Legal Information Management, 10 (2010), pp. 18–23
© The British and Irish Association of Law Librarians
doi:10.1017/S1472669610000113

Cataloguing: AACR2 and All That

Abstract: Guy Holborn, Librarian of Gray's Inn, gives some very practical help on how to catalogue the law collection whilst ensuring compliance with cataloguing standards
Keywords: cataloguing; law books

Introduction

The presentation on cataloguing given at the BIALL pre-Conference seminar in Dublin in 2008, on which this article is based, attracted a gratifyingly large audience. The majority wore their name badges, and were not too embarrassed to admit that the subject was of interest to them, nor that some practical tips would be welcome. The purpose of this article, as with the seminar, is to give some pointers both to the basics of cataloguing and to some of the tricky problems that can arise when dealing with law books. It is aimed mainly at those who do original cataloguing, either regularly or only from time to time, but those managers who have to supervise staff who do cataloguing might also find some of the content of relevance.

Why cataloguing standards are important

The importance of having a good catalogue that follows consistent standards may be self-evident. Ensuring that users find what they need is the most basic of requirements for any library, but it is a common experience that many users do not use the catalogue for themselves but simply ask the staff. It follows that the heaviest users of the catalogue are the staff. The worst nightmare is that poor cataloguing results in you sending a user away empty-handed, only to find a few moments after they have left that you had the item all along. High cataloguing standards also promote a professional image. Pernickety matters like capitalisation and punctuation may seem trivial, but in fact have a subliminal effect – it is very much like looking at a professionally copy-edited book as compared to an amateur self-published document. Precise standards also become essential if you participate in any form of co-operative cataloguing, for example at multi-site firms.

What standards to follow

This article assumes that the starting point for any standards is AACR2 (Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, Second Edition). "AACR3" in the form of RDA (Resource Description and Access) is on its way, but will not affect the basics of descriptive cataloguing. If you had to create a catalogue from scratch it would be madness to reinvent the wheel and try to write your own rules. Nonetheless one of the points of this article is to highlight some of the rules of AACR2 that give unsatisfactory results when applied to legal materials, and where that arises to weigh up the pros and cons of departing from AACR2. Of course in every case there is always the con that any departure compromises the concept of universal standards. But in most law libraries pragmatism rightly rules the day.

The value of an in-house cataloguing manual

Any agreed departures from AACR2 necessitate an in-house cataloguing manual, so that they can be applied consistently. In any event an in-house cataloguing manual is highly desirable for several reasons. First, it is necessary to record practices with regard to local information outside the scope of AACR2, such as style of shelf references and local notes. Secondly, AACR2 is a substantial affair, and replete with arcane rules that will never be needed in the average law library. For example whether to enter spirit communications under the spirit or the medium, or how to deal with liturgical works of the Eastern Orthodox Church. An in-house manual can form a quick reference guide, and highlight those rules that crop up most frequently when cataloguing legal materials. Continuity in the event of staff turnover and the training of new cataloguers are further benefits.

The basics of AACR2

When training new cataloguers, one impediment to achieving a grasp of the conceptual underpinning of AACR2 is that the cataloguer typically fills in a template on a screen arranged in order of MARC (Machine-Readable Cataloguing) fields. Even if numeric MARC tags are not used, the order of fields typically follows them. This means that you start with, for example, the main

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1472669610000113 Published online by Cambridge University Press

entry for a personal author in the 100 field, followed by the title and statement of responsibility in the 245 field, and then proceeding further down to other added entries in the 700s. AACR2 is structured in two parts: description and access points. Description is essentially copying out information as it appears in the book. It is not concerned with how users look it up. Access points are the means by which users find the book however it may have been described. Description and allocating access points are distinct intellectual exercises. Simply proceeding in the order of MARC tags carries the danger of muddling the two up – the 100 field is an access point decision, the 245 a descriptive decision, and the 700s further access point decisions. Having said that, there is of course a relationship between the two, most notably in the rule that any access points have to derive from matching information provided in the description.

Description

There are two questions here: where you take information from and when strict transcription of what appears on the book is required. The answer to the first question depends on the area of the record, and varies in its strictness, so that, for example, information for the title and statement of responsibility is taken only from the title-page, whereas information in the notes area can come from any source, not necessarily even from anywhere in the publication itself. Likewise with transcription: it is strict in the case of the title, but in the case of the name of the publisher merely "the shortest form in which it can be understood and identified internationally". There is no alternative but to study the relevant rules and familiarise yourself with them.

Access points

Again, there are two questions: which to choose, and then having chosen, the form of the name in question. The question of which to choose also raises the slightly fraught question of main entries versus added entries. It might be thought that agonising over what to give as the main entry is wasted energy nowadays – with an online catalogue it makes no odds which you choose provided that the relevant heading is given somewhere. True, except for two things. First, if you generate as a by-product of your catalogue any form of listing where any item is listed only once, then you have to decide which the single most useful heading is. This may arise with new acquisitions lists, current awareness bulletins, printed quick reference guides to particular material and shelf-lists. Secondly, if the arrangement of books on your shelves relates to the author (or other main entry) either generally or within subject groupings, then you need to decide what it is going to be. Even if these reasons for distinguishing between main entries and added entries do not apply, consistency dictates applying a rule of some sort, and if you are using MARC you have perforce to decide what is a 100 and what is a 700.

The following goes through the fields in a typical catalogue record, highlighting some of the tricky points that can arise.

Main entry: author or editor?

This is the "long-dead Chitty" problem. Rule 21.12B is one of the few examples, as applied to legal textbooks, when AACR2 is in conflict with its guiding principle that cataloguing should follow the thought-processes of users, not cataloguers. According to AACR2, if the title-page were to say "by Joseph Chitty", or if the title were "Chitty on contracts" without the mention of anyone else in a statement of responsibility, well and good: the main entry is Chitty. But otherwise, if the original author is considered to be no longer responsible, (a fair assumption as Joseph Chitty died in 1838) the original author is an added entry only. The example given at 21.12B1 is:

> Salmond on the law of torts. – 12th ed. / by R.V. Heuston

The instruction given is main entry under Heuston, not Salmond. When was the last time a reader came to the desk and asked for the well-known work on contracts other than by asking for "Chitty"?

Main entry: editor or title?

Where you have a collection by different people with a named editor, the paradigmatic example is a collection of essays, e.g. *The Quistclose trust: critical essays* / edited by William Swadling, then generally speaking the application of AACR2 rule 21.7B results in a main entry by title. The chief virtue of this rule is ease of application and resulting consistency. The drawback is again users' thought-processes, which often tend to put the name of an editor on par with the name of an author. At Lincoln's Inn Library, we do not strictly follow AACR2, particularly because most books are shelved by author. The instruction to cataloguers is to decide first how the book might most usefully be shelved and then assign the main entry accordingly. This is of course only presenting the dilemma the other way round, but it does sharpen the mind, and by and large results in readers' expectations being met.

A related problem is loose-leaf works. In the case of the typical loose-leaf encyclopaedia there is usually little difficulty in reaching the conclusion that main entry by title is best. Few users will identify the *Encyclopaedia of Planning Law* or *Butterworths Planning Law Service* otherwise, though you can get examples where a work starts out as conventionally authored but gradually over time

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1472669610000113 Published online by Cambridge University Press

migrates to the general loose-leaf service format. There is also the question as to what extent editors of loose-leafs are included in the catalogue record at all. The difficulty is that most of us only catalogue a loose-leaf work once, when we first get it. Few of us are conscientious enough or eagle-eyed enough to revisit the cataloguing several releases down the line. Thus it might be sensible to resist the cataloguer's urge to put in all possible access points, and eschew all editors unless they are unavoidably prominent (whether they are actually plastered over the binder, rather than just on the title-page is one guide) – certainly ignore the thirteen "contributing editors" and the person who contributed the chapter on tax (unless he is the managing partner of your firm).

Forms of names

This can cause difficulty since AACR2 (for sound reasons) has different rules for personal authors and for corporate authors. Where a personal author has a different form of name on different works, for example forename on one, initials only on another, or where the author has later been given a peerage, then a single form of name has to be chosen for use as the access point in the catalogue records for all the works (though remember that in the statement of responsibility in the *description* the form will be that on the particular work). The basic rule is to apply the following criteria in turn: most commonly found; if in doubt, latest; if still in doubt, fullest.

In contrast, if a corporate body changes its name then the heading changes too – the work is entered under the form of name at the time of publication. The other basic point is that different authors cannot have the same form of name. In the case of personal authors, if you have two different authors called "John Smith" on the catalogue, then you need to distinguish them, usually by adding dates.

The authors of law books include an unusually large number of people with knighthoods, peerages, and judicial titles. These cause untold difficulty, not least because forms of address for judges depend on whether they are given in a legal or non-legal setting, and because of the arcane conventions applying to peerage titles (particularly territorial designations). Scottish judicial authors also have their own problems. It seems most practicable to set out the relevant rules as an appendix, which can be used more easily for future reference.

Changes of title: serials

AACR2 12.1B4 specifies that if a "major change in the title proper" occurs then you create a fresh record under the new title, with linking notes "Continued by:" and "Continues:" on the old and new records respectively. This applies even if the volume numbering is not interrupted by the title change (which readers can find counter-intuitive). Any minor changes or variation in title can simply be recorded in a note. What amounts to a major change is a matter of judgment, but changes at the start of the title are likely to be more significant, especially if you arrange serials alphabetically on the shelves.

Changes of title: loose-leafs

This can be a serious nuisance, and is often occasioned by a loose-leaf changing publisher. An example is *Butterworths Discrimination Law*, which was taken over by Tottel, becoming on the title-page simply *Discrimination Law*, but elsewhere in the preliminaries *Tottel's Discrimination Law*, with, to make matters worse, bulletins under the title *Butterworths Discrimination Law* still filed prominently at the front. There is no general solution. Although it is not purist, it may be best to follow what appears on the binders, rather than on the title-page, and then to make liberal use of notes and added title entries.

Statement of responsibility or part of the title?

The basic rule is that if on the title-page the authorship is grammatically connected to or embedded in the title, then it is transcribed as part of the title proper, so:

```
Chitty on contracts
Snell's equity
```

But if the title-page were laid out as:

Woodfall
Landlord and Tenant

Then:

```
Landlord and tenant / Woodfall
```

This rule particularly affects the transcription of honorifics, degrees, etc., which are omitted from the otherwise strict transcription of a statement of responsibility but are included as a part of a title. For example a title-page:

Memoirs
By
The late Rt Hon Charles Fox, LLD

Becomes:

```
Memoirs / by Charles Fox
```

But the title-page:

Memoirs of the late
Rt Hon Charles Fox, LLD

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1472669610000113 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Becomes:

```
Memoirs of the late Rt Hon Charles
Fox, LLD
```

Statements of responsibility: for the work or for the edition?

This is a common problem with legal textbooks because of their publication in successive editions with changing authorship. The statement of responsibility for the first edition will naturally always be for the work and appear in the 245 field. Thereafter it is a question of keeping a sharp eye on precisely how responsibility is stated on the title-page. Even where there is only a single statement of responsibility, if it is different in the next edition, for example with an additional author, then the whole statement will go with the edition statement in the 250. A difficulty arises if you have a later edition, but not the earlier editions, with which to compare it. If in doubt it is probably best to treat the statement of responsibility as being for the work.

Multiple authors and/or editors: how many to include?

The limit for transcription purposes is three. If more than three, then give the first named only, followed by "… [et al.]". But counting is applied to each separate statement of responsibility. So a work by Tom, Dick and Harry, whose 5th edition is by Anne, Christine and Susan, has two statements of responsibility, which will be transcribed according to the number in each.

As mentioned earlier, you may well want to depart from the strict rule in the case of loose-leafs, and be more sparing in the number you transcribe, in order to avoid creating hostages to fortune as the work progresses. One way to approach this is to consider first what added author entries might be absolutely necessary, and transcribe only those in the description.

Editions

A first edition has no edition statement, except where, as now sometimes occurs on legal textbooks, the author or publisher have been presumptuous enough actually to put "1st edition" on the title-page.

Place of publication

Always put the first named. Only add a second if it is in your home country and the first is not. Law librarians in London and Dublin may thus catalogue, as far as this field goes, the same work differently.

Names of publishers

These are not transcribed strictly, just the shortest form that is internationally identifiable, so "Butterworths", not "Butterworths & Co (Publishers) Ltd", will do. They are not typically subject to rigorous authority control, as are names of persons or bodies, but you may want to have some in-house guide for consistency for common publishers, for example settle on either "TSO" or "The Stationery Office".

Physical description

You might wish to cut down on AACR2 and omit the number of pages in a very basic catalogue, but it does serve a purpose by distinguishing the slim pamphlet from the massive tome. It is also essential with multi-volume works, and loose-leafs. The latter are so described even if only in one volume : "1v. (loose-leaf)" – with a hyphen.

Notes

This field is an opportunity to add any helpful information not already given elsewhere in the catalogue record. Users seldom read them, so keep them succinct. On the other hand staff, as a matter of professional habit, should look at them, so include information that would be helpful to staff. Distinguish, and enter in separate fields, notes relating generally to the bibliographical record, which will apply universally, and local notes that relate to your particular copy or your particular library.

The following are some typical applications:

- Explaining any added entry given as an access point which is not otherwise mentioned in the description. For example, if you have an added title entry because there is a variant title on the cover, put: "Cover title:"
- Changes of title from previous editions.
- Listing the contents if not apparent from the title proper.
- Highlighting any material in appendices that might be useful generally or in your particular library.
- Updating mechanisms not apparent from the record, e.g. "Kept up to date by pocket part supplements" or "Online updates available".
- Accompanying materials, e.g. "Precedents also published on accompanying CD-ROM".
- Explaining the subject matter or jurisdictional coverage if not apparent from its title.
- Local information, e.g. "Gift of the author" – the author will like that and it will be useful for future reference of the staff – or "CD-ROM kept at the desk".

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1472669610000113 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Supplements

The standard cumulative supplement to a textbook is best included in the main record. Ensure that it is prominent and the date is given. At Lincoln's Inn Library we put "2002 + 2008 supplement" in the date of publication field. It is sometimes necessary to catalogue "special supplements" separately, particularly where they are published independently from the main work, in which case provide linking notes on each record.

Old editions

If you retain old editions of textbooks, there are three options. First fully catalogue each separately. This is the best solution from a purist point of view, and essential if all the old editions are not shelved together. From the practical point of view users are in danger of retrieving 61 records, when all they want is the latest edition of Archbold. Secondly, catalogue the current edition only and add holdings of earlier editions as a local note. This reduces the clutter of 61 records in the catalogue for Archbold, but the single record itself may get cluttered. It also may give rise to complicated notes as to the location of old editions. Thirdly, a compromise is to create full separate records for the current edition and the pre-current edition, and then add a note on the latter as to holdings of earlier editions. This makes shelf references to current and older editions clearer and keeps the record for the current edition uncluttered; on the other hand there is a distinct danger of users thinking you only hold those two editions. The first solution is followed for example by the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, the second by Inner and Middle Temple libraries, and the third by Lincoln's Inn and Gray's Inn libraries.

Appendix: Forms of Names for Judges, Peers etc.

English Judges

English judges above the rank of Circuit Judge ("His Honour Judge Smith") have different styles of name in the legal and non-legal context. For cataloguing purposes, the non-legal form is used. High Court judges are always knighted or created a Dame. Court of Appeal judges in addition are always made Privy Councillors. Law Lords were always made life peers. All the Justices of the United Kingdom Supreme Court, which replaced the Law Lords from October 2009, are at the time writing life peers, having been so created before the Supreme Court came into being. New appointees will not be made life peers, and will only carry such titles as they already have.

High Court Judges

Legal:	The Hon Mr Justice Mann
	The Hon Mr Justice Christopher Clarke (forename only because another Clarke)
	The Hon Mrs Justice Proudman, DBE ("Mrs" even if single or maiden name)
Legal texts:	Mann J, Christopher Clarke J, Proudman J
Non-legal:	Sir Anthony Mann
	Sir Christopher Clarke
	Dame Sonia Proudman, DBE
Catalogue:	Mann, Sir Anthony
	Clarke, Sir Christopher
	Proudman, Dame Sonia

Court of Appeal Judges (Lord Justices of Appeal)

Legal:	The Rt Hon Lord Justice Sedley
	The Rt Hon Lady Justice Arden, DBE
Legal texts:	Sedley LJ, Arden LJ
Non-legal:	The Rt Hon Sir Stephen Sedley
	The Rt Hon Dame Mary Arden, DBE
Catalogue:	Sedley, Sir Stephen
	Arden, Dame Mary

Law Lords (Lords of Appeal in Ordinary)

Legal:	The Rt Hon Lord Steyn
	The Rt Hon Lord Bingham of Cornhill
	The Rt Hon Baroness Hale of Richmond
Legal texts:	Lord Steyn

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1472669610000113 Published online by Cambridge University Press

	Lord Bingham (or Lord Bingham of Cornhill)
	Lady Hale (or Baroness Hale, or Baroness Hale of Richmond)
Non-legal:	As for legal.
Catalogue:	Steyn, Johan Steyn, Baron
	Bingham of Cornhill, Thomas Bingham, Baron
	Hale of Richmond, Brenda Hale, Baroness

Peers

All peers are gazetted as "of somewhere" but the "of somewhere" is only included in the name (and catalogue heading) if it is part of the peerage title proper (usually because there is or has been another peerage with the same name): contrast above Lord Steyn and Lord Bingham. If in doubt look at *Who's who* or the list of peers on the Parliament website.

The peerage title is usually the same as the family name (and so the latter is repeated in the catalogue heading) but not necessarily so, in which a cross-reference should be provided, e.g.:

```
Hailsham of St Marylebone, Quintin McGarel Hogg, Baron
x Hogg, Quintin McGarel, Baron Hailsham of St Marylebone
```

All peers below the rank of Duke *may* be referred to in speech as "Lord" (so "Lord Longford" for the Earl of Longford), except Barons (the rank of all life peers) who are *always* called "Lord". Anomalously, women holding the equivalent rank to a Baron may be referred to interchangeably as "Baroness" or "Lady" (so Lady Thatcher or Baroness Thatcher). However, in all cases the formal peerage rank is used in the catalogue heading.

Scottish Judges of the Court of Session ("Senators of the College of Justice")

In Scotland, the equivalent of English High Court and Court of Appeal judges take a judicial title prefixed with "Lord". Despite being called "Lord" they are not peers. However, like peers their judicial title may or may not be the same as their family name. Where it differs provide a cross-reference, e.g.:

```
Coulsfield, John Taylor Cameron, Lord
X Cameron, John Taylor, Lord Coulsfield
```

Biography

Guy Holborn is the Librarian at Lincoln's Inn Library. Earlier in his career he held posts at the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies Library and the House of Lords Library, which included working in their cataloguing departments.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1472669610000113 Published online by Cambridge University Press