



# EX ANTE

## OUR MISTAKES

In our 2015 *Almanac & Reader* we announced new rules for the nomination and selection of exemplary legal writing to be honored in the 2016 *Almanac & Reader*. We like our new rules, but we regret that we made a mistake in the ones for judicial opinions. The idea was, and remains, to encourage judges who are active writers to nominate their peers' best work. To that end we said:

*Who can nominate?* Any judge who issued a signed opinion in 2014 that is available in WestlawNext's "Cases" database.

That constraint is too tight. The written work of many fine judges appears only in WestlawNext's "Trial Court Orders" database. So, our nomination rule for judicial opinions should have been, and now is:

*Who can nominate?* Any judge who issued a signed opinion in 2014 that is available in WestlawNext's "Cases" database or its "Trial Court Orders" database.

In other erroneous business, Nicole Garnett's *Three Things: A Tribute to Judge Morris Sheppard Arnold*, 18 GREEN BAG 2D 255 (2015), managed to get to the printer with two errors in it. We will fix them now:

Pages 259: *As printed* – “. . . did not initially lead me eager to delve into the arcane world of servitudes . . . .” *As corrected* – “. . . did not initially leave me eager to delve into the arcane world of servitudes . . . .”

Page 260 n.5: *As printed* – “He, yet again, reversed, reasoning ruled that the government’s position could not be said to be substantially justified . . . .” *As corrected* – “He, yet again, reversed, reasoning that the government’s position could not be said to be substantially justified . . . .”

Several attentive readers spotted an error in Greg Goelzhauser’s *Justice Blackmun’s Blood Oath*, 18 GREEN BAG 2D 163 (2015). Steve Duvernay and Hardin T. Haynes sent especially kind and complete corrections. As Duvernay tactfully put it:

A minor correction to *Justice Blackmun’s Blood Oath*, 18 GREEN BAG 2D 163. On page 171, when discussing *Huffman v. Western Nuclear, Inc.*, the author writes that Justice Blackmun was “unable to avoid using ‘viable’ in its non-mathematical sense.” I believe the author meant to capture Blackmun’s despair at using the word in its “nonmedical sense.”

There. That’s better.

## A JOURNAL WITH STYLE

*The New Rambler* is not a law journal, or a travel magazine. It is a new online review of books. But two of its three editors (Eric Posner of the University of Chicago and Adrian Vermeule of Harvard) are lawyers. And it does review plenty of books about law (as well as history, political philosophy, politics, theology, the humanities, and the natural and social sciences).<sup>1</sup> We like *TNR*’s style – its authors tend to say interesting things using words even we can understand, maybe because that’s what *TNR* asks them to do:

### Style Guidelines

1. Write for a general, educated audience. You can use *The New York Review of Books* as a model if you want.
2. No footnotes; hyperlinks are fine.
3. If you quote the book you are reviewing, include the page number in parentheses.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See [newramblerreview.com/the-new-rambler-review](http://newramblerreview.com/the-new-rambler-review).

<sup>2</sup> [newramblerreview.com/images/files/NRR-Guidelines-for-Reviewers\\_150608.pdf](http://newramblerreview.com/images/files/NRR-Guidelines-for-Reviewers_150608.pdf).