professional indexers' but by people whom we refer to as 'authors'. We do rather tend, in the Society, to adopt an 'us' and 'them' attitude, don't we? And this attitude is not only misconceived but contrary to the interests of the Society. According to our Constitution, 'Membership of the Society shall be open to all bona fide indexers'. But bona fide simply means 'genuine', so if you first write a book and then index it, does the fact that you are a genuine author prevent you from being also a genuine indexer? It should be the Society's objective to attract author-indexers into membership by every means possible, and if author-indexers can win five out of twelve Wheatley Medals, what could be more bona fide that that?

What matters about indexers is that all should become better indexers. We might do more to get book reviewers interested in indexing, for although one reviewer commented that a certain index 'could not be faulted' there has never been, except in a Platonic sense, a perfect index. We are not yet perfect, and no matter how expert we become there is still room for improvement, still more to learn. Of course those who have to assess the quality of other people's indexes sometimes find it only too easy to discover flaws in every index, but all of us should think first of improving our own standards and then of helping other indexers to improve theirs.

You all, I'm sure, have ideas about how these aims should be achieved, but the more you can do for yourselves the better will you advance the cause of good indexing. I say this for a very good reason, for there are limits to what the Society can do, limits within ourselves. The possibilities are unlimited, but we are a voluntary Society that can only do as much as its members, individually and collectively, are able and willing to do. This conference provides an example, for it could not have happened had not several members been willing to give up time, to make an effort, to take on responsibilities.

Everything that this Society does is done by voluntary effort, and though *The Indexer* is one tangible benefit of subscription, each issue is produced by the voluntary efforts of the Editor and many other members. When you receive this year's Annual Report you will see how much is being done, not only to administer the Society and maintain its efficiency, but for publishers, for people and for organizations who regard a free advice service as something they can take for granted, for members and non-members seeking help and information, for hundreds of people thinking of taking up indexing, and for the advancement of good indexing in a multitude of ways. Being Secretary is exciting, for I get to know at least something about almost everything that is going on, and what impresses me more than anything is the immense concern that most of our members have, for the art and craft and science of indexing and for the Society itself. With you rests the future success of both.

Discussion of points raised by Mr Gordon came later in the Open Forum. His talk was followed by Mr Turnbull whose stimulating address closed the morning's proceedings. After a lunch break characterized by an informal but lively interchange of views, Mr Russell Walker spoke on the making of the *Scottish national dictionary*, and Mrs Wallis, from her experience as Registrar, dealt with techniques and standards in an address which merged into vigorous discussion. Mr Bakewell had to leave before the Open Forum began; it was conducted by Mr Gordon, who finally closed the conference by replying on behalf of the speakers and organizers to a vote of thanks from those others present.

---

THE PUBLISHER'S VIEW OF INDEXING

Archie Turnbull
Secretary to the Edinburgh University Press

The book is the information-retrieval system par excellence and some books are nothing else. A telephone directory is a book and an index; so is a dictionary, but you don't index dictionaries. So an index is an information-retrieval system to an information-retrieval system that does not provide its own immediate easy access, and its function as a displayed filing-system is to show the user whether some particular topic is discussed in the book; if so, it must direct him quickly to the right page. That is its essential function. But it can also do something related to collective identity, for it can show the reader what the book is about, can offer a conspectus of the book, its range, scope, level and even intention. I have tried to make this second function a feature of all my indexes, but I am now seriously thinking of abandoning this very valuable index function, for I have to say: 'Who cares? Who cares about quality any more?'

Dr F. R. Leavis has iterated that our civilization, week by week, is crumbling away at the edges, eroding, almost without our noticing, till it's gone and we can't ever get it back again. One of the changes is in what has happened to the book, printing and allied trades, which used to be run by folk who knew about books and printing; now they're run by financial managers who know about money, management and marketing, but who wouldn't...
know a pica from a peashooter. Publication proposals are assessed solely by profitability and books are treated like packages of soap.

Why has Thomas Nelson in Edinburgh ceased to exist; Oliver and Boyd been sold, along with E. & S. Livingstone, to the Longman group, just part of a larger empire; why does R. & R. Clark belong to Imperial Tobacco and T. & A. Constable to the Financial Times? Because only a change in ownership could obtain capital to transform the industry from small business to big business, to revolutionize the technology of print, just as in publishing it revolutionized marketing and distribution. Such changes are capital-intensive; to keep costly machines running at all times you have to be geared to economies of scale and the mass-market.

Unfortunately, a book remains an intensely human thing that involves human judgements based on experience and intuition, and the men who control the machines are ignorant of what a well-printed book should look like; advanced technology has brought about the gradual abandonment of quality. Isn't it sad that there is no means in Britain today to print a book as well as was done before by craftsmen using relatively primitive equipment but natural, trained and instinctive judgement and taste? Binding is worse; paper is even worse. Still, I am willing to try anything; I have been among the first in Britain to use new techniques such as four-line mathematical composition, computer-produced books and colour microfiche. I have a commitment to advanced technology, but I have a commitment to quality also, and I cannot match them any more. It becomes ever harder to sustain even quite moderate standards, and even if I were willing to pay the earth I still could not get the quality that was taken as a norm only twenty years ago. I wonder if the people who don't care what a book looks like care about an index?

Now we come to costs. As quality has declined, so costs have soared, and I face a double problem: how to sustain quality, regardless of costs; and how to sustain publishing at all, given what has happened to costs. Breaking down the cost of producing one of my standard formats under composition, printing, paper, binding, jacket, I find that the book that sold in 1970 for £2 must now in 1977 be put on sale for £6.80. This is going to affect my market, so if I am to stay in business I must find means of cutting corners to keep costs down. That is, I must collude with those in the printing trade whom I have just been criticizing. I must on my part abandon quality to keep in business.

It is long years since I abandoned galley proofs; I go straight to page, not helping my indexer thereby, since I cut his preparation time drastically. I have long given up the refinement of setting quotations a size or two sizes smaller than the text. And don't ask for footnotes on the foot of pages! So indeed I am one of those whom Leavis rightly attacks; week by week I am abandoning the elegancies that have for so long been part of our culture.

So why should the indexer be exempt from this sad doom to which all else in the book is subject? The answer is that he is not exempt; and if he doesn't soon mend his ways he will be abandoned, for the obvious way to save costs on an index is not to have one. In considering who pays for the index the publisher has first to make a value-judgement, almost to decide a question of ethics. If an index is essential it is too important to be left to the author, especially in its second function of providing a synoptic view of the whole book. Assuming that indexing is a skill, a craft that has to be learned and mastered, has the author any responsibility in the matter? Some publishers let the author do the index, or else charge him, either by cash payment or by deduction from royalty, for having it done by a skilled indexer. This worries me. I do not charge the author for having an artist design a book jacket, nor for the skilled work of my in-house editor, so, once I have determined that there should be an index, I should not leave the author with the option of doing it himself or paying for it. My own method is to discuss with the author the necessity of having an index, what kind of index, and whether or not he can provide it himself. If he can, I let him; if not, I undertake to provide it at my cost and to allow him to approve it and suggest modifications. This system allows me to get the best index I can, from the user's standpoint, but it is at my cost and I can't much longer afford it.

I don't know if your society tries to agree a going rate for indexing; if so, don't tell me; I don't want to know! If I undertake to meet the cost of an index it's going to be what I can afford, and that may very well be lower than what you think you should receive. It will almost certainly be lower than what I think you should receive.

Let us assume that the indexer of my book receives £100, though I have never paid anything like that for one. Breaking down processing costs as before, there will be for a sixteen-page double column index to my standard book another £200 for composition, machining, paper and binding; a total of £300. And that means an increase in selling price of the book of 75p. That is what the customer has to pay for having that book thoroughly indexed. I, as publisher, haven't got £300 to spend on providing a source; even if the author provides the index himself, it is still £200, and such sums do not grow on trees in the gardens of short-run scholarly publishers. So it is a blue lookout for you.

If you and I agree that the index is a necessary part of a book, what can we jointly do to help it survive? My answer is: be absolutely clear as to the kind, length and time involved. The first recommendation I would make is, never undertake an index without a precise and formal brief from the book's editor, and preferably a written brief. It is the editor's job to define what kind of index is needed, what its scope should be; the onus is on him.
If, however, he says that you must decide, you must make up your own mind; get that in writing too, and he has no come-back.

If the brief must first say 'what kind' it must then say 'how long'. I don't really know which is the more critical, and indeed they cannot be taken apart. Kind conditions length, and vice versa. But in deciding what kind, we are involved in value-judgements and subjective factors; with length the editor has practical issues to guide him or to solve. These are based on the fact that books today are usually printed in sheets of 32, 64 or 128 pages; this affects the length of the index, since adding oddments of paper is costly and unsatisfactory. So back we go to our problem, which is yours and mine. How do you accommodate the index at the end of a book?

The best and cheapest way to proceed is to call for non-imposed page proofs, called tag proofs; they are the proper pages, in sequence and foliated but not 'backed-up', proofed on one side only. If the publisher is more extravagant he can ask for 'page-in-galley', much the same thing, but it may well be costed against him as a separate operation. Now, if the indexer works from tag proof he can finalize the index in one go; it can be set, proofed, read, and corrected, and the printer can then impose the text and the index as a single operation. He can adjust his imposition to absorb any oddment into the penultimate sheet, thus leaving the final sheet normal and strong, and the problem of trimming the index to fit whatever is left over is avoided; it doesn't arise. So if an editor limits you to only four or five pages because that is all that is left on the last sheet, point out to him that he should use tag proofs.

Even so, it is perfectly proper for an editor to impose a length limit on the indexer, and if he does, it is absolutely vital that you should stick to it; there is no excuse at all for exceeding it. He may tell you how many A4 pages, double-spaced, are allowed, or he may give this as so many printed pages. If so, ask how many printed lines per column, and then, allowing for narrow column setting and turnovers, you can type within his limits. But let him do the homework of detailing those limits, for that's what he is paid for.

The two people who suffer most in the making of a book are the indexer and the binder, for they come right at the end of the process. Inevitably in the whole process there arise some delays, and time lost is sales lost and money lost, so everyone is going to make it up by forcing the indexer, and the binder, to conform to revised schedules, to compensate for earlier delays that had nothing to do with them at all. So the third main problem is time. I try to work to a sixteen-week schedule, from typescript to bound book, and I need to have the book processed and printed in twelve weeks; this doesn't give the indexer much time. Remember, I'm talking about survival.

If I can actually produce and publish in something like four months, not only do I start getting my money back that much sooner—and we live under the God of Cash Flow—but there are things I can afford to publish, and with profit, which I could not afford if they took nine months to get out.

It follows that the indexer must start his job with a copy of the typescript. Maybe you always do. Do you? (The answer was 'No'.) If you don't get started till a page-proof is available, then you'll never finish in time to allow the index to be imposed along with the book, allowing the printing process to be continuous from start to finish. Working from typescript gives you a four-weeks start. I am not here to tell you how to do it; that would be presumptuous; but however it's done, I am quite clear that efficient and economic book production means that the indexer works from typescript. After the four-weeks start he will be given a set of unimposed page proofs, or page-in-galley, and be required to hand in the index within two weeks of their receipt. Two weeks is all that is possible, and if I can't work within these limits then I have really no option; the answer is—no index. But I assure you it can and does work, provided that we go through the whole editorial process like a drill squad at Sandhurst, index and all.

I want, finally, to throw out a few suggestions about little ways of saving money on indexes; little ways of eroding our civilization, every one of them, but better some index than no index. First, it's an index, not two indexes. Never commit the solecism of an author and a subject index; we have only the one alphabet and we know its sequence. I've yet to meet a scholar who doesn't deplore a plethora of indexes. Second, limit your punctuation. Maybe you think you've not much scope for reducing punctuation in an index, but I bet most of you limit them for him if you will, and let him ask the author to identify his characters. Do not waste time on that job, for you're not getting paid for it.

Finally, the thorniest problem of them all, how do we treat subheads and sub-subs? Given that, for economy, we are using for the index small type in narrow measure, what's the point of narrowing the measure still further by indenting subs and sub-subs? Now, where subheadings are concerned, there is always a good case for running them on. You do this, in any case, with the kind of chronological index customary with biographical and historical works. If
it is necessary to indent, then make it the minimum indent; but I honestly wonder if it is essential. Where you run to sub-subs, you have a problem. I throw out two suggestions. First, use italic for sub-subentries and run on. It won't work if you are already using italic for something else, like book titles. Second, turn the subentry into a main entry; instead of Black, sub-John, sub-Mary, why not two full-out entries, Black, J; Black, M?

I am sure that if we kept to a single index, reduced unnecessary punctuation, stopped cross-referencing, freed the indexer from having to search for full proper names, ran-on all subentries, reduced sub-subs to an absolute minimum and tried to run them on also, so as to make the fullest use of the narrow column measure, significant savings could be made. And every penny saved is helping to save the index itself.

Discussion: Lively debate followed Mr Turnbull's controversial address. Defence of the cross-reference was made by Mr Bakewell, Mr Dixon, Mr Gordon and Mrs Howat from both the indexer's and the user's point of view, and Mr Dixon also challenged the view that run-on subheadings were easier to use than those in tabulated form. Mr Turnbull, however, maintained his position on both matters. Mrs Dainty asked about the use of capitals, which Mr Turnbull thought were best limited as far as possible. Mr Vyner suggested numbering paragraphs at the typescript stage, but the usefulness of this was considered to be doubtful. Mrs Wallis asked the speaker how he judged an author's indexing competence and how he made allowances for the author's preferences if an indexer was employed. Mr Turnbull said it was a matter of personal judgement in assessing an author, usually with acquaintance over a period of time, and though he found it exceptional for an author to be a good indexer he could also make useful suggestions about indexing his own work.

HOW A DICTIONARY WAS MADE:
THE SCOTTISH NATIONAL DICTIONARY

Russell Walker
Editorial Manager, Churchill-Livingstone,
Medical Division of the Longman Group

Mr Walker defined the scope and intention of the ten volumes that comprise the SND, and stressed that it is not a dictionary of Scottish Gaelic or a dictionary of the whole of the Scottish language; the words dealt with are those used from about 1700 to the present day. And, despite its name, it has no connection with the politics of Scottish Nationalism. He then commented on Scottish participation, of long standing, in British lexicography, starting with Dr Johnson who had conceived the idea of making a Scottish dictionary, though this came to nothing. Of the six scribes employed by Johnson in preparing his own dictionary, five were Scots.

Dr Johnson's Scottish counterpart was Dr John Jamieson who, in 1808, issued his Etymological dictionary of the Scottish language in two volumes. Jamieson mistakenly thought that the Scots language was a direct derivative of Scandinavian tongues and that the Picts were Scandinavian Goths, but his was a splendid piece of work for one man and he recruited many helpers or correspondents throughout Scotland who sent him words and examples of current usages in their dialectal areas, Scott described him as 'a little prolix and heavy, somewhat prosaic', and he was taken in by some young 'correspondents' in rural Ayrshire who obliged him with a list of absurd but plausible words which he printed in his dictionary as 'possibly French'. They have been preserved in the SND, with a parenthetical note: 'Jam., of extremely doubtful origin'.

Jamieson's work encouraged publication of early Scottish texts and glossaries, and Andrew Crawford, a contemporary, produced what he called An eik to Dr. Jamieson's Dictionary, 'eik' being, as in English 'to eke out', a supplement, and can be used for 'an addition to a glass of whisky'.

Continuing a historical progression of Scottish lexicographers, Mr Walker mentioned in particular Sir James Murray, a famous philologist, and Sir William Craigie of Dundee, probably the most distinguished English/Scots lexicographer of all time and one equally renowned in America. When, in 1907, the Scottish Dialect Committee was formed, Craigie was collaborating with William Grant and the collection of material for the SND was begun. Craigie began work in 1928 on the Dictionary of the older Scottish tongue, which deals with the middle period of Scots before Parliamentary Union, 1707, whereas the SND records Scots words after 1700 and up to the present. Its Scots-speaking areas exclude the Highlands and Western Islands, but include Campbeltown, Ulster, Caithness, Orkney and Shetland.

In 1929 Part I of the Scottish national dictionary was published. It was based partly on historical