A small addendum will show that the prevailing plural style in the pre-Civil War period did not turn merely on any idiosyncrasies of the verbs “are” versus “is.” Thus, taken from a random sampling, in Chief Justice Marshall’s opinion in the notable case of *Cohens v. Virginia*, 6 Wheat. (19 U.S.) 264, 413 (1821), we find The Great Chief Justice writing “That the United States form, for many, and for most important purposes, a single nation, has not yet been denied.” Not “the United States forms.” Or in a nearby opinion, *The Gran Para*, 7 Wheat. (20 U.S.) 471, 486 (1822), Marshall writes “against a nation with whom the United States were at peace.” Not “the United States was at peace.” It might also be noted that Marshall and some of his brethren had a habit of often writing about “the Union” where they might have said “the United States,” so to that extent this grammatical nicety would not even arise.

Bennett Boskey
Washington, DC

**WHERE ARE THE BOBBLENAPPERS?**

To the *Bag*:

I looked long and hard in my copy of the Summer 2008 *Green Bag* for the *Ex Post* article “Bobblenapping” by the BLA. Ok, not that long or that hard, but I did look for it. It’s mentioned on the cover, but not in the table of contents inside. And I can’t find it at the end of the issue. Editing problem with the cover, perhaps?

Michael Kwun
Electronic Frontier Foundation
San Francisco, CA

To the *Bag*:

I received my copy of the Summer 2008 *Green Bag*, and after a quick perusal, I am having it preserved in acid-free, temperature- and light-controlled storage because of its obvious value: It seems that instead of the *Ex Post* article, *Bobblenapping*, by the BLA, listed on the front cover, in my copy there were printed four “Subscription Information” pages, not counting the inside back cover. I’m
To the Bag

sure this will be like a double-stamped penny or the postage stamp with the upside-down airplane. But I digress. I’m very much inter-
ested in reading the aforementioned article. Would it be possible to post it online?

Theodore P. “Jack” Metzler, Jr.
Covington & Burling LLP
Washington, DC

To the Bag:

Okay, I’m stumped. Is the missing Ex Post in the latest issue of GB intended as a puzzle or a teaser, or am I searching for something I shouldn’t be searching for? Any clue will greatly increase the pro-
ductivity of me and two of my colleagues here.

Adam Sachs
Folger Levin & Kahn LLP
San Francisco, CA

For a response from the editors, please see pages 1-8 above.