

pings, but it pales in comparison to the problem of retrieving an interesting and useful source analog from memory in response to a novel target analog." (p.251)

In the concluding section, under the heading "The Future of Analogy" the authors ask "Where does analogy go from here?" (p.262) They conclude that analogical thinking will continue to play the extensive, crucial role that it has in the past. They acknowledge that analogical thinking is not without pitfalls (involving false or misleading analogies) but urge that critical analysis is a way to minimize such pitfalls.

They then address the question "what more is required to have a complete scientific theory of human use of analogy?" (p.262) They acknowledge that the "creative construction" of analogies is among the most formidable problems for such a theory. It is often not simply the question of retrieving from memory a ready-made source analog and applying it to the target. Rather, there are significant mental operations which must be understood in conjunction with technical issues such as analogical coherence integrated with "deliberative and explanatory coherence". In short, there is still much work to be done in a variety of fields - psychology, philosophy, linguistics, and computer science - before we have that complete scientific theory of analogy.

I would have preferred to see more explicit definitions of the many analogy-related concepts that are introduced. Too often, the terms are used with only indirect indication of their meaning. They can at last be understood after thorough reading of the material, but personally I find it more meaningful and educationally efficient to see explicit definitions up front.

In addition, it seemed on a number of occasions that the presentation of ideas fell a little short of being systematic and cohesive, sometimes seeming to skip around haphazardly. Considerable material was covered but in a style occasionally lacking in methodical order. Nevertheless, I found the book very informative and thought-provoking. Overall, reading *Mental Leaps* was well worth the effort, and the value of insights far overshadows these shortcomings.

Charles T. Gilreath

Charles T. Gilreath, 217 NW 34th Drive, Gainesville, FL 32607 USA

BURKLE-YOUNG, FRANCIS A., & MALEY, SAUNDRA ROSE (1996). *The Art of the Footnote: The Intelligent Student's Guide to the Art and Science of Annotating Texts*. Lanham, MD / London: University Press of America. XIV, 151 p., 0-7618-0347-5, 0-7618-0348-3.

GRAFTON, ANTHONY (1995). *Die tragischen Ursprünge der deutschen Fußnote*. [The tragic origins of the German footnote]. Aus dem Amerikanischen übersetzt von H. Jochen Bußmann. [Translated from the American by H. Jochen Bußmann]. Berlin: Berlin Verlag. 228 p., 3-8270-0159-5.

LÜTKEHAUS, LUDGER (1994). *Unfröhliche Wissenschaft: Die Lage der Geisteswissenschaften aus der Sicht der Fußnote. Eine längere Anmerkung*. [The state of the humanities from the point of view of the footnote. A longer note]. (Nebensachen und Seitenblicke, 1). Marburg: Basiliken-Presse. 25 p., 3-925347-28-3.

"You have to write everything that is important in your main text; everything that is not important does not even belong in your footnotes." This was the advice my supervisor often repeated as I was writing my dissertation. Obviously, he did not like footnotes, particularly the footnotes of his doctoral candidates. According to his opinion, we were unable to organize the knowledge of our texts properly, and the most salient indication of this misorganization was our footnotes, which supposedly contained knowledge with no relevance to our prospective readers. Since this time I have been very reluctant to use footnotes in my own texts and I have been very critical about the footnotes of other authors. Thus the advice of my supervisor has continued to haunt me when dealing with the problem of annotating texts.

Ludger Lütkehaus, the author of "Unfröhliche Wissenschaft" shows an attitude towards footnotes which is even more critical than that of my supervisor. In his extremely polemic essay on footnotes in German humanities ("Geisteswissenschaften"), he denounces footnotes as absolutely superfluous, as far as the understanding of the main text is concerned. He makes the point that footnotes in the humanities serve as the *singularly most* important proof of the scientific nature of the humanities. Without footnotes there would be no difference between a journalist and scientist. However, for Lütkehaus, footnotes, in fact, do not *really* contribute to the scientific nature of texts in the humanities. Instead footnotes serve their creators in achieving academic status and receiving research grants. In this sense, footnotes are not concerned with epistemological questions but with questions of social recognition in an academic community. Lütkehaus has some good reasons¹ for his irony and sarcasm, but his approach is completely destructive. For somebody who wants to know how footnotes can properly contribute to the organization of knowledge, he offers no answers.

In many respects Anthony Grafton's "Die tragischen Ursprünge der deutschen Fußnote" displays the same tone as Lütkehaus' essay. One can get the impression that irony and sarcasm are necessarily closely related to footnotes. In contrast to Lütkehaus, Grafton, although criticizing footnotes as an ugly part of scientific writing habits, nevertheless, in his conclusions, he acknowledges their usefulness and necessity.

Grafton comes to his conclusions by concentrating on a particular species of footnote producers, the historians. He asks how it came about that modern historians have developed a particular narrative structure which divides their texts into two parts – the narration and the footnote or endnote. Grafton traces the origins of this text structure back to:

- the ancient practice of annotating the books of famous authors and commenting on them,
- the practice of archaeologists and antiquarians in the 17th century,
- the practice of ecclesiastical historians in the 17th century, and
- the literary practices of the enlightenment.

Thus, one cannot say that modern historians like Ranke or Gibbon invented the footnote; instead they merely took up and transformed existing traditions. In the light of Ranke's historicism, the footnote has become an icon of the scientific nature of history. Summarizing Grafton's extensive considerations of this topic, we can say: since the time of Ranke, the ideal of the footnote or other types of annotation is to fulfill the following functions:

1. to identify the sources which were used by the historian and upon which he² relied before writing his narrative,
2. to illustrate different opinions on the subject in question,
3. to support the reader's understanding either by explaining what might be unknown to him, or by advising her or him to pay particular attention to related topics, or by making cross references to other parts of the text.

Grafton shows that not even Ranke, its main promoter, constantly followed this ideal. At times, the famous German historian first wrote his text and then went searching for support for his statements, citing the corresponding sources in his footnotes (a practice which is quite common today). Thus, in contrast to the ideal of historicism, the footnotes did, in fact, not represent sources in the strict sense but were rather verifications compiled or constructed in retrospect.

Grafton does not provide us with a systematic presentation of the different non-scientific uses of a footnote. However, from the variety of examples he has given, one can infer that footnotes serve the fol-

lowing functions not compatible with the scientific ideal³:

1. to poke fun at colleagues,
2. to attack colleagues,
3. to express and/or hide taboo subjects,
4. to be humorous,
5. to express erudition,
6. to display one's affiliation with a paradigm (or to say it more negative: to display one's affiliation with a citation-cartel),
7. to gain acceptance by the academic world,
8. to add something which was not in the author's mind when he wrote his main text.

Grafton has written a long but witty and very readable essay. He shows that the different scientific and even non-scientific uses of footnotes turn the written text (which usually is more or less a monologue) into a dialogue. The footnotes fulfil this task, since the reader is urged to check the truth of the sources, comments or alternative opinions given in a footnote and, if the reader is ambitious, he reacts according to the results of his checks within his scientific community. Whether the dialogue arising from this process is critical, funny, insulting or whatsoever depends on the intentions of the authors and the quality of the footnotes. The urge to enter into dialogue leads to a particular tension between the main text and the footnotes. The reader has to decide whether he wishes to be more active by seriously attending to the footnotes or to be more receptive by ignoring the footnotes.

The book by Burkle-Young and Maley, "The Art of the Footnote", aims at the quality of footnotes. It intends to offer a practically minded state-of-the-art introduction for students and writers. It is not polemic but rather a "how-to-do-book" for students and writers interested in using footnotes to enrich their text and to enhance their reader's understanding.

The starting point for Burkle-Young and Maley is an ethical one. They complain about contemporary students' and modern writers' inability to document their use of sources and the development of their research. According to the authors, this inability leads to an undesirable plagiarism, which could be avoided by the correct use of footnotes. In addition, footnotes can help to make the main text more coherent and comprehensive. Thus side-remarks and additional information documenting the writer's research can be inserted where they do not disturb the flow of the main text.

Burkle-Young and Maley's argument for footnotes follows the lines of Ranke's ideal as depicted by Grafton. They identify 12 useful types of footnotes which enhance textual understanding and provide insight into the process of research:

1. Bibliographical footnotes

2. Brief biographical footnotes
3. Geographical identifications
4. Object descriptions
5. Expanded information about secondary topics
6. Glosses for unusual words or expressions
7. Documentation of contrasting views
8. Side-remarks and commentaries
9. Suggested relationships and associations
10. Translations of quoted material
11. Cross references to other locations in the text
12. Expressions of acknowledgement and gratitude.

The authors provide ample examples and very helpful comments on how to construct footnotes of these various types. After reading their book I felt that my supervisor might well have been wrong and that I need to question my own habit of using only parenthetical notes for bibliographical information.

Helpful in this connection is a comparison made by Noel Coward and mentioned by Grafton in his essay⁴. According to Noel Coward, looking up a footnote is like interrupting a game of love in order to go downstairs to answer the door bell. I think elaborating on this example could help us better to understand the contrasting attitudes towards footnotes. Some people go down to open the door, because they feel obliged to do so and thus do not dare to ignore it; other people go down, because they expect at the door something which might enhance their pleasure upstairs; still others will go downstairs, because they expect at the door something more interesting than the action in which they are presently engaged and lastly, some, of course, decide simply to ignore the door bell altogether.

Having this in mind, in my opinion a good writer should be cautious about ringing the door bell: Is it really necessary to ring the bell? Is it the right moment? Is the way of ringing annoying? On the other hand, a good reader should ask oneself: What do I really want? Do I need to go downstairs? Can I use my prospective experience downstairs for the action I am engaged in upstairs? To answer these questions, the reader needs to have a considerable amount of competence and self-confidence; otherwise he must always go downstairs every time the bell rings. Finally, a good footnote should leave it to the reader as to how she or he should react to the ringing bell. In other words: a footnote should not impose itself upon the reader in such a way that ignoring it would impede understanding of the main text.

Notes:

- 1 He illustrates one of his arguments by extensively quoting from Hinkmar von Repkow's dissertation "Noten ohne Text" (Notes without text). In this dissertation, published in 1743 by Rabener, Repkow argues that a writer will become famous only through his footnotes,

not by his main text. Consequently, Repkow's dissertation almost entirely consisted of notes.

- 2 I dare to be sexist in using only the male pronoun, but in Ranke's time there were no female historians. It was men who were supposed to make history and men who were supposed to write history.
- 3 Although these functions do not serve scientific purposes I have to admit that I occasionally like to see at least one of the first four functions to be fulfilled in some footnotes. Sometimes this is the only reason why a text is worthwhile to read.
- 4 The following passage shows that, despite my change of mind, I have not yet joined the ranks of the footnote-freaks. I considered relegating this illustration to the footnotes, but decided instead to incorporate it into my text after all.

Ewald Kiel

Dr. Ewald Kiel, Universität Göttingen, Institut für Interkulturelle Didaktik, Waldweg 26, D-37073 Göttingen, Germany

BUDER, MARIANNE, REHFELD, WERNER, SEEGER, THOMAS, & STRAUCH, DIETMAR (Eds.), (1997). *Grundlagen der praktischen Information und Dokumentation: Ein Handbuch zur Einführung in die fachliche Informationsarbeit*. [Fundamentals of Practical Information and Documentation. A Manual Serving as an Introduction to Professional Information Work]. Initiated by Klaus Laisiepen, Ernst Lutterbeck and Karl-Heinrich Meyer-Uhlenried. (4th entirely revised ed.). München/New Providence/London/Paris: Saur. XLIII, 1069 p., 3-598-11310-2.

Only five years after its 3rd edition, the "Fundamentals of Practical Information and Documentation" is now presented in a substantially revised version, a fact furnishing convincing proof of the importance of this standard work.

In all, 50 editors and authors (some two thirds of whom also contributed to the aforesgoing edition) once again present the current state of the art not only in its manifold forms of expression and function, but also in its entire breadth, ranging from time-tested procedures like punched cards (still good for 6 pages) to various forms of automated procedures, e.g. for abstracting. The overall concept and thematic structure of the preceding edition being found meaningful and valid, they were left intact. By the same token, the overall arrangement of the work was retained, without adverse effects on the presentation of current developments. However: "Only a few contributions could, with minimal updating, be taken over 'as is' into the 4th edition. Most had to be completely revised and rewritten as well as updated." (Foreword, VIII-IX)