

JEWS—DASH: Library of Congress Subject Headings for Judaica: a Methodology for Analysis

Bella Hass Weinberg

*YIVO Institute for Jewish Research and
St. John's University
New York*

Berger and Wachs

Library of Congress Subject Headings (*continued*)

CHANGES

OLD

{ANCIENT ISRAEL
{ISRAEL, ANCIENT

ANGELS—CULTUS
AMAUROTIC FAMILY IDIOCY
ARABIC LITERATURE IN
FOREIGN COUNTRIES
FRINGES (JEWISH CULTUS)
(BM 657.F7)

HEAVEN (JUDAISM)
HELL (JUDAISM)
HIGH HOLY DAY SERMONS
HIGH HOLY DAYS

IMMORTALITY (JUDAISM)
JESUS CHRIST—ATTITUDE
TOWARDS JEWISH DIETARY
LAWS [ATTITUDE TOWARDS
JEWISH LAW, ETC.]

JUDAEA, WILDERNESS OF
(ISRAEL AND JORDAN)
KISHINEV MASSACRE, 1903
(DS135.R9)

LUTHER, MARTIN, 1483-1546—
ATTITUDE TOWARDS JEWS
PAUL, THE APOSTLE, SAINT—
ATTITUDE TOWARDS JUDAISM
PHYLACTERIES
PROVERBS, ARABIC (JUDEO-
ARABIC) (INDIRECT)
RELIGIOUS LITERATURE,
JEWISH
SACRIFICE (JUDAISM) (BM517)
SINAI PENINSULA (EGYPT)
(DS110.5)
SYNAGOGUE MUSIC—HIGH
HOLY DAY SERVICES

NEW

SEE SUBDIVISION
HISTORY [ANCIENT PERIOD SUB-
DIVISION] *UNDER HEADING* JEWS
ANGELS—CULT
TAY-SACHS DISEASE (INDIRECT)
ARABIC LITERATURE—FOREIGN
COUNTRIES (PJ8020)
ZIZITH (INDIRECT) (BM657.F7)

HEAVEN—JUDAISM
HELL—JUDAISM
HIGH HOLIDAY SERMONS (BM746)
HIGH HOLIDAYS (INDIRECT)
(BM693.H5)

IMMORTALITY—JUDAISM
JESUS CHRIST—VIEWS ON
JEWISH DIETARY LAWS [VIEWS
ON JEWISH LAW, ETC.]

JUDAEA, WILDERNESS OF

MASSACRES—MOLDAVIAN S.S.R.
—KISHINEV
AND/OR

KISHINEV (MOLDAVIAN S.S.R.)
—HISTORY

LUTHER, MARTIN, 1483-1546—
VIEWS ON JEWS

PAUL THE APOSTLE, SAINT—
VIEWS ON JUDAISM

TEFILLIN (BM657.P5)
PROVERBS, JUDEO-ARABIC
(INDIRECT)

JEWISH RELIGIOUS LITERATURE
(INDIRECT)

SACRIFICE—JUDAISM
SINAI (EGYPT)

SYNAGOGUE MUSIC—HIGH
HOLIDAY SERVICES

Need for the Study

While many synagogue libraries use small, specialized lists of Judaica subject headings, most Judaica research librarians are dependent upon Library of Congress (LC) cataloging copy, and therefore use its subject headings. For a variety of reasons, these libraries generally modify some Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH), and/or compile lists of local headings to supplement them. In the Judaica library community as a whole, there is little exchange of information on in-house modification of LCSH, and therefore no coordination among libraries in this area. We are not aware of the extent of such modification, and hence cannot measure the dissatisfaction with Library of Congress subject headings for Judaica. We get isolated reports of individual correspondence with LC concerning specific subject headings, but there is no organized activity in this area—in contrast to the Association of Jewish Libraries' efforts in the area of descriptive cataloging.

All of the above reasons warrant a study, but there is a more pressing reason at this time. As the Judaica research library community is on the threshold of automation, with the imminent Hebraic capability of the Research Libraries Group's (RLG) Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), increasing attention will have to be paid to cataloging standards and compatibility of bibliographic records contributed by various libraries. In RLIN, stringent requirements have been established for uniformity in descriptive cataloging, while choice of a classification scheme is up to the individual library. LCSH is the standard for subject headings, unless RLG's BibTech—Subcommittee on Bibliographic Standards and Control has approved an alternative thesaurus (as it has done in the fields of art and medicine), and RLG's Board of Governors has authorized its use. Local modifications of LC subject headings are considered non-standard in RLIN, and a charge is incurred for creating catalog records that contain such headings, while original standard cataloging input to RLIN is free. The pressure to

Pearl Berger is Dean of Libraries at Yeshiva University and President of the Research and Special Libraries Division of AJL. Sharona R. Wachs is currently working on a Judaica

cataloging project at Yeshiva University's Mendel Gottesman Library. She serves as Treasurer of the Association of Jewish Libraries.

conform to LCSH thus has a financial aspect.

While standardization is a lofty ideal, service to a library's user community is even more important, and one is reluctant to recommend that Judaica libraries cease all in-house tampering with LCSH in the interests of economy and uniformity. A more sensible approach is to study the extent of this practice and then determine whether the way to proceed is to recommend changes to LC or—if the in-house modifications are numerous, and it is anticipated that LC will not be receptive to so many changes—perhaps the best course is to develop a separate, possibly LC-compatible Judaica list of subject headings. The latter has the potential for applicability in areas such as Judaica periodical indexing.

Methodology for Analysis

In meetings of Judaica librarians, and of catalogers in particular, one often hears grumbling about LC subject headings for Judaica. Alternative terms are sometimes suggested, without the proposer's having a clear grasp of how the objectionable heading fits into the LC scheme, or what the implications for change are. If coordinated efforts at recommending changes to LC in the area of Judaica subject headings are to be undertaken, we must thoroughly master LCSH's principles and structure. (If independent development of a Judaica thesaurus is the course chosen, an even greater level of knowledge is demanded.)

It does not suffice to say "I don't like this LC subject heading"; the cataloger must be able to give the reason for the objectionability of the heading in professional terms—backing up the criticism in terms of library science or linguistic principles, or by bringing in evidence from Judaica literature. We can succeed in effecting changes in LCSH only when we demonstrate that the Library of Congress has violated *its own principles* in establishing the objectionable headings.

In the chart accompanying this article, fourteen types of criticism of LCSH are listed, each of which is discussed and illustrated below. The list of problem areas, which is probably not exhaustive, is cross-tabulated first with two questions that should be posed before recommending a change:

(1) Is there *literary warrant* for the LC term? In other words, can evidence for the subject heading be found in reference works and the literature? If so, there is not much point in writing to LC, even if within the Jewish world, an alternative term is preferred.

(2) Is the term *consistent with the LC pattern for other groups*? In recent years, LC

has tried to make application of LCSH more predictable by establishing pattern headings in a variety of areas, including religious and ethnic groups. If an objectionable Judaica subject heading falls into such a pattern, there is no point in recommending a change to LC that will necessitate the revision of its entire paradigm, affecting hundreds of thousands of headings for Christians, Arabs, and other religious and ethnic groups.

Once these questions have been answered, there are five possible courses of action for an individual library or for Judaica librarians acting in concert regarding objectionable subject headings.

(1) **Accept LC**—If, for example, it is determined that a particular Judaica subject heading fits into a pattern, and it is thus pointless to recommend a change, we may simply decide to live with a less-than-ideal situation, pointing to the economic advantages of using LC copy as justification.

(2) **Recommend Changes to LC**—If it can be demonstrated that LC is violating its own principles, and if literary warrant for the proposed alternative Judaica heading can be demonstrated, it is reasonable to ask LC to modify a heading.

(3) **Reject the Term**—For certain subject headings, which are either redundant with headings in the author-title catalog, too general to be useful in a Judaica library or too objectionable, the decision may be made to omit the LC subject heading, and not to substitute any other for it.

(4) **Revise (one-to-one change)**—For the majority of headings, a single replacement will generally be the recommended course of action, with a term that is more current or more acceptable to the Judaica library community.

(5) **Revise (one-to-many change)**—For LC subject headings that are not specific enough for Judaica library purposes, multiple headings may be recommended, either to supplement an LC heading, or to replace it.

The various problem areas are now discussed in detail with reference to the above-defined procedures for analysis and possible courses of action. The examples given do not necessarily reflect current LC practice; they have been selected to illustrate categories of objectionable Judaica subject headings that have warranted in-house modification or the use of alternative term lists.

1. **Theologically objectionable**—LC has often been accused, most vocally by Sanford Berman, of "Christian Primacy" (Ber-

man, 1981, p. 121). This means it is assumed that Christianity is the standard, normal religion, and only non-standard ones need be named in subject headings. Thus, in some cases, the Judaica heading *per se* may not be objectionable, but rather the unmodified heading which it follows, such as G-D or ANGELS, which LC assumed included the Christian aspect. With the addition of a (CHRISTIANITY) gloss, this type of Christian primacy is easily rectified. A more difficult case is the heading BIBLE. O.T. (Old Testament), which is also used in descriptive cataloging, and is theologically objectionable in many Judaica libraries. There is clearly literary warrant for it in thousands of Christian works, which the evidence from Jewish literature probably cannot outweigh. The implications for the Library of Congress of a revision of the Bible heading are mind-boggling. Not only would all the descriptive and subject headings for *Bible O.T.* have to be changed, but all Bible headings would have to be revised to *Bible + N.T.*, and the *Bible N.T.* heading would have to be revised to *New Testament*, as is done at the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem. There is no chance, however, of the Judaica community's winning such a theological debate with LC, and there is thus no point in initiating it. Where a Judaica librarian feels strongly that his/her user community would object to such an LC subject heading on theological grounds, the only solution may be in-house modification. There are other areas where a case for neutrality can be made, and the Christian primacy can be extricated from LCSH. Where a theological phenomenon is relevant only within Judaism, it is plausible to argue that the preferred terminology of the adherents of that religion be employed in LCSH.

2. **Politically objectionable**—Most headings that are politically objectionable to Judaica libraries concern the State of Israel. Many of the arguments brought in for the *Bible O.T.* question apply to the debate on the status of the Occupied Territories. It is unrealistic to expect LC to replace the heading WEST BANK (which replaces an older, more objectionable heading) with JUDEA and SAMARIA, no matter how many demonstrations we hold or letters we write. As for the recognition of JERUSALEM as the capital of Israel, we should try to bring in evidence from the field of international law. LC's use of the term PALESTINE for the Antiquities of the pre-state period also appears to involve some bias, despite its literary warrant, because for historical materials on other countries, such as the SOVIET UNION, the latest name is used exclusively in subject headings. If LC is arguing that PALESTINE was the name of the country

Proposed Methodology for the Analysis of Library of Congress Subject Headings for Judaica

Problem Category	Example	Analysis			Solution				
		Literary Warrant?	Consistent With LC Pattern for Other Groups?	1 Accept LC	2 Recommend Change to LC	3 Reject Term	4 Revise Term (One-to-one Change)	5 Revise Term (One-to-many Change)	
1. Theologically Objectionable	BIBLE. O.T.								
2. Politically Objectionable	WEST BANK								
3. Sociologically Objectionable	JEWISH QUESTION								
4. Obsolete Terminology	AMAUROTIC FAMILY IDIOCY								
5. Transliteration vs. Translation	SHABBAT SHUBAH/ SABBATH								
6. Lack of Specificity	JEWS—HISTORY for <i>Anshe Keneset Ha-Gedolah</i>								
7. Insufficient Subdivision	HOLOCAUST, JEWISH								
8. Redundancy of Headings	Haggadah/ HAGGADOT—TEXTS								
9. Inversion Desirable	JEWS—; JEWISH...								
10. Inversion Undesirable	COMMANDMENTS, TEN								
11. Inconsistent Pattern	JEWISH SERMONS; SERMONS, HEBREW								
12. Unclear Scope	MARRIAGE (JEWISH LAW) MARRIAGE CUSTOMS AND RITES, JEWISH								
13. Insufficient Cross References	JEWISH CRIMINALS								
14. Inaccurate Cross References	LADINO xJudismo								

during the period discussed in historical works, it should add the heading JUDEA for works dealing with an even earlier period.

The guideline for subject heading analysis in this area is: if the LC term is one that the rest of the world and the media are using, there is not much point in requesting a change, no matter how strong our political convictions. It must be noted that even

within the Judaica library community, agreement on such questions as the terminology for Greater Israel is not expected, as we reflect all shades of the political spectrum.

3. **Sociologically Objectionable**—In this category, we focus on terms that are offensive to the Jewish people, and which carry connotations of anti-Semitism. The one that

has received the most attention is JEWISH QUESTION, and in response to the pressure from Sanford Berman and a variety of organizations, the Library of Congress recently abolished this heading without replacing it. In my view, this heading was not objectionable, and the term Sanford Berman proposed as its replacement, i.e., JEWS—RELATIONS WITH GENTILES (Berman, 1981, p. 121), is not a synonym.

Many Jewish and pro-Jewish writers have written on the Jewish question in a variety of languages, always translating the term literally. The fact that multiple governments had to come up with special laws for their Jewish citizens is not a pleasant one, but there is no other easily recognizable name for the topic. Coining euphemisms is a disservice to our users.

Laymen perusing LCSH may point to a heading such as JEWISH CRIMINALS and note the absence of certain other ethnic groups among the CRIME AND CRIMINALS headings. Before dashing off a protest letter to LC, we must recognize several things: (1) There are Jewish criminals; (2) Books have been written about Jewish criminals, most often by Jews; and (3) Since there is literary warrant for the heading, there is no bias in its establishment by LCSH.

A lot of attention is focused by critics of LC on the indigenous names of ethnic groups, with the argument that names applied by outsiders are pejorative. This is true of ESKIMOS vs. *Inuit* and FALASHAS vs. *Ethiopian Jews*. Even if an ethnonym originally had pejorative connotations, if its current usage carries no stigma, I feel it is wrong to agitate for reform, especially if the indigenous form is not known to the library's users. Furthermore, it has been shown that an ethnic group eventually adopts the pejorative name assigned by outsiders as its preferred label. This is true for *Blacks* as well as for *Jews*. Much evidence for this can be found in older publications which feature "Israelites" and "Hebrews" as euphemisms for *Jews* and "Mosaic" for the adjective *Jewish*. Carrying the "indigenous" argument to its extreme, we should demand that the Library of Congress use all Hebrew terminology in its subject headings for Judaica rather than English translations coined by "outsiders."

In considering LC subject terms that are sociologically objectionable, we should try to avoid *semantic engineering*, modifying the language to reflect a non-existent situation. There have been many sad chapters in Jewish history, and there are many unpleasant aspects of modern Jewish life. Changing subject headings to mask these unpleasantities is futile and constitutes a disservice to both scholars and laymen.

4. Obsolete Terminology— We would like our users to find material on a subject under the first term that they try, and the use of obsolete terminology constitutes a hindrance. The replacement of the heading AMAUROTIC FAMILY IDIOTCY by the former cross reference TAY-SACHS' DISEASE is a welcome change by LC, especially since the former heading has offensive connotations.

5. Transliteration vs. Translation—For many Judaic concepts, we have a choice of establishing a heading in systematic Romanization from the Hebrew, or of using a rough English equivalent. It is often difficult to determine which form is better known to our users. LCSH certainly features both patterns, and applies them inconsistently for related headings, e.g., SABBATH vs. SHABBAT SHUBAH. In the recently established liturgy headings, we find both translation and transliteration, the latter based on the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* form. In a previous paper, it has been pointed out that translation has been chosen where the transliterated form is better known (PILGRIM FESTIVALS vs. *Shalosh Regalim*) and vice versa (Weinberg, 1984, p. 70). One is reluctant to recommend absolute consistency, however, because certain Jewish concepts are clearly better known in the English-speaking world in an Anglicized form. LC cannot be guided by the speakers of "Judeo-English"—those who pepper their English liberally with Hebrew and Yiddish words— in establishing its subject headings. There must be substantial literary warrant for transliterated forms in scholarly Judaic publications for them to be preferred over translations.

6. Lack of Specificity—This is the charge most frequently leveled at LCSH by librarians in many subject specialties, and it is the most frequent reason for the development of independent lists of subject headings. Before accusing LC of lack of specificity, however, the Judaica librarian must determine: (a) whether his/her specialized collection is richer than LC's is in that area, and (b) whether more detailed subject analysis is being done in the special library than at LC. For example, if there is a special collection on Jewish crafts containing works in a variety of media, and only 10% of those works are held at LC, it is not fair to criticize LCSH for lack of specificity, because LC does not have the literary warrant for numerous subject headings on that topic. We must keep in mind that LCSH is not a theoretical list of all possible topics, but rather a practical tool for retrieval of works held by the Library of Congress.

There are cases, however, where one can demonstrate that LC owns works on a specific topic, but uses broader headings in cataloging them. In an LC Hebraica card recently seen for a book on *Anshe Keneset Ha-Gedolah* (#83-165788), the only subject heading assigned was JEWS—HISTORY with a period subdivision. This important corporate body certainly warrants a heading of its own, possibly in translation as Men of the Great Assembly. Another example found in the same batch of LC Hebraica

cards is a book about the prayer *Ashre* (#83-231368), to which the general headings BIBLE O.T. PSALMS (with form subdivisions) and JUDAISM—LITURGY were assigned by LC. There is a precedent at LC for the establishment of subject headings for individual prayers in SHEMA. Using *Encyclopaedia Judaica* as its authority for uniform titles of liturgical works, LC should have assigned ASHREI to this work.

As for the second point, depth of subject analysis, we must keep in mind that LC practices *summarization* only in its subject heading work—characterizing the overall content of the book—rather than analyzing chapters within it. If a Judaica library acquires a book on sociolinguistics, and wants to call to the attention of its user community that the book contains a chapter on "Yiddish-English bilingualism in the Lubavitch Community of Brooklyn," one cannot fault LC for not having a subject heading to characterize the latter topic. LCSH is not designed for periodical indexing or analysis of the contents of books. Libraries that wish to engage in such commendable activities must either develop supplementary terminology to LCSH or use an alternative system for subject analysis, such as a detailed classification scheme.

7. Insufficient Subdivision—In some cases, LC has established terminology for major topics in Jewish Studies, but has not instituted enough subdivisions of main headings for the breakdown of voluminous files. An example frequently cited is HOLOCAUST, JEWISH, and Judaica libraries of all types have developed local lists of subdivisions of this heading to provide adequate specificity in their catalogs. [See DEWEINEAZAR in this issue—Eds.]

LC's recent development of free-floating subdivisions and of pattern headings makes it easier for libraries that collect more intensively in certain areas than does LC to assign appropriately specific subdivisions to certain headings, but where *topical* rather than *form* subdivisions are required, the standard subdivisions are of no help.

Sometimes the problem is a lack of *pre-coordination* rather than of subdivision. This is evident in the older LC records for the Holocaust, where, for a work on the *Holocaust in Poland*, e.g., we would find two separate subject headings: WORLD WAR, 1939-1945—JEWS and WORLD WAR, 1939-1945—POLAND. As we move towards automation, there is a reluctance to request increasing pre-coordination of headings in LCSH, since a computerized catalog permits *post-coordination*, i.e., the combination of terms at the searching stage (e.g., HOLOCAUST and POLAND). In a manual envi-

ronment, however, pre-coordination is essential in all but the smallest catalogs. Otherwise, one would have to scan all of the HOLOCAUST subject entries to determine which related to POLAND.

8. Redundancy of Headings—Whereas we would usually like LC to *add* terms, in some cases, we would like them to eliminate subject headings that are redundant. There are several patterns to this: (a) when the identical subject is expressed in two ways; (b) when the subject heading duplicates the information in the author-title catalog; and (c) when a broad heading is assigned in addition to a specific one (in technical terms, *generic posting*). For Judaica research libraries with large catalogs, all three of these practices can be expensive in terms of space and clerical time. An example of the first is the “flipping” of pre-coordinated headings, such as ISRAEL—FOREIGN RELATIONS—EGYPT. The Foreign Relations headings are one of the first groups for which LC instituted “double” subject access, with the justification that it is a reciprocal relationship. While this is true, it is more sensible for a library with a rich collection on Israeli politics to make a cross reference from EGYPT—FOREIGN RELATIONS—ISRAEL rather than to assign the redundant heading. Another example is in the [Topic—Place] category of headings, which are in some cases reversed to provide access under [Place—Topic]. SYNAGOGUES—JERUSALEM and JERUSALEM—SYNAGOGUES is a pair of headings found on LC Card #84-123528 that illustrates this type of redundancy; however, this record was recently revised as LC discontinued its ‘city flip’ policy (LC, 1985), thus limiting the application of this category of duplicate subject heading practice.

The most prominent example of the second type of redundant heading is the new LC pattern for cataloging liturgical works, where, for example, for each work that is a *Haggadah*, the subject heading HAGGADOT—TEXTS is assigned. This problem has already been analyzed in detail, and a cross reference structure suggested (Weinberg, 1984, pp. 71-73).

Generic posting, the third type of redundant subject heading practice, is now applied by LC to liturgical works (JUDAISM—LITURGY—TEXTS), and has been applied for several years to biographical ones, where, e.g., for every work about MOSHE DAYAN, we have the additional heading STATESMEN—ISRAEL—BIOGRAPHY. The problem with this type of generic posting has been pointed out in a previous paper (Weinberg, 1978, pp. 23-25). Essentially the flaw in this practice is that it yields a useless

subarrangement. While it is useful to identify Israeli statesmen in the subject catalog, the subarrangement of this general heading by *authors* of the biographies rather than by *biographees* is a disservice to our users.

In cases of redundant subject heading practices, where LC is unlikely to change its practices, even though they represent a violation of the principle of specific entry, individual Judaica libraries may decide to reject certain headings, or turn them into cross references.

9. Inversion Desirable—For the Judaica librarian, the preponderance of LC subject headings in our field that begin with the letter *J* is a disadvantage. In fact, the primary characteristic of local Judaica subject heading schemes is the elimination of the Jewish modifier—in initial or secondary position, as it is assumed that all subjects relate to Jews or Judaism (Kurland, 1982, p. ii). Analogous practices are common in many specialized subject heading lists, and a recent paper comparing *Catholic Subject Headings* with LCSH notes that a Christian context is assumed in the former (Nichol, 1985, p. 1983). [This is interesting in light of the accusation that LCSH features “Christian Primacy,” as noted under category 1 above.] *Catholic Subject Headings* often omits the CHRISTIAN modifier found in LCSH.

Although it may be argued that for the majority of works in a Judaica library, the qualifiers JEWS, JEWISH and JUDAISM are redundant, there are two reasons for not totally eliminating them: (1) in some cases, a distinction must be made between the ethnic and religious aspects of a topic; (2) almost all Judaica libraries collect some general works—if only for reference or comparative purposes—and those must be distinguished from the specifically Jewish works. Nichol’s suggestion that when specialized lists of terms are combined with general subject heading lists, a word characterizing the context of each of the specialized terms be added (e.g., CATHOLIC or JEWISH) further complicates this problem (Nichol, 1985, p. 187).

Once we grant that the Jewish modifiers are necessary, before arguing for inversion, we must study the LC pattern. Was a certain group of JEWS—headings created in an analogous fashion to a group of CHRISTIANS—headings? If so, recommending inversion is likely to be futile, because all religious groups are being treated uniformly. We must keep in mind that whereas Judaica collections focus on one nationality, the Library of Congress is collecting material on

hundreds, if not thousands, of peoples; thus, the modifier JEWISH, which is highly frequent in our catalogs, is relatively rare in the LC catalogs. We would like to disperse the various topics in Judaica throughout the alphabet, but for someone searching the vast Library of Congress catalog, it may be preferable to have these clustered under *J*. For the individual Judaica library, in-house modification is a rather simple option.

10. Inversion Undesirable—One of the principles of American subject heading practice is that terms should be established in direct order. Headings like COMMANDMENTS, TEN violate this principle and give our patrons the impression that librarians never establish subject terminology that matches users’ search terminology on the first try. Moreover, “cross references make cross readers.”

The rationale for such inversions is that they bring to the fore the more “important” word of the heading—usually the noun. In the case cited, LCSH is juxtaposing COMMANDMENTS, SIX HUNDRED AND THIRTEEN with COMMANDMENTS, TEN. Such attempts to create classified groupings of headings through inversion reduce the predictability of alphabetical subject headings and violate a cardinal principle of subject cataloging. We cannot have both direct access to the names of topics and avoid the scatter of related topics by the accident of their alphabetical position at the same time. These are arguments we can direct to LC in requesting the reversal of undesirable inversions, and we may make in-house changes while awaiting LC’s response.

11. Inconsistent Pattern—In some cases, pattern headings notwithstanding, the order of compound LC subject headings appears to be totally inconsistent. An example recently encountered was on LC card #84-124429, which featured the headings JEWISH SERMONS—IRAQ and SERMONS, HEBREW—IRAQ. (The ninth edition of LCSH has SERMONS, JEWISH). While the principle applied in this new practice may be that the religious modifier precedes the term SERMONS and the language modifier follows it, the juxtaposition of the two appears ludicrous. Furthermore, one suspects that in the subarrangement of sermons by language, there is an assumption that they are Christian in orientation. Perhaps the recommendation could be made that all sermons for one religion be collocated, and then subarranged by language.

In general, it is unpredictable in LCSH whether the JEWISH modifier will be in initial or inverted position, and many incon-

sistent pairs of related headings can be identified.

12. **Unclear Scope**—Whereas we usually request that LC add headings and subdivisions to ensure greater specificity, sometimes our leader makes such fine distinctions that even the knowledgeable Judaica librarian cannot determine in which cases the headings are to be applied. Some recent examples are the distinction between EDUCATION, JEWISH; JEWISH RELIGIOUS EDUCATION; and JUDAISM—STUDY AND TEACHING. The distinction between rites, customs and laws of Jewish ceremonies and holidays is also difficult to apply in light of the maxim that “a custom in Israel is like a law.” An example from the ninth edition of LCSH (1980) of a pair of headings that illustrates this point is MARRIAGE (JEWISH LAW) and MARRIAGE CUSTOMS AND RITES, JEWISH (with no *see also* references between them). Post-dating the ninth edition is the heading MARRIAGE—RELIGIOUS ASPECTS—JUDAISM, and records have been found that contain all three overlapping headings.

When the scope of a heading is unclear, we are assured of inconsistency in its application. In such cases, we should write LC for clarification, and if it is felt by the Judaica library community that useless distinctions are being maintained, collapse of two headings into one, or the elimination of one of them, should be recommended.

13. **Insufficient Cross References**—Because of the numerous ways in which Judaica subject headings can be established—in direct or inverted order; in translated or transliterated form, to name just a few alternatives—our users often do not find the topics they are seeking. The larger the catalog, the greater the problem; e.g., LC has established JEWS—EMPLOYMENT rather than JEWISH OCCUPATIONS, and these entries will be very far apart in a research library catalog. (The cross reference OCCUPATIONS, JEWISH—more likely to be sought—is also missing). We can, of course, add cross references in our own catalogs, but it is helpful if LC makes them “official.” This relieves the individual librarian of the burden of trying to think of all the alternative ways in which a subject can be expressed.

We should focus not only on *see* references, but on *see also* references as well, to assure that our users are led to related headings. Sometimes LC uses a *see also* reference in place of a *see* reference from an inverted form. For example, there is no *see* reference from CRIMINALS, JEWISH to JEWISH CRIMINALS, only a *see also* reference from CRIME AND CRIMINALS.

14. **Inaccurate Cross-References**—As there is very little true synonymy in natural language, sometimes LC equates different phenomena via *see* references. In some cases, the recommendation should be the establishment of separate headings; in others, the elimination of the incorrect reference. The scholarly literature can be cited to provide evidence for these arguments, but sometimes there is a conflict between the scholar's term and the best-known form. I recently encountered an example of this in reviewing the draft standard on language codes for the National Information Standards Organization. The Association of Jewish Libraries' representative objected to the code LADINO, derived from LCSH, and advocated its replacement by JUDEZMO, the more scholarly term, which encompasses LADINO and other varieties of “Judeo-Spanish.” Since *Encyclopaedia Judaica* uses “Ladino,” as do many popular writers on the subject, and since it is not easy to distinguish between Ladino and other varieties of Judezmo, the decision was made to stay with LADINO and refer from JUDEZMO.

A charge of incorrect cross-referencing in LCSH may also stem from differing theological, political and social points-of-view in the Judaica library community and in Washington. Thus we come full circle to the initial categories on this list. Sanford Berman advocates that offensive terminology be placed in quotes in cross references to indicate that it is not the librarian's preferred usage.

Procedure for the Study

The following procedures are recommended for a study of in-house modifications of Library of Congress subject headings for Judaica:

A. Each library in which such modifications are compiled should submit lists of such changes, as well as other LC subject headings found objectionable, to an AJL committee coordinating this effort—most likely, a subcommittee of the AJL Committee on Cataloging.

B. These lists should be analyzed structurally by the AJL committee, possibly using the above-suggested methodology, or a revised and expanded version thereof.

C. Statistics should be compiled on the number of changes—in total, and categorized by type.

D. A report should be made to the AJL membership, and feedback solicited.

E. A decision should be taken to either:

1. Propose specific changes in subject heading practice to LC— if the number of

such changes is not too great. If this course is chosen, each recommendation should be backed up by evidence from reference works and local library practices.

2. Prepare an AJL list of Judaica subject headings, preferably compatible with LCSH, indicating the nature of correspondence between AJL and LC terms (e.g., one-to-one—substitution; one-to-many—addition of specific headings for a broad term; inversion). If this course is chosen, attempts should be made to have this alternative list officially recognized by bibliographic utilities.

A compilation which may be of assistance in the proposed study is Daniel Stuhlman's *Library of Congress Subject Headings for Judaica*, originally published in 1982 and updated in 1983, with a new edition announced for 1986. One problem with the list is that it includes some local modifications to LCSH without clearly tagging them. The main advantage of the compilation is that it is maintained in machine-readable form, so that changes, insertions, and deletions are implemented with ease. Libraries may purchase the disc and program to maintain lists of their own modifications; an AJL committee coordinating the subject heading study could also use this database.

The proposed study is not a simple one, and it will require the contribution of time and effort by many Judaica librarians. The work will not end with the study, however. If the study is to have any utility in the long term, there must be constant monitoring of additions and changes to LCSH as they affect Judaica. The reports on these in this journal's CATALOG DEPARTMENT serve as the data collection phase; we need to move on to the analysis phase if we are to be more than passive consumers of a centralized cataloging product.

The recommendation to develop an alternative list of Judaica Subject Headings should not be made lightly, as its maintenance is a very time-consuming and hence expensive proposition. The only justification for it could be the existence of numerous LC subject headings which the Judaica library community finds unacceptable, and which the Library of Congress is unwilling or unable to change. Only then, could the benefit of improved user service in Judaica libraries outweigh the cost of deviating from centralized cataloging copy.

Acknowledgment

A careful review of the manuscript by Sharna R. Wachs of Yeshiva University is gratefully acknowledged.

(continued on page 40, column 3)

Media

Jewish Educational Media

784 Eastern Parkway
Brooklyn, NY 11213

Tapes of the Lubavitcher Rebbe's addresses.

Nefesh Ami

107 B. Broadway
P.O. Box 651
Hicksville, NY 11801

Fall-Winter 1985 Catalog. 12 p.

This catalog lists records, books, cassettes, video-cassettes, and games. It features a large collection of all types of Jewish music from the U.S. and Israel, including a long section on children's music.

Tara Publications

29 Derby Avenue
Cedarhurst, NY 11516

A Harvest of Jewish Music. 46 p.

This firm has added computer software to its extensive catalog of books, records and cassettes in the field of Jewish music. The dealer also provides search service.

Publishers' Catalogs

Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists

1373 Coney Island Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11230

Publications of Interest to Orthodox Jewish Scientists.

Contains AOJS publications, as well as others concerned with the relationship of Orthodox Judaism to science and medicine. Includes a list of cassette tapes on this theme.

C.I.S. Communications, Inc.

674 Eighth Street
Lakewood, NJ 08701

Publisher of books with an Orthodox orientation. The catalog includes works on religious topics, as well as fiction for young adults.

Holocaust Publications

216 West 18th Street
New York, NY 10011

A non-profit organization, the goal of which is to publish works of all types on the Holocaust.

Institute Bne Issakher

Tseelim 1/21
Jerusalem, Israel

American Contact:
Rabbi David Sebag
1474 59th Street
Brooklyn, NY 11219

The Sephardic Library. Part I (April 1985); Part II (May 1985).

Catalogs of books written by Sephardic Rabbis. Some are contemporary, and others date from earlier periods. This is a non-profit organization that intends to publish books dealing with the Sephardic Jewish heritage.

Reviews

Seforim Newsletter.

Vol. I No. 1, March, 1985-. Monthly.
c/o Eichler's
1429 Coney Island Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11230

Edited and written mostly by Yaakov Elman, formerly of Rabinowitz Book Store, this newsletter is devoted to short reviews of new books "within the limits imposed by fidelity to a viable, traditional Judaism." As an organ of a bookstore, one would expect that the reviews would generally be positive, yet some notices are critical. The annotations vary in length and depth. Some entries feature short descriptions; others are mini-review essays. In the first three issues, the number of reviews grew from 8 to 32, and there are plans to double the size of an issue and to add special features and columns. Included are English and Hebrew titles, as well as juvenilia. All reviews are in English.

This is a specialized type of selection tool, but no doubt every Judaica library will find a number of books of interest. The timeliness of this newsletter—if it keeps to its publication schedule—is certainly useful. We welcome this addition to our collection of Judaica acquisition tools and look forward to its growth and expansion.

Edith Lubetski is Assistant Professor of Library Administration and Head Librarian, Hedi Steinberg Library, Stern College for Women, Yeshiva University. She is the author with her husband, Prof. Meir Lubetski, of Building a Judaica Library Collection, which was published by Libraries Unlimited in 1983. Professor Lubetski is also the Vice-President/President-Elect of the Association of Jewish Libraries.

Weinberg (continued from p. 25)

References

Berman, Sanford "The Jewish Question' in Subject Cataloging." In his: *The Joy of Cataloging: Essays, Letters, Reviews and Other Explosions.* Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 1981, pp. 113-123.

Kurland, Mildred; Weine, Mae. *Subject Headings for a Judaica Library.* 4th ed. [New York]: Association of Jewish Libraries, 1982.

[LC]. "City Flip' Discontinued in Subject Cataloging Practice." *Cataloging Service Bulletin*, No. 30 (Fall 1985), pp. 29-32.

[LCSH] *Library of Congress Subject Headings.* 9th ed. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1980.

Nichol, W. Thomas "Theological Subject Headings Reconsidered." *Library Resources & Technical Services*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (April/June 1985), pp. 180-188.

Stuhlmán, Daniel D. *Library of Congress Subject Headings for Judaica.* Chicago, IL: BYLS Press, 1982.

Weinberg, Bella Hass. *Implications of Changes in Library of Congress Cataloging Policy for Judaica/Hebraica Librarians.* [Miami, FL: Association of Jewish Libraries, 1978.

Weinberg, Bella Hass "The Cataloging of Jewish Liturgy by the Library of Congress: a Critique." *Judaica Librarianship*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Spring 1984), pp. 70-74.

Dr. Bella Hass Weinberg is an Associate Professor in the Division of Library and Information Science of St. John's University and Consulting Librarian at YIVO Institute for Jewish Research. She also chairs the Index Education Committee of the American Society of Indexers.

This paper is based on a presentation made at a Cataloging Workshop of the New York Metropolitan Area Chapter of the Association of Jewish Libraries, held at the Jewish Theological Seminary on Dec. 12, 1984. Many of the problems cited in the paper are based on questions raised by participants in the series of Cataloging Workshops.