

New Horizons for the American Name Society

Edwin D. Lawson

State University of New York, Fredonia
1996 ANS Presidential Address

In order for the American Name Society to continue to grow and to remain an influential international organization, some rethinking of our goals may be in order. Our journal *Names* is undoubtedly our best representative to the scholarly world—not only in North America but in all countries. The quality of manuscripts continues to increase, even though the rejection rate in 1996 was the highest in our history.

Names is listed in many indexes, abstracted by many different services, and included in a number of databases. This past year I was able to get *Names* included in the databases of OCLC's ArticlesFirst and UnCover. ArticlesFirst has a database of some 13,000 journals, UnCover some 33,000. (There is some overlap.)

I was further able to register *Names* with CCC, the Copyright Clearing House. Registration with CCC means that royalties paid by libraries and others will now come to the American Name Society. UnCover sends periodic payments to ANS for articles they reproduce, but only for articles published during the past five years. The system is simple: Suppose you want a copy of an article published in *Names* in 1994 but you do not have that particular issue, nor does your regular library. You can request a photocopy from another library on inter-library loan. The cost of that copy will include a minimum of \$3.50 for copyright royalty. Before registration with CCC and UnCover about two years ago, the money which would have gone to ANS, since it was the copyright holder, was never forwarded. However, we have now registered and some royalties have come in. I had expected an income of at least \$200-\$300 per year, but I found that we were lucky if \$20-\$30 was generated.

In searching for the reasons for this disparity, I turned to the *Arts & Humanities Citation Index* (AHCI). This index lists articles by author,

title, and by whom cited. Thus if you published an article in 1992 in a journal searched by AHCI, you would be able to locate the article by author or by title. If you wanted to learn if any other author(s) referred to that article in their own work you could look up the article under the author's name in any subsequent year(s). You could also find listings of other articles that cited your article since the last issue of AHCI came out. This type of listing is helpful if you are trying to identify current research that is building on the research reported in the original article.

To see how well articles in our journal were represented, I listed all the articles which had appeared in *Names* between 1991 and 1995. There were 93 articles, concerned with a variety of onomastics: placenames, names in literature, personal names, etc. I decided to do a sample evaluation to see how many articles were picked up for citation by other scholars. What I found was cause for concern for all of us.

Names is not in the basic database of the 6,100 journals searched by AHCI. Under the category of "name" or "names," there were 612 listings but *Names*, as a journal, was not one of them. With the help of a librarian who specializes in bibliographic searches at the University of Buffalo library, I listed the first 39 items; we did not find any citations for *Names*. Since this type of search is expensive, rather than running off the entire 612, I requested searches of the six authors who had published most often in *Names* during that five-year period: Leonard R. N. Ashley, Herbert Barry, III, Frederic G. Cassidy, Gerald L. Cohen, Robert F. Fleissner, Edwin D. Lawson and Dorothy E. Litt. None of these authors appeared on the search reports. (I should add that there were several citations for Fleissner but these were for pre-1991 publications.)

I decided next to abandon the *Arts & Humanities Citation Index* and try the *Social Sciences Citation Index*. Here we were more fortunate, with 32 citations to articles in *Names*. Among the authors represented were Herbert Barry, Charles E. Joubert, Stanley Lieberson and Wilbur Zelinsky.

What can account for the huge discrepancies in representation between the two indexes? At least half of all the articles published in *Names* would seem to be classified in the humanities and yet a significant number of the articles which appear there are cited in the social sciences but not in the humanities. Why should this be? I believe it

means that those whose studies touched on the social sciences are more likely to have their work picked up. I pursued this possibility with several librarians who work in both areas. They agreed and further explained that researchers in the social sciences tend to be more systematic in their bibliographic searches. Social scientists thus use more extensive and more thorough retrieval techniques. It is probably also true that, while social scientists had a number of citations to articles in *Names*, they too could substantially benefit from more searching for previously published articles relating to their present work. This certainly does not mean that the articles which have appeared in *Names* and which lean toward the humanities are less scholarly than those which lean toward the social sciences. Rather, I think this situation stems from the following:

1. We have been less effective than we should be in letting people in the humanities know of our work,
2. We have been less effective than we should be in demonstrating that onomastics has a major contribution to make to other disciplines,
3. We have not been searching for relevant literature to the same extent as researchers in either the sciences or social sciences.

We have only to glance through recent issues of *Names* to find articles that touch upon a variety of fields: anthropology, communication, English and other languages, genealogy, geography, linguistics, literature, political science, popular culture, psychology, religion, sociology, speech, and others. The problem may well be that scholars in these disciplines are unaware of the relevance of the articles regularly published in *Names*.

How does the notice of *Names* compare with that of other journals? To answer this question I contacted the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI), which publishes AHCI and several other sources, including *Current Contents*. I asked at ISI about including *Names* in the database. The response was negative. Although no official reason for the rejection was given, I was able to determine some of the criteria upon which the decision was based. To be included, a journal must:

1. Appear regularly and currently,
2. Be cited appropriately often.

Names does come out on time, and so meets the first criterion. However, it may not be meeting the second. As I mentioned above, the

call for the journal, at least in the time frame considered, is nil for the humanities and probably low for the social sciences.

Clearly, if the ANS and the journal are to grow and to maintain their influence in the scholarly community, some actions must be taken. Primarily, we must strengthen and broaden the appeal and use of the journal. Specifically, I would suggest:

1. Increasing the number of reprints/offprints. The distribution of copies of an article is a staple among colleagues. Many journals provide an author 50 copies, gratis. *Names* gives only 15 [20 beginning with the first number of 1997. Ed.]. I recommend that the number be immediately raised to 50. I would also recommend that a generic cover for the reprints be produced which would describe the journal and the American Name Society. These suggestions are based upon the fact that authors probably know better than anyone else how copies of their articles can be distributed for the greatest effect. In general, authors are more likely to know others who are doing similar work and who would be most interested in the subject. Including a cover would not only be a quality touch, it would also give greater visibility to the journal and the American Name Society.

2. Including second language abstracts. Many members may not realize how many scholars outside of the United States are interested in the articles which appear in *Names*. Most, perhaps, are in Europe, but readers and contributors also come from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. While it is true that many whose first language is not English do read English to some degree, there are many who read it only with difficulty and with limited understanding. A second language abstract may have the advantage of conveying to these readers a sense of the article and allowing them to determine if the article is important enough for them to work through on their own or to have it translated. [Abstracts in both French and German are now included in each issue. Ed.].

3. Considering the possibility of prior publication. The term *prior publication* may be new to many of those whose academic disciplines lie in the humanities, but it is well known in the sciences and in some social sciences. I believe the practice began when investigators working on government projects wanted to see that their results were available to other scientists as quickly as possible.

This is the way prior publication works. Assume that a group of chemists had perfected a new technique and had written it up. The journal to which they submitted it had a two-year backlog of articles. The chemists felt that the article was important and should be published as soon as possible. The journal agreed to publish the article in the next issue providing the authors assume the page cost. This is what is known as prior publication. It has spread to a number of the social sciences, particularly psychology. Perhaps it is time that we in onomastics consider prior publication as well.

Adoption of prior publication has benefitted authors, readers, and editors. The number of pages in journals with prior publication has been expanded, thus readers get more for their money. For an author, the cost of publishing an article would vary with the number of pages; *Psychology Reports* charges \$27.50 per page in multiples of four pages. (However, authors receive 200 reprints.) For *Names*, I imagine the cost would be around \$25 per page; a 16-page article would run about \$400. Many universities have special funds to assist in publication and to pay for reprints.

I would stress that prior publication in no way means a weakening of quality control or of standards of acceptability. Nothing would be changed from the usual evaluation process; the only difference would be that the author(s) would have the option of having the work published more quickly than would be the case otherwise.

4. Reaching out to a wider audience. There are many researchers working in different areas of onomastics. I would like to see the Editor and Editorial Board seek out and showcase the work of those whose discipline and approach is somewhat different from that of the articles generally published in *Names*. Some of our own members are important contributors in fields of onomastics which have been underrepresented or even absent from the pages of *Names*. These scholars could lead the way with a special issue of the journal and thus show the scholarly world that the American Name Society has assumed a leadership role in onomastics. Among these might be such topics as Religion and Names, Population Structure and Names, Sociology and Naming, Psychology of Names and Naming, Politics of Names and Naming.

Taking these steps, I believe, would be useful measures to insure and perhaps increase as well the role of our journal and of our organization as major contributors to onomastic studies of all kinds.

The following prospectus was submitted by William Bright; it should be of interest to readers of *Names*.

This notice is to announce the preparation of *Native American Placenames of the United States* (NAPUS), a large reference book in dictionary format, to be published by the University of Oklahoma Press. The work is to be prepared under the editorial direction of William Bright, of the University of Colorado, during the period 1997-2002, and is planned for publication in 2003.

GOAL. The emphasis in the book will be on the origins of US placenames, used in English, which derive from Native American languages. The aim is to produce a work which is responsible to existing placename scholarship, but which will provide authoritative etymological information based on current linguistic research.

CONTENT. Among published reference works on American placenames, there are a few which cover the entire US, and many devoted to particular states; but in general these do not give special attention to Native American names. A handful of books deal with Native names in particular states, but all existing works are grounded primarily in historical and literary research. The aim of NAPUS is to supplement such materials by drawing on published and unpublished research by linguists who specialize in Native languages, in order to create a volume which will be comprehensive and definitive for the entire nation.

THE EDITOR. William Bright is Emeritus Professor of Linguistics and Anthropology, UCLA, and Professor Adjoint of Linguistics, University of Colorado, Boulder. His specialties include anthropological linguistics, sociolinguistics, and American Indian languages. In the field of toponymy, he has published *Colorado Place Names* (1993), edited a special issue of *Names* on American Indian placenames (1996), and most recently has prepared a revised (4th) edition of E. G. Gudde's *California Place Names* (to appear).

EDITORIAL BOARD. The Editor will be joined in the preparation of the volume by a board of Consulting Editors who are outstanding researchers in the field of Native American linguistics. These scholars will take responsibility for language families and/or areas in which each has expertise. The following have agreed to serve:

158 Names 45.2 (June 1997)

Wallace Chafe, Linguistics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA (Iroquoian, Caddoan)

Ives Goddard, Anthropology, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC (Algonquian)

Jane H. Hill, Anthropology, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ (O'odham, Southwest)

Kenneth C. Hill, Tucson, AZ (Hopi, Southwest)

Lawrence Kaplan, Alaska Native Language Center, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, AK (Eskimo-Aleut)

James Kari, Alaska Native Language Center, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, AK (Athabaskan)

M. Dale Kinkade, Linguistics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver (Salish, Northwest)

John McLaughlin, English, Utah State University, Logan, UT (Uto-Aztecan)

Marianne Mithun, Linguistics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA (Iroquoian)

Pamela Munro, Linguistics, University of California, Los Angeles, CA (Yuman, Muskogean, Southeast)

David Pentland, Linguistics, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg (Algonquian)

Robert Rankin, Linguistics, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS (Siouan, Plains)

CONSULTANTS. Information regarding particular languages and areas will be obtained by consultation with a large number of native speakers, linguistic specialists, and onomastic scholars throughout the nation. The participation of all interested parties is welcomed.

William Bright
1625 Mariposa Ave
Boulder, CO 80302
Phone 303-444-4274
Fax 303-492-4416
brightw@spot.colorado.edu