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. Wüster shortly before his death.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1977-1-49 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY

Spiegel provides a brief outline of levels of special languages and the processes of standardization.

The *truncated* form of *Wüster's* lecture on the interdisciplinary nature of terminological studies is regrettable, not so much because it wrests credit from his pioneering achievement in the study of special languages—he is consistently quoted—but more importantly because it omits the description of the links that the study of special languages must establish with linguistics, logic, ontology, information science, and the special subjects. These may now be widely recognized but cannot be underestimated. The closely argued contribution by *Wersig* on methods of terminological work should be compulsory reading for anybody entering this field and is exemplary in its conciseness.

Klaus' highly condensed but fundamental observations on the semiotic implications of standardization stress that standardization is and must remain a relative concept. This is followed by *Filipec's* excellent essay on the nature and types of terms. *Pelka's* brief comparison of special languages with non-linguistic means of communication raises the significance of the interface with other semiotic systems. All three articles show by implication points of departure for further research.

In the chapter on descriptions of German special languages we find *Schütze's* exploration of the semantic structure of the compound words, and his outline of the syntagmatic possibilities of this type of word formation. *Herzog's* investigation of word formation tendencies in a special field (data-processing), which is characterized by homogeneity and directly traceable influence of foreign borrowings, illustrates clearly the different conventions developed by similar speech communities to deal with the same phenomena. Another section of Pelka's thesis presents a classification of metaphoric usage, and *Drozd's* description of reduction tendencies provides an exemplary demonstration of linguistic behaviour asserting the principle of economy against that of precision, which usually results in compromise. *Beneš's* comprehensive statement of the syntactic peculiarities of the German language of science is an example of the influence of pragmatics on text types and grammar. Whereas the previous articles were mainly concerned with the classificatory use of language, *Warner's* essay on phrase structure returns to the communicative aspect. Though written with a directive purpose the article contains substantial insights into the nature of special languages and the categorical nature of some of the statements does not detract from the value of his observations which are well-founded and justified by reference to linguistic behaviour.

The section on sociolinguistic aspects of special languages is well introduced by *Ischreyt's* first attempt at establishing aspect categories for special languages and their consequences for methods of standardization. To demonstrate the paucity of research in this area this is followed by a new article by *Bausch* which represents an original and genuine step forward in research. Taking as his starting point the communicative process in general he questions the assumptions made in relation to the widely accepted principles of economy and precision and demonstrates their paradoxical nature. In his analysis of the different requirements and potentials of special languages he comes very close to seeing them as gradations on a sliding scale moving from natural language (open system) to artificial language (closed system). *Möhn* postulates the values of the diachronic approach to the study of special languages and exemplifies the mutual influence of common core and special language. This point of view is exemplified by an excerpt from *Spiegel's* thesis on the historical growth of a special language which demonstrates tendencies in word creation.

The final chapter is a factual description by *Schewe* and *Spiegel* of the methods and nature of the terminological work carried out by the DIN, the VDI and by ISO and this is a useful summary statement for a wider public unaware of the institutional efforts in language planning.

From such a first anthology a reader expects substantial insights into the subject, examples of proven research methods and more indirectly indications of areas not yet explored but requiring investigation. These criteria are largely met and at the same time the variety of authors brought together here prove the interdisciplinary character of this aspect of applied linguistics, the relevance of this field of study to a great diversity of other disciplines, and also the existing lack of cohesion in approach which has to be overcome before the results of all these research efforts can be translated into the guidance our communication conscious society needs so much.

The bibliography is very select, but the reader is referred to a forthcoming major bibliography which should further help to consolidate the infrastructure of the study of special languages.

J. C. Sager

BORKO, H., BERNIER, C. L.: **Abstracting Concepts and Methods.** New York–San Francisco–London: Academic Press 1975. 250 p. = Library and Information Science Series. ISBN 0-12-118650-4

The authors state in their preface that the text is meant for graduate library school study, exercises are provided at the end, as well as the glossary mentioned. The authors present their topic in three sections with three chapters each, as follows: I. Nature of abstracts: 1 Characteristics and types of abstracts. 2 Historical review of abstracting services. 3 Criteria, instruction and standards. II. Abstracting procedures: 4 Contents and format. 5 Editing. 6 Publishing. III. Mangement, automation, and personnel: 7 Abstracting services. 8 Automatic abstracting. 9 Career opportunities. In Section I eight examples for different kinds of abstracts are presented and a new kind (actually already introduced by C. Bernier in 1970) of a document surrogate for the fast reader is described: *terse literatures* (these are very short condensations). Some varieties possible are explained such as "Terse conclusions", "Terse explanations", "Terse intensions", a.o.

The text is very well presented. The sub-chapter on 'Classifying and indexing of abstracts' has been kept too short and too general. Otherwise it looks like a very necessary book, not only for teachers and students of library science but also for every practitioner in information science, especially for all the editors and publishers of abstracting and indexing services.

I. Dahlberg

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1977-1-49 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY