



ESSAYS
ON
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARIANSHIP

PRESENTED TO
CALVIN HENRY SCHMITT

Edited by
Peter De Klerk
Earle Hilgert

The American Theological Library Association
Philadelphia

1980

Copyright 1980 by The American Theological Library
Association.

Corrigendum, p. 55, l. 18:

Read "Zeitalters" rather than "Zeites."

Printed in the United States of America.

CONTENTS

Foreward, vii

Tabula Gratulatoria, xi

I. Calvin Henry Schmitt

1. Calvin H. Schmitt: Curriculum Vitae, 1
2. *Jack L. Stotts*, Calvin H. Schmitt: a McCormick Appreciation, 5
3. *Richard W. Dorn*, Ein Brief an Calvin Schmitt, 11

II. Theological Books and Their Contents

4. *Ans J. van der Bent*, Counseling Students in Ecumenical Research at the Doctoral Level, 17
5. *Maria Grossmann*, The Luther-Gesellschaft and its Publications, 29
6. *Edgar Krentz*, Theological Bibliography in the Eighteenth Century, 47
7. *John B. Trotti*, Theology and Literature, 67

III. Theological Libraries and Their Management

8. *Lowell C. Albee, Jr.*, Can These Bones Live? The Place of Rare Books in a Denominational Theological Seminary, 87
9. *Earle and Elvire Hilgert*, The Librarian-Educator in a Theological School, 119

10. *Stephen L. Peterson*, Collection Development in Theological Libraries: a New Model--a New Hope, 143
 11. *Louis Charles Willard*, An Analysis of Paper Stability and Circulation Patterns of the Monographic Collection of Speer Library, Princeton Theological Seminary, 163
- IV. Theological Information and Its Control
12. *G. Fay Dickerson*, Religion Indexes and the Future, 175
 13. *Doralyn J. Hickey*, The Bibliography of Theological Bibliography: a Problem Seeking a Solution, 195
 14. *Kenneth O'Malley, C.P.*, Corporate Headings with Form Subheadings in Theological Libraries, 215
- Contributors, 237

FOREWARD

The choice of a Festschrift as a means of honoring Calvin H. Schmitt is particularly appropriate both in light of the importance he has always placed on the collection of such volumes in the McCormick Theological Seminary Library and in view of his longstanding concern for adequate bibliographical control of multi-author works in religion. He has given tangible expression to this concern through his leadership of the American Theological Library Association's Board of Indexing, which has recently inaugurated *Religion Index Two: Multi-Author Works* (Chicago: American Theological Library Association, 1978-) and will soon release *Religion Index Two: Festschriften, 1960-1969*, edited by Betty and Elmer O'Brien.

This book responds also to a need felt by the Association for more extensive professional literature in the field of theological librarianship. The editors hope that the volume will begin to fill this longstanding lacuna and will encourage continuing research and publication in theological librarianship.

Intrinsic to a Festschrift is the fact that it is the work of many people. This book is such indeed, and has engaged the efforts of a number of persons in addition to its authors. The proposal for the volume originated in 1978 with the ATLA Committee on Publication, whose members were Murray Wagner (Bethany Theological Seminary), chairperson, James Dunkly (Nashota House), Peter De Klerk (Calvin Theological Seminary), and Kenneth Rowe (Drew University). This committee has sponsored the project throughout. The frontispiece photograph was graciously supplied by Thomas J. Arthur (McCormick Theological Seminary); the photographs reproduced on pp. 108-115 are the work of Steven Anderson (Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago). Alice Muir-Schmitt conspired with the editors in providing data for the Curriculum Vitae, while Eileen Fitzsimons (Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago) did much of the proofreading. Cheryl Dieter, John Nelson, and Nelda Rhoades of the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago have helped in many ways. Appreciation is also due Mrs. Joan Allman and her staff of typists for preparing the book for printing, and to Ned Thomson of Thomson-Shore Printers, Inc., of Dexter, Michigan, for production of the printed volume.

Our greatest appreciation, however, goes to the honoree himself. For more than three decades he has been a leader in theological librarianship whose effectiveness in his field has been enhanced by significant contributions as churchman, educator, and internationalist. These words, in Calvin Schmitt's first language, fit him well:

Um umzuschaffen das Geschaffne
Damit sich nicht zum Starren waffne,
Wirkt ewiges, lebendiges Tun.

(Goethe, *Eins und Alles.*)

The Editors

TABULA GRATULATORIA

Among the many who would wish to congratulate the honoree are the following:

Gregory D. Alles
Norman E. Anderson
Dean Timothy Andrews
Rubén Armendáriz
Sue Armendáriz
Charles Harvey Arnold
Thomas Arthur
Homer U. Ashby
Richard E. Asher
Martha B. Aycock
David Baker
Sean M. Barnett
Robert F. Beach
Henry J. Bertels, S.J.
Joel Bjorling
Joan Blocher
Robert G. Boling
John A. Bollier
Harold H. Booher
Gloria Borson
Liane Bowden
Raymond A. Bowden
Peter Bower
Richard P. Breaden
George H. Bricker
Duncan Brockway

Oscar Burdick
Anna H. Burgess
John E. Burkhart
James L. Caddy
Alva R. Caldwell
Thomas Edward Camp
Edward F. Campbell
Jerry D. Campbell
Phyllis Campbell
Winifred Campbell
Frederick L. Chenery
Adela Y. Collins
Leo M. Constantino
Eloise Cueto
Alice M. Dagan
Simeon Daly, O.S.B.
Janet L. Davidson
Elizabeth A. Dean
Jeffrey J. Dean
Josephine M. Dearborn
Paul M. Debusman
Ronald F. Deering
Peter De Klerk
John A. Delivuk
John B. DeMayo
William Richard Denton

| | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Lenore M. Dickinson | Arthur E. Jones, Jr. |
| Cheryl Dieter | Josantony Joseph |
| Carl S. Dudley | J. Stillson Judah |
| Shirley S. Dudley | Kaiser Ramaker Library |
| George Lees Douglas | North American Baptist |
| Robert Dvorak | Seminary |
| James P. Else | Norman J. Kansfield |
| Tim Erdel | Martha Keener |
| J. Irving Erickson | Dennis H. Kelly |
| Donn Michael Farris | Evelyn Kieffer |
| Joyce L. Farris | Jay Kieffer |
| Arlene M. Feiner | Evah O. Kincheloe |
| Paul-E. Fillion | Douglas Kings |
| Kelly Fitzpatrick | Roland E. Kircher |
| Eileen Fitzsimons | Mary Kirklin |
| Wilson N. Flemister | Warren S. Kissinger |
| Les R. Galbraith | Calvin C. Klemt |
| Roger Gambrel | Judy Knop |
| Neil W. Gerdes | Charmian Kuhr |
| Paul Gericke | R. Virginia Leach |
| Francis Germovnik | Harriet V. Leonard |
| Dorothy Jane Gilliam | William E. Leshner |
| Ward E. Gongoll | Annie May Alston Lewis |
| Delena Goodman | Rosalyn Lewis |
| William G. Guindon, S.J. | Evelyn M. Lobell |
| Jeanie Haapalainen | Robert Losee |
| John R. Haas | Cynthia W. Lund |
| Dikran Y. Hadidian | Joel W. Lundeen |
| Lucille Hager | Kathleen M. Lutz |
| Hugh Halverstadt | Sarah Lyons |
| Roberta Hamburger | George Magnuson |
| Bobbi Wells Hargleroad | Robert Maloy |
| Don S. Hasty | John T. Maniatis |
| Jane T. Hasty | Linda Mason |
| Sr. M. Esther Hanley | Donald N. Matthews |
| Brian L. Helge | Mrs. Donald N. Matthews |
| William Daviess Hennessy | Brenda McCarthy |
| Lawrence H. Hill, O.S.B. | Terrence McCloskey, C.S.S.R. |
| Jerene Houser | Laurence W. McGrath |
| Doran A. Hill | H. Eugene McLeod |
| Judith Hochberg | Karen McLoughlin |
| Robert D. Ibach, Jr. | John B. McTaggart |
| Catherine Ipser | Warren R. Mehl |
| James S. Irvine | Beverly Melchor |
| Leesa Jacobson | Don L. Meredith |
| Cynthia Jarvis | Richard H. Mintel |
| Marci Jensen | Sara M. Mobley |
| Melvin K. Johnson | Jean K. Morris |
| Carolyn Jones | Raymond P. Morris |

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Lewis S. Mudge | Franklin Sherman |
| Robert Navarro | Joseph Sittler |
| John Nelson | Lynne W. Smith |
| John W. Neth | Newland F. Smith 3rd |
| Margaret E. Newhall | Niels H. Sonne |
| Betty A. O'Brien | Debbie Soule |
| Elmer J. O'Brien | William S. Sparks |
| Ellis E. O'Neil, Jr. | Thomas H. Spence, Jr. |
| Edwin C. Osburn | Kay L. Stockdale |
| James A. Overbeck | Isabelle Stouffer |
| Irene Owens | Dianne Strickert |
| Thomas D. Parker | Charles Strietelmeier |
| Dorothy Ruth Parks | Karen Summers |
| Adonijah Pauls | Dee Talley |
| Martha L. Payne | Leanne Talley |
| Jasper Pennington | Grace M. Teague |
| F. J. Peppard | Anne Tedeschi |
| Heidi Peterson | John Tedeschi |
| Roscoe M. Pierson | William G. Thompson, S.J. |
| Richard P. Poethig | Robert Tobias |
| Brewster Porcella | Walter Alan Tuttle |
| Barbara Prasse | United Theological Seminary |
| Patricia B. Pressey | Library |
| Gertrude Priester | Peter N. VandenBerge |
| Marcus J. Priester | Gwendolyn R. Vandon |
| Harold B. Prince | Miriam Waggoner |
| Holly Reed | Don Wardlaw |
| David C. Reeves | David J. Wartluft |
| Nelda Rhoades | Carol Wehrheim |
| Edythe Rieck | Frederick K. Wentz |
| Bruce V. Rigdon | Velma Bane Wheeler |
| Vera Louise Robinson | Ernest M. White |
| Nellie Rosa | Margaret Whitelock |
| Paul Roten | Sr. Marian Wiegel |
| Kenneth E. Rowe | Henry L. Williams |
| Peter Rupprecht | Roger M. Williams |
| John Sayre | Jean Willis |
| Thomas Schafer | Keith C. Wills |
| Esther Schandorff | Glenn R. Wittig |
| Winifred Schaumburg | Robert C. Worley |
| Erich R. W. Schultz | Charles E. Yost, S.C.J. |
| Susan A. Schultz | Esther Zink |
| Mildred Schuppert | |
| Robert Joseph Scollard, C.S.B. | |
| Andrew D. Scrimgeour | |
| Frank C. Senn | |
| Kenneth M. Shaffer, Jr. | |
| Henry K. Shaw | |

- 1913 Born at Ellsworth, Minnesota, son of Mary Greenfield and the Rev. Henry Adam Schmitt, pastor of the Ellsworth Presbyterian Church; grandson of the Rev. Henry Schmitt, D.D., pioneer German Presbyterian minister in Iowa.
- 1913-1930 Boyhood spent in rural parishes in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Illinois.
- 1930-1934 Student at University of Dubuque. B.A., 1934.
- 1934-1935 Graduate student in psychology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- 1935-1938 Enlisted man, U.S. Cavalry, Fort Bliss, Texas; intelligence work on U.S.-Mexican border.
- 1938-1941 Student, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago. B.D., 1941; thesis: "The Last Days of the Kingdom of Judah."
- 1941 Married Alice Muir, daughter of the Rev. James Blakely Muir of Seattle, Washington.

- 1941 Ordained minister, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
- 1941-1944 Pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Las Vegas, New Mexico.
- 1944-1948 Director, Colegio Americano, Caracas, Venezuela.
- 1946 David Muir Schmitt born.
- 1948-1949 Graduate student, Union Theological Seminary in New York (Old Testament) and Columbia University (Library Science).
- 1949-1980 Librarian, McCormick Theological Seminary. Instructor in Hebrew, 1949-1961.
- 1954 Janet Schmitt born.
- 1957- Professor of Bibliography, McCormick Theological Seminary.
- 1957-1958 President, American Theological Library Association.
- 1959-1979 Chairperson, Periodical Indexing Board, American Theological Library Association.
- 1961-1966 Secretary, Library Development Program, American Theological Library Association.
- 1962 Published *Self-Appraisal Guide* (New Haven: ATLA Library Development Program).
- 1965 Consultant to theological seminary libraries, Buenos Aires, Argentina, and Montevideo, Uruguay, for the Fund for Theological Education.

- 1966-1973 Member, Board of National Missions,
United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
Member of Executive Committee, 1969-1973.
- 1969 Litt.D., Alma College.
- 1969-1970 Chairperson, Chicago Area Theological
Library Association.
- 1970 Chairperson, Committee on Reorganization
of Seminary Governance, McCormick Theo-
logical Seminary.
- 1970 Member, Presidential Search Committee,
McCormick Theological Seminary.
- 1973-1976 Member, Program Agency, United Presby-
terian Church in the U.S.A.
- 1974 Tour of Europe and the Middle East.
- 1974 Liaison with rural village missions in
Colombia on behalf of the United Pres-
byterian Church in the U.S.A.
- 1975 Member, Presidential Search Committee,
McCormick Theological Seminary.
- 1975-1980 General Director, the Jesuit-Krauss-
McCormick Library, Chicago.
- 1980- Archivist and Director of Placement,
McCormick Theological Seminary.

Jack L. Stotts

"What do you think a librarian is? A warehouse?"

It was an untypically sharp and hyperbolic response for Calvin Schmitt to make. The occasion was a budget meeting where scarce resources were being accommodated to competing needs and interests. The amount at issue was relatively small--several hundred dollars for travel to professional meetings. The principle, however, was critical--the nature of a librarian and, more basically, the vocation of a theological library.

What was typical in the interchange was Calvin Schmitt's advocacy on the basis of principle. As McCormick Theological Seminary's respected Professor of Bibliography and Librarian for over thirty years, Calvin Schmitt has persistently stimulated his colleagues and students to reflect with him on the fundamental purposes and goals of education for the Church's ministry. A theological library was, he rightly contended, simultaneously an educational expression and a servant of such an encompassing perspective. Questions about such diverse matters

as compensation policies, collection development, and dusting Chicago soot off books were finally matters that could only be rightly resolved on the basis of shared commitments to fundamental principles.

It has been one of Calvin Schmitt's great gifts to McCormick that he has helped the Seminary ground its life and work on firm theological and educational principles. Yet he has done so in the only way such lofty commitments ever become actualized, by hard, disciplined, and persistent attention to the multiple channels of everyday institutional activity. His genius for melding theory and practice made him a superb librarian. It also propelled him into the heart of almost every major institutional activity at McCormick. The myriad committees to which he was assigned and called by fellow faculty, administrators and the Seminary's Board of Directors were and are a function of that wisdom. If they have been at times an affliction, that is the penalty he himself would confess a person who believes and feels deeply about matters must bear. There is something very Calvinistic about that view!

To rehearse all of Calvin Schmitt's contributions to McCormick would require more space than his own modesty and frugality would allow. Not to mention certain highlights of his contribution would, however, be less than gracious or fair.

As a librarian, Calvin Schmitt has always been a professor. He has been a teacher, concerned that the library building, the library collection, and library service enable and stimulate learning. Under his tutelage, the library itself became an

educational resource, supporting fundamental faculty research and enticing both willing and unwilling students to go farther than they had thought either possible or necessary. The library reflected its leader, unobtrusively but persistently expanding insights and stimulating root thought and pertinent application of knowledge. It embodied the concern for excellence so well recognized as characteristic of Calvin Schmitt.

As a theological educator, Calvin Schmitt was challenged by a generous vision of the Church. As a result, he challenged McCormick to open itself to the internationalizing of theological education. The development of ways by which students and faculty might be engaged by the polymorphic nature of the world's cultures was always on his agenda. His own earlier mission engagement in South America aided the Seminary in its struggle to equip Hispanic Americans for a more effective partnership in ministry. And McCormick's International Program and Latino Studies Program bear the mark of his commitment and dedication. They testify to his breadth of concerns.

Almost coincident with his entry into a small and cluttered office in a building more aesthetically pleasing to partisans of Greek revival architecture than functional as a library facility, Calvin Schmitt was involved with issues of physical location, of both the Seminary and its library. Following McCormick's decision in the 1950's to rebuild on its then current site, he presided with characteristic thoroughness over the planning and construction of a superb library building. It was a showcase facility, applauded by architects and librarians,

faculty and students. It was a suitably excellent location for the increasingly impressive collection and services developed under his leadership.

Yet it is a measure of Calvin Schmitt's transcending commitments that he gave firm, if reluctant, support in the 1970's to McCormick's leaving its comfortable home to take up residence in a cluster relationship on the south side of Chicago. Not only did he support the relocation on educational, ecumenical, and financial grounds; he also oversaw the exodus from the promised land of his finely wrought physical plant to a new Jerusalem educationally superior but physically far less adequate.

As part of McCormick's relocation a new title--General Director of the Jesuit, Lutheran and McCormick Libraries--supplemented Cal Schmitt's assignment as McCormick librarian. Open-heart surgery in the midst of the relocation process barely slowed down his arduous work of integrating three important collections into one library and three fine staffs into one team. A finer library, taking advantage of the strengths of three schools, utilizing modern technologies, and cooperating intimately with the Chicago Cluster of Theological Schools and the Regenstein Library of the University of Chicago, is further testimony, if such were needed, to Calvin Schmitt's principled center of gravity.

Because of Calvin Schmitt's work as a theological librarian, many know about McCormick Seminary. His own contributions beyond McCormick have cast a favorable light upon the Seminary. But we at McCormick like to think that anyone who knows our recent history inevitably thinks of McCormick and Cal Schmitt

together, for person and institution have been enfolded together in a way that has made institutions of both!

We at McCormick, of course, have had the blessing of Calvin Schmitt's ongoing presence, not only as a theological educator but also as a charming and gracious friend and colleague. He and Alice Muir Schmitt have been a husband/wife presence that has contributed immeasurably to the concord of our seminary's life together. Their dignity, humor, and thoughtfulness toward colleagues, staff, and students have elicited deep and abiding affection.

Fortunately, Calvin and Alice Schmitt's involvement with McCormick is not concluded. That such is the case surely means that McCormick's respect and affection for both will continue to grow. It means that with Cal there will still be arguments about resources, plans about curriculum, discussions about the administration of libraries, and debates about issues yet unforseen. It also means that we at McCormick will not be exempt in any consideration from the probing questions of principle. Cal will see to that. And we will continue to be grateful that he does.

Richard W. Dorn

Lieber Calvin Schmitt,

Sie sollen aus Anlass Ihres Ausscheidens aus den Diensten der McCormick Theological Seminary Library durch eine Festschrift geehrt werden, und ich bin aufgefordert worden, hierzu einen Beitrag zu leisten. Ich habe gern zugesagt, obgleich eine unwissenschaftliche Grussadresse, wie ich sie schreiben werde, sich wahrscheinlich etwas einsam vorkommen wird zwischen den Beiträgen von gelehrten Kollegen Ihres Fachs. Es ist mir sogar erlaubt worden, Deutsch zu schreiben. Das gäbe der Festschrift einen internationalen Charakter, meinte der Herausgeber. Nun denn!

Wir gehören beide der Welt des Buches an. Es ist eine schöne, eine vielseitige Welt. Wir bekennen uns sogar mit Stolz zu der Familie derer, die am Buche arbeiten und schaffen. Am Buche schaffen kann man in mannigfaltiger Art. Der eine schreibt Bücher, der andere verlegt sie, dieser druckt sie, jener verkauft sie. Andere verwalten und bewahren

sie für künftige Generationen. Aber eines ist uns allen gemeinsam: Wir lesen die Bücher, wir leben in ihnen, die Welt breitet sich durch sie vor uns aus. Unsere Berufe gehören sicher zu den faszinierendsten, die es gibt. Mit dem Gegenstand Buch lassen sich Glück, Wissen und Freude verbreiten.

Aus der grossen Familie der am Buch Schaffenden denke ich heute aber in erster Linie an die Bibliothekare, und zwar an die amerikanischen Bibliothekare, und unter diesen in ganz besonderem Masse an den Bibliothekar Calvin Schmitt.

Die amerikanischen Bibliothekare sind etwas Besonderes. Meine jahrelangen Erfahrungen im Umgang mit ihnen berechtigt mich zu dieser Feststellung. Ihnen ist jene ganz besondere Fähigkeit eigen, eine erfreuliche und fruchtbare Wechselwirkung zwischen sich selbst und ihrer Bibliothek und ihrem Buchhändler herzustellen und zu pflegen. Man kennt das in Europa nicht ganz in diesem Masse. Für den amerikanischen Bibliothekar spielt der Buchhändler, besonders der Buchhändler aus Europa, die Rolle eines Vertrauensmannes bei der Ausübung seines Berufes. Daraus hat sich jene einzigartige Zusammenarbeit zwischen amerikanischen Bibliothekaren und europäischen Buchhändlern entwickelt, die ich wiederum bei der Ausübung meines Berufs als so wohltuend empfinde. Das Buch und das Vertrauen des Bibliothekars in seinen europäischen Buchhändler hat dauerhafte Freundschaften wachsen lassen. Das geht so weit, dass ich mich in Amerika stets als ein Mitarbeiter der Bibliothek fühle, solange ich unter ihrem gastlichen Dach weile.

Das amerikanische Bibliothekswesen hat in den

letzten hundert Jahren eine unvorstellbare Entwicklung durchgemacht. Die grössten Bibliotheken sind nicht mehr in Europa, sondern in Amerika. Unter Wahrung aller Bescheidenheit glaube ich sagen zu dürfen, dass die europäischen Exportbuchhändler einen nicht zu unterschätzenden Anteil an dieser Aufbauarbeit haben. Es gibt in den Vereinigten Staaten einige Bibliotheken, die von unserer Firma allein im Laufe dieser hundert Jahre je etwa eine Million Bände bezogen haben. Genau gezählt wurde das leider nie.

Befähigt wurden wir zu dieser Arbeit durch das uns entgegengebrachte Vertrauen. Seinen höchsten Ausdruck fand dieses Vertrauen wohl während der letzten zwanzig Jahre durch die Übertragung so vieler Blanket Orders auf unsere Firma. Damit sind wir mitverantwortlich geworden für die Auswahl der anzuschaffenden Bücher.

Aber nun zum Bibliothekar Calvin Schmitt. Er ist ein typischer Vertreter dieses amerikanischen Bibliothekswesens und ihm gebührt Dank, Anerkennung und Bewunderung für seine geleistete Arbeit. An dieser Stelle möchte ich auch meinen persönlichen Dank abstaten, denn nur diese vertrauensvolle Zusammenarbeit mit Bibliothekaren Ihres Schlages hat den Wiederaufbau unserer Firma nach ihrer volligen Zerstörung bewirkt.

Ich kann mich beim besten Willen nicht mehr erinnern, wann wir uns zum erstenmal begegnet sind. Es muss aber schon sehr lange her sein, denn als wir uns im Jahre 1960 zusammensetzten, um den Text für eine Blanket Order für Theologische Literatur zu entwerfen, kannten wir uns schon lange gut.

Damals arbeiteten Sie noch im Gebäude der Virginia Library, das ich wegen seines reinen griechischen Stils so bewunderte und liebte. Es war nach meinem Urteil das schönste Gebäude in griechischem Stil in den Vereinigten Staaten, ein herrlicher Marmorbau, Griechenland auf amerikanischem Boden. Wir standen noch beide davor, als Sie schon in das neue Gebäude eingezogen waren, und ich bat Sie, dafür zu wirken, dass es erhalten bleibe. Aber eine kurzsichtige Collegeverwaltung, ohne viel Sinn für das klassisch Schöne, hat es doch abreißen lassen. Wir waren beide gleichermassen betrübt. Bei jedem Besuch auf dem alten Campus in der West Belden Avenue zeigte ich auf den Standort und sagte: "Da stand sie einmal, Ihre schöne Virginia Library." Aber trösten Sie sich, im alten Europa hat man es nicht besser gemacht. In Deutschland zum Beispiel wurde so manches schöne Gebäude, das den zerstörerischen Krieg ganz oder teilweise überlebt hatte, abgerissen, um Platz zu schaffen für hässliche Zement- und Glaskästen.

Ihre Blanket Order war eine der ersten, die uns anvertraut wurden, auf jeden Fall die erste theologische Blanket Order. Wir haben sie in allen Einzelheiten durchgesprochen, bevor Sie sie schriftlich abgefasst haben. Dank der Genauigkeit und der Gewissenhaftigkeit in ihrer Abfassung hat sie seitdem funktioniert, und Sie haben mir wiederholt schriftlich und mündlich gesagt, dass wir sie zu Ihrer Zufriedenheit gehandhabt haben. Man hätte die Bücher zählen sollen, die wir auf diese Blanket Order geliefert haben. Es würde sich da wahrscheinlich eine ganz erkleckliche Anzahl ergeben.

Doch wie alles im Leben war auch diese Blanket Order Metamorphosen unterworfen; je nach dem Stand Ihres Budgets wurde sie mal etwas beschnitten und mal wieder erweitert, aber sie bildet nun seit fast 20 Jahren einen festen Bestand in Ihrer Erwerbspolitik.

Inzwischen ist die Entwicklung weitergegangen. Wenige Jahre nach dem Bezug Ihres neuen Bibliotheksgebäudes auf dem alten Campus hat McCormick sich mit zwei anderen Theological Colleges zusammengeschlossen. Nun wirken Sie in wesentlich erweitertem Rahmen in der 55. Strasse im Süden von Chicago. Sie haben das Schicksal Ihrer Bibliothek durch lange Jahre bestimmt, Sie haben sie entwickelt, vermehrt - äusserlich und innerlich -, und Sie dürfen mit Stolz und Freude auf ein erfolgreiches und ausgefülltes Lebenswerk zurückblicken.

Neben den vielen Begegnungen, die dem Ausbau Ihrer Bibliothek gegolten haben, blieb uns auch noch Zeit zum Plaudern. Und Büchermenschen wie Sie und ich haben sich immer etwas zu erzählen. Unvergesslich ist mir, wie Sie mir vor einigen Jahren behilflich waren, den Standort des Goethedenkmals in Chicago zu ermitteln. Dieses Denkmal hatte ich vor über 25 Jahren schon einmal bewundert, wusste aber nicht mehr, wo es sich in dieser riesigen Stadt befindet. Ich wollte es aber in vorgerücktem Alter noch einmal in Ruhe auf mich wirken lassen, denn es ist nicht nur das einzige grosse Goethedenkmal in den Vereinigten Staaten, es ist gleichzeitig eines der schönsten überhaupt. Das will viel heissen, denn Denkmäler sind nicht immer schön. Nun, wie gesagt, Chicago ist eine riesige Stadt, in der man nicht

so leicht etwas wiederfindet, das man einmal aus den Augen verloren hat. Aber Sie entwickelten ein wirklich detektivisches Talent. In kurzer Zeit konnten Sie mir beschreiben, wo es steht. Sie mussten anschliessend lachend gestehen, dass Sie jahrelang täglich an diesem Platz vorbeigefahren seien. Sie brauchen sich aber nicht zu entschuldigen, denn an diesem Platz stehen, wie sich jedermann überzeugen kann, mehrere Denkmäler. Ich bin seitdem öfter dort gewesen und erfreue mich immer wieder an der Schönheit und an der inneren Grösse dieses Denkmals. Es ist für mich das schönste Goethedenkmal, und ich kenne deren viele. Ich hoffe, gerade dieses Denkmal noch häufig zu sehen und dabei immer Gelegenheit zu haben, an Sie zu denken.

Nun wünschte ich, dass Ihr Ausscheiden aus dem Bibliotheksdienst nicht das Ende unserer freundschaftlichen Beziehungen bedeuten wird. Ich möchte einen Freund, den ich über zweieinhalb Jahrzehnte schätzen gelernt habe, nicht aus den Augen verlieren. Mögen uns auch in Zukunft Begegnungen bevorstehen, die uns Gelegenheit zur Rückschau in ein tätiges Leben geben.

Ans J. van der Bent

The Library of the World Council of Churches, housed in a separate building of the Ecumenical Center in Geneva, came into existence more than thirty years ago. It started in 1946 as a small library with a few hundred books and very few documents. Today it has a collection of almost 70,000 books and pamphlets, 1,500 titles of current and ceased periodicals, and 15,000 boxes of manuscripts, containing between twenty-three and twenty-five million sheets of paper. The Library is the most well-equipped ecumenical library in the world. With a few exceptions it possesses all the ecumenical literature and documents produced during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in all languages and in many forms of reproduction. Some official reports of the Assemblies of the World Council of Churches, for instance, are available in braille form. Two or more copies of many important ecumenical books and records are held. The Library adds between 3,000 and

3,500 titles annually to its various collections. Its manuscript collection grows by leaps and bounds.

The Dewey Decimal Classification has been used from the beginning. Fifteen years ago a comprehensive and detailed ecumenical classification was constructed in the 280.1-280.9 range of the Dewey System. The geographical and confessional subdivisions (mnemonic features) of the Dewey Classification were retained. This ecumenical classification provides for more than 700 classification numbers in the fields of the history of the ecumenical movement, the history of the World Council of Churches, world confessional bodies, the ecumenical movement by continents and countries, literature on unity and church union negotiations, denominational positions in the ecumenical movement, specific themes in ecumenical theology, and biographies of ecumenical personalities. In 1972, G. K. Hall and Company in Boston published a *Classified Catalogue of the Ecumenical Movement* in two volumes, containing 19,000 catalogue cards from the Library, reproduced in book form. A first supplement of 13,000 cards will be issued in 1980.

The Library serves first of all the staff of the World Council of Churches and related organizations, such as the Lutheran World Federation, the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, and the Conference of European Churches. Its main *raison d'être* however, is to provide services to professors, students, pastors, priests, and laypersons who come from all over the world for study and research on a general or specific ecumenical topic. Out of this clientele some dozen students stay every year from one to six

months to start, continue, or finish their doctoral research on an ecumenical theme. In 1977 the Library published *Doctoral Dissertations on Ecumenical Themes: A Guide for Teachers and Students*. This book consists of two parts. Part I is a list of topics suggested for a doctoral dissertation in ecumenical studies:

- A. General ecumenical topics
- B. Specific topics suggested by staff members of the World Council of Churches
- C. Biographies of ecumenical leaders and theologians

Part II is a list of doctoral dissertations available in the Library, arranged alphabetically by author. More than 300 ecumenical doctoral dissertations in typewritten, stenciled, offset, printed, and microfilm form have been catalogued according to subject thus far.

The counseling of students in doctoral ecumenical research raises various questions and problems. They are described as follows.

I. The Choice of a Theme

Some students come to the Ecumenical Center in Geneva to inquire about a theme for their research. Several have consulted the *Guide* and desire additional information on the topic of their choice. Contacts with staff members of the Ecumenical Center, who are familiar with certain areas of ecumenical thought and endeavor, are frequently made. The student then seeks the advice of professors on the feasibility and value of the proposed study. Depending upon the area of research, students often return to Geneva for one or more prolonged stays.

Other students arrive with a manuscript in a more or less advanced stage. Through these visits to the Ecumenical Center or through correspondence they at times discover that another student already has written on the same or on a quite similar ecumenical theme. A few years ago some half-dozen students discovered they were all doing research on the subject of intercommunion. This, of course, was a frustrating experience. Sometimes it is extremely difficult to change the theme or the method of approach to the field of investigation to such an extent that overlapping research and writing can be avoided. In some cases the student has been forced to drop the subject and to begin work anew on another topic.

II. The Literature to be Consulted

Few doctoral dissertations on ecumenical themes are limited to research in published material alone. Most dissertations can only be done through a thorough and systematic investigation of both published *and* archival material. Some dissertations are based almost exclusively on literature of archival nature, *i.e.*, documents in mimeographed, typewritten, or handwritten form. While the area of printed publications can pose problems for satisfactory and responsible research, in spite of the fact that the classified catalogue of the Library guides the student to the most detailed parts of a subject, yet the search for relevant material in the Library's archives is even more an endless one, for none of the various collections of historical archives has been indexed or cataloged. The 15,000 boxes in which they are contained are labeled with

but a minimum of information; only a few boxes contain a typewritten index of their contents. Many of the archival collections, whether before or after the organization of the World Council of Churches in 1948, consist of subcollections arranged according to geography, subject, conference, and correspondence. Within the Library we have a small area under lock and key which houses confidential material, such as the correspondence of the World Council of Churches General Secretariat, starting in the 1930's, the files of the Central and Executive Committees, correspondence with member churches, early relations with the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Churches, the records of the Commission on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, and other documents.

Frequently the student working on the files of an ecumenical pioneer or on a topic which pertains to several areas and strands of ecumenical endeavor must search for documents in different collections located in different areas of the Library. At times a doctoral student spends up to six months in gathering, photocopying, annotating, and classifying materials. Particularly in the realms of Faith and Order, Life and Work, and Mission and Evangelism the manuscript materials are so voluminous that no student can ever be sure of having discovered and collected all the literature relating to the subject under study. Some students, having made over three or four thousand photocopies of documents, donate their research materials to the library of their university or seminary after they have earned

their doctoral degree and have published their dissertation.

III. The Methodology of Research

From the very beginning it is essential that a doctoral student determine the scope, the bearing, and the limit of the historical period to be investigated. In order to arrive at a clear understanding of the feasibility and the limitation of a theme, it is frequently necessary to spend a few weeks surveying the material available, without entering into too detailed a reading and evaluation of all the documents. Quite often the student must decide at a relatively early stage of the research whether to deal with the topic from 1910 until the 1930's, or until 1948, or until a more recent date. On some topics the material is so voluminous that the study should not cover more than one or two decades. Some doctoral dissertations have been of poor quality and little value because the historical period embraced was too long. Depending upon the topic, in the course of research a student must also determine whether it will be necessary to add a second volume to the dissertation itself. This volume should contain not only a detailed bibliography arranged according to printed literature (books, pamphlets, reports of conferences and consultations, periodical articles) and according to the material found in the various sections of the World Council of Churches archives, but it should also reproduce key documents essential to better insight into and understanding of the text of the dissertation. In case a dissertation is published, it may be neces-

sary to publish the second volume also, or to combine both volumes into one. Some dissertations, however, are sufficiently documented with footnotes and with a conventional bibliography at the end, so that a second volume is not necessary.

IV. The Problem of Confidential Documents

Every student who uses the Library must fill out a form and answer, among others, the following question: "Do you promise that, if you will quote from World Council of Churches documents, you will submit all your proposed quotations to the World Council of Churches for approval before publishing your manuscript?" It goes without saying that paragraphs and sentences of official reports and documents (in either printed or mimeographed form) can be quoted freely. Even mimeographed documents marked "confidential" usually may be quoted, as most of these documents were confidential for a limited period of time only. But the minutes of the World Council of Churches Executive Committee (in mimeographed or offset form) are an exception. In some cases they can be consulted, but the student should not quote, but only refer to them. The problem of confidentiality arises when correspondence of living or dead persons is consulted. In case quotations are made from letters, the student is advised to contact the living person, or the relatives of dead persons, to ask for permission to quote from specific items of their correspondence.

The problem of misusing confidential documents and violating the confidentiality of correspondence has hardly arisen so far. From the outset it is

emphasized that the ecumenical movement is a movement and not a bureaucratic institution devising rigid rules for consultation and research and limiting the use of the ecumenical archives. An atmosphere of cooperation and trust is created by pointing out that submission of quotations for approval provides protection to the student. In rare cases students have been advised to omit a quotation, and this advice has been readily followed. Students learn during their research how to use controversial and delicate documents appropriately and intelligently. In only one case a dissertation, on the World Council of Churches and the Jewish people, was not approved. The student returned to Geneva to rewrite the entire manuscript.

V. The Value of the Dissertation

The Librarian of the World Council of Churches in Geneva at times has been requested to comment on the quality of research in dissertations that have not been found acceptable for degrees. The reason often given for such rejection was that the student had not adequately evaluated the subject and drawn pertinent conclusions from the research. In this connection it is important that both theological professors and students understand not only the complicated and time-consuming task of gathering twentieth-century ecumenical documents, but also the peculiar nature of these materials. In many instances it is extremely cumbersome and puzzling to reconstruct the historical process of common thought and action. The "consensus nature" of official reports of assemblies, conferences, con-

sultations, and symposia poses problems at the outset. Committee reports should not always be taken at their face value. The developmental process in the preparation of the ecumenical drafts which leads to a final document must be taken into account. Even a careful analysis of the several drafts of a major theme or of a committee report does not necessarily guarantee a correct understanding of the thought, the discussion, and the decision process. One has to discover who initiated a certain thought, topic, or slogan; who influenced the successive preparatory committees and the conference; what was behind the specific study and action program; why it was launched at a certain time; and why it disappeared after a number of years. In other words, all official ecumenical documents carry a subjective, *ad hoc* character, reflecting the mood and concern of a larger or smaller group of people at a given time, and thus cannot be classified as once-and-for-all valid and binding pronouncements of the World Council of Churches. It is frequently impossible to explain why a certain ecumenical concern in slogan form was introduced, lasted for perhaps five or seven years, and sometimes thereafter was reintroduced in another form, either with or without success.

Consequently, the student arriving at the final phase of a dissertation can be faced with a considerable amount of uncertainty, complexity, and options of interpretation. Any student concentrating, for instance, on the ecumenical movement *vis-à-vis* the development of Marxist and Communist ideology must reckon with a degree of

ambiguity, incompleteness, and bias in conclusions. Standards of conventional and reliable academic "objectivity" cannot be directly applied. Students and professors should understand that a margin of dissatisfaction and inconclusiveness often is unavoidable. Even insiders intimate with the process of ecumenical endeavor, in whatever theological, geographical, historical, or cultural context, admit that no definitive judgment can be made on the why, how, and when of a joint church enterprise. This has been the case since the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910. No twentieth-century ecumenical conference since is an exception to this strange rule.

VI. Topics to be Dealt With

There is still a wide field of ecumenical themes to be dealt with. No scholarly research has been undertaken on such twentieth-century movements as the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, the International Christian Youth Conferences, the World Student Christian Federation from 1945 until today, or the Christian Peace Conference (Prague). There are no serious studies of the Roman Catholic Church and the ecumenical movement before 1948, the integration of the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches in 1961 at the New Delhi Assembly, the relationships between the World Council of Churches and world confessional families, the growth of various indigenous churches in the Third World, or the origin, growth, and impact of various regional and national councils of churches

and their relationships to the World Council of Churches. Various aspects of the unity of the church, mission in the ecumenical movement, updating medical mission, the interreligious and interideological dialogue, the church and modern society, charity and service in the ecumenical movement, the churches and world development, the churches and international affairs, the ecumenical program to combat racism, Christian education in the ecumenical movement, ecumenical concerns for women in church and society need far more detailed and careful analysis. No complete scholarly biographies of ecumenical leaders, such as Henry Avery Atkinson, Vedamayagam Samuel Azariah, Marc Boegner, Willoughby Dickinson, Robert Hallowell Gardiner, L. P. Germanos, Elie J. Gounell, Henry-Louis Henriod, Adolf Keller, Rajah Bhushanam Manikam, Henry Pitney Van Dusen, or Stefan Zankov are available.

Many of the themes listed here are of sufficiently general nature to be pursued at any university or seminary. Others--in particular, twentieth-century movements and ecumenical pioneers--can only be dealt with by using the archives of the Library of the World Council of Churches in Geneva. The Library staff is very willing to introduce doctoral students to the various ecumenical collections and to make their stay (or several visits) as pleasant and productive as possible.

Maria Grossmann

The Luther-Gesellschaft came into existence in 1918, and its publications, the *Luther-Jahrbuch* and *Luther, Zeitschrift der Luther-Gesellschaft*,² in 1919. English-speaking scholars have not paid enough attention to these two serials,³ and it seems important to point to their value and relevance to scholarship. Certainly compared with the Verein für Reformationsgeschichte and its publications,⁴ they have often been overlooked. Since 1926 with Volume 8, one of the most important bibliographies for Reformation research has been published in each volume of the *Luther-Jahrbuch*, and particular attention will be given to it in this paper.

In 1917, Rudolf C. Eucken, the famous "philosopher of life" and Nobel laureate in literature for 1908, speaking in Wittenberg on the 400th anniversary of Luther's posting his Ninety-Five Theses, called for an association like the Luther-Gesellschaft. The following year, before the end of World War I, the Luther-Gesellschaft was founded in that city. It

may be wondered why, at one of the lowest points of German history, there should have been a call for a society concerned exclusively with Luther studies. While one cannot ignore some overtones of nationalism, closer reading of Eucken will show that this was not at the heart of his message.⁵ It was a genuine desire to turn away from the secularism of the time, to turn to the genuine values of life itself, that moved Eucken on this occasion. He dwelt on the inner unity of life and the way Luther's life was unified and centered in his faith in the one God that gave him strength. Eucken came to the conclusion that this was the spirit that the Germans of that time needed so that they could cope with the world around them and the threats that civilization imposed upon them. The progressive optimism of the nineteenth century had proved itself inadequate, according to Eucken. What was needed was concern with man's inner life, religion, and common values of mankind. It was the non-theologian Eucken who called for a return to the spiritual values of life; the crisis for him was not political or military, but spiritual or even theological.⁶ It was the power and strength of Luther's faith that Eucken was groping for.

The organization was not to be in competition with the Verein für Reformationgeschichte and its publications; this was made clear from the very beginning. The Verein and its publications, since 1883, had been devoted to scholarly and historical work on a very sophisticated level. First somewhat limited to the German-speaking countries, it later broadened out and today, as we all know, is concerned with all as-

pects of the Reformation, whether Lutheran, Reformed, Catholic, or non-conformist, and covers geographically all corners of the earth. The new group, the Luther-Gesellschaft, started out by limiting itself to interpretations of Luther and the world around him, and what he means for the contemporary world. It wanted to appeal to a much larger audience. Not popular, but semi-popular, at least in its *Mitteilungen*, it conceived of itself as a religious and theological body rather than a secular, historical one. As Müller⁷ pointed out, it was not confessional in the strict sense of the word, but it was interested in the "ecumenical" importance of Luther; he was the first of a series of reformers and his importance was not to be confined to the Lutheran churches.

As one scans volumes of *Luther* and the *Luther-Jahrbuch* between 1919 and 1941, one is struck by the names of the Luther scholars in Germany who were involved in the organization and who contributed to the publications; we find Paul Althaus, Walter Friedensburg, Emanuel Hirsch, Karl Holl, Ludwig Ihmels, Paul Joachimsen, Paul Kalkoff, Theodor Knolle, Hans Lietzmann, Friedrich Loofs, Hanns Rückert, Otto Scheel, Hans von Schubert, Nathan Söderblom, Hans Volz. Hardly the name of a major Luther scholar is missing.

Many issues of the *Luther-Jahrbuch* commemorated an event 400 years earlier, with articles centering around this particular subject; for example: 1921, The Diet of Worms;⁸ 1925, The Peasant War;⁹ 1926, Luther and Erasmus, the Diet of Speier;¹⁰ 1930, The Diet of Augsburg;¹¹ 1934, the completion of the Bible translation by Luther.¹²

The *Luther-Mitteilungen* give us information about

the various general and regional meetings of the Luther-Gesellschaft. Regional groups were formed from the beginning, starting at Wittenberg, and expanding to Erfurt, Stuttgart, Magdeburg, Berlin, and even Stockholm and Uppsala. During the 1930's there were very few general annual meetings; the smaller, regional meetings were preferred, a phenomenon with which we are well acquainted today. In the 1930's there were also some interesting meetings in conjunction with lawyers and writers. We find several well-known names among the participants: Werner Bergengruen, Walter von Molo, Rudolf Alexander Schroeder, Martin Beheim-Schwarzbuch. Of course, from the very beginning the membership of the Luther-Gesellschaft was not limited to theologians and scholars; a wide spectrum of society was always present, engineers, industrialists, artists, writers, etc.

It is interesting to observe throughout the years who the leaders of the Luther-Gesellschaft were. The main force for nearly four decades was Theodor Knolle who helped to build up the organization from the beginning. From 1918, when he was pastor in Wittenberg, until his death in 1955, when he was Bishop of Hamburg, he carried the major administrative burden of the society. Presidents of the organization were Rudolf C. Eucken (1918-1920), Wilhelm von Hegel (1920-1925), Karl Holl (1926), Paul Althaus (1927-1964), Walther von Loewenich (1965-1975), and since 1976, Gerhard Müller.

Through the years between the two World Wars the membership of the Luther-Gesellschaft was German, with some Scandinavian participation. We do not find

any radical nationalism; the society was too genuinely religious-Christian oriented for that. In the 1920's as Germany was trying to recover from the defeat of the first World War, the German Lutheran theologians were conscious of the fact that their Lutheranism was a German one, and they wanted to help in the recovery of their Germany. After 1933 we do not find any open support for Hitler or National Socialism, but every once in a while a strong nationalism emerges. There are constant references to the German Lutheran churches abroad, in Estonia, Danzig, Poland, Romania, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and we are reminded that they are part of the German church movement. Yet, while the Society shared these concerns for Germans outside of Germany with the Nazi government, we are not to forget the real, ecumenical, supranationalistic character of Luther. In 1939 there was a call by the editor, Theodor Knolle,¹³ for reuniting German Lutherans abroad with their mother church. For Knolle, at this particular historical moment, Luther became a "German" prophet. At the same time, Knolle¹⁴ fought Arno Deutelmoser's interpretation¹⁵ of Luther, which sought to win Luther for National Socialism. In September 1940, when the second World War had already broken out, the Luther-Gesellschaft had its meeting in Wittenberg, and we do not hear a word about the war or the Nazis or the Jews; rather the meeting harked back to the "genuine" Luther and what he means for the world of the day and God in history. We all know from the history of the German churches in the 1930's that they were divided, that they were confused, and that the pressures from the

Nazi state made life most difficult for many. It is only fair to say that nationalistic remarks in the publications of the Luther-Gesellschaft were the exception and that the society was trying its best to remain a religious, Lutheran, Christian community.

It took some time for the Luther-Gesellschaft to reconstitute itself after World War II. The first post-war meeting took place in 1954 in Hamburg. Professor Martin Doerne of Halle and Professor Oskar Thulin of Wittenberg attended this meeting, thus representing East Germany. It is important to point out that since the division of Germany the society and its publications have continued as a joint venture of East and West Germany. Since the first post-war volume in 1957, the *Luther-Jahrbuch* has been edited in Leipzig and published in the West; *Luther* has always been edited and published in the West. The new board of the society had a more international flavor; representatives from Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Switzerland, and the United States were included. Althaus and Knolle were reelected as president and second vice-president, in spite of their representations that the younger generation ought to take over. This did not happen until very recently. Again, as before the war, regional groups were emphasized.

In two editorials¹⁶ Franz Lau, the new editor of the *Luther-Jahrbuch*, summarized why the Luther-Gesellschaft decided to start again with meetings and publications. Strong emphasis was put on the fact that this was not a new beginning but a continuation of the endeavors of the past. Lau again pointed to the different emphases of the two publications: *Luther* was intended to interpret Luther and his the-

ology, biography, and influence to a very wide audience. It was hoped that a large number of Lutherans would again want to read and be informed about the Lutheran movement, now more than ever on an international level. The *Luther-Jahrbuch* was to serve scholarship. Lau mentioned that before the second World War the *Luther-Jahrbuch* was a justifiable publication because German research on Luther was flourishing; the *Luther-Jahrbuch* had always been a German research tool. It had not been published for fifteen years because Luther research was not possible in these years. Many German Luther scholars of the older generation had died during the war or shortly thereafter. It remained to be seen whether German Luther research would again emerge as a genuine discipline. Now, Lau said, he hoped to continue the old tradition.¹⁷ The *Luther-Jahrbuch* would again be devoted to scholarly research and substantial book reviews would be published, important papers from the meetings of the society would be published in either of its publications, and the bibliography in the *Luther-Jahrbuch* would try to cover Luther literature on an international level. It would take time to bring the bibliography up to standard; conditions at the moment made world-wide coverage highly difficult. Lau made no secret of the fact that it was even more difficult to operate from Leipzig in East Germany. He warned that the bibliography for 1941-1953 was to be very selective, but expressed the hope that from 1954 onward it would approach completeness. Lau appealed to the international Luther community to inform him about Luther research.¹⁸

Both publications have changed their character

since the early 1920's. *Luther* has become less popular and more scholarly; it contains longer essays and more book reviews, though not on the level of the *Luther-Jahrbuch*. The *Luther-Jahrbuch* over the years has become an international Luther research tool and accordingly in 1971 its subtitle was changed to "Organ der internationalen Lutherforschung." In his preface to the 1971 *Luther-Jahrbuch* Lau¹⁹ announced that because of ill health he was handing over the editorship to Helmar Junghans, his collaborator since 1962. Junghans, a student of Lau, is *Dozent* for church history at the University of Leipzig and an excellent bibliographer.

Since 1975, with the retirement of Walther von Loewenich and Erwin Mühlhaupt from the presidency and vice-presidency of the society, a new generation has taken over. Gerhard Müller of Erlangen has become president and Karl Dienst, of the Hessian church administration in Darmstadt, vice-president. In the final paragraph of his recent summary on the Luther-Gesellschaft, Müller²⁰ points to the extensive Luther research by Roman Catholics, which offers new approaches. He²¹ also emphasizes the fact that the publications of the society have become increasingly scholarly and less devoted to popularization and interpretation of Luther and his relevance to everyday life. It remains to be seen what the future will bring. There is no doubt that the *Luther-Jahrbuch* will continue to serve the scholar as it has in the past and that its bibliographies will continue to be of major importance.

For the first time the intention of bringing out an annual Luther bibliography was mentioned in the pref-

ace²² to the *Luther-Jahrbuch* for 1922, volume 4. We are informed that so far it had not been possible to realize that project and that to carry out such a project from Wittenberg was very difficult. No book reviews were to be published, but reference was made to Karl Holl's first volume of collected essays, *Luther*.²³ This was done in view of the importance of these essays and their fundamental and basic reinterpretation of Luther.

The first Luther bibliography, for the year 1925, edited by Hanns Rückert, appeared in volume 8, 1926. It was at the initiative of Karl Holl, who had just died, that the Luther bibliography finally was started. In his short preface to the bibliography, Rückert²⁴ stated that absolute completeness was hoped for, without regard to scholarly and other values of publications, yet he also acknowledged that for the moment this goal could not be achieved. The selection had been random, due to circumstances; some important material surely had been overlooked, while less important works were included. The editor asked for special indulgence because he had not been able to cover foreign literature on Luther or to offer a more comprehensive coverage of Reformation literature which pertains to Luther. He had received much information second-hand and could not check it for accuracy. This first bibliography was five pages long, preceded by a list of abbreviations. It had several subdivisions; basically this arrangement was carried on till 1941 (1939 bibliography) and resumed in 1957. After an in-between period of various revisions, the bibliography changed its arrangement in 1964. As the bibliography expanded, as

scholarship changed its emphasis, and as more literature was cited, new categories emerged. Since 1963 the bibliography has started with multi-authored volumes and *Festschriften*; articles contained in these volumes and indexed in the bibliography are referred back to the numbers of these volumes. There have been author and title registers since 1969.

Hanns Rückert was still responsible for the bibliography in volume 9, 1927. Volume 10, 1928, had no bibliography and volume 11, 1929, had a new editor for the bibliography, Kurt Dietrich Schmidt. Volume 12, 1930, again had no bibliography, and volume 13, 1931, listed Heinrich Seesemann as editor; he continued in this position till 1941. In 1937 Seesemann acknowledged help in the compilation by Creutzig, an assistant in Berlin, and in 1938 help by a foreign scholar, H. Harboe of Oslo, who was to cover Scandinavian literature on Luther. In the years between the two wars the bibliography did not change much in scope or arrangement. It was a German bibliography with a sprinkling of foreign literature; the arrangement remained the same, with minor changes. It was good but not excellent.

With the first post-war volume (volume 24, 1957) of the *Luther-Jahrbuch*, under the editorship of Franz Lau, the character of the Luther bibliography changed. It is interesting to read in the preface of the 1971 *Luther-Jahrbuch*, the last one that Lau²⁵ edited, that one of his conditions for becoming the editor in 1952/53 was that he could create a new kind of bibliography. He wanted to make it an international bibliography of Luther studies.²⁶ Looking at it today, one must conclude that he was highly successful. His

work is being continued on the same worldwide scale by Helmar Junghans.

Another important new feature of the *Luther-Jahrbuch* was the addition of book reviews beginning also with the first post-war volume. The reviews have become more extensive and important as the years go on, especially with the addition of a section in each volume, "Luther und die Welt der Reformation," summarizing works which were not to be reviewed individually. Since the new beginning in 1957 more foreign contributors have been recruited and at present well over twenty scholars from all over the globe are helping to make the Luther bibliography an international tool. Let us look at some details which seem important.

The material contributed by foreign scholars increased greatly by 1959; the arrangement of the bibliography was revised in 1961. No longer restricted to a particular year, it began to list everything published known to the editor at the time of printing. The number of items suddenly increased to 691. The preface of that year is dedicated to a very informative account of the revision of the bibliography. Lau was also concerned about book reviews; he felt strongly that it is better to have longer reviews of a few books and then a summary of many titles, rather than short reviews of many works.²⁷

An outstanding bibliographic contribution in 1965 has a bibliography of Polish Luther literature, 1530-1962, by Janusz Narzyński,²⁸ numbering 325 items. As Lau²⁹ said in his preface, this was the first one of its kind and had not even been attempted before.

The years 1966-1977 have seen the following developments in the *Luther-Jahrbuch*:

1966. This was the tenth year of the *Luther-Jahrbuch* since its reinception. Lau,³⁰ in a longer than usual preface, wrote mostly about his attempts to cover Luther research in all its angles, citing the various problems during and after the war. Luther research in Germany was interrupted. In other countries it continued, especially in Scandinavia, where, unfortunately, important material was no longer published in the German language. Luther research in North America had become strong and important. Thus he was happy that the first article that year was by an American, Gottfried G. Krodel.³¹ The bibliography listed 736 items.

1968. This year brought two important bibliographies: one on Marxist Luther literature in East Germany, 1945-1966 (247 items);³² the other a bibliography of Spanish-language literature on Luther, 1942-1966 (78 items).³³ The regular Luther bibliography listed 1063 items! This abundance of Luther literature, according to Lau,³⁴ could be traced to the celebration of the 450th anniversary of the Reformation. In this year the volumes of the *Luther-Jahrbuch* for 1919-1941 were reprinted by John Benjamins in Amsterdam.

1969. Included for the first time was an author and title register to the bibliography; authors, editors and titles of anonymous works were indexed.

1971. This volume was the last under Lau's editorship. A bibliographic essay by Bernhard Lohse³⁵ on Luther research in German-speaking countries since 1966, i.e., since the Third International Congress

on Luther Research in Helsinki, was among the articles.

1972. Helmar Junghans took over the editorship.

1974. The first yearbook without a preface by the editor appeared, and we have had none since.

1975. An article by Helmar Junghans³⁶ about the Luther bibliography was published, describing its current contents, arrangement, and form. Anyone interested in serious Luther research will find these explanations very informative. The subdivisions are rather complicated but the author and title indices ought to be helpful. Since this volume, modern bibliographic standards (i.e., International Standard Bibliographic Description [ISBD]) have been used for entries.

1976. The *Luther-Jahrbuch* was published in paperback for the first time. The subsidies that the Luther Gesellschaft had received up to this time had ceased and in order not to raise the price paperback binding became necessary. This volume contained a bibliographic essay by Wolfgang Franke³⁷ on English interpretations of Luther, 1782-1848, and a bibliography of Heinrich Boehmer (1869-1927).³⁸

1977. This volume could be called a bibliographic issue of the *Luther-Jahrbuch*. Included were articles on Luther research in German-speaking countries since 1970,³⁹ in Scandinavia since 1966,⁴⁰ in the Netherlands since 1969,⁴¹ in the Romance languages since 1970,⁴² in Japan since 1967,⁴³ and in English-speaking countries since 1971.⁴⁴ Another article is on Müntzer research, 1965-1976.⁴⁵ The bibliography numbered 1160 items.

1978 and 1979. These two volumes continued the

strong scholarly tradition of the last years; the number of items of the bibliography ranged between 700 and 1000.

The *Luther-Jahrbuch* has become a modern, scholarly, and very valuable research tool; it has lost the flavor of personalities that it had in the 1920's and 1960's. It has adjusted to modern times and ranks with the very highest scholarship of today.

Anyone interested in Luther and his environment ought to consult the *Luther-Jahrbuch* and *Luther* almost before starting his research. A deeper analysis of the Luther Gesellschaft and its publications would necessitate a thorough study of German Luther research since 1918; this has not been attempted here. Rather it is hoped that this descriptive history will convince scholars of the value of the two publications.

NOTES

1. There are three very helpful articles which should be mentioned in connection with this article, viz., Helmar Junghans, "Inhalt, Ordnung und Form der Lutherbibliographie," *Lutherjahrbuch* 42 (1975): 126-130; Theodor Knolle, "Die Luther-Gesellschaft," in Theodor Knolle, ed., *Luther in der deutschen Kirche der Gegenwart*; eine Übersicht, hrsg. im Auftrag der Luther-Gesellschaft, Schriftenreihe der Luther-Gesellschaft, 14 (Gütersloh: Verlag C. Bertelsmann, 1940), pp. 52-59; Gerhard Müller, "60 Jahre Luther-Gesellschaft," *Luther* 49 (1978): 99-109. A different kind of article is that by Hans-Ludwig Slupina, "Was mir die Luther-Gesellschaft bedeutet," *ibid.*: 49-59. It is a charming and appealing article by a pastor standing within the church and within the Luther-Gesellschaft who muses on all aspects of the Luther-Gesellschaft throughout the years with great insight and humor. In volume 49 (1978) of *Luther* there is an index

- to all the publications of the Luther-Gesellschaft, entitled "Register zu den Veröffentlichungen der Luther-Gesellschaft 1919-1978," hrsg. von Hans Schulz, *ibid.*: *1-*38. The index is divided into an author register (888 entries), a subject index to Luther's theology, and a location index to the Luther bibliography. Added to these indices is a list of publications in the "Schriftenreihe der Luther-Gesellschaft" (14 numbers, 1925-1940, the first four numbers published under the title, "Veröffentlichungen der Luther-Gesellschaft"), and a list of "Flugschriften der Luther-Gesellschaft" (10 numbers, 1920-1925).
2. *Luther-Jahrbuch*; Jahrbuch der Luther-Gesellschaft, Band 1-37, 1919-1941, 1957-1970; *Lutherjahrbuch*; Organ der internationalen Lutherforschung, Band 38-1971-. Several publishers have been involved in the publication of the *Luther-Jahrbuch*: Breitkopf & Härtel, Leipzig (1919-1921), Verlag der Luther-Gesellschaft, Wittenberg (1922-1925), Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München (1926-1936), Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, Weimar (1937-1939), Verlag C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh (1940-1941), Lutherisches Verlagshaus, Berlin (1957-1961), Friedrich Wittig Verlag, Hamburg (1962-1973), and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen (1974-). The second publication, *Luther*; Mitteilungen der Luther-Gesellschaft, Band 1-7, 1919-1925; *Luther*; Vierteljahrsschrift der Luthergesellschaft, Band 8-19, 1926-1937; *Luther*; Mitteilungen der Luthergesellschaft, Band 20-32, 1938-1941, 1953-1961; *Luther*; Zeitschrift der Luther-Gesellschaft, Band 33-, 1962-.
 3. There are fewer than 100 subscriptions to the annual *Luther-Jahrbuch* in the United States and even fewer to the periodical *Luther*. Many of these are subscriptions by private individuals rather than libraries.
 4. *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, Band 1-, 1903/04-44, 1951-. *Ibid.* Beiheft, *Literaturbericht*, Band 1-, 1972-.
 5. Rudolf C. Eucken, "Weshalb bedürfen wir einer Luther-Gesellschaft?" *Luther-Jahrbuch* 1 (1919): 5-8.
 6. Müller, "60 Jahre Luther-Gesellschaft," p. 100.
 7. *Ibid.*, p. 102.

8. Gustav Roethe, "Luther in Worms und auf der Wartburg," *Luther-Jahrbuch* 4 (1922): 3-29.
9. Wilhelm Stolze, "Die Lage des deutschen Bauernstandes im Zeitalter des Bauernkrieges," *ibid.* 6 (1924): 38-51; Paul Althaus, "Luthers Haltung im Bauernkriege," *ibid.* 7 (1925): 1-39.
10. Walter Friedensburg, "Die Reformation und der Speyerer Reichstag von 1526," *ibid.* 8 (1926): 120-195.
11. Johannes von Walter, "Der Reichstag zu Augsburg 1530," *ibid.* 12 (1930): 1-90.
12. Paul Althaus, "Der Geist der Lutherbibel," *ibid.* 16 (1934): 1-26; Hans Vollmer, "Die deutsche Bibel," *ibid.*: 27-50.
13. Theodor Knolle, "Vor zwanzig Jahren," *Luther* 21 (1939): 43-45.
14. Idem, *Luthers Glaube: Eine Widerlegung*, Schriftenreihe der Luther-Gesellschaft, 10 (Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlhaus Nachf., 1938).
15. Arno Deutelmoser, *Luther, Staat und Glaube* (Jena: Eugen Diederichs Verlag, 1937).
16. Franz Lau, "Luther-Jahrbuch 1956," *Luther* 27 (1956): 91-93; Idem, "Vorwort," *Luther-Jahrbuch* 24 (1957): vi-viii.
17. Idem, "Vorwort," p. viii.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. vii-viii.
19. Franz Lau, "Vorwort des Herausgebers," *Luther-Jahrbuch* 38 (1971): 5.
20. Müller, "60 Jahre Luther-Gesellschaft," p. 109.
21. *Ibid.*
22. Julius Jordan, "Vorwort des Herausgebers," *Luther-Jahrbuch* 4 (1922): iii-iv.
23. Karl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*. Band 1, *Luther* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1928).
24. Hanns Rückert, "Luther-Bibliographie 1925," *Luther-Jahrbuch* 8 (1926): 201.
25. Lau, "Vorwort," *ibid.* 38 (1971): 5.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

27. Franz Lau, "Sammelbesprechung," *ibid.* 28 (1961): 130-135.
28. Janusz Narzyński, "Bibliographie der polnischen Luther-Literatur 1530-1962," *ibid.* 32 (1965): 182-192.
29. Franz Lau, "Vorwort des Herausgebers," *ibid.*: 5.
30. Idem, "Vorwort des Herausgebers," *ibid.* 33 (1966): 5-7.
31. Gottfried G. Krodel, "'Wider den Abgott zu Halle,'" *ibid.*: 9-87.
32. Günther Wartenberg, "Bibliographie der marxistischen Luther-Literatur in der D.D.R. 1945-1966," *ibid.* 35 (1968): 162-172.
33. Bruno Knoblauch, "Bibliografia de Lutero; Bibliographie spanischsprachiger Lutherliteratur von 1942 bis 1965," *ibid.*: 173-176.
34. Franz Lau, "Vorwort des Herausgebers," *ibid.*: 5.
35. Bernhard Lohse, "Die Lutherforschung im deutschen Sprachbereich seit 1966," *ibid.* 38 (1971): 91-120.
36. Helmar Junghans, "Inhalt, Ordnung und Form der Lutherbibliographie," *Lutherjahrbuch* 42 (1975): 126-130.
37. Wolfgang Franke, "Englische Lutherdeutung von 1782 bis 1848: Reformation, Revolution und Reform," *ibid.* 43 (1976): 36-91.
38. Hans Hofmann und Günther Wartenberg, "Bibliographie Heinrich Boehmer (1869-1927)," *ibid.*: 103-108.
39. Ernst-Wilhelm Kohls, "Die Lutherforschung im deutschen Sprachbereich seit 1970," *ibid.* 44 (1977): 28-56.
40. Steffen Kjeldgaard-Pedersen, "Die Lutherforschung in Skandinavien seit 1966," *ibid.*: 57-70.
41. Jos E. Verduyze, "Die Lutherforschung im niederländischen Sprachbereich seit 1969," *ibid.*: 71-74.
42. Idem, "Die Lutherforschung im romanischen Sprachbereich seit 1970," *ibid.*: 75-88.
43. Yoshikazu Tokuzen, "Die Lutherforschung in Japan seit 1967," *ibid.*: 89-104.

44. Lowell C. Green, "Luther Research in English-speaking Countries since 1971," *ibid.*: 105-126.
45. Siegfried Bräuer, "Müntzerforschung von 1965 bis 1975," *ibid.*: 127-141.

Edgar Krentz

In the past fifteen years four major works of eighteenth century theological bibliography have come into my possession. They were compiled by Christoph Matthaus Pfaff, Johann Franz Buddeus, Michael Lilienthal, and Johann Georg Walch. They have generally disappeared into historical oblivion. This brief note seeks to call them to the attention of historians, bibliographers, and theological librarians. Though such an inquiry is outside the normal focus of my scholarly interests, I could think of no better mode of honoring Calvin Schmitt. He has himself demonstrated his bibliographical acumen by maintaining and developing a distinguished theological library at McCormick Theological Seminary. He has used that acumen to serve the world of scholarship in religion and theology by chairing the Indexing Board of the American Theological Library Association. In that position he has had major influence on the development of *Religion Index One: Periodicals* and its younger sibling, *Religion Index Two: Multi-Author Works*. This incur-

sion into the history of bibliography is my small *donum amicitiae* to a long-standing friend.

In many ways the eighteenth century is the age in which the sudden growth of knowledge in the Renaissance and the seventeenth century is now harvested, bundled, and marketed. This age sees the codification of knowledge in major works of reference. Denis Diderot's *Encyclopédie* (1751-1772) is only the most notable of these efforts.¹ One need think only of J. H. Zedler's great *Universal Lexikon*² or Christian Gottlieb Jöcher's *Compendiöses Gelehrten Lexicon* and its greatly expanded successor, the *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon*,³ to recognize the truth of the statement. Zedler and Jöcher are still the fundamental resources for information about scholars and research in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. A plethora of other bio-bibliographical aids originated in this century. The four that will be noticed here are simply examples of a flood of works.

Yet many are unused and unknown today, at least by theological scholarship. They were still mentioned by author's name in some of the works that introduced students to the study of theology in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. With the decline of works in "theological encyclopedia," the earlier works of scholarship tended to be lost in stacks (if present) or even discarded by unwitting guardians of collections. Names like Martin Lipenius and Michael Lilienthal are monuments in library catalogs.

In the English speaking world the significant

work by Philip Schaff, *Theological Propaedeutic*,⁴ does not mention our four writers in the index of authors, but does cite Budde (Buddeus), Pfaff, and Walch as compilers of works that give practical advice to theological students (p. 13). The standard handbook by Crooks and Hurst,⁵ based on the German introduction to theological method by Karl Hagenbach, does better. Pfaff and Buddeus are mentioned because their works show, by the structure adopted, the fundamental concept of theology. Pfaff is praised for placing exegetical theology first as the basic theological discipline, while Buddeus gives pride of place to dogmatic theology. Both are faulted for giving "an extended history of the literature," since this tended to make of theological "encyclopaedia . . . a mere bibliographic guide." The description reveals a disdain for bibliographic tools that is surprising. Lilienthal is not mentioned, while J. G. Walch comes under the same stricture as Pfaff and Buddeus.⁶

Alfred Cave gives a bit more attention to our authors in his survey, *An Introduction to Theology: Its Principles, Its Branches, Its Results, and Its Literature*.⁷ He mentions a long list of writers who compiled theological bibliographies, including Pfaff, Lilienthal, and the later excellent work of Danz, but omits Buddeus (p. 108; he mentions him earlier on p. 25). A few works are singled out for special praise, among them the *Bibliotheca Theologica Selecta* of J. G. Walch. Cave calls this a "monument of erudition, by far the most complete and valuable work then published, and even today a compendium not wholly superseded."⁸ Cave does not men-

tion that Walch built on the earlier work of his father-in-law, Buddeus, whose library he inherited. And his words of praise, *mutatis mutandis*, could apply equally do well to Pfaff and Buddeus.

Two standard nineteenth century German works deserve mention. G. B. Winer mentions Pfaff, Buddeus, and Walch in his theological bibliography, but not Lilienthal.⁹ The magnum opus of theological bibliography in the nineteenth century, the four-volume *Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften* edited by Otto Zöckler,¹⁰ discusses the structure of theology as reflected in Pfaff, Buddeus, and Walch *inter alios*, ascribing to all of them a strong literary and literary-historical interest. Walch is criticized for seeing only two major disciplines in theology, a theoretical (i.e. dogmatical) and a practical (i.e. moral). All other theological studies are grouped under the heading of *Hilfswissenschaften*, a severely myopic view of theology. Walch reflects his relationship to late orthodoxy in this concern.

There are, of course, discussions of these authors in the standard works of biographical reference and the theological encyclopedias. But these discussions tend to concentrate interest on biographical accounts and theological systems. Our report on each author will seek to do two things. A short biographical notice will show the training on which the writer's bibliographical competence was based. Then a description of the bibliographical contribution of each author will be made. There will be nothing original in the notices. Their significance, if any, lies in re-

calling to mind some gifted (and occasionally irascible) scholars of surprising depth and breadth of knowledge whose bibliographical works might still point people to significant works of an earlier age.

I

Christoph Matthäus Pfaff (1686-1760) published his *Introductio in historiam theologiae literariam notis amplissimis, quae novum opus conficiunt, illustrata* between the years 1724 and 1726.¹¹ He was at the height of his powers. A review of his life serves to justify Wagenmann's¹² evaluation of him as "einer der gelehrtesten und angesehensten Protestantischen Theologen des 18. Jahrhunderts."¹³ The list of his published works reaches 215 titles.¹⁴

He was born in Stuttgart on Christmas Day in 1686, the son of the pastor of the Lutheran Leonhardskirche.¹⁵ After schooling in Stuttgart he received his baccalaureate from the University of Tübingen in 1699 (aged thirteen!) and entered the famous Tübinger Stift. At this early age he specialized in biblical philology and the languages of the Near East. In 1702, at the ripe age of sixteen, he gave a lecture to the theological faculty in Samaritan; he received his master's degree in the same year. In 1704 he was examined for the ministry by the consistory and began to preach. The next year he was appointed vicar of Lustnau, a village about three kilometers from Tübingen, and named a Repetent in the Stift.

His duke supported his extensive travels that began in 1706 and ended 1717. After studying rabbinics in Halle, he went to Hamburg to hear

Edgaard, then moved to Rostock to listen to Dr. Fecht in 1707. The next year saw him in Greifswald, Copenhagen, Holland, England, Cologne, Marburg, and finally Giessen, where he studied Ethiopic with Bürklin. From 1709 to 1712 he was tutor, companion, and pastor to Crown Prince Carl Alexander of Württemberg, spending most of the time in Turin, Italy. Entertained with his prince at the court of Savoy, Pfaff became, as Preuschen put it,¹⁶ a complete cavalier. But he also used the opportunity to read extensively in the library of Victor Amadeus II. His first publications, an edition of Lactantius in 1712 and the *editio princeps* of four unknown fragments of Irenaeus (Den Haag, 1715), brought both attention and notoriety. The Irenaeus fragments were published during a two-year stay in The Hague (1712-1714). Almost at once their authenticity was questioned; Pfaff was suspected of an intentional deception and credited with having forged the fragments personally. As Preuschen dryly puts it, "es bleibt immer noch genug begründetes Misstrauen gegen Pfaffs Redlichkeit übrig."

In 1714 a rescript of the court of Württemberg named him a professor of theology at Tübingen University, though the faculty was opposed. He took up his duties as third professor in 1717 after a trip to Paris with the prince, 1715-1716. On the death of his father he became the second professor of theology and took up the deanship attached to it (1720), only to accede to the first professorship and the chancellorship of the university on the death of Professor Jäger a few weeks later. He held

that position for thirty-six years. In 1724 he was named *comes Palatinus* by royal diploma. In 1727 he became Abbot of Kloster Lorch. In that role he participated in the *Landtag* at Stuttgart in 1737-1739.

In his later years he was not particularly popular or politic, and his last years reflect that. He was given the post of Chancellor of Mosheim near Göttingen in 1755, but delayed leaving to take up his post till February of 1756. The delay gave rise to the rumor that he was infirm and growing very testy. He broke his journey in Frankfurt am Main, and there received the news that he had been appointed superintendent and chancellor of the University in Giessen. He took up that position and occupied it until his death in 1760.

Pfaff's catholic interests and encyclopedic knowledge led him to write and lecture over a broad range of topics in every discipline of theology. His most significant works appeared in the early years of his Tübingen professorship. Among these were his introduction to the literary history of theology. It appeared in its first dress as a series of *Programme* between the years 1718 and 1720, was published in full in 1720, and republished as a *novum opus* in 1724 to 1726 by J. G. and C. G. Cotta, the great Tübingen printers.¹⁷ It is a work that is ideal for the use and display of the encyclopedic learning Pfaff possessed, and is on any reckoning a major *tour de force*. The three volumes are beautifully printed, with the printer's device on the title page, some headpieces, and engraved initial letters. Page size is 20.5 cm by 16.5 cm.

The contents give an idea of Pfaff's understanding of the nature of theology. After twelve pages of initial matter, Pfaff devotes pages 1-53 of Volume I to a general introduction, pages 54-188 to exegetical theology, pages 189-403 to dogmatic theology, and concludes with a five page *index rerum*. The 452 pages of Volume II are devoted to polemical theology. A twenty page *index auctorum* concludes the volume. The final volume devotes pages 1-341 to *historia ecclesiastica* and pages 342-376 to *theologia practica*. Pages 377-545 contain ten *Programmata*, three orations for the Nativity of Jesus, a catalog of Pfaff's works, and indexes of authors and subject matter.

Pfaff's method is to divide each major division of theology into logical sections. He then presents the literary history of each section, with listings of authors by name. The order is partly chronological partly evaluative. An extensive set of notes to each section leads the student into the literary history, provides key documents, lists editions, refers to supporting literature, etc. Paragraph VII in Volume II might serve as a good example. It covers *theologia anti-pontificia*, anti-papal polemic. The discussion mentions that the subject includes the history of the papacy, highlights Luther's controversial writings and those of his opponents, and then calls attention to *acta publica* in Rome and Germany (p. 37). Then he turns to the Council of Trent, listing first works of history and then the Protestant works that discuss its theology, the responses from the Roman Catholic side, and then the later Protestant responses. A total of 166

footnotes are given to the three pages of the discussion. Those notes completely fill pages 39-172. In them are reprinted the bull of Leo X, *Exurge Domine*, and his later bull, *Decet Romanum Pontificem*. Editions of the Canons and decrees of Trent are listed in the original language and in translation. Literature from Germany, England, France, Switzerland, etc. is cited. The literature is dated. Attention is called to the preferred editions. In short, Pfaff has left us a massive documentation of the intellectual life of the theology of his time. Students of the history of Christian thought would find it a resource of first rank.

II

Johann Franz Buddeus (1667-1729) is described by Emmanuel Hirsch¹⁸ as "der gelehrteste und der fleissigste wissenschaftliche Theolog seines Zeites."¹⁹ He mastered philosophy, became an orientalist, and wrote excellent books in exegesis, church history, dogmatics, and ethics. Thus Hirsch gives Buddeus praise as high as Wagenmann gives Pfaff. The Swabian from Tübingen finds his counterpart in the Pomeranian from Jena and Giessen.

His life flowed in regular channels. He was born on June 25, 1667, the day of the Presentation of the Augsburg Confession, at Anclam in Pomerania, the son of a Lutheran pastor. He entered Wittenberg University in 1685 and received his master's degree in 1687. Two years later he was appointed adjunct of the faculty of philosophy, only to move to Jena to lecture on philosophy and to study history. In 1692 he became professor of Greek and

Latin in the gymnasium at Koburg, the city in which Luther had spent anxious days during the Diet of Augsburg in 1530. A year later he was appointed professor of moral and political philosophy (*philosophia moralis et civilis*) in the recently founded University of Halle. He received his licentiate in theology in 1695, his doctorate in 1705. Though he was highly respected by the philosophical faculty, the theological faculty caused him problems when he gave lectures in their field. He gladly accepted a call to the University at Jena in 1705, where he began a long and fruitful career as second professor of theology. In 1714 he became *Professor primarius* and Kirchenrat. In 1719 he moved to Giessen, where he held a chair of theology till his death.

Buddeus published significant theological writings that took a mediating position between the Orthodox Lutherans and the Pietists. Called by the former a "Pietistenpatron," Zinzendorf called him an "Himmlischer Agent."²⁰ His major works were his *Institutiones theologiae moralis* (1711), the first detailed work of Lutheran ethics, the *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* (1723), and his *Isagoge historico-theologica* (1727).²¹ He had a truly historical approach to theological disciplines that was epoch-making in theology. Thus his dogmatics broke with much of the terminology of the Lutheran scholasticism, and in a sense freed it from a conceptual burden. He separated the theology of the Reformation Period (in which he included John Gerhard) from that of Scholasticism (the seventeenth century) and recognized the significance

of Descartes as having inaugurated a new age in thought (though he was bitterly critical of Spinoza and Wolff). He left his library to his son-in-law, J. G. Walch, who published some of his works posthumously and built upon them. Buddeus wrote over one hundred works; considering their number, they are of surprisingly consistent excellence.

Buddeus' *Isagoge historico-theologica ad theologiam universam singulasque eius partes*, published by Thomas Fritsch of Leipzig in 1727, is significant for its bibliographic coverage. Hirsch²² described this work as "die erste Gesamtübersicht über die Theologie als einen geschlossenen Kreis wissenschaftlicher Disziplinen." That praise is, perhaps, too high.²³ Pfaff's work does antedate Buddeus'. But it is fair to say that the *Isagoge* is a worthy partner to Pfaff's *Introductio* in its attempt to describe the purpose, method, and history of theology and its disciplines.

The copy of Buddeus in my possession was printed in 1727; it was reprinted in 1730 with a new appendix. It is a massive work in quarto, 1844 pages in length (page size 21.5 cm by 17 cm), mostly in closely printed double columns. The preliminary pages (a2-4, b1-3) contain a dedication to Frederick, Duke of Saxony (along with a fine copper plate of the prince), and an introduction for the reader. Unnumbered pages (102!) at the rear give a list of chapter numbers and titles, an *index auctorum* (an impressive list), and an *index rerum*. The single index makes it easier to use than the separate indexes bound in each of Pfaff's volumes.

The work falls into two sections of unequal

length. The first book (*liber prior*) deals in four chapters with preliminary matters: the goal of theological inquiry, the qualities and virtues needed by the student of theology, the means by which theological aptitude is gained, and the requisite non-theological disciplines that are preliminary to theological study (*propaedeumates theologiae*). Here Buddeus reflects both his deep piety (he discusses the role of prayer in theological study) and his humanistic and philosophical training. The whole is bolstered by numerous references to ancient and modern authorities, profane and ecclesiastical. The listing of ancient authors, for example, that he suggests the theological student ought to know (pp. 148-150), would strain the recognition factor of most modern theological students.

The second book (*liber posterior*) fills the major part of the work (pp. 335-1844). It deals with the various theological disciplines in an interesting order: 1. thetic or dogmatic theology; 2. confessional theology (*theologia symbolica*); 3. patristic theology; 4. moral and mystical theology, together with divine jurisprudence and pastoral jurisprudence (practical theology); 5. ecclesiastical government; 6. ecclesiastical history; 7. polemical theology; 8. exegetical theology. The order contrasts sharply with that of Pfaff. Dogmatic theology is primary, even as compared with confessional theology. Exegetical theology comes last.

The structure is much like that of Pfaff, so far as physical arrangement is concerned. Each major section is composed of several chapters, e.g.

thirteen in exegetical theology. Each chapter begins with a thetical statement of the significance of the particular branch of theological study and literature (e.g., Old Testament history or New Testament history); that is followed by extensive bibliographical references with notes. At times only authors' names are given; sometimes titles and places of publication are mentioned. The weakest sections appear to be those that deal with church history and exegesis. The strongest are those in dogmatic and polemical theology.

III

Michael Lilienthal (1686-1750) was a learned Lutheran with broad interests, who never obtained a professorial chair.²⁴ The entire career of this man was passed in East Prussia. Born at Liebstadt, he entered the University at Königsberg in 1700. In 1706 a study trip took him to Wittenberg, Leipzig, and Jena, in the last of which he received his master's degree. He spent some time in Rostock doing research in 1708, went to Holland in 1710 only to return to Prussia via Berlin in 1711. In Berlin he was named a member of the Royal Academy of Prussia. In 1713 he was appointed Inspector of Alumen in Königsberg. He assumed the post of sub-Librarian of the city library in 1714, became an ordained deacon at the Domkirche in Kneiphof in 1715, then deacon of the "altstädische Kirche" of Königsberg in 1719. In 1733 he was named a member and honorary professor of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences. He died in 1750. He published many works, most of them dealing with the history of the Prussian Kingdom or cities within it. His publications in theology and religion

reflect the life of the parish pastor: an account of the celebration of the second centenary of the Reformation in Königsberg (1723), tracts to build up the faith of his parishioners, sermons, and catechetical helps.

Lilienthal published a massive bibliography of materials on the Old and New Testaments. The volume described here is that on the New Testament. Its long title gives a good description of its contents and purpose:

*Biblischer Archivarius der heiligen Schrift Neuen Testaments, Welcher, nach vorhergegangenen guten Wahl und sorgfältigen Prüfung, vermittelst eines Nahmen-Registers, die besten Autores, so wohl von alten, als fürnehmlich von neuern Scribenten anzeigt, die über ein jedes Buch, Capitel und Vers des Neuen Testaments geschrieben, und dessen Stellen, entweder auf exegetisch-philologische, oder homiletisch-practische Art abgehandelt und erläutert haben; Mit möglichstem Fleiss und Richtigkeit zusammengetragen, und zum allgemeinen Nutzen herausgegeben von M. Michael Lilienthal.*²⁵

The work was published in Königsberg and Leipzig by Christoph Gottfried Eckhardt in 1745.

Lilienthal clearly had a practical aim. He wrote his book not for the scholar of his day, but for the parish pastor. For this reason he used the German language rather than learned Latin. As he says in his preface, he draws not only on technical exegetical literature, but also on collections of sermons, works of doctrine, catechesis and the like. He calls attention to the value of the *Programmata*, of tracts which like *Publicationes vagantes* might easily be overlooked because of their slight form, and of the *Dissertationes*, and expresses the wish that the printers and sellers of books would form an association to gather and publish these works in

great collections so that they might be more easily available (p. 5).

His arrangement of materials is exemplary. Lilienthal begins with commentators on the entire New Testament, listing them by their confessional adherence (Lutheran, Reformed, Papal, Socinian). Then come works of introduction and history. There follow in order works dealing with larger sections of the New Testament (e.g. Gospels), individual books, chapters, and verses. There are no evaluative comments; interpretations are not characterized.

Lilienthal's 844 pages, printed in double columns, give a guide to the biblical interpretation current in the eighteenth century. His listings show the type of resources actually used by parish pastors and thus provide a corrective to the impression one might have from reading the intellectual history of the *Aufklärung*. Lilienthal's life coincided almost exactly with that of Johann Sebastian Bach. A study of the bibliographic materials listed in his work, which was printed in Leipzig five years before the death of Bach, might illuminate the type of preaching the composer heard from the pulpit of the Thomaskirche.

IV

Johann Georg Walch (1693-1775), the fourth bibliographer in our study can be treated most cursorily, since he is by far the best known of them;²⁶ therefore we will not rehearse the details of his life. It is perhaps enough to note that he was the son-in-law of Buddeus, inherited his library, and in many ways built on and carried forward his work.²⁷ Edu-

cated at the University of Leipzig, Walch spent his academic career (1718-1775!) in various positions at the University of Jena. Tschackert describes him well as one endowed "mit rastlosem Eifer, ausgezeichneter Arbeitskraft und vorzüglichem Urtheil."²⁸

Walch's name is memorialized in scholarship by a number of works that are still indispensable today.²⁹ He edited the works of Luther (in German) in twenty-four volumes (Halle, 1740-1752), an edition that was standard until the Erlanger Ausgabe appeared in the nineteenth century. His *Historische und Theologische Einleitung In die Religions Streitigkeiten Der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirchen*, 5 vols. (Jena: Johann Meyers Wittwe, 1730-1739) and *Historische und Theologische Einleitung in die Religions Streitigkeiten Welche sonderlich ausser der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche entstanden*, 5 vols. (Jena: Johann Mehers Wittwe, 1724-1736) are basic yet today for their collection of source materials. He published a number of works in the area of bibliography, e.g. his *Bibliotheca Patristica* (Jena: Croecker, 1770).

But pride of place goes to his *Bibliotheca theologica selecta litterariis adnotationibus instructa*, 4 vols. (Jena, 1757-1765), printed by Croecker. It is in many ways the fruition of the work of Pfaff and Buddeus, a monument of erudition and industry. To this day, it ought to be the first bibliography for which one reaches when seeking the resources of theology available from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries. It is written with breadth and leisure and thus far surpasses its predecessors in size (though it is printed in large

octavo, not quarto). It is fitted with excellent indexes to the authors mentioned, volume by volume. It should prove to be a major resource for the precise identification of some of the mysterious references that abound in this early literature.

Pencilled into the front cover of Volume I of my copy of Pfaff is the note that the work, offered for sale for \$2.25, did not sell. Eventually it was marked down to \$1.00. When one considers the value of these bibliographies, he can only pray for an earlier and simpler age in which earlier imprints could still be found, and at affordable prices.

Yet in these later days, where books are dear when available, it is probably a better act of respect to blow off the dust and recall them to their honored place in the working collections of historians and theologians. *Sint monumenta in aeterna!*

NOTES

1. See the interesting set of articles in the *Yale Alumni Magazine* 38, 8 (May 1977).
2. *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste*, 64 vols. in 63 (Halle: J. H. Zedler, 1732-1750); supplement, 4 vols. (Leipzig: J. H. Zedler, 1751-1754).
3. Christian Gottlieb Jöcher, *Compendiöses Gelehrten-Lexicon*, 3rd ed., 2 vols. (Leipzig: Johan Friedrich Gleditschens seel. Sohn, 1733); id., *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon, Darinne die Gelehrten aller Stände sowohl männ- als weiblichen Geschlechts, welche vom Anfange der Welt bis auf die ieszigen Zeit gelebt, und sich der gelehrten Welt bekannt gemacht, Nach ihrer Geburt, Leben, merkwürdigen Geschichten, Absterben, und Schrifften aus den glaubwürdigsten Scribenten in alphabetischer Ordnung beschrieben werden*, 4 vols. (Leipzig: in Johann Friedrich Gleditschens Buch-

- handlung, 1750-1751). A supplement was published: *Fortsetzung und Ergänzungen zu Christian Gottlieb Jöchers allgemeinem Gelehrten-Lexico*; Vols. 1-2, ed. Johann Christoph Adelung (Leipzig: Gleditsch, 1784-1787); Vols. 3-7, ed. Heinrich Wilhelm Rotermund (Vols. 3-6, Bremen: Johann Georg Heyse, 1810-1819; Vol. 7, Leipzig: K. W. Hiersemann, 1897). The entire set was reprinted in 1961 by the Georg Olms Verlag of Hildesheim.
4. *Theological Propaedeutic. A General Introduction to the Study of Theology, Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical including Encyclopedia, Methodology, and Bibliography*, 7th ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907). The first edition was published in 1892.
 5. George R. Crooks and John F. Hurst, *Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology on the Basis of Hagenbach*, Library of Biblical and Theological Literature, Vol. III (New York: Phillips & Hunt; Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe, 1884), p. 128.
 6. The later publication, *An Outline of the History of Christian Literature* by George Leopold Hurst (New York: Macmillan, 1926), mentions none of these writers.
 7. Alfred Cave, *An Introduction to Theology: Its Principles, Its Branches, Its Results, and Its Literature*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896).
 8. *Ibid.*, 113.
 9. Georg Benedict Winer, *Handbuch der theologischen Literatur, hauptsächlich der protestantischen; nebst kurzen biographischen Notizen über die theologischen Schriftsteller*, 3rd ed., 2 vols. (Leipzig: Carl Heinrich Reclam, 1838-1840), II, 457, 705, 824.
 10. Otto Zöckler, "Grundlegung. Das theologischen Wissensganze," in *Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften*, ed. Otto Zöckler, 3rd ed., 4 vols. (Nördlingen: C. H. Beck, 1889), I, 95-96.
 11. Christoph Matthäus Pfaff, *Introductio in historiam theologiae literariam notis amplissimis, quae novum opus conficiunt, illustrata*, 3 vols. (Tübingen: Jo. Georg & Christian Godof. Cotta, 1724-1726).

12. Wagenmann, "Pfaff, Christoph Matthäus," *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (Leipzig: Dunker & Humblot, 1887), XXV, 587.
13. For a review of Pfaff's career the following will be useful in addition to Wagenmann (n. 12): Zedler's *Universal-Lexikon*, 27, 1198ff.; Jöcher, *Fortsetzung*, V, 2153-2157; Heinrich Doering, *Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands im achtzehnten und neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, 4 vols. (Neustadt a. d. Orla: Johann Karl Gottfried Wagner, 1831-1835), III, 249-266; Erwin Preuschen, "Pfaff, Christoph Matthäus," *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd ed., 24 vols. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1896-1913), XV, 233-237. Pfaff, like the other writers discussed in this paper, is not mentioned in the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F. L. Cross et al., 2nd ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1974).
14. Doering, *Die gelehrten Theologen*, III, 254-266.
15. The Leonhardskirche is one of the two old, pre-Reformation church buildings in the center of Stuttgart today.
16. Preuschen, "Pfaff," 234.
17. The Cotta family had a long history as printers. They had published Johann Gerhard's *Loci theologici*, 15 vols. (Tübingen, 1762-1776). The firm remained in Tübingen until 1798, when it moved to Stuttgart, then (1803) to Ulm, and finally (1816) to Augsburg; cf. Karl Faulmann, *Illustrierte Geschichte der Buchdruckerkunst* (Leipzig, Wien, Pest: A. Hertlebens Verlag, 1882), p. 454.
18. Emanuel Hirsch, *Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie*, 5 vols. (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1949-1954), II, 319.
19. On Buddeus' life see Jöcher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon*, I, 1458-1459; Doering, *Die gelehrten Theologen*, I, 174-187; Frank, "Buddeus, Johann Franz," *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, III, 500-501; E. Schwarz and Johannes Kunze, "Buddeus (Budde), Joh. Franz," *Realencyklopädie*, III, 518-522; Kurt Aland, "Buddeus (Budde), Johann Franz," *Neue Deutsche Biographie* (Berlin: Dunker & Humblot, 1955), II, 715; Hirsch, *Geschichte*, II, 318-335.

20. Frank, "Buddeus," 500.
21. On his theology, see Hirsch, *Geschichte*, II, 318-335, and Schwarz-Kunze, "Buddeus," 520-522.
22. Hirsch, *Geschichte*, II, 320.
23. Other evaluations are not so generous; see Zöckler, *Handbuch*, I, 95-96, for a basic critique.
24. Jöcher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon*, II, 2436-2438; Doering, *Die gelehrten Theologen*, II, 311-316 (he lists sixty-one items in the bibliography); Erbkam, "Lilienthal, Michael," *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, XVIII, 650. There is no entry in the *Realencyklopädie*.
25. Umlauts, indicated in the original by small superscript \bar{e} , have been resolved into modern spelling ("").
26. See Doering, *Die gelehrten Theologen*, IV, 630-640; P. Tschackert, "Walch, Johann Georg," *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, XL, 650-652; W. Möller and G. Kawerau, "Walch," *Realencyklopädie*, XX, 792-794. Hirsch, *Geschichte*, II, 335-336, gives a short evaluation of his theological significance. He lived too long to be included in Jöcher's four volumes; the supplement did not get to the letter W.
27. Hirsch, *Geschichte*, II, 335.
28. Tschackert, "Walch," 651.
29. The list in Doering, *Die gelehrten Theologen*, IV, 635-640, gives 137 titles.

John B. Trotti

There has been a great deal of confusion among both literary critics and theologians as to the nature, limits, shape, trends, and proper concerns of their interdisciplinary work in "theology and literature."¹ Theological librarians participate in that confusion as we shuffle through our subject headings from "religion and literature" to "Christianity and literature," with side trips to "religion and poetry," "religion and drama," "Christianity in literature," "religion in literature," "liturgy and literature," "literature and morals," "story-telling (Christian theology)," and still other local options.

David H. Hesla tells us that we are in "the second stage," in which this interdisciplinary work will move into more non-Western literature, into analysis of popular culture, and into studies of the impact of religion on literary history and biography. Thus, he postulates, we will speak more and more of "literature and religion" and not

of "literature and theology" or "literature and Christianity."² Be that as it may, this essay concerns itself with the broad range of theological concerns relating to literature which are common to theological libraries and to their clientele of students and pastors, using the non-subject (according to L.C.) of "Theology and Literature." Perhaps we should be cheered to see the experts moving toward the old subject "Religion and Literature"--one less change to make in the card catalog.

Our aim here is to survey the literature under this broad thematic umbrella, noting some trends and emphases and supplying bibliographic leads for the development of our collections. In four years of offering courses in Theology and Literature for students and pastors, we have developed an extensive annotated bibliography of secondary or critical tools in the area. It is not possible, and probably not desirable, to attempt a bibliography of primary sources which one could, and should, consider in the wide range of the world's literature.

With the exception of some survey articles cited here, we shall not attempt to review periodical articles per se, but will focus on monographs and collected essays. We do not write primarily for the technical scholar--Biblical, theological, or literary--but for the students and pastors with whom we theological librarians most regularly deal.³ The discussion will cut across all these lines, but it is less a critical assessment for the specialist than an analysis of sources for the generalist.

The interdisciplinary work in theology and literature began to take clear shape in the 1940's,

and by the 1950's real academic structure emerged. In the fifties the theological schools began developing graduate programs with reference to literature, the Conference on Christianity and Literature was founded, and the stream of literature with which we are now coping began in earnest with Amos Niven Wilder, Nathan A. Scott, Jr., Stanley Romaine Hopper, Richard Warrington Baldwin Lewis, and others. Out of the dialogue of the fifties still more graduate programs emerged, more initiative was taken by the literary critics in challenge and response to the theologians, and the Seminar in Literature and Religion was established by the Modern Language Association. In 1961 *The Christian Century* devoted an issue to "Faith and Literature in Confrontation," noting that "in recent years there has come about a renewal of theological interest in the arts."⁴

In the 1970's the dialogue was especially active between literary critics and Biblical scholars. The literature of that dialogue is voluminous, and it is common to see members of the Society of Biblical Literature engaged in interested and vigorous debate in the American Academy of Religion's active and productive section on "Arts, Literature, and Religion." We cannot document all the trends nor develop a history of the movement here; however, the reader will find a good survey in the periodical articles cited above⁵ and in the initial chapter of the most recent book by Giles Gunn.⁶

The bibliographies given below are frustratingly selective. Our own bibliography at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, selectively based on our

holdings, runs to over 180 titles.⁷ The "select" bibliography of holdings in the University of Notre Dame Libraries entitled "Religion and Literature" runs to over 700 titles.⁸ Rushing in where angels fear to tread, we select representative pieces from the 1950's to date.

I. Religion and Literature

Brooks, Cleanth. *The Hidden God*. Studies in Hemingway, Faulkner, Yeats, Eliot and Warren. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963. xi, 136p.

Cary, Norman Reed. *Christian Criticism in the Twentieth Century*. Theological Approaches to Literature. National University Publications. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1975. 136p.

Eversole, Finley, ed. *Christian Faith and the Contemporary Arts*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. 255p.

Frye, Roland Mushat. *Perspective on Man*. Literature and the Christian Tradition. Stone Lectures, 1959. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961. 207p.

Gardner, Helen Louise. *Religion and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971. 195p.

Gunn, Giles B. *The Interpretation of Otherness*. Literature, Religion, and the American Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979. x, 250p.

_____, ed. *Literature and Religion*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971. xi, 238p.

Hopper, Stanley Romaine, ed. *Spiritual Problems in Contemporary Literature*. New York: Harper & Row, 1957. xvi, 298p.

Jarrett-Kerr, Martin. *Studies in Literature and Belief*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954. x, 203p.

Killinger, John. *The Failure of Theology in Modern Literature*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1963. 239p.

_____, *The Fragile Presence*. Transcendence in Modern Literature. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973. x, 166p.

- Lockerbie, D. Bruce. *The Liberating Word*. Art and the Mystery of the Gospel. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974. 125p.
- Lynch, William F. *Christ and Apollo*. The Dimensions of the Literary Imagination. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960. xvii, 267p.
- Mallard, William. *The Reflection of Theology in Literature*. A Case Study in Theology and Culture. Trinity University Monograph Series in Religion, 4. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1977. xi, 271p.
- Meeter, Merle. *Literature and the Gospel*. Biblical Norms for Literature. Nutley, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1972. vii, 168p.
- Newport, John P. *Theology and Contemporary Art Forms*. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1971. 131p.
- Nott, Kathleen. *The Emperor's Clothes*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1958. 328p.
- Richards, Irvor Armstrong. *Beyond*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1974. xv, 201p.
- Ruland, Vernon. *Horizons of Criticism*. An Assessment of Religious-Literary Options. Chicago: American Library Association, 1975. ix, 265p.
- Scott, Nathan A., Jr. *The Broken Center*. Studies in the Theological Horizon of Modern Literature. The William Lyon Phelps Lectures, 1965. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966. xv, 237p.
- _____, ed. *The Climate of Faith in Modern Literature*. New York: Seabury Press, 1964. xvi, 237p.
- _____. *Modern Literature and the Religious Frontier*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. xiv, 138p.
- Tenneyson, G. B. and Ericson, Edward E., Jr., eds. *Religion and Modern Literature*. Essays in Theory and Criticism. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975. 424p.
- TeSelle, Sallie McFague. *Literature and the Christian Life*. Yale Publications in Religion, 12. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966. ix, 238p.
- Vahanian, Gabriel. *Wait without Idols*. New York: George Braziller, 1964. xvi, 256p.

These titles represent significant discussion of theoretical issues in the relationship of literature and literary criticism to religious studies. A wide variety of essays urge the theologically inclined reader to consider the artist in his/her own right rather than to seek Christian preachments, invite an exploration of secular as well as Christian literature, and discuss the fruitful, constructive lines of interdisciplinary work (Brooks, Killinger, Tenneyson, TeSelle). It is significant to note the shift in Killinger's two works cited, in which he lamented the dearth of theological reflection in the "world come of age" in *The Failure of Theology in Modern Literature* in 1963, but returned in 1973 (together with a host of theologians) to see in secular literature an incarnational theology which he had missed, entitling this new look *The Fragile Presence*, with the subtitle, *Transcendence in Modern Literature*.

A number of volumes have appeared which attempt to analyze trends in literary criticism and their relation to theology and to Christian criticism (Cary, Meeter, Nott, Ruland, Vahanian). The best guidebook through the morass of criticism up to 1975 is the work of Ruland. Cary describes schools of Christian criticism and Meeter attempts to delineate Biblical norms for such criticism. Both Nott and Vahanian raise flags of warning with regard to those who attempt to "Christianize" secular literature.⁹

Analyses of the contemporary world situation in which the modern artist works abound (Eversole, Hopper, Killinger, Newport, Scott). Particular empha-

sis has been given to the relation of belief and art, the impact of the writer's belief on his/her art (Jarrett-Kerr; Scott, *The Broken Center*).

Theoretical reflection on the application of literary methodologies to religious studies (Frye, Gardner, Gunn), on Biblical and literary imagination (Lockerbie, Lynch), and on religious dimensions of literature (Hopper, Killinger, Mallard, Richards, Scott, Tenneyson) represent a significant sampling of a much more extensive literature.

II. Bible as/in Literature

Ackerman, James Stokes, et al., Eds. *The Bible as/in Literature*. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1976. 439p.

_____. *On Teaching the Bible as Literature. A Guide to Selected Biblical Narratives for Secondary Schools*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967. xxi, 121p.

_____, et al. *Teaching the Old Testament in English Classes*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973. xvii, 494p.

Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis. The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1957. 498p.

Bartel, Roland, ed. *Biblical Images in Literature. The Bible in Literature Courses*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975. 383p.

Beardslee, William A. *Literary Criticism of the New Testament*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship Series. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970. x, 86p.

Brown, Douglas Charles, ed. *The Enduring Legacy. Biblical Dimensions in Modern Literature*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975. xvii, 389p.

Capps, Alton C., ed. *The Bible as Literature. Patterns in Literary Art Series*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971. xiv, 418p.

Dillistone, Frederick William. *The Novelist and the Passion Story*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1960. 128p.

- Fairman, Marion A. *Biblical Patterns in Modern Literature*. Cleveland: Dillon/Liederbach, Inc., 1972. 152p.
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Four Essays. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957. x, 383p.
- Frye, Roland Mushat, ed. *The Bible*. Selections from the King James Version for Study as Literature. Riverside Editions. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965. xlv, 591p.
- Fulghum, Walter B., Jr. *A Dictionary of Biblical Allusions in English Literature*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965. viii, 291p.
- Funk, Robert Walter. *Jesus as Precursor*. Semeia Supplements, 2. Philadelphia: Fortress Press; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975. xviii, 165p.
- _____. *Language, Hermeneutic, and the Word of God*. The Problem of Language in the New Testament and Contemporary Theology. New York: Harper & Row, 1966. xvi, 317p.
- Gros Louis, Kenneth R. R., ed. *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*. The Bible in Literature Courses. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974. 352p.
- Henn, Thomas Rice. *The Bible as Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970. 270p.
- Juel, Donald, et al. *An Introduction to New Testament Literature*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1978. 368p.
- Kermode, John Frank. *The Genesis of Secrecy*. On the Interpretation of Narrative. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979. xii, 169p.
- Moseley, Edwin M. *Pseudonyms of Christ in the Modern Novel*. Motifs and Methods. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1962. xvi, 231p.
- Price, Reynolds. *A Palpable God*. Thirty Stories Translated from the Bible with an Essay on the Origins and Life of Narrative. New York: Atheneum, 1978. 195p.
- Robertson, David A. *The Old Testament and the Literary Critic*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977, 87p.

- Ryken, Leland. *The Literature of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974. 356p.
- Sandmel, Samuel. *The Enjoyment of Scripture*. The Law, the Prophets, and the Writings. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972. x, 300p.
- Swaim, Joseph Carter. *Unlocking the Treasures in Biblical Imagery*. A Reflection Book. New York: Association Press, 1966. 128p.
- Thompson, Leonard L. *Introducing Biblical Literature*. A More Fantastic Country. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978. xvi, 350p.
- Warshaw, Thayer S., et al., eds. *Bible-Related Curriculum Materials*. A Bibliography. The Bible in Literature Courses. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976. 168p.
- _____. *Handbook for Teaching the Bible in Literature Classes*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1978. 416p.
- Wilder, Amos Niven. *The Language of the Gospel*. Early Christian Rhetoric. New York: Harper & Row, 1964. 143p.
- Ziolkowski, Theodore. *Fictional Transfigurations of Jesus*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972. x, 315p.

Some very useful material has grown out of the Indiana University Institute on Teaching the Bible in Literature Courses, most of it published by Abingdon Press in its series, "The Bible in Literature Courses" (Ackerman, Bartel, Gros Louis, Juel, and the two Warshaw titles). Two of these volumes give scholarly background for the teaching of Biblical literature, the Old Testament (Ackerman) and the New Testament (Juel). Another is a collection of critical essays on the Bible as literature (Gros Louis), while yet another deals with the working out of Biblical narratives and themes in literature (Bartel). An extensive bibliography has been added to the series suggesting print and non-

print resources for pupils and teachers dealing with the Bible as/in literature (Warshaw, *Bible-related*). Although not comprehensive, this bibliography is a significant resource for locating literature which develops particular Biblical passages. The last publication in the series to date is a practical handbook for teachers giving both theoretical discussion and specific classroom suggestions for teaching the Bible as literature and the Bible in literature (Warshaw, *Handbook*). A final related piece, from Indiana University but not by Abingdon, is *On Teaching the Bible as Literature* (Ackerman), which gives background and helps in presenting Biblical narratives in literature classes.

Quite similar in aim and usefulness are the anthologies of readings for the study of Biblical literature in relation to stories, plays, or poems based thereon (Ackerman, *The Bible as/in Literature*; Brown) and selections of Biblical texts for study as literature (R. M. Frye). A related volume traces Biblical patterns in modern literature (Fairman), and yet another is a dictionary of Biblical allusions encountered in English literature (Fulghum).

Among the several works dealing with the life of Christ and with types of Christ in literature, we have cited four (Dillistone; Funk, *Jesus*; Moseley; Ziolkowski). There is an abundant literature related to Christ typology and the dangers inherent in such designations.

Biblical scholars are well aware of the plethora of tools giving help in literary analysis of scripture; only three key examples are cited here (Beardslee; Funk, *Language*; Wilder). In addition, we

note a few classic and comprehensive texts (Auerbach, Capps, Henn, Robertson, Ryken). We note with interest the work of a novelist reflecting on the power of Biblical narratives and translating thirty of them (Price), a Jewish Biblical scholar pressing for enjoyment of the Biblical literature (Sandmel), a discussion of the rich variety of Biblical imagery (Swaim), a promising application of literary criticism to the Gospel of Mark (Kermode), an enthusiastic guide to Biblical language and patterns (Thompson), and a literary critic opening up the role of myth in Biblical literature (N. Frye).

III. Theology in Literature

- Anderson, David. *The Tragic Protest*. A Christian Study of Some Modern Literature. London: SCM Press, 1969. 208p.
- Babbage, Stuart Barton. *The Mark of Cain*. Studies in Literature and Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966. 157p.
- Berbrich, Joan D., ed. *Heaven and Hell*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975. vii, 268p.
- Boyd, George N. and Boyd, Lois A., comps. *Religion in Contemporary Fiction*. Criticism from 1945 to the Present. Checklists in the Humanities and Education: A Series. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1973. xii, 99p.
- Brooks, Cleanth, ed. *Tragic Themes in Western Literature*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971. 178p.
- Cox, Roger L. *Between Earth and Heaven*. Shakespeare, Dostoevsky, and the Meaning of Christian Tragedy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969. xix, 252p.
- Gardiner, Harold Charles, ed. *American Classics Reconsidered*. A Christian Appraisal. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958. x, 307p.
- Glicksberg, Charles Irving. *Modern Literature and the Death of God*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966. 161p.

- _____. *The Tragic Vision in Twentieth-Century Literature*. Crosscurrents: Modern Critiques. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press; London: Feffer & Simons, 1963. xviii, 187p.
- Hyers, M. Conrad, ed. *Holy Laughter*. Essays on Religion in the Comic Perspective. New York: The Seabury Press, 1969. vi, 264p.
- Kort, Wesley A. *Shriven Selves*. Religious Problems in Recent American Fiction. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972. x, 149p.
- Krieger, Murray. *The Classic Vision*. The Retreat from Extremity in Modern Literature. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1971. xiv, 376p.
- _____. *The Tragic Vision*. Variations on a Theme in Literary Interpretation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966. xiv, 271p.
- Macaulay, Rose. *Some Religious Elements in English Literature*. Hogart Lectures on Literature Series, 14. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1972. 160p.
- McDonnell, Thomas J. *Listening to the Lord in Literature*. Canfield, Ohio: Alba House Communications, 1977. xiv, 252p.
- MacIver, Robert Morrison, ed. *Great Moral Dilemmas in Literature, Past and Present*. Religion and Civilization Series. New York: The Institute for Religious and Social Studies, 1956. vii, 189p.
- Milward, Peter. *Christian Themes in English Literature*. Tokyo: Kenkyuska, 1967. xvi, 296p.
- Moeller, Charles. *Man and Salvation in Literature*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1970. xii, 189p.
- Mueller, William Randolph. *The Prophetic Voice in Modern Fiction*. New York: Association Press, 1959. 183p.
- Rowland, Stanley J., Jr. *Hurt and Healing*. Modern Writers Speak. New York: Friendship Press, 1969. 96p.
- Saint Joseph College. *Literature as Christian Comedy*. The McAuley Lectures, 1961. West Hartford: Saint Joseph College, 1962. Pp. 31-80.

Scott, Nathan A., Jr. *Craters of the Spirit*. Studies in the Modern Novel. Washington: Corpus Books, 1968. 288p.

_____, ed. *Forms of Extremity in the Modern Novel*. Chime Paperbacks. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965. 96p.

_____. *Rehearsals of Discomposure*. Alienation and Reconciliation in Modern Literature: Franz Kafka, Ignazio Silone, D. H. Lawrence, T. S. Eliot. New York: Columbia University Press, King's Crown Press, 1952. xv, 294p.

_____. *The Tragic Vision and the Christian Faith*. New York: Association Press, 1957. 346p.

Stewart, Randall. *American Literature & Christian Doctrine*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963. 26p.

Turnell, Martin. *Modern Literature and Christian Faith*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961. 69p.

Webb, Eugene. *The Dark Dove*. The Sacred and Secular in Modern Literature. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1975. x, 280p.

If it is problematical to find Biblical themes played out in literature, it is much more so to locate theological ones. There are no comprehensive indexes to theological themes although one volume attempts a selective treatment of English language materials from 1943 to 1973 (Boyd), and several others deal with a selection of theological themes (Babbage; Hopper cited above; Kort; Milward; Rowland; Scott, *Craters*). These volumes may be supplemented by ones giving broad essays on theology in literature (Macaulay, Stewart, Turnell).

There has been a great flow of material dealing with angst, alienation, and particularly the tragic. The energetic debate about whether there can be Christian tragedy or not is seen in the literature on tragedy (Anderson; Brooks; Cox; Glicksberg, *Tragic*

Themes; Krieger, *Tragic Vision*; Scott, *Forms*; *Tragic Vision*; *Rehearsals*; Tinsley) and in the counter discussion of the classic or comic vision (Hyers; Krieger, *Classic Vision*, Saint Joseph College).

Related to the discussion of alienation and tragedy is the impact of such literature on the death of God movement (Glicksberg, *Modern*; Vahanian cited above).

Notable Catholic appraisals of theology as seen in literature have appeared (Gardiner, McDonnell, Milward). Many monographs have taken focus on particular theological themes: heaven and hell (Berbrich), the sacred and secular (Webb), morals (MacIver), and salvation (Moeller), to cite but a few. One could double the size of this survey by treating individual monographs dealing with poetry, drama, and prose with focus on select theological themes and/or individual authors. It is regrettable that to date there is no comprehensive index of such treatments.

IV. Rhetoric

Crossan, John Dominic. *The Dark Interval*. Towards a Theology of Story. Niles, Ill.: Argus Communications, 1975. 134p.

Frei, Hans W. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*. A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974. 358p.

Frye, Northrop. *The Secular Scripture*. A Study of the Structure of Romance. The Charles Eliot Norton Lectures, 1974-1975. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976. viii, 199p.

Kort, Wesley A. *Narrative Elements and Religious Meanings*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975. ix, 118p.

- Lynch, William F. *Images of Faith: An Exploration of the Ironic Imagination*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1973. x, 184p.
- McKnight, Edgar V. *Meaning in Texts: The Historical Shaping of a Narrative Hermeneutics*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978. xi, 332p.
- Macneice, Louis. *Varieties of Parable*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1965. vi, 157p.
- Navone, John J. *Towards a Theology of Story*. Slough: St. Paul Publications, 1977. 156p.
- Noel, Daniel C., ed. *Echoes of the Wordless "Word"*. Colloquy in Honor of Stanley Romaine Hopper. Religion and the Arts, 2. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1973. xiii, 195p.
- O'Brien, William James. *Stories to the Dark*. Explorations in Religious Imagination. New York: Paulist Press, 1977. vii, 163p.
- Rice, Charles Lynvel. *Interpretation and Imagination*. The Preacher and Contemporary Literature. The Preacher's Paperback Library. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970. xiv, 158p.
- Sayers, Dorothy Leigh. *The Poetry of Search and the Poetry of Statement*. And Other Posthumous Essays on Literature, Religion and Language. London: Victor Gollancz, 1963. 286p.
- Scholes, Robert E. and Kellogg, Robert. *The Nature of Narrative*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966. 326p.
- Schneidau, Herbert N. *Sacred Discontent*. The Bible and the Western Tradition. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1976. xiii, 331p.
- Sharpless, F. Parvin. *Symbol and Myth in Modern Literature*. Rochelle Park, N.J.: Hayden Book Co., 1976. x, 260p.
- Simon, Ulrich E. *Story and Faith in the Biblical Narrative*. London: S.P.C.K., 1975. x, 126p.
- TeSelle, Sallie McFague. *Speaking in Parables*. A Study in Metaphor and Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975. vi. 186p.
- Wicker, Brian. *The Story-Shaped World*. Fiction and Metaphysics: Some Variations on a Theme. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975. viii, 230p.

Wiggins, James B., ed. *Religion as Story*. A Harper Forum Book, RD103. New York: Harper & Row, 1975. xi, 203p.

Wilder, Amos Niven. *The New Voice*. Religion, Literature, Hermeneutics. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969. 269p.

_____. *Theopoetic*. Theology and the Religious Imagination. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976. vi, 106p.

Wimsatt, William Kurtz, Jr. *The Verbal Icon*. Studies in the Meaning of Poetry. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1954. xviii, 299p.

Young, Robert D. *Religious Imagination*. God's Gift to Prophets and Preachers. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1979. 176p.

One may quibble with the designation "rhetoric," but within the general discussions of religion and literature there is a wealth of material taking focus on the meaning and implications of specific literary forms. One implication of this discussion is to see the significance of literary criticism not only in analysis of texts, but also in the more constructive tasks of preaching (Rice) and doing theology (TeSelle).

A major thrust is in the field of narratology--the study of narrative or story (Frei; Kermode cited above; Kort; McKnight; Price cited above; Rice; Scholes; Simon; Wiggins). Theologians have been investigating the link between faith and story, viewing the "story" form of the biblical tradition and the Christian faith as paradigmatic for contemporary formulations. There is special emphasis on biblical travel stories and their counterpart in biography (TeSelle, Navone). Emphasis on telling the story and the power of imagination in preaching have had a significant impact on homiletical styles

(Rice, Young). Notable interpreters of the impact of structuralism on Biblical interpretation abound (Frei, Kermode cited above, McKnight, Scholes).

Another focus of study in which Biblical scholars and literary critics are finding common cause is in the study of parables (Crossan, TeSelle, Macneice). TeSelle carries the discussion beyond the study of parables per se to suggest the form of the parable as a model for theological reflection and construction. Her suggestion is consistent with the rather extensive literature on poetry and the poetic nature of theological thought (Sayers; Wilder, *Theopoetic*; Wimsatt).

Other titles cited here deal with general discussion of metaphor and story (Noel, Wicker), with Biblical rhetoric (Wilder, *New Voice*), romance (Frye), and with symbol, myth, and the imagination (Lynch, O'Brien, Schneidau, Sharpless). In these and other works, the theoretical and analytical discussion moves to very practical application to the way theologians do theology and preachers go about homiletics.¹⁰

V. Fantasy Literature

Ellwood, Gracia Fay. *Good News from Tolkien's Middle Earth*. Two Essays on the "Applicability" of *The Lord of the Rings*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1970. 160p.

Elwood, Roger, comp. *Chronicles of a Comer, and Other Religious Science Fiction Stories*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1974. 138p.

Ketterer, David. *New Worlds for Old*. The Apocalyptic Imagination, Science Fiction, and American Literature. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974. xii, 347p.

- Montgomery, John Warwick, ed. *Myth Allegory and Gospel*. An Interpretation of J. R. R. Tolkien, C. S. Lewis, G. K. Chesterton, Charles Williams. Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1974. 159p.
- Reilly, Robert James. *Romantic Religion*. A Study of Barfield, Lewis, Williams, and Tolkien. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1971. 249p.
- Rose, Lois and Rose, Stephen C. *The Shattered Ring*. Science Fiction and the Quest for Meaning. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1970. 127p.
- Urang, Gunnar. *Shadows of Heaven*. Religion and Fantasy in the Writings of C. S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and J. R. R. Tolkien. Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1971. 186p.
- Warrick, Patricia and Greenberg, Martin Hay, eds. *The New Awareness*. Religion through Science Fiction. New York: Delacorte Press, 1975. 485p.

This category includes both fantasy literature and science fiction. Theologians have been quick to perceive the theological significance of imaginative fantasy literature--especially that of C. S. Lewis and of J. R. R. Tolkien (Ellwood, Montgomery, Reilly, Urang). In this critical literature there is helpful discussion of the myth, allegory, and romance of this type of moral, quest narrative.

There is now a growing awareness that some of the best literary grappling with sin and morality, especially social ethics, and with eschatology appears now in some science fiction (Ketterer, Rose, Warrick). Due to the fact that this age of literature is in the early stages of analysis and theological appreciation we have included one anthology of religiously oriented science fiction stories (Elwood).

Should space allow, one should certainly pursue the related critical studies of Meyer Howard Abrams, Wayne Clayson Booth, T[homas] S[tearns] Eliot, Eric

Donald Hirsch, Jr., Robert Leland Kellogg, Frank Raymond Leavis, Richard Warrington Baldwin Lewis, Daniel Patte, I[vor] A[rmstrong] Richards, Austin Warren, René Wellek, Brian Wicker, William Kurtz Wimsatt, Artur Yvor Winters and others whose work in literary criticism, and particular structuralism, have influenced Biblical and theological work. Similarly, one should take note of the more familiar theologians, philosophers, and Biblical scholars whose work has touched upon and shaped the discussion, such as Karl Barth, Rudolf Bultmann, Harvey Cox, Claude Levi-Strauss, Jacques Maritain, Jürgen Moltmann, Helmut Richard Niebuhr, Reinhold Niebuhr, Paul Ricoeur, Paul Tillich, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and others well known to our theological library collections.

It should be clear, even from this brief and selective survey, that Biblical scholars, theologians, and homileticians are engaging in a fruitful exploration of the treasures of literature and the methodologies and findings of literary critics. Theological librarians will do well to keep up with these trends and to give some attention to collection development in the secondary sources, even if the vast gamut of primary literary texts is beyond our ken.

NOTES

1. See Joseph C. Harrison, "Religious Implications in Contemporary Literature," *Saint Luke's Journal* 16 (December 1972): 81-89; David Robbins, "Religion and Literature: An Overview," *Anglican Theological Review* 50 (1968): 283-307; and Giles B. Gunn, "Preface" in Giles B. Gunn, ed., *Literature and Religion* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), pp. ix-xi.

2. David H. Hesla, "Religion and Literature: The Second Stage," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 46 (1978): 181-192.
3. For surveys of recent more technical literature in the fields of literary criticism and theology, see Anthony C. Yu, "Religion and Literature," *The Journal of Religion* 55 (1975): 492-498, and Robert Detweiler, "Recent Religion and Literature Scholarship," *Religious Studies Review* 4 (1978): 107-117.
4. "Comment on this issue," *The Christian Century* 78 (1961): 226.
5. Hesla, "Religion and Literature," pp. 181-192; Robbins, "Religion and Literature," pp. 283-307.
6. Giles B. Gunn, *The Interpretation of Otherness. Literature, Religion, and the American Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 9-51.
7. John B. Trotti, *Theology and Literature: Bibliography* (Richmond: Union Theological Seminary Library, 1979).
8. Anne Kearney, "Religion and Literature. A Select Bibliography of Materials Available in the University of Notre Dame Libraries," College Library Bibliographic Series, no. 3 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1978). 56 leaves (mimeographed).
9. Harrison, "Religious Implications," pp. 81-89, and Stuart Barton Babbage, "Christianity and Literature," *Columbia Theological Seminary Bulletin* 60 (July 1967): 31-42; both contribute substantively to this discussion.
10. See Charles Lynvel Rice, *Interpretation and Imagination. The Preacher and Contemporary Literature. The Preacher's Paperback Library* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970). See also John P. Newport, "Questions Ministers Ask about Contemporary Literature and Drama," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 10 (Spring 1968): 31-47.

CAN THESE BONES LIVE? THE PLACE OF RARE
BOOKS IN A DENOMINATIONAL
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Lowell C. Albee, Jr.

In a society which increasingly places a premium on that which is new, what place is there in a denominational theological seminary library for rare books? We have asked this question in this form on the assumption that the place of rare books in a theological school associated with a university is another matter. However in a denominational theological seminary the question becomes acute when the programs of the seminary do not, for the most part, draw on the resources of such collections. The question might very well be put in the words of the Spirit to Ezekiel in the valley of the dry bones, "Can these bones live?" (Ezekiel 37:3).

Yet the curricula of such seminaries attempt to portray where God's people have been on their pilgrimage of faith, and that journey has a past, as well as a present and a future. In order to describe that experience fully, all three dimen-

sions of time are necessary to the story.

During the late '60's and early '70's there was little interest among theological students either in history or in rare books. That generation of students sometimes proudly called themselves "non-book students." They asserted that they were interested in practical things, in serving living people in need, not in the decaying bones of the past. It was tragic that their laudable goals seemed to them necessarily to rule out an interest in history and rare books. However, with the emergence of black pride, and the whole "roots" phenomenon, it became apparent to many that the past provides the living with a key to self-identity in the present.

Perhaps it would not be too much to say that rare book collections in denominational theological seminary libraries also provide at least one key to the riddle of identity which many are attempting to solve. Once a clearer picture of that identity emerges, then the paths which lead into the future can be embarked upon with a greater sense of confidence in who we are, and in whom we trust.

The libraries in most denominational theological seminaries have rare books in their collections. If their history is like that of the rare books in the Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library (the cooperative library enterprise of the Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago, the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, and McCormick Theological Seminary), these books have come to the library by gift or an occasional purchase. Since financially hard-pressed seminaries never seem to have the resources nor the disposition to be serious rare

book collectors, the collections have grown up over the years without any systematic plan of acquisition, and without much thought given to their care and use. Although they may be of scholarly use from time to time, little attention has been given to how they may be used in other ways.

In this essay, I would like to describe briefly the collections in the Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library, to tell how they were acquired, and to give an account of the modest program of conservation and exhibits which has been set in motion in the past five years.

In the Krauss collection of rare books, the chief component is the L. Franklin Gruber Collection. Gruber was president of the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary at Maywood from 1928-1941. Alice Dagan, who for many years was librarian at Maywood, describes him as a gentleman in the true sense of the word, and courteous in an old-world way. He never showed anger, and his patience was inexhaustible. His dignity precluded any nickname, and he was always "Dr. Gruber," even to his intimate friends.

During the depression years, he assumed the duties of manager of the seminary's investments, personally collected rents, re-arranged mortgage payments, took title to delinquent properties, and through his efforts the seminary remained solvent. These years in which he served the church were hardly ideal for the gathering of a significant collection of rare books, yet this is exactly what he managed to achieve.

Gruber was a scholar with clear goals in mind for

his collection. A collection of old books is just so many dry bones unless one bone is connected to the other bone, and a story is told by the items included in the collection. Since he was very interested in how the Bible came to be, he purchased several Greek New Testament manuscripts. The late Kenneth Clark in the mid-thirties wrote of Gruber's collection:

The first private collection of size was acquired by a middle-western minister of the Evangelical Lutheran church, L. Franklin Gruber, now president of the seminary in Maywood, Illinois. By 1920 his collection exceeded that of Drew Theological Seminary, and remained the largest in America until 1922.¹

As a Lutheran pastor, Gruber was very interested in the contribution which Luther made to the Christian world through his work of translating the German Bible. Somehow he managed to assemble what has been described by John Tedeschi of Chicago's Newberry Library as one of the most significant collections of German Luther Bibles in the western hemisphere. Gruber had contacts with antiquarian book sellers in England and in Germany who notified him of "finds." His modest income was prudently used to purchase only what he believed would augment his collection.

In 1928 Gruber published a book entitled *The First English New Testament and Luther*, the theme of which is clearly set forth in the subtitle, "The real extent to which Tyndale was dependent upon Luther as a translator."² This interest in the English Bible and his conviction that Luther played an important part in influencing the first modern English translator of the Bible led him to acquire a good collection of landmark first editions of

English Bibles including the Matthew Bible of 1537, the Geneva Bible of 1560, the Bishop's Bible of 1568, the Rheims New Testament of 1582, the Douay Old Testament of 1609 and 1610, and the King James Bible of 1611. With the addition of numerous Reformation "Flugschriften" and Luther tracts, he rounded out his collection.

When Gruber died in 1941, his books were appraised at \$250,000. The Board of Directors of the seminary agreed to provide Mrs. Gruber with a lifetime annuity if she would leave the books with the seminary. She agreed. The annuity provided her with a modest income, but when she died in the early '70's, the seminary had paid her only a small fraction of what the collection was actually worth. In fact the collection is one of the most magnificent gifts the seminary library has ever received. Now housed at the Krauss Library, it has been supplemented with books from Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois.³

The Special Collection and Rare Book section of the Library of the Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago⁴ contains 736 volumes bearing pre-1800 imprint dates. The books are generally in usable condition, in spite of their having been shipped from Europe (many in the late 1940's) and having been moved considerable distances in 1964 and 1970. Since 1970 they have been kept in the controlled environment of the Rare Book Room at the Lutheran School of Theology.

The collection contains three incunabula:

Anon., *Sermones Thesaurus novi de tempore* (Argentine [Strasbourg]: [Printer of the 1483 'Vitas Patrum'], 1486). This work has been attributed to Petrus de

Palude. It is the only known copy in the U.S. (Goff, *Incunabula in American Libraries*, 3rd census).

Johannes Gerson, *Opera Omnia*, 3 vols. ([Strasbourg: Johann (Rheinhard) Gruninger?], 1488).

Battista Trovamala, *Summa Rosella* (Venetiis: Giorgio Arrivabene, 1495).

A first major subject area represented in the collection is patristics. The holdings include four early modern editions of the works of St. Augustine (11 vols., Basileae: Froben, 1556; 10 vols., Antwerpiae: à Congregatione Sancti Mauri, 1700; 11 vols., Parisiis: Franciscus Muguet, 1679-1700; Secunda editio veneta, 18 vols., Venetiis: ex Typographia Joannis Baptistae Albritii Hier. Fil., 1756-1769). There are also several editions of the works of St. John Chrysostom (5 vols., Basileae: ex officina Hervagiana, 1539; 4 vols., Parisiis: apud Carolam Guillard viduam Claudij Cheuallonij & Gulielmum Desboys, 1556; 2 vols., s.l. [Heidelberg?]: apud Hieronymvm Commelinvm, 1596; 8 vols., Etonae: excudebat Ioannes Norton, Regius Typographus, 1612; 7 vols., Venetiis: ex Typographia Balleoniana, 1780). Among the other works of the Church Fathers represented in the J.S.T.C. collection are those of St. Athanasius (Lvgdvni: ex officina Melchioris et Gasparis Trechsel Fratrum, 1532); St. Basil (3 vols., Parisiis: sumptibus Aegidii Morelli, 1637-38); St. Ephraim (Coloniae: apud Arnoldum Quentilium, 1603); St. Gregory the Great (Parisiis: apud Clavdivm Chevallonivm, 1533; 3 vols., Venetiis: typis & sumptibus Angeli Geremia, Caroli Pecori, & Augustini Savioli, 1744); St. Irenaeus (2 vols., Venetiis: apud Franciscum Pitterium, 1734); St. John Damascene

(Basileae: excvdebat Henricvs Petrvs, 1536); and St. Leo the Great (Editio secunda, 2 vols., Lugduni: apud Joannem Certe, 1700).

In moral theology the collection includes most of the major figures of sixteenth and seventeenth-century scholasticism. These works provide a basic resource for historical work in the classical modern assessment of questions in personal and political morality, e.g. on the nature of law and justice, marriage and the family, tyrannicide, treaties and usury, and questions concerning war and international relations.

A third significant area is represented by about seventy titles in canon law. These treatises and multi-volume commentaries handle the procedures and organizations of the Roman Catholic Church. Closely related to this section are five of the early sixteenth-century *summulae*, which were used as handbooks by pastors and confessors.

The collection is filled out with other individual items of significant interest such as Martin Chemnitz' *Examen concilii Tridentini* (Francoforti ad Moenvm: [P. Fabricium], 1574) and Caesar Baronius' *Annales ecclesiastici* (12 vols. in 7, Mogvntinae [Mainz]: sumptibus Ioan. Gymnici et Antonij Hierati Coloniēs, 1601-1609[?]).

The Lane Seminary Library, housed with the McCormick collection, goes back in large part to 1836, when Calvin E. Stowe, the husband of Harriet Beecher Stowe, travelled widely in Europe to collect valuable works for Lane Theological Seminary at Cincinnati. That library was brought to McCormick a century later and since that time its rare books

have augmented those in the McCormick collection, a library which also began in the 1830's. The McCormick-Lane collection contains nine papyrus fragments, a thirteenth or fourteenth-century Latin Bible, and a number of early editions of the Church Fathers and sixteenth-century works dealing with the Reformation, including Pope Leo X's bull excommunicating Martin Luther. Also in the collection are eighteenth and nineteenth-century materials on the development of Protestantism in America, and a significant body of books and pamphlets dealing with the involvement of the church in the slavery controversy. The archives of Lane Seminary provide hundreds of manuscript items on theological education from the 1820's onward; two significant collections of American editions of Bibles assembled by P. Marion Simms and Blackford Condit are also present. In 1975 the McCormick-Lane collection was moved to the campus of the Lutheran School of Theology and is now housed with the Krauss and Jesuit collections.

Every year several scholars travel to Chicago to use the resources of these rare book collections. A good example of this type of use is the work of Professor Kenneth Strand of Andrews University who reproduced *Facsimiles from Early Luther Bibles* in a two volume set, enabling scholars to compare the texts of the Gospel of John from the "December Bible" and the Wittenberg editions of 1534 and 1545 of Luther's Bible.⁵ Each year classes in liturgics and New Testament Greek visit the collection to examine early hymnals and church orders as well as the Greek New Testament manuscripts. However, the

main use of the collection has not been of a scholarly nature.

In 1971, Holy Trinity Lutheran Church, Chicago, made a gift of \$25,000 to the Lutheran School of Theology. Of this amount, \$10,000 was designated for the furnishing of a rare book room, and \$15,000 was provided for student scholarships. The Rev. Joel W. Lundeen, then librarian at L.S.T.C., had been serving the people of Holy Trinity on weekends, and they approved his suggestion to furnish a suitable room for the L. Franklin Gruber Collection.

Since that time, the collection has proved, surprisingly enough, to be the focal point of visits to the seminary complex by about 1,000 persons each year from the supporting constituency of L.S.T.C.: confirmation classes, senior citizens groups, and church councils, as well as persons with a bibliophilic interest. The amount of interest in these "tokens" of the faith has been amazing. A number of visitors have made substantial contributions to the care and conservation of volumes in the collection which were in poor condition. In the last year, the constituency of McCormick Seminary has shown the beginnings of similar interest.

In the parable of the talents (Matt. 25), Jesus says, "For to every one who has will more be given." This has been true of our rare book collection. On several occasions visitors to the collection have been moved to make gifts of sixteenth-century imprints.

In the early '70's the Lutheran Brotherhood Insurance Company made a generous grant of \$4,000 to rebind the King James Bible of 1611 and to strengthen

the bindings on several Luther Bibles. Each year since that time, the library has done a modest amount of rebinding.

Mrs. John Tedeschi, a conservationist, was employed on a part time basis two years ago and has contributed greatly to the condition of the collection. Not only has she built boxes for some of the manuscripts and books, but she has also given valuable advice on the conservation of books beset with special problems. Her advice has been sought by several of the libraries with whom Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick is associated in the Chicago Cluster of Theological Schools.

In order to make students aware of the intellectual content of the collection, a series of exhibits has been prepared by Mrs. Tedeschi to call attention to the way in which these "dry bones" continue to live in the worship expressions of living persons today. Among the more recent exhibits have been the following: photographs of people and places as well as historical documents in celebration of the sesqui-centennials of McCormick and Lane Seminaries; Pope John XXIII, his life as a man, as a scholar, and as Pope; and antecedents of the *Lutheran Book of Worship*. Several of the exhibits show how the history of printing and the history of the Reformation were closely interrelated. They have been entitled: "Incunabula from Three Collections--Jesuit, Krauss, McCormick Rare Books"; "The Reformation in Switzerland--Books from the McCormick Collection"; and "Printers' Stamps and Devices from Books in the Rare Book Collection." Last summer, an exhibit was mounted to show faculty and students some of the

problems faced by libraries in caring for books, entitled: "The Care and Conservation of Rare Books and Manuscripts." This exhibit was both practical and informative.

Reproductions from items in the collection have been used on many occasions to decorate the covers of service bulletins used for events at L.S.T.C. and in a number of parishes. A set of notepapers was produced four years ago to provide a useful souvenir of a visit to the school. These papers already have been reprinted.

Although there are still many things which can be done with the collections, we at Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library are convinced that these bones can live, and that it is part of the library's task to use these gifts from God in new and creative ways.

Below is a brief catalog of Greek papyri, Greek New Testament manuscripts, manuscripts of Martin Luther, and early printed Bibles in the Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Rare Book Collections.

Greek Papyri in the McCormick Seminary Library

| <i>Number</i> | <i>Contents</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Published</i> ⁶ |
|---------------|---|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Hib. 60 | Letter of Zenodorus to Ptolemaeus | ca. 245 B.C. | HP 1, 206 |
| Hib. 61 | Order to Ptolemaeus to produce persons before an official | 245/44 B.C. | HP 1, 206 |
| Hib. 129 | Acknowledgment of a loan | 247/46 B.C. | HP 1, 325* BASP 7: 39-41 |
| Hib. 135 | Two fragments of an account; on verso, another account | ca. 250 B.C. | HP 1, 326 |

| | | | |
|----------|---|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Hib. 139 | Receipt for 9 drachmae of copper for beer tax | ca. 247 B.C. | HP 1, 327* BASP 7: 41-43 |
| Oxy. 406 | Leaf from unidentified work in codex form containing quotation of Isa 6:10 as found in Mt 13:15, Ac 28:27; uncial | II-III A.D. | OP 3, 10-12 |
| Oxy. 805 | Conclusion of a letter | 25 B.C. | OP 6, 256 |
| Oxy. 807 | Fragment of an official list of sheep and goats; on verso, part of an account | ca. A.D. 1 | OP 4, 256* |
| -- | Unidentified fragment | -- | -- |

*Greek New Testament Manuscripts in the Gruber Collection (Krauss Library)*⁷

| <i>Gregory No.</i> | <i>von Soden No.</i> | <i>Gruber No.</i> | <i>Content</i> ⁸ | <i>Date</i> |
|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| 1282 (2293) | ε1129 | 44 | e | XII |
| 1424 (λ) | δ30 | 152 | eapr | IX-X |
| 2304 | ε4022 | 50 | e | XIII |
| 2388 | | 121 | e | XII |
| 2389 | | 119-120-54 | e | XI-XII |
| 2393 | | 122 | e | XIII |
| 2426 | | 114 | e | XII |
| λ1536 (λ1544) | 935 | 52 | e | XII- XIII |
| λ1624 | | 53 | e | XIII |
| λ1625 | | 56 | e | XII- XIII |
| λ1626 | | 123 | e | A.D. 1186 |
| λ1627 | | 124 | e | XI |
| λ1628 | | 125 | e | XIII |
| λ1677 | | 111 | e | XIV |

L. Franklin Gruber Collection (Krauss Library)
Manuscripts of Martin Luther

| <i>Content, place, date</i> | <i>Published</i> ⁹ |
|--|--|
| Letter to Albrecht of Mansfeld, Wittenberg (?), 3 June 1523 (?) | WA Br 8, pp. 664-666 (cf. WA Br 3, pp. 78-82 [No. 6191]) |
| Christmas sermon on Isa 9, Wittenberg (?), 1526 | WA 19:147, 1, 27-148 1, 32 |
| Letter to Johann Schlagenhaufen, Pastor in Köthen, Wittenberg, 12 Dec 1533 | WA Br 6, p. 561 (No. 2073) |
| Letter to Chancellor Gregor Brück, Wittenberg, 6 Jan 1543 | WA Br 10, pp. 236-238 (No. 3836) |

*Early Bibles through 1613 in the Gruber Collection.*¹⁰

Bible. O.T. Jeremiah. Latin. Vulgate. 1450-1455.
Mainz, Gutenberg.

A leaf from a copy of the 42-line Bible, also called the Mazarin or Gutenberg Bible. One page containing portions of chapters 23-25 of Jeremiah. Gruber 168.

Bible. O.T. Psalms. Latin. Vulgate, 1450-1455.
Mainz, Gutenberg.

A leaf from a copy of the 42-line Bible, also called the Mazarin or Gutenberg Bible. One page containing chapters 33-35 and parts of chapters 32 and 36 of the book of Psalms. Gruber 169.

Bible. Latin. Vulgate. 1478. Nuremberg, Koberger.
Title page missing.

2^o. [468] leaves, numbered ii-ccccclxi. Without signatures. Double columns, 51 lines and headline to a column. Marginal notes. Gothic type. Colored initials.

Preliminary leaves pasted together with loss of three preliminary leaves. Lacking ff. 412 and 413.

Gruber 5. Goff: B559. Brit. Mus. Cat.: v. 17, col. 25. Brit. Mus. Cat. Germ. Books: p. 84, IC 7180. Hain: 3069. Gesamtkatalog: 4234.

Bible. German. 1483. Nuremberg, Koberger.

No title page. Text begins, v. 1: Hie hebet an die Epistel des heyligen priesters sant Iheronimi

. . .
2^o. 2 v. [583] leaves, numbered ii-ccccclxxxiii. Without signatures. Double columns, 50 lines and headline to a column. Gothic type. Initials and woodcuts, colored by hand.

Gruber copy 1, 182-183, copy 2, 250-251. Darlow & Moule: 4184. Goff: B632. Brit. Mus. Cat. Germ. Books: p. 88, Cii. d. 4, 5.

Bible. N.T. Greek & Latin. Erasmus. 1516. Basle, Froben.

NOVVM IN // strumentū omne, diligenter ab ERASMO
ROTERODAMO // recognitum & emendatum, . . . //
APVD INCLYTAM // GERMANIAE
BASILAEAM. // [Froben's device] // CVM PRIVILEGIO
// MAXIMILIANI CAESARIS AVGVSTI, // NE QVIS ALIVS
IN SACRA ROMA- // NI IMPERII DITIONE, INTRA
QVANTV // OR ANNOS EXCV DAT, AVT ALIBI // EXCVSVM
IMPORTET.

First edition.

2^o. 324, [629] pages. Signatures. Text in parallel columns, Greek on the left, Latin on the right; 39 lines plus headline and signature line. Roman type. Some initials and ornamented borders (one colored).

Last quire misnumbered: pages 619-629 numbered 669-[675].

Gruber 7. Darlow & Moule: 4591.

Bible. N.T. Greek & Latin. Erasmus. 1519. Basle, Froben.
 NOVVM TESTA- // MENTVM OMNE, MVLTO QUAM ANTEHAC DI
 // ligentius ab ERASMO ROTERODAMO recognitū, . . .
 // SALVO VBIQVE ER ILLABEFACITO // ECCLESIAE
 IVDICIO. // Addita sunt in singulas Apostolorum
 epistolas // Argumenta per ERASMVM ROT. [orna-
 mented border].

Second edition.

2^o. 120, 566 pages. Signatures. Text in parallel columns, Greek on left, Latin on right; 39 lines plus headline and signature line. Roman type. Some initials and ornamented borders.

Gruber 6. Darlow & Moule: 4597.

Bible. N.T. German. Luther September, 1522. (The September Testament) Wittenberg, Lotther.

Das Neue Testa- // ment Deutzsch [title ornamented]

 // Vvittenberg.

2^o. [222] leaves. Signatures. 45 lines plus headline and signature line. Gothic type. Marginal notes. Initials.

The September Testament includes a brief prologue on the canonicity of scripture by Martin Luther in which the Letter of James is Called the "epistle of straw." Twenty-one woodcuts in the style of Lucas Cranach (probably from his studio) accompany the Apocalypse.

Gruber 155. Brit. Mus. Cat.: v. 18, col. 1388.

Brit. Mus. Cat. Germ. Books: p. 110, C.36. g. 7.

Bible. N.T. German. Luther. December, 1522. (The December Testament) Wittenberg, Lotther.

Das Neue Testa- // ment Deutzsch [title ornamented]

 Vvittenberg. // [design].

2^o. [205] leaves. Signatures. 46-48 lines plus headline and signature line. Gothic type. Marginal notes. Initials.

The second edition of Luther's New Testament. Text re-set with corrections. Woodcuts are repeated

from the September Testament, some of them being in their second state.

Gruber 32. Brit. Mus. Cat.: v. 18, col. 1389.
 Brit. Mus. Cat. Germ. Books: p. 110, 1214. k. 3.
 Library also holds a 1524 edition of Lotther's printing of Luther's New Testament. Gruber 58.

Bible. N.T. Greek. 1524. Argentorati (Strasbourg), Cephalaeum.

NOVVM // testamen // tvm grae // ce. // [design]
 // Argentorati, apud Vuolfium Ce- // phalaeum.
 Anno. 1524.

8°. 160, 118 leaves. Signatures. 29 lines plus headline and signature line.

Gruber copy 1, 3. Copy 2, unnumbered from the collection of Augustana Seminary. Darlow & Moule: 4600.

Bible. N.T. German. Luther. 1530. Wittenberg, Lufft.
 Das Neue // Testament // Mar Luters // Wittemberg,
 ..
 // M.D. XXX. [ornamented border].

8°. [412] leaves. Signatures. 32 lines plus headline and signature line. Gothic type. Marginal notes. Initials and woodcuts.

Gruber 59.

Bible. German. Luther. 1534. Wittenberg, Lufft.
 Biblia // das ist // die // ganze Heilige Sch-
 // rifft Deudsch. // Mart. Luth. // Wittemberg.
 //Begnadet mit Kür- // furstlicher zu Sachsen //
 freiheit. // Gedrucht durch Hans Lufft. // M.D.
 XXXIIII. [ornamented border].

2°. 2 v. ([426], [489] leaves). Signatures. 50 lines plus headline and signature line. Gothic type. Marginal notes in New Testament. Initials and numerous woodcuts.

Gruber copy 1, 184, 188. Copy 2 unnumbered. Darlow & Moule: 4199.

In addition to these two complete Bibles, the collection includes one partial copy. Lufft published the parts of the German Bible as they were ready for the presses. The Gruber collection includes a number of these separately published fascicles which were used to make up the first complete edition of Luther's German Bible in 1534. The library also holds partial copies of the 1535 and 1536 editions.

Bible. O.T. English. Coverdale. 1535. Marburg(?), Cologne(?); Cervicornus and Soter (?)

Twelve leaves (cvi-cxvii) containing the last part of II Chronicles, all of Ezra, and a portion of Esther.

Gruber 2. Herbert 18. Brit. Mus. Cat. v. 17, col. 74-75.

Bible. English. Matthew. 1537. Antwerp(?), For R. Grafton and E. Whitchurch of London.

The Byble // which is all the holy Scrip- //
 ture: in whych are containyd the // Olde and
 Newe Testament, truly // and purely translated
 into En- // glysh by Thomas // Matthew. //
 [ornament] // Esaye. i. // Hearcken to ye
 heauens and // thou earth geaue eare: For the //
 Lorde speaketh. // M. D. XXXVII, // Set forth
 with the Kinges most gracyous lycēce. [title
 page in black and red within woodcut borders].
 First Edition.

2^o. [547] leaves. Signatures. Double columns, 60 lines plus headline and signature line to a column. Marginal notes. Gothic type. Initials and some woodcuts.

Gruber 25. Herbert: 34. Brit. Mus. Cat. v. 17, col. 75. Schaff: 10:66.

Bible. Swedish. Vasa. 1540-41. Uppsala, Richolff. Title page missing.

First edition.

2^o. [479] leaves. Signatures. 54 lines plus headline and signature line. Marginal notes. Gothic type. Initials and woodcuts.

Translated from the German version of M. Luther by O. Petri and L. Petre, Archbishop of Uppsala, with Luther's prefaces. Incomplete copy in poor condition. Text begins in Leviticus and ends in Luke. Numerous tears with loss of text. From Augustana Theological Seminary Collection.

Not in Gruber Collection. Brit. Mus. Cat. v. 17, col. 308.

Bible. Latin. Châteillon. 1556. Basle, Oporinus.

BIBLIA. // INTERPRETE SE- // BASTIANO CASTA- //
 LIONE. // UNÀ CUM EIUSDEM // *Annotationibus.* //
 Totum opus recognouit ipse, . . . // [device] //
 Basileae, per IOAN- // nem Oporinum. 1556.

2^o. [4] leaves, 1743 (i.e. 1728) columns, [24] leaves. Signatures. Double columns, 62 lines plus headline and signature line per column. Marginal notes. Roman type.

Gruber 4. Darlow & Moule: 6137.

Bible. N.T. English. Geneva. 1557. Geneva, Badius.
Title page missing.

8^o. [8], 455 leaves. No signatures. 37 lines plus headline. Marginal notes. Roman type. Initials and some borders.

Lacking title and several preliminary pages.

Gruber 166. Herbert: 106. Moeckli: p. 30.

Bible. English. Geneva. 1560. Geneva, Hall.

THE BIBLE // and // HOLY SCRIPTVRES // CONTEYNED
IN // THE OLDE AND NEWE // Testament. // TRANS-
LATED ACCOR- // ding to the Ebrue and Greke, and
conferred With // the best translations in diuers
langages. // WITH MOSTE PROFITABLE ANNOTA- //
tions . . . // [device] // AT GENEVA // PRINTED
BY ROLAND HALL. // M. D. L. X.

First edition of the Genevan version, known as the "Breeches Bible."

4^o. [614] leaves. Signatures. Double columns, 63 lines plus headline and signature line to a column. Marginal notes. Roman type. Some initials and maps.

Copy 1 bound with: The Whole Booke of Psalms; collected into English meetre by Thomas Sternhold, John Hopkins, and others . . . London, 1601.

Copy 2 incomplete.

Gruber copy 1, 164; copy 2, 24. Herbert: 107.

Moeckli: p. 41.

Bible. English. Bishop's. 1568. London, Juge.

Title page missing.

First edition.

2^o. [800?] leaves. Signatures. Double columns, 56(?) lines plus headline and signature line. Marginal notes. Gothic type. Initials and woodcuts.

This copy in poor condition. Lacking title, preliminary, and closing leaves. Several leaves torn with loss of text. Fire damage.

Gruber 64. Herbert: 125.

Bible. N.T. English. Reims. 1582. Rheims, Fogy.

THE // NEW TESTAMENT // OF IESUS CHRIST, TRANS- //
LATED FAITHFVLLY INTO ENGLISH, // out of the
authenticall Latin, . . . // In the English Colledge
of Rhemes. // Psal. 118. // Da mihi . . . //

PRINTED AT RHEMES, // by Iohn Fogny. // [line] //
1582. // CVM PRIVILEGIO. // [border].

First edition.

4^o. [28], 745, [23] p. Signatures. 41 lines plus
headline and signature line. Marginal notes. Roman
type. Some initials.

Gruber 117. Herbert: 177.

Bible. N.T. English. Rheims. 1600. Antwerp, Vervliet.

THE // NEVV TESTAMENT // OF IESUS CHRIST FAITH-
// FVLLY TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH, // . . . // . . .
BY THE ENGLISH // COLLEGE then Resident in RHEMES.
// SET FORTH the second time, by the same COLLEGE
novv // returned to DOVVAY. // . . . // PRINTED AT
ANTVVERP. // by Daniel Vervliet. // [line] // 1600.
// VVITH PRIVILEGE.

Second edition.

4^o. [32], 745, [25] p. Signatures. 41 lines plus
headline and signature line. Marginal notes. Roman
type. Some initials.

Gruber 16 or 12, vol. 3. Herbert: 258.

Bible. O.T. English. Douay. 1609-10. Douay, Kellam.

THE // HOLIE BIBLE // FAITHFVLLY TRANS- // LATED
INTO ENGLISH, // OUT OF THE AVTHENTICAL // LATIN.
// . . . // By the English College of Doway. //
. . . // Printed at Doway by LAVRENCE KELLAM, //
at the signe of the holie Lambe. // [line] // M.
DC. IX. // [border].

First edition.

4^o. 2 v. ([20], 1115, 11241 [1], p.) Signatures.
42 lines plus headline and signature line. Mar-
ginal notes. Roman type. Some initials.

Contents: t. 1. Genesis-Job. 1609.--t. 2. title:
The second tome of the Holie Bible . . . Psalms-
Esdras. 1610.

Gruber 12. Herbert: 300.

Bible. English. Authorized. 1611. London, Barker.

THE // HOLY // BIBLE, // Conteyning the Old
Testa- // ment, and the New: // Newly translated
out of // the Originall Tongues: and with // the
former Translations diligently // compared and
reused, by his // Maiesties speciall Com- //
mandement. // Appointed to be read in Churches.
// [line] // IMPRINTED // at London by Robert //

Barker, Printer to the // Kings most Excellent //
 Maiestie. // [line] // Anno Dom. 1611. // [orna-
 mented border].

First edition.

2^o. [749] leaves. Signatures. Double columns, 59
 lines plus headline to a column. Marginal notes.
 Gothic type. Initials and tables, copperplate
 engravings.

Imperfect copy: map (2 leaves) before Genesis,
 and last page of Revelation (1 leaf) wanting.
 Gruber 1. Herbert: 309.

Bible. English. Authorized. 1613. London, Barker.

THE // HOLY // BIBLE, // Conteyning the Old
 Testa- // ment, and the New: // Newly translated
 out of // the Originall Tounes: and with // the
 former translations diligently // compared and
 reuised, by his // Maiesties speciall Com- //
 mandement. // Appointed to be read in Churches.
 // [line] // IMPRINTED // at London by Robert //
 Barker, Printer to the // Kings most Excellent //
 Maiestie. // [line] // Anno Dom. 1613 // [orna-
 mented border].

Second folio edition. Sometimes called the second
 issue of the first edition.

2^o. [750] leaves. Signatures. Double columns, 59
 lines plus headline to a column. Marginal notes.
 Gothic type. Initials and tables. copperplate
 engravings.

New Testament dated 1611. Lacking map before
 Genesis (2 leaves).

No Gruber number. Herbert: 319.

Bible. English. Authorized. 1613. London, Barker.

THE // HOLY // BIBLE, // Conteyning the Old
 Testa- // ment, and the New: // Newly translated
 out of // the Originall Tounes: and with //
 the former translations diligently // compared
 and reuised, by his // Maiesties speciall Com-
 mandement. // Appointed to be read in Churches.
 // [line] // IMPRINTED // at London by Robert //

Barker, Printer to the // Kings most Excellent //

 Maiestie. // [line] // Anno Dom. 1613 // [orna-

 mented border].

Third edition. ("The true 1613 folio edition of King James' Bible.") Herbert: 322.

2^o. [528] leaves. Signatures. Double columns, 72 lines plus headline to a column. Marginal notes. Gothic type. Initials and tables, copperplate engravings, one map.

Gruber 9. Herbert: 322.

Gregory 2304 (v. Soden ε4022).


The four Gospels, written in the 13th century. Each page measures 10.5 x 9 cm and contains one column of 30 lines. The manuscript consists of 234 parchment folios and is bound in wooden boards covered with red morocco. The manuscript also contains Eusebius' letter to Carpianus, the Eusebian canon tables, *kephalaia*, *titloi*, Ammonian section and Eusebian canon numbers, a *menologion* table, a colophon, quire marks, and lacunae. (See Kenneth W. Clark, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937], pp. 91-92.) The passage shown here is John 1:1-5a. Gruber Collection.



μαρξή η̅η̅ ο̅λ̅γος· και̅ ο̅λ̅γ̅
 η̅η̅ προς̅ τον̅ θ̅ν̅· και̅ θ̅ η̅η̅
 ο̅λ̅γος· ου̅τος̅ η̅η̅ μαρξή
 προς̅ τον̅ θ̅ν̅· πα̅ν̅τα̅ δ̅ι̅αι̅
 του̅ ο̅λ̅γ̅ου̅· και̅ χω̅ρι̅ς̅ αι̅του̅
 ο̅λ̅γ̅ου̅ ου̅δε̅ β̅ν̅· ο̅ γ̅ο̅ρ̅ η̅η̅· ε̅ρ̅
 αι̅τω̅ ζω̅η̅ η̅η̅· και̅ η̅ ζω̅η̅ η̅η̅
 ρ̅ο̅φ̅ω̅ς̅ του̅ μα̅ρ̅ξ̅ου̅· και̅ το̅ φ̅ω̅ς̅
 β̅ν̅ τ̅η̅ς̅ ο̅π̅τι̅ς̅ φ̅αι̅ρει̅· και̅ η̅

Biblia / das ist / die gantzæ Heilige Schrift Deudsch.
Wittemberg: Hans Lufft, 1534.

Title page of the first edition of Luther's complete Bible in German.



Gottes wort
bleibt ewig.

Biblia/ das ist/ die
ganze Heilige Sch-
riffte Deudsch.

Mart. Luth.

Wittemberg.

Begnadet mit Kür-
fürstlicher zu Sachsen
freiheit.

Bedruckt durch Hans Lufft.

M. D. XXXIII.

Biblia / das ist / die gantze Heilige Schrift Deusch.
Wittemberg: Hans Lufft, 1534.

Frontispiece of the first edition of Luther's complete Bible in German.



Biblia / das ist / die gantze Heilige Schrift Deudsch.
Wittenberg: Hans Lufft, 1534.

Woodcuts illustrating the Book of Revelation:
The Second Trumpet, Revelation 8:8-9
The Third Trumpet, Revelation 8:10-11

Die Neunte Figur.



Das ist Marton / Und der ander Engel posaunete / vnd es fur wie ein grosser berg
 Manichens mit sei mit fewer brennend ins meer / vnd das dritte teil des meers ward blut /
 nen Cataphrygis. vnd das dritte teil der lebendigen creaturn storben / vnd das dritte teil
 der schiff wurden verderbet.

Die Zehend Figur.



Und der dritte

NOTES

1. Kenneth W. Clark, *A Descriptive Catalog of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), p. xi.
2. L. Franklin Gruber, *The First English New Testament and Luther: The Real Extent to which Tyndale was Dependent upon Luther as a Translator* (Burlington, Iowa: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1928).
3. In 1962 the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary at Maywood, Illinois; the Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois; Grandview Theological Seminary, Des Moines, Iowa; Suomi Theological Seminary, Hancock, Michigan; and Central Theological Seminary, Fremont, Nebraska; became the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, and in 1967 relocated on the present campus in Hyde Park (Chicago).
4. This section on the Jesuit Library collection was written by Jared Wicks, S.J., of the Gregorian University, Rome, and Eileen Fitzsimons, Acting Librarian of the Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago.
5. Kenneth A. Strand, *Facsimiles from Early Luther Bibles*, 2 vols. (Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Publishers, 1972).
6. HP: Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., *The Hibeh Papyri*, Part I (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1906; OP: idem, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 10 parts (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898-1914); BASP: John W. Shumaker, "Two Papyri from the McCormick Theological Seminary," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 7 (1970): 39-43. Items starred (*) are described, but not fully published. Table prepared by Earle Hilgert.
7. The information in this table is drawn from Clark, *Descriptive Catalogue*, pp. 90-106, where further description will be found. Table prepared by Earle Hilgert.
8. e = Gospels; a = Acts and Catholic Epistles; p = Epistles of Paul; r = Revelation.
9. WA: *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar: Böhlau, 1883-); WA Br: *ibid.*, *Briefwechsel* (Weimar: Böhlau Nachfolger, 1930-).

10. This listing was prepared by John Nelson of the Lutheran School of Theology on the basis of data collected by him and Elinor Johnson, formerly Associate Librarian of the Lutheran School.

Earle and Elvire Hilgert

Students of Herman Fussler at the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago will not forget his insistence that among the factors which shape an academic library should be the goals of its institution. The intent of this essay is to focus on this principle and to consider some of its implications for theological librarianship. Among theological librarians, no one has worked longer and more consistently from this point of view than Calvin H. Schmitt. His leadership of the McCormick Theological Seminary Library for over thirty years has reflected constant concern that the library should move in step with the academic, financial, and physical development of its institution.

I. The Library as a Partner in Education

The principle that an academic library should formulate its goals in harmony with those of its school means that the library's goals are basically educational. The library is one of the loci of edu-

cation; as we know it in the late twentieth century, theological education occurs principally in three physical contexts: the classroom, the field, and the library. The undertakings in each of these loci should be equally consonant with the educational goals of the school. While these activities are mutually supportive in a variety of ways, those in no one area are purely ancillary to the others. Thus while classroom based study provides essential intellectual and informational content for field based learning, and field based experience strengthens existential internalization of classroom instruction, each one in its own right is a legitimate and necessary aspect of theological education. The same is true of library based learning. The resources of the library and activities of its staff provide a context and program which, while supporting both classroom and field based education, constitute an independently identifiable element in the educational enterprise. As a member of an educational troika, the library is an equal partner with classroom and field and shares mutually in the task of forwarding the institution toward its goals. Each element of the troika informs the others, supports the others, and at the same time fulfills those educational responsibilities that it can perform best. Thus the service which the library is committed to give derives from its own position of mutually supportive partnership.¹

II. Educational Roles of Theological Librarians

What are some of the implications of the principle of institutionally oriented library goals for the responsibilities of librarians? How does a recog-

dition of one's library as an equal partner in the educational enterprise inform one's professional activity? Let us consider certain specific areas of library functions.

Doubtless that aspect of librarianship most closely and obviously related to the other educational undertakings of a school is *reference service*. One most easily thinks of reference librarians as the educators within a library staff. It is of special importance that librarians who work in reference see their work as clearly in touch and in harmony with the goals of their school. The librarian who is genuinely a partner with classroom and field based teachers will understand him/herself as engaged more broadly than simply in telling students "where they can find what they're looking for." Several studies agree in estimating that in many academic libraries, from 50 to 80 percent of questions asked of reference librarians are "simply directional or informational" which "can be answered by nonprofessional staff."² This suggests that the librarian who is content simply "to wait for the next customer" likely spends much of his/her time in activities not representative of genuine educational involvement.³ The librarian-educator, on the other hand, must carry out an aggressive program of reaching out to users. In a theological library, reference librarianship can include instruction in the use of the library, collection or development of reliable, up-to-date subject bibliographies, and knowledgeable counseling with students and faculty in regard to their study and research projects in light of the available resources.

An anomaly of many academic libraries is the surprising degree to which few other than librarians understand many aspects of classification and cataloging essential to an efficient use of the catalog; such matters as the structure of book numbers, filing rules, corporate entries, subject cataloging, and the effective use of all the information on a catalog card too often remain mysteries but half revealed to groping students. Considering the amount of time seminary students spend in a library and the graduate level at which they pursue their studies, few things can be of greater value to them than a thorough introduction to these arcana.

Success in developing pertinent bibliographies and in counseling students on their research demands that the librarian engaged in reference be in close touch with the classroom based faculty, and be familiar with courses offered and with the type of material pertinent to papers students are expected to prepare.⁴ In working with students, the librarian-educator cannot take the place of the classroom based teacher; rather he/she performs a parallel function in thinking through a research issue or area with a student in terms of the body of resources available for further learning.

In the area of *collection development* we find an obvious tie between the materials added to and deleted from the collection, and the educational goals of the school. A closer look reveals, however, that this relationship is not always as effectively maintained and nurtured as it can be when the institutional educational goals are kept clearly in sight.

A case in point is the question of faculty selec-

tion of books. Many educational institutions still rely heavily on teachers' recommendations of new materials to be acquired; not a few allocate the acquisitions budget to academic departments either on the basis of past experience as to expressed needs or in accord with formulas that seek to take into consideration such matters as the number of courses taught and of students enrolled. However these allocations are determined, faculty are looked to for the selection of the bulk of new material to be acquired, while librarians monitor the budget, shift unused balances to departments crying for additional money, and focus their own selection activities in large measure on general and reference works.

The pattern described here is not foreign to theological schools. On first sight it may seem to offer an approach virtually guaranteed to keep collection development and educational goals closely in step by adding primarily those materials that the faculty thinks important. Who knows better where the institution should be and is headed than they? Who can bring better background knowledge to the selection of materials than they?

On closer inspection, however, this approach can be seen to have serious weaknesses. Faculty based collection development is notorious for its production of unjustified "potholes" and "peaks" in a collection, on the one hand because many teachers decline to participate actively in selection, and on the other because some teachers are more than usually zealous in choosing materials in their specialized areas of interest. Administrative restraints applied by librarians may succeed in rounding off

the peaks, but can do little for the potholes. It is true that no librarian, however expert in bibliography, can have as full knowledge in every area as will be possessed by some of his/her classroom or field based colleagues, and it will always be desirable to draw on their expertise and support (while in turn supporting them!). But initiative, leadership, and decision in collection development belong in the library, not only administratively but also bibliographically if the library is genuinely to fulfill its educational responsibilities. Over the past twenty years this point of view has been recognized increasingly in American academic libraries, and book selection has become more and more a function of librarians.⁵

In recent years the analysis of existing collections and the projection of patterns for their further development have become more sophisticated through the application of statistical methods and formulas and the study of literature behavior.⁶ Such approaches can be dangerous if they lull librarians into believing that a relatively simple formula--and especially one borrowed from another institution--can almost automatically assure an adequate and balanced collection, or that quantifiable factors alone, in however elaborate a formula, can produce this result. At the same time statistical approaches do offer important aid in the analysis and development of collections if librarians approach their design and application as educators. Where possible, factors representative of the goals and emphases of the institution involved should be included.⁷ In any case, it should

be recognized that statistical approaches can at best offer guidelines; the librarian's understanding of education, of his/her institution's goals and processes, and of the literature of theology must remain factors which, though admittedly subjective, will continue to be essential elements in collection development.

This principle appears to be equally pertinent to collection weeding. Particularly under strictures of space and maintenance costs, in recent years some libraries have turned to industrial management techniques in determining what materials should be weeded from their collections. As in industry equipment is discarded when it is not used sufficiently to warrant its retention on financial grounds, so circulation records are checked to determine whether a given book has been used sufficiently to warrant retaining it on the shelf. For educators, however, issues other than use must take precedence. Regardless of frequency of use, the content of a book--its significance to its field, its potential as either primary or secondary research material at some time in the future, and its relevance to the educational goals of the institution--all these become questions of first importance in determining whether it should be kept in the collection. If such decisions are to be made in an even-handed manner across the collection, they should be made by librarians who understand the educational goals and processes of their institution.

Library administration should bring into focus all aspects of the library's role in the educational enterprise. For the library genuinely to serve as a

locus of education, it must be understood in this light by its administrators. It is they who set the tone for their colleagues and provide resources and opportunities for their functioning as educators.

Librarians as administrators exercise their educational responsibilities in a number of ways. A primary instrument of policy is, of course, the budget. Both budget preparation and budget management will reflect the degree to which the library is seen either as a primary center of education within the institution or as merely an ancillary service. The question of whether the school understands its library as chiefly a collection of materials geared to the day-to-day needs of classroom based teaching, or whether it seeks to maintain a resource within which students can take responsibility for and exercise ownership of their own education may well be mirrored in the amount of funds allocated to collection development. Funding for staff development through continuing education and participation in professional meetings likewise will reflect the library's educational priorities. Allocation of personnel, which is both a budget and an organizational issue, constitutes another index of the library's commitment to educational involvement. Is there adequate balance in professional staff between those persons engaged primarily in technical librarianship and those working more directly with students and teachers? Are adequate paraprofessional and other support staff provided to allow professional librarians to spend their time largely in work that is genuinely and creatively educational? Similarly the selection of staff is critical. Is

potential to function effectively not simply as a librarian but as a librarian-educator given priority when new professional staff are recruited?

Particularly in administrative matters, it is important to recognize that responsibility for envisioning and empowering the library as an educational center lies finally with the administrative leadership of the school as a whole. If library administrators and staff are to understand themselves as directly engaged in the educational enterprise, and not simply as supplying a support service to education, it is essential that trustees, president and dean--not to mention faculty--also see the library and its personnel in this light.

A fourth area, that of *technical services*, appears on the face of it to have only a second-hand relationship to the educational program of a theological school. Can--or should--catalogers, for instance, be considered, let alone required to be, educators? Are not classification and cataloging specified undertakings that are done badly or well depending on the expertise of the librarian-technician in following classification schedules, cataloging rules, published subject lists, and verified forms of names? Do they not also demand on the part of the librarian-technician concern for cost- and time-effectiveness which can justify as adequate the acceptance of "standard" cataloging?

In recent years, spiraling costs of ordering, cataloging and classifying library materials have required librarians, including theological librarians, to make greater use of "standardized" cataloging and classification, generally in the form of

that prepared by the Library of Congress, often changing from another currently used classification system to the Library of Congress system. This trend has replaced earlier concerns in theological libraries to have cataloging and classification reflect more carefully the peculiarities of theological literature as well as the doctrinal and theological stances and beliefs of a particular theological school. While Julia Pettee's classification system developed for the collections of Union Theological Seminary in New York is the best known Protestant specialized system, the compulsion to modify, expand and change existing classification systems to meet specified local needs and viewpoints only too often was demonstrated among theological libraries. Special expansions or classification schemes were often developed to allow for more accurate classification of peculiar denominational materials. As church mergers and divisions occurred, these changes and modifications required further development which had to be carried out on a local basis, for one particular situation or library. Cataloging rules were changed when they did not seem to reflect the way a particular clientele would search for material. Lists of specialized headings were prepared to provide for particular topical concerns or linguistic usage. But economic constraints coupled with the additional work loads created by more rapid growth of theological collections have gradually eroded attempts to individualize bibliographical access to these collections. Apparently the librarian-technician has had no choice but to accept "canned" cataloging and "frozen" bibliographical records. The librarian-technician may try

to assure accuracy and consistency of bibliographical control of items in a collection, along with accuracy of bibliographical description and consistency of access points, i.e., names, subjects, series and titles. But he/she may have lost sight of trying to mesh concerns for accuracy and consistency with concerns for contributing to the educational role the library plays as it shares in helping fulfill the goals of the institution it serves.

The librarian-educator may do well to look to the past to be reminded of the efforts of predecessors to make bibliographical description relevant to the particular concerns of the library's clientele, even though many of these attempts may seem to have been at best tangentially concerned with institutional educational goals.

But the librarian-educator must also look to the future, through the present. Along with the constraints of standard cataloging imposed through economic considerations, advances in technology offer him/her freedom to go beyond such cataloging. By accepting some of the economies of standard cataloging, the technical services librarian-educator can be free to develop a framework within which this cataloging can provide the basic bibliographical core to which specific educationally and institutionally oriented enhancements can be added. Technology can help provide these enhancements without prohibitively high expenditures. The librarian-educator does not need to redo basic bibliography. Instead, he/she can build into the bibliographical core additional access points, explanatory and historical notes, and such other reference points

as will lead the user of the bibliographical base not merely to locate a specifically identifiable item, but also to learn about the contents of the collection. Thus the technical services librarian-educator not only will build a finding tool for the collection, but will work with the user of this finding tool to help this user learn to take better advantage of it. In return he/she will learn from the user what may be done further to enhance the framework being developed around the basic bibliographical core of this tool.

III. The Education of Theological Librarians

What we have said raises focal issues for the education of theological librarians. It would seem self-evident that at least the head librarians of theological schools should be trained both in library science and in theology.⁸ Unfortunately over the years this principle has had but spotty representation in the accreditation standards of the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) and is not now specifically recognized. In point of fact, however, most heads of theological libraries have been educated in both disciplines.

That such dual education might also be expected of staff librarians has never been a part of ATS accreditation standards; the current standards focus only on their having professional training in librarianship.⁹ In light of what we have said regarding the educational function of the library and the degree to which this function should be reflected in the responsibilities of the library staff, it seems appropriate to question the adequacy of these standards.¹⁰ Today many theological libraries have

staffs of several professional librarians, often with specific responsibilities for collection development and reference as well as for various aspects of technical services. If professional library staff are educators, their qualifications should be established in terms not only of their technical but also of their educational responsibilities--educational in the widest sense of this term.

Rather than to suggest specific degrees that librarians in a theological school should possess, we would prefer to consider competencies appropriate to the responsibilities of librarian-educators. Usually these competencies will be represented by specific graduate academic and professional degrees. The degree itself, however, is only a publicly recognized attestation of a presumed competency that normally does, but in some cases may not, exist.¹¹ Conversely, librarians may possess thorough competency in areas for which they hold no degrees.

What competencies are essential, then, if librarians are to fulfill the library's function as a locus of education in full partnership with classroom and field?

In most areas of higher education subject specialization is essential. Even in seminaries it is many a decade since the last "Professor of Theological Encyclopaedia" disappeared from the faculty. But because theological schools are narrowly focused as compared with many institutions in higher education, it is possible for the librarian-educator who is a theological generalist to function at a high level of effectiveness. In fact, in the inevitable seminary situation, where a faculty of specialists are

engaged in educating students to be general practitioners, the librarian-generalist who is an effective educator may be a significant factor in bridging this gap.

To say that the librarian-generalist may often perform a particularly valuable educational function is not to offer an apology for his/her being less well educated than classroom based colleagues. The criterion here is competency to fulfill an educational role appropriate to the goals and needs of the institution. Thus while highly specialized education is appropriate for a teacher of Old Testament or Church History, by the same token broad competency may be equally appropriate for the librarian-educator. It can be argued that librarians working in technical services, along with their expertise as catalogers and systems persons, should command a breadth of competency in theology at least at the level represented by the Master of Divinity degree, together with a working facility in both ancient and modern languages. Librarians engaged in developing collections and working with students and faculty may need somewhat less specialized knowledge of technical matters, but should have subject competencies beyond those of the M.Div. For them also the ability to use the languages easily is essential. Particularly in the case of the librarian-educator who works directly with students and faculty, the competency represented by personally having done research at the doctoral level is appropriate and desirable.

In addition to professional library and subject area competencies, the ability to think and live

beyond the walls of the library and to understand the institution as a whole is essential to the librarian-educator. Only in this way can a librarian genuinely and coherently participate in the library's role as a major locus of theological education.

IV. Faculty Status for Theological Librarian-Educators

What we have said about the education of theological librarians has implications as well for the debated question of faculty status.¹² Among academic librarians in general the issue of faculty status came to the fore at the 1969 American Library Association Convention in Atlantic City, when the membership of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) voted that the attainment of faculty status for all academic librarians should be a major goal. Two years later, at Dallas, the same body adopted a statement on "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians,"¹³ which pointed out the key role librarians play in research and higher education and declared:

College and university librarians must be recognized as equal partners in the academic enterprise, and they must be extended the rights and privileges which are not only commensurate with their contributions, but are necessary if they are to carry out their responsibilities.¹⁴

The document spelled out the implications of such recognition in terms of professional responsibilities and self determination, library and institutional governance, compensation, tenure, promotion, leaves, availability of research funds, and academic freedom. In each instance, librarians and classroom based faculty were to enjoy the same responsibilities and privileges. These standards were subsequently adopted

by the American Library Association and the Association of American Colleges. That they have been influential in extending faculty status for librarians is suggested by a comparison of the results of two surveys: in 1966 a study by Schiller indicated that 51 percent of academic librarians had faculty status, while in 1975 a similar study by ACRL yielded a result of 75 percent.¹⁵

The ATS standards of accreditation have long recognized the importance of full faculty status for head librarians.¹⁶ The current standards maintain this insistence and amplify it to include the requirement that the library "administrator shall be an *ex officio* member of any administrative group wherein long- and short-range planning for educational and financial policies are determined." In these provisions the essentially educational function of the library and its chief administrator are clearly recognized.

What, however, are the implications of this principle for other members of the staff? That faculty membership may be appropriate for staff other than the director was first recognized by ATS in 1972, when the provision for faculty status for head librarians was extended to read, "*at least* the chief administrator..., as one who is involved in a major way with the total educational program, shall be a full, voting member of the faculty."¹⁷ It is important to note that this standard, while offering no explicit criteria for determining who on a staff other than the head librarian might appropriately hold faculty membership, does implicitly suggest that a criterion for such membership is significant

involvement in the educational program. Let us explore the implications of this principle.

In some quarters of American academia, the argument has been advanced that if academic librarians are to achieve deserved levels of salary, perquisites and other benefits, as well as influence in institutional decisions, they must have faculty status. On this view, the achievement of faculty status is the key to improved benefits and prestige, and is thus seen as an initial goal.¹⁸

Such an approach, it seems to us, is inappropriate to the library of an institution that takes as its primary concern the task of education and seeks to evaluate its structure and its actions in light of its commitment to that task. The issue of faculty membership does not belong at the beginning of a discussion of librarian-institutional relationships, as an initial goal. Instead, whatever decision is reached in regard to it should be a logical outgrowth of prior commitments by both institutional administration and library staff in regard to librarians' responsibilities as educators. Librarians' recognition of these responsibilities should be reflected in their professional preparation for and continuing involvement in the educational enterprise. Here lie the criteria for an answer to the question of faculty membership.¹⁹

Seen from this point of view, faculty membership relates directly to the function of librarians as educators as we have already seen to be suggested by current ATS standards. This is not to imply, however, that this educational function ought to be conceived in any narrow way as limited to involvement

in classroom instruction. It may not even be limited to direct, constant contact with students, although this, at least in informal contexts, is highly to be desired. What is essential to the idea of educational function is that a librarian should understand him/herself as an educator, and informed by this self-understanding, should carry out responsibilities that significantly form and further the educational program of the institution.

Such responsibilities rightly include understanding the educational goals and program of the institution, focusing one's work in such a way as intentionally to promote this program, living in contact with students and faculty so as mutually to nourish and support each other's involvement in learning and education, participation with classroom based faculty in committee work and other academic activities, pursuing research and publication at the growing edge of one's discipline--either professional or traditionally "academic," but hopefully bringing the two together. In all the above areas, indeed, it is the fact that the librarian can be an academic generalist of a high order that makes his/her resources of special value to the institution's educational effort. When such an educational function is alive and well in an academic library, its staff have a legitimate claim on faculty membership.

In summary, we have sought to demonstrate that a line of logical conclusions can be drawn from the premise that an academic library should share the goals of its institution. From this premise it follows that a library's task is first of all its engagement in the

educational enterprise. This commitment in turn informs all the operations of a library: collection development, reader services, administration, and technical services, and it has essential significance for the education of librarians. Finally, the question of faculty status for academic librarians can only be answered rightly in the light of all the foregoing. Librarians as processors and controllers of books--even at the highly sophisticated level of modern electronic systems--do not necessarily qualify for faculty membership; librarians as educators should be members of their faculties.

NOTES

1. A review of the developing accreditation standards set for libraries by the (American) Association of Theological Schools (ATS) shows a varying awareness of these principles. As first formulated in 1936, standards for libraries were brief and general: "An accredited theological seminary or college should have a library which is live, adequate, well distributed and professionally administered, with collections bearing upon the subjects taught and with a definite annual appropriation for the purchase of new books and the appropriate contemporary periodicals" (AATS *Bulletin* 11[1936]: 43). This paragraph continued to be the total of ATS standards for theological libraries until 1954, when a lengthy and valuable statement of principles and standards was adopted. It declared: "The American Association of Theological Schools is keenly interested in advancing the quality and effectiveness of theological education. The library of the school is an essential part of that concern.... The library staff needs to possess insight, fundamental knowledge, imagination and ability to carry the library program into the heart of the school....The ideal library...concerns itself with the effectiveness of the educational program of the school....It is a colleague of the classroom. Be-

yond its capacity in serving as strictly an educational tool, the library as an integral part of the total program of the school is also concerned with the fullest personal development of the Christian worker....The library program should be integrated into the clearly formulated objectives of the school....The library should be regarded by the students and faculty as an inseparable partner with the classroom in the learning process" (Ibid., 21 [1954]: 11-12). Four years later, this statement was much abbreviated, particularly as to underlying principles, which were reduced to the following sentence: "The library program of an accredited theological school should be thoroughly integrated with the educational objectives of the school" (Ibid., 23 [1958]: 8). The standards currently in force are essentially those initiated in 1972. Repeatedly throughout them an understanding of the educational function of the library appears: "The library shall be a primary information resource for the educational and research programs of the institution or cluster. Its services shall be thoroughly integrated with the current or proposed educational objectives....In its scope, an adequate library must devote considerable professional staff time to supplying the special information requirements of the courses, seminars, and research projects which comprise each major program of instruction....The library should support both students and faculty to acquire the information skills and materials necessary for the continuing performance of their respective professions....The services should include systematic instruction of students in the use of the library's resources, particularly the bibliographical tools which are essential to independent study and research" (ATS *Bulletin* 33:3 [1978]: 14-15).

2. These studies are summarized by Rao Aluri and Jeffrey W. St. Clair, "Academic Reference Librarians: an Endangered Species?" *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 4 (1978): 82.
3. Ibid., 82-84.
4. Cf. the current ATS accreditation standards: "Members of the library staff have an obligation to know the current content of and methods employed in each course of instruction being offered by the school. Faculty have a reciprocal obligation to

- take initiative in the provision of such information" (*ATS Bulletin* 33 [1978]: 3, 15).
5. Cf. remarks regarding this development by Hendrik Edelman and G. Marvin Tatum, Jr., "The Development of Collections in American University Libraries," *College and Research Libraries* 37 (1976): 236.
 6. See, for instance, B. C. Brookes, "Numerical Methods of Bibliographic Analysis," *Library Trends*, July, 1973: 18-43; Joseph J. Kohut, "Allocating the Book Budget: a Model," *College and Research Libraries* 35 (1974): 192-199; James C. Baughman, "Toward a Structural Approach to Collection Development," *ibid.*, 38 (1977): 241-248; Robert N. Broadus, "The Applications of Citation Analyses to Library Collection Building," *Advances in Librarianship* 7 (1977): 299-335; F. W. Lancaster, *The Measurement and Evaluation of Library Service* (Washington: Information Resource Press, 1977), pp. 165-206; Christina E. Bolgiano and Mary Kathryn King, "Profiling a Periodicals Collection," *College and Research Libraries* 39 (1978): 99-104.
 7. Means of providing for such factors are suggested by Kohut, *ibid.*: 193.
 8. The first such proposal of which we are aware, made by Raymond P. Morris in 1932, recommended a sliding scale for the level of librarians' qualifications, based on the library's budget: if a budget of \$5,000, the librarian should have a B.A. and a B.D.; if \$10,000 and over, a B.A., a B.D., and one year of library school or three years' experience in a library of not less than 50,000 volumes; if the institution offered degrees beyond the B.D., the librarian should meet the preceding requirements and also have a degree equal to the highest given by the school ("A Study of the Library Facilities of a Group of Representative Theological Seminaries in the United States and Canada," Master's thesis, Columbia University, 1932); extensive summary published in *The Education of American Ministers*, 4 vols. (New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934), vol. 3: *The Institutions that Train Ministers*, by Mark A. May, pp. 149-91.
 9. The accreditation standards of the ATS contained no reference to the qualifications of librarians

until 1954, when the following was adopted: "The library should be under the direction of a full-time, professionally trained librarian. The training of the librarian should include, preferably, formal study leading to a degree in library science or its equivalent in library experience and training, combined with a broad knowledge of theological subject matter and its related literature, achieved either through courses leading to the B.D. degree or their equivalent....Contingent upon the size of the faculty, the student enrollment, the size of the collections and the nature and variety of library services to be rendered, there should be an adequate number of library assistants appropriately trained for their specific tasks" (AATS *Bulletin* 21 [1954]: 12). In 1958, these provisions were shortened to read: "The head librarian....should be professionally trained in library science and have a general knowledge of theological subject matter and the prevailing teaching and research methods used by the faculty and students. He should have qualified professional and clerical assistance commensurate with the current requirements and the long-range program of the library" (Ibid., 23 [1958]: 9). In 1970 the standards again were amplified: "The chief librarian... should possess the moral, religious, and academic qualifications expected of faculty members.... Professional training in library services and theological subject matter is essential for this responsibility....The library should be staffed with qualified professional and non-professional assistants in a way commensurate with the current requirements and the long-range program of the library" (Ibid., 29 [1970]: 14-15). The current standards, adopted in 1972, state that "the administrator shall have the professional training and experience necessary to direct a library which provides services in support of educational programs. The staff of that portion of the library concerned with the management and care of book and periodical materials shall have professional training and experience in library service" (Ibid., 33 [1978]: 3, 15).

10. Cf. the remarks of Louis A. Kenney in a letter published in *C&RL News* 7 (1975): 214, protesting the inadequacy of the Association of College and Research Libraries' (ACRL) policy statement

- recognizing the master's degree for academic librarians (*Ibid.*, 69), and pointing to the need for librarian subject specialists with at least relevant subject master's degrees as well. See similar remarks by H. William Axford, "The Three Faces of Eve: or the Identity of Academic Librarianship," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 2 (1977): 276-277.
11. The current ATS standards of accreditation recognize this principle by implication. The general standard is that "the faculty shall be of such number and quality as to constitute with the students, a vigorous community of faith and learning, and to provide adequate instruction for those degree programs offered by the school" (*ATS Bulletin* 33 [1978]: 3, 12). More specifically, in regard to the M.Div. degree, the standards state: "Members of faculty teaching *academic* disciplines shall *normally* be expected to have completed doctoral or equivalent studies in the field of their teaching" (*Ibid.*, 22; italics ours).
 12. For background and literature on this issue, see especially Nancy Huling, "Faculty Status--a Comprehensive Bibliography," *College and Research Libraries* 34 (1973): 440-462; Virgil F. Massman, *Faculty Status of Librarians* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1972).
 13. Published in *C&RL News* 8 (1971): 210-212.
 14. *Ibid.*: 211.
 15. Anita Schiller, *Characteristics of Professional Personnel in College and University Libraries* (ERIC Document #020766), p. 63, as cited by C. James Schmidt, "A Letter to H. W. Axford," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 2 (1977): 281.
 16. Such a standard was first adopted in 1954: "He [the head librarian] should be a person of such training and quality as to deserve and receive faculty status" (*AATS Bulletin* 21 [1954]: 12). This provision was dropped in 1958 and nothing like it appeared again until 1970, when the following standard was adopted: "The chief librarian...should possess the moral, religious, and academic qualifications expected of faculty members, and should exhibit competence in re-

- lating the library to the educational task of the institution" (*AATS Bulletin* 29 [1970]: 14-15).
17. *ATS Bulletin* 33 [1978]: 3, 15; italics ours.
 18. See, for instance, Arthur M. McAnally, "The Dynamics of Securing Academic Status," in *The Status of American College and University Librarians*, ed. Robert B. Downs, ACRL Monograph, no. 22 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1958), pp. 28-41; Robert B. Downs, "Are College and University Librarians Academic?" *ibid.*, 77-85. More recent articles that focus on the perquisites and privileges attendant to faculty status, as well as the responsibilities, are Nancy Davey and Theodora Andrews, "Implications of Faculty Status for University Librarians, with Special Attention to Tenure," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 4 (1978): 71-74; Stella Bentley, "Collective Bargaining and Faculty Status," *ibid.*: 75-81; Aluri and St. Clair, *ibid.*: 82-84.
 19. Recent writing repeatedly has recognized the pressures on librarians for research and publication if they are to gain or maintain faculty status: see, for instance, Davey and Andrews, *ibid.*: 71-74; John Campbell, "Publish or Perish, Library-style," *Wilson Library Bulletin* 52 (1977): 250, and ensuing letters to the editor, especially those from Bruce Morton (*ibid.*: 689, 733) and Richard Eggleton (*ibid.*, 53 [1978]: 172-73); and H. William Axford et al., "The Three Faces of Eve," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 2 (1977): 276-285. Bentley ("Collective Bargaining," p. 80) in 1978 reported that a survey of all librarians in six universities revealed that "52.7 percent had not published anything, and only 27.7 percent had written an article or a book, yet 70.5 percent feel that publications are important for promotion." The point of view expressed in the present essay does not focus specifically on research and publication as essential to faculty status, but rather on the librarian's broad and knowledgeable contribution as an educator (of which research and publication may well be a component).

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT IN THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARIES: A NEW MODEL
--A NEW HOPE

Stephen L. Peterson

One way to view the last decade of theological librarianship is to see it as a time in which the impulses of the Library Development Program as well as the earlier initiatives which created the Board of Microtext and the Board of Periodical Indexing were stabilized and extended.¹ These years should not be understood as a period of consolidation. They were vigorous years, years in which the influences of these three programs were felt in virtually all the institutions of the Association of Theological Schools and in not a few colleges and universities. In this same decade the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) inaugurated two publication series and established a new indexing tool, *Religion Index Two*. In these years the professional specialization called theological librarianship has reached a degree of sophistication which is both due in some measure to these earlier programs and is a credit to the generation of out-

standing theological librarians whose energies and ambitions initiated these programs.

One way to view the present situation of theological librarianship is to see the profession again at the threshold of significant new endeavors. We have been ushered to this threshold, in part, by past developments in the ATLA and, in part, by emerging demands of both librarianship and theological education. Already the broad shape of these new endeavors is apparent. There are significant programs afoot to bring the bibliographical description of theological collections into the emerging national bibliographic networks, a development most appropriate given the depth of resources contained in the theological libraries. There is an emerging concern to conserve and preserve large bodies of theological literature, even entire collections, which are likely to be fundamental to present and future research. There is a concern to integrate more fully the use of theological library resources in the processes of theological education--processes which must prepare men and women for considerable self-sufficiency in the marketplace of ideas and information. There is also a discernable concern to exercise much greater stewardship in the area of collection development. Probing questions are now being asked about what material should be acquired by theological libraries as well as how much material these libraries should acquire. These are not only pragmatic questions reflecting the present concerns for budgets and stack space, they are also questions about the very nature of the Christian record which will be available for students and

scholarship in the remainder of this century and well into the next century. There are other coordinates shaping this new threshold and, while the general outlines are becoming clear, there is considerable discussion and uncertainty about all the details.

In a time marked by such fertile possibilities it is important to reassess the fundamental assumption and strategies of our profession. The challenge of this reassessment is to understand these fundamentals in ways that will be instructive for the emerging agenda. That is, the new formulation of the questions has as much to do with shaping future developments as do the answers to the questions.

One such fundamental question or reformulation of a question is the focus of this essay. Simply put, the question is: What are the collection development obligations of the theological libraries of the United States and Canada?² What is the scope of our obligation, what are its limits? What must our libraries do to avoid being irresponsible, what collections can we leave to other libraries-- libraries in our own countries and elsewhere in the world?

The shape of this question is deliberate. The rapidly developing networks of library cooperation are sufficient admission of the realization that no one library can any longer collect all of the literature important for a broad area of study. In the field of religion, or more specifically theology, the possibility of single library self-sufficiency is now simply preposterous. The only way to raise the question of collection development is to phrase

the question in collective terms. Yet, library co-operation is not the end of our concern, but rather the means for achieving what are all too often as yet undefined common goals.

The shape of the question also admits forthrightly that there are limits to what may reasonably be expected of our North American theological libraries and these limits must be recognized squarely. On the other hand, just as surely as there are limitations there are also obligations. There are collections over which we have special custody, collections which we must not fail to acquire and preserve. On some as yet undefined larger scale of cooperation, these are collections which the international community of Christian scholars must know are in the libraries of Canada and the United States.

There are other reasons why it is important to consider this particular question at this time in the development of theological libraries. A great many of our institutions of higher learning seem to be faced with a lengthy season of static if not reduced resources. Library budgets, even acquisitions budgets, will not escape the pruning that this scarcity will occasion. This problem is compounded by the unfortunate possibility that there may be educators among us who are willing to settle for less, even substantially less in terms of scope, method, and quality rather than maintaining a vision of what is essential and then finding ways to achieve these essentials with revised approaches and new strategies.

Another quite practical reason for considering the question of collection development responsi-

bilities is suggested by the rapidly developing computer networks for resource sharing. It is probably inevitable that when a new technology or a new application of a technology is highly visible, it will draw a disproportionate amount of attention. Certainly the technology and systems which are now helping libraries to share effectively bibliographic data and resources are bringing a veritable revolution to our libraries. Yet it is urgent to ask about the nature of the collections these systems propose to share. It is possible to find ourselves using highly advanced computer technologies to access and share mediocre if not badly deficient collections--a possibility no less ludicrous than using the Concorde to deliver third-class mail.

Furthermore, we need to face directly the question of collection development in that many of our institutions of higher education seem to have an unyielding preoccupation with management and planning by objectives. All too often educational objectives are short-range if not short-sighted. Such objectives are inappropriate for library collections. Indeed, even long-range objectives, if these do not extend more than twenty years, are insufficient for library collection development. In a very real sense, we are buying today the research collections of the next century. Collection development programs which are too narrowly defined in terms of present curricula and institutional needs will almost assuredly leave a legacy of severely impoverished resources for scholars of the twenty-first century.

Thus it would seem timely, some would say urgent,

to probe again the question of the obligations and limits of collection development in North American theological libraries. The method here is to propose a typology which characterizes theological libraries in terms of their collection development objectives. That is, the typology considers libraries rather than library materials as the point of focus. As with most typologies, the purpose of this proposal is to establish a vantage point, a perspective, which may illuminate the collection development problem in ways which other approaches render less clear. This particular typology, emphasizing its shift in perspective from material to library, responds to some particular stimuli present in contemporary discussions of collection development.

The first such issue is the nature of library cooperation itself. Libraries, i.e., institutions, enter into cooperative programs. The foundations of our thinking about library cooperation must be based on reliable ways of understanding our particular institutions. Furthermore, many theological libraries have adopted collection development policies based on clearly stated objectives. It is hoped that by addressing the larger question of our aggregate collection development obligations in the terms proposed here, individual libraries may be able to correlate more easily their present statements of objectives with a larger view of our common obligations.

Again, one frequently hears of the need for some means of ranking publications in terms of priorities that may be helpful in the day to day book selection process. Indeed, not a few collection development

policies include such priority classifications.³ The basic and still unresolved problem with such stratifications is that the application of these priorities to any body of literature is left to the individual bibliographer, and invariably librarians will apply these classifications quite differently. The problem is compounded in cooperative collection development in that the lack of uniformity is spread across a number of libraries, creating even larger potential for serious lacunae to appear in the collections.

It therefore seems at least possible that by identifying specific types of libraries and defining these types by the literature that they should collect, the basic question faced by selection officers is constructively altered. No longer does one need to assign a priority or ascertain a level of study before ordering a book. Rather, one need only determine if a given publication fits the library objective or type of library collection which is intended. This shift changes the fundamental context in which book selection decisions are made. It focuses attention on the anticipated results of the selection process rather than on the contents or suitability of a given bibliographic unit. It permits objectives to govern practice, rather than practice to dictate results. It is the process, in one way of thinking, that produces libraries rather than mere aggregations of books.

The proposed typology has both descriptive and prescriptive elements. It is not possible, short of an exhaustive survey, to know and accurately describe the collection development policies of some 140 ATLA libraries. Yet hopefully the descriptive

elements of the typology correlate favorably with actual policies as these have been reported and discussed in seminars and meetings of the ATLA. The prescriptive elements represent only the author's view. As such, they are intended as an invitation to other viewpoints rather than a benchmark statement.

The typology identifies four categories of collection development which govern ATLA libraries. An hierarchy is not intended. Each type of library has its own objectives and each has its own role to play in the larger picture of North American theological collections. One of the clearest results of analyzing our theological libraries by means of this typology is that the interdependence of these collections is readily apparent.

I. Primary Library Collection Development (Types I and II)

Curriculum support is the fundamental objective of what is here called primary library collection development. Libraries that view their objective essentially as curriculum support intend to buy material which classroom instruction requires and material students will need for papers or independent study. Such libraries also often acquire material which instructional officers require for their own class preparation and study but exclude most of the material scholars will need in order to pursue their own research.

There is, however, a second ingredient contained in the concept of curriculum support which a primary library collection development program must take into account. At any one time, the curriculum of a

theological school is only a momentary expression of a more comprehensive theological agenda. It is the seasonal flowering of a more deeply and broadly rooted enterprise of Christian thinking and study. This is not to say that one step removed from the stated curriculum of a theological school is an enterprise embracing the whole of Christian thought and history. Rather, it is to call attention to the fact that behind a given curriculum is a particular view or understanding of the contemporary demands of Christian theology. Behind a curriculum stands a school's sense of obligation to a heritage or tradition within the broader field of Christian history. This sense of mission is expressed, albeit variously, in the several disciplines of the theological curriculum, but to the extent that these disciplines are dealing responsibly with the shape of the Christian witness in our day, there is a common mooring for the several endeavors.

A library collection development program which seeks to support an institution's curriculum must also support this expanded understanding of the curriculum. Put more simply, course syllabi and reserve reading lists can never comprise the whole of a library acquisitions program. Often the bibliography and footnotes of faculty papers will not suffice. The collection development program of a library must respond to that broader range of literature which is nurturing faculty thought and teaching.

Within this somewhat extended definition of curriculum support, it is possible to identify two types of primary library collection development.

The first, Type I, fulfills its collection development obligation by confining its acquisitions almost exclusively to North American publications. Such a library will acquire only a minimal amount of European or other foreign publishing. Where non-American materials are acquired, these materials will probably be essential research monographs from Europe, perhaps from a country or a theological tradition with which the school feels an association. A Type I library probably acquires between 800 and 1,200 monographs a year and perhaps not more than 200 or 300 journals. For the most part such a library will not have unusual resources to share with other schools in a cooperative program and is likely to be highly dependent on other libraries for both primary and secondary material.

A Type II library will share the above characteristics plus one additional feature. In its program to cover the literature essential to the current theological curriculum, it would acquire much more material published outside of North America. Such a library would probably want to add most other English language material and certainly would buy more continental European publications. Such a library might have 300 or more standing orders to monographic series, and its total acquisitions program might almost double that of a Type I library. Nevertheless, its denominational or confessional heritage would be quite clearly visible in the library collection and, while it would strike scholars as a sound working library, it would not have distinctive research capabilities.

II. Documentary Library Collection Development (Type III)

In addition to its acquisition of secondary or scholarly publications at a level appropriate for Type II, Type IV or conceivably Type I, a Type III library is involved in collecting documentary literature. Documentary literature is acquired by libraries basically to provide a record, to demonstrate or explicate contemporary thought. This definition of documentary literature has two aspects.⁴ Some literature is documentary by its very nature or purpose, e.g., minutes, reports of meetings and conferences, statistics. The other aspect of documentary literature has not to do with the nature or intent of the literature but the purpose for which libraries acquire this literature and its long-term function in research.

Theology is unusual among the humanistic disciplines in that it produces both a highly technical and learned body of literature as well as a much larger body of semi-popular and popular literature which plays an important role in the life of religious people. Almost all theological libraries acquire at least some of this non-critical literature. It is not, however, the mere acquisition of documentary literature which classifies a library as a Type III or documentary library.

A Type III library collects both kinds of documentary literature, not on a random or representative basis, but with the purpose of fully documenting some particular topic in Christian life and thought--some particular movement, era, tradition, some piece of the whole. That is, to give substance

to the concept of documentary library collection development we need a full vision of our common responsibility. It is now most difficult to escape the conclusion that United States and Canadian theological libraries must thoroughly document the religious life and thought of the denominations and constituencies which sponsor the libraries of our theological schools. Thus, a Type III or documentary library is one that in pursuit of this larger objective is actively acquiring some broad segment of non-scholarly religious literature.

Now there are several problems connected with this proposition. The first, and perhaps most important, is the patently denominational character of the documentation program proposed. It is clear that not all religious life in North America is confined to churches and organizations related to organized denominations. Yet it is also clear that a great part of our religious life has been persistently denominational, and even if this is regretted by people of ecumenical persuasion, the fact remains that the denominational structure of Christianity is going to survive into the indefinite future. This being the case, a collection development program aimed at documentation must respond to the realities as they are. Surely from this perspective the religious life and thought of the denominations must be documented in our libraries.

Even this observation raises the question of the extent of the necessary documentation. Again, it is argued here that the libraries of the theological schools that have been sponsored by these denominations surely are obliged to provide as full a docu-

mentary record of their parent organizations as possible. That would appear to be the *sine qua non* of North American documentary library collections. That is to say, whatever else we may seek to do in our collections, the documentation of religious life is to be universally expected and thereby an essential obligation. The fact that our national copyright deposit libraries are acquiring almost all of this literature should not negate this responsibility. Collecting current documentary literature is but one part of our obligation. We must also see that this literature is preserved for scholarly use well into the future. It may be assumed that over the long haul special interest groups, i.e., the ATLA and its constituent institutions, will prove better and more thoughtful custodians of this literature than the large governmentally assisted libraries. Furthermore, our theology libraries, of course, will provide a much better bibliographic if not service context in which this literature can be studied.

It is the purpose of this paper to delimit materials that our theological libraries should be collecting. There are, however, three classes of literature not mentioned here, and thereby excluded from the imperative argued for the other literature in these pages, which need special mention.

There is admittedly a large body of religious literature which could be collected for documentary purposes which would not be captured in a denominational framework. That is to say, a good deal of religious life and literature exists at the extremities of organized religion, and while this is very important literature for understanding our times,

it is not certain that a denominational framework is able to identify and collect this material.

The real question, however, is whether or not our theological libraries ought to make a concerted effort to buy this literature. This is not to ask whether or not the literature itself is important for understanding of Christianity, but only to ask if collecting this material is an inherent obligation of the libraries of our theological seminaries. The suggestion here is that it is not. Our libraries need to respond to this literature in constructive ways, but it is not demonstrably their obligation to collect the material systematically or comprehensively.

In response to this literature some libraries may choose to collect popular religion; some libraries may do so as an extension of their efforts to collect mainstream denominational documentary literature. Another response would be for ATLA libraries to seek allies in college and university libraries. One or more such institutions may well have an interest in collecting this literature, especially if these institutions know that their collections will not be competing with theological collections and yet will fit a larger framework of cooperative collection development. Surely the theological libraries must exercise a concern for this literature as diligent as they exercise for the material they are collecting.

Manuscript material, while an exceedingly important source of documentation, has not been mentioned in these pages. To be sure, many theological libraries are actively gathering and organizing

manuscript collections. The problems connected with manuscript collections, however, are sufficiently specialized to merit a discussion far more complete than is possible here. The work of denominational historical societies must be taken into account as well as state and even local historical collections. What is clear is that theological libraries must increase their stewardship regarding manuscript material even if this means encouraging other denominational instrumentalities to undertake this work. Yet by the very nature of manuscript material, it is likely that more and more of our theological libraries will need to undertake special programs to acquire, organize, and preserve manuscripts.

The documentary record for churches and religious life outside of North America raises an unusually difficult issue for our theological libraries. Considering the extent of the Christian community in Europe and in Asia and particularly the growth of Christianity in Africa, the preoccupation of North American theological libraries with literature published on this side of the oceans seems almost irresponsible. Yet we must ask what may reasonably be expected of our collection development in this regard.

In the first instance it is helpful to make a distinction between the documents of recognized church and ecumenical bodies and the semi-popular literature which sustains the religious life of Christians in other countries.⁵ Put this way it seems reasonable to expect that the ATLA libraries would be able cooperatively to collect the official documentation of foreign church bodies. Again, this

may very well be done on denominational lines and certainly cooperatively among the several schools of the same denomination. In essence, what is needed is a concerted program within our theological libraries to assure that the official records, reports, study documents and periodical publications of almost all of the world's churches are collected somewhere in the North American libraries. As ambitious (and perhaps naive) as this sounds, it would seem to be a minimal expectation in a time when Christianity is rapidly becoming more influential in the countries of the younger churches than it is in Europe and in the Americas.

Beyond this official leave of documentation, however, it is doubtful whether our libraries can provide much other systematic coverage. Individual libraries may choose to cultivate special interests, and to the extent that these acquisitions are reported in the national bibliographic networks, they will enrich our total available resources. Nevertheless, the fact remains that our North American libraries will simply not be able to document current popular religious life on the other continents.

III. Research Library Collection Development (Type IV)

It is most unfortunate that, in American librarianship, the designation "research library" has become a coveted symbol of prestige rather than a somewhat onerous assignment of an unusual and often burdensome obligation. Furthermore, in a steadfast reluctance to address serious issues of quality, American librarianship has almost unilaterally associated research

libraries with collections of a certain size and rate of growth. Size and rate of acquisition do have something to do with the research which libraries may sustain, but only as these factors relate to available material and the depth of coverage required.

In the realm of theological libraries, a research library (Type IV) may be considered a special type of documentary library. That is, a research library is one which intends to acquire the scholarly literature essential to the history and development of all branches of Christian thought without regard to language, date, country of origin, and theological or denominational perspective. Practical limits, of course, govern each of these aspects, but as far as intention is concerned this type of library has nearly universal scope. This intention should not be taken to mean that such a research library is attempting to buy all of Christian literature. Exhaustiveness is not part of the definition for a research library. Rather, the focus is on acquiring the scholarly literature which has defined and is shaping Christian thought. This is by no means an easy agenda to pursue, and the officers of research libraries uniformly express considerable consternation about the nature and success of their endeavors. Nevertheless, this type of collecting is necessary for the well-being of Christian theology, and it is a role that some theological libraries in North America must fill. No university library or, for that matter, national library can or will attempt to undertake this obligation. If some of our theological

libraries do not do it, the whole future of Christian theology and understanding will suffer adversely.

IV. Uses of This Typology

As mentioned at the outset of this essay, our purpose was to reformulate the basic question of collection development in our theological libraries in a way that would help these libraries respond to the numerous challenges at hand in a truly thoughtful and responsible fashion. More specifically, it is hoped that this typology might help individual libraries identify more clearly their own role and obligation in the larger picture of theological collections in the United States and Canada. A close corollary of this expectation is the hope that the typology will prove of value to bibliographers and book selection officers as they make their day to day decisions. Here, the premise, again stated, is that a clearer view of the end result of book selection activity may be a better way to inform the day to day decisions that must be made rather than a classification or ranking of the materials themselves.

Another purpose of this typology may be to call our several theological libraries to an enlarged sense of responsibility for bodies of literature which are currently not adequately represented in our collections. Indeed, the call is not so much for an enlarged sense of responsibility for a body of literature as it is a call for a sense of responsibility to the international community of Christian scholars and theological schools. That is, when one seriously thinks of the international dimension of Christianity and particularly of the responsibility

of the American libraries within this international context, it becomes clearer that our prime obligation is to make sure that the literature reflecting our own religious life is systematically acquired and preserved.

It is hoped that this typology will demonstrate even more clearly than has previously been the case the areas in which cooperative library activity is needed. Certainly at the outer reaches of current library cooperation we can begin now to see the fact that almost all of our theological libraries are interconnected not only in their dependence on each others' collections, but also in their common goal of building an international research resource.

Finally, it is hoped that this essay will bring some measure of honor to the person whose celebration has occasioned its writing. Calvin Schmitt is an esteemed friend and counselor--a colleague with whom it has always been possible and fruitful to discuss the persistently difficult question of theological education and theological librarianship. It is a privilege to join his many friends and colleagues in offering him thanks, congratulations, and *birkat Yahweh*.

NOTES

1. The Sealantic Fund generously supported all three of these programs.
2. This essay consistently focuses on the theological libraries of the United States and Canada. Most of the individual members and all of the institutional members of the American Theological Library Association are from these two countries. Also, the focus is on the problems of Christian theology. This is not to imply that the problems

for other traditions are less significant, but only to recognize that the author has no basis in experience or training to address the questions faced by these traditions.

3. The "Guidelines for the Formulation of Collection Development Policies" of the Resources and Technical Services Division of ALA define five levels of "collection densities": comprehensive, research, study, basic and minimal. See *Library Resources and Technical Services* 21 (1977):40-47.
4. I have discussed this distinction as well as other aspects of collecting documentary literature at length in the paper, "Documenting Christianity: Towards a Cooperative Library Collection Development Program," read at the 1978 Annual ATLA Conference, Latrobe, Pennsylvania, and forthcoming in print in the proceedings of that conference.
5. See note 4 above.

II AN ANALYSIS OF PAPER STABILITY AND CIRCULATION
 PATTERNS OF THE MONOGRAPHIC COLLECTION OF
 SPEER LIBRARY, PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL
 SEMINARY

Louis Charles Willard

The purpose of this essay is to summarize and review the results of an extensive examination of the general book collection, carried out during the first six months of 1976 and based on a random sample consisting of approximately 2,000 titles. From the data collected, we are in a position to make observations with a high degree of confidence about the paper stability and circulation patterns of books in this library and, to the degree that they may be similar, other theological research collections. We can also make observations about the imprint distribution in the collection as well as subject concentrations, language strengths, average pagination, volume to title ratios, and so forth.

Although analyses of circulation patterns in research libraries have been made in numerous libraries, we had concluded that any proposal that might be perceived, rightly or wrongly, as having

a potentially adverse effect on access to library materials, whatever the age, would have to be supported by evidence based upon this specific collection. It would also have to reflect scholarly activity in this community rather than generalized observations and conclusions. For that reason, we were glad to be able to take advantage of the skills and capacities of a member of the Association for the Advancement of the Mentally Handicapped when they were made available to Speer Library.¹ Andrew Scrimgeour and I developed a strategy that we hoped would yield solid data on the nature of books and their circulation in this library over a long period of time.

We concluded that with the available personnel it would be possible to undertake a substantial investigation. A sample of 1,843 volumes, we found, would provide results with a confidence of 99% and a small (+/- 3%) tolerance.² We decided to limit the analysis to the monographic collection, excluding periodicals, pamphlets, folios, titles with no or unknown imprints, and rare books and other limited or non-circulating titles, e.g., dissertations and manuscripts.

The sample would have to be purely random rather than stratified; both a computer and a manually generated number set were used to provide a random selection of a shelf list drawer and to locate to a sixteenth of an inch each catalog card to be selected. These cards were then photocopied and stapled to a processing sheet. Titles were collected from the stacks in groups of fifty. A number of pieces of data were recorded for each title on

the basis of a physical examination of the volume, and then each volume was subjected to a chemical and a physical test. These data (catalog record, observation, and tests) provide a substantial body of information, of which we here analyze only a few facets.

We specified that in the instance of a multivolume set being selected, the second volume should be taken and this fact noted. If the title were one of several titles bound in a single volume, this was also to be noted. We asked that rebinding be noted, if observed, and as a further check on this possibility, we asked that the ownership stamp, which contains the date of accession, on both the title page and the inside front cover be recorded. Princeton's circulation policy has varied over the past century and a half. In the earliest days, loans to each member of the community were recorded in ledger books, and it was not until approximately 1940 that date due slips began to be used. From that time until 1971, however, books charged to faculty members were simply stamped "faculty," while those loaned to others were charged with a specific date. Finally date due slips are not automatically put in every title added to the collection. We requested, therefore, that the absence of a date due slip be recorded. We asked for the earliest date found and for the total faculty and non-faculty circulation before 1971 and for each year from 1971 through 1976.

To form a primitive estimate of the strength of the paper, the corner of the fortieth page of each book was folded up to five times. If it broke on or before the fifth fold, the breaking fold was noted.

If it did not break, this too was noted. The inner margin was tested with a chlorophenol solution to determine whether it was acidic or alkaline.³

Finally, the date of these observations and tests was recorded.

In the four tables that follow, I have endeavored to organize some of the data that were collected. As I have suggested, the primary focus of this study is on paper stability and circulation patterns of the monographs in Speer Library. There are, however, many other questions of potential interest to theological research libraries to which the available data would be quite responsive. I would be glad to share with anyone interested the raw information for other analyses.

TABLE 1: PAPER STABILITY

| A | B | C | D | E | F |
|----------|-------|-----|----|-------|----|
| 1970-75 | 194 | 3 | 2 | 166 | 86 |
| 1960-69 | 281 | 5 | 2 | 241 | 86 |
| 1950-59 | 167 | 30 | 18 | 161 | 96 |
| 1940-49 | 154 | 47 | 31 | 148 | 96 |
| 1900-39 | 503 | 337 | 67 | 492 | 98 |
| 1860-99 | 329 | 272 | 83 | 307 | 93 |
| 1800-59 | 157 | 78 | 49 | 139 | 89 |
| Pre-1800 | 58 | 25 | 43 | 53 | 91 |
| Totals | 1,843 | 797 | | 1,707 | |

1. Explanatory notes.

a. Columns A and B show the chronological periods into which the data have been organized for the purposes of this essay, Column B containing the number of titles that the random sample identified from

the shelf list. These two columns are repeated, for convenience, in each table that follows.

b. Column C contains the books that failed the corner fold test in each period, and column D is the percentage of the titles in each period that failed the test. All percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number.

c. Column E shows the number of books in each period in which the paper was found to be acidic, and column F provides the percentage in each period that may be so characterized.

d. By way of illustration, the sample contains 154 titles (B) published in the ten year period, 1940-49 (A). Of these titles, 47 (C) or 31% (D) failed the corner fold test, i.e., the corner broke off before five folds. Of these titles, 148 (E) or 96% (F) tested acidic.

2. Observations.

a. It is striking that the paper in a substantial proportion of all books in the sample is acidic. As we had anticipated, the problem is most severe in the century beginning about 1860, but the high levels on both sides of that peak are disquieting. It is possible that acidic glue used in the binding process might have migrated into the inner margins of the paper; had the Barrow test been performed at the center of pages, it might have produced a different reading; on the other hand, it is mostly at the binding that the effects of brittle paper are seriously felt. Other factors are speculative possibilities, but since they were not controlled in this experiment, it would be better to leave them aside.

b. A curve plotted for the fold failures is similar to one for the acid paper, with the exception of the time lag.

TABLE 2: TOTAL CIRCULATION

| A | B | G | H | I |
|----------|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| 1970-75 | 194 | 358 | | |
| 1960-69 | 281 | 659 | 1,017 | 58 |
| 1950-59 | 167 | 198 | 1,215 | 69 |
| 1940-49 | 154 | 118 | 1,333 | 76 |
| 1900-39 | 503 | 299 | 1,632 | 93 |
| 1860-99 | 329 | 96 | 1,728 | 98 |
| 1800-59 | 157 | 32 | 1,760 | 99 |
| Pre-1800 | 58 | 4 | 1,764 | 100 |

1. Explanatory note.

Column G represents the total circulations for 1971-75 for all titles with an imprint from the period shown. Column H is the running cumulation of the entries in Column G. Column I is the percentage that the corresponding cumulative figure represents of the circulation of the whole sample during 1971-75. The 154 titles with 1940-49 imprints, that is, were represented by 118 circulations (G) in the period 1971-75. The sum of these circulations and those of the later imprints, 1950-75, is 1,333 (H), representing 76% (I) of all circulations of the sample during the period 1971-75.

2. Observations.

The figures speak for themselves. It is noteworthy that slightly more than three of every four circulations were of imprints after 1940.

TABLE 3: CIRCULATION BY TITLE

| A | B | J | K | L | M | N |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|
| 1970-75 | 194 | 99 | | | 95 | 49 |
| 1960-69 | 281 | 149 | 248 | 47 | 132 | 47 |
| 1950-59 | 167 | 63 | 311 | 59 | 104 | 62 |
| 1940-49 | 154 | 39 | 350 | 67 | 115 | 75 |
| 1900-39 | 503 | 114 | 464 | 89 | 389 | 77 |
| 1860-99 | 329 | 47 | 511 | 98 | 282 | 86 |
| 1800-59 | 157 | 12 | 523 | 99 | 145 | 92 |
| Pre-1800 | 58 | 1 | 524 | 100 | 57 | 98 |

1. Explanatory notes.

a. Column J displays the number of titles in each period that circulated one or more times during 1971-75. Column K cumulates the periods, and column L represents these cumulated totals as percentages of the total number of titles circulated.

b. Column M is the number of titles for each period that did not circulate during 1971-75.

c. Column N is the percentage of the titles in each period represented by column M.

d. In other words, 63 titles (J) of the 167 titles in the sample (B) from the period 1950-59 (A) circulated at least once during 1971-75. The cumulative number of 1950-75 imprints (K), i.e., 311, represents 59% of the total titles circulated. For this chronological period (1950-59), 104 titles (M), or 62% of the imprints in this period (N), did not circulate.

2. Observations.

a. Of the titles that circulated at all between 1971 and 1975, 67% were published in or after 1940.

b. Of the 1,843 titles in the sample, 1,319 (the sum

of the figures in column M) or 72% did not circulate in the most recent five year period.

TABLE 4: COMPARISONS

| A | B | I | L | D |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1970-75 | 194 | | | |
| 1960-69 | 281 | 58 | 47 | 26 |
| 1950-59 | 167 | 69 | 59 | 35 |
| 1940-49 | 154 | 76 | 67 | 41 |
| 1900-39 | 503 | 93 | 89 | 70 |
| 1860-99 | 329 | 98 | 98 | 88 |
| 1800-59 | 157 | 99 | 99 | 97 |
| Pre-1800 | 58 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

1. Explanatory note.

The first four columns are taken directly from previous tables, A representing the periods, B the number of titles in each imprint period, I the percentage of the total circulations represented by the cumulative total, and L, the same percentage by titles rather than circulations. Column O is the percentage of the whole sample of 1,843 titles represented by the running cumulation of imprint groups. That is to say, the 154 titles (B) with imprints between 1940 and 1949, when taken together with the 642 titles in the three more recent imprint periods, amount of 41% of the sample (O).

2. Observations.

Table 4 is merely to extend Tables 1-3. Titles published after 1939, that is, only in the thirty-five years preceding the study, represent over 40% of a collection that has been under development for more than 150 years. This smaller segment of the collection, however, accounted for over 75% of the circu-

lation and over 65% of the books circulated during the most recent five year period.

It is unnecessary to remark at length on the conclusions that may be drawn from the data summarized in this paper. The bare figures are unsettling enough. Research librarians preside over collections that are eroding as surely as seashores. The sheer scope of the problem, however, especially when contemplated in the aggregate, probably contributes to the paralysis of will to take significantly remedial steps. There are, on the other hand, some positive aspects. Those parts of this and similar collections that are the most seriously imperilled are the least heavily used, which suggests that microform preservation, as the currently most effective means of insuring the permanent availability of the intellectual content of this literature, could be pursued in a coordinated and comprehensive way with a minimum disturbance of the actual research practices of scholars and students. The sample, I believe, also holds the necessary data for further refinement and analysis. Not only do we learn much about older library materials, but a more detailed examination of the circulation patterns, let us say, of imprints of the most recent twenty years might provide clues to the informed development of future policy. Are there identifiable characteristics associated with low-volume titles that might be isolated as a part of the acquisition process?

By the imaginative, of course, additional inferences will be drawn.

NOTES

1. As I begin this essay, I am surprised at the number of people who are called to mind as having participated in the study. Andrew Scrimgeour was the overall supervisor of the project. Lester Stephens was the member of the Association for the Advancement of the Mentally Handicapped who executed the detailed and exacting routines involved in identifying titles to be examined and securing the volumes, running the chemical and paper strength tests, and recording the data. Donna Stroup devised the first, manual process for constructing the random sample, which a group of students from the Princeton High School employed to translate sets from a random number table into drawer identifications and card depth measurements. She also designed and ran the computer program for generating the last batch. Georgia Rose arranged and transferred to summary sheets the data collected on individual volumes, and Debbie Douie ran statistical analyses of the preliminary data sorts.
2. Carl M. Drott, "Random Sampling: a Tool for Library Research," *College and Research Libraries* 30 (1969):124.
3. Our experience with Barrow's chlorophenol test (*Spot Testing for Unstable Modern Book and Record Paper* [Richmond: W. J. Barrow Research Laboratory, 1969], pp. 11-12) is a casebook example of the trials and triumphs of do-it-yourself library science. Barrow calls for 0.420 grams of chlorophenol red in one liter of distilled water. Well, does your corner drugstore stock chlorophenol red? We turned to the orange pages and looked up the number of the chemistry department of Princeton University. Fortunately a graduate student took pity on us and was willing to make up the solution. But the main ingredient had to be ordered and, of course, came in a minimum quantity far exceeding our need. With what we got, we could have made gallons of the solution although we needed less than a quarter of a cup. Next, how do we get the solution on the specimen page of the book? We did not want permanently to mar the page, and a spot of the solution, no larger than the head of a pin, was actually sufficient to show the color change clearly. We

tried droppers and syringes of many shapes and sizes, finally ending up with extremely small pipettes--naturally in minimum quantities much beyond our needs.

The result is that we were able to run the chemical side of our project to our satisfaction with sufficient chlorophenol left over to test another million titles, should anyone be interested.

G. Fay Dickerson

It is appropriate that this chapter in the Festschrift for Calvin H. Schmitt, chairman of the American Theological Library Association's Periodical Indexing Board from 1957-1979, consider the Association's options for future abstracting and indexing services in religion. This paper reflects the editor's consideration of the existing potential for expanded services and for the development of a substantial database, and it provides the occasion for reevaluation of recent expansion. More importantly, it examines new procedures and considers their application to expanded service. It reflects the editor's conviction that a smooth transition in any administrative position reflects earlier judicious development and substantive cooperation.

I. Background

The reputation of the *Index to Religious Periodical Literature* (IRPL) Volumes 1-12, 1949-1976, developed

over a full quarter of a century. That history is documented in the Prefaces to those volumes and in the Reports of the Periodical Indexing Board published in the *Proceedings* of the Annual Meetings of the American Theological Library Association, (ATLA) 1949- .

The IRPL's successor, *Religion Index One: Periodicals* (RIO), and the sister product, *Religion Index Two: Multi-Author Works* (RIT), are built on the familiar structure of the IRPL, modified to adjust to the advantages and the limitations of computer processing. There will be more changes and expansion in the next twenty-five years primarily because of modern technology.

The IRPL followed a policy of gradual growth. Expansion was circumscribed by a cumbersome manual system of compilation and a limited staff, which began with an editor and a typist, and even by 1975 had expanded only to a five-person staff. Notably, though, sufficient success was achieved during this period to provide funds for the transition to a new production system involving programming, computer processing, and photo-composition.

II. Production Responses to Users

The photo-composed pages of each publication since 1975 successively reflect computer program modifications and the use of new programs all intended to speed production and expand coverage. The number of documents (separate author articles in journals or books and main entries for multi-author books) has increased from 4,300 in 1975 to 10,500 in 1979, largely because of the inauguration of *Religion Index Two*. In addition, there are cita-

tions locating book reviews published in journals. Documents in the database will increase dramatically in 1980-1982 with the addition of *Religion Index Two: Festschriften, 1960-1969*, edited by Betty and Elmer O'Brien, and of *Religion Index Two: Multi-Author Works, 1970-1975*, partially funded by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Obvious advantages of the computer include its capability for exploding material, then sorting it. Its demand for absolute consistency to predetermined forms is both freeing and limiting. Communication with the big, dumb machine is often frustrating, but usually we succeed in outwitting it. We have outlined specifications for new programs for quality control as well as for faster processing of additional information, but we have not yet achieved a balance between editorial/indexing input and time spent in the technological details of processing. Such a balance would permit more attention to our *raison d'être*, the continued publication of hard copy indexes and the development of a major religion database, which at some future date will be more comprehensive than the hard copy. In January, 1980, we are investigating mini-computer production to free us from the cumbersome key-punched Hollerith card input.

Technology, though, is only a vehicle for substantial growth. Periodic reevaluation of the publications is equally important. We want to build wisely and avoid bibliographic sprawl.

ATLA members do not only express their appreciation for the publications of the Periodical Indexing Board, but they also ask for added indexing of

journals, for more frequent publications, and even for an index to monographs in religion. A report of the Ad Hoc Committee on ATLA Needs in 1977, which mentioned "concern for the indexing of Festschriften and other multi-author works," was printed in the same *Proceedings*¹ as a report by the editor on the inauguration of "Religion Index Two: Multi-Author Works."²

III. Title Coverage

Journal title selection for RIO is a more complex problem than book title selection for RIT. The first is a commitment to continued coverage. The second has a related problem for books in series only. Annual issues of RIT have progressively more titles indexed, increasing from 241 in 1976 to 306 in 1977 and 347 in 1978. The number of in-scope titles may or may not increase as dramatically for future volumes, but an added title involves subject-author coverage for its contents only, not for successive volumes, as is true for a new journal title added to RIO. The scope statement for RIT is intended to be sufficiently restrictive to provide full coverage for in-scope titles.³ There is no comparable policy statement for RIO. The following discussion considers a more precise scope statement for RIO.

The *Index to Religious Periodical Literature* was "representative," and properly so. It began as a response to the ATLA membership's expressed need for a secondary journal⁴ to access the most widely used theological journals in their respective libraries. Library dependence on this representative tool resulted in pressure for broader coverage.

Titles indexed have increased from 31 in Volume 1 to over 220 in the semi-annuals for Volume 14 (1979-1980). At no time, however, has it been possible to say that journal X is included instead of journal Y because X is demonstrably more worthy of such control. Instead, Y has been added as system and work force permitted. But, as each Y becomes an X it is replaced by a host of Y's.

Now, in considering further expansion for RIO, certain maxims of the library world need to be re-evaluated. The most common are: "Avoid duplicate indexing"; "Index scholarly journals only"; and "Be as comprehensive as possible." Questions derived from those maxims are:

1. Should RIO seek to be "comprehensive" for "scholarly" religion journal titles?
2. How are scholarly titles identified?
3. Should the full contents of RIO periodicals be indexed, or should there be more selection of in-scope articles?
4. Should RIO avoid indexing journals whose titles are listed in other abstracting and indexing (A & I) services?
5. To what extent is the fragmented state of religion A & I services endemic to the discipline, or is more cooperation among producers possible?

The "answers" which follow reflect concerns and suggestions from users, but are modified by the in-house indexing and editing experience of the author.

IV. American National Bibliography: Some Considerations

For question one, as regards journal coverage, I suggest systematic growth in specific areas and continued discussion with other American A & I services with the intent of developing a single magnetic tape database.

RIO has the potential for developing a database providing bibliographic access to a high percentage of the substantive periodical literature in theology and religion in the United States. This would be an invaluable source for historical research, and an important contribution to national bibliography. A complementary increase in English language titles from other countries to support specified subject areas is reasonable and would respond to the broad support of RIO in many countries. Cooperative arrangements with other A & I services as described later would encourage such expansion, and could be mutually advantageous. The addition of a few titles each year by a single service, attempting to provide better service, is inadequate. No scholar can fully anticipate the journal location of all the literature that will be most valued by future scholars; some may be unaware of the extent to which religious literature is scattered in journals representing other disciplines. RIO already provides indexing for more journals than can be supported financially by the libraries of the ATLA, but it remains too limited in coverage to be indispensable for the control of well-identified journal literature in American national bibliography. Such indispensability is the only realistic goal this editor can imagine if RIO is to realize its potential. Therefore, she suggests the following priorities for RIO:

1. Comprehensive title coverage of North American (Canada, United States, Mexico) scholarly journals in religion and theology, including theological seminary journals.
2. Selected scholarly articles in religion from American professional journals in other disci-

plines (literature, history, social sciences) and from multi-disciplinary journals.

3. Selected substantive articles in religion from the large subscription, general magazines.

4. Expanded index coverage of in-scope English language journals from other countries as they complement certain subject areas.

Priority 1. is a responsible goal and recognizes North American interrelationships. Selective indexing of journals in 2. and 3. above provides the only practical means for achieving moderately complete coverage in a specialized index of the religious literature scattered across a wide spectrum of both scholarly and general journals. Priority 4. recognizes that the need for scholarly literature crosses geographic and political boundaries.

A difficult scope question remains. Is it possible to maintain current coverage of Western European language journals, especially German and French, and still expand coverage of American, English language journals to an extent that meets the requirements of American national bibliography? Eventually the answer may have to be "no," though for the present I argue for maintaining the core list of journals as found in Volume 14 (1979-1980). Some South American journals in Spanish and Portuguese might be added to enhance American coverage.

Queries to users indicate that a majority prefer our continuing 20 percent non-English coverage. German and French authors are eager to have abstracts of their work published in RIO. Curiously, this concern is reflected in German university subscription support but not in support from French libraries.

The scope statement for RIT (published in each

issue) anticipates substantial bibliographic control of European scholarship. So, interestingly, we are providing noticeably greater subject-author access to the contents of more German, French, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, and Scandinavian language articles in RIT than we would lose in RIO should we have to limit RIO coverage of non-English material.

V. Out-of-Scope Materials

Religious newspapers, denominational magazines, religious education and catechetical materials are too extensive to be considered for RIO bibliographic control. In many cases such literature is well indexed in denominational indexes. In addition, polemical, narrowly sectarian, or self-serving literature is out of scope even though it provides source data for interpreting the psychological and sociological facets of the American religious scene. The collection of such material is an archival function. A special form entry in RIO, SPECIAL COLLECTIONS, has been established to notify index users of the existence and location of such collections of useful research material.

VI. Scholarly Use

In the second question, "How are scholarly titles identified?" the word "scholarly" implies that documents are either "scholarly" or "unscholarly." The phrase "that of which scholarly use may be made" better identifies the intended scope of RIO/RIT.⁵ RIO/RIT journal and book titles are not to be chosen just because they are "scholarly," although that is an important consideration. Some less "scholarly" source material may be far more important for

scholarly work than a secondary or tertiary evaluation of the source document. Briefly, in addition to developing a database of "scholarly" literature, editors must document material that reflects the religious orientation of the present.⁶

VII. Comprehensive vs. Selective Indexing

The third question reflects the tension between comprehensive and selective indexing of journal titles. Having the full contents of each issue indexed provides bibliographic control for all the literature of some geographic entity or of a discipline, and permits the user the luxury of choice. Selection of in-scope material and the omission of all other is appropriate for a highly specialized index but not for RIO, which provides full coverage for core journals: all articles, bibliographies, longer obituaries and certain other special features. Indexing each article builds an index with broad subject coverage in the humanities and social sciences as well as in religion. Many articles have been written by persons with religious concerns but are not *per se* studies of theology or religion. Complete indexing, however, recognizes the national bibliographic task of subject/author control and will be continued. The listing of book reviews, though, is selective in an attempt to list somewhat critical reviews rather than book notes.

The scattering of literature on religious topics in interdisciplinary and general journals presents another problem for comprehensive subject coverage which the Religion Indexes have not faced as realistically as have many other specialized

indexes. The situation in religious studies necessitates systematic searching of interdisciplinary and general literature. Some of this material will be indexed by more than one service, but that does not insure retrieval for the user who cannot afford searches in multiple databases or who does not have access to the printed indexes.

VIII. Duplicate Indexing and/or a Comprehensive Database

The fourth question responds to the dictum, "avoid duplicate indexing," and is considered with the fifth question concerning the multiple religion A & I services. The outline for expansion in this paper has its goal the production of a more valuable database. It should have no adverse effects on related services such as *Catholic Periodical and Literature Index*, *Religious and Theological Abstracts*, *Old Testament Abstracts*, *New Testament Abstracts*, and *Index to Jewish Periodicals*. Specialized services are supported by faithful publics. Actual overlap of indexing among these five and RIO may be less than a mere comparison of titles indicates. Nevertheless, the nagging question about the cost of duplicate indexing, even for disparate purposes, remains. Though this paper charts the direction, some bibliographic statesperson or organization must provide a detailed blueprint for a comprehensive American database in religion. Systematic bibliographic cooperation could be negotiated that would provide assurance to each academic or denominational group that it would be better served than in the past. One magnetic tape database produced as a single product, with contributions from each

member, could have entries tagged for spin-off products for the hard copy, separate products. These could be published by the respective services and distributed to their subscribers. Personnel at each "center" could provide indexing for specified titles, and could trust fellow A & I services for other indexing and abstracts. A single, comprehensive hard copy volume would not be published, but the combined bibliographic resources would be in a common database for bibliographic searches. Equitable payments could be negotiated. The development of a joint thesaurus would provide assurance that related material could be retrieved by the same search strategy. The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) provides a model, though one more complex than is this suggestion for religious and theological literature. The religion database would provide bibliographic access to some of the holdings of theological, university and public libraries. ERIC provides an additional document service.

There is an informal agreement between the editors of RIO/RIT and the *Catholic Periodical and Literature Index* that neither service will add titles covered by the other. Therefore, these two indexes really complement each other. The careful subject delineation of both *Old Testament Abstracts* and *New Testament Abstracts* results in our duplicate coverage of articles but not of the full contents of most journals. Also, RIO/RIT provides subject indexing rather than a classified arrangement.

IX. Proposed New Products and Services

Production concerns to date have centered around two substantial products and the development of a

database. The quality of indexing is being enhanced by giving more attention to enriching titles with pertinent information (historical, biographical, title of a document, Bible reference, bibliography, etc.). A form entry, SPECIAL COLLECTIONS, used twice in RIO Volume 13 (1977-1978), could become a very useful location device. Libraries are invited to send information about special collections to the Index Office. Addresses, costs of services, a description of the collection or other information will be included in the abstract section. In addition to the listing of the collection in the Subject Index under SPECIAL COLLECTIONS, subject access will be assigned.

As mentioned earlier, subscription sales of the IRPL and inventory covered the development costs of *Religion Index Two: Multi-Author Works*. Now, in 1980, partial funding of *Religion Index Two: Multi-Author Works, 1970-1975*, by the National Endowment for the Humanities is a departure from the "pay as you go" policy of ATLA Indexes. We are in a position to utilize existing software to produce new products. A realistic cost-pricing structure is a prerequisite for each product. Those for which there is less demand will have to be priced proportionately higher.⁷

Probably the most important new service will be the availability of the RIO/RIT database through some information vendor. Rapidly developing technology, though, suggests that the Index Office itself at some future date, with an in-house mini-computer, can provide on-line searches for current input.

Several additional products for which data are available, but for which further processing is required, include: 1. periodic early notification of book titles being processed in the current issue of RIT; 2. a comprehensive list of books processed in *Religion Index Two: Festschriften, 1960-1969*, *Religion Index Two: 1970-1975* and the RIT annuals for 1976, 1977, and 1978; 3. computer to microfiche production of RIO and RIT, as separate products, at more frequent intervals; 4. the publication of the RIO/RIT thesaurus; and 5. special topical indexes. Each project will require substantial manipulation of data. All are possible, but increased costs will necessitate higher prices than would be imagined by those who would expect pricing in proportion to the very modest subscription prices for RIO and RIT.

Our first recommendation for a new product requiring extensive key-boarding is the conversion of data from *Index to Religious Periodical Literature*, Volumes 1-11 (1949-1974), to magnetic tape. This could be printed as a cumulative hard cover volume and in microfiche. Additional journal coverage could be provided by adding indexing for current titles previously omitted. Such retrospective indexing would increase the cost of the publication but would also increase its value even to libraries that have the original eleven volumes.

"Retrospective indexing" of journals from 1900 to 1949 is a project that could be broken down into five or even fewer manageable segments. Distribution to subscribers by fiche or hard copy could begin early in the production of the first segment. Another project, or series of projects, would be the

retrospective indexing of non-Festschriften multi-author works for the period from 1960 to 1969 to complement the work on Festschriften by Betty and Elmer O'Brien. All these projects, in whatever variations of scope and chronological period, will require special grants or substantially increased pricing to subscribers.

An annual index to monographs in religion (*Religion Index Three: Monographs*) would largely eliminate the need for individual library subject cataloging of current, major works in religion. Specific subject access (person, place, event, object, concept) to important chapters would far exceed that which is indicated in the two to four precoordinated terms in LC cataloging. Effective subject control of theological and religion books possible through such a system is not new, it was suggested in a library school paper by this editor, has been explicitly recommended by ATLA members, and implicitly recommended by scholars who produce special bibliographies with more specificity than that which is possible through book classification and subject cataloging. The production of such a third major index in the RIO/RIT family is not an unrealistic suggestion, nor would its cost be prohibitive. We could insure adequate indexing for a carefully circumscribed list of books within a pre-determined scope. The subscription price to libraries would be less than the cost of in-house subject cataloging and card catalog maintenance for the same number of books. Such depth indexing surely will be produced by some other service if not by the ATLA indexes. Realistically, I do not

recommend immediate inauguration of such a product. The software is adequate and the coverage would greatly enhance the value of the RIO/RIT database; but it is such a major undertaking that financing, planning, and execution must be delayed until after the completion of RIT 1970-1975 and the conversion of IRPL Volumes 1-11 to magnetic tape.

X. Proposed Research

1. An objective evaluation of the abstract section in RIO that would compare these abstracts to other forms of bibliographic information is needed. Most authors appreciate having their abstracts published; some even submit abstracts for earlier articles; others do not respond to the request that they submit an abstract for publication in a secondary publication, RIO;⁸ therefore, abstract coverage is incomplete. One solution, for which we have not made a comparative cost study, is in-house abstracting. Another would be to use the abstract space to list all the subjects assigned to the article, the institutional affiliation and address of the author, the translation of a non-English title, or other relevant information. The fact that abstracts are submitted in other Western languages, primarily German and French, as well as English has not been demonstrated to be superior to an English translation from which English language terms used in a search strategy would provide more extensive article access than is likely from subject headings only.

2. A study for religion comparable to the National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing

Services (NFAIS) Overlap Study⁹ would provide a more accurate assessment of the duplicate indexing question than has been available to date. The Overlap Study indicated far less actual duplication in fourteen scientific secondary journals than had been assumed by their listing of the same journal titles. The method is directly applicable to religious literature. Selected secondary journals would need to cooperate in gathering statistics and in checking actual indexing records. A project director would:

- a. Select an A & I service and compare its overlap by title with other services. (I would recommend RIO, because of its substantial title overlap.)
- b. Select a representative number of primary journal titles from the "overlap" list for further study regarding actual duplication.
- c. Select a given year or years for which each A & I service completed indexing of the above primary journals.
- d. Determine whether each issue for the designated titles for those years was actually processed by each service.
- e. Then, for selected issues that each service reported as indexing, check the actual coverage and depth of indexing in each service.

XI. Conclusion

It has not been the intention of this paper to provide a blueprint for the direction the Religion Indexes should expand or to compute the costs of such expansion. It suggests the need for cooperation among the United States religion A & I services, but does not make that a requirement for

expanded coverage. It is, in part, a response to many subscribers. It considers the potential both for enhanced service through current products and for a few new services for which the capability now exists. The list offered here of the latter is not exhaustive. There also has been the reminder that services cost. We anticipate more production faster, but this must be supported by a realistic cost-pricing structure.¹⁰

For the future, as in the past, we intend to produce quality services for which there is demonstrated need. We expect that excellent rapport with users will continue, and that the number of users will increase dramatically as the full resources of the RIO/RIT database become available.

NOTES

1. "Ad Hoc Committee on ATLA Needs," by R. Grant Bracewell, Chairperson, American Theological Library Association, *Summary of Proceedings, Thirty-First Annual Conference, Vancouver, British Columbia, June 20-24, 1977* (Philadelphia: ATLA, 1978), p. 45.
2. G. Fay Dickerson, "The Religious Essays Index Project," *ibid.*, pp. 77-81.
3. Scope for *Religion Index Two* (Periodical Index Board revised statement, November 1978):
To be included:
 1. Separately published works which are the collection of the works of more than one author. The publications may be prepared or collected in honor of scholars or events or may be collections other than Festschriften.
 2. Works which include a religious or theological subject focus.
 3. Works that are intended to be scholarly.
 4. Works that are in the Western languages. Scholarly materials appearing for the first time in English translations will be included.

5. Collections comprised of contemporary source materials.

6. Reprints of scholarly articles not previously included in ATLA indexes.

To be excluded:

1. Collections or reprints intended as "readers" for classroom convenience which do not meet the criteria of 5 or 6 above.

2. Serial publications in journal format.

Doubtful titles:

Collections that are mixed or interdisciplinary in subject content will be included when the majority of the articles in the collection are in scope. If the minority of the articles are in scope then only selected articles in the collection will be indexed. (The bibliographic listing will indicate selectively indexed titles.)

Date of materials to be included:

Polygraphs that fall within the scope but that appear too late for inclusion with the year of publication will be included in subsequent years.

4. The term "secondary journal" as used in this paper denotes a serial publication that provides bibliographic information about the contents of other "primary journals."
5. Stephen L. Peterson, "Documenting Christianity: a Cooperative Library Collection Development Program," to be published in American Theological Library Association, *Summary of Proceedings, Thirty-Second Annual Conference, Latrobe, Pennsylvania, 1978*.
6. G. Fay Dickerson, "The Index and Its Public," American Theological Library Association, *Summary of Proceedings, Twenty-First Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois, June 12-14, 1967* (Wilmore, Kentucky: ATLA, n.d.), pp. 21-30.
7. In order to reflect our costs more accurately for an individual product in the price of that same product, we have developed a pricing formula. Basically, it adds development costs, the cost of materials and labor, storage costs, and overhead, and then divides that sum by anticipated sales to arrive at a realistic unit price.

8. The percentage of articles entered with abstracts is about 40 percent in the forthcoming July-December 1979 semi-annual issue. Of that portion, two-thirds are provided by the authors and the final third is drawn from the journal in which the article appeared.
9. National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Services, *A Study of Coverage Overlap between Major Science and Technology Abstracting and Indexing Services*, Report submitted 20 August 1976 to the National Science Foundation Division of Science Information (Philadelphia: NFAIS, 1976).

Doralyn J. Hickey

Sometime during the 1950's or early 1960's, a science fiction story appeared in a library publication. It attracted attention primarily because that particular style of literature is not ordinarily found among regular professional contributions. In this case, however, it was justified because its author foresaw the destruction of civilization as the result of the breakdown of automated bibliographic systems. Ironically, the current bibliographic systems seem to have failed to retrieve the story itself (which may be the first step in the ultimate breakdown), but its thrust remains clear: in the futuristic world, all of knowledge may be lost simply through the circularity of a cross reference, and the bibliographies of bibliographies of bibliographies . . . (bibliographies to the nth power, perhaps) will disappear into the memory banks of a dying civilization.

The bibliography of theological bibliography may not yet have reached this rather dire state, but

those who have attempted to retrieve a current, thorough, and critical analysis of bibliographic sources in the field of theology and religion have found their search complicated by a number of factors, not the least of which is the lack of a systematic and comprehensive review medium for the field. The key terms here are "systematic" and "comprehensive," for there is no lack of reviewing media per se. The basic problem is that these media are often focused rather narrowly upon certain research areas in religion, or do not appear with any regularity. The religion student is thus forced to explore a plethora of unrelated lists, many of which either do not fully cover the field or are not recent enough to be fully reliable.

For a number of years, librarians have recognized the problems in locating relevant bibliographic sources and have tried to provide their own means of compensating. Among these have been (1) the use of the subheading "--Bibliography" attached to subject headings in library catalogs, (2) preparation of in-house lists of reference materials appropriate to certain regularly studied topics in theology, (3) systematic review of periodical literature for bibliographic notices which could be transcribed into local files for later retrieval, (4) participation in the development of an index to religious periodical literature which could identify bibliographic articles, and (5) compiling, for publication, systematic lists of bibliographic sources.

Despite these library-initiated efforts, only one major tool for the identification of theological bibliographies has been published during the past

century, and it is now woefully out of date. This work, *A Bibliography of Bibliographies in Religion* by John Graves Barrow,¹ was recently reviewed through a project undertaken as part of the doctoral study of Cecil R. White, Assistant Librarian for Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Ft. Worth, Texas.² White found that the material gathered by Barrow was organized in two phases: initially in 1930, when Barrow was preparing his doctoral dissertation at Yale University; and later, in the 1940's, when the list was being updated for publication.

White further noted that the Barrow bibliography, while intended to serve as an "annotated listing of all bibliographies in religion which were separately published,"³ has been criticized as deficient in a number of regards. Treatment of the various denominations and sects appears to be uneven, perhaps as a result of the lack of balance in the libraries which Barrow was able to visit. In particular, White cites the Anabaptist bibliography compiled by Hans Hillerbrand⁴ as including a number of bibliographies omitted by Barrow.

Another fault in the Barrow work is its conscious limitation to "separately published" bibliographies. As was acknowledged by Raymond Morris in his review of Barrow's list,⁵ the omission of bibliographies published in periodicals and as parts of books deprives the theological student of many valuable sources. White suggests that this limitation would, for example, cause the significant bibliographies of Karl Barth in *Antwort*⁶ and *Parrhesia*⁷ to be overlooked.

The Barrow list may also be recognized as somewhat weak in the field of non-Christian religions and in materials associated with religion in developing countries. Although it makes some attempt to assess the quality of the bibliographies included, it provides no general discussion of the topics in perspective so far as their degree of bibliographic control, or lack of it, is concerned. This, coupled with the omission of bibliographies published as part of larger works, leaves the user without guidance as to whether the identified bibliographies can be expected to exhaust the particular area being studied or merely to touch upon it.

Despite the problems which the Barrow volume presents, it constitutes the only attempt to control the bibliographic output of the theological community at the specific subject level. Other bibliographies of bibliographies cover the field either only in very broad dimensions or quite selectively. For example, Besterman's *World Bibliography of Bibliographies*⁸ includes a section on theology and religion, but this provides no more than a start for the religion student. The *Bibliographic Index*⁹ includes relevant listings, but the user must imagine the appropriate subject term in advance, since the bibliographies are indexed by specific topical headings which are arranged in alphabetical order. *Bibliographic Index* has the advantage of having been published regularly since 1937, but it restricts its coverage to bibliographies primarily in Germanic and Romance languages and to those which contain at least fifty citations. Because of its breadth of coverage, it cannot be expected to identify

anything other than major bibliographies, and it certainly offers no context for the evaluation of religious bibliography. (It should be noted at this point that the symbol "T/R" will be used hereafter to indicate the combined fields of theology and religion.)

Sheehy's *Guide to Reference Books* (8th edition)¹⁰ provides some help in identifying the bibliographies in T/R, further reinforcing the impression that there are few of them and that they are neither comprehensive nor up-to-date. Only one of the citations under "Religion, General Works, Bibliography" involves the bibliography of bibliography directly, and this proves to be the Barrow work (already mentioned). Other items are simply bibliographies which, in the course of reviewing a topic, mention existence of other bibliographic sources. For example, the Diehl annotated bibliography *Religions, Mythologies, Folklores*¹¹ is cited by Diehl herself as appropriate for "librarians and theologians not prepared to use the comprehensive work [i.e. Barrow],"¹² and Sheehy mentions it as such.¹³

An examination of librarians' solutions to this problem of the lack of a comprehensive and up-to-date bibliography of bibliographies in T/R leads eventually to the conclusion that the librarians are coping, but only just barely. A review of each solution, and its associated difficulties, may help to elucidate the problem further.

I. Use of the "--Bibliography" Subdivision under T/R Subject Headings in the Library Catalog

Stephen L. Peterson, librarian of the Yale University Divinity School, has questioned the con-

tinued insertion of subject cards into an already crowded catalog.¹⁴ He maintained, with considerable justification in terms of numbers of cards placed under relatively broad headings, that the student of religion (and this term is used to categorize *any* person investigating the T/R resources, whether faculty member, theology student, or layman interested in the field) could not effectively utilize this file because it offered too much undifferentiated information of unknown value. His alternative was the inclusion of subject entries only for bibliographic resources, thus pointing the student's way to materials which would further define and refine the search process, leading eventually to the relevant informational sources themselves.

Although the idea is reasonable and certainly would eliminate much of the subject "clutter" in the catalog, its success is dependent upon a thoroughgoing recognition and identification of such bibliographies as part of the cataloging process. While such an analytical process *could* be introduced into many theological libraries, the present situation is that many cataloging units depend heavily upon the descriptive analysis of materials as supplied by central sources such as the Library of Congress (LC). Although LC does note, sometimes through extra subject headings, the presence of a major bibliography in a topical work and certainly adds the "--Bibliography" subdivision when the entire work is bibliographic in nature, this process is not sufficiently routine to assure that a "bibliography" subdivision will be attached for all important listings.¹⁵ Given the extent of

the LC staff's responsibilities and the amount of materials which must be handled expeditiously, it is remarkable that as many bibliographies are identified as there are.

Even if LC were to accept responsibility for pointing out all bibliographic apparatus through the addition of a subheading, there is some doubt as to how useful this might prove to be to the student. Except for popularized literature in T/R, most works contain some sort of bibliographic citations. The LC staff could hardly be expected to appraise each of these to determine which ought to be recognized; however, if no such appraisal occurred, the number of subject entries in the catalog would very likely be diminished only slightly. While cards headed merely "Theology, Doctrinal" would disappear, they would reappear as "Theology, Doctrinal--Bibliography" in almost every case, for example.

The use of a bibliographic subdivision has another disadvantage in that, when attached to a specific topical heading, it does not reveal the interrelation of bibliographic apparatus. In this regard, the classified catalog has significant advantages over the alphabetic-specific list. Assuming that the student is likely to approach the bibliographic resources without much understanding of their generality or particularity, then the classed catalog (or shelf browsing, perhaps) may be of more immediate assistance than a search through the various alphabetic terms in the subject catalog. Even the most experienced student of T/R has faced the card file (or even the computer console) with a blank mind, hoping for a flash of

insight as to what term should be selected for beginning a search.

Most important, perhaps, is the fact that library cataloging tries to remain carefully objective in selecting subject entries. The student, however, needs guidance as to which bibliographies are likely to be the most productive, reliable, up to date, simple to use, etc. The insertion of a "--Bibliography" subdivision helps little in this regard.

II. Preparation of In-house Lists of Bibliographic Resources

It might effectively be argued that the cataloger is not the person to offer bibliographic assistance, for this is the classic function of the reference librarian. While the catalog might help in identifying and locating bibliographies, the interpretation should be offered by the reference staff. Where personalized attention cannot be given or is not sought, the reference librarian may be present through a surrogate, namely, a previously compiled review of the resources in various topics popular for investigation. A number of these in-house efforts have eventuated in guides to the literature, theological book lists, and the like;¹⁶ many others reside as mimeographed handouts on the reference or circulation desk of the local theological library.

While such efforts are in no way to be denegated, they cannot serve every need. Nor can each reference librarian be expected to act as an expert in all branches of T/R so that truly sophisticated help may be forthcoming. Many of these lists, further, may become severely out of date but are not revised

because the time to perform such systematic revision is not available. Often overarching each of these relatively minor problems is the simplest one of all, namely, making sure that the right list gets into the student's hands at the propitious moment. Since the reference staff cannot be available to each person at every hour of the day--and some library users do not even ask for help--many needs may go unfilled.

III. Systematic Review of the Literature for Bibliographic Information

A regular analysis of new monographic and serial acquisitions as a means of coping with the lack of bibliographies of bibliographies in T/R shares most of the drawbacks associated with reliance on in-house lists. In this manifestation, however, the concern is focused more upon keeping the library staff aware of such bibliographic resources, so that the staff may in turn pass these data on to their clientele. The information thus resides primarily in the heads or the personal "tickler" files of the staff. If there were assurance, again, that library users would ask for help in all cases, this approach might be reasonable. Until the library closes its stacks and its catalogs to all who have not initially consulted a librarian (and this seems not likely to occur in the near future), there can be no security about the users' knowledge of either the bibliographic resources or the appropriate search strategy.

IV. Development of a Bibliographic Index to the Periodical Literature of Theology/Religion

The present periodical indexes for the field of T/R frequently give as much up-to-date and systematic assistance in finding bibliographic resources as do the aforementioned library activities. *Religion Index One*¹⁷ (previously called the *Index to Religious Periodical Literature*) offers a complement to the Barrow work by identifying the bibliographies in works imbedded in serial publications. Similarly, *Religion Index Two*,¹⁸ with its emphasis on collections of monographs in T/R, undertakes to point out bibliographies occurring in such items. Other indexes, e.g., the *Catholic Periodical and Literature Index*,¹⁹ perform a similar service.

In some ways, the defects of the use of the "--Bibliography" subdivision in the library catalog are also found in the process of searching the periodical indexes. As in the card file, there is no systematic (classified) approach to the bibliography of an area (e.g. Biblical studies) unless the student is willing to examine several alphabetical segments of the index. It could be argued, understandably, that the student would, in the case of Biblical bibliographies, be better served by going directly to the *Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus*²⁰ or *Old Testament Abstracts*,²¹ *New Testament Abstracts*,²² etc. This argument, however, simply strengthens the point: there is no easy way for the student to analyze the possible bibliographic resources *in toto* and develop a strategy which will provide the best response for the least amount of tedious effort.

V. Compilation of Systematic Lists of Bibliographic Resources

As was noted in connection with the compilation of in-house lists of resources, many library bibliographies eventuate in some sort of publication or generalized distribution. The pages of the *Newsletter* of the American Theological Library Association,²³ for example, regularly call attention to the availability of new lists produced by theological librarians or by commercial agencies. It is surprising, therefore, that very little attention has been focused upon compiling bibliographies of bibliographies. The stress has been, rather, upon producing systematic bibliographies themselves, not upon identifying the bibliographic resources produced by others.

In recent years, the bibliographic efforts seem to have become--except for the work of the periodical indexers--more micro- than macrocosmic. Valuable analyses such as those produced by Warren Kissinger for the Sermon on the Mount and the parables of Jesus²⁴ are quite narrowly conceived, possibly because the volume of T/R literature is such that no one person can be expected to survey the field as a whole. It is most curious that the field has given rise to a variety of general guides to the literature of T/R, periodical and collection indexes, and narrow bibliographical analyses, but it has not been able to develop a systematic, up-to-date bibliography of bibliographies.

VI. A Possible Model for a Bibliography of Bibliographies in Theology/Religion

There is clearly little likelihood that theological students or librarians will be deterred from

continuing to prepare bibliographies for topics that interest them. It might be desirable, however, for at least a few of them to look more objectively at the problems of gaining access to the full range of literature available in T/R. Rather than continuing to prepare narrowly defined bibliographies, even with associated interpretation and historical perspective, some of the effort needs to be diverted to attain better control over the materials already available. Borrowing--and corrupting--an old idea: The one who does not know the bibliography is doomed to repeat it.

Before trying to construct a model for a bibliography of bibliographies in T/R, it is important to ask why such a resource is not already in existence. One reason may be that the task appears too monumental for one person (or even a coordinator of a group) to undertake. Barrow's effort, however useful, was not fully successful; it can hardly be expected that, given the increase in resources during the 1960's and 1970's, anyone else would elect to follow him, especially when it is discovered that Barrow spent parts of a twenty-five year span in compiling his limited list.

A second reason may be the belief that the major need in the field is the creation of new literature or, barring that, the compilation of bibliographies of that literature. The preparation of a bibliography *of* bibliographies seems too removed from the cutting edge of the discipline to be very important or exciting, perhaps. Bibliographic research, while recognized as necessary, is often seen as a "cut and paste" kind of activity; from

that perspective, bibliography of bibliography might be ranked even lower: the cutting and pasting of previous cuttings and pastings.

A third reason may lie in the failure of theological librarians to take their responsibilities to theological inquiry as seriously as they ought. Their tendency to solve the problems on an immediate and personal level, thereby benefitting local clientele, often precludes the development of broader professional skills. Connected with this factor is the view which theological seminary administrators and faculty often hold of the library staff as essentially managers of library circulation and cataloging, not as colleagues in theological scholarship.

Each of these three reasons for not having developed a bibliography of bibliographies in T/R must be considered in the formulation of a model for this activity. At the outset it is clear that no one person can undertake the task alone. Leaving aside the obvious problems of obtaining subsidy for what would be a fulltime position requiring both professional and clerical skills, the reliance upon one viewpoint would be undesirable because no one person can offer expertise in all the branches of T/R. The project must be a collegial one, if only to secure the breadth of knowledge and perspective required for a sophisticated analysis of the bibliographic resources.

The second and third reasons for not already having such a service are harder to overcome. A process of "education" may be undertaken to elevate bibliographic research to a higher position in the

hierarchy of theological investigation; however, it is more likely that the effort will be accorded higher status once it produces something of worth to the theological community. In a sense, then, the worth of the project must be envisioned by the theological librarian before it can be viewed as of high value by administrative and faculty colleagues.

Assuming that some librarians take on this task as one of great importance, how might it be accomplished? First, a "bibliographic fanatic" needs to be located--one who both appreciates the value of bibliographic analysis and possesses the drive and administrative skills to humor, cajole, coerce colleagues into participating in a "grand scheme" and can locate appropriate "angels" to pay for the work. Since it is highly likely that almost every library with any research interests would subscribe to *any* bibliography of bibliographies, a persuasive fanatic ought to be able to secure the resources.

Finding a fanatic with superior administrative skills may, however, be more difficult. Perhaps it will take a fanatic and an administrative aide in tandem to devise the system and carry it out. The project cannot be undertaken by a semi-interested committee or task force; it clearly requires the driving personal commitment of one (or more) who believes in the value of the work.

Once the fanatic is located, it might be argued that the project will take its own direction. Given a skilled leader, perhaps, any system will work. True as this may be, certain guidelines might be helpful in directing the efforts of the creative

force. Among these are the following, many of which came out of the discussions of theological librarians during a 1978 seminar:²⁵

1. Theological scholars *and* librarians should be recruited to provide the ongoing analysis and criticism of theological bibliography. Without either group, a valuable perspective for the student is lost.

2. Both individual bibliographies and the bibliographic effort as a whole need to be reviewed systematically so that each bibliography can be assessed in the context of the alternatives and complements available.

3. Reviews of new bibliographies ought to be made available at least quarterly, and an annual summary and analysis should be published. Once every three to five years, a retrospective analysis should be undertaken, as well.

4. Those who prepare the annual reviews should be selected to "alternate" so that different perspectives on the bibliographic resources could be reflected. A "team" approach could be considered to obtain the same results.

5. The coverage of the bibliography of bibliographies should be as broad as possible. Attention should be given to bibliographies occurring as separate publications, as parts of monographs, as articles in serials, or as parts of articles in serials. Although a priority might be established to give first attention to separately published bibliographies, those attached to scholarly investigations should not be overlooked.

6. The scope of the examination of bibliographies should not be restricted to theological literature,

even though this might be accorded primary attention. T/R bibliographies do occur in the publications of other disciplines and ought to be identified there.

7. The format of the resulting bibliography of bibliographies in T/R might be that of a quarterly journal. Its arrangement would be generally expected to reflect some type of classification so that the interrelation of broad and narrow bibliographic efforts could be observed.

8. This project might utilize, under appropriate direction, the services of theological students and library students with course work in T/R. If an effective "form" for the review of a bibliography could be developed, certain bibliographic "nodes" might be distributed in seminary or library school settings.

On the assumption, then, that the project will never be undertaken unless it is viewed as one of high value to the theological community, this analysis has been presented as a stimulus to further consideration. Hopefully, the task of preparing bibliographies of bibliographies will receive future recognition as essential to an intelligent use of available resources. While it is possible that some "circular reference" will someday invalidate the elaborate structure of bibliographic control, it seems even more likely that society will simply remain impoverished by not knowing about the existence of the information which it has already produced.

NOTES

1. John Graves Barrow, *A Bibliography of Bibliographies in Religion* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Edwards Bros., 1955).
2. Cecil R. White, "Barrow Revisited; or, Do We Need a New 'Bibliography of Bibliographies in Religion'?" (Unpublished research paper, North Texas State University, School of Library and Information Sciences, Denton, Texas, 1979).
3. Barrow, *ibid.*, Preface.
4. Hans J. Hillerbrand, *Bibliography of Anabaptism, 1520-1630* (Elkhart, Ind.: Institute of Mennonite Studies, 1962).
5. Raymond P. Morris, Review of Barrow, in *Library Journal* 80 (September 1, 1955): 1789.
6. *Antwort. Karl Barth zum siebzigsten Geburtstag* (Zollikon-Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, 1956), pp. 945-960.
7. *Parrhesia. Karl Barth zum 80. Geburtstag* (Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1966), pp. 709-723.
8. Theodore Besterman, *A World Bibliography of Bibliographies*, 4th ed., 5 vols. (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1965-66).
9. *Bibliographic Index*, 1937+ (New York: H. W. Wilson Co.).
10. Eugene P. Sheehy, *Guide to Reference Books*, 9th ed. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1976).
11. Katharine Smith Diehl, *Religions, Mythologies, Folklores: An Annotated Bibliography*, 2nd ed. (New York: Scarecrow Press, 1962).
12. *Idem*, "A Librarian Looks at Schools of Theology," *Special Libraries* 47 (September 1956): 320.
13. Sheehy, *ibid.*, p. 252.
14. Stephen L. Peterson, "Subject Headings--Theology, x Superfluity: An Alternative Approach to Subject Cataloging in Theological Libraries" (unpublished paper distributed to participants in the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) Cataloging Workshop, Washington, D.C., September 15-18, 1976).

15. This matter was discussed in the ATLA Cataloging Workshop, Washington, D.C., 1976, during the session held in the Subject Cataloging Division of the Library of Congress.
16. Among the "mainstays" of the bibliographies and book lists produced by and for theological librarians are the following: Raymond P. Morris, comp., *A Theological Book List* (Oxford, England: Blackwell; Naperville, Ill.: Allenson, distributor, 1960); Ella V. Aldrich and Thomas Edward Camp, *Using Theological Books and Libraries* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963); John B. Trotti, ed., *Aids to a Theological Library* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977). Contributions to the bibliographic resources have also been made regularly by the Boston Theological Institute (BTI) in its publication, *Religious and Theological Resources*, and the later bibliographic newsletter issued by the BTI Library Development Program, *Renewals* (vol. 1 began in 1978). A bibliographic survey aimed at general librarians appeared in *Library Trends* as part of the double issue called "Bibliography: Current State and Future Trends": Charles Harvey Arnold, "Philosophy and Religion," *Library Trends* 15 (January 1967): 459-77.
17. *Religion Index One: Periodicals* (Chicago: American Theological Library Association), beginning with the July/December issue for 1977. The predecessor to this publication was the *Index to Religious Periodical Literature* (Chicago: American Theological Library Association), covering the years from 1949 through June 1977 (13 vols.).
18. *Religion Index Two: Multi-Author Works* (Chicago: American Theological Library Association), beginning in 1976.
19. *The Catholic Periodical and Literature Index* (Haverford, Pa.: Catholic Library Association), beginning with a July/August issue for 1968. This publication represents the merger of the *Catholic Periodical Index* (published to cover the years from 1930 through 1966) and *The Guide to Catholic Literature* (covering the years from 1888 through 1967), both issued under the auspices of the Catholic Library Association.

20. *Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press), published separately beginning with vol. 49 for 1968. Previously the *Elenchus* had been issued as a part of the periodical *Biblica*.
21. *Old Testament Abstracts* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America), beginning with vol. 1 in February 1978.
22. *New Testament Abstracts* (Cambridge, Mass.: Weston School of Theology), beginning with vol. 1 in 1956.
23. Each issue of the American Theological Library Association *Newsletter* includes news notes about such publications. The five-year indexes to the *Newsletter* show page references to these notices under the heading "Bibliographies."
24. Warren S. Kissinger, *The Sermon on the Mount: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography*, ATLA Bibliography Series, no. 3 (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1975). Kissinger, *The Parables of Jesus: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography*, ATLA Bibliography Series, no. 4 (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press and the American Theological Library Association, 1979).
25. "Report of the Second Workshop on Subject Analysis," *American Theological Library Association Newsletter* 26 (August 1978): 23-26.

Kenneth O'Malley, C.P.

Scholars have focused on the importance of the library catalog from the *Pinakes* of Callimachus in the celebrated Alexandrian Library to the present day beginnings of computer-stored catalogs of twentieth century libraries. In 1880, Justin Winsor noted that it is the library catalog that makes the difference between a library and a mob of books. Cutter compared the library catalog to a city directory.¹

The library is like a key--a key which can become dulled by time and must be shaped and sharpened to turn the complex tumblers of modern locks and bolts which open the doors to the most abundant and wealthiest library treasures known.

The library catalog is essential for retrieving items from a library collection. As an agency of display, the library catalog should give quick and accurate access to the holdings of a library's collection. The library catalog is not self-explanatory. The variety of arrangements, the diver-

sity of languages and of forms of materials represented in the library catalog contribute to its complexity. Therefore, it is imperative that the library catalog be continually tested and improved as an instrument of retrieval.

The classic statement regarding the purpose of the library catalog was made by Charles Cutter in his *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog*:

1. To enable a person to find a book of which the author, or the title, or the subject is known.
2. To show what the library has by a given author on a given subject in a given kind of literature.
3. To assist in the choice of a book as to its edition (bibliographically), as to its character (literary or topical).²

Future purposes and capabilities of the library catalog must be clearly defined to guide the designers of the library catalogs into this new era of its development.

Remarkably little research has been done to measure the use and capabilities of the library catalog. Research is needed because users and their needs are subject to change. Change in user's needs can affect the form as well as the structure of the library catalog. The library profession has been alerted to the plight of the users of the library catalog. Gorman says that the most neglected aspect of catalog theory and practice is the use made of the library catalog.³ Berelson notes that very few people use the library catalog with any regularity.⁴ Haygood is more specific when he states that at least thirty-seven percent of library users withdraw materials from libraries without using the library catalog.⁵ He further remarks that at least six per-

cent of library patrons never use the library catalog. Chervenik suggests that the reason so many patrons of the library avoid using the library catalog is its complexity. He claims that for a person to obtain minimum efficiency in the use of the library catalog at least sixty hours of instruction are necessary, plus at least two hundred hours of practice.⁶ Rather insists that the library catalog is a difficult tool because of the variety of arrangements, languages, and types of entries.⁷

The number of different types of entries and headings in a library catalog is a factor in its complexity. Presently the current code accepted by the library profession is the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules II*. One area of concern that caused discussion when using the first edition and continues with the appearance of the second is the use of corporate headings with form subheadings. A *corporate body* is "an organization or group of persons that is identified by name and that acts or may act as an entity."⁸ A *subheading* is "a word or a group of words added to a heading and designed to delimit a particular group of entries under the heading, or to designate a part of the entity named in the heading."⁹ And a *form subheading* is "a heading, not consisting of an author's name or of a title, designed to delimit a group of entries according to some common characteristic of form, e.g., *Laws, Treaties, etc.* under the name of a country."¹⁰ It is the intent of this paper to discuss the effectiveness of corporate headings with form subheadings in the library catalog of theological libraries.

I. Corporate Headings

Attention has been brought to focus on the concept of corporate headings in library catalogs by the recent work of Eva Verona, entitled *Corporate Headings: Their Use in Library Catalogues and National Bibliographies; a Comparative and Critical Study*.¹¹ Two papers were issued prior to Verona's landmark contribution, dealing with the history of corporate headings, must be singled out for attention. The first is a paper by Julia Pettee which traces the origins of corporate headings back to Sir Thomas Hyde, librarian of the Bodleian Library in 1674.¹² The second is a paper by Verona which traces the first appearance of corporate headings to the catalog of Thomas James in 1605.¹³

Corporate headings have been so prevalent in the United States that Dubester's study in 1964 estimated that 36.2 percent of the cards produced by the Library of Congress include some kind of corporate heading. Of these, sixty-one percent are main entries.¹⁴ The two librarians whose philosophies of cataloging have contributed to the acceptance or rejection of corporate headings are respectively Cutter¹⁵ and Dziatzko.¹⁶ Dziatzko held that a work is remembered primarily by the sequence of important words in a title and only secondarily by the authorship. Furthermore, he considered all works issued by a corporate author as anonymous for the purpose of entry. The opposite is true for Cutter; he considered authorship to be of primary importance whether it was personal or corporate.

II. Form Subheadings

Intimately associated with the problem of construction of corporate headings is the problem of form subheadings. The form subheading is used first for the purpose of individualizing the document entered in the library catalog, and second to characterize the documents as to form and subject content. Examples of corporate headings with form subheadings are: Bolivia. *Laws, statutes, etc.*; United States. *Constitution*; Catholic Church. *Liturgy and ritual.*

The form subheading like the corporate heading has been a constant source of controversy both in the United States and abroad. Among those who have opposed the use of form subheadings are Dorothy Anderson, Ruth Eisenhart, William Fletcher, Seymour Lubetzky, Shiyaha Ranganathan, and Elizabeth Tate; among those who have supported their use are Charles Cutter, Werner Ellinger, James Hanson, and Charles Martel. The debate concerning the legitimacy of form subheadings is especially relevant at this time because of the new edition of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*.

Law and theology libraries are the two types most affected by the use of corporate headings with form subheadings. The literature indicates a lack of unanimity regarding the use of form subheadings among theology and law libraries.

III. Catalog Use Studies

Phyllis Richmond points out that sound research is lacking in catalog use.¹⁷ Brown and Taube have agreed that insufficient knowledge of users' relationships to the library catalog hinders the

establishment of internal criteria which give retrieval systems excellence and control.^{18, 19} Catalog use studies are therefore pertinent to felt needs.

IV. Methodology

This paper reports the results of an experiment which tested the effectiveness of the corporate headings with form subheadings in the library catalogs of two theological schools. The design of this study is a quasi-experimental design, a "Posttest Only Control Group Design."²⁰ Students from both schools, enrolled in master's programs, were selected randomly and assigned specific problems. This sample group was especially important because they were specialists in one of the two disciplines, theology and law, most affected by the use of form subheadings, and hence are required to use corporate headings with form subheadings frequently. This study is an obtrusive study with search problems designed by the investigator.

V. Hypothesis

The following hypothesis was stated and tested:

The less form subheadings are used with corporate headings in a library catalog the easier it will be for graduate students to retrieve specific items, because the complexity of the file is reduced.

In order to insure understanding and to record observations accurately and consistently, four items were defined:

1. "Easier" was defined as that which takes fewer search arguments and less time to locate a specific item.

2. "Graduate students" were defined in this study as those enrolled in a master's program in one of two theological schools.

3. "Specific items" was defined as a specific entry selected by the investigator and considered to be the only correct entry for a specific search problem.

4. "Complexity" was defined as that attribute of the catalog which is determined in part by the artificiality of the form subheadings filed in a library catalog. In the case of corporate headings with form subheadings this means introducing into an author-title based catalog a designation for a form or type of material.

In development of the hypothesis, two assumptions appeared evident. These were:

1. The hypothesis assumes that the students involved in the test have some familiarity with the use of the catalog, by their own admission.

2. The hypothesis assumes that a desirable quality in a catalog is to afford the user easy access to items in as short a period of time and with as few searches as possible.

The causal element used to test the hypothesis was "the complexity of the file" in the library catalog when form subheadings are used. The hypothesis predicted that the theological students would be more successful in solving search problems consisting of entries without form subheadings than they would be in solving those consisting of corporate headings with form subheadings. "Success" was measured in three ways: (1) by locating the correct answer using a specific entry, (2) by the number of

search arguments conducted by the participants (a "search argument" is the participant's effort at searching for an answer to the search problem from the opening of the catalog drawer until it is closed), and (3) by the time required for each search problem. The success or failure of a search argument was understood as due to the complexity created in the catalog by the corporate headings with form subheadings or the lack of complexity by an entry without a form subheading.

This study used three rates in measuring the complexity of the search problems: (1) the Time Rate (TR): a record of the minutes and seconds used by the participants to answer a search problem; (2) the Search Rate (SeR): a record of the number of search arguments used by the participants to answer a search problem; and (3) The Success Rate (SR): a record of the success or failure of the participants in locating the answer to the search problems. The success rate was considered as the most important of the three rates in the scoring of results of the search problem.

VI. Research Methodology: Posttest Only Control Group Design

The Posttest Only Control Group Design is called a "quasi-experimental design" because it does not have a "control group" in the usual sense. This design is the equal of the fifth and sixth cells of the Solomon Six Cell Design. The strength of the Posttest Only Control Group Design is that both groups are chosen at random. It calls for maximum similarity between the experimental setting and the natural setting to insure internal validity,

and equity of population sampling to insure generalizability.

The Posttest Only Control Group Design eliminates pretesting, places few demands upon the participants, avoids a reactive effect to the testing by oversensitizing the participants, insures representative sampling from the sample population, and avoids the difficulty of equation through matching. It insures precision in the manipulation of the independent variable.

Variables being Measured. The independent variable tested was the corporate heading with form subheading. The dependent variable tested in this study was the "complexity" in the catalog file due to the presence or absence of corporate headings with form subheadings. The "complexity" or dependent variable was measured by three rates: the success rate, the search rate, and the time rate.

Each participant received a set of search problems. The fifteen search problems were composed of three author (personal) entries, two title entries, two subject entries, five corporate headings without form subheadings, and three corporate headings with form subheadings. Each participant's efforts were measured by his/her success with each search problem, the number of search arguments each search problem required, and the amount of time each search problem required. The success rate, the search rate and the time rate for each search problem were recorded for each participant. When all participants had completed the test, each type of search problem's success rate, search rate, and time rate was com-

pared with those for other types of entries in order to accept or reject the hypothesis.

VII. Design of Instruments Used to Collect Data

The sites for the test were two theological schools. The schools had libraries of similar size, one with a dictionary catalog and the other with a divided catalog. An obtrusive catalog use study was used; the strength of such a study is that the investigator is able to observe the participants more closely and record the data more easily. A further strength of the obtrusive study is that the investigator can control the types of entries and sections of the library catalog which are being studied.

Design of the Search Problems. The investigator chose to use entries that were in both library catalogs prior to the study. Three principles guided in the designing of the search problems. First, the search problems were to be representative or typical of the types of citations the ordinary graduate student in theology brings to a catalog. Second, entries were to be representative of as many sections of the library catalog as possible. Third, the complexity of the corporate heading with form subheadings was to be tested without sensitizing the participants to the particular type of entry being tested.

The investigator decided that a purposive sample was necessary to obtain a representative sampling of corporate headings with form subheadings in each of the catalogs.

Instruments to Measure Complexity. Of the three rates used in this study to measure the complexity

of the search problems, the Time Rate (TR), the Search Rate (SeR), and the Success Rate (SR), the Success Rate was the most important. It has several facets: 1. Success (Specified), 2. Success (Unspecified), 3. Mistake, 4. Incomplete, and 5. Skips. Regarding the Search Rate, this study allowed ten search arguments per problem. If a participant did not identify the correct answer by the tenth search that problem was discontinued and the participant continued with the next search problem. Regarding the Time Rate, no time limit was imposed upon the participants for a particular search problem, but a total of fifty minutes was allotted to answer the fifteen search problems.

Once the fifteen search problems and a method to evaluate them were designed, other instruments were developed to insure the collection of accurate and relevant data. First, a 3" x 5" card was prepared for each of the search problems, which contained relevant information for conducting that search; a place also was designated on the card for the answer (the call number) to be recorded. Second, a questionnaire to be self-administered was designed to gather demographic information about the participants. Third, a form was designed for the investigator to use in scoring the results of each participant's investigation. Finally, a set of instructions was drawn up to insure equal information to each participant.

A pretest involving five participants was conducted to test the search problems, to determine the time length of the test, to clarify the language or instructions, and to observe patterns of usage.

In general, the purpose of the pretest was to verify the methodology and to anticipate possible difficulties.

After the pretest was conducted and necessary changes were made, sixty students were selected at random from two theological schools of similar size, thirty from School 1 and thirty from School 2. Pearson's Product Moment Coefficient was used to test and identify the significant differences between the two groups. Correlations with significance levels of .05 or less were considered indicative of correlations that were important for their influence on the success or failure of the two groups. Eight correlations were indicated as being significant.

- (1) Fourteen (23.3%) participants in this test were women, of whom eleven (78.5%) were enrolled in School 2, three (21.4%) were in School 1.
- (2) Thirty (50%) participants used the library catalog eleven or more times a quarter. Twenty (66%) of these participants were in School 2.
- (3) Four (6.7%) participants with public library work experience used the library catalog eleven or more times a quarter.
- (4) Forty-three (71.1%) participants had received instruction in the use of the library catalog: twenty-six (60.5%) of these were in School 1 and seventeen (39.5%) were in School 2. Of these forty-three, twenty-three (53%) in School 1 and thirteen (30%) in School 2 had received general instruction, while
- (5) twenty participants (46.5%, or 33.3% of the entire group) had library work experience; eight (40%) of these had worked in a special library.
- (6) Library work experience and entries used in the library catalog were shown to be related: four

(57%) out of seven participants who had college library work experience, and four (80%) out of five who had public library work experience used subject heading entries in the library catalog. (7) Duties performed in library work experience influenced choice of entries. Sixteen participants with library work experience in circulation, processing materials, and shelving used subject heading entries, but five participants with library work experience in filing used title entries. (8) Two participants (3.3% in School 1 were in a joint master's program.

The *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS)*²¹ was selected to analyze the data. The following tests of descriptive statistics were used: Pearson's Product Moment Coefficient, Chi Square, Cramer's V, Kendell's Tau b, and Bonferroni's Method.

VIII. The Fifteen Search Problems by the Three Rates

Table 1 is provided to help summarize and analyze the test exercise by the three rates. The Success Rate is subdivided as: SR #1, the participant selected the correct answer using the specified entry; SR #2, the participant selected the correct answer using an unspecified entry; SR #3, the participant selected an incorrect answer; SR #4, the participant began but did not finish selecting an answer; and SR #5, the participant did not attempt to answer the search problem. The Search Rate is subdivided as: SeR #1, the number of search arguments required when the participant selected the correct answer using the specified entry; SeR #2, the number of search arguments required when the participant selected the correct answer using an unspecified entry; SeR #3, the number of search

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF THE THREE RATES

| | School 1 | School 2 | Total | Percent |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Success Rate | | | | |
| SR #1 | 101 | 95 | 196 | 21.7 |
| SR #2 | 58 | 98 | 156 | 17.3 |
| SR #3 | 30 | 18 | 48 | 6.0 |
| SR #4 | 142 | 175 | 317 | 35.2 |
| SR #5 | <u>114</u> | <u>69</u> | <u>183</u> | 20.3 |
| Total | 445 | 455 | 900 | |
| Search Rate | | | | |
| SeR #1 | 118 | 132 | 250 | 18.4 |
| SeR #2 | 123 | 171 | 294 | 16.9 |
| SeR #3 | 88 | 42 | 130 | 8.3 |
| SeR #4 | <u>526</u> | <u>466</u> | <u>992</u> | 57.1 |
| Total | 925 | 811 | 1,666 | |
| Time Rate | | | Library 1 | Library 2 |
| Time by school | | | 1,413'25" | 1,172'00" |
| Total Time | | | 2,585'25" | |
| Average time per participant | | | 43'05" | |
| Average time per participant per problem | | | 2'52" | |

arguments required when the participant selected an incorrect answer; and SeR #4, the number of search arguments required when the participant began but did not finish selecting an answer. The Time Rate (TR) is divided into the amount of time required by the participants from each school, the total amount of time required by all participants, the average time required by each participant for all fifteen search problems, and the average time required for each search problem. Table 1 shows that thirty-nine percent of the search arguments conducted by the participants resulted in correct answers. This resulted from adding the results of the SR #1 (21.7%), in which the participants located the correct answer using a specified entry,

and SR #2 (17.3%), in which the participants located the correct answer using an unspecified entry. Unexpectedly, thirty-five percent of the search problems were begun but not answered (SR #4), and twenty percent were not even begun (SR #5). Not so surprising because of the difficulty of these problems, six percent of the search problems resulted in incorrect answers (SR #3).

Closely related to the results of the Success Rate was the Search Rate. Table 1 shows that thirty-five percent of the search arguments conducted by the participants resulted in correct answers. This resulted by adding SeR #1 (18.4%) and SeR #2 (16.9%). Unexpectedly, fifty-seven percent of the search arguments were begun but not finished (SeR #4). Only eight percent of the search arguments resulted in incorrect answers (SeR #3). Finally, Table 1 shows that the participants used as a mean time 43'05" for the fifteen search problems, and 2'52" per search problem.

The high failure rates in this study are explained when the search problems are studied by the five types of entries: the author (personal) entry, the title heading entry, the subject heading entry, the corporate heading entry with form subheading, and the corporate heading entry without form subheading. Table 2 shows summaries of the Success Rate, the Search Rate and the Time Rate of the fifteen search problems by the five types of groupings. Participants required more time, an average per person of 5'25" (34.9%) per entry, more searches, a total of 179.0 (32.6%) for the whole group, and experienced the least success, only 2.6 (4.4%) successes per

TABLE 2

THE THREE RATES BY TYPES OF ENTRIES

| | School 1 | School 2 | Total ²² | Average ²³ | Percent ²⁴ |
|---|----------|----------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Success Rate #1 | | | | | |
| Author (personal) heading entries | 51 | 44 | 95 | 31.6 | 52.7 |
| Title heading entries | 25 | 36 | 61 | 30.5 | 50.8 |
| Subject heading entries | 10 | 1 | 11 | 5.5 | 9.2 |
| Corporate headings without f/s | 10 | 11 | 21 | 4.2 | 7.0 |
| Corporate headings with f/s | 5 | 3 | 8 | 2.6 | 4.4 |
| Search Rate #1 | | | | | |
| Author (personal) heading entries | 137 | 137 | 274 | 91.3 | 16.6 |
| Title heading entries | 27 | 48 | 75 | 37.3 | 6.8 |
| Subject heading entries | 146 | 89 | 235 | 117.5 | 21.4 |
| Corporate headings without f/s | 314 | 301 | 615 | 123.5 | 22.5 |
| Corporate headings with f/s | 301 | 236 | 537 | 179.0 | 32.6 |
| Time Rate #1 (average per participant) | | | | | |
| Author (personal) heading entries | | | 6'25" | 2'08" | 13.7 |
| Title heading entries | | | 1'26" | 0'42" | 4.5 |
| Subject heading entries | | | 7'06" | 3'33" | 22.9 |
| Corporate headings without f/s | | | 18'35" | 3'43" | 24.0 |
| Corporate headings with f/s | | | 16'17" | 5'25" | 34.9 |

problem within the entire group, with search problems which were corporate headings with form subheadings. Further analysis beyond that shown in Table 2 points up the difficulties participants experienced, which confirms the hypothesis of this study, in that par-

ticipants began but failed to complete answering (SR #4) search problems consisting of corporate headings with form subheadings sixty percent of the time. This was more frequent than the average for subject heading entries (39.3%), corporate headings with form subheadings (29.7%), author (personal) heading entries (29.4%), and title heading entries (1.7%).

Although as a type of entry, corporate headings with form subheadings proved to be the most difficult for the participants, particular search problems which were not corporate headings with form subheadings also caused difficulties. The one problem that proved to be the most difficult for the participants was Search Problem 7: Catholic Church. Pope, 1939-1958 (Pius XII). Only one participant (1.7%) located this corporate heading using the proper entry. The reason for this difficulty is that this particular entry uses an office or position to identify a person in a position of authority, which like the use of a form subheading is also a departure from an author-title approach to an entry. Thirty participants (50%) began but did not finish locating an answer to this search problem. A second problem that caused difficulty for the participants was Search Problem 3: Paris. Saint Severin. Only three participants (5%) located the correct answer using the specified entry for this search problem. This high level of failure supports the decision of the Descriptive Cataloging Committee of the American Library Association and the Committee on Revision of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* of the Canadian Library

Association²⁵ to delete rules 98 and 99.²⁶

Although specific search problems provided difficulties for the sixty participants, of the types studied, those problems involving a corporate heading with form subheading proved to be the most difficult. This type of entry required more time, more searches, and resulted in the highest level of search failure (95.6%). Therefore the hypothesis of this study is accepted, that the less form subheadings are used with corporate entries, the more successful participants will be in locating materials in the library catalog, because the complexity of the catalog is reduced.

IX. Sources of Difficulty

During the data collection process, it was observed that certain factors were sources of failure for the participants in locating answers to the search problems. These sources of difficulty were both internal and external to the library catalog.

Briefly, six factors internal to the library catalog were sources of failure. These were, first, the physical condition of the library catalog. The differing weights of the card stock caused the cards to stick together and prevented the participants from locating the correct answer. Second, participants failed to locate the correct answer because they stayed with the author-title catalog and failed to consult the subject catalog. Third, total dependence on guide cards resulted in search failures for some. These participants were under the impression that all cards filed after the catalog guide card had identical headings; they were unaware of there being further breakdown and different

headings after the initial card. Fourth, although participants located the correct cross references that directed them to several other entries, including the correct answer with the specific entries, they used only one referral point for access, while the one physical catalog record offered several more referrals. When the first referral record failed to yield the correct answer, they did not go back to the subsequent referrals on the cross reference record. Fifth, lack of cross references and word variants to help direct the participants to correct entries was a source of failure. Sixth, long unbroken files of entries, e.g. "Bible" and "Catholic Church," discouraged and influenced the participants to discontinue their searching after having conducted several search arguments.

Two factors external to the catalog that contributed to the difficulties participants had in this test were their personal backgrounds and certain types of entries absent from the catalog. First, eleven of the sixty participants, not raised and educated in the United States, did not find the rules and structure of the library catalogs immediately obvious. Such rules and practices as cross references, ignoring initial articles, and spelling out of M, Mc, initials, and abbreviations, were sources of continual difficulty. Second, the absence of certain types of entries in the library catalog, i.e., non-standard entries such as commercial publishers and forms of materials (e.g. Bulls, Devotional Calendars, Documents, Encyclicals, Laws, Letters, etc.) were also a source of failure

in the searching process for some participants.

X. Future Research

Several areas for future research that this study suggests are:

1. The question of the point at which library instruction is to be provided to library patrons and what that instruction should include.

2. The justification for the use of corporate entries with and without form subheadings.

3. The designing and revision of catalog codes.

4. The use and non-use of title entries by Library of Congress copy.

5. The importance of non-standard information, as well as the importance of cross references.

6. The physical characteristics of both the library catalog and the elements contained in the retrieval instrument, whether it be a card, a book, or an on-line catalog.

7. Further analysis of the graduate student as a patron.

8. The function of the library catalog in the academic and special library.

NOTES

1. Charles A. Cutter, "New Catalog of Harvard College Library," *North American Review* 108 (January 1869): 129.
2. Idem, *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1889), p. 12.
3. Michael Gorman, *A Study of the Rules for Entry and Heading in the AACR, 1967* (London: Library Association, 1968), pp. 66-67.
4. Bernard R. Berelson, *The Library's Public* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), p. 86.

5. William C. Haygood, *Who Uses the Public Library?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938), pp. 70-73.
6. Paul Chervenie, "Library Catalogs in the American Academic Libraries," *Drexel Library Quarterly* 7 (January 1971): 56-57.
7. John C. Rather, "Filing Arrangement in the Library of Congress Catalogs," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 16 (Spring 1972): 242-243.
8. *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*. Prepared by the American Library Association, the Library of Congress, the Library Association and the Canadian Library Association. North American Text with Supplements of additions and changes (Chicago: American Library Association, 1967), p. 344.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 332.
10. *Ibid.*
11. Eva Verona, *Corporate Headings: Their Use in Library Catalogues and National Bibliographies; a Comparative and Critical Study* (London: International Federation of Library Associations, 1975).
12. Julia Pettee, "The Development of Authorship Entry," *Library Quarterly* 6 (July 1936): 270-290.
13. Verona, "Historical Approach to Corporate Entries," *Libri* 7 (January 1956): 1-40.
14. Henry J. Dubester, "Studies Related to Catalog Problems," *Library Quarterly* 34 (January 1964): 97-105.
15. Cutter, *Dictionary Catalog*.
16. Carl Dziatzko, *Instruction für die Ordnung der Titel im alphabetischen Zettelkatalog der Königlichen und Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Breslau* (Berlin: Asher, 1886).
17. Phyllis Allen Richmond, "Research Possibilities in the Machine-Readable Catalog: Use of the Catalog to Study Itself," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 2 (November 1976): 224-229.
18. Margaret C. Brown, "The Graduate Student's Use of the Subject Catalog," *College and Research Libraries* 8 (July 1947): 203.

19. Mortimer Taube, "The Cataloging of Publications of Corporate Authors," *Library Quarterly* 20 (January 1950): 1-20.
20. Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley, *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research* (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1973), pp. 25-27.
21. Norman Nie et al., *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS)*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975).
22. The figures in this column under Success Rate #1 represent the total number of successes experienced with each type of entry listed; under Search Rate #1, the total number of searches made with each type of entry; under Time Rate #1, the total time expended with each type of entry, averaged per participant.
23. The figures in this column are the result of dividing each total by the number of search problems of each type (3 author [personal], 2 title, 2 subject, 5 corporate without f/s, 3 corporate with f/s), to give an average per problem.
24. The percentages in this column under Success Rate #1 represent the average number of successes per problem experienced with each type of entry ("average" column) divided by the number of participants (60); the percentages under Search Rate #1 and Time Rate #1 represent the average for each type of entry divided by the total. Thus under Search Rate #1, 16.6% of the total searches were made on author (personal) heading entries; under Time Rate #1, 13.7% of the total time expended was on such entries.
25. Library of Congress. *Cataloging Service Bulletin* 104 (May 1972): 4.
26. *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*, pp. 97-99.

CONTRIBUTORS

Lowell C. Albee, Jr. is Director of the Library of the Lutheran School of Theology and Coordinator of Reader Services, the Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library, Chicago, Illinois.

Ans J. van der Bent is Librarian of the World Council of Churches, Geneva, Switzerland.

Peter De Klerk is Theological Librarian, Head of the Theological Division of the Library, and Curator of the H. Henry Meeter Calvinism Research Collection, Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Richard W. Dorn is Director of the firm of Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, German Federal Republic.

Maria Grossmann is Librarian of the Andover-Harvard Theological Library and Member of the Faculty of Divinity, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

G. Fay Dickerson is Editor of *Religion Index*, published in Chicago by the American Theological Library Association.

Earle Hilgert is Professor of Bibliography and Biblical Studies, McCormick Theological Seminary, and Coordinator of Collection Development, the Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library, Chicago, Illinois.

Elvire Roth Hilgert is Librarian of McCormick Theological Seminary and Coordinator of Technical Services, the Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library, Chicago, Illinois.

Doralyn J. Hickey is Professor of Library and Information Science, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas.

Edgar Krentz is Professor of Exegetical Theology (New Testament), Dean of Graduate Studies, and Consultant to the Library, Christ Seminary--Seminex, St. Louis, Missouri.

Kenneth O'Malley, C.P., is Director of the Library, Catholic Theological Union, Chicago, Illinois.

Stephen L. Peterson is Librarian of the Divinity School, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

Jack L. Stotts is President and Professor of Christian Ethics, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.

John B. Trotti is Librarian and Henry Muller Brimm Associate Professor of Bibliography, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia.

Louis Charles Willard is James Lennox Librarian, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.