order. We are told (19) that the order of a compound subject's elements is not the same as the order of collocation–nor is it an inversion of any macro-order beyond the discipline–. This may seem true if we compare the order between categorial instantiations in a single subject-heading or class number with the order between (say) the natural and the social sciences; but it explicitly ignores (while it implicitly demonstrates, e.g. on 104) that the order between any two or more whole headings is wholly determined by the order of their categorial elements. And while a one-place catalog (mentioned above) is seen as necessarily (for the sake of consistency) being governed by citation-order rules, the possibility is raised of a factorial number of orders among the categorial elements of every compound heading–ignoring the most important of all factors in citation order, namely that order which confers meaning and which, when changed, changes meaning. The problem of the relation between the ultimate limits of ordered entities in the library (from categorial elements at the lowest limit to collocation of disciplinary domains at the highest) has not been solved, but it would seem that Langridge would at least be the one to try it (rather than, as here, shoving it aside) just because of his deep concern for the effect of outside (tool) disciplines as they form parts of the literature of any target discipline: if psychology, philosophy, sociology, physics, etc. are part of the literature of music, what order is best for them there and what retroactive effect does this order have on their order *as* disciplines on their own, rather than (as here) as secondary to the target discipline of music?

This brings me to the second major disagreement. (The answer to the question just above is that the problem is largely kept from arising for Langridge by virtue of his argument that each discipline is best kept all together, rather than being treated as secondary to various target disciplines. Thus we do not concern ourselves too much for the order between psychology of music, philosophy of music, sociology of music, and physics of music, as if they were parts of the target discipline of music (safer: the main class of music), because we prefer to let each such study be located within the 'applied' sector of each tool discipline.)

The primary example of this predilection of Langridge's is *history*:

> history is concerned with all aspects of human activity. Are not religious, intellectual and cultural history equal in importance to political, social economic? ... Economic history is not the history of economics; it is history written from a particular point of view. (40–41)

To which I counter: No, it is neither; it is the history of economic events, just as church history is the history of ecclesiastical events, etc. This does not in any way denigrate the general social-historical *importance* of economic history or of church history; but to be a source for general history does not make a document itself class with general history, as Langridge himself explicitly argues (41 f.) in the case of novels.

While the same sort of argument is applied to the philosophy of this and that target discipline (63), it is not so done for education, organization theory, etc. (perhaps because these are not within the humanities?). But then conflicts arise: archaeology should be compact, not strewn about with the history of the various sites (44: I wholly agree, but see this as contradictory of Langridge's own position; or is there a higher principle at work here which has not been made explicit?); in a special classification (here, of cricket) the tool disciplines must be kept inside the target discipline rather than be left in the 'fringe' (113).

Another fairly serious objection: why the confining of the authorities cited to English-language ones only? In particular, why no use of Gardin, Soergel, or Dahlberg?

All in all, then, though there are points that occasion serious debate, this volume is a worthy exemplification and explication of Langridge's assertion (which I wholeheartedly endorse) that "the central discipline of librarianship ... [is] classification." It is true both that the general organization and conduct of the argument is exemplary and that the detail is appropriate and illuminating. Many of these details are worth individual commendation:

- the insistence that characteristics on which to class must be obvious and generally agreed on, and non-judgmental (35, 48);
- the argument that dictionaries and the like do not well enough show the use of concepts (especially in compounds) to be used as the sole basis of the analysis of a vocabulary for a special classification (99);
- the urging that history schedules include a facet for kinds of event (55);
- the well-organized and carefully argued distinction between the several types of indexing.

In this last instance we see well how fundamental classification is to librarianship and indeed to any serious intellectual endeavor: it is the analysis of indexing into its facets and foci and their re-synthesis into the named types which renders the discussion so clear and fruitful. Langridge fully justifies his assertion (V) of "the educational (rather than merely instrumental) value of classification" in this work, at both the macro- and the micro-level.

J. M. Perreault

MALTBY, Arthur (Ed.): **Classification in the 1970s: a second look.** London: Clive Bingley 1976. 262 p. ISBN 0-208-01533-7.

The blurb states that this book "has been revised in the light of developments in classification during the first half of the present decade." Apart from the General Introduction and an interesting new paper by Karen Sparck Jones, the actual revisions could probably be accommodated comfortably on about five pages. One measure of them can easily be made by studying the citations; this journal, *International Classification*, which one would have thought rated at least a mention, is quoted once, in reference to a little-known piece of specialised work by A. J. Mayne.

The papers cover the same ground as before: the main general schemes, and a series by B.C. Vickery, E.M. Keen, D. Austin, and R. R. Freeman, mostly on classification because their original efforts were, on the whole, forward-looking, and not a great deal can happen in five years. It must have been difficult to arouse any enthusiasm for real revision so soon. Even the chapter on the

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1977-1-47 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY

Decimal Classification of Dewey shows little change apart from a paragraph on the Abridged 10th edition, and a couple of pages on the 18th. The Broad System of Ordering, surely an important new development, should have had separate treatment, but comes in only in the Introduction and the paper by Lloyd on the U.D.C.

Vickery's paper still contradicts Keen's, and so does the citation of work by Troller (p. 205), showing the value of classification in a real-life situation, whatever may happen in the seclusion of a library schol! This view is now further reinforced by Sparck Jones, who states that "In 1976 the status of automatic information classification is unclear", and concludes that "apparent prospects for automatic classification for library purposes are not very bright . . . However, classification is a general requirement of information management"; so the work on constructing a general theory must go on.

The disappointing paper by D. Austin gives in my view only a very partial account of "The C.R.G. research into a freely-faceted scheme", and I take issue with many of his statements. He says (p. 165) that a classification based on main classes finds it difficult to insert new topics, yet in the very same paragraph admits that "knowledge advances more through the juxtaposition of already familiar concepts, perhaps in unexpected ways, rather than in the evolution of entirely original ideas". Familiar concepts will, I imagine, already be in the schedules of any scheme, and it is precisely the virtue of faceted classification that it can cater for new and even unexpected co-ordinations. Later (p. 174) Austin criticises Integrative Level theory as containing some "doubtful logic", giving as an example that it leads to branching structures, not a linear sequence. This was pointed out in the first C.R.G. discussions of this theory (see *Sayers Memorial Volume*), and all his other objections have in fact been foreseen in relating Integrative Level theory to General System Theory; there are several publications dealing with this, none of which are quoted here. Austin's "new approach" (p. 186) to subject index production is not new; it has been tossed around frequently in discussions on KWIC and KWOC indexes for years.

Thus one cannot extend a welcome to this book. Not only are there few "second looks", but it seems to me to reveal a very unfortunate trend in the field of classification. The further away one gets from actual readers, in index factories or library schools, the less one appreciates the role that classification actually plays in reader service. Fortunately, information officers and special librarians who face real life problems with enquiry work continue to "vote with their feet"; classification is a basic human mental process, and is not likely to be superseded, even by computers.

D. J. Foskett

WERSIG, G., NEVELING, U. (Comp.): **Terminology of Documentation**. A selection of 1200 basic terms published in English, French, German, Russian and Spanish. Paris: Unesco Press. München: Verlag Dokumentation 1976. 10+274 p., DM 55,–

This multilingual set of definitions lists some 1200 terms in English, with definitions in English, and translations of the terms in French, German (including five cases giving different West and East German usage), Russian and Spanish. The terms are classified into 5 main groups, subdivided into a total of 35 sections, notated by numbering the section by the group number and the section number in a pseudo-decimal notation (e.g. group 3 runs from 31, through 39, to 315) and then by numbers reflecting the alphabetical arrangement of words in the section, (e.g. 310–28 for "subject heading"). There follows a UDC index to the sections and sometimes individual words of the directory. Finally, there are alphabetical indexes in each language, referring to the section number.

A previous approach, by the same 'authors' as editors, in only German, English and French, with definitions in German, was published by the Verlag Dokumentation, alone, in the previous year, and this has been reviewed in Intern. Classificat. 3 (1976) p.109. That review listed various errors; most of these do not appear in the present work, and it is not clear how much the two are correlated. There is no mention, in the present book, of the German work. The present work contains, however, many other errors.

The method of presentation is peculiarly, and often irritatingly, unhelpful. A classification of terms can be helpful, but it is not the principle one needs in searching for definitions. One can find words most easily in their alphabetical order, and one needs to have the definitions attached to them in that position. The classification could then be helpful as an appendix, and the initial word list would then of course refer the reader to the appropriate classified section for location of related terms. As it is, the different groups of the compilers' classification inevitably cut across the groups which other people might have in mind (as the cross-references show), and the alphabetical order within each section is not classification! If the classification was in an appendix, it could be more accurately prepared (although a good classification of the wide field would not be easy to make). One is thus driven to look for terms first in the alphabetical index, and to go from there to the classified definition section. Even then, reference is not easy as the code numbers are printed between the words (and their translations) and the definition, and are not too easily found, even though they are in bold type; the use of running headings does not much help.

The main consideration must however be the words and their definitions and translations. Since the definitions are in English, it is mainly from the English standpoint that they must be judged. A number of the terms seem unnecessary, being obvious compounding of terms (e.g. 'classification research'–the first term in the vocabulary!); or standard dictionary words, e.g. 'fact'–and here its definition as a "state of things or relation between things" is incorrect: a fact is 'a thing known to be true or to have occurred'–; or out-of-date words, e.g. "relevance ratio"–now always called 'precision'–and "relevance factor" [what is this?] and "precision ratio" [incorrect] entered as sub-terms; also "ramisyllabic notation" (syllabic notation is also listed). On the other hand, some words are obvious mangled translations of German compound terms, e.g. "dialogous search" (correctly 'interactive search', which is not given), or "Leihing library" (presumably 'lending library'), or "express information". Some of the definitions are inadequate, or wrong. For

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1977-1-47 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY