

seduced by a courtesan, Couperin laid hands on that very same *rondo* with a bizarre title, thinking that he would return it on the first appropriate occasion.” (p. 568).

Ambiguities and mysteries, a real stimulus for historians and musicologists. The bubonic plague disappeared, but whatever was left to be feared took other shapes even then, in the 17th century, by now infinitely multiplied and refined. The music, that strange *rondo* exists as well, regardless of who composed it, but can one still listen to it and be healed among bombs exploding in buildings, undergrounds, buses and trains? Then, there is always the danger of false idols, more harmful than the epidemic. Even if music could have been one of the causes of the sudden disappearance of the plague, arousing the conflict of the powers in a Europe now long gone, what other cures are being “composed” today in the laboratories of civilizations?

Now, in less serious a manner, a personal solution could also be experienced instead of appointments with psychoanalysts, a procedure both cheaper and more pleasant: listening (on CD) to the mysterious *rondo* of François Couperin.

The Pathological Nature of a Bibliography
Or
On a Bibliography – With a Non-Bibliographer’s Eyes

Emese G. CZINTOS
PhD Student, Central European University
Budapest

A hundred years ago the writing of a handbook was a much more prestigious endeavor than it is today. To state this as a fact, it is quite enough to take one glance at the reference room of any self-respecting old library: its shelves are burdened by series of lexicons, encyclopedias, collections, dictionaries, bibliographies, or handbooks of many volumes. Nonetheless, this is still the place from where any scholar of social sciences or the humanities starts his/her research even today. In new or modernized libraries (which, seen from where we are, still means “foreign” in the first place) all this can be accessed via electronic means, the magic words being: CD-ROM, database, Internet, and the like. The computer “sweeps away the dust” of old reference rooms – its importance is hard to be overestimated, it is much faster and more “sterile” in its

usage, but it undoubtedly fails to offer the atmosphere, the environment, and the intensity of a reference-room study. Because, even today, this kind of study requires the physical presence of the book.

The title of the book in this review is: *A romániai magyar társadalomtudományi irodalom bibliográfiája. Cikkék, tanulmányok, 1990-1999* (A bibliography of Hungarian social sciences literature in Romania. Articles, studies, 1990-1999)¹, collected and edited by Róbert Meister, bibliographer at the Department of Bibliographic Information and Documentation of the “Lucian Blaga” Central University Library in Cluj-Napoca, Romania. The first lines of the *Introduction* reveal that the present volume is a continuation of a previous one published in 2002². However, while the first volume was a selection of the social sciences literature of the period it encompassed (1946-1989), this second one processes the complete material from the period between 1990 and 1999, “making use of the experience gained during its [the first volume’s] edition, (hopefully) eliminating its mistakes and deficiencies, significantly improving the criteria of the collection of material and procession and the principles of organization, and increasing the number of thematic indexes”.³ A larger amount of material primarily means a larger number of genres included in the bibliography. While the first volume concentrated on studies only, this second volume also includes other subjects – reports, journalism, essays, interviews, works of literary history and theory, reviews, etc. The editor’s decision to include such genres will be highly valued by scholars who do not come from the narrower field of social sciences (as do sociologists, political science scholars, anthropology, etc.), but from other fields in the humanities. Thus, it can be used as an instrument of research by historians, literary historians, theoreticians of literature, philosophers, or even psychologists, offering an increased use as compared to the first volume. The justification of this decision – namely, that all interpretation and reception is socially and historically determined, the notions of literary theory and social sciences overlap, and thus practically any field of the

¹ Published in 2004 in Csíkszereda (Miercurea Ciuc, Romania), at the Pro-Print publishing house. (Henceforth referred to as *Bibliography*).

² Róbert Meister (ed.), *A romániai magyar társadalomtudományi irodalom válogatott bibliográfiája: Cikkék, tanulmányok, 1946-1989* (A selected bibliography of Hungarian social sciences literature in Romania: Articles, studies, 1946-1989), Csíkszereda (Miercurea-Ciuc, Romania): Pro-Print, 2002.

³ Introduction, in *Bibliography*, p. 5.

humanities can be relevant for social sciences¹ – also points out that the sharp differentiation of distinct disciplines is in fact an illusion. This does not only mean that the borders between disciplines are traversable, but, on a more general level, that the verbal representation of the world is multi-faceted, and it happens along notions, and not disciplines – as it is revealed, for instance, by continuously reading out the entries of the subject index.

The volume encompasses social science material of ten years (1990-1999), in a wide sense, alphabetically organized into 10 526 entries. A first interpretation of the bibliography, the first scientometrical, statistical analyses of material can be encountered in the *Introduction*, suggesting the directions of interpretation for the information processed in the volume. Following the *Introduction*, the main corpus of the book is also preceded by a list of the periodicals examined and a table of the subjects, through which the reader is offered a first-hand image of the processed material and the number of disciplines included. However, the real orientation in quantity and quality regarding the material occurs with the help of the indexes following the main work. In the case of a bibliographic work the indexes structured and edited in a clear and accurate way are just as important as the material itself, because – needless to say – when they are not there the material is practically unusable. In the author's words: "the information which is not labeled, wrongly labeled, or not adequately processed nowadays should be regarded as lost".² Therefore it is not surprising that the indexes comprise about half of the volume's full content. The *Introduction* gives a detailed account on the types and features of the indexes, not much can be added to that. There are seven kinds of indexes: authors index, reference name index (more than 3000 entries), discipline index, analytical subject index, index of institution types, index of institutions and periodicals, and geographical index. A trained bibliographer may have a much better idea than the writer of this review (herself not being a bibliographer) about the use of these indexes beyond information retrieval. However, even with the lack of a thorough theoretical and methodological training in this respect, it is obvious for me too that a bibliography, by the analysis of its indexes (and mainly of the analytical subject index and the reference name index), may reveal – and may also conceal – a great deal of further information as well. Such an attempt can be most interesting in both cases – and I shall return to it later.

¹ Ibid.

² *Introduction*, p.8.

Accordingly, an edition of a bibliography is not one of the most prestigious or important scientific endeavors. It is not a spectacular accomplishment as it is “merely” a great deal of data, and it does not offer new scientific results, as its task is to process the results already available.

Nevertheless, it is hardly possible to claim that a hardcover book of 780 pages, with dimensions of 24x17,5 cm, is not a spectacular work. Even more so its spectacular nature is not only due to its size, but rather to the qualities of Mr. Meister’s work such as gap filling, well-structured, thoroughly thought out, and offering an in-depth perspective. These last two qualities must be further emphasized, as many bibliographies can be gap-filling or well-structured without being well thought out and offering an in-depth perspective at the same time. At the last resort a bibliography is indeed a great deal of data, a juxtaposition of various data, often only according to alphabetical or chronological criteria: that is, a compilation. Compilation is the art of assembly, if it is not accomplished accurately enough, the cracks may show: the subject headings may not be precise enough, the indexes may not be analytical enough, the differentiation of disciplines may not be consistent enough, and so on. The guarantee for a well-assembled compilation is to be well thought out and to offer an in-depth perspective over the material it uses, because this is what makes a bibliography (*this* bibliography) coherent. This is how everything finds its right place within it, and this how its indexes work properly. These qualities can naturally be expected of any bibliography, but which, as it is, seem extraordinary enough to be distinctly mentioned...

The statistical analysis of the indexes of a bibliography of social sciences reveals the symptomatic – or rather pathological – nature of the genre of bibliography. It explores, observes, settles facts: it diagnoses, but prevention or curing is not one of its tasks (if for no other reason, then merely because of chronology). It has a descriptive nature, it offers data about a certain “disease” which will turn later into strategies of interpretation. The indexes – as previously mentioned – may reveal and may also conceal (or wrongly reveal) a lot about an age; that is, for lack of a proper methodology and approach, or of an adequate scholarly attitude it may be deceiving (or, remaining at the medical analogy, the diagnosis can be misleading). Previously to the retrospective analysis, the process of compilation may also contain factors of influence, selectivity in the first place. The criterion of selection may seem irrelevant in the case of a bibliography which claims to be comprehensive; but it is a criterion of selection in the first place – should we call it involuntary

selection – even to determine which texts to be included as relevant for social sciences and which not. This choice may depend on the editor's personal ideological preferences, value judgments, or other matters of principle even in the case of the most comprehensive of bibliographies. The situation is naturally somewhat different in the case of bibliographies which were meant to be selected in the first place; here the involuntary selection criteria are doubled by the criteria and relevance of voluntary selection. In both cases the necessity of the editor's objectivity cannot only be a requirement, or even less an illusion: it must be a constraint. Quoting the author once more: "It is not only about social determination, but also about the operation of those individual filters of communication which, made up of prejudices deriving from personal experiences and the process of socialization, lead to a selective perspective. To avoid this effect, the bibliographer must strive to offer the researcher different levels of information material and varied possibilities of interpretation in order to maintain his objectivity."¹

The analytical approach to the bibliography may have to face the same kind of problems. The necessity of objectivity is a constraint also in this case, yet it cannot be disregarded that the analyzer (whether a bibliographer, a sociologist, or simply a person who likes to think and comprehend) is not *tabula rasa*. All the data, names, or subject indexes offered by a bibliography cannot work without the analyzer's previous knowledge, leading to a kind of "situational subjectivity" (which may also be the cause of all the things one *cannot* find out from a bibliography).

Of the several kinds of possible investigations I shall try to perform the analysis of the analytical subject index and the authors and reference name indexes – however, without a claim to a methodologically based scientometrical or statistical analysis.

I. From the analytical subject index I have selected the words which appear most frequently in the processed material. Then I have organized them into thematic groups in order to map the most widespread social and political discourses of the period between 1990 and 1999. I have purposefully left out of the analysis those very general entries – e.g. *Romanian, Hungarian, Hungarian from Romania, Transylvanian, minority* – which are not peculiar to one discourse or another. The basis for organizing the thematic groups is the analyzer's previous knowledge or experience about the events of this period. Or, to put it the other way round: the categories are established on the basis of this previous

¹ *Introduction*, p. 6.

knowledge, comprising the subject headings, rather than being constructed by them. However, even in the case of pre-defined categories, one should rather speak of categories and subject headings which mutually complete and strengthen, and not exclude, each other.

The subject headings which occur most frequently – that is, those which contain the largest number of references next to them – can be organized into six categories. This means that there are six discourse groups which seem to have most clearly defined the mentality of the decade between 1990 and 1999. These groups are the following:

1. psychological/psycho-sociological discourse
2. minority/nationalist discourse
3. ethnological/anthropological discourse
4. sociological/political analytical discourse
5. general situation analysis discourse
6. cultural theoretical discourse.

This enumeration does not mean any kind of intended hierarchy, the only criterion of this order is the alphabetical order of the subject headings. The individual discourse groups can best be characterized by the enlisting of the pertaining subject headings. The first group – the psychological/psycho-sociological discourse – has a much lesser range than the other five. Its characteristic subject headings: *aggression, AIDS, family, deviancy, hate*.¹ The representatives of this discourse analyze the symptoms of that decade by the means and methods of social psychology, discussing general social problems, rather than referring to the situation of the Hungarian minority in Romania. However, the impact of this socio-psychological discourse is so reduced in comparison to the other five discourses that it is perhaps not quite appropriate to call it an individual discourse, but rather a more emphatic presence of one particular discipline.

The other group which is indeed a fully extended discourse, but again with no specific reference to the situation of the Hungarian minority in Romania (as its scope is much larger than that) is the fifth in the list, the general situation analysis discourse. In order to clarify the scope of this discourse, let me present some of its most characteristic entries: *“ceausism”* [referring to the period of Ceaușescu’s rule], *ensorship, gypsies, democracy, fascism, revolution, globalization, holocaust, Yugoslavian crisis, capitalism, communism, corruption,*

¹ Here and elsewhere, in the enlisting of the subject headings, I have kept the alphabetical order of the words in Hungarian. All the words are only referred to in English translation.

liberalism, orthodoxy, privatization, change of regime, socialism, totalitarianism. These entries clearly reveal that this discourse describes, discusses and evaluates the social and political changes which took place in the decade after the fall of the communist regime in Romania.

The other four discourses have a narrower scope. Each of these has as its object the analysis, from one perspective or another, of the situation of the Hungarian minority in Romania. Of these, the ethnological/anthropological discourse listed as the third is still popular today, it primarily examines the material and linguistic culture and traditions of the Hungarian minority in Romania, concentrating mainly on rural society. The subject headings defining this discourse are: *mother tongue, bilingualism, the "Csángós"* [an ethnic group of the Hungarians living in the Eastern part of Transylvania], *ethnography, village, carnival, folklore, traditional crafts, folk customs, language usage*; a part of these prove the interest in traditional ethnographic research (folk customs, tradition, rural research), others however betray an interest in anthropological and socio-linguistic studies (bilingualism, language usage, etc).

Closest to this discourse in its subject is the one listed on the sixth place, as it also deals with the cultural aspects of the age. The subject headings included into this discourse are: *drama, value, value system, philosophy and connected subjects, tradition, historiography, time, truth, interpretation, literature, literary criticism, Christianity, publishing, culture, myth, freedom, art, modern–postmodern, history, science*, that is, those works of the period which are primarily concerned with the theoretical, historical, and artistic achievements of minority existence in Transylvania.

The two most emphatic discourses are those listed in the second and fourth place, the minority/nationalist discourse and the sociological/political discourse. Their parallel and equally strong presence is not surprising, considering the fact that, albeit with somewhat changed proportions, these are still the main discourse types of Hungarian journalism and social-political publicity in Romania. It is not by chance thus that these two discourse types share the greatest number of common entries. Notions such as *autonomy, Romanians from Transylvania, ethnic/ethnicity, identity, ideology, minority, community, Hungarian university, nationalism, education, RMDSZ* [The Democratic Association of Hungarians from Romania], which are neutral in themselves, can equally be listed into either of the two categories, as they only gain their meaning when related to the other subject headings within

one category or the other. At the same time, it is with these categories that the reviewer might easiest be guided by her own preferences, prejudices, or subjectivity when grouping a term into one discourse or the other. There are entries nonetheless which indeed “speak for themselves”, as they have their own history within each of the two discourse types, and thus are not subject to such kind of “misplacement”. Such notions as *assimilation, discrimination, Transylvaniam* [a term used to denote a peculiar Transylvanian ideology beginning with the 1920s], *Trianon, etc.*, which is familiar to those acquainted with Transylvanian journalism as parts of the discourse of Transylvaniam of the 1920s, based on the elements of blame and martyrdom. On the other hand, there are notions such as *civil (society, sphere), communication, mass media, multiculturalism, publicity, regionalism*, terms which are spread in the Hungarian consciousness in Transylvania mostly as items of a more objective and scientific sociological-political analysis and journalism (mainly from the second half of the 1990s).

The sharp distinction of subject headings as implied by the categories defined above cannot be of course completely clear, since it occurs as an implicit association in the light of already known and predefined discourses. The same thing can be said also about terms which fit into one “box” or another only on the basis of this implicit association. Let us only think of headings such as *prejudice, emigration, faith, intolerance/tolerance, religion*, in the context of which the terms *autonomy, Romanians from Transylvania, ideology, identity, nationalism, Hungarian university, education* plus the specific words of the nationalist discourse enlisted above naturally imply a completely different interpretation of the situation than in the context of words such as *interethnic relationships, human rights, Europeanism, European integration, Central Europeanism* and the other specific words of the sociological discourse.

The distinct representation of these two discourses in the total material would justify a further division of the subject headings according to other criteria. On the basis of my previous knowledge of the situation, I consider that a further division of the material according to years would be practical, as it would point out the temporal changes and proportions of the two horizons of interpretation.

II. The analysis of the authors and reference name indexes also occur on the basis of premises similar to those of the analytical subject index analysis. That is, here also the reviewer’s previous knowledge will structure to some extent the interpretation of the names to be analyzed,

which thus carry their meaning in themselves, as they represent different conceptions, ideologies, standpoints.

I also performed two kinds of analyses on the name indexes. First, I selected the names which appeared most frequently in the indexes, trying to draw conclusions on the basis of these.¹ Then, I listed the foreign names (Romanian and other) which appeared most frequently in both name indexes for each periodical in part and in its totality, examining the quantity and quality of the non-Hungarian material.

Not surprisingly, the greatest number of authors appearing in the authors index are the journalists from Hungarian newspapers and reviews (accounting for more than 50 occurrences), thus these data do not carry any special significance. It is characteristic for the representatives of this category that most of their writings appear on the pages of the same periodical. Some of these are with the number of occurrences: Hugó Ágoston (103), Zoltán A. Bíró (66), László Bogdán (133), Péter Cseke (57), Gyula Dávid (68), Zsolt Gálfalvi (140), Ernő Gáll (127), Andor Horváth (67), Lajos Kántor (153), Aladár Lászlóffy (147), Zoltán Rostás (86), István Szöcs (117), etc.

These are followed by an average of 20 to 50 occurrences: this is a category of transition, which equally contains the representative type of the previous category (journalist, mainly writing for one particular review): Béla Bíró (24), Barna Bodó (22), Miklós Bakk (23), Tamás Jakabffy (22), but also predicts the dominant author type of the next category (occurrences below 20). These include in large numbers the names of known politicians, intellectuals, or public figures (especially those who have a greater affinity for writing): Péter Egyed (38), Éva Cs. Gyimesi (46), József Kötő (35), Nándor László Magyarai (46), Enikő Magyarai Vincze (39), to name but the most representative of names. Finally, the most dominant group of this category (as it only appears here) is that of the senior, though still active, generation of historians from Transylvania, working in the circle of the *Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület* (Transylvanian Museum Society): Elek Csetri (28), Ákos Egyed (57, but still pertaining to this category), István Imreh (45), Zsigmond Jakó (29), András Kiss (28), András Kovács (28). Their writings appeared mainly in the cultural historical reviews *Művelődés* (Culture) and *Erdélyi Múzeum* (Transylvanian Museum).

¹ I must note here that I ignored to analyzing separately the proportion of the occurrence of authors from Hungary; however, this criterion can be applied for further analysis.

The third category is the group of occurrences below 20, which is actually the most representative category of the three as it offers the greatest number of conclusions. Some important names from this category: István Berszán (10), Géza Domokos (18), Zsolt Láng (11), Béla Markó (18), Levente Salat (19), Sándor Szilágyi N. (15), Géza Szócs (12), László Tökés (13), László Vetési (18), etc. The names cover personalities who are active on the stage of Hungarian politics or intellectual life in Transylvania, and most of them belong to the category of the more liberal and objective intellectuals (see the fourth discourse group of the analytical subject index analysis). Regarding their “main occupation”, they are not (or they did not begin their career as) professional politicians, there are literary critics, poets, political studies specialists, linguists, or priests among them. They all published in the *Korunk* (Our Age) review (which has proved thus to be the most ideologically open periodical of the age), the next title appearing most frequently is *A Hét* (The Week) (with authors such as Berszán, Salat, Szilágyi N., Markó and Láng publishing here), and in certain cases the *Magyar Kisebbség* (Hungarian minority) (Tökés, Markó, Szócs). László Vetési – alone in this category – mostly published in the *Művelődés*. Further titles are the *Látó* (The Seer) and the *Helikon*, but both of them are important in a literary and cultural, rather than social-political, context.

It is difficult (and also risky) to settle the definite outlines of the intellectual orientation or preferences of one particular periodical only on the basis of this amount of data. However, if the results obtained above are corroborated with the distribution of foreign names in various periodicals, the two groups of data in each other’s completion may yield a clearer view on the matter.

I have examined the foreign (Romanian and other) names appearing in the two name indexes (authors and reference names) in two ways: firstly, according to the total amount of representative names, and secondly, according to their quantitative distribution in different periodicals. In this second category I made no distinction between Romanian and other foreign authors (this distinction in fact may lead to further analyses).

The list of foreign authors yields a quite representative appearance of contemporary European and American authors in practically any field of social sciences. Therefore this category may serve in the future as a precise instrument of research for the reception of Western philosophical, literary, sociological, or historical ideas, and it

may also represent the intellectual orientation of the social historical and theoretical thinking of Hungarians from Transylvania. (To offer but one example: the list of translated and cited foreign authors in the period between 1990 and 1999 is headed by Heidegger and Gadamer, while Foucault and Derrida, who are equally representative names of Western spiritual life, are overshadowed by Huntington – probably by his influential work, *The Clash of Civilisations* [1996] – and Bourdieu). There are some of the names with the number of their occurrences: M. Heidegger (52), H. G. Gadamer (33), S. P. Huntington (27), P. Bourdieu (25), J. Habermas (25), J. Derrida (22), F. Fukuyama (21), M. Foucault (18), J. Ortega y Gasset (15).

The proportion of Romanian names is higher than that of foreign names – which is in fact not surprising. Those who are most translated or cited are: Gabriel Andreescu (48), Andrei Pleșu (39), Emil Cioran (31), Mircea Eliade (21), Gabriel Liiceanu (20), Andrei Pippidi (19), Adrian Marino (18), etc. Both cases show first of all the presence of “great names”; it cannot be excluded though that a more detailed analysis of the numbers will alter this prediction. It is important to emphasize nonetheless that these Romanian authors – as proved by this simple numerical comparison – are canonized names of 20th century Romanian culture rather than young, contemporary authors. This fact may justly raise the question whether the Hungarian reception of, and reaction to, contemporary Romanian culture and journalism was indeed up-to-date during those ten years. The yearly analysis of the publication of Romanian authors will hopefully help to more accurately describe and understand the existence and nature of this reception/reaction in the future.

The distribution of Romanian and foreign authors in different periodicals first of all defines the image of these periodicals. The reviews discussed from this point of view are: *Korunk*, *A Hét*, *Látó*, *Helikon*, *Művelődés*, *Magyar Kisebbség*. The analyses (ignoring now the enumeration of all the authors) show the following picture: the range of foreign authors (both Romanian and other) is the largest in the *Korunk*. It is this periodical which seems most consistent (or I could also say programmatically) open to Romanian culture. The list of authors publishing in this review mostly pertains to the type presented above: the theoretical writings of social and cultural studies prevail. The profile of the *Helikon* is quite similar, with the difference that the number of foreign authors is lower than in the *Korunk*. The number of non-Hungarian authors is even lower in the *Látó* (at least in that part of the material

which was included into the Bibliography), and its orientation is even more theoretical and literary, in accordance with the primarily literary character of the review. It is probable that the fact or appearance of the prevalence of canonized authors published in periodicals during the decade 1990-1999 is primarily due to the continuous presence and cultural character of these three reviews on the Hungarian cultural scene in Transylvania. The *A Hét* shows a completely different picture: the proportion of non-Hungarian material is lower than in the other three reviews, the range of authors is much narrower, and the writings are largely journalistic. The *Művelődés* shows again a different direction, this has probably the most conspicuous material of all: it publishes the writings of curious foreign authors (Arabian, Polish, Japanese, Georgian, Danish), primarily from the field of ethnography or anthropology, in accordance with the cultural historical character of the review. The non-Hungarian material published in the *Magyar Kisebbség* shows once again a different image: it is quite reduced in number, but it is very clearly political in nature, especially concerning minority politics and theory.¹

Returning for a moment to the pathological nature of the bibliography: the categories and points of view used in this analysis can be the possible directions or topics of a pathological investigation which intends to diagnose the state of social sciences and thinking between 1990 and 1999. However, the prestige this diagnosis might enjoy in one age or another depends on whether anybody is interested in it in a given social situation or would rather ignore it. In such cases the (artificial) diminution of the importance and necessity of bibliography writing in the name of other, “socially relevant” and “ardently important” researches can be an excuse quite at hand. It is so because a bibliography is merely a great deal of data, as it has been quite satisfactorily proved, I hope, in the previous ten or so pages. Information collection and processing is not a priority, there are much more important investigations to undertake at any time, such as our history, literature, our situation as a minority nation, our values, subjects which are always eligible for any kind of support. This could have been perhaps the professional objection of the Advisory Board of the *Sapientia Foundation* when it decided in 2001 that the huge

¹ For the numeric analysis of the data I used the online version of the bibliography at <http://meister2.adatbank.transindex.ro>. This well structured database was a great help to me in finding the accurate numbers. The bibliography can also be accessed in database form at the Department of Bibliographic Information and Documentation of the “Lucian Blaga” Central University Library in Cluj-Napoca, and a CD-ROM version of the bibliography would also be welcome in the future.

work entitled *A Bibliography of Hungarian Social Sciences Literature in Romania. Articles, studies*. was not eligible for their funding. But how can all these historical, literary, minority researches be conducted without an accurate retrieval and processing of all the information and data available about the matter? How can we understand exactly what we are speaking about if we are deprived of data? How can we see clearly, without any kinds of ideological veils, what happened and what is happening today in Transylvania? How can we understand our (Transylvanian) selves?

Borrowing again the author's words, "among other things, it depends on this work if orientation will become easier in the increasing flood of information".¹

Trends and Senses

Marginals on a "technical history" of the
methods of information retrieval²

István KIRÁLY
Department of Philosophy
"Babeş-Bolyai" University, Cluj-Napoca

A history is "technical" when it does not propose to think expressively about the interiority of the meaning-connexions of the processes. Moreover, it proposes the reflection on the skeleton of methods through which something is internally organized – in time – into *trends*. However, such a "history" is and remains essential – thus with preparatory *utility* – for the problematizations, that will be capable of pointing at the horizon of *senses*...

Detailed analyses are needless in order to ascertain: the autochthon librarianship literature – especially maybe the one referring to questions regarding matters of "information and documentation" – remains pre-eminently restricted to problematizations and analyses with a

¹ Introduction, p. 8.

² Curta Olimpia: *Metode tradiționale și moderne de regăsire a informației în biblioteci (Traditional and Modern Methods of Information Retrieval in Libraries)*. Presa Universitară Clujeană – Colecția "Philobiblon" a Bibliotecii Centrale Universitare "Lucian Blaga", Cluj-Napoca 2004, 117 (155) p. The electronic version of the volume can be found at the address: http://www.bcuccluj.ro/re/oc/met_bib/