

Judaica Cataloging: The Hebrew Bibliographic and Israeli Traditions*

Elhanan Adler

University of Haifa Library
Haifa, Israel

Introduction

Bibliographic description of Hebrew books can be divided into two approaches which have developed from the 17th century to this day: the "integrative" approach, which uses Roman-character description as far as possible, entering only minimal data (if any) in the Hebrew alphabet, and the "stand-alone," purely Hebrew approach. The first allows Hebrew data to be integrated freely into general catalogs and bibliographies and to be used to a certain degree even by non-Hebrew readers. This approach began with the first Hebrew bibliographic work, Johannes Buxtorf's *Bibliotheca Rabbinica* (1613) and continues to this day in Hebrew cataloging practice outside of Israel. The "stand-alone" approach assumes full knowledge of Hebrew by the user and allows convenient solutions to specific problems of Hebraica, at the expense of segregating this data from general (Roman-character) bibliographic data. This approach began with the first Hebrew bibliography by a Jew, Shabbetai Bass's *Sifte yeshenim* (1680) and continues in Israeli cataloging practice today.

In this paper, I discuss the particular advantages and disadvantages of the "stand-alone" tradition and the changes which it has undergone in Israeli cataloging practice. In addition to descriptive cataloging, I discuss classification and subject headings for Judaica, as used in Israel.

Traditional Jewish Hebraica Bibliography

The three milestones of general Hebrew bibliography are Bass's *Sifte yeshenim*

(1680), Ben-Yaakov's *Otsar ha-sefarim* (1880), and Friedberg's *Bet 'eked sefarim* (2d ed., 1950-1956). (For a detailed historical survey of these and other Hebrew bibliographies, see Brisman, 1977, pp. 2-35). A fourth (future) milestone will be the long-awaited publication of the Institute for Hebrew Bibliography project, which should be the ultimate and definitive work.

Bass's work, while of no practical use today, was the first attempt to create a Hebrew bibliography for the Jewish public. It records books by title, with an index by author (forename entry) and a rudimentary subject index. This title-entry approach was followed by both Ben-Yaakov and Friedberg. (Ben-Yaakov created an author index which was, unfortunately, never published; Friedberg has both author and broad subject indexes.) The Institute for Hebrew Bibliography project's specimen brochure (which appeared over 25 years ago – in 1964) indicates entry under author, with multiple indexes.

Title main entry (which actually originated with Buxtorf) has several advantages in arranging Rabbinic literature. It avoids the problem of entering many works of Midrash and Kabbalah under their attributed authors. Uniform title entries also interfile more readily with titles than authors. (Bass recognized the concept of uniform title, entering all Biblical texts under *Tanakh*.) Problems of form of ancient and medieval names also seem less significant when they appear in a secondary index, rather than as main entries. Probably the most obvious benefit of title entry in Rabbinic literature is the fact that, in practice, authors' names were not known, or were ignored – indeed, even today, very few users of the well-known commentary on Rashi, *Sifte hakhamin*, are aware of the name of its author, the very same Shabbetai Bass.

Descriptive data in all these works was minimal: title, author, place, and date, occasionally with a few words of explanation. (Friedberg added pagination.) Several editions were often recorded under a single bibliographic entry, simply by additional places and dates. All data was entered in Hebrew; these bibliographies were not meant to be used by the non-Hebraist.

The Israeli Cataloging and Bibliographic Tradition

The Israeli cataloging tradition grew out of the practices of the Jewish National and University Library (JNUL) in the 1920s and 1930s – the formative years, when attempts were made to adapt modern methods of librarianship to Judaica and Hebraica cataloging and classification. Since the JNUL was the largest and most important library in Mandatory Palestine, and, for many years, was the site of the only school of librarianship in Israel, its practices usually became *de facto* standards for all the libraries of the country. Its bibliographical quarterly *Kiryat sefer* (1924-) was also a means for disseminating bibliographic data as recorded in the JNUL catalogs. (For further information on the development of Judaica librarianship in Israel, see Adler, 1989.)

The JNUL approach, subsequently adopted by all Israeli libraries, has been to try to adapt traditional approaches to international (primarily Anglo-American) standards. This process continues even today, although with the development of many other large libraries of Judaica in Israel, the JNUL serves more as a "first among equals" than as the unquestioned standard-setter. Cataloging rules for Judaica in the academic libraries are set today by an inter-university sub-committee on cataloging, which is made up of representatives of all seven universities in Israel. The cataloging decisions of this sub-committee have been published

*Revised and updated version of a paper delivered at the First International Conference of Judaica and Israeli Librarians, Jerusalem, July 3, 1990.

(Adler, 1991a) and made available to all interested libraries. An authority file of Judaica uniform title headings, which is slated for publication, is available for searching via the ALEPH network.

Judaica Cataloging in Israel

Judaica (Roman-character) cataloging in Israel follows the prevailing international cataloging standards (currently AACR2 [*Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd ed.]), with certain exceptions – primarily relating to uniform headings. Israeli libraries could not accept the theological basis of such headings as BIBLE. O.T. and BIBLE. N.T., preferring to consider BIBLE (=Tanakh), NEW TESTAMENT, and APOCRYPHA as three separate, independent headings. Israeli practice is also to treat the Dead Sea Scrolls as a canonical body of literature rather than scattering the individual works, as AACR2 mandates.

Israeli libraries never used the old, quasi-corporate entry JEWS. LITURGY AND RITUAL, nor have they gone to the other (AACR2) extreme of total scattering of all prayer books under highly spe-

cific headings. In current Israeli practice, while many types of prayer books are entered directly under their individual headings, some are still kept together under the Romanized heading TEFILLOT. Some examples of Israeli uniform title headings compared with AACR2 forms are in Table 1.

Romanized headings are also used for non-Hebrew publications of Israeli corporate bodies (*Universitat Tel-Aviv* rather than *Tel-Aviv University*), according to AACR2 practice. Unfortunately, there is still disagreement as to which Romanization scheme should be used: some libraries follow the LC tables, while others prefer those of the Academy of the Hebrew Language (1957). (There is agreement, however, to make cross-references when there are significant differences in the initial words of a heading according to the two schemes.)

Hebraica Cataloging in Israel

While non-Hebrew cataloging generally follows international practice, in the area of Hebrew cataloging significant differences have developed.

Although automatic title entry is a thing of the past, Israeli libraries have retained the "stand-alone" approach of Hebrew bibliography – meaning separate Hebrew- and Roman-character catalogs. In the Hebrew catalog, all descriptive data is in the original script (see Figure 1). In practice, this approach has been extended to Arabic-script publications in libraries with collections in this script. Some Israeli libraries also retained separate Cyrillic-character catalogs (others Romanize the Cyrillic data), making for four separate catalogs. Because of the problems of interfiling Hebrew and Yiddish entries, separate Yiddish catalogs were often maintained as well. With the advent of computerized cataloging in the university libraries, the number of non-Roman-script catalogs has been reduced but not eliminated – Hebrew and Yiddish are interfiled, Cyrillic is Romanized, and Arabic is either kept as a separate script (with special terminals) or Hebraized.

Separate catalogs allow the reader ready access to publications, under access points as they appear in the publications themselves. The primary disadvantage of separate catalogs is that they require multiple searches in order to locate all items under a specific heading in more than one script (e.g., all works of an author in all languages). This is more a problem of descriptive cataloging than subject access – in most libraries the subject catalog (classified or alphabetical) lists works in all scripts. Separate catalogs also create complications in cataloging works with multiple titles in various scripts.

Another major variation from accepted international practice relates to the form of Hebrew access points. In non-Hebrew cataloging, variant spelling of access points is retained – *labor* and *labour* coexist, and no one would consider uniting *Shapiro* and *Schapiro*. Hebrew is much more problematic. In many publications orthographic variance (*ketiv male* and *ketiv haser*) abounds, both consistent and inconsistent. The reader cannot be expected to know which orthographic form was used in a specific publication or edition (e.g., *shulhan* with or without a *vav*), and recording authors, titles, etc., as they appear in the specific work would have led to bibliographic chaos. The Israeli solution to this problem has been to normalize all access points to a single orthographic form, while retaining exact transcription of the title page in the

**Table 1
AACR2 and Israeli Uniform Title Headings**

AACR2	Israeli Form
Bible	Bible + New Testament
Bible. O.T.	Bible
Bible. O.T. Pentateuch	Bible. Pentateuch
Bible. O.T. Apocrypha	Apocrypha
Bible. O.T. Apocrypha. Ecclesiasticus	Apocrypha. Ecclesiasticus
Bible. O.T. Apocryphal Books*	Apocrypha
Book of Jubilees	Apocrypha. Book of Jubilees
Bible. N.T.	New Testament
Dead Sea Scrolls	Dead Sea Scrolls
Temple scroll	Dead Sea Scrolls. Temple scroll
Talmud	Talmud Bavli
Talmud. Bava kamma	Talmud Bavli. Bava qamma
Talmud. Minor tractates	Minor tractates
Haggadah	Haggada shel pesah
Kinot	Kinot
but	
Maḥzor	Tefillot. Maḥzor
Siddur	Tefillot. Siddur

*AACR2 distinguishes between two groupings, Apocrypha (rule 25.18A5) and Apocryphal Books (rule 25.18A14). Israeli practice is to use the Apocrypha heading for all Jewish Apocryphal works.

descriptive data fields. For both historical and practical reasons, the brief classical form (*ketiv ḥaser*) has prevailed, despite the fact that the trend of modern Hebrew is more and more towards the fuller *ketiv male*. As long as separate Yiddish catalogs were maintained, Yiddish was recorded in its fairly standard full form; however, with computer merging of Hebrew and Yiddish an interesting compromise has been reached: titles and other uniquely Yiddish headings remain in their full Yiddish form, while personal name entries have been reduced to Hebrew *ketiv ḥaser* form.

Subject Cataloging

Until the 1970s, virtually all Israeli libraries used the classified catalog, rather than alphabetic subject headings, for subject access. There are various reasons for this: the lack of an accepted list of subject headings, the lack of adequate Hebrew terminology in the formative years of the JNUL, and the fact that Israel has (even today) a highly multilingual population.

Classification

In the 1920s, the period in which the JNUL was founded, no classification system seemed to have adequate detail in the area of Judaica, and so the JNUL commissioned an expansion of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) to meet its detailed needs. This expansion was prepared by the late Professor Gershom Scholem, then head of the library's Judaica Department, and unofficially, the classification is known as the "Scholem System" even today. Expanding DDC, rather than inventing an entirely new, independent system, enabled the JNUL to use a single classification system for its entire collection. The JNUL still uses this system, updating and republishing it periodically (4th ed., 1981). Many other Israeli libraries followed the JNUL example and adopted the system as well.

Scholem's approach was to expand the areas of DDC that were allocated to Jewish topics, both by adding subdivisions to topics that were insufficiently broken down, and by redefining the scope of topics to include more than DDC intended. Thus, for example, many subdivisions were added to 296 (Judaism) and 892.4 (Hebrew literature). Jewish history posed a special problem,

since DDC recognized (until 1965) only the history of geographic entities. Scholem's solution was to redefine and expand 933 (whose feature heading in DDC, even today, is "Palestine to 70 A.D.") to include Jewish history of all periods and geographic areas. (This creates an interesting anomaly, since material on modern Jewish history is found as part of class 930 – history of the ancient world.) Scholem also moved such topics as Jewish art and music, Jewish law, and Jewish education to class 296 (Jewish religion), rather than leave them with their specific disciplines. The geographic subdivision for Israel was abbreviated to a letter (E) and prefixed to general numbers (e.g., E550 = geology of Israel). Various elements of the Universal Decimal Classification (UDC) were also used for further detail and subdivision.

The Scholem System was designed for use in the JNUL – a library that naturally wished to emphasize the Jewish and Israeli facets of every subject. Its use by other libraries was a bit more problematic: not every library wished to segregate Jewish music from all other music, or Israeli education from general education. Furthermore, the complicated UDC-style numbers, containing prefix letters, parentheses, and other punctuation marks, did not lend themselves readily to open-shelf collections. In addition, changes in the DDC itself have complicated the system somewhat: specific Scholem numbers are often based on general DDC numbers whose meaning has changed since the former scheme was designed, and in some areas DDC today (Dewey, 1989) is even more detailed than Scholem (e.g., period subdivisions under Hebrew literature).

Today, most public libraries use an abridged Israeli edition of DDC (Dewey, 1983) that has a simplified Judaica section in which there is less detail than in the Scholem system, most UDC punctuation has been dropped, and prefixes have become suffixes (geology of Israel is back in geology). Many large Judaica libraries, however, still use the full Scholem System.

In 1969, the University of Haifa Library became the first major Israeli library to adopt the Library of Congress (LC) classification. Haifa was followed during the 1970s by the Hebrew University's Library of Social Sciences and

Humanities, Ben Gurion University Library, and several others. While the reasons for converting to LC had nothing to do with Judaica, they forced these libraries to review the LC Judaica classification and make certain modifications. While there has not been official coordination on adaptation and changes, it is generally accepted that LC classification for Judaica (primarily classes BM (Judaism), BS (Bible), DS (History), and PJ (Language and Literature)) is quite detailed and that only minimal changes should be made. Two examples of such changes are: (1) rearranging the BS table so that the books of the Bible appear in Jewish rather than Christian order, and (2) the relocation of a great deal of Holocaust literature from D (general history) to DS (Jewish history).

It is interesting to note that, in all cases, Israeli libraries have opted for classing Judaica as part of general classification schemes, rather than creating separate ones. Even with expansions and reallocations, both DDC and LC still retain a Christian orientation: Old Testament is found together with New Testament (as part of Christianity and separate from Judaism), and, in the case of DDC, Judaism is even relegated to the miscellaneous religions section at the end of the 200 (religion) class.

Subject Headings

As mentioned above, Israeli libraries have generally followed the JNUL tradition of using the classified catalog for subject access. Extensive use of alphabetic subject headings is found today primarily in the university libraries, particularly (but not solely) in those using LC classification. These libraries use LC subject headings (in English), relying on the fact that their reader communities supposedly have a working knowledge of English terminology. Here also, minimal changes have been made to problematic headings. For example, the parallel use of PALESTINE (pre-1948) and ISRAEL (post-1948) by the Library of Congress is clearly unacceptable (LC generally uses the current name of a country only, e.g., IRAN for PERSIA). In Israeli usage, the heading PALESTINE is used only for the publications of the British Mandatory authorities. Examples of other required changes are Hebrew rather than English terminology (PESSAH rather than PASSOVER) and uniform title headings (as described above).

The use of Hebrew subject headings in Israeli catalogs is very limited. A general list of Hebrew subject headings does not exist, and creating one is a major undertaking. Bar-Ilan University does use Hebrew subjects for its Hebrew books [see paper by Gita Hoffman et al. in this issue – Ed.]. While this approach simplifies the situation somewhat (there is no need for Hebrew terminology for topics on which there are no Hebrew publications), it does have the disadvantage of dividing subject access for subjects that appear in both Hebrew and Roman scripts. Probably the closest thing to a general Hebrew subject heading list is the thesaurus of the *Index to Hebrew Periodicals* (1977-) project at the University of Haifa, which contains over 40,000 terms, but it too is limited to subjects covered in Hebrew publications. (The thesaurus is issued periodically on computer-produced microfiche and on occasion as a printout of several thousand pages; it has not been published in book form.)

The limitation of separate subject access by script should not be too great for public libraries whose collections are primarily in Hebrew. Public libraries have retained the classified catalog primarily because this approach has been followed by the catalog card service of the Center for Public Libraries, to which they subscribe. Lately there has been some discussion of the possibility of instituting Hebrew subject headings in the public libraries (based on the Haifa thesaurus), and a change in this direction seems likely.

Automation and Hebrew Cataloging

The advent of automation has had a major effect on cataloging in Israel in general, and on Hebraica cataloging in particular. Until automation, there was very little interest in cooperative cataloging and in the sharing of bibliographic information (except for the public libraries, which receive their cataloging from a central agency). With computerization and the need for massive conversion of existing collections, the importance of sharing data became obvious to all. This came about first and foremost in the university libraries, which had the largest collections to convert and, in the inter-university ALEPH library network, had a tool which, theoretically at least, would make it easy to copy cataloging data from each other. The network does work, but not as well as

it should for many reasons. (For a description of the ALEPH network, particularly in connection with Judaica, see Adler, 1989, pp. 49-51.)

The logic behind sharing cataloging data assumes that such data is in a form that can be readily used by the receiving library, with minimal changes, if any. In 1983, the Standing Committee of the National and University Libraries (SCONUL) set up a Sub-Committee on Cataloging and Catalog Conversion, whose primary function was to unify the cataloging procedures of the various university libraries to enable maximum exchange of cataloging data. The subcommittee soon found that although all the university libraries subscribed to AACR2, there were many different interpretations and local exceptions, particularly in the "oral law" of Hebrew cataloging.

Perhaps most problematic was the question of Hebrew orthography: several different systems were in use in the different libraries: *ketiv haser*, *ketiv male*, and a "compromise" form of *yod haser* and *vav male* (also used by the Center for Public Libraries). Variant orthography would require a copying library to check and change headings on a word-by-word basis. Over a period of several years, cataloging variants were thrashed out and binding decisions were reached (in the case of orthography, *ketiv haser* was chosen), so that there is today much greater uniformity of descriptive cataloging among the university libraries than in previous years. These decisions were not always easy and occasionally required painful changes at some libraries. As mentioned above, a summary of these decisions has been published (Adler, 1991a).

The Center for Public Libraries has converted its file of card-service cataloging data to machine-readable form, and is now distributing both current and retrospective data on diskettes to public libraries with automated systems. The cataloging standards of this data differ somewhat from those of Israeli university libraries, making interchange difficult.

Coding, Format, and the Sharing of Data

While automation has led to greater standardization and uniformity within Israel, it has created a new area of difference between Israeli and non-Israeli

bibliographic data. The generally accepted RLIN (Research Libraries Information Network) standard for non-Roman bibliographic data (for details, see Aliprand, 1986-1987) appeared only recently; it mandates a full Romanized record, to which parallel vernacular fields may be appended. Israeli libraries could not wait for the international bibliographic community to decide how to handle Hebrew; besides, the Romanization-plus-Hebrew approach is not acceptable to them. (For further information on the differences between Israeli and American standards for automated cataloging, see Adler, 1991b.)

The Israeli ALEPH system uses unique mnemonic field codes which do not have exact MARC (machine-readable cataloging) equivalents. ALEPH has been adapted to accommodate the MARC format recently, but Israeli university libraries have their own coding conventions. (See Hebrew codes for bibliographic elements in Figure 2.) This does not seem to bother the Israeli library community at this point: bibliographic data can be (and is) imported from abroad in MARC format and then downgraded to ALEPH format. Sharing of data is taking place only between libraries using the same systems.

As networking improves and increases, it is more and more likely that Israeli libraries will wish to mesh into international bibliographic networks as well – giving as well as receiving. Israel should be the source of cataloging data relating to Israeli publications in all languages. This will require adherence to MARC format and standards, at the very least at the export stage, and ultimately internally as well. The problems are not trivial: they include not only character and format conversion, but also creation of data fields not commonly used in Israel (for details see Adler, 1988).

This will take time – it is not a high-priority item in libraries trying to complete retrospective conversion under severe manpower and budgetary constraints. I believe, however, that the Israeli bibliographic community will have to consider its role in the international exchange of information soon, and that the result will be further changes in cataloging standards, formats, and procedures.

Conclusion

The Israeli cataloging tradition is an amalgam of traditional Jewish bibliographic approaches and international cataloging standards. The computer age has brought about greater uniformity within Israeli libraries and increased dependence on foreign (particularly American) systems and standards. This has led to changes in cataloging rules and procedures. As the Israeli bibliographic network gradually meshes with those of other countries and begins to supply as well as receive data, further changes are inevitable.

References

Academy of the Hebrew Language. "Rules for Transliteration from Hebrew to Latin Script," *Zikhronot ha-akademiyah*, vol. 3-4 (1955/56-1956/57), pp. 5-8 (Hebrew).

Adler, Elhanan [1988]. "The Use of Israeli Machine Readable Cataloging by American Libraries," *Judaica Librarianship*, vol. 4, no. 1 (Fall 1987-Winter 1988), pp. 23-26.

Adler, Elhanan [1989]. "Judaica Librarianship: the View from Israel," in *Judaica Librarianship: Facing the Future*, edited by Charles Berlin (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Library, 1989, pp. 39-52. Reprinted in *Judaica Librarianship*, vol. 4 no. 2 (Spring 1988-Winter 1989), pp. 133-137.

Adler, Elhanan [1991a] (ed.). "Cataloging Decisions and Rule Changes in Israeli University Libraries," *Yad la-kore*, vol. 25 no. 2 (Jan. 1991), pp. 69-74. (Hebrew).

Adler, Elhanan [1991b]. "The State of the Art in Hebraica Library Automation: American and Israeli Standards and Practices" in *Hebrew Studies*, edited by Diana Rowland Smith and Peter Shmuel Salinger. London: British Library, 1991, pp. 210-219.

Aliprand, Joan M. "Hebrew on RLIN," *Judaica Librarianship*, vol. 3, no. 1-2 (1986-1987), pp. 5-16.

Bass, Shabbetai. *Sifte yeshenim*. Amsterdam, 1680.

Ben-Yaakov, Jacob. *Otsar ha-sefarim*. Vilna, 1880.

Brisman, Shimeon. *A History and Guide to Judaic Bibliography*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1977. (*His Jewish Research Literature*; vol. 1) (Bibliographica Judaica; 7).

Buxtorf, Johannes. *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*. Basel, 1613.

Dewey, Melvil. *Taktsir ha-miyun ha-esroni*. 5th ed. Jerusalem: Center for Public Libraries, 1983. (Hebrew).

Dewey, Melvil. *Dewey Decimal Classification*. Ed. 20. Albany: Forest Press, 1989.

Friedberg, Chaim D. *Bet 'eked sefarim*. 2d ed. Tel-Aviv, 1950-1956.

Index to Hebrew Periodicals. Haifa: University of Haifa Library, 1977- (Hebrew).

Institute for Hebrew Bibliography. *Specimen brochure*. Jerusalem, 1964. (Hebrew).

Jewish National and University Library. *Seder ha-miktso'ot be-mada 'e ha-yahadut*. 4th ed. Jerusalem, 1981.

Kiryat Sefer. Jerusalem: Jewish National and University Library, 1924- .

Elhanan Adler is assistant director of the library and senior lecturer in librarianship at the University of Haifa.

Example of Israeli Hebrew Cataloging
(From University of Haifa Library)

PZ83
.T558G3

טוקטלי, אהוד.
גלות בין גלים / אהוד טוקטלי, שמואל
וג'ודי קליצנר ; עטיפה וציורים מיכאל
נצר. -- ירושלים : פרי הארץ, תשמ"ז.
90 ע' : איורים ; 23 ס"מ. --
(עלילות ילדי תרשיש ; 1)
I. קליצנר, ג'ודי. II. נצר, מיכאל.
III. קליצנר, שמואל. IV. כותר. V. סדרה.

Figure 1. Card Format

CL PZ83.T558G3

טוקטלי, אהוד	מח
גלות בין גלים	כת
אהוד טוקטלי, שמואל וגי'ודי קליצנר ; עטיפה וציורים מיכאל נצר	אח
ירושלים	מק
פרי הארץ	מל
תשמ"ז	שנ

FY 1987

90 ע' : איורים ; 23 ס"מ.	עמ
עלילות ילדי תרשיש ; 1	הס
קליצנר, ג'ודי	מש
נצר, מיכאל	מש
קליצנר, שמואל	מש

LN HEB
CN 702143

Figure 2. ALEPH Format