one time several different terms for the same concept are in circulation, some of them Hebraized words from foreign languages, some created from original but different roots of Hebrew. Quite a few of them are so good that they are speedily accepted by the general public, even before their official recognition by the Academy. Others are unsatisfactory and only short-lived, but, even when superseded by still others, have sometimes had time to leave their imprint in the names or in the writings of the organizations which coined them. The indexer dealing with scientific and technical material is quite often at a loss which terms to choose, and mostly the only solution is to cross-reference from a Hebraized foreign term, which is generally understood, to the new official term, which has not yet taken root in popular usage. Sometimes it is even advisable to make additional cross-references to one or more “private” terms, which although possibly wrong, and neither generally nor officially accepted, are for a certain time and for a certain type of user the only understandable terms.

The difficulties with the indexing of the English text of our directories are conditioned by the fact that only indexers whose mother-tongue is English are really qualified to do it. When added to this the desirable qualification of a scientific background, it becomes obvious that, in a country where English is not the mother-tongue, it is not easy to find man-power answering these requirements. There is also the additional difficulty, that even a person possessing the above-stated qualifications will not always be suitable, as his mode of working depends very much on the English-speaking country where he obtained his initial training. Then, although the fundamental concepts are certainly the same, and seemingly we have only to make the choice between such basic principles as “word by word” or “letter by letter” indexing, in practice we have found that the whole practical approach to the problems involved varies very much with the country of origin of the indexer.

CORRESPONDENCE

ONE INDEX, OR MORE THAN ONE?

Sir,

Since the appearance of my notes under the above title in the last number of The Indexer I have come across three “authoritative pronouncements” on this subject. I have already quoted H. B. Wheatley’s How to make an index, but his other work, What is an index? (1879) contains the following downright assertion: “an index should be one and indivisible, and not broken up in several alphabets”.

Commenting on this in her New York State Library indexing: principles, rules and examples (4th edn., 1942), Martha Thorne Wheeler states:

“All these authorities [J. B. Nichols, W. I. Fletcher, etc.] imply that the classified index is exceptional. In ordinary book indexes it is generally conceded to be inconvenient and few will question the dictum of the veteran indexer [H. B. W. as above]. Curious exceptions may be found which serve to emphasize the value of this rule. Hutchins’s Dorset, brought out in a new edition in 1874, has eight separate indexes, that is (1) Places ;
Pedigrees; (3) Persons; (4) Arms; (5) Blazons; (6) Glossorial; (7) Domesday; (8) Inquisitions. A work in six quarto volumes, entitled Canada: an encyclopaedia of the country, is provided with a slender index volume divided into no fewer than twenty-three sections, eleven of which are arranged alphabetically, the remaining twelve being contents grouped under class headings and arranged in order of occurrence.

A third undoubted authority who supports my contention is Sir Edward Cook, who in the well-known essay on Indexing in his Literary recreations writes as follows:

"In applying these principles, I lay down as the first rule, One book One index. It was once a custom to have several indexes to one book, in order, I suppose, not to mix up titles incongruously. There would, for instance, be an index of persons and places, a second of subjects, a third of words, and so forth. The practice was common in editions of the classics, and the Latin phrases were often used in English books—index locorum, rerum, verborum, and so forth. Such multiplication of indexes is an unmitigated nuisance. It makes reference less easy. One index alphabetically arranged is the only right plan."

These three acknowledged authorities seem to be strongly in favour of the views I then ventured to express. The earliest indexes were undoubtedly "one and indivisible". My own impression (for what it is worth) is that multiple indexes must have been introduced by someone in imitation of the system of classification in use in library catalogues. But, although they have some rules in common, indexing and cataloguing are entirely distinct arts.

G. NORMAN KNIGHT.

Sir,

Our Chairman's article in your Autumn, 1962, issue (pp. 70-1) on the above subject raises a point of great importance, and his invitation to others to "air their views" is charming!

With the general principle he advocates one cordially agrees, and especially where two possible separate indexes contain items that overlap, e.g. where (as he says) an author may also be a subject. There are, however, some qualifications in special cases, though it would be difficult to draw the line between any of these and the general principle. In passing, one may note that though "ease of reference" is served by having one index, in that one is saved the time involved in looking through several, it may (alternatively) save time to find a given entry of a special category in a small collection of like entries rather than in a large mass of heterogeneous ones: e.g. in a book on colours it may be easier to find "red ochre" among other pigments than among general items such as Red bank, Reddaway, Red House, etc. There are three kinds of index that conceivably may be better separate:

(1) Those in which the items differ in sequence (i.e. are not alphabetical) are an obvious case: the author mentions Biblical passages; chronologies are a case already mentioned in this journal. Classified order is even more obvious.

(2) More varied are those in which items differ in kind: e.g. in different languages (such as Latin names of plants); or of different subject-matter (e.g. the index of artists, separate from that of place-names, in Baedeker's, the Italian Tourist Club's and other guide-books—the present writer has found this arrangement advantageous).
(3) Lastly there are those which differ in the form of items, e.g. where numerals occur as well as words; or different alphabetical characters, e.g., Greek or Russian, though the Chairman has said he thinks those of the former language can be interspersed with English.

As a device to separate different kinds of items the author of the article mentioned “different typography”, and this is invaluable. It can, however, be used to distinguish not only individual items in one index but even the whole of the items of a separate index (like those of artists referred to), as that fact makes the special category clear at a glance.

H. V. MOLESWORTH ROBERTS.

Dear Sir,

In your Autumn issue E. M. Hatt asks, “Who can imagine an index entry doing justice to (or indeed failing to bruise and batter), Professor Galbraith’s remark that ‘Wealth is not without its advantages, and the case to the contrary, although it has frequently been made, has never proved widely persuasive.”

Would not “Wealth, ? advantages . . .” be better than nothing?

E. S. TEW.

OBITUARIES

H. ROBINSON SHIPPERD

It is with great regret that we have to record the death on the 26th July, 1961, of H. Robinson Shipperd, of Long Island, N.Y. Mr. Shipperd, who joined the Society in 1958, was a free-lance editor and was so fond of indexing that he used to compile indexes for works that lacked them and present the result to libraries.

He was a direct descendant of the famous English divine, the Rev. John Robinson, who formed the idea of a Puritan colony in America and was responsible for the sailing of the Pilgrim Fathers in 1620. He married a direct descendant of the Rev. John Yonges who, settling in America in 1640, founded the township of Southwold on Long Island, naming it (as well as its county of Suffolk) after the parts of England whence he had sailed.

Mr. Shipperd contributed to The Indexer, Vol. II, No. 2, an article on “The Best Indexing”.

LT.-COL. IAN STUART CHARLES ROSE

We record with deep regret the death, on the 11th December, 1962, of Lt.-Col. I. S. C. Rose, of Edinburgh, who joined the Society in May, 1961.

Col. Rose attended the Society’s Course of Training at the North Western Polytechnic last year. He had already compiled the index for Portrait of a patriot (John Wilkes) by C. P. Chenevix-Trench (Blackwoods, 1962) and at the time of his passing was engaged in assisting in the production of the Library Association’s British technology index.