

Decimal Classification of Dewey shows little change apart from a paragraph on the Abridged 10th edition, and a couple of pages on the 18th. The Broad System of Ordering, surely an important new development, should have had separate treatment, but comes in only in the Introduction and the paper by Lloyd on the U.D.C.

Vickery's paper still contradicts Keen's, and so does the citation of work by Troller (p. 205), showing the value of classification in a real-life situation, whatever may happen in the seclusion of a library school! This view is now further reinforced by Sparck Jones, who states that "In 1976 the status of automatic information classification is unclear", and concludes that "apparent prospects for automatic classification for library purposes are not very bright . . . However, classification is a general requirement of information management"; so the work on constructing a general theory must go on.

The disappointing paper by D. Austin gives in my view only a very partial account of "The C.R.G. research into a freely-faceted scheme", and I take issue with many of his statements. He says (p. 165) that a classification based on main classes finds it difficult to insert new topics, yet in the very same paragraph admits that "knowledge advances more through the juxtaposition of already familiar concepts, perhaps in unexpected ways, rather than in the evolution of entirely original ideas". Familiar concepts will, I imagine, already be in the schedules of any scheme, and it is precisely the virtue of faceted classification that it can cater for new and even unexpected co-ordinations. Later (p. 174) Austin criticises Integrative Level theory as containing some "doubtful logic", giving as an example that it leads to branching structures, not a linear sequence. This was pointed out in the first C.R.G. discussions of this theory (see *Sayers Memorial Volume*), and all his other objections have in fact been foreseen in relating Integrative Level theory to General System Theory; there are several publications dealing with this, none of which are quoted here. Austin's "new approach" (p. 186) to subject index production is not new; it has been tossed around frequently in discussions on KWIC and KWOC indexes for years.

Thus one cannot extend a welcome to this book. Not only are there few "second looks", but it seems to me to reveal a very unfortunate trend in the field of classification. The further away one gets from actual readers, in index factories or library schools, the less one appreciates the role that classification actually plays in reader service. Fortunately, information officers and special librarians who face real life problems with enquiry work continue to "vote with their feet"; classification is a basic human mental process, and is not likely to be superseded, even by computers.

D. J. Foskett

WERSIG, G., NEVELING, U. (Comp.): **Terminology of Documentation**. A selection of 1200 basic terms published in English, French, German, Russian and Spanish. Paris: Unesco Press. München: Verlag Dokumentation 1976. 10+274 p., DM 55,—

This multilingual set of definitions lists some 1200 terms in English, with definitions in English, and translations of the terms in French, German (including five cases

giving different West and East German usage), Russian and Spanish. The terms are classified into 5 main groups, subdivided into a total of 35 sections, notated by numbering the section by the group number and the section number in a pseudo-decimal notation (e.g. group 3 runs from 31, through 39, to 315) and then by numbers reflecting the alphabetical arrangement of words in the section, (e.g. 310–28 for "subject heading"). There follows a UDC index to the sections and sometimes individual words of the directory. Finally, there are alphabetical indexes in each language, referring to the section number.

A previous approach, by the same 'authors' as editors, in only German, English and French, with definitions in German, was published by the Verlag Dokumentation, alone, in the previous year, and this has been reviewed in *Intern. Classificat.* 3 (1976) p.109. That review listed various errors; most of these do not appear in the present work, and it is not clear how much the two are correlated. There is no mention, in the present book, of the German work. The present work contains, however, many other errors.

The method of presentation is peculiarly, and often irritatingly, unhelpful. A classification of terms can be helpful, but it is not the principle one needs in searching for definitions. One can find words most easily in their alphabetical order, and one needs to have the definitions attached to them in that position. The classification could then be helpful as an appendix, and the initial word list would then of course refer the reader to the appropriate classified section for location of related terms. As it is, the different groups of the compilers' classification inevitably cut across the groups which other people might have in mind (as the cross-references show), and the alphabetical order within each section is not classification! If the classification was in an appendix, it could be more accurately prepared (although a good classification of the wide field would not be easy to make). One is thus driven to look for terms first in the alphabetical index, and to go from there to the classified definition section. Even then, reference is not easy as the code numbers are printed between the words (and their translations) and the definition, and are not too easily found, even though they are in bold type; the use of running headings does not much help.

The main consideration must however be the words and their definitions and translations. Since the definitions are in English, it is mainly from the English standpoint that they must be judged. A number of the terms seem unnecessary, being obvious compounding of terms (e.g. 'classification research'—the first term in the vocabulary!); or standard dictionary words, e.g. 'fact'—and here its definition as a "state of things or relation between things" is incorrect: a fact is 'a thing known to be true or to have occurred'—; or out-of-date words, e.g. "relevance ratio"—now always called 'precision'—and "relevance factor" [what is this?] and "precision ratio" [incorrect] entered as sub-terms; also "ramisyllabic notation" (syllabic notation is also listed). On the other hand, some words are obvious mangled translations of German compound terms, e.g. "dialogous search" (correctly 'interactive search', which is not given), or "Leihing library" (presumably 'lending library'), or "express information". Some of the definitions are inadequate, or wrong. For

example, the compilers have fallen into the trap of trying to differentiate between 'journal', 'periodical' or 'serial', without achieving a clear distinction; in England, the B.S.I. committee agreed that 'serial' should be the preferred term; 'merging' is defined in relation to intermingling punch cards, only, whereas it has an important meaning as the intermixing of files in a computer. The 'Inverted file' definition does not, as would be useful, correlate the term with 'aspect card' or Peek-a-boo type of index. "Noise ratio" is defined as the "ratio of relevant items recovered . . . to the total number of items retrieved", which is a definition of 'precision'; 'noise ratio', if the term is ever used, would be the ratio of the non-relevant items retrieved to the total items retrieved. "Profit" (is this term needed?) is defined as "the economic realization of outputs of a system", which might mean selling price, whereas 'profit' in economics means the gain in money received over costs. 'Citation index' is not "an index of published documents in which each of the earlier documents cited in the bibliography [is?] appended to the later document being indexed", but an index of the cited documents, with the later citing documents appended to each of them; and 'citation indexing' is not "the method of preparing a citation index by bibliographic coupling", which is a very loose definition since bibliographic coupling (as invented by Kessler) is a different process of a classification type, and this term is also not well defined as "a method of indexing by the number of cited references which two documents have in common". It is impossible to list here the very large number of such errors.

Many useful terms are omitted, e.g. 'literary warrant', 'aspect (or subject) card' (given within a definition, but not separately). 'Relevance' and 'Precision' have been left out of the English alphabetical index. The translation are often dubious. The French version gives "efficacité" for both effectiveness and efficiency; 'efficacité' means effectiveness, or efficiency of a *drug*, but industrially 'efficiency' should be 'rendement'. Even the German terminology is not always correctly correlated, e.g. 'Wirkungsgrad' is effectiveness, not efficiency—this error was noted as present in the previous work. The terms in other languages often appear to be valiant attempts, but not always successful; just occasionally the translation is put in parentheses, showing that the translator is not happy with any equivalent. The chief complaint to be made must however be that all the English writing, in the definitions and also in many entry words, is subtly or even grossly incorrect as English, e.g. "unrelevant" for 'non-relevant', "confrontation of" for 'comparison with'. The compilers cite many English glossaries, etc. as sources of information, but they have obviously decided, wrongly, that they know better. There is a continuous feeling of unease in looking through the whole work, to the point of becoming infuriated. Such a compendium does a great disservice to the workers in the field, who will not be able to solve their problems or standardize their terminology, and who will in fact be led astray more than they may have been before. This a book to avoid!

Jason Farradane

BAUSCH, K.-J., SCHEWE, W. H. U., SPIEGEL, H.-R.; Deutsches Institut für Normung (DIN): *Fachsprachen. Terminologie. Struktur. Normung*. Berlin – Köln: Beuth Verlag 1976. 168 p., DM 28,— = Normungskunde H. 4. ISBN 3-410-10731-2\*

The study of special languages is at long last being recognized as a serious interdisciplinary field of enquiry. This is most obviously observed in the literature emerging from the German market. After many years of isolated theses and articles dispersed in a wide range of journals, recent years have seen the publication of two substantial books devoted entirely to this topic (Drozd/Seibicke 1973, Hoffmann 1975). The next step in the growth of a discipline is an anthology collecting a number of seminal, not easily accessible articles on the subject. This is offered now by the Deutsche Institut für Normung which is uniquely meritorious for its long-standing concern with the linguistic aspects of standardization and beyond this with the extension of our knowledge of special languages.

The authors constitute a respected team of theoreticians and practitioners in the field and have therefore the qualifications required to select, edit and introduce this collection; within the physical limitations of a slender volume they have restricted their choice to the German language and to largely applied aspects of the study of the language of science and technology and even under this self-imposed constraint acknowledge omissions beyond their control.

The *Introduction* surveys the state of the art but highlights at the same time the shortcomings of the criteria of selection adopted. The phenomenon of special languages is a universal one which cannot be adequately examined by publications in one language only, and with reference to one language, even though considerable methodological insights are gained from the observation of linguistic processes in one speech community. Both these limitations are confirmed by the articles themselves. The chapter division does not clearly reflect the three aspects enumerated in the subtitle but follows other, though equally valid criteria.

The collection of often heavily abridged versions of previously published articles is supplemented by a small number of original contributions. Space does not permit the detailed consideration of each article and this review is consequently a brief commentary on the contents.

The first original contribution (*Möhn*) is largely a survey of existing studies of word-formation and derivation in special languages leading to a plea for further such analysis. The second half of the article takes the form of an endorsement and justification of a German ministerial resolution to teach technical languages in school without, however, questioning the reasons for such a demand. The fact that linguistic research has so far not taken a serious and persistent interest in special languages should not lead to a polemic overstatement of their importance, which is inappropriate in the environment of this anthology. Elsewhere in his essay the author rightly stresses the dependence of special languages on general language. A second introductory article by

\* This review was already published in *Plus und Minus* 3(1976) p. 14–17. Its reprint here was recommended by the late Prof. Wiüster shortly before his death.