I hope you all enjoyed your time in Chicago, and got to join us for some of the LHRB-SIS events. This summer, we hosted a fascinating presentation on law and elopement in pre-revolutionary France from the Morris L. Cohen winner, Jillian Slaight, a detailed presentation on the some of the low points in Chicago’s legal history, an excellent presentation on presidential libraries, as well as a congenial reception at Quartino Ristorante. A number of our members also took part in a variety of other presentations and displayed great creativity in their poster sessions. This year also saw the introduction of the small but mighty archives roundtable, which saw some great discussion on problems that we all face and the batting around of ideas of what ways the committee can contribute to LHRB and AALL as a whole.

And speaking of committees, the Archives Committee is just one of which you can join! While some of the larger SISes have a very limited number of committee and leadership positions available for their membership, LHRB welcomes all who wish to get involved. Some of our committees that are currently accepting new members include the Newsletter Committee, the Outreach Committee, the Publications Committee, the Rare Book Committee.
Cataloging Committee, and the Archives Committee. Not sure you want a full year commitment? Want to get a publication on your resume? Contact Kasia Solon Cristobal on the Newsletter Committee or Mark Podvia on the Publications Committee, and they’ll be able to steer you in the right direction. For more information on what these committees all do, please check LHRB’s officers and committees page: http://www.aallnet.org/sections/lhrb/officers

I can understand that some of us may be curious or concerned about the rebranding of AALL, and how it will affect LHRB and the other SISes. I personally think there were a number of false starts to this initiative, but it seems like we’re beginning to find our stride. The tagline they’ve chosen of “Your Legal Knowledge Network” is strong and succinct. It certainly hits all of the points that I’m looking for in a professional organization, and is broad enough to include my interests, in particular, my interest in legal history and rare books. Ours is the study of the foundation of law; our interest is legal knowledge at its core. I also appreciate the inclusion of the word “network” in AALL’s tagline as that also reflects the work that LHRB has been doing to continuously built a strong and vibrant community of those who have an interest in legal history and rare books. Kasia’s inception of the “5 minutes or less” posts has been a wonderful way of getting to know each other a bit better. The formation of the Archives Committee helps to meet a need that many of our membership (and other AALL members) have. We’re also going to begin a project to collect and distribute information on the various special collections which we maintain, in an attempt to assist each other toward our goals and to help our patrons toward theirs. It is this network that we continue to solidify in LHRB.

I anticipate that there may be some more growing pains to come in this rebranding transition, but in general, I think it’s a positive step that remains inclusive of what we do and what we care about as legal history and rare book information specialists.
Hello everyone! I’m excited to take over editing the newsletter from Mark Podvia as it provides a great way for me to stay involved with LHRB, not to mention that I’m a bit of a newshound. As you know, Mark must hold the AALL record for length of time served as an editor, so I have big shoes to fill. Thank you Mark for helping me with the transition!

As a self-confessed newshound, let me seize the opportunity with this column to highlight a few entertaining news items ICYMI—in case you missed it. So pulling from LHRB’s Twitter account (now with 182 followers!):

- Watch the Full-Length PBS Documentary Hamilton’s America, Online Now (Slate)
- Restoring the Gravestone of the Father of American Law (Historical Society of the New York Courts)

And with the presidential election coming up, I encourage you to check out the Washington Post’s Presidential podcast on previous presidents if you haven’t already done so. This series features a wide array of heavy hitters, like David McCullough, and even librarians from the Library of Congress. The one on Chester Arthur is my personal favorite. Who knew he would be so compelling?

Finally, thanks so much to our contributors to this issue! I appreciate everyone’s hard work. Feel free to send me any comments or feedback: kcristobal@law.utexas.edu.
Kasia Solon Cristobal, 2015/16 LHRB Chair, moderated a program on Presidential libraries in which speakers addressed library design, record administration and the role of interpretive exhibits. Together they placed the upcoming Obama Library in historical context and provided an excellent overview of Presidential libraries for the standing-room-only crowd.

Blair Kamin, Chicago Tribune architecture critic and author of Why Architecture Matters: Lessons from Chicago, began the program with a lovely tribute to Morris Cohen whom he had known. Moving to his topic, Kamin noted the particular challenges of designing a Presidential library. How will it be used? How does the architect go beyond the tendency to use the building as a symbol to glorify the departed ruler? Kamin also noted a peculiar problem of Presidential libraries: how to move beyond the typical replica of the Oval Office to something that highlights the skills needed to be president.

To set up a discussion of the potential design of the Obama library, Kamin led the audience through a quick historical tour of some of the existing Presidential libraries, which have grown in size over the years and provide a mirror to the state of our culture. Some are temple-like; others look more like large houses. Republican Presidential libraries tend to be stately, while Democratic Presidential libraries usually continue the sleek, Modernistic design trend that Jackie Kennedy began with the John F. Kennedy Library.

Given this lineage, what we should expect from the Obama Presidential library and what might make it distinctive from the libraries of previous Presidents? The Obamas chose the architectural team of Tod Williams and Billie Tsien. Tsien will be the first woman to co-design a Presidential library. The Obama Library will also be the first to be constructed in a primarily African-American section of a city. While the location had not been chosen at the time of Kamin’s presentation, the Obama Foundation announced on July 30th, that Jackson Park, site of the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair, would be the home of Obama’s Presidential library.

Kamin speculated that Williams and Tsien would be most likely to produce a Modernist structure, perhaps “a hive of the digital age.” The architects, known for taking large singular structures and breaking them down into smaller ones, “design with the idea that a building should be a place not a thing, a verb not a noun.” Regardless of their design tendencies, Kamin suggested that the fact that Chicago is a city with a long-standing tradition of great architectural innovation sets a high bar for Williams and Tsien.

John Laster, director of Presidential materials at the National Archives followed with a discussion of how the National Archives and Records Administration prepares Presidential records and provides access to the materials. He spoke on record keeping and the legislative history of Presidential libraries.
Franklin Roosevelt created NARA’s Presidential library system in 1941, at which time NARA started systematically collecting records. Despite NARA’s collection activities, the actual ownership of Presidential records wasn’t really considered until President Nixon announced his plan to destroy the audiotapes of his Oval Office meetings. Nixon wanted to dispose of his “personal” material; instead, his records were seized.

The Presidential Records Act of 1978 (44 USC 2201-2209) established public ownership of Presidential records and codified the definition of those records. It also transferred legal custody of the records to NARA at the end of an administration. The act covers more than just Presidential records, but it does not include personal items like diaries.

Presidential records are also subject to requests under the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 552). This begins five years after the end of the administration. Laster noted the huge increase in requests between the first months of availability of the Bill Clinton and George W. Bush papers. In its first month, the Clinton Library received 179 requests amounting to 2.13 million pages. By contrast, the George W. Bush Library fielded 291 requests—59.6 million pages—in its first month of public operation.

What will NARA face with the Obama Library? NARA will have legal custody of all records by January 21, 2017. Laster anticipates NARA will receive tens of millions of pages of textual files created or received by the White House, as well as tens of thousands of artifact and gifts. The greatest challenge will be electronic records. The Clinton Administration produced two terabytes of documents; the George W. Bush Administration submitted eighty-two terabytes. The Obama Administration numbers are unknown as yet, but conservative estimates suggest NARA will receive at least 200 terabytes of electronic records. Amongst these will be the newer challenges of social media such as Twitter, SnapChat and Flickr. All of this produces a significant test for NARA, since FOIA allows the public to sue if requests are not filled within 20 working days.

The final speaker, Olivia Mahoney, senior curator at the Chicago History Museum and guest curator at the Springfield Lincoln Museum, turned the program from design and records to thoughts on how we interpret presidents through exhibits. She gave a brief overview of the core exhibit at the Lincoln library, where visitors journey through Lincoln’s life in a series of greatly romanticized tableaus. These tableaus fall short of connecting Lincoln’s life to the key issues of his time and give little insight into his views and how they changed during his presidency.

To complement the core exhibit and address some of its shortcomings, the museum charged Mahoney with creating a new exhibit in 2014. “Undying Words: Abraham Lincoln 1858-1865” examined the fundamental change in Lincoln’s views of slavery and racial equality—a change that Mahoney argued helped save the union.

The new exhibit examined the changes in Lincoln’s views through five key speeches: “A House Divided”, June 16, 1858; the First Inaugural Address, March 1861; the Gettysburg Address, November 19, 1863; the Second Inaugural Address, March 4, 1865; and Lincoln’s Speech on Reconstruction, April 1865. In 1858, Lincoln opposed
the extension of slavery but not necessarily its existence, and he favored colonization as an answer to the large black population. By April 1865, Lincoln had freed the slaves and spoke of his plans to extend voting rights to blacks. To punctuate the evolution of Lincoln’s views, Mahoney ended the exhibition with the Fifteenth Amendment.

Mahoney summed up by stating that exhibits within Presidential libraries should address the whole person, not just the larger than life figure. The latter can a particular problem when dealing with presidents of Lincoln’s stature.

The three presentations complemented each other well, clearly demonstrating some of the architectural, exhibition and archival challenges unique to Presidential libraries. Audience members left the entertaining and informative program with a better understanding of the benefits and pitfalls of preserving Presidential memory through such monuments.

Linda Tesar
Head of Technical Services and Special Collections
Wolf Law Library, College of William & Mary

♣

**Baseball, Ballots, and Bombs: Why Chicago’s Legal History Still Resonates (Host City History Roundtable), Monday, July 18**

Another conference, another city to get to know. What better way to do so than LHRB’s Host City History Roundtable? We had an excellent turn-out. As usual, the room was packed to the gills. Two very knowledgeable speakers, Mike Maben and Scott Burgh, put on a presentation of some of the memorable events in legal history of Chicago.

Mike spoke to us about 1919 Black Sox Scandal, giving the attendees a close look into baseball’s biggest game fixing scandal. His presentation discussed the background of how poor relations with the White Sox’s team owner, Charles Comisky, lead a group of players to throw the World Series. While some players, like Eddie Cicotte, were clearly in on the fix, the involvement of some members in the conspiracy is still debated.

It was interesting to hear some of the more intricate details of the issues, like how the Black Sox changed their tactics in game 7 in an attempt to win the series, as group of gamblers that the Black Sox were in league with were not forthcoming with the agreed upon payoff. Likewise, it was interesting to hear about the mob connection to the scandal, which I was unaware of prior to his talk.

Mike concluded his presentation calling for another look at the players and their actual involvement in the scandal. He believes that those who knew about, but did not participate in the fix should not have been treated as harshly as those who directly participated. He argues that players, like “Shoeless” Joe Jackson, would potentially have a place in the Baseball Hall of Fame, were it not for this blemish on his record.
Scott gave us a presentation on the stolen aldermanic election of the 14th Ward in 1880, which seems like a good plot for an opera, a la The Cradle Will Rock. During a period when tension was high between labor movements and socialists and their detractors, the election officials of one precinct successfully (at least temporarily) kept the socialist movement at bay through underhanded means.

The most surprising and alarming part of the tale is the copious amounts of alcohol that the election officials seemed to be drinking throughout the entire episode. After unsuccessfully preventing the socialist and pro-labor candidate Frank A. Stauber’s supporters from voting (by attempting to keep them out of the bar that the elections were being run out of), the now quite inebriated election officials, who supported Republican candidate, J. J. McGrath, brought the ballot box to the home of one official where they opened the results, tallied the votes (leading to a win for Stauber), and preceded to erase the votes cast for Stauber, and change them to votes for McGrath.

After McGrath “won” the election, a case was brought against the election officials, who were found guilty of election fraud. But the story doesn’t end there. It still took another year to oust McGrath from office and reinstate Stauber in his place.

Both Mike and Scott put a lot of research into their presentations, and we really appreciate the amount of work they put in. We hope to see you all at the Host City History Roundtable in Austin in 2017.

Karen Wahl
Reference/Legal History & Rare Books Librarian
Jacob Burns Law Library
George Washington University School of Law
Bibliographic metadata (once upon a time known as cataloging) reflects three distinct standards, and includes three different and often inconsistent approaches to dealing with extinct jurisdictions. Indeed, the standards all have different ideas as to what exactly constitutes an "extinct" jurisdiction, especially if one can argue that the putatively extinct jurisdiction is actually simply an older form of an existing jurisdiction.

Consider the Kingdom of Hawaii, or Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg (a name still used on official documents even though the city is neither free nor Hanseatic) or the Kingdom of France. What about various governments that are now considered illegitimate but were certainly at least de facto in their day such as the Confederate States of America, or the État Français (1940-1944) or Cromwell’s Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland. Just contemplate the distinctions between today’s Russian Federation, the Czarist Russian Empire and the Soviet Union (and who can forget that infamous subject heading: Soviet Union--Foreign relations--Byzantine Empire). Some would say that these are extinct jurisdictions, but others would say that they are simply earlier names for jurisdictions that still exist. While this sounds like counting angels on the head of a pin, the distinction between "extinct" and "earlier name" is profound from a cataloging perspective.

Descriptive cataloging is currently governed by RDA (Resource Description and Access), a standard produced jointly by the national libraries and library associations of the leading Anglophone "bibliographic powers". One part of the rules requires transcribing what appears in the resource (this usually goes in the 245 field), while another determines the form of access points (heading) based on the name at the time a resource (work) was created. (e.g. "Siam" rather than "Thailand" for works created when the country was known as "Siam"). Furthermore, for jurisdictions, that form of name usually reflect the English language form even for non-Anglophonic jurisdictions (e.g. "Italy" rather than "Italia").

Subject headings are a system of controlled vocabulary for all disciplines (not just law) based on LCSH (Library of Congress Subject Headings), which is controlled entirely by the Policy and Standards Division of the Library of Congress, though they consult with others. Under LCSH, the form of names of jurisdictions is governed by RDA, however LCSH used the current name for existent jurisdictions. (e.g. "Thailand" rather than "Siam" even for resources created or discussing the period when "Siam" was the country’s name). The LCC (Library of Congress Classification, including "our" K schedules) are also governed by the Library of Congress, but independently of RDA and LCSH, and with law-specific classification reflecting the needs of legal scholars (something not always possible with metadata standards serving all disciplines).

As an example, consider works produced by, or about, the country know currently as the République démocratique du Congo. The access point for works produced by the government will have a 110/710 heading for the established name in English at the time of the publication (such as Belgian Congo or Zaire or Congo (Democratic Republic), even though the 245 field transcribes from the work/resource itself (which is unlikely to be in English). Regardless of date of publication or what period the work refers to,
the subject headings will use the name *Congo (Democratic Republic)*. Notes in the LCSH authority records for all previous forms refer subject usage to the current form. The works will be classed in KTX (which has a well thought-out caption "Congo (Democratic Republic), Previously Congo Free State (Belgian Congo), Previously Zaire (1971-1997)"). This reflects that from its (admittedly dubious) origin in the late 19th century, there was a continuity in spite of several name changes. Therefore this is not an extinct jurisdiction, merely a name change. The well-established “rule” is that when a jurisdiction changes its name, the name heading (governed by the descriptive cataloging rules) reflects the name at the time of publication, and the subject heading reflects only the current name. This situation is not a problem, and the rules work well.

If a jurisdiction is “extinct”, in theory, there will be NAF (name authority file) records for the name but with no references indicating not to use the heading as a subject headings. In theory, there will be valid numbers in the K schedule for the extinct jurisdiction. A model for an extinct jurisdiction is the *Roman Empire*, which has a valid heading in the NAF (*Rome*) and its own numbers in LCC (in the KJA schedule). Virtually no one would think that work on the Roman Empire should class in KKH9857 (for the modern city), though perhaps there should be a reference just to be sure. Note that in that area of KKH, there are references from modern cities to extinct jurisdictions with similar names (e.g. from the modern city of *Venice* at KKH9858 to the *Serenissima Repubblica* at KKH8501-KKH8509, even though LCSH requires use of the same subject heading for both), but when an extinct jurisdiction is considered (unwisely) to be reasonably the same as a modern jurisdiction the modern number is used with an including note (cf. KKH9853, *Milan, Including the extinct Duchy*).

A modern example of how the system doesn’t work is *British Somaliland*, which was dissolved into the current Republic of Somalia. The colonial jurisdiction classes in KQP, however its cities and towns class with the modern Somalia in KTK (a pattern found elsewhere, the local places in extinct jurisdictions class only with the current number for the place). The complication is that some Somalis are trying to re-establish a separate jurisdiction in what was British Somaliland (NAF: *Somaliland (Secessionist government, 1991- *)*), though as yet LC hasn’t received any law books from there so the K-class question hasn’t been addressed, though one option would be to re-open KQP, another would be to establish a new range, and the third would be to establish the "separate" jurisdiction as a part of the "official" Somalia, and probably the State Department official position will affect the decision, since it is Library of Congress policy to follow the official American government policy in such matters. Note however that the Descriptive rules, under RDA still set up a distinct name heading for the jurisdiction, which may or may not be reflected in subject cataloging.

So the "rule" is that if a jurisdiction stays intact and changes its name, the classification accommodates the new name with a change in caption but the numbers stay the same, and while the descriptive headings reflect usage at time of publication, subject headings reflect the current name. On the other hand if a jurisdiction is deemed to be extinct then the numbers for the "extinct" jurisdiction are not used for a successor, and new numbers are established for those jurisdictions (usually more than one) that are carved out of the extinct jurisdiction, but the subject heading will reflect the name when the jurisdiction existed and not a current name.

If it was really all that simple.
For starters, some extinct jurisdictions aren’t recognized under descriptive rules and the references point users to modern jurisdictions with perhaps only a tenuous connection, legally and historically, to the extinct jurisdiction. The Ottoman Empire was a very large multi-ethnic state extending over much of western Asia and northern Africa. However the NAF has a UF to Turkey (treating modern Turkey as the current name of the Ottoman Empire), and there isn’t so much as a caption in KXX telling where to class Ottoman law, though catalogers have consistently classed works on Ottoman law in KXX as Turkish law, rather than in KMC for Middle Eastern law. The NAF and LCSH recognize the existence of the Holy Roman Empire (the one Voltaire purportedly said was neither holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire) but it classes in KK290+ (under German law), though it appears that some materials have been classed in KKJ in Austrian law (since by its end, it was the de facto Austrian Empire). While the NAF recognized the “Austro-Hungarian Monarchy”, LCSH says to use “Austria”, and nothing in KKJ indicates where the laws of that empire class, and it appears that works on the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Austria Empire, and the Holy Roman Empire during the early modern period tend to be classed under today’s very unimperial Austria—but that is based on catalogers’ judgments, not anything written in the schedules. In these cases, the problem could be addressed by country-specific (“exception”) captions to the history number in European table governing both countries (in "KJ-KKZ1 120"). Note that the Holy Roman and Austrian empires, and the Ottoman Empire, were very significant, and still have a major impact on the legal systems of the countries that emerged from their breakup. For lesser known jurisdictions the difficulty is compounded since most catalogers never heard of the place, and if one never heard of the place it becomes difficult to know if the jurisdiction still exists under a different name.

Varying standards of whatever passes for being “politically correct” at the time, sometimes including complaints from the country involved, have resulted in various inconsistencies. For example, British India classes in KNS, along with the current, and much smaller, Republic of India, and the schedules for Pakistan and other former parts of the "Raj" class separately, leading to interesting problems when dealing with their shared legal history (such as trials of Indian nationalists in what is now Pakistan).

The British mandate in Palestine which was partitioned at roughly the same time as British India broke up, is considered an extinct jurisdiction with its own numbers at KMQ1001-1499, distinct from the numbers of the jurisdictions that replaced it or from the post-breakup region encompassing the same territory. Czechoslovakia (KJP1-4999) and the Soviet Union (included in KLA with imperial Russia), which also split up during the 20th century, are "extinct" meaning legal literature on the post-breakup countries classes differently than the extinct pre-breakup regime. For these countries there are excellent notes in the schedule, though for many smaller countries one needs to consult the references in the name authorities (which may reflect a different "take" on the matter) or reference sources.

Whether a "regime change" results in a new classification should in theory reflect changes in borders and continuity of legal systems, but not always. England before and after the Norman conquest is in the same schedule, and with the same headings. Almost all European colonies when they gained independence are in the same schedule unless the boundaries significantly changed. American states have the same numbers for their pre-statehood periods, even if the boundaries were radically
different such as for *New York, Virginia or Texas*—with the exception of Hawaii whose pre-statehood number is in KVJ. The NAF, governed by RDA, and which in turns governs LCSH, ignores regime change even when the changes were quite radical, such as for the Republic of *Texas* or the Kingdom of *Hawaii*, both of which are treated in name and authority headings as earlier name of the current jurisdiction, with an exception for "*New York (Colony)*" which is a valid descriptive, though not a subject heading, perhaps to distinguish it from "*New Netherland*" which was a much larger jurisdiction that is classed with *New York State* in KFN by cataloging tradition rather than explicit instruction).

And of course there are exceptions. When *Hong Kong* changed from a British colony to a Chinese "special administrative region", rather than changing the captions and indentations, the 500 number common law schedule in KNR was treated as an "extinct" jurisdiction (rather than a change of name and governance), and Hong Kong law was henceforth put in a 100 number table at KNQ9301-9399. The breakup of the *Soviet Union* and *Yugoslavia* resulted in setting up new ranges for what were now independent countries (albeit with largely unchanged borders and government continuity), in part since it would have been difficult to provide adequate ranges in their former schedules (the former Yugoslav republics were each in 100 number tables not designed for independent countries, and many of the former Soviet Republics were in the Afro-Asian schedules even though the countries were clearly in Europe). For a variety of reasons, the "regime change" for Hong Kong is reflected in the NAF, whereas it isn't reflected in the names for the former Yugoslav and Soviet republics (the former names being UF references to the current name).

Many extinct jurisdictions are apparently classed inconsistently because there is no explicit instruction where to class them (e.g., *New Spain*). Especially for provinces, it is often easier to squeeze them into an existing number rather than to research what is happening politically in what is to most American catalogers a very remote part of the world. This is not correct by any standard of cataloging policy.

One solution is that catalogers working with historical materials should not be content with "fitting" a resource into an existing number, caption or heading, but should change the authority records and amend captions (or add numbers) to reflect the resource being cataloged. At one time checking the history of a jurisdiction required walking to an encyclopedia and a historical atlas, but now only a few clicks can clarify if one is dealing with a name change, a regime change, a boundary change, or a brand new or totally defunct jurisdiction. While there is a need to clarify the rules (and coordinate LCC with LCSH and RDA), which requires action by the LC Policy and Standards Division, individual catalogers need to pay attention to history and current affairs and to make proposals if something doesn't look right (this is a "plug" for the cooperatives SACO and NACO programs, or at least to contact someone at LC—and if the name authority has already been changed, amending an existing LCC caption probably can and should be done without a formal proposal).

This article expresses my personal views and is obviously not a statement of official LC policy. This article is adapted from an article directed to catalogers from the March issue of the Technical Services Law Librarian.
An Interview with Angela Spinazzè, ATSPIN consulting
Kasia Solon Cristobal

At this year’s AALL Annual Meeting in Chicago, I had a chance to hear Angela Spinazzè of ATSPIN consulting give a talk during the Roman Law, Roman Order, and Restatements program, coordinated by LHRB member Marylin Raisch and also featuring LHRB member Timothy Kearley as speaker. (A copy of Spinazzè’s presentation is available online.) I was intrigued to hear from an independent consultant, and wanted to learn more, so she kindly agreed to participate in this informal interview.

KSC: Please tell us a little bit about yourself—what you do and your professional background?

AS: My two primary roles are as facilitator and project manager. As a facilitator, I work with organizations on a range of issues, such as group development and working collaboratively. Frequently, I’m brought in to plan and lead conversations around turning an idea into a set of requirements that can be developed (in the case of technology) or, enabling a group of organizations to articulate how they might work together to realize a shared solution to a shared problem. I’m basically a neutral third party that uses multiple methods of facilitation such as one-on-one interviews, appreciative inquiry, the Technology of Participation (ToP), and others to elicit the information needed for an organization to structure and carry out projects. I’m not strictly focused on IT however, technology design and implementation work is something that I know well, and based on my experience is often a good excuse for institutional development and change.

For project management, I’m brought on board when there is a skills gap; when no one is available on staff to lead a process. My approach is to transfer my knowledge and management expertise to the team that I’m working with so that when my contract comes to a close the people, tools, and process are in place to ensure long-term maintenance. Also, I offer ongoing support as needed. The length of time that I might be involved in a project varies widely, from short term (say, six months) to long term (as long as five years).

My background is that I started at the Art Institute of Chicago and was part of the team that, as part of the taking of a physical inventory, built their first database for managing the collections. One of my responsibilities was to manage the process of converting the hand written catalogue cards into digital object records akin to converting a library’s print catalog to an online database. Since then, I’ve worked with a range of organizations, mainly nonprofits and higher education, such as libraries, museums, archives, performing arts organizations, and universities. It’s a niche area I’ve developed, through a combination of personal interest and professional experience.
KSC: Could you highlight some of your favorite projects that people check out online?

AS: I worked with Mystic Seaport, a maritime history museum in Connecticut on a project that involved digitizing manuscript materials, including their captain’s logs. The logs are part of the library special collections and are quite fragile. They decided to digitize them in order to provide online access to them for researchers. As part of the project, we talked across the organization about cataloguing standards, controlled vocabulary, and how different departments might more closely align their use of terminology. My experience with Mystic is a case in point of how working towards one goal—digitization—can lead to a larger goal. In the end, the library led the way for contributing maritime history vocabulary to the Art and Architecture Thesaurus, a resource used around the globe by museums, libraries, archives, scholars, and others working in the domains of art history, architecture, and the humanities.

Another project to highlight is the public user interface re-design project for ArchivesSpace, an open source archival management application. We put a call out for member participation in the process and twelve institutional members signed on. We worked together for six months to review the current interface, identify exemplars from other communities, document workflows, test functional wireframes, and in the end, the group came to consensus around a shared set of features and functionality that would be developed. The interface is in the process of being built and will be available for use next year. It’s really gratifying to engage with librarians, archivists, curators, and other subject matter experts to collaboratively design solutions for their user communities.

KSC: Law libraries often have a rare book collection and archives, with the archives often relating to the history of its home institution. There usually are not that many images. How do you think your work would be tailored or customized to law library special collections?

AS: Well the questions asked basically remain the same, but the answers will vary, the presentation and distribution constraints will be different, and the user environments may also differ. For me, a successful project begins with asking a lot of question in order to get to the heart of the effort because books, manuscripts, organizational archives, and special collections can be approached from multiple perspectives. They can be objects of study, in and of themselves, in addition to the text. When beginning a project, questions to ask include who is the audience, what is it that you’re trying to achieve, who will be affected, what are the consequences of not doing the effort you are suggesting needs to be done? And, I would urge flexibility and openness to taking the time to plan well.

KSC: Could you sketch out a rough timeline of a how a project might unfold—does it ever start with help identifying grants to apply for?
AS: I can come in at any stage of the process, although I emphasize spending a lot of time upfront on planning. I can recommend grants, but I don’t recommend tailoring a project to fit a grant. In fact, in several of the projects that I’ve worked on, the institution applies for a grant to bring me in for the initial exploratory stages. An example of how that might work would be to start small, with some information gathering exercises, interviews perhaps, and discussions about the proposed project. That could be followed by an on site planning meeting over the course of two days, wherein everyone who might potentially be involved would participate in defining requirements and committing to actions. The results might be a grant proposal to fund a first phase, or a complete project proposal depending on the scope. The idea is for everyone to participate from the beginning, to lend their expertise, to share the work, and the success. I’m always open to speaking with anyone about project ideas they have and to explore how I might be of service. ■
From the Lillian Goldman Law Library, Yale Law School:

“Law and Authority in the Most Serene Republic: Illuminated Manuscripts and Printed Books from Renaissance Venice”

Using the Yale Law Library’s rich collection of Venetian law books and illuminated manuscripts, the exhibit will examine Venetian government, law, and criminality during the long sixteenth century when the Venetian Republic was at the height of its power. The exhibition will also include drawings and medals on loan from the Yale University Art Gallery.

Those who cannot visit the Yale Law Library to view our colorful new exhibit now have two options for viewing the exhibit online:

- The exhibition catalogue has been published as a PDF document in the Yale Law School Legal Scholarship Repository: http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/itsta/7/
- An album on the Rare Book Collection’s Flickr site presents a slightly abbreviated version of the exhibit: Representing the Law in the Most Serene Republic
- Periodic excerpts can also be found on the Yale Law Library Rare Books Blog: http://library.law.yale.edu/blogs/rare-books

Law and Authority in the Most Serene Republic, curated by Michael Widener (Rare Book Librarian, Yale Law Library) and Christopher Platts (Art History, Yale University), will be on view in the Rare Book Exhibition Gallery, Level L2, Sterling Law Building from September 8 – December 15, 2016.

“In Celebration of Halloween: Books from the Law Library’s Early Modern European Witch Trial Collection”

From the Yale Law Library’s Foreign and International Collection, a selection of books from the Early Modern European Witch Trial Collection will be on display from approximately October 15th through November 15th, 2016.
Recent Acquisitions

Linda Tesar

Confessions of a law reporter, and other Yale Law Library acquisitions, by Mike Widener, Rare Book Librarian, Lillian Goldman Law Library, Yale Law School

Of all the recent Law Library’s Rare one of greatest members is probably Simon Greenleaf of a law reporter. the founding Harvard Law School, Reports of Cases Determined by the Court of the State of 1830-1832), which decisions from the statehood in 1820. Cambridge, Mass., Augusta, Maine, the first half of the business aspects of made from $1,000 to and retained the turns to his method, much easier for the as it comes, than to material parts & alone.”

Other significant acquisitions include:

- A collection of 60 volumes on the Mexican Constitution of 1917, including the earliest printings, the preceding debates, and an enormous flurry of revised state constitutions, all of them products of the Mexican Revolution and seven of them the only U.S. copies.

- The first law book printed by a woman: Argumentum Institutionum imperialium, printed in 1519 by Charlotte Guillard, widow of two Paris printers who went on to have an outstanding career in her own right as a scholarly printer.

- Reformacion der Stat Nuremberg (1522) with a stunning woodcut by Albrecht Dürer.

- Two more books from the collection of Anthony Taussig with outstanding provenances: Daines Barrington’s Observations Upon the Statutes (1767), James
Boswell’s copy; and Richard Crompton’s *L’autorité et iurisdiction des courts* (1594), possibly Sir Edward Coke’s copy.

- The 1648 Antwerp edition of the *Corpus iuris canonici*, with almost every margin and dozens of tipped-in sheets crammed with manuscript annotations, possibly the lecture notes of an early 18th-century law professor.

***

**First edition of Broom’s *Selection of Legal Maxims* returns home**, by Ryan Greenwood, Curator of Rare Books and Special Collections, Riesenfeld Rare Books Research Center, University of Minnesota Law Library

The Riesenfeld Rare Books Research Center recently purchased a book that was originally owned by the University of Minnesota Law Library when it was the Minnesota Territorial Library (1848-1858). The advertisement for the 1845 book describes it as "Original sheep, crudely rebacked, ex-Minnesota Territorial Library (with a lengthy and unusual manuscript de-accession statement), else a clean copy." Law library staff were quite excited to get back one of the library’s original books because a significant fire in 1881 destroyed much of the existing library.

***

**New additions to George Washington University Law Library’s collection of incunabula**, by Jennie C. Meade, Director of Special Collections, Jacob Burns Law Library, George Washington University

The most recent incunables acquired by the Jacob Burns Law Library are bound in one volume: *Utilissima Confessionalis Summula* by Saint Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, and *Tractatus de Societatibus*, by Angelo de Perigli. The first work was published in Venice by Pietro Quarengi in 1497 (http://jacob.law.gwu.edu/record=b1743863-S2), while the second was published in Brescia by Angelus Britannicus in 1500 (http://jacob.law.gwu.edu/record=b1748239-S2).
Saint Antoninus (1389-1459) was a Dominican friar who served as a papal theologian at the Council of Florence. This work acquired by the library, one of three guides he wrote for confessors, also contains his *Tractatus de Restitutionibus*. Perigli (died around 1453) taught at Perugia and Padua and authored many *consilia*. His work on companies, as here, was often appended to other works because of its brevity.

These works are the 176th and 177th incunables acquired by the Jacob Burns Law Library.

---

**Member News**

Mike Widener

---


***

**Timothy Kearley** (University of Wyoming) has published “Justice Fred. H. Blume and the Translation of Justinian’s Codex,” in volume 1 of the three-volume Codex of Justinian: A New Annotated Translation, with Parallel Latin and Greek Text, Based on a Translation by Justice Fred H. Blume (Bruce W. Frier, ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016). This monumental work is a direct result of Kearley’s resurrection of Justice Fred Blume’s unpublished English translation of Justinian’s Codex.

***

***

Jennie C. Meade (George Washington University Law Library) has posted a new article, “Life of a Library: A History of The George Washington University Law Library,” in the “Front & Center” category at A Legal Miscellanea: The Gazette of the Jacob Burns Law Library. To have a look, please visit www.alegalmiscellanea.com. Using archival materials from the University’s Special Collections Research Center, her article provides a look at how the Law Library developed, with a rare focus on the earlier years of the “first” founding of GW Law in 1826 before its reopening after the Civil War in 1865. GW Law celebrated its 150th Anniversary in the academic year 2015-2016. Jennie adds, “If you have yet to receive e-mail alerts when new articles and interviews are posted, please click on ‘Receive Alerts’ at A Legal Miscellanea’s landing page and sign up! Since its move to virtual in 2015, A Legal Miscellanea is no longer issued in hard copy.”

***


***

On September 25th our humble retired LH&RB editor, Mark Podvia (University of West Virginia), addressed the Susquehanna Mystery Alliance. The topic was “Haunted Libraries: Pennsylvania and Beyond.” The program was held at Mechanicsburg Mystery Books, Mechanicsburg, PA.

***
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