practical guide to the terminology used in the production and distribution of books new and old, not necessarily the technical language of the various sectors of the trade, but rather the words in common use in a publisher’s office, in a bookstore, or among collectors.’

Not as witty and artful as John Carter’s *ABC for Book Collectors* or as detailed and comprehensive as Geoffrey Glaister’s *Glaister’s Glossary of the Book*, Peters’ work overlaps both and is broader in scope; *e.g.*, only in *The Bookman’s Glossary* does the entry for William Caxton follow the one for Cathode-ray tube. Ms. Peters’ work does share with the other two the same lack of Canadian content; CBA (Canadian Booksellers Association) is the only Canadian reference I located.

Any criticism that can be levelled against this useful edition is minor; with Carter and Glaister it remains a basic source. Peters’ ‘Selected Reading List’ is just that; one could quibble with the inclusion of prices for the items listed, as they quickly go out of date. Those of us who are functionally illiterate in the field of the new technology will thank Ms. Peters for easing our pain in attempting to understand computer jargon. As she points out, it is fitting that *The Bookman’s Glossary* ‘becomes the first book from the Bowker Book Division to use an electronic text management system in its editing and composition.’

**REVIEW EDITOR**


This is a relentlessly functional, no-frills reference tool. The only criteria for evaluating such a work are: 1) whether it fills a legitimate need, 2) its ease of use, and 3) its accuracy. Aesthetic considerations, rather obviously in this case, are irrelevant.

With respect to the first criterion, the usefulness of an index that attempts to list comprehensively all book reviews exceeding one hundred words in length, written in English, French, and German and relating to the field of British and American bibliography may not seem readily apparent to the layman. However, bibliography – used by the compilers in the widest sense of the term, including the history of printing and critical editions of literary works – is not only a vital discipline in its own right, but is the indispensable handmaiden of serious scholarly work in most other fields. Bibliographers, subject specialists, and librarians, among others, all have an interest in monitoring contributions to this esoteric, but important genre. Furthermore, as the editors point out, the academic book review is itself often a vehicle for valuable scholarly insights.

With respect to the question of ease of use and accessibility, the 1979 volume shows a marked improvement over its predecessors, due mainly to a more rational subject index. Indexes and classification schemes should be as simple as possible. An elaborate apparatus whose arrangement and purpose cannot be easily grasped and which does not lend itself to quick reference serves only to demonstrate the excessive ingenuity of the compiler. Earlier volumes provided subject access through a cumbersome system of numbered categories. This has been replaced by a more conventional
alphabetical subject listing that, however much one may quibble about the appropri-
ateness of individual headings, greatly enhances the overall usefulness of the Index.

The Index is divided into five sections: a Master List of periodicals covered, in
abbreviated and expanded form; an Author / Editor-as-Author Index containing the
main entries, numbered consecutively and arranged alphabetically by author of the
work reviewed, and separate alphabetical listings of subject headings, short titles,
editors (of critical editions), and book reviewers. A brief introduction discusses aims
and methodology and includes an interesting comparative analysis of international
patterns in bibliographical research as revealed by the contents of the current vol-
ume. The subsidiary indexes and the main Author Index are linked by means of the
latter's unique entry numbers. For most applications, this is an eminently practical,
straightforward arrangement.

Individual entries supply the bare minimum of information: an entry number,
main heading (usually the author, editor, or compiler), full title, and abbreviated
citations of the journals in which reviews of the work appeared, together with the
name of the reviewer if known. One might wish to be provided with the imprint and
pagination; on the other hand, this is not intended to be a bibliography of bibiliog-
raphies, although it can obviously be used as such for certain limited purposes. Bare
identification was considered adequate for a mere index to book reviews.

A more serious limitation is the failure to distinguish between conventional bibli-
ographies and checklists, and works of textual criticism; the title of a book is often an
uncertain guide to its nature and contents. The editors indicate they will take steps to
correct this deficiency in future volumes by adding a classification scheme similar to
their discarded subject index. But one wonders whether the problem lies rather in the
overly broad scope of the Index. Does a critical edition of Nicholas Nickleby, a
concordance to the poems of Dylan Thomas, or the Letters of Virginia Woolf properly
belong in an index explicitly dealing with bibliographical publications? Perhaps
works of textual analysis and criticism and so-called scholarly editions – which
comprise almost half of the 896 entries in this volume – deserve their own index.

To demand infallible accuracy in a complex compilation of this kind would be
unreasonable. However, a fairly cursory perusal revealed a couple of significant omis-
sions, both of them, alas, pertaining to Canadian works. A number of entries, not
surprisingly, list reviews that have appeared in our own Papers, identified in the main
Author Index by the cryptic abbreviation PBSC. But one looks in vain for any mention
of the Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada in the Master List of periodicals
and abbreviations at the front of the volume. In another instance, one finds a refer-
ce to a review by D. Lochhead published in the Spring 1979 issue of VPR. Again, VPR
fails to appear in the Master List. One does, however, find there the abbreviation VPN,
which stands for Victorian Periodicals Newsletter. It is just possible to deduce from
this that VPR probably refers to the Victorian Periodicals Review, which, some
research reveals, has recently superseded the Newsletter.

I do not wish to make too much of these relatively minor errors, so long as they are
limited to a reasonable number – such seems to be the case – and are not repeated in
subsequent volumes. Nobody, after all, is perfect. As a library cataloguer, I am hardly
in a position to cast the first stone.

R.V. CUPIDO