

**Table 1** Common Sikh title and relationship terms

Title or term	English meaning	Title or term	English meaning
Sardar	Mr	Sardarni	Mrs
Bibi	Miss	Pita, Papa, Bauji or Daddy	Father
Mata, Biji or Mummy	Mother	Vir or Bhaji	Brother
Bhen or Didi	Sister	Taya	Father's older brother
Tayi	Father's older brother's wife	Chacha	Father's younger brother
Chachi	Father's younger brother's wife	Bhua	Father's sister
Fuffar	Father's sister's husband	Mama	Mother's brother
Mami	Mother's brother's wife	Massi	Mother's sister
Massar	Mother's sister's husband	Babba or Dada	Grandfather (paternal)
Bebbe , Bibi or Dadi	Grandmother (paternal)	Nanaa	Grandfather (maternal)
Nani	Grandmother (maternal)	Jija or Bhayia	Brother-in-law (sister's husband)
Bhabhi or Bharjai	Sister-in-law (low tone) (brother's wife)	Puttar or Beta	Son
Puttari or Beti	Daughter	Pati or Aadmi	Husband
Patni or Theevee	Wife	Potra	Grandson (paternal)
Potri	Granddaughter (paternal)	Dotra	Grandson (maternal)
Dotri	Granddaughter (maternal)	Nuha	Daughter-in-law
Jawai	Son-in-law	Sanddu	Wife's sister's husband
Salla	Wife's brother	Sallahar	Wife's brother's wife
Saas	Mother-in-law	Saura	Father-in-law
Nanad	Sister-in-law (husband's sister)	Jeth	Husband's older brother
Jethani	Sister-in-law (wife of Jeth)	Devar	Husband's younger brother
Derani	Sister-in-law (wife of Devar)	Khandan	Family (ancestral)
Pariwar	Family (immediate)		

## Conclusion

Sikh names are very easy to understand and to index, and as noted below, there a number of useful web resources that can help.

## Useful websites

[www.sikhwomen.com](http://www.sikhwomen.com)

[www.sikhmissionarysociety.org](http://www.sikhmissionarysociety.org)

<http://sikhchic.com>

[www.sikharchives.com](http://www.sikharchives.com)

*Manjit K. Sahai has been providing freelance indexing services since 1997. She has indexed over 400 books and journals. Her experience and background is focused on medical, scientific and scholarly books and journals. Email: Manjit3@gmail.com*

# Zoological indexing

## Max McMaster

*Understanding zoological nomenclature is the key to indexing zoological taxonomic texts. This paper provides an overview of zoological classification and explains how this interacts with the role of the indexer. A detailed account of how to handle common names of animals is also provided.*

## Introduction

According to *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (1993), zoology is 'the science of the structure, physiology, behaviour, classification, and distribution of animals'. As such, zoological indexing has to occur across all of these fields. It covers living animals, both vertebrates – amphibians, birds, fish, reptiles and mammals – and invertebrates – insects, arthropods, molluscs, annelids (worms), nematodes, sponges, cnidaria (jellyfishes) and more – as well as extinct and fossilized forms. Indexing general zoological texts is relatively straightforward and is comparable to indexing similar works in the biological sciences. Shere (2009) provides a general overview. Handling

zoological nomenclature, however, raises difficulties for indexers.

Within the Kingdom Animalia, the following levels of classification apply: phyla, subphyla, class, subclass, order, suborder, family, genus and species. The following example illustrates how complicated the topic can be.

Phylum Chordata  
 Subphylum Vertebrata  
 Class Chondrichthyes (cartilaginous fishes)  
 Subclass Elasmobranchii (sharks and rays)  
 Order Selachii (sharks)  
 Suborder Galeoidei (typical sharks)

Family *Orectolobidae* (wobbegongs)  
Genus *Orectolobus*  
Species *ornatus*

To succeed as a zoological indexer, it is essential that you understand this hierarchical structure and do not feel overwhelmed by it.

Returning to our previous example, the most common name for *Orectolobus ornatus* is ornate wobbegong, but just to add to the confusion, it is also known by the alternative names of carpet shark or gulf wobbegong.

## Number of indexes

For general zoology texts, a single index is sufficient. When indexing larger zoological taxonomic works, however, it is very common to have separate indexes for the scientific (taxonomic) names and the common names, although this is not mandatory.

## Common names

When indexing common names of animals, the dilemma is deciding whether to use direct entry or one or more of the inverted forms. Alternatively, the entries can be double or triple posted. The decision comes down to audience, publisher's preference and the amount of space available in the index. A decision also needs to be made on whether to start each element of the common name with an upper-case letter or to use lower case throughout. Each style can affect the readability of the entries, so this is an important decision for the indexer to make. Generally, though, the indexer should follow the style used in the text. Aside from the following two examples, this paper uses lower-case letters for common names, unless the organism incorporates a named person or geographical feature in its name.

eastern yellow robin 89 *or* Eastern Yellow Robin 89  
Bruun's cut-throat eel 243 *or* Bruun's Cut-Throat Eel 243

With inverted forms, another dilemma arises. Do you go with the singular or plural? For example:

cut-throat eel, Bruun's 243 *or* cut-throat eels, Bruun's 243

The consensus among zoological indexers is to go with the plural, because the text may contain general entries on cut-throat eels. If, however, the publisher insists on using the singular, it is perfectly acceptable. Your index entries, using the plural form, will then appear as follows:

cut-throat eels 238–48, 290  
Blache's 244  
black 242  
Bruun's 243  
grey 247  
naked 245

In addition to the heading 'cut-throat eels', there should also be entries under the broader class 'eels'. For example:

eels 218–19  
Australian longfin 223  
basketwork 238, 241, 741  
blind 24  
conger 269–83  
cut-throat 238–48, 290  
duckbill 261, 284–7

In the above example, the subheadings refer only to the broader groupings of eels. Although sub-subheadings to specific named eels could be made (for example, to specific basketwork, conger, cut-throat or duckbill eels), this is not usually done. However, for illustrative purposes, here is a brief extract of the 'eels' entries using both subheadings and sub-subheadings.

eels 218–19  
Australian longfin 223  
basketwork 238, 241, 741  
cape 241  
blind 24  
conger 269–83  
blackedge 269  
blunt-tooth 272  
deepsea 274  
enigmatic 281  
hairy 274  
cut-throat 238–48, 290  
Blache's 244  
black 242  
Bruun's 243  
grey 247  
naked 245  
duckbill 261, 284–7  
ingolf 261  
periscope 287  
smallhead 286  
wonky 285

Although this style is acceptable, it is harder for readers to navigate and is therefore less popular among zoological publishers.

## Levels of zoological classification

Indexing the higher levels of Kingdom Animalia (phylum, e.g. Arthropoda; subphylum, e.g. Hexapoda; class, e.g. Insecta; and order, e.g. Coleoptera [beetles and weevils]) should pose few problems for indexers, as these levels are mainly referred to in general biological and zoological texts. Once you move below the order level, however, life for the indexer becomes increasingly difficult. The shark/wobbegong example given above was complicated enough, but within the insects, for example, the situation can become even worse. The following beetle example illustrates this complexity.

Order Coleoptera  
Suborder Polyphaga  
Series Staphyliniformia

**Table 1** Example with an explanatory note

Index entries	Hierarchical explanatory note
Coleoptera	Order
<i>Glypholoma rotundulum</i>	Genus–species
Omalinae	Subfamily
Polyphaga	Suborder
<i>rotundulum</i> , <i>Glypholoma</i>	Species–genus
Staphylinidae	Family
Staphyliniformia	Series
Staphylinoidea	Superfamily

  

Superfamily Staphylinoidea
Family Staphylinidae
Subfamily Omalinae
Genus <i>Glypholoma</i>
Species <i>rotundulum</i>

When indexing, entries such as the above should be filed in strict alphabetical order, disregarding the hierarchy. However, as a means of demonstrating how the filing affects the hierarchical levels, explanatory notes are provided in the example given as Table 1. The notes do not form part of the index entries.

## Zoological names

According to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN Code) (1999), ‘The name of a species is comprised of a combination of a generic name and a specific name; together they make a binomen.’ In the above example, *Glypholoma* is the generic name and *rotundulum* is the specific name. However, in general parlance we refer to these names as genus and species. The taxonomic name for this organism is *Glypholoma rotundulum*. Note that the name is in genus–species order.

Both the genus and species names are in Latin and should be italicized. The genus name always begins with an upper-case letter, whereas the species name is always written with lower-case letters. This rule applies, even if the species is named after a geographical feature or a person. For example, in the case of Macmillan’s catshark, the species name still begins with a lower-case letter – *Parma-turus macmillani*.

For all hierarchical levels above genus, that is, from subfamily through to phylum, names will always be in Roman and will commence with an upper-case letter.

Trinomens involving three elements – genus, species and subspecies – also exist. For example, the taxonomic name for the dingo is *Canis lupus dingo*. This distinguishes it from *Canis lupus domesticus*, the domestic dog, and the grey wolf, the ‘parent’ of all dogs, *Canis lupus*.

Zoological taxonomic indexing differs from botanical taxonomic indexing in its handling of index entries. Botanical index entries only need to be included in genus–species order, but academic/scholarly zoological index entries must be included in both genus–species and species–genus order. So both *Glypholoma rotundulum* and *rotundulum*,

*Glypholoma* are needed. The reason for this unusual approach is explained in the synonymy section below.

## Zoological name styles

In indexes, zoological names at the genus–species level can be entered using one of three styles. The style chosen will depend largely on the author and the publisher’s house style.

### Style 1

*Gymnoscopelus* 625–6  
*bolini* 653  
*fraseri* 653  
*hintonoides* 613, 654  
*microlampas* 654  
*nicholsi* 686  
*piabilis* 655

### Style 2

*Gymnoscopelus* 625–6  
*Gymnoscopelus bolini* 653  
*Gymnoscopelus fraseri* 653  
*Gymnoscopelus hintonoides* 613, 654  
*Gymnoscopelus microlampas* 654  
*Gymnoscopelus nicholsi* 686  
*Gymnoscopelus piabilis* 655

### Style 3

*Gymnoscopelus* 625–6  
*G. bolini* 653  
*G. fraseri* 653  
*G. hintonoides* 613, 654  
*G. microlampas* 654  
*G. nicholsi* 686  
*G. piabilis* 655

When discussing a range of species from a particular genus, authors will use Style 3, as it avoids having to repeat the genus name after its initial use. However, using this style in an index is debatable. The major difficulty is readability of the index, as the style produces a sea of ‘G’ entries, making it hard for the reader to ascertain where they are. The other disadvantage of Style 3 is that it is incompatible with indexing software, causing considerable difficulties for filing.

For indexing, Style 1 is preferred, as it is clearer to read. Style 2, although acceptable, looks cluttered and takes more space in the index.

## Synonymy

Renaming and reclassification of zoological organisms occurs very frequently. The reasons for this are complex, but are based, among other things, on the principles of priority, homonymy and revision. The ICZN Code provides a detailed explanation. Taxonomic revision relies on the acceptance and recognition of related physical and genetic characteristics occurring predominantly between family, genera and species, but sometimes at higher levels of taxonomy as well.

In zoology, once an organism has been given a specific name, it retains that name forever, regardless of whether the name of the genus is changed. The only exception to this rule occurs when a species is moved to a different genus. In such cases, the ending of the species name may need to change to meet gender agreement. This is based on the rules of Latin grammar. Refer to *Scientific style and format* (2014), Section 22.2.3.10, for details.

In addition to providing the binomial (genus–species) entry, indexers should include the species name as an entry point. These entries are invaluable to taxonomists, because an organism can still be found, even if the genus changes and they have no idea what it became. To provide a simple example, the slender smooth-hound shark, *Triakis attenuata*, was renamed *Gollum attenuatus*. As a result, index entries are needed for the current name, the former name and the inverted forms in species–genus order. For example:

*attenuata*, *Triakis* 91  
*attenuatus*, *Gollum* 91  
*Gollum attenuatus* 91  
*Triakis attenuata* 91

An alternative approach would be to index as follows, with the ‘see’ written in Roman, rather than italic, to enhance readability.

*attenuata*, *Triakis* see *Gollum attenuatus*  
*Triakis attenuata* see *Gollum attenuatus*

To illustrate how complicated synonymy can be for the indexer, the following example from Last and Stevens (1994) is provided:

Lemon shark – *Negaprion acutidens* (Rüppell, 1837)  
 Alternative name: Sharptooth shark  
 Local synonymy: *Aprionodon acutidens queenslandicus* (Whitley, 1939); *Mystidens innominatus* (Whitley, 1944); *Negaprion queenslandicus* (Munro, 1956)

The names in parentheses refer to the persons who described the organism. The date is the year of description. Rüppell described the shark first, so has priority. Many others, however, have offered alternative descriptions, as can be seen. Fortunately, as far as indexing is concerned, whoever described the organism can generally be ignored. But even without this level of detail, there are still more than enough index entries to include. For example:

*acutidens queenslandicus*, *Aprionodon* 263  
*Aprionodon acutidens queenslandicus* 263  
*innominatus*, *Mystidens* 263  
 lemon shark 263  
*Mystidens innominatus* 263  
*Negaprion queenslandicus* 263  
*queenslandicus*  
*Aprionodon acutidens* 263  
*Negaprion* 263

sharks  
 lemon 263  
 sharptooth 263  
 sharptooth shark 263

In the above index, the entry *queenslandicus*, *Aprionodon acutidens* is potentially problematic, because the entry follows the subspecies–genus–species format. Providing index entries from the subspecies level is not discussed in the ICZN Code, nor is it a topic even mentioned by taxonomists. However, there is logic in including the subspecies entries. As mentioned above, including the species name as an index entry point is invaluable for taxonomic continuity. Similarly, including subspecies names as index entry points is desirable, because subspecies can be elevated to full species in revisions, and vice versa. But is there any authority for including these entries?

According to Dr Elycia Wallis, Manager of Online Collections at Museum Victoria, future proofing an index against taxonomic name changes or new combinations is very important. In an email to me on 4 April 2017, Dr Wallis wrote that in the absence of a formal rule on indexing trinomials (e.g. from the ICZN), ‘findability is going to be the most important consideration’. Therefore, she concludes that ‘it would indeed be best to index all variants of a name’. This means that genus–species–subspecies (*Aprionodon acutidens queenslandicus*), species–subspecies–genus (*acutidens queenslandicus*, *Aprionodon*) and subspecies–genus–species formats should all be included in the index. Dr Wallis’ only caveat was about space for the index. If the publisher baulks at the potential increase in the page count caused by including the subspecies–genus–species entries, then these entries may be omitted.

## Verifying references

Although indexers assume that the text is the authority, it pays to be on the alert for errors when indexing taxonomic works. This does not mean that you have to check the name of every organism or every taxonomic grouping, but if a name looks suspect, do check it.

Depending on the field of zoology you are working in, there are a number of recognized international databases that can be used to verify taxonomic names and their synonymy. Table 2 lists a selection of the databases available, but is by no means comprehensive.

## Conclusion

Most indexers find the terminology of zoological nomencla-

**Table 2** Relevant international databases

Atlas of Living Australia	<a href="http://www.ala.org.au/">www.ala.org.au/</a>
AviBase – The World Bird Database	<a href="https://avibase.bsc-eoc.org/">https://avibase.bsc-eoc.org/</a>
Catalogue of Life: indexing the world’s known species	<a href="http://www.catalogueoflife.org/col/info/databases">www.catalogueoflife.org/col/info/databases</a>
The Reptile Database	<a href="http://www.reptile-database.org/">www.reptile-database.org/</a>
Wilson and Reeder’s Mammal Species of the World	<a href="http://vertebrates.si.edu/msw/mswcfapp/msw/index.cfm">http://vertebrates.si.edu/msw/mswcfapp/msw/index.cfm</a>
WoRMS – World Register of Marine Species	<a href="http://www.marinespecies.org/">www.marinespecies.org/</a>

ture daunting. Once you can understand the hierarchies, the indexing will fall into place.

## References

- International code of zoological nomenclature* (1999) 4th edn. London: International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature.
- Last, P. R. and Stevens, J. D. (1994) *Sharks and rays of Australia*. Melbourne: CSIRO.
- The new shorter Oxford English dictionary* (1993) Oxford: Clarendon Press.

*Scientific style and format: the CSE manual for authors, editors and publishers* (2014) 8th edn. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.

Shere, T. (2009) 'Environmental studies and natural history texts: indexing issues.' *The Indexer* 27(2), 50–7.

*Max McMaster has been a full-time freelance indexer for 24 years, with in excess of 2,300 indexes to his name, is an instructor for the University of California, Berkeley Extension virtual indexing course, and has been awarded the ANZSI Medal on three occasions. Email: max.mcmaster@masterindexing.com*

# Names and titles in the Orthodox Church

*Stephen Ullstrom*

*The practice of the Orthodox Church, also known as the Eastern Orthodox Church, in regard to names and titles is very different from that in the western world. Stephen Ullstrom guides us through this unfamiliar territory with particular reference to the challenge Orthodox names and titles can present to the indexer.*

## Introduction

The Orthodox Church, also commonly known as the Eastern Orthodox Church, is the second largest Christian body in the world, yet is largely unknown outside of the traditionally Orthodox countries. Here I give a brief overview of the church, then focus specifically on how names and titles are given and used, with some thoughts on how best to index them. This article is not about Russian, Greek, Arabic, Serbian and similar names, each of which could fill an article of its own. Nor does it discuss the naming conventions of churches related to, but not in communion with, the Eastern Orthodox, such as the Oriental Orthodox (which includes the Armenian, Coptic, and Ethiopian churches) or the Eastern Catholic, or Uniate, churches.

A few Orthodox jurisdictions also contain western rite parishes and monasteries. Small in number, these are communities that worship according to a modified Anglican or Catholic liturgy, or a revived ancient Western liturgy. This is often seen as a pastoral response to those who want to be Orthodox but who either find the Eastern rite too strange and/or do not want to give up the traditions they love. It is also seen as a restoration of the churches which existed in Western Europe prior to the Great Schism. Much of what I write here is probably applicable to the Western rite communities as well, but since my experience is in the Eastern rite, I cannot say for sure.

## Introduction to the Orthodox Church

The Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches shared a common history for the first thousand years of their existence, until they separated in the Great Schism, conventionally dated to 1054. In terms of structure, the Orthodox, unlike the Catholic church, is composed of several independently administered, or autocephalous, local churches. What

binds these churches together is shared faith and doctrine, which is expressed in shared communion.

The four original autocephalous churches are the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople, the name Orthodox Christians still use even though most people now say Istanbul; Alexandria, in Egypt, which has jurisdiction over all of Africa; Antioch, now headquartered in Damascus; and Jerusalem. There are now 10 or 11 other autocephalous churches, which are the churches in Russia (also known as the Moscow Patriarchate), Serbia, Bulgaria, Romania, Georgia, Greece, Cyprus, Poland, Albania, and the Czech Lands and Slovakia. The status of the church to which I belong, the Orthodox Church in America (OCA), is disputed, though the OCA is still in full communion with the others. In addition to the autocephalous churches, there are also a handful of autonomous churches, which are mostly self-governing but which ultimately report back to their mother church. These include the churches in Finland, Japan, and Sinai.

Non-canonical Orthodox churches generally adhere to Orthodox doctrine and practices, but are not in communion with the mainstream Orthodox churches. This can be for nationalistic reasons, such as in Ukraine, where there are three competing Orthodox churches with the main issue being autocephaly. Another common reason, for the churches known as the True or Genuine Orthodox or Old Calendarists, is the belief that the mainstream, or 'world,' Orthodox churches have somehow deviated from the true faith. A subset, though with older origins, is the Old Believers from Russia.

Given the administrative divisions, consensus is the primary way in which decisions are made and conflicts resolved. The ecumenical patriarch, in Constantinople, is considered to be the first among equals of all of the bishops, but his actual authority is limited. He cannot unilaterally intervene in the life of another autocephalous church, or even in the life of another diocese within his own church.