THE WORLD LIST OF SCIENTIFIC PERIODICALS

Kenneth I. Porter

My subject is specifically the preparation of the World list of scientific periodicals in its incarnation as New periodical titles, and I will try to restrict myself to discussing this publication alone, although I trust it is generally realised that the World list comes into being as an integral, though separable, part of the BUCOP process. BUCOP, or the British union-catalogue of periodicals appeared originally in four volumes and a Supplement, bringing the coverage of periodical holdings in British libraries up to 1960. The fourth edition of the World list, also bringing its coverage up to 1960, has been in existence for about a year, in its three volumes. Before this appeared, however, the new BUCOP had begun to show itself, in the form of quarterly issues. The first four quarterlies, which appeared during 1964, were cumulated about this time last year into a comprehensive volume, bearing the title of BUCOP, and also into a ‘restricted’ cumulation, as the men who control the computer process think of it, as the World list of scientific periodicals. This restriction excludes about a third of the total number of titles published during the year, and reflects the proportion of new titles in the field of science and technology, which I am sure I do not need to remind you, is the concern of the World list.

About two years ago I gave a talk to Aslib, in which I described the preparation of BUCOP in some detail, and I should like to take the opportunity of citing its published form: Aslib Proceedings, London, Vol. 16, No. 6, June 1964, pp. 189-199. Lest anyone think that it is rather pompous of me to make this citation, I should like to say that there is really very little to say on the process of compiling the World list that has not been said already—although I propose to make a very general recap.—but I would like to say something about the ‘correct’ citation of periodical literature, wherein the World list has always, and I hope does now, made a valuable contribution. But first I must describe again briefly how the World list is now compiled.

The information on periodicals taken and filed in libraries, as supplied to us by the contributing libraries, is first amalgamated into our Periodicals Union Catalogue. From this catalogue, the entries for new titles and those which changed their titles, or which ceased publication in and after 1960, are extracted and transformed into decklets of punched cards. A ‘decklet’ is simply the collective word for the cards which compose a single entry—one each for each line of the information on the publication itself, plus one card for each of the holding libraries. A punched card contains 80 vertical columns which are ‘punched’—a process rather like typing—with patterns of holes which, when read by the impulses passing through a computer, either instruct the computer what to do (when properly programmed) or produce the text as it appears in BUCOP/World list. The first 32 columns of the punched card, reading from the left, contain the instruc-

* Based on the script of a paper read at a meeting of the Society on 17th March, 1966. The departure of the writer shortly after the meeting for an extended visit to New Zealand made it impossible for him to revise the script for publication. He consequently regrets any stylistic shortcomings it may have.
tions to the computer, arranged in five fields, as they say. The sixth field, from columns 33 to 80, contains the matter that actually appears in the publications. These fields have been described in the article cited above; suffice it here to say that they serve to put the entry into its proper place in relation to other entries, and also to arrange the entry in its proper order within itself. The third field is the most interesting to us at the moment, since it is this which brings about the separation out from the complete file of the World list entries, and since it also has certain potentialities from the viewpoint of subject division which are coming closer to realisation.

This 'subject field' as I shall call it, runs from columns 17 to 22 of the punched card. At the moment column 23 is a 'skip' or blank column, but could also be called into play if required as an additional place in this field. Column 17 is always punched when the decklets are being prepared either with a figure 1—which signifies that the subject of the periodical concerned is in the humanities or social sciences, or is of a 'general interest' nature, or with a 2—which signifies that it deals with an aspect of science and technology, or a 3—for a subject like Geography or Psychology which might be thought of as straddling the fence between the 'two cultures'.

To produce the World list, the sorting machines which operate in conjunction with the computer are instructed to bring out all the decklets punched with a 2 or a 3 in column 17, and these are then printed out in the same way as is the complete file of decklets which produces the comprehensive cumulation. This process is operated only at the cumulation stages, and never in the quarterlies. There is also the matter of the recommended title abbreviations, which seem to be of such importance to users of the World list that they merit treatment at some length. This aspect of the publication was barely mentioned in my talk at Aslib because, although it now astounds me to think of it, we had considered omitting this feature altogether.

Everyone knows that the recommended title abbreviations were printed in italics in the four 'normal' editions of the World list, as part of the entry. The current limitations of the process we now use ruled this out, since upper and lower case are stylistically important, and the computer can only provide—at the moment—upper case exclusively. Consequently, when it was decided that title abbreviations would be included in the computer-produced World list, the only way to achieve this was to make it a separate section of the work. This is done by sorting out from the file of 2's and 3's in column 17 all the 'title' cards, which are punched with a 1 in column 26. I use this print-out as a working sheet and insert on it the recommended abbreviations by hand. The print-out cannot itself be used in the final publication as the other print-outs are, by being photographed and at the same time reduced on a photo-litho machine, because it is impossible to combine with typography or any other separate process, and also because not all the 'titles' that the machine produces are required; printing out the 1's in column 26 also brings out the references, as well as a great number of non-scholarly periodicals for which there is no point in providing an abbreviation. So the first thing I do with this print-out is to go through it eliminating the titles not required for the purposes of this section—a very satisfying activity. Then I go through the remainder adding the abbreviations, and later pass this copy on to the publisher. Last year the final result was achieved by means of an electric typewriter, which seemed to be quite satisfactory.

Perhaps it would be desirable to say something about the form of the abbreviations chosen. There is a draft new British Standard on the subject, which allows for alternative abbreviated forms according to different requirements, and I used this as the basis of the current World list style, since I was fortunate enough to be given sight of it. The same draft governed the abbreviated forms employed in the 4th edition of the World list, and it has no doubt not escaped notice.
that there are certain differences between the 4th edition and the current *World list*. I hope that there will not be dismay if I say that I do not think this matters very much. An abbreviation should, after all, be regarded as a sort of short-hand for a correct title citation, serving a special and restricted purpose, and should never be regarded as the correct citation itself. In other words, it only has meaning when used in conjunction with an easily accessible key, either in the publication or an article which uses the abbreviations, or by specifically citing a source, like the *World list*, which can be presumed to be available in a wide range of libraries.

As head of the Periodicals Department of the N.C.L., a position I hold in conjunction with that of Editor of *BUCOP/World list*, I am very much aware of the difficulties that can be caused by the abuse of abbreviations. They should only be used when space is an important consideration and when a key is readily available; the full form should always be given when seeking to follow up a specific reference in a library, especially if the request has to proceed through the channels of inter-library loan.

It is amazing to see what can happen to an abbreviation when it emerges from the hands of a typist—or even how an abbreviation can be misconstrued in the course of its citation. A library recently asked on one of our interlending forms for a periodical it called *Forschungsh* (not a *World list* abbreviation). Even though it was clear that the word ‘Forschungshefte’ was meant, it was still clearly an inadequate reference, since it means something like ‘Research papers’—obviously something was missing. The form was returned to the applying library, and returned, unamended, but with the source of the reference quoted. On looking this up, we saw the word ‘Freiberg’ before the word in question. Admittedly there was no typographical variation in the citation to make it clear what part of it was the title, though it might have been thought that it was odd to put the place of publication before the title. In any case, the title actually required was in full *Freiberger Forschungshefte*.

I referred earlier to the stylistic importance in the *World list* of upper and lower case, and there is also great significance in the presence or otherwise of a full stop. While due weight may be given to these points in printed sources, I have yet to see them actually being used on an application form coming into the N.C.L. where an abbreviation is used in preference to the full form. There are a number of sources of references, even abstracting organs which should know better, which do not provide a key to their abbreviations, and do not even make clear from their form of entry what kind of publication they are referring to. In these cases, and at the risk of seeming inconsistent, I would say that it is safer to reproduce the citation exactly as it is, and not to attempt to expand it. It is difficult enough to locate a title when it is asked for as an abbreviation; but it is easier to trace from an abbreviation than from an incorrect approximation to the full title.

To wind up my strictures on the misuse of abbreviations; I believe that to search for a system of abbreviations from which the original can be at once reconstructed in full is to pursue a chimera. In the current *World list* I have reverted to the simplicity of the earlier editions in many cases, and have modified the main entry filing scheme in order, as I hope, to make it easier to locate a title from an abbreviated form, or even a close but inaccurate approximation. I have not worried too much if the language of the original is not immediately apparent from the abbreviation, but on the other hand have left in a preposition or left unabbreviated a word for which a standard abbreviation exists if the result in toto would be downright misleading. I regard the recommended forms as susceptible of change when we reach the stage of cumulating the cumulations, if my attention is drawn to some inadequacy in the form as it first appeared.

As I have said, I regard the abbreviations as no more than the stand-ins for the full title, and consider that they should be used
only when there are cogent reasons against using the full form. The only really cogent reason I can think of in favour of their use is in an article or publication where the same title tends to be referred to again and again. One might add that a very well known title might qualify for citation by abbreviation no matter how often or how seldom it appears in an article, etc. Then one might go further and say that there are some periodicals that are so well known—at least to those working in the same field—that the initials alone are sufficient to identify them, though few abbreviation codes go so far as to recommend this practice. I must admit that I have taken a step in that direction myself in the World list by admitting groups of initials representing the names of bodies, where these are tolerably well known, into abbreviations. In some titles, of course, the body already appears in this form; the current World list practice is to give such groups of initials as if they were words, though in capitals, while groups of initials separated by full stops indicate that the words appeared in full in the original title. Maybe some day there will emerge an international documentation centre of such authority that it can produce codes rather than abbreviations, that will be universally accepted—something like the forms that appear in Chemical titles, for instance.* I notice, however, that citation by World list number, though not unknown, did not commend itself, for reasons that I dare say do not need deep investigation. Some kind of mnemonic principle will undoubtedly continue to be required of systems of short-cut citations, even though the end sought is the utmost in brevity. One notes a tendency in this direction even in the original titles of some publications; consider AIAA Journal, MULL (Modern uses of logic in law) or R & D, or the terrifying codes that conceal rather than distinguish so much of the most difficult—bibliographically speaking—of difficult publication categories, report literature.

I should now like to say more about the correct citation of periodical literature, giving prominence to the details of the publication itself, rather than to the article. To dismiss the article itself in a few words, important though it is: for us at the N.C.L., the most useful indexes give the first indexing priority to the author, and then to the actual title, since it is most often a specific article which is being sought. Is much use made, I wonder, of such indexes as subject bibliographies, with no specific articles initially in mind, even though a subject arrangement is popular? Certainly at the N.C.L., where the needs may be rather more special in this regard, checking such items by a subject approach is rarely resorted to, unless the arrangement of the index forces it upon us, and it is not easy to divine the correct subject heading from the title of an article one may need to trace. Personally, I believe a KWIC (Keyword-in-context) index to periodical titles is more useful than arrangement by subject divisions, as it can serve more than one function.

The article itself, however, has no direct concern with the processes in which the World list is involved, though it is an important consideration in the work of the N.C.L.'s Periodicals Department. I am at the moment most concerned with the citation of the periodical itself; I know I have also had something to say on this topic before, but it is important enough to need repeating at regular intervals. First, and most important, the title. The whole current BUCOP style now follows what has always been the World list approach, of entering the title of a periodical exactly as it appears on the title page, and of making successive entries, linked by remarks (or references to numbers in the four editions of the old World list) where there have been title changes. The old

* The author would like to draw readers' attention to the CODEN project, in the hands of Dr. L. E. Kuentzel, vice-chairman of Committee E-13 on Absorption Spectroscopy of the American Society for Testing and Materials. CODEN are machine-readable, five-letter codes for the titles of periodicals. The number of such codes amounts to some 40,000, and is growing. There is an article by Dr. Kuentzel on the 'Current status of the CODEN Project' in Special Libraries, New York, 57(6), July-August, 1966, pp. 404-406.
BUCOP resorted to entry under a corporate body, and under its earliest name at that, wherever the name appeared directly or by implication in the title, and otherwise under the earliest title which the publication bore. This results in the user being referred to another part of the work depressingly often, and complicates the matter of sorting out actual holdings from the cluster of information assembled under the uniform heading. The World list style removes this problem, and the user has much more immediate access to the information it contains—as long as his own citation is in the same style. Assuming that this is often not the case, the current practice is to make a large number of references where these seem to be required, and to incorporate (thanks to the operation of the second, or 'body' field in the punched cards) an Index of Sponsoring Bodies.

Another feature of the new World list to help the user with a faulty reference—which I suspect is all too common—is the modification of the filing order which I referred to above, interfiling, for example, forms which are often confused, such as 'Boletim' and 'Boletín', 'Japan' and 'Japanese', the various forms in different languages of 'Archives' (so long as these begin with the element 'Archiv'). It will be noted that these forms—and the great majority of the cases where interfiling takes place—all begin with the same combination of letters. In a few well justified cases we go further, for instance in interfiling 'Nihon' and 'Nippon', which I believe for inscrutable reasons are different guises for the same word in the original script. I would emphasise, however, that despite these interfilings, we still endeavour to give the title exactly as it appears on the title-page. I say 'endeavour' because we do not have easy access to a large collection of periodicals, and have to rely on the information relayed, in wildly different forms and often with a certain slurring of detail, by our contributing libraries. How happy I would be, and how useful it would be for both the users and the practitioners of documentation techniques, if it were agreed that catalogues, lists, abstracts, etc., would all cite periodicals (and indeed, publications of all kinds) by what they call themselves, making such added entries as might be needed to assist those who were unsure of the precise title they were seeking. It probably does not need emphasising that this is the only way to ensure standardization of practice in this regard, which I am sure we all agree is eminently desirable.

For all I know I am preaching to the converted, since I suppose that most of this audience already knows and appreciates the World list style in this matter. If this is the case, then please proselytise, as there are still a number of fastnesses in this country and abroad where the light has not yet entered. I must say that I find that very valuable publication New serial titles often frustrating in this respect, since it often disguises the titles listed in a very puzzling manner; it is virtually impossible to reconstruct the actual title, and consequently to be sure that a title one knows of is the same as the entry. When a body heading is used, even when the language of the uniform heading is not the same as that of the title concerned, the title is reduced to the word or phrase signifying the type of publication—'Journal', or 'Annales', and so on—and where subordinate bodies are concerned the situation is even more confusing. Strange, when the rules for descriptive cataloguing are so precise in the matter of books, that they should be relaxed when dealing with a notoriously difficult—again, bibliographically speaking—class of publication.

I know that the principle of entry under published title is not always as easy as it sounds; there are serials with 'scattered' titles, where the various component parts of what should be the title appear on different parts of the title-page in different type faces, and they have to be knitted together. The World list does have clear-cut rules for coping with this situation, as outlined in its Introduction. There is also the case of the serial without a title—where it can only be identified by the name of the sponsoring body. This is a case where the name of a body is used as the title in the current
World list, though in round brackets. I believe it to be unsafe to invent a title, such as ‘Publications’. I have already mentioned the case of periodicals which identify themselves by codes, rather than titles, and these are used as titles by the World list. Not a very satisfactory solution I admit, but the situation is somewhat intractable. And I should like to interpolate here another of my convictions, that librarians, documentalists, bibliographers, indexers, and so on, might all be able to make life easier for themselves and certainly make their work more effective if they were to mount and maintain a permanent campaign against bad bibliographical habits on the part of publishers, or the sponsors of periodical publications. I know of an institution in London which published a journal whose title began with the word ‘Journal’, and also an associated series under a distinctive title. Their board proposed to amalgamate the two publications, using the distinctive title as the main one and the phrase beginning ‘Journal’ as the subtitle. They proposed further to discontinue the numbering of the distinctive title as it had been numbered in the past, but to continue the journal’s numbering in the new publication. Luckily, the librarian of the institution argued to such good effect that what promised to be a very confusing situation was modified to a merely slightly confusing one—it was decided to begin a new series of numbering for the new publication. Of course it is very difficult to retrieve the situation once a bad decision has been taken, in the matter of titling and numbering, but I feel sure that it would be worth attacking bad practices as they are discovered ‘pour encourager les autres’, and also to devise, improve, expand and publicize standards in this connexion: there is in fact a British Standard along these lines, which has had a valuable effect. This work could well be carried much further. An attempt by the Library of Congress to establish cataloguing at source was a failure, but it still seems to me that more consideration should be given to influencing the source of bibliographical problems.

I have dwelt on the title, since experience seems to show that its overriding importance in identifying periodicals is not everywhere conceded. As I have said, publishers are sometimes over-casual in choosing this title, and sometimes I find that libraries do not bother to correct title errors in published sources, even when they have the opportunity of doing so. Luckily, the World list practice is flexible enough to allow us to make corrections when necessary, and I must seize the earliest opportunity of correcting an error which I know to be in the World list cumulation which is in the mill at the moment: on the BUCOP desiderata lists which we circulate, we once included a title which we had been informed was ‘Journal of the Nigerian Agricultural Society’. We were informed by one of our libraries that they held this. Later we listed a title ‘Nigeria Agricultural Journal’, published by the Agricultural Society of Nigeria. The same library informed us that they held this one. On later noticing that they both began with the same volume number and date, it became evident that they were in fact the same thing, though the differences in both titles and the names of the bodies as we had been informed of them were sufficient to separate the two entries and the added entries so completely that it was only by accident that the double entry was discovered. The latter title was the correct one.

The title alone is not always sufficient to identify a periodical, however, so I shall now skip quickly over the other elements of a citation in the order in which they appear in the World list entry. If the name of a sponsoring body does not appear as part of the title, it is often useful to have this, or the name of a commercial publisher, or both, following the title. This is not absolutely vital, so long as the title is quite distinctive. It is important, however, if the title is vague, or of a nature that might be chosen by several publishers concurrently. More important, however, is the place of publication, and this should always appear in the citation; perhaps even where it is implied in the title
itself. If this had been done, maybe there would not have been the confusion that occurred in the case of the Freiberger Forschungshefte I mentioned above. Having said that the place of publication is important, I now say that a precise place of publication, being often difficult to establish, is not essential. The World list makes provision for giving a country, or at any rate a more general region than a town, where the place itself is unknown or in doubt. I know that there are publications which omit the place of publication completely—not such a rare occurrence. There are some libraries which give only the country as the place of publication, and I am increasingly inclined to think that this is a better solution than the rather restless one we use of adding ‘(etc.)’ after the name of one of the places we know or believe the periodical to have been published in, either in succession to, or concurrently with, others. I would say that the U.S. and Germany are good examples of countries where it is often difficult to pinpoint a particular place. I know there are periodicals which are published internationally as well, which adds another complication and here ‘(etc.)’ after the name of a town or country cannot be avoided. Of course, if an item is published in a specific place and states this clearly, then this is the best form to give.

To link the two previously-mentioned parts of a citation: if a title is sponsored by, say, an Australian university and published by a Dutch publisher, then both the sponsoring body and the name of the commercial publisher ought to be mentioned in the citation to explain why an item which one would expect to be published in Sydney is actually published in Leiden.

This brings me to the numbering and dating of the issue being cited. Where a publication appears in volumes and issues, the BUCOP/World list approach is to put the part number in brackets after the volume number, and add the date (using abbreviations for the months) thus: 16(6), Je 1964. The numbering and dating should be given together for completeness and as a double check. The old World list, as you know, gives only years, and in the holdings only the last two digits of the years of the holdings. Where the life of a periodical spans two centuries, it is not always clear from the entry precisely what years are held. The old BUCOP, in its holdings section, gives whatever the library had passed to the editor. We are now trying to encourage contributing libraries to give both numbers and dates, and this is the way it should certainly appear in a citation. There are of course other forms of numbering, and publishers need to be trained in this matter as much as they do in connexion with the title.

The only logical alternative to a system of volumes and issues would appear to be a continuous consecutive numbering. It strikes me as unnecessarily flowery to have a running number in conjunction with volume numbering; it is, however, less of a trap for librarians than a system of numbering from 1 within each year, using the year as in effect the volume number. With apologies, I must confess that this is the system used currently by BUCOP/World list in numbering the quarterlies. In extenuation, I would like to point out that by retaining the original title of BUCOP, we had the situation of volumes numbered according to a different scheme from that normally used in numbering periodicals, so had to adopt the present pattern. There will in future be a note to this effect at the back of the title-page, stating that the first year of publication in this form was 1964.

There have been several cases in the work of compilation where I have been misled by a library informing us that their holding ran from, say, No. 1 of 1964, into thinking that this was the first issue. This is not necessarily so, and the holding library cannot of course be blamed—they are not to know the style of numbering until their holding continues into a second year. Where a case of this sort has been ‘isolated’, I would recommend that the issue number should follow the year, as if the year were the volume number. In BUCOP/World list such a
situation is shown thus: 1964 (1). Using the same order but making the citation fuller, it might be better if space allows to put this as: 1964, No. 1. Whatever numbering is used, publishers should certainly think long and hard before continuing it over a change of title; it is far better to start a new series. If anyone needs examples of the difficulties that can be caused by varying systems of numbering in conjunction with changes of title, may I refer them to that fascinating exhibit, the various forms of the IEEE Transactions . . . . These are not held very widely in the U.K., but when we try to obtain a particular issue from a library alleged to hold them—well, it is seldom easy. Finally, in this discussion of numbering and dating, I would recommend that the dates given should always be those of the issue. Where the actual date of publication differs from the issue date, this should be added to the citation in brackets.

In BUCOP/World list we follow the ‘imprint’ (place of publication, and numbering) with a remarks section. This is probably not important in a normal citation; it may be interesting to know what the previous title of the publication was, but it is not essential. What should follow immediately in a citation are the page numbers of the article referred to, and then the author and title of the article itself. I would advise putting the author and title of the article last, to make quite clear the distinction between this and an independent monograph.

There is just one other point I should like to make about citations: exquisite care should be taken to ensure that they are correct in all particulars. There has been a distressing tendency lately for citations in collections of abstracts and elsewhere to be completely inaccurate—and when the citation is in print, it is often difficult to convince enquirers of the fact.

In conclusion, I should like to say a little about future features that may be added to BUCOP/World list, though emphasising that no final decisions have been taken on these. I have been considering ways in which a KWIC Index might be employed as an aid in locating titles where these are imperfectly known. To those who are not familiar with this device, it is a method of treating a periodical title (or the title of a periodical article, for which it has been mainly used up to now) by a computer in such a way as to give prominence to key words in a phrase, putting these in alphabetical order. This would also be useful in giving prominence to topic words and phrases in a title, thus acting as a kind of subject index as well. However, on this subject of subject indexes: I said earlier that the field which is used by the computer to separate out the titles not required in the production of the World list print-out had a number of columns which are not at present in use. We are thinking of using some of these columns to make a very general subject classification of each serial, using the first two figures of the Dewey Decimal Classification. Thus a list of serials could be prepared and arranged in a limited Dewey order. New serial titles does publish such a list at the moment, with a fairly full classification, and at monthly intervals only; it seems to me that the feature might be even more useful if cumulated. However, both this and the KWIC Index approach would have, at least in the first instance, to appear in BUCOP/World list as part of a cumulation of cumulations, rather than as a regular annual feature. Another division under consideration is along regional lines: a separation of periodicals published in a certain region (meaning one as broad as a geographical ‘realm’), together with periodicals published in other areas dealing specifically with those regions. There exist already other possibilities of making separate printouts, on the basis of the contributing libraries—by area within the British Isles, or by type of library. More details were given on these possibilities in the article referred to in Aslib Proceedings.

We shall not necessarily be limited for ever to upper case, nor to the somewhat restricted range of punctuation now available. Personally, I rather like the use of upper case throughout the entry, and I notice that New serial titles has retained
this style, even though now theoretically capable of varying it. Others may think differently, however. But it does mean that the title abbreviations, assuming that the stylistic features remain as they are at present, can be printed with the entry where required. On the other hand, it may be that they are preferred as a separate section. But a point I should like to stress is that the system is fairly flexible, and can possibly be adjusted to demands that may exist for various treatments of the collected card file. The demand, of course, has to be expressed to be considered.

The Society of Indexers as a Servant of the World of Letters*

G. V. Carey

At the close of a business meeting on a Saturday morning what most of you want, I'm quite sure, must be to get away as soon as possible, and not to be talked to by anybody—least of all by a last-minute substitute for someone really worth while. So I promise to be brief.

Since you did me the great honour of election to the presidency I've seldom attended Council meetings, in the belief that society presidents are expected to emerge only rarely from their proper place: which is the Shelf. But it happens that I did attend the last Council meeting, and I'm very glad I did; for the Council had decided that this, the seventh year of our Society's existence, was the right time for a reappraisal (though not an agonising one, it's to be hoped) of our progress and of our policy in general. I was thus able to be present at their first deliberation on this subject. Our talk, based on a thoughtful paper submitted by a wise and experienced member of our staff,** was purely exploratory; no decisions were taken; any conclusions reached hereafter will naturally be laid before you in due course. Meanwhile it would be premature and quite out of place for me now to attempt any detailed report of our discussion, but I think that I may be permitted just one, very general, reflection prompted by it.

The occurrence in the aforesaid paper of a warning against 'grandiose' notions was criticised by another wise and experienced member of the Council; and in so far as it was liable to misinterpretation in the particular context in which it appeared, it was perhaps open to criticism. Nevertheless 'grandiose' struck me at once as a very apt cautionary word that we, as a Society, should do well to keep at least at the back of our minds; for aren't we perhaps just occasionally tempted to forget that our part on the literary stage, essential though it be, is not and never can be a star part? (I'm referring of course to literary indexing only. The various forms of scientific indexing remain, I'm ashamed to say, in spite of the admirable expositions that we're privileged to hear or read from time to time, a profound mystery to me, and I'm inclined to regard all concerned with them as stars of the first order.)

Believe me, I'm not myself immune from this temptation—to think of our calling just a little more highly that we ought to think. The longing to create is common to nearly all of us, and some of you, I dare say, may have experienced something of the feeling that often comes to me on the completion of an index—the flush of pride, soon tempered by the thought: 'IF ONLY I could write a book, paint a picture, compose a song, de-

* Written by the then President from notes of his address given at the A.G.M., 1964.
** The then Secretary, E. Alan Baker.