headings such as family, political parties, school, etc. An example of the breakdown under economizing is as follows:

- Economizing: on food, 165-167; on bottles and boxes, 167-168; on paper, 168; on clothing, 168-169; on fuel, 169-170; on electricity, 171; on taxes, 171-172.

The simplest of indexes is often quite adequate depending on the book and its purpose. Such a book is British Historical Portraits, published by Cambridge University Press, 1957. There is an index of artists and another of sitters. This is simple but certainly adequate.

An exceptionally valuable and unusual index is found in Conrad's Gates of Fear. Instead of listing individual bullfighters in the index, names which cannot be remembered in all probability, large headings have been chosen:

- Bullfighters, chronological list, 38-41;

Instead of putting all the bullfights in Spain under the name of the country, names of cities have been used, such as Madrid, Seville, Valencia, etc. This index evidences the "reading through" of the manuscript before the index was even started—a must for a good indexer.

And, of course, The Introduction to Reference Work by Margaret Hutchins is invaluable to the librarian, chiefly because of the superb index and table of contents. What a joy it is to have a book with such a trustworthy index that one can refer to it at the last moment before an important meeting and know that the desired reference can be found in a matter of minutes.

Lord Campbell could be called the patron saint of the indexer for he wrote: "So essential did I consider an index to be that I proposed to bring a bill into Parliament to deprive an author who publishes a book without an index of the privilege of copyright and moreover to subject him for his offence to a pecuniary penalty."

ONERY-ANDERY

E. M. HATT

Every now and then an indexer wearies of the conventions which ensure succinctness and space-saving, and just lately I have grown very tired of the onery-andery of indexes compiled by myself. No one would deny the usefulness of "and" as a linking-word which allows the indexer to pass on to the reader of his index some of the synthesizing that is the "invisible" work done by indexers. However, it has occurred to me more than once recently that this "and" can be too often used... not too often for indexer's convenience, but too often for faithful reflection of authors' meanings.
For “and” is non-committal. It so often means, “Well, this is in some way connected with that, but if you think I can be constantly defining the nature of the connection in my index, you must think again”. To take but one example: supposing that the book being indexed concerned food adulteration, and that its author had mentioned certain purple-dyed bon-bons, flavoured with a chemically medicated, artificially fabricated glucose substance, as having poisoned five little boys at a Weenie-Roast in Connecticut. This is a tiresome bit of information to condense, and the temptation to index as:

**Glucose-sweets, poisoning and**

is not quite, but almost, irresistible. But what does this short-circuiting of ideas do to the truth? This is one of thousands of cases in which the nimble “and” is given too positive a rôle.

**Onery** is no less prevalent, and suggestions for cure would be welcome. Most indexable books quote opinions and views and prejudices for the sake of re-affirming or discrediting. Therefore the indexer, collecting his preliminary material, finds himself with a few score, or a few hundred, names of persons whose opinions on another man or on some notion acceptable to others but not to him must be mentioned. This leads to a series of such entries as:

**Disraeli on Byron, Byron on Disraeli, Southey on Byron and Disraeli, Moore on Southey, not to mention Southey, Moore, and so on.**

Enough of this in an index, and you get a comical leapfrog effect. You begin to picture undignified and even surrealistic **amoncellements** of worthy figures, and to envisage the great men of the given period piled up like cargoes from an abattoir. Then, even if the mind’s eye is not working in this way, the repetition of this “on” soon sounds like nagging... on, and on, and on.

It is, of course, quite possible to avoid the easy “on” but only at the cost of compulsion to paraphrase. It might be feasible to isolate all these opinions held by one of another and by another of one, with side-issues, permutations and combinations affecting fresh batches of characters; but only at the risk of impoverishing individual main entries. Other possibilities may lead to wordiness. At present I do not know the answer to the problem; and perhaps it is an entirely modern problem, for the innocent-seeming word “on” has taken on several slangy implications in the course of its long life (“He’s on to that dodge”; “How she do go on, don’t she?”; “I guess he was more than somewhat on”; “Oh, bang on”). In fact the word has lost caste for all whose mind and vocabulary are not exceptionally pure, and even the continuing, if etiolated, existence of its elegant cousin “anent” cannot restore it to mere prepositional neutrality of meaning.

I have talked myself into it, into the conclusion that the only remedy is graceful paraphrase. Paraphrase is simple enough, but paraphrase with résumé demands ingenuity. This brings us back to the invisible work of indexers and the comforting (I hope) reminder:

“Think not because no man sees
Such things will remain unseen.”