committees affiliated with the National Endowment for the Humanities. Their names are included in this directory to assist those planning humanities programs in locating scholars in a particular subject or geographical area.” The committees must indeed be assemblies of back scratchers, distributing the presumed honor of being a “humanist” in the most capricious manner. For example, Arizona State University, the only major institution in the Phoenix area, has 320 faculty members in the humanities departments; not one of them is listed among the thirty-seven Arizona scholars. Northern Arizona University, in remote Flagstaff, with a faculty about one-fourth the size of Arizona State University, has ten scholars listed, all in American studies, with emphasis on the Southwest.

Scholars were requested to list “public policy issues” they were willing to discuss. Why the restriction of the scholar to issues of public policy was established is not addressed in the prefatory matter. The result is that such inhumane topics as “Human dignity and the way welfare vs. social insurance programs are administered” and “Effective government” dot the pages.

Because of the lack of standards in the selection of scholars, the heavy emphasis on the social sciences to the almost complete exclusion of the arts, and the chautauqua-like topics of interest to these scholars, the entire section on scholars in the humanities is next to worthless. One regrets seeing public funds squandered on such an amorphous project as this.—Henry Miller Madden, California State University, Fresno.


In selecting articles to be reprinted from The Indexer, the official journal of the British, American, and Australian societies of indexers, the editor, and former editor of the journal, sought the advice of heads of a number of British and American library schools. The fifty-nine articles selected took into account the suggestions received from six British and eleven American schools. The articles were not reset but were reproduced as they originally appeared. The reproduction is very good.

Except as noted below, the chosen articles ranged in quality from good to excellent, with each contributing unique and valuable information to produce a volume representative of all the various problems, concerns, and facets of indexing. As would be expected, the writing varies from popular to scholarly, with bibliographical references included for the twenty-one articles of the latter type.

The subject arrangement of the volume is excellent and presents the articles in a logical and interesting way in seven sections: “I. The History of Indexing”; “II. The Practice of Book Indexing (Principles and Techniques, Case Histories, Indexer-Author-Publisher Relations, The Ownership of Indexes)”; “III. Index Typography”; “IV. Indexing Periodical and Multi-Volume Publications (Some Principles and Techniques, Periodicals, Encyclopaedias)”; “V. Indexing Scientific and Technical Literature”; “VI. A Selection of Indexing Systems and Methods”; and “VII. The Application of Modern Technology to Indexing.” The eight articles in this last section, of course, deal with computer applications.

To my mind a stronger selection would have resulted from the substitution of almost any other articles for three articles that add nothing but bulk. “Indexes to Children’s Books Are Essential” takes one and one-half pages to make this very statement, which is included in an article by another author that precedes it. “Subject Bibliographies in Information Work” is primarily about just that, with only a marginal excursio into the realm of indexing. The weakest contribution by far is “The Moving Finger,” which probably was included because of the promise implied in its subtitle “The Future of Indexing.” Unfortunately, after a rambling discourse in the manner of Mark Twain’s account of Jim Blaine’s story about his grandfather’s old ram (but much longer and, to the same degree, less amusing), the reader finds that the only substance was that of the subtitle. Perhaps the beginning sentence of the “Summary of the Discussion on Mr. Gee’s Paper” indicates stunned si-
lence: "In the discussion which followed, the audience appeared reluctant to take up the big issues which the speaker had raised, nor did they attempt to rival him in prophecy about future developments."

Also, it is unfortunate that three articles of a general nature (p.323-44) were included in section VI rather than in section II (under "Principles and Techniques"). After the substantial four articles that precede them, it is a decided letdown to switch abruptly back to generalities.

Considering that one assumes that the original text was both edited and read through by an indexer and likewise with the reprinted text, it was surprising to come across fourteen typographical errors and two author errors. Eight of the typographical errors, unfortunately, occur in illustrations, where they cause more confusion than they would within the text.

Of course, there is an index! Using the "Criteria Used as Guidelines by the Wheatley Medal Selection Committee" (p.29) and checking the first three pages of the index against the text, this reader was surprised to discover that three of the fifteen criteria were not met: 2. The index must be accurate (ten page reference errors were found in the first three pages); 3. Significant items in the text must appear in the index (Boolean logic, 384, and INIS, 386, were omitted, as was the additional reference 329 for Ranganathan); 8. The terms must be chosen consistently (the CRG entry on p.418 is inconsistent with the treatment of the SMRE entry and should have been a one-line cross reference—which would have eliminated the two-line entry entirely, since referral would have been made to Classification Research Group, where the 306, 308 variation of the correct 306-308 page reference already was entered under the appropriate subheading).

Other index errors were discovered. A cross-reference from Cathedrals (p.19) to Churches seems warranted. The second subheading under Chapter headings should read "sub-divisions as substitute for index entries" instead of "sub-divisions as useful index entries." The subheading "cumulative index, usefulness, 372" under Indexer, The, was not warranted, since it leads to this bit of non-information: "But consider the value of a ten-year cumulative index to the Library Association Record or The Indexer." Finally, it was most annoying to find no subheading "criteria, 25-29" under both Index(es) and Indexing when "criteria, need for" was added to each. The criteria cited above were found only through reference to the Wheatley Medal entry where "criteria" is a subheading.

Despite the deficiencies noted above, it seems clear that this very handsomely produced and durably bound volume belongs in library school collections and all other collections attempting comprehensive coverage of library science and publishing materials. Its balanced and representative selection of the more important articles on indexing deserves the widest possible audience. In addition to its being of use to indexers and would-be indexers, it is to be hoped that many non-indexers (including publishers!), after being exposed to its contents, will appreciate the importance—the necessity, even—of good indexes to make information more accessible.—Eldon W. Tamblyn, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.
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Reference statistics were collected and analyzed for a three-year period from fall 1974 to