

Announcing

**THE NEWLY REVISED
UNIFORM SYSTEM OF CITATION
SEVENTH EDITION
(1947)**

A Convenient, Well Indexed System of Citation
for
American and English Cases and Reports,
Periodicals, Treatises, Services, Restatements,
Government Publications,
and Statutes

Rules for Capitalization, Italicization,
and Abbreviation

35 cents postpaid

ADDRESS ORDERS TO
HARVARD LAW REVIEW ASSOCIATION
GANNETT HOUSE CAMBRIDGE 38, MASS.

First advertisement for the Bluebook.

and much of the content of the *Bluebook* and thus require Yale to concede to Harvard at least an equal share of credit for the genesis of uniform citation.

Finally, page 13 of the 1927 edition of Harvard's *Instructions for Editorial Work* includes the following news of the *Bluebook*, confirming some but not all of Griswold's recollections:

D. Uniform Citation Plan.

In 1926 the HARVARD LAW REVIEW, the COLUMBIA LAW REVIEW, and the YALE LAW JOURNAL adopted a uniform system of citation. Since that time several other law reviews and legal publications have acceded to the plan. In all write-ups for the REVIEW use the forms given in the Uniform Citation booklet. (Since the system was inaugurated several changes have been found desirable or necessary. Consequently, until a new edition of the citation booklet is published, it will be necessary to use the old citation booklet, together with a mimeographed supplement.)

The *Green Bag* welcomes any information about when the *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* got its oar in the water.

**SILICON FOUNDERS ☺
DIGITAL JUSTICES**

THE HIGH-TECH ACTION may be on the coasts, but in law the cutting edge runs through the Midwest. West Publishing is in St. Paul, Minnesota, and Lexis is in Dayton, Ohio. Findlaw (in Mountain View, California) is the exception that proves the rule. Now, far from the daily coastal planting and harvesting of .coms, other Midwesterners are producing some useful and entertaining legal source material on CDROM and the Internet. The University of Chicago Press and the Liberty Fund have converted *The Founders' Constitution* (Chicago 1987) – the widely admired and very expensive (on paper) five-volume collection of documents relating to the U.S. Constitution and its first twelve amendments – into a free searchable Internet site (press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders). For those without Web access, or with limited patience for ethereal logjams, there is a CDROM version as well. Northwestern University Press has a nifty new CDROM of its own, *The Supreme Court's Greatest Hits*, available in the gift shop at the high court and, we hope, at stores everywhere. Based on the "Oyez" website (oyez.nwu.edu), *Greatest Hits* features hour after hour of complete oral arguments from dozens of leading cases and even announcements of a few decisions, plus a variety of visual accessories.

IN MEMORIAM

"PRETTY MUCH EVERYBODY will want to print some sort of tribute to Charles Alan Wright," observes Derek Chan, a former student of Professor Wright at the University of Texas. "You can ruminate all you

want about *Federal Practice & Procedure* or the Nixon defense days, or whatever else the man has done, but his intellectual achievements stand on their own. His memos to the *Law Review*, on the other hand, really show a keen sense of humor familiar to few who did not meet him.”

For example, admiring journal editors sent Wright a *Texas Law Review* mug imprinted with, “Should anal retentive be hyphenated?” His response:

September 27, 1995

To: Texas Law Review
From: Charles Alan Wright

I thank you for the small token of respect you sent me recently, but I am surprised at the question on the back of it. Of course a phrasal adjective such as the one on the mug must be hyphenated. As Bryan Garner has recently written: “Seemingly everyone in the literary

world knows this except lawyers. For some unfathomable reason – perhaps because they are accustomed to slow, dull, heavy reading – lawyers resist these hyphens.” Garner, *A Dictionary of Modern Legal Usage* 657 (2d ed., 1995).

A few years earlier, the *Law Review's* book review editor had invited Wright to comment on a new edition of the *Bluebook*. Demurring, Wright said that he was probably not the best person for the job, as such reviews often require a humorous take. He suggested that perhaps the senior (and formerly only) co-author of *Federal Practice & Procedure*, Arthur Miller of Harvard, might have some thoughts on the subject, particularly on freshly-minted Rule 15.1.1. Compare *Bluebook R. 15.1* (14th ed. 1986) with *Bluebook R. 15.1.1* (15th ed. 1991). See also *Tribute to Professor Charles Alan Wright*, 144 Cong. Rec. s9944-45. 