

Society of Local Archivists by Holworthy in 1946? Biographical notes on the life and work of the master would also have lent much to this volume.

The editors have done well in handling the formidable task of selecting what they consider to be the most significant writings in the context of their dual objectives. The cross section reflecting Jenkinson's catholic interests in various fields of his profession is impressive. His intellectual examination of a variety of topics, his methodology, presentation and conclusions stand the test of time well, providing exemplars for later generations of archivists. The numerous antiquarian themes based on mediaeval and early modern archives may have little practical use to most of today's and tomorrow's archivists, but the methodology is invaluable. Perhaps one minor critical observation may be offered. In a book of 380 pages, was the allocation of 62 pages and 8 plates (out of a total of 21) to mediaeval tallies really justified? The 35 pages of the article itself are excellent, but was it necessary to reproduce all 23 pages of the third appendix, which is a transcript and analysis of private tallies? Would not a page or two of this remarkable table have been sufficient to indicate to present day archivists the apparatus expected of them as regards setting out supportive evidence? Incidentally, it appears that although the appendix's table required a double page spread, it appears with the righthand matching page on the dorse of each leaf, making it extremely difficult to follow. Was the original in *Archaeologia* like this or was something lost in the conversion to the present book under review? One would have welcomed an explanatory note from the editors.

Apart from this, the only other criticism is, of course, that Jenkinson's style of writing is at times very hard to follow. It is a matter of opinion whether it is a good example of classical English or not. However Jenkinson's written emanations may have been valued in his working lifetime, they would fare badly in a present day assessment by the "communications" generation. Indeed, the rambling sentences (admittedly beautiful and correct from a grammarian's viewpoint) are irksome and frequently tend to obscure his thoughts. Even if Jenkinson's ornate classical style may have been acceptable to his contemporaries and peers, it must be recognized that it is now alien to most English-speaking archivists and not conducive to a ready understanding of the subject.

The book has some usefulness to students but it would appear to belong to the "desirable" rather than the "must" category. Practising archivists may dip into it on occasion with profit, but it is unlikely to be in constant demand.

A.D. Ridge

The Making of a Code: the Issues Underlying AACR2. Edited by DORIS HARGRETT CLACK. Chicago: American Library Association, 1980. vii, 256 p. ISBN 0 8389 0309 6 pa. \$15.00

*In the library cataloguers come and go
Talking of rules U.S. and Anglo*

Like its predecessor first edition (1967), the second edition of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* (1978) has been the subject of several post-publication conferences, dozens of workshops throughout North America, and numerous articles and interpretive monographs. The essays in this book, a theoretical examination of the rules and their complex development, were presented at one such conference held in Tallahassee, Florida, between March 11-14, 1979. Among the participants were several key figures in the creation of AACR2, including Michael Gorman, a joint editor, and Ronald Hagler, a professor in the

School of Librarianship at the University of British Columbia. Seymour Lubetzky, the instigator of the first edition of *AACR*, also addressed the conference.

AACR2 was developed to serve “in general libraries of all sizes,” yet the rules were “not specifically intended for specialist and archival libraries,” nor were the rules intended to be used as they stand for the description of archival records. As Frances Hinton points out in her paper on the description of cartographic materials, manuscripts, music and sound recordings:

The very fact that no term more general than ‘bibliographic’ has appeared shows how far we are from acknowledging that any and all forms for transmitting information and culture are equal.

The intellectual bias of the librarian is towards recognition of production-oriented values with bibliographic items, whereas archivists focus their attention on generic qualities of the records themselves, not who produced them but how they were produced and what functions they served. This fact was commented upon by Hinton, who notes that the rule governing the statement of responsibility (authorship) was modified to allow for the inclusion of such a statement since manuscripts, unlike books, do not always acknowledge their creator.

This provision (rule 4.1F3) allows for a host of analogous rules for all other unpublished media – sound recordings, photographs, artwork, home movies and video recordings, etc. It must always be borne in mind when reading the rules that with the exception of chapter four on manuscripts, they were written to deal with published information. Hinton, in one instance, though she remembers this is so with respect to manuscripts, forgets this aspect of the rules in her discussion of how the principle of a collective title may be applied to sound recordings:

although a library may be equally likely to catalog a sound disc as a single item or to catalog each separately titled work on that disc as a separate item, it is most unlikely that any library would elect to treat a group of sound recordings as a unit *unless the producer supplied a collective title for the group.* (italics added)

A sound archives would have no hesitation about supplying a collective title where the recordings are recognized as having a collective unity.

Archives, even more than museums, have lagged behind in providing a standard of description for their records as well as the necessary rules of description. The standard defense for this state of affairs is that archival records are unique, unpublished items. As long ago, relatively speaking, as 1965, Schellenberg warned of the danger of avoiding standardization. There should be not only one standard for arrangement, but one standard for description of archival records. *AACR2* offers a solution which is feasible without compromising either the integrity of archival needs or the framework of the rules. The fact that the new rules (and the old) treat several kinds of materials preserved by archives does not necessarily make these library rules better than descriptive techniques applied by archives, but to my mind the fact that codification has taken place for rules to describe manuscript collections, maps, sound recordings, motion pictures, video recordings, graphic materials (photographs, artwork, etc.) and machine-readable data files qualifies *AACR2* for serious consideration as a source for a similar set of rules for archival cataloguing. The Library of Congress, not totally satisfied with the generalist treatment of some of the nonprint media, has one of its divisions producing an expanded version of chapter eight on graphic materials. The Association for Recorded Sound Collections has also published a fuller version of chapter six on sound recordings.

The politics of creating *AACR2* can be read between the lines and sometimes in the lines themselves. The selected bibliography of writings on *AACR2* also leads to the same kind of information. Lubetzky, for example, was unhappy with the less than total adherence to the concept of main entry – a meaningless ideal for an archives’ catalogue. S. Michael

Malinconico, an expert on automated cataloguing, came up with some startling observations on preconcepts held by those who believe *AACR2* will make automation an easier task. He pointed out that

whatever choice is made by the vast majority of libraries that employ automated systems, they will necessarily create inconsistent data bases which may prove too troublesome to reconcile, when, eventually, they will have the facilities necessary to use them as the bases for alternative catalog forms.

Malinconico is leading up here to a choice many libraries were forced to make, including the Library of Congress, to "freeze" their old catalogues and create a new file of catalogue records consistent within itself. When provincial archives and the Public Archives of Canada establish, as I believe they will within the next quarter century, centralized automated systems for handling accessioning and cataloguing procedures, they will find themselves having to close catalogues created along media lines in order to effect a more cost-beneficial use of whatever computer system is chosen. Libraries have shown that media divisions are not insurmountable bibliographic barriers, yet because archives are divided into divisions by physical format we have a wide variety of descriptive techniques in use even within one institution.

The Making of a Code mirrors the organization of the first three parts of *AACR2* corresponding to generalities (theory), description and access points. The fourth part of the book deals with the future of *AACR2*, including implementation of the new code at the Library of Congress. Readers of the Library of Congress *Information Bulletin* and the *Cataloging Service Bulletin* will be familiar with most of the main points in this particular paper. The National Library of Canada has been publishing its rule interpretations in *National Library News*.

By far the most meaningful part of this book is the section discussing various *AACR2* chapters dealing with description and access points. Some of the writers take an interpretive approach and analyze the rules as they stand, while others debate the philosophy behind the rules. Frances Hinton's chapter demonstrates a third approach, that of examining selected rules for interpretations and arguing the merits of options a cataloguer may bring to the rules. The fact that cataloguers have with *AACR2* more flexibility in creating a bibliographic description has caused some distress in members of the old guard such as Lubetzky.

The new cataloguing rules are much easier to use and understand than the 1967 edition. Part of this literary legibility is due to the adoption of the International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD) developed by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) as part of a program known as Universal Bibliographic Control. ISBDs have been published for all media and all have the same structure: eight areas of description by which any published form of information can be described. This is the first step in cataloguing according to the new rules. Previously cataloguers would begin by assigning the main entry or heading which best described responsibility for the intellectual content of an item. The issue of the main entry is profitably examined by Elizabeth L. Tate and some of her ideas may be incorporated into future archival catalogues.

With the same spirit of cooperation and compromise exhibited by librarians, it would be possible for archivists to study *AACR2* and the appropriate ISBDs in order to produce a standard of description and cataloguing rules which are compatible with these library-oriented tools. Archivists do not need to reinvent the bibliographic wheel, nor do users of archives need to be burdened with a catalogue that is out of step with library trends.

David Mattison,
Sound and Moving Image Division
Provincial Archives of British Columbia