There is no simple means to go around this problem (at least I did not find a simple way out) while preserving the feature devised by L. Lamport of separating the footnote marks from the footnote texts, as he explains on pages 99 and 156 of the \LaTeX\ book.

1st solution

Explicitly place multiple footnote marks as math exponents in the table entries. Afterwards typeset the footnote texts using only
\footnotetext{\{number\}}{\text} with its optional argument that agrees with the exponents that were set.

2nd solution

- Redefine a new boolean variable, say \texttt{tablenote}:
  \% \tablenote is false by default
  \newif{\if\tablenote}
- Redefine \texttt{\table} so that it sets \texttt{\tablenote}true.
- Redefine the \footnotemark and \footnotemarkx commands so they operate on the \texttt{mpfootnote} counter, instead of \footnote, if \texttt{tablenote} is true.
- Tag all your table entries that required tagging with the same mark (except the first one, which is marked with the full \footnote command) with the \footnotemark{\{number\}} that makes use of its optional argument.

3rd solution

Define a new environment. Locally redefine \texttt{\cf\footnote} and \texttt{\thefootnote} to be equivalent to \texttt{\cmpfootnote} and \texttt{\thempfootnote} respectively, using \texttt{\let}.

I used the first two solutions. The second one is definitely better, but it requires that you know where you put your hands within the internal \LaTeX\ macros. The third solution seems very simple.

Maybe someone has an even better solution?
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Errata: “See also” indexing with Makeindex

Harold Thimbleby

In TUGboat 12, no. 2 (page 290) I gave the \LaTeX\ definitions to enable an author to obtain ‘see also’ entries in their index. I am grateful to Professor John C. Slattery of Texas A&M University for pointing out that they did not work.

The following correction works for me (using \texttt{Textures} and \LaTeX\ 2.09), but not for Slattery who is using a NeXT, though the same version of \LaTeX:\
\def\subsee#1#2{\em see also/}\{#1\}
\% the \#2 consumes a comma
\def\nosee#1{}
\% consume the page number
\def\seealso#1#2{\index{\#1!zzzzz\string\subsee{\#2}\!nosee}}
The intention is, given the definitions as shown above, and supposing index entries for “Scheme” \{\index{Scheme}\} occur on pages 147 and 401, this is how \seealso{Scheme}{LISP} would end up in the index:

\begin{quote}
Scheme. 147, 401
see also LISP
\end{quote}

If you have the problems reported by Slattery, \seealso must written out in full with you manually replacing the parameters \#1 and \#2 with what you want.

I made two errors in the original note: First, I published a fragment of \LaTeX\ without testing it exactly as it appeared in print. The second error was conceptual. I naively forgot that a \TeX\ definition is referentially opaque: I had assumed that given \def{\seealso{x}}, then \seealso can be written for \texttt{x} (with the exception of various cases where \texttt{x} contains things like \texttt{\futurelet}). In my case I had checked \texttt{x} but not the form \seealso that I used in the article. I had been fooled by the innocent appearance of \texttt{\index{argument}} — and I had not appreciated the \LaTeX\ manual's remark that \index should not appear inside another command's argument, as it does here with \def.

I apologize for inconvenience caused, and I will look forward to any suggestions for a general solution. Is there any way for macros like \LaTeX\'s \index to detect when they are being used improperly?
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