SUBJECT INDEX TO ALCHEMY BIBLIOGRAPHY

I am very close to sending the bibliography to the publisher (probably late May or eraly June) and I would welcome the views of potential users of the bibliography on the following thoughts regarding the Subject Index.

The bibliography is arranged in a classified sequence (think of a public or university library). The subject index is the key to the class numbers, so if you are interested in, e.g. Lions in alchemical symbolism, the subject index tells you that the number is P599.742.711.

In classificatory terms, lions form part of a chain – going back up the chain

Lions

Large felines
Felidae. Cats (Family)
Fissipedia. Terrestrial carnivores (This sub-order is actually now defunct)
Carnivora. Carnivores (Order)
Mammals (Class)
Chordata (Phylum)
Animalia (Kingdom)

As indicated above, there is a subject entry leading to a class number for Lions: Symbols & symbolism (as there are specific class numbers for other mammals such as Hares, Dogs & Apes)

I am considering adding terms higher up the chain into the subject index. These will not lead to specific class numbers, but would lead to a broader concept, below which are the specific subjects, so

Mammals: Symbols & Symbolism P599 would not actually have any bibliography entries, but beneath it would have the entries for P599.325.1 \sim Hares & rabbits, P599.742.1 \sim Dogs, P599.742.711 \sim Lions, P599.88 \sim Apes.

Similarly the entry for Animals: Symbols & symbolism P592/599 would not have any specific bibliography entries, but would lead to specific items on Fish, Birds, Snakes & Mammals.

I have been thinking that I could distinguish between entries for 'real' items and these 'broad' concepts by putting the latter in italics, e.g.

Malyn, Gerard: France: Texts AA(44)[MAL] *Mammals: Symbols & Symbolism P599*

Man, Cornelis de: Netherlands: Painting: Special topics R75(492)[MAN]

In some cases the broader concept, e.g. Netherlands: Painting: Special topics R75(492) in the example above does have actual bibliography entries, so that would not be distinguished by italics.

My questions are for a user of the bibliography:

- 1. Would the broader subject entries be useful?, and,
- 2. Is the idea of differentiating between real items and broader concepts a good one?

Alan Pritchard. 28/04/2013