150 YEARS OF ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY PUBLISHING

By Ian W. Archer

ABSTRACT. The 150th anniversary of the Royal Historical Society offers an opportunity for an investigation into its publications over the *longue durée*. Its slow transformation from an association of literary dilettanti to a body of professional historians in the period 1890–1910 was accompanied by changes to its publication programme: the appointment of a Literary Director, an improvement in the quality of papers read, the merger with the Camden Society, and the commitment to a programme of historical bibliographies, established the basis of the Society's publishing programme for much of the twentieth century. The interwar years saw new initiatives including the launch of *Guides and Handbooks*, but the Society was already losing momentum, and an ill-fated foray into the publication of diplomatic records stymied its reputation. The 1950s and 1960s were a period of ongoing stasis, from which the Society was rescued in the early 1970s by G.R. Elton and his allies, who promoted a monograph series and the *Annual Bibliographies*. The momentum of change was sustained by the early commitment to an electronic version of its bibliographies, and still more recently by a commitment to open access monographs. The changing profile of the Society's publications by gender of author, period, and area is charted, raising questions about future directions.

The ambiguities of 'professionalization'

Between December 1890 and March 1891 the Royal Historical Society was rocked by some of the most contentious meetings in its history. On 18 December Council considered a paper proposing the appointment of a Literary Director with an honorarium of £50 per annum, who would take over the supervision of the Society's publications, tasks which were currently performed by the Honorary Secretary. The proposal was highly contentious, presumably because of the threat to the current Secretary, Patrick Edward Dove, a barrister with historical whose friends rallied in his support. Discussion of the paper was deferred on two occasions in January 1891; it was eventually carried by one vote (4:3) when discussed on 19 February, but the motion that the Society proceed immediately to fill the position of Literary Director was then lost by one vote. The reformers had to wait until the next meeting to confirm their

victory, but the motion for the appointment of Hubert Hall*[1] to be appointed to the post was carried only on the casting vote of the Society's new President, Sir Mountstuart Elphinstone Grant Duff.*[2] Hall was currently a junior clerk at the Public Record Office (he was promoted to the position of senior clerk in the following year), and had an established reputation as an editor of medieval texts; he had published in *Transactions* for the first time in 1886, and been a member of Council since 1887. Appointed for initially two years, Hall would not relinquish the post until 1938 when he was in his eighties.[3]

The Society's origins had been pretty disreputable, and it had soon become the tool of Charles Rogers*, the journalist, antiquarian and Scottish Presbyterian cleric with a penchant for founding societies, on whose resources he heartily gouged. Even after the coup which removed him from the Secretaryship in 1881, *Transactions* remained pretty idiosyncratic, and the Society was predominantly frequented by 'clergymen and physicians, army officers and civil servants, barristers and solicitors, bank managers, journalists, engineers, [and] teachers'.[4] John Burrow has wittily dissected the characteristics of its leading early contributors, such as George Harris, 'the eccentric polymath … a briefless barrister and a man of grandiose though thwarted ambition', Cornelius Walford, a writer on insurance matters and a statistician, Albert Wratislaw, a Slavonic scholar, and Gustvus Zerfi, 'a Romantic exile' and would be intellectual historian.[5] Phillipa Levine has commented that in the mid 1880s the Society 'was caught uncomfortably between the amateur tradition and a desire to emulate the rigour of the new professionals'.[6] Reform was perhaps more incremental rather than revolutionary. A trickle of historians from the universities were recruited to Council; there was talk of a merger with the fledgling *English Historical Review* in 1887; the Society played a leading role in the Domesday commemoration, from which emerged two volumes of *Domesday Studies* (1888, 1891), edited by Dove; in 1889 Council announced that it was sponsoring an edition of tracts on medieval husbandry edited by Rev William Cunningham* and his assistant Miss E.M Leonard, and suggested that it was

---

[1] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* has proved helpful on the backgrounds, careers, and values of key individuals. Rather than citing articles individually, I have adopted the expedient of identifying subjects in the *Dictionary* by means of an asterisk.
[2] RHS, Council, 18.12.1890, 15.1.1891, 29.1.1891,19.2.1891, 19.3.1891. See also R.A. Humphreys, *The Royal Historical Society 1868–1968* (1969), pp. 23–4; T.F. Tout, 'Presidential address', *TRHS*, fourth series, 9 (1926) is also revealing on the Society's early years.
[3] C[harles] J[ohnson], 'Hubert Hall, 1857–1944', *TRHS*, fourth series, 28 (1946), 1–5.
[4] Humphreys, *Royal Historical Society*, pp. 1–20, quotation at pp. 11–12.
[5] J. Burrow, 'Victorian Historians and the Royal Historical Society', *TRHS*, fifth series, 39 (1989), 125–40.
[6] P. Levine, *The Amateur and the Professional. Antiquarians, Historians, and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838–1886* (Cambridge, 1986), p. 173.

contemplating the publication of 'certain collections of state papers, especially of the French Revolution and Napoleonic periods'.[7]

The driving force behind the changes of 1890–1 was Oscar Browning*, in many ways an unlikely sponsor of reform: as Burrow has suggested his role in the Society may have been a form of rehab. His tenure as housemaster at Eton had ended with more than a whiff of sexual impropriety in 1876, but he had reinvented himself as one of the new breed of History dons at Cambridge. He was one of the first university historians to join the Council in 1884, of which he became Chairman in the following year, and he proved energetic in recruiting others, particularly from Cambridge where a branch of the Society was established in 1886. But his scholarship was 'superficial, inaccurate and diffuse'; he was a terrific snob and hated by many of his fellow dons; in the toxic politics of the Cambridge History syllabus he stood against the research ideal promoted by the future Presidents of the Society, Adolphus Ward* and George Prothero*, and stood behind Sir John Seeley's* emphasis on a schooling for statesmanship.[8] As others have remarked, there were different species of professionalism, and it is notable that two of the leading early reformers, H.V. Malden and Hall himself were archivists rather than university teachers: Philippa Levine suggests that the record office men were 'the nascent professionals in the historical field'.[9] Moreover, Browning's allies on Council, the men who carried the critical votes, are themselves revealing of its still eclectic character. Firm in their support were T.W. Rhys Davids*, the orientalist scholar and professor of Pali at the University of London, and Benjamin Franklin Stevens, a member of Council since 1888, involved in the book export business and for thirty years the London dispatch agent for the United States, but also a noted bibliographer committed to identifying sources in European archives for the history of the American Revolution. Frustratingly absent from the key meetings of 1890–1 were Lord Acton* and Seeley who were Vice Presidents, and Cunningham who sat on Council. At the height of the controversy S.R. Gardiner* turned down the Society's Presidency, and Council had to settle for the more middle-of-the road Grant Duff.

---

[7] P.E. Dove, 'Preface', *TRHS,* old series, 4, (1889), n.p.; Humphreys, *Royal Historical Society*, pp. 20–2.
[8] Burrow, 'Victorian Historians', pp. 135–8; R.N. Sofer, *Discipline and Power. The University, History, and the Making of an English Elite, 1870–1930* (Stanford, 1994), pp. 54–6, 90–6.
[9] Levine, *The Amateur and the Professional*, p. 133. For the debate over professionalization and the ambiguities of the process, see D. Goldstein, 'The Organizational Development of the British Historical Profession, 1884–1921', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 55 (1982), 180–93; R. Jann, *The Art and Science of Victorian History* (Columbus, OH, 1983), P.R.H. Slee, *Learning and a Liberal Education. The Study of Modern History in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Manchester, 1800–1914* (Manchester, 1986), Sofer, *Discipline and Power.*

But there is no doubting that the appointment of Hall as Literary Director marked a key step in the development of a more serious programme of publications. The Publications Committee was put on a firm footing; *Transactions* henceforth was to appear annually; new features included the publication of editions of documents (I.S Leadam's highly respected editions of sections of the 1517 enclosure survey eventually morphed into a book published under the Society's auspices), and an annual *tour d'horizon* of historical writing (including continental and North American scholarship) penned by Hall under the portentous title, 'The Progress of Historical Research'; still more significantly Council announced in February 1893 its commitment to 'a continuous and uniform series of publications' with *Transactions* to be supplemented every two years by a book. Volumes in the pipeline included papers relating to English diplomacy in Russia in 1802–4 and the secret service under George III to be edited by Oscar Browning and B.F. Stevens respectively.[10] Hall's own position was consolidated in the wake of the reorganisation following Dove's bankruptcy and suicide in 1894, as he took over the Secretary's duties, and his honorarium raised to £126 per annum.[11]

It has to be said that some of the aspirations of the 'reformers' proved difficult to achieve. The survey of historical literature was dropped after two years. Neither Browning's nor Stevens' much touted editions appeared for some time and under different editors.[12] Leadam's volume on enclosures proved much more expensive than envisaged because of the discovery of an additional manuscript at the eleventh hour. In terms of fulfilling the programme of a regular cycle of publications, the Society's merger with the Camden Society in 1897 was therefore crucial. The Camden Society, founded in 1838 by a group of antiquarians 'for the publication of early historical and literary remains' had by the 1880s established its scholarly credentials, with the leading historian of the Stuart period, S.R. Gardiner and key Public Record Office men, James Joel Cartwright and James Gairdner* at the helm. Its editorial standards had risen, with notable editions by Gardiner himself, and his pupil Charles Firth*. But, faced with competition from the proliferating publishing societies of the high Victorian era, its membership had fallen, and it was struggling to make ends meet.

[10] RHS, Council, 12.5.1892, 16.2.1893.
[11] Humphreys, *Royal Historical Society*, pp. 24–6.
[12] RHS, Council, 19.3.1903; *Select Despatches from the British Foreign Office Archives Relating to the Formation of the Third Coalition Against France, 1804–1805*, ed. J. Holland Rose (Camden Society, third series, 7, 1904); *Parliamentary Papers of John Robinson, 1774–1784*, ed. W.T. Laprade (Camden Society, third series, 33, 1922).

[13] Cartwright wrote in desperate terms to Gairdner in June 1894: 'nothing can save us but £200 ready money … and a permanent addition of at least 100 to our number of members', whether they could bring out T.G. Law's volumes on the Archpriest controversy on which much had been spent already would depend on the willingness of the publishers to extend credit. As Gairdner noted wrily, 'I am afraid brandy will not save us'. [14] The prospect of imminent dissolution made the Camden Society amenable to the idea of a merger, and discussions began in January 1896. The Camden Society consulted its membership in April with pre-printed postcards: there were 67 ayes, three noes, and three not opposed.

The Royal Historical Society benefited from the boost in membership, including new subscribing libraries, and acquired a prestigious series; its Council was afforced by three recruits from the Camden Society. The appearance of printed instructions to editors and publishers in 1898, revised in 1915 and 1925 was a sign of the centrality of publishing to the Society's *raison d'etre*, and its seriousness of scholarly purpose. The composition of the Publications Committee in 1901 testifies to the change in the Society's intellectual profile. Hall, it is true, was perhaps not the sharpest pencil in the box (Maitland noted his 'curious fluffy mind', and his edition of the *Red Book of the Exchequer* was savaged by J.H. Round among others) but there was no doubting his dedication to hard work ('the most unselfish man I have ever known' continued Maitland);[15] in any event the historians were the prime movers. S.R. Gardiner sat alongside his protégé, Charles Firth; others included the Anglo-Saxon scholar W.H. Stevenson, and two whose reputations have fared less well at the hands of later generations: Charles Raymond Beazley, research fellow at Merton College, Oxford, and later professor at Birmingham, and a fellow traveller of the right, and (in ecumenical spirit) the Benedictine monk, Francis Aiden Gasquet*. Among the archive professionals were Gairdner and Malden. The presence of men as varied as I.S. Leadam, a barrister with a strong publications record, including the edition of *The Domesday of Enclosures*; Frederic Harrison,* the polymathic positivist and friend of progressive causes; and the Treasurer

---

[13] F.J. Levy, 'The Founding of the Camden Society', *Victorian Studies* 7:3 (1964), 295–305; C. Johnson, The Camden Society, 1838–1938', *TRHS*, fourth series, 22 (1940), 23–38; Humphreys, *Royal Historical Society*, pp. 52–67.

[14] RHS, Camden Society, Secretary's correspondence file, C3/2.

[15] *The Letters of Frederic William Maitland*, ed. CH.S. Fifoot (Cambridge, 1965), p. 181. I am grateful to George Garnett for drawing Maitland's letters to my attention. For more on Hall, see Humphreys, *Royal Historical Society*, p. 40. See also T.F. Tout, 'Review of *The Red Book of the Exchequer.* Edited by Hubert Hall', *English Historical Review*, 13:49 (1898), 145–50, and more damning, R.L. Poole, 'Review of *Studies on the Red Book of the Exchequer*. By J.H. Round and *The Red Book of the Exchequer: A Reply to Mr J.H. Round.* By Hubert Hall', *English Historical Review*, 14:53 (1899), 148–50. The Round-Hall affair has been subject to comprehensive analysis by M. Procter, 'The *Red Book of the Exchequer*: A Curious Affair Revisited', *Historical Research*, 87:237 (2014), 510–32.

Robert Hovenden, who combined his perfume wholesaling business with antiquarian and genealogical pursuits, shows a continued eclecticism in recruitment to Council though all had serious scholarly credentials. Browning remained, a survivor from the 1880s, perhaps less at ease among men of this acumen. He certainly ought to have been.

The merger with the Camden Society ensured that the Society could fulfil its commitment to a regular programme of publishing. Volumes appeared regularly albeit not at the rate previously achieved by the Camden Society. Costs had to be carefully monitored. Whereas in the four years up to 1897, expenditure on printing and stationery had been £297 per annum, in the period 1897–1902, it was £394 per annum, an increase which was only to some extent offset by swelling subscription income. There were periodic attempts to limit expenditure on publications; in March 1904 a cap of £350 inclusive of editorial expenses was set, any increase requiring the approval of Council; in 1921 a more sensible policy of seeking to set a target of £750 per annum averaged over three years was adopted, the difference in costs being an indication of the inflationary pressures.[16] Honoraria to editors, requests for assistance with transcription, and the cost of authors' corrections tended to push costs upwards. [17] There were periodic spats with the publishers. Although the high quality of Spottiswode's product satisfied the Society, 'their system of rendering accounts and disregard of official directives is utterly opposed to economy and efficiency' Council declared indignantly in 1907.[18] One suspects that the publisher's narrative, confronted by uncertain page extents and endless corrections, would have been somewhat different.

There was a steady expansion in the circulation of the Society's publications, as its membership and the number of subscribing libraries swelled (Table 1). Moreover, there was a real effort to diversify the range of history covered. Prothero expressed a desire that *Transactions* should not be 'too exclusively insular and medieval', and Council announced that it would give preference to papers dealing with the modern period and general historical subjects.[19] A similar policy was adopted with regards to Camdens. Whereas the Camden Society had concentrated on medieval and early modern texts, there was a shift in emphasis with volumes more evenly spread, 30 per cent of the volumes published under Hall's

[16] RHS, Council, 17.12.1903, 17.3.1904, 21.4.1904, 15.12.1904, 8.12.1921, 12.6.1924.
[17] RHS, Council, 15.12.1904, 20.12.1906, 18.6.1908, 17.12.1908, 16.3.1909.
[18] RHS, Council, 12.1.1907.
[19] G. Prothero, 'Presidential address', *TRHS*, new series, 19 (1905), 15–17; Report of Council, 1904–5.

stewardship covering the period 1700–1900 (Table 2).[20] As early as 1893, Council took 'regard of the fact that the publication of medieval records and memorials has been for many years past undertaken both by the Treasury and by private publication societies whilst the modern state papers especially such as illustrate the foreign policy and statesmanship of this country in the great crisis of its history during the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars have been almost entirely neglected by the authorities'. Worse still, 'these state papers have for many years past been known and highly appreciated by foreign historians who have made considerable use of them though necessarily in a desultory manner so that we are actually in danger of having some of the greatest episodes in our own history interpreted on the authority of our own archives by foreigners instead of by native historians'. Publication of these records 'will prove of the highest utility to students of history and will also be the honour and advantage to the Society'.[21] These patriotic sentiments notwithstanding, the country faced a greater challenge in the Great War of 1914–1918, during which many of those associated with the Society took on work in the Foreign Office intelligence service, an experience which seemed to confirm the need for a proper understanding of international relations.[22] In 1920 the eighteenth-century political historian Basil Williams* suggested that the Society publish a series of diplomatic instructions on the model of the *Recueil des Instructions données aux Ambassadeurs et Ministres de France (1648–1789)*, and the proposal was enthusiastically endorsed, and all pretence of historical objectivity discarded, 'with a view to making known the real intentions of our foreign policy and incidentally vindicating its general straightforwardness and continuity'. Failing government support, the Society could imagine that 'no nobler field could be offered to private generosity. The publication would be no less a service to the country than to history'. The hope that these volumes could be supplementary to the target of two Camdens per annum was not fulfilled, and private funding did not materialise, but the series went ahead. It was not a scholarly success, however. Harold Temperley*, doyen of the historians of international diplomacy and member of Council, wrote a searing review of the first volume relating to Anglo-Swedish diplomacy pointing out that the English diplomatic instructions were not comparable to, and of less intrinsic interest than, the *Receuils* and that the attempt to remedy the defects by a selection of other despatches compounded the problem because the principles of selection were unclear. The

[20] Hubert Hall's 'Memorandum on the Serial Distribution of the Royal Historical Society's Publications', prepared for RHS, Publications Committee, 21.9.1933 documents the shifting balance of publications.
[21] RHS, Council, 16.2.1893.
[22] C. Parker, *The English Historical Tradition Since 1850* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp. 109–117.

Diplomatic Instructions series threatened 'the reputation of British historical scholarship'. It was one of several critical reviews of the series.[23]

The origins and early years of the Bibliographies

It was in the 1920s, however, that the first fruits of another of the Society's projects, its bibliographies of British history appeared. To understand their gestation, we need to go back a bit to the turn-of-the-century concerns about the standing of British history in the international community. Britain was behind Europe and North America in developing systematic bibliographies as research aids. The Germans in particular had laid down the gauntlet with the *Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft* and its antecedents published from 1878.[24] It was perhaps significant that the pioneer of bibliographies of British history was an assistant professor at Harvard, Charles Gross (1857–1909), who had studied at Leipzig, Berlin and Paris, and took his PhD from Göttingen in 1883. He was responsible for a *Bibliography of British Municipal History* (1897), and the influential *Sources and Literature of English History from the Earliest Times to about 1485* (1900). The product of a course of lectures on British history, his bibliography of medieval history provided 'a systematic survey of the printed materials relating to the political, constitutional, legal, social, and economic history of England, Wales and Ireland to 1485'.[25]

Gross's initiative focused the concerns of those who appreciated the need for critical bibliographies in other periods. Three men were particularly influential. Henry Richard Tedder* was the librarian of the Athenaeum, who in a lecture of 1885 to the Library Association at Plymouth had taken the subject of 'Proposals for a bibliography of national history'. He became a fellow of the Society in 1902, and served as treasurer from 1904 until 1924. But the discussion within the Society was opened by Frederic Harrison in a paper of 1896 which took its cue from the possibilities of the merger with the Camden Society for the type of collaboration currently being modelled by the *Dictionary of National Biography*, to produce a bibliography of English (*sic*) history.[26] The first mention of a bibliography in the

[23] H. Temperley, 'Review of *British Diplomatic Instructions, 1689–1789. Vol i. Sweden, 1689–1727*', *English Historical Review*, 38:150 (123), 281–3; idem, 'Review of *British Diplomatic Instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. ii, France, 1689–1721*', *English Historical Review*, 41:164 (1926), 603–4; R. Lodge, 'Review of *British Diplomatic Instructions, 1689–1789. Vol. iv, France, 1721–1727*', *English Historical Review*, 43:171 (1928), 433–8.

[24] Historische Gesellschaft zu Berlin, *Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft im Auftrage der Historischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin* (Berlin, 1878–1913).

[25] Gross, *Sources and Literature*, p. ii.

[26] F. Harrison, 'A Proposal for a new Historical Bibliography', *TRHS*, new series, 11 (1897), 11–30.

Council's minutes comes in 1900 but discussion was adjourned.[27] It was Sir George Prothero, former professor of history at Edinburgh, and since 1899 editor of the *London Quarterly Review*, President of the Society from 1901 until 1905 who really made the project central to the Society's aspirations. Prothero had studied in Germany, admired Ranke, and stood for a more scientific approach to the discipline. He dedicated the bulk of his presidential address of 19 February 1903 to a call for a systematic bibliography of the history of the British Isles. Drawing unfavourable comparisons with the Germans, he suggested that the Englishman was characterised by a 'muddle through' philosophy, but 'of the higher practicality, which consists in forethought, preparation, system, the qualities which make for national efficiency, he has, I fear, but a very small share'. He noted that 'in this matter of bibliographies we are, as a nation, amazingly badly off', and it was a matter of reproach that the largest listing of works on British history was contained in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, while the pioneer Charles Gross was an American, an 'ornament of Harvard'.[28]

Prothero mobilised other luminaries of the Society like Firth, but it was really the American Historical Association that drove it forward. At its meeting at Richmond, Virginia on 30 December 1908 the Association heard proposals for a general bibliography of modern British history, and a committee under the chairmanship of the Tudor historian E. P. Cheyney was appointed. The Society followed suit in 1909, appointing a committee chaired by Prothero, and including Firth and Tedder, to build up an Anglo-American co-operation. It was decided that there should be one volume of general bibliography, and that the period-specific works on British history since 1485 should be covered in two volumes with a break date at 1714, designed to complement Gross's existing work. Some progress was made before the First World War; Prothero was appointed general editor, funds were raised by subscription, and a publisher was found. But the war diverted energies and although Prothero was still working on the project shortly before his death in 1922, there was little concrete yet to show. In 1923 the scheme was scaled back; the general volume was abandoned, and the plans for the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century volumes shelved; and it was agreed that the American and

[27] RHS, Council, 15.3.1900.
[28] George Prothero, 'Presidential address', *TRHS*, new series, 17 (1903), ix–xxxiv. For Prothero, see also C.W. Crawley, 'Sir Gorge Prothero and his Circle', *TRHS*, fifth series, 20 (1970), 101–28; M. Bentley, 'The Age of Prothero: British History in the Long *Fin de Siècle*, 1870–1920', *TRHS*, sixth series, 20 (2010), 171–93.

British teams should take on separate responsibility for volumes respectively in the Tudor and Stuart periods.[29]

In the determination to show something for all the investment of time and money, the Stuart volume under the editorship of Godfrey Davies, a former pupil of Firth, was rushed out, probably too soon, appearing in 1928. The reception was pretty critical. Reviewers pounced on the omissions and criticised the organisation of entries under the sub headings by date of publication which had the effect of separating material on related subjects. Some lessons were learned by Conyers Read whose Tudor volume received a warmer reception.[30] Prothero's bequest in 1934 of the bulk of his estate (valued at £22,400) and the enthusiasm of F.M. Powicke*, another reforming president (1933–7), enabled the Society (with the co-operation of the Institute of Historical Research (IHR) to embark in 1935 on a new project, the annual listing of publications on British history, modelled on American, French and German exemplars. The first volume, covering the *Writings on British History* of 1934, appeared three years later. This and the next two volumes were compiled by Alexander ('Jock') Taylor Milne, then junior librarian of the Society, and later secretary and librarian of the IHR, but progress was interrupted by his wartime service.[31]

The bibliographies represented an attempt to diversify the Society's offering by providing key research tools. It was already sppreciated that a regular diet of Camdens (and a somewhat force-fed one at that, bundled as they were into subscriptions) did not meet all the needs of historians. In 1933 Publications Committee proposed a new series supplementary to Camdens which it hoped would be of interest to students of modern history. Proposals included lists of diplomatic agents and civil servants, lists of statistical material relating to eighteenth-century commerce to be pursued in conjunction with the Economic History Society, 'a volume of chronological data', 'a volume of the historical equations of coinage and exchange', and 'materials in private muniments of business houses'.[32] It was essentially a blueprint for what became the *Guides and Handbooks* series, though progress had already been made with the lists of eighteenth-century diplomatic agents in a Camden volume edited by D.B. Horn

[29] See the illuminating correspondence folders on Bibliography projects, 1911–74 at RHS for negotiations with publishers and fund raising initiatives.
[30] *Bibliography of British History, Stuart Period, 1603–1714*, ed. Godfrey Davies (Oxford, 1928); *Bibliography of British History, Tudor Period, 1485–1603*, ed. Conyers Read (Oxford, 1933).

[31] Humphreys, *Royal Historical Society*, p. 35; RHS, Council, 14.3.1935; 12.5. 1945, 15.12.1945, 15.3.1947; Royal Historical Society, *Writings on British History: 1934–* (London, 1937–86).
[32] RHS, Council, 12.10.1933, with report of Publications Committee, 21.9.1933.

published in 1932. In 1938 the Society was able to contemplate the publication of one additional volume per annum, but the war and the ensuing austerity put paid to that, and in any event editors made slow progress: only six handbooks had been published by 1951; the volume on British diplomatic representatives 1509–1688 (on which work had commenced in 1937)[33] did not appear until 1990. But there were impressive fruits like Powicke's *Handbook of British Chronology* (1939), and Christopher Cheney's *Handbook of Dates* (1945), a long term bestseller.

The place of women

We have passed the half-way point of this account, and so far the only woman mentioned has been one of Archdeacon Cunningham's research assistants, Ellen Marianne Leonard of the LSE.[34] It's been very much a case of the study of *The History Men*.[35] But one of the most surprising aspects of *Transactions* is the space given to female historians in the early twentieth century (Table 3). The proportion rose steadily from the 1890s and peaked in the 1920s with 40 per cent of published papers by women, a proportion which has never been equalled, and from which there was steady falling off until as late as the 1990s. Women were particularly successful in the Alexander Prize essay competition, accounting for eight of the twelve winners between 1898 and 1917. The first, Frances Hermia Durham* went on to a distinguished career in the civil service, but others like Rose Graham* (1903), Rachel Reid (1906) and Isobel Thornley (1917) went on to further academic distinction. Graham, a noted medieval church historian, and tutor at Somerville College was to become the first female member of Council in 1920 and holds the record for articles published in *Transactions* (Presidents apart) with five contributions up to 1930. Other returnees included Caroline Skeel*, leading light at the women's college of Westfield in London (three articles), Maud Violet Clarke, tutor at Somerville (two), and the remarkable Inna Lubimenko (four). Lubimenko (1878–1959) had received her initial historical training in St Petersburg, but pursued a doctorate at the Sorbonne under the supervision of Charles Bémont on Jean de Bretagne, developing an interest in Anglo-Russian relations in the early modern period during her visits to London. She was the only woman to address the International Historical Congress at London in 1913, in which the Society played a leading role; in the following year

[33] RHS, Council, 11.3.1937. The series on diplomatic agents was first mooted in 1927 and was strongly supported by both Temperley and Sir Richard Lodge: Council, 8.12.1927.
[34] 'Ellen Marianne Leonard - President of the Students' Union, 1907', http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/lsehistory/2016/03/24/ellen-marianne-leonard/
[35] The swipe at J.P. Kenyon, *The History Men: The Historical Profession in England Since the Renaissance* (second edition, 1993) is intentional.

she addressed the Society on the subject of Elizabeth I's correspondence with the tsars. Further papers were published in 1918, 1924, and 1928. Her last visit to the west was in 1928, but although she continued to correspond with her émigré sister in Paris she was unscathed in the Stalin years, and continued to publish in Russian.[36] Although in 1921 the Society elected its probably most reactionary President, Sir Charles Oman*, no friend of the cause of women in the universities, a trickle of female Councillors followed Rose Graham through the inter war years: Caroline Skeel (1926–9), Eleanor Lodge* (1923–36), Irene Churchill (1926–38), Hilda Johnstone (1927–30, 1931–5), Helen Cam* (1936–40, her first term), Evelyn Jamison (1938–41), and Eileen Power* (1939–40). But two to three women Councillors at any one time was just about as good as it was going to get before the 1990s (Table 3). At a time when (1920), just 11 per cent of the Society's fellows were women, and of those three quarters unmarried, the profile of women in the Society's publications is striking. But there were also some less visible women, who played key roles in publications. M. Berryl Curran, a product of Girton, published in *Transactions* and edited a volume of diplomatic correspondence for Camden in 1903, but she had a bigger role as the Society's Secretary and Librarian from 1901 to 1943: letters to her from Hubert Hall at the end of his tenure as Literary Director show that she was no mere factotum in the publishing regime, but an active participant.[37] She was the first of the key women behind the scenes who tolerated all the foibles of the academics and got things done. Aileen Armstrong (Secretary and Librarian, 1946–70), Jean Chapman (Executive Secretary, 1977–87), and Joy McCarthy (Executive Secretary, 1987–2005, 2006) were cut of the same cloth;[38] Janet Godden and Christine Linehan likewise were to be crucial to the success of *Studies in History*. These are contributions which the distortions of archival survival can all too easily efface.

The growing prominence of women in the Society's publications in the early twentieth century followed by a retreat is perhaps typical of patterns in the profession more widely. The proportion of female historians in British universities remained fairly static between the 1920s and 1970s. Although the phenomenon is worthy of further research, it seems that at the turn of the century there were more opportunities on the fringes of a profession still in the process of defining itself, with very porous boundaries between professional and non-

[36] I am grateful for help with the Alexander Prize and women in *Transactions* to Katy Cubitt and Simon Baker respectively. For Lubimenko, my research student Mikhail Belan has provided invaluable assistance. The archivists of Somerville College and Lady Margaret Hall in Oxford and Girton College in Cambridge have been helpful on the careers of women scholars.
[37] RHS, Box 3, folder 143/2, Hall was writing to Miss Curran at least twice a week.
[38] Joy McCarthy, 'Jean Chapman, 1934–2015', *Newsletter*, October 2015; Peter Mandler, Presidential Letter, *Newsletter*, December 2016.

professional. Many women historians found work as teaching assistants and as researchers on projects like the *Victoria County History*. Durham, for example, had trained in palaeography after completing her Cambridge education, and had been employed in cataloguing family archives. The Royal Historical Society may have been publically silent on the question of women's role in the profession, but in the wider academy some of its leading lights were supportive, and Oman was something of an outlier in his views. Archdeacon Cunningham (President, 1909–13) had been an early supporter of women's education at Cambridge; T.F. Tout* (President, 1925–9) campaigned for the same opportunities for women as for men at Manchester University, 'a medievalist in his studies but most modern in his views'. No fewer than seventeen women, six of them on the same day,[39] became Fellows in 1915 during Firth's Presidency (1913–17); they included Helen Cam, Irene Churchill, Hilda Johnstone, Eleanor Lodge, and Eileen Power. Several of the women we have been discussing had come under the wing of Hubert Hall, perhaps unfairly dismissed as a 'dry, dull archivist of legal and diplomatic records'. He was a close friend of the Webbs and a leading light in the establishment of the London School for Economics, for which he provided palaeography classes from 1896 to 1919 as well as teaching in economic history. Other women historians had family ties to leading male historians. Eleanor Lodge, Principal of Westfield College was the sister of Sir Richard Lodge (President, 1929–33), and Hilda Johnstone, one of the first female professors in London, was Tout's sister-in-law.[40]

Stasis

The falling away of female contributors – between 1951 and 1970 there were eleven years in which there were no women contributors to *Transactions* – was just one manifestation of the loss of momentum in the third quarter of the twentieth century. Publication conditions post war were indeed challenging. Costs in 1950 were said to be 100 percent higher than in 1938, while subscription income had grown by just 50 per cent.[41] The aspiration articulated in 1938 to publish four volumes per annum could not be realised. In May 1946 it was agreed that only one Camden and a volume of *Transactions* could be published each year, with a *Guide* or

[39] RHS, Council, 18.2.1915.
[40] J.V. Beckett; 'Women Historians and the VCH', paper at 'London Women Historians: A Celebration and a Conversation', 2017, podcast online at http://www.history.ac.uk/exhibitions/womenhistorians/index.html; Carol Dyhouse, *No Distinction of Sex?: Women in British Universities, 1870–1939* (2016), pp. 135–8, 145–6; M. Berg, *A Woman in History: Eileen Power, 1889–1940* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 71, 156–7; B.G. Smith, *The Gender of History. Men, Women and Historical Practice* (1998), ch. 7. I have also benefited from the insights of Caroline Barron and Jane Garnett on these questions.
[41] RHS, Bellot Papers, Memorandum of 20.6.1950.

Handbook every other year, a position which was reiterated in December 1956.[42] The rate of output of Camdens slowed to the lowest rate in the series' history. Only six handbooks were published between 1945 and 1970. The format of *Transactions* barely changed. The costs of the bibliographic projects with seemingly little returns made some Councillors doubt their utility. Volumes of *Writings* appeared only fitfully after the war, although the Society was spending £350–400 per annum (12 per cent of its income in 1946) on the salary of the researcher at the IHR and by 1960 the backlog of unlisted publications dated back to 1945.[43] Likewise, there had been some loss of direction in the production of the critical select bibliographies initiated in 1909, with key Councillors in the post war years acknowledging that they had lost track of the business.[44] Attempts to pick up the threads resulted in some tetchy correspondence and fraught meetings with the Americans. Relations were at a low point in 1952. Conyers Read emerged from meetings with T.F. Plucknett (President, 1948–52) and Hugh Hale Bellot, currently the Society's Secretary, with a sense that it was more interested in *Writings* than in the compendium volumes to which the Americans remained committed , ending a letter to W.K. Jordan, 'More than once … I sighed for the more capacious days of Sir George Prothero'.[45] But Bellot, shortly succeeding as President (1952–56), did his best to set things on an even keel by securing money from the Ford Foundation in 1956 to compile a retrospective listing of the *Writings* of 1901–33, which finally appeared in five volumes in 1968–70, and also to resume work on the select bibliographies, for which new volumes were commissioned form 1956 onwards.

By and large those serving as Literary Director in the post-war years were historians of distinction. The post was first split on Hall's retirement in 1938 between the admittedly intellectually lightweight Valentine Judges and the much more substantial C.R. Cheney*, and although Philip Grierson (1945–55)*, Denys Hay (1955–8), and Pierre Chaplais (1958–64) served alone, thereafter the split became permanent, increasingly with a modernist serving alongside an early modernist or medievalist. But Literary Directors tended to be recruited from among those who thought that the existing publishing programme was a good thing, and the Society fell prey to institutional inertia. There were hardly any new initiatives. 60 per cent of the papers published in *Transactions* in the 1960s were on political history, sometimes

[42] See the helpful summary of Council resolutions in letter from R.H.C. Davis to Ian Christie, 8.9.1968, Bodleian Library, K.V. Thomas papers, Box 21. I am grateful to Sir Keith Thomas for permission to consult his papers.
[43] RHS, Bellot papers, C. Clay to Bellot, 4.6.1946.
[44] RHS, Bellot papers, T.F. Plucknett to Bellot, undated, ?1949.
[45] RHS, folder on Bibliographies of British History, Read to Jordan, 18.7.1952.

rather narrowly conceived; there was little sense of the world beyond Europe apart from some excursions into US diplomacy and the admittedly scintillating paper by John Elliott on Hernan Cortes (still among the most frequently downloaded articles); the impression is of the dominance of the golden triangle in selecting speakers, and historians of the left of the calibre of E.P. Thompson or Eric Hobsbawm were conspicuously absent.

There were murmurings of discontent about the Society's purpose. As early as 1950 Dom David Knowles* asked Bellot 'whether the Society 'exists to be predominantly a publishing society with its meetings little more than a recording of matter for its *Transactions*, or does it envisage becoming a rendezvous for all activities of learned societies?', though his own Presidency (1956–60) saw little change. Writing to Geoffrey Elton* early in his Presidency, Brian Harrison quoted with approval what he had been told by E. P. Hennock at the beginning of his career that the Society was 'largely irrelevant, a sort of dignified do nothing body for people within easy striking distance of London'.[46] There were some stirrings of reform: it was under Richard Southern* (President, 1968–72) that the Society began its programme of regional conferences which began to diversify the fare in *Transactions*: the themes of the first three, history and the new techniques, history and the arts, urban civilization (1970–2) suggest a willingness to push at the interdisciplinary and methodological frontiers.

The Eltonian revolution in publications

But this was nothing in comparison to what was to follow. On assuming the Presidency in 1972, Elton descended on the culture of complacency (at least that is how he saw it) with ferocity. Writing to Harrison in June 1973, he claimed that 'the Victorian hangover is powerful, manifest and stifling'. Writing to the Treasurer in 1974 he described the Society as 'a dim and distant maw devouring one's subscriptions and turning out … volumes of not much interest in compensation'.[47] Needless to say, he was not deterred by opposition: 'It's solid conservatives like Ian [Christie] who make me think that maybe I really am the radical of my dreams'.[48] Elton questioned in particular the value of the Camden series suggesting that there were other ways of making primary sources available, for example through microfilm reproduction. He was keen on research guides and especially on monographs.

[46] RHS, Bellot Papers, Knowles to Bellot, 15.11.1950; cf. same to same 3.11.1949; Elton papers, Presidential correspondence, Harrison to Elton, 12.9.1973.
[47] RHS, Elton Papers, Presidential correspondence, Elton to Harrison, 29.6.1973; Elton to G. Davis, 9.2.1974.
[48] RHS, Elton Papers, Presidential correspondence, Elton to K.V. Thomas, 31.10.1973.

The Literary Directors, Keith Thomas (1970–4) and Valerie Pearl (1974–7, the first woman in that role) supported Elton's critical approach. The Society determined on a consultation of its membership about its publications strategy, the first time I think that such a survey had been attempted. The returns survive, and provide a fascinating snapshot of the fellowship's feeling about its publications. There were 136 responses, mainly (75 per cent) from historians working in England and Wales (there were just four from Scotland and two from Ireland), but with 13 per cent from North American institutions (and only one from mainland Europe). 23 women (17 per cent) replied. A full spectrum of views was expressed. Just over a third (49) were pretty hostile to Camdens, but the series attracted support from 78 (58%), and of these 19 expressed themselves in pretty strong terms. G.L Harriss declared the series 'vital', William Kellaway opined that 'nothing wears as well as a well edited text', Lawrence Stone condemned it as 'hopelessly outdated', and breaking rank with many of his fellow medievalists Rees Davies declared that it had 'outlived its purpose', *Miscellany* volumes were declared by another respondent to be 'a bleak inglorious graveyard at best'. Others called for a 'reformed Camden' with longer introductions and better editorial apparatus combined with a more proactive commissioning policy. Other moderates expressed themselves content with reducing the number produced to one a year to make space for other types of publication. The suggestion that microfilm publication of records should be sponsored by the Society as a substitute for editions drew withering fire ('ask a microfilm to supply the skill of a Chaplais', quipped M.R. Powicke), while some expressed scepticism about the need for more monographs, claiming that more were being published than the paper assumed. Nor did the supposedly sacrosanct *Transactions* escape censure: J.P. Cooper attacked the quality of papers at the Society's conferences, others criticised the allegedly large number of typographical errors. [49]

There was clearly no mandate for the abandonment of Camdens, but Council did agree in February 1974 that once the backlog of already commissioned volumes was cleared, just one volume should be published each year, to be supplemented by an annual publication of an 'Aid to Research', and an occasional series of short monographs of 25,000 to 30,000 words. This was a somewhat pyrrhic victory, particularly as implementation would be delayed, nor was there much consensus about a monograph series on those terms (none appeared), while

[49] RHS, File of returns to survey on publications, 1973. See also Elton papers, Presidential correspondence, P. Chaplais to Elton, 2.2.1974, J.C. Holt to Elton, 17.12.1973 for the notion of the 'reformed Camden'.

practical proposals for research aids were thin on the ground and often delayed.[50] Elton was not to be deterred. In September 1975 Council returned to the question of monographs and declared that it was matter of 'great urgency'. It was decided to publish the books commercially with a modest subsidy from the Society for editorial work, and selling them at a discount to fellows. A circular to fellows went out in the autumn of 1975, an editorial board had been constituted by May 1976, and by September of that year £10,000 had been raised sufficient to support the series for three years. The first volumes were published in 1977 by Swifts (Boydell and Brewer took over in 1985). *Studies in History* had arrived.[51]

Elton also cut the Gordian knot on the bibliographies. Recognising the key problem with *Writings* that they were not current, and the scale of the unindexed backlog, Elton sought to get the Society to sponsor the production of annual listings of publications on British history to appear within nine months of the year in which they were published, and this was implemented with the *Annual Bibliographies*. Again he moved with astonishing speed. He carried forward the negotiations with Harvester Press, supervised a pilot project for the first quarter of 1974, recruited the specialist section editors, and produced the text on his own typewriter.[52] The *Annuals* were at first designed to trade something of the *Writings'* comprehensiveness for greater topicality, but they grew in volume, reflecting the increase in historical output as well as the compilers' more liberal approach to the interdisciplinary margins; the numbers of items indexed rose from 2,033 in 1975 to 3,677 in 1989, 6,764 in 1997 and 11,237 in 2002, the last year of hard copy publication.

Whatever one thinks of his politics, or indeed his history, there is no doubt that Elton was one of the Society's great reforming Presidents. The monograph series in particular was aimed at what we now call early career researchers. Elton's intense personal involvement in the early years of the series is evident in the bulging correspondence files relating to the series held in the Society's offices. The *Annuals* were foundational to the Society's later bibliographic endeavours. It is unfortunate that none of this was recognised in the published proceedings of the symposium, 'The Eltonian legacy' held to discuss his work after his death. As Patrick Collinson has remarked in the *Oxford DNB* entry on Elton, 'as an act of dismemberment, it was reminiscent of the last scene of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus, or of the Orpheus legend'.

[50] RHS, Council, 8.2.1974.
[51] RHS, Council, 20.9.1975, 21.11.1975, 5.3.1976, 18.9.1976.
[52] RHS, Council, 8.3.1974, 21.9.1974, 18.9.1976.

The changing landscape of publications. The digital turn: challenges and opportunities

In December 1992 at the beginning of Rees Davies' Presidency (1992–6) the Society embarked on a review of all its activities through a series of working parties, among them its publications. The current programme was upheld, albeit with a reduced priority for monographs, but a key change was the switch of publishers for *Transactions* and Camdens in 1995 from Boydell and Brewer to Cambridge University Press and the introduction of an opt-out on Camdens with a variable subscription rate.[53] The contract was renewed in 2000 on the basis of a profit-share scheme which has served the Society well in sometimes testing market conditions. The more commercial approach has released more funds to enable it to do more things, notably research support. Whereas publication costs accounted for about two-thirds of normal expenditure at the beginning of the twentieth century, and still around 50–60 per cent in the mid-1990s, by the 2010s it was one third; the other big change is the inflow of royalty income (in 2012–13 £93,460 in grants and royalties, admittedly boosted by one-off payments from the Cambridge digital archive, against expenditure of £95,364).[54] The Royal Historical Society is now much less a purely 'publishing society' than at earlier periods in its history.

The 1992–3 review had been asked to consider other modes of publication, including electronic, but at that stage no concrete proposals were forthcoming. The digitisation of the Society's publications had to wait until 2007–10, when the combination of student demand, falling costs and enhanced revenue opportunities made the proposals attractive to publishers: the back list of *Transactions* went live on JSTOR in 2007; in 2010 Camdens were made available through the Cambridge University Press Digital Archive, a substantial addition to the resources available for the study of British history. In the period 2011–15 downloads from *Transactions* across the CJO and JSTOR platforms averaged 430 per day, while downloads from Camden fifth series were at a more disappointing 4.6 per day: is that a measure of utility or discoverability?

In the meantime the Society had made great progress with the digitisation of its bibliographies.[55] In 1989 taking advantage of the changing technologies, it took the decision to create a searchable database, bringing together the various sources of bibliographic

[53] RHS, Council, 121.12.1992, 28.5.1993, 21.1.1994. Boydell and Brewer continued to publish *Studies in History*.
[54] Reports of Council.
[55] The paragraphs which follow draw on the author's personal recollections, but the story can be followed through the successive reports of Council in *TRHS*, as well as the reports to AHRB/AHRC as archived in the Publications Committee papers. There is a considerable amount of information on the BBIH project website. See also http://www.history.ac.uk/makinghistory/resources/articles/RHSB.html

information, and over the next few years secured funding from the Leverhulme Trust and the British Academy. The contents of the underlying bibliographies were scanned, gaps in coverage (notably in imperial and commonwealth history, women's history and Roman history) identified and plugged, and the resulting bulky print-outs sent out to an army of scholars (including many North Americans) who checked the information, and added indexing terms, including the period covered. John Morrill, the project's mastermind and general editor, described it as 'an extraordinary modern example of what the early modern period would have called the putting out system'. Their collective labours bore fruit in the eventual publication of a CD-ROM by Oxford University Press in 1998, allowing the complex searching of around 250,000 records on British history from 1900 until 1992.

The static character of the CD-ROM, the greater flexibility of the web and the prospect of new funding opportunities shaped the next phase. The cusp of the new century was a good time for public funding of electronic projects; following initial support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the Esmée Fairbairn Trust, the Arts and Humanities Research Board and its successor the Arts and Humanities Research Council provided three consecutive Resource Enhancement grants (2001–9) to enable the bibliography to be available on the internet free at the point of use, and to develop interoperability with other resources.

Under Ian Archer, its General Editor from 1999 to 2012, the project now firmly based in the Institute of Historical Research, developed successful collaborations with *London's Past Online* and *Irish History Online*. The bibliography pioneered cross-searchability with other resources like the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, linkage to library catalogues and online text through OpenURL technology. Since going live in July 2002 and the time of writing the database has doubled in size from around 300,000 to 600,000 records. But the irony was that at the precise point at which pressures for open access were building up in the higher education sector, the Society was forced to redevelop the resource on a subscription model. The core problem is that its usefulness depends on its being current (an average of 14,230 records per annum were added in the years 2012–16), and the editing of the records brings significant costs. The Society's President, Colin Jones and the Director of the IHR, Miles Taylor worked with Archer and Jane Winters, then Head of Publications at the IHR. to secure a three-way deal with the Belgian publisher Brepols which allows the salary costs to be covered, and keeps the subscription levels at the more modest end of the spectrum. In 2010 the rebranded Bibliography of British and Irish History (BBIH) was launched with significantly improved searching capabilities.

The *Studies in History* series had undoubtedly delivered in terms of providing publishing opportunities for early career historians, but there were signs by the 2010s that it was losing momentum. Reduced print runs (500–550 in 1993, 400 in 2000, 200 in 2015) were a problem shared with other publishers, reflecting pressure on library budgets, but more worrying was the fall in new proposals; the series seemed a less attractive proposition for early career historians, perhaps because less focused than most of its competitors.[56] This coincided with the growing pressure for open access in which the Society, having already worked under the leadership of Peter Mandler to modify government proposals for open access journals to take account of the specific circumstances of the humanities, wished to play a leading role. The challenges were considerable as University presses charged £5,000, and even dedicated open access publishers £3,500, for an open access monograph. But in 2016 the Society announced its *New Historical Perspectives* series of books which would be authored, edited, or co-edited by early career historians and available both in print and digitally as open access, with all production costs being borne jointly by the Society and the IHR. In place of the mentoring previously provided by the *Studies in History* series, authors are to be invited to workshops at which their work will be subjected to critical and constructive scrutiny by a panel of experts. The first volumes are imminent at the time of writing.[57]

Diversification, Innovation, Wider dissemination. It is difficult in a piece of this nature to avoid a teleological narrative of progress to our current 'happy state'. It ought to be sobering to remind ourselves that the terms of the debate within the Society on publications show considerable continuity. Anxieties about a narrow focus were being expressed in the 'age of Prothero'; some of the answers given then were not necessarily the right ones as the ill-fated foray into diplomatic history showed. The Society has found it difficult to shed its reputation for catering primarily to historians of the British Isles; that dominance is built into its bibliographic project (somewhat half-hearted efforts to produce a union bibliography in the late noughties for the various European resources foundered on the issues of cost and co-ordination, and Brexit will be another nail in that particular coffin);[58] Camdens (which are branded 'British') have proved remarkably resilient even in the face of the Eltonian onslaught; British history has likewise remained pretty dominant in the *Studies in History* series (Table 4), though *Transactions* has been more successful in diversifying in coverage,

[56] Paper by Andrew Pettegree, 'The Studies in History Monograph series', RHS, Publications Committee, April 2014. The proposals were initially quite contentious.
[57] S. Newman and P. Summerfield, 'New Historical Perspectives', *Newsletter* May 2016.
[58] See the author's paper 'Towards a Closer Union: European Historical Bibliographies', RHS, Publications Committee, 23.11.2007.

both temporal, geographical, and thematic (Table 5). One of the challenges facing the *New Historical Perspectives* series will be that it manages to diversify. And there have been real limits to the Society's willingness to innovate. It remains committed to the monograph and to conventional edited texts, both of which have their critics; some might think that its *Transactions* (essentially invited papers) sits uneasily in a world of peer review; BBIH just might be overtaken by ever more sophisticated library catalogues and is perhaps just 'too smart' for the average user. That is not to say that these modes should be abandoned – they have their staunch supporters too – but the speed with which both the publishing landscape and the nature of the profession are changing means that the Society will need to be more flexible than ever.