tion, a medal for taking the scare out of *RAD* (as a 1970s archivist, I can safely say that) and a plus for readability.

Some minor sadnesses of the book – and there are some – is that it is void of humour, from cover to cover. This is a serious *RAD* manual. I tried hard to find some humour, even imagining for a minute that there might be something funny about the Mary Bell fonds description, the records of a neuroanatomist-histology technician-pathologist with a specialty in brain vascular morphometry, whose records "also make reference to ballet in Halifax during the 1950s." The *RAD* examples, which so help to give flesh to the manual, are decidedly Eastern in flavour and frankly, rather stark. What about adding a farm foreclosure fonds from Success, Saskatchewan or the Andrew Norelius fonds (the Klondike gold-seeker who missed the gold-rush but caught the salmon rush and made just enough money to take a boat home to Insanti, Minnesota in the summer of '99)? Alright, they don't have to be funny, they just have to come out of real Canadian history from coast to coast, top to bottom.

Other things? Nothing major, just small glitches, like calling the one and only appendix, Appendix A (when there isn't a B), and the use of that strange phrase that always made my old history professor wince – "time period?" An annotated bibliography might have been useful. And a last one: this primer costs to print, so we can understand it costing thirty dollars, but perhaps there can be a good break for bulk purchase so that groups can truly benefit?

The efforts of the authors and their assistant, Lori Eddy, in the creation of what may well become a *RAD* classic, is to be commended. A definite "must" for the archivist's shelf and the Outreacher's travel pack.

Kathlyn Szalasznyj
Saskatchewan Council for Archives and Archivists

Encoded Archival Description on the Internet. DANIEL V. PITTI and WENDY M. DUFF, eds. Binghampton, NY: Haworth Information Press, 2001. 241 p. ISBN 0-7890-1398-3. Co-published simultaneously as *Journal of Internet Cataloging*, Volume 4, Numbers 3/4 (2001).

The evolution of the Encoded Archival Description (EAD) standard has been one of the most important developments in archival practice in recent years. With increasing international acceptance, and now international participation in its further development, EAD has become an important tool for making archival descriptions available on the Internet, and also the basis of renewed development of, and interest in, descriptive standards in general.

Encoded Archival Description on the Internet is an interesting collection of essays ranging from theory to case studies to future possibilities. Starting with

an exploration of EAD in the broader context of archival description and an overview of the standard's development, moving to a series of thematic case studies, and then to a consideration of how it can be exploited to enhance retrieval systems, the essays discuss the implementation as well as the implications of EAD.

Janice Ruth's article, "The Development and Structure of the Encoded Archival Description (EAD) Document Type Definition," gives some useful background on the development of EAD, from the Berkeley Finding Aid Project to the release of the first production version of EAD (version 1.0) in 1998. It also gives an overview of its structure.

Both Kent Haworth and Michael Fox tackle the issue of EAD in the context of archival description in general. Michael Fox explains one taxonomy of standards for describing cultural resources – structural, content, data values, and communications. He provides an overview of some of the standards that fit into one or more of these categories, notably MARC (Machine Readable Cataloguing) and ISAD(G) (General International Standard Archival Description), and discusses their relationships and interoperability. He argues that EAD is both a structural standard and a communications format, but notes the lack of a content standard completely appropriate for use with EAD. Kent Haworth's article focuses on content standards for multi-level archival description, including the principles of arrangement and description and the hierarchical descriptive model. He concludes that EAD is the first data structure standard to fully allow multi-level description and that "enables a semantic and structural representation of archival material that is faithful to archival principles." The discussion in both articles explains why the CUSTARD project (Canadian US Task Force on Archival Description, which was in the planning stages at press time) is a promising development. EAD is a data structure standard in search of a content standard, while *Rules for Archival Description* (*RAD*) is a content standard lacking a data structure standard. The CUSTARD project is an initiative to develop a Canada/U.S. content standard for archival description through an "amalgamation" of the *Rules for Archival Description* and *Archives, Personal Papers and Manuscripts* (APPM), the current content standard for archival description in the United States.

In "Archival Cataloging and the Internet: The Implications and Impact of EAD," Steven Hensen discusses the relationships between EAD and MARC, the data structure standard used for both library and archival catalogue records. While EAD was developed in large part because of the limitations of MARC, notably its inability to handle multi-level description in any significant way, Hensen argues that there is still a role for MARC as "navigational metadata," that is, with MARC records as less detailed surrogates for EAD finding aids. He does briefly explore the potential of using EAD to automate the process of creating MARC records. "While the broad applicability and robustness of EAD make it tempting to use as a stand-alone database, its real

power is fully realized when used in conjunction with MARC cataloguing." For Canadian archivists, with less history of using MARC, the focus might be on ways to use EAD to achieve some of the same advantages of the brevity of MARC records. EAD, after all, is a data structure standard and a communications exchange format, not an end in itself. Hensen also provides some background about what has since emerged as the CUSTARD project.

The next series of articles focus on case studies. Two articles are about consortial approaches to the implementation of EAD and focus on the Online Archive of California, a union database of EAD finding aids from a wide range of California repositories. A third article outlines the Research Libraries Group's Archival Resources initiative, a union database (available by subscription) which delivers EAD finding aids and MARC records from a wide range of contributing institutions. These article merit attention from Canadian archivists who are involved in the "consortia" of provincial CAIN (Canadian Archival Information Network) networks. The second article in particular (by Timothy Hoyer, Stephen Miller, and Alvin Pollock) focuses on the importance of developing "an acceptable range of uniform practices." These practices were codified as *The Encoded Archival Description Retrospective Conversion Guidelines: A Supplement to the EAD Tag Library and EAD Guidelines*. The article outlines the types of standardization attempted through these guidelines, and also discusses some of the issues encountered in converting existing finding aids to EAD. The Research Libraries Group has also developed application guidelines (recently updated) for contributing institutions. Standardization of practices relating to EAD is particularly important if the outputs are to be meaningful to users, and searchable across finding aids, let alone multiple institutions.

An article by Meg Sweet and colleagues at the Public Record Office (PRO) in the United Kingdom describes the implementation of EAD in a large government archives. Since EAD is often associated with manuscript collections (descriptions of personal papers), it is useful to have an example of implementation in an institutional archives. This article focuses on the details of implementation within the PRO, but it highlights the fact that EAD need not be the sole technological tool. In this case, EAD is one piece of an integrated system, and important for data exchange. Richard Rinehart's article on the implementation of EAD in the museum community reinforces how EAD has a descriptive model which can deal with both collection and items, and explores the potential of using EAD to access both archives and museum resources.

The final two articles, by Richard Szary and Anne Gilliland-Swetland, investigate an important aspect of EAD implementation that has had, to date, too little attention. As Szary notes, most of the previous EAD literature has dealt with "underlying principles" and "methodologies for implementation." These two articles focus on reference service and EAD's capacity to facilitate retrieval. Gilliland-Swetland's article in particular explores in detail one of

EAD's greatest promises: its ability to deliver information about archival material to a wide range of audiences. Gilliland-Swetland adapts and extends a retrieval model articulated by Marcia Bates to include ten search strategies, and outlines, by indicating key design features, how these strategies might be achieved in an EAD-based retrieval system. These strategies include footnote chasing, repository scanning, name, date, geographic location, physical form/ genre and subject searching, and top-down and bottom-up searching. This goes far beyond using EAD to replicate the look and feel of paper-based finding aids, and is a very useful starting point for "exploit[ing] the potential of EAD most fully." Moreover, Gilliland-Swetland argues that EAD can be used to bridge the gap between the traditional "materials-centric" approach to finding aid development, and a "user-centric" approach which would reflect "how many users actually use, or want to use" archival materials. This article forms an important basis for further research on search strategies and EAD, and emphasizes the importance of looking beyond the basic structure of EAD when designing retrieval systems and stylesheets for finding aids.

The preparation of this book pre-dates the release (in fall 2002) of EAD version 2002,[1] but this is not a significant drawback, since the focus is on general principles and implementation issues rather than tagging details. *Encoded Archival Description on the Internet* nicely complements an earlier collection of essays published in two volumes of the *American Archivist* (volume 60, no. 3-4, 1997). While both collections have a good mix of theory and practice, archivists and institutions contemplating the implementation of EAD may find the *American Archivist* collection an easier place to start. But along with the Tag Library and the Application Guidelines, *Encoded Archival Description on the Internet* should become one of the basic texts for archivists implementing or considering EAD.

Tim Hutchinson
University of Saskatchewan Archives

Reading In: Alice Munro's Archives. JOANN MCCAIG. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2002. 193 p. ISBN 0-88920-336-9.

"How can literary archives – that is, the manuscripts, correspondence and personal papers of authors – be used in conjunction with contemporary theories of literature to explain the inexplicability of authorship?" (page 3)

JoAnn McCaig's book *Reading In: Alice Munro's Archives* analyses the career development and cultural positioning of Canadian short-story writer Alice

---

1 See the book notice for this publication in this issue of *Archivaria*.