

inscribed on a medium or on the mind, and which ultimately requires privacy. At least that is true for the most part: in some circumstances, he seems to mean just a big collection of something, as in his statement that one 18th-century London-based author “possessed a bottomless archive of performing characters but could never identify an actor” (p. 32). At other times, he means archives as we know them: a collection of records.

I have only scratched the surface of Vincent’s wide-ranging book, and that is one of its drawbacks: it feels at times as if we are making a breathless dash through a vast swath of social history. Too often the author summarizes texts in so succinct a fashion that big statements are left unexplored, with simply a footnote to direct the reader to whole volumes on the topic. However, as a primer, pointing to a much larger literature, which is the author’s explicit aim, the book cannot be faulted. It says much about the intersection of records, communications technologies, and privacy in the Western world throughout the centuries and, as such, is a valuable reference tool for archivists and other information professionals. My suggestion is to romp through it once, then go play in the bibliography.

Carolyn Heald
Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario

Encyclopedia of Archival Science. LUCIANA DURANTI and PATRICIA C. FRANKS, eds. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015. x, 454 pp. ISBN 978-0-8108-8810-4.

The *Encyclopedia of Archival Science* is described by its editors as “a foundational reference work” (p. ix). Since reference works are those in which we seek authoritative facts and information, generally through brief or occasional consultation, the *Encyclopedia of Archival Science* certainly fits the bill. But any encyclopedia, at least etymologically speaking, has a loftier pedagogical goal: to contribute to a round education (*enkyklios paideia*). And from this pedagogical perspective, the book here reviewed is an excellent and very timely contribution. Instructors for archival courses will undoubtedly find in it articles that can be very conveniently used to introduce important subjects and concepts in the classroom.

This is the first contemporary encyclopedia that focuses exclusively on archival science. The existing *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences*, 3rd ed. (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2011) deals with archives as part of the larger universe of the information sciences, and although its entries are longer, they are limited to only a few of the central archival functions, specialties, institutions, and concepts.

Although the word does not appear in the title, this is avowedly an *international* encyclopedia. In listing the advisory board, the editors placed particular emphasis on their geographical provenance, and this is understandable for a field in which cultural differences in practices, methods, and theory loom very large. International, yes; but, at the same time, overwhelmingly North American, with more than 75 percent of its approximately 110 contributors coming from Canada and the United States, about 20 from European countries, and the remaining handful from Australasia. Their geographical origin aside, most contributors are described as “authorities in the area,” with only a handful being “emerging scholars and archival students” (roughly a 6–1 ratio).

The international nature of the encyclopedia does not merely reflect an attempt to be inclusive in this day and age of globalization. Instead, there is an important connection between the geographical provenance of the authors and the nature of their contributions. It makes sense, for instance, that Australian scholars were assigned some topics that we identify mostly with their archival culture (e.g., Postcustodialism, Records Continuum, Series System); this is also partially true for European contributors (e.g., Protocol Register, Archival Fonds), although most of their entries cover the broader or more generic disciplinary terms (e.g., Archival Method, Archival Science, Archival Education, Archival History, Records Management, Archival Standards, Auxiliary Sciences).

The general criterion cited as the driver of the selection process is the harmonization of the universal or international goals of theory and standards with a practice that necessarily addresses local and unique aspects of archival material. As for the perspective adopted by authors, the editors encouraged a combination of personal expertise and/or experience with common and alternate points of view. Overall, the resulting encyclopedia successfully reflects both elements.

Not counting cross-references and bibliography, entries range in size from about 300 to 2,000 words. The shorter entries, following the simplest structure of definition, concept explanation, and conclusion, are generally restricted to narrower, technical terms; the longer ones, in contrast, introduce the reader to the historical discussion as well as to current perspectives on a central concept. Judging it in pedagogical terms, the encyclopedia provides much-needed entryways into fundamental concepts, by laying out different points of view rather than advocating a single one. This is a most welcome approach, not only from the student’s perspective but also, as mentioned above, from the instructor’s. In using readings to introduce central concepts for discussion, too often educators have to resort to articles that, although fundamental, clearly advocate a particular perspective. The main pedagogical contribution of this work is to help alleviate the relative paucity of archival publications that focus more on introducing a topic than pushing a particular interpretation of that concept.

The preface provides some basic information as to the development process, and it is on this aspect of the overall work that the remainder of this review focuses. (For obvious reasons, the individual entries are bound to show differences in their comprehensiveness and quality, and it would be virtually impossible and unavoidably unfair to provide specific assessments and criticisms of them here.) The work comprises conceptual terms exclusively, with no entries for any personal name. The editors state that “more than 200 archival terms were identified, 154 of which were considered key terms for inclusion in the encyclopedia” (p. x). It would have been interesting to have information on which entries were identified in the first round yet did not make it into the final version. The editors state that “the remaining terms are listed in the index,” but the index contains in the vicinity of 1,000 terms, with no clear indication which ones made the first cut but not the second. Perhaps a better option would have been to include those terms as “See” entries in the body of the encyclopedia. More information about the process might have helped explain some of the questions that naturally arise for the reader regarding inclusion or exclusion from a canonical work. Most of these are obviously mere matters of choice (or personal preference on the part of this reviewer); a few others seem to be more a matter of inconsistency.

Whether it is peculiar to archival science or not, many concepts in our field tend to come in pairs and can only be properly understood in this oppositional relationship. Think of primary and secondary values, the principles of provenance and pertinence, manuscript and public records traditions, functional and structural analyses, etc. The editorial choice with respect to these paired concepts appears to have been to keep them as separate entries assigned to different authors. This has both possible disadvantages (entries may be repetitious or uneven) as well as advantages (diversity of perspective), and it would have been interesting to know the specific reasons behind the choice. These pairs might have been more successful as joint entries.

A slightly different procedure seems to have been followed in cases where concepts came in clusters rather than dyads. For instance, the entries for Impartiality, Interrelatedness, Naturalness, and Uniqueness are all separate, written by the same contributor. Perhaps one single entry on Characteristics of Records would have provided a more robust approach. (This route was followed with the entry on Status of Transmission (Records), for instance, although there is also a separate entry for Facsimile and only partial cross-referencing between the two.) Similarly, perhaps a short introductory entry on Archival Functions might have unified the many independent entries that fall under that umbrella.

Some apparent inconsistencies can be found in the treatment of clustered concepts, particularly if they refer to different approaches to the performance of a particular archival function. For instance, there are entries for Architectural and for Artistic Records, but not for Financial/Business,

Medical, or other kinds of records. Chain of Preservation gets its own entry but the OAIS Reference Model does not. The reason for this case may well be that a decision was made not to include individual entries for standards, no matter how important they may be (there is a generic Archival Standards entry, and specific standards are also discussed in the entries for the different archival functions and are listed in the index). Again, this is not to find fault with the criteria used; but it might have been helpful if some of these general criteria had been laid out in the preface.

Of course, every sports fan is a coach, and every reviewer would be able to find both missing as well as “undeserving” entries, reflecting his or her own view of the archival discipline. Here is this reviewer’s short list of missing entries: Accession(ing), Finding Aid(s), Genre, and concepts related to Data (as there are several entries for concepts related to Information); perhaps a Forms of Acquisition entry (there is one for Donation but not for Gift or Purchase); Identity and Archives might have been a more inclusive heading than Ethnicity and Archives (or perhaps deserving of a separate entry); and, finally, entries for specific approaches to appraisal and acquisition (e.g., Macroappraisal, or the Minnesota Method) might have complemented some approaches that do get their own entry (such as Documentation Strategy or Documentation Plan).

In any case, these are unavoidable quibbles regarding a work of this kind, and they by no means belittle the significance of this contribution to the reference literature on archival science. Overall, this is very opportune and well-conceived project that will make a mark in archival education, and the editors (and editorial board) should be congratulated for it.

Juan Herbaig
University of Toronto

The No-Nonsense Guide to Archives and Recordkeeping. MARGARET CROCKETT. London: Facet Publishing, 2016. xi, 212 pp. ISBN 1-85604-855-2.

One of the greatest challenges in writing a useful handbook or manual for the “lone arranger” archivist, volunteer archivist, or museum/historical society staff member who also manages archives is striking the proper balance of instruction, complexity, and ease of use: too much information can be intimidating, but not enough will limit a book’s usefulness. Margaret Crockett ably strikes that balance in *The No-Nonsense Guide to Archives and Recordkeeping*, having created a guidebook whose comprehensiveness belies its relatively short length. While busy lone arrangers and archival volunteers may lack the time to dive fully into a book such as this one, it is nonetheless a valuable resource that these audiences would do well to have on their shelves for frequent consultation and guidance.