

Thiago Henrique Bragato Barros (sean.vogel@gmail.com) and **João Batista Ernesto de Moraes** (jota@marilia.unesp.br)
Universidade Estadual Paulista, Marília SP Brazil

The Discursive Construction of Archival Science: Conceptual Foundations of a Discipline in Construction

Abstract: This work outlines a theoretical background established in Archival Science based mainly on discourse analysis as a key discipline to understand which the differences are and points of conceptual commonality in the area. Uses the French Discourse Analysis as a principle with a theoretical and methodological framework to typify the archive as a discursive practice defined by their historical aspects of its institutional junctures. The study of discourse helps to understand how certain linguistic formations construct the discourse, concerned mainly with the context in which the text was produced. This analysis take place from manuals and treatises of Archival Science produced during the development of discipline and regarded as grounds for discipline. We analyzed the Manual of an Archival Arrangement and Description (vor Handleiding van het ordenen in bescheijven archieven) of Muller, Feith, and Fruin (Ed.1 1898). Another work considered is the Manual of Archive Administration Including the Problems of War Archives and Archive a Making (1 Ed. 1922) and some of late works of Sir Hillary Jenkinson and finally analyzed the work of Theodore R. Schellenberg some aspects of his vast bibliography. With this analyzes we established a radiography of the Archival Science basis.

1 INTRODUCTION

The Archival Science has changed in the last 20 years, the practical performance and the theoretical and methodological constitution, due to the advancement of technologies and through an increase in the academic / professional performance in a great number of countries, especially Canada, United States, England. In this sense, this new professional situation ultimately leads to a revision and renewal of the paradigms of the traditional archival practice allowing the appearance of different studies and analysis.

By this concept it is possible to understand that this shift is the result of a new context of administrative documents and the search for techniques of treatment not only leads to the redefinition of technical procedures, but also the reconstruction and reorganization of the discipline.

Thus, we seek to demonstrate in this research key aspects of past that reflex the present of Archival Science through the use of French Discourse Analysis as a principle with a theoretical and methodological framework to typify the archive as a discursive practice defined by their historical aspects of its institutional junctures.

The study of discourse helps to understand how certain linguistic formations are constructed concerned mainly with the context in which the text was produced.

As the Archival Science is a product of knowledge constructed historically, the conceptual context of production ultimately reflected in different streams of thinking and approach.

The document in its archival sense is part of a scientific and bureaucratic process permeated by an ideological-historical position, intentionally or not, since, in technical processing, there is a theoretical, but there is also an ideological field and a professional that infers on the documents they organizes.

Therefore, archival practice produces and reproduces the discursive practices related to ideological and scientific aspects of the period that their concepts were enunciated.

In this perspective, we seek study concepts known and considered fundamental to the treatment methodology / organization of Archival Science, that are part of the theoretical instruments that the archivist uses to organize and understand the document, relying mainly from theoretical foundations of discourse analysis and the proper historical and conceptual framework of the Archival Science discipline.

This analysis take place from manuals and treatises of Archival Science produced during the development of discipline and regarded as grounds for discipline.

The plurality of manuals analyzed at different times of Archival Science due to constantly changing occurred in archives the past two centuries and it's responsible for the enactment and development of Archival Science principles and methodologies in different periods of history and of the archives, producing therefore, and multiple discursive practices.

It should be taken into account to analyze the discourse, first of all, identify the effects between the text and its interlocutors (Pêcheux, 2002)

To analyze the statements set within the Archival Science is to understand how these concepts are organized within the text and how it justifies the existence of that concept, to understand the text styles and also identify the subject that is not in author himself but the position he occupies in the discipline, contextualizing how and what is stated from the angle built in the analysis.

It is envisaged that discourse analysis as a theoretical method for understanding the linguistic productions, addressed by the subject positions and ideology.

We discussed the conceptual history of the discipline, marking the place and the subjects who enunciated its concepts, starting with the onset of the Archival Science, its fundamental definitions, in the initial crystallization present in the Dutch Manual and its further development, because from the historic construction of discourse we can understand the place that a text occupies within a discipline.

This exercise of trying to identify the archaeological history of the discipline through its treatises-authors is already part of the analysis that suggests, and to this end, it is important to study's author, his work and the context of both, because only from that point we can understand the role they played in the archival practice, because its development is also a result of changes in society. As postulated by Orlandi (2007, p.66) about discourse analysis, "The object of discourse is not given, it assumes the analyst's work"

The authors were selected based in the following requirements: acceptance in the area, treaties most referenced and cited along a series of books, articles and events, so the manuals most recognized, either by forming part of the conceptual basis of the discipline or because of their importance to the country that produced it, because they identify how we understand the core of the discipline.

The selection also seeks to represent, through these books, different traditions in Archival Science, seeking a triangulation of concepts among the authors, the publications promulgated at the beginning of the discipline formed a basis for the emergence of the next and from that point the concept starts to have a formal definition and would exist a theoretical relation between these authors.

Such analysis is the first in a historical moment, the result of speculations of a vast number of authors important to Archival Science (Terry Cook, Brien Bothman and others.

As part of the structure of the discipline, we analyzed the Manual of an Archival Arrangement and Description (vor Handleiding van het ordenen in bescheijven archieven) of Muller, Feith, and Fruin (Ed.1 1898). Another work considered is the Manual of Archive Administration Including The Problems of War Archives and Archive a Making (1 Ed. 1922)

and some of his late works of Sir Hillary Jenkinson and finally analyzed the work of Theodore R. Schellenberg some aspects of his vast bibliography.

Through the analysis we could perceive the history of the Archival theory and its notions this discipline and build a conceptual radiography in the discipline development, important to the actual status of the Archival Science.

2 The discourse analysis as a methodological theory: shaping a concept

The history of formulation of the concepts of discourse analysis is quite contradictory, since there isn't a unique moment to its foundation series of authors over field development were responsible for its expansion.

However, there is consensus that Michel Pêcheux, Michel Foucault and Jean Dubois were fundamental to the emergence of the current theoretical base of the discourse discipline.

The emergence of discourse analysis (hereafter DA) is part of a profound change in the 1960s in language studies. An important reference for the development of DA is the work of American linguist Z.S. Harris, who influenced all the initial work of DA. With the theoretical framework presented by Dosse (1993) and Gregolin (2006) we can understand the role that structural linguistics played in the development of structuralism, its base was essential for the foundation of the structuralism project.

The DA was first reported as part of the late 1960s structuralist ideas, based on careful study of the works of Freud and Marx. Foucault and Pêcheux were part of this group and the ideas of these two authors have been shaped by these influences.

The DA come to modify the structure of how we can understand the phenomenon of language that is no longer just focused in the language itself, an ideologically neutral system, but also a level outside the strictly linguistic.

DA it's mainly concerned with the historical, ideological and psychological aspects of oral and textual productions based on theoretical studies of Freud and Marx.

This argument is endorsed by (Orlandi, 1994 9):

[The interpretation and understanding of Discourse Analysis] in my work, revert to my statement that, in discourse analysis, the notion of ideology is different, the concept of history is different, the concept of social is another and so on . That is, discourse analysis opens a theoretical region itself both in relation to language as in the social sciences

In the DA understanding, we can reach the conclusion that any study of language cannot fail to take into account aspects of society that produces it, since the processes that constitute the language itself are part of a historical and social processes.

In this sense, the DA aims to combat the excessive formalism that was prevailing in linguistics in the 1960s, seen as a new faction of the bourgeois type. Beside this revolutionary trend, DA seeks to de-automatize the relationship of the linguistics with the language. Strictly speaking, what the DA does more corrosive is to open a field of issues within the language itself, operating a marked shift in the land area, primarily on the concepts of language, history and subject, left out by the linguistics in the 1960s.

The DA is a paradigm shift that causes a break in the field of language studies, relating to the history and social sciences, aiming to study the language in use situations related to scientific and doctrine discourses and in present time daily and advertising discourses.

DA it's also related with textual criticism present in France, Maingueneau (1997, 9) commented as follows "In France and in general Europe is tradition fundamentally involve

reflection and history in texts." As Pêcheux (1998, 45), one of the most fundamental authors in DA says:

[The DAF¹] is first of all - and that since approximately 1965 - the subject of linguists (referring to distributional of Harris initially, following the work of J. Dubois), but also of historians (in most cases, experts in the century XVIII and the French Revolution), and some psychologists (specialists in social psychology, in critical break with that discipline).

Therefore, the development of DA owes much of its approach to the French textual practice and the interdisciplinary connection with the psychology, history and linguistics.

The discourse can be understood as a network never complete and finished, where possible changes caused by ideology, history can modify the direction and the meaning in the discourse order.

Brandão (1997, 12) complements the concept of discourse as follows: "language as discourse is interaction, and a mode of social production, it is not neutral or innocent (as it is engaged in intentionality), nor natural, is a privileged place for the manifestation of ideology"

Another key aspect of discourse is the way we can understand the language, because it's part of a process that changes the meaning from the ideological and historical moment.

The discourse is nothing more than the reverberation of a true born before our very eyes, and when it can finally take the form of discourse, where all can be said and the discourse can be said about all, is because all things and expressed and exchanged in their meaning, can return to the quiet interiority of self-consciousness. (Foucault 1997, 49)

As for the other authors cited, for Foucault, the discourse is a historic space that once produced the discourse that are only possible within a context, permeated by a sense that it is ideological and it is private.

The key point of the discourse materiality is the statement, since it is the most basic set of meanings that can be individualized within the discourse.

Foucault (1997, 133) outlines the statement as follows:

Examining the statement, which was discovered a function that relies on a set of signs, which cannot be identified neither with grammatical acceptability, even with the correction logic, and requires him to perform a referential (which is not exactly a tact, a state of things, not even an object, but a principle of differentiation), a subject (not the consciousness that speaks not the author's formulation, but a position that may be employed under certain conditions, by different individuals); an associated field (which is not the real context of the formulation, the situation in which it was articulated, but a domain of coexistence for other statements), a materiality (and not only the substance or the support of the joint, but a status, rules transcription, ability of use or reuse)

The discourse can be understood as an order, a field of experience or a reference. The statement is the materiality of this reference and the object that is possible to be submitted to an analysis.

Foucault understands the discourse as a dispersal system, which the analyst is responsible to describe and understand this link between the statements, its historical and ideological concept, making certain connections between statements that belong to one discourse formation for him and the description of this connection is an archaeological analysis of discourse possible.

In this sense, Orlandi (2007, p.66) states: "The discourse is not a given object", the analysts assumes a role examining the statements and reaching the discourse, we must first

¹ French Discourse Analysis

understand the texts (oral and written) production as a linguistic materiality and such object as a theoretical web.

As they relate different pieces of the same discursive formation and cuts the universe of analysis possible (within the discursive formation) due to certain positions of discourse, such analysis is no longer materially language and became part of a process discursive, producing a organized cut in the analysis corpus.

"Our starting point is that discourse analysis aims to understand how a symbolic object produces meaning" (ORLANDI, 2007, p.66)

The meaning of this object is the final propose of the DA, explained by their relations to other words that are not said, words that could have been said but were not and words that were said previously by other texts, this effect is traditionally understood as the metaphoric effect (Pêcheux 1969 and 1975) and we seek to demonstrate this in the Archival Science, in the DA doesn't exists a strait analysis methodologies because through the analysis we seek to demonstrate the history and the structure of a discourse, taking into account the statement as a fundamental particle in the discursive practice.

3 The history of Archival Science trough a discursive perspective: analyses of manuals

The Archival Science is a discipline connected to a very specific field of practice and because of that its theory development mostly is addressed in technical manuals. This start to change in late 1950s in the USA with the academic courses and publications of Ernest Posner and Theodore Roosevelt Schellenberg.

Before the development of the theories promulgated by Schellenberg, the Archival Science has passed through an embryonic stage for about a century; with the publication of treatises and manuals seeking to systemize techniques for the organization and description of archives.

This statement makes us wonder how the archival theory is summarized in the early works and its relation with the modern Archival Science. The revision of the early works and the past of the discipline make us understand who we are and where we can go with the actual problems the area have.

As we said before the discourse analyze works like a "lantern on the stern" and helps us to understand some aspects of how a statement can work within a text, but we never really know where that will lead us.

Archival practice and the archival theory have its high point in the late nineteenth century with the publication of the Manual of Dutch Archivists.

This manual establishes the discursive formation of the Archival Science, there is a confluence of previously stated assumptions, summarized in this publication. Its importance is a consensus in the area since it was the first major publication, reaching Canadians, Brazilians, Spanish, Portuguese archivists. As indicated by Ketelaar, Horsman & Thomassen (2003, 249), in their article published due to the centennial of the Dutch manual, "the *Manual for the Arrangement and description of Archives* (1898) is usually regarded as a starting point of archival theory and methodology". This quote reinforces the importance attached to this manual for the international archival community. The enactment of this book is due, among other things, the strategies applied in the Netherlands Archives in the XIX century.

According to Ketelaar Horsman & Thomassen (2003, 249)

Archival records originally served to settle legal disputes and to support the administrative apparatus. In the course of the eighteenth century, however, Dutch administrators began to consider records as a source of knowledge about the history of their cities and thus about the heroic acts of their own forefathers

The French Revolution and the French Empire were responsible for changes that take place throughout the nineteenth century, these changes occurred in the Netherlands due to the Revolution and the invasion of Napoleon.

This change in scenery caused the flourishing of Dutch Archival Science. In the early nineteenth century, they began to apply the diplomatic methods for the arrangement and description in medieval archives, due to approximation with the Ecole des Chartes serving as a subsidy to trace the historical course of Netherlands.

Terry Cook (1997: 21) makes the following note concerning the Manual of Dutch Archivists:

Muller, Feith, and Fruin produced their manual for the Dutch Association of Archivists, in cooperation with the State Archives of the Netherlands and the Ministry of the Interior. Each of the one hundred rules advanced in the *Manual* was formally debated by the Society during the 1890s. Typical of a work written by committee, the accompanying text bears many marks of careful qualification and elaborates examples, even if the rules themselves are forcefully stated. The *Manual* also reflects Muller's exposure to French archival theory from his attendance in 1873 at the Ecole des Chartes in Paris and the introduction from Germany of the concept of provenance into several Dutch archives.

This manual can be considered not only a milestone for the discipline in the strict sense, but as the engine of a new discursive formation, in order to establish the basic requirements for the classification / arrangement and description of archives, gathering much of the discussion contained in the area until then.

The principles such as provenance, for example, already existed in practice since in its enunciation in Germany, but with these manual gain theoretical explanations.

Returning Cook (1997, 21), he explains about it as follows:

Dutch authors' chief contribution was to articulate the most important principles (or "rules") concerning both the nature and the treatment of archives. The trio stated in their very first rule, which to them was "the foundation, upon which everything must rest," that archives is "the whole of the written documents, drawings and printed matter, officially received or produced by an administrative body or one of its officials" Rules 8 and 16 enunciated the twin pillars of classic archival theory: archives so defined "must be kept carefully separate" and not mixed with the archives of other creators, or placed into artificial arrangements based on chronology, geography, or subject; and the arrangement of such archives "must be based on the original organization of the archival collection, which in the main corresponds to the organization of the administrative body that produced it."

The merit of this book is certainly not only unite the two centuries Archivist's initial discipline, but name them differently. With the publication of this book begins a series of actions in Europe that lead to development of archival concepts and methods this is the beginning of Archival Science as technique and its theoretical discourse.

Years later another manual is published in England and was responsible for more advancement in archival science. Hillary Jenkinson is based primarily on the manual of the Dutch archivists regarding the description and arrangement of archives and his own experience in working with it.

Unlike the Dutch manual, which was a collective work and institutional, Jenkinson began their studies from the work he did with the medieval archives, studying paleography and diplomatic.

Hillary Jenkinson was graduated from Cambridge University and studied more thoroughly Greek and Latin. At that time, a possible career for an academic devoted to Latin and Greek, history and culture was the public service, so he started his career in the Public Record Office in London (1906).

Eastwood (2004, 33) in his article, published as an introduction to a new edition of Jenkinson's late words, explains that in England at this time there wasn't a school of Archives and formalized studies, so the study of the archives before everything happened in practice. "His mentor introduced him to the intricacies of the study of early records, how to read the documents (for they were in unfamiliar, handwritten script), and how to understand them in the context of the administrative procedures of the office of origin".

In the same period, the Archivist in England still in the early stages and is based mainly on the practice paleography and diplomatic. Publication Manual of the Dutch had happened some years before and the English translation only happen in the 1940s.

Archivists, despite being part of a young discipline, contemporary, its development was very late if we compare the development of administration and technology, since, the work of Jenkinson was worried a lot more with the reaffirmation concepts and passing the responsibility of appraisal documents for administrators, neglecting the issue.

Jenkinson can be considered the great naturalist's in Archival Science. We can find, throughout his career, a series of statements reaffirming that, like this one (DAVIS apud COOK, 1997, 23):

The Archivist's career is one of service. He exists in order to make other people's work possible.... His Creed, the Sanctity of Evidence; his Task, the Conservation of every scrap of Evidence attaching to the Documents committed to his charge; his aim to provide, without prejudice or afterthought, for all who wish to know the Means of Knowledge The good Archivist is perhaps the most selfless devotee of Truth the modern world produces...

It is possible to understand the very positive view that the author had about archives and archivists. These are objective and neutral, invisible and passive. The archivist is seen as a guardian of the documents, the document is seen as a residual of administrative activity, the archivist is not responsible for the selection of documents and knowingly does not interfere in the documentation they store and organize.

Another important idea in his manual is the major differences between the concerns with the concept of evidence. For him, the archives are, above all, the sanctity of evidence, which to him is related to the Truth, built to record endorsed by the institution producing the document.

From there, we can set up a concept of archive related primarily to legal and institutional apparatus, without a doubt one of the constituent principles of a record, but not the only one.

In the manual, we can find the following definition record (Jenkinson, 1922, 11):

A document which may be said to belong to the class of Archives is one which was drawn up or used in the course of an administrative or executive transaction (whether public or private) of which itself formed a part; and subsequently preserved in their own custody for their own information by the person or persons responsible for that transaction and their legitimate successors

It can be seen in the definitions of both manuals - especially in the Jenkinson - a view no doubt related to the institutional identity and the production of the official documents. These concepts reflect a historical tradition associated with positivism, in which only archives - strictly speaking - are evidence and truth and, above all, impartial. Jenkinson (1922, 83) epitomizes also the principle of respect to the funds as follows:

Fonds we may render, for lack of a better translation, Archive Group, and define this as the Archives resulting from the work of an Administration 2 which was an organic whole, complete in itself, capable of dealing independently, without any added or external authority, with every side of any business which could normally be presented to it. This, it may be said, is to make the Archive Group a division

much wider, much less strictly defined than the Fonds. But it is so in appearance only.

It is apparent that, unlike the Dutch manual - based mainly on practical methods to improve the arrangement of archives - for Hilary Jenkinson, the archive is first and foremost an institution of custody and guardian documents, but is apparent in his work a concern with the purpose of the institution. The archive in addition to being a deposit is, for him, an institution that has the ability to inform, that is, the author is concerned about the use made of the documents.

In the 1950s the Archival Science starts to change with the publications of Schellenberg, the situation in North America was very different then that we found in the beginning of the century in England, because in the 1930s is founded the National Archives and the Society of American Archivist this institutions gave the possibility of a better planning in the organizations policies.

The Archivist was, until then, a discipline that was concerned mainly with the description of the documents and the methods of recovery, but at that time due to the exponential increase of the documents, the archivists are facing a new reality.

According Stapleton (1983), Schellenberg took over responsibility in the newly created U.S. National Archives in 1935 and responsibility over ten million cubic meters of documents, accumulated over a period of a century and a half. On account of the Great Depression, caused by the crash of the stock in 1929, began a series of government programs aimed at controlling the economy, which further intensified the production of records.

Complementing with Cook (1997 p.26)

When the National Archives in Washington was created in 1934[1935], it inherited an awesome backlog of about one million meters of federal records, with a growth rate of more than sixty thousand meters annually. By 1943, under the expansion of the state to cope with the Great Depression and World War 11, that growth rate had reached six hundred thousand meters annually

This led Schellenberg to concentrate efforts to reduce the volume of documents by selecting only documents standing order files. Schellenberg can be considered, undoubtedly, one of the great scholars of Modern Archival Science at its base.

Posner (1970, p.195), also responsible for the emergence of the concept of life cycle and value of the documents, which worked with the National Archives with Schellenberg, in an article published by his death, with contributions from a number of archivists in various parts of the world, he says about the initial work of Schellenberg:

His great aim in life was the systematization and, to the extent possible the standardization of archival principles and techniques. In his first paper entitled European Archival Practices in Arranging records[...],Schellenberg cleared the ground for this future constructive efforts by pointing out the European experience has only limited applicability to the processing of records in this country this papers was followed by articles that systematically explored the problems of arranging and describing records and private papers

This article was followed by others who systematically exposed the problems about arrangement of archives. They provided the substance for his major works. It is noticeable that Schellenberg sought to build an American perception for the organization of archives, based primarily on selection

His first article, " European Archival Practices in Arranging records ", the author served to reflect European concepts promulgated by them, noting that the European experience, until the 1940s, had no basis for the organization of modern records. In a letter to a friend, he says (Schellenberg apud SMITH, 1981, 319):

In my professional work I'm tired of having an old fossil cited to me as an authority in archival matters. I refer to Sir. Hilary Jenkinson, former Deputy Keeper of Records at the British Public Record Office who wrote a book that is not only unreadable but that has given the Australians a wrong start in their archival work.

Jenkinson focused primarily on the fundamental principles of archival, i.e., to demarcate the playing field of the archivist, however, put aside the problems of document production and the needs of users.

Schellenberg remained more interested in such problems, but his focus was on the problems faced in the archives where he worked. Jenkinson believed that only material preserved for the information of the creative organ kept in custody could be considered files as cited but Stapleton (1983, 78)

Schellenberg was very critical of Jenkinson's definition of archives. He contended that, in conjunction with natural accumulation, the second essential characteristic of archives is their preservation "for reasons other than those for which they were created or accumulated." Thus in his definition, Schellenberg emphasizes reference and research use. He also discounted Jenkinson's stand on custody on the grounds that the volume, complex origins, and haphazard development of modern records made "futile any attempt to control individual documents." Finally, Schellenberg did not support an inflexible definition, insisting instead that perceptions varied from country to country and from time to time. In particular, he stated that the modern archivist, as opposed to an archivist like Jenkinson who worked with older records, "has a definite need to redefine archives in a manner more suited to his own requirement.

Therefore, we conclude that Schellenberg's point is quite different from Jenkinson, since its definition is based on the uses we make of the document. For him, the document must be preserved for reasons beyond those related to production.

Accordingly, he divides the given value to the document on two levels. Currently, criticisms can be made in relation to these levels of value.

But for the early assessment, meaning its value in dividing the primary (administrative-evidence) and secondary (historical-cultural-informational) was fundamental to a categorization. He believed it was necessary to redefine the institution of a file more susceptible to the modern requirements of archivists.

Finally, Schellenberg (2003, 36) reaches the following definition:

All books, papers, maps, photographs or other documentary material, no difference in their physical characteristics, made or received by any public or private institution in the course of legal obligations or in connection with a transaction from its own business and preserved or appropriate for preservation by that institution or its legitimate successor as evidence of its functions, policies, decisions, procedures, operations or other activities or because of the informational value content in them.

The proposed comparison to some extent, justified the break occurred in the United States, separating into two distinct professions, Record managers and Archivist.

Brothman (2006, .237) says what can currently be seen as the life cycle of documents:

1) the life cycle as a metaphor or analogy for the *records management life cycle* process – the creation, capture, maintenance, use, and disposition of records; 2) the life cycle as encompassing "active" or "business," "inactive" or "dormant," and dead, or retired, or archival phases of the *records' life cycle*; and, less commonly, 3) the keeping of records as a social means of either emphasizing or mitigating the stark difference between human life and death, mortality and immortality, absence and presence in the *human life cycle*.

The author brilliantly compares the existing concept of life cycle of documents with the life cycle of human beings, trying to explain the difference between them and seeking the real meaning given to that life cycle.

Schellenberg's ideas and Posner came to Europe around 1962 and served as the basis for the Belgian historian Carlos Wyffels, years later, promulgated the theory of three ages (1972).

Schellenberg is a leading archivist to the development that occurs in the Archives in the decades 1980-1990. During this period, Archival Science starts working with other problems due to a third wave of exponential increase in the production of documents, due to the emergence of electronic documents, in which the presentation structure is often modified.

4 Conclusion

The analyzed authors were fundamental to the construction of the Archival Science as a discipline, since they were the first to think the organization of archives.

The Archival Science have a really recent theoretical development if we compare with more traditional disciplines of the social sciences or even if we compare with the Library Science, but with the analysis we presented is possible to understand some milestones to the area and how this authors were fundamental to the development of the discipline, we can see a struggle beneath the publications and some of the statements positions.

The conjuncture of the power is established in these authors and this basis is present as a discursive practice even in the present time, we can see two sides of this discursive formation, in one side we have authors that can be called as "neo-Jenkinsonians" as Terry Cook suggested "that rejects Schellenbergian particularism and restates Jenkinson's conception of the universal nature of archival records."(Tschan, 2002, 190) and in the other side we have new perspectives that the statements of Schellenberg were fundamental as the Functional Archival Science.

Turn back to the basics or classics are an emergency in all scientific fields and even the in Archival Science its necessary, because only knowing what we were we can know where we can go as a field of practice.

References:

- Brandão, N. H. H. 1993 , *Introdução a Análise do discurso*. 2.ed. Campinas: Ed. da Unicamp
- Brothman, Brien 2006. Archives, life cycles, and death wishes:a helical model of record formation, *Archivaria* 61.spring. pp.235-269
- Charaudeau, Patrick. & Maingueneau, Dominique. 2004 *Dicionário de Análise do Discurso*. São Paulo:Contexto,
- Cook, Terry. 1997 What is Past is Prologue: a History of Archival Ideas since 1898, and the future paradigm shift. *Archivaria*, 43, Spring,p. 18-63.
- Dosse, François.1993. *História do estruturalismo*. Campinas: Ed da Unicamp,. 2v.
- Eastwood, Terry. 2004 Jenkinson Writings on Some Enduring Archival Themes. *American Archivist*, 67, spring/sumer, p.31-44
- Foucault, Michel. 1997 *A Arqueologia do Saber*. 5. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense,.
- Foucault, Michel. 1996 *A ordem do discurso*. 3. ed.São Paulo: Edições Loyola,
- Gadet, F. Hak,T. (Org.) 2001 *Por uma análise automática do discurso: Uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux*. 2.ed. Campinas : Ed. da Unicamp
- Gregolin, Maria Do Rosário. 2006. *Foucault e Pêcheux: na análise do discurso - diálogos & duelos*. São Carlos: Ed Claraluz,

Thiago Henrique Bragato Barros and João Batista Ernesto de Moraes. 2011. The discursive construction of archival science: Conceptual foundations. In Smiraglia, Richard P., ed. *Proceedings from North American Symposium on Knowledge Organization*, Vol. 3. Toronto, Canada, pp. 196-206.

- Horsman, P., Ketelaar, e & Thomassen, T. 2003 New Respect for the Old Order: The Context of the Dutch Manual. *American Archivist*. 66, winter/spring, p.249-270
- Jenkinson, Hillary. 1980. *Selected writings of Sir Hilary Jenkinson*. Gloucester: Alan Sutton ,
- Jenkinson, Hillary. 1922 *A manual of archive administration: including the problems of war archives and archive making*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press
- Muller, S, Feith, J. A, Fruin, Th. Az. R. 1968. *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives*. New York: H. W. Wilson Company
- Orlandi, Eni de Lourdes Puccinelli. 2007 *Análise de discurso: princípios e procedimentos*. 2. ed. Campinas: Pontes
- Pêcheux, Michel. 2002. *Discurso: Estrutura ou acontecimento*. Campinas: Pontes
- Schellenberg, Theodore Roosevelt. 2003 *Modern Archives: principles & techniques*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists.
- Schellenberg, Theodore Roosevelt. 2002 *Arquivos Modernos: princípios e técnicas*. Trad. Nilza Teixeira Soares. 2ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: FGV
- Tschan, Reto. 2002 A Comparison of Jenkinson and Schellenberg on Appraisal *American Archivist* 65, 2, pp. 176-195.