clues so generously provided by Burger should at least give users a head start.

To use a technical term that originated in one technolect in quite a different field of application always risks misunderstanding and possible ridicule. However, when carefully used, such adaptions can be quite stimulating or illuminating. Consider, for example, the implications of extending the use of Cutter numbers to generate an acteme, CUTTER, for the process of classifying any numbered object. Librarians will readily recognize this term as applied to the production of a call number for a library book. Can it be applied to the other contexts? Let us suppose that a mail-order house wants to identify precisely every kind of item offered for sale in a catalog. Each commodity type is given a serial number, but one could "cutter" the additional refinements to specify color or grade. However, anyone proposing such an extension of the term would want to have a good knowledge of its original context of use, and be able to explain the extension to good natured critics.

9. A more difficult problem, I believe, arises from Burger's handling of the problem of polysemy. He uses each word in one and only one sense, while admitting that it may have additional meanings. However, he seeks to restrict his usage of each word to a basic or root meaning, and to find more precise synonyms for the additional senses of each polyseme. It strikes me that in the usage of many readers it may be just such an additional meaning of a word that seems to be its "basic" sense. The suggested synonyms may then seem to be inappropriate or unnecessary. I cannot offer a solution to this problem, but I suspect it will become a real stumbling block for some users.

10. Burger asks reviewers to compare *The Wordtree* with the first editions of ordinary dictionaries or the original version of *Roget's Thesaurus*. In its first edition it cannot meet the technical standards that can be achieved years later, after many revisions and a flood of user reactions. We must remember also that this work is not the product of a large establishment – it reflects, instead, the results of 27 years of hard work by a single scholar, an anthropologist/engineer/lexicographer. Although he received contributions and suggestions from a host of collaborators, he takes personal responsibility for the final structure and content of his book, of which he is also the publisher.

In defense of his decision not to seek out an established publisher he argues that since his approach represents a great intellectual discovery and a new paradigm, it would not be appreciated by publishers who oriented to conventional entrepreneurship and unlikely to take the large risks such a venture poses. Taking these points into consideration, it would indeed be ungenerous to point out any of the numerous petty flaws that can be found in the work, or to make fun of the strange sounding neologisms peppered throughout.

11. However, as a concluding observation I would like to quibble with Burger's claim that "The language already contains a word for every idea found useful," (p. 14) and that accordingly users of *The Wordtree* will be able to find a word for whatever process they have in mind.

The truth is, I think, that we may often come up with concepts (processes) that are, indeed, useful in our work but have not yet been named. This has, of course, always been true and it has led to the continuous proliferation of new words to name new ideas. This process has scarceley stopped and, indeed, is probably accelerating as new inventions and discoveries multiply. Were it not so, the number of neologisms in Burger's collection would not be so great.

But Burger leaves untouched the many new terms that will, in coming years, be required to make newly appreciated and useful distinctions. To facilitate the introduction and evaluation of such innovations we shall need another generation of reference works. Such works will also be based on a new paradigm, one that starts with defined concepts and opens the door, not just to the identification of established terms for known concepts, but also for the coining of terms suitable for the naming of new concepts. By maintaining a continuously active computerized data base, the opportunity for openness to innovation will also be assured.

However, to say this is not to criticize what Burger has done, for his imaginative and energetic contributions are immense – I only mean to suggest that the last word has not yet been written, and we still have a great deal of work to do.

Fred W. Riggs

Prof. F.W. Riggs
Department of Political Science,
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, H, 96822, USA

STEVENSON, Gordon; STEVENSON, Sally: **Reference Services** and **Technical Services: Interactions in Library Practice**. New York, NY: The Haworth Press 1984. 176 p., $ 24,– (hardbound); ISBN 0-86656-174-9. Also published as The Reference Librarian, No. 9

There are two sentences in this collection of papers that, while they do not summarize the whole collection, at least light the path that most of its papers attempt to travel:

> ... library staff members have tended to look at their professional tasks as bifurcated, with the builders of the catalog and the inventory keepers on one side and the middlemen or customer representatives on the other side. The online catalog is changing all that because this tool needs to be fashioned by a collaborative effort. (53)

Pauline Atherton Cochrane's paper (from which I quote) is not consciously synoptic, nor is her point without opposition in other papers. But the overwhelming impression from the volume as a whole is that

(a) it is counterproductive for these two essential functions of every library to be organized and staffed so as to make what I call the "picket fence mentality" all too easy;

(b) the librarians in the two 'sectors' must at the very least get to know the fundamentals of the other sector's ethos in order for users' needs to be effectively satisfied;

(c) the presence of massive changes (decline of funding / the dislocations almost inevitable with the adoption of a new cataloging code / automatization, yea even

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1985-2-110 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY

unto the online catalogue, in those libraries able to afford it) cannot be ignored: they impinge upon the cataloguing and reference functions, as well as upon the service that flows (however sluggishly) from their relationship;

(d) the service that does thus flow needs all the help it can get: our users are *not* getting the best possible or even the best available reference-service-based-on-the-catalogue;

and (e) this deficiency can in fairly large part be attributed to the grip on the American library community of the providers of standardized services such as descriptive cataloguing based on *AACR*2, subject headings based on *LCSH*, class numbers based on the LC classification or the (oft-execrated 19th edition of the) *DDC*. And most of this seems to me to be unpackable out of Cochrane's two pregnant sentences.

Following a brief glance at the picket fence, *G. Stevenson's* opening paper brings up the question: Are the available nationally standardized systems giving what local libraries need? He seems to doubt it, but worries that the very standardization of our cataloguing stands in the way of local improvement.

W. Wiegand gives an informative history of how American libraries got where they did in the first quarter-century of their professionalized existence, 1876–1901: following a halcyon period when white male scholars from the genteel layer of society were able to handle all aspects with relatively little strain, there ensued a period of rapid growth in which the WASP leaders kept on building their collections and doing reference, turning the cataloguing function over to women graduates of Dewey's schools, women who were in understaffed departments and thus eager to adopt standardized products that would surely have been rejected by the individualistic scholar-cataloguers of the 19th century, but which promised greater efficiency. *Miksa's* paper later in the volume gives further historical developments in terms of several attempts to provide for greater user convenience by dividing users into various categories. But in Miksa's mind all these attempts have failed (since we are still in essence where we were in 1901) because it is not *users* which can be categorized as generalists or specialists, causal or thorough, average or scholary – but *use*. It has been cataloguers who have tried to devise standardized systems catering to such putative groups of users, but experienced reference librarians all know that Miksa's critique is well-aimed: *each* user is sometimes in one group, sometimes in the other. (But even when standardized systems are the order of the day, there is no invocation of Ranganathan's answer, namely that refined systems can answer broad questions, while broad systems cannot answer refined questions.)

After Wiegand's history, *Stevenson* has another paper in which he surveys current problems: Are the systems we use *good* for our users? What is the *effect* of national systems on local reference users? Does the catalogue's national basis make it over-complicated for local collections (*Ishimoto's* paper in the volume gives excellent examples of such problematic complications)? How will online catalogues be *used*? Can *LCSH* be improved, not merely in particular inadequacies (*Berman's* paper later in the volume, as expected, deals well with some of these), but *structurally* (Berman, as expected) ignores these. What about such developments as faceted classification and post-coordinate indexing? Can LC Classification be used in online searching?

Cochrane, besides the central point already credited to her, focuses on the appropriate 'home' of automatization in the library organization, and notes that while technical services seems the obvious answer, references too are using computers to good advantage (even before the online catalogue) in DIALOG-, ORBIT-, and BRS-based periodical retrieval. She also raises another crucial point: that while the *format* of the online catalogue is argued about, its *content* is not, even though it needs to be if more sophisticated (not more faster) retrieval is hoped for. *N.D. Stevens'* paper later in the volume supports this: known-item searches succeed far more than do subject searches; and subject searches in periodicals (through article-by-article indexing) are more reliable and productive than are subject searches in books (through subject headings in the catalogue).

In one of the two best papers in the volume (along with Miksa's) *M. Gorman* argues (*pace* Cochrane) that the organizational effect of problem (c) is not collaborative but "divisive": automatization and dwindling funds produce "an intensification of the divisions between the two 'kinds' of librarianship" (56) – though he agrees with her in principle that it would be better for librarians to be defined not by function but by "area of service", in order to wring out the 60% or more of each function that is non-professional. He sees the leverage for this change in the displacement of the massive files (which forced technical service centralization upon us in the first place) by terminals. (His version of the picket fence is the "esoteric" rule-following cataloguer as against the "bluff" referencer with PR skills.)

L. Bone considers the third main sector of professional library work (along with cataloguing and reference), collection development, and argues that it should not be taken over by technical services. He gives, however, no exemplification of the trend he opposes; I can only guess that he is alluding to the use of approval plans, etc., and I agree with his caveat: it is the reference librarian who knows user needs *and* the collection's ability (or inability) to respond to it. (His argument that collection development was "an ancillary process" early on stands against Wiegand's historical documentation of the matter.) He cites Lundy's attempt (at Nebraska) to use the French academic-library organization plan (= subject and area specialists each of whom deals with all three major sectors of work as they relate to the subject or area), but says that it has caught on only "in the smallest American libraries" (70) – whereas I keep hearing it argued to be appropriate only in the largest libraries; in *Gray's* paper later in the volume the idea is called "utopian" (146)). Bone's version of the picket fence: reference sees cataloguing (in its use of *LCSH*, etc.) as "unresponsive" to local user needs, cataloguing sees reference as "unstructured and unsystematic" in its ignorance of code-complexity (68–69). The two attitudes come head to head in the argument of reference that, were cataloguing doing its job

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1985-2-110 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY

fully, *their* job would be much reduced so that they could get on with building the collection (the library): ". . . if the library is well organized, the user can somehow find what he wants!" (70) – But there are two diametrical ways of construing this pregnant sentence: Is what the user needs *here*, has it been selected? And, can the most relevant (for *this* user) among the totality of items be made to come forth merely by application of a (national and thus un-individualized) system? *N.D. Stevens* cautions against even hoping for this second possibility: online searching gives faster results than the card catalogue, but the reference person is still essential: "We should not expect to substitute efforts at subject analysis on the part of catalogers for those broader professional skills", i.e., of the reference person (111).

C. Ishimoto's paper is only implicitly relevant to the problem of function-relationship, by demonstrating some of the difficulties of reference use of *AACR*2-generated entries (thus casting doubt on one part of N.D. Stevens' contention that known-item searches are largely successful). Her most telling points exemplify parallel cases solved differently by (different) *AACR*2 principles: the most important of all principles, predictability, is thus destroyed in the expectations of referencers as well as users.

S. Stevenson and *G. Deiber* drive the point home: patrons ask for ILL of items held at their own library, because they do not find entries for such items in the split files caused by adoption of *AACR*2 (no mention, unfortunately, is made of such other factors in failure as filing-rules, which might well confuse users even prior to code-changeover). "A total of 32% of the errors" arose from "patron ineptness or carelessness" (91), i.e., from non-comprehension of *AACR*2 forms or choices of entry, or of the resulting split files.

D. Karpuk argues that in serials work, "service as the ultimate goal" (102) should mandate integration of the acquisition, cataloguing, and reference functions.

(N.D. Stevens' and F. Miksa's papers have been dealt with in their agreement/disagreement with earlier papers.)

S. Berman points out several deficiencies in standardized cataloguing: the library concerned with service must go beyond such lacks; must repair several "bad ideas"; must let ALA and LC know about local dissatisfactions with their products and decisions; must 'do it right' locally if national change cannot be brought about. He wonders whether PRECIS could solve the *LCSH* problem, but fears that the bureaucracy would only drag it down too.

R. Gray argues that the relation between cataloguing and reference is not mere interaction but "synergism" (he does not mention the third sector, collection development), thus each professional *should* do both cataloguing and reference – but then he backs away from his own argument as being utopian, not efficient (Cochrane's paper earlier in the volume, on the other hand, calls a similar shift "more realistic" (47)). The idea in his title, "Classification Schemes as Cognitive Maps", in that the mapping function derives from context and stability – and thus he attacks many recent relocation-changes in *DDC*, e.g., the placement in the OOOs (which should be nothing but a *form*-class) of *topics*. (I fear that he sees earlier editions of *DDC* as *good* cognitive maps just because of their familiarity and because of their superiority in collocation over that of the LC classification.)

J. Humphry and *J. Kramer-Greene* reply to Gray that such changes are supported by a majority of the vast apparatus of users involved in such decisions about relocation.

. . .

Can we do reference work without cataloguing having been done? Surely not. Does the quality of reference work depend on the quality of the antecedent cataloguing? Yes, to a large extent. Is cataloguing in American libraries being done at a high enough quality; and if not, is there a reason for this lack? Not really; and the reason is largely the standardized systems in use. What is to be done? –

What, indeed? To me, this volume gives no clear answer (though the ideas about integration seem the most promising, but not sufficiently defended, emphasized, or developed). But it is good that the questions have been raised, and that several directions have been suggested in which answers can be sought.

Jean M. Perreault

J.M. Perreault
Associate Professor of Bibliography,
The Library, University of Alabama in Huntsville, USA

KAULA, P.N.: **A Treatise on Colon Classification** New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd. 1985. XV, 314 p. Rs. 150.

Colon Classification is veritably considered the pet child of Ranganathan's brain. To get it due popularity, Ranganathan wished a popular yet authoritative "help book" explaining its mechanism and working to librarians of all ranks and intellect. He wished his famous disciple Professor P.N. Kaula to do that wished book. For one reason or the other, that project could not mature in Ranganathan's own life time. Nevertheless, such a book has always been at the top of Kaula's priorities; and now in his formal retirement from the Banaras Hindu University, it seems the first task he attended to. The result is the handsomely produced volume under review.

Prompted by the prominent place given to the Colon Classification in the curricula of Indian library schools, there have been published more than half a dozen books to explain the ins and outs of the system. This still is the first book on the CC from a person who remained so close to Ranganathan.

Kaula informs that he "had a series of letters from Ranganathan on the working of Colon Classification in particular. The bound seven volumes of the communication between the author and Ranganathan contain a number of letters elucidating, interpreting and the application of the numbers worked out through his scheme" (Preface, p. ix). Then outside the DRTC, who could be considered more authoritative than Professor Kaula? Inspite of this, he has taken full note of the work done by others and asserts that "the present work provides a different approach in analysing theory behind Colon

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1985-2-110 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY