Book Reviews

WÅHLIN, Ejnar: **Research on Classification Systems**: Summarizing Report on Classification Systems and their Application. Stockholm: Swedish Council for Building Research 1978. 129 p., 48 refs. ISBN 91-540-2917-1; also published as FID/CR Report No. 17.

The title of this report is scarcely generous in giving away information. Over 70% of the 133 pages of text, appendices and index is occupied by proposals which the author has been making over the last 3 decades on the outline structure of *general* classification systems. The remaining 30% of the book deals with social and philosophical aspects of classification which form the background of Ejnar Wåhlin's thinking and practical activity.

Wåhlin is perhaps best known outside his own country for his work on the classification of the field of Building, but it is clear from the bibliography of his writings, given in this volume, that the problems of the classification of the totality of knowledge have constantly engaged his attention, Nevertheless, the underlying technological bias is very evident in this report. Such a bias is perhaps a useful and valid starting point for a wider foray into the area of universal classification.

The author unfolds his exposition in a manner which may justifiably be described as enumerative, or even episodic. He makes discoveries, one after another, he discerns tendencies, but never ventures into comprehensive conclusions which would connect the isolated phenomena discovered. His discoveries arise from action, rather than from flights of abstract thinking, or from any regurgitation of the thinking of others. He has laboured to draft outlines of general classification schemes. In the course of this labour he has encountered many problems, some trivial, a few of fundamental importance. He has an ahnost infallible eye for picking out, in their surface manifestations, the really crucial and far-reaching issues in general classification. Among such issues are: phenomena versus disciplines, the collocation of technologies with their parent sciences, or alternatively their separation, and the fact that the conceptual tool subjects (e.g. mathematics, logic, communication) upon which the sciences depend, are themselves the products of human culture, which is in turn a further area of study with which the general classification system must deal. Wåhlin observes the outcrop, but never delves into the subterranean body. The observations may stimulate others, but offer neither practical solutions nor an embracing theory.

The report describes proposals by Wåhlin, dating back as far as 1949. They begin with the tabulation of a "concept series", reflecting, on the whole, a Comtean "filiatory" order, passing down from Energy, through Matter and Inanimate nature to Human beings. This tabulation led to 4 Universal Systems (US). In all the US versions the Humanities are treated with little variation, the main changes involving Science and Technology. In US1 the structure is phenomena-oriented. Technology is here in part interspersed with the physical and chemical topics comprehended under Matter and Force, and in part assigned to a residual class, General and Final Technology, located between Force and Universe-Earth. US2 sets out a conceptually similar sequence, but now in disciplinary terms. Technology is separated from its parent sciences, and History is grouped with Language and Spiritual culture. Also, a new class Individual and Family is introduced, thus anticipating the Broad System of Ordering, which inserted a similar phenomena class, 470 Human needs, into a sequence otherwise of disciplinary character. US3 has a structure in which every main class outside Technology has a corresponding sub-class within Technology, but the correspondence may be in respect of different relationships. Thus 22 Acoustics is related to 422 Applied acoustics as parent science to applied science, but 76 Music is related to 476 Musical instruments as activity to tool. US3 also places greater stress than do its predecessors upon notational combination for the representation of binary composite subjects. Wåhlin correctly points out that the conventional subdivisions of many fields include what are, in effect, subject combinations or intersections rather than logical subgenera. Recognition of this fact should lead to a consideration of the whole underlying syntactic axis of classification, as extensively explored by Ranganathan and exploited in both pre- and post-coordinate indexing systems. Pre-coordinate combination techniques, particularly in classification systems, immediately raise questions of combination order. The author appears to evade or minimise this problem, glibly citing the argument for freedom and flexibility. Some of his own examples indicate how a given combination or citation order *changes meaning*. For example, B2 is microbiology and G3 is soil. Wåhlin is not sure whether G3—B2 has the same meaning as B2—G3. He suggests that G3—B2 is perhaps the action or influence of microorganisms in soil, while B2—G3 perhaps means that class of microorganisms which lives in soil. Clearly if these suggestions are correct then the connecting symbol must stand for very different kinds od relations, while at the same time possessing a single filing value. This is the UDC colon pitfall all over again, introducing the well-known ordinal chaos. If we wish to use notational combinations in classification, we must either discriminate the various relations represented by the combinations, or restrict the relations which may be represented by a given connecting symbol in a stated citation order.

Another proposal included in the report is Wåhlin's Field System. This is an enumeration of 16 (17 if one counts 'Other') major subject fields embracing the whole of knowledge. Each field has alphabetically mnemonic single character notation, which, however, has no ordering function. The purpose of the Field System is obscure. The author himself states "there may be reason to ask whether a series of Fields standardised for all purposes is necessary". He goes on to suppose that the units of this system might be useful as units of fruitful discussion by groups of scientists regarding the internal structure of their respective fields. Subject combination by direct conjunction of notation is also a feature of the Field System. Thus, P is Psychology and S is Society, so PS is Social psychology. At first sight this is a neat and tidy mechanism, until one recalls that Social Psychology is *not* equivalent to the Psychology of Society. Furthermore the combination facility produces concepts which while possibly meaningful in Swedish are very doubtfully so in English, e.g. Medical chemistry KM. One can

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1983-1-41 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access -

only guess whether this means simply Human biochemistry (if so, why not KBM?) or Human biochemistry plus Pharmacology plus Toxicology plus Chemical methods in pathology plus Chemicals in the environment as health hazards, etc.). Combinatory systems without explicit relators, or without restrictions upon relations which can be expressed, readily tempt those who use them to slip into the purely verbal plane when they are supposedly dealing with concepts.

Finally the report describes the AR (Adapted Reference) System. This is a proposition of considerable interest in connection with ideas for the reconciliation or interconnection of diverse indexing languages. The AR System comprises an unlimited number of Adapted Systems, linked by a common Reference system. We have heard of such ideas before, but AR reverses one important aspect of what is in danger of becoming the conventional wisdom in this area of endeavour. The common reference system R is universal in scope and *elaborated in depth,* while A the adapted systems are individually less specific, narrower in scope, and apparently derived from the reference system in some way which ensures that each adapted system takes account of all the other adapted systems. Combined notations comprising an A element and an R element are used. The method has been tried out with a Product Classification and a document classification for the field of Building.

In short, this document contains many valid insights, some of which are hardly more than half glimpsed. They are not in any way integrated into a coherent theory of general classification, and they would be more accessible to readers if they were not so frequently embedded in a rather limp connecting discourse. E.J. Coates

Mr. E.J. Coates
11, Mount Pleasant
St. Albans, Herts. AL3 4QH
England

ARNTZ, Reiner; PICHT, Heribert: **Einführung in die übersetzungsbezogene Terminologiearbeit.** (Introduction into translation-oriented terminology work.) Hildesheim: G. Olms Verl. 1982. 238 p., DM 24,80 = Hildesheimer Beiträge zu den Erziehungs- und Sozialwissenschaften, Bd. 17.

Nachdem in den letzten Jahren mehrere Einführungen und Sammelbände zu den Themen "Fachsprache" und "Angewandte Fachsprachenforschung" erschienen sind, hat nun mit der "Einführung in die übersetzungsbezogene Terminologiearbeit" auch die sich interdisziplinär verstehende und im Rahmen der Informations- und Dokumentationswissenschaft etablierte "Terminologielehre" ein zusammenfassendes und einführendes Werk erhalten. Es ist anwendungsorientiert und setzt sich zum Ziel, Studenten und Wissenschaftler mit Wesen und Methodik der Terminologiearbeit in einer sprachen- und fächerübergreifenden Form vertraut zu machen.

Nach einer Überblicksdarstellung des Verhältnisses von Fach- und Gemeinsprache und einer Erörterung des Fachwortbegriffes werden von den beiden Autoren die Grundelemente der Terminologielehre – Begriff, Begriffssystem und Benennung – dargestellt. Es folgen Darstellungen der Äquivalenzproblematik und der Methoden fachsprachlicher Lexikographie sowie der terminologischen Arbeitsmethoden und Terminologiedokumentationsverfahren. Am Schluß stehen ein Überblick über die Arbeit nationaler und internationaler Terminologieorganisationen und -institutionen, ein geschichtlicher Abriß der Entwicklung der Terminologielehre und ein Aufgabenkatalog, der zukünftige Arbeiten des Faches verzeichnet. Eine kurze Bibliographie sowie ein Verzeichnis deutscher und internationaler Grundsatznormen sowie eine Liste von Normungsinstitutionen ergänzen den Text. Leider wird kein Sach- und Namenregister beigegeben, was die Handhabung des Buches erschwert. Ansonsten ist diese verständlich geschriebene und gut lesbare Einführung ein eminent praktisches Buch. Praxisbezogen nicht nur, weil es eine ausführliche Anleitung zur Anfertigung terminologischer (Diplom-)Arbeiten mit konkreten Beispielen aus Diplomarbeiten der Universität Saarbrücken und der Wirtschaftshochschule Kopenhagen enthält, sondern weil in nahezu jedem Kapitel versucht wird, anhand von Textbeispielen, Textanalysen, Tabellen und Graphiken die Grundlagen und Methoden der Terminologiearbeit zu vermitteln. So wird zum Beispiel durch sechs Wörterbuchauszüge die – für den Übersetzer und Terminologen äußerst wichtige – systematische Darstellung der vielfältigen terminologischen Lexikographie veranschaulicht.

Insgesamt dokumentieren die Autoren den Stand des in der Terminologielehre erreichten und machen – weitgehend ohne selbst Stellung zu nehmen oder Lösungsmöglichkeiten anzubieten – divergierende Auffassungen und offene Fragen deutlich. Sicher kann eine Einführung vieles nur andeuten und skizzieren, dennoch wären etwa die Bereiche "Terminologisierung", "Abkürzung" und "Entlehnung" ohne großen Aufwand in Kap. 4 zu ergänzen und zu aktualisieren. Hier sollten auch anstatt der Bezeichnung "Wortzusammenstellung" die eingeführten Bezeichnungen "terminologisierte Wortgruppe" oder "Mehrwortbenennung" verwendet werden. Für die schichtspezifische Analyse und Einordnung fachsprachlicher Texte in Kap. 1 ist im Hinblick auf die Einteilung der Texte nach ihrem Fachlichkeitsgrad die Übernahme der Terminologie von D. Möhn (innerfachlich, interfachlich, fachextern) zu empfehlen, die inzwischen in der germanistischen Fachsprachenforschung weitgehend Anerkennung gefunden hat und hier zumindest präziser wäre. Zu revidieren ist ebd. die Aussage, daß in dem auf S. 29 abgedruckten Text ("Mechanische und elektrische Schreibmaschinen") alle Fachwörter durch Zusammensetzung gebildet sind, denn danach wären "Wagen", "Walze" oder "Taste" gemeinsprachliche Bezeichnungen. Unverständlich bleibt, warum die terminologische Arbeit des VDI und die von ihm herausgegebenen Richtlinien unerwähnt bleiben, da diese z.B. für Neubenennungen relevant sind (vgl. u.a. Schewe/Spiegel: Der Beitrag des DIN und VDI zur Terminologiearbeit und Fachsprachenforschung. In: Gnutzmann/Turner (Eds.): Fachsprachen und ihre Anwendung. Tübingen 1980. S. 11ff.).

Diese Detailkritik soll indes nicht den Gesamtwert dieser gut didaktisierten Einführung schmälern, die jedem angehenden Übersetzer und Terminologen sowie allen, die sich über den Fachbereich der angewandten Terminologielehre informieren wollen, Hilfe und praktischen Rat bietet. Hans-Rüdiger Fluck

Dr. H.-R. Fluck
Tongji-Universität,
Shanghai

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1983-1-41 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY