal with the proviso that the departments concerned did not express any objections. The reason Danvers gave for wanting the records from the departments sent to the Registry and Records Department on a regular basis was that he be able to classify and arrange documents with an economy of space and labour, and to clear records not required to be retained for record purposes (IOR/L/R/4/2, 1879-1885, p. 249). Danvers' work indicated that he had a sophisticated understanding of records management, particularly in regard to gaining intellectual control over them, and the value of a retention and disposal schedule.

In Departmental orders of 21 February 1888 Danvers was directed to discontinue the work of classifying and arranging the old records and implement a plan for the making of Press Lists<sup>32</sup> and Calendars<sup>33</sup> (IOR/L/R/4/5, 1890-1892, p. 349). At that time the documentation practice of the Public Record Office was to produce calendars (Cantwell, 1991, p. 246). Foster (1919, p. 50) noted that, with regard to Secret Records, "the press list does not exhibit clearly the relations between the various records". Press lists were only printed for official use and generally not available to the public (Foster, 1919, p. x). Danvers was disappointed at being instructed to prepare press lists because they were expensive to produce and of limited use.

This Departmental order was made showing that Danvers had to abide by the records management priorities set by the India Office management committee, and also that his superiors did not share his enthusiasm for investigating the EIC records. Danvers was disappointed his superiors did not share his enthusiasm for the archival records; however he had to do as he was instructed. He had insufficient staff to carry out all the record-keeping activities he would like, having to adhere to the direction of the records management of the India Office records being his first priority. As far as the

---

<sup>32</sup> See the entry for *press lists* in the Glossary section of this thesis.

<sup>33</sup> See the entry for *calendars* in the Glossary section of this thesis.



India Office management committee were concerned investigating the ‘old company records’ would have to wait.

In 1890 Danvers read his paper entitled *The India Office Records: a brief account of the results of his examination, during the last six years, of the records relating to India and the East India Company, now in the possession of the Secretary of State for India* before the assembled members of the Society of Arts in London, previously mentioned in chapter 1. He remarked that, though the custodianship of public records in the nineteenth century had been neglected, an opportunity existed to preserve records they held in trust from previous generations, together with records of their own time, and hand them on to the next generation (Danvers, 1890, p. 159-160). He was articulating the importance of archives and the need for considered and careful custodianship of them.

Danvers’ remarks in the quote above indicate that he wanted to advocate actively for archives being a source of information he felt was undervalued by the academic community of his era. He saw the custodial responsibility would have to become active necessarily because preservation of archives can only happen when an active interest is taken in their preservation over time. Danvers cited a case wherein records had been assessed in 1830 and deemed to be useful for preservation, but later to be flagged for destruction when they were reassessed in 1858 (Danvers, 1890, p. 162). His opinion was that better care should be given to archival records from 1890 onwards compared with the neglect given before 1890, the key being the importance of ongoing custody of records by archivists.

From the proposals and detailed discussion in Danvers’ 1890 paper, the researcher concluded that Danvers had a sophisticated understanding of the nature of archival records, and the importance of their accumulation under responsible custody.

Danvers revealed his knowledge that he knew that some of the records of the India Office, newly created during his time as Registrar and Superintendent of Records, would later become archives too. This knowledge can be traced to Danvers’ 1884 report on records management practices in which he outlined how each department should send the records required to be retained to the Registry and Records Department on a regular basis (IOR/L/R/4/2, 1879-1885, p. 249). His comprehensive approach to record-keeping was influenced by Danvers having to

manage the “old” records and the “new” records, thus he developed an approach to providing access to the EIC collection using intellectual control through description. This solution stood in stark contrast to that of De Jonge: physical re-arrangement of the records - a much more primitive solution to the problem which obscured the administrative origins of the records.

Danvers was also influenced by the need to have finding aids to encourage researchers to access the archives. The registry system he had put in place aimed to address the issue of having intellectual control over the newly created records, Danvers being influenced by “new” records being in their first custodial phase as well as by the “old” records being in the second custodial phase and moving towards the third custodial phase. He was hampered by having to prioritise the work load of his staff when the newly created records came into the Records and Registry Department each day; however he used every available management tool he could, for example, he provided statistics on the number of researchers using the collection, so approval would be forthcoming when he applied for the additional funding for extra staff to investigate and arrange the old records (IOR/L/R/4/2, 1879-1885, p. 221, 225). An average of 70 searches per year between 1884 and 1898 were made by Records and Registry staff on behalf of public enquiries (Danvers, 1898, Table 4).

In 1891, Danvers once more took up the challenge of arranging the records of the EIC in his custodianship. Table 7 indicates the list of records that had been examined by Danvers by 1891 and the categories of documents delineated.

**Table 7: Records examined by Danvers by 1891**

**EIC Records examined and completed, arranged by 1891**

Original correspondence series (1603-1708) – 72 volumes  
Court Minutes (1599-1858/59) – 191 volumes  
Despatches to India (1653-1753) – 28 volumes  
Despatches to several Presidencies and elsewhere (1753-1858) – 488 volumes  
Home correspondence (1702-1859) – 119 volumes  
Colonial Office (East Indies) & Board of Control Records (1748-1858) – 2904 volumes

**Records collected from various collections, arranged and bound by 1891**

Java Records (1595-1827) – 71 volumes  
Sumatra Records (1615-1818) – 162 volumes  
Borneo Records (1648-1814) – 2 volumes  
Straits Settlements (1769-1830) – 196 volumes  
Saint Helena (1677-1836) – 154 volumes  
Cape of Good Hope (1773-1836) – 24 volumes  
The French in India (1664-1813) – 15 volumes  
China and Japan (1596-1840) – 290 volumes  
Parchment Record; Charters, etc. (1493-1747) – 92 documents

**Records classified but not yet finally arranged by 1891**

Fort St. David Records (1684-1759) – 11 volumes (more to be done)  
Persia & Persian Gulf (1620-1874) – 130 volumes (more to be done)

**Records partially examined and classified, but not yet arranged by 1891**

Marine Records – about 15,000 books and bundles  
Egypt and Red Sea Records

**Collections examined and tables of their contents made by 1891**

The Dundas Papers – 41 volumes  
Collection known as “Miscellaneous Records” – 68 volumes  
Similar work is now in hand with regard to  
The Wilks Collection – 13 volumes (more to be done)  
The Orme Collection – 231 volumes (more to be done)

Work remaining to be done (arrangement, binding, etc.)

The Dutch in India  
The Portuguese in India  
Early Home Records of the East India Company  
Factory Records of the East India Company  
Home correspondence, Letters received (1709-1858)  
Miscellaneous loose papers relating to the Home Affairs of the East India Company in the 19<sup>th</sup> century  
Table of contents of the Buchanan Hamilton Collection

*Details for this table drawn from Danvers 1891 report (IOR/L/R/4/5, 1890-1892, p. 347, 349)*

Also in his 1891 report, Danvers described the administrative periods of the East India Company as:

- Factory Records, dated from 1600-1708
  - Territorial Records, dating from 1708-1858
  - Imperial Records, dating from 1858-current [1891]
- (IOR/L/R/4/5, 1890-1892, p. 339)

By describing the distinct administrative periods he had discerned from the records, Danvers demonstrated a desire to have the archival records arranged to reflect the organisational structure that created the records. This compares favourably with the approach being used by Van Riemsdijk when identifying the organisational structure creating the records in their first custodial phase.

However, Danvers produced the 1891 report before he had met Van Riemsdijk in August 1893. Therefore, as far as this research can ascertain, Danvers' desire to have the archival records arranged to reflect the organisational structure creating them occurred before he met Van Riemsdijk. It is further observed that Danvers' arrangement to reflect the EIC structure happened because Danvers had first-hand experience of the EIC structure from early in his career when the EIC had employed him. Danvers' academic background in structural engineering and statistics provided him with an appreciation of structure and order which was also useful in his work. He had written reports, e.g., 1875, 1877, published articles, e.g., 1879, and had a patent for a mechanical pencil accepted in 1889 (Danvers, 1875, 1877, 1879, 1889). As was apparent in 1884 when he produced a revised structure for the Records and Registry Department, Danvers demonstrated his use of sound research methodologies to investigate issues and propose solutions thoughtfully.

Another example of Danvers' innovative approach to enhancing access services to users of the records was a novel solution which he said was to "aid the memory" of recent past events related to India and the East. In June 1893 *An Index to events relating to India and the East referred to in "The Times" between the years 1850 and 1889 inclusive* was published. In the preface, Danvers explained he "conceived the idea of making a compilation ... of references to India and the East contained in the quarterly issues of the 'Index to the 'Times' newspaper' "(Danvers, 1893, p. 2). In this project, he was assisted by two of his staff, TC Fenton and W Foster, who had identified references in 160 volumes of indexes of *The Times* to newsworthy political, administration and social events "that occurred with reference to India and the East generally during the latter years of the Honourable East India Company and the first thirty-one years of the administration of India by the Imperial Government" (Danvers, 1893, p. 2). Apart from showing the type of enquiries for information his office received, this statement by Danvers also shows he knew 1858 to be the last year of

the EIC and the first year of the India Office. This is further evidence that Danvers not only straddled the first and second custodial phases of the EIC records, but also understood the significance of the custodial change.

### 5.3 Danvers' visit to the VOC Archives from 1893-1895

Danvers was deputed from 1891-1892 to inspect records at archives in Portugal (Lisbon & Evora) and The Hague from 1893-1895 to source original materials that could be transcribed and translated. The records he inspected in Portugal were related to the Portuguese activities in India, he produced a report of his visit as well a two-volume history of the Portuguese in India published in 1894 (Danvers, 1892, 1894). Portuguese activities in India were particularly topical at that time because in 1898 Portugal celebrated the 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Vasco Da Gama's discovery of India on 20<sup>th</sup> May 1498 (Danvers, 1892, p. 1).

Danvers met Van Riemsdijk when he visited the General State Archives in The Hague during August 1893, September 1894 and during 1895. He researched the VOC Archives to identify documents relating to seventeenth century interactions between English and other European nations with the Dutch in India and the East (Danvers, 1895b, p. 54). Therefore, by looking for complementary records in the VOC Archives, Danvers was an active shaper of the information held in the EIC Archives on the rivalry between the EIC and VOC, particularly in the seventeenth century.

During his visits to the General State Archives, Danvers had searched through 564 volumes of the VOC Archives (Danvers, 1895b, p. 3), including the *Letters and papers received from Asia* that De Jonge had worked on (see Chapter 4). Danvers, assisted by Willem Roosegaarde Bisschop and occasional transcribers provided by Van Riemsdijk, began a working list of the volumes he researched, and on page 30 of the working list he has annotated, "Some of the books are in their original state and have not been re-arranged by Mr. De Jonge and others" (IOR/I/3/86, 1893-1895, p. 30) [see also the researcher's transcription Appendix 1 page 3]. Danvers was aware of the volumes De Jonge had published (Danvers, 1895b, p. 4; De Jonge, 1862-1888), De Jonge's rearrangement activity on the VOC Archives was discussed in chapter 4.

Danvers selected 2,646 documents (26,278 pages) for transcription in Dutch and of these 1,517 documents (4,903 pages) were translated into English [see Appendix 3]. Most of the documents Danvers selected for transcription referenced to activities of the English and the EIC. He also selected several documents relating to Dutch exploration of Australia in the seventeenth century, such as the transcription included at the end of this thesis [see Appendix 5<sup>34</sup>]. At this point it is obvious Danvers was an active shaper, with a particular interest in enhancing users' access to information based on authentic records. Selection is one of the primary ways in which archivists actively shape collections in their custody.

Danvers' working list [transcribed in Appendix 1] includes volumes before 1670 following a pattern of their being numbered in each year only, whereas after 1670 the volumes had a consecutive volume as well as the yearly volume number. The subtleties of this numbering can be understood by analysing Danvers' working list as set out in Appendix 1. Danvers noted throughout his working list where particular documents had already been published by De Jonge (see Appendix 1, entry for 1612 - Vol. III and entry for 1669-70 - Vol. III – Bantam).

These transcribed and translated documents were bound into a series of 106 volumes and have been kept in the India Office Records (IOR) under the shelfmark *BL: IOR I/3/1-I/3/106 Dutch Records at The Hague v.1-v.106*<sup>35</sup>. Danvers took particular care to ensure the Dutch transcribed documents were bound in the same arrangement and description as he had found them. The English translation volumes match the Dutch volumes perfectly, enabling a researcher to have both volumes side-by-side for comparative studies. Rather than sorting these documents into subject order or some other order, Danvers made the choice to retain the order in which he had found them. By maintaining the same order he demonstrated his understanding of the record's order and context. His maintenance of the order of the transcribed VOC documents is the reason the researcher was able to match some of the volumes Danvers listed in his working list to the *1992 Inventory of the VOC Archives* (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992). The results of this comparison can be seen in Appendix 2: *Descriptions from*

---

<sup>34</sup> Document IOR/I/3/100 B\*\*\*\*\*7 illustrates the extraordinary find that Danvers made over a century ago. It is a copy of the Instructions given to the explorer Abel Tasman by Antonio van Diemen, Governor General of Batavia, dated August 13, 1642.

*Danvers' working list that appear to match entries in the 1992 Inventory of the VOC Archives.*

From the investigation of the 106 volumes the researcher conducted in June-July 2003 at the British Library, only 53% of the Dutch transcripts had been translated into English. Of the 2,646 documents (26,278 pages) transcribed Dutch documents from the VOC Archives only 1,517 documents (4,903 pages) were been translated into English.

Appendix 3 comprises a list of the number of documents and pages contained in the 106 volumes of *BL: IOR I/3/1-I/3/106 Dutch Records at The Hague v.1-v.106*. This information is presented here for the first time.

Appendix 4 is a proposed descriptive summary of the 106 volumes of *BL: IOR I/3/1-I/3/106 Dutch Records at The Hague v.1-v.106*, setting out the range of document numbers in each volume, and whether the volume is in Dutch or English. This detailed information is presented here for the first time.

Appendix 5 is a transcription of Document B\*\*\*\*\*7 in *BL: IOR I/3/100 Dutch Records at The Hague v.100* and has been included to illustrate the inadequacy of the current finding aid, and the extraordinary find that Danvers had made over a century ago. It is a copy of the Instructions given to the explorer Abel Tasman by Antonio van Diemen, the Governor General of Batavia that was dated August 13, 1642. The existence of this document in Danvers' *Dutch Records at The Hague* is not listed by the current finding aid. It is the researcher's understanding that the existence of this document in the Danvers' collection of *Dutch Records at The Hague* is presented here for the first time.

Appendix 6 contains sample pages from a draft of the full finding aid compiled by the researcher. The full finding aid lists all 2,646 documents, incorporating the information contained in Danvers' working list as well as the details gathered when the researcher inspected all 106 volumes at the British Library.

The full finding aid compiled by the researcher, if published in the future, will assist users to access the documents in the 106 volumes of Danvers' *Dutch Records at The*

---

<sup>35</sup> These volumes were also copied as part of the Australian Joint Copying Project (AJCP) in the 1960s and the AJCP microfilms are held in the National Library of Australia.

*Hague*. Danvers' working list (see Appendix 1) contains details about the VOC volumes he searched through, however he did not select documents from all the volumes through which he searched. Therefore Danvers' working list (Appendix 1) is a partial list of the 564 volumes through which he searched, whereas the researcher's finding aid is a list of the documents contained in the 106 bound volumes of Danvers' *Dutch Records at The Hague*, sample pages of which (Appendix 6) are presented here for the first time.

#### **5.4 Summary of Danvers' archival work**

Danvers' experience with the records of the EIC was unique because it straddled the first and second custodial phases of the EIC Archives. He had experienced the EIC's functions and practices, as well as caring for the records after the company's demise, this experience must have influenced his thinking. Danvers' activities of investigating and reporting on the records of the EIC in their second custodial phase demonstrate the difference continuity of record-keeping care can make. His work shows that Jenkinson's hypothesis of neglect in the second custodial phase need not be inevitable. Danvers' activities can also be interpreted as an early example of the benefits of the proactive approach to record-keeping similar to ideas developed by Maclean and Upward discussed in Chapter 2.

Though Danvers carried out his investigation before the *1898 Dutch Manual*, a similar development of archival practice between Danvers' archival activities and those of Heeres' with the VOC Archives occurred in that they both carried out investigations into the archives and documented what they had done. In essence, they were carrying out a new archival practice that was a departure from the work of their predecessors. In Danvers' case, the prior practice was to sift through the records and select documents for transcription into a separate collection, generally for the purpose of writing up a specific history, such as the Wilks and Orme "selected collections" listed in Table 7. While Danvers acknowledged these "selections" were "calculated to



popularise State Records” he would rather have had his limited staff resources attend to identifying and describing all of the records.

Evidence from his visit to the General State Archives towards the end of his career indicates Danvers to be aware of the concept of the original order of records. This is clear because Danvers had identified a point in the VOC records he was investigating from which De Jonge had not rearranged the VOC records. Danvers’ comment has been transcribed by the researcher showing, in the context of the order of the VOC records he was viewing, in Appendix 1, page 3, as “Danvers’ note”. For Danvers to make this note, he must have understood that De Jonge’s rearrangement had disturbed the original order of the records.

By the time of his retirement in 1898, Danvers had developed a thoughtful basis for the arrangement and description of the EIC archives. By carefully investigating and recording the details of the EIC records sorted, he was able to show why the records were arranged as they had.

### **5.5 The work of later archivists – from 1898 onwards**

After 1898, the practice Danvers had initiated - investigating and documenting the EIC records in the context of the organisation that had created them, was continued to some extent by his immediate successors Arthur Wollaston (1898-1907) and William Foster (1907-1923) (Lancaster, 1965, p. 293). During Foster’s tenure as Registrar and Superintendent of Records the *Guide to the India Office Records 1600-1858* was published in 1919.

Table 8 shows the description Foster gave to the various components of the EIC Archives, even though they are described as India Office Records.

**Table 8: Description of the India Office Records 1600-1858 (Foster, 1919)**

<p><b>The Home Administrations</b>  <u>The East India Company</u>            Court Minutes (1599-1858) ; Committees            Correspondence: A. Home Letters Received ; B. Home Letters Sent ; C. Letters Received from India, etc ; D. Despatches to India etc.            Charters ; Home Miscellaneous ; Accounts  <u>The Board of Control</u>            Minutes ; Correspondence</p>
<p><b>The Administrations in India</b>  <u>Bengal</u>            The Early Factories ; Consultations ; Correspondence ; Accounts ; Courts of Justice  <u>The Government of India</u>            Consultations ; Correspondence ; Accounts  <u>The Agra Presidency</u>            Consultations ; Accounts  <u>The North-Western Provinces</u>            Consultations ; Accounts  <u>The Punjab</u>  <u>Madras</u>            The Early Factories ; Consultations ; Correspondence ; Accounts ; Courts of Justice  <u>Bombay</u>            The Early Factories ; Consultations ; Correspondence ; Accounts ; Courts of Justice</p>
<p><b>Countries, etc. outside India</b>            Borneo ; Cape Colony ; Celebes ; Ceylon ; China, Japan, Cochin China, and Tonquin ; Denmark ; Egypt and the Red Sea ; France ; Holland ; Java ; Persia and the Persian Gulf ; Portugal ; Siam ; St Helena ; Straits Settlements ; Sumatra ; Turkey ; United States</p>
<p><b>Shipping</b>            Journals and Logs ; Ledgers and Receipts Books ; Miscellaneous</p>
<p><b>Personal</b>            General ; East India House ; Board of Control ; Indian Civil Establishments ; Indian Military Establishments ; Marine Establishments ; Europeans not in the Company's Service</p>
<p><i>Details for this table drawn from Foster (1919).</i></p>

Lancaster (1970, p. 131) noted Foster's *1919 Guide* displayed for the first time the EIC Archives "as an entity comprising groups of records which had been produced by a living and developing administration". However, it should be remembered, that the years 1600-1858 covered the period of the EIC and Board of Control as the India Office was not established until 1858, and as of 1858 the India Office had not generated any records.

The *1919 Guide* included a broad description of the 106 volumes of *Dutch Records at The Hague* that Danvers had collected together in 1893-1895 under *Holland. B.*

*Transcripts from Archives at The Hague* (Foster, 1919, p. 97). While the 106 volumes were described in the *1919 Guide*, the project Danvers carried out during 1893-1895 had not been completed by the time he had retired in July 1898.

In 1923, the Record Department of the India Office was reorganised, Moir (1996, p. xiii) describing the duties carried out by the Record Department after 1923 as being basic custodial responsibility and less pioneering than in Danvers' and Foster's time. The public were allowed to access the EIC Archives (1600-1858) via special application to the Record Department, but it was not allowed access to the India Office Records.

When in 1947 India and Pakistan achieved independence, the India Office was dissolved, and the India Office Records together with the India Office Library passed to the control of the Commonwealth Relations Office. The India Office Librarian was also the Keeper of the India Office Records.

Joan Lancaster was appointed Deputy Keeper of the India Office Records in 1960, the first professional archivist to have charge of the Records (Moir, 1996, p. xiv). Her appointment was timely, as a large accumulation of the surviving twentieth century records had been gradually sent to the India Office Library and Records (IOLR) following the dissolution of the India Office in 1947.

The IOLR collections were moved into a new building in Blackfriars Road, London in 1967. Moir (1996, p. xiv) observed that the move to the new building "transformed the whole historic archive into a modern record office, repository and centre for research". However the IOLR continued to maintain links with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

The administration of both the India Office Records and India Office Library was transferred to the British Library in 1982. Through the twentieth century, the EIC Archives have retained their status as the predecessor records to the India Office Records conveying "a clear sense of their administrative cohesion and continuity" (Moir, 1996, p. 279).

Table 9 provides the latest list of categories of IOR. Some of these categories can be searched via The National Archives (TNA) Access to Archives (A2A) website<sup>36</sup>.

**Table 9: List of Classes of India Office Records (2008)**

A: East India Company: Charters, Deeds, Statutes and Treaties c1550-c1950
B: East India Company: Minutes of the Court of Directors and Court of Proprietors 1599-1858
C: Council of India Minutes and Memoranda 1858-1947
D: East India Company: Minutes and Memoranda of General Committees 1700-1858
E: East India Company: General Correspondence 1602-1859
F: Board of Control Records 1784-1858
G: East India Company Factory Records c1595-1858
H: India Office Home Miscellaneous Series c1600-1900
I: Records relating to other Europeans in India 1475-1824 <sup>37</sup>
J&K: East India College, Haileybury, Records, and Records of other institutions 1749-1925
L: India Office Departmental Records
L/AG: India Office: Accountant-General's Records c1601-1974
L/E: India Office: Economic Department Records c1876-1950
L/F: India Office: Financial Department Records c1800-1948
L/I: India Office: Information Department Records 1921-1949
L/L: India Office: Legal Adviser's Records c1550-c1950
L/MAR: India Office: Marine Records c1600-1879
L/MED: India Office: Medical Board Records c1920-1960
L/MIL: India Office: Military Department Records 1708-1959
L/PARL: India Office: Parliamentary Branch Records c1772-1952
L/PO: Secretary of State for India: Private Office Papers 1858-1948
L/PWD: India Office: Public Works Department 1839-1931
L/P&J: India Office: Public and Judicial Department Records 1795-1950
L/P&S: India Office: Political and Secret Department Records 1756-c1950
L/R: India Office: Record Department Papers 1859-1959
L/SUR: India Office: Surveyor's Office Records 1837-1934
L/S&G: India Office: Services and General Department Records c1920-c1970
L/WS: India Office: War Staff Papers 1921-1951
M: Burma Office Records 1932-1948
N: Returns of Baptisms, Marriages and Burials 1698-1969
O: Biographical Series 1702-1948
P: Proceedings and Consultations 1702-1945
Q: Commission, Committee and Conference Records c1895-1947
R: Records received in London and incorporated in India Office Records
R/1: India: Crown Representative: Political Department Indian States Records 1880-1947
R/2: India: Crown Representative: Indian States Residencies Records c1789-1947
R/3: India: Viceroy's Private Office Papers and other Government Records 1899-1948
R/4: India: British High Commission Cemetery Records c1870-1967
R/5: Nepal: Kathmandu Residency Records c1792-1872
R/8: Burma: Records of the Governor's Office 1942-1947
R/9: Malaya: Malacca Orphan Chamber and Council of Justice Records c1685-1835
R/10: China: Canton Factory Records 1623-1841
R/12: Afghanistan: Kabul Legation Records 1923-1948
R/15: Gulf States: Records of the Bushire, Bahrain, Kuwait, Muscat and Trucial States Agencies 1763-1951
R/19: Egypt: Records of the Cairo, Alexandria and Suez Agencies 1832-1870

<sup>36</sup> The search page for A2A <http://www.a2a.org.uk/> [accessed 17 March 2008]

<sup>37</sup> This class includes the 106 volumes of Danvers' *Dutch Records at The Hague I/3/1-I/3/106*.

R/20: Aden: Records of the British Administrations in Aden 1837-1967 S: Linguistic Survey of India c1900-c1930 V: India Office Records Official Publications Series c1760-1957 W, X & Y: India Office Records Map Collections c1700-c1960 Z: Original Registers and Indexes to Records Series c1700-1950
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<i>Details for table from the British Library, India Office Records website <a href="http://www.bl.uk/collections/iorarrgt.html">http://www.bl.uk/collections/iorarrgt.html</a> [accessed 17 March 2008]</i>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 5.6 Summary of the EIC Archives and archival influences

The following issues raised in this chapter are discussed further in chapters 7 and 8.

1. When Danvers started his archival activities on the EIC Archives in 1884, they were a discrete collection in their second custodial phase. Foster continued the work till 1923, however the work was not continued after Foster left. The physical location of the EIC Archives was not in a purpose built repository until 1967. In 1982, when the EIC Archives moved into their third custodial phase they were part of the accumulation of IOR. Therefore, the significant arrangement and description of the EIC Archives occurred in the second custodial phase over a forty-year period.
2. The custodial history of the EIC Archives becomes a striking example of how attentive management of the records in the second custodial phase makes a big difference to the ultimate preservation of the records.
3. During the second custodial phase of the EIC Archives Danvers carried out his work, this being the crucial difference between Danvers' work with the EIC Archives and Heeres' and Colenbrander's work with the VOC Archives in their third custodial phase.
4. Danvers' role as an active shaper initially took the form of investigating and documenting the EIC records in the context of the organisation that had created the records. By 1898, he had provided

a thoughtful basis for the arrangement and description of the EIC archives.

5. Like Heeres and Colenbrander, Danvers thoughtfully used arrangement and description to reflect the original organic structure of the creating body, and in doing so, assisted the user to understand that structure enabling them to access and use the records.
6. Danvers' research project carried out in the VOC Archives during 1893-1895 put him in contact with Van Riemsdijk during the 1890s, a decade of intense archival discourse prior to the publication of the *1898 Dutch Manual*. Danvers' note in his working list that some of the volumes were in their original order and had not been re-arranged documented his awareness of original order.
7. By looking for complementary records in the VOC Archives, Danvers was an active shaper, enhancing the information held in the EIC Archives.

## **CHAPTER 6. THE EFFECTS OF CUSTODIAL PHASES ON THE RAC AND HBC ARCHIVES**

The custodial histories of the archives of the Royal African Company (RAC) and Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) provide a comparison with the custodial histories of the EIC and VOC Archives that provided the main focus of the previous chapters. Whereas the VOC and EIC Archives have been discussed in the context of nineteenth century archival practice, the RAC and HBC Archives must be discussed in the context of twentieth century archival practice.

The link between these two collections, and one of the reasons they have both been presented as case studies in this thesis, is that Hilary Jenkinson worked on both of them at different stages of his career. He was also familiar with the EIC Archives and thus with the product of Danvers' work.

### **6.1 Royal African Company (RAC) Archives**

This third case study of the RAC Archives discusses the records during their third custodial phase. The custodial phases of the RAC Archives have been set out in Table 9 from which it can be seen the third custodial phase began from 1847. The archival activities of Hilary Jenkinson during the first decade of the twentieth century are discussed. However unlike the VOC and EIC Archives, Jenkinson's work on the RAC Archives took place when the RAC Archives had been in the third custodial phase for over seventy years. Nevertheless, until Jenkinson began work on them approximately seventy years after their transfer to archival custody they had received little, if any, attention. Additionally, Jenkinson (1912, p. 189, footnote 1) was in the first decade of what would be a distinguished archival career at the Public Record Office. Jenkinson viewed the records of the EIC as the only similar collection of records with which he could compare the RAC Archives. Whether Jenkinson was an

active shaper or passive keeper during his tenure as custodian of the RAC Archives is also discussed.

### 6.1.1 The archival work of H Jenkinson from 1906-1912

The Royal African Company Archives were arranged and described by Hilary Jenkinson (1882-1961) in the first decade of the twentieth century, also the first decade of his career at the Public Records Office (PRO) in London. The records of the Royal African Company date from the seventeenth century and Jenkinson's archival activities within these records are referred to by him in a paper he gave to the members of the Royal Historical Society in London in 1912, as well as the last paper he gave to the members of the Society of Archivists in 1960 (Jenkinson, 1912, 1960). Jenkinson (1912, p. 189) noted that the only parallel collection to the Records of the English African Company he was aware of at that time were the Records of the East Indian Companies. As the EIC Archives have been discussed at length in the chapter 5, a discussion of Jenkinson's arrangement and description activities of the RAC Archives is given here for the purpose of comparison with that of Danvers' work on the EIC Archives.

**Table 10: Custodial Phases of the RAC Archives**

<b>Custodial Phases of the Royal African Company (RAC) Archives</b>
<p><b>1670-1820 (First custodial phase)</b>            Company of Royal Adventurers Trading to Africa (1662-1672), Royal African Company of England (1672-1750), Company of Merchants Trading to Africa (1750-1820)</p>
<p><b>1820-1847 (Second custodial phase)</b>            Treasury</p>
<p><b>1847-current (Third custodial phase)</b>            The Records of the African Companies (1670-1820) came into the Public Record Office<sup>38</sup> in London in 1847.</p>
<p><i>Table 10 shows that the Records of the African Companies came into the Public Records Office in 1847 (Jenkinson, 1912, p. 197).</i></p>

<sup>38</sup> The Public Record Office is now known as The National Archives (TNA).



Table 10 shows the custodial phases of the RAC Archives. Jenkinson investigated the Records of the African Companies during their third custodial phase for some time after he joined the Public Record Office in 1906 and prior to the publication of his 1912 article. His task had been to arrange and list the records of the African Companies (Conway Davies, 1957, p. xv). By this time the RAC Archives were in their third custodial phase, these records providing Jenkinson with the only experience of company records he had in his first six years at the Public Record Office (Conway Davies, 1957, p. xv). Jenkinson had access to the 1910 French edition of the *1898 Dutch Manual*, noting that, in the preface to the *1910 Manuel*<sup>39</sup>, Pirenne gave the basis for the correct arrangement as “*le respect pour les fonds*” (Jenkinson, 1912, p. 186, footnote 2). He further reported that *Fonds* “may be roughly paraphrased [from Pirenne’s description in French as] ‘collections as they have come down to us from their collectors’” (Jenkinson, 1912, p. 186, footnote 2).

Though Jenkinson (1922, p. 84; 1966, p. 101) would later define the “*Fonds*”<sup>40</sup> as an *Archive Group*<sup>41</sup> in his *1922 Manual of Archive Administration* (1922 Manual), the point here is that, at the time Jenkinson worked on arranging and describing the RAC Archives, his view of *fonds* as the basis for correct arrangement was to keep the collection as it had been received, and this detail became embedded in the custodial history of the RAC Archives. This is an example of how an archivist influences the collections which they arrange and describe with the record-keeping guidance they have at that time.

As Jenkinson progressed with his investigation of the Records of the African Companies he discerned there were three companies. Table 11 sets out the details Jenkinson gives through his 1912 article about the various categories of records he found in the RAC Archives. The details in the table illustrate the successive nature of the company structure, particularly the final stage of the company when it received financial support from the public purse through the Treasury.

---

<sup>39</sup> Jenkinson cited “Pirenne in his preface to the French edition of Feith and Fruin’s *Manuel pour le classement ... des Archives*” therefore Jenkinson was using the 1910 French edition of the *1898 Dutch Manual* which has been described as the *1910 Manuel*.

<sup>40</sup> See the entry for *fonds* in the Glossary section of this thesis.

<sup>41</sup> See the entry for *archive group* in the Glossary section of this thesis.

**Table 11: Jenkinson's Initial Classification of the RAC Archives (1912)**

<p><b>First company (1662-1672) incorporated by Letters Patent in 1622</b></p> <p>1. Proceedings (7 books)  #1 Minute Book – 1663-1672 [AC rec #75] covers nearly the whole of the life of the company. (Jenkinson noted this minute book worth printing in full (Jenkinson, 1912, p. 205)  #2 Home Journal – 1662- [AC rec #309]. #3 Home Ledger #2 – 1663- [AC rec #599]  #4 Gambia Journal – 1665- [AC rec #544]. #5 Jamaica Ledger – 1665- [AC rec #1594]  #6 Barbados Ledger – 1662- [AC rec #1564]. #7 Invoice Book – 1663- [AC rec #909]  Waste Books  Journals</p>
<p><b>Second company (1672-1750) Royal African Company of England</b></p> <p>1. Copies of Documents issued and received  A. General In-letter Books  Special In-letter Books (e.g. from West Indies &amp; the Home Correspondents)  Abstract Letter Books (e.g. from the Committees of Shipping, of Goods, of Accounts, etc.)  Minute Books (68 books)  <i>(The fullness of these series, together with the Clerks habit of entering the purport of many letters read in the 'Minute Books' has led to the destruction of practically all the originals (Jenkinson, 1912, p. 202)</i>  B. Out Letter Books  Africa – 1685- ; Plantations – 1687- ; Home Correspondents; Captains of Vessels  ... And so forth. <i>The number of Letter Books belonging to the second company is 55.</i>  2. Accounts  Journals ; Warrant Books – 1672- ; Waste Book #5 1682- ; Ledgers – 1673-  Invoice Books – Inwards 1673- ; Outwards 1673-  Special Books, from Jamaica, Cape Coast Castle and Gambia  Book of packets sent to Africa  Special Book of Soldiers or Garrison Ledgers (6 books)  Cash Books of the Company's Husband (the Chief Executive Office) (26 books)  Petty Cash Books of the Company's Husband (19 books)  Customs Books (32 books) <i>(The numbers of books are given in Jenkinson, 1912, p. 203, footnote 1.)</i>  Rough Books  Logs or Journals of Ships (earliest ship <i>Friesland</i> 1674 [AC rec #1210])</p>
<p><b>Third company – Company of Merchants Trading to Africa (1750-1820)</b>  (had a trading capacity but no corporate existence. It was a body of traders, not a Trading Body (Jenkinson, 1912, p. 204)</p> <p>Minute Books; Letter Books; Africa Books continue, particularly the Cape Coast Castle.  Fort Books (for each of the 11 important forts.) <i>Cape Coast Castle 1770-1818 (a fine set).</i>  Day Book ; Garrison Ledger or Pay List; Abstract of Accounts – elaborately classified.  <i>(The instructions of record-keeping at these forts were issued by the "Home Committees" later known as "Court of Assistants".)</i></p>
<p><b>Third company with the subsidization of the Treasury</b></p> <p>Annual Balance Sheet showing expenditure of the Public Grant  Pass Books with the Bank of England (replacing the cash books and petty cash books of the Second Company)  Transferred Class  Private Letters (undelivered, confiscated or unclaimed)  Account Books</p>

#### Indexed Books

- Official Registers of the Company's Servants [AC rec #1454-1456]  
(contains details of the various posts held, their sureties, dates of appointments, etc.)
  - earlier Lists of Living and Dead at the Company's Forts.
  - Lists of Passengers
  - Castle Charge Book, etc [AC rec #1423-1453 for earlier Lists]

Table 11 describes the description of the various categories of material Jenkinson found such as Minute Books, In-Letter Books, Out-Letter Books, Accounts, Ships Logs and Journals, etc. He observed that the most interesting details on the trade were to be found in the ships' journals, logs, or books among the miscellanea of the Companies records "though nothing like the quantity to be found in the [East] India Company's 'Marine Records'" (Jenkinson, 1912, p. 213). This comment indicates that the Marine Records Danvers received in 1883 (see chapter 5 on EIC Archives) did get listed within three decades at most.

The RAC Archives were to provide Jenkinson with an example of how he considered a "Private Archive" can change, for "administrative reasons", from the date the archives were vested in the Crown, and become "Public Records" (Jenkinson, 1960, p. 370, footnote 1). For Jenkinson 'from the date the archives were vested in the Crown' was significant enough to warrant the change of description for the RAC Archives from private archive to public records. However, the RAC Archives did not maintain that description, as from the beginning of the twenty-first century, a later generation of archivists has categorised the RAC Archives as "Not Public Records"<sup>42</sup>. Therefore, Jenkinson's description in 1960 was valid in 1960 but has not been accepted by a later generation of archivists. This would suggest the definition of 'public records' has changed from that used by Jenkinson in 1960 to the definition used now at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

Jenkinson cited several examples about archival practices from the RAC Archives in his 1922 *Manual of Archival Administration*. In his discussion of the term 'form' as "being understood in the sense of both physical shape and of diplomatic conception" he illustrates his point by declaring,

---

<sup>42</sup> TNA: PRO T 70 *Company of Royal Adventurers of England Trading with Africa and successors: Records*. 1,696 volumes. <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/catalogue> [Accessed 2 Feb 2008]

“The reason why among the Archives of the African Company, the *Journals* of Cape Coast Castle formed a large separate series while the Day Books of that and other forts in Africa lay hid among masses of miscellaneous papers, was that the second of these series was contained in small paper-bound books while the first was an imposing collection of large volumes” (Jenkinson, 1922, p. 26 and footnotes 2, 3).

From the examples and detailed discussion in this paper, it can be concluded that Jenkinson’s work with the RAC Archives formed part of his archival experience and in turn, he drew on this experience when he was composing his *1922 Manual*.

Another topic in his *1922 Manual* cited by Jenkinson uses an example from the RAC Archives concerning the involvement of past custodians in the transmission of archives. To illustrate his scenario of the manner a chain of custody could remain unbroken, even if the administrative functions and the archives were transferred to a totally different administrative authority, Jenkinson reasoned that the chain of custody of the RAC Archives had remained unbroken due to the official nature of the Act of Parliament in 1820 abolishing the last of the three African companies, directing the archives be passed to the Treasury (Jenkinson, 1922, p. 37). Therefore, as part of the Treasury archives, the RAC Archives became, to Jenkinson, “Public Records”. The point to be made here is Jenkinson’s interpretation in 1912 of what constituted a “public record” becoming embedded in the product of his arrangement and description activities in 1912.

Jenkinson used an hierarchical classification system when setting out the various categories of archives he discussed in his *1922 Manual*. The descriptions, in which he included the African Companies, are shown in Table 12.

**Table 12: Jenkinson's Hierarchical Classification System (1922)**

<u>Public Departments.</u>	<u>Public but Independent Administrations.</u>
. Treasury.	.Boroughs and Other Corporations
.. Expired Commissions.	.. Trading Companies.
... African Companies.	... African Companies.

From the discussion above, it can be concluded that Jenkinson was influenced by his experience of arranging and describing the RAC Archives early in his career. Like

Danvers' work with the EIC Archives, Jenkinson worked towards arranging and describing the RAC Archives after he had made preliminary investigations and listings of what he had found, and from that analysis decided how they ought to be arranged. Jenkinson influenced the RAC Archives for the period of time that arrangement and description was kept. When the RAC Archives were re-described later in the twentieth century, Jenkinson's work would become embedded in the documentation and the arrangement of some of the collection.

When Jenkinson gave the Presidential Address to the Society of Archivists in 1960, his paper, entitled *Roots*, exemplified terminology he used to describe different types of Public Records. In fact, he was relating the form of the records he had identified, and these are set out in Table 12, which illustrate the commercial rather than public origins of the records. He wrote:

“[T]he Archives of the *African Company* of 1662 became part of those of a new Company in 1672 and both sets were turned over to yet a third body, the *Committee of Merchants trading to Africa*, in 1750; all three were private organisations but when, in 1820, the Nation assumed responsibility for West African affairs their Archives were vested with their Forts and other property, in the Crown and became, *as from that date*, Public Records” (Jenkinson, 1960, p. 370).

Jenkinson (1912, p. 190, 195) understood that the African Company archives, like the East India Company archives, belonged to a class of records he termed the *violent transfer* class, as they were “not originally or in their nature Government archives, they have become so because Government took them when it took the position of their compilers and natural owners”. His preliminary investigation of the RAC Archives “suggested that among the beginnings of new policies and activities here displayed we may expect new forms of the Records themselves – the commercial forms, for instance” (Jenkinson, 1912, p. 191). These comments show that by investigating the RAC Archives, Jenkinson was expanding his knowledge of the variety of forms of records raised in the course of the company's activities.

Jenkinson (1960, p. 371-373) advocated that archivists should “want and need” to include analysis as part of their archival activities so they could understand the “how, why and what” of their archives, and they could pass the information that they had gathered on each of the series of records by writing their administrative history.

These administrative histories could be used by later archivists to understand the content and context of the records, particularly where the handwriting was difficult to read or decipher. As well, Jenkinson opined that the archivist must “engage himself actively” to add to the administrative history as needed. He was quite clear that such analytical activities should only be conducted on archives in their third custodial phase.

By documenting his initial investigations into the context surrounding the creation of the records and his interpretation of the effect of the transfer of all the records to the Treasury after the cessation of the third company Jenkinson’s archival activities became part of the custodial history of the RAC Archives.

### 6.1.2 The work of later archivists

Jenkinson’s arrangement and description of the RAC Archives in the first decade of the twentieth century does not seem to have been followed up by the next generation of archivists after he retired from the Public Record Office in April 1954 (Conway Davies, 1957, p. xxvii). A comment on Jenkinson’s arrangement “amongst the records of the Treasury (T 70<sup>43</sup>) ... we owe the arrangement of the records in their present form [to H. Jenkinson]” was made by Davies in his book *The Royal African Company* (Davies, 1957, p. 374). Davies noted that the description of the RAC Archives was in *Treasury Records (Expired Commissions). Records of African Companies*, thus we know that by 1957 no changes had been made to Jenkinson’s arrangement of the RAC Archives.

By 1987, Jenkinson’s T 70 arrangement of the RAC Archives had been used for research by Henige, who recorded:

that Jenkinson (1912) and Davies (1957) had “little or nothing to say about the recordkeepers or record-keeping practices of the RAC and its successors. Given how little we know about other day-to-day operations of these bodies, any specific and detailed information about these matters is almost certainly unobtainable now” (Davies, 1957; Henige, 1987, p. 108, footnote 34; Jenkinson, 1912).

---

<sup>43</sup> Full current citation: *The National Archives (TNA): Public Record Office (PRO) T 70 Company of Royal Adventurers of England Trading with Africa and successors: Records.*

Henige's observation indicates that there had been no further archival activity on Jenkinson's T 70 arrangement of the RAC Archives by 1987.

By the late twentieth century, archivists would re-evaluate Jenkinson's description *Treasury Records. (Expired Commissions). Records of African Companies* and re-describe them as *Company of Royal Adventurers of England Trading with Africa and successors: Records*.<sup>44</sup> As well, the category of record was changed from *Public Records* to *Not Public Records*. These changes may have occurred during the data entry of the description either into PROCAT or an earlier database of the Public Record Office.

Jenkinson had described the RAC Archives as part of the records of the Treasury, as it had been to that department that the RAC Archives had passed in their second custodial phase. Though Jenkinson's description was changed by a later generation of archivists, the shelf mark *T 70* of the RAC Archives would retain their link to the Treasury, the shelf mark retaining evidence of the custodial and arrangement history of the RAC Archives. The description may have changed but the physical arrangement did not alter, ensuring that later archivists were building on the archival practice that Jenkinson had used when he had arranged the RAC Archives.

Through his process of arrangement and description, Jenkinson showed himself to be an active shaper of the product (*T 70*) of his arrangement. Later in his career, he would draw on his experience with the RAC Archives to document examples of archival practice and methodology such as in his *1922 Manual* and subsequent articles. Thus, Jenkinson was also an active shaper of the process of arrangement and description.

### **6.1.3 Summary of the RAC Archives and archival influences**

The following issues raised in this section on the RAC Archives are discussed further in chapters 7 and 8.

1. The deposit of the RAC Archives with the records of the Treasury during the second custodial phase of the RAC Archives had a

profound effect on the future description of the RAC Archives as Treasury Records. This is an example of record-keeping activities in the second custodial phase having an influence on the records in their third custodial phase.

2. Jenkinson was the first person to investigate the RAC Archives in their third custodial phase. He identified the EIC Archives as the only parallel archival collection from which he could draw comparisons.
3. When Jenkinson carried out his work in the 1910s, the RAC Archives were not a discrete collection but part of the records of the Treasury, having been in their third custodial phase for over fifty years. Therefore, the significant arrangement/description of the RAC Archives happened over a five-year period fifty years into their third custodial phase.
4. The RAC Archives provided Jenkinson with an example for his observation that archives pass through an inevitable period of neglect, as the RAC Archives had not received any archival attention for almost 90 years, i.e., the forty years of their transfer and the initial fifty years of their third custodial phase.
5. Jenkinson had this experience with the RAC Archives in the first decade of his career and the experience was influential in his later writings wherein he observed that the transfer phase is an inevitable period of neglect for archives.
6. Later in the twentieth century, archivists at the Public Record Office would re-evaluate Jenkinson's description of the RAC Archives and describe them separately as being Royal African Company records<sup>45</sup>. However the shelf mark of the RAC Archives would retain their link

---

<sup>44</sup> TNA: PRO T 70 Company of Royal Adventurers of England Trading with Africa and successors: Records. 1660-1833. 1,696 volumes. Open access. Not Public Records [accessed 19 Dec 2007: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/catalogue> (formerly PROCAT)]

<sup>45</sup> TNA: PRO T 70 Company of Royal Adventurers of England Trading with Africa and successors: Records. 1660-1833. 1,696 volumes. Open access. Not Public Records [accessed 19 Dec 2007: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/catalogue> (formerly PROCAT)]



to the Treasury, thereby retaining evidence of their custodial and arrangement history, and therefore as a part of the record of the RAC Archives' custodial history.

7. Through his process of arrangement and description Jenkinson was an active shaper of the product of the arrangement and description of the RAC Archives during the first decade of his archival career.
8. Jenkinson would later draw on his experience with the RAC Archives to document examples of archival practice and methodology in his *1922 Manual* and later articles.

## 6.2 Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) Archives

This fourth case study of the HBC Archives discusses the records during their second custodial phase. The custodial phases of the HBC Archives are set out in Table 13, which shows that the second custodial phase began from 1870. The archival activities of RH Leveson Gower during the 1930s are discussed. However unlike the VOC, EIC and RAC Archives, Leveson Gower's work on the HBC Archives took place when the HBC Archives were still part of the assets of the HBC. The influence of Hilary Jenkinson on the arrangement that was used in the HBC Archives is also discussed, he being consulted on the arrangement. Finally, whether Leveson Gower was an active shaper or passive keeper during his tenure as custodian of the HBC Archives receives attention.

### 6.2.1 Records of the HBC moving from the first to second custodial phase

Like the EIC and RAC, the HBC began by English Royal Charter in the seventeenth century, a Royal Charter by Charles II being granted to *Governor & Company of Adventurers Tradeing into Hudson's Bay and their successors* from May 1670 (Simmons, 2003, p. 4). In 1870, the Canadian government took control of the land that had been administered by the HBC on behalf of the English crown. Therefore, records relating to administration of Prince Rupert's Land were no longer created by the HBC after 1870. The HBC continued to exist after 1870 with reduced trading operations and major offices in London and Winnipeg (established in 1860) only. The HBC Archives remained at the warehouse at No. 1 Lime Street, London, a former warehouse of the EIC, where they had been since 1865 (Simmons, 2003, p. 8). The main differences between the three companies founded in Britain (that is, the EIC, RAC and HBC) were:

- 1) the majority of the trading activities of the HBC had been between one country, Prince Rupert's Land, later Canada and London; and
- 2) the HBC continued in a reduced capacity, keeping custody of the pre 1870 HBC Archives ensuring they maintained their identity and integrity as company archives.

**Table 13: Custodial Phases of the HBC Archives**

<b>Custodial Phase of the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) Archives</b>
<p><b>1670-1870 (First custodial phase)</b> Hudson's Bay Company Empire (1670-1870), North West Company (1786-1851), Russian American Company (1821-1903), Buffalo Wool Company (1823-1824), Assiniboine Wool Company (1829-1836), Red River Tallow Company (1832-1833), Puget's Sound Agricultural Company (1838-1934), Vancouver Island Steam Sawmill Company (1859-1867), Vancouver Coal Mining Company (1861-1900)</p>
<p><b>1870-1994 (Second custodial phase)</b> Under the Rupert's Land Act of 1868 HBC land reverted to the Crown and was transferred to the government of Canada. HBC continued reduced operations with major offices in London and Winnipeg (established 1860).</p>
<p><b>1994-current (Third custodial phase)</b> The HBC Archives (1670-1994) placed in the custody of the Provincial Archives of Manitoba<sup>46</sup> in Winnipeg in 1994.</p> <p><i>Table 12 shows that ownership of the HBC Archives was transferred from the Hudson's Bay Company to the Government of Manitoba and the custody of the Provincial Archives of Manitoba in Winnipeg, Canada (Simmons, 2003, p. 174, 180). Information on the predecessor companies of the HBC obtained from the Provincial Archives of Manitoba website<sup>47</sup>.</i></p>

Table 13 depicts the three custodial phases of the HBC Archives, showing that, during the first custodial phase the inclusion of the records, of a number of related and subsidiary companies, added to the complexities of the content of the archival collection now known as the HBC Archives, and located in Section F: *Records relating to Companies connected with or subsidiary to the Hudson's Bay Company*<sup>48</sup>.

During the first decade of the HBC's operations (1670-1680) the records of the Company moved in a lockable sturdy chest, which was moved to various establishments in London for the records to be available at each Committee meeting. These records were kept initially at the Company's Fenchurch Street premises in London for almost a century from 1696 to 1794, and then at Hudson's Bay House in London for another long period from 1794 to 1865. This stability of repository location provided for all the records to be kept together as they moved from their first custodial phase through to the second custodial phase (Simmons, 2007, p. 5).

<sup>46</sup> The Provincial Archives of Manitoba is now known as Archives of Manitoba.

<sup>47</sup> Accessed 31 Jul 2006 [http://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/archives/hbca/resource/rel\\_rec/index.html](http://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/archives/hbca/resource/rel_rec/index.html)

However, records being kept in one place and records being kept together in good order and condition are two different matters. Simmons (2007, p. 140) notes that when the first librarian, R.E. Gosnell, was appointed to the HBC in 1893, he started by cleaning up a room armed “with a pitchfork and a wheelbarrow” as the pile of books and newspapers “had grown hard, almost solid, from years of being trodden on”. At the bottom of the pile Gosnell found original journals and other official documents misplaced for twenty years. Generally, the HBC records were not well maintained through their second custodial phase, and as with the VOC, EIC and RAC Archives, it was a case of the records “surviving destruction” in the second custodial phase being the reason for their surviving into their third custodial phase.

As is so often the case, a significant anniversary raised the profile of the ‘old company records’ as significant historical documents, when in 1920 the HBC celebrated the 250<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its founding. Historian Sir William Schooling produced the souvenir brochure of the anniversary and it was Schooling’s encouragement of the HBC to “move towards intellectual and material arrangement of the records” (Simmons, 2003, p. 12) which motivated the beginning of the HBC Archives Department in the early 1930s.

### **6.2.2 The archival work of RH Leveson Gower from 1931-1950**

The first archivist appointed by the Hudson’s Bay Company in London was Richard Leveson Gower (1894-1982) who worked on the HBC Archives through the years 1931-1950. Prior to his role as archivist, Leveson Gower had been engaged in the mid-1920s to answer enquiries received by the Company (Simmons, 2007, p. 221). Leveson Gower travelled to Canada in 1927 and during his four-month stay he identified inactive records, and arranging for their transfer to London. Jenkinson inspected the HBC Archives in 1932, providing a report in which he concluded “a summary of the collection inventory should be prepared, a catalogue number attached to every item in the inventory, and then a list prepared by catalogue number”, averring until that was done, the archives could not be used by the public (Simmons, 2007, p. 227). The next year, 1933, Jenkinson met again with Leveson Gower and they developed a plan of classification that “reflected both the existing order and

---

<sup>48</sup> Accessed 3 Dec 2007 [http://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/archives/hbca/resource/rel\\_rec/index.html](http://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/archives/hbca/resource/rel_rec/index.html)

Jenkinson's theories of classification based on the administrative provenance of records, as explained in his *Manual*" (Simmons, 2007, p. 228). Professor Coupland of Oxford University also contributed to the discussion (Craig, 1970, p. 70).

Table 14 outlines the initial description of the HBC archives documented by Leveson Gower in the first of a series of articles he published in the *The Beaver*<sup>49</sup> (Leveson Gower, 1933).

**Table 14: Initial description by Leveson Gower (1933)**

<p>Section A - London Office Records – 86 classes            [Class 1: Minute books of the Governor &amp; Committees 143 vols, 1671-1870]            Section B – Administrations in North America – 350 classes – 23 divisions            [e.g. of subdivisions A. Post journals; B. correspondence books; C. account books]            Section C - Ships' Records – 8 classes [e.g. 1 class for ship's logs arranged alphabetically by ship]            Section D – Special Section of Records – 16 classes            [e.g. Journals of exploration by members of the HBC staff; Records of the Red River Colony; Records appertaining to the Riel Rebellion; Miscellaneous papers relating to a variety of persons &amp; subjects; correspondence of HBC administrators in North America e.g. Sir George Simpson &amp; of other Governors-in-Chief of Rupert's Land]            Section E – Records of Subsidiary companies &amp; organization of HBC – 17 classes            [e.g. documents possessed by the Company pertaining to 1) North-West Company; 2) The Puget's Sound Agricultural Society Limited; etc.]            Section Z - Miscellaneous records – records not forming part of the archives of any HBC administration [e.g. correspondence of HBC servants exclusively of a private nature; books of newspaper cuttings; Parliamentary Acts; Stowe papers published by HBC in 1923 from the collection of the late Duke of Buckingham and Chandos]</p>
<p><i>Details for table drawn from (Leveson Gower, 1933, p. 41-42, 64)</i></p>

The mid-1930s had been a period of intense investigative archival activity for Leveson Gower. However, with the threat of war in 1939 looming, he packed and relocated the HBC archives to Governor Cooper's estate in Hertfordshire, forty miles northeast of London (Simmons, 2007, p. 298). He was called up for active service during the Second World War, Alice Johnson taking charge of the HBC archives while they were stored outside London. After he returned in 1947 to resume his job as archivist, Johnson devoted her time to editorial work on publications for the Hudson's Bay Record Society (HBRS).

<sup>49</sup> *The Beaver* began with v.1(1) Oct 1920 and was created as a 250<sup>th</sup> anniversary present to the staff of HBC. Now known as *The Beaver: Canada's history magazine*  
<http://www.historysociety.ca/bea.asp>

### 6.2.3 The work of later archivists – from 1950 onwards

#### The archival work from 1950-1968 of Alice Johnson McGrath

By 1950, when Alice Johnson (1907-1987) was appointed archivist, she had almost twenty years secretarial, editorial and archival service with the HBC. Johnson was appointed after the resignation of Mr G. Potter James who had only stayed with the company for a couple of months following his appointment on 9 March 1949 (Simmons, 2007, p. 251). Potter James may have been part of the first group of students to graduate as diplomates from the newly formed School of Librarianship and Archive Administration at the University of London. Jenkinson (1952, p. 281, footnote 20) remarked that one of the students, to whom he had lectured at the newly formed School, had been appointed to the HBC between 1948 and 1950. Of interest is that sometime during 1949 Jenkinson was consulted about the necessary qualifications required for the position of HBC archivist by Mr RA Reynolds, Secretary of the HBC (Simmons, 2007, p. 251).

Johnson continued the system of classification Jenkinson had recommended to Leveson Gower in 1932 (Simmons, 2007, p. 251). In her monthly report of January 1950, she recorded “Sir Hilary Jenkinson’s recommendations as to the Sections and Classes used in Classification have ... been followed, and the experience gained has enable us to fit into the system the different kinds of documents to be found in the Company’s archives” (Johnson, 1950, cited by Simmons, 2007, p. 251-252, footnote 106). It follows that Jenkinson’s views of archival practice influenced the archivists of the HBC employed in London between the 1930s and 1950s, and they in turn must surely have been familiar with Jenkinson’s 1922 *Manual of Archive Administration*.

It also seems reasonable to postulate that these HBC archivists from 1950 had commenced a microfilming program of the HBC records with Craig (1970, p. 70) observing the “classification work proper took a back seat and pride of place was given to the preparation of records for microfilming”. The microfilming program was completed in 1966. The sorting and classification work of the post-1870 records resumed in 1967. Alice Johnson McGrath retired in 1968.

In 2007, the TNA<sup>50</sup> was known to hold a microform set<sup>51</sup> of the Hudson's Bay Company Archives comprising 3,640 microform rolls covering the years 1667-1991.

The archival work from 1968-1972 of Joan Murray Craig, last English HBC archivist

During Joan Craig's tenure as HBC archivist, she was much involved with the discussions and preparations for the eventual transfer of the HBC archives from London to Winnipeg once the Company had decided that its offices were moving from London to Canada (Simmons, 2007, p. 300). Though Craig carried out the preparatory work for the move, she did not move to Canada.

The archival work from 1973-1990 of Shirlee Anne Smith, first Canadian HBC keeper

As the first Canadian keeper of the HBC archives, the beginning of Shirlee Smith's tenure saw a 12-month posting to London to oversee the daily operations of the HBC archives as well as organising the move of tons of archival material and artefacts to Winnipeg (Simmons, 2007, p. 301).

Smith had been an advocate for the HBC archives to be relocated to Canada, being involved in the final decision process. Smith completed the transition of the HBC records from London to Winnipeg commenced by Craig.

In 1981 Alex Ross, an archivist and records manager, joined the HBC recommending to Smith that the record group classification be adopted for post-1870 new and unclassified records (Simmons, 2007, p. 189, 190). Table 15 lists the categories of record groups raised during the 1980s.

---

<sup>50</sup> The National Archives, Kew at shelfmark: BH 1 <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/catalogue>

<sup>51</sup> For details on the HBCA microforms see <http://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/archives/microfilm/index.html>

**Table 15: HBCA Record Group categories (1980s)**

Record Group (RG) 1 - Land Department Records RG 2 - Canadian Committee Office RG 3 - Fur Trade Department RG 4 - Bay Steamship Co. RG 5 - Retail Stores RG 6 - Wholesale Department RG 7 - Northern Stores Department RG 8 - Hugh Sutherland RG 9 - Head Office / Corporate Head Office RG 10 - Henry Morgan RG 11 - Rupert's Land Trading / Revillon Freres RG 12 - Central Lands / HBC Real Estates Ltd. RG 13 - C. M. Lampson / Beaver House Ltd. RG 14 - Hudson's Bay Record Society RG 15 - HBC Fur Sales Ltd. / HBC North Russian Trading Co., Hudsons' Bay and Annings RG 16 - HBC Fur Sales Inc. RG 17 - Simpsons RG 18 - Zellers RG 19 - Markborough Properties Ltd. RG 20 - Hudson's Bay Company Archives RG 21 - Sale & Co. RG 22 - French Government Records RG 23 - North West Company Inc. RG 24 - Hudson's Bay Company Inc.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Details for this table from the Hudson's Bay Company Archives website  
<http://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/archives/hbca/holdings/arrangement.html> [accessed 17 March 2008]

Simmons (2007, p. 289) remarked that the system developed by Jenkinson and Leveson Gower in the 1930s was “based on record type and chronology” and by 1981 “was no longer adequate for describing the records of a modern corporation”. However, the record group categories were used for post-1870 records while the pre-1870 records kept the classification system of Jenkinson and Leveson Gower. It was also noted that the “record group system also conveniently fit into the fonds/series system of description developed by the Bureau of Canadian Archivists in the 1990s and used as the basis for the Keystone Archives Description Database” (Simmons, 2007, p. 290, footnote 11). Thus, from the 1980s, the HBC Archives had two different systems of classification broadly divided for pre-1870 and post-1870 records.



### The archival work from 1990-2001 of Judith Hudson Beattie

It was during Judith Beattie's tenure as keeper that the HBC archives were donated to the Province of Manitoba in 1994, And the accommodation prepared for the archives were state-of-the-art vaults built within the Archives of Manitoba building (Simmons, 2007, p. 302). Beattie oversaw the movement of the pre-1870 HBC archives from their second custodial phase in to their third custodial phase and housed in purpose-built archival accommodation. Beattie retired in 2001.

The well-considered placement of the HBC Archives with the Archives of Manitoba is a reflection of the Canadian public's interest in the Company. Students of archival studies in Canada, in particular at the University of Manitoba, have begun investigating the history of the record-keeping activities used on the HBC Archives<sup>52</sup>. As well, archival studies students are encouraged to take up funded internships with the HBC Archives at the Archives of Manitoba<sup>53</sup>.

### The archival work of Maureen Dolyniuk, current Manager, HBC Archives

In 2001, the Archives of Manitoba began a process of re-describing its holdings, including the HBC Archives (HBCA). Gradually the 1930s classification scheme (see Table 14), and the 1980s record group categories (see Table 15) will be phased out as the records of the HBC are arranged and described using the series system. The series system implemented by Archives of Manitoba builds on the Australian series system and the Canadian series approach developed by the Archives of Ontario (Dolyniuk, 2007, p. x). The HBCA Redescription Project<sup>54</sup> will allow access to the records through the Archives of Manitoba's online search page of their Keystone Archives Description Database<sup>55</sup>.

---

<sup>52</sup> Research Theses listed: <http://www.umanitoba.ca/history/archives/thesis.html> [8 Mar 2008]

<sup>53</sup> Funded internships mentioned: <http://www.umanitoba.ca/history/archives/> [accessed 8 Mar 2008]

<sup>54</sup> The Redescription Project is described at <http://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/archives/hbca/holdings/arrangement.html> [accessed 17 March 2008]

<sup>55</sup> Keystone Archives Description Database search page at <http://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/archives/keystone/index.html> [accessed 17 Mar 2008]

In 2006, the Hudson's Bay Company Archival records were nominated (Dodds & Dolyniuk, 2006) for inclusion in the UNESCO Memory of the World Register and the application was accepted in 2007<sup>56</sup>.

### **6.2.3 Summary of the HBCA and archival influences**

The archival activities carried out on the HBCA during the twentieth century showed initial archival activities by English archivists whilst the HBCA were located in London, followed by the archival activities of Canadian archivists when the HBCA were transferred to Winnipeg. Unlike the EIC, VOC and RAC Archives, the custodianship of the HBCA had stayed within the Hudson's Bay Company throughout the second custodial phase of the records, and the HBC, albeit much reduced than it was in 1870, still exists as a company in Canada.

As with the EIC, VOC and RAC Archives, the HBCA contain 'old company records' of companies raised in the seventeenth century. The custodial history of the HBCA is different to that of the other three in that the HBCA have always had an identity as one collection. However, like the RAC Archives, the system of arrangement that Hilary Jenkinson recommended for the HBCA in 1932, still influences their arrangement, albeit until the redescription project is completed.

The following issues raised in this section on the HBCA are discussed further in chapters 7 and 8.

1. Leveson Gower was the first archivist appointed by the HBC to investigate the HBCA during the latter part of their second custodial phase.
2. When Leveson Gower carried out his archival work in the 1930s, the HBCA were a discrete collection. Like the EIC Archives, the HBCA were in their second custodial phase, but unlike the EIC where operations had ceased in 1858, the HBC had merely reduced its operations in 1870. Therefore, the first significant arrangement and description of the HBCA occurred during a seven-year period, sixty years into their second custodial phase. Leveson Gower was influenced by the arrangement and description

---

<sup>56</sup> Details obtained from <http://portal.unesco.org> [accessed February 2, 2008]

advice given him by Hilary Jenkinson in the 1930s, the latter having inspected the HBCA in 1932 and provided guidance on the preparation of an inventory for the records.

3. Through his process of arrangement and description, Leveson Gower was an active shaper of the forthcoming product. Using his process of applying the principles of investigative archival analysis, Horsman's archaeological archivology, he diligently pieced together the context of the records. As well, through his product of arrangement and description, he connected the research he made into the original context of the records with the reconstruction of that context. Archaeological archivology is an important methodology and tool for archivists who are active shapers.
4. Archivists who followed Leveson Gower were involved with archival activities other than arrangement and description, the product of Leveson Gower's work being still current [see Table 15].
5. Jenkinson's influence on the arrangement, description and management of the HBCA in their third custodial phase is clear, thus adding to the evidence that Jenkinson was not only an active shaper himself, but also influenced others to be active shapers too.
6. The archivists who followed Leveson Gower have built upon the work of their predecessors, providing access to the HBCA both for interested researchers and the Canadian public. This active shaping of the identity of the HBCA by successive generations of archivists has propelled the HBCA to become recognised internationally, being part of the UNESCO Memory of the World.

## CHAPTER 7. DISCUSSION

### 7.1 Introduction

Usual understanding is that theory influences practice, but the discussion hereunder shows archival practice to aid in the development of archival theory. Archival practice, both good and bad, and professional discussion have contributed to developing professional understanding of the importance of provenance, original order, and the need for a sound methodology for analysis of the records to precede arrangement and description. All record-keeping activity relating to the arrangement and description of 'old company records' contributes to the custodial history of the archival records, from the first custodial phase when the records were created, to their second custodial or transfer phase, and during their third custodial or archival management phase.

The researcher's proposition that developing archival practice influences the development of archival theory through archival processes and products will be supported by a discussion of the following:

1. The custodial phase in which the significant arrangement and description occurred by asking:
  - a. who did it, and
  - b. whether or not the collection was seen as a discrete collection at the time or thereafter;
2. In which documentation can the processes and products of the archivist's arrangement and description practices be seen; and
3. What influences on accepted practice and theory can be discerned through the activities in 1 and 2 above?

The four case studies will be used to trace the development of the archival craft and in doing so, will invoke the historical development of a thoughtful profession. Archivists have a history of sharing ideas in the interests of actively shaping the development of their profession.

## 7.2 Archival processes and products

In his 2001 paper on the topic of new formulations for archival science in the twenty-first century, Cook argued for the research paradigm of archival science to shift:

“from the analysis of the properties and characteristics of individual documents or series of records, to an analysis of the functions, processes, and transactions, which cause documents and series to be created. With a focus on record-creating processes rather than on recorded products, core theoretical formulations about archives will change” (Cook, 2001, p. 21).

Analysis of archival practices should move from the micro-view of an individual document and its contents to a macro-view of how and why a series of documents was or will be created. Cook sees the archival theoretical discourse shifting from product to process, from archival structure to archival function and from passive keepers to active shapers. The above shifts encompass all the following elements: product, process, archival structure, archival function, passive keeping and active shaping. By examining archival practices used in the past on the archival collections that exist today, some light may be thrown on the way this shift in theoretical discourse has not only progressed over time, but has been influenced by practice in significant cases. Thus, there is value in reviewing how the archival collections that exist today have been handled by successive generations of custodians. The archival activities of arrangement and description were discussed in the literature review in the context of having a *process* and a *product*. Similarly, the overall archival actions of successive generations of custodians through the *process of custodial phases* produce the *product of custodial history*. There is value in discussing how the *process* arrived at the *product* as the two are inextricably linked by the passage of time.

### 7.3 Custodial phases

The three custodial phases through which each of the archival collections of ‘old company records’ discussed in this thesis have passed, have all occurred over a period of more than 300 years, that is, since the seventeenth century. The ‘old company records’ discussed are: the VOC Archives (now in the National Archives of The Netherlands, The Hague); the EIC Archives (now in the British Library, London); the RAC Archives (now in The National Archives, London, U.K.); and the HBC Archives (now in the Archives of Manitoba in Winnipeg, Canada). The unique aspect of these collections is that they provide a compact illustration of custodial phases compared with the very large volume of government records now contained in the repositories mentioned above. These ‘old company records’ are “finite” collections of records that have discernable phases in their custodial history, however, each collection has not had the same record-keeping treatment over their history.

Comparison of the similarities and differences in record-keeping practices, particularly the archival practices applied in the third custodial phase, yields data that can be used to evaluate the influence these cases have had on the development of arrangement and archival description. Examining the practice of successive custodians of each collection will provide insights into the ways changing practice has influenced the development of archival theory.

VOC Archives: When Heeres commenced his work in 1877, the VOC Archives were not a discrete collection, but an accumulation of records from the Ministry of Colonies that included the VOC Archives, then being in their third custodial phase. Colenbrander had continued the archival duties after Heeres, which Meilink-Roelofs was to complete in 1963, the VOC Archives finally becoming a discrete collection. The physical location of the VOC Archives throughout its entire third custodial phase was a purpose-built archival repository, therefore, the significant arrangement and description typifying the third custodial phase took more than ninety-six years to complete.

EIC Archives: When Danvers started the work in 1884, the EIC Archives were a discrete collection, being in their second custodial phase. Foster continued Danvers’ work until 1923; however the work was not continued after Foster retired. The

physical location of the EIC Archives was not in a purpose built repository until 1967. In 1982, when the EIC Archives moved into their third custodial phase they were part of the accumulation of India Office Records, the significant arrangement and description of the EIC Archives having happened in the second custodial phase over a forty-year period. The significant activity occurring in the second custodial phase shows this transfer phase can be a period of intensive archival activity, rather than the inevitable period of neglect observed by Jenkinson.

RAC Archives: When Jenkinson carried out his work in the 1910s, the RAC Archives were not a discrete collection but part of the records of the Treasury to which the ‘old company records’ of the RAC had passed in their second custodial phase. By this time the RAC Archives had been in their third custodial phase for over fifty years. Later in the twentieth century, archivists at the Public Record Office would re-evaluate Jenkinson’s description of the RAC Archives and describe them separately as the Royal African Company records<sup>57</sup>. However the retention of the shelf mark of the RAC Archives continued to demonstrate their link to the Treasury, thereby retaining evidence of custodial and arrangement history, and with this aspect of professional arrangement and description contributing to documenting the RAC Archives’ custodial history. Nevertheless, the significant, foundational arrangement and description of the RAC Archives happened over a five-year period, fifty years into their third custodial phase.

Two points can be drawn from Jenkinson’s work on the RAC Archives during his first decade as an archivist. The first point is that the RAC Archives provided Jenkinson with an actual example for his observation that archives pass through an inevitable period of neglect, the RAC Archives demonstrated the point through not having received any archival attention for almost ninety years. This ninety years of neglect was comprised of the forty years of their transfer phase and the initial fifty years of their third custodial phase. The second point is that Jenkinson had this experience with the RAC Archives in the first decade of his career, this period being very influential in his later writings when he concluded the transfer phase to be an inevitable period of neglect for archives. However, as pointed out in the researcher’s

earlier discussion on the EIC Archives, neglect in the second custodial phase is not inevitable. At least that was not Danvers' experience until he was forced to turn his attention to current India Office records, rather than the inactive old company records. Although situations in the second custodial phase may conspire to cause neglect, the conclusion can be drawn that it is not inevitable. Nevertheless, Jenkinson's influential writing alerted the profession to the potential for neglect in the second custodial phase and the need to be prepared to counteract it.

HBC Archives: When Leveson Gower carried out his work in the 1930s, the HBC Archives were a discrete collection. Like the EIC Archives, the HBC Archives were in their second custodial phase, but unlike the EIC's cessation of operations in 1858, the HBC only reduced its operations in 1870, being still an active company. Jenkinson had inspected the HBC Archives in 1932, providing guidance on the preparation of an inventory for the records. Although the HBC old company records suffered neglect in the early part of their second custodial phase, the significant arrangement and description of its archives happened over a seven-year period, sixty years into their second custodial phase.

Summary: Jenkinson hypothesised that the second custodial phase would inevitably be a period of neglect. The custodial histories of both the VOC Archives and the RAC Archives support his hypothesis. For these two collections, the significant activities of archaeological archivology, with its resultant arrangement and description, took place in the third custodial phase after long periods of neglect in their second custodial phases.

However, the cases of the EIC and HBC Archives caution that the second custodial phase, or transfer phase can be a period of intensive archival activity rather than an inevitable period of neglect as observed by Jenkinson. For these two collections, the significant archaeological archivology and arrangement and description activity both occurred in the second custodial phase.

Traces of earlier arrangement history such as the shelf mark of the RAC Archives, which provides evidence of their link to the Treasury, can provide important clues for

---

<sup>57</sup> TNA: PRO T 70 Company of Royal Adventurers of England Trading with Africa and successors: Records. 1660-1833. 1,696 volumes. Open access. Not Public Records [accessed 19 Dec 2007: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/catalogue> (formerly PROCAT)]



archaeological archivology. These traces form part of the record of the RAC Archives' custodial history.

Therefore, analysing the record-keeping activities carried out in either the first, second or third custodial phases allows the observation of the subtle differences in the activities over time, and discourse on how the record-keeping activities have been influenced by the custodial phase in which the records are situated. The importance of passing on information about the records through documentation, not only of the records themselves, but also of the processes applied to them, allows future archivists and users of the records to be able to understand the content and context of the records better.

#### **7.4 Documentation of arrangement and description products and processes**

Through documentation of arrangement and description products and processes, archival practice aids in the development of archival theory:

1. through archivists' thoughtful approaches to practical problems experienced in their work; and in some cases,
2. through an archivist's solution to a practical problem that also, in some way, influences the profession around them.

Archivists share the information gleaned from their archival craft through such products of their work as inventories and finding aids. They can also share their ideas through a number of avenues of discourse.

##### **7.4.1 Inventories and finding aids**

Working on the inventories and finding aids in these two groups of cases (EIC/VOC and RAC/HBC) led to the publication of manuals which were vehicles for communicating best practice between archivists and significant foundation texts in archival theory.

### 7.4.2 Sharing ideas

Archivists share their knowledge and solutions through avenues of discourse such as:

1. presenting their ideas at a conference or meeting of their peers or the wider archival community;
2. sharing ideas in written discussion through letters and published articles, or through verbal discussion;
3. building upon the knowledge of an experienced archivist's work by thoughtful analysis of the experienced archivist's work; and
4. publications of manuals and textbooks which teach the next generation of archivists.

Examples presented in this thesis are:

1. Van Riemsdijk's presentation to the Conference of Dutch State Archivists in 1890 of his *Principles of Respect for Archival Structure*.
2. Danvers' presentation to the Society of Arts members in 1890 on the importance of active custody of archival collections, in particular, the EIC Archives.
3. Colenbrander and Van Riemsdijk's discussions in the 1890s on investigative archival analysis in the VOC Archives.
4. Danvers and Van Riemsdijk's discussions from 1893-1895 on filling gaps of information in the EIC Archives. The gap identified by Danvers was the need for documents from the seventeenth century and he filled this gap with an artificial collection of transcribed and translated documents copied from the originals held in the VOC Archives.
5. Jenkinson's discovery in the 1910s of the EIC Archives being a parallel collection to the RAC Archives.
6. Leveson Gower's activities in the 1930s on the arrangement of the HBC Archives based upon Jenkinson's recommendations.

7. The *1898 Dutch Manual* is the influential forerunner for modern, standards-based practice. It is an important manifestation of the way practice has been refined through thoughtful work on problematic collections and ultimately the development of archival theory. There were certainly discussions between Danvers and Van Riemsdijk or Heeres. This can be concluded from Danvers' note about De Jonge's rearrangement (IOR/I/3/86, 1893-1895, p. 30) [see also the researcher's transcription in Appendix 1 page 3]. It is very likely that influential exchanges occurred between Danvers and the Dutch archivists.
8. Jenkinson's work on the RAC influenced his thinking on the practice of arrangement and description, the outcomes of which he later shared through his work with Leveson Gower. He also shared his ideas with the wider profession through his *1922 Manual* and his teaching on archival science at University College, London.
9. Jenkinson was among the vanguard of specialist archival educators. By taking on this educational role and sharing his knowledge with the next generation of archivists he was among those who helped the move towards the role of the archivist becoming a fully fledged profession, characterised by having professional education programs that teach and develop a specialist body of theory.

This section has given an account of the means by which these archivists, historically, have developed and communicated their ideas. The next section will consider the way archival practice and theory has been changed through the influence of their work.

### **7.5 Moving from physical control to intellectual control**

The degree with which archivists have either passively kept or actively shaped archival records is evident in more than just the arrangement and description product of the archives that have survived. Using changing practice as a lens, this thesis has examined the way practice has influenced the development of archival theory. Two fundamental changes have been discussed in this thesis. The first fundamental change was the move from managing archives using physical control, through physical arrangement on the shelf to intellectual control through documentation. The second

fundamental change was the development of the inventory process in such a way that it allowed the inventory product to represent the context, structure and contents of the archive it chronicles.

A stark contrast exists between the management of archives using physical control through physical arrangement on the shelf, and using intellectual control through documentation. Examining the difference between De Jonge's view in the 1860s-1870s, and Heeres' view from the 1890s shows this first fundamental change. De Jonge used physical rearrangement to provide the subject access that he considered necessary; in contrast, Heeres saw that archives could be maintained using physical control, through arrangement, to represent the organisation creating the records and the information in the archives, and could be accessed using intellectual control, through documentation, such as published works. This paradigm shift, which heralded a new era in the history of archival practice in The Netherlands, was discussed in chapters 2 and 4.

As the second fundamental change, the development of the inventory process allowed the inventory product to represent the context, structure and contents of the archive chronicled by it. The development of the inventory product from a simple list to a comprehensive document containing an inventory and custodial history is exemplified in the work of the archivists in the VOC Archives discussed in this thesis. Van Riemsdijk had theorised the inventory process and Heeres, Colenbrander and Meilink-Roelofs had implemented and demonstrated the inventory process which culminated in the product - the completed inventory.

This development began with Van Riemsdijk's ideas being a conceptualisation of a new era in the history of archival practice in The Netherlands. From the 1880s, Van Riemsdijk had "placed the intellectual centre of gravity of the inventory process at the level of the organization of the administration and more particularly in the organization of the administrative process, which the arrangement of the archives was presumed to mirror" (Horsman et al., 2003, p. x). As mentioned in section 4.5, Van Riemsdijk "believed that the basis of archival theory was careful observation and analysis of phenomena and organizations" (Ketelaar, 1996b, p. 60). The mantra, theory influences practice, is being questioned in this thesis whereby the examination of past archival practices used on the archival collections extant today, throws some

light on the way theoretical discourse has been influenced by practice in significant cases.

The stark contrast between De Jonge's activities and Heeres' and Colenbrander's activities in the VOC Archives demonstrates the move of intellectual focus from finding specific information in the archives to comprehensively documenting the archives, thus providing intellectual access to the whole archive via the device of the inventory process and inventory product. This comprehensive documentation, both an inventory and custodial history, allowed specific information to be found by searching through it. Using the documentation rather than physical arrangement to access the records yielded multiple possible access points rather than just one physical access point. The availability of multiple possible access points is also the reason why comprehensive documentation was much more efficient than the temporary usefulness of the subject finding aids which were produced to assist known-subject research enquires. Moving the intellectual focus in the matter outlined above required development of the inventory process that produced the documentation.

At the core of the inventory process are the investigative activities conducted by the archivists on the archival records being investigated. Van Riemsdijk's *Principle of Respect for Archival Structure* argued that, the order in which the documents have survived should be kept, while the context in which the documents were raised in the first custodial phase are researched and documented. Van Riemsdijk's process of *functional methodology* required that the context of the documents in relation to the organisational structure that created them be chronicled in a preliminary inventory, analysis of these results then allowing an informed decision to be made by the archivist on whether or not the order in which the documents have survived is the arrangement used when the documents were created in the first custodial phase.

The practices of thoughtful archivists like Van Riemsdijk and Colenbrander are essential to further developing criteria for arrangement and description best practice.

## **7.6 Investigative archival activities**

At the 1890 Conference of Dutch State Archivists, Van Riemsdijk advocated a *Principle of respect for archival structure* (Ketelaar, 1996a, p. 34). This principle is

instructive when an archivist is rearranging an archival collection to reflect the records management structure that had maintained the records in their first custodial phase.

As discussed in section 2.1 of the literature review, arrangement as a product fixed at a point in time through archival description is a representation of the archivist's interpretation of how arrangement and description principles should be applied to that specific body of records. Rearrangement occurs when record-keeping professionals have concluded the scheme of arrangement of the records as presented to them is not the arrangement in which, as a result of their research, they believe the records ought to follow. It is useful at this point to distinguish between collections that have survived intact in their original order, as they were in their first custodial phase in the organisation that created them; and collections having for some reason had that order obscured. Current archival thinking requires original order in the former must be preserved and not disturbed. This theoretical stance has developed over time, aided by thoughtful practising professionals like Van Riemsdijk, Heeres, Colenbrander, Danvers and Jenkinson. Yet the cases presented in this study on which they worked had all lost their original order, at least to some extent. In the VOC and HBC Archives, the original order had almost been completely lost, and in the EIC Archives much of the original order remained, but some records were in complete disarray, requiring reconstruction. Furthermore, a significant quantity of documents had been lost, inspiring Danvers' mission to fill the information gaps by making an artificial collection from the copies of records from the VOC Archives. The RAC Archives also required extensive research by Jenkinson who was trying to reconstruct the original order of them, that is, the order prior to that in which they were kept at the Treasury. This loss of administrative context and order inspired the custodians of the collections to conduct their archaeological archivology so as to re-establish the context as far as possible, reflecting it in their descriptive products. Thus practice developed to deal with problematic collections contributed to the development of archival theory.

However, this approach has not always been the norm. De Jonge's work to rearrange a part of the VOC Archives was not to reflect an interpretation of original order of the records but rather as his remedy to finding no contents tables for those particular years. At this stage of archival thinking, reconstructing administrative context and

order was certainly not a priority. De Jonge's view was that the records of the VOC were the means to his end of finding information about a particular subject; and that he would later publish selected documents in a series on the *Rise of Dutch Sovereignty in the East Indies* (De Jonge, 1862-1888). For De Jonge preserving the order of the archives was not important if that order did not assist researchers in finding information in the records. Yet his approach was a shortsighted and rather primitive one to the provision of access, since he catered only to his own research interests and needs, and possibly those of a few other current researchers. He did not seem to consider that by exploiting his own privileged position as archivist to pursue his own interests and facilitating access for this particular research topic, he may have been hindering access for future researchers, yet unknown, whose interests he could not imagine.

Heeres followed De Jonge, but for him preserving the evidential nature of the documents gave validity to the information contained within them. This archival development of the idea of evidentiality is entirely dependent upon the ability to demonstrate the records' context and origin in the administrative structure that created them, thereby establishing their authenticity. In developing this theoretical stance, Heeres built on Van Riemsdijk's work, exploiting knowledge of authenticated context to demonstrate that the information in the records is authoritative and accurate, that is, it can be presented as evidence.

Heeres' work on the VOC Archives was to rearrange a part of them to reflect the scheme of arrangement in which the records had been originally held. His view was that the VOC records should reflect its organisation, he had a much more sophisticated understanding of the nature of archival materials than De Jonge. He demonstrated an understanding of provenance, not only from the crude perspective of a total collection and the now accepted general principle of not mixing records from different sources, but also by taking into account internal administrative structure and change. Heeres was able to discern different administrative units because he wrote up his analysis of the documents by making an inventory of what he had found. He contributed to the development of archival theory by discerning that intellectual access was possible via the inventory thus making unnecessary physical re-arrangement redundant.

The sheer volume of work to be done determined that Heeres would not be able to finish, having to pass the task on to the next archivist. Nevertheless an observation by Cook (2001, p. 4) that the archivist's role is as an active shaper of societal memory, certainly qualifies Heeres as a contender for this title.

After leaving VOC Archives, Heeres became Professor at the Dutch Colonial Institute in Delft, publishing in 1899 *The Part Borne by the Dutch in the Discovery of Australia 1606-1795*. He acknowledged the documents on which his work was based were housed in the General State Archives and thanked Van Riemsdijk and Colenbrander for their assistance (Heeres, 1899, p. iii). Heeres' intention in publishing this volume was to show that documentary evidence exists of the Netherlanders seventeenth and eighteenth centuries exploratory voyages along the coasts of Australia, and that "the first authenticated discovery of any part of the great Southland was made in 1606<sup>58</sup> by a Dutch schip the *Duifken*" (Heeres, 1899, p. iii). Heeres also presented the documents in Dutch and English for further evidentiary comparison, a demonstration of historical fact.

The fundamental change to be seen between De Jonge's view in the 1860s-1870s and Heeres' view from the 1890s, was that archives could be maintained using physical control, through arrangement, to represent that the organisation creating the records and information in the archives could be accessed using intellectual control through documentation, such as published works.

Also of basic importance was that the VOC Archives had been in their third custodial phase having crossed the archival threshold to be in an environment where archivists could observe the archival structure of the records, including the arrangement presented, the chronicling of the organisation creating the records, and the custodial history of the records. These conditions facilitated observations that enabled Van Riemsdijk's development, by 1890, of his *Principle of Respect for Archival Structure*, which averred the structure of an archival collection as presented to have a history. Thus, through observation and analysis, the archivist could demonstrate whether or not the structure represented the original arrangement of the records during its first custodial phase.

---

<sup>58</sup> The 400-year anniversary of this discovery was celebrated in 2006 by Australia and The Netherlands. Source: [<http://www.australian-embassy.nl/thag/wc2.html>] accessed 7 Feb 2008]



Obviously, archivists need time to carry out investigations in the third custodial phase, if the administrative structure of the organisation and the record's arrangement were not documented in the first custodial phase. Over the years experienced archivists have observed that, with planning, records in the first custodial phase could be embedded with the information to facilitate their smooth transition into the third custodial phase. By viewing the records as moving from a first custodial phase to a second custodial phase and then into a third custodial phase focuses attention on the context of the records themselves. This view of custodial phases is one of Jenkinson's contributions to the development of archival practice and theory. This thesis has used this particular view as the focus for a discussion on the product and process of arrangement and description.

The investigative activities used by Colenbrander on the VOC Archives and Jenkinson on the RAC Archives showed that the product of arrangement of the records, that is, the order of the records when each archivist came to work on them, was a result of the arrangement occurring in the relevant, previous custodial phase. And this could be established by analysing a collection of records using "archaeological archivology" (Horsman, 1999, p. 47), and advanced "reconstructive" work (Maclean, 1962, p. 145). These applications involved an analysis of the custodial history of a collection of records to identify the place where the collection was found (provenience), and further analysis to identify where the records were raised (provenance) (Maclean, 1962, p. 140). This process takes time to identify what aspects of the arrangement and description, having survived, can be seen in the collection of records extant. Colenbrander observed some of the early records of the VOC to contain ship's logs (see chapter 4), however, of the large numbers of ships existing in the early seventeenth century, only a small number of the ship's logs had survived. Recording details of what ought to be held but was not found at the time the archivist carried out the analysis then becomes part of the custodial history. This is an important part of documenting custodial history because light is thrown on what was known at a particular time about what records ought to have been present but were not. And, in turn helps to clarify knowledge about the structure of the records in the context of the activities of the organisation creating them.

The purpose of conducting investigative analysis in archives is to support the reasons for rearranging all or part of the records if it is decided to rearrange; or to confirm that the arrangement in place reflects the structure of the records system creating the documents. An important element noted by Horsman is that the “structure of the fonds is determined by the records managers rather than by the administration” (Horsman, 1999, p. 47). The decisions made by the custodian of the records in the first custodial phase on how the records should be organised is reflected in the structure implemented in the first custodial phase. The records managers, working with the records creators, decide what records should be created and kept to provide the necessary evidence of business conducted and accountability.

Archivists, working with archival collections in their third custodial phase, build up a body of knowledge and experience which then comprises the context of the records; they become familiar with the habits of the people creating the records through the process of arranging and describing them.

Ketelaar (1996a, p. 33) credits Van Riemsdijk with being “a forerunner of the modern post-custodial paradigm, in which analysis of the characteristics of individual documents is replaced by understanding the business functions, transactions, and workflows that cause documents to be created”. At the core of Van Riemsdijk’s functional methodology was the extensive research he carried out into the structure of the records in the first custodial phases, as well as the organisation of the administration creating them. Additionally, Colenbrander’s work on the VOC archives shows he carefully investigated how the surviving documents were raised in their first custodial phase.

The micro-view of providing contextual information focuses on the arrangement, description and boundaries of archival custody, the macro-view widens that focus to include the influence by the archivist on the archives they select to enable them to produce such contextual information. The custodial history of the archives connects the two views to the custodial phases linking the record-keeping activities of past custodians with the archival activities of current custodians.

Comparing what archivists have done in the past when they have arranged and documented an archival collection with the ideal professional practices of their time shows not only how they arranged and documented, but also how their solutions

became part of the professional archival practice of the time. That archival practice then became embedded in the arrangement and description of archives. Archival practices are also indicative of how archivists think; therefore glimmers in understanding of the development of archival thinking through their practices can be discerned.

The arrangement and descriptive practices used on the VOC and EIC archives in the late nineteenth century reflected the professional practices and ideas of that time. While these processes and products were influenced by past practices, the ideas of functional methodology were in their formative stage, the context surrounding the creation of the records being interpreted according to the functions represented by the records when they were created. With that context in place, the integrity of the archival records can be demonstrated.

## **7.7 Reflection of custodial history in arrangement and description**

The research questions outlined in chapter 3 have been the guiding structure for details of the research recorded in this thesis.

### **7.7.1 Research Question 1**

The first question asked:

What effect does its custodial history have on the arrangement and description of archives?

By documenting the custodial history of a collection, archivists can shed light on why the records have been arranged and described the way they have. The four cases chosen for this thesis demonstrate that custodial history can profoundly affect the arrangement and description process, and products, for a collection. Although Jenkinson's assertion that neglect is inevitable in the second custodial phase has been demonstrated as an overstatement, even where profound neglect has taken place, careful observation of provenience, research into provenance and preservation of documentation about processes applied to the records, can be compiled by later custodians so helping to counteract the effects of that neglect.

Later in the twentieth century, archivists at the Public Record Office would re-evaluate Jenkinson's description of the RAC Archives describing them separately as being Royal African Company Records (see chapter 6). However the shelf marks of the RAC Archives would retain their link to the Treasury, thereby retaining evidence of custodial and arrangement history as a part of the record of the RAC Archives' custodial history.

The custodial history of the HBC Archives is different to that of the other three, the HBC Archives having an enduring identity as one collection (see chapter 6). However, similar to the RAC Archives, the system of arrangement Jenkinson recommended for the HBC Archives in 1932, still influences the arrangement of them, albeit until the re-description project is completed.

### **7.7.2 Research Question 2**

The second question asked:

What influence have archivists had on the custodial history of an archive through decisions made when arranging and describing that archive?

Record arrangement and record description are both a process and a product.

Examination of the product surviving allows the process to be analysed, this analysis providing data for use detailing:

1. the records themselves;
2. the methodology of the record-keeping practice; and
3. the custodial phases through which the records passed.

The manner in which records are grouped together depends on, the custodial phase in which they are found, and ascertainment of the influences on:

1. which custodial phase the records are in, will influence which category of record-keeping professional is responsible for their maintenance and care;
2. how the records have been changed by any variations of record-keeping methodology used to maintain them; and

3. whether the record-keeping professional is influenced by the idiosyncrasies of the record collection they are maintaining.

The development of flexible systems of record and intellectual control to cope with the idiosyncrasies of the record collection can be seen in “finite” collections, such as the ‘old company records’ discussed in this thesis, when compared with ongoing collections of governmental and bureaucratic records in which the government framework is continually being changed by successive administrations.

### **7.7.3 Research Question 3**

The third question asked:

Does the archivist’s influence become embedded in the custodial history of the records?

An archivist’s influence exists where the archivist has interpreted either:

- 1) the product of arrangement and description analysed and defined; or
- 2) the process of arranging and describing based on current archival practice.

However, *all* record-keeping professionals who have participated in the arranging and describing processes have the potential to influence the product of arrangement and description.

An archivist’s influence becomes embedded in the custodial history of the records by way of the product of arrangement and description the archivist has left, and more visibly, by the documentation of the custodial history the archivist has either produced or preserved from previous custodial work. However, that influence can be lessened if the product of the arrangement they have left is rearranged following analyses by the next generation of archivists who decide it to be necessary. Exemplifying this is the work of De Jonge in the VOC Archives, for when Colenbrander had completed the rearrangement of the volumes already changed by De Jonge, the product of De Jonge’s rearranging activities no longer existed. The fact that De Jonge had changed the arrangement of the volumes continues to be known through the documentation of the custodial history for the VOC Archives, but it can be traced, not only through De

Jonge's own publications (De Jonge, 1862-1888), but also through chronicling left by his successors, and by some who worked on the collections, as Danvers did, commenting about his work. More recently, De Jonge's work has been recorded in the history of the VOC Archives written by Pennings (1992).

Furthermore, though the influence of De Jonge's work is no longer found in the product of the arrangement of the VOC archives, the reaction to De Jonge's rearrangement can be found in the archival theory that emerged in the pre-*Manual* period. It is probable the inspiration for the *1898 Dutch Manual* was the challenge of outlining rules so that archivists after 1898 would not repeat the mistakes of their predecessors who had "pulled apart" the records as described by (Ketelaar, 1986, p. 49) and discussed in chapter 4. Therefore, rearrangement activities such as those performed by De Jonge helped to inspire production of the *1898 Dutch Manual*.

In contrast, Danvers provides an example of a custodian whose work not only prevented neglect of the records in his care, but also actively enhanced the original collection. He researched the VOC Archives to identify and create an artificial collection (see chapter 5) and he did this in an exemplary manner, carefully documenting his sources and their original context as he found them. His work contributes to the custodial history of two collections: both the EIC and the VOC. Although his work has not been documented in any formal VOC custodial history, it does provide researchers into the custodial history of the collections with evidence of the arrangement of the VOC records as they were found at the time.

The significance of Danvers' development of the artificial collection from the VOC records, and its contribution to the value of the EIC collection, has hitherto been unsung. Nevertheless, he is a particularly good example of an archivist whose work has shaped and become embedded in the custodial history of the collection upon which he worked.

Leveson Gower also provides an example of a custodian whose work not only prevented neglect of the records in his care, but also actively enhanced the original collection. Through his product of arrangement and description, Leveson Gower integrated his research with the original context of the records by reconstructing that context.

Jenkinson was the first person to investigate the RAC Archives in their third custodial phase, identifying the EIC Archives as the only parallel archival collection with which he could draw comparisons. Jenkinson used archaeological archivology to discern the organisational structure of the RAC from the existing discrete sets, such as the volumes of Day Books and Journals from the various forts in Africa (see chapter 6). By recording his initial investigations into the context surrounding the creation of the records, his interpretation of the effect of the transfer of those records to the Treasury after the cessation of the third company, Jenkinson's archival activities became part of the custodial history of the RAC Archives.

#### **7.7.4 Research Question 4**

The fourth question asked:

What influence does the custodial history of the records have on the archivist, and in turn, on the archivist's contribution to archival practice? Is that contribution reflected in the archival theory of the archivist's era?

The custodial history can provide evidential documentation that the context of the documents within the archives has been preserved or reinstated by the process and product of arrangement and description, it adds a further contextual layer beyond that inherent in the original order of the archival collection, and its chronicles can influence successive archivists by informing them of what has happened to the records prior to their involvement with them. Where there is no documentation of the latter, the archivist must perform archaeological archivology, using the products of earlier arrangement and description, lists, or any other sources that can be found.

Archaeological archivology involves investigative activities archivists carry out on the structure of the archival records to ascertain the original structure in which the records were raised. Their deductions may well be influenced by similar characteristics they have seen in other archival collections. As they build up further information about the custodial history, they may re-evaluate previous deductions, thereby making fresh deductions about schemes of arrangement and description used in the past.

Jenkinson's work on arranging and describing the RAC Archives started with his investigation of similar collections from which he could draw a parallel, identifying the EIC Archives as a similar collection (Jenkinson, 1912, p. 213). Like Danvers' efforts with the EIC Archives, Jenkinson worked towards arranging and describing the RAC Archives after he had made preliminary investigations and listings of what he had found, then making an analysis from which was decided the manner in which the archives ought to be arranged. When the RAC Archives were re-described later in the twentieth century, Jenkinson's work was to become embedded in the documentation and arrangement of some of the collection. Jenkinson influenced the RAC Archives for the period of time that arrangement and description was kept, and through his interpretation of the process was an active shaper of the product (T 70) of his arrangement. Later in his career, Jenkinson would draw on his experience with the RAC Archives to document examples of archival practice and methodology as recorded in his *1922 Manual* and later articles.

The case of the VOC Archives is a good example of a collection undergoing re-evaluation, the work of Heeres and Colenbrander being evidence of the returning of the documents rearranged by De Jonge to their original order (see chapter 4). A development of archival understanding can be seen with the stark contrast between De Jonge's activities, which disturbed the origin, and connection between the documents, and Heeres' activities which demonstrated he had a more sophisticated understanding of the nature of archival materials than De Jonge.

### **7.7.5 Research Question 5**

The fifth question asked:

Do references listed in Danvers' manuscript occur in JKJ de Jonge's work *Opkomst van het Nederlandsch Gezag in Oost-Indie*? If so, could Danvers have sourced material from the same original records used by De Jonge?

In answer to the first part of question 5, no references listed in Danvers' manuscript (Danvers, 1895b) have been identified in De Jonge's work (De Jonge, 1862-1888).

In answer to the second part of question 5, yes, Danvers sourced some of the same original records that De Jonge used. Danvers' research project in the VOC Archives



(see chapter 5) undertaken during the years 1893-1895, resulted in the collection of over 2,646 handwritten transcriptions<sup>59</sup> of VOC original documents from the years 1609-1700. Danvers continued his project by having the Dutch language transcriptions translated into English. The researcher's analysis of the data concluded that the documents in Danvers' *Dutch Records at The Hague* "The First Series" *Letters from India* were sourced from *Overgekomen brieven en papieren uit Indie aan de Heren XVII en de kamer Amsterdam, 1614-1700* [=Letters and papers received from Asia by the Heren XVII and the Amsterdam Chamber]. This analysis compared the document description collected from Danvers' volumes with the description contained in the *1992 Inventory of the VOC Archives* (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992). The results of this analysis can be seen in Appendix 2, showing a partial match of the documents Danvers' researched compared with those in the *1992 Inventory of the VOC Archives*. That the order of the volumes can be compared proves Danvers maintained the order of the volumes discerned in the VOC Archives during his investigations from 1893 to 1895, and kept that same order for the documents he had selected for transcription.

Danvers did source material from the same volumes that De Jonge used, but Danvers' method was to first go through each of the volumes of the series *Letters and papers received from Asia by the Heren XVII and the Amsterdam Chamber* and prepare a working list from which he then selected the documents he wanted transcribed. In this way, Danvers was able to discern that some of the volumes had been rearranged, making the following note on 1 Oct 1894 between vols. I-III (1670) and vols. I-IV, 1669-70 "Some of the books are in their original state and have not been re-arranged by Mr. De Jonge and others" (IOR/I/3/86, 1893-1895, p. 30) [see also the researcher's transcription in Appendix 1, page 3].

Danvers annotated the particular documents on his working list which had already been published by De Jonge (see Appendix 1, page 1, entry for 1612 - Vol. III and Appendix 1, page 3, entry for 1669-70 - Vol. III – Bantam). Danvers' working list (transcribed in Appendix 1) shows that volumes before 1670 followed a pattern of being numbered in each year only, whereas, after 1670, the volumes carried a

---

<sup>59</sup> IOR/I/3/1–IOR/I/3/106, *Dutch Records at The Hague*, series 1, 2 and 3 (106 volumes) India Office Records, British Library.

consecutive volume number as well as the yearly volume number. The subtleties of this numbering can be seen when an analysis of Danvers' working list is performed (see Appendix 1; and in chapter 5).

Danvers' work to create an artificial collection relevant to the EIC Archives by copying relevant documents from the VOC Archives clearly marks him as an archivist who was an active shaper of the collection upon which he worked. He is an exemplar of high standards of both historical research and archival documentation, in that he carefully recorded his sources and commented upon where and how the source documents had been arranged. He also provided a separate formal written account of the relevance of the documents he selected (see chapter 5) from the VOC Archives (Danvers, 1895b). This thesis is the first to set out the significance of his work; it has filled a gap in the description of the EIC Archives, using archaeological archivology to analyse and document the original source and arrangement of Danvers' collection. The research undertaken on Danvers' work has matched his collection with its source in the VOC Archives, demonstrating that they are one and the same.

*Appendix 1* provides a summary of the volumes searched by FC Danvers and WR Bisschop during the years 1893-1894 at the Rijksarchief, The Hague; from their notes in their "working list" in *BL: IOR I/3/86 Dutch Records at The Hague v.86*. The original working list consists of 119 pages, listing all of his source volumes in the VOC Archives. The summary in Appendix 1 also contains a transcription of Danvers' notes with his comments clearly showing his awareness of De Jonge's work.

Appendix 2 records the results of the researcher's analysis comparing the documents Danvers' viewed with the *1992 Inventory of the VOC Archives* (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992). This research was able to match some of the volumes Danvers listed in his working list with the *1992 Inventory of the VOC Archives* because Danvers had maintained the order of the volumes from which the transcribed VOC documents originated.

The researcher's investigations at the British Library produced a preliminary inventory listing the 2,646 documents Danvers had copied - a 298-page document. While too big to be included as a print appendix to this thesis, this draft finding aid is available for publishing at a future date and sample pages are included as Appendix 6.

### **7.7.6 Research Question 6**

The sixth question asked:

Were there similarities between the archiving process used by De Jonge and Danvers? Did both of these archivists, as a result of their own investigations of the documents held in the VOC and EIC Archives respectively, create “artificial collections” to assist future researchers to understand the actions of the Dutch in the East Indies during the seventeenth century?

It seems likely that the intent of both De Jonge and Danvers was to identify documents in the VOC Archives that could assist future researchers to understand the actions of the Dutch in the East Indies during the seventeenth century. De Jonge went on to have the documents he selected published between 1862 and 1888 in a series of 13 volumes (De Jonge, 1862-1888), whereas Danvers identified documents to be transcribed in Dutch and later translated into English, then having them bound in matching Dutch and English volumes (Danvers, 1895a).

### **7.7.7 Research Question 7**

The seventh question asked:

Did Danvers, by sourcing material from the General State Archives in The Hague in 1893-1895 seek to fill a gap he had identified in his India Office Records collection holding the EIC Archives in custody? Did Danvers subsequent actions of having the Dutch records transcribed, then having them translated and housed in the India Office Records collection, illustrate his altering the records of the events occurring in the East Indies during the years 1609-1700?

Evidently, Danvers did source material from the VOC Archives to fill an information gap he had identified as missing from the EIC Archives because many EIC records had been destroyed [see chapter 5, Danvers cites a case where records had been assessed in 1830 and deemed to be useful for preservation to be later flagged for destruction when they were reassessed in 1858 (Danvers, 1890, p. 162).] However, Danvers’ intention was to create a set of volumes of VOC documents following the same arrangement in which he found them in the VOC Archives. He did not seek to mix the EIC and VOC records in any way, so he did not alter or obscure the EIC

record of events with insertions of copies from the VOC records. He scrupulously observed the principles of provenance and original order in his work.

The Danvers' collection of *Dutch Records at the Hague* was an artificial collection of 106 volumes containing copies of VOC documents, Danvers' visionary work being undertaken in an attempt to provide a more rounded information source in his collection for future researchers. He made it possible for readers to gain a fuller and clearer picture of the international trading activities of the time by providing access to relevant records from the EIC's principal competitor. There can be no doubt that he was a fine example of an active shaper of the collection in his care, and provider of a potential information service.

Of interest is that the arrangement of the documents listed in the working list used by Danvers contains a snapshot of how the volumes he viewed in 1893-1895 were arranged at that time.

Thus Danvers' artificial collection provides evidence verifying that:

1. these documents were in the VOC collection at the time; and
2. arrangement practices had been applied to this collection at this date (1895).

Danvers' work verifies the custodial history of the VOC collection at the date of his work, the by-product of his work is a unique set of evidence providing insights into the development of archival practice at a crucial point in the development of archival theory, culminating in the development of the *1898 Dutch Manual*, the first formal standard for arrangement and description.

## **7.8 Questions for Further Research**

It could be of use to investigate whether it was common practice in the early nineteenth century in The Netherlands (and perhaps England too) for documents to be rearranged according to newly identified subject interests. The answer to this question may shed light on whether De Jonge and Leupe were ignoring accepted archival practice, or whether they were the last examples of a formerly common practice that had ceased being used. If the latter, a clearer picture would be had of

the developing awareness of the importance of context in archival arrangement and description, and consequently, the principles of provenance and original order.

## CHAPTER 8. CONCLUSIONS: PASSIVE KEEPERS OR ACTIVE SHAPERS?

### 8.1 Introduction

This thesis has taken an holistic view of archival influence that incorporates the archival practice of the archivist's era and the custodial history of the archival collection. Through their work described in the case studies presented, these archivists (Danvers, Heeres, Van Riemsdijk, Colenbrander and Jenkinson) have actively shaped their archival craft and collections. The body of work they produced is a representation of their translation of the archival principles to which they were exposed and used in their archival practice. In particular, this is seen in their use of investigative analysis and the considered evaluation of previous custodians' activities. While some also articulated their practice in manuals of instruction for use by other archivists, all embedded their processes in the arrangement and description products of the collections described in this thesis. The investigative analysis of their work, in turn, reveals their employment of this technique in the products of their predecessors. The archival activities described in this thesis reveal that Danvers' work with the EIC Archives and De Jonge's, Heeres' and Colenbrander's work with the VOC Archives, and Van Riemsdijk's influence at the General State Archives during the last half of the nineteenth century contributed to professional discussion within the archival community in England and The Netherlands respectively. Their discussions concerned moving from a broad perspective of seeing the archive as a whole to understanding how records of a particular administrative unit formed part of the overall administration process creating the records.

Jenkinson's work on the RAC Archives was influential in developing his thinking; as this is evidenced by his use of examples from them in his *1922 Manual of Archive Administration*. He benefited from both the *1898 Dutch Manual* and Danvers' work,

which he knew well through his familiarity with the EIC Archives, but which knowledge he passed on through his work with Leveson Gower on the HBC Archives.

Through these discussions and reflections on archival practice, the development of archival theory can be discerned. The major contribution of these archivists to shaping archival practice and theory was achieved through their common conviction that the detailed administrative structure of the creating organisation must be documented and, where possible, be reflected in the arrangement of the archival records in their care. They also developed methodologies allowing intellectual access to occur independent of the actual physical arrangement of the records in the repository.

By identifying these issues and implementing positive solutions to solve them, archivists in The Netherlands working on the VOC Archives were contributing to the development of actively shaping the archival profession at the end of the nineteenth century. Similarly in Britain, Danvers' enthusiasm for actively shaping his archival craft can be seen emerging through his work at the end of the nineteenth century. Jenkinson was then able to draw on both streams of enthusiasm for his archival craft from the start of his archival career in the early twentieth century. By the end of his archival career, Jenkinson's contribution to British archival development was quite influential. In particular, the next generation of archivists after Jenkinson would draw on his published works, which have become enormously influential.

## **8.2 Passive Keepers or Active Shapers**

Cook (1997b, p. 21) commented that the *1898 Dutch Manual* was based on the experience that Muller, Feith and Fruin had "either with limited numbers of medieval documents susceptible to careful diplomatic analysis or with records found in well-organized registries within stable administrations". The researcher has shown in this thesis, that other archival practitioners of the era of Muller, Feith and Fruin, before and immediately after the *1898 Dutch Manual*, had lengthy experience with records organised in such a way as to retain little relationship to their original order, in collections whose custodial history had not been at all stable. Furthermore, they all

either knew each other, or knew of the others' work. Van Riemsdijk and Colenbrander worked together; and Van Riemsdijk knew and worked with Danvers through his visits to The Hague. Van Riemsdijk was in close discussion with Muller, Feith and Fruin during the development of the *1898 Dutch Manual*. Later, Jenkinson was aware of Danvers' work through his own work on and knowledge of the EIC Archives. He used that knowledge when working on the RAC Archives, explicitly comparing the similar origins of the two collections in his writing. No doubt he drew on this knowledge much later in his career when providing advice on the HBC Archives. More particularly, in relation to Colenbrander's work, the *1898 Dutch Manual* was only one of the components that he needed to fully complete his archival activities. He worked closely with Van Riemsdijk, who influenced him and whose methodology he used in his work of analysing and reconstructing the administrative structure of the VOC records.

In contrast to Muller's, Feith's and Fruin's experiences with well-organised records, the experiences of De Jonge, Heeres, Colenbrander, Danvers and Jenkinson were with archival collections of business records of administrations that no longer existed. Further, the nature of their records being of trade and business transactions set them apart from the records of governments and cities upon which archival practice had developed. Nonetheless, archival practice on these 'old company records' would contribute significantly to broader archival theory. With guidance from the methodology of Van Riemsdijk, and the rules outlined in the *1898 Dutch Manual*, Colenbrander completed the arrangement of the Amsterdam Chamber of the VOC Archives in 1912. However, the publication of the *1898 Dutch Manual* did not affect the arrangement of the EIC Archives, which effectively ended with Danvers' retirement in 1898.

The arrangement and description of the EIC, VOC, RAC and HBC archival collections were affected by the successive stages of custodianship. Archivists influenced the arrangement and description of the records, each successive archivist's influence becoming embedded in the custodial history of the records.

De Jonge's work of actively reshaping some of the VOC records to suit his retrieval of information provided a clarion call to Heeres and Colenbrander about the need to separate the role of the archival practitioner in arranging the records, from the role in



facilitating access to the records by interested researchers. That is, they saw that the way in which intellectual access can be provided need not echo the physical arrangement of the records. The intellectual order of the indices to the collection can be quite different to the physical order of the records. Colenbrander was also able to draw on the expertise of Van Riemsdijk by using careful observation and analysis to find an arrangement of the archival records that respected the original order in which the active business records had been created.

### **8.2.1 Active Shapers**

Heeres, Van Riemsdijk, Colenbrander, Danvers and Jenkinson were far more than passive keepers of the archives in their care, they are all examples of professional archivists who actively shaped their collections and contributed to shaping their profession, leaving a legacy of thoughtful practice reflected in the developing archival theory of their day.

They were all active in building up an understanding of the content and context of these collections of business archival records. It is perhaps easiest to identify Van Riemsdijk's and Jenkinson's roles in shaping archival theory as well as practice. In Van Riemsdijk's case, this can be seen through his contribution to discussions that concluded with the *1898 Dutch Manual*, and through his own publications, but taken further through his development of archival methodology which influenced Colenbrander's process of arrangement and description of the VOC Archives.

Jenkinson's early work on the RAC Archives influenced his professional thinking, which he later shared through his work with Leveson Gower on the HBC Archives. He also shared his thinking in his *1922 Manual of Archive Administration*, a foundational publication in archival theory, influencing his own and future generations of archivists in their approach to their practice. Jenkinson turned to academia, becoming one of the founding professional archival educators, and thus a leader in shaping the future of the profession by teaching the next generation of archivists.

Danvers is unique among this group of active shapers in that he created an additional artificial collection from the VOC records to complement the EIC records in his care. He was a forerunner of the twenty-first century professionals who now use Internet

tools to create links between collections, enhancing users' access and understanding of the activities documented in the records and of the records themselves. It can be speculated that he is also unique in that he worked with Van Riemsdijk in The Hague, and may in turn have influenced Jenkinson, who drew on Danvers' work on the EIC Archives.

They were all advocates for their profession, publishing and speaking to professional meetings in the cases of the Dutch archivists; publishing and speaking to influential societies in Danvers' case, and in Jenkinson's case through publishing and teaching.

They all demonstrated the value of using sound methodology, providing the foundations for what has more recently been called archaeological archivology: careful observation, making detailed notes and reports, and analysing the results to build a detailed administrative structure and history of the body or bodies creating the records.

Together, these men characterise the archivist as active shaper; they all worked at a crucial period in the development of the profession, contributing to the thinking that culminated in the publication of two important theoretical manuals, one in The Netherlands and one in Britain. They thoughtfully developed archival methodology; applied it to the collections upon which they worked; published standards that laid out the principles on which their practices were based; discussed and developed archival theory; and shared their thinking by mentoring fellow professionals. Their work laid the foundations that allowed archival practice to mature and develop into archival science.

## GLOSSARY

**Archival collection:** “1. Is the whole of the written documents, drawings and printed matter, officially received or produced by an administrative body or one of its officials, in so far as these documents were intended to remain in the custody of that body or of that official” (Muller et al., 2003, p. 13 Rule 1). 2. “An organic archival whole”. 3. “Translation of ‘archival collection’ in Dutch is ‘archieff’, is French is ‘fonds d’archives’”. 4. “Idea of an organic archival whole termed as ‘archive group’ by Jenkinson’s Manual of Archive Administration whereas ‘archival collection’ is the term in general use by The National Archives in Washington”. (Muller et al., 2003, p. 13, footnote 1). 5. “Rule 3 contains “A merchant, as well as a business partnership or company, posses an archival collection consisting of journals, cash books, letters received, copies of letters sent, etc.” (Muller et al., 2003, p. 20).

**Archival depository:** “Rule 4 starts with “A sharp distinction should be made between an archival collection and the contents of an archival depository as a whole. In an archival depository one may find six kinds of archives ...” (Muller et al., 2003, p. 20-21).

**Archival description:** “1. The process of analysing, organizing, and recording details about the formal elements of a record or collection of records, such as creator, title, dates, extent and contents, to facilitate the work’s identification, management, and understanding. 2. The product of such a process.” (Pearce-Moses, 2005)

**Archive:** "1) The whole body or group of records of continuing value of an agency or individual. See also Record group (1). 2) An accumulation of series or other record items with a common provenance, or of a distinct organisation, body or purpose” (Ellis, 1993, p. 462).

**Archive group:** "1. English translation of the French term "fonds" suggested by Jenkinson (1922). 2. Jenkinson (1922) defined “fonds” as “the chief Archive unit in the Continental system and the basis of all rules as to arrangement” and he rendered the French term “fonds” in English as “archive group”, with the caution that he had chosen the term ‘archive group’ “for lack of better translation” (Jenkinson, 1922, p. 84). See also Record group.

**Archivy:** “The discipline of archives” (Pearce-Moses, 2005)

**Archives management:** “The general oversight of a program to appraise, acquire, arrange and describe, preserve, authenticate, and provide access to permanently valuable records.

Note: Archives administration includes establishing the program’s mission and goals, securing necessary resources to support those activities, and evaluation of the program’s performance.

Archives management is distinguished from library, museum, and historical manuscripts traditions by the principles of provenance, original order, and collective control to preserve the materials’ authenticity, context, and intellectual character” (Pearce-Moses, 2005).

**Arrangement:** “1. The process of organizing materials with respect to their provenance and original order to protect their context and to achieve physical or intellectual control over the materials. 2. The organization and sequence of items within a collection.” (Pearce-Moses, 2005)

**Authenticity:** “The quality of being genuine, not a counterfeit, and free from tampering, and is typically inferred from internal and external evidence, including its physical characteristics, structure, content and context” (Pearce-Moses, 2005)

**Business activity:** “Umbrella term covering all the functions, processes, activities and transactions of an organisation and its employees. See also function” (*Recordkeeping definitions of the State Records Authority of New South Wales*, 2005).

**Business archives:** “Records created or received by a commercial enterprise in the course of operations and preserved for their enduring value. Note: Business archives may be created by any size commercial activity, ranging from a sole proprietorship to a multinational corporation” (Pearce-Moses, 2005).

**Calendar:** “A calendar of an archival collection or part of a collection is a chronologically arranged table of contents of all formal documents present in the original or in transcript in that collection or part of a collection” *1898 Dutch Manual* Rule 73 (Muller et al., 2003, p. 165).

**Calendaring:** “The practice of synthesizing the contents of individual items that have been arranged chronologically” (Berner, 1983, p. 6).

**Calendars:** Calendars are compilations of events, narratives, reports on a specific topic (Source: IOR database).

**Custodian:** “The individual or organization having possession of an responsibility for the care and control of material. Note: Custodians may not own the materials in their possession. The function of custodianship may be assigned to individuals with other job titles, including

archivist, files custodian, records custodian, or records management clerk. In some instances, a custodian may have legal custody without physical custody” (Pearce-Moses, 2005).

**Custody:** “Care and control, especially for security and preservation; guardianship. Note: Custody does not necessarily imply legal title to the materials” (Pearce-Moses, 2005).

**Enduring value:** “The continuing usefulness or significance of records, based on the administrative, legal, fiscal, evidential, or historical information they contain, justifying their ongoing preservation. Note: Many archivists prefer to describe archival records as having ‘enduring value’ or ‘continuing value’, rather than ‘permanent value’. ‘Enduring value’ emphasizes the perceived value of the records when they are appraised, recognizing that a future archivist may reappraise the records and dispose of them. The phrases are often used interchangeably” (Pearce-Moses, 2005).

**Fonds:** “The entire body of records of an organization, family, or individual that have been created and accumulated as the result of an organic process reflecting the functions of the creator” (Pearce-Moses, 2005).

**Function:** “The largest unit of business activity in an organisation or jurisdiction (AS 4390-1996, Part 1, 4.15). See also business activity” (*Recordkeeping definitions of the State Records Authority of New South Wales*, 2005).

**Functional appraisal:** “Functional appraisal methodology begins by defining the functions and activities which government agencies perform and identifying the archival records needed to document these functions fully over time” (*Glossary of Archives and Recordkeeping terms*, 2006, p. 14).

**Functional archival science:** Understand that the unique character of archives is due to their provenance as transactional records created within a functional context. Functional archival science obliges the archivist to look through the records to their contextual history (Ketelaar, 1996a, p. 36-37).

**Functional methodology:** “A methodology described by Theodoor Van Riemsdijk in the 1890s that can be used to investigate organisational administrative structure through careful observation and analysis of phenomena” (Ketelaar, 1996b, p. 60). See also Functional archival science

**Inventory:** “The inventory is a guide to the archival collection, intended for those who wish to consult the archives” *1898 Dutch Manual* Rule 78 (Muller et al., 2003, p. 176).

**List:** “A written series of discrete items. Note: A list may be ordered or random. The items in a list may be of any nature, and the list may contain different types of items” (Pearce-Moses, 2005).

**Original order:** “The organization and sequence of records established by the creator of the records” (Pearce-Moses, 2005).

**Original use:** “Jenkinson’s definition of archives, like Schellenberg’s of records, emphasizes the original use and preservation of documents, whereas Schellenberg’s emphasizes their selection and secondary use” (Livelton, 1996, p. 74). See also Primary value

**Press List:** is a list of records in a series (Source: IOR database)

**Primary value:** “The value of records derived from the original use that caused them to be created” (Pearce-Moses, 2005). See also Original use

**Principle of original order:** “Maintaining records in original order. The principle does not extend to respect for original chaos” (Pearce-Moses, 2005).

**Principle of provenance:** “Or the principle of **respect des fonds** dictates that records of different origins (provenance) be kept separate to preserve their context” (Pearce-Moses, 2005).

**Principle of Respect for Archival structure:** The order in which documents have survived should be kept intact while investigations into the context in which the documents were raised in their first custodial phase can be established and documented. *First presented at the 1890 Conference of Dutch State Archivists by Theodoor Van Riemsdijk, General State Archivist, General State Archives, The Hague, The Netherlands.* (Ketelaar, 1996a, p. 34).

**Provenance:** “1. The original or source of something. 2. Information regarding the origins, custody and ownership of an item or collection” (Pearce-Moses, 2005).

**Provenience:** “Place where an archival collection is found [to differentiate from provenance – the place of origins of the records]” (Maclean, 1962, p. 140, footnote 7).

**Record group:** “A theoretical unit for the purpose of archival control used to describe: 1) All of the *records* of an *agency*. See also Archive (1). 2) A body of archives organisationally and functionally related on the basis of *provenance*” (Ellis, 1993, p. 477).

**Secondary use:** “Jenkinson’s definition of archives, like Schellenberg’s of records, emphasizes the original use and preservation of documents, whereas Schellenberg’s emphasizes their selection and secondary use” (Livelton, 1996, p. 74). See also Secondary value

**Secondary value:** “The usefulness or significance of records based on purposes other than that for which they were originally created” (Pearce-Moses, 2005). See also Secondary use

## REFERENCES

- Bastian, J. A. (2004). Taking custody, giving access: a postcustodial role for a new century. *Archivaria: journal of the Association of Canadian Archivists*, 53, 76-93.
- Berner, R. C. (1983). *Archival theory and practice in the United States : a historical analysis*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Birdwood, G. (1891). *Report on the old records of the India Office, with supplementary note and appendices. 2nd reprint*. Calcutta; London: W.H. Allen & Co., Limited.
- Bruebach, N. (2003). Archival Science in Germany - traditions, developments and perspectives. *Archival Science*, 3, 379-399.
- Cantwell, J. D. (1991). *The Public Record Office 1838-1958*. London: HMSO.
- Conway Davies, J. (1957). Memoir of Sir Hilary Jenkinson. In J. Conway Davies (Ed.), *Studies presented to Sir Hilary Jenkinson* (pp. xiii-xxx). London: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, T. (1997a). Archives in the post-custodial world: interaction of archival theory and practice since the publication of the Dutch Manual in 1898. *Archivum: journal of the International Council on Archives*, 43, 191-214.
- Cook, T. (1997b). What is past is prologue: a history of archival ideas since 1898, and the future paradigm shift. *Archivaria: journal of the Association of Canadian Archivists*, 43, 17-63.
- Cook, T. (2001). Archival Science and Postmodernism: new formulations for old concepts. *Archival Science*, 1(1), 3-24.
- Craig, J. (1970). Three hundred years of records. *The Beaver*(Autumn 1970), 65-70.
- Danvers, F. C. (1875). Tunnel under English Channel. *Quarterly journal of science, and Annals of mining, metallurgy, engineering, industrial arts, manufactures, and technology*, 12 (NS5), 486-496.
- Danvers, F. C. (1877). *A Century of famines, being particulars of all the famines that have visited India since the year 1770, and an inquiry as to the best means of providing against them* (No. BL: IOR V/27/830/15). London, England: India Office.
- Danvers, F. C. (1879). *What is the gross value of the agricultural produce of India* (No. BL: IOR C/142). London, England: India Office, Revenue Department.
- Danvers, F. C. (1889). An improved arrangement for pen and pencil cases, which is also applicable for other small tools and instruments. *Application No. 18,435 to the Patent Office, London of 19 Nov 1889, accepted 26 Apr 1890*, 4pp.
- Danvers, F. C. (1890). The India Office Records: a brief account of the results of his examination, during the last six years, of the records relating to India and the East India Company, now in the possession of the Secretary of State for India. *Journal of the Society of Arts*, XXXVIII(1,940), 159-178, 178-179.
- Danvers, F. C. (1892). *Report to the Secretary of State for India in Council on the Portuguese Records relating to the East Indies, contained in the Archivo da Torre do Tombo and the Public Libraries at Lisbon and Evora*. Reprinted by Asian Educational Services, New Delhi, Madras in 1991.



- Danvers, F. C. (1893). *An Index to events relating to India and the East referred to in "The Times" between the years 1850 and 1889 inclusive*. London, England: Printed by Order of the Secretary of State for India in Council for Official use only.
- Danvers, F. C. (1894). *The Portuguese in India: being a history of the rise and decline of their Eastern Empire*. London: Cass, reprinted in 1966.
- Danvers, F. C. (1895a). *Dutch Records at The Hague*. First series: Letters from India Vols. I-LVI, 1600-1699. Second series: Letters from the XVII to India Vols. I-IV, 1615-1700. Third series: Letters from Governor General to various factories Vols. I-IX, 1617-1699. Held British Library (BL): India Office Records (IOR) I/3/1-I/3/106 Dutch Records at The Hague v.106.
- Danvers, F. C. (1895b). Report on the Records relating to the East in the State Archives in The Hague. In N. R. Ray (Ed.), *Dutch activities in the East (Seventeenth Century): being a Report with two appendices by Frederick Charles Danvers*. Calcutta: The Book Emporium Ltd, 1945.
- Danvers, F. C. (1898). *Report on India Office Records*. Held at British Library (BL): India Office Records (IOR) L/R/4/17.
- Darke, P., & Shanks, G. (2002). Case study research. In K. Williamson (Ed.), *Research methods for students, academics and professionals: information management and systems* (pp. 111-124). Wagga Wagga, NSW: Charles Sturt University, Centre for Information Studies.
- Davies, K. G. (1957). *The Royal African Company*. New York, NY: Longmans Green.
- De Jonge, J. K. J. (1862-1888). *De Opkomst van het Nederlandsch Gezag in Oost-Indie. Verzameling van Onuitgegeven Stukken uit het Oud-Koloniaal Archief [= The Rise of Dutch Authority [Sovereignty] in the East Indies: collection of unpublished documents of the Old Colonial Archives (Record Office)]*. 's-Gravenhage; Amsterdam: Martinus Nijhoff; Frederik Muller.
- Dodds, G., & Dolyniuk, M. (2006). *Nomination document to have the Hudson's Bay Company Archival records entered into the Memory of the World Register [Ref No 2006-19]*, from [http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/files/21678/1143621635119\\_Canada\\_HBC\\_Fonds.doc/19%2BCanada%2BHBC%2BFonds.doc](http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/files/21678/1143621635119_Canada_HBC_Fonds.doc/19%2BCanada%2BHBC%2BFonds.doc)
- Dolyniuk, M. (2007). Foreword. In D. Simmons (Ed.), *Keepers of the Record: The History of the Hudson's Bay Company Archives*. (pp. ix-xi). Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Eastwood, T. (2000). Putting the parts of the whole together: systematic arrangement of archives. *Archivaria: journal of the Association of Canadian Archivists*, 50(Fall), 93-116.
- Ellis, J. A. (Ed.). (1993). *Keeping Archives. 2nd ed.* Port Melbourne, Vic.: DW Thorpe in association with the Australian Society of Archivists Inc.
- Fischer, G. (1973). Letting the archival dust settle: some remarks on the record group concept. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 4(8 (October)), 640-645.
- Flyvberg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.
- Foster, W. (1919). *A Guide to the India Office Records 1600-1858*. London: India Office by Eyre and Spottiswoode.
- Glossary of Archives and Recordkeeping terms*. (2006). New Zealand: Archives New Zealand.

- Hall, H. (1908). *Studies in English official historical documents* (2006 : <http://www.elibron.com> Elibron Classics Replica Edition ed.). Cambridge: University Press.
- Ham, F. G. (1981). Archival strategies for the post-custodial era. *American Archivist*, 44(3 (Summer)), 207-216.
- Hedstrom, M. (1998). *Interfaces with time*. Paper presented at the Place, Interface and Cyberspace: Archives at the Edge, Fremantle, Western Australia, 6-8 August 1998. Keynote address pages 11-22.
- Heeres, J. E. (1899). *The Part borne by the Dutch in the discovery of Australia 1606-1765 [=Het Aandeel der Nederlanders in de ontdekking van Australie 1606-1765]*. London; Leiden: Luzac & Co, London; Boekhandel en Drukkerij voorheen E.J. Brill, Leiden.
- Henige, D. (1987). In Quest of Error's Sly Imprimatur: the concept of "authorial intent" in modern textual criticism. *History in Africa*, 14, 87-112.
- Holmes, D. (2006). Passive keepers or active shapers: a comparative case study of four archival practitioners at the end of the nineteenth century. *Archival Science*, 6, 285-298.
- Horsman, P. (1999). Dirty hands: a new perspective on original order. *Archives and Manuscripts: the journal of the Australian Society of Archivists*, 27(1), 42-53.
- Horsman, P. (2002). The last dance of the phoenix, or the de-discovery of the archival fonds. *Archivaria: journal of the Association of Canadian Archivists*, 54, 1-23.
- Horsman, P. (2003). *Samuel Muller, the Inventaris, and ISAD. Passion and power in archival description*. Paper presented at the Seminar in honour of Kent Haworth organised by Association of Canadian Archivists, 21 March 2003, Toronto, Canada. 8 pp. Available from <http://www.archiefschool.nl/docs/samuel.pdf>.
- Horsman, P., Ketelaar, E., & Thomassen, T. (2003). Introduction to the 2003 reissue. In *Manual for the arrangement and description of archives: drawn up by direction of the Netherlands Association of Archivists by S. Muller Fz., J.A. Feith and R. Fruin Th.Az.; translation of the Second Edition by Arthur H. Leavitt* (pp. v-xxxiii). Chicago, Illinois: The Society of American Archivists.
- Hurley, C. (2005). Parallel Provenance: (1) What, if Anything, is Archival Description? *Archives and Manuscripts*, 33(1), 110-145.
- IOR/I/3/86. (1893-1895). *Dutch Records at the Hague. First series. Volume LVII. Item 1 is Danvers' 119 page working list of Docs. I-MCCLXXXIII (1-1283)*. Collated by FC Danvers. Held at British Library, India Office Records, IOR/I/3/86.
- IOR/L/R/4/2. (1879-1885). *Papers and Orders relating to the Registry & Records Dept. 1879-1885*. Held at British Library (BL): India Office Records (IOR) L/R/4/2.
- IOR/L/R/4/4. (1880-1889). *Papers and Orders relating to the Registry & Records Dept. 1880-1889*. Held at British Library (BL): India Office Records (IOR) L/R/4/4.
- IOR/L/R/4/5. (1890-1892). *Papers and Orders relating to the Registry & Records Dept. 1890-1892*. Held at British Library (BL): India Office Records (IOR) L/R/4/5.

- Jenkinson, H. (1912). The Records of the English African Companies. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. 3rd series, 6*, 185-220.
- Jenkinson, H. (1922). *A Manual of Archive Administration : including the problems of War Archives and Archive Making*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Jenkinson, H. (1947). The English Archivist: a new profession: being an Inaugural lecture for a new course in Archive Administration delivered at University College, London, 14 October 1947. In *Selected writings of Sir Hilary Jenkinson* (pp. 236-259). Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1980.
- Jenkinson, H. (1952). Archive developments in England 1925-1950 [Miscellanea Archivistica, Angelo Mercati, 337-361, 1952]. In *Selected writings of Sir Hilary Jenkinson* (pp. 271-292). Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1980.
- Jenkinson, H. (1955). The Future of Archives in England: presidential address to the Society of Archivists, 15 December 1955. In *Selected writings of Sir Hilary Jenkinson* (pp. 321-329). Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1980.
- Jenkinson, H. (1960). Roots : Presidential Address to the Society of Archivists, 7th December 1960. In *Selected writings of Sir Hilary Jenkinson* (pp. 368-380). Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1980.
- Jenkinson, H. (1966). *A Manual of Archive Administration: a reissue of the revised second edition with an introduction and bibliography by Roger H. Ellis, Secretary, Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts*. London: Percy Lund, Humphries & Co. Ltd.
- Johnson, A. (1950). *Monthly report from HBC Archivist to HBC Secretary dated 4 January 1950*. Hudson's Bay Company Archives. RG20/2/119.
- Kaminisky, A. P. (1986). *The India Office, 1880-1910*. London, U.K.: Mansell Publishing Limited.
- Ketelaar, E. (1986). Muller, Feith and Fruin (originally published 1986). Reprinted. In E. Ketelaar (Ed.), *The Archival Image. Collected essays*. (pp. 43-64). Hilversum: Verloren, 1997.
- Ketelaar, E. (1996a). Archival theory and the Dutch Manual. *Archivaria: journal of the Association of Canadian Archivists, 41*(Spring), 31-40.
- Ketelaar, E. (1996b). Archival theory and the Dutch manual: *Archivaria 41* (Spring 1996): 31-40. [Does not include the abstract published in *Archivaria*.] Reprinted. In E. Ketelaar (Ed.), *The Archival Image. Collected essays*. (pp. 55-65). Hilversum: Verloren, 1997.
- Lancaster, J. (1965). The India Office Records. *Archivum, XV*, 293-302.
- Lancaster, J. (1970). The India Office Records. *Archives: the journal of the British Records Association, IX*(43), 130-141.
- Leveson Gower, R. H. G. (1933). The Archives of the Hudson's Bay Company: an outline of the work accomplished in London since 1924 of assembling these priceless records which are the source material of Western Canadian history. *The Beaver*(Dec 1933), 40-42, 64.
- Light, M., & Hyry, T. (2002). Colophons and annotations: new directions for the finding aid. *American Archivist, 65*(Fall/Winter), 216-230.
- Livelton, T. (1996). *Archival Theory, Records and the Public*. Lanham, Maryland; and London: The Society of American Archivists and The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Maclean, I. (1959). Australian experience in records and archives management. *American Archivist, 22*(4 (October)), 383-418.

- Maclean, I. (1962). An analysis of Jenkinson's "Manual of Archive Administration" in the light of Australian Experience. In A. E. J. Hollaender (Ed.), *Essays in Memory of Sir Hilary Jenkinson* (pp. 128-152). Chichester, England: Moore & Tillyer for the Society of Archivists.
- MacNeil, H. (2005). Picking our text: archival description, authenticity and the archivist as editor. *American Archivist*, 68(Fall/Winter), 261-278.
- McKemmish, S. (1997). *Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: A Continuum of Responsibility*. Paper presented at the 14th National Convention, Records Management Association of Australia, 14-17 September, 1997, Radisson Observation City Hotel, Scarborough Beach, Western Australia.
- McKemmish, S. (2000). Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: A Continuum of Responsibility. In A. Pederson, M. Brogan & A. Huma (Eds.), *Documenting Society [compact disc] version 1.1: an interactive multimedia short course on the fundamentals of recordkeeping for organisation and societal purposes*. Perth, Western Australia: Edith Cowan University, School of Computer and Information Science.
- McKemmish, S. (2001). Placing records continuum theory and practice. *Archival Science*, 1, 333-359.
- Meilink-Roelofs, M. A. P. (1992). Inventaris van de Archieven van de Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie [in Dutch only]. In R. Raben & J. C. M. Pennings (Eds.), *De archieven van de Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie [= The Archives of the Dutch East India Company] (1602-1795)* (pp. 137-555). 's-Gravenhage: Sdu Uitgeverij Koninginnegracht.
- Moir, M. I. (1996). *A General Guide to the India Office Records*. London: The British Library.
- Muller, S., Feith, J., & Fruin, R. (2003). *Manual for the arrangement and description of archives: drawn up by direction of the Netherlands Association of Archivists; translation of the second edition by Arthur H. Leavitt; with new introduction by Peter Horsman, Eric Ketelaar, Theo Thomassen and Marjorie Rabe Barritt*. Chicago, Illinois: The Society of American Archivists.
- Nesmith, T. (2005). Reopening archives: bringing new contextualities into archival theory and practice. *Archivaria: journal of the Association of Canadian Archivists*, 60, 259-274.
- Pearce-Moses, R. (2005). *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology*. Retrieved Nov 2007, from <http://www.archivists.org/glossary/index.asp>
- Pennings, J. C. M. (1992). Origin and Administration of the VOC Archives. In R. Raben & J. C. M. Pennings (Eds.), *De archieven van de Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie [= The Archives of the Dutch East India Company] (1602-1795)*. *Algemeen Rijksarchief, Eerste Afdeling*. (pp. 30-46). 's-Gravenhage: Sdu Uitgeverij Koninginnegracht.
- Pennings, J. C. M. (2007). *History of the Arrangement of the VOC Archives: 4. Archival Management by the National Archives of the Netherlands since 1856*. Retrieved 22 February 2008, from [http://www.tanap.net/content/voc/history/history\\_generalstate.htm](http://www.tanap.net/content/voc/history/history_generalstate.htm)
- Raben, R. (1992). History and manual. In R. Raben & J. C. M. Pennings (Eds.), *De archieven van de Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie [= The Archives of the Dutch East India Company] (1602-1795)*. *Algemeen Rijksarchief, Eerste Afdeling*. (pp. 1-136). 's-Gravenhage: Sdu Uitgeverij Koninginnegracht.

- Radoff, M. L. (1948a). A Guide to Practical Calendaring (part 1). *American Archivist*, 11(April), 123-140.
- Radoff, M. L. (1948b). A Guide to Practical Calendaring (part 2). *American Archivist*, 11(July), 203-222.
- Ray, N. R. (Ed.). (1945). *Dutch activities in the East : seventeenth century being a "Report on the records relating to the East in the State Archives in The Hague" with two appendices by Frederick Charles Danvers circa 1895; edited by Nihar-Ranjan Ray*. Calcutta: The Book Emporium Ltd.
- Recordkeeping definitions of the State Records Authority of New South Wales*. (2005). Retrieved 13 March, 2008, from [http://www.records.nsw.gov.au/recordkeeping/definitions\\_4615.asp](http://www.records.nsw.gov.au/recordkeeping/definitions_4615.asp)
- Roe, K. D. (2005). *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts*. Chicago: The Society of American Archivists.
- Scott, P. J. (1966). The Record group concept: a case for abandonment. *American Archivist*, 29(4), 493-504.
- Simmons, D. (2003). *Keepers of the Record: The Hudson's Bay Company and three centuries of records management*. Paper presented at the First International Conference on the History of Records and Archives (I-CHORA). Conference Programme and Participants' Papers Oct 2-4, 2003, University of Toronto, Canada [copy of paper obtained from Archives, Baillieu Library, University of Melbourne, 16 March 2004].
- Simmons, D. (2007). *Keepers of the Record: The History of the Hudson's Bay Company Archives*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Sutton, S. C. (1967). *Guide to the India Office library with a note on the India Office records*. London: H.M.S.O.
- Upward, F. (1996). Structuring the Records Continuum - Part One: Postcustodial principles and properties. *Archives and Manuscripts*, 24(2), 268-285.
- Upward, F. (1997). Structuring the Records Continuum - Part Two: Structuration Theory and Recordkeeping. *Archives and Manuscripts*, 25(1), 10-35.
- Upward, F. (2000). Modelling the continuum as paradigm shift in recordkeeping and archiving processes, and beyond - a personal reflection. *Records Management Journal*, 10(3 (June)), 115-139.
- Van Riemsdijk, T. (1885). *De griffe van Hare Hoog Mogenden. Bijdrage tot de kennis van het archief van de Staten-General der Vereenigde Nederlanden*. 's-Gravenhage, The Netherlands: Cited in: Ketelaar, E. (1996). Archival theory and the Dutch Manual. *Archivaria: journal of the Association of Canadian Archivists*, 41(Spring), 31-40.
- Walker, P. (1985). *Discovery of Tasmania 1642 by Abel Tasman. Prepared for Tasmania Day, 24 November 1985 by Peter Walker, MHA*. Hobart: Government Printer.

## APPENDICES

**Appendix 1: Summary of volumes searched by FC Danvers and WR Bisschop during the years 1893-1894 at the Rijksarchief, The Hague; as per their notes in their “working list” in *BL: IOR I/3/86 Dutch Records at The Hague v.86* (119 pages).**

Appendix 1 shows a summary of the volumes of VOC records that Danvers and Bisschop searched through during the years 1893-1894 at the Rijksarchief in The Hague, which the researcher has transcribed from their 119 page working list (IOR/I/3/86). The researcher has also transcribed the spelling of the place names exactly as discerned from the handwriting in the 119 page working list, and also transcribed any comments, presumably written by Danvers or Bisschop, found through the list. Any comments made by the researcher are included as footnotes in this appendix.

The document range for the index in I/3/86 is First series Vols. I-L documents I – MCCLXXXIII (1–1283) 1600-1694 only. The final count of transcribed VOC documents that Danvers obtained was 2646. Therefore, this working list that Danvers and Bisschop used contains less than 50% of the total number of transcribed documents. Hence, the description of the list as a working list used by Danvers and Bisschop, rather than as a finding aid for the 106 volumes of Danvers’ *Dutch Records at The Hague*.

LETTERS FROM INDIA
<b>1598-1600 – Vol. 2 – Compagnie Van Verre 2<sup>nd</sup> volume – 2<sup>nd</sup> voyage 1598-1600.</b> -- Memorandum of the discoveries between us [the Dutch] and the Kings, Governors, Sabauchors, and other Noblemen at different places of Java, Amboina, and Banda at the time we were still together with our four ships as well as when we were separated. – 12 January – 15 March. -- Letter to the Directors of the Old East India Fleet at Amsterdam from Frank van der Does, Ternate. – 12 Sep 1600
<b>1599-1602 – Vol. 3 – Compagnie Van Verre</b>
<b>1601-1605 – Vol. 4 – Compagnie Van Verre</b>
<b>1606-1610 – Vol. 5 – Compagnie Van Verre</b>
<b>1607-1609 – Vol. 6 – Fleet of Pieter Willems Verhoef &amp; Pieter Both</b>
<b>Vol. 7 – Magellan E.I.C.</b>
<b>1602-1612 – Vol. I – E.I. Co - Invoice, Bills of Lading, Accounts. Vol. II – E.I. Co – Arranged according to Factories – Atchin 1608-10; Jambi 1610; Borneo; Sucadaux 1608-09; Coromandel, Ceylon, Surat 1607-12.</b>

<b>1612 – Vol. III</b> – These documents relate almost exclusively to the Moluccas and Banda, and have not been searched through for copies of documents, being satisfied for the time with what de Jonge and Tiele have written on the subject. <b>Vol. IV</b> – This volume has only been searched relative to Siam and Japan.
<b>1613-1614 – Vol. I</b> (no vol. 2) only Japan, Arabic & Coromandel searched.
<b>1615-16 – Vol. II (vol. I not searched)</b> Voyage of Mr. De Haze and Borneo only searched.
<b>1615-16 – Vol. III. Vol. IV.</b>
<b>1617-1618 – Vol. I</b> – Contains documents relating to different ships; re expedition of Admiral Lam (searched by Mr. De Jonge; general Govt. of India amongst which latter are documents specifically relating to the English. <b>Vol. II</b> (searched only Coromandel, Arakan, Ceylon, Surat and Japan). -- In 1617, the Portuguese of Macao asked the Emperor of Japan again for a house in Nagasaki, in which to carry on their trade in the same way as the Dutch (with a Factor); also to be allowed to carry on trade in Japan. The Emperor however refused. (Letter from Specse – 12 Oct 1617).
<b>1619 – Vol. I</b> – Examined – Letters from Jacatra & Bantam & documents regarding the English. <b>Vol. II</b> – Coromandel, Surat & Japan examined. -- Among several of the Dutch Records it is seen that several members of the Co were unable to write their names and so made their marks – (Danvers' comment).
<b>1620 – Vol. I</b> (only one volume for this year)
<b>1621 – Vol. I; Vol. II</b>
<b>1622 – Vol. I; Vol. II</b>
<b>1622-25 – Vol. I</b> (one only) -- Letter of 12 Jan 1623 from Mr. Lenant Caumpt from Firando – “It is apparently certain that no junks will sail from Japan to Siam, as H.M. does not intend to give a pass, and thinks thereby to keep the R.C. Xians the more effectively out of his country”. -- For the Captn – a majority of the crews are generally Xians who, if they have the opportunity, would secretly carry some papists with them, whereof H.M. has an aversion.
<b>1623 – Vol. I</b> – Only searched – general Govt. letters & letters relating to affairs with the English. Trade (or shipping mark) (new standing mark – 1623) 1 4 A <u>Algemeene</u> OVC <u>Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie</u> [General United East India Company]
<b>1623 – Vol. III</b> – Correspondence relative to the fleet of defence – 1621-23 Commanders Dedel and Humphrey Fitzherbert. This fleet sailed to damage the Spanish and Portuguese in the waters of China, Manilla and Malabar, according to an instruction of the C[ouncil] of D[efence] of 11 Oct 1621. They were compelled by contrary winds to remain beneath the equinozial line, they sailed south of the Maldives towards Africa, cruised upon the Portuguese carracks near Madagascar and on 16 Feb 1622 part of the fleet went to the Red Sea under the command of Van Gorcom. On 20 Sep the fleet again united before Surat. Then went to Mozambique and gained a victory over the Portuguese. They then proceeded to Goa, from whence a part of the fleet sailed again to the Red Sea to promote a trade with Persia and Arabia. This part had an engagement with 8 Portuguese gallions and 40 frigates, in which the Dutch Commander Becker was killed. The result of this engagement seems however to have been dubious although.
<b>1624 – Vol. I</b> (Searched only general letters from Bantam, Japan, Coromandel, Surat and Persia).
<b>1625 – Vol. I</b> (Examined only the General letters and documents referring to English.). <b>Vol. II.</b>
<b>1626 – Vol. I; Vol. II</b>
<b>1627 – Vol. I; Vol. II</b> (Searched China, Formosa, Japan, Coromandel, Surat and Persia)
<b>1628 – Vol. I; Vol. II</b>
<b>1629 – Vol. I; Vol. II</b>
<b>1630 – Vol. I</b> – Not searched. Contains Ternate, Banda, Amboyna, Java, Mataram, WC of Sumatra, Malacca and Patani. <b>Vol. II</b> – Not searched. China, Formosa and Japan.
<b>1630-31 – Vol. I</b> (Bantam not searched); <b>Vol. II</b> (Researched only Coromandel, Surat and Persia)
<b>1631-32 – Vol. III</b> – Expedition sent out against the Portuguese
<b>1631 – Vol. IV</b> (Not searched – Bantam and Batavia)
<b>1632 – Vol. I; – Vol. II</b> (Only searched Coromandel and Persia – nil)
<b>1633 – Vol. I; Vol. II</b> (Contains Amboyna, Ternate, Banda and Jambi – not searched)
<b>1633-34 – Vol. III</b>

<b>1631-33 – Vol. IV</b> (Japan, Amboyna and Orpheus – Not searched)
<b>1633-34 - Vol. V</b> (Siam, China and Japan – not searched)
<b>1634 – Vol. I</b> (Searched only general letters and declaration). <b>Vol. II</b> (Amboyna, Banda, Sumatra and Malacca – not searched). <b>Vol. III</b> (Siam, Formosa, China and Japan – not searched). <b>Vol. IV</b> (Surat and Persia searched. Second part only looked through)
<b>1635 – Vol. I</b> (searched only general letter and California and looked at B...). <b>Vol. II</b> (Searched only Coromandel, Surat, Hindustan and Persia).
<b>1636 – Vol. I. Vol. II</b> (Borneo only searched – nil). <b>Vol. III</b> (Formosa, Siam, China and Japan – not searched). <b>Vol. IV</b> .
<b>1637 – Vol. I. Vol. II</b> (Not searched. Contains Ternate, Amboyna, Banda, Moluccas, Sumatra, Siam and Camboja). <b>Vol. III</b> (Not searched. China, Formosa, Japan). <b>Vol. IV</b> .
<b>1638 – Vol. I. Vol. II</b> (Not searched. Bali, Moluccas, Amboyna, Ternate, Banda, Maccassa, Borneo, Sumatra, Mallacca, Siam, Mataram). <b>Vol. III</b> (Not searched. China, Macao, Formosa). <b>Vol. IV</b> .
<b>1639 – Vol. I</b> – General letters only. <b>Vol. II</b> (Not searched. Banda, Maccassa, Borneo, Sumatra, Malacca, Siam). <b>Vol. III</b> (Not searched. Formosa, Tonquin). <b>Vol. IV</b> (Not searched. Japan). <b>Vol. V. Vol. VI</b> .
<b>1640 – Vol. I. Vol. II</b> (Not searched. Amboyna, Moluccas, Ternate, Banda, Jourual, Malacca, Formosa, Japan). <b>Vol. III</b>
<b>1641 – Vol. I</b> (Not searched. Amboyna, Justice, Moluccas, Ternate, Maccassar, Banda and Sumatra). <b>Vol. II</b> (Not searched. Malacca, Siam). <b>Vol. III</b> (Not searched. Formosa, Tonquin, Japan). <b>Vol. IV. Vol. V</b> (Persia and Mauritius searched – Nil).
<b>1642 – Vol. I. Vol. II</b> (Not searched. Ternate, Amboyna, Banda, Sumatra, Malacca.). <b>Vol. III</b> (Not searched. Siam, Camboja, Tonkin, Russian, Formosa, China, Japan). <b>Vol. IV</b> .
<b>1643 – Vol. I</b> (Not searched. Amboyna, Ternate, Banda, Macassar, Sumatra, Jambi, Achin, Malacca). <b>Vol. II</b> (Not searched. Siam, Zuinam, Tonkin and Formosa). <b>Vol. III</b> (Not searched. Japan). <b>Vol. IV. Vol. V</b> .
<b>1644 – Vol. I</b> (Not searched. Amboyna, Ternate). <b>Vol. II</b> (Not searched. Banda, Solor Timor, Macassa, Sumatra, Belambampi, Achin, Malacca, Siam, Tonquin). <b>Vol. III</b> (Not searched. Formosa, Tywan, Suelang and Macao). <b>Vol. IV</b> (Not searched. Japan). <b>Vol. V</b>
<b>1645 – Vol. I</b> (Not searched. Ternate, Amboyna, Banda, Macassar)
<b>1644/5 – Vol. II. Vol. III</b> (Not searched. Tonkin and Japan). <b>Vol. IV</b> .
<b>1645 – Vol. I. Vol. 5</b> .
<b>1646 – Vol. I</b> (Rest not searched). <b>Vol. II</b> (Not searched. Formosa and Manilla). <b>Vol. III</b> (Not searched. Japan.) <b>Vol. IV. Vol. V</b> (Not searched. Embassy to Persia)
<b>1647 – Vol. I. Vol. II</b> (Not searched. Ternate, Amboyna, Banda, Macassa, Salor, Sumatra, Mallacca, Siam, Tonkin). <b>Vol. III</b> (Not searched. Manilla, Formosa, Japan). <b>Vol. IV</b> .
<b>1648 – Vol. I</b> (Batavia, Amboyna, Moluccas, Ternate, Banda. Searched. Nil.). <b>Vol. II</b> (Solor, Mataram, Sumatra, Macassa, Siam, Formosa and Lamai – not searched.). <b>Vol. III</b> .
<b>1649 – Vol. I. Vol. II</b> – Molluccas, Ternate, Amboyne, Bandar, Solor Timor, W.C. Sumatra, Malacca, Siam, Formosa, Japan. Not searched. (Coromandel – nil.). <b>Vol. III</b> (large quantity of letters, especially Surat. Not searched as in too bad a condition.)
<b>1650 – Vol. I</b> – Not searched. (Part of General letter in too bad a condition & Amboyna, Formosa & some other papers. Also wrecked ships at Bantam.) <b>Vol. II</b> – Not searched – Tonquin, Banda, Macassar, Solar, Mataram, Malacca, Siam, Japan and other letters illegible from Decay. <b>Vol. III</b> – Not searched – Formosa, Tywan, Japan. <b>Vol. IV</b> – Most in vad condition very much decayed specially Bengal and Coromandel. <b>Vol. V</b> – Bad condition, not searched. Malabar, Surat, Persia
<b>1651 – Vol. I. Vol. II</b> – Not searched. Amboyna, Molluccas, Ternate, Banda, Macassar, Sumatra, Achin, Malacca, Tywan. <b>Vol. III</b> – Voyage of William Verbeghen to Tonquin, Tywan .. , Japan etc. (Japan not searched). <b>Vol. IV</b> – Part Persia – illegible treaty. <b>Vol. V</b> – Not searched. Expedition by A. de Vlaming van Outshooren to Banda, Ternate, Amboyna, Moluccas.
<b>1652 – Vol. I. Vol. II</b> – Not searched. Amboyna, Banda, Macassa, Solor, Jambi. <b>Vol. III</b> – Not searched. Formosa, Tywan, Japan, Tonquin, Quinam, Siam, Malacca. <b>Vol. IV</b> – Not searched. Tonquin, Quinam. <b>Vol. V</b> .
<b>1653 – Vol. I. Vol. II</b> – Nothing to note beyond General letters. Ternate, Amboyna & Banda. <b>Vol. III</b> – Nothing to note &: Expedition of Il Vlacussigh to the Moluccas. <b>Vol. IV</b> – Nothing to note &: Malacca, Tigan, Siam, Tonquin, Canton, Formosa & Japan. <b>Vol. V</b> .



From this date General letters thoroughly searched. The Dutch sent an Embassy to the King of Canton in 1653 for facilities of trade but it proved unsuccessful owing to the machinations of the Portuguese.
<b>1654 – Vol. I. Vol. II</b> – Ternate, Amboyna, Molluccas – Nothing to note beyond General letters. Preparations being made for a war with the Spaniards. <b>Vol. III</b> – Bandar, Solor, Sumatra, Malacca, Tonquin. Nothing to note beyond General letter. <b>Vol. IV</b> – Formosa. Not searched. <b>Vol. V</b> – Japan, Arakan & China. Not searched. <b>Vol. VI. Vol. VII.</b>
<b>1655 – Vol. I. Vol. II</b> – Amboyna (3 Expedition by Il Vlacussigh). <b>Vol. III</b> – Macassar, Solar, Banda, Sumatra, Achin, Jacatra, Malacca, Siam, Japan. <b>Vol. IV</b> – Formosa. <b>Vol. V</b>
<b>1656 – Vol. I. Vol. II</b> – Nothing – see G.L. Ternate, Amboyna, Banda. <b>Vol. III.</b> Macassa, Solor, Timor, Atchin, Jambi, Malacca, Siam Lambaja, Tonquin China. <b>Vol. IV.</b> Japan, Formosa. <b>Vol. V.</b> Arakan & Ceylon. <b>Vol. VI.</b>
<b>1657 – Vol. I. Vol. II.</b> Ternate, Amboyna, Banda, Macassar, Salor, Timor, Sumatra, Malacca, Siam, Camboja. <b>Vol. III.</b> Embassy of China. <b>Vol. IV.</b> Japan. <b>Vol. V.</b> Formosa. <b>Vol. VI.</b> Arakan, Choromandel, Ceylon. <b>Vol. VII.</b>
<b>1658 – Vol. I. Vol. II.</b> Ternate, Amboyna, Banda, Solo Timor, Macassar. <b>Vol. III.</b> Sumatra, Siam, Camboja, China, Formosa, Japan. Nothing particular beyond General letters. <b>Vol. IV.</b> Arracan, Bengal, Coromandel. Nothing particular beyond General letters. <b>Vol. V.</b> Malacca, Persia, Arabia, Ceylon & Surat.
<b>1659 – Vol. I</b> – G.L. – Amboyna, Ternate. [note: G.L. = General Letters]. <b>Vol. II.</b> Banda, Macassa, Solor Timor, Sumatra, Malacca, Siam, Tonquin, Formosa, Japan, Coromandel, Bengal. <b>Vol. III.</b> Ceylon & Malabar, Surat, Hindustan & Persia – Nil G.L.
<b>1660 – Vol. I. Vol. II.</b> Macassa, Sumatra, Siam, Formosa, Japan, Bengal, Coromandel, Ceylon, Hindustan, Surat, Persia, C of G H, Amboyna. <b>Vol. III.</b>
<b>1661 – Vol. I.</b> Macassa, Sumatra, Jambi, Quinam. <b>Vol. II.</b> Siege and conquest of Formosa by the Chinese during 1661/62. <b>Vol. III.</b> Japan, Coromandel, Bengal, Ceylon, St. Thomas, Surat, Persia, Arabia, C of G H, Madagascar. <b>Vol. IV.</b> General letter book bound with table of contents, para by para & pages.
<b>1662 – Vol. I.</b> Three General letters. <b>Vol. II.</b> Formosa, Malacca. <b>Vol. III.</b> Coromandel, Bengal, Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Hindustan, Persia, C of G H, Mozambique. <b>Vol. IV.</b> Letters to G.G. from various factories
<b>1663 – Vol. I. Vol. II.</b> Amboyna, Tonquin, Sumatra, Malacca, China, Japan, Coromandel, Bengal. <b>Vol. III.</b> Cochin, Malabar, Ceylon, Surat, Persia, C of G H. <b>Vol. IV.</b> Letters sent to the G.G. in Council from Various Factories. <b>Vol. V.</b> Journal and letters.
<b>1664 – Vol. I. Vol. II.</b> Coromandel, Bengal, Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Persia. <b>Vol. III.</b> Letter book for Persia, Sumatra, Ceylon, Japan, Banda, China. <b>Vol. IV.</b> Letter book from all parts. <b>Vol. V.</b> Letters from different parts.
<b>1665 – Vol. I. Vol. II.</b> Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Persia. Nothing. Letter books. <b>Vol. III. Part I. Vol. III. Part II. Vol. III Part III</b>
<b>1666 – Vol. I. Vol. II.</b> Bengal, Coromandel, Banda, Sumatra. Nothing. <b>Vol. III.</b> Ceylon, Malabar. ( <b>Seals.</b> ) Nothing. <b>Vol. IV.</b> Surat, Persia, C of G H. – Nothing.
<b>1666 – Letter Book I. Letter Book II.</b> Nothing. <b>Letter Book III.</b> Nothing. <b>Letter Book IV.</b> Amboyna – nothing.
<b>1667 – Vol. I. Vol. II.</b> Resolutions about Macassa, China, Sumatra. Coromandel, Bengal – Nothing. <b>Vol. III.</b> Ceylon, Surathe, Hindostan, Persia. <b>Vol. IV</b> – Letterbooks. <b>Vol. V.</b> Letterbooks. Nothing outside general letters. <b>Vol. VI.</b> Letterbooks. Nothing outside general letters.
<b>1668 – Vol. I. Vol. II.</b> Macassar, Banda, Mouluca, Siam, Choromandel, Bengal, Ceylon, Malabar, Suratte, Hindostan, Persia, Cape of Good Hope. <b>Vol. III.</b> Letterbooks. <b>Vol. IV.</b> Letterbooks.
<b>1669 – Vol. I. Vol. II.</b> Macassa, Banda, Borneo, Jambi, Tonquin China. <b>Vol. III.</b> Bengal, Coromandel. Nil. <b>Vol. IV.</b> Letterbooks 1, 2, 3 – nothing particular to note. [Danvers note: Letter of 27 Oct 1669 contains particulars of the tolls and revenues of Ceylon. This letter has not yet turned up.]
<b>1670 – Vol. I. Vol. II.</b> Ceylon & Malabar. Rest of volume searched. <b>Vol. III.</b> Surat, Hindustan, Persia & Cape. [Danvers note: 1 Oct 1894]
<b>Danvers note: Some of the books are in their original state and have not been re-arranged by</b>

<b>Mr. De Jonge and others.</b>
<b>1669-70</b> – Vol. I – Amboyna, Banda & Ternate – nothing particular – <b>vol. 24.</b> Vol. II – Macassar – nothing particular – <b>vol. 25.</b> Vol. III – Bantam – vide Mr. De Jonge – <b>vol. 26.</b> [Ceylon: Note in pencil “Missing”]. Vol. IV – Vingorla, Surat, Persia, Japan, Tonquin, Siam, Macassar – <b>vol. 27.</b>
<b>1671</b> – <b>Vol. I</b> (Portfolios) G.L. & Macassar [Note: G.L. = General Letters]. <b>Vol. II</b> – Coromandel & Bengal. <b>Vol. III</b> – Ceylon & Malabar, Surat and Persia.
<b>1670-1671</b> – Letterbook May 1670-Dec 1671 – Amboyna, Banda, Macassar, Timor – <b>vol. 28.</b> <b>Vol. 29.</b> Amboyna, Palambang, Jambi, Siam, W. Coast of Sumatra, Coromandel, Bengal, Ceylon, Bantam, Virgorla. [Ceylon note in pencil “Missing”]. <b>Vol. 30.</b> Bantam, Japarra, Malacca, Palambang, Jambi, W. Coast of Sumatra, Tonquin, Japan. <b>Vol. 31.</b> Bengal, Coromandel, Surat, Persia.
<b>1672</b> – (Portfolio) – <b>Vol. I.</b> <b>Vol. II</b> – Cambodia, Japan, Coromandel, Bengal, Surat, Hindustan, Ceylon, Malabar, Persia.
<b>1671-1672</b> – Book <b>Vol. 32</b> – Amboyna, Banda, Ternate – Nil. Book <b>Vol. 33</b> – Banda, Macassar, Timor, Ternate. Book <b>Vol. 34</b> – Bengal, Ceylon, Calicut, Surat, Persia.
<b>1673</b> – <b>Vol. I.</b> <b>Vol. II</b> – Siam, Coromandel, Bengal, ..., Hindustan, Ceylon & M..., Persia, St. Helena
Book <b>Vol. 35</b> – Amboyna, Banda, Maca..., Tonquin, Japan, Mal.... <b>Vol. 36</b> – Batavia, Bantam, Japarra, Siam, Tonquin, Japan, ..., Sumatra. <b>Vol. 37</b> – Bengal. <b>Vol. 38</b> – Amboyna – Nil.
<b>1674</b> – <b>Vol. I.</b> <b>Vol. II</b> – Judicial Papers about the Case of Mr. Daniel Michelhem. <b>Vol. III</b> – Banda, Macassar, ..., Japan, Coromandel, ... fol. 524a-529. <b>Vol. IV</b> fol. 225-226a; fol. 233a-242a.; fol. 254-256a; fol. 261-273a; fol. 299; fol. 307-308a; fol. 391a. <b>Vol. V.</b> fol. 7-37; fol. 389a-395. <b>Vol. VI</b> fol. 419-419a. <b>Vol. VII.</b> Surat, Hindustan, Persia, Cape of G. H. fol. 835-835a; fol. 220-220a
<b>1674</b> - <b>Vol. 39</b> – Amboyna, Nil. <b>Vol. 40</b> – Banda, Ternate, Macassar, Timor, Solor. Vol. 41 – Bantam, Japarra, Jambi, ..., W.C. Sumatra, Bengal, Coromandel & Palambang fol. 357a-360; fol. 368-372; fol. 390-393a; fol. 395-397a.
<b>1675</b> – <b>Vol. I</b> fol. 286-353a; fol. 605-606; fol. 61a-116a. <b>Vols. II and III</b> - ...isoate Cases (Bengal). <b>Vol. IV</b> – Coromandel, Bengal, Ceylon, Malabar – Nil.. <b>Vol. V</b> – Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Hindustan, Persia – Nil.
<b>1675</b> – <b>Vol. 42</b> – Amboyna. <b>Vol. 43</b> – Macassar – Timor. <b>Vol. 44</b> – Japan, Malacca, Bengal, Coromandel, Ceylon, Malabar, Vingorla, Surat, Japarra, Banda... <b>Vol. 45</b> – Banda
<b>1676</b> – <b>Vol. I</b> fol. 13a-64a.; fol. 257-284a; fol. 135-184a. <b>Vol. II</b> – Ternate, Amboyna, China, Bengal, Coromandel. <b>Vol. III</b> (all letters in 1677)
<b>Vol. 46</b>
<b>Vol. 47</b>
<b>Vol. 48</b> – Bantam, Bengal, Cape, Ceylon, Jambi, Japarra, ..., Malambar, Mauritius, Palambang, Cochin, ..., Sumatra – Nil
<b>Vol. 49</b> – Amboyna
<b>Vol. 50</b> – Banda
<b>Vol. 51</b> – Macassar
1676 - Vol. 52
<b>Vol. 53</b> – Ceylon, Malabar, Vingorla, Surat, Persia, Cape ..., Japarra, Bantam
<b>Vol. 54</b> – Amboyna
<b>Vol. 55</b> – Ternate, Banda
<b>Vol. 56</b> – Macassar, Timor
<b>1677</b> - <b>Vol. 57</b>
<b>1677</b> - <b>Vol. 58</b> – Bantam, Cape, Bengal, ..., China, Japarra, Japan, Jambi, Macassar, ..., Palambang, Siam, ..., W.C. Sumatra fol. 395-468a; fol. 631-631a; Fol. 678a-705; Fol. 119a-120. <b>Vol. 59</b> – Also Japarra & Java.
<b>1677</b> – <b>Vol. II</b> – Malacca, Coromandel, Bengal – Nil. <b>Vol. III</b> – Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Hindustan, Persia – Nil.
<b>1678</b> – <b>Vol. I</b> fol. 530-560; fol. 23-71. <b>Vol. II</b> – Coromandel, Bengal. <b>Vol. III</b> – Malabar, Ceylon, Surat, Hindostan & Persia.
<b>Vol. 60</b> – Amboyna. <b>Vol. 61</b> – Banda and the Moluccas. <b>Vol. 62</b> – Voyage in the Moluccas. <b>Vol. 63</b> – Banda, Macassa, Ternate, Timor
<b>1678</b> - <b>Vol. 64</b> fol. 712a-716a
<b>Vol. 65</b> – Japan & Coromandel. <b>Vol. 66.</b> <b>Vol. 67</b> – Siam, China, Tonquin, Japan, ..., Malacca, Sumatra, Bengal, Arrakan, Coromandel. <b>Vol. 68</b> – Ceylon, Surat, Malabar, Persia, Cape G.H.,

Japaira, Bantam, B....
<b>1679</b> – <b>Vol. I</b> fol. 173-174a; fol. 16-32a. <b>Vol. II</b> fol. 326a-465a. <b>Vol. III</b> – Sumatra, Siam, Coromandel, Bengal. <b>Vol. IV</b> – Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Hindustan & Persia
<b>Vol. 69</b> – Amboyna. <b>Vol. 70</b> – Ternate, Moluccas. <b>Vol. 71</b> – Banda, Macassar, Timor.
<b>Vol. 72</b> – Amboyna, Banda, Ternate, Macassar, Timor, Palambang, Jambi and Ausbingiri
<b>Vol. 73</b> – China, Tonquin, Japan, Malacca, W.C. Sumatra, Bengal, Arakan, Coromandel.
<b>Vol. 74</b> – Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Persia, Cape of G.H., Sumatra, B..., Batavia
<b>Vol. 75</b> – Coromandel & private affairs, Tonquin Japan, Malaca, Bengal, Arakan, Coromandel.
<b>Vol. 76</b> – Amboyna.
<b>Vol. 78</b> – Ceylon, Persia, Java, Banda, Batavia.
<b>Vol. 79</b> – Ternate & Moluccas
<b>1680</b> – <b>Vol. I</b> fol. 1040-1041. <b>Vol. II</b> fol. 141-172. <b>Vol. III</b> – Bantam, Sumatra, Chinese Embassy, Coromandel, ... Bengal. <b>Vol. IV</b> – General letters – Rules of the 17 in 1676 & ... of same to G... & reply. <b>Vol. V</b> – Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Hindustan, Persia
<b>Vol. 80</b> – Amboyna, Banda, Ternate, Timor, Macassar, Palambang, Malacca, W.C. Sumatra.
<b>Vol. 81</b> - Bengal, Coromandel, Malabar, Surat, Persia, Cape, Japaira, Java, Indrasnan, Cheribon, Bantam, Sunda, Batavia.
<b>Vol. 82</b> – Amboyna, Banda, Ternate, Macassar, Timor, Java, Bantam, Batavia, Sunda
<b>Vol. 83</b> – China, Japan, Palambang, Jambi, Malacca, Sumatra, Sillide, Bengal, Coromandel.
<b>Vol. 84</b> – Ceylon, Malabar, Persia, Surat, C of G.H.
<b>1681</b> – <b>Vol. I</b> fol. 120-307a; fol. 584-617a; fol. 639-676a. <b>Vol. II.</b>
No number: English correspondence. Extract letter from Mr. Croff – 10 Feb 1681. Protest from Mr. Croff – 1 Feb 1681
<b>1681</b> – <b>Vol. III</b> – Ceylon, Malabar, Ternate, Sumatra, Siam, Coromandel, Bengal, Surat, Hindustan, Persia. fol. 86a-88a
<b>Vol. 85</b> – Ternate, Palambang, Malacca, Sumatra, Arakan, Bengal, Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Persia, The Cape
<b>Vol. 86</b> – Siam, Tonquin, China, Japan, Java, Japaira, Indrasnan, Cheribon, Bantam, Batavia, Sunda.
<b>Vol. 87</b> – Ternate, Moluccas
<b>Vol. 88</b> – Amboyna, Banda, Macassar
<b>Vol. 89</b> – Timor, Malacca
<b>1682</b> – <b>Vol. I</b> – Bantam, & General. <b>Vol. II</b> – Malacca, Coromandel, Bengal. fol. 392-393. <b>Vol. III</b> – Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, ..., Persia & C. of G. Hope. English letters only. Proclamation by King Charles 16 Nov 1681. Letter from Fort St. George to Dutch Co – 13 Sep 1682.
<b>Vol. 90</b> – Amboyna, Ternate, Macassar, Timor, Palambang, Jambi
<b>Vol. 91</b> – Siam, Tonquin, China, J..., Malacca, Sumatra, G..., Arakan
<b>Vol. 92</b> – Bengal, Coromandel
<b>Vol. 93</b> – Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Persia and C. of G. Hope
<b>Vol. 94</b> – Java, Tingaran & letters ... cruising vessels.
<b>Vol. 95</b> – Bantam.
<b>Vol. 96</b> – Amboyna, Ternate, Timor, Macassa.
<b>Vol. 97</b> – Banda, Malacca
<b>1683</b> – <b>Vol. I</b> fol. 221-576. <b>Vol. II</b> fol. 94a-305. <b>Vol. III</b> – Bengal, Coromandel fol. 15a-31; fol. 41a-42; fol. 93a-98; fol. 148-208; fol. 261-262. <b>Vol. IV</b> – Ceylon, Malabar. <b>Vol. V</b> – Surat, Persia, Arabia
<b>Vol. 98</b> – Amboyna, Banda, Ternate, Timor, Macassar
<b>Vol. 99</b> – Siam, Tonquin, China, Japan, Malacca, Palambang, Jambi, Sumatra & Gold mines
<b>Vol. 100</b> – Bengal, Coromandel, Ceylon
<b>Vol. 102</b> – Moluccas
<b>Vol. 103</b> – Ternate, Moluccas
<b>Vol. 104</b> – Banda
<b>1684</b> – <b>Vol. I</b> – General letters fol. 443-460; fol. 48-95a; fol. 141a-171. <b>Vol. II</b> – General [letters] & Batam. <b>Vol. III</b> – Japan, Coromandel, Bengal. <b>Vol. IV</b> – Ceylon. <b>Vol. V</b> – Voyage of Ship 1683-1684 – Malabar
<b>Vol. 105</b> – Bantam

<b>Vol. 106</b> – Amboyna, Banda, Ternate, Timor, Macassar, Palambang, Jambi, J..., China, Tonquin, Malacca, Sumatra Gold Mine, Bengal
<b>Vol. 107</b> (?) [Danvers ?mark] – Java & The Cape
<b>Vol. 108</b> – Coromandel, Ceylon, Cape.
<b>Vol. 109</b> – Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Persia Agreement with King of Cochin – 25 Jul 1684.
<b>Vol. 110</b> - V
<b>Vol. 111</b> – Macassar, Java, Palambang, J..., Siam, China, Tonquin, Ja..., Malacca, Sumatra, Bengal
<b>Vol. 112</b> – Molacca, Coromandel
<b>Vol. 113</b> – Amboyna, Ternate, Macassar, Timor
<b>Vol. 114</b> – Banda
<b>1685</b> – <b>Vol. I</b> fol. 254a-295; fol. 81a-238. <b>Vol. II</b> fol. 1058a-1070a; fol. 1173a-1174a. <b>Vol. III</b> – Visit of M. of C. to Bengal, Surat, Persia, etc. <b>Vol. IV</b> – Sumatra, Malacca, Siam, Japan, China, Tywan. <b>Vol. V</b> – Coromandel, Bengal. <b>Vol. VI</b> – Ceylon, Malabar fol. 547a- fol. 645-678. <b>Vol. VI</b> – Surat & Persia.
<b>Vol. 115</b> – Amboyna, Banda, ..., Macassar, Timor, Pallambang, Jambi, Bengal, Coromandel.
<b>Vol. 116</b> – Sumatra, Gold Mines, Mala..., Siam, Tonquin, China, Jap...
<b>Vol. 117</b> – Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Persia
<b>Vol. 118</b> -
<b>1895 = begin</b> <sup>60</sup>
<b>Vol. 119</b> – Malacca
<b>Vol. 120</b> – Amboyna, Moluccas ...
<b>Vol. 121</b> – Nil. <b>Vol. 122</b> – Nil. <b>Vol. 123.</b> <b>Vol. 124.</b> <b>Vol. 125</b> – Nil
<b>Vol. 126 to 131</b> – Nil
<b>Vol. 132.</b> <b>Vol. 133.</b> <b>Vol. 134.</b> <b>Vol. 135.</b> <b>Vol. 136 &amp; 137</b> – Nil. <b>Vol. 138</b>
<b>First Series 3.</b> <sup>61</sup>
<b>1687</b> – <b>Vol. 138</b> [continued] p.218/220. <b>Vol. 139</b> – Surat, Persia, Bassora, Cape of Good Hope p. 425/427.; p428/428a.; p.429/430. <b>Vol. 140</b> – Letters from Heer van Mydrecht p.116a last 1b. p.117, p117a lines 1-4.; p.284 last 13, 284a lines 1-11. <b>Vol. 141</b> – Moluccas. Searched, nothing found. <b>Vol. 142</b> – Banda, Ternate, Macassar, Palembang, Jamby, Sumatra W. Coast. . P. 502.; p. 502a/503a, 504 lines 1-27.; p.892/893a. <b>Vol. 143</b> – China, Japan, Bengal, Ceylon, Siam, Malabar & Coromandel. p. 1087/1088; p.1198a/1200. <b>Vol. 144</b> – Malabar, Surat, Persia, Cape of G.H., Java. Searched, nothing found. <b>Vol. 145</b> p.2241a/2242.; p.2242a/2250.; p. 2394a last 13, 2395 lines 1-31.
<b>1688</b> – <b>Vol. 146</b> p. 474 lines 1-16. . p. 53f last 9, 53a, 54 lines 1-11. . <b>Siam:</b> p.57/61a-62 lines 1-6.. <b>Tonquin:</b> p.72a last 11 p.73 lines 1-6. <b>China:</b> p.80/81a-82 lines 1-2.. <b>Malacca:</b> p.104 last 7.104a lines 1-14. Batavia. p. 108a last 17 p. 109 1-16. New Sultan. P. 109a last 13 p.110 lines 1-14.. <b>Bengal:</b> p.121a last 14. <b>Bantam:</b> p.139-139a lines 1-12. . <b>Batavia:</b> p.151a last 11, 152, 152a lines 1-4. <b>Bantam:</b> p.203a last 10, 204/205 205a lines 1-14
<b>1688</b> – <b>Vol. 147</b> p.578-578a lines 1-4. <b>Vol. 148 Introduction:</b> p.24a last 5, 22-22a lines 1-5 <b>Palambang:</b> p. 105a last 9 p.106 lines 1-20. <b>Siam:</b> p. 131a/132a, 133, lines 1-5. <b>Japan:</b> p. 168 lines 7-13. <b>See F15.</b> Batavia p.184 lines 11-19. p.183 last 4, 183a lines 1-9. Malacca: p. 196 lines 1-19.. P.202a lines 6-16. Sumatra W. Coast: p.229 last 4, 229a/231a-232 lines 1-12. <b>Bengal:</b> p. 239 last 3 239a/240. P.243 last line 243a/244-244a lines 1-2. . P. 252/252a-253 lines 1-8. <b>Coromandel:</b> P.261a last 12, 262 lines 1-6. Ceylon: p.292 last 9, 292a all. <b>Malabar:</b> p. 303a, last 9, 304-304a lines 1-6.. P.314a last 9, 315/317a, 318 lines 1-8.. P.323 last 3, 323a all. <b>Surat:</b> P.335a last 7, 336/337a-338 lines 1-11. p.1084 last 8, 1085-1086.. <b>Java E. Coast:</b> p.353a last 12, 354 lines 1-10. . <b>Bantam:</b> p. 372a last 15, 373/378a, 379 lines 1-12. <b>Batavia:</b> p. 470 last 6, 470a/482a. <b>Vol. 149</b> p.1111/1112.; p.1114/1116a.; . p.1117/1117a.; p.1118/1118a. <b>Vol. 150</b> – Bangermassing, Japan, Amoy, etc. p.408/410a.; p.1658-1663. <b>Vol. 151</b> – Ceylon & Coromandel p.227a/229a , 230 lines 1016.; p.388a last 6 389/... 392 lines 1-16; p.444/459. <b>Vol. 151</b> – Ceylon & Coromandel. p.460/471a.; p.472/473.; p.474/477a.; . p.155a last 20, 156 156a lines 1-19; p.164/174.; . p175/178; p.181/182.; p.183/185. <b>Vol. 152</b> – Ceylon, Surat, Persia & Cape of Good Hope. P.667/670a, 671 lines 1-3. P.677/681. <b>Vol. 153</b> – Commissioner Heer van Wydrecht. p.307 last 2 307a lines 1-32.; p.639 last 20

<sup>60</sup> 1895 seems to refer to the year the transcriptions were made. Same handwriting in the working list above and below this note.

<sup>61</sup> Handwriting changed from the line “First Series 3”.



<p>last 11 lines, 223 lines 1; p.226a/229a 230 lines 1-8; p.270/275a. <b>Vol. 184</b> (Commissioner Heer van Ulydrecht) p701/702; p.703/703a; p698/699a; p700/700a; p704. <b>Vol. 185</b> (Commissioner Heer van Ulydrecht). Searched, nothing found. <b>Vol. 186</b> p431/433; p284/286a; p400/400a; p407/407a. <b>Vol. 187</b> (Searched. Nothing found.) <b>Vol. 188</b> (Ambon, Banda, Ternate, Macassar, Timor) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 189</b> (Banda) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 190</b> (Ternate.) (This volume is not paged.) ±120 pages. <b>Vol. 191</b> (Malacca) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 192</b> – OUT. <b>Vol. 193</b> (Bengal, Coromandel, Ceylon, Surat) p314a / 319a; p518/519a. <b>Vol. 194</b> (Batavia, Bantam, Java, Tanjongpoura, Cape of Good Hope p.24a / 26; p.96 / 98; p.392a last 15, 393 lines 1-14.</p>
<p><b>1692 – Vol. 195 Malacca, Johor:</b> p222 last line 222a / 223a, 224 lines 1-9: <b>Sumatra W. Coast:</b> p.263 last 4, 265 / 266: <b>Coromandel:</b> p300 last 12 lines, 300a: <b>Malabar:</b> p.334 last 6 lines, p. 334a / 338a, 339 lines 1-10: <b>Surat:</b> p352a last 16 lines, 353 / 354: <b>Batavia:</b> p.442 last 7 lines, 442a / 444a, 445 lines 1-12. p455 g a last 3 lines, 456h / 456 I a:</p>
<p><b>1691 – Vol. 196 .</b> p1214/1216 p.1102/1190a.</p>
<p><b>1692 – Vol. 197 China:</b> p.59/60a: <b>Malacca:</b> p.64 last 8 lines, 64a: <b>Surat:</b> p.73 last 10 lines, 74 lines 1-11: <b>Sumatra W. Coast:</b> p.100a last 8 lines, p.101 lines 1-14. -- p.334 / 351a; . p373; . p374 / 378a; p416 / 416a. <b>Vol. 198</b> (Ceylon) p.20a/21a, 22 lines 1-18; p108 last 4 lines, 108a, 109 lines 1-2: P123a last 12 lines, 124 lines 1-17. <b>Vol. 199</b> p511 / 511a; p5181 last 11 lines, 519 / 531a. <b>Vol. 200</b> (Bengal) p21 last 16 lines, p21A, p22 lines 1-13: P52 last 12 lines, p52a lines 1-14; p.168 last 6, 168a lines 1-15; p291/294a; p295/296. <b>Vol. 201</b> (not paged) (Commissioner Heer van Ulydrecht) 22 Articles (5 ½ pages); (2 pages) 8 Articles; (6 pages) 14 Articles. <b>Vol. 202</b> (Fiscal) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 203</b> (Amboina, Banda, Macassar) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 204</b> (Amboina, Banda, Ternate, Macassar, Timor.) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 205</b> (Sumatra W. Coast) – OUT. <b>Vol. 206</b> (Coromandel, Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Persia) . p127/131: p131/133a: p133a/134a: p134a/154a: p154a/160a: p161/163a: p183a/184a: P165/186: . P196/198a: . p205/206: . P206/206a: P214/216a: p388a/389: p389/390a p390a/391). <b>Vol. 207</b> – (Batavia, Bantam, Java, Tanjongpoura, Cape of G. H.) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 208 China:</b> p102a last 13 lines, 103, 103a lines 1-21 <b>Bengal:</b> p158 lines 5-18: <b>Bengal / C...:</b> p161a last 9 lines, 162, 162a lines 1-15: <b>Coromandel:</b> p166a lines 7-17: P191a last 5 lines, 192/194a, 195 lines 1-10. <b>Malabar:</b> p210 last 6 lines, 210a / 211 211a lines 1-12. <b>Vol. 209</b> p1426a last 10 lines, 1427 1427a line 1: . p1457 last 12 lines, 1457a / 1459 1459a lines 1-9. <b>Ternate:</b> p69 last 12 lines, 69a / 70: <b>China:</b> p104 last 10 lines, 104a, 105 lines 1-15: <b>Bengal:</b> p121a last 10 lines, 122 lines 1-15: <b>Malabar:</b> p137 last 3 lines, 137a, 138 lines 1-17. -- p432/434; p570 / 574a.</p>
<p><b>1693 – Vol. 211 : Mauritius:</b> p27 last 20 lines, p27a lines 1-13: <b>Batavia:</b> p37a last 3 lines, 38 lines 1-10; p.265 / 268a; p300 / 300a. <b>Vol. 212</b> (Ceylon) : p338/339. <b>Vol. 213</b> : p.899a last 7 lines, 900 lines 1-4; : p1481 last 7 lines, 1481a / 1482 1482a lines 1-8; : p1496 / 1498a; : p1499 / 1501; p1527 1527a 1528 lines 1-5; : p1787a last 15 lines, 1788, 1788a, 1789 lines 1-17; : p 1794 last 9 lines, 1794a lines 1-5. <b>Vol. 214</b> (Bengal, Surat, Persia) p.372/413: P437/437a lines 1-8. <b>Vol. 215</b> (Coromandel) p35a last 2 lines, 36/43 43a lines 1-11: p52 last 5 lines, 52a / 60a 61 lines 1-8: P79a / 81... p364 / 365a: . P368a last 2 lines, 369 / 371a, 372 lines 1-9: . P377a / 472a; p479 / 492:; p500a last 15 lines, 501 / 503a 504 lines 1-8: p519 last 14 lines 519a / 520: p544 / 548: P549 / 553a: p561 / 562a p565 / 573 p574 / 583: . p584 / 585: . p586 / 589a:). p590 / 591a: p600 / 601a: p.602 / 624. p772 / 802a p.803 / 804. <b>Vol. 216</b> p.806 / 814; p.825 last 7 lines, 825a / 826: . P.828a / 832: . P.851 last 8 lines 851a lines 1-2: . P.854 last 21 lines, 854a lines 1-2: . P.906 lines 13-20; p.917 / 924a; p.1504 / 1506a; p.1526 / 1536; p.1537 / 1539; p.1542 / 1543a; p.1572 / 1574. <b>Vol. 217</b> (Correspondence Com. Bacherus, Special Ambassador to Mogol). p.347 / 353a. <b>Vol. 218</b>. p.1037 / 1040a. <b>Vol. 219</b> (Fiscal. Surat) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 220</b> (Amboina, Banda, Macassar) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 221</b> (Ternate, Malacca) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 222</b> (Ternate) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 223</b> (Amboina, Banda, Ternate, Macassar, Timor) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 224</b> (Palembang, Siam, Tonquin, Japan, Malacca) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 225</b> (Sumatra W. Coast, Bengal, Coromandel) p.679a / 680a; p.818a / 819; p.857 / 858a; p.858a / 861; p.861a / 871a; . p.872. <b>Vol. 226</b> (Ceylon, Malabar) Searched. Nothing found. <b>Vol. 227</b> (Surat, Persia, Java, Cape of Good Hope) p.258/259; P.265/266; p.266a / 267: <b>Palembang:</b> p.166 last 13 lines, 166a, 167 lines 1-10: <b>China:</b> P.203 / 208: . <b>Japan:</b> p.229 last 11 lines, 229a lines 1-4: Sumatra W. Coast: p.256 last 11 lines, 257 lines 1-15: t. Bengal: p.274a / 276 276a lines 1-11: . P.283a last 6 lines, 284, 285 285a lines 1-4: <b>Coromandel:</b> p.288 / 289a. P.292a / 298a 299 lines 1-7: . P.324 last 17 lines, 324a / 326a, 327 lines 1-13: . <b>Surat:</b> p.370 last 8 lines, 370a / 372a. P.377 last 12 lines, 377a. <b>Vol. 229</b> p.1037 / 1043a; p.1067 / 1072a; P.1073 / 1105; p.1106 / 1112d.</p>

**1694 – Vol. 230 Bengal:** p.139 last 11 lines 139a / 143a:. **Coromandel:** p.146 last 2 lines, 146a / 150 151 lines 1-9: **Surat:** p.152 / 153 153a lines 1-7. **Vol. 231** (Ceylon) p.742 / 743. **Vol. 232** : p. 1626:. p.1628. **Vol. 233** (Coromandel) p.770 / 773: . P.774 / 777: . P.778 / 779a: . P.829 / 832a. **Vol. 234** (Malabar) . p. 474 / 475. **Vol. 235** p.231 / 231a: . p.231a / 232: . p.462 / 462a: . p.463 / 463a p.463a / 464. **Vol. 236** (Surat) Searched. Nothing found. **Vol. 237** (Amboina, Banda) Searched, nothing found. **Vol. 238** (Amboina, Banda, Ternate &c) Searched, nothing found. **Vol. 239** (Ternate) Searched, nothing found. **Vol. 240** (Ternate) Searched, nothing found. **Vol. 241** (Malacca) Searched, nothing found. **Vol. 242** (Amboina, Banda, Ternate, Macassar, Timor) Searched, nothing found. **Vol. 243** (Palembang, Siam, Tonquin, Japan, Malacca, Sumatra W. Coast) . p.202a: p.302a p.302a / 303: 9 Articles. p.303 / 304: p.304 / 306a: . p.306a / 307 p.307a / 308: p.308 / 308a: p.308a p.308a / 309: p.309: p.309 / 309a: p.309a: p. 309a: p.309a / 310: p.310 / 310a: . p.310a. **Vol. 244** (Bengal, Coromandel) p.20a / 21 p.21a / 22: p.60a: p.81a / 83: p.95 / 97: p.97a / 99: p.243 / 245a: , p. 246a / 247a: p.250 last line, 250a lines 1-14: p.254 / 264: p.346 / 349a: p.445a / 451: p.600 / 601. **Vol. 245** (Ceylon, Malabar) p.447 / 448. **Vol. 246** (Surat, Persia, Java and Cape of G.H.) Searched, Nothing found.

[End of Transcription of the 119 pages of index in I/3/86]

**Appendix 2: Descriptions from Danvers’ working list that appear to match entries in the 1992 Inventory of the VOC Archives<sup>62</sup>**

From the researcher’s analysis it is concluded that documents in Danvers’ *Dutch Records at The Hague* “The First Series” *Letters from India* were sourced from *Overgekomen brieven en papieren uit Indie aan de Heren XVII en de kamer Amsterdam, 1614-1700* [=Letters and papers received from Asia by the Heren XVII and the Amsterdam Chamber]. The researcher’s analysis compared the document description with that collected from Danvers’ volumes with the description contained in the *1992 Inventory of the VOC Archives* (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992). The results of this analysis shows a partial match of the documents Danvers’ viewed compared with the *1992 Inventory of the VOC Archives*. That the order of the volumes can be compared shows that Danvers maintained the order of the volumes that he had discerned in the VOC Archives during his investigations from 1893 to 1895 by keeping that same order for the documents he had selected for transcription.

Entry in Danvers’ 119 page working list	Entry from Meilink-Roelofs, M. A. P. (1992). Inventory. In R. Raben & H. Spijkerman (Eds.), <i>De archieven van de Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie</i> [=The Archives of the Dutch East India Company] 1602-1795
	E.5.a. <i>Overgekomen brieven en papieren uit Indië aan de Heren XVII en de kamer Amsterdam</i> [=Letters and papers received from Asia by the Heren XVII and the Amsterdam Chamber]
<b>1674 – Vol. II</b> – Judicial Papers about the Case of Mr. Daniel Michelhem. [No docs transcribed]	<b>1674</b> – [#1296] MMMM. Zesde boek: stukken betreffende de procedure tegen Daniël Wichelhuysen, lid van de Raad van Justitie. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 178)
<b>1679 - Vol. 71</b> – Banda, Macassar, Timor. [No docs transcribed]	<b>1679</b> – [#1335] RRRR. Vierde boek: Banda, Makassar, Timor. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 179)
<b>1681 – Vol. 86</b> – Siam, Tonquin, China, Japan, Java, Japaira, Indrasnan, Cheribon, Bantam, Batavia, Sunda. [No docs transcribed]	<b>1681</b> – [#1362] TTTT. Tiende boek: Batavia’s Ingekomen brievenboek, deel IV: Siam, Tonkin, China, Japan, Java’s Oostkust, Japara, Indramayu, Cheribon, Bantam, Batavia, Straat Sunda. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 180)

<sup>62</sup> To be confirmed against the VOC Archives held at the ARA, The Hague, at some point in the future.



<b>1687 – Vol. 143</b> – China, Japan, Bengal, Ceylon, Siam, Malabar & Coromandel. p.1087/1088; p.1198a/1200: Account by six English sailors of their adventures on a voyage from New Netherlands to Madagascar 1686. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/70.]	<b>1687</b> – [#1429] AAAAA. Twaalfde boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel II: Malakka, Siam, China, Japan, Bengalen, Coromandel, Ceylon, Malabar. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 181)
<b>1687 – Vol. 144</b> – Malabar, Surat, Persia, Cape of G.H., Java. [No docs transcribed]	<b>1687</b> – [#1430] AAAAA. Dertiende boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel III: Surat, Perzië, Kaap de Goede Hoop, Java. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 181)
<b>1690 – Vol. 167</b> – Banda, Macassar, Timor. [No docs transcribed]	<b>1690</b> – [#1460] DDDDD. Vierde boek: van Batavia betreffende Banda, Makassar, Timor. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 181)
<b>1690 – Vol. 168</b> – Amboina, Banda, Ternate, Macassar, Timor, Solor &c. various pages p.300a-p.396a. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/72-IOR/I/3/73]	<b>1690</b> – [#1461] DDDDD. Vijfde boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel I: Ambon, Banda, Ternate, Makassar, Timor, Solor. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 181)
<b>1690 – Vol. 169</b> – (Siam, Tonquin, China, Japan, Palembang, Jamby, Malacca, Sumatra W. Coast) . various pages p.244a-p.485a. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/72-IOR/I/3/73]	<b>1690</b> – [#1462] DDDDD. Zesde boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel II: Siam, Tonkin, China, Japan, Palembang, Jambi, Malakka, Sumatra's Westkust (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 181)
<b>1690 – Vol. 170</b> – (Bengal, Coromandel) various pages p.3a-p.403. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/73]	<b>1690</b> – [#1463] DDDDD. Zevende boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel III: Bengalen, Coromandel. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 181)
<b>1690 – Vol. 171</b> (Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Persia, Cape of Good Hope) various pages p.53-p.500a. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/73]	<b>1690</b> – [#1464] DDDDD. Achtste boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel IV: Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Perzië, Kaap de Goede Hoop. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 181-182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 175</b> (Ceylon). various pages p.175-326a. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/73]	<b>1691</b> – [#1468] EEEEE. Derde boek: Ceylon, eerste deel. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 176</b> (Ceylon). p.499. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/73]	<b>1691</b> – [#1469] EEEEE. Vierde boek: Ceylon, eerste deel, vervolg. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 177</b> various pages p.760-p.817a. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/73]	<b>1691</b> – [#1470] EEEEE. Vijfde boek: Ceylon, tweede deel. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 178</b> – (Bengal) various pages p.72-p.421. [see Appendix 3 for details. IOR/I/3/73]	<b>1691</b> – [#1471] EEEEE. Zesde boek: Bengalen. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 179</b> (Coromandel) p1010 / 1013; p1055/1056. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/73]	<b>1691</b> – [#1472] EEEEE. Zevende boek: Coromandel, eerste deel. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 180</b> various pages p.743-p.766[see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/73]	<b>1691</b> – [#1473] EEEEE. Achtste boek: Coromandel, tweede deel. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 181</b> (Malabar) various pages p.183-775a. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/73]	<b>1691</b> – [#1474] EEEEE. Negende boek: Malabar. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 182</b> (Surat) p.428/429. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/73]	<b>1691</b> – [#1475] EEEEE. Tiende boek: Surat, eerste deel. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 183</b> (Surat and Persia) various pages p.215-p.275a. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/73 – IOR/I/3/74]	<b>1691</b> – [#1476] EEEEE. Elfde boek: Surat, tweede deel: Perzië. (Meilink-Roelofsz, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 187</b> (Searched. Nothing found.)	
<b>1691 – Vol. 188</b> (Ambon, Banda, Ternate,	<b>1691</b> – [#1481] EEEEE. Zeventiende boek: van

Macassar, Timor) [No docs transcribed]	Batavia betreffende Ambon, Banda, Makassar, Timor. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 189</b> (Banda). [No docs transcribed]	<b>1691</b> – [#1482] EEEEE. Achttiende boek: van Batavia betreffende Banda. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 190</b> (Ternate). Journal of a voyage by the English through the South Sea to Maguidanao May 6 1684 – Aug 23 1687 under command of Capt. Peter Harris. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/74 – IOR/I/3/75]	<b>1691</b> – [#1483] EEEEE. Negentiende boek: van Batavia betreffende Ternate. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 191</b> (Malacca). [No docs transcribed]	<b>1691</b> – [#1484] EEEEE. Twintigste boek: van Batavia betreffende Malakka. NB: Het eenentwintigste boek overgekomen brieven en papieren van 1691: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel I, ontbreekt. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 192</b> – OUT. [The note OUT indicates that Danvers did not see this volume.]	<b>1691</b> – [#1485] EEEEE. Tweëntwintigste boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel II: Palembang, Jambi, Siam, Tonkin, China, Japan, Malakka, Sumatra's Westkust. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 193</b> (Bengal, Coromandel, Ceylon, Surat) p314a / 319a; p518/519a. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/75]	<b>1691</b> – [#1486] EEEEE. Drieëntwintigste boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel III: Bengalen, Coromandel, Ceylon, Surat. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1691 – Vol. 194</b> (Batavia, Bantam, Java, Tanjongpoura, Cape of Good Hope) various pages p.24a- p.393. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/75]	<b>1691</b> – [#1487] EEEEE. Vierentwintigste boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel IV: Java, Kaap de Goede Hoop. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1692 – Vol. 202</b> (Fiscal) [No docs transcribed]	<b>1692</b> – [#1495] FFFFF. Achtste boek: independent-fiscaals. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1692 – Vol. 203</b> (Amboina, Banda, Macassar) [No docs transcribed]	<b>1692</b> – [#1496] FFFFF. Negende boek: van Batavia betreffende Ambon, Banda, Makassar. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1692 – Vol. 204</b> (Amboina, Banda, Ternate, Macassar, Timor.) [No docs transcribed]	<b>1692</b> – [#1497] FFFFF. Tiende boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel I: Ambon, Banda, Ternate, Makassar, Timor. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1692 – Vol. 205</b> (Sumatra W. Coast) – OUT [The note OUT indicates that Danvers did not see this volume.]	<b>1692</b> – [#1498] FFFFF. Elfde boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel II: Palembang, Siam, Tonkin, Japan, Malakka, Sumatra's Westkust, Bengalen. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1692 – Vol. 206</b> (Coromandel, Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Persia) various pages p.127/131 - p390a/391. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/75 - IOR/I/3/76]	<b>1692</b> – [#1499] FFFFF. Twaalfde boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel III: Coromandel, Ceylon, Malabar, Surat, Perzië. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1692 – Vol. 207</b> – (Batavia, Bantam, Java, Tanjongpoura, Cape of G. H.). [No docs transcribed]	<b>1692</b> – [#1500] FFFFF. Dertiende boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel IV: Java, Kaap de Goede Hoop. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 212</b> (Ceylon) : p338/339. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/76]	<b>1693</b> – [#1505] GGGGG. Vijfde boek: Ceylon, eerste deel. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 213</b> various pages p.899a – p.1794a. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/76]	<b>1693</b> – [#1506] GGGGG. Zesde boek: Ceylon, tweede deel. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 214</b> (Bengal, Surat, Persia) Extract	<b>1693</b> – [#1507] GGGGG. Zevende boek:

letter Feb 22 1693: p.372/413: P437/437a lines 1-8: Present 2 elephants to Queen. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/76]	Bengalen, Surat, koopman Hendrik Zwaardcroon op Ceylon (gewezen secretaries van commissaris-generaal H.A. van Reede tot Drakenstein), Perzië. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 215</b> (Coromandel) various pages p35a-p.803 / 804. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/76 - IOR/I/3/77]	<b>1693</b> – [#1508] GGGGG. Achtste boek: Coromandel, eerste deel. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 216</b> various pages p..806 / 814 - p.1572 / 1574. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/77]	<b>1693</b> – [#1509] GGGGG. Negende boek: Coromandel, tweede deel. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 217</b> (Correspondence Com. Bacherus, Special Ambassador to Mogol). List of Treaties with or privileges obtain of native Princes on Coast Coromandel 1612/1687: p.347 / 353a. [IOR/I/3/77 last document]	<b>1693</b> – [#1510] GGGGG. Tiende boek: commissaris over Noord-Coromandel en extraordinair ambassadeur naar het hof van Golconda, Johannes Bacherus, eerste deel. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 218.</b> Translated Perwana (and list of 11 ditto) handed to Co's interpreters. [one dated Nov 1688]: p.1037 / 1040a: Passes for free trade and freedom of toll, privilege granted the Dutch by Emperor Aleuigior in 1691. [IOR/I/3/78]	<b>1693</b> – [#1511] GGGGG. Elfde boek: commissaris over Noord-Coromandel en extraordinair ambassadeur naar het hof van Golconda, Johannes Bacherus, tweede deel. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 219</b> (Fiscal. Surat) . [No docs transcribed]	<b>1693</b> – [#1512] GGGGG. Traalfde boek: independent-fiscaal van Surat. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 220</b> (Amboina, Banda, Macassar). [No docs transcribed]	<b>1693</b> – [#1513] GGGGG. Dertiende boek: van Batavia betreffende Ambon, Banda, Makassar, Timor. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 221</b> (Ternate, Malacca). [No docs transcribed]	<b>1693</b> – [#1514] GGGGG. Veertiende boek: van Batavia betreffende Ternate en Malakka. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 222</b> (Ternate) . [No docs transcribed]	<b>1693</b> – [#1515] GGGGG. Vijftiende boek: van Batavia betreffende Ternate. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 223</b> (Amboina, Banda, Ternate, Macassar, Timor) . [No docs transcribed]	<b>1693</b> – [#1516] GGGGG. Zestiende boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel I: Ambon, Banda, Ternate, Makassar, Timor. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 224</b> (Palembang, Siam, Tonquin, Japan, Malacca). [No docs transcribed]	<b>1693</b> – [#1517] GGGGG. Zeventiende boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel II: Palembang, Siam, Tonkin, Japan, Malakka. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 225</b> (Sumatra W. Coast, Bengal, Coromandel) various pages p..679a-p.872. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/78]	<b>1693</b> – [#1518] GGGGG. Achttiende boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel III: Sumatra's Westkust, Bengalen, Coromandel. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 226</b> (Ceylon, Malabar) [No docs transcribed]	<b>1693</b> – [#1519] GGGGG. Negentiende boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel IV: Ceylon, Malabar. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1693 – Vol. 227</b> (Surat, Persia, Java, Cape of Good Hope) various pages p.258-267; p.166-p.377a. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/78]	<b>1693</b> – [#1520] GGGGG. Twintigste boek: Batavia's Ingekomen brievenboek, deel V: Surat, Perzië, Java, Kaap de Goede Hoop. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1694 – Vol. 231</b> (Ceylon). March 29 1693 p.742 / 743: Informing him of the movements of the French fleet. [IOR/I/3/78]	<b>1694</b> – [#1524] HHHHH. Vierde boek: Ceylon, eerste deel. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1694 – Vol. 233</b> (Coromandel) p.770 / 773; p.774 /	<b>1694</b> – [#1526] HHHHH. Zesde boek: Coromandel.

777; p.778 / 779a; p.829 / 832a. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/78]	(Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1694 – Vol. 234</b> (Malabar). Mar 19 1692 p.474 / 475: Demanding satisfaction for the hostility by Portuguese man-of-war to Dutch yacht “Cochin” near Barsoloor. [IOR/I/3/78]	<b>1694</b> – [#1527] HHHHH. Zevende boek: Malabar, eerste deel. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 182)
<b>1694 – Vol. 239</b> (Ternate) [No docs transcribed]	<b>1694</b> – [#1532] HHHHH. Twaalfde boek: van Batavia betreffende Ternate, eerste deel. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 183)
<b>1694 – Vol. 240</b> (Ternate) [No docs transcribed]	<b>1694</b> – [#1533] HHHHH. Dertiende boek: van Batavia betreffende Ternate, tweede deel. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 183)
<b>1694 – Vol. 241</b> (Malacca) [No docs transcribed]	<b>1694</b> – [#1534] HHHHH. Veertiende boek: van Batavia betreffende Malakka. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 183)
<b>1694 – Vol. 242</b> (Amboina, Banda, Ternate, Macassar, Timor) [No docs transcribed]	<b>1694</b> – [#1535] HHHHH. Vijftiende boek: Batavia’s Ingekomen brievenboek, deel I: Ambon, Banda, Ternate, Makassar, Timor. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 183)
<b>1694 – Vol. 243</b> (Palembang, Siam, Tonquin, Japan, Malacca, Sumatra W. Coast) . various pages p..202a - p.310a. [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/78]	<b>1694</b> – [#1536] HHHHH. Zestiende boek: Batavia’s Ingekomen brievenboek, deel II: Palembang, Siam, Tonkin, Japan, Malakka, Sumatra’s Westkust. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 183)
<b>1694 – Vol. 244</b> (Bengal, Coromandel) various pages p.20a - p.600 / 601 [see Vol. 2 for details. IOR/I/3/78 and IOR/I/3/79]	<b>1694</b> – [#1537] HHHHH. Zeventiende boek: Batavia’s Ingekomen brievenboek, deel III: Bengalen, Coromandel. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 183)
<b>1694 - Vol. 245</b> (Ceylon, Malabar) April 6 1893 p.447 / 448: Information about the movements of the French fleet [from Simon van den Bergh]. [IOR/I/3/79]	<b>1694</b> – [#1538] HHHHH. Achttiende boek: Batavia’s Ingekomen brievenboek, deel IV: Ceylon, Malabar. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 183)
<b>1694 – Vol. 246</b> (Surat, Persia, Java and Cape of G.H.) [No docs transcribed]	<b>1694</b> – [#1539] HHHHH. Negentiende boek: Batavia’s Ingekomen brievenboek, deel V: Surat, Perzië, Java, Kaap de Goede Hoop. (Meilink-Roelofs, 1992, p. 183)

**Appendix 3: Number of documents and pages in volumes *BL: IOR I/3/1 – 106 Dutch Records at The Hague v.1-v.106***

Appendix 3 shows the number of documents and pages that made up the 106 volumes of *Dutch Records at The Hague* that Danvers collected during his visits to The Hague over the years 1893-1895. This information is presented here for the first time.

Year	Transcription (in Dutch)	# Docs	# Pages	Translation (in English)	# Docs	# Pages
<b>I/3/1-86</b>	<b><i>Dutch Records at The Hague. Collected by F.C. Danvers. First series. Letters from India. Vols. I – LVI (1-56) 1600-1699</i></b>					
Year	Transcription	# Docs	# Pages	Translation	# Docs	# Pages
1600-1608	I/3/1	67	426	I/3/2	67	131
1607-1616	I/3/3	50	402	I/3/4	50	154
1615-1620	I/3/5	69	533	I/3/6	73	384
1621-1623	I/3/7	65	391	I/3/8	70	165
1622-1624	I/3/9	75	490	I/3/10	75	150
1625-1625	I/3/11	132	655	I/3/12	132	256
1625-1626	I/3/13	42	517	I/3/14	42	182
1626-1629	I/3/15	65	380	I/3/16	64	175
1629-1634	I/3/17	35	520	I/3/18	35	140
1634-1637	I/3/19	29	409	I/3/20	29	123
1638-1639	I/3/21	16	407	I/3/22	16	108
1639-1642	I/3/23	42	447	I/3/24	42	136
1643-1644	I/3/25	26	407	I/3/26	26	145
1644-1645	I/3/27	27	558	I/3/28	27	140
1645-1647	I/3/29	49	581	I/3/30	47	182
1646-1651	I/3/31	18	343	I/3/32	18	111
1650-1651	I/3/33	33	333	I/3/34	33	110
1652-1654	I/3/35	14	441	I/3/36	14	127
1654-1655	I/3/37	29	382	I/3/38	29	122
1655-1656	I/3/39	31	408	I/3/40	31	149
1656-1657	I/3/41	23	424	I/3/42	23	113
1657-1658	I/3/43	15	367	I/3/44	15	103
1659-1660	I/3/45	15	340	I/3/46	15	88
1660-1661	I/3/47	17	312	I/3/48	17	84
1661-1662	I/3/49	16	272	I/3/50	16	79
1662-1663	I/3/51	22	268	I/3/52	22	90
1662-1665	I/3/53	25	292	I/3/54	24	80
1665-1667	I/3/55	13	291	I/3/56	13	81
1667-1670	I/3/57	29	298	I/3/58	29	111
1670-1672	I/3/59	24	331			
1672-1673	I/3/60	21	399			
1673-1674	I/3/61	13	363			
1674-1675	I/3/62	14	378			
1674-1679	I/3/63	35	308			
1679-1681	I/3/64	28	339			

1681-1683	I/3/65	32	369			
1683-1684	I/3/66	18	383			
1684-1686	I/3/67	17	434			
1685-1686	I/3/68	30	362			
1686	I/3/69	10	378			
1687-1689	I/3/70	33	364			
1688-1689	I/3/71	43	334			
1689	I/3/72	22	340			
1690	I/3/73	53	291			
1688-1689	I/3/74	10	316			
1689-1691	I/3/75	41	310			
1691-1693	I/3/76	29	334			
1691-1692	I/3/77	22	409			
1690-1693	I/3/78	55	377			
1693-1694	I/3/79	27	430			
1694-1695	I/3/80	76	504			
1696-1697	I/3/81	58	515			
1696-1697	I/3/82	26	458			
1697-1699	I/3/83	43	473			
1698-1699	I/3/84	45	383			
1698-1699	I/3/85	42	368			
1623-1640	I/3/86	6	292			
<b><i>Dutch Records at The Hague. Collected by F.C. Danvers.</i></b>						
<b><i>I/3/87-94 Second series. Letters from the XVII to India. Vols. I-IV (1-4) 1614-1700</i></b>						
Year	Transcription (in Dutch)	# Docs	# Pages	Translation (in English)	# Docs	# Pages
1614-1620	I/3/87	50	370	I/3/88	50	140
1624-1633	I/3/89	48	404	I/3/90	48	149
1633-1666	I/3/91	73	310	I/3/92	73	124
1666-1700	I/3/93	59	244	I/3/94	59	85
<b><i>Dutch Records at The Hague. Collected by F.C. Danvers.</i></b>						
<b><i>I/3/95-106 Third series. Letters from Governor General to various factories. Vols. I-IX (1-9) 1617-1699</i></b>						
Year	Transcription (in Dutch)	# Docs	# Pages	Translation (in English)	# Docs	# Pages
1617-1622	I/3/95	71	272	I/3/96	71	134
1622-1632	I/3/97	73	360	I/3/98	73	152
1633-1643	I/3/99	49	197	I/3/100	49	100
1644-1655	I/3/101	41	267			
1656-1662	I/3/102	32	253			
1663-1666	I/3/103	32	269			
1668-1680	I/3/104	52	244			
1681-1686	I/3/105	42	319			
1686-1699	I/3/106	62	333			
<b>TOTAL</b>						
<b>of 106 vols</b>		<b>2646</b>	<b>26278</b>		<b>1517</b>	<b>4903</b>

**Appendix 4: Proposed Descriptive Summary of volumes *BL: IOR I/3/1 – 106 Dutch Records at The Hague v.1-v.106***

From the researcher's investigations at the British Library in July 2003, a preliminary inventory listing the 2,646 documents that Danvers had copied was produced. The result is a 298-page document. While too big to be included as a print appendix to this thesis, samples pages are provided as Appendix 6. The researcher hopes that the full listing can be published at a future date. This Appendix 4 is a short finding aid that would provide a more complete description of what is contained in the 106 volumes than that of the current finding aid in the British Library<sup>63</sup>. The detailed information on the range of documents numbers in each volume is presented here for the first time.

Vol. #	Volume title	Documents	Transcription (in Dutch) Translation (in English)
<i>Dutch Records at The Hague. Collected by F.C. Danvers.</i>			
<b>I/3/1-86</b>	<b>First series. Letters from India. Vols. I – LVI (1-56) 1600-1699</b>		
I/3/1	Vol. I, 1600-1608	Docs. I – XXXI (1-31)	In Dutch
I/3/2	Vol. I, 1600-1608	Docs. I – XXXI (1-31)	In English
I/3/3	Vol. II, 1607-1616	Docs. XXXII-LXXXVIII (32-78)	In Dutch
I/3/4	Vol. II, 1607-1616	Docs. XXXII-LXXXVIII (32-78)	In English
I/3/5	Vol. III, 1615-1620	Docs. LXXIX-CXXVI (79-126)	In Dutch
I/3/6	Vol. III, 1615-1620	Docs. LXXIX-CXXVI (79-126)	In English
I/3/7	Vol. IV, 1621-1623	Docs. CXXVII-CLXXI (127-171)	In Dutch
I/3/8	Vol. IV, 1621-1623	Docs. CXXVII-CLXXI (127-171)	In English
I/3/9	Vol. V, 1622-1624	Docs. CLXXII-CXC (172-190)	In Dutch
I/3/10	Vol. V, 1622-1624	Docs. CLXXII-CXC (172-190)	In English
I/3/11	Vol. VI, 1621-1625	Docs. CXCI-CCXXI (191-221)	In Dutch
I/3/12	Vol. VI, 1621-1625	Docs. CXCI-CCXXI (191-221)	In English
I/3/13	Vol. VII, 1625-1626	Docs. CCXXII-CCXXXIV (222-234)	In Dutch
I/3/14	Vol. VII, 1625-1626	Docs. CCXXII-CCXXXIV (222-234)	In English
I/3/15	Vol. VIII, 1626-1629	Docs. CCXXXV-CCLXXXVIII (235-288)	In Dutch
I/3/16	Vol. VIII, 1626-1629	Docs. CCXXXV-CCLXXXVIII (235-288)	In English
I/3/17	Vol. IX, 1629-1634	Docs. CCLXXXIX-CCCXVIII (289-318)	In Dutch
I/3/18	Vol. IX, 1629-1634	Docs. CCLXXXIX-CCCXVIII (289-318)	In English
I/3/19	Vol. X, 1634-1637	Docs. CCCXIX-CCCXLIX (319-349)	In Dutch
I/3/20	Vol. X, 1634-1637	Docs. CCCXIX-CCCXLIX (319-349)	In English
I/3/21	Vol. XI, 1638-1639	Docs. CCCL-CCCLXVII (350-367)	In Dutch
I/3/22	Vol. XI, 1638-1639	Docs. CCCL-CCCLXVII (350-367)	In English
I/3/23	Vol. XII, 1639-1642	Docs. CCCLXVIII-CDV (368-405)	In Dutch
I/3/24	Vol. XII, 1639-1642	Docs. CCCLXVIII-CDV (368-405)	In English
I/3/25	Vol. XIII, 1643-1644	Docs. CDVI-CDXXV (406-425)	In Dutch
I/3/26	Vol. XIII, 1643-1644	Docs. CDVI-CDXXV (406-425)	In English

<sup>63</sup> *Contents list for India Office Records Collection IOR/I in OIOC Reading Room, British Library, 2003, p. 5-9.*

I/3/27	Vol. XIV, 1644-1645	Docs. CDXXVI-CDLI (426-451)	In Dutch
I/3/28	Vol. XIV, 1644-1645	Docs. CDXXVI-CDLI (426-451)	In English
I/3/29	Vol. XV, 1645-1647	Docs. CDLII-CDXCVI (452-496)	In Dutch
I/3/30	Vol. XV, 1645-1647	Docs. CDLII-CDXCVI (452-496)	In English
I/3/31	Vol. XVI, 1646-1651	Docs. CDXCVII-DXIV (497-514)	In Dutch
I/3/32	Vol. XVI, 1646-1651	Docs. CDXCVII-DXIV (497-514)	In English
I/3/33	Vol. XVII, 1650-1651	Docs. DXV-DXXXVII (515-537)	In Dutch
I/3/34	Vol. XVII, 1650-1651	Docs. DXV-DXXXVII (515-537)	In English
I/3/35	Vol. XVIII, 1652-1654	Docs. DXXXVIII-DL (538-550)	In Dutch
I/3/36	Vol. XVIII, 1652-1654	Docs. DXXXVIII-DL (538-550)	In English
I/3/37	Vol. XIX, 1654-1655	Docs. DLI-DLXXVIII (551-578)	In Dutch
I/3/38	Vol. XIX, 1654-1655	Docs. DLI-DLXXVIII (551-578)	In English
I/3/39	Vol. XX, 1655-1656	Docs. DLXXIX-DCI (579-601)	In Dutch
I/3/40	Vol. XX, 1655-1656	Docs. DLXXIX-DCI (579-601)	In English
I/3/41	Vol. XXI, 1656-1657	Docs. DCII-DCXXIII (602-623)	In Dutch
I/3/42	Vol. XXI, 1656-1657	Docs. DCII-DCXXIII (602-623)	In English
I/3/43	Vol. XXII, 1657-1658	Docs. DCXXIV-DCXXXVIII (624-638)	In Dutch
I/3/44	Vol. XXII, 1657-1658	Docs. DCXXIV-DCXXXVIII (624-638)	In English
I/3/45	Vol. XXIII, 1659-1660	Docs. DCXXXIX-DCLIII (639-653)	In Dutch
I/3/46	Vol. XXIII, 1659-1660	Docs. DCXXXIX-DCLIII (639-653)	In English
I/3/47	Vol. XXIV, 1660-1661	Docs. DCLIV-DCLXIX (654-669)	In Dutch
I/3/48	Vol. XXIV, 1660-1661	Docs. DCLIV-DCLXIX (654-669)	In English
I/3/49	Vol. XXV, 1661-1662	Docs. DCLXX-DCLXXXV (670-685)	In Dutch
I/3/50	Vol. XXV, 1661-1662	Docs. DCLXX-DCLXXXV (670-685)	In English
I/3/51	Vol. XXVI, 1662-1663	Docs. DCLXXXVI-DCCV (686-705)	In Dutch
I/3/52	Vol. XXVI, 1662-1663	Docs. DCLXXXVI-DCCV (686-705)	In English
I/3/53	Vol. XXVII, 1662-1665	Docs. DCCVI-DCCXXVIII (706-728)	In Dutch
I/3/54	Vol. XXVII, 1662-1665	Docs. DCCVI-DCCXXVIII (706-728)	In English
I/3/55	Vol. XXVIII, 1665-1667	Docs. DCCXXIX-DCCXXXVIII (729-738)	In Dutch
I/3/56	Vol. XXVIII, 1665-1667	Docs. DCCXXIX-DCCXXXVIII (729-738)	In English
I/3/57	Vol. XXIX, 1667-1670	Docs. DCCXXXIX-DCCLXVI (739-766)	In Dutch
I/3/58	Vol. XXIX, 1667-1670	Docs. DCCXXXIX-DCCLXVI (739-766)	In English
I/3/59	Vol. XXX, 1670-1672	Docs. DCCLXVIII-DCCXC (768-790)	In Dutch
I/3/60	Vol. XXXI, 1672-1673	Docs. DCCXCI-DCCCXI (791-811)	In Dutch
I/3/61	Vol. XXXII, 1673-1674	Docs. DCCCXII-DCCCXXV (812-825)	In Dutch
I/3/62	Vol. XXXIII, 1674-1675	Docs. DCCCXXVI-DCCCXXXIX (826-839)	In Dutch
I/3/63	Vol. XXXIV, 1674-1679	Docs. DCCCXL-DCCCLXXII (840-872)	In Dutch
I/3/64	Vol. XXXV, 1679-1681	Docs. DCCCLXXIII-DCCCXCIX (873-899)	In Dutch
I/3/65	Vol. XXXVI, 1681-1683	Docs. DCD-DCDXXIX (900-929)	In Dutch
I/3/66	Vol. XXXVII, 1683-1684	Docs. DCDXXX-DCDXLVI (930-946)	In Dutch
I/3/67	Vol. XXXVIII, 1684-1686	Docs. DCDXLVII-DCDLXIII (947-963)	In Dutch
I/3/68	Vol. XXXIX, 1685-1686	Docs. DCDLXV-DCDLXXVI (965-976)	In Dutch
I/3/69	Vol. XL, 1686	Docs. DCDLXXVII-DCDXC (977-990)	In Dutch
I/3/70	Vol. XLI, 1687-1689	Docs. DCDXCI-MXX (991-1020)	In Dutch
I/3/71	Vol. XLII, 1688-1689	Docs. MXXI-MLIV (1021-1054)	In Dutch
I/3/72	Vol. XLIII, 1689	Docs. MLV-MLXXVI (1055-1076)	In Dutch
I/3/73	Vol. XLIV, 1689-1690	Docs. MLXXVII-MCXXXII (1077-1132)	In Dutch
I/3/74	Vol. XLV, 1688-1689	Docs. MCXXXIV-MCXLI (1134-1141)	In Dutch
I/3/75	Vol. XLVI, 1689-1691	Docs. MCXLII-MCLXXI (1142-1171)	In Dutch
I/3/76	Vol. XLVII, 1691-1693	Docs. MCLXXII-MCC (1172-1200)	In Dutch
I/3/77	Vol. XLVIII, 1691-1692	Docs. MCCI-MCCXXII (1201-1222)	In Dutch
I/3/78	Vol. XLIX, 1690-1693	Docs. MCIII-MCIV; MCCXXIII-MCCLXXV (1103-1104; 1223-1275)	In Dutch
I/3/79	Vol. L, 1693-1694	Docs. MCCLXXVI-MCCCI (1276-1301)	In Dutch
I/3/80	Vol. LI, 1694-1695	Docs. MCCCII-MCCCLXXVII (1302-1377)	In Dutch



I/3/81	Vol. LII, 1696-1697	Docs. MCCCLXXVIII-MCDXXXV (1378-1435)	In Dutch
I/3/82	Vol. LIII, 1696-1697	Docs. MCDXXXVI-MCDLXI (1436-1461)	In Dutch (3 in English)
I/3/83	Vol. LIV, 1697-1699	Docs. MCDLXII-MDIV (1462-1504)	In Dutch
I/3/84	Vol. LV, 1698-1699	Docs. MDV-MDXLIX (1505-1549)	In Dutch
I/3/85	Vol. LVI, 1698-1699	Docs. MDL-MDLXXXVIII (1550-1588)	In Dutch
I/3/86	Vol. LVII, 1623-1640	Items I-V [Item I is a 119 page working list of Docs. I-MCCLXXXIII (1-1283) compiled during acquisition process]	In English & Portuguese

***Dutch Records at The Hague. Collected by F.C. Danvers.***

***I/3/87-94 Second series. Letters from the XVII to India. Vols. I-IV (1-4) 1614-1700***

I/3/87	Vol. I, 1614-1620	Docs. 1-51	In Dutch
I/3/88	Vol. I, 1614-1620	Docs. 1-51	In English
I/3/89	Vol. II, 1624-1633	Docs. 52-99	In Dutch
I/3/90	Vol. II, 1624-1633	Docs. 52-99	In English
I/3/91	Vol. III, 1633-1666	Docs. 100-169	In Dutch
I/3/92	Vol. III, 1633-1666	Docs. 100-169	In English
I/3/93	Vol. IV, 1666-1700	Docs. 170-228	In Dutch
I/3/94	Vol. IV, 1666-1700	Docs. 170-228	In English

***Dutch Records at The Hague. Collected by F.C. Danvers.***

***I/3/95-106 Third series. Letters from Governor General to various factories. Vols. I-IX (1-9) 1617-1699***

I/3/95	Vol. I, 1617-1622	Docs. A-X2 (order A-Z, A1-Z1, A2-Z2 etc.)	In Dutch
I/3/96	Vol. I, 1617-1622	Docs. A-X2 (order A-Z, A1-Z1, A2-Z2 etc.)	In English
I/3/97	Vol. II, 1622-1632	Docs. Y2-Y5 (order Y2-Z2, A3-Z3, A4-Z4 etc.)	In Dutch
I/3/98	Vol. II, 1622-1632	Docs. Y2-Y5 (order Y2-Z2, A3-Z3, A4-Z4 etc.)	In English
I/3/99	Vol. III, 1633-1643	Docs. Z5-N7 (order Z5, A6-Z6, A7-N7)	In Dutch
I/3/100	Vol. III, 1633-1643	Docs. Z5-N7 (order Z5, A6-Z6, A7-N7)	In English
I/3/101	Vol. IV, 1644-1655	Docs. O7-W8 (order O7-Z7, A8-W8)	In Dutch
I/3/102	Vol. V, 1656-1662	Docs. X8-C10 (order X8-Z8, A9-Z9, A10-C10)	In Dutch
I/3/103	Vol. VI, 1663-1666	Docs. D10-I11 (order D10-Z10, A11-I11)	In Dutch
I/3/104	Vol. VII, 1668-1680	Docs. J11-I13 (order J11-Z11, A12-Z12, A13-I13)	In Dutch
I/3/105	Vol. VIII, 1681-1686	Docs. J13-Z14 (order J13-Z13, A14-Z14)	In Dutch
I/3/106	Vol. IX, 1686-1699	Docs. A15-K17 (order A15-Z15, A16-Z16, A17-K17)	In Dutch

**Appendix 5: Transcription of Document B\*\*\*\*\*7<sup>64</sup> in *BL: IOR I/3/100 Dutch Records at The Hague v.100***

From the researcher's investigations at the British Library in July 2003, the following document was transcribed from the English translation that Danvers had made in 1895 of the Dutch transcription he had had made at the General State Archives in The Hague. This document is one of a number of documents that were not listed in Danvers' working list, therefore its existence has not been known through the finding aids produced to date for Danvers' documents. Ironically, this document is available on microfilm and could be borrowed through any Mormon Family History Library across the world, if researchers knew of its existence. The following transcription is included by the researcher to illustrate the inadequacy of the current finding aid, and the extraordinary find that Danvers had made over a century ago. The series Danvers collated for this document had the nomenclature *Letters from Governor General to various factories. Vol. III, 1633-1643*. The researcher has not been able to identify the volume in which this document was contained in the VOC Archives.

An excerpt of the eleventh paragraph "Should you meet with civilised tribes ..." was published in 1985 by the Tasmanian Government (Walker, 1985, p. 10), where the excerpt was from a translation made in 1965<sup>65</sup> of *Abel Tasman's Journal* published by Frederik Muller & Co in 1898. However when the two versions are compared the 1965 translation is very different to the 1895 translation obtained by Danvers. More importantly, Danvers maintained the connection between his translations of the document with their originals in the VOC Archives. The value Danvers added was maintaining the link of the translation to the context of the creator of the original document.

---

<sup>64</sup> *BL: IOR I/3/100 Dutch Records at the Hague v.100*. Collected by FC Danvers. Third Series. Vol. III. Translations. Letters from the Governor General to Various Factories. 1633-1643. Document B\*\*\*\*\*7.

<sup>65</sup> *Abel Janszoon Tasman's Journal: on his discovery ... being photolithographic facsimiles of the original manuscript in the Colonial Archives at The Hague with an English translation and facsimiles of original maps; ...* edited by J.E. Heeres, LL. D. ... Amsterdam: Frederick Muller & Co. (F. Adama Van Scheltema and Anton Mensino), 1898. Los Angeles: N.A. Kovach, 1965. [A Project Gutenberg of Australia eBook, accessed 31 July 2008 <http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks06/0600571h.html> ]

**Document B\*\*\*\*\*7 in BL: IOR I/3/100 Dutch Records at The Hague v.100**

*Instructions for the Captain Commander Abel Jansz. Tasman, the chief mate Franchoyz Jacobsz. Visscher, and the Council on board “the Heemskerck” and the flute “de Zeehaen”, on their voyage for the discovery and exploration of the Land of the South, the South East Coast of New Guinea, and the adjacent islands.*

*[signed by Antonio van Diemen<sup>66</sup>, Cornelis van der Lyn, Joan Maetsuycker, Justus Schouten, Solomon Sweers, Cornelis Witsen and Pieter Broeck.*

*In the Castle of Batavia, August 13<sup>th</sup>, 1642.]*

It is a well known fact that a hundred and fifty years ago but a third of the earth surface was known (divided into Europe, Asia and Africa) and that the then unknown part of the world, generally called America or the New World has been discovered in the time of the kings of Castile and Portugal, (Ferdinand the Catholic and Don Emanuel) by the renowned heroes of the sea, Christoph Colombus and Americus Vespurus, whilst about the same time the unknown coasts and islands of Africa and the East Indies were for the first time visited by the famous Vasco de Gama and other Portuguese navigators. The enormous benefits derived from these discoveries and the increase in power, wealth and commerce, they have entailed on the countries of Spain and Portugal are well known and rightly valued by all reasonable persons, and should lead many other potentates of Europe to imitate their example of these princes.

However up to the present time no serious attempt has been made by any of the Christian states to discover the remaining portion of the earth, which is situated in its Southern part and is probably as large as either the old or the New World, and contains as many fruitful countries as the other portions, whilst it is more than probable that in the genial latitudes they have important populations. And as many lands between 15 and 40 degrees north of the equator are rich in mines and precious metals it may be inferred that such is also the case in the countries of the same latitude south of it. The gold and silver mines of Peron, Chili Monomotapa or Sofala would serve to warrant this supposition.

It being further evident that no other European colony is better situated than the town of Batavia for the discovery of these lands. Our predecessors Jan Pieters. Coen and Hendrick Brouwer had intended to send out expeditions for this purpose, but were prevented by more important matters. Our directors are equally convinced of the significance of similar undertakings, and we have therefore resolved in council that two suitable vessels could at present be conveniently spared from our naval forces in India and shall be equipped for this voyage of discovery, the command of which we intrust to you, confident that you will execute your commission with such wisdom, discretion and patience that it may be entirely successful.

We will not enlarge on the different schemes purposed to us by experienced navigators, the copies of which we enclose and which you will be able to consult at leisure. We will only give general instructions for your guidance with full liberty to alter them according to circumstances, and by the advice from your council.

---

<sup>66</sup> Governor General Antonio van Diemen died 19 Apr 1645 (Heeres, 1899, p. XVI footnote 3).

The vessels will both leave at the same time, and traverse the Straits of Sunda with the utmost speed in order to get as soon as possible into the S.E. trade winds. You will then take your course westward to the island of Mauritius, and keeping Diego Rodrigos in view, anchor in the South Eastern harbour in front of the fort Frederick Hendrick, and deliver our dispatches and diverse merchandises to Commander Adrian van der Stel, take on provisions of water, wood and other necessaries, but remain not above 14 or 16 days, or at the latest till the 15<sup>th</sup> of October, taking special care of the health of the crew and giving them fresh meat and foodstuffs, as we have ordered Commander van der Stel to provide in plenty and give permission for the catching and shooting of game. After leaving Mauritius you will sail as for South as the weather and wind will allow, till, at about 36 or 38 degree lat : South, you will enter into the region of variable tradewinds and you will there meet with some trouble to get through a Southern course into the westerly tradewinds. Then keep in the same direction till you meet the Land of the South at about 52 or 54 degrees South, and if at that latitude you find no land, you will set the course due East and continue the same till you reach the East point of New Guinea or one of the Solomon islands, situated at 220° longitude and you will find the undiscovered land.

It is necessary to note down all continents, islands, gulfs, bays, inlets, rivers, shallows, sandbanks, sands, rocks, cliffs, etc. which you may meet, to describe them carefully and draw their outline, for which purpose we have appointed a draughtsman, and also to state minutely their latitude and longitude, their direction and the distances between the several coasts, islands, capes, heads, points, bays and rivers, their notable mountains, and the marks by which they may be recognized, as well as the depths and shallows of the coasts, the hidden rocks, the abrupt steeps at the points and how best to avoid them; whether the grounds be hard or soft, sharp, steep or even; where to land; how to recognize the best anchorage in the bays and inlets, how far the openings and rivers stretch and to what extent they are navigable. It is also necessary to take account of the most frequent direction of the wind in those parts, the currents, and whether ebb and flow are regulated by the moon or the wind; the changes produced by the monsoons, rains and droughts; in one word everything which may be useful to subsequent navigators. The season of long days and short nights will be most suitable for these several observations, so that we advise no time should be uselessly wasted at any particular spot, but the best use be made of the Summer Season, when you will be able to navigate by night as well as by day, so as to make as many discoveries as possible in the shortest space of time.

As we mentioned before the land to be discovered lies to the East or should no land be found you will continue your course eastward as far as the utmost point of New Guinea or the Salomon's islands unless it would be found better to sail as far as the Eastpoint of the Land of the South, such as it is known at present, or to the island of St. Peter and Francis, and then to change your course to northward and keep along the East coast to see whether this Land of the South is joined to New Guinea at a point above Cape Reernier (Return) or whether it is separated from it by a Strait or Canal, in which case its westerly coast might easily be found from here; but as it seems most probable that these lands are connected, and as it is uncertain of the voyage along the east coast could be continued as far as New Guinea on accounts of the Easterly tradewinds, and as in that case you would be obliged to return to Batavia, we think our first scheme more suitable, and might at all events lead to the discovery of a passage from the Indian Ocean into the South Sea and a short cut to Chili. Having then arrived at the Salomon islands or at a point from 100 to 200 miles to the East of them, you will then direct your course along the East coast of New Guinea, thence change it to a north and westerly direction, as far as the island of Gilolo, where we feel sure you will find some channels or passages leading to the South. To make this trial successful you will try to be at that place in the doubting (variable)? month (April) to take advantage of the variable tradewinds and cross on

the inside of the islands of Cerum, Canwer, Grey and Aru, to reach Cape Reerneur (Return) which must all be accomplished before the East Monsoon, as otherwise you will find many difficulties in your way. After reaching Cape Reerneur (18° South) you will sail along the coast as far as the Willem river (21° South) situated close to the island Eendracht (Union) making all the minute observations which are specified above, especially investigating whether between New Guinea and the island Eendracht are any canals communicating with the South, which is a most important point. Already in 1636 Commander Gerrit Pool has been entrusted with instructions for the discovery of these matters, copy of which we enclose.<sup>67</sup>

We expect you will find yourselves at Willem river about the month of May or June of next year, from thence you will sail direct for Java, along the South coast, cross between Westpoint and Prince island, and through the Straits of Sunda, return to Batavia.

For the security of the many precious lives you have under your charge, you will see that a careful look out be kept constantly. More especially when nearing the coast, and a large reward should be promised to whomever first discovers new land or unknown rocks and shallows. In the other matters concerning the navigation of your ship and the discipline of the crew we trust to your great experience, your prudence and the wisdom of the council.

We further recommend you always to choose for anchoring the safest and most protected spots. We have shipped for this purpose two “tingongs” which will enable you to discover the several topographical conditions of the coast. Great care must be exercised in landing. We know that these Southern lands are inhabited by very rough and wild people, it will be expedient therefore always to be armed, for experience has taught us, that, in no part of the wild savages can be trusted, they immediately conjecture, that the strangers who so suddenly appear among them, come only with hostile intentions. The careless trusting to their supposed friendliness has been the cause that many of the pioneers of America have been cruelly murdered. In meeting these savages you will approach them with intimations of goodwill, overlook any small act of robbery they may commit, and endeavour by kindly intercourse to obtain information respecting their country and the facilities for commerce. After a short time you will know what kind of productions and animals the country contains, the appearance of the people, their dwellings, customs, manners, clothing, food, education, religion, government etc. if they are peaceable or inclined to war, of gentle or savage disposition. You will show them some of the specimens of the goods of your cargo and offer them some in exchange for theirs, noting if they show any predilection for a particular article. All these matters should be entered into a diary, and an account kept of every thing you see or hear, so that on your return you may be able to give us a minute and exhausting report.

Should you meet with civilized tribes, (which we doubt), you will at once inform them that you have come for the purpose of trade and enter into negotiations [sic] for exchanging your commodities. You will then carefully watch what articles of commerce they prefer. Also whether they have gold and silver and the value they attach to it. Should they offer you any in exchange you must pretend not to care for it, leaving them in ignorance of their true value, and showing them some copper, pretending that the latter mineral is considered more precious among us.

You will strictly prevent any insolent behaviour of your crew towards the natives, and allow no deprivations of their property, no insult to their wives, and allow no person to be carried away against their desire, but should you find any inclined to accompany you, you will bring

---

<sup>67</sup> A transcription of Pool’s instruction is in Heeres, J.E. (1899) *The Part Borne by the Dutch in the Discovery of Australia 1606-1765* p.64-71. Pool was killed on the south-west coast of New Guinea 28 April 1636 (Heeres, 1899, p.64).

them to us at Batavia. If during this voyage any fruitful or rich countries or islands be discovered, you may rely that the commanders as well as the deserving among the crew will be richly rewarded by the Company for their excellent services.

The crew of the two ships consist of 110 hands, 60 on the “Heemskerk” and 50 on the “Zeehaen”. They have been victualled [sic] with all necessary provisions for 12 months and with rice for the space of 18 months. See that the ordinary rations be daily distributed, and a certain allowance of arrack. We have shipped some special arrack to give the sailors during the cold weather. The greatest watch should be kept on the distribution of water and no waste allowed, as want of it might cause the failure of the enterprise, and oblige you to return to Batavia without its purpose having been achieved.

In order that all these instructions may be carefully carried out, order and discipline be maintained among the crew; and the voyage may be conducted to the greatest glory and profit of the Company we have appointed the Honorable Abel Jansz. Tasman, commander of both ships, authorizing him to carry the flag from the topmast of “The Heemskerk”, to convene the council, of which he will be the president, and commanding all officers and sailors on both vessels, with no exception, to respect, obey and recognize the same Abel Tasman as their commander, and in all occasions to assist him with good council, diligent service and faithful obedience for the furtherance of this voyage of discovery, in such manner as it behoves trusty servants, who on their return will account to us for their behaviour.

The council for these vessels is composed of the following persons:

Commander Abel Jansz. Tasman	Perpetual President
Captain Yde L. Yerixsz.	On the Heemskerk
Captain Gerrit Jansz.	On the Zeehaen
Chief pilot Francois Jacobsz. [Visscher]	On the Heemskerk
Factor Isaac Gilsemans	On the Zeehaen
Underfactor Abraham Coopmans Secretary	On the Heemskerk
Chief mate Hendrick ...	On the Zeehaen

In matters relating to the navigation of the vessel and the execution of our orders the president shall have two votes, in matters connected with the exercise of justice, the superior officers of both vessels shall also be admitted to the council, according to the direction of our Directors, but in matters connected with the course of the vessel and the discovery of the new lands the Chief pilot Francois Jacobs will have the casting vote, and his advice be duly considered, the present voyage having been proposed by him. All resolutions will be duly registered, immediately signed and executed without delay.

In case of the death of Commander Tasman, Captain Yde ‘L. Jercksen shall take his place and in every respect act in accordance with the instructions and intentions of his predecessor. The vessels will keep close together at sea, and a code of signals be devised for communication, which is of the highest importance, in case of being separated by storms.

In conclusion pious wishes for success and a safe return.

In the castle of Batavia, August 13<sup>th</sup> 1642.

Was signed

Antonio van Diemen, Cornelis van der Lyn, Joan Maetsuycker, Justus Schouten, Salomon Sweers, Cornelis Witsen and Pieter Broeck.

## **Appendix 6: Sample pages from the proposed full finding aid for *BL: IOR I/3/1 - 106 Dutch Records at The Hague v.1-v.106***

From the researcher's investigations at the British Library in July 2003, a preliminary inventory listing the 2,646 documents that Danvers had copied was produced. The result is a 298-page document. While too big to be included as a print appendix to this thesis, sample pages from this draft finding aid are included here. It is hoped that the full finding aid can be published at a future date. In addition, a short finding aid (Appendix 4) was produced, based on the information from the full finding aid.

The full finding aid will assist users to access the 2,646 documents in the 106 volumes of Danvers' *Dutch Records at The Hague*<sup>68</sup> (Danvers, 1895a). Danvers' working list (see Appendix 1) contains details about the VOC volumes he searched through, however he did not select documents from all the volumes through which he scanned. Therefore Danvers' working list (Appendix 1) is a partial list of the 564 volumes through which he searched, whereas the full finding aid compiled by the researcher is a list of the 2,646 documents contained in the 106 bound volumes of *BL: IOR I/3/1-I/3/106 Dutch Records at The Hague v.1-v.106*. These sample pages from the full finding aid are presented here for the first time.

### Notes to each column in the finding aid

Columns 1-6. Columns 1-4 contain details of the documents transcribed in the original language, mostly in the Dutch language. Columns 3-6 contain details of the documents translated from the original language in to the English language. Each volume in the transcription series matches a volume in the translation series. However, not all of the transcription series volumes were translated. The descriptions in Columns 2-6 were transcribed from handwritten notes made by the researcher when she viewed all 106 volumes (in hardcopy) in June/July 2003 at the British Library, London.

Column 7 is a transcription of the working index used by Danvers' and his assistant over the years 1894-1895, which is now found in *BL: IOR I/3/86 Dutch Records at The Hague v.86*. The researcher transcribed the contents of this column from a photocopy of the microfilm of the 119-page index.

---

<sup>68</sup> Full current citation: *British Library (BL): India Office Records (IOR) I/3/1-I/3/106 Dutch Records at The Hague v.1-v.106*

*I/3/3 Dutch Records at the Hague. First series. Volume II. Letters from India 1607-1616. Docs #XXXII-LXXVIII (32-78). [In Dutch]. Collected by FC Danvers [on spine]*

*I/3/4 Dutch Records at the Hague. First series. Volume II. Translations. Letters from India 1607-1616. Docs #XXXII-LXXVIII (32-78). [In English]. Collected by FC Danvers [spine fallen on]*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I/3/3	In original language	Description [transcribed by the researcher in June 2003] from actual volume.	Date	I/3/4	Translation into English.	Entry from I/3/86 (current index to the I/3 series)
	Leaves numbered unless otherwise noted	Note: at the top of page 1, of both volumes, written in pencil is the number 165.			Leaves numbered left hand bottom of page unless otherwise noted	
						1607-1609 – Vol. 6 – Fleet of Pieter Willems Verhoef & Pieter Both [cont'd]
XXXII.	#1-4	Letter from Wemmer von Bercham at Massulipatam to Adolf Thomas at Paliacatte. – 20 Jun 1612.	20 Jun 1612	XXXII.	1p (not numbered)	Letter from Wemmer van Berchem – 20 Jun 1612.
XXXIII.	1p (not numbered)	Ref only: “The printed instructions to Governor-General P. Both”		XXXIII.	1p (not numbered)	Instructions to Pieter Both first GG
XXXIV.	Same page	Ref only: “A Portuguese letter”		XXXIV.	Same page	Portuguese letters D.J. da Silva & Pieter Both also Van Caerden 16-20 March 1612
XXXV.	Same page	Ref only: “A Portuguese letter”		XXXV.	Same page	Correspondence .... 19 May – 1 June 1612.
XXXVI.	2p (not numbered)	Ordinance written by Hans Baron on ship “Gelderland”. – 8 Mar 1612.	8 Mar 1612	XXXVI.	1p (not numbered)	Ordinance of 8 March 1612
XXXVII.	#1-3	Short account of the towns of Atchin asked for at Bantam.		XXXVI.	2p (not numbered)	Voyage of W.W. Hermanesz. To India 1601-3. Short account of Achin & Bantan & Eeron.
						Vol. 7 – Magellan E.I.C.
XXXVIII.		Several letters from Europe				Memorandum 36/9C.
XXXVIII. 1.	#1-2	Latter dated 15 Aug 1609	15 Aug 1609	XXXVIII. 1.	1p (not numbered)	
XXXVIII. 2.	#3	Letter from Rochelle, 1 Aug.		XXXVIII. 2.	1p (not numbered)	
XXXVIII. 3.	#4	Letter from Genoa, 26 Jul		XXXVIII. 3.	1p (not numbered)	
XXXVIII. 4.	#5	Letter from Lisbon, 24 July 1609	24 July 1609	XXXVIII. 4.	1p (not numbered)	
XXXIX.	#1-3	Letter from King of Atchin to Prince Mauritius de Massau.		XXXIX.	2p (not numbered)	Letter from the King of Achin ? 1616 [? Is Danvers' note]
XL.	#1-7	Letter from King of Atchin to Frederick Hendrik, Prince of Orange, containing an allowance for free trade.		XL.	3p (not numbered)	Letter from the King of Achin.
XLI.	#1-5	Letter from Mauritius, Prince of Orange et al. s' Gravenhage, to Emperor and King of Japan. – 18 Dec 1610.	18 Dec 1610	XLI.	3p (not numbered)	Letter from Prince Maurits – 18 Dec 1616.
XLII.		Documents relating to the ... of the English and Dutch E.I. Companies		XLII.		4 letters correspondence with English.
XLII. 1.	#1-4	Procuration given by the Hon. Most Powerful Gentlemen the States to their most Powerful Representatives to the Conference with the English. –	14 Feb 1615	XLII. 1.	2p (not numbered)	



		14 Feb 1615.				
XLII. 2.	#5-13	Answer and first ... handed by the Deputies of the E.I. Company at the Conference at the Hague to the English Commissaries on 18 Feb, 1615. (Starts: "to help you to recapitulate the last conference held in England...")	18 Feb 1615	XLII. 2.	4p (not numbered)	
XLII. 3.	#14-19	First writing handed by the English Commissaries on 16 Feb at the Hague to the rep of the Most Powerful Gentlemen the States and those of the East India Company.		XLII. 3.	3p (not numbered)	
XLII. 4.	#20-28	Item entitled: Document in French. (Starts: Recapitulating the conference held in England...")		XLII. 4.	4p (not numbered)	
XLIII.	#1-9	Testimony by P. Carpentier, Jacques Specse, Gerrick Fredericksz. Druyff, D.A. Strobautus by attestor Usys. Corn. Vleyshausser, Secretary. – 21 Feb 1622.	21 Feb 1622	XLIII.	4p (not numbered)	Letters from the Dutch Company 21 Feb 1622.
XLIV.	#1-5	Report by P. de Carpentier, Willen van Antzen, D.A. Strobanus. – 13 Dec 1621	13 Dec 1621	XLIV.	2p (not numbered)	Letters from the Dutch Company – 14 Dec 1622.
XLV.	#1-8	Complaint about the Competition of the English, report by Gerrick Frederyksz. Druyff, Jacques Caetely, W. Coroningham, F. Braseman to Jan Pietersz. Coen. – 8 Feb 1622.	8 Feb 1622	XLV.	3p (not numbered)	Letter from Mr. Druiff – 8 Feb 1622.
XLVI.	#1-8	English arguments in the case of George Bruey, as he was brought into court by several Fukabilauts under the Government of the Dutch Company at Batavia by Henry Nanly, Richard Bix, George Museliauis. – 13 April 1626	13 Apr 1626	XLVI.	2p (not numbered)	Correspondence with English.
XLVII.	#1-4	Declaration by Jacques Specse (Hans Putnam, Sebald Wouderer) authenticated Mr. Wraerck. – 11 Feb 1626.	11 Feb 1626	XLVII	2p (not numbered)	Letter by the Dutch Co. – 11 Feb 1626
XLVIII.	#1-11	Account of the meeting of the Dutch and English in Batavia (Jacques Specse, P. Vleck), - 14 Feb 1626.	14 Feb 1626	XLVIII.	4p (not numbered)	Letter by the Dutch Co. – 14 Feb 1626. (English sent Press Gangs on shore in Banda to press men for crews).
XLIX.	#1-11	Report by Jacques Specse, P. Vleck on their visit to the English factory on 14 July 1626.	14 Jul 1626	XLIX.	3p (not numbered)	Letter from Dutch Co – 17 June 1626 (No. 8)
L.	#1-10	Letters by Jacques Specse, Antonio van Dieman at Batavia. – 15 Sep 1626	15 Sep 1626	L.	3p (not numbered)	Letter from Dutch Co. – 15 Sep 1626 (No. 10)
						1602-1612 – Vol. I – E.I. Co Invoice, Bills of Lading, Accounts
						1607-1612 – Vol. II – E.I. Co – Arranged according to Factories – Atchin 1608-10; Jambi 1610; Borneo; Sucadaux 1608-09; Coromandel, Ceylon, Surat 1607-12.
LI.	1p (not numbered)	Reference only: Copy of the original letter at No. XXVI, p. 1-3.		LI.	1p (not numbered)	Letter from Pieter Isaacs Eijloff – 14 Nov 1608. [same as

						XXVI added by Danvers]
LII.	#1-11	Letter from P.T. Eyloff, Lucas Janss and others at Masulipatam to the Admiral of the United East India Company at Cochin. – 15 Feb 1608.	15 Feb 1608	LII.	4p (not numbered)	Letter from Masulipatam – 15 Feb 1608
LIII.	#1-11	Letter from Pieter Tsachss Eyloff, Masulipatam. May 1608.	May 1608	LIII.	3p (not numbered)	Letter from Masulipatam – May 1608.
LIV.	#1-7	Memorandum of the merchandise asked for in Japan.		LIV.	4p (not numbered)	List of commercial articles ...
LV.	#1-3	Letter written at Candy by the Emperor of Ceylon, rec'd 28 Mar 1610; and answer written 30 Mar 1610 by Willem Janss or Abraham Fonteyn. See LIX, p. 1.	30 Mar 1610	LV.	2p (not numbered)	Letter from Sup. Of Ceylon & reply
LVI.	#1-4	Letter written by P.G. Borgonje at Tierapopelie. May 1610	May 1610	LVI.	1p (not numbered)	Extract letters from Borjanje - May 1610.
LVII.	#1-2	Letter from P.G. Borgonje at Tierapopelie to Arent Maertensf and Willem Janss. – 24 May 1610.	24 May 1610	LVII.	1p (not numbered)	Extract letters from Borjanje – 24 May 1610.
LVIII.	1p (not numbered)	Reference only: Copy of the letter from Mr. Van Deynssen under no. XXV, 1-7.		LVIII.	1p (not numbered)	Letters from Mr. Van Deniysen from Berkamprov – 17 Dec 1607.
LIX.	#1-11	Letter from Abraham Fonteyne at Velour to Jacques l'Hermite at Bantam. May 1610.	May 1610	LIX.	4p (not numbered)	Letters from Abraham Fontegne – 31 May 1610.
LX.	#1-7	Letter from Jan van Wesick at Masulipatam to the G.G. or the Factor at Bantam. – 15 Jun 1610.	15 Jun 1610	LX.	3p (not numbered)	Extract letter from Mr. Jan van Wrosick – 15 June 1610.
LXI.	1p (not numbered)	Reference only: the same as the copy at no. LIX.		LXI.	1p (not numbered)	Extract letter without signature – 8 Jun 1610.
LXII.	#1-7	Instructions to Jacob Dirckz Corhenhoff viz his voyage to Arracan by Jan van Wesick, Willam Janss, Anthonio Schorer		LXII.	4p (not numbered)	Letter from Jan Van Wresick to Corbenhoek – 1610.
LXIII.	#1-20	Letter from Marcellis Michialss Boshouwer in Ceylon to the Directors of the E.I. Company. – 28 Mar 1612.	28 Mar 1612	LXIII.	5p (not numbered)	Letter of Mr. Veoshouwer – March 1612.
						1612 – Vol. III – These documents relate almost exclusively to the Moluccas and Banda, and have not been searched through for copies of documents, being satisfied for the time with what de Jonge and Tiele have written on the subject.
LXIV.	#1-8	Letter from Jacques l'Hermite at Bantam to the Directors at Amsterdam. – 28 Jan 1608.	28 Jan 1608	LXIV.	3p (not numbered)	Extract letter from Mr. L'Hermite – 28 Jan 1608.
						1612 – Vol. IV – This volume has only been searched relative to Siam and Japan.
LXV.	#1-7	Letter from Cornelis van Wyeuroche and Maertens Houtman at Judea (Siam?) to Hendrick Janssen, factor at Patani. - 3 May 1612.	3 May 1612	LXV.	3p (not numbered)	Extract letter from Maerten Houtman from Judja (Siam) – 3 May 1612.
LXVI.	#1-8	Letter from Cornelis van	2 Sep	LXVI.	3p (not	Letter from Maerten

		Wyeuroche in Judea (Siam?) to Hendrick Janss at Patani. – 2 Sep 1612	1612		numbered)	Houtman and other – 2 Sep 1612.
LXVII.	#1-8	Letter from Maarten Houtman in Judea (Siam?) to Hendrick Janssen at Patani. – 5 Nov 1612	5 Nov 1612	LXVII.	3p (not numbered)	Extract letters from Maerten Houtman – 5 Nov 1612; 7 Dec 1612 & 26 Dec 1612.
						1613-1614 – Vol. I (no vol. 2) only Japan, Arabic & Coromandel searched.
LXVIII.	#1-15	Letter written at Langesachi. – 3 Nov 1610.	3 Nov 1610	LXVIII.	4p (not numbered)	Letter from Nagasaki – 3 Nov 1610.
						LXVIII. Extract letter from Jacques Speox – 29 Dec 1614 (copied)
LXIX.	#1-49	Letter from Wemmer van Berchem at Masulipatnam to Matheus Couteels at Bantam. Aug 1613.	Aug 1613	LXIX	16p (not numbered)	Letter from Mr. Bercheur – Aug 1613.
LXX. 1.	#1-6	Letter from Cornelis de Heda at Naraspor to Wemmer van Bercham at Masulipatna. – 20 Oct 1612.	20 Oct 1612	LXX. 1.	1p (not numbered)	Letter from Cornelis de Heda – 20 Oct 1612
LXX. 2.	#7-10	Letter from Cornelis Claus de Heda, Naraspor to Wemmer van Bercham, Massulipatam. – 14 Jan 1613.	14 Jan 1613	LXX. 2.	2p (not numbered)	Ibid - 14 Jan 1613
LXX. 3.	#11-14	Letter from J.L. Vossio, Cornelis de Heda, Naraspor, to Wemmer van Berchem, Director of the Coast of Chormandel, Masulipatam. – 18 Apr 1613.	18 Apr 1613	LXX. 3.	2p (not numbered)	Ibid - 18 Apr 1613
LXX. 4.	#15-17	Letter from Cornelis de Heda at Narospor. – 23 May 1613.	23 May 1613	LXXX. 4.	1p (not numbered)	Ibid - 23 May 1613
LXXI.	#1-7	Letters from the Sabandan and Governor at Surathe to Wemmer van Bercham at Massulipatam. 1614.	1614	LXXI.	3p (not numbered)	Letter – the Saukhatam of Surat to Mr. Van Bercheur A.H. 1023.
						1615-16 – Vol. II (vol. I not searched) Voyage of Mr. De Haze and Borneo only searched.
LXXII.	#1-4	Letter from King of Candy to Hans de Hase at Masulipatam. – 14 Mar 1615.	14 Mar 1615	LXXII.	2p (not numbered)	Letter from King of Ceylon – 14 March 1615.
LXXIII.	#1-4	Letter from Jans de Haze at Masulipatan to the Emperor of Ceylon. – 16 Jan 1615.	16 Jan 1615	LXXIII.	2p (not numbered)	Letter to King of Ceylon – 16 Jan 1615
LXXIV.	#1-6	Letter from King of Arracan to G.G. Pieter Both. – 1 Dec 1614.	1 Dec 1614	LXXIV.	3p (not numbered)	Letter from the King of Arracan – 1 Dec 1614.
						1615-16 – Vol. III
LXXV.	#1-2	Letter from Abram Sherck, Jamby. – 6 Nov 1615.	6 Nov 1615	LXXV.	1p (not numbered)	Letter from Sterck – 6 Nov 1615
LXXVI.	#1-22	Letter from Audries Soury, Jamby. – 10 Jan 1616.	10 Jan 1616	LXXVI.	7p (not numbered)	Letter from Sourey – 10 Jan 1616
LXXVII.	#1-13	Letter from P. van den Broecke at Bantam to the Directors at Amsterdam. – 20 Sep 1615.	20 Sep 1615	LXXVII.	4p (not numbered)	Letter from Pieter Broecke – 20 Sep 1615
LXXVIII.	#1-22	Letter from P. van den Broecke at Bantam to the Directors at Amsterdam. – 15 Dec 1616.	15 Dec 1616	LXXVIII.	7p (not numbered)	Letter from Pieter Broecke – 15 Dec 1616.