one self-citation, understandable in a doyen, but could have been strengthened by Foucault: *L'ordre du discours* 1971 (in GROLIER). Phyllis A. RICHMOND reviews favourably (p. 413–5). However, "Overlapping (sic) fan-histories" need not be a mere compromise, possibly even a lattice?

WÅHLIN, E.: "The AR-Complex – Adapted systems used in combination with a common reference system" (p. 416–49). An exposition of product classification (Brussels Tariff) building documentation (A-Z system) combined with a simple reference grid. The bibliography, of 8 items, are all self-citations (one in GROLIER). The paper can well be read in conjunction with MÖLGAARD-HANSEN, see above, but PC in one is not PC in the other.

KEDROV, B. M.: "Klassikatsiya nauk. Ege printsipe. Ege tsiklicheskaya forma" (Classification of knowledge. Its principles. Its cyclic form) (p. 472–93). Bibliography *passim*. An author's abstract in E, F, D, with reference to GROLIER's citation to his "La classification des sciences" 1956, mentioned in §43, p. 492, would have been useful.

LACHARITÉ, N.: "Questions about 'classifiables' and 'classifiers' submitted as a commentary to various papers" (p. 494–503). 1) Refers to ASHWORTH (p. 494); 2), to SHEA (p. 494–5), 3) (p. 495–7) to LA FRANCE/HEELAN, 4) (p. 497–503) to FARRADANE.

DAHLBERG, Ingetraut: "Principles for the construction of a universal classification system: a proposal" (p. 450–71). The definitions (p. 450–1), contain some German words (p. 450) *Massgabe* = existence? "Knowledge fields consist of clusters" (p. 451). It would also be useful to define knowledge as "forms" and "fields". "A scientific discipline represents the last stage of a knowledge field" (p. 451). Here the question of "wissenschaftlich" arises. In English usage "scientific" still has natural science overtones, better to use "scholarly", "learned" or even „objective." This could well be a subject for the Düsseldorf group, whose influence is strong in this paper. The Postulates (p. 452–3), cover arrangement, contents, relations, notation and presentation. Two schemes are elaborated with schedules (p. 456–63) with decimal notation but certain free spaces at various places. A practical step is the collection of "field terms"; a fruitful proposal for "indicative" as well as "informative" indexing is made, (p. 464), why not in depth "evaluation" indexing?

Philosophy is dealt with (p. 464–6), with a neat hegelian triad. The thrust of the argument is towards "integrative levels" which leads to the theory of JOLLEY and the practical application of AUSTIN via Feibleman. There is a faustian pentagram (p. 468), illustrating the whole system described as "Ontologic-categorial". Perhaps it would have been better to concentrate upon the teleological before going into the ontological. Exegesis before hermeneutics! The bibliography, (p. 469–71), 28 items, has six authors who are in the Conference, three of these are editors of the *International Classification* journal, the mains fruit of the Conference? Five authors are also mentioned in GROLIER, two are also editors of IC and the other three contain two library theoreticans and St. Körner whose *Categorial frameworks* links the paper with AUSTIN.

A. J. Dickson

BARTELT, Frauke: **Standardlisten zur Schlagwortgebung.** Hilfsmittel der verbalen Sacherschließung in Bibliotheken (Authority lists for the assignment of subject headings. Aids for the verbal subject access in libraries) (In German). Köln: Greven Verlag 1978, 124 p. – BLI Heft 46: ISBN 3-7743-0546-3

This little book of 89 pages is based on an intensive study of the literature on subject heading lists; altogether 313 items are cited in the list of references (pp. 91–124). The book is a revised version of the author's thesis for the degree of "Assessor" at the Bibliothekar-Lehrinstitut, Köln. "Standardlisten" was translated by "authority lists" (for subject heading assignment). What is meant could also be expressed by "controlled vocabularies". It is concerned with those controlled vocabularies which are used in universal libraries; thesauri are treated only from a theoretical point of view (chapter 1). In chapter two the history of universal subject heading lists in the USA is traced, especially of those of the major ones, as e.g. Library of Congress Subject headings (LCSh), the Sears List, the one from the New York Public Library a.o. The third chapter focusses on the LCSh alone. Its structure and application by the Library of Congress is described and investigations for its improvement especially the ones from J. E. Daily towards "Classified Library of Congress Subject headings" as well as future plans concerning the discontinuation of the Library of Congress card catalogue beginning 1980 are taken into consideration. The fourth chapter provides a survey on the distribution of universal subject heading lists in other countries, such as Canada, Australia, Latin America, Spain, Italy, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Great Britain, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, East-Europe and Asia, Germany, Switzerland and Austria. In a final chapter the subject heading catalog is confronted with the subject heading list. The inconsistencies of the former must be seen to belong to its nature, a thesaurus-like and computer-controlled subject heading list may well serve to compensate for its shortcomings.

The book gives a wealth of information, it is also timely and well-written. It should be translated into English soon. An English version might bring along the necessary feedback from the authorities in other countries (Chapter 4) and would possibly reveal that the literature sources consulted were sometimes somewhat old. This holds also for the availability of English-language thesauri, there is some outdated information on the pages 2–3 regarding the thesaurus collection at the Case Western Reserve University, (see Intern. Classificat. 6 (1979), No. 1, p. 38: IINTE Clearing House).

I. Dahlberg