

**Pros/Cons of Proposed Bible. O.T. Models**  
rev. 5/24/06

Model	Pros	Cons	Other
<b>Current</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We're used to it</li> <li>• Any change to heading structure would require an extensive authority and bibliographic file maintenance effort</li> <li>• Note: Extent of maintenance work should not drive decision. RDA may require spelling-out of O.T./N.T. which would necessitate maintenance work anyway</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriateness of using "Old Testament" for Hebrew Bible</li> <li>• The term "Bible" refers to two different collections of texts sacred to two religious traditions, yet the heading "Bible," signifies the Christian Bible</li> <li>• Does not conform fully with requirement that the form of heading reflects reference sources related to the religious group to which the scripture belongs</li> <li>• Does not incorporate RDA's global perspective</li> <li>• Inappropriateness of using Jewish divisions/versions under "Bible. O.T.," e.g. Five Scrolls, JPS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption that Hebrew Bible and Old Testament are equivalent works</li> </ul>
<b>A</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addresses inappropriateness of using "Old Testament" for Hebrew Bible</li> <li>• Although "Hebrew Bible," is not the most common term in Christian usage, it is found in Christian and other scholarly literature</li> <li>• Could consider another term acceptable to all religious traditions, e.g., "Tanakh" on the basis of using heading in its original language; Tanakh is also found in English language sources</li> <li>• Doesn't disrupt form/application of headings for Christian Bible as a whole or for New Testament</li> <li>• Maintenance is relatively one-to-one (requires no human intervention to implement)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of parallelism of O.T. &amp; N.T. in referring to Christian canon</li> <li>• Inappropriateness of using Christian divisions/versions under "Hebrew Bible," e.g. Historical books, Authorized, Apocrypha</li> <li>• Does not address problem of using unqualified "Bible" to signify the Christian Bible</li> <li>• Possible replacement terms for O.T. have drawbacks, e.g., "Tanakh" not widely known outside Jewish community; "Hebrew Bible" may be mistakenly understood as the language of the text rather than its origin</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption that Hebrew Bible and Old Testament are equivalent works</li> </ul>
<b>B</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addresses inappropriateness of using "Old Testament" for Hebrew Bible (or equivalent term)</li> <li>• Provides greatest specificity of Bible terminology (term "Bible" is not ambiguous)</li> <li>• Maintenance is relatively one-to-one (requires no human intervention)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of parallelism of O.T. &amp; N.T. in referring to Christian canon</li> <li>• Inappropriateness of using Christian divisions/versions under "Bible (Jewish)" (or equivalent term)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption that Hebrew Bible and Old Testament are equivalent works</li> </ul>

<p><b>C</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addresses inappropriateness of using “Old Testament” for Hebrew Bible</li> <li>• Retains current indexing under “Bible”</li> <li>• Requires least maintenance of all models--is completely one-to-one (requires no human intervention)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treats Hebrew Bible as subordinate to Christian Bible</li> <li>• Does not address problem of using unqualified “Bible” to signify the Christian Bible</li> <li>• Inappropriateness of using Christian divisions/versions under “Hebrew Bible” (or equivalent term)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption that Hebrew Bible and Old Testament are equivalent works</li> </ul>
<p><b>D</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addresses inappropriateness of using “Old Testament” for Hebrew Bible</li> <li>• No bib maintenance for N.T.</li> <li>• Provides possibility of distinguishing between Jewish &amp; Christian canons</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determining canon may be difficult, especially in the case of comparative or scholarly works (and in particular, for subject heading assignment) in which the religious orientation is not obviously Jewish or Christian (Policy to double headings in case of doubt might be required)</li> <li>• Uses two headings (“Hebrew Bible” and “Bible. O.T.”) to signify texts currently treated as the same work (i.e., assumes they are different works on the basis of differences in content)</li> <li>• Does not address problem of using unqualified “Bible” to signify the Christian Bible</li> <li>• Maintenance is not one-to-one (requires human intervention)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption that Hebrew Bible and Old Testament are not equivalent works</li> <li>• Separate name authority records (NARs) required for each canon</li> </ul>
<p>D<sub>2</sub></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addresses inappropriateness of using “Old Testament” for Hebrew Bible</li> <li>• Term “Bible” is not ambiguous</li> <li>• Parallelism of O.T. &amp; N.T. in Christian canon is preserved</li> <li>• Provides possibility of distinguishing between Jewish &amp; Christian canons</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determining canon may be difficult, especially in the case of comparative or scholarly works (and in particular, for subject heading assignment) in which the religious orientation is not obviously Jewish or Christian (Policy to double headings in case of doubt might be required)</li> <li>• Uses two headings (“Bible (Jewish)” and “Bible (Christian). O.T.”) to signify texts currently treated as the same work (i.e., assumes they are different works on the basis of differences in content)</li> <li>• Maintenance is not one-to-one (requires human intervention) and requires bib maintenance for ALL headings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption that Hebrew Bible and Old Testament are not equivalent works</li> <li>• Separate NARs required for each canon</li> </ul>

E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addresses inappropriateness of using “Old Testament” for Hebrew Bible</li> <li>• Retains indexing under “Bible” for individual books and groups of books</li> <li>• Hebrew Bible is not treated as subordinate to Christian Bible</li> <li>• Facilitates treatment of individual books and groups by eliminating subordination to testament and precluding the need to determine the canon</li> <li>• Sanctioned ambiguity allows authenticity of using the term “Bible” to signify sacred scriptures in accordance with each religious tradition</li> <li>• Supports RDA’s “what you see is what you get” approach</li> <li>• Use of version qualifiers could help clarify ambiguities; subject policies could be modified to expand use of version</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses same heading “Bible” to signify different works (Hebrew Bible and Christian Bible)</li> <li>• Uses two headings (“Bible” and “Bible. O.T.”) to signify texts currently treated as the same work (i.e., assumes they are different works on the basis of differences in content)</li> <li>• Maintenance is not one-to-one (requires human intervention)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption that Hebrew Bible and Old Testament are not equivalent works</li> <li>• Special usage of the heading “Bible” to be addressed in expanded note under 25.18A5 and in usage note in NAR</li> <li>• Treat Apocrypha as a group of Biblical books, “Bible. Apocrypha,” and enter individual books of the Apocrypha directly under Bible, e.g. “Bible. Maccabees, 1st.”</li> </ul>
---	--	---	--

F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addresses inappropriateness of using “Old Testament” for Hebrew Bible</li> <li>• Allows authenticity of using the term “Bible” to signify sacred scriptures in accordance with each religious tradition, while qualifiers (Christian) and (Jewish) eliminate ambiguity</li> <li>• Parallelism of O.T. &amp; N.T. in Christian context is preserved</li> <li>• Provides possibility of distinguishing between Jewish &amp; Christian perspectives</li> <li>• Hebrew Bible is not treated as subordinate to Christian Bible</li> <li>• Facilitates treatment of individual books and groups by eliminating subordination to testament and precluding the need to determine the canon</li> <li>• Retains indexing under “Bible” for individual books and groups of books</li> <li>• Supports RDA’s “what you see is what you get” approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses two headings, (“Bible (Jewish)” and “Bible. Old Testament”) to signify texts currently treated as the same work (i.e., assumes they are different works on the basis of differences in content)</li> <li>• Determining canon may be difficult, especially in the case of comparative or scholarly works (and in particular, for subject heading assignment) in which the religious orientation is not obviously Jewish or Christian (Policy to double headings in case of doubt might be required)</li> <li>• New abstract usage of the unqualified heading “Bible” may be confusing</li> <li>• Maintenance is not one-to-one (requires human intervention) and requires bib maintenance for ALL headings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption that Hebrew Bible and Old Testament are not equivalent works</li> <li>• Separate NARs required for each canon</li> <li>• Special usage of the unqualified heading “Bible” to be addressed in usage note in NAR</li> <li>• Treat Apocrypha as a group of Biblical books, “Bible. Apocrypha,” and enter individual books of the Apocrypha directly under Bible, e.g. “Bible. Maccabees, 1st.”</li> </ul>
---	---	--	--