

viewpoint and under the aspect of worldwide validity (FÖLDI, p. 154–167): Economics Dictionary Project; MEYNEN, p. 168–171: The Multilingual Dictionary of Technical Terms in Cartography – ICA; International Geographical Glossary – IGU; NEUMAN: p. 172–173: Glossary of Administration/Kamus Administrasi). In these papers, processes are explained and possible solutions offered. What is basically new, is an approach in the lexical field, which, in addition, establishes classification relations and gives weight to the procedural character of transitive verbs (BURGER, p. 174–181). In the area of application of text retrieval, contributions are centred, in the main, on two problem complexes: a) the search for criteria in the choice of descriptors with key functions in thesauri and their availability in hierarchic classification schemes and/or alphabetically ordered vocabularies (MEYRIAT, p. 182–184; JUDGE, p. 185–201) and b) how can organizational conditions and methodical processes, compatibility between retrieval languages be attained (LITOUKHIN, p. 202–206; DAHLBERG, p. 207 proposes four compatibility matrices; AITCHISON, p. 208: Feedback procedures for existing descriptors and relevant modifications of classification schemes and the selected concepts; SOERGEL, p. 209–223; DIENES, p. 224–233).

In contrast to the more reproductive fields of text interpretation and text retrieval, text production must find a solution for one major field: the identification and marking of new concepts, a problem which is impeded by the fact that there are no standardized dictionaries in the Social Sciences. The following solutions to the problem of identification have been put forward: a special reference methodology with thesaurus-type features, which stresses the onomasiological as against the semasiological approach (RIGGS, p. 234–276: COCTA Glossaries); model-type application and extension according to the method of the COCTA glossaries in the form of the pilot project INTERMIN (MOLNAR/ROSZA), p. 277–282, of the standards in ISO/TC 37 (NEDOBITY, p. 287–290), together with the proposal of a "Terminology Thesaurus TERMIA" (CHAN, p. 282–286); semantics-oriented technical dictionaries for special fields of research (MOGEY, p. 291–300: a conceptual frame will be produced for the term "family"; WOLFSON, p. 301–312: following inventories based on organizational theory, a few basic axioms are to be used as a point of departure and as a test of the behaviouristic concept).

The results of the papers discussed at the CONTA Conference were put into concrete terms as resolutions and recommendations for future concept and terminology research (p. X–XII). In general, the main emphasis lies on retrievability of concepts and terms (1.1), the establishment of computerized data bases (1.3), the firm institutionalization within the disciplinary associations of the social sciences to deal with conceptual and terminological problems (1.4), and projects (1.5), and the holding of regional meetings in Third World countries to discuss problems specific to their experience under Western influence (1.6). In particular, the CONTA Conference recommends the establishment of an "International Encyclopedia of Social Science Concepts" (2.1), the development of classified analytic glossaries in specialized areas (2.2), and the planning of an integrated

thesaurus for the Social Sciences (2.3) including the appropriate methodical aids (2.4; 2.5).

With the publication of Vol. 1 of the "International Conceptual Encyclopedia for the Social Sciences" (1985) the CONTA Conference has, in the meanwhile, put into effect one of its recommendations and through this has been able to fulfil its forwards-oriented purpose, which is no mean indication of the productivity of analytic concept and terminology research!

Gisela Hartwig

Dipl. Soz. G. Hartwig
Ahornstr. 25, D-1000 Berlin 41, FRG.

BERMAN, S.: Subject Cataloging. Critiques and Innovations.

New York, NY: Haworth Press 1984. 252 p., \$ 22.95. ISBN 0-86656. = Techn. Serv. Quarterly 2 (1984) No. 1/2.

There are reports here of subject cataloguing *innovations*; the largest value they can represent to the reader often rests in the lists appended to some of the papers, which demonstrate how a solution to a particular problem has been devised: (in special library catalogues:) D. Choquette on new religious movements, S.A. Smith on referral systems in human services; (in general library catalogues:) S. Berman on women's headings, Berman on teenage headings. P.R. Murdock gives thorough directions for establishing a multilingual authority file for a multilingual collection; and Berman's concluding contribution is simply an annotated bibliography of sources for those who perceive the need to do-it-better-themselves but need some help or guidance.

But the rest – the majority of the volume – is *critique*, which is all too appropriate, given how poorly American libraries often serve their information-seeking clientele. (I almost ended that sentence "... often without being at all aware of that very deficiency"; but more emphasis is needed than the subordinate clause implies.) This volume, if it reaches its ideal readership and makes its intended point, first and foremost says: "*Become aware of these your own deficiencies, do not go on with business as usual; look at yourselves and at what you are doing! – and then do something about it!*"

As much as this aim is salutary, as much as the deficiencies mentioned are so deeply built into the systems and policies we operate with that we seldom look beyond them – and they *must* be looked beyond – as much as this is true, still the content as well as the style of many of these critiques often show their own grave deficiencies. A most serious overlooking is that none of these authors advert to (are they unaware of it?) the basic distinction between the *nature* of a subject-system and the *policies* (explicit or implicit) that govern its application. J.R. Likins criticizes the LCSH **Apple growers – U.S. – Bibliography – Juvenile literature** in its application to a children's book on Johnny Appleseed, but does so in the context of a paper listing LCSHs that are in themselves ridiculous or inaccurate or offensive. A. Taylor, in a useful "popular" description of the advantages of PRECIS, compares an LCSH for a particular book (one that quite misses the theme by focusing only on the subject – the same dichotomous

failing is discussed in E. Koger's paper on children's fiction) with the two PRECIS strings (which focus on theme to the exclusion of subject): there are LCSHs that are just as good as the PRECIS strings assigned, but they were not so assigned — but most readers will perceive in this not a poor *application*, but rather LCSH's inferiority to PRECIS, *as system*. Berman replaces a single LCSH with nine narrower ones (for the same work): how could it be otherwise than that the nine improve access to this work? But here the question should not even be one of policy over against system (since all ten headings are from the same system), but of whether the one LCSH assigned at the Library of Congress is in fact superordinate to the nine Berman prefers: if so, the Library of Congress did very well by their own lights as well as in terms of the implicit theory that governs all subject cataloguing¹.

The critiques usually imply (or openly argue) "LCSH is inadequate because its headings are so often ridiculous, inaccurate, or offensive". Let us look at some of these arguments:

"Ridiculous":

Likins criticizes jargon like **Contango and backwardation** (I could find these terms in only one economics/business dictionary; such terminology is probably nearly obsolete); like **Jesus Christ — Person and offices** (I recently encountered the phrase in C.S. Lewis's *The Problem of Pain* — a popular-theological work by a writer not given to obfuscation, a stylist, no mere logic-chopper); like **Sprang** (a textile handicraft appropriately connected to its related terms in LCSH — however odd it may sound to non-sprangers); like **Script of a motion picture of the same title** (which could have been more learnedly phrased **Script of an eponymous motion picture**, or **Moving-picture plays — Sources, Eponymous**). But each of these headings, however clumsily or even faintly ridiculously, does get across an idea that is often only clumsily phraseable; is there really a substitute candidate that would not also be at least faintly ridiculous too, in most such cases? He criticizes **Phony peach disease**, but makes it seem far more ridiculous than it is by itself by attaching to it an imaginary heading **Hypochondria in fruits** — attached, let it be noted, incorrectly, by *sa*, as if the latter were *subordinate* to the former, rather than by *xx*, showing the latter correctly as *superordinate*. But jargon seems ridiculous only to those who are "on the outside" — which leads to the question "Why do you want to know about a subject if you don't want to know how its insiders talk/write about it?" How, in many cases, can this concept be expressed better and more crisply than with jargon?

"Inaccurate":

Likins argues that it does not make sense to mix topical and form subdivisions; he seems to mean that such a heading as **Bankruptcy — Popular works**, or **Watergate affair, 1972 — Study and teaching (Secondary) — Simulation methods** *mean* that bankruptcy is or is being encouraged to become 'popular', or that someone would seek to 'simulate' Watergate. The ALA Subject Analysis Committee's report on LCSHs incorporating the word 'primitive' is thorough, first-rate in every sense: it points out inaccuracy without ever becoming scurrilous. Berman's substitution of **Hansen's disease** for **Leprosy** is salutary, but his parallel suggestion of **Work centers** for

Sheltered workshops is about as ambiguous and vague as the contemporary usage of 'product' for 'laundry product' for 'laundry detergents/soaps', i.e., a clear example of the degradation of the language through the influence of the mass media. Berman in another paper rightly (but for the wrong reasons!) opposes **God and Theology** as equivalents to those terms *in Christianity*. And he wants Jewish headings for books on a Jewish prostitute and a Jewish painter, but never mentions such other person-subjects whose Jewishness is similarly non-thematic, like Spinoza and Buber (somewhat thematic in many books of them), or Husserl and Bergson (seldom thematic): to give such superordinate postings *could* be advantageous in the case of a writer whose Jewishness is universally seen as central (e.g., Philo Judaeus, Moses Maimonides), but for others it should be at most only done for such a book (say) as expressly deals with Husserl's difficulties with the Nazi regime².

"Offensive":

Berman shows well his underlying political/polemical motivations in preferring (against his own principle that a group must be referred to in headings that match how *they* refer to themselves, not just how readers in general do) **Nazism** to **National socialism**; but if *no* group should be offended, why go out of our way to bait *this* group (because we disapprove of them)? The many substitutions that can be seen as rectifications of offensive headings in several of Berman's papers (women; teenagers; Jews) all exemplify his general (and reasonable) principle, but it is truly silly for him (and the ALA Jewish caucus, as quoted) to argue against "even [the defilement of library catalogues with **Jewish question**] as a crossreference." Is the concept, even as a historical fossil, and however offensive, to be expunged in the manner of the revisers of history in Orwell's *1984*? Some of the usages of 'primitive' that ALA/SAC deals with are not only inaccurate but also offensive; they too are dealt with without any unnecessary spleen or posturing.

* * *

Taylor's paper perhaps represents the most cogent critique here of LCSH as a whole, but its validity is somewhat vitiated both by the already-mentioned tendency to ignore the distinction between systems and application, and also by the lack (a lack seen by no means just in this volume!) of consideration of LCSH as a *system* rather than merely in terms of its individual headings. If this mode of investigation (i.e., the systematic) is ignored there is no chance of a fair comparison of it with an alphabetico-classed system like PRECIS, in which each string carries many of the terms within it which are associated, in LCSH, with the target heading *only by syndesis*. I doubt that anyone can call me a promoter of LCSH, but unless the comparison of it with PRECIS (or with any other candidate for substitution) is fair we are no closer to making good decisions. In this journal, in 1978, I showed how such a fair comparison could be made (in reviewing P. Richmond's comparison of PRECIS and LCSH published in the proceedings of the 1976 Maryland workshop³); it is disappointing to realize that this point has not been taken by those who would tout PRECIS, even at this late date.

But most of the volume under review does not deal with LCSH as a whole, but rather only with details — and at that level, there is no doubt that the target is touched, even if not always in its bullseye. As much as

I criticize Berman (especially in the polemical and bullying attitude and the sophomorphism of his own work and that of many of his followers), he does aim at an essential point: *much that is done "for" us by national agencies such as the Library of Congress must be done right, even if that means it has to be done over, by ourselves.* He is (unfortunately) right to expect non-acceptance by many:

This "do-it-yourself" approach may strike some as tedious and even sinful, since it indisputably violates the holy canons of standardization and "follow-the-leader." (p. 185)

— but *he* is right, not those who follow the leader: what good are we or our libraries unless we *can retrieve what our users need?* and how can we expect to retrieve what they need unless we *store what they need* with those needs in mind?

Jean Martin Perreault

Prof. J.M. Perreault
University of Alabama. The Library
Huntsville, Ala. 35899, USA

Notes:

- 1 See Perreault, J.M.: Some Perils of the 'User-Friendly' Attitude in Cataloguing. In: Simonton, W. (Ed.): *Advantages in Librarianship* 14 (1985) (Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press 1985) [in press].
- 2 See the paper cited in fn. 1.
- 3 *Int. Classif.* 5 (1978) p. 120.

HARROD, Leonard Montague: **Harrod's Librarians' Glossary** of terms used in librarianship, documentation and the book crafts and **Reference Book**. 5th ed. Revised and updated by Ray Prytherch. Aldershot, Hants. Gower Publ. Co. 1984. 861 p. £ 37.50, ISBN 0-566-03460-3

Five editions within less than half a century of its existence bear witness to the striking popularity of this one volumed multipurpose reference book. Its successive editions demonstrate a success story of a book which is more than a "Librarian's glossary . . . and reference book".

Harrod has deservedly become a household name in librarianship. Successive generations of librarians have learned on this work. Over the years it has secured a niche of its own and every serious student of Library and Information science (LIS) desires this book to be at her/his elbow and makes this the first port of call. This dependence has increased ever the more since Thomas Landau's encyclopaedia became dated and non-extant. To be brief, it pervades our works and thoughts and is a part of the librarian's lore in the real sense of the word. It has survived many upheavals both in the LIS field and in its publishing history. This is due to its abiding intrinsic merit.

The first edition of 1938 contained only 1600 terms and aimed at meeting "the requirements of Library Association's examination". But it proved to be of much more value to many shades of librarians, as it still does. The second edition of 1959 with a total of 2800 terms had 75% more entries than the first. The third edition (1971) of about 5650 entries registered a 100% growth; in many ways is still considered the best and revolutionary edition. The fourth edition (1977, reprinted 1982) had about 6750 terms. All these edi-

tions are based on the immediately preceding ones respectively. They are the product of the labour, knowledge, organization, skill, and imagination of one man; Mr. Leonard Montague Harrod. It is his mentefact and it is he who created and established it as an institution of LIS. As Mr. Harrod is now in his eighth decade of life, the responsibility of updating and perpetuating of his work has fallen on Mr. Ray J. Prytherch, an experienced teacher, educationist, and a prolific writer, who has at his disposal one of the richest collections in the field of LIS embodied in the school library of Leeds Polytechnic.

The fifth edition in question has been revised by Prytherch in consultation with Mr. Harrod. This edition in line with the previous edition has affected about 1000 terms of which 300 are newly added, while 700 have been retouched or expanded. The new additions are inevitably in the area of information science and technology. The attached supplement (p. 849–861) to the fifth edition updates the entries to 1983.

The field of purview of this dictionary is very large and has widened with successive editions. The lengthy title succinctly indicates its scope. Now it has taken in its fold new areas involving new information equipment and technology. It also includes some terms concerned neither with LIS nor bookcrafts but deemed useful for the librarians. The major entries are of terms which concern concepts, institutions, associations, equipment, library and information systems and services. Some such terms have also been included which ordinarily defy definitions. This widened scope is not without its disadvantages. The included topics, though once related, are now so disparagedly apart that to straddle them is a futile exercise in all intents. It is a rendezvous not for two lovers but for strangers. Each field prevents the other from fully expressing itself. This has led in some entries to not more than expanding the abbreviations. On the average, length of an entry varies from one line to half a page.

Alphabetization is word by word. Entries have been entered under acronyms or abbreviations, if the latter are widely known. However, there are some inconsistencies, e.g., "International Conference on Cataloguing Principles" (Paris, 1961: a Conference also equally known by ICCP) has been entered as such, while for a relatively lesser known "International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts" (Copenhagen, 1969) one is cross referred to IMCE. Copious use of cross references and connectives has been made to direct the readers from a synonymous or abbreviated term not used to the term used, and to interlink the related terms. To test the efficacy of the terminology some terms were consulted at random by the reviewer. The recall ratio came out to be hundred percent.

In spite of its international use in the English speaking world, the unpronounced British bias is apparent and at times the work appears to be emphatically British. Perhaps the editors have the confidence in the capability of American librarianship to take its own care; and God is there for the developing countries. Some of Ranganathan's terms included are mostly from classification. His terminology for other fields does not find place here. Not only this, his famous Classified Code has no entry. There is no mention of the Soviet classification BBK; Ranganathan's chain indexing has been mentioned