Citation Characteristics of English-Language Monographs in Philosophy

John M. Cullars
University of Illinois at Chicago

This study examines 539 references from 183 single-authored philosophy monographs, excluding collections of essays, published in 1994 and indexed by *Philosophers' Index,* with each reference counted as frequently as it was cited in the randomly selected citations. The citations were classified as to source type (book, article in book, journal article, manuscript, thesis), language, the gender of both citing and cited authors, the citing authors' attitudes toward the cited material, the subject correlation between citing and cited sources, and the chronology of the citations. The type of presses publishing philosophy monographs and which journals are cited are also discussed. While many contemporary philosophers consider their discipline more related to the sciences than to the humanities, their citation patterns are typically humanistic, with the bulk of citations to books rather than journal articles and the citation of much material older than 20 years. The topics studied were found to be predominantly 20th-century with an emphasis on analytic philosophy and little concern for recent trends in continental philosophy, except for feminist philosophy. A quarter of citations were to disciplines outside philosophy.

Philosophy is generally classified among the humanities in indexing tools and guides to the literature, but within contemporary academic departments, particularly in North America and the British Isles, modern philosophy frequently is viewed by its practitioners as more closely related to the sciences (Putnam, 1997). This view reflects the high prestige of the sciences in the past 50 years. It rejects

I wish to acknowledge the advice in preparing this project that I have received from Joan Fiscella, Julie Hurd, Ann Weller, Glenn Weller, and Stephen Wiberley, Jr.; and the suggestions of Stephen Wiberley, Jr., on the difficulty in making a valid distinction between philosophers and critics of philosophy such as can be made between literary and artistic creators and their critics.

Direct all correspondence to: John M. Cullars, Bibliographer for the Humanities, Collections Development, The University Library, Box 8198, The University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60689 <U50094@uic.edu> or <jcullars@uic.edu>.

Library & Information Science Research, Volume 20, Number 1, pages 41–68
 ISSN: 0740-8188

metaphysics, theology, and even ethics, for centuries debated by the greatest philosophers, as meaningless for philosophical investigation since they are not subject to either logical certainty or practical verification. Instead, modern Anglo-American philosophy has tended to restrict itself to analysis of the logical structure of language and the establishment of principles about the world that are logically sound and/or subject to verification. Other schools or trends of modern philosophy that have been influential in this period on the European continent have had more appeal to literary scholars than to American and British philosophers. Given the claim of Anglo-American philosophers that theirs is a field of science, this article, among other concerns, will seek to establish whether the characteristics of modern philosophical monographic publication coincide with those of the sciences or of the humanities.

Citation characteristics of the journal literature of the sciences, social sciences, and humanities have been investigated and tabulated for at least 35 years with notably less attention paid to the monograph. Given the consistently demonstrated primacy of the journal article as the primary medium of scholarly communication in the sciences and most of the social sciences, this relative neglect of the monograph in those disciplines is not surprising. The primacy of the monograph as the leading medium of scholarly communication in the humanities makes the study of the monographic literature in the humanities more central to documenting the shape of those disciplines. As will be seen, notwithstanding many contemporary philosophers' self-image as nearer to the sciences than to the humanities, philosophy's citation characteristics align it with such humanities as literary and fine arts criticism.

In recent years, the frequency of citation studies as the principal tool to study the characteristics of scholarly publications has led to numerous articles pointing out limitations to such an approach. While such limitations must be acknowledged, particularly in fairly broad studies that may ignore the more subtle methods of analysis, the conscientious use of the citation study method, particularly when used in conjunction with other approaches, has yet to be discredited. As Laura Baird and Charles Oppenheim (1994) point out:

> What is embarrassing for the critics of citation counting is this fact: Whatever measure you take for the eminence of an individual scientist or of a journal or of an institution, citation counts provide strong correlation with that result...So, despite the many valid criticisms of the crudity of citation counting, the fact is that they reasonably reflect the esteem that a particular author or paper enjoys (p. 8).

An indication that citation study offers a reliable guide to philosophers use of the relevant literature is the finding by Mary Ellen Sievert (1989) that:

> philosophers tend to cite only works they have looked at and found valuable in some way. This is more important to them than developing comprehensive bibliographies *per se*. The most common source and

> importance-indicator of work by other philosophers is bibliographic tracings (p. 37).

Topics to be investigated in this article include the frequency of citation to types of sources (books, articles in books, articles in serials, manuscripts or other unpublished materials, theses and dissertations); the gender to the citing and the cited authors; the language of the cited references; whether citations are self-citations, whether they are positive, value-free, or negative toward the cited author; and whether the citing author's work shares a close subject relationship with cited sources, as indicated by Library of Congress (LC) Subject Headings and Class Numbers. The frequency and nationality of the type of monographic publisher (university press, academic, trade, government document, and association) for citing and cited authors and which journals are most frequently cited are also tabulated. A division into primary and secondary sources was attempted and rejected as inappropriate to the discipline for reasons that will be discussed.

BACKGROUND

A brief summary of major developments and emphases in 20th-century philosophy, particularly over the past 50 years, is of use in understanding the nature of the topics and philosophers studied; why certain schools, periods, and philosophers, but not others, are cited; and what new trends can be discerned in recent decades. An examination of the books that served as the basis for this study found the greater part to have 20th-century topics and philosophers as primary subject matter with a strong emphasis on analytical philosophy, its offshoots, and related trends, as well as a substantial minority of books with an interdisciplinary scientific or social scientific focus.

Investigation of the history of the discipline in recent decades shows these emphases to fit well with current practice and emphases in the discipline. Terrence Tice and Thomas Slavens (1983) succinctly outline the situation:

> Philosophy has ancient beginnings, yet most of its significant literature has appeared in the last 100 years, a major revolution has occurred since 1945, and a still sharper rise in quality and scope of effort has become manifest during the past twenty years in virtually every area (p. ix).

While Alfred North Whitehead's witticism that all philosophy consists of footnotes to Plato (Wellek, 1963) is widely known even among non-philosophers, contemporary American and British philosophy is not conspicuously concerned with pre-19th century philosophers. Marx (1818-1883) and Nietzsche (1844-1900) are the oldest figures widely cited by the authors in this study.

According to John Searle (born 1932) (1991), analytical philosophy is the dominant mode of thought in the United States, Great Britain, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and Scandinavia. In oversimplified but not misleading terms, analytical philosophy and particularly logical positivism were based on the work of Gottlob Frege (1848-1925), Rudolf Carnap (1891-1970), G. E. Moore (1873-1958), Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951), W. V. Quine (born 1908), and Bertrand Russell (1872-1970), who were "the chief architects of the way philosophy has come to be practiced in the English-speaking world (and beyond)" (McGinn, 1997, p. 9). Analytic philosophy led to the rejection of virtually all earlier traditional philosophy as fruitless topics for study in that, as Roger Scruton (1995) puts it, "all metaphysical, ethical and theological doctrines are meaningless, not because of any defect of logical thought, but because they are unverifiable" (p. 274).

Seeking to differentiate the primary objectives of earlier, traditional philosophy from those of contemporary philosophy as practiced in most philosophy departments in the United States and Great Britain, Searle (1991) writes:

> Where traditional philosophers have taken their task to be to discuss the nature of the good, the true, the beautiful, and the just, the positivist and post-positivist analytic philosopher took their task to be to analyze the meaning of the concepts 'good,' 'true,' 'beautiful,' and 'just.' They saw this task as the legitimate heir of the traditional philosophical enterprise, but an heir purged of the metaphysical nonsense and confusion that had discredited the traditional enterprise ... It was a second-order discipline analyzing the logical structure of language in general but not dealing with first-order truths about the world (pp. 144, 146).

In addition to neglecting the concerns of traditional philosophy from Antiquity until the late 19th-century, contemporary English-language philosophy has also ignored and/or disparaged the more theoretical or metaphysical continental schools of Structuralist, Post-Structuralist, and Deconstructionist frameworks drawn from the works of Claude Lévi-Strauss (born 1908), Roland Barthes (1915-1980), Michel Foucault (1926-1984), Jacques Lacan (1901-1981), and Jacques Derrida (born 1930), as well as that descended from the thought of Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) or Jürgen Habermas (born 1929) that has been so influential since the 1970s in some other humanities and social scientific disciplines.

Hilary Putnam (born 1926) (1997) clarifies this situation in terms of analytic philosophy's self-image as related to the sciences:

> The leading Ph.D.-granting institutions rarely include texts by Foucault or Derrida in their courses, and the work of Jürgen Habermas has only begun to receive attention—and then only in ethics courses—fairly recently ... At first blush, this might seem astonishing; after all, philosophy is classified as one of the humanities, and French 'theory' is taken very seriously indeed in the *other* humanities. This indifference of ana-

> lytic philosophy departments is not surprising ... when one realizes that the self-image of analytic philosophy is scientific rather than humanistic. If one aspires to be a science (even if what one actually writes is closer to science fiction), then being different from the humanities will seem a positive virtue (p. 201).

Steve Fuller (1989) suggests a further reason for analytical philosophy's avoidance of continental philosophy: Analytical philosophy attempts to align its methods and goals with those of science and mathematics, and,

> throughout the twentieth century, continental European philosophy has been the source of many radical critiques of science, most stemming from either Heidegger or Marx. Both strands claim that the authority of science in modern society rests on certain myths of rationality and realism that have become associated with the scientific method (p. 598).

Despite the predominance of analytic philosophy since the 1950s, other philosophical trends have shown some influence. Since the 1980s, some of the leading tenets of analytical philosophy have been undermined, and new directions have gained adherents in and outside philosophy departments, among them, the philosophy of science, artificial intelligence, and cognitive science; philosophy's reentry into the arena of public policy through the influence of John Rawl's (born 1921) work on the just society, *A Theory of Justice* (1970); applied philosophy in business ethics and medical ethics; and feminist philosophy (Nehamas, 1977).

These newer tendencies are controversial, even illegitimate, to some traditional philosophers. The questioning of basic assumptions of traditional philosophy by continental philosophers is also found among radical feminist philosophers, as will be seen, but some eminent contemporary philosophers question the validity even of trends that are less revolutionary in intention. Heidi Storl (1995) quotes John Searle on some of these trends:

> The philosophy of mind, as well as cognitive science and certain branches of psychology, present a very curious spectacle. The most striking feature is how much of mainstream philosophy of mind of the past fifty years seems obviously false. I believe there is no other area of contemporary analytic philosophy where so much is said that is so implausible (p. 419).

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

With the exception of the articles and chapters in books summarizing the recent history of philosophy and how its schools and alliances have developed in the 20th-century, little library literature deals specifically with the disciplinary charac-

teristics of philosophy, some of which is not directly relevant, dealing, for instance, with philosophers' use of interlibrary loan (Broadus, 1989). It is possible that the perceived uncertainty about where to classify philosophy has contributed to its relative neglect in citation studies since such studies are generally based on either a single discipline or upon the humanities, social sciences, or the sciences, rarely addressing the entire spectrum of scholarly endeavor. D. J. de Solla Price (1970) and A. J. Nederhof (1989) are among the few to examine citation characteristics of a variety of disciplines, including philosophy, across the spectrum.

Mary Ellen and Donald Sievert (1989) performed the most in-depth survey of the bibliographic and scholarly habits of scientists in a report for the Council on Library Resources. This report is based on the results of a survey philosophers in 1976. They updated this to some extent in 1991. Anne Buchanan and Jean-Pierre Hérubel (1993) compared citation characteristics found in philosophy and political science dissertations. The position of women in philosophy and the related, but not identical topic of feminist philosophy, have been discussed by Gertrude Himmelfarb (1997), Linda Lopez McAlister (1989; 1996), and Mary Ellen Waithe (1989), specifically in the context of academic philosophy rather than as an adjunct to Women's Studies or Feminism.

Numerous studies of the humanities literature, however, offer points for illumination, comparison, or contrast to the findings of this study. John Cullars (1985, 1992) examined the monographic literature of English and American literary criticism and of English and American fine arts criticism. A. J. Nederhof and E. C. M. Noyons (1992), Rebecca Watson-Boone (1994), and Stephen Wiberley and William Jones (1994) examined information-seeking behavior of scholars in the humanities. Madeleine Stern (1983), Richard Heinzkill (1980), and John Budd (1986) investigated the citation characteristics of English-language literary scholarship. Carolyn Frost (1979), Terrence Brooks (1986), and B. C. Peritz (1992) provided information on mixed motivations for citations. Information on the correlations of subjects between citing and cited authors is provided by Stephen Harter, Thomas Nisonger, and Aiwei Weng (1993), and by Blaise Cronin (1994).

Procedures

This is, strictly speaking, a reference rather than a citation study in that each citation is counted as frequently as it occurs in the random selections. Thus if a given work is cited three times, it is counted as three references rather than one citation. In book-length studies of major philosophers, a scholar may cite the same primary source repeatedly in a study of a long work such as Plato's *Republic* or Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations*. Randomly selected citations will frequently be to multiple citations of such works. To limit such references to a single citation regardless of how frequently they are cited would give a lopsided picture of the shape of the literature. The term "citation" is used, nevertheless, since that is the accepted terminology for these studies.

The books examined were those in-scope monographs indexed for the year 1994 by the *Philosopher's Index* in its online format. This authoritative work has been described in the following terms by the standard guide to reference books edited by Eugene Sheehy (1986) :

> Originally an index to 'major American and British philosophical periodicals, selected journals in other languages, and related interdisciplinary publications,' with separate author and subject listings ... Beginning 1980, books as well as periodicals are included ... With v. 18 (1984), non-English language books are indexed and abstracted (p. 332).

The high ranking of *Philosopher's Index* is further supported by Sievert and Sievert's (1991) finding that the philosophers surveyed listed it as the tool most heavily used in the beginning stages of research. This study used single-authored monographs that were originally written in English. The single-authored work, whether monographic or serial, is the standard in the humanities and, to a lesser extent, in the social sciences (Wiberley & Jones, 1994). Collections of essays and translations were excluded. In a study devoted to documenting the scholarly characteristics of monographs as opposed to those of the journal literature, the use of collections of essays, even by the same author, might skew the findings.

The term "monograph," as used for this study, is not restricted to the intensive investigation of a given narrow topic that is its most precise meaning, but includes any single-authored sustained examination of at least 75 pages on topics indexed and abstracted by *Philosopher's Index*. The minimum length was arbitrarily set at 75 pages since this is midway between the 64 and 100 pages that Elizabeth H. Thompson (1943) designated as the dividing line between pamphlets and books. Unlike the Cullars (1985, 1992) studies of literary and fine arts criticism, however, none of the books examined included biographies, and biographical criticism played a far more minor role than in literary and artistic studies.

A colleague created a computer program to generate pairs of random numbers. Each book listed by the online search of *Philosopher's Index* that had not been eliminated as not single-authored, less than 75 pages, a translation, or a collection of essays was numbered 1 to 193. This was a known number, though some of these books could and would turn out to be out-of-scope upon physical examination, and was the first coordinate in the numbered pair. The second coordinate referred to the number of the citation in the book indicated by the number of the first coordinate. In advance, there was no way to know the exact magnitude of this number. An arbitrary upper limit of 2,500, which was considerably higher than the number of citations Cullars had found in any of his earlier monographic studies, was set. For example, the pair (34, 276) is the book numbered 34 on the printout of the computer search of *Philosopher's Index* and to examine citation number 276, after counting all the citations in the book.

The computer program was set up to guarantee that each of the in-scope books would occur at least once. Citations randomly chosen ranged from one to seven per book. If the number of the citation was higher than any in the book—521, for instance, in my example of a book with 276 citations—a random-number table was used to determine which digit(s) to drop to obtain a number that corresponded with a citation in that book. When a citation contained references to more than a single source, a random-number table was consulted to determine which reference to record.

Frequently, parenthetical page references to texts of major philosophers were included within the text. While all pages were skimmed for internal citations, the count of internal citations may be less accurate as that of footnotes and endnotes. Since this is a citation study, explanatory footnotes were excluded unless they also included at least one bibliographical reference. Such non-bibliographical footnotes were uncommon.

Three books could not be obtained and, upon inspection, seven others were eliminated as out-of-scope—three had no citations; two were books of essays; one was a translation; and one was a reprint, leaving a total of 183 books used for this project. The scholarly convention of documenting one's sources in citations is clearly central to the philosophical literature of the English-speaking world. It would be of interest for a later study to examine whether this is equally so for French, Italian, and Spanish philosophical writing since Cullars (1996) found literary and fine arts scholarship in those traditions to be more belletristic, less committed to such documentation than are Anglo-American and German scholars, with 36% of the French fine arts monographs eliminated for having no citations.

The books ranged in length from 113 to 766 pages with an average length of 275 pages. They were apt to be relatively concise books, with only 58 books (31.7%) having as many as 300 pages. In a sample of 30 literary monographs, Cullars (1985) found the books to range from 132 to 874 pages with an average length of 345 pages (p. 514); for the fine arts (1992) he found the 158 books to range from 84 to 844 with an average of 289 pages. There were 67,283 citations in all, including internal references. The number of citations per book in the present study ranged from 46 to 1,637 with an average number of 368 per book. Fifteen (2.8%) of these were self-citations.

FINDINGS

Types of Presses Publishing Philosophy

The type of publishers which produced both the citing and the cited books was examined. As can be seen, the publication of philosophy monographs is a predominantly academic business. The citing sources are by definition all monographs, and among the cited serial references, all but six are to academic journals

TABLE 1
Types of Presses Publishing Philosophy Monographs

	Citing books		*Cited books*	
Type of press	*%*	*N*	*%*	*N*
US University Press	33.9	(62)	22.7	(98)
Joint US/UK UP	27.3	(50)	17.4	(75)
Foreign UP	1.1	(2)	1.4	(6)
US Acad. Trade Press	8.7	(16)	.9	(4)
Joint US/UK Acad. TP	11.5	(21)	9.0	(39)
Foreign Acad. TP	12.0	(22)	25.9	(112)
Popular TP	4.9	(9)	15.3	(66)
Specialized Press*	.6	(1)	7.4	(32)

Note: *Includes government documents, associational papers, religious presses, and university departments

published by university or academic presses. Among the citing books, only 4.9% (9 of 183 books) are published by popular trade presses, which publish fiction as well as nonfiction intended to appeal to mass market audiences as well as the occasional academic title expected to reach a broader audience than is the case with most books published by university and academic trade presses. Domestic and foreign university presses combined account for 62.3% (114 books), and 32.2% (59) of the other books were published by such academic trade presses, combining domestic and foreign totals, as Routledge, Blackwell, J. Benjamins, Greenwood, or Rodopi.

Of the 539 cited sources, 432 could be identified as to publisher when serials and internal citations that did not specify the publisher were subtracted. Here a somewhat wider scope of publication activity was identified, even though domestic and foreign university and academic presses still accounted for a combined 77.3% (334 monographs). Trade and more popular publishers accounted for 15.3% (66 books) of the cited monographs. Specialized publishers (associations, departments in institutions of higher learning, government documents, religious publishers) played a negligible role among the citing books, but accounted for 7.4% (32 books) of the cited books. The greater use of trade publications can, in part, be explained by the interdisciplinary nature of some contemporary philosophy, which gives rise to citations of religious/ethical, political, historical, economic, or feminist sources that reach a broader audience.

Table 1 shows a considerable variation in percentages of citations to the different kinds of publishers between citing and cited sources in all categories except for the percentage of sources cited from foreign university press publications. In four of the categories, the variation is at least 10 percentage points. While 86.3% of the citing books were published by presses that either originated in or had joint publication in the United States, that was the case with only approximately 60% of the cited sources. Additional investigations would be needed to determine whether these variations between the citing and cited sources reflect differing trends in

TABLE 2
Subjects of Monographs by Chronological Periods

	%	*N*
20th century topics	53.0	(97)
19th century topics	9.3	(17)
18th century topics	7.1	(13)
17th century topics	3.8	(7)
16th century topics	.6	(1)
Medieval topics	0.0	(0)
Classical topics	4.9	(9)
Overlapping topics	21.3	(39)

scholarly practice between American and European scholars or whether they are more the result of the selection process used by *Philosophers Index*.

Table 2 shows the breakdown of topics of the citing books by century or larger chronological period, where appropriate. The predominance of 20th century topics is even greater than is apparent from Table 2 when one considers that another 10.4% (19 books) in the overlapping category either overlap the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries or cover both more broadly. Thus, almost 65% (116) of the books have topics that are at least partially 20th century. This emphasis on recent philosophy tallies well with the literature cited earlier indicating that contemporary British and American philosophy tends to concentrate on analytic philosophy and even more modern trends rather than earlier traditional topics and philosophers.

Cullars (1986) reported 46.6% of English-language literary criticism to have 20th century topics and only 6.7% to have 19th century topics, but in the literature of art criticism (1992), he found only 27.8% of the topics 20th century and 22.2%, 19th century. While approximately half of the literary and art critical topics fell in the last two centuries, there was a more even distribution of the remaining topics throughout the centuries, reflecting the great prestige enjoyed by some pre-modern authors, artists, and artistic or literary movements. It is interesting that none of the 183 books deals extensively with the Middle Ages, and only a limited number of studies addressed Classical philosophy. Relatively few of the books with overlapping topics reached back beyond the 17th century.

While it is impossible to discuss the topics of all 183 monographs, a few details and generalizations may be made. Nine separate books dealt with Nietzsche, six with Kant, five with Aristotle, Hegel, Marx, and Wittgenstein; four with Heidegger, three with Plato and Habermas, two with Descartes, Schopenhauer, Hume, Peirce, Foucault, and Rorty. Another 38 philosophers ranging in time from St. Augustine (354-430 A. D.) to living contemporaries such as Stanley Cavell (born 1926), figured in the titles, subtitles, or LC subject headings of a single book. Twenty of these philosophers were 20th century thinkers; two were 19th century, and the rest from the 17th and 18th centuries, except for Erasmus (died 1536).

Among the topics covered (in no particular order of frequency or hierarchy) by the citing authors were postmodernism, the philosophy of science and social science, space and time, scientific realism, semantics, feminist philosophy, property rights, game theory, free will, disjunction in logic, the philosophy of mind, political liberalism, human consciousness, virtual reality, phenomenology, causation, Marxist history, child psychology, skepticism, civil rights, faith, modernism, ends and means, ethics and values, evolution, the Enlightenment, slavery, the mind-body problem, cognition, pragmatism, materialism, human consciousness of the Divine, the philosophy of education, the free market, political diplomacy, common law, African philosophy, and the nature of democracy. Some of these topics, such as modernism, ethics, feminism, and consciousness, were addressed by two to four of these 183 monographs.

Citation of Disciplines outside of Philosophy

Table 3 indicates how interdisciplinary contemporary philosophy has become, perhaps more so than the historical summaries by well-known philosophers cited above would have led one to predict. All of the citing books were indexed by the *Philosopher's Index,* and 80.2% (147 books) of them were classified by the catalogers at the Library of Congress in the Bs, with 12 classed in the Hs, 7 in the Qs, 10 in J or K, 4 in P, 2 in D, and one in T. Among the cited sources, 25% (135 citations) were to non-philosophical disciplines: the sciences, literature, sociology, religion, economics, history, political science, psychology, mathematics, anthropology, fine arts, and film studies, in order of the number of citations. This classification is based on the LC subject headings and class numbers assigned to the cited sources.

TABLE 3
Citations to Sources outside Philosophy

Discipline	*%*	*N*
sciences	19.3	(26)
sociology	13.3	(18)
literature	13.3	(18)
religion	12.6	(17)
economics	11.1	(15)
history	10.4	(14)
political science	10.4	(14)
psychology	4.4	(6)
mathematics	3.0	(4)
other*	2.2	(3)

Note: *Anthropology, film studies, and the fine arts received one citation each.

Thematic Agreement of Citing and Cited Sources

There has been discussion in the library literature of the degree to which authors cite sources that are not closely related to the topics in which they are writing. Cronin (1994), for instance, reports that the relationship between the main topics of citing and cited sources may be no more than tangential:

> There may be occasions when the citing author's (citing paper's) major theme or focus is a very minor, even tangential, strain as far as the cited author (cited paper) is concerned, not least from the subject indexer's perspective, which could explain the lack of commonly assigned index terms (p. 537).

Harter, Nisonger, and Weng (1993) also found little correlation between citing and cited works:

> Often the citing and cited documents are in different fields altogether. Usually they share only one or two topics among many others treated by one document or the other. These topics in common reflect the semantic connections between the two documents constructed in the mind of the citing author (p. 550).

Philosophy's citations to other disciplines may, in part, derive from its historical role vis-à-vis those disciplines. According to Tice and Slavens (1983),

> both historically and in terms of current practice, there appears to be a phase in the formation of every theoretical discipline in which it necessarily remains a part of philosophy, whatever else it may be ... Once it becomes an established discipline with technical methods and agreed results of its own it leaves philosophy, as it were, and thereafter returns only to the degree that new problems arise that are of a foundational nature or that require philosophical therapy. In this sense, philosophy as a field has continually expanded and contracted, maintaining relations to other fields in a way that is dependent on changing needs and awarenesses on both sides (pp. 307-308).

This complex relationship can be seen between philosophy and the sciences and social sciences, for instance. The philosopher might claim that, if philosophy now draws much of its substance and methodologies from these disciplines, it also set their agendas in the first place.

Table 4 contains the breakdown between the subjects of the 183 citing authors and the topics of their citations as approached by comparing the LC Subject Headings and LC class numbers of the two groups of authors. Column one indicates the

TABLE 4
Subject Agreement between Citing and Cited Sources

% in common between Citing & Cited Sources	*% in common of LC Subject Headings*	*% in common of LC Class Numbers*
100 agreement	22.4 (*N* = 41)	8.2 (*N* = 15)
75	3.8 (*N* = 7)	0.0 (*N* = 0)
66	12.0 (*N* = 22)	7.7 (*N* = 14)
50	10.4 (*N* = 19)	8.7 (*N* = 16)
33	8.2 (*N* = 15)	7.1 (*N* = 13)
25	6.0 (*N* = 11)	6.0 (*N* = 11)
Other	5.5 (*N* = 10)	3.3 (*N* = 6)
0	31.7 (*N* = 58)	59.0 (*N* = 108)

percentage of agreement between the citing authors and the sources that they cited. Columns two and three contain the percentages and numbers of the 183 books (*N*) that matched that percentage of agreement as measured by comparisons of LC Subject Headings and LC class numbers, respectively. For instance, interpreting the top line of the table, 41 books had at least one subject heading in common with all of the randomly selected citations chosen for this study, but only 15 books had the LC class number in common with all of the randomly selected citations.

One reason for the higher hit rate with subject headings than with class numbers is the fact that many books had numerous subject headings assigned, whereas all books had only a single class number. If one of several subject headings assigned to the citing book corresponded to even one of several assigned to the cited sources, it qualified as a match, whereas there could be only a single direct match between class numbers.

Even with this approach, for many of the books, there was no match of subject signifiers between citing and cited sources, nearly a third in terms of subject headings and almost 60% in terms of LC class numbers. This result seems to substantiate findings that authors cite a great deal of material that is not closely related to their topics. Another possible explanation is the subjectivity of assigning subject headings and class numbers. In comparing these groups of sources, I was sometimes surprised that certain books did not receive the same subject headings and class numbers when I judged their topics to be very similar.

Primary and Secondary Sources in Philosophy?

A discipline is entitled to define its own terms and set its standards, but one result is often that the meaning of commonly understood words differs from disciplinary context to disciplinary context. Thus, the distinction between primary and secondary authors seems to be largely irrelevant to philosophy as viewed from within the discipline. It is thought-provoking that a 1996 book with the title *Critical Sense: Interviews with Intellectuals* had received the subject heading "Philosophers—interviews." Perhaps that juxtaposition offers a clue to the explanation. The disci-

pline of philosophy views its scholars, teachers, or intellectuals, as many outside the profession would have it, as philosophers. This tendency may reflect the post-World War II rejection of the grand, all-encompassing ethical, metaphysical, and historical topics of earlier philosophical traditions in favor of more modest clarification of verifiable semantic and linguistic concepts.

My operational definition for a philosopher was to have been an individual profiled in either the *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (1967) or, to cover more recent philosophers, Routledge's *A Biographical Dictionary of Twentieth-Century Philosophers* (1996). By checking all of the cited authors against these two sources, it became apparent that almost every 20th century writer in philosophy who has achieved any degree of academic success was ranked as a philosopher. This would have given an extraordinarily high rate of primary citations, far higher than seemed intuitively justifiable to me.

Searle (1991) writes that nearly all of the professional philosophers in the United States are employed as professors in over 2,000 colleges and universities. Observe that he calls them "philosophers," not "teachers of philosophy." The editors Brown and Collinson of *A Biographical Dictionary of Twentieth-Century Philosophers* (1996) confirm this situation: "At present, the very great majority of those who would describe themselves as philosophers are academics with posts in various types of educational institutions in which they are employed to teach the subject" (p. vii). To be able to make a meaningful differentiation between primary and secondary authors, I believe there has to be a clear division between teachers and practitioners, as there is in the arts and literature.

It is a line that can—and frequently is—crossed, but it is nonetheless clear in literary and fines arts scholarship. Most scholars will admit that hypothetical Professor X's criticism of T. S. Eliot's poetry, which has gained him a wide reputation among those interested in 20th century poetry, is a different kind of achievement from Eliot's in writing the poetry. Hypothetical Professor Y was a student of Quine and is one of the most highly regarded authorities on Quine. His exegesis of Quine's views are as highly regarded and unproblematical as such things can be in a contentious field. He has written numerous scholarly articles and two monographs on Quine's views. He has organized and led seminars on Quine. He has not, however, advanced his own system of thought or even been (perish the possibility) a popularizer of Quine's complex views.

Professor Y is treated as a philosopher and not a teacher of philosophy in *A Biographical Dictionary of Twentieth-Century Philosophers*. My point is not to belittle the achievements of Professor Y, but it strikes me that he as well as many of his colleagues treated as philosophers by the discipline have qualitatively different achievements from the individuals named earlier in the historical overview. They have not founded new systems of thought; they have not led new schools or proposed new trends of philosophy. Rather they have elaborated and elucidated the concepts and systems of others. This activity does not seem qualitatively different from Professor X's analysis of Eliot. Based on my own admittedly subjective analysis, applying the creator/commentator

dichotomy traditional in other disciplines, this method of classifying philosophy professors as philosophers inflated primary citations by at least 15%, a considerable magnitude. Philosophers would probably reply that what a Quine and a Professor Y do is so similar in format, style, and content that no meaningful distinction can be made.

Citations by Types of Sources

Citation of Books. Table 5 contains the percentage of citations and the number of books within each category in terms of the type of source cited. Articles are divided into two categories: those cited within books and those cited in journals or newspapers. If the total of articles cited in books is added to that of the monographic citations, 84.6% (456 books) of the total citations were to books. This figure corresponds with the findings of Buchanan and Herubel (1993) that 81.3% of citations in philosophy dissertations are to monographs. This is a higher percentage of citations to books than is found in most of the other humanities, despite the well-established fact that the monograph is the most heavily cited vehicle of scholarly communication in the humanities.

Cullars (1986, 1992) reported between 65.7% and 72.2% citation in English-language literary criticism and 60.6% of the citations in fine arts criticism to books (p. 334). Stern (1983) reported between 78.8% and 82.7% citations to monographs for literary criticism; Heinzkill (1980), 75% of the citations in the journal literature of English literary studies; and Budd 64%, for American literary criticism. Thus, philosophy's use of books is high, even when articles in books are excluded, and has the highest percentage of all the disciplines surveyed when they are factored in.

Citation of Articles. Buchanan and Hérubel (1993) reported 13.3% of citations in philosophy dissertations to journal articles. Philosophers' use of the journal literature is correspondingly low, and corresponds to what Cullars (1986; 1992) reported for literary criticism, 13.3% to 14.5%, though he reported 23.6% for fine arts criticism. Other studies of English and American literary criticism have found somewhat higher percentages of citations to journal articles: Stern (1983) lists 15.1% to 16.5%; Heinzkill (1980), 19.9%; and Budd (1986), 26.7%, the highest percentage to journal and newspaper articles.

TABLE 5
Percentages of Citations by Type of Sources Cited

Source Type	*%*	*N*
Monograph	70.1	(378)
Article in Book	14.5	(78)
Serial Article	13.4	(72)
Manuscripts	1.5	(8)
Theses	.5	(3)

Such findings call in question contemporary philosophy's view of itself as related to the sciences rather than the humanities. Regardless of its self-image, philosophy's use of the literature is strongly humanistic, more so than in many self-proclaimed humanistic disciplines. A. J. Nederhof (1989) reports that some humanities disciplines are approaching the primary use of journal articles found in the sciences and many of the social sciences, giving Dutch linguistics as an example, but neither the present nor earlier studies indicate that philosophy is tending in this direction.

What is true, according to the philosophers interviewed by Sievert and Sievert (1989), is that philosophers working in such areas as cognitive science, artificial intelligence, medical ethics, or computer studies rank journal articles as important or more so than monographs. While half of those surveyed ranked journals to be as important or more so than books, either they represent a small minority of philosophical publication or they choose to cite relatively few of the journal sources they consult.

The other philosophers interviewed by Sievert and Sievert (1989) had the traditional view concerning books found among most humanities scholars:

> Books represent more sustained arguments, treatments and investigations than is possible in journal articles; most worthwhile journal articles will eventually be developed into books and then will have the merits of books just mentioned; worthwhile journal articles that do not eventually develop into books per se will become part of anthologies. Their inclusion in such anthologies indicates their value, and they, therefore, will be worth the time required for reading them (p. 68).

They also reported that they could not find enough "substantive and worthwhile" material in journal articles. Except in those newer, more science-derived areas mentioned above, currency is not a great concern. These same philosophers report that they consider "current" publications to be up to five years old and "recent" publications up to 20 years old.

Journals Cited by Philosopher. While 56 separate serial publications were cited, only 11 were cited more than a single time, and no serial title was cited more than five times. Those titles with multiple citations were *Journal of Philosophy* with five citations, *Philosophy and Public Affairs* (3), *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* (3), and the following with two each: *American Philosophical Quarterly*, *Hypatia, Journal of Philosophical Logic*, *Monist*, *Nous*, *Philosophy of Science*, *Physical Review*, and *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung*, which was one of four non-English language serials cited.

Forty-five journals or newspapers were cited a single time.[1] Perhaps the most immediately striking observation to make about this lengthy list is that at least 27 (48.2%) are from disciplines outside philosophy, based on LC class numbers and subject headings. No core collection of journals is conceivable in a situation in

which 56 separate titles account for 72 citations, and, with one exception, no single journal receives more than three citations.

Citation of Manuscripts and Theses. As with other disciplines, the use of manuscripts and theses is minimal in philosophy. Each category is cited only twice in the study of five philosophy dissertations conducted by Buchanan and Herubel (1993, p. 67), in which the source type of 17 of 391 citations is not accounted for. While citation of manuscripts in other humanities disciplines varies, it is generally higher than in philosophy, varying from 2.2% to 12.6% (Cullars, 1986, p. 518), and 14.8% in English-language art criticism (Cullars, 1992). Philosophy's low percentage perhaps reflects a readiness to work with the well-established rather than the potentially ground-breaking.

The philosophers interviewed by Sievert and Sievert (1989), for instance, testified that they mainly worked with the *Philosopher's Index*, the *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, and bibliographical tracings based on their own reading, which frequently had been suggested by a colleague; 70% felt confident that such an approach was sufficient to find the most useful materials. Only the untenured tried to keep abreast of the latest scholarship. Such attitudes and work habits are not conducive to toiling away in archives and manuscript collections to bring previously unknown or forgotten material to light, and fit the idea that worthwhile philosophy eventually will find its way into print, preferably in books. This is a point with which feminist philosophers disagree, as will be seen.

Gender of Citing and Cited Authors

Table 6 displays the breakdown of both citing and cited authors by gender. In the case of the citing authors, it was possible to determine the author's gender in every case. In the case of the cited authors, this was not true in six cases. Conventionally male names are taken to apply to men and conventionally female, to women. This

---

1 *Advances in Computers*, *American Political Science Review*, *American Sociological Review*, *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, *Classical Quarterly*, *Dilthey Jahrbuch*, *Female Tatler* (from 1709), *Foundations of Physics*, *Guardian*, *History of European Ideas*, *History of Science*, *Inscriptions*, *Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly*, *Journal of Art and Design Education*, *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, *Journal of Values Inquiry*, *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, *Mind*, *New Republic*, *New Scientist*, *New York Review of Books*, *New York Times*, *Nietzsche-Studien*, *Philosophia*, *Philosophical Investigations*, *Philosophical Review*, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, *Philosophy and Literature*, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *Review of Metaphysics*, *Reviews in American History*, *Science News*, *Social Philosophy and Policy*, *Telos*, *University of Chicago Law Review*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Women's Review of Books*, *Women's Studies International Forum*, *Yale Review*, and *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*.

TABLE 6
Gender of Authors

	Citing Authors		Cited Authors	
Gender of Authors	%	*N*	%	*N*
Male	85.2	(156)	90.3	(487)
Female	14.8	(27)	8.5	(46)
Unknown	0.0	(0)	1.2	(6)

procedure may underrepresent women. When initials only were used or the given name was one used by either gender, further verification of gender was sought in bibliographies or biographical sources. In hard cases, the cited sources themselves were consulted, and it was usually possible through a blurb, foreword, or introduction to determine the author's gender. In two cases where initials only were used for all publications by that author, this was not the case. The other four members of the "unknown" category were unsigned newspaper blurbs, government documents, and the *Bible* and *Upanishads.*

This classification by gender was included because philosophy is an area in which women traditionally have not been strongly represented; it seemed useful to document how much of a presence female authors have established after 30 years of the feminist revival of forgotten or unknown women. Linda Lopez McAlister (1996), in a recent survey of female philosophers, reports that, during her graduate training in philosophy in the late 1960s, women philosophers were never taught or mentioned. No woman received an entry in the authoritative eight-volume *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (1967). Women literally did not know that there had been female philosophers.

Mary Ellen Waithe (1989) reports that the substantial and in its time influential publications of Hypatia of Alexandria (died 415 A. D.), Hildegard von Bingen (1098-1179), Anne Viscountess Conway (1631-1679), Margaret Cavendish (1624-1674), and Catherine Trotter Cockburn (1679-1749), among others, had been allowed to go out of print and were excluded from the history of philosophy. She writes, "Courses in the history of philosophy which exclude contributions made by women cannot legitimately claim to teach this history. This is true, not merely because those histories are incomplete, but rather because they give a biased account" (pp. 132, 136). A "quick-and-dirty" survey of the gender of the 12,470 philosophers (excluding 667 names whose gender could not be determined from the given information without further investigation) listed in the 1996-97 volume of *Directory of American Philosophers* found 16.1% (2,006 individuals) to be female. Of the 995 entries that I counted in the *Biographical Dictionary of Twentieth-Century Philosophers* (1996), 77 (7.7%) are female. Sievert and Sievert (1989) reported that 10% of their respondents were female and referred to another study in which 12% of the 53 philosophy professors interviewed were female.

It is interesting to note that a substantial number of the citing and cited sources by women specifically address feminist or women's studies issues. This is the case with 10 of the 27 female citing authors (37%), and with 21 of the 46 cited sources (45.6%) written by women. This appears to indicate that, if more women are involved in the discipline of philosophy than previously, a substantial minority of them are not addressing traditional issues in traditional ways.

There is some evidence for this in the literature. Gertrude Himmelfarb (1997) writes that:

> feminism, for example, not only transcends the disciplines; in its most radical form, it transcends the principles and methods upon which all the disciplines traditionally rest. There are feminist philosophers who regard truth, reason, and logic as 'logocentric' and 'phallocentric,' violating women's natural mode of thought and imposing upon them an alien 'logos' (P. 154).

McAlister (1996) has elaborated on this feminist critique of traditional male-dominated philosophy:

> Feminist philosophy as it has emerged in recent years contests many of the assumptions underlying this traditional way of conceiving philosophy. It calls into question the 'innocence' of philosophy by calling into question the notion that philosophical thought is, or could be, ungendered, unaffected by the political, social, psychological, and other positions philosophers occupy ... These critiques demand that the feminist history of philosophy approach its subject in a new and multifaceted way (p. xii).

Given the traditional assumptions of conventional philosophy, including analytic philosophy, it is not surprising that such radical approaches are not necessarily granted validity by traditional philosophers, making for a ghettoization of feminist philosophy. Fuller (1989) points out that one reason that British and American philosophers have been unwilling to endorse strands of continental philosophy is that these schools of thought tend to undermine the authority of the scientific method that English-speaking philosophers like to believe supports their philosophical practice. A similar objection is raised by the iconoclasm of much feminist philosophy.

Hans E. Bynagle (1997), in his introductory chapter to a recent guide to the philosophical literature, discusses feminist philosophy separately and last in a summary of influential 20th century trends in philosophy:

> This overview is incomplete, nonetheless, without some discussion of feminist philosophy. It would be inaccurate, or at least premature at

> this point, to place this as a major philosophical tradition alongside the five [Continental Philosophy, including Phenomenology and Existentialism, Structuralism, Analytic Philosophy, Marxist Philosophy, Neo-Scholasticism] described above; on the other hand, it is too important a part of the contemporary philosophical scene to go unmentioned here (p. 11).

Feminist and other approaches to philosophy influenced by continental trends raise questions about the presuppositions of philosophy that strongly call into question Nehamas's (1997) contention that:

> one very interesting feature of American philosophy during the period [since 1950] is that unlike many other disciplines in the humanities, such as modern languages and literature, it has not faced a generational, political, and ideological split. Nothing in philosophy resembles the violence of the change from the New Criticism to structuralism to post-structuralism to race, gender, and ethnic studies that we have witnessed, for instance, in English departments (p. 220).

Compare this statement with those of Himmelfarb and McAlister quoted above. One might be discussing two different disciplines or two different generations.

Language of Citations and Use of Translations

Examining Tables 7 and 8, one sees that 15.4% of the citations were to non-English language sources, and that 25.4% (116) of the 456 citations to English-language sources were to translations. Thus, 36.9% (199 citations) were to sources originally outside of the English-language orbit. It probably reflects the diminishing mastery of foreign languages even among the highly educated in the English-speaking world that there are more citations to foreign sources in English translation than there are citations in those languages. Another explana-

TABLE 7
Percentages of Individual Languages Cited

Languages Cited	*%*	*N*
English	84.6	(456)
German	8.4	(45)
Latin	2.6	(14)
French	2.0	(11)
Greek	2.0	(11)
Other*	.4	(2)

Note: *Italian and Spanish were cited once each.

TABLE 8
Percentages of Translated Sources Cited

Language from which Translated	*%*	*N*
German	66.4	(77)
Greek	13.8	(16)
French	9.5	(11)
Latin	6.0	(7)
Other*	4.3	(5)

Note: *One citation to Dutch, Hebrew, Italian, Norwegian, and Sanskrit

tion is the avoidance of continental philosophy by American and British philosophers for ideological reasons that has been documented earlier in this article.

Sievert and Sievert (1989) also found little use of non-English language sources in the Anglo-American tradition of philosophy. This finding also agrees with M. S. Batts' (1972) finding that, in the humanities, 90% of the citations on English topics will be in English. Peritz (1983) reported that 99.5% of the citations in American literary criticism were to English-language sources. Broadus (1987) found that, in the humanities, 87.7% of all interlibrary loan requests were for English-language materials. Cullars (1992) reported 70.2% of the citations in English-language fine arts criticism to be to English language sources. The prestige of German scholars and the number of famous German philosophers is reflected in the fact that German heads the list in terms of foreign-language citations and citations to translated sources. That the French Structuralist, Post-Structuralist, and Deconstructionist philosophers currently so lionized among other disciplines have yet to make much of an impact on American and British philosophy except for the feminist philosophers is indicated by the limited citation of French sources. Classical philosophy is more represented in translated sources than in the original Greek and Latin.

Citing Authors Attitudes toward Cited Authors

Studies of the reasons why authors cite sources reveal that citation is seldom a straightforward and unambiguous activity. Brooks (1986) reports that 70.7% of the scholars interviewed mentioned more than one reason for most citations. It is also true that, in the humanities, citing authors seldom explicitly praise or condemn the sources they cite. Michael MacRoberts and Barbara MacRoberts (1988) point out that authors even sometimes choose to hide negative points. Peritz (1992) writes, "There are also instances when a study is cited in a negational mode, but these are rare, hard to define unambiguously, and sometimes do not detract from the value of the cited publication" (p. 448).

Frost (1979) reports that scholars in German literary criticism criticize views expressed in 6.79% of their citations. Brooks reports 9.1% negative citations among an interdisciplinary group of scholars, but specifies that all of these negative citations came from the same 25% of the population. Budd (1986) reported

positive evaluations in 3.5% and negative criticism in 1.6% of the literature of American literary criticism. Cullars (1992) found 4% of the citations positive and 2.2%, negative in fine arts monographs.

Philosophers are considerably more willing to distribute praise and especially condemnation than other scholars. Fully 18.5% of the citations express an explicitly favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the material being cited. In most disciplines, citations are made to give various types of background information, recommend further reading, or to support an argument. When value judgments are offered, they are more apt to be positive than negative. The opposite situation prevails in philosophy: 11.1% (60 citations) were negative evaluations of a named scholar's opinions or analysis, and 7.4% (20 citations) were explicitly positive evaluations of a named individual's work. One philosopher even made a negative citation to his own previous work! Perhaps this penchant for controversy reflects the discipline's self-image of these scholars as philosophers rather than simply teachers of philosophy, thus having a more active stake in the development of the discipline than as simply interpreters and intermediaries. This argumentativeness also may be a carry-over from a pedagogical device in university philosophy training in which the development and structure of an argument can be as highly regarded as its outcome.

Citations by Chronological Period

Table 9 breaks down the citations by decade back to 1950. Broader summary categories are then used because of the smaller numbers of citations in each decade prior to that date. Combining the data in the first two groupings, one sees that 45.3% (234 citations) of the citations were published since 1980. A total of 86.5% (447 citations) were published since 1950, with 36.4% of the citations to sources published in the 1980s, the most heavily cited decade in this study of books published in 1994. The 1960s is the last decade with citation figures in the double digits, 14.3% (74 citations). Prior to that date, the number of citations drops off drastically, though some go back to the 16th century, and one monograph cited articles from an early 18th century serial.

Earlier studies of the humanities literature tend to document a more even spread of citations throughout the present century as well as a greater use of pre-20th century sources than is the case with the present study. Such a limited interest in sources published before the Second World War fits the perception of most scholars describing the discipline in the past 50 years that American and British philosophers have been concerned with recent rather than historical trends and developments.

Buchanan and Herubel (1993) report that 17.3% of the citations to monographs in philosophy dissertations are five or fewer years old and that 47.2% are from 1970 or later, which leaves 52.8% of the citations from earlier than 1970. On the other hand, they reported 51.2% of the citations to journal articles to be within the

TABLE 9
Percentages of Citations by Chronological Period

*Dates of Citations**	%	*N*
1990-	8.9	(46)
1980-1989	36.4	(188)
1970-1979	18.2	(94)
1960-1969	14.3	(74)
1950-1959	8.7	(45)
1920-1949	6.5	(34)
1890-1919	3.7	(19)
Pre-1890**	3.3	(17)

Source: *Precise dates were available for only 517 of the 539 citations.
**These ranged from 1553 to 1888.

past five years and only 23.7% of these journal citations to be from earlier than 1970. The present study found 36.5% of its citations to all source types to be prior to 1970. Peritz (1983) reports that references to sources over 50 years old are more often found in monographs and articles than in dissertations (p. 200). Sievert and Sievert (1989) reported that philosophers consider as "recent" publications up to 20 years old, but that the importance of currency varies from specialty to specialty: in Kantian studies, 40 years old is acceptable; for applied ethics, the publication should be within the year. For most philosophers, a two to three year delay in seeing a source is no problem.

De Solla Price (1970) documented that different specialties in philosophy have different needs in terms of the currency of the material: in the generalist *American Philosophical Quarterly*, only 12% of the citations dated from within the past five years, whereas in two explicitly science-oriented philosophy journals, the percentage of citations within the last five years is much higher, 22% for *Journal of Symbolic Logic* and 21% for *Philosophy of Science*.

Buchanan and Herubel (1993) also document 20 years as an acceptable age for philosophy monographs, though greater currency is often sought for the journal literature. Cullars (1985, 1992) found 47.7% of the citations in literary criticism and 47.3% of those in fines arts criticism to be to sources published since 1960. He also reported 9.1% citation in literary criticism and 18.6% in the fine arts to be to sources published prior to 1890. This relatively heavy use of pre-20th century sources reflects an interest in pre-modern literature and art lacking among many philosophers in the Anglo-American tradition. Nonetheless, except for this lesser interest in materials older than 50 years, the citation patterns of philosophers show the humanities emphasis on citing older materials, particularly monographs, rather than the scientific and social scientific emphasis on the most recent journal articles or even pre-prints. In fact, Sievert and Sievert (1989) reported only one of the philosophers interviewed ever reads pre-prints.

CONCLUSION

This study documents that contemporary American and English philosophy is largely concerned either with issues arising from analytic philosophy as it developed in the second half of the century or with interdisciplinary trends drawn from the social sciences, stressing political action, gender studies, psychology, economics, and history. On the other hand, 20th-century continental philosophy, which has been so influential in some of the humanities, has shown little influence other than in feminist philosophy, which is still somewhat marginalized, at least partially because it draws on trends that seek to undermine commonly held philosophical assumptions. Philosophy is still currently a male-dominated discipline with a substantial part of the small group of female philosophers restricting their contributions to exclusively feminist or at least gender-related topics.

Most self-styled philosophers today teach philosophy in institutions of higher education. Given this disciplinary equation of philosophers and teachers of philosophy, it is unrealistic to speak of primary and secondary citations, because there is no sure way to make a real distinction between those who make seminal contributions in the development of modern philosophy and those who comment on these contributions. Philosophers do tend to be more explicitly critical of the views of other named philosophers than is the case in other humanities disciplines.

While many contemporary philosophers, particularly those engaged in analytic philosophy, tend to view their discipline as more closely related to the sciences than to the humanities, their citation patterns are typical of such humanities as literary studies and fine arts criticism. Almost 70% of citations (over 80% if citations to articles in books are included) are to books, and less than 15% of all citations to journal articles. Almost 55% of the citations were to sources published before 1980, and philosophers consider "recent" publications to be up to 20 years old. The rate of citation fell sharply prior to 1960.

Philosophy does not demonstrate a strong correlation between the subject matter of the citing and citing authors as reflected in LC subject headings and class numbers. In part this reflects the extensive use of disciplines outside philosophy. Philosophy is a sufficiently professionalized discipline that most of the citing and cited monographs were published by university or other academic presses. No core journals were identified: Fifty-six separate journals and newspapers were cited, 45 of them only a single time. Almost 85% of citations were in English, though a quarter of these had been translated from other languages.

This study drew on the citations in philosophy monographs. Several earlier studies suggest that certain specializations in philosophy draw more heavily on the journal literature than does most traditional philosophy. The findings of this study do not substantiate that claim, but they do not necessarily refute it either, given the paucity of citations to these newer, more scientifically-oriented trends in this study. It would be of particular interest to learn if the citation patterns of these

areas more closely agree with those of the sciences. Since the journal article is the primary vehicle of scholarly communication in the sciences, a study of the journal literature of philosophy might yield different findings than that of its monographic literature if there is any validity to the claim that philosophy is more related to the sciences than to the humanities.

Further work could also be done on the kind of philosophical topics, feminist and otherwise, that female scholars are examining. The discipline's self-image as basically grounded in analytic philosophy is only partially substantiated by this study. More attention might profitably be paid to the frequently cited disciplines outside of philosophy as well as to the numerous non-analytic topics still being pursued by traditional philosophers and to the disciplines drawing on the hard sciences or continental philosophy being studied by philosophers with a less traditional bent.

Library selectors need to consider the most clear-cut facts about the literature of philosophy. As with the other humanities, they should concentrate on acquiring monographs above serials. In fact, the extreme scatter of serial citations in philosophy strongly suggests that no core collection of journals can adequately serve user needs. After acquiring the major, general journals, selectors should subscribe only to more specialized journals that fit local research and teaching interests. They can rely on cooperative arrangements, document delivery, and full-text online services for the rest.

The fact that philosophers cite a quarter of their sources from outside the discipline offers a strong indication that selectors need to carefully consider faculty research and teaching interests in deciding what monographs to acquire. Given limitations of funds, there is always a trade-off between acquisition in some depth to cover current local specializations and the purchase of high quality materials in basic areas that may be used later rather than sooner. Those institutions with cooperative collection development arrangements should consider the most effective divisions of philosophy topics possible to serve both local and broader needs.

REFERENCES

Bahm, Archie J. (Ed.). *Directory of American philosophers 1996-1997.* (1996). 18th ed. Bowling Green, OH: Philosophy Documentation Center, Bowling Green State University.

Baird, Laura M., & Oppenheim, Charles. (1994). Do citations matter? *Journal of Information Science, 18,* 2-15.

Batts, Michael S. (1972). Citations in the humanities. *IPLO Quarterly, 4*(July), 20-40.

Broadus, Robert N. (1987). Use by humanists of university press publications. *Scholarly Publishing, 19*(1), 43-48.

Broadus, Robert N. (1989). Use of periodicals by humanities scholars. *Serials Librarian, 16*(1/2), 123-131.

Brooks, Terrence A. (1986). Evidence of complex citation motivation. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 37,* 34-36.

Brown, Stuart, Collinson, Diane, with Wilkinson, Robert. (Eds.). (1996). *A biographical dictionary of twentieth-century philosophers.* New York: Routledge.

Buchanan, Anne, & Hérubel, Jean-Pierre V. M. (1993). Comparing materials used in philosophy and political science dissertations: A technical note. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian, 12*(2), 63-70.

Budd, John. (1986). Characteristics of written scholarship in American literature: A citation study. *Library & Information Science Research, 8,* 189-211.

Bynagle, Hans E. (1997). *Philosophy: A guide to the reference literature.* 2nd ed. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Cronin, Blaise. (1994). Tiered citation and the measure of document similarity. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 45,* 537-538.

Cullars, John M. (1985). Characteristics of the monographic literature of British and American literary studies. *College & Research Libraries, 46,* 511-522.

Cullars, John M. (1996). Citation characteristics of French and German fine arts monographs. *Library Quarterly, 66,* 138-160.

Cullars, John M. (1992). Citation characteristics of monographs in the fine arts. *Library Quarterly, 62,* 325-342.

DeSolla Price, Derek J. (1970). Citation measures of hard science, soft science, technology, and nonscience. In C. E. Nelson, & D. K. Pollock (Eds.), *Communication among scientists and engineers* (pp. 3-22). Lexington, MA: Heath Lexington Books.

Frost, Carolyn O. (1979). Use of citations in literary research: A preliminary classification of citation function. *Library Quarterly, 49,* 399-414.

Fuller, Steve. (1989). Philosophy of science since Kuhn: Readings on the revolution that has yet to come. *Choice, 12,* 595-601.

Harter, Stephen P., Nisonger, Thomas E., & Weng, Aiwei. (1993). Semantic relationships between cited and citing articles in library and information science journals. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 44,* 543-552.

Heinzkill, Richard. (1980). Characteristics of references in selected scholarly English literary journals. *Library Quarterly, 50,* 352-365.

Himmelfarb, Gertrude. (1997). Beyond method. In A. Kernan (Ed.), *What's happened to the humanities?* (pp. 143-161). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

McAlister, Linda Lopez. (Ed.). (1996). *Hypatia's daughters: Fifteen hundred years of women philosophers.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

McAlister, Linda Lopez. (1989). Some remarks exploring the history of women in philosophy. *Hypatia, 4*(1), 1-8.

McGinn, Colin. (1997). Is Wittgenstein losing his hold? *TLS, 489*(January 3, 1997), 9-10.

MacRoberts, Michael H., & MacRoberts, Barbara R. (1988). Author motivation for not citing influences: A methodological note. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 39,* 432-433.

Nederhof, Anton J. (1989). Assessing the usefulness of bibliometric indicators for the humanities and the social sciences and the behavioral sciences: A comparative study. *Scientometrics, 15,* 423-435.

Nederhof, Anton J., & Noyons, E. C. M. (1992). International comparison of departments' research performance in the humanities. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 43,* 249-256.

Nehamas, Alexander. (1997). Trends in recent American philosophy. *Daedalus, 126,* 209-223.

Peritz, Bluma C. (1983). A classification of citation roles for the social sciences and related fields. *Scientometrics, 5,* 303-312.

Peritz, Bluma C. (1992). On the objectives of citation analysis: Problems of theory and method. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 43,* 448-451.

Putnam, Hilary. (1997). A half century of philosophy, viewed from within. *Daedalus, 26,* 175-208.

Scruton, Roger. (1995). *A short history of modern philosophy: From Descartes to Wittgenstein.* London, England: Routledge.

Searle, John. (1991). Contemporary philosophy in the United States. In D. Easton, & C. S. Schelling (Eds.), *Divided knowledge: Across disciplines, across cultures* (pp. 139-170). London, England: Sage.

Sheehy, Eugene P. (Ed.). (1986). *Guide to reference books.* 10th ed. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Sievert, Mary Ellen C., with Sievert, David E., & Edwards, Anne G. (1989). *Scholarly needs and library resources: The case of philosophers.* Final report of Grant 8011. Washington, DC: Council on Library Resources

Sievert, Mary Ellen C., & Sievert, Donald E. (1991). Online searching in philosophy: A comparison of *Philosopher's Index* and FRANCIS. *Online Review, 15*(2), 63-76.

Stern, Madeleine. (1983). Characteristics of the literature of literary scholarship. *College & Research Libraries, 44,* 199-209.

Storl, Heidi. (1995). Marks and masks of personhood: Investigations into the nature of self. *Choice, 33,* 411-425.

Thompson, Elizabeth H. (1943). *A.L.A. glossary of library terms.* Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Tice, Terrence N., and Slavens, Thomas P. (1983). *Research guide to philosophy.* Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Waithe, Mary Ellen. (1989). On not teaching the history of philosophy. *Hypatia, 4*(1), 132-138.

Watson-Boone, Rebecca. (1994). Information needs and habits of humanities scholars. *RQ, 34,* 203-216.

Wellek, René. (1963) *Concepts of criticism.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Wiberley, Stephen E., Jr., & Jones, William G. (1994). Humanities revisited: A longitudinal look at the adoption of information technology. *College & Research Libraries, 55,* 499-509.