

laboration past, present, and future. A first resource for librarians interested in everything collaborative from statewide document delivery and catalogs to virtual reference, replacing brittle books, or international cooperation. — *James R. Kuhlman, University of North Carolina at Asheville.*

Encyclopedia of Library and Information

Science, 2nd ed., Ed. Miriam A. Drake. New York: Marcel Dekker, 2003. 4 vols. alk. paper, \$1,500 (ISBN 0824720776; 0824720784; 0824720792; 0824720806). LC 2003-48938.

The first edition of the *ELIS*, published in a base set of thirty-five volumes from 1969 to 1983 and continued with thirty-seven annual supplemental volumes to 2002, is undoubtedly very familiar to this readership as a wall of blue and red bindings in the reference area taking up much more room than its use in most collections would warrant. The second edition, under the general editorship of Miriam Drake, attempts to update the first and compress the span into four volumes with projected electronic supplements.

The intended readership for this second edition is still as unclear as it was to reviewers of the first edition. Library and information professionals, students in LIS programs, interested people outside the field, and, perhaps, an assortment of others may well find it of interest or potential value, but it is doubtful if many of these, particularly those on the periphery of the information professions, would think to look for authoritative information in articles titled "Humanities Computing," "Taxonomy" (as a subject apparently divorced from the traditional concerns of our occupations), or "Mapping Object-oriented Model into a Relational Model" in this particular source. This, of course, is part of the major difficulty with which reviewers of the first edition of this encyclopedia found

fault. The scope of the work is ill defined and vague, and the headings used for the articles are frequently obscure. There must be a better or more generally useful name for "An Intelligent Dictionary Help System" than leaving it in the alphabetical sequence under *I*.

In face of the lack of any preface or introduction detailing the processes used in the compilation of this monumental effort, it would be hoped that the articles focusing on the field would be able to elucidate the concerns of LIS as a specialization. But there is neither an article on library science nor one on information science, thus leaving both to be defined by inference from the contents of these four volumes. One could perhaps cobble a definition of the term *information* from following the index references, but that effort defeats one of the essential functions of an encyclopedia. If the scope of the compendium is LIS and the coverage is comprehensive, it should follow that the coverage of the various topics is coterminous with the field.

The array of topics chosen by the editors and executed by the contributors to these volumes is impressive, but fails, as did the first edition, to adequately cover the myriad potential topics that compete for inclusion under the LIS rubric. We have individual articles on the universities of Arizona, British Columbia, Colorado, Hawaii, Massachusetts, and Toronto, among many others, but none for Illinois, Florida, or Wisconsin. There are entries for the libraries of Wayne State, Oklahoma State, and Washington State universities, but none for Florida State, Georgia State, or North Carolina State. There is none on Harvard or Yale, though Georgetown and Northwestern make the cut.

The national libraries of Albania, Australia, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malaysia, Namibia, the Phil-

ippines. Poland, Kazakhstan, Romania, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Scotland, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, and Wales are represented by separate entries, as is the Library of Congress. However, there is nothing for the British Library or any of the South or Latin American countries, and Africa and the Far East are ignored for the most part.

There are separate biographical entries for Charles Ammi Cutter, John Cotton Dana, Melvil Dewey, and Shiyali Ramamrita Ranganathan, but none for others who have shaped the field of librarianship or of information science. Robert Downs, William Frederick Poole, and Jesse Shera are conspicuous in their absence. It is true that most of the major figures are represented in *The Dictionary of American Library Biography* and the *ALA World Encyclopedia*, but the inclusion of these four in *ELIS* and the exclusion of others who have made equally as great a contribution to the fields covered raises some serious questions about the scope of the work.

The issue here is that as a reflection of the dimensions of the field, this effort fails to cover the bases that would reasonably be expected. It is a criticism that was leveled effectively by Louise Rosenberg and Gay Detlefsen in their review of the first edition in 1973.¹ Whether the failure to define the scope of the work is a design flaw or derives from the inability of the editorial board to find qualified authors really does not matter. It is still a major drawback to the work. Any reference work such as this must address at the outset the dimensions of the field and represent that field in such a way that it constitutes a holistic overview for the potential user. If separate articles titled "Paper" and "Papyrology" are allowable (with "The Paperless Society" intervening), there should be an article on printing, which is apparently ignored by the encyclopedia. Why is there an article en-

titled "Bibliometrics History" with none on bibliometrics itself?

In essence, the failure here is one of either conception or execution; in either case, it makes this work much less than it could have been and less than any reasonable user would expect.

One of the classic criteria for evaluating encyclopedic treatments of any subject area is the current state of information. Even historical encyclopedias have to include research and findings that reflect the knowledge about the various topics treated at the time of publication. In the early 1970s, I remember Susan Artandi complaining that her article on "Coordinate Indexing" had just appeared in the first edition of the *Encyclopedia*, several years after it had been written. Her objection was based on the fact that by 1972, her contribution, written in the 1960s, was hopelessly dated.

The list of contributors to these volumes is certainly distinguished but includes many who either are no longer living or have not been active participants in the LIS field for some time. Roy Stokes, who died in 1995, is author of the entry "Bibliography" that appears in this new edition of the encyclopedia. It is not quite a simple reprint of the article under the same title from the first edition. The editors have added headings to separate the sections of narrative, have changed the whiches to thats (undoubtedly at the insistence of Spell Check), and rewritten the last sentence into a considerably less felicitous form than that of Stokes's original statement. The major research of the past four decades in bibliography is unacknowledged.

Martha Boaz, who died in 1985, is still represented by her contribution for the first edition, "Censorship," which is here reprinted with no apparent changes. In the first edition, this was followed by Jay Daily's article, "Censorship, Contempo-

rary and Controversial Aspects of," which carried Boaz's wide-ranging historical treatment through the 1960s. Peng Hwa Ang's, "Censorship of the Internet" competently reviews the issues involved with this developing information resource, but he only covers the issues through September 2001. A remarkable hole is left in the narrative with the dropping of Daily's piece.

Daily is represented in his "Descriptive Cataloging" entry, which, again, is reprinted with few emendations from the original edition. The only obvious change is the word *further* being replaced by *furthermore* for no obvious stylistic or syntactic reason. This article covers the field reasonably well up to the development of the "Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules" but falls far short of what should be expected in terms of currency of information. The MARC format receives a separate entry authored by the venerable Henrette Avram, which, again, is reprinted verbatim from the first edition. We find that "LC plans to continue to export MARC until all of LC cataloging (approximately 250,000 titles annually) is encompassed within the MARC system." The second edition of *ELIS* carries a publication and copyright date of 2003, and the contributors' list still has Henrette Avram at the Library of Congress. The publisher may underestimate the set's potential readers, but it would be reasonable to suspect that the unwary would assume this thirty-some-year-old statement represents current planning at the Library of Congress.

The editors expended a bit more effort on Lawrence S. Thompson's article, "Binding." This is a reprint from the original edition incorporating the same illustrations that, although attractive, are not particularly illuminating or well related to the text of the article. However, someone has taken seven of the references

cited by Thompson in the first edition and made endnotes of them following the brief mentions of the specific source in the text of the original. I suspect that Thompson would have objected to the practice of dropping the first names of the authors of his references in preference for their naked initials as a bibliographical abomination.

Edwin T. Coman Jr.'s "Business Literature" and Charles L. Bernier's "Abstracts and Abstracting" survive intact from earlier incarnations. Susan Artandi's article on coordinate indexing is no longer here, and many areas of rapid technological change are represented with new offerings or significantly revised articles from the earlier base volumes and the supplements. The article titled "Business Process Management," for example, is a significant revision from the earlier "Business Process Engineering," and John Bateman's "Automatic Discourse Generation," published in supplement 25 (volume 62) in 1998, shows signs of extensive reworking. Even though there is evidence of significant new material and extensive revision of older entries, all of the articles here are presented as elements of a new 2003 edition of what should be a standard comprehensive and current work covering the entire field of library and information science. Therein lies its major failure.

The first edition continued with supplemental volumes long after the basic alphabetic sequence appeared. The editors promise that this tradition will be continued in a Web-based version, and the entire set of articles is available online at this point. At present, purchasers are given a one-year subscription to the online version. The schedule of additions and updates to the set through this mechanism is unclear, as is the charge for a continuing subscription to the electronic encyclopedia. Using the electronic format

to continue the work is certainly appropriate and a better solution than the annual supplementary volumes of the first edition, but basing the ongoing project on these four physical volumes demonstrates a clear lack of editorial focus or control. When Allen Kent defended the first edition against its reviewers, he failed to address their criticisms in any meaningful way, preferring instead to defend the idea rather than the reality of what was actually produced and thus failed to adequately refute the criticisms of the first edition.² The wholesale reprinting of earlier entries in the new edition, the lack of a conceptual framework on which to base inclusion of articles, and the general unfocused approach to the field still are major issues that have not been faced by the editors and lead to the suspicion that the projected supplemental material will be a series of random articles rather than an encyclopedia.

Other problems were noted by the reviewers of the earlier edition and its supplements that recur here. One major criticism of the first edition was the almost gratuitous inclusion of illustrations that add nothing to the information but greatly increase the bulk (and presumably the cost) of the set. This tradition is continued here, with the odd assortment of reproductions of title pages in the article titled "Center for Research Libraries" (why the cover from the *Locomotive Engineers Journal* for July 1922?) and the full page devoted to the cover of the *Croatian Library Association Journal* or the reproduction of the Certificate of Recognition awarded to the Jamaica Library Association by the International Association of School Librarians for hosting a conference in 1996.

A reviewer also can cavil about the binding, which probably will not last more than a few years in a general reference collection and the lack of a let-

ter guide on the spines that should be required of any alphabetically arranged multivolume reference work. But the issue is that although the new edition of the *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science* is more than a *The Best of the First Edition of ELIS*, the enhancements do not justify the cost, particularly because any collection interested in acquiring such a work would already have the first edition and its supplements.

This is a shame. There are articles here that individually represent worthwhile, and in some areas, major contributions to the literature of library and information science. They are, it is true, more descriptive than research based and probably not publishable in the journal literature, but they do provide information of value to students and others that would be difficult to find elsewhere. It is lamentable that these articles do not add up to an encyclopedia.—Lee Shiflett, *The University of North Carolina at Greensboro*.

1. Louise Rosenberg and Gay Detlefsen, "Is ELIS Worthy of the Name? —'No!'" *Wilson Library Bulletin* 47 (Mar. 1973): 598–601.

2. Allen Kent, "The Editor Replies: Is ELIS Worthy of the Name? —'Yes!'" *Wilson Library Bulletin* 47 (Mar. 1973): 602–4.

Patricia Okker. *Social Stories: The Magazine Novel in Nineteenth-century America*. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Pr., 2003. 202p. alk. paper, \$37.50 (ISBN 0813922402). LC 2003-6547.

Professor Okker has given us a small book on a big topic: serial fiction in nineteenth-century America. Even so, simply by raising it, she reminds us that this is a major and underinvestigated area in the history of the book in North America. At the beginning of the new republic, there were about twelve magazines competing for readers; by the end of the nineteenth century, there were more than 3,000—and