2

Defining the Object of Study

Specifying the object of study, establishing the boundaries of the subject, are the first tasks of any new intellectual discipline. By so doing, it differentiates itself from other, rival disciplines. Although drawing a circle around a certain body of material may be essential in order to found a discipline, the very act gives rise to arguments about limits. Necessarily, it also disrupts the totality and continuity of reality and thereby prompts questions about the relations between inside and outside.

Design historians agree that their object of study is the history of design, but there is not yet a consensus concerning the meaning and scope of the term/concept 'design'. For example, does design include architecture? Is architecture part of the object of design history or art history or is architectural history an independent discipline in its own right? Similar uncertainties arise in respect of the crafts, the minor or decorative arts and the mass media. In relation to the latter, design is undoubtedly a *part* of film-making, television production, pop music and advertising but these are also the concern of film, media, cultural studies and sociology. Consequently, there is plenty of scope for territorial disputes.

What is certain is that the boundary line of any discipline is fuzzy rather than sharp and that it overlaps the circles of several other disciplines.

The Word/Concept 'Design'

'Design' is a word which occurs in many contexts: a design, graphic design, fashion design, interior design, engineering design, architectural design, industrial design, product design, corporate design, design methods. It is not immediately obvious that a

common essence underlies all these different usages. Ludwig Wittgenstein's notion of family resemblance may be more appropriate as a linking concept than the idea of a single essence.[1]

Like all words and concepts, 'design' gains its specific meaning and value not only because of what it refers to but also differentially, that is, via its contrast with other, neighbouring terms such as 'art', 'craft', 'engineering' and 'mass media'. This is one reason why definitions of 'design' which purport to encapsulate an essential meaning tend to be so unsatisfactory. And, like most other words, 'design' causes ambiguities because it has more than one common meaning: it can refer to a process (the act or practice of designing); or to the result of that process (a design, sketch, plan or model); or to the products manufactured with the aid of a design (designed goods); or to the look or overall pattern of a product ('I like the design of that dress').

Another reason why definitions are inadequate and provisional is that language, like everything else, is subject to historical change. The word 'design' has altered its meaning through time: during the Renaissance '*disegno*' (which in practice meant drawing) was considered by art theorists such as Vasari to be the basis of all the visual arts; consequently these were often referred to as 'the arts of design'. At that time *disegno* described the inventive, conceptualizing phase which generally preceded the making of paintings, sculptures and so forth. All artists engaged in design as part of their creative activities, hence design was not yet considered the exclusive concern of a full-time professional. Designers as such only emerged later as a result of the growing specialization of functions which occurred in Europe and the United States as part of the industrial revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. At least this is the generally accepted story. A different view is held by Simon Jervis whose ideas will be considered shortly. Thus, eventually, design came to mean a full-time activity undertaken by trained specialists employed or commissioned by manufacturers. The designer did not normally make the product he or she designed.

It is clear from the above that any comprehensive history of design ought to include a history of the evolution of the concept 'design' as well as a history of designers and designed goods. Such

a history would need to explain the emergence of design as distinct from art and craft, and trace its subsequent development in relation to the changing status of the latter as a result of the transition from a feudal to a capitalist mode of production and the growth of industry, engineering, technology, mass production and mass media/communication. It would also need to clarify the meanings and usages of older expressions such as 'art manufactures', 'the industrial arts', 'the applied arts', 'commercial art', 'ornament' and 'the decorative arts'. An examination of the fluctuating fortunes of these terms would be valuable because changes of nomenclature are one sign of changes in material reality.

During the 1980s, when design was promoted as the solution to Britain's industrial decline, the words 'design' and 'designer' took on a new resonance. They became values in their own right. For example, people spoke of 'designer jeans' (and even 'designer drugs', 'designer socialism'). Since all jeans are designed, the adjective was redundant but its use demonstrated how 'the design' was being perceived as a desirable attribute rather than the product as a whole. One journalist described 'designer' as a marketing trigger word. Part of the same process was an emphasis on the names of particular designers – a Katherine Hamnett T-shirt, a James Stirling museum, an Ettore Sottsass sofa. This habit derived from the fine arts where the signature of the artist was the guarantee of uniqueness, authenticity, individuality and creativity. In the end what counted was not the suitability and practicality of the designed object but merely the fact that it was by such and such a famous name. The designer's label on the product became more important than the product itself.

The Scope of the Subject

Novice design historians can be intimidated by the sheer number and variety of topics with which they are expected to be familiar. As an indication of the range and heterogeneity of the field, consider the subjects covered by the volumes displayed in London's Design Centre Bookshop: graphics, packaging, cinemas, streamlining, design for the disabled, the grammar of form and colour, signs and symbols, ergonomics, human factors

engineering, anthropometry, town planning, textiles, ceramics, fashion, office lighting, interior design, modelmaking, transportation, arts and crafts, engineering, consumerism, copyright, safety standards, solar energy systems, patenting, shops and shopping, theories and methods of design, famous designers, art and design schools and academies, the design of nations and epochs, the styles of design, housing, landscape design, computers, computer-aided design, typography, histories of invention and industrial processes ... the list is apparently endless.

Of course, some of these topics can be considered more central than others. It would be possible to arrange them in an order: central, closely related, marginal. The boundaries between design, art, craft, engineering and mass media are not sharply defined and some subjects, such as architecture, appear to overlap several realms. (Architecture can involve art, engineering, craft methods and industrial production.) As human knowledge develops both quantitatively and qualitatively, an increasing tendency towards fragmentation and specialization occurs. Whereas, initially, architectural history included design - because the discipline was based on great modern architects who also designed furniture and fittings - design history is now a separate field. Similarly, one finds that the subjects of art, craft, design, architecture, photography and film all have their separate museums and institutions. In part, these divisions represent real, material conditions: in the twentieth century the various arts have tended to go their separate ways. At the same time, such divisions have their disadvantages: mixed-media forms, for example, tend to be neglected because they cut across several categories and thus appear to belong to none of them. Pop music, for example, involves music, singing, clothes, make-up, hairstyling, musical instruments and sound systems, stage sets, lighting, record covers, posters, promotional goods, still photography, film, video and television. In London it is the National Sound Archive and the Theatre Museum which take most responsibility for collecting and preserving material in this field.

As yet London does not have a museum of industrial design. One is due to open at Butler's Wharf in 1989, but even then the design historian will still need to visit many other places and

institutions if the full range of design is to be scanned. For instance, London has museums of the applied arts, science and engineering, furniture, aircraft, transport, weapons of war, plus several eighteenth-century stately homes and a William Morris museum, all of which contain examples of designed artefacts. As far as architecture is concerned, the whole city provides a conspectus of design through the ages. In terms of consumer goods, no design museum, however large, is likely to be able to match the quantity of contemporary examples to be found in large department stores like Selfridges and Harrods.

While theorists strive to draw ever sharper boundaries around the realms of art, design, craft and so forth, their efforts are constantly undermined by practitioners who delight in working in the gaps between realms or who combine them in unexpected ways. (Creativity appears to flourish at margins and interfaces.) Design historians thus find themselves confronting hyphenated beings called 'artist-designers' and 'designer-craftpersons' and hybrid artefacts which are half furniture and half sculpture. A cross-section of this kind of experimental work is gathered together in the volume *New British Design* (1986) edited by John Thackara. By celebrating the 'strange, impractical and uneconomic artefacts' of a number of advanced designers this text reproduces the avant garde versus the mainstream, minority/majority, syndrome so familiar from the history of modern art.

Design historians can limit their object of study by concentrating upon examples of good or exceptional design. Hence the popularity of texts about the work of famous architect-designers or about so-called design classics or cult objects. This approach is derived from art history and architectural history. In the latter, for example, a qualitative distinction is often made between distinguished and undistinguished structures: a cathedral is an example of architecture, whereas a bicycle shed is a mere building. Since, in most cases, high quality structures are those designed by professionally-trained architects, the high/low distinction is equivalent to the professional/amateur distinction.

While some design historians ignore anonymous, vernacular design on the grounds of low quality or because there is too

much of it, others, influenced by the anthropologist's concept of material culture as embracing all the artefacts of a society, seek to encompass all designed goods – good, bad and indifferent – whether by professional designers or not. The quantity problem, they contend, can be overcome by selecting representative examples. Good design histories are problematical, they argue, because of the contentious issue: whose taste or preference determines good and bad? Are the tastes and value judgements of the historian or design world experts to prevail over those of other social groups? A negative answer does not mean, however, that the issue of the historian's value judgements and the question of quality can be dispensed with altogether. In this regard it would be helpful if design historians distinguished between their personal assessments and those of others and tried to explain any divergence of views. It would also be useful to examine changes in value judgements over time.

While design historians may agree that the central focus of their research is the designer, the design process and designed goods, other topics such as style, taste, the role of clients, management, marketing and consumers also need to be investigated. Furthermore, these topics cannot be studied in isolation because they are aspects of a dynamic system which itself is part of a larger social and historical process. (See Chapter 5.) It is for this reason that however sharply the boundaries of the subject are drawn, sooner or later the design historian has to address external factors.

Definitions of Design

Many texts on design include a definition on the assumption that the theoretical problems of specifying the discipline's object of study can be solved in this way. Scepticism concerning the value of such definitions has already been expressed, but we can review a small sample to assess their strengths and weaknesses. Three definitions of industrial design will be considered. (As far as many scholars are concerned, design *is* industrial design.)

Design is what occurs when art meets industry, when people

> begin to make decisions about what mass-produced products should look like.[2]

This definition, by Stephen Bayley, locates the origin of design with the advent of industrialization and mass production methods. (The idea that design is the result of a marriage between art and industry was common in the 1930s when design was often referred to as 'industrial art'.) Bayley does not supply a time or place for the union and he seems to think design is limited to issues of visual appearance and style – function and utility are not mentioned. The use of the word 'people' is vague: it does not reveal who has the power to make design decisions.

> Industrial design is a process of creation, invention and definition separated from the means of production, involving an eventual synthesis of contributory and often conflicting factors into a concept of three-dimensional form, and its material reality, capable of multiple reproduction by mechanical means. It is thus specifically linked to the development of industrialisation and mechanisation that began with the Industrial Revolution in Britain around 1770 . . .[3]

Clearly, this is a more complex and sophisticated definition. The advent of design is located both historically and geographically and it is differentiated from craft production. One weakness is that the role of the consumer or the market in influencing the design process is not mentioned. The definition describes an impersonal process – designers do not appear. By specifying 'three-dimensional form' the author appears to exclude two-dimensional products such as advertisements.

> The industrial designer is a technical specialist in visual appeal . . . [he] is retained by a manufacturer with one object only: to increase the demand for his products through their increased attractiveness to the consumer. He is paid by the manufacturer according to his success in achieving that object. The industrial designer stands or falls upon his ability to create and maintain profitable trade. He is first and foremost an industrial

> technician and not primarily an educator of public taste. Under existing conditions his business must be to make profits for his employers.[4]

This description has the merit of frankness about the role of the twentieth-century designer as a servant of capitalism ('existing conditions'). Designers are employees, they sell their mental labour-power to manufacturers in return for wages or fees; the primary motive of their employers is private profit. Four weaknesses can be detected: first, design is limited to visual appearance (function is not cited); second, the fact that designers are also employed in the public sector where the ethos is often social utility rather than profit, is ignored; third, only men appear to be designers; fourth, the industrial designer is conceived of as the sole 'author' of the products in question, though the role of consumers is hinted at.

These three definitions necessarily exclude other design activities taking place outside the industrial context, that is, designing undertaken by non-professionals. (For example, someone who designs and makes their own clothes or someone who customizes their scooter.) For this reason it would be unduly restrictive to equate design solely with industrial design.

Among contemporary design historians the dominant definition is the modern one, that is, design as a specialist activity associated with the industrial revolution, mass production manufacture, the modern movement in architecture, and the consumer society. There are, however, a few dissenting voices. One is Simon Jervis, a furniture expert, museum curator and author of *The Penguin Dictionary of Design and Designers* (1984). He is critical of the modern definition on the grounds that it excludes so much design dating from the period 1450 to 1800 and because it is anti-ornament like modernist design theory. Jervis' conception of design can be called, therefore, 'pre-modern' or 'anti-modern'. Jervis ingenuously admits that 'the question of the definition of design is begged'. Nevertheless, even if it is not explicit some concept of design must be implicit in the book by virtue of what it includes and excludes.

Jervis gives most attention to ceramics, furniture, glass, interior

decoration, ornament and textiles. Graphics, consumer durables and typography are touched upon to a lesser extent while heavy industrial, theatre and dress design are 'almost wholly excluded'. Jervis sees design as closely linked to art and architecture hence he features biographies of many artists and architects. Pre-modern design, he argues, was the province of goldsmiths, engravers, sculptors, painters and architects. They produced engraved designs and cartoons for making such things as furniture, metalwork and tapestries. These designs were chiefly concerned with decoration and ornament. A clear distinction is made between designers and craftsmen. The former are judged to be superior in status and are regarded as generating luxury goods for the ruling strata, the wealthiest sector of society.

This dictionary proved controversial within the design history profession. An acrimonious exchange of letters occurred in the *Design History Society Newsletter* following a critical review.[5] Polytechnic historians felt that Jervis was unduly narrow in his definition of design and lamented the exclusion of fashion and engineering. They also considered that the emphasis in any dictionary of this kind should be on the modern design of the past 200 years and also that more women designers should have been featured. Jervis responded by claiming that the polytechnics' concept of design history had been 'created by committee'. No doubt to outsiders the dispute will seem a storm in a designer teacup. However, it did illuminate the fact that different institutions - museums, polytechnics - tend to generate different, antagonistic conceptions of design based upon their separate histories and social functions.

As the dispute between Jervis and his critics revealed, engineering is a bone of contention among design historians. While on the one hand the subject has more to do with science and technology than with design, craft and the decorative arts, on the other hand design *is* undertaken by engineers. In fact, in many cases they design the machines which make the products other designers design. Because engineering design is highly technical in character and primarily concerned with function, it lacks the visibility and glamour of other kinds of design. Furthermore, the huge size of some of their structures precludes their display

in shops or design exhibitions. Gui Bonsiepe once criticized a design show on precisely these grounds and regretted the domestic bias of its organizers: 'There was a total absence of producers of capital goods such as agricultural equipment and tools, manufacturing and building machinery. The narcissistic preoccupation with the perfection of the living room predominated.'[6]

Another dissenting voice is that of Victor Papanek (b. Austria 1925), a professional designer and ex-dean of the school of design at the California Institute of the Arts. His polemical book *Design for the Real World: Human Ecology and Social Change* (1972) is a sustained critique of modern industrial design and a plea for a different kind of design serving the needs of the poor, the sick, the handicapped and the peoples of Third World countries. Papanek's conception of design is also, to a certain extent, anti-modern but, unlike Jervis', his outlook is not traditionalist. His conception of design can be called 'libertarian', 'alternative' or 'ecological'.

His book begins with an all-embracing definition:

> All men are designers. All that we do, almost all the time, is design, for design is basic to all human activity. The planning and patterning of any act towards a desired, forseeable end constitutes the design process ... Design is composing an epic poem, executing a mural, painting a masterpiece, writing a concerto. But design is also cleaning and reorganizing a desk drawer, pulling an impacted tooth, baking an apple pie, choosing sides for a back-lot baseball game, and educating a child ... Design is the conscious effort to impose meaningful order.[7]

The problems inherent in this definition are obvious and multiple.

Feminists will note the absence of women. Apparently, design includes art, poetry, music, dentistry, cooking, sport and education! It is also motivated by a utopian socialist perspective: the truism that design is a process all human beings engage in to some extent ignores the specialized, professional character of design in modern society though, in fact, Papanek later attacks the design profession for failing to meet the real needs of

humanity. He also observes: 'The ultimate job of design is to transform man's environment and tools and, by extension, man himself.' This remark is valuable because it highlights the fact that design has a feedback effect upon human beings: it is not merely environmental change that is taking place but also self-transformation - for good or ill.

Design, for Papanek, is primarily a problem-solving activity. He provides a much more precisely defined notion of design via a diagram which he calls 'the function complex'. Around the central core of function are clustered six interlinked concepts - use, need, telesis, method, aesthetics, association.

It should be clear by now that the various definitions of design discussed above are inflected by the different ideological-political positions of those who devise them. Materialist historians of industrial design may argue: 'Our definition is the most objective, we simply try to describe the world as it is.' No doubt Papanek would respond by saying: 'It is not sufficient to accept the world as it is, our conception of design ought to encompass the world as it might be.'

The Concept 'Design': Open or Closed?

Who determines what the concept 'design' encompasses? Is design, like art, an 'open' concept in the sense that it can be extended, revised, changed? In answer to the first question: it is primarily the design world (that is, those professionally concerned with design - designers, critics, historians, museum curators, clients and associated institutions) who determine the contemporary meanings of the term 'design'. However, the fact that design has changed its meaning historically suggests that it is possible for individuals and groups to propose new definitions, new objects of study. Whether the design world and society as a whole accepts these new proposals is another matter.

Given the fact that design history is a new discipline, it is somewhat surprising that concepts of design have so quickly become conventional and orthodox. For example, new research on design usually focuses upon an extremely narrow range of

topics: consumer goods, public transport, advertising, the home, etc. 'Safe' topics predominate. Why are design historians so unimaginative? Why are they so reluctant to consider military weapons, police equipment, scientific instruments, sexual aids, space vehicles, engineering machines, computer hardware and software, the role of the state in promoting design, the relation of design to pollution, profit and exploitation, as topics worthy of analysis? There appears to be a deeply-entrenched conservatism among design historians, an unwillingness to confront the relationship between design and politics, design and social injustice. Regrettably, a great deal of design in the twentieth century has been directed towards anti-social and anti-human ends: the design of concentration camps and gas chambers; the design of instruments of torture, surveillance and repression; the design of all kinds of dangerous products. What would we think of general histories which only described good people and happy events?

Even within the limits of present popular topics there is a need for a more sceptical, questioning and critical approach: are there not disadvantages to the ever-expanding production of goods? Is the continual redesign of 'old' products essential in all cases? Are the values promoted by design and advertising socially beneficial or socially detrimental? Is the design historian's function merely to celebrate and reinforce a particular kind of commercial culture?

It could be argued that design, in its most general sense, is a form of politics: humanity struggles to shape its environment and society in order to satisfy its needs. It follows that design historians could, legitimately, extend their object of study to include the design of political structures and ecological systems.

External Factors and Interdisciplinary Perspectives

The design historian's task is complicated by the fact that besides issues internal to design, external factors also have to be considered. This is because design is affected by wars, revolutions, economic booms and slumps, technological innovations and so forth. At this point the problem of limiting the object of study becomes acute. To what extent, for example, should design

historians study the economy of a society? They might decide to take a crash course in economics but they would quickly discover that there is not one economic theory which can be speedily grasped but a variety of competing theories about how the economy works. Attempting to apply the findings of another discipline is thus not a straightforward matter. Furthermore, it is surely impractical to expect design historians to master all the related fields of knowledge that impinge on design.

A solution would be to establish criteria of relevance, that is, taking into account only those factors directly influencing the character of design. For example: the Arab-Israeli War of 1973 caused a reduction in the supply of oil reaching the West; this in turn caused an increase in the price of petrol and cars became more expensive to run; hence a need arose for cars to be redesigned so that their engines achieved more miles to the gallon and so that their shapes caused less air resistance. This seems a clearcut chain of events: a political/military clash – an economic consequence – a design change.

A second example will serve to illustrate the difficulty of establishing links between economic and stylistic changes. In 1987 a fashion reporter from New York observed that while the value of shares on the stock exchange plunged, the hemlines of women's dresses rose to heights not seen since the mini-skirts of the 1960s. It seems unlikely that in this case there was a correlation between the two events. In all probability, activities in parallel spheres were travelling in opposite directions. This is not to say, however, that a Wall Street crash might not at some stage have an impact upon the economy of the fashion industry or upon people's ideas about how they should dress. But how that impact would be manifested in terms of the style of clothes is hard to predict because designers could respond in several ways.

The general theoretical problem here is one of determination. In most cases events are overdetermined, that is, various factors or forces determine them. Once these have been identified the task then is to decide what weight to assign to the individual factors involved.

In regard to the economic determinants of design, a materialist

theorist such as Necdet Teymur would be critical of the idea that it is simply a question of identifying outside forces or of taking account of the economic constraints imposed by the design brief. Quite rightly, Teymur argues that the activity of design is imbricated within particular economic systems - certain modes of production and exchange - which permeate it through and through.[8] He contends that because the economic determinant is integral to design it is largely invisible to those in the profession and those in design education.

In the light of this we can perhaps distinguish between those general economic conditions which underpin design in the long term and those exceptional economic events - breakdowns, crises - which influence it in the short term.

'Interdisciplinary' is a word increasingly associated with design. For instance, the activity of design is regarded by members of the Design Research Society as interdisciplinary in two respects: first, it occurs in various arts and industries (fashion, architecture, engineering, etc.); and second, it synthesizes information derived from a range of disciplines (ergonomics, sociology, psychology, etc.).

The word 'interdisciplinary' is also being applied to design history. Design historians envisage that they will use concepts, theories and methods drawn from other disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, linguistics, art history and economics. While it is perfectly proper that design historians should learn as much as possible from other disciplines, the importation of 'foreign' concepts is problematical because the objects of study and goals of such disciplines differ from one another. (A synthesis of, say, Marxism, feminism, psychoanalysis and semiotics is extremely difficult to achieve; and what may result is a deformed hybrid.)[9] A critical, discriminating attitude towards all ideas no matter what their source is essential.

Furthermore, there is a problem of compatibility: ideas drawn from different disciplines may well contradict one another. Advocates of the multidisciplinary approach rashly assume that the greater the plurality of perspectives the better, but this ignores the problems of how fundamental ideological differences between various perspectives are to be reconciled.[10] Critics of

pluralism argue that not all accounts of reality are equally valuable; some, they insist, are better, more truthful than others. (Marxists, for example, argue that historical materialist approaches to design are superior to idealist approaches.) A mere accumulation of different perspectives will tend to produce a relativistic confusion; again, discrimination is essential. In short, there is a danger that design history could suffer from scholarly eclecticism and become an incoherent ragbag.

Also, unless the object of study of design history is precisely defined the sheer magnitude of its possible subject matter will reduce the researcher to impotence. The young discipline could dissipate itself among a thousand topics and find itself disputing the roles and territories of a dozen existing academic disciplines.

None the less, academic disciplines often share certain characteristics: for example, empirical methods of study and theories such as functionalism. In such areas of overlap the results obtained by different disciplines may well be commensurable. Even when two disciplines are far apart, new insights may be gained by applying the theories of one to the object of study of the other in an analogical fashion. For instance, some historians have found the biological theory of evolution useful in thinking about the temporal development of art and design.

Perhaps the most effective way in which design historians could benefit from a multidisciplinary approach would be to establish teams of scholars from different disciplines to work collaboratively on common themes and problems.

Notes and References

1. On the notion of family resemblance see L. Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1953) pars 66-7.
2. S. Bayley, *Art and Industry* (London: Boilerhouse Project, 1982) p. 9.
3. J. Heskett, *Industrial Design* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1980) p. 10.
4. F. Mercer, *The Industrial Design Consultant* (London: The Studio, 1947) p. 12.
5. Hazel Conway (book review), *Design History Society Newsletter*, (23) November 1984 pp. 13-15. Plus letters: from Jervis, (24) 1985 pp. 6-7; D. Greysmith, (25) 1985 pp. 4-6.

6. G. Bonsiepe, quoted in, J. Bicknell and L. McQuiston (eds), *Design for Need* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1977) p. 16.
7. V. Papanek, *Design for the Real World: Human Ecology and Social Change* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1972) p. 17.
8. N. Teymur, 'Design without economics? The economic blindness to the materiality of design' in R. Langdon and P. Purcell (eds), *Design Theory and Practice* (London: Design Council, 1984) pp. 75–80.
9. Possibly these remarks are too pessimistic. Sut Jhally's book *The Codes of Advertising* (London: Pinter, 1987) draws upon Marxism, psychoanalysis and anthropology; it also undertakes empirical research using the social science method of content analysis. These different elements are successfully combined to generate new insights into the nature of television advertising. One reason why this works is that the concept of fetishism – which Jhally foregrounds – is common to all three disciplines cited above.
10. Terry Eagleton remarks: 'Pluralists believe there is a little truth in everything.' He adds: 'This theoretical pluralism also has its political correlative: seeking to understand everybody's point of view quite often suggests that you yourself are disinterestedly up on high or in the middle, and trying to resolve conflicting viewpoints into a consensus implies a refusal of the truth that some conflicts can be resolved on one side alone.' *Literary Theory: an Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983) p. 199.