this volume's index will be made good. The following examples will demonstrate the importance of not assuming on the evidence of the index alone that all works dealing with a sought subject have been traced.

Suppose one has an enquiry relating to the genealogy of American families. There is an index entry 'Genealogy: United States, 693'. However, other relevant material will be found within the section indexed under 'Genealogy and heraldry, 520-42', including Waters' Genealogical gleanings in England: abstracts of wills relating to early American families, the entry for which quotes a review describing the work as almost unequalled in extent and importance for American genealogical research. It may be argued that to look under a general heading as well as under a specific one is not an uncommon or an unreasonable search strategy, but this could have been covered in the introduction to the index.

Less easy to account for is the varying treatment of some guides to archives. There is a general entry 'Archives, 551-3' followed by 38 entries for archives of particular places or subjects. However, a work on the archives of the University of Cambridge (page 313) cannot be traced this way, presumably because of an unstated policy not to index under this heading archives of institutions. The solution here would be a blanket 'see also' statement. Staying with the heading 'Archives', more discrepancies appear. There is a sub-heading for 'Bedfordshire, 634', generated for a guide to the Bedfordshire Record Office, but also on page 634 a guide to the Huntingdonshire Record Office has no entry under the 'Archives' heading, an omission which applies also to Emmison's Guide to the Essex Record Office (page 638). The danger is of course that a user who chooses the search term 'Archives' will assume that the counties listed there are the only ones for which guides to archives occur in the volume.

A final example concerns two works on awards for gallantry. Abbott and Tamplin's British gallantry awards is described on page 271, and is indexed under 'Awards—armed forces, 271-2'. On page 541 the entry for Wilson and McEwen's Gallantry: its public recognition and record appears, but this is indexed under 'Gallantry, Orders of'. The only potential link between the two in the index is really a near miss, because an entry under the general heading 'Awards' refers to page 540 only.

Indexers deservedly have their award; reviewers have a thankless task. It is expected of reviewers that they will find faults, and when the object under review is an index there are always some faults to find. What finally matters is whether an index will help rather than hinder the effective use of the text indexed. Without question Taylor's index to Walford 4/2 does help, and with some fine tuning of the subject indexing when the cumulative index is prepared we should be able to extract full value from this outstandingly useful work of reference.
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Indexing LISA
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The cumulative index to the leading English language abstracting journal on librarianship and information science is a vital reference tool for those who do not have access to an online search service. Those who do have access to such a service will, of course, answer their enquiries for specific items of information far more quickly by using it.

The index is in two sequences—a name index (pages i-xcvii) and a subject index (pages xcix-ccclxxi). There is a brief introduction to explain that in both indexes entries refer to issue year and abstract number, with the year shown in bold type. The introduction could be much longer, as much more explanation is needed, particularly in relation to the name index. For example:

1. Scope: what is a name? Titles are clearly included, but I would have expected to find 'AACR' in the subject index rather than in the name index. 'PRECSI' appears to be a subject from 1976-78 but a name from 1979-80. I would have regarded 'Benefit Assessment and (surely for?) System Change' as a subject. MARC is a name and a subject from 1979-80 but a subject only before then.
2. Form of heading: AACR could have been used as a guide here:
(a) Why 'Aston University' but 'University of East Anglia'?
(b) An entry under 'Acquisition of Latin American Library Materials. Seminar' refers to 79/1026; another entry under 'Seminar on the Acquisition of Latin American Library Materials' refers to 80/4665 and 76/2323 as well as 79/1026. There is similar inconsistency in the entries for 'BALLOTS' and its full name, 'Bibliographic Automation of Large Library Operations using a Time-Sharing System.'
(c) The 'Acquisition of Latin American Library Materials Seminar' is the only one favoured with an entry under 'Seminar'; such entries as 'Business Archives, Seminar on', 'Cataloguing in isolation, Seminar on' and 'No-growth budgets, Conference on' are not given direct entry under 'Seminar' or 'Conference'.
(d) The reason for such entries as the following is not clear:
Manchester (UK). Public libraries
Manchester Business School (UK)
Manchester Polytechnic (UK)
Manchester University (UK)
These forms of heading are used consistently, but why not 'Manchester Public Libraries', as a corporate body, filing between 'Manchester Polytechnic' and 'Manchester University'?
(e) Personal names are entered in the form used in the article, so that the same author can appear in two different forms. Thus, Fred Ayres appears as 'Ayres, F.' and 'Ayres, F. H.'; David Bromley as 'Bromley, D.' and 'Bromley, D. W. '; Royston Brown as 'Brown, Roy' and 'Brown, Royston'; Alan Day as 'Day, A.' and 'Day, A. E.'; John Eyre as 'Eyre, J.' and 'Eyre, J. J.'; Phil Holmes as 'Holmes, P.' and 'Holmes, P. L.'; Bridget Howard as 'Howard, B.' and 'Howard, B. M.'; and Eric Hunter as 'Hunter, E.' and 'Hunter, E. J.' Authors should clearly try to use one form of name consistently!
3. Arrangement: This is not explained. Some points are obvious—eg word-by-word, figures filed as letters, personal names before corporate names. Others are less clear:
(a) Why does 'ABI/INFORM' follow 'Abidi' but 'B/NA' precede 'Baader'?
(b) Why does 'Brunswick Technological University' precede 'Brunswick Street United Church' and why does 'Carnegie Non-European Library' precede 'Carnegie-Mellon University'?
(c) 'Library & information science abstracts' files between 'Library Front' and 'Library Inspectorate', the & presumably being ignored; but 'Library and Bibliographic . . .', 'Library and Book Trade . . . ' and 'Library and Reading Year' all precede 'Library Applications . . .', as I would expect.
(d) The following arrangement is not clear:
St. Patrick's . . .
St. Petersburg . . .
Saint Paul . . .
St. Stefan . . .
St.-Pierre, L.
(e) Why ever does 'United Arab Emirates University' file between 'Laval University' and 'Lavaluit'?
There is occasionally over-generous use of double entry in the name index (eg PRECIS and Preserved Context Index System, van Wesemael and Wesemael). 'See' references would have saved space here, and 'see' references could usefully have been provided in a number of other cases: for example, from 'European Communities. Commission' to 'Commission of the European Communities'; from 'Educational Resources Information Center' to 'ERIC'; from 'International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions' to 'IFLA'; from 'ILEA' to 'Inner London Education Authority'; and from such headings as 'Barnet' and 'Camden' to 'London Borough of Barnet', 'London Borough of Camden', etc. (Are users, incidentally, more likely to consult 'London Borough' than 'Barnet', 'Camden', 'Ealing', 'Hackney', etc.?)
The name index is a valuable indicator of the main writers on librarianship and information science. I was delighted to find every member of the staff of Liverpool Polytechnic's School of Librarianship and Information Studies represented, and not surprised to find a large number of entries under such names as Foskett, Line and Ranganathan. Maurice Line (with 47 references) was, however, pipped at the post by P. Nyeng with 48.
In the 1969–1973 cumulative index, titles of articles were listed under each author, thus:
Collison, R. L. Lionel Roy McCollin: a bibliography of his writings 69/783
Collison, R. L. Abstracts and abstracting services 71/2032
Collison, R. L. Current American trends in indexing 72/1968
Collison, R. L. American libraries 1973 73/2083
This is clearly more helpful than the simple listing of numbers found in the 1976–1980 index:
Collison, R. L. 76/3772
Harrod, L. M. 79/1908, 78/2564, 77/3298
Piggott, M. 78/2564
Wellsch, H. H. 79/1103, 1149, 2454, 78/1364, 3728, 77/1145, 76/532, 3745
Most people, however, are likely to use the subject index, and here again some explanation is called for but not provided. Library & information science abstracts is well known for its use of chain indexing, an efficient and economic system but one which relies for its effectiveness on a good classification scheme. The problem with the cumulative index is that the references are to item num-
bers rather than to classification notations, so that it is not immediately apparent why there are some subheadings but not others. Here, for example, are the entries for book indexing:

**Indexing**

- **Books** 76/3772–3776
- **Books: Children's books** 76/3778
- **Books: Christian Church: Published materials** 78/2571
- **Books: Italian art: Published materials** 78/2574
- **Books: Law: Published materials by subject** 78/3218
- **Books: Social sciences and Humanities: Published materials** 79/537

The distinction between 'Books' and 'Books: Published materials' is unclear and, in fact, seems to stem from inconsistent indexing. When using chain indexing, the indexer must decide whether a specific term needs to be qualified by a more general term. The 1976 indexer decided (rightly in my view) that 'Books' did not need to be qualified by the more general term 'Published materials' but the 1977/80 indexer(s) did not agree.

More importantly, what of the 20 references under 'Indexing: Books: Published materials'? The significant point is that all of these refer to the notation 774.38—ie to one place if a classification scheme is used. A glance at the 'feature headings' with the notations, however, shows that subdivision would be helpful (and would indeed be provided if a system like PRECIS were used):

- **80/2597 Published materials. Books. Alphabetical subject indexing. Nigeria**
- **78/2577 Published materials. Books. Alphabetical subject indexes. Index entries. Typographical design**
- **77/3298 Published materials. Books. Alphabetical subject indexing. Standards for**

The principle of chain indexing—and the point which needs to be explained—is that the more specific the entry term is, the more detailed will be the entry, thus:

**Nigeria**

- Alphabetical subject indexing: Books: Published materials 80/2599

**Typographical design**

- Index entries: Alphabetical subject indexing: Books: Published materials 78/2577

**Standards**

For Alphabetical subject indexing: Books: Published materials 77/3298

**Evaluation**

- Layout: Index entries: Influence on Searching: Alphabetical subject indexing: Books: Published materials 77/3300

The problem, of course, is how does the uninitiated searcher know which is the most specific subject, especially if he or she is not familiar with the classification scheme?

A further illustration is provided by the following entries under Indexing services: 80/416–418, 2240–2243, 3159–3160, 3902, 4005, 79/1011, 1757–1759, 2342, 2992, 3582, 78/397–398, 77/1022–1023, 1716–1717, 3760, 76/1056, 1680, 2297–2298, 3554–3555. These 25 entries all refer to the notation Rs and the following are some of the 'feature headings':

- **80/416 Indexing services. Computerised. Education. Cooperation. Australia. Australian Education Index**
- **80/417 Indexing services. Computerised. Road transport. Cooperation. Australia. Australian Road Index**
- **80/3902 Indexing services. Medicine. Ultrasound**

Again, the more specific the search term the more detailed the index entry:

**Computerised indexing services**

- 80/416–418, 2243, 3160, 77/428, 1023, 76/3550–3552

**Education**

- Computerised indexing services by subject interest 80/416, 3160

**Cooperation**

- Education: Computerised indexing services 80/416

**Australia**

- Cooperation: Education: Computerised indexing services 80/416
- Cooperation: Road transport: Computerised indexing services 80/417

**Medicine**

- Indexing services 80/3902, 78/392, 398, 77/3760, 76/1675, 3555

**Ultrasound**

- Medicine: Indexing services 80/3902

The entries for Australian Education Index and Australian Road Index, being titles, appear in the name index.

I am not suggesting that notations should have been given after each subject index entry—the item numbers make it easier for the user to find specific abstracts. I am suggesting that the value of chain indexing is negated by the divorce from classification. As one who has used, taught and defended chain indexing for very many years, I now wonder whether it has any real value except for the indexer. There is also its tendency to 'hide' information; for example there are eight columns of entries under 'Australia' and it would be very easy to overlook 'Education', 'Road transport' and 'Computerised indexing services' because of the 'unwanted intermediary' 'Cooperation'.
However, this is not an article on the problems of chain indexing. LISA does use chain indexing at present—perhaps one day it will change to PRECIS—and, within its limits, chain indexing is used effectively in this cumulative index. Certainly, as a systematic indexing method, it is far more effective than the 'hit or miss' methods used in so many alphabetical subject indexes.

I have been critical, and I accept that it is easy to sit back with a copy of the cumulative index and a few copies of the abstracts journals and criticize—I hope, constructively! It is much more difficult to compile such a massive index. Nick Moore and Sandra Driskell are to be congratulated on providing an indispensable reference tool for library school lecturers, students of librarianship and information science, and those practising librarians and information scientists who wish to keep abreast of their subject.
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**Eight decades of literary criticism at one's finger tips**

*The Times Literary Supplement* was first published as an insert to *The Times* on 17 January 1902. It began publication as a separate journal on 5 March 1914, and continues to present a weekly review of current literature, which, of course, is often a reexamination of the past. Although British imprints (including translations) form the bulk of the items noticed, foreign-language works and movements in other parts of the world have not been ignored. The contributors have included the foremost writers of their day—anonymous until 1974 (except where reprinted essays divulged the writer's identity), named since the advent of John Gross as editor.

Although each year's issues were indexed, each successive indexer had his own style and ideas on indexing, and this, on the publisher's own admission, 'has made it difficult for users to undertake intensive and prolonged research, or, at times, to locate a specific item'. (Have we not encountered similar problems nearer home?) Publication this year of the second part of *The Times Literary Supplement Cumulative Index 1902–1980* brings to an end a project (which has taken eight years to complete) to make a single, coherent and comprehensive index to the *TLS*.

The cumulative index covers reviews, articles and letters which have appeared in the *TLS* from the first issue of 1902 up to the last issue of 1980. It is in two parts. Part I, in two volumes, covers 1902–1939; Part II, in three volumes, covers 1940–1980. (Reading: Research Publications, Part I: UK £150, overseas $300; Part II: UK £300, overseas $600.) Each part lists in a single alphabetical sequence entries for authors, editors, translators and illustrators—all followed by the relevant title—of each work reviewed; authors of articles, reviews and letters; titles of all works noted; subjects; cross references. Articles, reviews and letters are indicated as such Subjects, whether personal or topical, are distinguished by being printed in capitals. The location is shown by the page number, followed by the year. Why not the other way round? Most libraries will have annual volumes or the microfilm reproduction which is also divided into years.

An introduction explains the content and arrangement of the index. Alphabetical order is word-by-word. Mac and Mc are interfiled. No nonsense about how numerals are to be filed, they are written out and filed as words: 1707 becomes seventeen hundred and seven. St. is read and filed as Saint, and all the saints—Augustine, Nicholas, Patrick et al—are there with St. Ewe and Saint-Exupery. Kings and pharaohs are, however, distributed according to their names, as Charles II (King) and Tutankhamen (Pharaoh), Egypt. Local place names are preferred to entry under a larger region, both for places as subjects and as qualifiers, as in Christ's Hospital, Abingdon, Berks. The names of regiments, societies and institutions have, however, been indexed to the keyword in their name, which gives rise to some odd entries: Navy, Royal; Portrait Gallery, National: Prayer, Book of Common. A note distinguishes which subject terms are to be entered directly when they relate to Great Britain, as History: Nineteenth century, and which are to be considered international headings and subheaded by place, as Archaeology: Suffolk. Under the names of countries appear such subheadings as Culture, Currency, History, Land, Politics, Sociology.

It is very proper that the index should be prefaced by a statement of the main conventions which guided the team of indexers and which can now, after a moment's study, help users to find a reference to a single work, by author or by title, to compile readily at least a portion of the twentieth-century bibliography of an author or critic, and to list some of the most important essays written in English on a variety of subjects during the last eighty years.

The yearly issues of the *TLS* are available on microfilm from 1902–1983. Beginning this year, the weekly edition is also available on microfiche.

M.P.