Kalküle, die Ableitung vieler relevanter Theoreme und – wo das möglich ist – Beweise der Widerspruchsfreiheit und Vollständigkeit. Beim Durcharbeiten etwa von Beweisen in komprimierter Darstellung wird der Leser einige Druckfehler als besonders lästig empfinden. Er wird aber, sofern er an den Problemen interessiert ist, auch dann Gewinn aus der Lektüre ziehen, wenn er mit formal schwierigen Passagen – wie vom Verfasser empfohlen – großzügig blätternd verfährt.

Wolfgang Heydrich

HENDERSON, Kathryn Luther (Ed.): **Major Classification Systems: The Dewey Centennial**. Urbana–Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library Science 1976. XIV, 182 p. = Allerton Park Institute 21. ISBN 0-87845-044-0

For survival, a classification scheme, like a human being, has to face vicissitudes. In this sense, DDC has stood up with its values. It is the only scheme to complete one hundred years – a full-life span of a human-being according to the *Vedas* – and has retained its acceptance in many libraries throughout the world. Notation, especially its simplicity, is the secret beauty of this scheme as emphasised by Mr. Dewey himself.

Allerton Park Institute No. 21, a fine contribution in collective, is devoted to classification in general and to a critical appraisal of the DDC in the current context. It is made very interesting by contributions of *David Batty*, *John P. Comaromi, Margaret Cockshutt, Mary Ellen Michael, Joel Downing, Gordon Stevenson, Peter Lewis, Hans H. Wellisch, Derek Austin* and *Paule Rolland-Thomas.*

While tracing the growth of library classification *Batty* emphasises the impact of intellectual climate on classification design, and terms Ranganathan's analytico-synthetic classification as the final word in sophistication – a watershed – in the classification design. His overview is that faceted classification expounded in Ranganathan's as well as UDC schemes is a natural transformation in tune with time, like an egg laid hatching into a bird later. DDC protagonists, however, not agreeing with this, have scrupulously avoided the use of punctuation marks as facet indicators in their schemes – a point in favour of DDC and its simplicity in mechanising shelf arrangement. Batty has caught the heart of the problem of maintenance of the general scheme for classification by rightly emphasising as "it would be a mistake to see those shelf classifications only as listing mechanisms, their makers described them explicitly also as a means of naming and locating subjects, and tracing relationships among subjects." – *Comaromi* traces the origin, source and continuity of the DDC scheme in his paper in a fascinating way. Mrs. *Cockshut* investigates the influence of Ranganathan and CRG in developing DC-17 and 18, and brings the stream of thinking which culminated in Ranganathan's general theory of classification. *Mrs. Michael* shows how the DDC is keeping itself up to date not losing sight of the importance of satisfaction to the clientele. Change, particularly in relation to Phoenix Schedules, is said to be a great danger for its popularity. And yet, DDC's life concern for meeting the current demand for subject structure is reflected by the Phoenix schedules. The author ruefully says "at best DDC ist accused of being the only baby in the world who cries." *Downing* sets the use of Dewey in Britain and tries to explain how the fervour of Ranganathan's ideas had their impact on the use of DDC in BNB and its later development – interactive contribution of Britain with the Forest Press. He pleads for a truly international role of DDC. *Stevenson* brings in an excellent relief, the relationship between LCC and DDC. A set of criteria has been developed to assess the relative merits. The summum bonum of the reclassification problem is the dynamics of change and resistance to change – a true case study for diffusion research.

Peter Lewis discusses the use of DDC along with the LCC, UDC and Bliss. Because of the structure of these general schemes being discipline-oriented, the problem arises in adopting them in missionoriented institutional libraries. The most widely used scheme in Britain is DDC. But it did not rate very high in its total value for libraries although it proved to be the best scheme in question. The study suggests DDC cannot equal an ideal classification scheme for a general library, yet it is the nearest among the existing schemes. *Wellisch* highlights the links between DDC and UDC, although in recent years, there are marked differences in their structure particularly in relation to class 4. He mentions also the role of the Broad System of Ordering and its possible impact on classification research. *Derek Austin* says that PRECIS is not classification linked approach, but acts as a symbiotic foil to the DDC system. By its very genesis, PRECIS has links with DDC as shown in BNB, although it does not link its "role operators" totally with DDC's structuring of the Universe of Knowledge. Indeed Austin believes in relieving of DDC from its notational expressiveness to high precision, and leaves PRECIS to do that in subject catalogues. Mrs. Rolland-Thomas brings an excellent synthesis in the short span of the essay on "Future role of classification" the findings of totemic classification as delineated by Lévi-Strauss, and of the contradiction of Kedrov and Piaget regarding static and dynamic classification. She introduces Piaget's "Epistemological levels" and "Circle of the sciences" in a purposive manner and suggests research in library classification in this direction. Her conclusion is that "the future of classification for information retrieval lies in the confrontation of economics and the intrinsic value of research and its application". This stress of economics in spite of the need for situational changes in the structure of subjects in different types of libraries, has been leading us to tend towards "standardised models" in classification.

The panel of reactors have rightly emphasised the need for the United States to get into deep waters of classification in order to derive a multiplier effect than look at it as "mark and park" device. The user behaviour during browsing and assimilating information and its relevance to design of classification has been suggested for investigation.

The Allerton Park document is well edited and printed. If one pains to know whatever lively discussion these papers might have generated in the Institute one will be disappointed, they could not be reported. But the symposium of papers itself contains a fund of knowledge for practitioners and theorists.

M. A. Gopinath

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1979-2-130 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY