

book is not exempt from them either. The most amusing is to find Lenin in the index with the forename of Nikolai. Or is it just the sign of the times, a pardonable slight? Another slip obviously committed in a humorous vein is the case when the reader interested in indexing as a hobby is directed to a blank page. Other more serious mistakes which might even result in information loss include e.g. the confusion around medical vs. biomedical terms. On the one hand important information in this context (on p. 273) is ignored and remains unindexed, on the other - though "biomedical terms" is designated as the preferred term in the index - the article on Latin terms retains a subchapter entitled "Medical terms" (boldfaced).

The bibliography is possibly the best concise compilation one can find in this field but again, that has been another specialty of the author. It is conveniently up-to-date, divides into selected major writings about indexing and handy technical reference aids respectively; confirming - willy nilly - that the basic orientation is towards beginners and to a lesser extent to practitioners.

The easy-going, witty style, often anecdotic makes it an attractive reading for all those interested.

Irrespective of its intended audience this book should be part of private and public reference collections for a long time to come.

Daniel Benediktsson

(1) Bar-Hillel, Y.: Language and information: selected essays on their theory and applications. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley, 1964. p.361.

(2) Soergel, D.: Indexing languages and thesauri: construction and maintenance. Los Angeles: Melville, 1974.

(3) Knight, G.N.: Indexing, the art of. London: Allen & Unwin, 1979.

Prof.D.Benediktsson, University of Iceland, Library and Information Science Studies, Oddi, 101, Reykjavik, Iceland.

HARROLD, Ann; LEA, Graham: MUSAURUS: A Music Thesaurus. A new approach to organising music information. London: Music Press 1991. 128p. ISBN 1-873260-00-8

In 1960 a paper was published by B.C.Vickery with the title "Thesaurus - a new word in documentation" (1). Nowadays "thesaurus" no longer is a "new" word in the field of documentation.

Outside traditional documentation many new approaches for thesaurus application are seen to exist as for example in expert systems, interface systems, object-oriented design and programming, hypertext systems, machine translation and machine abstracting (2). In the meantime, special thesauri are available for nearly all fields of knowledge (3) and in this connection MUSAURUS indeed is a new word in the world of music, a new instrument in organizing music information, which can permit the inclusion of music scores and the scholarly, professional and business aspects of music as well. The

aim of MUSAURUS is to provide a comprehensive system for indexing the whole field of music, including music scholarship, the music profession, and the music industry.

Furthermore, MUSAURUS is designed to be suitable for indexing music books, journal articles, newspaper items, documents, recordings, instruments, brochures, files, artefacts - in fact anything of musical interest. MUSAURUS consists of a subject part with the following seven subject divisions, which are divided in "subdivisions" of different degrees of specificity: A Musicology, B Musical instruments, C Musical works, D Performance, E Music profession & education, F Music business, G Music documentation. In addition some auxiliary tables can also be used, for example: history, geography, and language auxiliaries. Each auxiliary table has its primary, secondary and tertiary divisions, each division has a code and an associated term.

A rotated index allows to enter the MUSAURUS by using the codes. I think MUSAURUS is a suitable combination of a classification and thesaurus. "Both classification systems and thesauri have their specific strengths and weaknesses. Through properly combining both approaches one can eliminate the latter and largely preserve the strengths" (4).

As to future developments it is intended that MUSAURUS will be used to index a database, called MusBase, that will store data, full text, digitized musical notation, scanned documents, and bibliographical references.

Gerd Bauer

(1) Vickery, B.C.: Thesaurus - a new word in documentation. J.Doc. 16(1960)No.4, p.181-189

(2) Schmitz-Esser, W.: New approaches in thesaurus application. Int.Classif.18(1991)No.3, p.143-147

(3) Dahlberg, I. (Ed.): Classification systems and thesauri, 1950-1982. (International Classification and Indexing Bibliography. ICIB-1). Frankfurt: INDEKS Verlag 1982. XIV,143 p. (The bibliography is continued in the issues of the journal International Classification.)

(4) Fugmann, R.: An interactive classaurus on the PC. Int.Classif. 17(1990)No.3/4, p.133-137

Dr.Dr.Gerd Bauer, Rudolfsberg 6, D-2380 Schleswig

MEADOWS, A.J.(Ed.): Knowledge and Communication: Essays on the Information Chain. London: Library Assoc.Publ. (A Clive Bingley Book) 1991. IX,164p. ISBN 0-85157-454-8

Man needs information next to absolutely bare necessities of life; and every human being possesses knowledge of certain kind and level. But only a few persons in society are concerned with the 'science of knowledge' which cuts across many disciplines. The study of the nature of knowledge is the concern of anthropologists, philosophers, sociologists, psychologists, educationists,

linguists, research methodologists, as well as library and information scientists. Information is stock-in-trade of LIS workers. Study of the inherent nature of knowledge is as important to a librarian as the study of biology to a student of medicine. This importance has been emphasized with its bearing by D.W.Langridge, D.A.Kemp, and J.H.Shera (1903-1982) (see the bibliography, p.150-152). But S.R.Ranganathan (1892-1972), not mentioned in the bibliography was a pioneer, as in many other areas of LIS studies, in drawing our attention to the importance of such studies for librarians, and successfully got introduced relevant topics in the library science curricula of Indian universities. Above all, he did a scientific study on the modes of origin and anatomical growth of new subjects (1).

The info-sphere is cyclical in nature probably in the sense of, say, the water cycle in nature. Information is created, disseminated, consumed, and then again produced in a new form and the circle goes on endlessly. By definition there can be no information without a knower, a human being. Knowledge is social in character and totally human dependent. But in the visible information cycle taken in the very narrow sense, the components consist of authors, publishers, librarians, and teachers and the users.

The work in hand is a collection of eight specially commissioned essays to study the human components in the chain, and their work in the process.

In the first essay "Classifying Knowledge", D.W.LANGRIDGE starting with the types of classification schemes concentrates on bibliographic classification schemes and goes on to describe the major schools of thought in library classification, and succinctly presents a fine summary of the state of the art. Here perhaps the logic, theory, mechanism and methods of classifying knowledge would have been more appropriate to the situation. He could have given a summary of his already much appreciated book on subject analysis (2).

The second chapter by Michael REED illustrates the dissipation of knowledge over a long time in its transmission by taking examples of five artefacts, namely, St.Pancras Railway Station (19th century), Gardens at Stourhead in Wiltshire (18th century), Banquet House in Whitehall (17th century), Doomesday Book (11th century), and Stonehenge (2800 BC). It makes a rather esoteric reading.

In the third chapter "Author and Knowledge" Jack MEADOWS dwells upon the need of an author's knowledge of the stylistics in the communication of his knowledge to the readers. He writes on the problems of the choice of words, ambiguities of language; limitations of the book as a medium of communication; effect of specialization; role of computers in 'composing' texts; and lastly the author-publisher relations. In a nutshell its main concern is elusive authorial art which comes from long and vast reading and extensive writing, and from something more personal.

In the fourth chapter "Publishers and Knowledge" John FEATHER defines the concept and outlines the process of publishing. Publishing is a trade of gentlemen; to them a book is more than a commodity. Feather goes on to overview the stages of publishing, economics of publishing, author-publisher relations; he next writes on the effect of information technology, the databases and the DTP which have rather blurred the distinction between publishers, authors and librarians; and lastly touches upon the current trends in publishing especially in the U.K. What is said is not at all true of the Third World Publishers most of whom are nothing but crass profiteers.

The next two chapters: "Librarians and Knowledge" by Maurice B.LINE and "Information Scientists and Knowledge" by J.M.BRITAIN are obviously of key concern to us. These two chapters endeavour to prise apart the roles of these two inseparable species. Librarians' classic chores are described with a fresh standpoint. They identify and build a collection, analyse and organize, preserve and disseminate it. Line makes a peep into the future work of librarians. Above all, he tries to correct our terminology and phraseology as SDI is not information but bibliographic dissemination; or at best it could be SDD, last "D" for documents. Brittain clearly enumerates the characteristics of information scientists; and interestingly explains the difference between recorded, and heuristic knowledge. Information science subsumes librarianship skills; and Brittain goes on to explain the special skills of an information scientist such as knowledge of information needs and marketing; database creation and operation, information management and lastly the expert systems, uses of IT, and bibliometric studies. It is a succinct, lucid, skilful summarization of information work and services.

In the seventh chapter "Teacher and Knowledge", Helen LEWIS studies the problems of transmitting knowledge in schools. The teacher here first symbolizes the consumer of knowledge. It is an eclectic work quoting heavily from others. The questions addressed are: the process of knowing; the pedagogical aims; and most importantly 'How people satisfy their information needs'; and conversely why some people do not make use of information services. It adequately discusses the role of teachers in making students depend on self sought information; and to interact with the knowledge so gathered. It emphasizes the need of making teachers information literate. The librarian's bias is all too visible. There could have been an independent chapter on "Knowledge and Users".

In the last chapter "Epilogue", Kelvin McGARRY enumerates the differing views on knowledge in a historical perspective. It is not a summary of the preceding essays, but culls the views of philosophers from Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas to Karl Popper. Knowledge is a cultural entity and keeps shifting its pattern like a kaleidoscope. An emergence of the new knowledge modifies the structure of the whole. Contrary to H.E.Bliss (1870-

1955) there is no permanent order in knowledge. "Pattern is new every moment" said T.S.Eliot (1888-1965), with a poetic vision.

The book is well edited with near uniformity in presentation. In most chapters the text has been divided into sections with feature headings and concludes with a summary. But above all the important question invariably asked and answered in every chapter is whether knowledge is affected at every link in the process of communication. The answer is in the affirmative. An author's creation is constrained by what he/she has learnt from the environment both physically and intellectually. Librarians are gatekeepers of knowledge: publishers will only publish that is 'viable', other documents will never see the light of the day; librarians add value to the knowledge they select, classify and index. In selecting documents they help create and kill thousands of ideas. The teachers' role is too obvious here. But the book deals with much more. Many an itinerant idea runs across the pages, and nobody knows what may strike a reader to develop one into a revolutionary idea. On this and many other accounts the book provides profitable readings.

Mohinder Partap Satija

(1) Shera, J.H.: Sociological foundations of librarianship. Bombay: Asia 1970. p.141-183

(2) Langridge, D.W.: Subject analysis: Principles and procedures. London: Bowker-Saur 1989. 146p.

Dr.M.P.Satija, Guru Nanak Dev University, Department of Library and Information Science, Amritsar-143 005, India

SAGER, Juan C.: A Practical Course in Terminology Processing, with a Bibliography by Blaise Nkwenti-Azeh. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: J.Benjamins 1990. XI+254p.

Juan SAGER (University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology) needs no presentation. His name is a concept in Terminology. He now has at last come forth with what might be expected to be the quintessence of his terminology teaching and experience, notwithstanding the restrictive title. Titles like tags are bound to be deceptive. So let it be with this opus. If it is meant to cater for practitioners of terminology, it nevertheless allows lavish space for the theoretical underpinnings of the topic.

The actual title subject is covered only from chapters 5 to 8 on p.129 to 229 (V: Compilation, VI: Storage, VII: Retrieval, VIII: Usage of Terminology), the first four chapters setting the frame for Terminology processing (I: What is Terminology?, II-IV spelling out the cognitive, linguistic, communicative dimension respectively of what the author argues to be a non-discipline).

The work is conceived as guidelines for students at large, since "almost every contemporary teaching programme" would gain from including terminology as a

subject, so the author. Maybe he wants to fundamentalize terminology to the level of the three R's, reading, writing and arithmetics not counting as a discipline either in his view. Such a grass-root approach would indeed justify most of the short-cuts and warrant a great deal of simplification. If philosophical and epistemological considerations may be dismissed as impertinent, this cannot be done with concept theory and classification which is fundamental to terminology. The author's unease in this respect is brought out by affirmed concern about the absence of a generally acceptable subject classification scheme which, he says pp.10 and 28, theorists have so far failed to provide. Although I.Dahlberg has got two entries in the appended bibliography, her major contribution towards a valuable universal classification system, published twenty years ago, completely escaped the author's notice.

The undefined use of terms such as "knowledge", "subject of teaching", "practice" etc. and the fuzzy treatment of "definition", "concept", and "term", which conditions all the rest, are likely to leave the target population rather confused. This also holds for the term-concept link, where the author wants to get away from the blunt fact that a term is but the linguistic expression of a concept (pp.39 and 57).

Without going into too much detail regarding the shortcomings and internal contradictions of the theoretical part, one can but note that the envisaged reader often risks to be taken at unawares.

The Communicative Dimension deals with convention in the double sense of a) what is convenient in a given LSP speech situation, and b) what is the agreed meaning in LSP speech.

Much effort is spent on the elaboration of this homonymy, whereas no explanation is furnished as to why standardization is included under the communicative paradigm.

The below-the-belt punch at social sciences where (p.120) "terminologising is extensively practised as a surface indicator of scientific rigor" seems out of place under standardization, even though the ambition of social science authors may be to preempt general acceptance for their aboriginal ideas. Wish-dreaming in not standardizing!

Furthermore, even though standardization is, as depicted, a necessary adjunct to terminology, its pertinence to terminological processing does not justify the dimension it is given in this manual. This bias is also evidenced by the quotation, on p.124, of BSO, Part 1, 1981, which concerns referents, not terms, but which the author wishes to extend to terms, "for good measure"?

If "conceptual structures can be built according to perceived necessity and interrelations can be declared on the basis of fuller information after a substantial amount of data has been collected", then it would seem that such structures are not more than social science constructs and as such do not warrant the author's