Indexierungstiefe, ect.), the corresponding English term is indeed *indexing*. It would be interesting to find out what if any difference the editors perceive between "indexation" and "indexing" and why they think that the first term has to be added to the already overburdened English vocabulary of IS. *Wirkungsgrad* is not overall efficiency but *'effectiveness'*, *Wirtschaftlichkeit* is not 'economic efficiency' but *'cost-effectiveness'* (the editors tell us in a note that this term "ought not to be used", but it nevertheless exists and *is* widely used in the literature of management written in English, and cannot arbitrarily declared to be unsuitable). And where, in this context, is *cost-benefit ratio?* In English, at least, it is definitely not a "quasi-synonym" for cost-effectiveness. There are also outright howlers: *Schrift* (in the sense intended in the glossary) is not 'writing' but *script*. (Incidentally, it would have been useful to include *Schrift* also in the sense in which it is used in German for "work" or "document".) *Fehlselektion* is not a (non-existing) 'noise-unit' but a *false drop*, and there are many more instances where the editors happened to look up the wrong translation in their dictionary or were simply not familiar with English terminology.

The glossary is studded with what the learned editors call their "propositions" (someone ought to explain to them that the difference between this word and the correct "proposal" is the one between German "Antrag" and "Vorschlag"), clumsy and for the most part linguistically deficient attempts to invent English terms. Such a venture is doomed to failure because neither the British nor the Americans will readily accept terms coined for them by foreigners, even if they do not happen to have equivalents in their language for German terms. I am not even sure that the editors were justified in inventing non-existing German terms for the Germans; moreover, the professional language of IS in East and West Germany is now considerably divergent, a fact which is scarcely acknowledged anywhere in the glossary.

Finally, despite the large number of terms and their occasionally hairsplitting proliferation (is there really a need to distinguish between *Document, Documentary Unit,* and *Documentary Reference Unit*, quite apart from the fact that the last two terms do not exist anywhere in English IS literature?) there is at least one area that has been entirely neglected, namely *kinds* of documents as to their physical form, mode of production, handling, physical storage, preservation and use. In an (unpublished) draft for a new classification schedule in the UDC, submitted for discussion several years ago, more than a thousand such terms were identified. While this may have been too large a number, there are certainly at least several dozens of terms that necessarily belong in a glossary of IS, a science which, after all, deals with physical documents and records of all kinds, and not only with theories about them.

A trilingual glossary of IS, reflecting the terminology of the 1970's is indeed a worthwhile and urgently needed undertaking. The glossary under review here is, however, definitely not it. The KTS committee and the editors would be well advised to take it back to the drawing board, with a view to produce a work based less on a preconceived scheme and more on actual usage, with definitions and explanations in all three languages, and with the close collaboration and supervision of native speakers of the languages who are also information scientists themselves, so as to assure truly idiomatic and authoritative renderings of terms which will be acceptable to the IS community throughout the Western world.

Hans W. Wellisch

BUCHANAN, Brian: **A Glossary of Indexing Terms.** London: C. Bingley; Hamden, Conn.: Linnet Books 1976. 144 p., $ 8.– £ 3.75, ISBN 0-208-01377-6

This book contains nearly 1000 entries, expanded from a word list provided for students at Loughborough School of Librarianship, in England. A glossary was originally a collection of glosses, which could be definitions of, or comments upon, words in a given text. Nowadays, a glossary is usually taken to mean a collection of (hopefully authoritative) definitions of specialized, technical, or unfamiliar terms in a given field of knowledge, without the addition of comments or criticisms, although, if synonyms exist, preference for one term over another may be indicated. With the rapid growth of specialist jargon today, the need for glossaries is evident. I regret to have to say that this present book seems to me to be very unsatisfactory. The author breaks all the 'rules' for good construction of a glossary. He divides entries into (a) definitions, (b) examples and comments, and (c) 'see also' references. The definitions are not always clear, and are sometimes inaccurate, and examples of comments are sometimes intermixed with them. The incorporation of examples and extended explanations may be justifiable in a work to be used in teaching, but the (b) sections sometimes contain criticisms and opinions on the value of methods, or even only anecdotes; these are often clearly personal, and should not appear. The 'see also' references are sometimes to antonyms, which can be muddling. There are also errors in the examples, e. g. that for 'Analets'; the diagrams for Arrowgraphs and Circular Thesaurus (which appear to have been the authors invention – he has a penchant for the subject of weapons and hunting) show some strange interconnections. There are many unnecessary entries (such as "Brevity" and "Length *see* Brevity"); an entry for "Serendipity" gives only an anecdote (a letter from Horace Walpole) and a cross reference to Browsing, which is defined as 'to look . . . at random, with no conscious search strategy' or 'to choose . . . among documents by examining each'; browsing has a least the strategy that one is trying to find something on a desired topic, and not necessarily examining each. In any case, why enter 'Serendipity' at all?

There are some obvious omissions, e. g. File (Inverted File and Uninverted File (horrid term) *are* entered); MARC (surely a 'must' in an indexing glossary), Body-punched cards, Free-text searching, Cycling (as used in searching the Science Citation Index), etc. The area covered seems in fact rather vague and the terms defined show peculiar biases in favour of edge-punched cards, certain types of classification, and early work on keywords and information retrieval systems, and what there is, is outdated. In fact, one gets the impression that the terminology and experience of the author is that of ten to fifteen years ago. For example, there are several references to "the proposed

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1976-2-110 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY

CRG general classification", which is described as being based on only two facets: Entities and Attributes, following the work of Barbara Kyle; actually she used personalities and activities facets for her social sciences classification, and certainly not just two facets for general classification; she unfortunately died in 1966, and the CRG general classification attempt, though discussed for some time, has not yet taken shape. An unwarranted piece of editing is a reference to Deweys 'Relative Index'; all scholars scrupulously use the original Dewey spelling of 'Relativ Index'. The entries under Confounding, Integrative Levels, Literary Warrant are very misleading and partly inaccurate. There is not a clear distinction between Relational Indexing (which displays the relations in the indexing – and he omits Gardins SYNTOL, or Selyes Symbolic Shorthand, both of this type) and PRECIS, which uses relations in the initial analytic stage, but does not reveal these relations in the final print-out.

It is, I am aware, unfair to level such criticisms without giving many more examples, but limitations of space constrain their omission. Your reviewer, who has carefully examined every entry in the book, can only claim that he has been fortunate in having had extensive experience of glossary construction in the documentation field, for the British Standards Institution, and in ISO, and therefore hopes he can be granted some authority of viewpoint.

Jason Farradane

BROWN, A. G.: **An Introduction to Subject Indexing.** Vol. 2: UDC and chain procedure in subject cataloguing. Clive Bingley, London 1976. ca. 120 p., ISBN 0-208-01529-9

Der Untertitel deutet an, worum es sich wirklich handelt: um ein programmiertes Lehrbuch, das auf ca. 120 Seiten (frames) den Gebrauch der Universalen Dezimalklassifikation (UDC) für Katalogisierung und Registerherstellung lehrt. Zum Band I, der die Colon-Klassifikation behandelt, besteht ein unmittelbarer Zusammenhang insofern, als auch für die Benutzung der UDC empfohlen wird, mindestens die bekannte Formel PME-ST zu nutzen, um bei der Zuordnung von UDC-Zahlen zu Dokumenteninhalten eine gewisse Einheitlichkeit zu erzielen.

Der zweite Band kann mit Erfolg nur gelesen werden, wenn man die Colon-Klassifikation bis zu einem gewissen Grade kennt und eine (engl.) Auflage der UDC zur Hand hat. Dann allerdings wird man gründlich über alle Möglichkeiten und auch alle Fehlermöglichkeiten der UDC-Benutzung informiert. So empfiehlt sich das Buch als Einführung für alle Bibliothekare und Mitarbeiter von Informationssystemen, die praktisch mit der UDC arbeiten und Karteien, Kataloge, alphabetische Register o. ä. mit oder ohne Computerhilfe auf ihrer Basis anlegen müssen.

Auch dieses programmierte Lehrbuch hat die bekannten Vor- und Nachteile solcher Lehrmittel. Der Verlag legt ein ganzes Spektrum dieser Art programmierter Lehrbücher vor, u. a. auch schon eine frühere Einführung in die UDC.

Es sei darauf verwiesen, daß insbesondere im deutschsprachigen Raum bereits einige gute Einführungen in den Gebrauch der UDC existieren. Positiv am vorliegenden Lehrbuch ist der Bezug zur Colon-Klassifikation, der methodologisch neue Aspekte auch bei der Benutzung der UDC erbringt.

Siegfried Reball

INFOTERM: **International co-operation in terminology.** First Infoterm Symposium, Vienna 9 to 11 April 1975. München: Verlag Dokumentation 1976. 332 p., DM 48,–, Infoterm Series 3. ISBN 3-7940-5503-9

From April 9–11, 1975, one hundred and four experts met in Vienna to discuss various aspects of terminology. The unifying topic of the conference was international co-operation in terminological work. The participants represented sixteen countries from Europe and North America and sixteen international and European organizations. The strongest delegations came from three of the countries in which the study of terminology is an active and well-established field: twenty from Austria, the host country, and twelve apiece from the Federal Republic of Germany and from Canada. Sponsored by Unesco and initiated by Eugen Wüster, the symposium was organized and convened by Infoterm (International Information Centre for Terminology), directed by Helmut Felber. What follows is a review of the proceedings of the symposium, recently published by Verlag Dokumentation as the third volume in their Infoterm Series.

The papers are written in English (19), French (15) and German (4), some being available in parallel versions in two languages. They are arbitrarily arranged in five broad sections representing specific Infoterm priorities: (a) terminology in special subject fields (pp. 43–106), (b) international networks for terminological documentation (pp. 107–172), (c) terminological word banks (pp. 173–140), (d) central registration of neologisms (pp. 241–264) and (e) other reports (pp. 265–320).

Most of the thirty-five papers included in the proceedings represent either a clear description of a complex terminological task or a result of long experience with terminology and they cover an area much larger than suggested by the five sections above. Here is a selection of articles illustrating the variety of this valuable volume:

E. Wüster's opening address (pp. 32–36) outlines the development of terminological work and its pioneers, other than himself, and draws parallels between linguistics and the study of terminology. H. Felber's well-documented paper (pp. 281–296) is a useful complement, indispensable especially for those who need information on past evolution of terminological standardization and documentation in general, and on Infoterm in particular. The position of Infoterm within a world-wide information-sharing project is explained in the address by Wolfgang Löhner, representing Unesco (pp.25–27).

Among the more specifically linguistic contributions may be mentioned those by Guilbert, Spang-Hanssen and Rondeau. Louis Guilbert's paper (pp. 242–249) deals with essential, though often ignored questions of the specificity and the formation of terms ("terminologisms"). Henning Spang-Hanssen (pp. 96–101) examines the rôle of linguistics in terminological studies and warns against the shortcomings of standardization.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1976-2-110 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY