

Subject clusters : synonymous terms in Library of Congress Theological Subject Headings

Philip Harvey

Certain subjects have a choice of headings, all of them close in meaning and each seemingly valid. Here are twelve such 'clusters' with relevant distinctions that might be useful for these headings.

(1) Spiritual life / Religious life / Christian life / Religious experience / Spirituality / Spiritual direction / Spiritual formation / Religion / Mysticism

Unquestionably one of the commonest headings in theological library catalogues is 'Christian life'. It is the fallback for every general guide to ethics, conduct of life, spiritual life and so forth. 'Christian life' can cover everything from extreme asceticism to aggressive discipling. It is often the alternative when 'Christianity' gives too much the sense of the big picture, but it can also be the easy way out of defining a particular form of piety or devotion. Its value resides nowadays mainly in the fact it can be subdivided by author under denomination. As a practical access point it lost its effect long ago. Sometimes we are caught between this heading and 'Religious life', a heading that can cover anything under the sun so long as it's defined as religious, and that is sometimes used interchangeably and indiscriminately with the heading 'Religion'. In fact 'Religious life' is meant to be used in the narrow sense of "works descriptive of, or seeking to foster, personal religious and devotional life",¹ which is not how it is used in many cases. Very often the heading 'Religion' is used precisely to describe works in that narrow sense. This can touch on the thing known as religious experience, for which no adequate heading exists. All these headings are used at times to talk about religious experience and in part because 'Experience (Religion)' is a heading narrowly concerned with religious psychology rather than any of the broader forms of experience that are called religious.

Inevitably in this discussion we stumble across that grand indefinable term 'Spirituality'. 'Christian life' is frequently used as a synonym for 'Spirituality', 'Spiritual life', and all things spiritual, but all too often this is an escape from applying a specific heading. It has to be granted, the language of the clouds of unknowing is ineffable, mystical and special; it does not always lend itself to a hard noun like a subject heading. However, 'Spirituality' and its associates do have definite usages and we are asked to keep to them. 'Spirituality' is used for works that "describe the proper relationship to God or present a history of it within a particular Christian denomination." We take the lead from the words on the book in this case; if the word 'spirituality' is used prominently then we trust that is what the author means. This can sound like a tentative way of going about things, but the risk is that the word itself today is so overused and abused it has come to have both precise religious meanings and very warm and fuzzy meanings. 'Spiritual life' is subtly distinct from 'Spirituality'.

In this case we use the heading "for works recommending religious practices by which individuals may attain the proper relationship to God or may attain their religious objectives." It is for books that show how to live spiritually, rather than what spirituality is as defined. The heading covers

material that is directional or that is exemplary of the spiritual life. This has to be distinguished further by 'Spiritual formation' ("...works on the development of spiritual disciplines and spiritual growth.") and 'Spiritual direction', a heading with a special meaning within church orders in particular, where direction in the spiritual life is in fact understood to be direction in life generally speaking. An awareness of these minor differences of usage in certain contexts does help, but we can be forgiven on occasion for thinking that they all mean the same thing. In this whole discussion we have to keep in mind that term from another era, 'Mysticism'. We are assured that most mystics would not have known they were being mystical at all, rather espousing a practice of spiritual life or recording the same. Quite often works on mysticism overlap with this more popular word 'spirituality' and it is up to us to make the fine distinctions.

(2) Judaism / Jews / Jewish...

One definition of 'Jew' is: "A Jew is anyone whose mother is a Jew." An interesting definition in light of their patriarchal past. Dictionaries will say a Jew is anyone descended from the Hebrews. What we all know is that being Jewish doesn't necessarily have to mean following the religion of Judaism.

There are also those who convert to Judaism who were never Jews and we have the reality of Jews who convert to other faiths. This is an issue in subject cataloguing because the heading 'Jews' and its subheadings are often used interchangeably, and without apparent consideration, with the heading 'Judaism'. This is especially so with 'Jews - History', which is used frequently to mean much the same thing as 'Judaism - History'. 'Jews - History' in the pre-Christian period has come to cover what we call Old Testament history, again with the same broad brush. The two headings 'Bible - History of biblical events' and 'Bible - History of contemporary events' are so specific in scope no-one would dream of them as synonymous with 'Jews - History.' Attempts at using that Roman toponym 'Palestine - [...]' are fated to be inadequate. Because of this broad definitional usage of 'Jews' and the lack of alternatives for Bible history, we are left with no choice but to use the heading, always with an awareness of possible extra headings in the back of our minds.

It is apparent that 'Judaism' is used to mean the religion, the counterpart to 'Christianity', 'Islam', and so on. However, with a huge bulk of our material the race and the religion can mean two divergent things, not always synonymous at all. The same goes with the adjective 'Jewish' wherever it is used in subject headings. When we talk about Jewish law or Jewish literature we can be referring to a great host of things not directly connected at all with the Bible or the ancient Jewish peoples. Many subheadings under 'Jews' are religious, nevertheless, just as many headings containing 'Jewish' refer to the religion, amongst other things. A sensitivity to distinctions and accurate usage is asked for in this area because LC is not forthcoming on definitions of terms and does leave open the use of these headings for religious and theological purposes and for other purposes.

(3) Lord's Supper / Mass / Last Supper / Communion (Sacrament)

The singular event described in the Gospels as the 'Last Supper' takes that name in LC headings. As we know, this is the institution of what is called, so as to distinguish it from that first meal, the 'Lord's Supper.' Works about the final meal of Christ with his Apostles take 'Last Supper'; all works that talk about the sacrament take 'Lord's Supper.' 'Lord's Supper' is itself an ecumenical solution to a central fact of Christianity that is doctrine, practice, and form of reflection in its own right across all denominations.

There is not one denomination that remains neutral on the meaning of what happened in the Upper

Room. Hence terms that certain churches use as their standard synonym for the sacrament are expressly not used in LC: 'Cenacolo', 'Communion', 'Eucharist', 'Holy Communion' and 'Sacrament of the Altar.' See References become the solution each one of us falls back on in giving access to a term used by none of the mainstream churches for their central act of worship. Such are the backgrounds of our users, it is wise to encourage as many See References as relevant in this case. One noticeable Catholic breakthrough is the use of 'Mass', seen as distinctively different in kind from the broad 'Lord's Supper - Catholic Church' to warrant entry. As LC does not grace us with a definition of 'Mass' I will offer my own. 'Mass' covers those works that deal with the service of both Word and Sacrament within the Catholic family of rites found in the missal and which include the Kyrie, Gloria, Sanctus and so on, as well as the communion itself. 'Mass (Music)' is used for settings of these parts of the service. LC has difficulty distinguishing the historical from the mythical, the doctrine from the worship. Cataloguers become liturgists when determining which of the subheadings under 'Lord's Supper' are strictly doctrinal from those to do with worship and practice. This is further complicated by 'Lord's Supper (Liturgy)'. Sensitivity to the background of the author is vital in the case of 'Lord's Supper'. Historical and contemporary disputes generate their own controversial versions of meaning for which cataloguers must try to blunder through with the terms at hand.

(4) Church work with youth / Church work with young adults / Church work with teenagers / Church group work with youth

In LC the heading 'Children' is used for "people from birth through twelve years of age." Teenage defines itself. The heading 'Youth' is for works "on the time of life between thirteen and twenty-five, as well as on people in this general age range, including teenagers and young adults." 'Young adults' are those between eighteen and twenty-five. Adults are not defined by age in LC, nor is middle age. This leaves us with a complex range of judgements and decisions: when is a child also a teenager? is a teenager simply a youth? When can youths be described as young adults? The literature often makes no distinction between ages even though it is obvious we are talking about distinct age groups that are not adult. The terminology can be as blurry to the user as to the cataloguer, yet simple inclusion of one term (youth, say) and not another (teenager) can be critical in a search. Cataloguers are not oversensitive to this predicament and are wont to take one heading for an age group and be done with it. The various headings for 'Church work with...' youth, teenagers and so forth can be variously interpreted by a user; very often the literature is talking about all the groups at once. We find that cataloguers sometimes fall back on keywords, 'teenager' or 'youth' in particular, without caring to look further at the text. Perhaps one observation can be made. In the catalogue at the Joint Theological Library the term 'youth' is clearly more popular than the others, being used to cover age brackets that cannot be contained by the language of a system. The same is the case for these age groups as main headings, so in creating See References I would encourage scope notes wherever possible and definitely See References to any broader, narrower or similar term with 'youth'.

(5) Aged / Aging / Middle aged / Church work with the aged

The fact that subject headings are devised by adults perhaps helps explain how everyone under twenty-five can be compartmentalised while there are no defining limits for 'Middle aged' or the 'Aged'. Adulthood remains free of age boundaries. The heading 'Aging' is remarkably loaded with personal judgements of the cataloguer, where it can mean anything

from change of lifestyle through to the final stages of senescence. A normal definition of middle age, "it's all in how you feel", is not a final test in the world of scientific definition for subject headings. It is observable again how often the cataloguer takes the cue from the author, so that use of 'middle age' or 'aged' in title or contents is the one certitude. 'Church work with the middle aged' is not an LC heading while we do have 'Church work with the aged,' the implication here being that the aged we are talking about are the ones who need help. 'Church work...' is a prefix for those in need, something that raises questions about the neutrality of the cataloguing terms. The very uncertainty in LC about what it means to grow old - who, when and how - requires the cataloguer to be extra attentive to how these terms are used for the work in hand. We must be careful here to recognise what the author means by these terms and what the user of our catalogue will be looking for. This imperative is especially important in the current environment of pre-publication information that has not been drawn from seeing the text itself and is reliant on main terms that are value-laden.

(6) [] in the Bible / [] - Biblical teaching

We are enjoined by the Subject cataloging manual to treat topics in the Bible thus: "Establish and assign headings of the type '[topic] in the Bible' for works containing discussions of a particular subject in the Bible and/or lists of Bible verses in which a specific subject is mentioned, for example, 'Colors in the Bible'."² This is a highly circumscribed textual range, the words of the Bible and no terms outside the Bible. It assumes that the cataloguer works with terms of a recognised specificity that are named or can be identified in the text itself, and by and large this is kept to. Common sense is abandoned though when interpreting what is meant by the subdivision '-Biblical teaching'. Almost anything new under the sun can have a biblical teaching applied to it, if current practice is to be believed. Inventions, terms and standards of very recent vintage are given this subdivision, even though they would have been impossible dreams for the conveyors of Scripture itself. We are directed to "assign the free-floating subdivision '-Biblical teaching' under religious or secular topics for works on the theological and/or ethical teachings of the Bible, or its individual parts, on that subject, for example, 'Family - Biblical teaching'; 'Salvation - Biblical teaching'."³ Division of opinion begins when the question is asked, does this mean any topic interpreted with the use of the Bible can take the subdivision? If the Bible is used in discussion of some newfangled term, say 'Deconstruction', the loose use of the subdivision would seem to be acceptable, while the tight use would exclude it as a matter of principle. It becomes simply a matter of preference whether we interpret 'teachings' in this instruction to mean what the Bible teaches in the traditional sense, or to mean any interpretation of anything whatsoever that involves use of the Bible. Appeals to common sense are not always heeded in this case because there is no ready alternative other than '-Religious aspects', a subdivision that does not instantly remind the user of '-Biblical teaching'.

(7) Clergy - Counselling of / Clergy - Malpractice / Clergy - Professional ethics

Pastoral counselling is done by clergy and laity, but the literature is by and large directed for the use of the clergy. When it is the clergy who need counselling, something that we all know about, the heading is 'Clergy - Counseling of,' one ell or two? - but that is another discussion. Subdivisions under 'Clergy' refer back to the clergy themselves, so '-Malpractice' and '- Professional ethics' are self-evidently for works that deal with such questions when they affect a clergy person, not when they deal with how the clergy person addresses someone else's malpractice or professional ethics, or lack of them. Particular ethical questions that affect clergy require a heading

for the question and do not take the subdivision '-Clergy' which is used under names of denominations, though sometimes with further special subdivision, e.g. 'Catholic Church - Clergy - Sexual behaviour.'

(8) Evangelistic work / Evangelicalism

There is no subject heading for 'Evangelism,' instead a See Reference to 'Evangelistic work'. This heading, 'Evangelistic work,' covers every form of religious behaviour that could remotely be called evangelistic work: conversion, revivals, church growth, evangelism. It comes close to usurping 'Practical theology' in the range of its claimed activities. All the same, it is a heading meant to extend over all denominational divides and is understood to be active by definition. Some cataloguers fall into the trap, however, of thinking it synonymous with or a natural partner to 'Evangelicalism'. For all its manifestations, the movement known as Evangelicalism is used very precisely in LC, even though no definition is supplied. This is apparent by looking at the subheadings for 'Evangelicalism,' the majority being a list of the Protestant denominations. Two somewhat telling strings are 'Evangelicalism - Relations - Catholic Church' and 'Evangelicalism - Relations - Judaism,' the implication being that the latter are not to be confused with Evangelicalism in any way. After the Reformation the term 'Evangelical' was applied to the Protestant churches due to their emphasis on Gospel teaching. Since the 19th century the term has come to mean different things in different churches. In Germany and Switzerland the word means Lutheran, as distinct from Calvinist Reformed. In the Anglican Church it means strong emphasis on the sole authority of Scripture and a resistance to doctrines like Eucharistic sacrifice as emphasised within the Anglo-Catholic tradition. Other Protestant denominations have their own forms of this movement, which is an -ism. In other words, it is definable across churches as a recognisable type, even if the Evangelicals don't all agree with one another. As a coda to all of this old news, it is worth keeping in mind that the heading 'Evangelists' is used for modern revivalists and their kind, while the original Apostles, writers of the Gospels (i.e. the big four), and people called 'proclaimer' in the New Testament take the heading 'Evangelists (Bible)'.

(9) Medical ethics / Bioethics / Religion and medicine / Medicine – Religious aspects

Two headings that give us headaches are 'Medical ethics' and 'Bioethics.' 'Bioethics' is the broader term and has come to mean any ethical discussion of biology and the life sciences. This is why it is used in such profusion for collections of essays and studies of issues to do with medicine, simply because its coverage is wider. Too often in our catalogues though the terms have come to overlap completely. Unless you are an ethicist 'Bioethics' is probably a term you wouldn't use often, while 'Medical ethics' expresses itself very neatly. Cataloguers also have to consider the multiplicity of subjects that fall under these two huge areas of human discussion, deciding when the work is predominantly and mainly about the genome, IVF or euthanasia, and when it is too complex or various to rely on specific headings. Quite often we are left all the same with the familiar two headings. Hence our over-familiarity with 'Bioethics'. 'Religion and medicine' is not a heading, rather we have that LC solution to everything 'Medicine - Religious aspects,' a heading that broadens the possibilities enormously. It hardly needs explaining that 'Religion and medicine' is not the same thing as 'Medicine - Religious aspects,' how the latter necessarily excludes a vast range of literature in religious studies where it is the religious nature of the subject that is of prime importance, not its medical nature. The two can be one, especially when religion is defined as medicine

and the two are not separable. In many cultures, including Christian ones, religion is medicine, being health of body and soul. Be that as it may, 'Medicine - Religious aspects' is sometimes the only resort for works that discuss bioethical and medical issues from a religious moral point of view. It again presumes a great deal of the user, who can be forgiven for not expecting such discussions to be listed under that heading. The need is then vital for additional headings that do mention the ethics in the work.

(10) Women in Christianity / Feminist theology / Church work with women / Woman (Theology)

The massive output of works on 'Feminist theology' and its counterpart 'Women in Christianity,' has led to an overuse of these and other headings that at times is simply expedient if not actually random. As guidelines are not given for this bunch of headings the following scope definitions are offered as a user's guide. 'Women in Christianity' is an historical, biographical and general heading for works about any women identified as being Christian. It can be subdivided geographically. It is immensely popular, probably because of its very generality. It might or might not include works of overt feminist discourse. It may include women who appear in the Bible and women you meet in the supermarket aisle. It is not meant to be confused with 'Women in church work' but very often is. This second heading is of a type. It covers works on women who are active in the church, whether lay or clergy. There is an implied social involvement here, a description of roles, and a pastoral sense. It must not be confused with 'Church work with women,' a heading that like others of its type means that we are talking here of women as the receivers, rather than the givers, of pastoral care and attention.

'Feminist theology' enjoys the same breadth of treatment as 'Liberation theology' and other theologies, the boundaries extending far beyond the subject as strictly defined. The tendency to use the heading to say what the work is, rather than what it is about, has become as common as the same fault in the use of 'Theology, Doctrinal' and 'Catholic Church - Doctrines.' The scope note itself states: "Here are entered works on the feminist critique of traditional Christian theology and on the construction of an alternative theology from a feminist perspective. Works on the relationship between feminism and Christianity are entered under Feminism - Religious aspects - Christianity." Other feminisms like Womanist theology and Ecofeminism have further enhanced the discourse and added to the alternatives to 'Feminist theology.' In all of this it is as well to remember that not all feminist works require 'Feminist theology,' that many are on subjects of greater specificity, and that the subject of women has broader coverage in addition to feminism.

Headings that always cause a great deal of heat are 'Man (Theology)' and 'Women (Theology)'. The new scope note clarifies the position for 'Man (Theology)' very well: "Here are entered works on the theology of humankind from the perspective of two or more of the world's religions. Works on the theology of humankind in a given religion are entered under Man (Christian theology), Man (Jewish theology), Man (Islam), Man (Hinduism), etc. Works on the Christian theology of the male sex are entered under "Men (Christian theology)." The paradigmatic Other in this discussion is presented in the following way. 'Woman (Christian theology)' has been cancelled, likewise 'Woman (Theology)'.⁴ It is a fair question if this is helping anyone in any way. Why remove headings that do have a purpose and fail to replace them satisfactorily? To believe the Update Bulletin, the heading we now use for

'Woman (Christian theology)' and 'Women (Theology)' is the vague coverall 'Women - Religious aspects' with all its dependant terms as appropriate, e.g. Christianity. This would seem a backward step by LC, quite frankly. It is not consistent with the model already invented for man/men and seems based on the premise that women should be treated differently. Feminist theology itself has obviously had some part to play in the decision. In all of this it is as well to remember we are children of our time. Discussion on women is generated in great part by feminists today, with the result that feminism itself has many definitions, not one, dealing as it does with all areas of women's lives and history. In this respect, the heading 'Feminist theology' is already limited and is expected to cover too much territory in one go.

(11) Islands of the Pacific / Oceania / Polynesia

One of the perennial wonders of LC is the geographic heading 'Oceania,' a place that sounds like it belongs in a novel by Ursula LeGuin rather than an atlas, let alone heard in general conversation. The exact boundaries of this mystical land have always escaped even the worthiest lexicographer, so it is a surprise to check the scope note: "Here are entered comprehensive works on the islands of the Pacific Ocean belonging to the island groups of Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia. Comprehensive works on all of the islands of the Pacific Ocean as well as works on the islands of the North Pacific are entered under Islands of the Pacific." Surprise, because cataloguers find this heading is often used to include large islands like Australia as well, without any additional heading for those places. Oceania is often used to mean Polynesia or one of the other island groups of the South Pacific, as though they meant the same thing. Usage is not restricted either to what the note calls "comprehensive works."

Intriguingly, 'Oceania' is not listed in the New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary. The Oxford English Dictionary states that Oceania was first coined by the French in 1812 and adopted only later into English. All usages in the OED are different, the most useful stating that Oceania divides itself into "Malaysia, Australasia, and Polynesia."⁵ In other words, not only is Oceania not recognised as a word in common English currency anywhere, its meaning in LC is unique to LC. This is a quandary. We are asked to use a term that no one uses or knows the meaning of, for a region that might or might not include the place we live in, depending on your point of view. If scope notes can be used in your catalogue then there is a need to make strenuous efforts to present this complexity in its entirety. If you find that the work before you is about islands of the Pacific and Australia or Antarctica or other land masses surrounded by water in the general vicinity, then you would be encouraged to add headings for those additional places. Subheadings for 'Oceania' ought to be tested very closely and more helpful alternatives considered wherever possible.

In light of this piece of Americana, it is worth concluding this consideration with the OED's final citation for Oceania (1860): "In Oceania it has been asserted that nearly every island or group of islands possesses a speech which barely offers any affinity with that of the neighbouring groups."⁶

(12) Jesus Christ - Disciples / Apostles / Jesus Christ - Friends and associates / Jesus Christ - Family / Jesus Christ - Adversaries / Jesus Christ - Brethren

Anyone with an interest in the figure of the historical Jesus Christ usually develops some interest in those people close to him. The literature about these figures is enormous and so are the choices of subject heading. Let's start with 'Jesus Christ - Family.' The direction for this free-floating subdivision states: "Use for discussions of the person's family or relations with family members. Also use for genealogical works. Assign an additional heading for the name of the family."⁷ We do not know Jesus' family name (did they have one?), but we do know he was the son of Joseph and of the line of David. So this subdivision is usable for the famous genealogical tables of Jesus, his parentage, and his relations with other members of the family (once we have determined who they might all be). On one occasion Hilda Rum-pole reminds us that this is no ordinary family. The subject heading 'Jesus Christ - Family' is used in our catalogue for diverse works on the meaning of this family for Western culture, its depiction by artists of all epochs, and even gets linked from time to time with 'Jesus Christ - Views on the family.'

There is not time here to discuss the tangled business of how many brothers and sisters Jesus might have had or if the words 'brother and sister' are used in a special sense in the New Testament, only to say we have to keep them in mind when deciding whether to use this heading or 'Jesus Christ - Brethren.' This latter heading should be taken with a grain of salt. Works on the brothers of Jesus continue to appear regularly, their function amongst other things to define what is meant by 'brother' in the New Testament, which itself is not completely definite, if at all. The people being discussed might have sibling relations with Jesus, or they may be fraternal in the sense covered by the heading 'Jesus Christ - Friends and associates.' Books in the catalogue at Joint Theological Library which take '-Friends and associates' seem to include everyone from John the Baptist to the chosen Twelve through to anybody he happened to encounter along the way who was in some way friendly. The instruction says: "Use for discussions of the person's close and immediate contacts, such as companions, co-workers,"⁸ which can be as broad or narrow as you like when interpreting the New Testament.

The subdivision's generalness becomes an advantage nevertheless when confronted with 'Jesus Christ - Disciples,' as 'Friends and associates' clearly defines anyone who came into close contact with Jesus in the biblical stories. The instruction for the subdivision '-Disciples' reads: "Use for works discussing persons who received instruction from the individual or accepted his doctrines or teachings and assisted in spreading or implementing them."⁹ Sounds simple, but of course in the context we are dealing with disciples take a capital D and are the *sine qua non*. To talk of disciples in the New Testament context is to talk in the first instance of the chosen Twelve, and in the second of any or all of those who chose to follow Jesus. Socrates, Thomas Aquinas, Mahatma Gandhi and Carl Jung had and have disciples, but everyone knows this is not the same thing. So we do in fact have a heading here open to misuse and misunderstanding.

The best advice would be to go softly with this heading, to consider the form of discourse and the identities of those followers of Jesus first before using the heading; alternatives are available that could give a more direct guide to who is being discussed. We have, for example, what many would regard as an exact synonym in the heading 'Apostles.' The inner circle of Disciples is normally what we mean by the Apostles, though tradition names a small coterie of extras with Apostle also: Paul, Matthias, Barnabas, Andronicus and Junius. People in the Acts could arguably all be Apostles once they are presented with the right credentials. As

there is no instruction for the subdivision '- Disciples' warning us against using it under 'Jesus Christ,' it must be assumed we have two virtually identical headings for the same subject. The subtle differences between the two are so subtle as to evaporate when it comes to applying them to a book about the chosen Twelve.

The last of these subdivisions for Jesus' contemporaries (there are probably others) is 'Jesus Christ - Adversaries.' One reading of the saying "My Kingdom is not of this world" would imply that everyone was an adversary of Jesus, however for the sake of specificity let me read the rule: "Use for discussions of contemporaries who opposed the person's point of view or work." This is a word with a strong meaning; its tone is one of direct opposition and confrontation. That is certainly how 'Adversaries' is used in everyday English. Perhaps this is why there are considerably less uses of this subdivision under 'Jesus Christ', but quite a few under the Apostle Paul and Martin Luther. Normally such works deal with the named disputants over the law, the so-called Pharisees being infamous in this regard, and it is headings like 'Pharisees' that take first precedence in this area. For all the reasons I have just given, it is not surprising that 'Jesus Christ - Contemporaries,' although valid, is rarely if ever used, being too general altogether.

Endnotes

1. All scope notes cited are taken from *Library of Congress subject headings*. 18th ed. Washington, D.C. : Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service, 1995.
2. *Subject cataloging manual: subject headings*. 5th ed. Washington, D.C. : Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service, 1996. H 1295, February 1998.
3. Ibid.
4. *Theology cataloging bulletin*. Evanston, IL. : American Theological Library Association. Vol. 8, no. 2, February 2000, p. 10.
5. *The Oxford English dictionary*. Volume 7, N-Poy. Oxford : Clarendon, 1933, p. 49.
6. Ibid.
7. For this and all subsequent scope notes, *Subject cataloging manual*. H 1110, August 1999.

Philip Harvey
Joint Theological Library
Parkville, Victoria

ANZTLA Chat Room

A note from Tony McCumstie :



The ANZTLA Chat Room still exists!
www.ctcmelb.vic.edu.au/mannix/pages.chat.html

Log on to this site, wait for the room to "load", then follow instructions to log in. Unless you want to be all alone and chatting quietly to yourself, it is advisable to arrange a specific time to "meet" someone in the room.