10-1954

Fuller Library Bulletin - October-December, 1954, No. 24

Library, Fuller Theological Seminary

Wilbur M. Smith
Arnold D. Ehler
Clara B. Allen

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.fuller.edu/fts-lib-bulletin
EDITORIAL

RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

With this issue the BULLETIN closes its sixth year. August 31 marked the close of the seventh year of the operation of the Seminary and of the Library, although the first year the Library was in charge of a clerical assistant, while major responsibility was carried by Dr. Wilbur M. Smith, Chairman of the Library Committee. Before we enter into the next year it is well to look back and survey the past.

When the Librarian and Assistant came to the Seminary in June of 1948 approximately 5,000 volumes of well selected books had been accumulated. By October of that year supplies had been purchased, procedures set up and books arranged roughly by subject so that normal processing could begin. It was necessary to set up a subject heading authority file and to work out the philosophy of subject headings, which was done as they were needed. New subjects headings were created in some cases, but the Petree and Library of Congress lists were used as bases with the latter being given preference in case of conflict wherever feasible. From the beginning Library of Congress cards were used if available, and cataloging has generally followed L.C. standards. A few short cuts have been adopted. The catalog is a combined dictionary catalog, including such audio-visual materials as have been processed. Authority files are more or less complete for subject headings and series, but the author authority file was neglected in the press of early work until a couple of years ago, and is now being maintained and the backlog caught up as rapidly as possible.

Our 28,000th volume was accessioned on August 31, 1954. There is a backlog of around 1,300 volumes from the Fyens Collection, which are being picked up as rapidly as possible, although they represent some difficulties in cataloging. Fortunately there is an author list that came with the collection, so that access by author can be had to them if necessary.

An audio-visual department has been set up during the years, and now contains all the standard pieces of audio-visual equipment, some fifteen machines in all, and they are used quite extensively. Student sermons are tape recorded and the Professor of Homiletics goes over each one with the student preacher privately. Practice work is done and examinations given in the speech department on tape. One Hebrew course used tape recordings for daily work last year. Modern Arabic and Modern Hebrew Linguaphone records are used in these classes. Significant lectures and addresses are taped for permanent filing. A small collection of religious music on discs has been started.

Chief concern to the administration, faculty and library staff is the need for a library building. Preliminary plans have been made, a fund started, and prayer is being made for the Lord's provision.
The gracious acceptance of our Expansion of Dewey 200 (cf. No. 7, 8, July-Dec., 1950, of the BULLETIN) certainly has been gratifying and encouraging. Letters from librarians all over the country have come in with suggestions, questions, and just library talk; how we have enjoyed them! Many of them have mentioned subject headings. Probably the next logical step after a classification scheme is a subject heading list. However, from many letters I see that I am not alone in the feeling that subject headings are such personal things to a library that a standard list is merely a jumping-off place. Our problem is how to create a subject heading, or where to jump from the standard list.

Why have subject headings? Several surveys have been made and the Journal of Cataloging and Classification (v. 6) has summarized many of them. Their findings differ quite widely, yet all seem to feel that subject headings have a place. The Library of Congress survey found that less than 50% of the general public used the main entry to find a book, but that researchers used the main entry 2/3 of the time, and used the subject headings from 1/4 to 1/3 of the time. One out of three readers finds what he wants when only the main entry is in the catalogue, and this is even less when the main entry is a government heading. Thus their conclusion is that subject entries are equal in importance to the main entry for most library users. As long as our professors give assignments in (to them) specific subjects, and our clients are looking up material on a topic, they will need subject headings.

Just what is the purpose of subject headings? Once we get that settled we have a basis on which to build our policies. After discussing the idea with several librarians, and checking the library literature, I am convinced that the best statement of purpose is that of Dr. Lowman, Librarian of the Bible Institute of Los Angeles, "... To enable one to find the greatest amount of material on a subject in the least amount of time." P. Reich states, "... The art of subject cataloging is not intended to teach semantics or any other science, but to provide the most convenient way of finding books" (Journal of Cataloging and Classification, v. 5, #4, p. 69.) Wyllis E. Wright says "... Its value lies in its usefulness and not in its consistency" (A.L.A. Bulletin, Oct. 15, 1937.) From these we might conclude that subject headings are to make our library sources quickly available to our specific clientele. Surely the dictionary catalog is not meant to be an instrument of discipline, nor a show case for our library science knowledge, nor a device of hidden clues for detective hounds—daring them to find a book quickly — but it should be a tool to assist our clients in their pursuit of knowledge. Is it not the main reason for a library, even in a theological school, to help faculty and students, rather than to train, or frustrate them? They have classes and papers for such purposes.

What is a subject heading? The dictionary definition tells us that it is a word or phrase that tells what the book is about. However, on just what the word or phrase is, how broad, how specific, its language, etc., agreement will probably never be reached. After mulling over these problems for several years, I offer these suggestions for your discussion. In deciding what is the subject of a book, how broad should our thinking be? Historically our present dictionary catalog had its beginning in the alphabetico-classed catalog. This was an attempt to combine the classed catalog and the alphabetical subject catalog. Its entries were names of broad subjects alphabetically arranged, subdivided by a topic of the next order of comprehensiveness, further subdivided, etc., to the lowest order. Thus, to use an illustration from David Haykin’s book Subject Headings, a Practical Guide (Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951. 140 p.) to find material on frogs you would look under ZOOLOGY [or ANIMAL KINGDOM — VERTEBRATES — AMPHIBIANS — FROGS. This necessitates cross-references from each subhead back to the main head...
and to each other. Today in our dictionary catalog we go directly to the subject. Instead of entering works on the life of Napoleon, under BIOGRAPHY — NAPOLEON we enter them directly under NAPOLEON, or material on frogs is entered directly under FROGS. The one argument against this direct approach that we lose a logical arrangement in our catalog is met by the fact that the books are classified on the shelves logically. The subject headings are merely to help us find a particular subject within the large class in our classification, or with some other material in another class. Thus, should not our first thought in assigning subject headings be, What is this book about specifically? After we have decided what the book is about, then in order really to meet the purpose of a subject heading we should decide how our students will look for this material; what word or phrase will they look up to find the material in this book? We should use "the reader as focus" (Haykin, p. 7) in order to meet the "what" of the above question. We must choose headings that reflect our reader's language and modes. It is important first of all that our headings should be in the language used today by our readers.

Recent library literature makes much use of the phrase "present day American usage." Surely we should be very much aware of the semantics of the word we choose as a subject heading among our library users. The following incident reported by Education Digest (Feb., 1953, p. 11) explains the necessity for this better than any learned discourse could: "... High School students searched library files in vain for entries on 'cartoons,' 'dating,' and 'fraternities.' The information was there but under headings in the mode of an earlier day — 'caricatures,' 'courtship,' and 'Greek-letter societies' . . ." Our headings should change as language changes. To use another common illustration, 'Phthisis' became "Consumption," but now is "Tuberculosis." We have all noticed that most of today's readers use popular terms rather than the technical ones even in a specialized library. Even theologians look for "Salvation" rather than "Soteriology," "Holy Spirit" rather than "Pneumatology." In a theological library the semantics of the word Prophecy indicate Biblical Prophecy; thus is it not needless to add Biblical to our subject heading? But works of, or on, other types of prophecy need to have a qualifying term either in parenthesis or as a subhead, whichever you prefer.

Are we agreed that the term we select must be one our library readers' use? Should it not also express exactly what the book is about? Our recent library literature makes use of the term "Specificity" — meaning that the subject heading must be specific to the subject of the book, yet inclusive enough to cover all the books of that type and particular subject. We cannot do this if we are to use the author's terms or the connotations given to the subject by differing groups, for then we would have the same type of material under as many subject headings as we have titles. For example, of the various terms applied to the second coming of Christ, is one to use RAPTURE, SECOND COMING, SECOND ADVENT, or PAROUSIA? We have to choose a term with care and then apply it uniformly. Of course we must take care that the term is unambiguous to our users as well as to ourselves, and also that it does not overlap in meaning other terms in the catalog. Definition cards and cross references are helpful, but should we not guard against overloading the catalog with them? Might they not sometimes cause more confusion than they eradicate, especially when they come in large doses? Experience has warned us to watch carefully lest we use the same term for more than one subject. Sometimes this is unavoidable because of the limitations of our language. In such cases a qualifying term might be used, e.g., MAN, MAN (THEOLOGY), MAN (BIOLOGY). Mr. Haykin summarizes all this "... we have so far decided that a subject heading in the modern dictionary catalog is a term to designate the subject which is to be used consistently regardless of the language of the author. The term must be sanctioned by current American usage. It must not be broader than the subject matter of the books to which it is assigned" (p. 11).

The next problem in creating a subject heading is to get the user's viewpoint, or how will my library clientele look for the
material? We as librarians tend to be very logical and to think logically (at least it is logical to us) while most of the lay public have a more personal interest in the catalog. We have to fight constantly to forget our ideas when making subject headings, because the reader is influenced by psychological factors rather than logical. If subject headings are in conformity to the logical pattern and terms of the cataloger, rather than of the reader, they may not be found. The choice of terms should make for ease of approach for the student. We are apt to think of putting the subject headings in logical order, seeing the problem in view with the rest of the books in the library. The reader, however, thinks of the material in relation to his problem, or to the subject on which he wants information. Thus his approach to the question is a psychological one. After several years of closely observing students and professors use the card catalog librarians came to certain conclusions as to how folks look for material. At various meetings and discussions we find that most of us have the same conclusions, and these are in harmony with much of the recent library literature.

First, we noticed that they look up nouns — a person by proper name, a corporate body, an object, event, etc., by name. For example: JEFFERSON, THOMAS, rather than PRESIDENT OF THE U.S. — JEFFERSON; HARVARD UNIVERSITY, rather than UNIVERSITIES, HARVARD; TAJ MAHAL rather than ARCHITECTURE, ORIENTAL; BUNKERHILL, BATTLE, rather than BATTLES or U.S. HISTORY. REVOLUTION. BATTLES. BUNKERHILL. In fact, have you ever noticed anyone (even a member of the library staff) looking first under U.S. HISTORY? Most of them go directly to the topic wanted. This is what is meant by the psychological approach — what I want.

The second point we gleaned is that they rarely look under an adjective denoting language unless it is the language they want. For a grammar of the Hebrew language they would look up HEBREW LANGUAGE rather than GRAMMAR, but for a book of French architecture they generally looked up ARCHITECTURE, FRENCH. Thus the best subject heading is the simplest: a single noun as FAITH. Since the reader uses the psychological approach, and we wish to be specific, it is often necessary, in order to best express the subject, to use a phrase heading such as JEWISH QUESTION or CHURCH WORK WITH YOUTH. Our problem is to decide which is the most direct and simple form, and whether it expresses what the book is about, and yet is what the reader is likely to want from this book. In using phrases we are warned to be very cautious to be sure it is direct, and not cumbersome. If a single word will do, a phrase should not be used. Perhaps it is a little hackneyed nowadays even to mention inverted phrase headings. The annoyance of library users is very evident when they look up a perfectly good subject and find they have to go to the other end of the catalog before they find what they want. Inversion is to be avoided whenever possible. However since all good rules seem to have exceptions, phrase headings are used in inverted forms when the second word is used in the catalog as an independent heading. The inversion is then equivalent to a subdivision. For example, ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY and PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY are really subdivisions of PSYCHOLOGY and are usually looked up under that head, so we invert.

While our collections are relatively small, a single heading will suffice. In a theological library we are bound to have some books on secular subjects but not large sections, so it would not be necessary to subdivide. LOS ANGELES, e.g., is sufficient for all the books one might have on that subject; subdivisions like DESCRIPTION & TRAVEL or HISTORY, would be unnecessary as the reader should be able to pick up the title he wants from the relative few under that broad heading. For the same reason, elongated headings for history, science, etc., are rather unnecessary. A book on English history would not need several subheads. In fact, the trend seems to be away from many subheads. Where period subheads are needed, as in the case of Jewish history, we should make them correspond to recognized epochs in the history, or spans of time frequently treated in books. Merely
to tack on dates is proving to be more of a hurdle than a help for present day students. It is easier for our clients to find material under JEWS. HISTORY. EXILE, rather than JEWS. HISTORY. B.C. 953-586. In the interest of shortening subheads do we need the term HISTORY? Is not JEWS. EXILE enough?

Have you noticed that students generally look up first the aspects of the subject which they want under their own names rather than under the broad heading? For example they generally go directly to REFORMATION instead of CHURCH HISTORY. REFORMATION. Since we are striving to grow out of the cumbersomeness of the alphabetico-classed type of cataloging, should we not adopt it as a good rule to use as many subheads as possible as independent headings, rather than as subdivisions of a broader heading? This also follows the rule of specificity mentioned above. References from the broad heading will lead the reader to the specific headings subordinate to it. In a theological library, the term "Bible" is usually taken for granted and in most cases may be dropped or used as a subdivision. When our users want a commentary on the book of Romans they look under R O M A N S. COMMENTARIES, not BIBLE. ENGLISH. N.T. ROMANS. COMMENTARIES. I am in favor, as far as possible, of eliminating 'Bible' as a heading; using ANTIQUITIES OF THE BIBLE, rather than BIBLE. ANTIQUITIES; ANIMALS OF THE BIBLE rather than BIBLE. ANIMALS, etc. This helps to reduce the number of cards in the BIBLE drawers. In fact, if a specialized theological library used such headings, the drawers containing cards beginning with BIBLE would not only be unwieldy, but one little card would be lost in a mass of others; readers are discouraged just looking at the bulk.

Library users (faculty even more than students) as well as our library staff, do not like to go through several alphabets, but prefer just one. For example, put all material on Manuscripts under MANUSCRIPTS rather than further subdividing it by language, historical period, type of manuscript, etc. In a theological library the term BIBLE as a subhead seems to be a bit redundant; however, as there are few works other than Biblical, these could be noted with a qualifying phrase. If the collection grows I might make a division of O.T. and N.T. Thus instead of several short alphabets the reader has only three fairly long ones to look through. Formerly they gave up before they exhausted the list, or skipped over the very section they wanted. Students generally have a broad idea of what they want. They will look first under the name of the manuscript (thus the use of the proper noun wherever possible) and then they will go to the general topic MANUSCRIPTS. They do not look for minute subheads, and are annoyed when they have to go through the several sets of cards. After all, we have such divisions on our shelves, and a student might lose valuable material if he only looks under MANUSCRIPTS. BIBLE. GREEK. N.T. instead of under MANUSCRIPTS. N.T. Subdividing is resorted to only when no commonly used word or phrase is available.

One of the special features in subject headings which we have developed (or departed from the norm) here at Fuller is the use of the period. We use it in all places instead of the comma, dash, brackets, etc. We have just one form: ETHICS. N.T., ETHICS. PHILOSOPHY, ETHICS. SOCIAL. This makes it much easier to file and much less confusing to our users, who are told that the dictionary catalog is in a straight alphabetical order. Visualize, if you can, how confusing such a statement is when he is looking at

U.S. History. Exploration
U.S. History. Colonial Period
U.S. History. Revolution
U.S. History. Civil War

or

War
War (International Law)
War, Articles of see Military Law
War, Cost of
War, Declaration of
War, Maritime
War — Casualties
War — Economic aspects
War — Relief of sick
War and religion
War of worlds
War-ships

The only exception to this rule which we make is the use of parenthesis to distin-
guish between nouns that have different references, e.g., MAN, MAN (BIOLOGY); LOVE, LOVE (THEOLOGY).

The discussion of the use of standard lists perhaps should have come at the beginning of this discussion but their use is determined, in my mind, by what has been said so far. We have decided which way to jump, and where to jump; let us now look at where we are jumping from. The best spring boards for theological subject headings that I know of are: Julia Pettee's List of Theological Subject Headings and Corporate Church Names..., Chicago, A.L.A., 1947, and Oliver L. Kapsner's Catholic Subject Headings... 2d ed., Collegeville, Minn., St. John's Abbey Press, 1947. Both of these lists are designed for use with the Library of Congress subject headings, and follow the same pattern. The Library of Congress is a vast library of many categories, and therefore has to use involved headings. I have found that Library of Congress headings are too involved for an average sized library, and they certainly are not specialized in theology. The Journal of Cataloging and Classification (vol. 8, #4, Dec. '52) records a symposium on subject headings giving the pros and cons for standard lists — they are pretty evenly balanced. Perhaps we must each ask ourselves the following questions. Does the standard list fit my need? Do those headings make the material in my library quickly available to my library users? It is much easier just to follow blindly Library of Congress headings — then we can take the greatest advantage of their cataloging and use their cards with ease—but have we fulfilled our calling? Let us not go to sleep under conformity: surely the professional cataloger (especially a theological librarian) would never subject his mind to mechanical continuation of an established system. Let us not be slaves to the past or to "the accepted way of doing it." If it does not make for ease and quickness for our clientele to find the material, then it is wrong, no matter how right it might be in library science. As Oliver Kapsner so adequately states it "...Under that entry the book is also thoroughly concealed for the searcher in the [catalogs] where items are listed only under the 'established' entry" ("Contact for Catalogers," Catholic Library World, 25:8, p. 261). Principles need ever to be questioned and new ways to achieve desirable ends must be examined. Thus even lists of theological subject headings must be examined and questioned and our own subject headings made up to fit our own clientele. Yes, subject headings are a very personal matter.

This means, of course, that there will be changes to make. As long as your dictionary catalog and library are alive, and the heart of the school, there will be changes. Language changes, courses change, student bodies change, even faculty and assignments sometimes change, and our subject headings change. One suggestion made in the Journal of Cataloging and Classification a few years back is to have guide cards with the subject heading, then cards without typed headings filed behind them. Thus the terminology may be changed without the necessity of changing the heading on each card. This surely would help in making changes, but I can foresee confusion among our professors when they find a group of cards out of proper alphabetical order according to top lines, and can't you hear them say, "That is not the way they do it back in Timbuctoo University"? Have any of you tried such a system? We still haven't, but attempt to change all cards whenever we discover that some terms are not used, have changed in meaning, or that another term is being used by our students.

A paper on subject headings should mention something about cross-references, though that could be the central theme of another discussion. Let us just drop a word about them — use them sparingly. It is quite easy to overload our catalog with them, and then they become obstacles and hurdles rather than helps and guides. They definitely should be omitted if they will be filed next to each other or at any rate so close that neither is likely to be overlooked if one is looked up. You will also be surprised how the elimination of subheads, and elongated headings reduces the necessity for cross-references. The direct approach needs fewer crutches to hold it up. It doesn't do away with the need entirely, but if we are close to our users and use subject headings they think of, we greatly reduce the number of cross-references needed.
NOTES AND QUERIES

34. — ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA. Not everybody is aware that the publishers of the Britannica have abandoned the policy of numbering editions. The 14th was the last of the series bearing numbers. The policy now is to make some revisions each year and to print a limited number of sets for sale during each year. The 1952 edition was advertised as the "biggest revision in a quarter of a century," according to the brochure circulated. The treatment of religion by major national encyclopedias has not always been anywhere near satisfactory. Any criticism of this should bear in mind the limited space apparently devoted to religion, but nevertheless this is a fact.

In the above-mentioned brochure among the articles that are listed as having been involved in this major revision we find only five that are distinctly religious totaling 43 pages: Crusades (29), England, Church of (11), Jehovah's Witnesses (1), Jeremiah (1), Wisdom Literature (1). According to a letter from the editorial office of the publishers considerably more revision was done in the 1954 edition, involving the following articles: Anti-Semitism, Arval Brothers, Arya Samaj, Baptists, Bollandists, Church and State, Churches of Christ, Church History, Churching of women, Church of Brethren, Church of the Nazarene, Churchwarden, Collette, St., Congregationalism, Cruden, Alexander, Church of Cyprus, Ehud, Council of Ferrara-Florence, Gedasius, Hadith, Ireland, Church of, Jethro, Koran, Latter Day Saints, Church of Jesus Christ of, Parish, Parish Clerk, Surplice, Talmud.

The Americana reports seventeen new articles on the Bible in the 1954 printing. These articles cover seventy-two pages. Included are articles on "Bible history, literature, manuscripts, language, books, personages, apocrypha, epistles and higher criticism of the Old and New Testaments," and were prepared by a number of eminent authorities under the direction of Dr. Frederick C. Grant of the Union Theological Seminary. In the 1953 Americana there was "a vast amount of revision and expansion of religious topics," according to Mr. D. P. Charles of the School and Library Division. These included a large number of the early Christian fathers, saints and popes, the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the Jewish Cabala, Adam and Eve, the Orthodox Eastern Church, Christian Science, Church of the Nazarene, Mormons and Seventh-day Adventists, as well as a number of comparative religion articles: Bhagavad Gita, Rama, Rama-krishna and Ramayana. All in all there seems to be added attention being given to religious subjects by the major encyclopedias, and this is in harmony with the growing importance of religious literature as reflected by the best seller lists.

We still claim that the best religious coverage of any current national encyclopedia is the Swedish national encyclopedia, Svensk Uppslagsbok, just approaching completion. This goes for the number of articles and cross references and for variety and recency of bibliography. The Britannica, for instance, lists no bibliography on the Devil or the Millennium written within the last twenty-five years, and the Americana is no better at this point.

COVER PLATE

The plate on the cover of this issue is from the first edition of Arboritum Bibliicum by Johann Heinrich Ursinus (1608-1667) published in 1663. With our copy are bound also his Arboreti Bibliici Continuatio (ed. nova, 1699) and his Theologiae Symbolicae, sive Parabolarum Sacrarum Sylva (1699). Moldenke in his Plants of the Bible says, "Ursinus gives diagrammatic illustrations, often laughable in their inaccuracy, of the more important plants, and brief descriptions, culled mostly from the old Greek and Roman natural history writers, but goes deeply into the linguistic origins of their names, considering the original Hebrew and Greek Texts" (p. 3). The illustration shows the Branch that shall grow out of the root of Jesse, and Jehovah's promise that of His kingdom there shall be no end.

WANTED

Copies of the BULLETIN No. 7-8 (July-Dec., 1950) containing the Expansion of Dewey 200 by Miss Allen are needed, as our supply has been exhausted. We will pay 50¢ per copy for any returned.