From the Chair

Your SIS has worked hard to plan the July program. Here is how it looks at this time, so take out your calendars and mark the dates:

1. Sunday, July 19, 1:30 to 3:00. SIS business Meeting, election of officers, and roundtable discussions of manuscripts, archives and preservation issues. A particular item of discussion will be the report of the Special Committee on Preservation Needs of Law Libraries and its recommendations for SIS action (see the separate article “The Meeting after the Meeting” on page 9).

2. Monday, July 20, 2:00 until at least 5:30. SIS reception at Meyer Boswell Books, Inc., 2141 Mission Street. Directions will be available at the SIS business meeting and from the Meyer Boswell booth in the exhibit hall. For persuasive social reasons the reception has to be held in the afternoon, but it will start early enough and continue long enough for those who attend the AALL business meeting to come over before or afterward and enjoy the reception as well. Those who do not go to the business meeting and can tear themselves away from Meyer Boswell may find time to visit other antiquarian bookstores in the same neighborhood. [Joe Lutrell, our gracious host, will not be checking for SIS membership at the door and welcomes non-SIS members who are interested in finding out what we members get excited about. Of course, Meyer Boswell will be open throughout the convention for those who want to sample the books without distractions.]

3. Tuesday, July 21, 3:00 to 4:30. SIS Program on Crime and Punishment in Early California Law. A wonderful opportunity to acquire insights on the substance and practice of legal history from one of its foremost exponents, Professor Lawrence Friedman, of Stanford Law School.

4. Wednesday, July 22, 8:30 to 10:00 a.m. We will be co-sponsoring a program with the Acquisitions Committee, the Preservation Committee, and the Contemporary Social Problems SIS on Ephemera: To Collect or Not. Check the convention program for more details.

The growth in activities presented at the Annual Meeting by our SIS says a lot for its usefulness and vitality. As I get ready to pass the reins of chairpersonhood to Cynthia Arkin, I hope that the membership continues to take a proactive interest in our newsletter and other activities, helping her to be as effective as our past chairs. I started out the year thinking that my election to this office was a bit of a fluke and that I would just be a caretaker chair; but I have found what we always should find in a
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really active SIS: that with so many involved members, and with such excellent officers and newsletter editors, caretaking may be all the SIS needs!

However, I will close this column with the request that you continue to contribute ideas, newsletter articles, program participation, etc. and that you make legal history professors and rare book collectors at your law schools or firms aware of our SIS and encourage them to become members and contribute to the newsletter.

Thanks for making this such a good year.

Nick Triffin

Editor’s Column

Once again, the newsletter contains some interesting and thought-provoking articles. Byron Cooper’s column, now called *English Legal History*, focuses on the establishment of an authoritative text for Bracton’s *On the Law and Customs of England*. Nick Triffin has contributed a piece on the question of deaccessioning of materials from libraries when they are given or sold to book dealers. Be sure to note all the information about receptions, meetings, and programs in San Francisco.

You may, however, find the pickings a little slimmer than usual. Perhaps you’ve all seen the great articles published over the last year and thought there wasn’t any need for you to do any writing. Well now there is. I encourage new writers to contribute their thoughts about legal history and rare books. The best part of writing for a newsletter is that you don’t have to make the article as formal (or as long) as you would for a journal. I’m sure there are lots of libraries with interesting collections. Let us hear about them. And even if there’s only one aspect of either legal history or rare books you know about, tell us about it. So keep those cards and letters coming.

Janet Sinder

Report of the Nominating Committee

The nominating committee had an easy job this year in that we only had to come up with a candidate for the office of Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, since the Secretary/Treasurer has another year to go on her term. The Committee met by phone and nominated Dan Wade for the position of Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect. Dan has notified us that he is ready and willing to serve, if elected. Dan was one of the “founding fathers” of the SIS and his election would be a belated but deserved reward for his early and continuing efforts on its behalf.
Bracton
by Byron Cooper*
University of Detroit

Textual criticism is one of the most important tools of historical study. Establishing a sound text for an historical document is often necessary before any conclusions about its significance can be drawn. Probably no text has presented more baffling problems than that of Bracton's On the Laws and Customs of England, and certainly few have been debated so long and so acrimoniously.

Bracton was probably born around 1210. By 1239 he was a law clerk, and in 1247 he was made a justice of the court coram rege. He retired ten years later, and in the last decade of his life he continued to hold various judicial commissions. He died in 1268.

During his lifetime, someone wrote a treatise (or a collection of "treatises") to explain and rationalize the whole of English law. With the extensive legal developments in the 13th century, it is not surprising that someone would undertake such a task (see D.A. Carpenter, The Minority of Henry III at 401-02 (1990)). Within a few years of Bracton's death, many of the manuscripts of this treatise contained attributions to Bracton. From the pattern of case citations in the treatise, it was widely assumed to have been written around 1250.

Yet the text, which is full of "obvious" errors in all of the more than 50 surviving manuscripts, has always presented many problems. Should the obvious errors be corrected on the assumption that Bracton was "impeccable," or were the errors his own? Why would an author writing in the 1250s have cited 90 percent of his cases from the years 1217 to 1240? How much did he rely on Roman law? What accounts for the existence of several distinct manuscript traditions? Are the longer or shorter manuscripts closest to the original author's intent? Was the archetype prepared before or after Bracton's death?

The text was first printed by Richard Tottell in 1569. A modern edition was published by Sir Travers Twiss in six volumes in 1878-83, but it was generally condemned, and the need for a new edition was widely noted (see, e.g., 2 F.W. Maitland, Collected Papers 43 n.1 (1911)). Sir Paul Vinogradoff had discovered in the British Museum a 13th century notebook of court decisions, many of them cited by Bracton. Vinogradoff speculated that these notes had been drawn up for Bracton's use in writing his treatise. Frederic Maitland subsequently edited and published these case notes in three volumes (Bracton's Note Book (1887 & reprint by Rothman)).

In the meantime, controversy had developed about Bracton's use of Roman law. During the 17th century, John Selden had noted some instances of Bracton's reliance on Roman law (Ad Fletam Dissertatio 25-29 (D. Ogg ed. 1925) (1st ed. 1647)), and in 1861 Sir Henry Maine asserted that all of the form and a third of the contents of Bracton's treatise were derived from Roman law (Ancient Law 82 (1861)). Karl Guterbock explored the question in Bracton and His Relation to the Roman Law (1866 & reprint by Rothman). In response, Frederic Maitland attempted to assess Bracton's knowledge of Roman law and the extent of his reliance on it in Bracton and Azo (8 Selden Society (1894)). He compared Bracton's work to one of his Roman law sources and concluded that the Roman law content of the treatise was full of error and relatively insignificant. For the next 75 years, Bracton studies would focus chiefly on the extent of Bracton's knowledge and use of Roman law.
At the beginning of the 20th century, George Woodbine of Yale recognized that a new edition based on a more thorough consideration of the manuscripts was needed. After 35 years' work on 50 manuscripts, Woodbine produced four volumes that provided the Latin text with no translation (1915-1942).

When Woodbine's edition was nearly complete, it was sharply attacked by Hermann Kantorowicz, who issued a call for yet another new edition (Bractonian Problems 127 (1941)). Kantorowicz challenged Woodbine's failure to correct obvious errors and, in the process of correction, to utilize the Roman law sources Bracton had clearly used. Kantorowicz argued for the existence of a 13th century "redactor" who assembled the manuscript without understanding it. Woodbine replied forcefully to Kantorowicz's criticisms (52 Yale L.J. 428 (1943)), but his projected fifth volume of commentary and notes was never published.

Kantorowicz and Fritz Schulz were both emigré scholars from Nazi Germany; their knowledge of Roman law considerably exceeded their knowledge of English law. Yet their analysis—especially that of Schulz—revealed that Bracton's treatise contained far more Roman law than Maitland thought. Their work—and that of others—has shown that over 500 sections of the Code and Digest of Justinian, in addition to several other Roman law writers, were relied on in the text without attribution.

T.F.T. Plucknett took advantage of a hull in the battle to summarize where Bractonian scholarship stood in the 1950s (Early English Legal Literature 42-79 (1958)). But then the heavy artillery was brought in by H.G. Richardson. With his usual acerbity, Richardson denounced the work of both Woodbine and Kantorowicz. After comparing a few words across the manuscripts, Richardson faulted Woodbine severely for his methods and, on the other hand, attacked Kantorowicz with the cry that Bracton was "not impeccable" (Bracton: The Problem of His Text 16, 45 (1965)).

Samuel Thorne of Harvard undertook to republish Woodbine's text with an English translation on facing pages. Through the translation, Thorne hoped to address the criticisms made against Woodbine's text. In the first two volumes published in 1968, the 700th anniversary of Bracton's death, Thorne adopted a fairly free translation in an effort to make sense of the text. Thorne found that the English law portions of the treatise were just as mangled as those dealing with Roman law. Since it is extremely unlikely that Bracton was ignorant of English law, these errors support the theory of an ignorant "redactor." Therefore, the modern editor's task is to recover what Bracton probably wrote on the assumption that he knew what he was doing.

Over the next nine years, however, Thorne revised his approach. A careful analysis of the cases cited in the treatise clearly showed that it was written as early as the 1220s and already undergoing revision in the 1230s. Bracton perhaps took over the treatise while he was a law clerk in the late 1230s, and subsequently added citations to later cases, some of which concerned him. There is probably no connection between Bracton's Note Book and the author of the treatise. As a result, Thorne's translation in volumes 3 and 4 is much closer to the earliest texts (Thorne, "Translator's Introduction," in Bracton On the Laws and Customs of England xiii (1977)).

Work has continued on the problems raised by the text of "Bracton." As a result of Thorne's work, Paul Brand has suggested the possibility that the treatise originated in an outline of the common law prepared for use in Ireland ("Ireland and the Literature of the Early Common Law," 16 Irish Jurist (n.s.) 95, 97 (1981)), an interesting suggestion but one that is difficult to reconcile with many passages in the treatise. The work of Francis De Zulueta and Peter Stein on Roman law in England in the early 13th century has further illuminated some difficult passages (The Teaching of Roman Law in England Around 1200 (Selden Society Supp. Series 1990)).

A sample passage will illustrate how Bractonian scholarship has fared over the past century. The issue raised is one that occurs to many people wandering the condominium-dominated beaches of Florida and California. The traditional text at folio 7b has Bracton writing: "No one therefore is prohibited from access to the shore [litus] of the sea as long as he stays away from [abstimet] the houses and buildings, because the shores [litorea] are not common by the law of nations as is the sea." This sentence obviously makes no sense. The 1569 edition deleted the "not" in order to eliminate the contradiction. Maitland compared the text to Justinian's Institutes and to Azo's Summa, and found that they both contained the "not" but did not have "shores" [litorea]. Bracton's own sources said "because they are not..." meaning the buildings, not the shores, but Bracton in his ignorance of Roman law misunderstood the implied subject of "are not." (8 Selden Society 93).
Woodbine in his edition provided the text from the oldest manuscripts, noting only manuscript variants, a few of which had omitted the "not," but all of which contained the "shores" (2 Bracton De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae 40 (Woodbine ed. 1922). In a modest defense of Bracton in 1923, Vinogradoff suggested several explanations for the apparent inconsistency ("The Roman Elements in Bracton's Treatise," 32 Yale L.J. 751, 756 (1923)).

Certain that Bracton could not have written "such rubbish," Kantorowicz took up one of Vinogradoff's suggestions and argued that Bracton had not written "shores" [iiiora] in the text, but that a later copyist—perhaps the infamous Redactor—had taken a subject catchword that someone had written in the margin and copied it into the text (Bractonian Problems, supra at 88-89). Thorne translated the text as Woodbine had established it, but noted the controversy in a note.

Now Peter Stein has found that a lecturer on Roman law in England around 1200 had raised precisely the point that the author of this part of the treatise may have been making: that abstineat in the Institutes of Justinian may mean "refrains from [erecting]." That is, anyone has access to seashores but isn't free to erect buildings there because the shores are not common (The Teaching of Roman Law, supra at bv, 29). If nothing else, this example vindicates Woodbine's approach to editing "Bracton": the first step must be to ascertain the manuscript tradition and to avoid making the text say what we expect it to say.

If possible, most academic law libraries ought to have thorough coverage of the most important work of medieval common law; certainly every law school library should have the Thorne edition, Bracton's Note Book, and The Teaching of Roman Law in England Around 1200. Recent prices in the rare/out-of-print book market for the editions of Bracton's text are shown below:

-1569 ("Vulgate") edition: a copy offered for sale in 1992 for £4,500; another copy, which may once have belonged to Maitland, from the Bodleian Library offered at $15,000.
-Twiss edition: recently offered at £185; reprint available from Hein.
-Woodbine edition: a copy of the original edition offered for sale in 1992 for $375; Elliiots Books, shown in Books in Print to have copies from the original printing, no longer has any in stock.
-Thorne edition: the original edition is out of print; the Selden Society bought the remaining original stock, but has none left; a set of all 4 volumes was offered for sale in 1992 for £325; a fifth volume containing indices, appendices, and notes has been underway for several years and may be completed in the next decade; there are hopes that if the fifth volume appears Harvard University Press will reprint the entire set.

*The author thanks David Warrington of the Harvard Law School Library for his help with some bibliographic information.

---

ROBERT H. RUBIN BOOKS
P.O. Box 267
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Visitors Welcome by Appointment
WITH THE EXPRESS PERMISSION OF THE STAIR SOCIETY... 1992 PARTIAL REPRINT

THE STAIR SOCIETY PUBLICATIONS
Instituted in 1934 to encourage the study and advance of the knowledge of the History of Scots Law

VOLUME NO. | AN INTRODUCTORY SURVEY OF THE SOURCES AND LITERATURE OF SCOTS LAW. 1936. | PRICE PER VOLUME
--- | --- | ---
1. | | $86.00
1a. | An Index to Volume No. 1. 1939 | 60.00
2. | ACTA CURIAE ADMIRALLATUS SCOTIÆ. 1937. | 60.00
3. | HOPE'S MAJOR PRACTICKS. Volume I. 1937. | 73.00
4. | HOPE'S MAJOR PRACTICKS. Volume II. 1938. | 48.00
5. | BARON DAVID HUME'S LECTURES. Volume I. 1939. | 73.00
6. | LORD HERMAND'S CONSISTORIAL DECISIONS. 1493. | 40.00
7. | ST ANDREWS FORMULARE. Volume I. 1942. | 74.00
8. | ACTA DOMINORUM CONCILII. 1943. | 60.00
9. | ST ANDREWS FORMULARE. Volume II. 1944. | 48.00
10. | THE REGISTER OF BRIEFS. 1946. | 65.00
11. | REGIAM MAJESTATEM ET QUONIAM ATTACHIAMENTA. 1947. | 73.00
12. | THE JUSTICIARY RECORDS OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES. 1949. | 51.00
13. | BARON DAVID HUME'S LECTURES. Volume II. 1949. | 59.00
14. | ACTA DOMINORUM CONCILII ET SESSIONIS. 1951. | 48.00
15. | BARON DAVID HUME'S LECTURES. Volume III. 1952. | 82.00
16. | SELECTED JUSTICIARY CASES. 1953. | 60.00
17. | BARON DAVID HUME'S LECTURES. Volume IV. 1955. | 101.00
18. | BARON DAVID HUME'S LECTURES. Volume V. 1957. | 48.00
19. | BARON DAVID HUME'S LECTURES. Volume VI. 1958. | 76.00
20. | AN INTRODUCTION TO SCOTTISH LEGAL HISTORY. 1958. | 88.00
21. | THE PRACTICKS OF SIR JAMES BALFOUR OF PITTENDREICH. Volume I. 1962. | 48.00
22. | THE PRACTICKS OF SIR JAMES BALFOUR OF PITTENDREICH. Volume II. 1963. | 48.00
23. | THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE JURY IN SCOTLAND. 1966. | 48.00
24. | WILLIAM HAY'S LECTURES ON MARRIAGE. 1967. | 48.00
25. | THE JUSTICIARY RECORDS OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES. Volume II. 1969. | 48.00
26. | MISCELLANY I. 1971. | 55.00
27. | SELECTED justiciary cases. Volume II. 1972. | 48.00
28. | SELECTED justiciary cases. Volume III. 1974. | 60.00
29. | THE MINUTE BOOK OF THE FACULTY OF ADVOCATES. Volume I. 1976. | 60.00
30. | THE SYNOD RECORDS OF LOTHIAN AND TWEEDDALE. 1977. | 60.00
31. | perpetuities in scots law. 1979. | 60.00
32. | faculty of advocates minute book. Volume II. 1982. | 60.00
33. | the stair tercentenary studies. 1982. | 60.00
34. | the court of the official in pre-reformation scotland. 1982. | 60.00
35. | MisCellany II. 1984. | 60.00
36. | formulary of old scots legal documents. 1985. | 60.00
37. | the scottish whigs and the reform of the court of session. 1991. | 75.00

Special
Volume 1 | THE COLLEGE OF JUSTICE. 1991. | 75.00
38. | THE COURT OF THE BARONY AND REGALITY OF FALKIRK AND CALLENDAR. Volume I. 1991. | 75.00

SET PRICE: $2475.00
PRICES DO NOT INCLUDE POSTAGE & HANDLING
ALL PRICES SUBJECT TO CHANGE WITHOUT NOTICE.

PLEASE ORDER FROM:

WM. W. GAUNT & SONS, INC.
Law Book Dealers & Subscription Agents
Gaunt Building
3011 Gulf Drive
Holmes Beach, Florida 34217-2199

FAX # 813-778-5252
813-778-5211 800-942-8683 Telex # 3727834
Problem of Ambiguous Deaccessioning

by Nick Triffin
Pace University

Have you ever stepped into a used-book store and seen a library book on the shelf? Do you look inside and find no cancellation, "withdrawn," or "discard" stamp clearly indicating that the putative library owner has relinquished its ownership rights? Do you seek further and find either nothing or a date due stamp from, e.g. 1955? I find this experience not uncommon. In fact, I have found association copies of first editions inscribed by one eminent author to another equally eminent reader on dealer's shelves with clear indications that they belonged to a major law school library. (For non-rare book librarians, an "association copy" is defined in Carter's ABC for Books Collectors (New York: Knopf, 5th ed., 1988) as "a copy which once belonged to, or was annotated by, the author; which once belonged to someone connected with the author or someone of interest in his own right; or, again, and perhaps most interestingly, belonged to someone peculiarly associated with its contents.") As it happens, these indications did not correspond with reality, and the library had, in fact, sold the books to the dealer, though when I asked the libraries whether they knew they had discarded valuable association copies, it turns out they did not and wished they hadn't.

If I take the book to the store owners and suggest that they should return it to the library in question, they usually account straightforwardly for their ownership of the book. All too frequently, however, I get an indifferent stare and the distinct feeling that they would like me to crawl under a rock and vanish. After all, who wants the headache of determining true ownership and either the hassle of having to return a book to the person you bought it from for a refund or the financial loss of return-

ing it to the owner library for free?

Let me state at the outset that I am not for a moment impugning the motives or ethics of used book sellers, though they could, perhaps, improve their procedures. We can assume that booksellers, like all law abiding citizens, would shudder at the thought of being receivers of stolen property. Strengthening that assumption, most reputable booksellers adhere, explicitly or implicitly, to a code of ethics such as that promulgated by the Antiquarian Bookseller's Association of America (ABAA), paragraph three of which states:

An ABAA member shall be responsible for passing to the buyer clear title to all material sold, and shall not knowingly purchase, hold, or attempt to resell stolen materials. An ABAA member shall make all reasonable efforts to ascertain that materials offered to him or her are the property of the seller. An ABAA member shall make every effort to prevent the theft of antiquarian books and related materials. An ABAA member shall cooperate with law enforcement authorities in the effort to recover and return stolen material, and apprehend those responsible for the theft.


Assuming that all booksellers would like their clients to view them as ethical and that they all try to adhere to such a code as the one outlined above, why do we find library books on their shelves?

The prime responsibility lies at the feet of two other culprits: It rests first with the unethical patron who steals or fails to return a book or the improvident one who, for instance, dies without taking the
trouble of returning legitimately borrowed books first. These patrons may account for a small portion of the books in question. We can probably see, however, that libraries account for a far greater number of books of questionable ownership in the stream of commerce. I refer to the subset of the library universe made up of libraries that do not properly deaccession the books they discard or sell, either to dealers or in "friends of the library" sales. We cannot do much about the former; but we have complete control over the latter.

I would like to propose here that all libraries should adopt, as part of their library ethics procedures, a uniform and standard practice for identifying unambiguously books they have permanently withdrawn from their collections and discarded through sale or transfer of ownership to some other person or entity.

To the best of my knowledge, only one library organization has made an ethical statement on deaccession, and, in my opinion, it does not squarely address the problem examined here. The ACRL adopted Standards for Ethical Conduct for Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collection Libraries in 1987 that includes a section on deaccession:

Rare book, manuscript, and special collections librarians shall deaccession materials in their care only in accordance with the established policies of their institutions. Further safeguards, such as the advice of scholars in the field of the materials to be deaccessioned, might well be established. The procedure for the deaccession or disposal of materials shall be at least as rigorous as that for purchasing materials.

(Standards for Ethical Conduct for Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Libraries, 1987 Coll. & Res. Libr. N. 134-35.)

Let us note here that if the law library mentioned in the first paragraph had used this standard, it would not have discarded its association copies. In its defense, however, I should say that they had classified and shelved the copies in question in the regular collection and not as rare books.

At least some, if not all, rare book libraries no longer put ownership stamps on or bookplates in their rare books. Deaccessioning these unmarked books by sale or transfer to a book dealer does not present the problem I have noted above. However, those that do have such ownership stamps should have some means of cancelling them or, if they or the dealer now object to yet another stamp, of "trumping" them with a letter transferring title to the dealer and subsequent purchasers. Ideally, the library should write one such letter for each book. Although this might seem expensive, the selling price should include the cost, and, in the case of truly rare or valuable books, no reasonable buyer should balk at it.

In the much more likely situation where the books being discarded have no special value and do have library ownership stamps, libraries should use some standard, uniform, and, ideally, difficult to counterfeit or erase deaccession stamp. An ideal stamp would include the date of deaccession and the signature (original or stamped) of the person in charge of deaccessioning. While the use of such stamps will not deter the determined thief with the technical knowhow to counterfeit or erase them, few such sophisticated thieves would waste their time on non-rare books. On the other hand, the widespread use of such a stamp would give peace of mind and much greater certainty as to the actual deaccession of library materials than the current non-system.

If library associations could singly or jointly devise and adopt such a standard stamp, dealers could help make its use widespread by refusing to purchase any unstamped deaccessioned materials. Perhaps they should insist right away on any kind of deaccession stamp instead of waiting for a uniform one.

Coming as it does from a novice in the field, this proposal may strike the "old hands" as ridiculously impractical or quixotic. But if it has any merit at all, I hope the membership of the SIS will consider it carefully, improve on it, and lobby for its implementation in the law library world and beyond. I would welcome any thoughts you have on it in our next newsletter.

[The, almost certainly few, readers of this newsletter who study or dabble in the field called "General Semantics," may find it interesting that I wrote this article in E-Prime, a subset of the English language that does not use any form of the verb "to be." Those wishing to explore the whys and wherefores of this practice should find the following reference useful: Bourland, D. David and Johnston, Paul Dunnihorne, To Be or Not: An E-Prime Anthology (San Francisco: International Society for General Semantics, 1991).]
Meeting after the Meeting

The SIS's business meeting is San Francisco is scheduled from 1:30-3:00 on Sunday, July 19th. Since we don't anticipate that our business will take the entire hour and a half, we thought we might have an informal discussion following our general business and any housekeeping issues. Two topics we'd like to consider are:

1. How are you handling manuscripts? Are you actively collecting? And, if you are, what kind of processing are you doing, and what kind of access are you providing? Do you think we should sponsor a program on this topic in Boston in 1993?

2. Our response to the Report and Recommendations of the Special Committee on Preservation Needs of Law Libraries. The Special Committee produced a massive (over 370 pages) report, dated June 1991. The basic discussion and recommendation section of this report was sent to relevant SIS Chairs and others involved in the implementation of its recommendations. Margaret Leary, the AALL Executive Board Liaison for the Special Committee, has asked us to review, comment on, and implement its recommendations for action by this SIS. Those recommendations are:

   a. Develop educational materials on housing and care of rare books;

   b. Develop policy for retention of rare books and the entering of rare book records in national bibliographic databases; and

   c. Collect rare book definitions and policy statements prepared by law libraries.

Needless to say, a response will involve a certain amount of work. All those who wish to be involved in discussion and implementation should be sure to come to the business meeting. There will be a copy of the entire report for those who are interested in glancing at it. If you wish to obtain a copy for yourself, you should call AALL headquarters, which should have a supply of them.

Nick Triffin
Cynthia Arkin