ISSN 1125-5218
Fascicolo 1
gennaio - giugno 2011

Periodico di proprietà dell'Ateneo

SAPIENZA
UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA

DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE DOCUMENTARIE, LINGUISTICO - FILOLOGICHE E GEOGRAFICHE

SEMESTRALE DI STUDI E RICERCHE DI GEOGRAFIA

1

IN PRIMO PIANO

LA COSTRUZIONE DELLE BIOGRAFIE TERRITORIALI: ARCHIVI E RAPPRESENTAZIONI

a cura di Marco Maggioli

Geography and credibility in publishers' archives

Geografia e credibilità degli archivi degli editori
Géographie et crédibilité des archives des éditeurs

Charles W.J. Withers[*]

> «The archive is a special place for making knowledge, but it is a contradictory one. It is a place of memory and a place of loss. It is a place of power and a place of weakness. It is a place of excitement and a place of tedium». (Ogborn, 2011. P. 88)
>
> «There is no political power without control of the archive, if not of memory». (Derrida, 1996. P. 4)

1. Introduction: archives, books, credibility and geography at work

The archive has been of central concern, within geography and beyond, for some little while now. In addition to works, like Ogborn, which stress the term's inherent contradictions, or which emphasise, as does Derrida, connections between the archive as a topographical site and as a nominative space of power, other studies have addressed new post-modern conceptions of archives as political responsibilities as well as scholarly repositories, or explored the archive as a site of memory, part of the emergent institutions of civil and political authority, and as places of contemplative scholarly refuge and knowledge production (in a wide literature, see for example Barata, 2004; Cook, 1997, 2001, 2002; Cook and Schwartz 2002; Foucault 1972; Gagen, Lorimer and Vasudevan, 2007; Hofman, 2005; Ketelaar, 2001, 2005, 2007; Lorimer, 2010; Ogborn, 2004; Richards, 1993; Steedman, 2001; Withers, 2002).

At the same time, recent work within book history has identified as central concerns the materiality of books and the many «instabilities of print» (McKitterick, 2003. p. 217). Knowledge about our world is indissolubly linked to the words we use to print that world (Grafton, 2009). Printed books are commonplace taken-for-granted objects; things written, published and read. But they are often also objects reviled, written upon rather than written about (Daston, 2004), banned and even burned as embodiments of political sedition

[*] Institute of Geography, University of Edinburgh, Drummond Street, Edinburgh EH8 9XP, UK.

and counter-cultural opinion (Polastron, 2009). And yet whilst books are the subject of enormous and diverse scholarly attention and as we have come to understand the place of books in history – books as history (Pearson 2008) – others have cautioned about books being history, superseded by the information systems of the digital age (Cope and Phillips 2006; Gomez 2007).

Here, as in other respects, there are important parallels with archives and implications for geographical research. Where, once, archives were just physical sites for the housing of dead certainties, digital archives have transformed questions of access and archival authority. Scholars no longer have to travel to access sources: books, and other scholarly materials, can be scrutinised from distance (Barata, 2004). Digital archives and digital access to printed and manuscript material can mean that for some, writing geography – as an act of authorship and as an authoritative act – no longer means being in the archive. But where questions of access might make physical presence less vital, working with archival material remains central to the credibility of authorship, to the substance of the claims we make as authors in geography. Archives can help disclose those questions of authorship and of authoritativeness that lie behind books' making. So, too, other matters such as editing and the involvement of the publisher as redactive agent in the production of printed texts can be revealed.

These matters of archival authority, authorial position and scholarly credibility are the basis to this short paper. My central concern is with the idea of credibility in and beyond the archive. I draw in this respect upon the work of Osborne who, whilst recognising the contradictoriness and power inherent in the archive, stresses both the «ordinariness of the archive» and «the principle of the archive» (Osborne, 1999. PP. 52, 53). He calls for a more prosaic (but no-less-theorised) notion of the archive as an interpretative space: «Our historical sociology of the archive would do better to see things more in the technological terms of the sociology of power. For those who work in the historical disciplines, the archive is akin to the laboratory of the natural scientists. Perhaps the archive is even akin to what Bruno Latour would call a *centre of calculation*; except that what goes on there is less likely to be calculation as such than a certain art of deposition, preservation and – for the archivist and the historian, if more so the latter – interpretation. A centre of interpretation, then; that is what the archive is» (Osborne, 1999, p. 52).

At the same time, notes Osborne, «we might see the archive as a principle of *credibility*. As a principle of credibility the archive does need to exist as a real place, but, more than this, it functions as a sort of bottom-line resource in the carving-out of claims to disciplinarity. To take the most obvious example, the discipline of history, for instance, in whatever from, places a premium on archival credibility. One can write about the past in many ways, but unless one is unable to generate archival credibility, one is not *really* doing history. The status of such principles of credibility is at once epistemological and ethical: epistemological credibility because the archive is a site for particular kinds of knowledge, particular styles of reasoning that are as-

SEMESTRALE DI STUDI E RICERCHE DI GEOGRAFIA

sociated with it; and ethical credibility because knowledge of the archive is a sign of status, of authority, of a certain right to speak, a certain kind of author-function» (Osborne, 1999, pp. 53-4).

Drawing upon these notions, particularly the relationships between the epistemological and ethical bases to authorial credibility – that is, we as geographical authors make authoritative claims because we have been in the archive as, in turn, the archive can reveal how authoritativeness in printed books was achieved – this paper explores aspects of the material production of geographical knowledge in books. Examples from two archival collections are used to consider books not just as repositories of authoritative geographical knowledge but to suggest that books be seen as the expression of material and intellectual processes about the achievement of authority and of a certain kind of author-function.

My remarks are restricted to connections between book history, the making of geographical knowledge and the history of science and to matters of authorship, authoritative sources in knowledge claims and to author-publisher relationships. In illustration, I draw upon work in two archival holdings, both housed within the National Library of Scotland. The John Murray Archive is the extensive collection of author-publisher manuscript correspondence and other materials relating to the publishing firm of that name (http://digital.nls.uk/jma). The Bartholomew Archive relates to the world-leading Edinburgh-based cartographic firm of Bartholomew and Son and its work between 1820 and 2002 (http://digital.nls.uk.bartholomew). My concerns overall are several-fold: to illustrate how archives may be seen as sites for the interpretation of credibility (epistemological and authorial); to highlight the need for our own archival and ethical credibility as researchers and authors using archives; and to expose to further scrutiny the notion of printed books as themselves almost archival – a synthesis of ideas, authorial practices, publishers' responsibilities and audiences' expectations. Before turning to these questions, let me turn to the parallel issue of credibility as a central feature in book history and in the history of science.

2. Book history, authorship and credibility

Three important works signal to what has become understood as the geography of the book. Sustained attention dates from Febvre and Martin's examination of the impact and dissemination of printing in Europe from the mid fifteenth century (Febvre and Martin, 1976 (1958)). Febvre and Martin showed how printing flourished and spread in relation to the institutions of the Church and the worlds of law and scholarship and also, but for different works, from the demands of popular markets. Their account was concerned with the local circumstances of supply and demand, with variations within nations in terms, for example, of printing associated with the needs and restrictions of the Reformation and the Counter Reformation, and with the making of empires in print. In *The printing press as an agent of change* (1979),

Eisenstein departed from this diffusionist perspective, seeing printing as a revolutionary not an evolutionary phenomenon. Printing, Eisenstein argued, brought both fixity and standardization: 'The fact that identical images, maps and diagrams could be viewed simultaneously by scattered readers constituted a kind of communications revolution in itself' (Eisenstein, 1979, p. 53). Her account of printing's revolutionary impact and claims to print fixity was in turn the subject of critical attention, notably in Johns' *The nature of the book* (Johns, 1998a). Johns' argument centred upon authors' constant concern with their credibility, with the extent to which their works varied, and with the detailed social geographies of print production. For Johns, the very nature and make-up of print shops, at once 'library, scriptorium, study, home, and workshop' (Johns, 1998a, P. 75), meant that the place of production and its constituent social relationships had a significant effect on what books actually were.

Attempts to understand the book as an object of geographical knowledge have also addressed its material basis and the nature of the geography in the book (Ogborn and Withers, 2010). Darnton's notion of the 'communications circuit', only implicitly a concern with the geographical distribution of printing processes, emphasised the productive phases in the life of books (Darnton, 1982). Employing the notion of the sociology of the text, McKenzie investigated the ways texts came into the world: as manuscript, printed book, broadsheet or even digital file, and the impact that form had on use (McKenzie, 1985). Chartier has examined the processes whereby the materiality of the book is part of the meanings made by readers (Chartier, 1995).

Such concerns with materiality in book history resonate with recent work in the history of science and in the history of authorship within geographical writing. For Johns, «Indeed, it could plausibly be claimed that over the last generation the historiography of science has followed a parallel path to that of the book. [...] Its practitioners have embraced the same disciplinary approaches, ranging from scientometrics, semiotics and reception theory to anthropology and the study of practices of representation and appropriation. There has been a parallel reluctance to advance large-scale generalizations, and a similar concentration on the particular and the local» (Johns, 1998b, p. 189). His claim is borne out in others' work in the history of science where printed material, not just books alone, has been shown to be the crucial *via media* of scientific knowledge (Frasca-Spada and Jardine, 2000; Topham, 2000). For Secord, the making of science in and through print is never a simple matter of local making and dissemination. Rather than talk of «construction» and «reception», even of «dissemination» as separate processes or categories of analysis, he proposed the idea of «knowledge in transit» to understand the making of science as a matter of communicative action (Secord, 2004, p. 661). Such emphasis upon the materiality of communication in science is part of the recognition of science (in which context geography is to be included) not as a fixed and certain encounter with the world but as an assemblage of practices whose material expression – in the

form of the book, for example – both reflects and directs the knowledge claims in question: «In their material form media do not provide mere 'representatives' of an object described by theory, they create the space within which the scientific object exists in a material form» (Lenoir, 1998, p. 12).

That is why, as Johns has it, «The making of credibility should be our subject in analysing the importance and development of the book» (Johns, 1998b, p. 194). And that is why we can think about the making of printed books and such evidence for it as is present within archives as matters of credibility – epistemological, authorial and ethical. For Eisenstein – a point strongly rejected by Johns – print provided fixity: the form of the media was itself a guarantee of the credibility of the content. But for Johns and others, the credibility of and in print was something fought over and in different sites and social spaces; between printers and authors, by different readers.

So what is credibility in print the credibility of? For the printer, it is a technical accomplishment, even an artistic achievement. For the publisher, it is the implicit claim that the book discloses what its title indicates, and that no changes have been made to the author's words without good cause. For the author, credibility is at once ethical and epistemological, both ascribed and achieved. The author, particularly of factual works of exploration and accounts of travel, hopes that her/his words will be regarded as authoritative, written by an authority on the subject because s/he has been there, seen the objects in question or been told about them by a reliable authority. The reader will in turn judge others' such printed works to be true or not or, at least, written with authority depending upon certain pieces of evidence: by virtue of presence in the field or trust in reliable witnesses, by virtue of the prose style, from the readers' first-hand experience of the object being written about, and so on (Shapin, 1994). And last but no means least, geographical researchers can illuminate such questions on the basis of their archival credibility by undertaking a certain author-function, namely to write, with authority, from first-hand encounter with the archival evidence.

3. Geography, credibility and authorship in publishers' archives

Mayhew has signalled to four themes within an historical approach to printed evidence (Mayhew, 2007): authorship, in which notions of the author are not immutable and so need to be understood in historical context; audience, dissemination and reception, in which regard different people in different places read things differently and so we can think of intellectual contours of reception; the production of print, wherein «the author is not a lone figure making a book, but is enmeshed in a whole set of relations with agents, publishers, printers and booksellers to actually get their work into the public domain» (Mayhew, 2007, p. 27); and the historical geography of communication, given fashions in linguistic terminology and communicative practices. Mayhew has also demonstrated the importance of editorial practices in shaping versions of geographical knowledge in book form (Mayhew 2010). Others

have shown, too, how publishers could amend authors' words with a view to influencing content, creating an audience and, even, altering the chronology by which facts were encountered in order to lend a different emphasis to particular parts of the printed account (MacLaren, 1994). Authorial credibility is always something worked at.

3.1 Books and authorial credibility: narratives of travel and author-publisher relationships in the John Murray Archive

The John Murray publishing firm, established in London in 1768, rapidly became a major publishing house for books of all subjects. The firm's archives – its printing record, correspondence ledgers and all aspects of its publishing history – moved from its Albemarle Street offices in London to the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh, to become the John Murray Archive (JMA) in 2007. The JMA is a world-leading resource for the study of publishing, politics and society, literature, science, and travel and exploration since the late eighteenth century. Material relating to books of travel and exploration within this book collection offers rich opportunity for examination of the material and intellectual processes "behind and within" books of geographical exploration and narratives of travel.

For one commentator, the Murray's engagement with travel narratives was the firm's «greatest contribution to the advancement of knowledge and of human understanding of the world» (Carpenter, 2008, p. 124). It is in this respect that I have been examining materials within the John Murray Archive, principally travel narratives in the period *c.*1780– *c.*1850, focusing on questions of truth, credibility and narratives of exploration. Some of this work has been published (Withers and Keighren, 2011): more is in progress. Central to my concern has been how Murray managed his relationships with his geographical authors, before and after they became such, in order to promote credible narratives of travel and exploration. My credibility (ethical and authorial) in using the archival evidence lies in exposing the processes Murray effected to secure authorial credibility and how he and they secured epistemological credibility in what and how they wrote.

One strategy was for Murray simply to refuse to print all of what an author wrote. Writing with reference to a possible volume on Turkey, for example, Murray complimented the author for the «mass of most curious and interesting information regarding the Turkish Empire», but proposed drastic changes given contemporary interest in the topic: «The incidents of a journey in Turkey have lost their novelty – you will relieve your vessel by throwing them overboard, if not you will incur the risk of being swamped by your cargo. The stringent abridgements which I recommend would amount to *one half* – of the M.S. – but that is a matter of conjecture. I fear such a suggestion may sound disheartening but I make it with the confidence that you will profit both in a literary & pecuniary point of view by the abridgement» (National Library of Scotland [hereafter NLS], MS 41912, f.96). There is a clear sense, too, that Murray as publisher was not just aware of market de-

mand for travel narratives so much as consciously creating it by publishing or not at certain moments. For example: Murray published eleven accounts of travel and exploration in South America between 1824 and 1839. These works were geographically revelatory but also politically and culturally opportune, being published in the wake of pro-independence movements in the region and new commercial relationships between Britain and the emergent states. But when the failure of several British-backed speculative mining ventures in the early 1830s caused «everything connected with Spanish America» to fall into disrepute, Murray was disinclined to publish anything further upon the region (NLS, MS 40945, f.1). «The subject of South America is so utterly devoid of Public interest at the present time» [Murray wrote to Woodbine Parish, British diplomat and aspiring author, in 1838] «that I do not think that any work relating to it would have a chance of selling sufficiently to defray the expenses of its publication» (NLS MS 41910, f.1).

What Murray signalled of South America in 1838 and Asia Minor in 1847, he also did in 1841 for accounts of Polar exploration. Writing to his long-time associate, Sir John Barrow, over volumes being proposed by Barrow's son, Murray considered popular demand for books of travels «considerably diminished». But he offered Barrow junior a contract via his father «as I do not like to disturb long standing connexions»' (NLS MS 41911, f. 57). The long-standing connections to which Murray makes reference included Barrow's role as a reader for Murray's many exploration texts in his position as Second Secretary to the Admiralty and proponent of Arctic and African exploration. Barrow and Murray together scrutinised explorers' journals and manuscripts. As has been shown for the work and narrative of the polar explorer George Back, Back was keen to get into authorised print an account of what, in effect, had been a failed mission. Murray required that what Back called his «rough Journals, made from each days occurrences» (NLS MS 40033, f.23) be put to better order – that is, be re-written and re-arranged as to chronology and thematic significance – if they were to be published and attract interest. Both Back and Murray's editors altered passages: deleting sections in order to make the text run more smoothly – but less accurately as a description of the actual events – and, in places, even altering the sense of the narrative (MacLaren 1994).

My point, simply, is that books are not always what their authors wrote or what they claim them to be. Archival work within publishers' archives – here, the Murray papers – can disclose how publishers made authorial credibility work. It is incumbent upon geographical researchers, if they seek authorial credibility in their own books, not to take the credibility of others' books for granted. Let me illustrate these points yet further. In the preface to their *Journal of an Expedition* (1832), the Niger explorers Richard and John Lander noted: «We therefore humbly submit the following narrative to the public, without further apology for any deficiency of style or expression which may be discovered in it. It has at least the merit of a faithful account, for our journals were invariably written on the spot at the close of each day, and in

all our observations, to the best of our belief, we adhered religiously to the truth» (Lander, 1832, volume I, p. i). His remark about the time and manner of in-the-field writing is interesting for what it reveals about daily recollection and authorial regimen. The declaration about fidelity and adherence to truth was a common feature amongst authors and publishers keen to be documenting things as they really were and to establish honesty and direct observation as criteria of credibility (for the author) and credibility (for publicsher and author alike) among the buying and reading public (Shapin, 1994). These points are all the more relevant given that, in closing their preface, the Landers as authors made clear their indebtedness to others: «We think it necessary, however, to say, that the task of blending our journals into one, as well as constructing the route of our route through the country, has been performed by Lieutenant Becher of the Royal Navy, to whom we offer our sincere thanks, not only for the performance of these laborious services, but also for his friendly aid and valuable suggestions in many other points connected with the production of these volumes» (Lander, 1832, volume I, p. ii).

My archival work revealed that all was not what it appeared on the page. Beecher, working with Barrow, had taken issue with the Landers' prose because of who they were, rather than what they had written. Their lowly social status was deemed a source of concern over the truth claims of their narrative. As John Lander put it to John Murray, «I cannot help regreting [sic] exceedingly that because accident has thrown me into a humble sphere of life, my veracity is questioned & my promises treated with indifference & contempt. I am very much afraid Mr Beecher has not behaved to me with the candour & Sincerity of a Gentleman» (NLS, MS 40668). Here, the Landers' twin field-based accounts were put to order, later and elsewhere, by a third author who supplemented the brothers' narrative with additional map work and, in helping give their printed narrative an authoritative voice, transformed both word and author.

Whose book was it? The Landers' credibility lay in being the first to discover in the field the course of the River Niger. Their credibility as authors narrating that achievement was compromised by their social status, and by the fact that others worked on their book before it became published (a fact which the brothers admitted to in private but denied in print).

3.2 Archives as networks of credibility: authoritative sources for atlas production in the Bartholomew map firm

The Bartholomew Archive in the National Library of Scotland incorporates the administrative, production and financial records and correspondence of the Edinburgh-based map and atlas firm of John Bartholomew & Son and its predecessors, a leading cartographic concern from 1820 until its sale in the 1980s. The archive is extensive: 110 metres of business records between 1820-1992; 177 bound volumes, 60 boxes and 16 map drawers of the firm's printing record (1877-2002); some 20,000 printed and proof sheets of maps used for reference or as preparation copies, mainly for the period 1821-

1992; the firm's reference library (*c*.1,100 printed items); some 3,000 engraved printing plates, mainly for the period 1878-1957; and about 6,000 glass plates used for printing map sheets (*c*.1920-1950).

The range of this archive and its utility for research in cartographic history has been signalled to elsewhere (Fleet and Withers, 2010). Here, I want to illustrate the more general points of this paper by assessing the correspondence to and from the firm's officers with leading geographical authorities to illustrate how the Bartholomew map company was at the heart of printing and publishing activity in one particular genre of geographical book, the atlas. For atlas publishing no less than for maps or for other books, the reputation of the firm and of its authoritative correspondents were mutually bound up in claims to accuracy and credibility. Authors wanted to have their works and maps published and by a creditable firm. Publishers need to use explorer-traveller authors, and others, as reliable informants. Writing and correspondence does not form part of the final book. But it is an essential act of material inscription – an epistolary exchange; a matter of credit and credibility. And it is also, I suggest, a matter of epistemological credibility: on what grounds was the truth being advanced, and by whom? How do they know what they know? As I show, archival evidence allows us to see how map makers were able to keep up to date – and so claim authorial credibility as reliable modern publishers – by virtue of the many and repeated editorial adjustments that were made before, in time, a new edition was produced.

Much of the out-going correspondence from John Bartholomew and his staff was to leading figures and executive officers in institutions such as Ordnance Survey and the Royal Geographical Society, to staff in other publishing houses and to numerous distinguished individuals: Heinrich Berghaus, George Everest, Archibald and James Geikie, Patrick Geddes, Sir John Kirk, Sir Clements Markham, Sir John Murray, August Petermann, Ernst Georg Ravenstein, Cecil Rhodes and Henry Morton Stanley to name only a few. Credibility for the publisher rested in this network of associative authority.

On January 1 1903, for example, John Bartholomew wrote to leading institutions and individuals throughout Britain's dominions over the mapping of the British Empire in maps of uniform series. He closed his letter by stressing how «this was a matter of national interest as well as of political & educational value» (NLS Acc 10222/935): It was also, of course, a matter of his firm's commercial interests and its scientific reputation, but this was left unstated. The returns to his letters from various figures show how patchy was the mapped coverage of the British Empire. They also help reveal something of the networks upon whom atlas makers had to depend for up-to-date scientific information. Similarly, in dealing with the geography of religious authority, atlases had to be pulled together by regulating the knowledge of far-flung agents, not all of whom could be relied upon, even when coordinating bodies knew to whom to write. Accuracy of information from the networks of informants was paramount but so too was speed: preparing work for the World Missionary Conference of 1910 and an accompanying *Statistic-*

al Atlas of Christian Missions (1910), one organiser chastised the publishers for not having understood what had seemed a clear enough message concerning placenames, with the result that lithography had been begun using the wrong names for missions: «I regret exceedingly that you did not understand the meaning of my cablegram sent from Montreal… I showed it to several men to make sure the meaning would be clear». Corrections were duly notified: «I trust that you reached this conclusion clearly from my manuscript letter and later from my typewritten letter and that now progress is being made» (NLS Acc 10222/956). Only from such archival evidence do we get a fuller picture of how the Bartholomew map firm – a very particular centre of interpretation to draw from Osborne's phrase – depended upon different forms of inscriptive practice sent across considerable distance. Of course, in and of itself, this is a slight instance. But in the Bartholomew Archive, this example is repeated hundreds if not thousands of times. Only by having archival credibility, by tracing many such instances, can we come to know a little more clearly how the epistemological credibility of individual maps and atlases and the authorial credibility of different authors came to be arrived at.

4. Thoughts in conclusion: credibility at work in archives and books

This paper has shown that there is important work within geography, book history and the history of science addressing the book as a material object and the archive as a space for, and a principle of, credibility. Precisely because archives are places of delight and of tedium, places of responsibility as well as repositories of facts, we must take seriously and ethically our engagement with them. And precisely because books are so commonplace, we must not take them, their content, making or use, for granted. Even whilst we must be cautious about the dangers of generalisation from the case of one book to many, the examples here illustrate not only the idea of the book as itself a collection of processes and responsibilities. They point too to the possibilities for further insight into the making of geographical knowledge in the archive and, from archives and books, to wider geographical questions.

There is work to be done in the archive concerning the geography of the book – books' making, print history and, either for one book or for genres of books, their dissemination over space to be read by different audiences. There is also more to be done on geography in the book – on the category of 'author', on the redactive role of publishers or of editors, and on the importance of narrative in geography as a question of practice. In regard to the two collections briefly considered here, there are clear connections with Mayhew's themes. 'Authorship' is revealed as a process of inscription but not simply as the work of one authoritative voice. Audiences and reading communities can be reconstituted through sales ledgers and inferred in author-publisher correspondence. Ideas about dissemination are evident in relation to the different ideas publishers had over books' ad-

vertising, and reception can be interrogated via reviews and in other public and private commentaries.

These possibilities and examples affirm the notion of the book as a collection of processes, and, in doing so, re-affirm the materiality of communication and its importance in understanding geography's making and reception in book form. But there are implications, too, in respect of book collections, whether in libraries, print shops or scriptorium, as sites for knowledge making. Like collections of maps in individual text form (the atlas), or in institutional form (the map library), books as collections of processes can be revealed through the archive, a knowledge site, a repository and responsibility for whom questions of access and authority as author have to be worked at, now and in the past. Much of our engagement with books and with digital sources is predicated upon the notion of making knowledge free and accessible to all (Cook and Schwartz 2002; Ketelaar 2007). In such cases, it is incumbent upon archivists – if they are to demonstrate both ethical and archival credibility – that attention is paid by them to questions of provenance and of edition. For reasons of authorial and epistemological credibility, it is as vital that researchers in and out of the archive pose questions about how books were put together, for what we see in print may not be how things were at an earlier stage of knowledge's production. And what we glean from the archive may be only a fraction of what happened in those myriad geographical encounters whose traces in the archive remain the object of our continuing enquiries.

References

BARATA K., "Archives in the digital age", in *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 25, 2004, pp. 63-70.

CARPENTER H., *The seven lives of John Murray: the story of a publishing dynasty 1768-2002*, John Murray, London, 2008.

CHARTIER R., *Forms and meanings: texts, performances, and audiences from codex to computer*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.

COOK T., "What is past is prologue: a history of archival ideas since 1898, and the future paradigm shift", in *Archivaria*, 43, 1997, pp. 17-63.

COOK T., "Archival sciences and postmodernism: new formulations for old concepts", in *Archival Science*, 1, 2001, pp. 3-24.

COOK T., "Fashionable nonsense or professional rebirth: postmodernism and the practice of archives", in *Archivaria*, 51, 2001, pp. 14-35.

COOK T., SCHWARTZ, J., "Archives, records and power: from (postmodern) theory to (archival) performance", in *Archival Science*, 2, 2002, pp. 171-85.

COPE W., PHILIPS, A., eds *The future of the book in the digital age*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2006.

DARNTON R., "What is the history of books?" in *Daedalus*, 111, 1982, pp. 65-83.

DASTON L., "Taking note(s)", in *Isis*, 95, 2004, pp. 443-9.

DERRIDA, J. *Archive fever: a Freudian impression*. Translated by E. Prenowitz, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1996.

EISENSTEIN E., *The printing press as an agent of change: communications and cultural transformations in early-modern Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1979.

FEBVRE L. AND MARTIN H-J., *The coming of the book: the impact of printing 1450-1800*, Verso, London, 1976. [Originally published in French in 1958].

FLEET C., WITHERS C. W. J., "Maps and map history using the Bartholomew Archive, National Library of Scotland", in *Imago Mundi*, 62, 2010, pp. 387-92.

FOUCAULT M., *The archaeology of knowledge*, London, Tavistock, 1972.

FRASCA-SPADA M., JARDINE N., eds *Books and the sciences in history*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

GOMEZ J., *Print is dead: books in our digital age*, Macmillan, London, 2007.

GRAFTON A., *Worlds made by words: scholarship and community in the modern West*, Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 2009.

HOFMAN H., "The archive", in S. McKemmish, M. Piggott, B. Reed and F. Upward (eds), *Archives: recordkeeping in society*, Wagga Wagga, Centre for Information Studies, 2005, pp. 131-57.

JOHNS A., *The nature of the book: print and knowledge in the making*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1998a.

JOHNS A., "Science and the book in modern cultural historiography", in *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science*, 29, 1998b, pp. 167-94.

KETELAAR E., "Tacit narratives: the meaning of archives", in *Archival Science* 1, 2001, pp. 131-41.

KETELAAR E., "Recordkeeping and societal power", in MCKEMMISH S., PIGGOTT M., REED B., UPWARD F. (eds), *Archives: recordkeeping in society*, Wagga Wagga, Centre for Information Studies, 2005, pp. 277-98.

KETELAAR E., "Muniments and monuments: the dawn of archives as cultural patrimony", in *Archival Science*, 7, 2007, pp. 343-57.

LANDER R.J., *Journal of an expedition to explore the course and termination of the Niger; with a narrative of a voyage down that river to its termination*, 3 volumes. London, John Murray, 1832.

LENOIR T., "Inscription practices and materialities of communication", in LENOIR T. (ed.), *Inscribing science: scientific texts and the materiality of communication*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1998, pp. 1-19.

LORIMER H., "Caught in the nick of time: archives and fieldwork", in M. CRANG, D. DELYSER, S. HERBERT, L.MCDOWELL (eds), *The handbook of qualitative methods in human geography*, London, SAGE, 2010, pp. 248-72.

MCKENZIE D., *Bibliography and the sociology of texts*, British Library, London, 1985.

MCKITTERICK D., *Print, manuscript and the search for order 1450-1830*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

MACLAREN I., "From exploration to publication: the evolution of a 19th-century Arctic narrative", in *Arctic*, 47, 1994, pp. 43-53.

MAYHEW R., "Denaturalising print, historicising text: historical geography and the history of the book", in GAGEN E., LORIMER H., VASUDEVAN A. (eds), *Practising the archive: reflections on method and practice in historical geography*, London, Historical Geography Research Series Number 40, 2007, pp. 23-36.

MAYHEW R., "Printing posterity: editing Varenius and the construction of geography's history", in OGBORN M., WITHERS C. W. J. (eds), *Geographies of the book*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2010, pp. 157-87.

OGBORN M., "Archives", in PILE S., THRIFT N. (eds), *Patterned ground*, London, Reaktion, 2004, pp. 240-42.

OGBORN M.O., "Archive", in AGNEW J., LIVINGSTONE, D. (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Geographical Knowledge*, London, SAGE, 2011, pp. 88-98.

OSBORNE T., "The ordinariness of the archive", in *History of the Human Sciences,* 12, 1999, pp. 51-64.

OGBORN M., WITHERS C. W. J., "Introduction: book geography, book history", in OGBORN M. AND WITHERS C. W. J. (eds), *Geographies of the Book*, Aldershot, Ashgate, pp. 1-25.

PEARSON D., *Books as history*, British Library, London, 2008.

POLASTRON L., *Books on fire: the tumultuous story of the world's great libraries*, Thames and Hudson, London, 2009.

RICHARDS T., *The imperial archive: knowledge and the fantasy of empire*, London, Verso, 1993.

SECORD J., "Knowledge in transit", in *Isis*, 95, 2004, pp. 654-72.

SHAPIN S., *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth Century England*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1994.

STEEDMAN C., *Dust*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2001.

TOPHAM J., "Book history and the sciences", in *British Journal for the History of Science*, 33, 2000, pp. 155-222.

WITHERS C.W.J., "Constructing the geographical archive", in *Area*, 34, 2002, pp. 303-11.

WITHERS C.W.J., KEIGHREN I., "Travels into print: authoring, editing and narratives of travel and exploration, *c*.1815-*c*.1857", in *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 36, 2011, pp. 560-73 [forthcoming].

Summary

The paper examines the close relationships between the archive as a site of geographical responsibility and the notion of credibility with particular reference to the idea of authorial credibility in publishers' archives. Illustrations are taken from the John Murray Archive and the Bartholomew Archive in the National Library of Scotland. Authorial credibility is what geographical authors aim to achieve. Archival analysis reveals that they do not always do so. Study of publishers' archives can disclose how authors' actions were modified by publishers and how publishers achieved their credibility by recruiting authoritative sources.

Keywords

credibility, archives, archival authority, book history.

Résumé

Ce mémoire examine les liens étroits entre les archives en tant que lieu de responsabilité géographique et la notion de crédibilité en faisant référence notamment à la question de la crédibilité de l'auteur dans les archives d'éditeurs. Des exemples sont tirés des archives de John Murray et de Bartholomew dans la collection de la National Library of Scotland. Etablir la crédibilité de l'auteur, tel est l'objectif visé par les auteurs géographiques. L'analyse des archives démontre qu'ils ne l'atteignent pas toujours. Une étude des archives d'éditeurs peut révéler dans quelle mesure les actions des auteurs furent modifiées par des éditeurs et comment ces derniers ont gagné la crédibilité en faisant appel aux sources de bonne foi.

Mots-clés

la crédibilité, les archives, les archives de bonne foi, l'histoire du livre.