

UIC School of Law

UIC Law Open Access Repository

UIC Law Open Access Faculty Scholarship

1996

An Un-Uniform System of Citation: Surviving with the New Bluebook, 26 Stetson L. Rev. 53 (1996)

Darby Dickerson

John Marshall Law School

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.law.uic.edu/facpubs>



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#), and the [Legal Writing and Research Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Darby Dickerson, An Un-Uniform System of Citation: Surviving with the New Bluebook, 26 Stetson L. Rev. 53 (1996)

<https://repository.law.uic.edu/facpubs/651>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UIC Law Open Access Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in UIC Law Open Access Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of UIC Law Open Access Repository. For more information, please contact repository@jmls.edu.

**AN UN-UNIFORM SYSTEM OF CITATION:
SURVIVING WITH THE NEW *BLUEBOOK*
(Including Compendia of State and Federal Court
Rules Concerning Citation Form)***

A. Darby Dickerson**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	55
II.	SEVENTY YEARS OF <i>BLUEBOOK</i> HISTORY	57
III.	THE SIXTEENTH EDITION: MAJOR CHANGES AND UN-UNIFORMITY	65
A.	Initial Impressions	65
B.	Significant Revisions	66
	1. Introductory Signals	66
	2. Public Domain Citations	70
	3. Subsequent History	78
	4. Authors' Names	79
	5. Legislative Material	81
	6. Internet Material	82
C.	Other Notable Changes	83
	1. Textual Material in Footnotes	83
	2. Endnotes and Graphical Material	84
	3. Referencing Districts or Departments	85
	4. Short Cites for Cases	85
	5. Foreign Material	86
	6. Parallel Citations to U.S. Supreme Court Cases	87
	7. Table Numbering	87
D.	Overall Critique of Sixteenth-Edition Changes . . .	87

* © 1996 A. Darby Dickerson. All rights reserved. Editors' Note: Although other articles in this issue conform to the Fifteenth Edition of *The Bluebook: A Uniform System of Citation*, this Article conforms to the *Bluebook's* Sixteenth Edition, which was published after the other articles had been completed.

** Assistant Professor of Law and Director of Research and Writing, Stetson University College of Law; Law Clerk (1988–89), Hon. Harry W. Wellford, United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit; J.D. (1988), Vanderbilt University School of Law; M.A. and B.A. (1985, 1984), College of William and Mary. Professor Dickerson would like to thank Stetson students Frederick Busack, Deborah Pike, and Michele Stephenson for their invaluable assistance with various parts of this Article, and the Stetson law librarians for their assistance in locating many hard-to-find items.

IV.	THE <i>BLUEBOOK</i> EDITORS DO NOT FOLLOW THE "UNIFORM" RULES	88
V.	THE <i>BLUEBOOK</i> IS NOT A UNIFORM GUIDE FOR PRACTITIONERS	89
VI.	COMPETITION AND UN-UNIFORMITY	91
VII.	THOUGHTS FOR THE SEVENTEENTH EDITION	95
	A. Include, or at Least Reference, State Citation Requirements	95
	B. Eliminate Distinctions Between Law Reviews and Court Documents	95
	C. When Revising, Strive for Consistency	97
	D. Eliminate Rules and Exceptions that Everyone Believes Are Incorrect	99
	E. Miscellaneous Matters	99
	1. Order for D.C. Courts	99
	2. Designate Reporter Series	100
	3. Explain Title Changes	100
	4. Add a Table Listing Abbreviations for all Federal Courts	101
	5. Add a Rule Regarding Ordinal Numbers	102
	6. Proofread Again	102
	7. Show How to Cite the <i>Bluebook</i>	103
	8. Improve Physical Durability	103
	9. Distribute a "Redline" Version of the New Edition	103
VIII.	CONCLUSION	104
APPENDIX A:		
	Comparison of Fifteenth and Sixteenth Editions	105
APPENDIX B-1:		
	Compendium of State Court Rules Concerning Citation Format	167
APPENDIX B-2:		
	Selected California State, County, and Municipal Rules Concerning Citation Format	197
APPENDIX B-3:		
	Compendium of Federal Court Rules Concerning Citation Format	202

APPENDIX C:

Introductory Signals: Seventh Through Fourteenth Editions	212
---	-----

APPENDIX C-1:

Signals Indicating Support	212
----------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX C-2:

Signals Indicating Comparison, Contradiction, or Background Information	218
---	-----

APPENDIX D:

Introductory Notes and Prefaces	221
---------------------------------------	-----

I. INTRODUCTION

Five years¹ have flown by and another edition of the venerable

1. In recent years, new *Bluebook* editions have appeared every five years. Earlier editions, however, were issued on a more ad hoc basis. Each edition and its original publication date (many editions had several printings) are listed below.

<i>Edition</i>	<i>Initial Publication Date</i>
First	1926
Second	1928
Third	1931
Fourth	1934
Fifth	1936
Sixth	1939
Seventh	1947
Eighth	1949
Ninth	1955
Tenth	1958
Eleventh	1967
Twelfth	1976
Thirteenth	1981
Fourteenth	1986
Fifteenth	1991
Sixteenth	1996

Interestingly, these dates were difficult to locate, primarily because scholarly interest in the *Bluebook* did not begin until the late 1950s and most libraries did not keep copies of past editions. See Stanley E. Tobin, Book Review, 11 STAN. L. REV. 410 (1959) (reviewing the Tenth Edition) (this is the first review of the *Bluebook* the Author could locate; although others may exist, they cannot be easily located in periodical indices); see also *With the Editors*, 68 HARV. L. REV. vii, viii (Feb. 1955) (available only

*Bluebook*² has hit the shelves. The Sixteenth Edition's arrival was long-anticipated. Why? Because some segments of the legal community were anxious to see what changes the *Bluebook* editors would implement.³ This anticipation is ironic, because why should "A *Uniform System of Citation*" contain many changes? If it is truly uniform, very little should change, and the changes made should be primarily updates (such as adding F.3d) and developments since the last edition (such as increased coverage of electronic sources). Unfortunately, the Sixteenth Edition does not present a uniform system of citation. Instead, it contributes to the United States' un-uniform system of citation.

The U.S. citation system is un-uniform for at least four reasons. First, each edition of the *Bluebook* changes basic rules. Instead of adding rules for new sources that have appeared since the last edition, the editors tinker with other rules that many have

in the unbound paper volume) (stating incorrectly that "the publication [of the *Bluebook*] dates from 1931"); Geoffrey C. Mangum, Book Review, 18 WAKE FOREST L. REV. 645, 649 n.14 (1982) (indicating that "[l]ittle is known about the Second and Third Editions. The Fourth (1934), Fifth (1936), and Sixth (1939) Editions are known only from their listing in 150 LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, CATALOG OF BOOKS 676 (1942)."); cf. Books Noted, 50 COLUM. L. REV. 877, 877 (1950) (describing *A Practical Manual of Standard Legal Citations* by Miles O. Price as "seek[ing] to give some measure of coherence to the largely untreated area of legal citation" (emphasis added)). Indeed, the only place the Author could find all sixteen editions was the *Harvard Law Review* Business Office.

However, the *Bluebook* was an institution among law-review editors as early as the mid-1950s. See Edmond Cahn, *The Editor's Secret*, 28 N.Y.U. L. REV. 922, 922, 925 (1953) (addressing the Second National Conference of Law Review Editors and stating that "the law review editor enjoys a special pedantry in his stickler's devotion to form. In that devotion, we have invented an important new verb, 'to bluebook.'" (footnote omitted)); cf. James W. Paulsen, *An Uninformed System of Citation*, 105 HARV. L. REV. 1780, 1783 (1992) (reviewing the Fifteenth Edition) (indicating that the *Bluebook* was first advertised for sale in 1947, and that in 1949, the First National Conference of Law Review Editors proposed that the *Bluebook* be adopted as a national system of citation).

2. See THE BLUEBOOK: A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF CITATION (*Columbia Law Review et al.* eds., 16th ed. 1996). To conserve space, the various *Bluebook* editions will be cited by their edition number, e.g., FIRST EDITION, SECOND EDITION, etc. Interestingly, no one really knows how to cite the *Bluebook*. For various guesses, see *infra* note 319.

3. In addition, legal educators were hoping that the new edition would arrive before Fall classes began. Unlike the last two editions, which did not arrive until the middle of the Fall semester, the Sixteenth Edition arrived a day or so before many schools began classes. See Louis J. Sirico, Jr., *Fiddling with Footnotes*, 60 U. CIN. L. REV. 1273, 1273 (1992) (reviewing the Fifteenth Edition) (complaining that "[a] new edition published at the start of the school year and printed in insufficient numbers — we did not acquire enough copies until mid-October — is an outrageous imposition. But, then again, the editors pulled the same stunt with the fourteenth edition." (footnote omitted)). Those of us who teach research and writing implore the editors to complete their work so that the new edition arrives well before the start of Fall classes.

committed to memory, used, and relied upon.⁴ Therefore, any true level of consistency is impossible. Second, the schools that produce the *Bluebook* do not always follow its dictates.⁵ If the *Bluebook* editors do not follow their own “uniform” rules, why should others? Third, the *Bluebook* is not consistent with mandatory court rules that practitioners must follow.⁶ Because the *Bluebook* does not incorporate or adequately reference these court rules, it does not truly provide a uniform citation system — at least for practitioners. Fourth, because of its complexity and insularity, the *Bluebook* has attracted challengers who want either to supplement the *Bluebook*’s citation system or to supplant it completely.⁷

This Article explores all four reasons for un-uniformity. But first, the Article briefly traces the *Bluebook*’s origins and history.⁸ Realizing that the next edition is less than five years away, the Article concludes with proposed changes the *Bluebook* editors should consider for the Seventeenth Edition.⁹

II. SEVENTY YEARS OF BLUEBOOK HISTORY

What we now know as the *Bluebook* debuted seventy years ago, in 1926.¹⁰ During his summer break, Erwin N. Griswold, then a second-year law student at Harvard,¹¹ had his hometown printer in Cleveland, Ohio prepare a twenty-six-page¹² pamphlet concerning

4. See *infra* section III and app. A.

5. See *infra* section IV.

6. See *infra* section V and apps. B-1 to B-3.

7. See *infra* section VI.

8. See *infra* section II.

9. See *infra* section VII.

10. FIRST EDITION cover (1926) (portions on file with the *Stetson Law Review*). The *Bluebook* debuted well after the first student-edited law review was established. The first lasting student-edited law review — the *Harvard Law Review* — appeared in April 1887. See John Jay McKelvey, *The Law School Review 1887–1937*, 50 HARV. L. REV. 868, 869 (1937). However, the very first student-edited law review was the *Albany Law School Journal*, which was published in 1875 but survived only one academic year. See Michael I. Swygert & Jon W. Bruce, *The Historical Origins, Founding, and Early Development of Student-Edited Law Reviews*, 36 HASTINGS L.J. 739, 764 (1985). Ten years later, the *Columbia Jurist* was founded and lasted almost three years. See *id.* at 766–68.

11. Griswold was editor-in-chief of the *Harvard Law Review* in 1927–28. See ERWIN N. GRISWOLD, *OULD FIELDS, NEW CORNE* ch. III, at 67–68 (1992). He later served as Dean of Harvard Law School and Solicitor General of the United States. See *id.* chs. VI & IX; Henry J. Friendly, *Erwin N. Griswold — Some Fond Recollections*, 86 HARV. L. REV. 1365, 1365 (1973).

12. One author has indicated that the First Edition was 30 pages long, see Mary I. Coombs, *Lowering One’s Cites: A (Sort of) Review of the University of Chicago Manual of*

the form of law-review footnotes.¹³ Griswold's pamphlet was an expanded version of "Instructions for Editorial Work," an eight-page, internal manual for new *Harvard Law Review* members that was prepared sometime during the 1920s.¹⁴

Back then, however, the *Bluebook* was not blue,¹⁵ and it was not called the *Bluebook*.¹⁶ Instead, the First Edition was called *A Uniform System of Citation* and was graced with a grayish-olive cover.¹⁷ The next four editions bore brown covers.¹⁸ In 1939, the covers were changed to a "more patriotic blue"¹⁹ — a change some attributed to the editors' desire to dissociate with the brown worn by Adolph Hitler's troops.²⁰ After about thirty years of blue covers,

Legal Citation, 76 VA. L. REV. 1099, 1102 n.16 (1990); however, the last numbered page was 26. FIRST EDITION 26 (portions on file with the *Stetson Law Review*).

13. See Paulsen, *supra* note 1, at 1782 & n.14. Legal citation predates the *Bluebook*; indeed, legal citation can be traced to Ancient Rome. See Byron D. Cooper, *Anglo-American Legal Citation: Historical Development and Library Implications*, 75 L. LIBR. J. 3, 4 (1982) (tracing legal citation to A.D. 71). The earliest known citation manual, the *Modus Legendi Abbreuiaturas in Utroque Iure*, dates to approximately 1475. See *id.* at 20 & n.140.

14. See Jim C. Chen, *Something Old, Something New, Something Borrowed, Something Blue*, 58 U. CHI. L. REV. 1527, 1529-30 & n.10 (1991) (quoting Erwin N. Griswold, *The Harvard Law Review — Glimpses of its History as Seen by an Aficionado*, in HARVARD LAW REVIEW: CENTENNIAL ALBUM 1, 12 (1987)). Griswold wrote:

In due course, this booklet developed and was revised; other law reviews heard about it, and made suggestions for its improvement. This led to a meeting of the Presidents of the *Harvard*, *Columbia*, and *University of Pennsylvania Law Reviews*, and the *Yale Law Journal*. As a result of this meeting, the four journals now publish the *Bluebook* jointly and share the revenues; but virtually all the editorial work is still done at Harvard

Id. (quoting Griswold, *supra*, at 12).

15. In a 1955 issue of the *Harvard Law Review*, the editors, who had just released the Ninth Edition, wrote that recent covers had "ranged from calamine to ultramarine." *With the Editors*, *supra* note 1, at viii.

16. Lawyers should note that the *Bluebook* is not the only "blue book." See *Kelley Blue Book v. Car-Smarts, Inc.*, 802 F. Supp. 278, 285 (C.D. Cal. 1992) (explaining that the phrase "blue book" is not a generic term for vehicle valuation guides; "blue book" standing alone, refers to a number of items, including blank booklets used in taking examinations, directories of socially prominent persons, official British publications, a telephone directory and price guides for a wide variety of products").

17. See Paulsen, *supra* note 1, at 1782; Telephone Conversation with Colleen Verner, *Harvard Law Review* Business Office (Sept. 6, 1996) (verifying the cover color).

18. Telephone Conversation with Colleen Verner, *Harvard Law Review* Business Office (Sept. 6, 1996).

19. See Paulsen, *supra* note 1, at 1783.

20. See *id.* at 1782 (writing that "*The Bluebook* was marching toward world conquest, sporting a brown cover that some have found suspiciously similar in shade to shirts worn by Hitler's goon squads" (footnote omitted)); Alan Strasser, Book Note, *Technical Due Process*: ?, 12 HARV. C.R.-C.L. L. REV. 507, 508 (1977) (reviewing the

the Eleventh Edition appeared in 1967 with a white cover and "only a thin blue border . . . as a mocking reminder of the old ways."²¹ Many people called this edition the *White Book*.²² In 1976, the two hundredth anniversary of our Nation's birth, patriotism was in the air again, and a bright blue cover adorned the newly-published Twelfth Edition.²³ For the last four editions, the *Bluebook* has worn royal blue covers.²⁴ Although the nickname "the *Bluebook*" developed shortly after the 1939 edition, it did not become part of the official title until 1991, when the editors of the Fifteenth Edition re-christened it: *The Bluebook: A Uniform System of Citation*.²⁵

The *Bluebook's* size and price have also changed over the years. The First Edition measured approximately 3¼-by-5¾ inches and was only twenty-six pages long.²⁶ Since the First Edition seemingly was used only at Harvard, law-review students probably received copies at no charge. Both the Second Edition and the Third Edition measured approximately 3½-by-6 inches and were thirty-eight pages long.²⁷ Again, no information exists to assume that these edi-

Twelfth Edition) (indicating that "Germanic brown" covers "had disgraced the 1936 edition").

21. Strasser, *supra* note 20, at 508; see also Kevin G. Gralley & John C. Aisenbrey, Book Note, 65 GEO. L.J. 871, 872 n.10 (1977) (recounting that "[i]t has been suggested that the color white was chosen to symbolize the intellectual purity of virgin thought, and 'bluebook' was chosen as a moniker in remembrance of the blood sweat by countless Ivy Leaguers to give it birth").

22. See Jonathan M. Jacobson, Book Review, 43 BROOK. L. REV. 826, 826 (1977) (reviewing the Twelfth Edition).

23. TWELFTH EDITION cover (1976). The Twelfth Edition was printed in several different shades of blue. Books in the first printing had pastel blue colors. Later printings bore royal blue covers. See Richard L. Bowler, Book Review, 44 U. CHI. L. REV. 695, 695 n.1 (1977) (reviewing the Twelfth Edition). One author queried:

Why were blue and white the only choices? The entire rainbow beckoned. To be sure, brown was historically suspect. The same domestic critics that decried brown covers in 1937 made red covers suspect during the 1950's and 1960's. Red and white seem equally un-American; no one seems to have considered red, white, and blue. Magenta, of course, would command no respect. Blue and white became the only choices through a process of elimination of unconsidered alternatives.

Strasser, *supra* note 20, at 508-09 (footnotes omitted).

24. THIRTEENTH EDITION cover (1981); FOURTEENTH EDITION cover (1986); FIFTEENTH EDITION cover (1991); SIXTEENTH EDITION cover (1996).

25. FIFTEENTH EDITION cover (1991).

26. FIRST EDITION (1926) (portions on file with the *Stetson Law Review*); see also *supra* note 12.

27. SECOND EDITION (1928); THIRD EDITION (1931) (portions of both are on file with the *Stetson Law Review*).

tions were used outside Harvard. The Fourth Edition, which was the first jointly prepared by Columbia, Harvard, Pennsylvania, and Yale, was forty-eight pages long; the dimensions were the same as the Third Edition.²⁸ The Fifth Edition and the Sixth Edition were both fifty-one pages long, and again possessed the same measurements as earlier editions.²⁹ The Seventh Edition measured 4-by-6 inches and was sixty-five pages long.³⁰ The Eighth Edition also measured 4-by-6 inches but was eighty-four pages long.³¹ The Ninth Edition was ninety-two pages long, measured 4-by-5¾ inches,³² and cost fifty cents.³³ The Tenth Edition, which was first published in 1958, cost seventy-five cents, measured 4½-by-6 inches, and was 124 pages long.³⁴ The Eleventh Edition was 117 pages long, had the same dimensions as the Tenth Edition, and cost \$1.00.³⁵ The Twelfth Edition was also 4½-by-6 inches, was 190 pages long,³⁶ and cost \$1.50.³⁷

The Thirteenth Edition was enlarged to 5½-by-8½ inches, contained 237 pages,³⁸ and sold for \$2.50.³⁹ The Thirteenth Edition also introduced some helpful enhancements, including the "Quick References."⁴⁰ The Fourteenth Edition measured 6-by-8½ inches, contained 255 pages,⁴¹ and cost \$6.50.⁴² The Fifteenth Edition

28. FOURTH EDITION (1934) (portions on file with the *Stetson Law Review*). This is the first edition with a copyright notation. See *id.* inside cover. No price information is available. See also text accompanying *infra* note 61 (indicating that the Fourth Edition is the first edition available at the Library of Congress).

29. FIFTH EDITION (1936); SIXTH EDITION (1939) (portions of both are on file with the *Stetson Law Review*).

30. SEVENTH EDITION (1947) (portions on file with the *Stetson Law Review*).

31. EIGHTH EDITION (1949) (portions on file with the *Stetson Law Review*).

32. NINTH EDITION (1955) (portions on file with the *Stetson Law Review*).

33. See *With the Editors*, *supra* note 1, at x.

34. TENTH EDITION (1958) (portions on file with the *Stetson Law Review*); see Tobin, *supra* note 1, at 410.

35. ELEVENTH EDITION (1967) (portions on file with the *Stetson Law Review*); see Peter Lushing, Book Review, 67 COLUM. L. REV. 599, 599 (1967) (reviewing the Eleventh Edition).

36. TWELFTH EDITION (1976). The Author discovered that the Twelfth Edition is the first that can be easily found in libraries and sitting on some attorneys' bookshelves.

37. See Gary G. Sackett, Book Note, 3 J. CONTEMP. L. 140, 140 (1976) (reviewing the Twelfth Edition); cf. Jacobson, *supra* note 22, at 826 (indicating that the Twelfth Edition cost \$2.25).

38. THIRTEENTH EDITION (1981).

39. See Marilyn R. Walter, *The Lawyer's Bookshelf*, N.Y. L.J., Mar. 12, 1982, at 2 (reviewing the Thirteenth Edition).

40. THIRTEENTH EDITION v (1981).

41. FOURTEENTH EDITION (1986).

42. See Richard Saver, *Singing the Blues over Cite Rules*, LEGAL TIMES, Oct. 28,

measured 5¼-by-8 inches, contained 343 pages,⁴³ and cost \$7.50.⁴⁴ The Sixteenth Edition, which is 365 pages long and measures 5¼-by-8 inches,⁴⁵ retails for \$9.00.⁴⁶

Just as the *Bluebook's* color, size, and name have changed, so has its purpose. Originally prepared as an internal guide to teach *Harvard Law Review*⁴⁷ members how to prepare footnotes published in their own law review, the *Bluebook* evolved first into a citation guide widely adopted by law-review editors,⁴⁸ and then

1991, at 46.

43. FIFTEENTH EDITION (1991).

44. See Saver, *supra* note 42, at 46.

45. SIXTEENTH EDITION (1996). See generally Christopher W. Lane, *Bluebooks, Filled Milk, and Infield Flies: Deconstruction, the Footnote, and a Uniform System of Citation*, 19 WM. MITCHELL L. REV. 161, 171 n.57 (1993) (observing that "[t]he *Bluebook*, like other products of the bureaucratic process, is the victim of inevitable metastasization").

46. See Advertisement, 109 HARV. L. REV. v (June 1996) (unbound paper volume) (giving a discount to those who order 25 or more copies).

47. Editors at Columbia, University of Pennsylvania, and Yale did not join in preparing the *Bluebook* until the Fourth Edition, which was published in 1934. FOURTH EDITION inside front cover (1934); Telephone Conversation with Colleen Verner, *Harvard Law Review* Business Office (Sept. 6, 1996). The cartel almost crumbled in the 1970s, when editors at Columbia, Penn, and Yale threatened to create a competing manual because they believed Harvard was not fairly dividing *Bluebook* profits. The matter was settled peacefully. See Chen, *supra* note 14, at 1530; W. Duane Benton, Book Review, 86 YALE L.J. 197, 202 n.30 (1976) (reviewing the Twelfth Edition). Yale, Columbia, and Penn

felt that Harvard was illegally keeping all profits from the first eleven editions, estimated to total \$20,000 per year. However, the discontented trio had lost the correspondence indicating an agreement to split the profits. Their threats to sue brought a peaceful settlement, in the form of a contract which provides Harvard with only twice the profits of each of the other schools in return for continued production and distribution services.

Id. (citations omitted).

48. See KENT C. OLSON & ROBERT C. BERRING, PRACTICAL APPROACHES TO LEGAL RESEARCH 10 (1988) (noting that the Fourteenth Edition "lays down rules of style for legal writing, quotation, and citation which are scrupulously followed by law reviews"); Cahn, *supra* note 1, at 925-26; Paulsen, *supra* note 1, at 1782-85. In 1955, *Harvard Law Review* editors, in a preface to the February issue, explained:

A reader with an eye for the minute and a technical turn of mind may spot a few citations in this issue whose forms are a trifle irregular. They will, we trust, soon lose their novelty. For it is with this issue that the *Review* adopts the citation forms prescribed by the ninth edition of *A Uniform System of Citation*, which has just been published. . . . The idea was to establish a systematic uniform method of citation out of the prevailing chaos. The law reviews at Columbia, Pennsylvania, and Yale joined with Harvard in collecting and organizing for the first time what was thought to be the most sensible of the forms then in use by the reviews, courts, and lawyers. Early editions, as the present one, gave suggested forms for citing American and foreign cases and reports, periodicals, treatises, services, restatements, government publications, and inter-

into a citation guide used by virtually all attorneys for virtually all types of legal documents.⁴⁹ Indeed, the *Bluebook* has been called "the Bible of citation form,"⁵⁰ "a legal *Pilgrim's Progress*,"⁵¹ the "*Kama Sutra* of legal citation,"⁵² the "'Divine Word' on citing,"⁵³ the "pioneer citation manual,"⁵⁴ "a librarian's dream,"⁵⁵ and "the book that ends arguments."⁵⁶ Even reviewing the *Bluebook* has be-

national materials, as well as prescribing rules for capitalization, italicization, and punctuation. In the back were rather full listings of legal abbreviations. And the first edition, as the ninth, was published in a convenient pocket size.

With the Editors, *supra* note 1, at viii, x.

49. The Twelfth Edition was the first time the *Bluebook* was marketed as a practice guide for courts and attorneys. See Paulsen, *supra* note 1, at 1784. Another commentator agreed that the Twelfth Edition was a watershed event:

Although earlier editions gave some hints of the gradual attempt to extend the *Bluebook's* authority, the Twelfth Edition's extension is proclaimed more openly and is reflected in two significant innovations: explicit provisions governing citation in briefs and a shift from a form-book format, built around specific, self-contained rules for particular types of publications (e.g., cases, statutes, books, periodicals), to a manual-of-style format, emphasizing general rules purporting to cover a wide range of different types of authorities.

Bowler, *supra* note 23, at 698 (footnotes omitted).

Also, from the 1950s until publication of the Twelfth Edition in 1976, the *Harvard Law Review* Association printed a related publication called, at different times, *Citations to Current American Statutory Compilations*, *Citations to American Statutory Compilations*, and *State Statutory Codifications*, which contained a guide to citing American statutes. This publication was discontinued in 1976 because the information was incorporated into the Twelfth Edition of the *Bluebook*. See Cooper, *supra* note 13, at 21 n.143.

50. Jacobson, *supra* note 22, at 826.

51. Chen, *supra* note 14, at 1527.

52. Lushing, *supra* note 35, at 599.

53. Gene W. Teitelbaum, *The Periodical Section of the "Uniform System of Citation," Thirteenth Edition: A Review and Some Suggestions*, 76 L. LIBR. J. 264, 264 (1983).

54. MILES O. PRICE, A PRACTICAL MANUAL OF STANDARD LEGAL CITATIONS iv (1st ed. 1950).

55. OLSON & BERRING, *supra* note 48, at 10 (adding that "[t]his book is all form and no substance").

56. Saver, *supra* note 42, at 46 (quoting the senior executive editor of the *California Law Review*). Some, of course, have not been so kind. See, e.g., Floyd Abrams, *A Worthy Tradition: The Scholar and the First Amendment*, 103 HARV. L. REV. 1162, 1162 n.11 (1990) (calling the *Bluebook* tyrannical); Arthur D. Austin, *Footnote* Skulduggery** and Other Bad Habits****, 44 U. MIAMI L. REV. 1009, 1025 (1990) (referring to *Bluebook* form as "puritanical handcuffs"); Arthur D. Austin, *Footnotes as Product Differentiation*, 40 VAND. L. REV. 1131, 1140 & n.41 (1987) (calling the *Bluebook* "nit-picking" and "formalistic"); Richard A. Posner, *Goodbye to the Bluebook*, 53 U. CHI. L. REV. 1343, 1343 (1986) (referring to the *Bluebook* as the "hypertrophy of law"); Benton, *supra* note 47, at 197 (writing that the Twelfth Edition "joins Amy Vanderbilt, the Rules of Baseball, and totalitarian regimes throughout history in a modest quest to impose uniformity on more mundane spheres of human activity"); Bruce E. Parmley, *Book Review*, 27

come somewhat of a cottage industry.⁵⁷ Recent editions have been reviewed in verse,⁵⁸ as a review of a romance novel,⁵⁹ and as an imitation of Dante's *Divine Comedy*.⁶⁰

The *Bluebook*, however, was not an overnight success. Instead, it was an acquired taste. As one scholar discovered, "it was not by any means adopted immediately by other academic law journals. In fact, much evidence suggests that the manual was not widely adopted until the 1930s. The first copy owned by the Library of Congress was the fourth edition, published in 1934 and acquired in

CATH. U. L. REV. 449, 449 (1978) (reviewing the Twelfth Edition) (dubbing the *Bluebook* the "lawyer's dictionary of *abbreviated* mumbo jumbo (*abbrv. mbo. jbo.*)"); Sackett, *supra* note 37, at 140 (sniping that "[t]his is a review of a work which is proffered as the ultimate, stone-tablet authority in a substantively vacuous, yet functionally necessary, field; it is therefore not unlike a review of a cross-word puzzle dictionary"); *id.* at 142 (calling the Twelfth Edition the "Sea of Minutiae"); Aside, *Don't Cry Over Filled Milk: The Neglected Footnote Three* to Carolene Products, 136 U. PA. L. REV. 1553, 1565 (1988) (suggesting that extraterrestrials wrote the *Bluebook* because "[l]ike the technology of the ancient astronauts, the *Bluebook* is puzzling to all but an anointed few — who are probably not entirely human" (footnotes omitted)); Richard A. Leiter, *The Blue Book*, LEGAL ASSISTANT TODAY, July–Aug. 1995, at 76, 76 (commenting that "[t]he *Bluebook* has managed to become to legal writers what the Internal Revenue Code has become to Americans in general — so complex that not only are ordinary citizens completely baffled, but professionals are compelled to reach for a pack of Tums whenever they must put cites in their legal writing into *Bluebook* form"); cf. Lawrence Savell, *The Bluebook Blues*, NAT'L L.J., Apr. 10, 1995, at A19, A19 (stating sarcastically that "the *Bluebook* was created and is maintained by students at four leading law schools to ensure that, when they and their peers take their places at the bottom of the food chain of some prestigious firm, they will be regarded as competent in at least some small aspect of the practice of the law").

57. Indeed, the Fifteenth Edition was reviewed at least 14 times. See Steve Bromberg, Book Review, 55 TEX. B.J. 1192 (1992); Beverly Ray Burlingame, Book Review, 2 SCRIBES JOURNAL OF LEGAL WRITING 168 (1991); Campano, *infra* note 59; Chen, *supra* note 14; Gordon, *infra* note 99; Lane, *supra* note 45; Paulsen, *supra* note 1; Sirico, *supra* note 3; Slomanson, *infra* note 58; Smith, *infra* note 149; Jay W. Stein, Book Review, 59 DEF. COUNS. J. 592 (1992); Book Review, 11 CAL. LAW., Oct. 1991, at 67; George Gerard Campion, *On 15th Try, Bluebook Made Easier*, N.J. L.J., Apr. 20, 1992, at 15; Savell, *supra* note 56.

58. See William R. Slomanson, Book Review, 13 LEGAL REFERENCE SERVICES Q. 117 (1993) (reviewing the Fifteenth Edition); William R. Slomanson, (Blue) Book Review, 39 OKLA. L. REV. 565 (1986) (reviewing the Fourteenth Edition); Tobin, *supra* note 1, at 411. Tobin composed the following rhyme:

Handy to carry in pocket or purse
Written in language inscrutably terse

Id.

59. See Arnold B. Kanter, *Putting Your Best Footnote Forward*, BARRISTER, Spring 1982, at 42; see also Paul F. Campano, *A Kinder, Gentler Bluebook?*, 22 SETON HALL L. REV. 627 (1992) (reviewing the Fifteenth Edition in the format of a private confession).

60. See Mangum, *supra* note 1.

1936.⁶¹ As late as 1976, one reviewer bemoaned that “[t]he popular press has ignored the new edition of the *Blue Book*, and the literary establishment considers the book closed even before it has been opened. Not since the St. Louis Browns played their last game has so much labor produced so little public acclaim or public interest”⁶²

The introductory notes and prefaces tell an interesting story about the *Bluebook*'s evolution.⁶³ The First Edition was very unassuming. Limited to leading articles, it started by explaining: “This pamphlet does not pretend to include a complete list of abbreviations or all the necessary data as to form. It aims to deal with the more common abbreviations and forms to which one has occasion to refer.”⁶⁴ This unassuming nature continued until the Fourth Edition in 1934. Although still limited to leading articles, the Fourth Edition's Foreword declared that “[i]ts purpose is to indicate the more common abbreviations and . . . forms to which constant reference is made to constitute a basis for a complete citation system.”⁶⁵ By the Eighth Edition in 1949, the *Bluebook* no longer limited itself to leading articles.⁶⁶ By the Eleventh Edition in 1967, the editors unabashedly stated that “[t]he purpose of this uniform system of citation is to ensure that the authorities cited in legal writing can be identified and found by most readers.”⁶⁷ By the Twelfth Edition in 1976, the *Bluebook* proclaimed that “[t]he following uniform system of citation has been designed for use in all forms of legal writing.”⁶⁸ The Fifteenth and Sixteenth Editions took one final step and announced that “[t]he *Bluebook* . . . sets forth general standards of citation and style to be used throughout legal writing.”⁶⁹ So the unpretentious, internal citation guide for leading articles published in the *Harvard Law Review* has grown into an citation and style institution used and relied upon by large seg-

61. Cooper, *supra* note 13, at 21 (footnote omitted).

62. Strasser, *supra* note 20, at 507 (footnotes omitted).

63. See app. D (reprinting portions of prefaces, forewords, and introductory notes from all sixteen editions).

64. FIRST EDITION Foreword (1926) (portions reprinted in Appendix D).

65. FOURTH EDITION Foreword (1934) (emphasis added). It is important to remember that the Fourth Edition was the first jointly prepared by Harvard, Columbia, Penn, and Yale. See *supra* note 28 and accompanying text.

66. See EIGHTH EDITION Foreword (1949) (portions reprinted in Appendix D).

67. ELEVENTH EDITION Note (1967) (portions reprinted in Appendix D).

68. TWELFTH EDITION 1 (1976) (portions reprinted in Appendix D).

69. FIFTEENTH EDITION 3 (1991) (emphasis added); SIXTEENTH EDITION 3 (1996) (emphasis added) (portions of both reprinted in Appendix D).

ments of the legal community.

III. THE SIXTEENTH EDITION: MAJOR CHANGES AND UN-UNIFORMITY

A. Initial Impressions

At first glance, the Sixteenth Edition appears to be a clone of the Fifteenth. The covers are identical, except that the word “Sixteenth” has replaced “Fifteenth”; the books are about the same size (343 pages in the Fifteenth, 365 in the Sixteenth); and the color scheme for internal pages is identical (blue for Practitioners’ Notes and tables, and white for the rest). The Sixteenth Edition’s pagination is very close to that used in the Fifteenth.⁷⁰ The Quick Reference sections in the front and back look virtually identical to those in the Fifteenth.

A review of the Sixteenth Edition’s Preface reinforces the impression that the changes are relatively benign. Ironically, the Sixteenth-Edition editors list sixteen “noteworthy” changes, including:

- “**Rule 3.3** has been expanded to include citation formats for endnotes and graphical materials.”⁷¹
- “**Rule 12.8.5** has been expanded to include sentencing guidelines.”⁷²
- “**New rule 17.3.3** provides guidance for citing materials found on the Internet.”⁷³
- “**Rule 20.8.4** now provides citation formats for World Trade Organization and GATT materials.”⁷⁴
- “**Table 14** (Periodicals in Foreign Languages) has been eliminated. As a result, **tables 15 to 17** have been renumbered as **tables 14 to 16**.”⁷⁵

Having been comforted by initial appearances, users who venture beyond the Preface will be surprised by the sheer number of changes — both large and small, substantive and inconsequential

70. For example, the Practitioners’ Notes begin on page 11 of both editions. Rule 11 falls on page 73 in both editions. Table 1 begins on page 165 of both editions.

71. SIXTEENTH EDITION at v.

72. *Id.*

73. *Id.* at vi.

74. *Id.*

75. *Id.*

— incorporated into the Sixteenth Edition. Although the Preface lists only sixteen noteworthy changes, many other changes were made. Several sections were renumbered or numbered for the first time.⁷⁶ Some sections were added.⁷⁷ Some changes are notable and will affect everyday citation.⁷⁸ Some changes have no apparent purpose, other than to drive users insane.⁷⁹ What follows is a description and critique of the more significant revisions. Appendix A compiles most other changes included in the Sixteenth Edition.

B. Significant Revisions⁸⁰

1. Introductory Signals

The editors substantially revised rule 1.2 on introductory signals.⁸¹ As they noted in the Preface, “The number of signals has been reduced and the distinction between signals has been simplified.”⁸² Specifically, the “*contra*” signal and arguably the “*e.g.*,” signal,⁸³ have been deleted.⁸⁴ The definitions for [no signal], “*see*,” “*accord*,” and “*but see*” have been altered. The primary fallout from these changes probably will be that the number of “[no signal]” cites will decrease and the number of “*see*” cites will increase, because “*see*” must now be used to show that the cited authority “directly states or clearly supports” the proposition.⁸⁵ Table 1 contains a comparison of introductory signals in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Editions.

76. See, e.g., SIXTEENTH EDITION rules 2.1, 2.2, 3.3, 10.5(b), 10.5(c), 10.5(d), 10.6.1, 10.6.2, 10.7.1(b), 10.7.1(c) & 17.3.

77. See, e.g., *id.* rules 10.9(a)(ii) & 17.3.3.

78. See, e.g., *id.* rules 10.3.1(b), 10.7 & 10.9(a)(ii).

79. See, e.g., *id.* rules 10.9(a) & 12.9(c).

80. For revisions both significant and insignificant, see Appendix A.

81. Revising the introductory signal section appears to be a rite of passage for *Bluebook* editors. Since at least the Seventh Edition, the signals have been changed. See apps. C-1 & C-2 (listing changes in signals from the Seventh Edition through the Fourteenth Edition). According to Colleen Verner of the *Harvard Law Review* Business Office, the first six editions did not contain a section on introductory signals. See *supra* note 17.

82. SIXTEENTH EDITION at v.

83. See *infra* note 89.

84. Compare FIFTEENTH EDITION rule 1.2(a) & (c) with SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 1.2(a) & (c).

85. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 1.2(a) (emphasis omitted).

Table 1: Introductory Signals (Rule 1.2)⁸⁶

Signal	Fifteenth Edition ⁸⁷	Sixteenth Edition ⁸⁸
[no signal]	"Cited authority (i) <i>clearly states</i> the proposition, (ii) identifies the source of a quotation, or (iii) identifies an authority referred to in text."	"Cited authority (i) identifies the source of a quotation, or (ii) identifies an authority referred to in text."
<i>E.g.</i>	"Cited authority <i>states</i> the proposition; other authorities also state the proposition, but citation to them would not be helpful or is not necessary. ' <i>E.g.</i> ' may also be used in combination with other signals, preceded by a comma: <i>See, e.g.,</i> <i>But see, e.g.,</i> "	"' <i>E.g.</i> ' can be combined with any signal, including [no signal]; to indicate that other authorities also state, support, or contradict the proposition but that citation to them would not be helpful or is not necessary. <i>E.g.,</i> <i>See, e.g.</i> <i>But see, e.g.,</i> " ⁸⁹
<i>Accord</i>	"' <i>Accord</i> ' is commonly used when two or more cases <i>state or clearly support</i> the proposition but the text quotes or refers to only one; the others are then introduced by ' <i>accord</i> .' Similarly, the law of one jurisdiction may be cited as being in accord with that of another."	"' <i>Accord</i> ' is commonly used when two or more cases <i>clearly support</i> the proposition but the text quotes only one; the others are then introduced by ' <i>accord</i> .' Similarly, the law of one jurisdiction may be cited as being in accord with that of another."
<i>See</i>	"Cited authority <i>clearly supports</i> the proposition. ' <i>See</i> ' is used instead of '[no signal]' when the proposition is not directly stated by the cited authority but obviously follows from it; there is an inferential step between the authority cited and the proposition it supports."	"Cited authority <i>directly states or clearly supports</i> the proposition."
<i>See also</i>	"Cited authority <i>constitutes additional source material that supports</i> the proposition. ' <i>See also</i> ' is commonly used to cite an authority supporting a proposition when authorities that state or directly support the proposition already have been cited or discussed."	No change.
<i>Cf.</i>	"Cited authority <i>supports a proposition different from the main proposition but sufficiently analogous to lend support</i> . Literally, ' <i>cf.</i> ' means 'compare.' The citation's relevance will usually be clear to the reader only if it is explained."	No change. ⁹⁰
<i>Compare . . . with</i>	" <i>Comparison of the authorities cited will offer support for or illustrate</i> the proposition. The relevance of the comparison will usually be clear to the reader only if it is explained."	No change. ⁹¹
<i>Contra</i>	"Cited authority <i>directly states the contrary</i> of the proposition. ' <i>Contra</i> ' is used where '[no signal]' would be used for support."	No longer listed as an available introductory signal.
<i>But see</i>	"Cited authority <i>clearly supports a proposition contrary</i> to the main proposition. ' <i>But see</i> ' is used where ' <i>see</i> ' would be used for support."	"Cited authority <i>directly states or clearly supports a proposition contrary</i> to the main proposition. ' <i>But see</i> ' is used where ' <i>see</i> ' would be used for support."
<i>But cf.</i>	"Cited authority <i>supports a proposition analogous to the contrary</i> of the main proposition."	No change.
<i>See generally</i>	"Cited authority <i>presents helpful background material related to the proposition</i> ."	No change.

The editors also rewrote the rule about "signals as verbs." In the Fifteenth Edition, the rule reads that "See,' *but see*,' and so forth may be used as the verbs of ordinary sentences, in which case they are not italicized . . . 'Cf.' becomes 'compare' when used in this manner."⁹² The Sixteenth Edition provides:

Signals may be used as the verbs of ordinary sentences, in which case they are not italicized . . . When signals are used as verbs, matter that would be included in a parenthetical explanation should be made part of the sentence itself. . . 'Cf.' becomes 'compare' and 'e.g.' becomes 'for example' when used in this manner.⁹³

The rules concerning introductory signals are the *Bluebook* rules referred to most often in court opinions.⁹⁴ This is but one

86. Guidelines about when a parenthetical must or should be used are not included because they were not changed in the Sixteenth Edition. *See also* apps. C-1 & C-2 (concerning introductory signals for the Seventh through Fourteenth Editions).

87. All citations in this column are from rule 1.2 in the Fifteenth Edition.

88. All citations in this column are from rule 1.2 in the Sixteenth Edition.

89. The Preface explains that "[u]nder the modified rule, 'e.g.,' no longer appears as a separate signal but may still be used in conjunction with other signals." Rule 1.2(e), however, lists "E.g.," as a stand-alone signal. *Compare* SIXTEENTH EDITION at v *with id.* rule 1.2(e).

90. The fact that the "cf." signal was not reworded is surprising because "cf." is the signal with which courts and attorneys seem to have the most difficulty. *See, e.g.*, *Chemical Bank v. Arthur Andersen & Co.*, 726 F.2d 930, 938 n.14 (2d Cir. 1984); *Palmigiano v. Houle*, 618 F.2d 877, 881 n.5 (1st Cir. 1980); *Doleman v. Muncy*, 579 F.2d 1258, 1264 (4th Cir. 1978); *Gates v. Henderson*, 568 F.2d 830, 837-38 (2d Cir. 1977); *Local 194, Retail, Wholesale & Dep't Store Union v. Standard Brands, Inc.*, 540 F.2d 864, 867 n.4 (7th Cir. 1976); *Givens v. United States*, 644 A.2d 1373, 1376 (D.C. App. 1994) (Mack, S.J., dissenting); *Connell v. Francisco*, 898 P.2d 831, 838 (Wash. 1995) (Utter, J., dissenting); *see also Givens*, 644 A.2d at 1374 n.3 (concerning the "but cf." signal).

As one reviewer observed:

The introductory signals approved by the *Bluebook* have been the source of dispositive judicial debate. A single "cf." signal in a Supreme Court decision fostered extensive scrutiny among the circuits, and, with singular irony, the *Bluebook* was the source of ultimate authority in settling the legal questions raised in the cases.

Peter Phillips, Book Note, 32 N.Y.L. SCH. L. REV. 199, 199-200 (1987) (reviewing the Fourteenth Edition) (footnotes omitted). The case at issue was *Stone v. Powell*, 428 U.S. 465, 494 n.36 (1976). *See Phillips, supra*, at 200 n.8.

91. The Sixteenth Edition now illustrates how to use this signal. *See* SIXTEENTH EDITION at 23.

92. FIFTEENTH EDITION rule 1.2(e).

93. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 1.2(f).

94. *See, e.g.*, *Schmidt v. McCarthy*, 369 F.2d 176, 182 n.18 (D.C. Cir. 1966) (ex-

reason why changing the introductory signals every few years destroys uniformity. Authors use signals to indicate the purpose for which an authority is cited and the weight with which an authority supports or contradicts a particular proposition.⁹⁵ Changing what the signals mean effectively changes the substance of our common law.⁹⁶ If a 1932 decision states a proposition, followed by a case introduced by “see,” one would need the Third Edition to determine what degree of support the cited case gives the legal proposition.⁹⁷

Of course, many have no idea that the signals change from edition to edition to edition. And hardly anyone keeps old *Bluebook* editions lying around. Therefore, most will be surprised to learn that “see also” was not a signal option until the 1981 Thirteenth

plaining the significance of using “see” before a case cite); *National Org. for Women, Inc. v. Scheidler*, 897 F. Supp. 1047, 1062 n.14 (N.D. Ill. 1995) (concerning “see”); *State v. A.D.H.*, 429 So. 2d 1316, 1318 (Fla. 5th Dist. Ct. App. 1983) (chastising an attorney for failing to follow the *Bluebook’s* introductory signals); *Apgar & Markham Constr., Inc. v. MacAsphalt, Inc.*, 424 So. 2d 41, 42 (Fla. 5th Dist. Ct. App. 1982) (concluding that the “but see” signal indicated that the case cited contradicted the stated proposition); see also *supra* note 90 (concerning “cf.”).

95. See, e.g., TENTH EDITION at 83–84.

96. See Bowler, *supra* note 23, at 701. Bowler agrees that [although signal] changes are subtle and some are arguably of little substance, . . . any change in the longstanding rules for a highly technical and specific system of signals means that signals in one generation of law reviews denote a set of significations that could be inconsistent with the usages known to a later generation. Since the purpose of a signal system is to facilitate an orderly presentation of authority which gives readers the opportunity to reproduce the author’s research and the significance he assigns to his conclusions and authorities, changes in the signals could bring an accurate author’s credibility into question.

Id. At least one court has commented on the ever-changing signal system. See *Willett v. Lockhart*, 37 F.3d 1265, 1268 n.3 (8th Cir. 1994) (commenting on the “cf.” signal as used in two *Bluebook* editions), *cert. denied*, 115 S. Ct. 1432 (1995).

97. See Donald H. Gjerdingen, *A Uniform System of Citation*, 4 WM. MITCHELL L. REV. 499, 510 (1978) (reviewing the Twelfth Edition). This commentator observed that signal changes can change the meaning of a passage:

The tragedy is that one edition’s signals are meaningless to a person schooled in a different edition. Thus to a reader familiar with the Seventh Edition, the footnote citation “*But cf. Jones v. Smith*, 245 Minn. 567, 568, 23 N. W. 2d 490 (1943)” means contrary, distinguishable dictum. But to a reader familiar only with the Twelfth Edition the cite would mean the authority on those pages supports a proposition analogous to the contrary of the position stated in the text (and also that the citation was missing both a jump cite and an explanatory parenthetical, and that spaces between the initials of the regional reporter had been incorrectly inserted).

Id. (footnotes omitted); see also Bowler, *supra* note 23, at 700 (recognizing that “[a] more substantive problem with the Twelfth Edition’s treatment of the signal system lies in the subtle but potentially disruptive alterations in meaning in the signal terms themselves”).

Edition, and that “see (no italics)” was a signal from the Eighth Edition in 1949 until the Eleventh Edition was published in 1967.⁹⁸ As one commentator explained, “A signal gives a writer’s analysis of the law. Change the signals and a later reader may misinterpret the meaning of the citation.”⁹⁹ Change the signals and destroy any hope of building a truly uniform citation system.

2. Public Domain Citations

Public domain citations appear to be the wave of the future — if not the present.¹⁰⁰ A public domain citation is one that can be used by any publisher “without requiring reference to the proprietary products of any particular publisher.”¹⁰¹ Fortunately, the

98. See apps. C-1 & C-2. Reviewing the table of historical signals will also show younger lawyers that more experienced lawyers learned (and may still be using) older rules. For example, the *contra* signal has at various times been followed by a comma, a colon, and nothing. See app. C-2.

99. Gjerdingen, *supra* note 97, at 508. In a review of the Eleventh Edition, the signals were humorously (and somewhat accurately) described as follows:

Use *no signal* when you’ve got the guts. Use *e.g.* when there are other examples you are too lazy to find or are skeptical of unearthing. Use *accord* when one court has cribbed from the other’s opinion. Use *see* when the case is on all three’s. Use *cf.* when you’ve wasted your time reading the case. Insert *but* in front of these last two when a frown instead of a smile is indicated. See *generally* and *see also* are retained with an apparent acknowledgment that there is no difference between the two.

Lushing, *supra* note 35, at 601; see also Coombs, *supra* note 12, at 1108–11 & n.60 (proposing the following signals: “[w]ill not see in,” “[t]rust me, I’ve looked for it,” “[s]ee, sort of,” “[s]ee, randomly,” “[r]eally should see,” “[p]retend to have seen,” “[d]on’t you wish you could see,” and “[f]eel, e.g.”); James D. Gordon III, *Oh No! A New Bluebook!*, 90 MICH. L. REV. 1698, 1701 (1992) (reviewing the Fifteenth Edition) (joking that “[t]he Bluebook still leaves out some very useful signals, such as *read and weep* and *try to distinguish this one*. For contrary authority, it omits *disregard*, *ignore also*, and *for a really bizarre view, see*.”); cf. Savell, *supra* note 56, at A20 (remarking that “[e]nterprising marketers and propagandists appear to have inserted references to automobile models (‘Accord’), political groups (‘Contra’), Freudian psychotherapy concepts (‘Id.’) and eschatological constructs (‘Hereinafter’). There should be absolutely no place for the hawking of wares in the pages of an objective rule book. Where will it all end?”).

100. See Michael Gebhardt, *Vendor-Neutral: A Cite for Sore Eyes*, RECORDER, Aug. 9, 1996, at 4, 4 (recognizing that “[p]ublic domain citation is the future. And frankly, it’s such a simple concept, it should be the present.”).

101. See American Association of Law Librarians Task Force on Citation Formats, March 1, 1995 Report, at 5 [hereinafter AALL Report] (available on the Internet: <<http://lawlib.wuacc.edu/aallnet/citeform.html>>). Public domain citations are not necessarily vendor-neutral or medium-neutral. For example, “[c]itations to official reporters (Ill. and U.S., for example) are in the public domain.” *Id.* at 6. A “[m]edium neutral citation form” is one “that may be employed to refer to information in either book or electronic form, without additional information needing to be added to either. It may not refer to

Bluebook editors had the good sense to include a new section on public domain citations. Rule 10.3.1 now includes the following instructions:

If the decision is available as an official public domain citation (also referred to as a medium neutral citation), that citation should be provided instead [of the regional reporter]. A parallel citation to the regional reporter may be provided as well. When citing a decision available in public domain format, provide the case name, the year of decision, the name of the court issuing the decision, and the sequential number of the decision. When referencing specific material within the decision, a pinpoint citation should be made to the paragraph number at which the material appears in the public domain citation. The following fictitious examples are representative of the recommended public domain citation format:

Stevens v. State, 1996 S.D. 1, ¶ 217. .

Jenkins v. Patterson, 1997 Wis. Ct. App. 45, ¶ 157, 600 N.W.2d 435.¹⁰²

This rule comes just in time. Many courts are adopting vendor-neutral, or public domain, citation formats — or are at least studying the matter. On January 1, 1994, the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit “adopted an optional parallel electronic citation form.”¹⁰³ That same day, Louisiana’s public domain ci-

volumes or pages, for these exist naturally only in the book medium.” *Id.* A “[v]endor neutral citation form” is one that “may contain medium-specific information, but not vendor-specific information. For example, 366 Ark. 1 is a vendor neutral citation; the vendor that publishes Ark. is the lowest bidder, and changes over time. However, 366 Ark. 1 is not medium neutral. 1995 Wis 46 is both vendor and medium neutral. It should be noted that all official reporter citations are vendor neutral.” *Id.*

102. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 10.3.1(b), at 62. Users should note that Wisconsin has not yet adopted a public domain citation format. *See infra* note 106.

103. Kelly Browne, *The Ins and Outs of a Uniform Citation System*, NAT’L L.J., July 17, 1995, at C5, C5. In 1992, the Judicial Conference of the United States considered changing the citation form for all U.S. Court of Appeals decisions. The new citation form would have been: *Smith v. Jones*, 1990 FED App. 0322P (5th Cir.), where 1990 is the year, 322 is the 322d opinion issued during 1990, and P is for published opinion. This proposed form would have been used only until a West reporter citation became available. Although the Judicial Conference refused to adopt the proposal, it left each federal court free to adopt it individually. To date, only the Sixth Circuit has adopted the rule. *See AALL Report, supra* note 101, at 10. *See generally* Eric L. Brown, *Inexpensive Computer Research Plan Dealt Death Blow by Judicial Conference of the United States*, N.Y.

tation format took effect.¹⁰⁴ In May 1994, the Colorado Supreme Court ordered that its decisions be numbered by paragraph, stating that the paragraph numbers were acceptable alternative pinpoint citations to West's *Pacific Reporter* page numbers.¹⁰⁵ South Dakota switched to a vendor-neutral format effective January 1, 1996.¹⁰⁶ In May 1995, Wisconsin's Supreme Court decided to archive its opinions electronically for one year and then reconsider a petition by the State Bar and the Wisconsin Judicial Council to adopt a vendor-neutral citation system.¹⁰⁷ California is also considering a vendor-neutral citation format.¹⁰⁸

St. B.J., Feb. 1993, at 57 (discussing the Judicial Conference's decision and the status of electronic bulletin boards and electronic citations).

104. See Carol D. Billings, *Adoption of New Public Domain Citation Format Promotes Access to Legal Information*, 41 LA. B.J. 557, 557 (1994); Richard C. Reuben, *Numbers to Live By*, A.B.A. J., Oct. 1994, at 22, 22. Louisiana became the first state to adopt its own public domain citation system, implementing it on July 1, 1993 for all cases decided after December 31, 1993. "For cases decided before then, West citations prevail. The new format uses the case name, the date of issue, and the docket number, with pinpoint cites to the slip opinion. For now, lawyers still must use parallel references to West's Southern Reporter." *Id.* "Criticisms of the Louisiana form are that it uses page numbers (of the official slip opinion); that it is lengthy; that it is not medium neutral; and that it is not permanent until the Southern citation appears." AALL Report, *supra* note 101, at 11.

105. See Browne, *supra* note 103, at C5. "Criticisms of this form are that it is not permanent until the Pacific citation appears; and that it is not medium neutral." AALL Report, *supra* note 101, at 11.

106. See Kelly Browne, *Committee on Citation Formats*, 27 AM. ASS'N L. LIBR. NEWSL. 274, 274 (1996); Jill Schachner Chanen, *In the Matter of Cites*, A.B.A. J., Feb. 1996, at 87, 87. "[T]he state bar has been publishing opinions for two years using a sequential case numbering system similar to the one proposed in Wisconsin. Paragraphs also are numbered to provide the pinpoint citation. The South Dakota Supreme Court began issuing opinions using this cite format in January." *Id.*; see also Dana Coleman, . . . *Other States Battling over Universal Citations*, N.J. LAW., July 31, 1995 (LEXIS, NEXIS Library, LREV File) (detailing South Dakota's switch to the vendor-neutral format).

107. See Chanen, *supra* note 106, at 87 (explaining that "[t]he Wisconsin state bar . . . proposed identifying case law by a year, the court issuing the opinion and a sequential number" and that "[e]ach paragraph of the opinion also would be numbered, providing an alternative pinpoint citation"); see also Cary Griffith, *A Vendor/Media Neutral System of Citation?*, INFO. TODAY, Oct. 1994, at 16; John J. Oslund, *Wisconsin High Court Delays Decision on Case Citation Plan; West Publishing Opposes Proposed Change*, STAR TRIB., May 26, 1995, at 1D (both tracing Wisconsin's debate over vendor-neutral citations). As of late September 1996, Wisconsin still had not adopted a vendor-neutral format. Telephone Conversation with the Clerk of the Wisconsin Supreme Court (Sept. 23, 1996). For concerns about and criticisms of Wisconsin's proposed system, see AALL Report, *supra* note 101, at 11-12.

108. See Robert C. Berring, *California's Rush To Be in the Vanguard of Uniform Citation Might Be Jumping the Gun*, RECORDER, May 15, 1996, at 4, 4 (indicating that "[a] proposal on this issue has been reported on favorably by the California State Bar

Within the last two years, two prominent and powerful professional organizations, the American Bar Association¹⁰⁹ and the American Association of Law Librarians,¹¹⁰ passed resolutions calling for a vendor-neutral citation system. The ABA proposal recommends that states adopt a uniform citation system that could eventually eliminate references to bound reporters.¹¹¹ Specifically, the resolution calls for courts to assign permanent citations when cases are decided, as opposed to relying on commercial publishers to designate the citation by placing the case on a certain page, in a certain volume, or in a certain reporter set.¹¹² The change would make on-line systems (such as computer bulletin boards,¹¹³ electronic databases, and the Internet) and CD-ROM products more valuable research tools, because they typically appear before the printed reports.¹¹⁴ In jurisdictions in which commercial publishers

and is heading for the state Supreme court, which will hold hearings on adopting it").

109. See ABA Special Committee on Citation Issues, Report and Recommendations (May 23, 1996) [hereinafter ABA Report]. The ABA recommendations were passed on August 6, 1996. The recommendations, however, did not have unanimous support. The Conference of Chief Justices, which comprises the top judges in each state, asked the ABA to postpone the vote until the committee recommendation could be further evaluated. In addition, the ABA's intellectual property section formally opposed the plan. See Krysten Crawford & Thomas Scheffey, *ABA Backs Neutral Citation; Delegate Vote, Coupled with DOJ Stance in Suit, Forms Double Blow to West*, LEGAL TIMES, Aug. 19, 1996, at 2.

110. See AALL Report, *supra* note 101.

111. The Report begins: "BE IT RESOLVED, that the American Bar Association recommends that: 1. All jurisdictions adopt a system for official citation to case reports that is equally effective for printed case reports and for case reports electronically published on computer disks or network services . . ." ABA Report, *supra* note 109, at 2.

112. See *id.* The Report recommends that:

- A. The court should include the distinctive sequential decision number . . . in each decision at the time it is made available to the public.
- B. The court should number the paragraphs in the decision.

Id. The Report also indicates that its purpose is to "develop citation methods that work effectively both with books and with computer databases." *Id.* at 3.

113. At least 24 state courts, the U.S. Courts of Appeals, and U.S. Supreme Court now publish decisions on electronic bulletin boards. See *A Non-Lawyer's Look at the Case Citation Controversy; Nonproprietary Legal Case Citation Systems*, SEARCHER, Nov. 1994, at 10, 10.

114. See ABA Report, *supra* note 109, at 3. Many view vendor-neutral citations, or public domain citations, as a direct threat to West's virtual monopoly on primary sources. See Crawford & Scheffey, *supra* note 109, at 2 (observing that the ABA's August 6, 1996 resolution "is a blow to the West Publishing Co., which controls the de facto format for citing federal court decisions"); John E. Morris, *How West Was Won*, AM. LAW., Sept. 1996, at 73, 90.

Should West lose its page number monopoly, the door would be opened for new publishers, who can already obtain the text of many recent decisions electroni-

have copyrighted reporter page numbers, the resolution would open the market to other vendors¹¹⁵ because citations would not rely on West's claimed copyright in its National Reporter System volume and page numbers.¹¹⁶

cally via the Internet but who have a hard time competing without the West pagination. With or without its page numbers, electronic dissemination of decisions threatens West's lock on primary materials.

Id.

115. See Edward A. Adams, *ABA Urges Uniform Case Citation System for States*, N.Y. L.J., Mar. 29, 1996, at 1, col. 4, 4, col. 4; Crawford & Sheffey, *supra* note 109, at 2 (quoting Alan Sugarman, president of HyperLaw, Inc., a West competitor, as saying that the ABA resolution "shows that this is a mainstream approach to dealing with citation and the modern dissemination of legal opinions. It strengthens the hand in those states where attorneys and the judiciary want to deal with this."); Gebhardt, *supra* note 10, at 4.

Vendor-neutral citation would inject a much-needed [element] of competition into the legal publishing market. Alert entrepreneurs, unburdened by the overhead of a large corporation, could drastically reduce the price of legal resource materials by introducing lower-cost alternatives. Competition could also only help to serve the important goal of ensuring timely and accurate publication of court decisions.

Id.

116. As one reporter explained:

West citations, ubiquitous in legal discourse in America, list the edition, volume and page number of cases in West-published compilations, just as early volumes of U.S. case law are still referenced by the names of the editors who collected them, often while riding judicial circuits on a horse. No one may sell compilations of cases online or via CD-ROM that incorporate West page numbers without a license from the Minnesota-based concern.

"For over a century, West has . . . [collected] the case law of the United States. For this, they deserve much credit and appropriate reward," Robert L. Oakley, the Washington, D.C., affairs representative for the American Association of Law Libraries, wrote Attorney General Janet Reno Sept. 1, shortly before he was interviewed about the CALR business by Justice Department anti-trust attorneys. "However, West's claim of copyright in the . . . pagination of its volumes, together with [traditional] requirements . . . that pinpoint cites be provided to West products, gives West near monopoly-like power and severely limits the ability of others to enter the market and compete effectively."

Harvey Berkman, *Are Case Cites Public Property?*, NAT'L L.J., Oct. 17, 1994, at A6; see also Reuben, *supra* note 104, at 22 (explaining that "[a]s a private concern, West copyrights its publications, including page numbers. While West does not claim a copyright in the volume and initial page number of an opinion, the Minnesota-based publisher does enforce a copyright to the rest of the pages of the opinion."). See generally L. Ray Patterson & Craig Joyce, *Monopolizing the Law: The Scope of Copyright Protection for Law Reports and Statutory Compilations*, 36 UCLA L. REV. 719 (1989).

West's claimed copyright has generated heated litigation. Mead Data Central, which offers the LEXIS/NEXIS databases sued West several years ago. But the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit ruled for West, finding that West's page-numbering system fell within its copyright. See *West Publ'g Co. v. Mead Data Cent.*, 799 F.2d 1219, 1229 (8th Cir. 1986). West later licensed its page-numbering system to Mead Data. See Reuben, *supra* note 104, at 22. Matthew Bender and HyperLaw also have

If courts adopt the ABA recommendations,¹¹⁷ each individual court would number opinions in the order issued. Within an opinion, each paragraph would be sequentially numbered. The court would require its cases to be cited by year, court designator, sequential decision number, and the paragraph number¹¹⁸ that supports the stated proposition.¹¹⁹ Further, “[u]ntil electronic publications of case reports become generally available to and commonly relied upon by courts and lawyers in the jurisdiction, the court should strongly encourage parallel citations.”¹²⁰ Thus, according to the ABA, a sample citation for the Fifth Circuit would read: “*Smith v. Jones*, 1996 5Cir 15, ¶18, 22 F.3d 955.”¹²¹ A decision from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York would be cited: “*Smith v. Jones*, 1996 SDNY 15.”¹²² A Maryland Supreme Court case would be cited: “*Smith v. Jones*, 1996 MD 15, 696 A2d 321.”¹²³

In mid-1994, the American Association of Law Librarians (AALL) formed a Task Force on Citations.¹²⁴ The Task Force was created in response to the Sixth Circuit’s and the Louisiana Supreme Court’s adoption of alternative citation formats.¹²⁵ The AALL Task Force’s primary goal was to “consider and develop non-

sued to challenge West’s copyright to reporter page numbers; that case is currently pending in a New York federal district court. See Morris, *supra* note 114, at 19.

117. One problem with the ABA recommendations is that they fail to address how the new format will fit with the *Bluebook*. The format uses some *Bluebook* conventions (such as the abbreviation of F. Supp.) but ignores others (such as the abbreviation of F3d and spacing between a paragraph symbol and number). When presented with this conflict, one member of the ABA committee responded:

The editors of the Blue Book were invited to comment during our proceedings and, I assume, will integrate our conclusions into their formats. I note your comment that our report only incompletely uses Blue Book formats for court names. You are of course correct and I do not have a full response. I can note, however, that we were urged to eliminate as many as possible of the period and spacing intricacies of the Blue Book.

Letter from Prof. Patricia Brumfield Fry to Prof. Darby Dickerson (June 27, 1996) (on file with the *Stetson Law Review*).

118. See Gebhardt, *supra* note 100, at 4 (explaining that “[w]hen courts put decisions on an electronic bulletin board and/or Web site, the concept of ‘page’ has no relevance — the new case law is just a long block of text”).

119. See ABA Report, *supra* note 109, at 6.

120. *Id.* at 2.

121. *Id.* (the quotation marks are not part of the ABA’s proposed citation format).

122. *Id.* at 9.

123. *Id.* app. A, ¶ 3.

124. See AALL Report, *supra* note 101, at 2.

125. *Id.*; see *supra* notes 103–04 and accompanying text.

medium dependent citation forms for legal materials.¹²⁶ After examining possible alternatives,¹²⁷ the AALL Task Force proposed the following citation form for case law:

For those jurisdictions considering change to a medium neutral citation form, the Task Force recommends the use of the following case citation form: case name, year of decision, court, opinion number, and, where a pinpoint citation is needed, paragraph number.¹²⁸

Paragraph numbers would begin with the decision's first paragraph; indented quotations and footnotes would not be numbered; and numbering would be consecutive from beginning to end, including concurrences and dissents.¹²⁹ Finally:

Each court should have its own abbreviation. Periods should be left off, as they are superfluous. Intermediate appellate court circuits or districts which are not bound by each other's law should state the circuit or district number in parentheses, e.g., La App (5th), US App (8th). Lower courts should use their standard abbre-

126. AALL Report, *supra* note 101, at 2.

127. In addition to discussing the systems adopted by Louisiana and Colorado and the system proposed in Wisconsin, the Task Force also examined the "docket number approach" and the "percentage point system." See AALL Report, *supra* note 101, at 13. Under the docket number approach, the case would be designated by its given docket number. This approach was rejected because

docket numbers have no connection with whether a case is published or not; they do not indicate the sequence of publication; they are often quite long numbers, with more possibility for error; in some jurisdictions they are not unique; and they require adding the date to the citation. Using docket numbers would not only require continual revision of . . . each issue of the National Reporter Blue Book, but also official reports and print versions of Shepard's as well. Further, many electronic case law validation and research tools do not work with docket numbers.

Id.

The percentage point system requires that the pinpoint citation be to a percentage of the document length. *Id.*

For example, if the pinpointed material lay at a distance 25.3% [sic] from the beginning of the opinion, the citation would be Smith v. Jones, 513 N.W.2d 723, 24.3 (Iowa 1968); or Smith v. Jones, 1996 Wis 353, 24.3. The advantages of percentage systems are that they are easy to calculate with computers and that they solve the copyright problem. The disadvantages are that they do not work easily with print publications, and would be quite foreign to both attorneys and publishers.

Id.

128. *Id.*

129. See AALL Report, *supra* note 101, at 13.

viations, minus Ct., which is superfluous, e.g., Del Fam, Ill Cl, Mass Dist, NY Sup, NY Cl, NY Civ, etc., with any important information following in parentheses.¹³⁰

For statutes, the Task Force recommended that “the actual date of the latest amendment to the statutory section cited should be the one listed in parentheses, for example: 42 U.S.C. 1006 (1/31/94).”¹³¹ The Task Force also studied, but issued no recommendations concerning, session laws,¹³² administrative law,¹³³ administrative decisions and orders,¹³⁴ administrative rules and regulations,¹³⁵ administrative codes,¹³⁶ and secondary authority.¹³⁷ The AALL Executive Board adopted the Task Force’s report

130. *Id.*

131. *Id.* at 15 (the trailing period is not part of the recommended citation).

132. *See id.* at 15. The AALL Report states:

Citations to session laws must contain years (or legislative sessions) and sequential numbers for laws. At the federal level, Public Law numbers meet this requirement, but not citations to Statutes at Large, which contain volume and page numbers. Generally, session laws are internally numbered by section numbers, so citations to pages are not necessary.

Id.

133. *See id.* (explaining that “[j]ust as administrative law is similar in form and publication to either case law or statutory law, so deficiencies in current citation practices mirror deficiencies in case and statutory citation form”).

134. *See AALL Report, supra* note 101, at 15 (observing that “[a]dministrative decisions and orders can be analogized to cases. Administrative agencies could number their decisions sequentially; some already do. Internally, paragraph numbers should be inserted to end dependence on pages.”).

135. *See id.* at 16. The AALL Report indicates:

Administrative rules and regulations can be analogized to statutes. Registers are similar to session laws, in that adjacent material is essentially unrelated. Registers are different in that material is emanating from many different agencies . . . and also in that registers contain proposed rules, and other types of material . . . and not just the text of laws. The Federal Register . . . assigns each item published an “FR Doc.” number . . . A citation to the Federal Register could thus include this document number and the date of the Register and be unique and complete enough to find either in print or online . . . State registers could work the same way.

Id.

136. *See id.* (stating that “[a]dministrative codes represent the same problems as statutory codes. Using the dating method . . . would work for administrative codes as well.”).

137. *See id.* (noting that “all secondary authority is copyrighted by someone,” [but that] “secondary authority is being produced and published in electronic form and thus the same problems with citation form arise. For example, researchers who obtain periodical articles from online services do not have internal page numbers to include in their citations.”).

on November 6, 1994.¹³⁸ Since then, AALL members have been consulting with the ABA about the ABA's proposal.¹³⁹

In light of these changes, the *Bluebook* editors wisely included a new rule on public domain citations.¹⁴⁰ They made a good start upon which future editors will need to build. In the not-so-distant future, the editors inevitably will need to develop public domain citations for all types of legal authorities, not just cases, and may eventually need to replace citations for print sources with public domain citations.¹⁴¹

3. Subsequent History

Rule 10.7 now provides that references to denials of certiorari or other discretionary appeals should not be included "unless the decision is less than two years old or the denial is particularly relevant."¹⁴² This change is particularly welcome because such denials carry no precedential value and do not indicate that the higher court agreed with the lower court's decision.¹⁴³ The exception that denials should be included if the case is less than two years old is a good one because it informs readers that the lower court's decision has become final.¹⁴⁴ Unfortunately, this change may not have materialized if the *Bluebook's* primary competitor, the *Maroonbook*,¹⁴⁵

138. See *Fight over Legal Citations Heats up*, SEARCHER, Jan. 1995, at 8, 8.

139. See Browne, *supra* note 106, at 274; see also *supra* notes 109-12 (discussing the ABA proposal).

140. See SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 10.3.1(b).

141. See *supra* notes 100-04 and accompanying text.

142. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 10.7. Although the editors failed to explain what "particularly relevant" means, users probably will want to include the *cert. denied* designation (a) when the case in which the subsequent history is particularly important to the author's discussion or analysis, such as when an author prepares a comment on a particular case, and (b) when the Supreme Court issues an opinion explaining why a petition for certiorari was denied or when a dissenting opinion concerning the denial of certiorari has been prepared. See generally ROBERT L. STERN ET AL., SUPREME COURT PRACTICE §§ 5.5 & 5.6 (7th ed. 1993).

143. See *Darr v. Burford*, 339 U.S. 200, 227 (1950) (Frankfurter, J., dissenting on denial of *cert.*) (explaining that "[n]othing is more basic to the functioning of this Court than an understanding that denial of certiorari is occasioned by a variety of reasons which precludes the implication that were the case here the merits would go against the petitioner"); *United States v. Carver*, 260 U.S. 482, 490 (1923) (emphasizing that "[t]he denial of a writ of certiorari imports no expression upon the merits of the case, as the bar has been told many times"). See generally STERN, *supra* note 142, § 5.7.

144. The editors did a good job conforming examples throughout the Sixteenth Edition to reflect this rule change. However, a few stray "*cert. denied's*" still remain. See, e.g., SIXTEENTH EDITION at 12.

145. See *infra* notes 255-60 and accompanying text (concerning the *Maroonbook*).

had not included the change first.¹⁴⁶

4. Authors' Names

The Sixteenth-Edition editors rewrote the rules about how to cite an author's name.¹⁴⁷ This change was prompted by a Fifteenth-Edition change that was both widely applauded¹⁴⁸ and roundly criticized.¹⁴⁹ Traditionally, the *Bluebook* provided that an author was listed by only his or her last name and a single first initial.¹⁵⁰ The Fifteenth-Edition editors finally¹⁵¹ recognized that using just an author's last name did not give the author just credit for his or her¹⁵² work¹⁵³ and could confuse readers when several authors shared a surname.¹⁵⁴ It therefore provided that citations general-

146. See UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO MANUAL OF LEGAL CITATION 17 (*University of Chicago Law Review* and *University of Chicago Legal Forum* eds. 1989) [hereinafter MAROONBOOK]; see also *infra* section VI.

147. See SIXTEENTH EDITION rules 15.1.1, 16.1 & 16.5.1(a).

148. See, e.g., Gordon, *supra* note 99, at 1700; Paulsen, *supra* note 1, at 1792; cf. Savell, *supra* note 56, at A20 (wondering whether the change was made to make authors "more identifiable to talk-show or news-analysis producers in search of 'experts'").

149. See, e.g., Paulsen, *supra* note 1, at 1792-93 (calling the rule "a little too rigid" and wondering: "[A]re we really supposed to provide a first name and middle initial any time we cite a source, even if the author does not provide that information?"); David E.B. Smith, *Just When You Thought It Was Safe To Go Back into the Bluebook: Notes on the Fifteenth Edition*, 67 CHI-KENT L. REV. 275, 277-78 (1991) (arguing that "[a]uthors should be able to get proper credit for their efforts without having editors mangle their names" (footnotes omitted)); see also *infra* note 154.

150. See, e.g., FOURTEENTH EDITION rule 15.1. Judge Posner recognized that "[t]his is one of the few cases in which the Bluebook sins by omission." Posner, *supra* note 56, at 1345.

151. Some speculate that this change was fueled by the *Bluebook's* chief competitor, the *Maroonbook*, "which instructs users to supply full names in the interest of providing full information." Chen, *supra* note 14, at 1536.

152. See Katharine T. Bartlett, *Feminist Legal Methods*, 103 HARV. L. REV. 829, 829 n.* (1990) (complaining that omitting first names eliminated "one dignified way in which women could distinguish themselves from their fathers and their husbands"); see also Paulsen, *supra* note 1, at 1792.

153. See, e.g., Smith, *supra* note 149, at 278. But see Sirico, *supra* note 3, at 1276 (commenting that "this innovation certainly will make footnotes longer and nurture the egos of cited writers").

154. See Gordon, *supra* note 99, at 1700 (calling the change an improvement because "[t]here are more than forty law professors named Smith, and of course nonacademics also write articles. I have a suspicion that the fourteen other law professors who share my surname have been really ticked off at me until now." (footnotes omitted)); Posner, *supra* note 56, at 1345 (urging that an author's full name be given — especially "in an era of multiple Ackermans, Dworkins, Epsteins, Whites, [and] Schwartzes" — "so that the reader will be in no doubt who the author is — a bit of information that may tell him how much weight he wants to give the citation and whether he wants to look

ly¹⁵⁵ should include the first name, middle initial, and last name of those who authored books,¹⁵⁶ articles,¹⁵⁷ student works,¹⁵⁸ and A.L.R. annotations.¹⁵⁹ This change was applauded.¹⁶⁰ However, the Fifteenth Edition dictated that any middle name should be shortened to a middle initial "unless the author uses an initial in place of his or her first name, in which case retain the first initial and the full middle name."¹⁶¹ This change was criticized.¹⁶² If users followed this rule, they were forced to refer to Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes as Oliver W. Holmes.¹⁶³

On this point, the Sixteenth-Edition editors listened to those who suggested that "[p]erhaps the next edition . . . can simply state the rule as 'Cite the author's name as the author wants it.'"¹⁶⁴ The Sixteenth Edition now instructs users, when citing a book,¹⁶⁵ periodical,¹⁶⁶ student work,¹⁶⁷ or A.L.R. annotation,¹⁶⁸ to "always give the author's full name as it appears on the publication."¹⁶⁹ Now we may refer to Oliver Wendell Holmes,¹⁷⁰ John Hart

it up"); Paulsen, *supra* note 1, at 1792 (agreeing that "first names help"). *But see* Sirico, *supra* note 3, at 1276. Sirico remarked:

I do not understand why the reader needs this information in a citation. He or she can find it by checking the cited material. In those occasional instances when the writer wants to insure that the reader knows the cited author is a prominent individual — for example, Harry W. Jones and not Buster Jones — the savvy writer can find a way to convey this information.

Id. (footnote omitted).

155. As always, exceptions were noted. *See* Fifteenth Edition text accompanying *infra* note 156.

156. *See* FIFTEENTH EDITION rule 15.1.1.

157. *See id.* rule 16.1.

158. *See id.* rule 16.5.1(a).

159. *See id.* rule 16.5.5.

160. *See supra* note 148.

161. *Id.* rule 15.1.1. Some construed the "middle initial only" rule as antifeminist. *See, e.g.,* Ruth Colker, *An Equal Protection Analysis of United States Reproductive Health Policy: Gender, Race, Age, and Class*, 1991 DUKE L.J. 324, 324 n.*.

162. *See supra* note 149.

163. The Fifteenth Edition uses this example in rule 15.5.1(b).

164. Smith, *supra* note 149, at 278.

165. *See* SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 15.1.1.

166. *See id.* rule 16.1.

167. *See id.* rule 16.5.1.

168. *See id.* rule 16.5.5.

169. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 15.1.1. The new rule also applies to editors and translators. *See id.* rule 15.1.2 (instructing users to "always give the full name of an editor or translator according to rule 15.1.1").

170. *See id.* at 12, 108.

Ely,¹⁷¹ Charles Alan Wright,¹⁷² Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg,¹⁷³ and many others as we have come to know them and as they wish to be known. This is the way it should be. Bravo.

5. *Legislative Material*

The editors revised and expanded rule 13 concerning legislative materials. First, the editors modified rule 13 to eliminate the identification of the session number for federal legislative materials when the reader can infer the session from the remainder of the citation.¹⁷⁴ Consequently, a citation to a federal unenacted bill will read:

H.R. 3055, 94th Cong. § 2 (1976).¹⁷⁵

Not: H.R. 3055, 94th Cong., 2d Sess. § 2 (1976).¹⁷⁶
A U.S. Senate report will be cited:

S. REP. NO. 84-2, at 7 (1955).¹⁷⁷

Not: S. REP. NO. 2, 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 7 (1955).¹⁷⁸

In addition, the editors augmented narrative instructions for citing state legislative materials and added examples illustrating the rules.¹⁷⁹ Unfortunately, citations to state legislative material must include a session number,¹⁸⁰ thus making state and federal

171. *See id.* at 35, 36, 109.

172. *See id.* at 103.

173. *See id.* at 113.

174. *See* SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 13. This rule explains:

[I]nclude parenthetically the session number for both House and Senate materials published before the 60th Congress (1907), House Reports published before the 47th Congress (1881), and Senate Reports published before the 40th Congress (1847). For House and Senate materials published after these dates, the session number can be inferred from the year of publication: first sessions always fall in odd numbered years, while second sessions always fall in even numbered years.

Id.

175. SIXTEENTH EDITION Quick Reference: Law Review Footnotes.

176. FIFTEENTH EDITION Quick Reference: Law Review Footnotes.

177. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 13.4, at 91.

178. FIFTEENTH EDITION rule 13.4, at 88.

179. *See* SIXTEENTH EDITION rules 13.2(c) & 13.4(d).

180. *See id.* rules 13.2(c) & 13.4(d).

citation forms inconsistent and more difficult to remember.¹⁸¹

6. Internet Material

Another evolutionary change is found in newly-added rule 17.3.3, which instructs users how to cite Internet sources.¹⁸² The rule begins:

Because of the transient nature of many Internet sources, citation to Internet sources is discouraged unless the materials are unavailable in printed form or are difficult to obtain in their original form. When citing to materials found on the Internet, provide the name of the author (if any), the title or top-level heading of the material being cited, and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL). The Uniform Resource Locator is the electronic address of the information and should be given in angled brackets. For electronic journals and publications, the actual date of publication should be given. Otherwise, provide the most recent modification date of the source preceded by the term "last modified" or the date of access preceded by the term "visited" if the modification date is unavailable:

Mark Israel, *The alt.usage.english FAQ File* (last modified Nov. 17, 1995) <ftp://rtfm.mit.edu/pub/usenet/alt.usage/english/alt.usage.english_FAQ>.

Scott Adams, *The Dilbert Zone* (visited Jan. 20, 1996) <<http://www.unitedmedia.com/comics/dilbert>>.¹⁸³

The new rule also provides the following information about citing e-journals:

Citations to journals that appear only on the Internet should include the volume number, the title of the journal, and the sequential article number. Pinpoint citations should refer to the paragraph number, if available:

181. See *id.* rule 13.7(c) (showing complete citation forms and short citation forms for both federal and state legislative materials).

182. See SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 17.3.3.

183. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 17.3.3; see also Michael A. Arnzen, *Cyber Citations*, INTERNET WORLD, Sept. 1996, at 72, 72 (suggesting that Internet users "save or print all documents [they] intend to cite," instructing users to "[r]efer to a printed source, if available," and advising that users should "[o]pt for signed articles whenever possible" because on the Internet "anyone can publish anything").

Dan L. Burk, *Trademarks Along the Infobahn: A First Look at the Emerging Law of Cybermarks*, 1 RICH. J.L. & TECH. 1, ¶ 12 (Apr. 10, 1995)
 <<http://www.urich.edu/~jolt/vlil/burk.html>>. ¹⁸⁴

Although rule 17.3.3 provides a decent start, it is fairly limited. The next *Bluebook* editors need to go further and provide information and examples concerning other Internet materials — such as how to cite a Web site or Gopher — and other electronic materials, such as e-mail.¹⁸⁵ The editors might also consider adding a rule concerning parallel electronic and hard-copy citations, so users may choose which type of source to access.

C. Other Notable Changes

1. Textual Material in Footnotes

The Sixteenth Edition clarifies how certain material should be treated when it appears as textual material in footnotes. First, rule 2 has been reworked.¹⁸⁶ It now expressly distinguishes between textual material in the main text of a law-review article and textual material in the footnotes of a law-review article.¹⁸⁷ Whereas the Fifteenth Edition instructed users to abbreviate case names that appeared in footnote text when “only one of the two adversary parties is named or when no citation is given”¹⁸⁸ — meaning that regular roman typeface would be used when both parties’ names appeared within a citation — the Sixteenth Edition calls for italics “[w]hen a case name is grammatically part of the sentence in which it appears.”¹⁸⁹ The Sixteenth Edition’s rule is easier to remember and eliminates an unnecessary distinction.¹⁹⁰

184. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 17.3.3. For a list of e-journals, visit the following Web site: <<http://www.urich.edu/~jolt/other.html>>.

185. The following sources contain additional information about how to cite electronic and Internet sources: ANDREW HARNACK & GENE KLEPPINGER, *BEYOND THE MLA HANDBOOK: DOCUMENTING ELECTRONIC SOURCES ON THE INTERNET* (visited Oct. 20, 1996) <<http://falcon.eku.edu/honors/beyond-mla>>. See generally Arnzen, *supra* note 183, at 74 (describing several electronic citation manuals and providing the Internet address for each).

186. See SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 2; see also *infra* app. A.

187. See SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 2.2.

188. FIFTEENTH EDITION rule 2.2(b).

189. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 2.2(b)(i).

190. Many other rules now conform to the new “main text” and “footnote text” divi-

In addition, rule 6.2(b) now instructs users to spell out the words "section" and "paragraph" in the text, "whether main text or footnote text."¹⁹¹ This change also eliminates unnecessary distinctions between the text and footnotes of a law-review article. Unfortunately, the editors forgot to revise rule 12.9, which is cross-referenced in rule 6.2(b). Rule 12.9(c) still provides that "except when referring to the U.S. Code provisions, the word 'section' should be spelled out in law review text and footnote text."¹⁹² Surely the editors intend for rule 6.2(b) to control; otherwise, they would not have added the language concerning state codes.

2. Endnotes and Graphical Material

Recognizing that some publications use endnotes as opposed to footnotes and that many authors now append graphical material to papers, the *Bluebook* editors expanded the scope of rule 3.3, which is now entitled "Pages, Footnotes, Endnotes, and Graphical Materials."¹⁹³ The endnote rule is clear and straightforward; it instructs users: "To cite to an endnote, give the page on which the endnote appears (not the page on which the call number appears), 'n,' and the endnote number, with no space between 'n,' and the number."¹⁹⁴ Thus, a cite for an endnote will look just like a cite for a footnote.¹⁹⁵

The new rule on citing graphical material is also clear and straightforward: "When citing tables, figures, charts, graphs, or other graphical materials, give the page number on which the graphical material appears and the designation, if any, provided in the source. Use the abbreviations in **table T.16**."¹⁹⁶ Table 16 contains abbreviations such as "fig." for "figure"; "fol." for "folio"; "illus." for "illustration"; and "tbl." for "table."¹⁹⁷ Thus, a table might be cited:

Kevin M. Clermont & Theodore Eisenberg, *Xenophilia in American Courts*, 109 HARV. L. REV. 1120, 1131 tbl.2

tion. See, e.g., SIXTEENTH EDITION rules 12.9 & 13.7.

191. *Id.* rule 6.2(b).

192. *Id.* rule 12.9(c), at 87.

193. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 3.3.

194. *Id.* rule 3.3(c).

195. Compare *id.* rule 3.3(b) example with *id.* rule 3.3(c) example.

196. *Id.* rule 3.3(e).

197. SIXTEENTH EDITION T.16.

(1996).¹⁹⁸

3. Referencing Districts or Departments

Rule 10.4(b) provides that “[w]hen the department or district is of particular relevance, that information should be indicated.”¹⁹⁹ It is sometimes important to know which division of a court — for example, the Florida Second District Court of Appeal as opposed to the Florida Third District Court of Appeal — decided the case. The Sixteenth Edition now illustrates how that additional information can be conveyed.²⁰⁰

4. Short Cites for Cases

The editors made one completely unnecessary change and one very needed change regarding short cites for cases. First the unnecessary change. Rule 10.9(a) now provides:

In law review footnotes, a short form for a case may be used if it clearly identifies a case that is either already cited in the *same* footnote, is cited (in either full or short form, including “*id.*”) in a manner such that it can be readily found in one of the preceding five footnotes, or is named in the same general textual discussion to which the footnote is appended.²⁰¹

The rule is exactly as it appears in the Fifteenth Edition, except that the Fifteenth Edition used the number four instead of five.²⁰² This is exactly the type of change the editors should have avoided. There is no apparent reason for the change. This change appears to have been made merely for the sake of change. Many people memorized the “four” rule and must now unlearn that rule and remember the “five” rule — and for no reason other than the new *Bluebook* says so.

The editors redeemed themselves one page later. Rule 10.9(a)(ii) now explains how to short cite cases available on an

198. *Id.* rule 3.3(e) example.

199. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 10.4(b).

200. *See id.* (using as an example: “Schiffman v. Corsi, 50 N.Y.S.2d 897 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. County 1944).”).

201. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 10.9(a) (bold emphasis added); *see also id.* rule 12.9(c) (same rule, but regarding statutes).

202. *See* FIFTEENTH EDITION rule 10.9.

electronic database. Writers should "use a unique database identifier, if one has been assigned."²⁰³ The examples given are analogous to other short cites:

Clark v. Homrighous, No. CIV.A.90-1380-T, 1991 WL 55402, at *3 (D. Kan. Apr. 10, 1991)

becomes: *Clark*, 1991 WL 55402, at *2.

Albrecht v. Stanczek, No. 87-C9535, 1991 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5088, at *1 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 18, 1991)

becomes: *Albrecht*, 1991 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5088, at *2.²⁰⁴

Given the increasing number of cases available only in electronic databases, this addition fills an important gap.

5. Foreign Material

The editors made positive changes in the *Bluebook* sections that cover materials from other countries. They updated the table of countries to reflect newly created sovereigns.²⁰⁵ They similarly updated the table of foreign jurisdictions.²⁰⁶ Most importantly, for many foreign sources, Table 2 now provides citation formats for each individual country, so guessing and discretion should be minimized.²⁰⁷ As the *Bluebook* editors explained, "Rule 19 has been modified and now requires that citations to foreign materials conform as closely as possible to local citation practice of the jurisdictions whose material is being cited."²⁰⁸ Users can also take comfort in the fact that a group of outside experts assisted the *Bluebook* editors in revising the foreign materials.²⁰⁹

203. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 10.9(a)(ii).

204. *Id.*

205. See SIXTEENTH EDITION T.10.

206. See *id.* T.2.

207. See *id.*

208. *Id.* at vi.

209. See *id.* at vi. For example, Jarka Looks is a lawyer and librarian at the Swiss Institute of Comparative Law in Lausanne, Switzerland. See <<http://www.zsz.ch:888/Lcn>>. Vratislav Pechota is the assistant director of the Parker School of Comparative Law at Columbia University. See <<http://www.jurispub.com/ptot/p/arb3.htm>>.

6. *Parallel Citations to U.S. Supreme Court Cases*

Table 1 no longer states: "Do not give a parallel citation" when citing U.S. Supreme Court cases.²¹⁰ However, examples in the *Bluebook* continue to use only the United States Reporter cite. Since the editors did not explain this omission, readers will be left to wonder whether they omitted the language accidentally or intentionally.

7. *Table Numbering*

Former Table 14, "Periodicals in Foreign Languages," has been eliminated.²¹¹ Although the editors offer no explanation, one might assume that the table was deleted because it was used infrequently. Because of this change, readers should note that all remaining tables have been renumbered. Therefore, Table 14 is now "Publishing Terms," Table 15 is now "Services," and Table 16 is now "Subdivisions."²¹²

D. Overall Critique of Sixteenth-Edition Changes

Changes in the Sixteenth Edition are truly a mixed lot. Some changes — such as the addition of public domain citation formats²¹³ and examples of Internet citations²¹⁴ — are evolutionary and beneficial. Other changes — such as changing how many consecutive *id.*'s can be used in law-review footnotes²¹⁵ — serve no apparent purpose and are detrimental. Although the Sixteenth-Edition editors did a fair job of not making changes solely for the sake of change, they sinned at least to some extent. It is these changes that add to the un-uniformity of the United States citation system.

Even if not perfect,²¹⁶ to have a truly uniform citation system, we must have some sense of history and tradition upon which to rely. Stated differently:

210. Compare FIFTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 165 with SIXTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 165.

211. Compare FIFTEENTH EDITION T.14 ("Periodicals in Foreign Languages") with SIXTEENTH EDITION T.14 ("Publishing Terms").

212. See SIXTEENTH EDITION at vi; see also app. A (listing other changes in the tables).

213. See *supra* notes 100–41 and accompanying text.

214. See *supra* notes 182–85 and accompanying text.

215. See *supra* notes 201–02 and accompanying text.

216. See Phillips, *supra* note 90, at 201 (explaining that "a uniform system of citation need not be rational to be useful. It is the nature of uniformity that, at times, consistency prevail over logic").

[W]hen . . . a standard is altered, confusion and distraction arise as those mechanical matters formerly submerged into the subconscious are evoked once more by unfamiliarity. The promulgation of a new standard . . . forces those who have mastered the obscurities of the old standard to start the bedeviling learning process anew.²¹⁷

The editors cannot continue to change the citation system every five years.²¹⁸ The tinkering must stop.²¹⁹

IV. THE BLUEBOOK EDITORS DO NOT FOLLOW THE "UNIFORM" RULES

Despite their desire to make the *Bluebook* the sole arbiter of legal citation form in the United States, even the four schools that produce the *Bluebook* do not always agree on style and do not always follow its rules. In a 1991 article, a former *Harvard Law Review* executive editor disclosed that "Columbia . . . fails to use roman, italic, and large and small capitals as the *Bluebook* commands,"²²⁰ that Harvard compiles its own "common law" interpretations of vague and ambiguous rules in a document called the *Executive Editor Handbook*,²²¹ and that *Harvard Law Review* ignores many rules it champions in the *Bluebook*.²²² Another author

217. Smith, *supra* note 149, at 275 (footnote omitted); see also Gjerdingen, *supra* note 97, at 503 (explaining that "[t]o be useful, a system of citation must serve several needs. First, it must be workable. It should treat questions of citation in proportion to their occurrence and require only information of practical significance. A successful system of citation must be capable of use by practitioners and law review editors alike."); Gralley & Aisenbrey, *supra* note 21, at 874 (warning that "[t]hose who have committed prior editions to memory may shrink from the prospect of reindoctrination"); Sackett, *supra* note 37, at 140 (referring to the "transient disorientation caused by a new edition").

218. See Phillips, *supra* note 90, at 201 (complaining: "But now we are advised from Parnassus-on-the-Charles that the strict rules set forth in 1981 are being replaced by new strict rules. Why? No explanation is given." (footnote omitted)).

219. Sirico, *supra* note 3, at 1279. Sirico explained:

Intricate rules apparently do something to the psyche that compels tinkering. Even when a change has a rationale that is arguably functional, the rationale is often exceedingly thin. . . . The preoccupation with fiddling turns the best and brightest law students into players of a small, elaborate game of trivia. I have little hope that the sixteenth edition will have fewer rules and fewer trivial changes.

Id.

220. Chen, *supra* note 14, at 1531.

221. See *id.* at 1531 & n.13.

222. See *id.* at 1531. With regard to the Fifteenth Edition, Chen explained that:

noted that *Harvard Law Review* does not follow the multiple author directive²²³ contained in rule 15.1.1.²²⁴ If the editors do not follow their own rules, why should they expect others to? More importantly, if they use different rules, how can they claim the *Bluebook* system is uniform?

V. THE BLUEBOOK IS NOT A UNIFORM GUIDE FOR PRACTITIONERS

For decades, the *Bluebook's* sole purpose was to instruct law-review members how to cite sources in the footnotes of leading articles.²²⁵ It was not concerned with papers filed with courts.²²⁶ Beginning with the Twelfth Edition, however, it started to include citation information for legal memoranda, briefs, and court documents.²²⁷ Although the Sixteenth Edition does a better job than its predecessors, the *Bluebook* editors — who presumably have not practiced law — do not adequately explain that if practitioners blindly follow *Bluebook* rules, they may find themselves incurring a judge's wrath.

The *Bluebook*, in the Practitioners' Notes, now warns attorneys:

Make sure that you are familiar with and abide by any additional or different citation requirements of the court to which the document is to be submitted. If you are not certain about what a court

Bluebook 15's examples on the use of parentheticals contradict the *Harvard Law Review's* practice *Bluebook 15* may not believe in the use of articles within parentheticals, but Harvard does. Other examples abound. . . . [T]he example *Bluebook 15* gives to illustrate the line between "contra" and "but see" would be incorrect at the *Harvard Law Review*. . . . [and] "accord" and "contra" have fallen into nearly complete disuse at Harvard.

Id.

223. This rule states: "If a work has more than two authors, use the first author's name followed by "ET AL." SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 15.1.1.

224. See Paulsen, *supra* note 1, at 1793 & n.86. This author wrote:

Let us say, hypothetically speaking, that Arthur (sorry, "Arthur R.") Miller were to submit an article to the *Harvard Law Review* and cite sources such as "Wright, Miller & whomever." Under a new *Bluebook* rule for multiple-author works . . . , because "Wright, Miller & whomever" are more than two authors, everybody but "Wright," including famous-Harvard-Law-professor-and-grader-of-student-papers Arthur Miller, would just become another "et al." In any event, for some mysterious reason, the new "et al." rule has already been scrapped at Harvard.

Id. at 1793 (footnotes omitted).

225. See app. D (reflecting the *Bluebook's* stated purpose).

226. See *id.*

227. See *supra* note 49.

requires, you should consult with someone who is familiar with the court's rules or with the clerk of the court.²²⁸

In addition, Table 1 — before the Alabama listing — states that “in-state abbreviation and citation conventions may differ from those listed in this table.”²²⁹ However, the *Bluebook* then purports to instruct attorneys how to cite sources in documents submitted to courts in each listed jurisdiction.²³⁰

Although some courts have adopted the forms articulated in the *Bluebook*, many states have enacted rules requiring attorneys to cite sources in ways that deviate from pure *Bluebook* form.²³¹ And court rules trump the *Bluebook* every time.²³² Unfortunately, the *Bluebook* does not include, or even reference, these controlling rules and statutes, even though such information is readily available and could be easily added.²³³ Accordingly, the *Bluebook* does not contain a uniform citation system — because it does not conform to controlling, mandatory rules by which practitioners must abide.

228. See SIXTEENTH EDITION at 11.

229. *Id.* at 170.

230. See *id.* T.1.

231. See apps. B-1 to B-3.

232. As one attorney recalled:

Having earned their wrath, I left law school a Bluebookophile, ready to educate bar examiners and practitioners on the proper way to do things. My first shock came when the judge for whom I was clerking returned a draft memorandum with my *sees* changed to sees. “Improper,” said I, making reference to pages 6 and 7 of the “Bible.” “I don’t care,” said he, making reference to his 25 years experience as appellate lawyer and judge. His *sees* would never be *sees*, you see. He had a good point. How many of us *see*?

Parmley, *supra* note 56, at 450; see also *Oasis Publ’g Co. v. West Publ’g Co.*, 924 F. Supp. 918, 921 (D. Minn. 1996) (complaining that the Fifteenth Edition “does not direct citation to, or even mention the [official reporter] Florida Cases”); Campano, *supra* note 59, at 629.

[A]s omnipotent as prior renditions of *The Bluebook* purported to be, they never really had authoritative impact upon practitioners in the many jurisdictions, who generally followed local tradition. To the best of my knowledge, no argument has ever been precluded, or case lost, as a sanction for ignoring *The Bluebook*.

Id.

233. See apps. B-1 to B-3 (compiling court rules and statutes concerning citation format).

VI. COMPETITION AND UN-UNIFORMITY

Another reason that the *Bluebook* is truly not a uniform system is that competitive citation systems did and still do exist.²³⁴ For many years, the chief alternative²³⁵ to the *Bluebook* was Miles O. Price's *A Practical Manual of Standard Legal Citations*.²³⁶ According to one citation historian:

In the late 1940s, complaints about the "Harvard Citator" were frequent, especially among practitioners and beginning law students. In the course of preparing *Effective Legal Research* along with Harry Bitner, Price developed a citation manual, which was separately published in 1950, with a second edition in 1958. He based it primarily on citation practices he found in briefs.²³⁷

Price's guide was clearly written and gave many examples; it even showed users how to place cites within a brief.²³⁸ According to Price, his manual "was widely adopted in legal writing courses and by the bar."²³⁹ The latest version of Price's manual appeared in the 1979 version of *Effective Legal Research*.²⁴⁰

Other citation manuals have been prepared for typewritten work,²⁴¹ for briefs,²⁴² for particular jurisdictions,²⁴³ for government publications,²⁴⁴ and for international materials.²⁴⁵ In addition, some law review staffs, including those at St. John's,²⁴⁶ Ohio

234. See *supra* note 13. One scholar discovered that "[l]egal citation manuals . . . were rare before the twentieth century. A simple one consisting of only nineteen short rules was published by the Reporter of the Nebraska Supreme Court in the 1890s. In the early twentieth century, the Judge Advocate General's office also compiled a citation manual." Cooper, *supra* note 13, at 20-21 (footnotes omitted).

235. Cooper, *supra* note 13, at 22.

236. MILES O. PRICE, *A PRACTICAL MANUAL OF LEGAL CITATIONS* (1st ed. 1950).

237. Cooper, *supra* note 13, at 22 (footnote omitted).

238. See *id.*; see also *supra* note 236.

239. Cooper, *supra* note 13, at 22 & n. 162 (citing: Letter from M. Price to Legal Bibliography Teachers (July 12, 1956)).

240. See MILES O. PRICE ET AL., *EFFECTIVE LEGAL RESEARCH* ch. 32 (4th ed. 1979).

241. See, e.g., C. EDWARD GOOD, *CITING AND TYPING THE LAW* (3d ed. 1992).

242. See, e.g., EDWARD D. RE & JOSEPH R. RE, *LAW STUDENTS' MANUAL ON LEGAL WRITING AND ORAL ARGUMENT* (4th rev. ed. 1974).

243. See, e.g., *infra* app. B-1 notes 400 & 406.

244. See GEORGE D. BRIGHTBILL & WAYNE C. MAXSON, *CITATION MANUAL FOR UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS* (1974).

245. See, e.g., *International and Foreign Law Citator*, 6 VA. J. INT'L L. app. (1966); *Draft Selections: A.S.I.L.S. International Law Citation Manual*, 2 ASILS INT'L L.J. 53 (1978).

246. See *infra* app. B-1 note 406.

Northern University,²⁴⁷ the University of Florida,²⁴⁸ the University of Louisiana,²⁴⁹ and the University of Texas,²⁵⁰ have published adaptations of or supplements to the *Bluebook*.²⁵¹ Other law reviews, including the *Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law*,²⁵² have developed their own lists of deviations from the *Bluebook*²⁵³ or follow the *Bluebook* sometimes, but not always.²⁵⁴

In 1986, the *Bluebook's* most serious challenger emerged when the various University of Chicago law journals, with the support of several commercial publishers,²⁵⁵ unveiled *The University of Chicago Manual of Legal Citation*, also known as the *Maroonbook*.²⁵⁶ Some viewed the *Maroonbook* as the savior from the more rigid *Bluebook*.²⁵⁷ Weighing in at a "shockingly slim"²⁵⁸ sixty-three pag-

247. See *infra* app. B-1 note 408.

248. See *infra* app. B-1 note 403.

249. See *infra* app. B-1 note 404.

250. See *infra* app. B-1 note 411. As law librarian Richard L. Bowler explained in his 1977 *Bluebook* review, this guide was "the outgrowth of an article by Judge Greenhill . . . of the Texas Supreme Court, who set out a rather complete system of citation for Texas lawyers. Greenhill, *Uniform Citation for Briefs*, 27 TEX. B.J. 323 (1964)." Bowler, *supra* note 23, at 696 n.3.

251. See generally Teitelbaum, *supra* note 53, at 265.

252. See 16 BERKELEY J. EMP. & LAB. L. vi (1995) (offering to send authors "a style sheet listing the Journal's departures from Bluebook style").

253. See, e.g., 42 LOY. L. REV. ii (1996) (modifying citations for Louisiana appellate courts).

254. See, e.g., 20 OKLA. CITY U. L. REV. iv (Spring 1994) (indicating that "[t]he text and footnotes in the *Oklahoma City University Law Review* conform to *The Bluebook* . . . except where common sense dictates otherwise"); 43 UCLA L. REV. ii (Apr. 1996) (informing potential authors that citations "conform generally" to the *Bluebook*).

255. The publishers are Lawyers Co-operative Publishing Co., Bancroft-Whitney Co., and Mead Data Central, Inc. See UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO MANUAL OF LEGAL CITATION title page (*University of Chicago Law Review* and *University of Chicago Legal Forum* eds. 1989) [hereinafter MAROONBOOK].

256. The *Maroonbook* first appeared as an appendix to Richard A. Posner, *Goodbye to the Bluebook*, 53 U. CHI. L. REV. 1343 (1986). In 1989, it was published as a separately-bound booklet. See MAROONBOOK, *supra* note 255, title page.

257. See Douglas Laycock, *The Maroonbook v. The Bluebook: A Comparative Review*, 1 SCRIBES J. LEGAL WRITING 181, 181 (1990) (welcoming a second citation manual "[b]ecause the first one has become a monstrosity, consuming vast amounts of scarce time and some amount of scare dollars and sabotaging its basic purpose"); Posner, *supra* note 56, at 1343. But see Bryan A. Garner, *An Uninformed System of Citation: The Maroonbook Blues*, 1 SCRIBES J. LEGAL WRITING 191, 191, 193-94 (1990) (explaining that the "*Maroonbook* would unsettle us all by replacing our old standards with new illusory ones, these based on individual discretion" and that this discretion may hinder computer research).

258. Letter from Tom Dupree, Editor, *University of Chicago Law Review*, to ABA Special Committee on Citation Issues (July 21, 1996) (copy on file with the *Stetson Law*

es, the *Maroonbook* sought to “provide[] a simple, workable system of citation for legal writing,”²⁵⁹ and to encourage users to “adapt the rules to the particular needs of their formats.”²⁶⁰

Although the *Maroonbook* has its admirers, the number of converts is relatively few. *Vanderbilt Law Review*,²⁶¹ *Berkeley Women’s Law Journal*,²⁶² and *The Supreme Court Review*²⁶³ have switched.²⁶⁴ But most law reviews still cling to the *Bluebook*, flaws and all. Why? Four reasons come immediately to mind.

First, Harvard’s allure attracts followers. For generations, other law reviews have emulated the *Harvard Law Review*. Harvard is still the top-ranked law review,²⁶⁵ so why tinker with success? Try to emulate number one.²⁶⁶ Second, many editors were forced to learn the *Bluebook* as part of their first-year curriculum and have no desire to learn another citation system.²⁶⁷ Third, be-

Review).

259. MAROONBOOK, *supra* note 255, at 7.

260. *Id.* A current *University of Chicago Law Review* editor has written that the *Maroonbook* reflects

our belief that a citation system should prize ease of reference and internal consistency within a journal over a rigid adherence to form. We also believe that our writers and editors should devote their time to writing and editing, rather than spend hours slogging through the *Bluebook* to unearth an answer. Since it is neither possible nor desirable to craft a rule for every citation problem that could arise, the *Maroonbook* grants writers and editors a fair amount of discretion. This above all: Be clear, sensible, and consistent.

Dupree, *supra* note 258.

261. See 49 VAND. L. REV. i (Jan. 1996) (indicating that “[t]he *Review* will convert accepted articles to the *University of Chicago Manual of Legal Citation* style”).

262. See 6 BERKELEY WOMEN’S L.J. i (1990–91) (stating that “[c]itations generally follow *The University of Chicago Manual of Legal Citation*”).

263. See generally 1995 SUP. CT. REV. 1 (evidencing *The University of Chicago Manual of Legal Citation* form throughout).

264. *Duquesne Law Review* switched to the *Maroonbook*, but then switched back to the *Bluebook*. Compare 30 DUQ. L. REV. vii (1991) (indicating that citations should conform to the *University of Chicago Manual of Legal Citation*) with 34 DUQ. L. REV. iv (1996) (indicating that citations should conform to the *Bluebook*). Some commercial publishers, such as Lawyers Co-operative, also follow *Maroonbook* form. Telephone Conversation with Tom Dupree, Editor, *University of Chicago Law Review* (Sept. 6, 1996); see also Cooper, *supra* note 13, at 21 (stating that “[p]ublishers of law books generally do not use the ‘Harvard Citator’ and prefer instead to employ citation formats that facilitate the use of their other publications”).

265. See Colleen M. Cullen & S. Randall Kalberg, *Faculty Scholarship Survey: Chicago-Kent Law Review Faculty Scholarship Survey*, 70 CHI.-KENT L. REV. 1445, 1454 tbl.III (1995).

266. See Gjerdingen, *supra* note 97, at 501 (explaining that “most treat *A Uniform System of Citation* as scripture. This may be due in part because the *Columbia Law Review*, *Harvard Law Review*, *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, and *Yale Law Journal* stand behind it . . .”).

267. A current editor at the *University of Chicago Law Review* takes issue with this

cause the *Maroonbook* gives more leeway than the *Bluebook*, it is more difficult for editors to point to "the answer" when dealing with authors or other staff members. Whereas the *Bluebook* is the book that ends arguments,²⁶⁸ the *Maroonbook* may be the book that perpetuates them.²⁶⁹ Finally, judges and practitioners have not widely adopted the *Maroonbook*.²⁷⁰ Thus, many law schools have been reluctant to switch from the *Bluebook*, realizing that teaching only the *Maroonbook* may place their graduates at a disadvantage.²⁷¹

The *Maroonbook* has, however, served an important function. If nothing else, it has shaken the *Bluebook* editors from their complacency and made them reconsider some of their more rigid and illogical rules. For example, we can thank the *Maroonbook* for positive changes in the new *Bluebook* concerning citing authors' names²⁷² and citations to subsequent history.²⁷³ If only the *Maroonbook* editors and the *Bluebook* editors would combine forces, they could probably produce a logical, well-organized, less-confusing citation system that might, at some point, become truly uniform.

The *Maroonbook's* failure to convert the masses, however, does not necessarily mean that the *Bluebook's* future is secure. Other threats are on the horizon.²⁷⁴ As one commentator noted, "Clearly the *Bluebook* is still not the last word, nor is it ever likely to be."²⁷⁵

point. See Dupree, *supra* note 258 (writing that "[a]fter our staffers' initial reluctance to master a different citation system, they come to appreciate the *Maroonbook's* many strengths").

268. See *supra* text accompanying note 56.

269. See Garner, *supra* note 257, at 193 (asking: "Why not leave it to every legal journal, then, to devise its own system?").

270. See *id.* at 192.

271. See *id.* In his article, Garner opined:

If we are to talk about pedagogical malpractice, the charge should be leveled not against those who teach the *Bluebook*, but against legal-writing instructors who teach the seat-of-your-pants *Maroonbook*. How will law students fare once they hit the streets? The law school that [teaches the *Maroonbook*] may briefly "raise student morale," but in the upper echelons the improvement will disappear shortly, once the top students learn that judges such as John Minor Wisdom and Thomas Gibbs Gee are reluctant to hire clerks whose knowledge of citing legal materials extends only to the breadth of their discretion.

Id.

272. See SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 15.1.1; see also *supra* section III(B)(4) (discussing this rule change).

273. See SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 10.7; see also *supra* section III(B)(3) (discussing this rule change).

274. See, e.g., *supra* notes 101 & 109 and accompanying text.

275. Bowler, *supra* note 23, at 697.

VII. THOUGHTS FOR THE SEVENTEENTH EDITION

One problem with any student-run publication is the turnover. With students coming and going each year, it is difficult to establish a well-developed institutional memory.²⁷⁶ As a result, bad rules go unchanged and good rules are never added. Uniformity suffers. Nevertheless, below are several suggestions the Seventeenth-Edition editors should consider.

A. Include, or at Least Reference, State Citation Requirements

As emphasized earlier, the *Bluebook* does not control citations in court documents, unless local court rules have adopted the *Bluebook* format or are silent about citation format.²⁷⁷ The disclaimers currently contained in the Practitioners' Notes²⁷⁸ and Table 1²⁷⁹ simply are not sufficient. If the *Bluebook* aspires to be a truly uniform system used by editors and practitioners alike, it should include the citation forms required by courts. Adding an additional table, or incorporating the pertinent information into Table 1, would not be unduly burdensome and would benefit many users.²⁸⁰

B. Eliminate Distinctions Between Law Reviews and Court Documents

The Sixteenth Edition retains the typeface distinctions for law-review footnotes and for legal memoranda and court documents.²⁸¹ Although typeface distinctions may have been necessary in the age of typewriters and typesetters, such distinctions no longer make sense.²⁸² Most word processors can make large and small caps.

276. See, e.g., *With the Editors*, *supra* note 1, at i, vii (*Harvard Law Review* editors incorrectly asserted that the First Edition appeared in 1931, as opposed to 1926).

277. See *supra* section V.

278. See text accompanying *supra* note 228.

279. See text accompanying *supra* note 229.

280. The information that should be included has been compiled in Appendices B-1 to B-3. At a minimum, the editors could cite to controlling rules and statutes and indicate that if no reference is given, the court expects, or at least accepts, *Bluebook* form.

281. See SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 2.

282. According to one scholar:

[T]he use of large and small capital letters had developed shortly before World War I. At first the editors of the *Harvard Law Review* used them only in refer-

Therefore, practitioners preparing memoranda and court documents could easily incorporate law-review fonts.²⁸³ Or, the *Bluebook* could follow the *Maroonbook*²⁸⁴ and many commercial publishers and completely eliminate the complex typeface conventions.²⁸⁵

If the editors believe that the current typeface distinctions should be continued, they should give examples for citations in court documents throughout the book, not just in the Practitioners' Notes and the Quick Reference for Legal Memoranda and Court Documents. Other publications give examples for both law-review footnotes and practitioners' documents;²⁸⁶ it would not seem unduly burdensome for the *Bluebook* to do so as well. This change — which is the next best alternative to one set of typeface conventions for all documents — would at least eliminate the two-step process²⁸⁷ practitioners must now endure to conform to proper *Bluebook* form.²⁸⁸

ring to their journal; gradually the practice was extended to titles of books and journals in editorial notes and, finally, by 1915, to such citations in all articles. Cooper, *supra* note 13, at 21.

283. The rule regarding typeface conventions has softened over time. For example, the Eleventh Edition was very strict and dictated that law reviews conform exactly to the listed typeface conventions. See ELEVENTH EDITION at 96–98. The Twelfth Edition, however, stated that “[u]se of large and small capitals . . . is optional.” TWELFTH EDITION at 1. By the Fourteenth Edition, the *Bluebook* recognized that “[l]aw reviews use various typeface conventions with the forms given in this book for citation in footnotes.” FOURTEENTH EDITION at 5. The Sixteenth Edition continues to acknowledge that some law reviews no longer employ large and small capitals or italics. See SIXTEENTH EDITION at 30.

284. See MAROONBOOK, *supra* note 255, rule 1.

285. See *supra* note 220 and accompanying text (concerning typeface conventions used by the *Columbia Law Review*).

286. See, e.g., MARY MILES PRINCE, BIEBER'S DICTIONARY OF LEGAL CITATIONS (4th ed. 1992).

287. Practitioners (and students writing briefs and memos) must first find the applicable rule and then use either the Practitioners' Notes or the Quick Reference for Court Documents and Legal Memoranda to “adapt” the examples shown within the *Bluebook*. See SIXTEENTH EDITION at 11.

288. See Bowler, *supra* note 23, at 699 (observing that “while Rule 1(b)(iii) [of the Twelfth Edition] says that the typeface conventions illustrated in the examples throughout the book should be used in law review footnotes, the existence of Rules 1 and 2 giving general typeface rules now makes all references to the *Bluebook* at two-step, rather than a one-step process”) (footnote omitted).

C. When Revising, Strive for Consistency²⁸⁹

The *Bluebook* is — and for some time has been²⁹⁰ — internally inconsistent. Ponder the following internal inconsistencies.²⁹¹

- Why use “So. 2d” instead of “S.2d” when “S.” represents every other instance of “Southern”?²⁹²

289. The only written description of the revision process appears in an editors' note at the front of the February 1955 *Harvard Law Review* (unbound paper copies only):

The files now bulge with the hot arguments that took place then and before each of the eight subsequent revisions. We welcome all our readers and all users of the Blue Book to join the fun. We always appreciate suggestions for improvement. Since a new edition is published every few years, they will not go long before fulfillment.

Active work on the present revision of the Blue Book began in the fall of 1953. Letters were sent out to the nation's law reviews and other Blue Book users, soliciting comments. Editors went to work checking through libraries and listings to bring the abbreviations up to date The Topical Index was expanded and checked. Finally this fall a conference of the participating law reviews was held to work out final agreement.

As with past revisions, the system as a whole has been left essentially the same; the main effort was directed toward carefully eliminating possible ambiguities and confusion. The present wide acceptance of Blue Book citation forms, not only by legal publications but by an increasing number of law offices, judges, and textbook writers, made it advisable to leave settled all that could be, consistent with clarity and uniformity.

With the Editors, *supra* note 1, at x.

290. One reviewer made similar suggestions back in 1991. See Chen, *supra* note 14, at 1537–38.

291. In his review that satirizes Dante's *Divine Comedy*, attorney Geoffrey C. Mangum wrote:

The case had challenged the fundament of empire, positing as it did the disarmingly simply (but unthinkable!) question: “Is the Blue Book infallible?” Once admit that the Blue Book might contain inconsistencies, the fabric of civilization would surely unravel. Clerk recognized that only the most thoroughgoing explication of the Blue Book's inherent infallibility could support a judgment against this peon.

As he reexamined every aspect of the Blue Book, as he paged through old volumes of *Harvard Law Review* in search of the answer, the question raised by the peon plagued him. At every turn, what once seemed clear, concise, apt, became in his eyes nettlesome, inadequate, fraught with the peculiarity that corrodes high principle.

Mangum, *supra* note 1, at 647.

292. See Chen, *supra* note 14, at 1537. Compare SIXTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 180 with *id.* T.13, at 314 (abbreviating “*Southern University Law Review*” as “S.U. L. REV.” and “*South Carolina Law Review*” as “S.C. L. REV.”) and *id.* T.10, at 293 (abbreviating “*New South Wales*” as “N.S.W.”) and *id.* T.6, at 286 (indicating that “*South[ern]*” should be abbreviated as “S.”). Cf. MAROONBOOK, *supra* note 255, at 34 (listing “S” and “S2d” as suggested abbreviations for the *Southern Reporter*).

- Why have two different abbreviations of “Supplement” — “Supp.” in “F. Supp.” and “S.” in “N.Y.S.2d”?²⁹³
- Why use “P.2d” as a reporter abbreviation but “Pac.” for periodicals and case names?²⁹⁴
- Why abbreviate “federal” as “F.” in “F. Supp.” and “F.3d,” but as “Fed.” in “Fed. Reg.” and “Fed. R. Serv. 2d”?²⁹⁵
- Why abbreviate “Bankruptcy Court” as “Bankr.” when the “*Bankruptcy Reporter*” is abbreviated “B.R.”?²⁹⁶
- Why abbreviate the “*Supreme Court Reporter*” as “S. Ct.” when “*Supreme Court Review*” is abbreviated “SUP. CT. REV.”?²⁹⁷
- Why instruct users to abbreviate “university” as “univ.” when used in a case name but as “U.” when used in a periodical title?²⁹⁸
- Why abbreviate certain words in periodical titles but not in case names?²⁹⁹

293. See Chen, *supra* note 14, at 1537. Compare SIXTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 167 with *id.* at 200. The *Maroonbook* also uses two abbreviations for “supplement.” Compare MAROONBOOK, *supra* note 255, at 32 (“F Supp”) with *id.* at 33 (“NYS,” “NYS2d”).

294. Compare SIXTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 199 with *id.* at T.13, at 311 and T.6, at 286.

295. See Chen, *supra* note 14, at 1537. Compare SIXTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 166 with *id.* at 93 and *id.* T.15, at 321. The *Maroonbook* also abbreviates “federal” two different ways. See MAROONBOOK, *supra* note 255, at 32 (abbreviating “*Federal Supplement*” as “F Supp” and “*Federal Rules Service*” as “Fed Rules Serv”).

296. See SIXTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 167; see also *id.* T.13, at 301 (abbreviating “Bankruptcy,” when used in a periodical title, as “BANKR.”).

297. Compare SIXTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 165 with *id.* T.13, at 314.

298. Compare SIXTEENTH EDITION T.6, at 286 with *id.* T.13, at 315.

299. Compare SIXTEENTH EDITION T.6 with *id.* T.13. For example, Table 13 instructs users to abbreviate the following words, which Table 6 indicates (by omission) should not be abbreviated: Account[ant, ants, ing, ancy], bar, college, commerc[e, ial], estate[s], historical, y], human, journal, justice, juvenile, local, management, planning, property, and urban. Compare *id.* T.6 with *id.* T.13.

Tables 6 and 13 are also inconsistent in that Table 6 designates “lab.” as the abbreviation for “laborator[y, ies],” while Table 13 designates “lab.” as the abbreviation for “labo[r ur].” Compare *id.* T.6, at 285 with *id.* T.13, at 309. On a slightly different note, why use the abbreviation “sec.” for both “section” and “securities”? See *id.* T.13, at 313.

And the list could go on and on.³⁰⁰ So, as long as the *Bluebook* editors are making changes, they should strive for some degree of internal uniformity.

D. Eliminate Rules and Exceptions that Everyone Believes Are Incorrect

The *Bluebook* contains rules which, if actually used, are typically changed by editors or supervisors, because no one remembers the rule. The best example is rule 1.4, which states: "If one authority is considerably more helpful or authoritative than the other authorities cited within a signal, it should precede the others."³⁰¹ Whenever an author uses this rule, everyone thinks she is wrong. This rule and similar rules should be eliminated.³⁰²

E. Miscellaneous Matters

1. Order for D.C. Courts

Rule 1.4(d) provides that "[c]ases decided by the same court are arranged in reverse chronological order; for this purpose the numbered United States courts of appeals are treated as one

300. For the nonbelievers, below are two more examples:

- "Comm.," when used in a case name means "committee," but "comm." when used in "Comm. Fut. L. Rep." means "commodity." Compare SIXTEENTH EDITION T.6, at 285 with *id.* T.15, at 320.
- Users can abbreviate "employment" or "employee" in some services but not in others, see *id.* T.15, at 320 ("Employee Benefits Cas. (BNA)" versus "Empl. Coordinator (RIA)"); further, users cannot abbreviate "employment" or "employee" in a periodical title. See *id.* T.13, at 304 (no abbreviations listed for these terms).

301. SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 1.4. Even a former Executive Editor of the *Harvard Law Review* forgot this rule when penning a review of the Fifteenth Edition:

[M]any disputes between law review editors and authors revolve around *Bluebook* form. The editors' often superior grasp of *Bluebook* arcana enables them to enjoy a rare edge over their professors. For example, *Bluebook 15's* three-page rule on the order of authorities within each signal (pp 25–27) gives editors leverage over uncooperative authors who insist that an obscure article by the chairman of the tenure committee better supports a point than does a recent Supreme Court decision.

Chen, *supra* note 14, at 1535. Using Mr. Chen's example, the professor would be correct under the express exception in rule 1.4 that "[i]f one authority is considerably more helpful or authoritative than the other authorities cited within a signal, it should precede the others." SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 1.4.

302. Another rule many mark wrong when actually correct is the portion of rule 4.1 that states "[s]ources identified in explanatory phrases . . . are ignored for purposes of this rule." SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 4.1, at 41.

court³⁰³ No separate rule addresses how the D.C. federal courts should be ordered within a signal. Why not include the D.C. Circuit in this rule? There is no reason not to do so.

2. Designate Reporter Series

Bluebook Table 1 does a good job of indicating which reporters contain which materials. For example, by using Table 1, attorneys and students know that decisions by the various U.S. Courts of Appeals appear in the *Federal Reporter* from 1891 to date.³⁰⁴ They can also see that the *Federal Reporter* is now in the Third Series.³⁰⁵ What the *Bluebook* does not do for most states is indicate when reporter series begin and end. In other words, by looking up Massachusetts on page 192, the user knows that the correct regional reporter is the *North Eastern Reporter*, but cannot tell when citations to the *North Eastern Reporter, Second Series* begin.³⁰⁶ This information would be helpful, especially if an attorney or student needs to quickly verify whether the correct reporter was used in a citation.

3. Explain Title Changes

The tables concerning periodicals and services reflect that some material was added and some was deleted.³⁰⁷ An unknowledgeable reader using those tables would probably think that all deleted references are no longer published and that the new material was truly new. Such a reading, however, is inaccurate, because many modifications in those two tables simply reflect name changes. For example, since the Fifteenth Edition, Memphis State University School of Law changed its name to University of Memphis School of Law.³⁰⁸

Not surprisingly, the school's law review also changed its name.³⁰⁹ In the Sixteenth Edition, the new name (*University of Memphis Law Review*) is listed and the old name (*Memphis State*

303. *Id.* rule 1.4(d).

304. See SIXTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 165.

305. See *id.*

306. See *id.* at 192.

307. See SIXTEENTH EDITION T.13 & T.15; see also app. A (reflecting changes made to these tables in the Sixteenth Edition).

308. See *infra* note 310.

309. See app. A (section concerning Table 13).

University Law Review) has been deleted.³¹⁰ But the publication is the same review, just with a name change. Unfortunately, without cross-references, many people would not know this. In addition, according to the *Bluebook's* own dictates, older editions must reflect the old abbreviation.³¹¹

To reduce confusion, the Seventeenth-Edition editors should (1) cross-reference name changes, (2) indicate the volume of the name change, and (3) continue to list the old abbreviation.³¹² Therefore, a sample entry might read:

Cooley Law Review	COOLEY L. REV. (<i>use this abbreviation for volumes 1-7; for more current volumes, see Thomas M. Cooley Law Review</i>)
-------------------	---

* * * *

Thomas M. Cooley Law Review	T.M. COOLEY L. REV. (<i>use this abbreviation for volumes 8-date; for volumes 1-7, see Cooley Law Review</i>)
-----------------------------	--

With this information, users could cite the review's older and newer versions without confusion or any additional research.

4. *Add a Table Listing Abbreviations for all Federal Courts*

Despite rule 6, spacing rules still give many attorneys a headache. After forgetting to leave a space between the "F." and "Supp." and between the "So." and "2d," the most commonly missed abbreviations are those for the various United States District Courts and for the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second and Third Circuits. The next editors should consider adding a table that lists all federal court abbreviations. This material is not easily found within the *Bluebook* and its inclusion would assist both *Bluebook* novices and more experienced users who want to verify their work.

310. See SIXTEENTH EDITION T.13.

311. See *id.* T.13, at 299.

312. For those who believe this suggestion is nitpicky, some changes are not as obvious as the Memphis example. Who would have thought that the *Territorial Sea Journal* has been continued as the *Ocean and Coastal Law Journal*? See *infra* note 361.

5. Add a Rule Regarding Ordinal Numbers

The *Bluebook* should follow the *Maroonbook's* lead and add a rule explaining how to treat ordinal numbers.³¹³ Most people entering law abbreviate "second" as "2nd," not "2d," and need a written reference.³¹⁴

6. Proofread Again

Although the editors, in most instances, did a good job of conforming citations throughout the book to Sixteenth-Edition amendments, they did not do a perfect job. Some examples do not conform to Sixteenth-Edition revisions,³¹⁵ some statutory citations were not updated to reflect the most recent editions or supplements,³¹⁶ and the editors' proofreading — although better than in some prior editions³¹⁷ — was not perfect.³¹⁸ Given the authoritative nature of the *Bluebook* and the number of careful editors working on the project, these mistakes should have been caught and corrected.

313. See MAROONBOOK, *supra* note 255, rule 2.5 (explaining: "For ordinal numbers in citations, use 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, etc. Spell out ordinal numbers appearing in the text.>").

314. The Sixteenth Edition shows, but does not explain, abbreviations for "second" and "third." See SIXTEENTH EDITION at 48. In addition, Table 1 now uses the Second Circuit as one of the examples under the section for United States Court of Appeals. See *id.* T.1, at 165.

315. See, e.g., SIXTEENTH EDITION at 12 (example under P.1(a), which is a 1971 case from the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, contains a *cert. denied* reference, despite amended rule 10.7).

316. See *id.* at 74; see also *infra* app. A at 69 (discussing these examples).

317. See Gjerdingen, *supra* note 97, at 512 & app. (1978) (reviewing the Twelfth Edition of the *Bluebook* and pointing out that the first printing of the Twelfth Edition contained "at least forty typographical errors" (footnote omitted)).

318. As just a few examples, see the Sixteenth Edition at:

- Page 40 (the Fifteenth Edition, on page 39, read like this as well): "Indicate any particular in which the subsequent citation varies from the former." SIXTEENTH EDITION at 40.
- Page 43: On page 42, the *Bluebook* directs users not to place "hereinafter" in italics. Yet, on page 43 (Rule 4.2(b)), "hereinafter" appears once in italics. *Id.* at 42-43.
- Page 74: Citation is misspelled as "citationas." *Id.* at 74.
- Page 170: Extra space added, the example now reads: "National Railroad Adj ustment Board." *Id.* at 170.

7. *Show How to Cite the Bluebook*

Solve the mystery. How do the *Bluebook* editors think the *Bluebook* should be cited? Reviewers have noted this omission and attempted several different formats.³¹⁹ Why not just include an example?

8. *Improve Physical Durability*

The next editors should use a better binding technique. Although better binding might cost a bit more, most attorneys probably would be willing to pay more for a sturdier product. For every *Bluebook* edition I have used (three, for those who are counting), I have had to buy at least two because the plastic spirals have broken off and several pages have ripped out. Although I like that the book lies flat when open,³²⁰ more durable materials (such as plastic covers and three-ring binding) could achieve the same result.

9. *Distribute a "Redline" Version of the New Edition*

One reason attorneys — and especially legal educators — dread new editions of the *Bluebook* is that it is difficult — without a lengthy and time-consuming effort — to determine exactly what changes have been made.³²¹ Although the preface typically lists

319. See, e.g., Coombs, *supra* note 13, at 1102 n.16 (expressing surprise that “[g]iven the length of the Bluebook, one is surprised to find a gap in its prescriptions. Yet the correct citation form for a book like the Bluebook, lacking listed author or editor, is unclear.”); Lane, *supra* note 45, at 169 n.45 (listing several reviewers’ attempts to cite the *Bluebook*); Mangum, *supra* note 1, at 645 n.2 (noting that “[o]ne of life’s little ironies is that there is no definitive citation form for the Blue Book”); Parmley, *supra* note 56, at 449 (starting: “A Uniform System of Citation (Twelfth Edition) By ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?” (footnote omitted)); Sirico, *supra* note 3, at 1273 n.1 (observing that “[t]he *Bluebook* does not explain how to cite itself. . . . Though it has no editors, but only compilers, I follow the rule for citing a book with institutional editors. Though the *Bluebook* is organized not by paragraphs and sections, but by rules, I follow the analogous rule for books with paragraph or section numbers, which requires omitting the page number from a citation unless necessary to locate readily the specific matter cited.” (citations omitted)); see also Smith, *supra* note 149, at 275 n.1. For this Author’s attempt to cite the *Bluebook*, see *supra* note 2, which uses rule 15.1.3(b).

320. The spiral binding was first used with the Thirteenth Edition. Before that time, the books were paper bound; users had to crack the spine to make the book lie flat.

321. See Campano, *supra* note 59, at 632 (lamenting that the editors “have secreted a number of new rules and rule changes, some of which substantially alter former rules To the great majority of us who are veterans of previous editions, . . . it is impossible to understand the changes without a laborious comparison of former and

several noteworthy changes, it by no means includes them all. To reduce anxiety, the editors should produce and distribute a redline version that shows what language has been added and deleted.³²² In this computer age, such a document would not be difficult to produce — and it might actually outsell the new edition — which means more revenues for the *Bluebook* editors.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Despite having recently celebrated its seventieth birthday, the *Bluebook* still does not live up to its original title, “A *Uniform System of Citation*.” Uniformity remains but an elusive and unfulfilled aspiration. However, the dream need not remain unfulfilled. Of all the citation manuals, the *Bluebook* is the only one considered authoritative. It is the most complete and the most used. It has the potential to become a truly uniform system, but only if the editors take decisive steps.

First, the editors need to stop making petty changes. Second, the editors need to stop making drastic changes not warranted by evolving standards of practice and technology. Third, the editors need to be sensitive to the needs of courts and practitioners. Specifically, the *Bluebook* should reference or, even better, spell out, citation rules mandated by state and federal courts. Similarly, the editors must look outside the Halls of Ivy; they must examine innovations developed by competitors and other organizations. Finally, the editors must follow their own rules. Meanwhile, we must all live with un-uniformity and try to survive with the Sixteenth Edition.

current rules. So much for user-friendliness.” (footnote omitted)).

322. I must thank my Stetson colleague, Professor Peter L. Fitzgerald, for sharing this idea with me.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

Comparison of Fifteenth and Sixteenth Editions²³

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Practitioners' Note 1	Typeface Conventions for Court Documents and Legal Memoranda	No substantive changes; ²⁴ however, some examples were changed to reflect rule changes in other sections (for example, on page 12 in the Sixteenth Edition, Oliver Wendell Holmes' full name is spelled out — it was presented as Oliver W. Holmes on page 12 of the Fifteenth Edition — to correspond with the change in rules 15 and 16 concerning authors' names), and some examples were updated. ²⁵
Practitioners' Note 2	Citation Sentences and Clauses in Court Documents and Legal Memoranda	No substantive changes; however, the first signal in the example was changed from <i>e.g.</i> , to <i>see, e.g.</i> , (probably to conform to changes in rule 1.2).
Practitioners' Note 3	Parallel Citations for State Court Cases	The Sixteenth Edition adds that "[i]f the decision is available through an official public domain citation, that citation should be provided instead [of an official state reporter], and a citation to the regional reporter may be provided as well." This change was made to conform to the new rule 10.3.1(b), which concerns public domain citations. The Sixteenth Edition also warns that "local court rules may require a different format from that provided in rule 10.3.1(b)."
Practitioners' Note 4	Short Forms in Court Documents and Legal Memoranda	No substantive changes in sections (a) through (c). In the Sixteenth Edition, subsection (d) now applies to nonprint materials as well as books, pamphlets, and other nonperiodic materials; shorter works in a collection; periodical materials; and unpublished and forthcoming materials. The last example under subsection (d) has been corrected to add the author's first name.

²³For purposes of clarity, *Bluebook* rule 2.2(a)(ii), which concerns the typeface of publication titles in text, has not always been used in Appendix A.

²⁴Whenever the term "no substantive changes" is used, the rule has been revised in some manner that does not affect its operation. For example, "a" might have been substituted for "the," or a comma might have been added.

²⁵For example, Russell Baker's *N.Y. Times* article entitled *The Beer Culture*, has been replaced with a *N.Y. Times* article by Vicki Hearne entitled *Wise Men and Elephants*. See SIXTEENTH EDITION at 12. Might the editors have realized it is an election year?

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Practitioners' Note 5	Special Citation Forms for Federal Taxation Materials	<p>The Sixteenth Edition indicates that, "[i]n court documents and legal memoranda that discuss solely the current version of federal taxation laws, (f) citations to the Internal Revenue Code (rule 12.8.1) <i>should</i> omit the year and publisher; and (ii) citations to treasury regulations (rule 14.5.1) <i>should</i> omit the year or promulgation or last amendment." (Emphasis added.) The Fifteenth Edition used the term "may omit."</p> <p>In addition, General Counsel Memoranda may be cited G.C.M., as opposed to GOM, as indicated in the Fifteenth Edition. Private Letter Rulings may be abbreviated P.L.R., as opposed to LTR, as indicated in the Fifteenth Edition.</p>
Practitioners' Note 6	Capitalization in Court Documents and Legal Memoranda	<p>No substantive changes. The first example under section (a) was modified to add a comma after the case name.</p>
Practitioners' Note 7	Abbreviated Citations to Other Court Documents and Letters	<p>No changes.</p>
Rule 1.1	Citation Sentences and Clauses in Law Review Footnotes	<p>The rule has been renumbered. Rule 1.1(a) now concerns citations in footnotes (old sections (a) and (b) have been renumbered 1.1(a)(i) and 1.1(a)(ii)), while rule 1.1(b) concerns citations in text.</p> <p>Rule 1.1(b), which is new in the Sixteenth Edition, details when footnotes should be used:</p> <p>Authorities that support (or contradict) a proposition made in text are placed in footnotes. The footnote call number should appear in the text at the end of a sentence if the entire sentence is supported by the source. The call number should appear within the sentence next to the portion it supports if only that part of the sentence is supported (or contradicted) by the source. In either case, the citation in the footnote appears as a citation sentence, with a capitalized letter at the beginning and a period at the end.</p> <p>In the Sixteenth Edition, the example on page 22 has been changed slightly to conform to new rule 16.1 concerning how authors' names are presented and new rule 1.2 concerning signals. In addition, pinpoint page cites have been added in "footnote 4."</p>
Rule 1.2	Introductory Signals	<p>This section has been substantially revised. The revisions are explained in the main body of the article. See <i>supra</i> 3b.1 (showing changes from the Fifteenth to the Sixteenth Edition); <i>infra</i> apps. C-1 & C-2 (showing signals used in the Seventh through Fourteenth Editions).</p>
Rule 1.3	Order of Signals	<p>The Sixteenth Edition adds clarifying language that "[s]ignals of the same basic type . . . must be strung together within a single citation sentence and separated by semicolons." (Emphasis added.)</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 1.4	Order of Authorities Within Each Signal	<p>The first sentence under rule 1.4, which is new, reads: "Authorities within each signal are separated by semicolons."</p> <p>On page 27 of the Sixteenth Edition, following the list of secondary material in the order to be cited, the following clarification has been added: "Within each classification, cite materials by the same author in alphabetical order by first word of title."</p>
Rule 1.5	Parenthetical Information	<p>Whereas the Fifteenth Edition provided that "[e]xplanatory parenthetical phrases ordinarily begin with a present participle and generally should not begin with a capital letter" (emphasis added), the Sixteenth Edition is more definite and provides that "[e]xplanatory parenthetical phrases begin with a present participle and should not begin with a capital letter."</p> <p>Examples have been changed to conform with new rules 15.1 and 13, and some examples have been eliminated or shortened.</p>
Rule 1.6	Related Authority	<p>The introductory paragraph to rule 1.6 in the Fifteenth Edition did not italicize "at"; the Sixteenth Edition does ("The general format for such italicized explanatory phrases is to locate the specific material cited 'in' a work 'at' given pages or sections.")</p> <p>The reference for "translated in" is now rule 19.1.5, instead of rule 19.2.5.</p> <p>The rule regarding "in" has been altered:</p> <p>Fifteenth Edition: "When citing to a shorter work such as an article, essay, or speech found within a volume collecting such works, use 'in' to introduce the collection as a whole" (Emphasis added.)</p> <p>Sixteenth Edition: "When citing to a shorter work such as an article, essay, or speech originally published in a volume collecting such works, use 'in' to introduce the collection as a whole" (Emphasis added.)</p> <p>The rule regarding "reprinted in" also has been altered:</p> <p>Fifteenth Edition: "A work that conveniently reprints the primary authority but ordinarily would not be cited as a source for that authority may be introduced by 'reprinted in.'" (Emphasis added.)</p> <p>Sixteenth Edition: "A work that conveniently reprints a source originally published elsewhere may be introduced by 'reprinted in.'" (Emphasis added.)</p> <p>The Sixteenth Edition uses different examples to illustrate use of "reprinted in."</p> <p>Examples throughout rule 1.6 have been modified to conform to changes in rules 13 and 15.1. In addition, dates of code citations have been updated.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 2	Typefaces for Law Reviews	<p>Rule 2 has been renumbered. Rule 2.1 now concerns typeface conventions for citations. Rule 2.2 now concerns conventions for textual material.</p> <p>The example in 2.1(f) (formerly designated 2.2(c)) has been changed. That rule instructs users to "italicize commas, semicolons, etc., only when they fall within italicized material, and not when they merely follow it."</p> <p>Current rule 2.2 distinguishes between "main text" and "footnote text." Although material concerning main text is not substantively different than the Fifteenth Edition's rules on "law review text," the material on footnote text has been changed and expanded. The Sixteenth Edition indicates that "a sentence in the footnote text may include citations, which are contained in citation clauses embedded in the sentence." One change is that a case in footnote text is now italicized even if both parties' names are given and a citation is given. The Fifteenth Edition provided: "Italicize case names in textual material in footnotes whenever only one of the two adversary parties is named or when no citation is given." Thus:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Fifteenth</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">The Court addressed the issue in <i>Aguilar v. Texas</i>, 378 U.S. at 114.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Sixteenth</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">In <i>Leving v. Virginia</i>, 388 U.S. 1 (1967), the Court invalidated Virginia's miscegenation statute.</p> <p>The Sixteenth Edition also explains: "When the case name is not grammatically part of the sentence, but rather is used in a citation clause embedded in the footnote text, use the typeface conventions for citations . . ." The following example is given: "Justice Harlan quipped that 'one man's vulgarity is another's lyric,' <i>Cohen v. California</i>, 403 U.S. 16, 25 (1971), but failed to give further explanation."</p> <p>Finally, the rule concerning "all other authorities" in footnote text has been clarified:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Fifteenth</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">When a footnote refers to any other kind of authority without giving either the full citation or a citation shortened according to rule 4, follow the typeface conventions for law review text.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Sixteenth</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">When referring to any other type of authority, whether or not the reference is grammatically part of the sentence, use the typeface conventions for citations if the full citation or a citation shortened according to rule 4 is given. . . . If the reference appears without the full or shortened citation information, follow the typeface conventions for the main text of law reviews.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 3.1	Abbreviations	The Sixteenth Edition now refers to Table 16 for abbreviations (because old Table 14 was eliminated and the remaining tables were renumbered).
Rule 3.2	Volumes, Parts, and Supplements	<p>No substantive changes. Some examples were changed to conform to amended rules concerning authors' names.</p> <p>Readers should note that examples under rule 3.2(c) concerning supplements were <i>not</i> changed to reflect the most current supplements available.</p>
Rule 3.3	Pages, Footnotes, Endnotes, and Graphical Materials	<p>The title is now "Pages, Footnotes, Endnotes, and Graphical Materials" (as opposed to "Pages and Footnotes" in the Fifteenth Edition) to denote expanded coverage. The Fifteenth Edition did not cover endnotes or graphical materials.</p> <p>Subsection (c) now concerns endnotes and informs users to designate an endnote with "n."</p> <p>Subsection (d) now concerns "Multiple pages, footnotes, and endnotes." New rules instruct users to treat endnotes like footnotes. For example: "Cite multiple footnotes and endnotes by using 'nn.'" (Emphasis added.)</p> <p>New subsection (e) addresses graphical materials and states: "When citing tables, figures, charts, graphs, or other graphical materials, give the page number on which the graphical material appears and the designation, if any, provided in the source. Use the abbreviations in table T.16."</p> <p>New examples have been added to illustrate new rules. Other examples have been modified to conform with other rule changes.</p>
Rule 3.4	Sections and Paragraphs	<p>The introduction to rule 3.4 has been modified to allow page numbers to be cited more frequently in connection with sections and paragraphs:</p> <p>Fifteenth Edition: "If an authority is organized by sections (§) or paragraphs (¶), cite to these and give a page number only if the specific matter cited could not otherwise be readily located within the section or paragraph." (Emphasis added.)</p> <p>Sixteenth Edition: "If an authority is organized by sections (§) or paragraphs (¶), cite to these. In addition, a page number may be provided if useful in locating specific matter within the section or paragraph." (Emphasis added.)</p> <p>Rule 3.4(b) was clarified with new language that provides: "When citing multiple subsections within different sections, use two section symbols."</p> <p>Some examples were updated; some code examples were <i>not</i> updated to reflect the most current versions and supplements.</p>

CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION			
RULE	TOPIC		
Rule 3.5	Appended Material		
<p>The Sixteenth Edition renames this rule "Appended Material"; the former title was "Appendices, Notes, and Other Addenda."</p> <p>Rule 3.5 now cross-references abbreviation in Table 16 (old Table 14 was eliminated and the remaining tables renumbered).</p> <p>Some examples were modified to conform to amended rule 15.1; some code examples were <i>not</i> updated to reflect the most current versions and supplements.</p>			
Rule 3.6	Internal Cross-References		
<p>No changes.</p>			
Rule 4	Short Citation Forms		
<p>The introductory paragraph now refers specifically to rules 10-20 (a version of the second sentence was located in rule 4.1 in the Fifteenth Edition).</p>			
Rule 4.1	"/s/."		
<p>The last part of rule 4.1 has been modified:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Fifteenth Edition</p> <p>Sources identified in explanatory parentheticals, however, are ignored for the purposes of this rule.</p> </td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Sixteenth Edition</p> <p>Sources identified in explanatory parentheticals, <i>explanatory phrases, or subsequent history, however, are ignored for the purposes of this rule. (Emphasis added.)</i></p> </td> </tr> </table> <p>Additional examples have been added; some examples have been replaced.</p>		<p>Fifteenth Edition</p> <p>Sources identified in explanatory parentheticals, however, are ignored for the purposes of this rule.</p>	<p>Sixteenth Edition</p> <p>Sources identified in explanatory parentheticals, <i>explanatory phrases, or subsequent history, however, are ignored for the purposes of this rule. (Emphasis added.)</i></p>
<p>Fifteenth Edition</p> <p>Sources identified in explanatory parentheticals, however, are ignored for the purposes of this rule.</p>	<p>Sixteenth Edition</p> <p>Sources identified in explanatory parentheticals, <i>explanatory phrases, or subsequent history, however, are ignored for the purposes of this rule. (Emphasis added.)</i></p>		

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 4.2	"Supra" and "Hereinafter"	<p>Instances when "supra" and "hereinafter" may be used have been changed:</p> <p>Fifteenth Edition</p> <p>"Supra" and "hereinafter" may be used to refer to legislative materials, administrative and executive materials, books, pamphlets, unpublished materials, periodicals, services, treaties and international agreements, and regulations, directives, and decisions of intergovernmental organizations. "Supra" and "hereinafter" should not be used to refer to cases, statutes, or constitutions except in extraordinary circumstances</p> <p>Therefore, the Sixteenth Edition added legislative hearings to the "supra" list; added legislative material (other than hearings) and regulations to the list that may not be referenced with "supra"; and failed to explain how administrative and executive materials should be treated.</p> <p>The Sixteenth Edition now instructs practitioners to refer to P.4 for information on using "supra" in court documents.</p> <p>Some examples have been changed, many to conform to other new rules.</p> <p>On page 43, in one instance "hereinafter" is italicized, probably in error.</p> <p>No substantive changes; minor changes were made to examples.</p>
Rule 5.1	Indentation, Quotation Marks, Citation, and Punctuation	<p>Sixteenth Edition</p> <p>"Supra" and "hereinafter" may be used to refer to legislative hearings, books, pamphlets, unpublished materials, periodicals, services, treaties and international agreements, and regulations, directives, and decisions of intergovernmental organizations. "Supra" and "hereinafter" should not be used to refer to cases, statutes, constitutions, legislative materials (other than hearings), or regulations, except in extraordinary circumstances</p> <p>No substantive changes; last example in section changed slightly.</p>
Rule 5.2	Alterations	<p>No substantive changes; new examples are used in subsections (b)(iv) and (b)(v).</p>
Rule 5.3	Omissions	<p>No changes.</p>
Rule 5.4	Paragraph Structure	<p>No substantive changes. However, the text has been reformatted, examples have been changed, and the list of tables containing abbreviations that should be used has been eliminated.</p>
Rule 6.1	Abbreviations	<p>No changes.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 6.2	Numerals and Symbols	<p>Rule 6.2(a) was not changed.</p> <p>Rule 6.2(b) concerning section and paragraph symbols has been changed to provide that "section" and "paragraph" must be spelled out when used in either main text or footnote text, except when referring to a provision in the U.S. Code, a state code, or a federal regulation. The Fifteenth Edition indicated the symbols should be used in footnote text and stated that a symbol should be used in law review text when referring to the U.S. Code or a federal regulation.²⁸</p>
Rule 7	Italicization for Stylistic Purposes	<p>Subsection (c) was not changed.</p> <p>No changes.</p>
Rule 8	Capitalization	<p>No substantive changes, although some examples have been eliminated.</p>
Rule 9	Titles of Judges, Officials, and Terms of Court	<p>No changes.</p>
Rule 10.1	Cases: Basic Citation Forms	<p>No changes.</p>

²⁸The editors, however, forgot to change rule 12.9(c), which still indicates that the word "section" should be spelled out only when referring to U.S. Code provisions. See SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 12.9(c), at 87.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 10.2	Case Names	<p>Rule 10.2: Case Names: Rule 10.2 has been rewritten to conform to revised rule 2 concerning typeface conventions. Specifically, this rule now refers to "main text" and "footnote text."</p> <p>Rule 10.2.1: Case Names in Textual Sentences:</p> <p>Rule 10.2.1(a): Actions and parties cited. The part of section (a) concerning bankruptcy and similar cases has been clarified. Although the citation examples did not change, this section now reads:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">In bankruptcy and similar cases, the case name might contain both an adversary and a nonadversary name. If both appear at the beginning of the opinion, cite the adversary name first, followed by the nonadversary name in parentheses. Include either a procedural phrase such as "<i>In re</i>" or "<i>ex rel.</i>" before the nonadversary name, followed by a descriptive or introductory phrase such as "estate of" or "interest of," if any. If only an adversary name or only a nonadversary name appears at the beginning of the opinion, cite the name supplied.</p> <p>Rule 10.2.1(b): Procedural phrases. Subsection (b) does not contain any substantive changes, although the rule concerning "estate of" and similar terms now reads: "Include any introductory or descriptive phrases such as 'Accounting of,' 'Estate of,' and 'Will of.'" The Fifteenth Edition read: "Estate of and 'Will of' are not treated as procedural phrases and are not omitted."</p> <p>Rule 10.2.1(c): Abbreviations. This rule has been clarified to extend its application to textual material in the main text and footnote text.</p> <p>Rule 10.2.1(d): "The." No substantive changes; some examples have been added or replaced.</p> <p>Rule 10.2.1(e): Descriptive terms. No changes.</p> <p>Rule 10.2.1(f): Geographical terms. No substantive changes; some examples have been added or replaced.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION												
Rule 10.2 (cont'd)	Case Names	<p>Rule 10.2.1(g): Given names or initials. Some examples have been replaced. In addition, the rule now states: "Do not omit any part of a surname made up of more than one word." In addition, Vietnamese names are now included in the rule that instructs users to "retain the full name where the name is entirely in a language in which the surname is given first."</p> <p>Rule 10.2.1(h): Business firm designations. "N.A." and "F.S.B." have been added to the list of terms that should be omitted "if the name also contains words such as 'Ass'n,' 'Bros.,' 'Co.,' 'Corp.," and "R.R.".</p> <p>Rule 10.2.1(i): Union and local union names. No substantive changes. Some grammatical corrections were made to narrative instructions. Rules 6.1(b) and 10.2.(c) are cross-referenced in the section that indicates "a widely recognized abbreviation of the union's name . . . may be used."</p> <p>Rule 10.2.1(j): Commissioner of Internal Revenue. No changes.</p>												
Rule 10.3	Reporters and Other Sources	<p>Rule 10.2.2: Case Names in Citations: This rule has been reorganized and reworded. Old subsections (a) ("Abbreviation") and (b) ("Railroads") have been eliminated. However, no rules were changed.</p> <p>Rule 10.3.1: Parallel Citations and Which Source(s) to Cite: No changes.</p> <p>Rule 10.3.1(a): Parallel citations in state court documents. No changes.</p> <p>Rule 10.3.1(b): Case citations in all other documents. First, the Fifteenth Edition instructed users to "cite only to the relevant regional reporter, if the decision is found therein." The Sixteenth Edition omits the word "only." Second, the Sixteenth Edition permits citation to materials in the public domain. For additional information on public domain citations, see <i>supra</i> section III(B)(2). Finally, the preference order for materials not found in an official or preferred unofficial reporter, or as a public domain citation, has changed:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 20px;">Fifteenth</td> <td>Sixteenth</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Another unofficial reporter</td> <td>Another unofficial reporter</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Service</td> <td>Widely used computer database</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Widely used computer database</td> <td>Service</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Slip opinion</td> <td>Slip opinion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Newspaper</td> <td>Newspaper</td> </tr> </table> <p>Rule 10.3.2: Reporters: No substantive changes.</p>	Fifteenth	Sixteenth	Another unofficial reporter	Another unofficial reporter	Service	Widely used computer database	Widely used computer database	Service	Slip opinion	Slip opinion	Newspaper	Newspaper
Fifteenth	Sixteenth													
Another unofficial reporter	Another unofficial reporter													
Service	Widely used computer database													
Widely used computer database	Service													
Slip opinion	Slip opinion													
Newspaper	Newspaper													

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 10.4	Court and Jurisdiction	<p>Rule 10.4: (untitled introduction): The Sixteenth Edition directs users to Tables 1 and 2 for court abbreviations. A foreign example was added; in addition, rule 19.3 is cross-referenced "[for citations to foreign cases.]"</p> <p>Rule 10.4(s): Federal courts. The court abbreviation for the Federal Circuit (Fed. Cir.) is now included.</p> <p>Rule 10.4(b): State courts. The rule concerning when a court abbreviation can be omitted from the date parenthetical has been reworded; however, the rule has not changed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Fifteenth</p> <p>[W]hen the name of the reporter is the same as the name of a jurisdiction and no court is indicated, it is assumed that the decision is that of the highest court in the jurisdiction.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sixteenth</p> <p>[W]hen a decision is rendered by the highest court in a particular jurisdiction and the name of the reporter is the same as the name of that jurisdiction, neither the name of the court nor the name of the state need be given.</p> <p>In addition, this rule now contains an example illustrating how to include a district or department in a case citation, when that citation is "of particular relevance."</p>

CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION		
RULE	TOPIC	
Rule 10.5	Date or Year	<p>Rule 10.5 has been renumbered:</p> <p>Rule 10.5(a): Decisions published in reporters. This section was formerly called "Decisions." Instead of instructing readers to "use the date or year of decision," the Sixteenth Edition requests users to "provide" this same information. Further, the Sixteenth Edition reads: "In case of ambiguity, follow the year given in the running head (at the top of each page) in the reporter." The Fifteenth Edition specified "official report."</p> <p>Rule 10.5(b): Decisions published in other sources. A similar section previously appeared as an unnumbered introduction to Rule 10.5. The type of material covered has been altered:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Fifteenth</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Give the exact date for all unreported cases and for all cases cited to slip opinions, newspapers, periodicals, electronic databases, or looseleaf services.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Sixteenth</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Give the exact date for all unreported cases and for all cases cited to a looseleaf service, a slip opinion, an electronic database, or a newspaper.</p> <p>Rule 10.5(c): Pending cases. The rule, previously designated 10.5(b), has been reworded:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Fifteenth</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Use the date or year of the most recent major disposition. If the significance of the date given is not indicated elsewhere, indicate that significance within the parenthetical phrase.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Sixteenth</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Use the date or year of the most recent major disposition. Indicate the significance of the date within a parenthetical phrase, unless its significance is explained elsewhere.</p> <p>Rule 10.5(d): Multiple decisions within a single year. In the Fifteenth Edition, this rule was 10.5(c). The rule has not changed; however, examples have been altered to conform to revised rule 10.7 concerning denials of certiorari.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
<p>Rule 10.6</p>	<p>Paranetical Information Regarding Cases</p>	<p>The rule has been subdivided and reorganized.</p> <p>Rule 10.6.1: Weight of Authority:</p> <p>Rule 10.6.1(a): Generally. Although rules within this section have been reordered, no rules have been changed.</p> <p>Rule 10.6.1(b): "Mem." and "Per curiam." This rule was previously designated rule 10.7.1(b). The rule has been rewritten to apply to the U.S. Supreme Court and to other courts as well (the Fifteenth Edition seemingly limited the rule to U.S. Supreme Court cases).</p> <p>Rule 10.6.2: Order of paraneticals: This new section clarifies where paraneticals should be placed in a citation. The Sixteenth Edition provides:</p> <p>"Paranetical phrases indicating the weight of the authority should precede explanatory paraneticals, which give other information."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">and</p> <p>"Paranetical information (weight of authority paraneticals as well as explanatory paraneticals) about a case should always directly follow citation to that case, before any citation of prior or subsequent history."</p>

CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION	
RULE	TOPIC
<p>Rule 10.7</p>	<p>Prior and Subsequent History</p>
<p>Rule 10.7 has been revised and reorganized:</p> <p>Rule 10.7: Prior and Subsequent History: This rule now provides that "[w]henover a decision is cited in full, give the entire <i>subsequent</i> history of the case, <i>but omit denials of certiorari or denials of similar discretionary appeals, unless the decision is less than two years old or the denial is particularly relevant.</i>" (Second emphasis added.) For a further discussion of this rule change, see <i>supra</i> section III(B)(3).</p> <p>Rule 10.7.1: Explanatory Phrases and Weight of Authority: No changes.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Rule 10.7.1(a): Prior or subsequent history. No substantive changes.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Rule 10.7.1(b): Significance of disposition. This new section instructs users to "[g]ive the reason for a disposition if the disposition does not carry the normal substantive significance: <i>vacated as moot,</i> <i>appeal dismissed per stipulation,</i>"</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Rule 10.7.1(c): Overruled cases. This new section indicates that overruled cases should be noted in the subsequent history, and gives an example.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Rule 10.7.1(d): Multiple dispositions. This rule has been clarified and now indicates that "[m]ultiple dispositions following a primary case citation should be connected with the word <i>'and'</i> in italics."</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Former rule 10.7.1(b) regarding in "mem." and "per curiam" was moved to rule 10.6.</p> <p>Rule 10.7.2: Different Case Name on Appeal: This rule has been reordered. However, the effect has not been changed.</p>	

CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION	
RULE	TOPIC
Rule 10.9	Short Forms for Cases
	This rule has been subdivided.
	<p>Rule 10.9(a): Footnotes. The Sixteenth Edition allows short cites that "can be readily found in one of the preceding five footnotes, or is named in the same general textual discussion." The Fifteenth Edition allowed short cites in one of the preceding four footnotes.</p> <p>Rule 10.9(a)(i): Generally, Although reworded and reorganized, the rule remains the same. Additional examples have been included.</p> <p>Rule 10.9(a)(ii): Electronic databases. This new section provides information about how to short cite cases available on electronic databases. Readers are instructed to "use a unique database identifier, if one has been assigned." The following examples are given:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>Clark</i>, 1991 WL 55402, at *2. <i>Albrecht</i>, 1991 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5088, at *2.</p> <p>Rule 10.9(b): Text. No substantive changes, although the new terminology from rule 2, "main text" and "footnote text" is used.</p>
Rule 11	Constitutions
	The word "preamble" must be spelled out. ³⁷ The Fifteenth Edition required the abbreviation "pmb1."
Rule 12	Statutes
	No text; no changes.
Rule 12.1	Basic Citation Forms
	<p>The Sixteenth Edition acknowledges that electronic databases often print statutes before they are available elsewhere.</p> <p>The word "citations" at the top of page 74 is misspelled "citations."</p> <p>Several examples were not updated and therefore do not conform to rule 12. For instance, the example listed under "cited to current unofficial code" contains a 1991 date; the correct supplement date is 1996. Cites to the <i>Pennsylvania Statutes Annotated</i> and to the <i>Oklahoma Statutes</i> are also outdated.</p>

³⁷One reviewer called for this change in a 1992 book review. Maybe the editors actually followed his advice. See Sirico, *supra* note 3, at 1277-78 (lamenting that "the writer who cites the preamble of a constitution must use the abbreviation 'pmb1,' Perhaps the editors grew concerned that footnotes would take up too much space, given the rule about citing the full name of authors of secondary materials. They may have tried to compensate by reducing an eight-letter word to an innovative four-letter abbreviation." (footnote omitted)). The "pmb1" abbreviation did not appear in prior editions. See, e.g., FOURTEENTH EDITION rule 11; THIRTEENTH EDITION rule 11.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 12.2	Choosing the Proper Citation Form	<p>Rule 12.2.1: General Rule: This rule has been subdivided.</p> <p>Rule 12.2.1(a): Statutes currently in force. An example is now given. In addition, statutes not yet published in a current official or unofficial code may be cited to a widely used computer database, as well as to a looseleaf service, a periodical, or a newsletter -- in that order of preference.</p> <p>Rule 12.2.1(b): Statutes no longer in force. The Sixteenth Edition still instructs users to "cite statutes no longer in force to the current official or unofficial code if they still appear therein." However, the following language has been changed:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Fifteenth</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Otherwise cite to the session laws or a secondary source.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Sixteenth</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Otherwise cite to the last edition of the official or unofficial code in which the statute appeared or to the session laws or to a secondary source -- in that order of preference.</p> <p>Rule 12.2.1(c): Private laws. No changes. However, the rule now has its own subdivision.</p> <p>Rule 12.2.2: Exceptions:</p> <p>Rule 12.2.2(a): Scattered statutes. No substantive changes; examples were added and updated.</p> <p>Rule 12.2.2(b): Historical fact. No substantive changes; the example was updated.</p> <p>Rule 12.2.2(c): Materially different language. The date as of which the listed titles were codified into positive law changed from January 3, 1989 to January 4, 1993; the list of titles was not changed.</p>
Rule 12.3	Current Official and Unofficial Codes	<p>Rule 12.3: Current Official and Unofficial Codes: This rule now recognizes that not all states have official codes. It also clarifies that users should "cite to the official code whenever possible."</p> <p>Rule 12.3.1: Additional Information: The subsections of rule 12.3.1 do not contain any other substantive changes, although minor rewordings were included and some examples have been updated.</p> <p>Rule 12.3.2: Year of Code: No substantive changes.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 12.4	Session Laws	<p>Rule 12.4(a): Name. No substantive changes.</p> <p>Rule 12.4(b): Volume. The following part of this rule was revised:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Fifteenth</p> <p>When citing only part of an act, give the page on which the act begins and the page(s) on which the relevant section(s) or subsection(s) appears. In the latter case, also give the section or subsection number.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Sixteenth</p> <p>When citing only part of an act, give the section(s) or subsection(s) cited, the page on which the act begins, and the page(s) on which the relevant section(s) or subsection(s) appear(s).</p> <p>In addition, a new state law example has been added.</p> <p>Rule 12.4(c): Session laws amending prior acts. No changes.</p> <p>Rule 12.4(d): Year or date. The rule has been reworded and rearranged, but the effect has not changed.</p> <p>Rule 12.4(e): Codification information. The Sixteenth Edition omits the following information: "Other parenthetical information, such as the date on which an act becomes effective, may be given according to rule 12.7."</p>
Rule 12.5	Secondary Sources	<p>This rule has been subdivided, rearranged, and amended:</p> <p>Rule 12.5(a): Electronic databases. This new section describes how to cite codes and session laws located on an electronic database. Several examples are also given.</p> <p>Rule 12.5(b): Other Secondary Sources. The Sixteenth Edition warns that page numbers in <i>U.S.C.A.N.</i> and <i>Statutes at Large</i> often differ. A new example has been added. The rule clarifies that citing to a service is preferred over citing to a periodical.</p>
Rule 12.6	Repeal, Amendment, and Prior History	<p>Rule 12.6.1: Repeal: The Sixteenth Edition directs users to "[i]nclude a full citation to the repealing statute when particularly relevant." The Fifteenth Edition said to "add" a full citation. In addition, the space between the § and the section number in the second example has been closed; this is an error.</p> <p>Rule 12.6.2: Amendment: The rule has been slightly reworded, but has not been substantively changed.</p> <p>Rule 12.6.3: Prior History: No substantive changes; examples have been updated.</p>
Rule 12.7	Explanatory Parenthetical Phrases	<p>No substantive changes; the example has been updated.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
<p>Rule 12.8</p>	<p>Special Citation Forms</p>	<p>Rule 12.6.1: Internal Revenue Code: No substantive changes; the examples have been updated.</p> <p>Rule 12.8.2: Ordinances: The revised rule states: "Do not abbreviate the name of the political subdivision unless it is abbreviated in table T.10." The revised rule also clarifies that the exact date of adoption should be given in a parenthetical.</p> <p>Rule 12.8.3: Rules of Evidence and Procedure: This rule now applies to uniform rules of evidence or procedure in addition to "current" rules. In addition, the rule concerning rules no longer in force has changed:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Fifteenth</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Cite rules no longer in force in ordinary roman type and give the most recent official source in which they appear:</p> <p style="margin-left: 80px;">Sup. Ct. R. 7, 266 U.S. 657 (1912).</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Sixteenth</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">When citing rules no longer in force, give the most recent official source in which they appear and indicate the date of repeal parenthetically:</p> <p style="margin-left: 80px;">Sup. Ct. R. 8, 306 U.S. 691 (1912) (repealed 1954).</p> <p>The typeface for rules no longer in force has been changed from regular roman print to large and small capital letters.</p> <p>Rule 12.8.4: Uniform Acts: Expanded instructions are given for cites to the <i>Uniform Laws Annotated</i> (U.L.A.):</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">When citing a uniform act to the <i>Uniform Laws Annotated</i> (U.L.A.), provide the title of the act, the section number, the year of amendment or repeal (if any), the appropriate volume of the U.L.A., the page number on which the relevant section appears, and the year of publication.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
<p>Rule 12.8 (cont'd)</p>	<p>Special Citation Forms</p>	<p>Rule 12.8.5: Model Codes, Restatements, Standards, and Sentencing Guidelines: This rule was formerly named "Model Codes, Restatements, and Standards." By its name, readers understand that this rule now covers citations to sentencing guidelines. The rule also contains several other changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For restatements, give the year in which the restatement was published (not the year in which it was adopted). • For sentencing guidelines, give the year in which it was adopted, unless the version cited indicates that it incorporates subsequent amendments. • "If a restatement contains a subtitle, retain the subtitle in the citation." • "Indicate the author's name parenthetically, unless the work was authored by the American Bar Association, the American Law Institute, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Law, or a federal or state sentencing commission. Abbreviate the author's name according to rule 16.1.3 (institutional authors)." • Examining the examples, the first word of the institution's name may no longer be abbreviated. <p>Rule 12.8.6: ABA Code of Professional Responsibility and Opinions on Ethics: No substantive changes.</p>
<p>Rule 12.9</p>	<p>Short Forms for Statutes</p>	<p>Rule 12.9(a): Main text. This rule was previously called "Text." The rule has been reworded, but the effect remains the same.</p> <p>Rule 12.9(b): Footnote text. This rule was previously called "Footnotes." This new rule provides:</p> <p>[When referring to statutes in law review footnote text, use the forms listed in the "Text" column of the table below. Provide a citation (in full or short form according to rule 12.9(c)) in an accompanying citation clause or sentence when appropriate.</p> <p>Rule 12.9(c): Citations. This new section instructs:</p> <p>In law review citations, use any of the forms listed in the "Short citation" column of the table below that clearly identifies a statute if the statute is already cited (in full or short form) in either the <i>same footnote</i> or in a manner such that it can be readily found in <i>one of the preceding five footnotes</i>. Otherwise, use the <i>full</i> citation form.</p> <p>The table was updated but not substantively affected.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 13	Legislative Materials	<p>The Sixteenth Edition now provides:</p> <p>When citing any United States legislative material except debates, include the abbreviated name of the house, the number of the Congress, the number assigned to the material, and the year of publication. . . .</p> <p>In addition, include parenthetically the session number for both House and Senate materials published before the 60th Congress (1907), House Reports published before the 47th Congress (1881), and Senate Reports published before the 40th Congress (1847). For House and Senate materials published after these dates, the session number can be inferred from the year of publication: first sessions always fall in odd numbered years, while second sessions always fall in even numbered years. On rare occasions Congress holds a third session. When citing materials produced during a third session, provide this information parenthetically.</p>
Rule 13.1	Basic Citation Forms	<p>Examples for federal bill (unenacted): federal resolution (unenacted); committee hearing; federal report; federal document; and source reprinted in separately bound legislative history have changed in light of other revisions.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 13.4	Reports, Documents, and Committee Prints	<p>Rule 13.4(a): Numbered federal reports and documents. The revised rule reads: "Citations to numbered federal reports should include the name of the house, the number of the Congress connected by hyphen to the number of the report, the part or page number on which material being cited appears, and the year of publication." Thus:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Fifteenth H.R. REP. NO. 253, 98th Cong., 1st Sess., pt. 1, at 54 (1985).</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Sixteenth H.R. REP. NO. 99-253, pt. 1, at 54 (1985).</p> <p>To conform with the new <i>style</i>, the following language has been omitted: "Drop any part of the report or document number that identifies the Congress."</p> <p>Rule 13.4(b): Titles and authors. This newly-numbered and revised rule reads: "Titles of numbered reports or documents may be indicated; if the title is given, the author should also be named." The Fifteenth Edition did not specify "numbered reports."</p> <p>Rule 13.4(c): Unnumbered federal documents and committee prints. This rule was formerly subpart (b). This rule has been reworded to eliminate reference to the session number for federal materials.</p> <p>Rule 13.4(d): State materials. This rule was formerly subpart (c). This rule has been expanded and now reads:</p> <p>Citations to state legislative reports, documents, and similar materials must include the name of the legislative body, the number of the legislative body connected by hyphen to the number of the report or document, the number of the legislative session, and the year of publication. Unless it is clear from the title or author information appearing in the citation, provide the name of the state abbreviated according to table T.10 parenthetically. . . . Titles of numbered reports or documents may be indicated; if the title is given, the author should also be named.</p>
Rule 13.5	Debates	Citations to the daily edition of the <i>Congressional Record</i> should be used for matter "not yet appearing in the bound edition." The Fifteenth Edition stated "not yet in the bound edition."
Rule 13.6	Separately Bound Legislative Histories	No substantive changes. Examples have been conformed to new provisions in rule 13.
Rule 13.7	Short Forms for Legislative Materials	The rule has been newly subdivided to conform to revised rule 2. The new short forms conform to other changes in rule 13. Specifically, the session number is eliminated for most federal citations but must now be included for most state citations.
Rule 14	Administrative and Executive Materials	No changes.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 14.1	Basic Citation Forms	Some new examples were added; some examples were updated; one citation format -- that for an executive order -- was altered.
		<p style="text-align: center;">Fifteenth</p> <p>Executive Order No. 11,609, 3 C.F.R. 686 (1971-1975), reprinted in 3 U.S.C. § 301 app. at 370-72 (1982).</p>
		<p style="text-align: center;">Sixteenth</p> <p>Exec. Order No. 11,609, 3 C.F.R. 686 (1971-1975), reprinted as amended in 3 U.S.C. § 301 app. at 404-07 (1994).²²</p>
Rule 14.2	Rules, Regulations, and Other Publications	<p>Rule 14.2(a): Final rules and regulations. The Sixteenth Edition indicates that final rules and regulations can be cited by part, as well as by title, section, and in some cases, by page. New examples have been added; examples have been updated.</p> <p>Rule 14.2(b): Proposed rules and other notices. Part of this rule has been changed:</p>
		<p style="text-align: center;">Fifteenth</p> <p>For rules and announcements not appearing in C.F.R. or Fed. Reg., cite to U.S.C., a service (rule 18), or the original form of issuance -- in that order of preference.</p>
		<p style="text-align: center;">Sixteenth</p> <p>For rules and announcements not appearing in C.F.R. or Fed. Reg., cite to a service (rule 18) or the original form of issuance -- in that order of preference.</p>
Rule 14.3	Administrative Adjudications and Arbitrations	<p>Rule 14.2(c): Regular reports. No changes.</p> <p>Rule 14.2(d): Other publications. No changes.</p> <p>No substantive changes. However, some examples have been updated or added. Table 15 for services is now referenced (old T.16 was previously referenced). In addition "Commerce" is now spelled out in parentheses; the word was previously abbreviated "Comm."</p>
Rule 14.4	Advisory Opinions	No changes.
Rule 14.5	Federal Taxation Materials	No substantive changes.
Rule 14.6	SEC Materials	<p>Rule 14.6(a): No-action letters. For no-action letters, now give "the full date on which the letter became publicly available." The Fifteenth Edition required "the full date on which the letter was issued (not the date it became available)."</p> <p>Rule 14.6(b): Releases. Releases may now be cited to the SEC Docket, as well as to the <i>Federal Register</i> or a service. New examples have been used.</p>

²²This change actually conforms with rule 14.7, as it appeared in both the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Editions.

CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION	
Rule 14.7	TOPIC Presidential Papers and Executive Orders
	No substantive changes.
Rule 14.8	Court Administrative Orders
	No changes.
Rule 14.9	Short Forms for Regulations
	This rule has been reorganized to conform with revised rule 2. The actual short forms have not changed.
Rule 15	Books, Pamphlets, and Other Nonperiodic Materials
	No changes.
Rule 15.1	Author, Editor, and Translator
	<p>Rule 15.1.1: Author: The rule concerning authors' names has been changed to eliminate the "middle initial" exception:</p> <p>Fifteenth</p> <p>The first time a work is cited, always give the author's full name as it appears on the publication, including any designation such as "Jr." or "III" (inserting a comma before the designation only if the author does). Shorten any middle name (or names) to a middle initial unless the author uses an initial in place of his or her first name, in which case retain the first initial and the full middle name.</p> <p>Sixteenth</p> <p>The first time a work is cited, always give the author's full name as it appears on the publication, including any designation such as "Jr." or "III" (inserting a comma before the designation only if the author does).</p>
Rule 15.2	Title
	No substantive changes; examples and cross-references have been updated to correspond to other revisions.
Rule 15.3	Serial Number
	No rule changes; however "Economic" is now abbreviated in the first example in subpart (b).
Rule 15.4	Edition, Publisher, and Date
	Section (c) concerning pre-1900 works has been reorganized, but the rule remains the same. Various examples have been updated.

For additional information on this topic, see *supra* section III(B)(4).

Rule 15.1.2: Editor or Translator: Follow revised rule 15.1.1 for names of editors and translators.

Rule 15.1.3: Institutional Authors and Editors: No substantive changes, but the word "center" is abbreviated in the third example in subpart (a).

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 16.5	Shorter Works in Collection	No changes.
Rule 16.6	Prefaces, Forewords, Introductions, and Epilogues	No substantive changes; one example has been updated to correspond to the revision concerning authors' names.
Rule 16.7	Special Citation Forms	No changes. Readers might be interested in knowing that the example showing how to cite Shakespeare: "WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, THE SECOND PART OF KING HENRY THE SIXTH act 4, sc. 2" is the scene in which Dick Butcher says, "The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers." See George Gerard Campion, <i>On 16th Tty. Buzbook Made Easterf</i> , N.J. L.J., Apr. 20, 1992, at 15, 27.
Rule 16.8	Short Citation Forms	No substantive changes; some examples have been changed.
Rule 16	Periodical Materials	The Sixteenth Edition adds: "To cite journals and other periodical materials that appear only on the Internet, see rule 17.3.3."
Rule 16.1	Author	The author's name should be given as provided by revised rule 15.1.1 (as it appears on the work). Examples have been changed to reflect this revision.
Rule 16.2	Consecutively Paginated Journals	No substantive changes.
Rule 16.3	Nonconsecutively Paginated Journals and Magazines	No changes.
Rule 16.4	Newspapers	This section has been subdivided: <p style="margin-left: 2em;">Rule 16.4(a): In general. Contains no new rules; examples have been added.</p> <p style="margin-left: 2em;">Rule 16.4(b): Place of publication. Contains no new rules.</p> <p style="margin-left: 2em;">Rule 16.4(c): Consecutively paginated newspapers. Contains no new rules.</p> <p style="margin-left: 2em;">Rule 16.4(d): Electronic databases. In addition to cross-referencing rule 17.3.1, this section now adds several examples and provides: "If the article has been assigned a unique database identifier, include that identifier in the citation." and that "[i]f the electronic database does not indicate the first page of the article, the page number need not be indicated."</p>
Rule 16.5	Special Citation Forms	The author's name should be given as provided by revised rule 15.1.1 (as it appears on the work). Examples have been changed to reflect this revision.
Rule 16.6	Short Citation Forms	No substantive changes.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION				
Rule 17	Unpublished, Forthcoming, and Nonprint Sources	<p>A new introductory section has been added that provides:</p> <p>The following rules govern the most commonly cited materials that are not readily available in print form. If a source is not listed in one of these rules, attempt to apply the most closely analogous citation format and supply appropriate additional information to assist the reader in locating the source.</p>				
Rule 17.1	Unpublished Materials	<p>Rule 17.1: Unpublished Materials: Users are now instructed to provide information "as to where the work can be located." (Emphasis added.) The Fifteenth Edition used the word "might."</p> <p>Rule 17.1.1: Manuscripts: No changes.</p> <p>Rule 17.1.2: Dissertations and Theses: Both examples now include parentheticals indicating where the material can be located, as required in revised rule 17.1.</p> <p>Rule 17.1.3: Letters and Memoranda: No substantive changes. Some current <i>Bluebook</i> editors substituted their names for previous editors' names.</p> <p>Rule 17.1.4: Interviews: This rule now instructs: "When the author has not personally conducted the interview, provide the name of the interviewer."</p> <p>Rule 17.1.5: Speeches and Addresses: No changes.</p>				
Rule 17.2	Forthcoming Publications	No substantive changes.				
Rule 17.3	Electronic Sources and Databases	<p>This rule was formerly called "Electronic Databases."</p> <p>Rule 17.3.1: Electronic Databases Containing Separately Published Documents: This rule now states that "most newspapers, corporate or government reports, and statutory or legislative materials should be cited in their original form even if they are found or obtained by means of a database search." (Emphasis added.) The Fifteenth Edition used the word "may." This rule also references new rule 12.3.2(b) regarding citation of unpublished cases and statutes located on a database.</p> <p>Rule 17.3.2: Electronic Databases Containing Tabulated Data: The example was changed to capitalize the "f" in "file," thus:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Fifteenth</td> <td>Sixteenth</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Search of LEXIS, Genfed Library, US file (May 9, 1991).</td> <td>Search of LEXIS, Genfed Library, US Files (May 9, 1991).</td> </tr> </table> <p>Rule 17.3.3: Internet Sources: This section is new. For more detailed information, see <i>supra</i> section III(B)(6).</p>	Fifteenth	Sixteenth	Search of LEXIS, Genfed Library, US file (May 9, 1991).	Search of LEXIS, Genfed Library, US Files (May 9, 1991).
Fifteenth	Sixteenth					
Search of LEXIS, Genfed Library, US file (May 9, 1991).	Search of LEXIS, Genfed Library, US Files (May 9, 1991).					

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 17.4	Microform	No substantive changes; however, examples have been changed to conform with other revised rules.
Rule 17.5	Films, Broadcasts, and Noncommercial Videotapes	<p>This rule was formerly entitled "Films and Broadcasts." The newly added material on noncommercial videotapes provides:</p> <p>Cite videotapes containing images that have not been commercially displayed or broadcast by the title of the tape (if any), the name of the person or institution that produced the video, and the year of production:</p> <p>Videotape: Installing Your OX-56z (Daniel J. Libenson Electronics Co. 1995) (on file with the Boston Public Library).</p> <p>Videotape: Raiders of the Lost Hark (Harvard Law School Drama Society 1996) (on file with Harvard Law School Library).²³</p>
Rule 17.6	Audio Recordings	This rule was previously called "Sound Recordings." In the example for rule 17.6.2, the term "audio tape" has been substituted for the word "tape."
Rule 17.7	Short Citation Forms	Although some examples have been changed or updated to conform to other rule revisions, the rules have not changed. However, "sound recordings" are now "audio recordings" to conform to revised rule 17.6.
Rule 18	Services	The Sixteenth Edition suggests that readers "[c]onsult <i>Legal Looseleaves in Print</i> , which is updated annually, for a comprehensive listing of services."
Rule 18.1	Citation Form for Services	No substantive changes. Several examples have been updated to reflect new publishers and services. Readers are now referred to Table 15 for the list of service abbreviations. Table 15 was formerly numbered Table 16.
Rule 18.2	Short Citation Forms	No changes.
Rule 19	Foreign Materials	The Sixteenth Edition now instructs users that "[c]itation to foreign materials should conform as closely as possible to local citation practice, as modified by rule 19."
Rule 19.1	Non-English Language Documents	To begin with, this rule has been renamed; in the Fifteenth Edition, this section was called "Basic Citation Forms" and listed sample citations. The sample citations have now been eliminated and users are referred to Table 2 for sample citations.
Rule 19.2	Jurisdiction Not Evident from Context	New rule 19.1 now contains rules formerly numbered 19.2.
Rule 19.3	Jurisdiction Not Evident from Context	This rule was previously numbered 19.3. The rule is substantially the same but contains updated examples.

²³The editors do not explain why they chose to use a colon instead of a comma to separate the identifier "videotape" from the title.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION				
Rule 19.3	Cases	<p>This rule was numbered 19.4 in the Fifteenth Edition. In addition, the rule has been re-organized.</p> <p>First, the rule no longer contains a section on volumes.</p> <p>Second, the rule on common law cases no longer distinguishes between English cases and other cases.</p> <p>Third, users are directed to Table 2 for additional information on how to cite material from civil law and other non-common law cases. As a result of new information contained in Table 2, this section, now numbered 19.3.2, has omitted sections on date of decision.</p> <p>Finally, because rule 19 has been re-ordered, cross-references throughout the section have been changed to conform to the Sixteenth Edition.</p>				
Rule 19.4	Constitutions	<p>This rule was formerly 19.5. In addition, the rule for citing foreign constitutions not in English has changed:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Fifteenth</td> <td>Cite constitutions not in English by name, and append a translation of the name if the nature of the document is not otherwise clear from the context.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sixteenth</td> <td>Cite constitutions not in English by name. If the nature of the document is not otherwise clear from the context, include "Constitution" in brackets following the document name in the first citation. Successive citations may exclude this translation.</td> </tr> </table>	Fifteenth	Cite constitutions not in English by name, and append a translation of the name if the nature of the document is not otherwise clear from the context.	Sixteenth	Cite constitutions not in English by name. If the nature of the document is not otherwise clear from the context, include "Constitution" in brackets following the document name in the first citation. Successive citations may exclude this translation.
Fifteenth	Cite constitutions not in English by name, and append a translation of the name if the nature of the document is not otherwise clear from the context.					
Sixteenth	Cite constitutions not in English by name. If the nature of the document is not otherwise clear from the context, include "Constitution" in brackets following the document name in the first citation. Successive citations may exclude this translation.					
Rule 19.5	Statutes	<p>This rule was previously numbered 19.6</p> <p>Current rule 19.5.1 concerns common law statutes. The Sixteenth Edition no longer has separate rules for English cites, Canadian cites, and other common-law statutes. Instead, for all these categories, it directs users to "Cite like United States statutes (rule 12) if the jurisdiction's statutes appear in a codification or other compilation. Otherwise cite like English statutes (table T.2), noting the jurisdiction parenthetically at the end of the citation if not otherwise clear from the context."</p> <p>Rules for citing civil law and other non-common law statutes were not changed. These rules are now found in rule 19.5.2.</p>				
Rule 19.6	Periodicals with Non-English Language Titles	<p>This rule was formerly rule 19.7 and was formerly entitled "Periodicals with Foreign Language Titles." Despite the name change, the rule was not changed.</p>				

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 19.7	Short Citation Forms	<p>This rule was numbered 19.8 in the Fifteenth Edition. Although short forms for constitutions, statutes, and periodicals were not changed, the case rule was changed and now reads:</p> <p>For common law citations, use short forms analogous to those provided in rule 10.9 For civil law citation forms, because of the variety of foreign citation forms, it is impractical to promulgate a specific short form rule. Therefore, it is suggested that the short form should include information sufficient to identify the original citation.</p>
Rule 20.1	International Materials: Basic Citation Forms	<p>In subsection (b), the example for the Court of Justice of the European Communities is different to conform with changes in rule 20.6.2.</p> <p>Subsection (e) is now entitled "European Union," instead of "Materials of other intergovernmental organizations."</p> <p>Subsection (f) is new and illustrates how to cite material from the World Trade Organization and GATT.</p> <p>Subsections (g) and (h) contain material from the Fifteenth Edition that has been renumbered (Yearbooks and Digests).</p> <p>The title was formerly "Foreign Language Documents." The rule reference is now 19.1, not 19.2.</p>
Rule 20.2	Non-English Language Documents	No changes.
Rule 20.3	Jurisdiction Not Evident from Context	Rule 20.4.1 now cross-references rule 19.1.2; the Fifteenth Edition referenced 19.2.2.
Rule 20.4	Treaties and Other International Agreements	<p>Rule 20.4.1(a)(ii) has been changed. Users may no longer shorten the description that appears on the title page of an agreement, even if substantial space is saved and the result would be unambiguous.</p> <p>In rule 20.4.5(a), which concerns agreements to which the United States is a party, the citation forms for Senate Treaty Documents and Senate Executive Documents have been changed to reflect changes in rule 13.4.</p> <p>Rule 20.5.2, which concerns the Court of Justice of the European Communities has been changed.</p>
Rule 20.5	International Law Cases	<p>First, in subsection (a), entitled "Official reports," the Sixteenth Edition instructs users to "[p]lace the year designation before the reporter abbreviation." In addition: "Beginning with Part I, 1990, page numbers in the E.C.R. begin with a 'T' or 'II' before the number." An example of the new citation format is provided.</p> <p>Second, in subsection (b), entitled "Private services," users are instructed that when citing to volumes through 1973 of the <i>Common Market Law Reports</i> (C.M.L.R.) "include overall volume number after the year in brackets; when citing to volumes for 1974 and after, include the issue number after the year in brackets to reflect cessation of continuous issue numbering."</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Rule 20.6	International Arbitrations	No changes.
Rule 20.7	United Nations Materials	<p>Although rule 20.7.5 concerning the United Nations Charter did not change, the example used did:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Fifteenth Sixteenth</p> <p style="text-align: center;">U.N. CHARTER art. 2, ¶ 4. U.N. CHARTER art. 2, para. 4.³⁰</p>
Rule 20.8	Materials of Other Intergovernmental Organizations	<p>In rule 20.8.2(a)(ii), the former reference to "the EEC Treaty" has been replaced with a reference to "the EC Treaty."</p> <p>Rule 20.8.2(c), concerning "Founding treaties," has been substantially revised. The amendments include revised information about initial citations and contains updated information about the EC Treaty.</p> <p>Rule 20.8.2(d) is new and concerns "International treaties and agreements." The new rule instructs users to "cite treaties among EC member countries or between the EC and non-member states according to rule 20.4.5(b)."</p> <p>Rule 20.8.4 is new and instructs users on how to cite World Trade Organization and GATT materials.</p>
Rule 20.9	Yearbooks	Rule 19.1.3 is now the cross reference for citing yearbooks.
Rule 20.10	Digests	Rule 19.1.3 is now the cross reference for citing foreign digests.
Rule 20.11	Short Citation Forms	No changes.

³⁰This new abbreviation does not conform to rule 6.2(b).

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION									
Table 1	United States Jurisdictions Federal	<p>Supreme Court: The <i>Bluebook</i> no longer directs users not to give a parallel citation.³²¹</p> <p>Circuit Justices: Dates of two reporters have been changed:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Reporter</td> <td>Fifteenth Edition</td> <td>Sixteenth Edition</td> </tr> <tr> <td>United States Reports</td> <td>1869-date</td> <td>1893-date</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Supreme Court Reporter</td> <td>1926-date</td> <td>1893-date</td> </tr> </table> <p>Courts of Appeals: F.3d has been added as a citation option.³²² Also, the example now refers to "2d Cir.," instead of "1st Cir."</p> <p>Circuit Courts: No form changes.³²³</p> <p>Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals: The Sixteenth Edition notes that this court was abolished in 1983.</p>	Reporter	Fifteenth Edition	Sixteenth Edition	United States Reports	1869-date	1893-date	Supreme Court Reporter	1926-date	1893-date
Reporter	Fifteenth Edition	Sixteenth Edition									
United States Reports	1869-date	1893-date									
Supreme Court Reporter	1926-date	1893-date									

³²¹Despite this omission, the Sixteenth Edition does not include parallel citations for examples of United States Supreme Court cases. See, e.g., SIXTEENTH EDITION at 12, 16, 41, 65, 67.

³²²*Federal Reporter, Third Series* began in late 1983, after the Fifteenth Edition had been published. See generally Thomas E. Baker, *Judges, Heal Thyselfes: The Dawn of F.3d*, LEGAL TIMES, Mar. 7, 1993, at 30 (tracing the *Federal Reporter's* history); Matthew Goldstein, *69 Years, 99 Volumes of F.2d End as a New Era of F.3d Begins*, N.Y. L.J., Oct. 14, 1993, at 1.

³²³*Bluebook* aficionados should note that the example given on page 165: *Deirich v. Pittsburgh*, 18 Cas. 598 (C.C.V.D. Pa. 1859) (No. 10,444), is incorrect. The plaintiff's correct name is *Oelrich*. The Sixteenth-Edition editors, however, did better than their Fifteenth-Edition counterparts, who incorrectly listed the case name for the same citation as "*Hochman v. Sobeloff*." See FIFTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 165.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Table 1 (cont'd)	United States Jurisdictions Federal	<p>United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit: F.3d has been added as a citation option.³⁴</p> <p>United States Court of Federal Claims: The Sixteenth Edition notes that the United States Claims Court was renamed in 1992 as the United States Court of Federal Claims (Fed. Cl.).³⁵ It also adds the new <i>Federal Claims Reporter</i> (Fed. Cl.)³⁶ and changes the dates for the <i>United States Claims Reporter</i> to 1982-1992 (the Fifteenth Edition listed the dates 1982-date).</p> <p>United States Court of International Trade: No changes.</p> <p>District Courts: The Sixteenth Edition correctly instructs users to cite to F. or F.2d for U.S. district court cases decided between 1880-1932.³⁷ The Fifteenth Edition listed F. and F.2d as citation options, but did not list the reporter dates and abbreviations. Users should note that the Sixteenth Edition incorrectly lists Callaghan as the current publisher of Fed. R. Serv. 3d. Lawyers Cooperative began publishing Fed. R. Serv. 3d with volume 17.</p> <p>Bankruptcy Courts: The abbreviation for Bankruptcy Appellate Panels was changed from "Bankr. 1st Cir." to "B.A.P. 1st Cir."</p> <p>Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation and Special Court, Regional Rail Reorganization Act: The Sixteenth Edition lists the latter as "Special Court, Regional Rail Reorganization Act," whereas the Fifteenth Edition listed it as "Special Court Regional Rail Reorganization Act."</p> <p>Tax Court: <i>Tax Court Memorandum Decisions</i>, as published by Research Institute of America [T.C.M. (RIA), 1991-date], is now listed as a citation option.</p>

³⁴See *supra* note 332.

³⁵Federal Courts Administration Act of 1992, Pub. L. No. 102-572, 106 Stat. 4608 (Oct. 26, 1992). See generally J. MYRON JACOBSTEIN ET AL., *FUNDAMENTALS OF LEGAL RESEARCH* 49 & n.8 (6th ed. 1994) (describing the renaming of the United States Claims Court).

³⁶The *Federal Claims Reporter* begins with volume 27. JACOBSTEIN ET AL., *supra* note 335, at 52.

³⁷See JACOBSTEIN ET AL., *supra* note 335, at 50.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Table 1 (cont'd)	<p>United States Jurisdictions</p> <p>Federal</p>	<p>United States Court of Veterans Appeals: Information has been added for this court, which was created in 1988.³³ Citations are to the <i>Veterans Appeals Reporter</i> (Vet. App.), which began in 1990.</p> <p>United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces: The Sixteenth Edition reflects that this court (which the Fifteenth Edition called "Court of Military Appeals") was renamed the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (C.A.F.). Current citations will be to the <i>Military Justice Reporter</i> (M.J.) (p. 168). In the Fifteenth Edition, C.M.A. was translated as "Court of Military Appeals Reports"; in the Sixteenth Edition, C.M.A. stands for "Decisions of the United States Court of Military Appeals."³⁴</p> <p>Courts of Military Review: The table now refers to A.C.M.R., A.F.C.M.R., C.G.C.M.R., and N.M.C.M.R. Only the first two were listed in the Fifteenth Edition.</p> <p>Statutory compilations: The Sixteenth Edition adds:</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">United States Code Unannotated x U.S.C.U. § x (Gould 19xx)</p> <p>Session laws: No changes.</p> <p>Administrative compilation: No changes.</p> <p>Administrative register: No changes.</p> <p>United States official administrative publications:</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;"><i>Agricultural Decisions</i> is now <i>Agriculture Decisions</i> (but the abbreviation remains the same).</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">The Sixteenth Edition notes that the <i>Civil Aeronautics Board Reports</i> ended in 1979.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">The Sixteenth Edition omits <i>Court of Customs Appeals Reports</i>.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">The Sixteenth Edition adds <i>Determinations of the National Mediation Board</i> (N.M.B., 1935-date).</p>

³³Veterans' Judicial Review Act of 1988, Pub. L. No. 100-687, 102 Stat. 4105 (1988). See generally Laurence R. Helfer, *The Politics of Judicial Structure: Creating the United States Court of Veterans Appeals*, 25 CONN. L. REV. 155 (1992) (examining the role of the United States Court of Veterans Appeals).

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Table 1 (cont'd)	United States Jurisdictions States and District of Columbia	<p>The Sixteenth Edition added the following: "Note that in-state abbreviation and citation conventions may differ from those listed in this table. The abbreviations and citation conventions listed here are primarily intended to serve a national audience and to indicate clearly the source being cited." For a compilation of state rules concerning citation format, see Appendix B-1.</p> <p>Alabama: The abbreviation for <i>Alabama Administration Code</i> no longer appears in large and small capital letters.⁸³ Therefore, it appears:</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Ala. Admin. Code r. x (19xx)</p> <p>Alaska:</p> <p>Courts: The Sixteenth Edition refers to District Courts of Alaska (as opposed to District Court of Alaska) and lists <i>Alaska Federal Reports</i> (Alaska Fed., 1869-1937) as a citation option. <i>Alaska Federal Reports</i> is also listed as a citation option under the section that begins "United States District Courts for California and Oregon."⁸⁴</p> <p>Statutory compilation:</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Fifteenth ALASKA STAT. § x (19xx)</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Sixteenth ALASKA STAT. § x (Michie 19xx)</p> <p>Administrative compilation:</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Fifteenth ALASKA ADMIN. CODE tit. x, § x (month 19xx)</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Sixteenth ALASKA ADMIN. CODE tit. x, § x (19xx)</p>

⁸³This citation appears to be mistaken because other state administrative compilations still appear in large and small capital letters.

⁸⁴The *Bluebook* omits reference to *Alaska Territory Reports*, which contains cases decided by the District Court of Alaska from 1869-1940. See MORRIS COHEN ET AL., HOW TO FIND THE LAW app. B, at 615 (9th ed. 1989) [hereinafter HOW TO FIND THE LAW].

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Table 1 (cont'd)	<p>United States Jurisdictions</p> <p>States and District of Columbia</p>	<p>Arizona:</p> <p>Statutory compilation:</p> <p>Fifteenth</p> <p>Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated ARIZ. REV. STAT. ANN. § x (19xx)</p> <p>Sixteenth</p> <p>Arizona Revised Statutes ARIZ. REV. STAT. § x (19xx)</p> <p>Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated ARIZ. REV. STAT. ANN. § x (West 19xx)</p> <p>Administrative compilation:</p> <p>Fifteenth</p> <p>Official Compilation Administrative Rules and Regulations ARIZ. COMP. ADMIN. R. & REGS. x (19xx)</p> <p>Sixteenth</p> <p>Arizona Administrative Code ARIZ. ADMIN. CODE x (19xx)</p> <p>Administrative register:</p> <p>Fifteenth</p> <p>Administrative Digest Ariz. Admin. Dig.</p> <p>Sixteenth</p> <p>Arizona Administrative Register Ariz. Admin. Reg.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Table 1 (cont'd)	United States Jurisdictions States and District of Columbia	<p>California:</p> <p>Courts: Cal. 4th, Cal. Rptr. 2d, Cal. App. 4th, and Cal. App. 4th Supp. are recognized as citation options.</p> <p>Statutory compilations: The Sixteenth Edition refers to "West's Annotated California Codes" (as opposed to "Codes" in the Fifteenth Edition); however, the abbreviation is not affected. The Sixteenth Edition also refers to "Deering's Annotated California Codes" (as opposed to "Deering's Annotated and Unannotated California Codes" in the Fifteenth Edition). The Sixteenth Edition includes a reference to the Family (FAM.) code.</p> <p>Session laws: The Sixteenth Edition no longer says "Cite to Cal. Stat. if therein."</p> <p>Colorado: The Sixteenth Edition lists the <i>Colorado Lawyer</i> (Colo. Law.) and the <i>Brief Times Reporter</i> (Brief Times Rptr.) as citation options for state cases.⁴¹</p> <p>Connecticut: The Sixteenth Edition lists the <i>Connecticut Law Reporter</i> (Conn. L. Rptr.) and the <i>Connecticut Superior Court Reports</i> (Conn. Super. Ct.) as citation options for decisions issued by the Superior Court and Court of Common Pleas.</p> <p>Delaware: No changes.</p> <p>District of Columbia: F.3d is added as a citation option for cases decided by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. In addition, the Sixteenth Edition notes that citations for the <i>Federal Reporter</i> begin in 1919 (the Fifteenth Edition listed the start date as 1918).</p>

⁴¹The *Bluebook* does not indicate that Colorado has adopted a public domain citation format. See *supra* note 105 and accompanying text; see also SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 10.3.1 (concerning public domain citations).

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Table 1 (cont'd)	United States Jurisdictions States and District of Columbia	<p>Illinois:</p> <p>Courts: The Sixteenth Edition lists <i>Illinois Decisions</i> (Ill. Dec.) as a citation option for cases decided by the Illinois Supreme Court and the Illinois Appellate Court. The Sixteenth Edition also indicates that Illinois Supreme Court citations found in the <i>North Eastern Reporter</i> begin in 1886 (as opposed to 1885, which was listed in the Fifteenth Edition).</p> <p>Statutory compilations:</p> <p>Fifteenth</p> <p>Cite to ILL. REV. STAT. if therein (Because the numbering system in ILL. REV. STAT. and ILL. ANN. STAT. is not official, however, in textual references to Illinois statutes always use the name of the act and the original section number.)</p> <p>Sixteenth³²</p> <p>Cite to ILL. COMP. STAT. if therein.</p> <p>Illinois Revised Statutes ILL. REV. STAT. ch. x, para. x (19xx)</p> <p>Illinois Compiled Statutes x ILL. COMP. STAT. x/x-x (West 19xx)</p> <p>Smith-Hurd Illinois Annotated Statutes ILL. ANN. STAT. ch. x, para. x (Smith-Hurd 19xx)</p> <p>West's Smith-Hurd Illinois Compiled Statutes Annotated x ILL. COMP. STAT. ANN. x/x-x (West 19xx)</p>

³²The Preface to *West's Smith-Hurd Illinois Compiled Statutes Annotated* explains:

The Illinois General Assembly . . . effective September 1, 1989, directed the Legislative Reference Bureau to "submit to the General Assembly for consideration a plan for the comprehensive and systematic codification of the statutory law." The last official codification of the statutes resulted in the Revised Statutes of 1874. The contemporary plan submitted for consideration . . . ultimately resulted in the promulgation of the Illinois Compiled Statutes . . . which directed that the new compilation take effect January 1, 1993.

One reason for this codification was that a vendor claimed a copyright to the code. See AALL Report, *supra* note 101, at 10.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
<p>Table 1 (cont'd)</p>	<p>United States Jurisdictions</p> <p>States and District of Columbia</p>	<p>Indiana:</p> <p>Statutory compilations: The citation for Burns' statutory compilations has changed.</p> <p>Fifteenth</p> <p>Burns Indiana Statutes Annotated Code Edition IND. CODE ANN. § x (Burns 19xx)</p> <p>Sixteenth</p> <p>Burns Indiana Statutes Annotated IND. CODE ANN. § x (Michie 19xx)</p> <p>Session laws: Citations to session laws have also changed:</p> <p>Fifteenth</p> <p>Acts, Indiana 19xx Ind. Acts xxx</p> <p>Indiana Legislative Service (West) 19xx Ind. Legis. Serv. xxx (West)</p> <p>Sixteenth</p> <p>Acts, Indiana 19xx Ind. Acts xxx</p> <p>West's Indiana Legislative Service 19xx Ind. Legis. Serv. xxx (West)</p> <p>Burns Indiana Advance Legislative Service (Michie) 19xx Ind. Adv. Legis. Serv. xxx</p> <p>Iowa: No changes.</p> <p>Kansas:</p> <p>Statutory compilations: The Sixteenth Edition changed "Corporation Code" to "General Corporation Code," but did not change the abbreviation. In addition, the publisher is now West, not Vernon.</p> <p>Administrative compilation: The Sixteenth Edition changes the format slightly:</p> <p>Fifteenth</p> <p>Kansas Administrative Regulations (1989) (updated by supplements) KAN. ADMIN. REGS. x (19xx)</p> <p>Sixteenth</p> <p>Kansas Administrative Regulations (updated by supplements) KAN. ADMIN. REGS. x</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
<p>Table 1 (cont'd)</p>	<p>United States Jurisdictions States and District of Columbia</p>	<p>Kentucky: Cases: <i>Kentucky Appellate Reporter</i> (Ky. App. Rpt.) and <i>Kentucky Law Summary</i> (Ky. L. Summary) are now listed as citation options. Statutory compilations: Fifteenth Baldwin's Official Edition, Kentucky Revised Statutes Annotated KY. REV. STAT. ANN. § x (Baldwin 19xx) Kentucky Revised Statutes Annotated; Official Edition (Michie/Bobbs-Merrill) KY. REV. STAT. ANN. § x (Michie/Bobbs-Merrill 19xx) Session laws: The Baldwin's entry has been changed to reflect Banks-Baldwin as publisher. Administrative register: "Kentucky Administrative Register" is now "Administrative Register of Kentucky," but the abbreviation is the same (Ky. Admin. Reg.).</p> <p>Sixteenth - Baldwin's Official Edition, Kentucky Revised Statute Annotated KY. REV. STAT. ANN. § x (Banks-Baldwin 19xx) Kentucky Revised Statutes Annotated, Official Edition (Michie) KY. REV. STAT. ANN. § x (Michie 19xx)</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
<p>Table 1 (cont'd)</p>	<p>United States Jurisdictions States and District of Columbia</p>	<p>Louisiana Cases: The Sixteenth Edition recognizes that Louisiana has adopted a public domain citation format and instructs users that "[f]or cases that are available in a public domain format, these instructions should be modified in accordance with rule 10.3.1." In addition, the following reporter information has changed: Supreme Court: "Mart." has become "Mart. (o.s.)."³²³ Court of Appeals: Gunby's Reports (Gunby) has been added for 1885 cases. Maine: No changes. Maryland: Within the statutory compilations section, several code volumes have been deleted (including "Alcoholic Beverages," "Criminal Law," "Economic Development," and "Health—Environmental"), one volume, Labor and Employment," has been added, some volumes have been renamed (e.g., "State Personnel" is now "State Personnel and Pensions"), and some volumes have been subdivided into two volumes (including "Health," and "Transportation"). Massachusetts: Cases: Two older reporters have been added: Tyng (1806-22) and Williams (Will., 1804-05). The entry "1 Mass. to 17 Mass." for the years 1804-18 was deleted. Statutory compilation: "MASS GEN. L." is abbreviated "MASS. GEN. LAWS" in the Sixteenth Edition. Session laws: One entry was altered, one was added: Fifteenth Massachusetts Advance Legislative Service (Law. Co-op.) 19xx Mass. Adv. Legis. Serv. xxx (Law. Co-op.) Sixteenth Massachusetts Advance Legislative Serv. (Law. Co-op.) 19xx Mass. Adv. Legis. Service xxx (Law Co-op.)³²⁴ Massachusetts Legislative Service (West) 19xx Mass. Legis. Serv. xxx (West)</p>

³²³The abbreviation "o.s." stands for "old series." See HOW TO FIND THE LAW, *supra* note 340, app. B, at 630.

³²⁴It appears that the abbreviation and the full name were switched. In all likelihood, "Services" in the abbreviation should be "Serv." In addition, the period after "Law" is missing in the Sixteenth Edition.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Table 1 (cont'd)	United States Jurisdictions States and District of Columbia	<p>Michigan: Lawyers Co-op. now publishes <i>Michigan Statutes Annotated</i>; the prior publisher was Callaghan.</p> <p>Minnesota: No changes.</p> <p>Mississippi: <i>Mississippi Decisions</i> (Miss. Dec.) is now listed as a cited option for Supreme Court cases. The administrative register is now listed as "Mississippi Official and Statistical Register," but the abbreviation is still Miss. Reg.</p> <p>Missouri: The name of the official intermediate appellate court reporter is now listed as <i>Missouri Appeals Reports</i> (instead of "Appeal") and is listed for 1876-1954 (as opposed to 1952). West is now listed as the publisher for <i>Vernon's Annotated Missouri Statutes</i> and the <i>Missouri Legislative Service</i>. Finally, the administrative compilation is now the <i>Missouri Code of State Regulations Annotated</i> (MO. CODE REGS. ANN. tit. x, § x-x.x (19xx)).</p> <p>Montana: <i>State Reporter</i> (State Rptr.) is now listed as a citation option for Supreme Court cases. Although users are directed to cite to MONT. CODE ANN., "if therein, for statutes, <i>Revised Codes of Montana Annotated</i> (Allen Smith Company) is now listed as an option. The abbreviation is MONT. REV. CODE ANN. § x (Smith 19xx).</p> <p>Nebraska: An entire section for the Nebraska Court of Appeals has been added. Although users are directed to cite to NEB. REV. STAT., "if therein, for statutes, <i>Revised Statutes of Nebraska Annotated</i> (Michie) is now listed as an option. The abbreviation is NEB. REV. STAT. ANN. § x (Michie 19xx).</p> <p>Nevada: No changes.</p> <p>New Hampshire: Citations for Supreme Court cases to the <i>Atlantic Reporter</i> now date from 1885, not 1886. The administrative compilation is now N.H. CODE ADMIN. R. ANN. The code was previously not listed as an annotated version.</p> <p>New Jersey: The Sixteenth Edition indicates that the <i>New Jersey Tax Court Reports</i> dates from 1979, not 1981. For statutory compilations, users are instructed to cite to N.J. STAT. ANN. The Fifteenth Edition instructed users to cite to N.J. REV. STAT. <i>New Jersey Administrative Reports</i> is now in its second series.</p> <p>New Mexico: <i>New Mexico Advances Legislative Service</i> (Michie) has been added. The abbreviation is 19xx N.M. Adv. Legis. Serv. xxx. An entry for the <i>New Mexico Administrative Code</i> also has been added. The abbreviation is N.M. ADMIN. CODE tit. x, § x (19xx).</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Table 1 (cont'd)	United States Jurisdictions States and District of Columbia	<p>New York:</p> <p>Cases: Reporters for some older cases have been added. For the Court for Correction of Errors and for the Supreme Court of Judicature, entries have been included for <i>Edmond's Select Cases</i> (Edm. Sel. Cas., 1834-53), <i>Yates' Select Cases</i> (Yates Sel. Cas., 1809), and <i>Anthony's Nisi Prius Cases</i> (Ant. N.P. Cas., 1807-51). For the Court of Chancery, the additions are <i>Lansing's Chancery Reports</i> (Lans. Ch., 1824-26) and <i>New York Chancery Reports Annotated</i> (N.Y. Ch. Ann., 1814-47).</p> <p>Statutory compilations: Volumes concerning Optional County Government and Uniform Commercial Code Appendix have been omitted. Three new entries were added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gould's New York Consolidated Laws Unannotated (N.Y. [subject] LAW § x (Gould 19xx) Condemnation (CONDEMN.) Economic Development (ECON. DEV.) <p>A few abbreviations have been changed. The new abbreviations for <i>Civil Practice Law and Rules</i> are N.Y. C.P.L.R. x (McKinney 19xx) and N.Y. C.P.L.R. x (Consol. 19xx). The Sixteenth Edition also indicates that Uniform District Court Act should be abbreviated as UNIFORM DIST. CT.; however, this abbreviation appears to be a mistake. The abbreviation probably should have remained UNIFORM DIST. CT. ACT, as it appeared in the Fifteenth Edition.⁴³</p> <p>North Carolina: No changes.⁴⁴</p> <p>North Dakota: No substantive changes.</p>

⁴³The abbreviation for Uniform City Court Act remains UNIFORM CITY CT. ACT. SIXTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 205.

⁴⁴See *infra* app. B-1 n.407 (concerning North Carolina citation format).

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
<p>Table 1 (cont'd)</p>	<p>United States Jurisdictions States and District of Columbia</p>	<p>Ohio:</p> <p>Cases: The Sixteenth Edition indicates that Court of Appeals cases appear in the <i>North Eastern Reporter</i> from 1925-present, as opposed to 1921-present in the Fifteenth Edition. Several dates and entries for reporters containing cases decided by "other law courts" also changed. Beginning and ending dates were changed for <i>Ohio Miscellaneous, Ohio Bar Reports, Ohio Circuit Court Decisions</i>, and <i>Ohio Circuit Court Reports, New Series</i>.</p> <p>Statutory compilations: Publishers have changed:</p> <p>Fifteenth</p> <p>Ohio Revised Code Annotated (Anderson) OHIO REV. CODE ANN. § x (Anderson 19xx)</p> <p>Ohio Revised Code Annotated (Baldwin) OHIO REV. CODE ANN. § x (Baldwin 19xx)</p> <p>Sixteenth</p> <p>Pago's Ohio Revised Code Annotated OHIO REV. CODE ANN. § x (Anderson 19xx)</p> <p>Baldwin's Ohio Revised Code Annotated (Banks-Baldwin) OHIO REV. CODE ANN. § x (Banks-Baldwin 19xx)</p> <p>Session laws: As with the statutory compilations, Page's now publishes <i>Ohio Legislative Bulletin</i> (Anderson); however, the abbreviation was not affected. Banks-Baldwin publishes <i>Baldwin's Ohio Legislative Service</i>.</p> <p>Oklahoma: For cases, the starting date for Court of Appeals cases published in the <i>Pacific Reporter</i> was changed from 1969 to 1971. A section for the state administrative compilation was added. The ending date for <i>Oklahoma Gazette</i> is now listed as 1983, as opposed to 1982.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
<p>Table 1 (cont'd)</p>	<p>United States Jurisdictions States and District of Columbia</p>	<p>Oregon: No changes.</p> <p>Pennsylvania: Cases: For Supreme Court cases, the Sixteenth Edition instructs: "In documents submitted to Pennsylvania state courts, cite to Pa. if therein and to A. or A.2d if therein; otherwise, cite to another reporter listed below (other than A. or A.2d) and to A. or A.2d if therein."³⁴⁷ In addition, several reporters containing older cases were added: Monaghan (Monag., 1888-90) Sadler (Sadler, 1885-88) Walker (Walk., 1865-85) Pennypacker (Pennyp., 1881-84) Grant (Grant, 1814-63). Addison (Add., 1791-99) was deleted. For the Commonwealth Court, the <i>Atlantic Reporter</i> (first series) was eliminated as a citation option.³⁴⁸ Statutory compilations and session laws: West now publishes all listed material originally published by Furdor's; thus, West is now listed as the publisher in the abbreviations. Rhode Island: Entries were added for the state administrative compilation and administrative register.³⁴⁹</p>

³⁴⁷The Fifteenth Edition instructed: "In documents submitted to Pennsylvania state courts, cite to one reporter listed below (other than A. or A.2d) and to A. or A.2d if therein." FIFTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 204-05.

³⁴⁸This change is correct because the Commonwealth Court was not created until 1970. For a complete list of reporters containing opinions from other lower courts, see HOW TO FIND THE LAW, *supra* note 340, at 650-52.

³⁴⁹Readers should note that the *Bluebook* does not provide information about the Rhode Island Superior Court. For information on this court, see *id.* at 653.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
<p>Table 1 (cont'd)</p>	<p>United States Jurisdictions States and District of Columbia</p>	<p>South Carolina: For cases, abbreviations for some official reporters were changed to conform to Rule 239 of the South Carolina Rules of Court.³² Under the statutory compilation section, the Sixteenth Edition lists the publisher of the <i>Code of Laws of South Carolina 1976 Annotated</i> as Law Co-op. There appears to be a mistake in this abbreviation because all other references to Lawyers Co-op. are abbreviated as Law.³¹ South Carolina's administrative compilation is now abbreviated "S.C. CODE ANN. REGS. x (19xx)." South Dakota: Michie now publishes <i>South Dakota Codified Laws. South Dakota Advance Code Service</i>,³³ published by Michie Butterworth, has been added. Tennessee: The ending date for the Heiskell reporter is now listed as 1879, as opposed to 1876.³³ Texas: The entries for Texas have been extensively revised to deal with peculiarities in Texas law. Older reporters are now listed as citation options. The section on the Court of Criminal Appeals has been virtually rewritten. A section has been added about the Commission of Appeals. The Court of Appeals section has been expanded to explain Texas requirements concerning citing subsequent history. The Sixteenth Edition has omitted the section on the Texas Court of Appeals. The statutory compilations section indicates that "Texas is nearing the completion of a recodification of its laws" and lists the Vernon's series as citation options. In addition, the list of subject-matter codes has been modified; several volumes have been deleted, and some abbreviations have been changed. A new discussion section on session laws has been added. Within the session laws section, the Sixteenth Edition indicates that West now publishes <i>Vernon's Texas Session Law Service</i> and adds <i>Laws of the Republic of Texas</i> for nineteenth century references. Within the administrative compilation section, West is now listed as the publisher for the <i>Texas Administrative Code</i>.³⁴</p>

³²Rule 239 is reprinted in Appendix B-1.

³³See, e.g., SIXTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 192 (abbreviating *Annotated Laws of Massachusetts* as MASS. ANN. LAWS ch. x, § x (Law. Co-op. 19xx)).

³⁴Table 1 does not reference South Dakota's public domain citation format for cases. See *supra* note 106 and accompanying text; *infra* app. B-1 (quoting the relevant statute). But an example of the public domain format is given in rule 10.3.1. See SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 10.3.1.

³⁵For a complete list of reporters containing Tennessee Supreme Court cases, see HOW TO FIND THE LAW, *supra* note 340, at 655.

³⁶One reason for this codification is that a vendor claimed a copyright in the code. For a discussion of this issue, see L. Ray Patterson & Craig Joyce, *Monopolizing the Law: The Scope of Copyright Protection for Law Reports and Statutory Compilations*, 36 UCLA L. REV. 719, 725-26 (1959).

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
<p>Table 1 (cont'd)</p>	<p>United States Jurisdictions States and District of Columbia</p>	<p>Utah: A new section on the Court of Appeals directs users to cite to P 2d from 1987 to date. The administrative compilation is now known as <i>Utah Administrative Code</i> and is cited: <i>UTAH ADMIN. CODE</i> x (19xx).</p> <p>Vermont: Vermont's session laws are now entitled <i>Acts and Resolves of Vermont</i>, the abbreviation of which is 19xx <i>Vt. Acts & Resolves xxx</i>. The administrative compilation has been added. The title is <i>Code of Vermont Rules</i>; the abbreviation is <i>Vt. CODE R. x</i> (19xx). Vermont's administrative and executive register is now called <i>Vermont Government Register</i> and is cited <i>Vt. Gov't Reg.</i></p> <p>Virginia: Some dates on early official reporters were changed. The session law is now cited 19xx <i>Va. Acts ch. xxx</i>.</p> <p>Washington: No changes.</p> <p>West Virginia: The starting date for <i>West Virginia Reports</i> is now 1864, as opposed to 1863.³⁴⁵ The Sixteenth Edition includes an entry for the state administrative compilation, <i>West Virginia Code of State Rules</i>, which is cited as: <i>W. VA. CODE STATE R. tit. x, § x</i> (19xx).</p> <p>Wisconsin: <i>Wisconsin Administrative Code</i> is now cited: <i>Wis. ADMIN. CODE</i> § x (19xx). <i>Wisconsin Legislative Service</i> (West) is now <i>West's Wisconsin Legislative Service</i> but the abbreviation is the same.</p> <p>Wyoming: The statutory compilation is now <i>Wyoming Statutes Annotated</i>, which is abbreviated <i>WYO. STAT. ANN.</i> § x (Michie 19xx).</p>

³⁴⁵1864 is the correct date. See HOW TO FIND THE LAW, *supra* note 340, at 660.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
<p>Table 1 (cont'd)</p>	<p>United States Jurisdictions Other United States Jurisdictions</p>	<p>American Samoa: No changes.</p> <p>Canal Zone: No changes.</p> <p>Guam: The <i>Guam Code of Civil Procedure</i> is now cited: GUAM CIV. P. CODE § x (19xx). <i>Guam Session Laws</i> is cited: 19xx Guam Sess. Laws xxx. The session law entry is new.</p> <p>Navajo Nation: Court reporter dates now start in 1969. <i>Navajo Nation Code (Equity)</i> replaces <i>Navajo Tribal Code</i> as the statutory compilation. The abbreviation is NATION CODE tit. x, § x (Equity 19xx).</p> <p>Northern Mariana Islands: New listing.</p> <p>Puerto Rico: The court reports have been changed and <i>Laws of Puerto Rico Annotated</i> is cited as: P. R. LAWS ANN. tit. x, § x (19xx). The abbreviation did not change from the Fifteenth Edition. The <i>Official Translations of the Opinions of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico</i> has been added as an additional citation option for the Puerto Rican Supreme Court.</p> <p>Virgin Islands: <i>Virgin Island Session Laws</i> has been renamed <i>Session Laws of the Virgin Islands</i>. The abbreviation is 19xx VI. Sess. Laws xxx.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
<p>Table 2</p>	<p>Foreign Jurisdictions</p>	<p>As with Table 1, much in Table 2 has been updated or changed. A new feature for each country is a new section explaining the citation format for cases, statutes, and some other material with an example for each.</p> <p>The following jurisdictions have substantial changes:</p> <p>Brazil (cases and statutes) Canada (statutes) Czech Republic (courts, constitution, and statutes and regulations) France (ordinary jurisdiction, statutes and decrees, and treaties and conventions) Germany (lower civil and criminal courts, codes, and treaties and conventions) Hungary (constitution and codes) India (supreme court, and session laws and regulations) Italy (treaties and conventions) Japan (all sections) Mexico (federal courts, codes, statutes and decrees) New Zealand (statutes, session laws, and regulations) Spain (statutes and decrees) United Kingdom (statutes)</p> <p>The following jurisdictions were added:</p> <p>Israel Russian Federation South Africa</p> <p>The following jurisdictions were omitted:</p> <p>German Democratic Republic USSR Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic</p>
<p>Table 3</p>	<p>Intergovernmental Organizations</p>	<p>No substantive changes.</p>
<p>Table 4</p>	<p>Treaty Sources</p>	<p>No changes.</p>
<p>Table 5</p>	<p>Arbitral Reporters</p>	<p>No changes.</p>

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION																																														
<p>Table 6</p>	<p>Case Names</p>	<p>The following abbreviations were added in the Sixteenth Edition:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Word</th> <th>Abbreviation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Advertising</td><td>Adver.</td></tr> <tr><td>Bankruptcy</td><td>Bankr.</td></tr> <tr><td>Broadcasting</td><td>Broad.</td></tr> <tr><td>Casualty</td><td>Cas.</td></tr> <tr><td>Center, re</td><td>Chr.</td></tr> <tr><td>Director</td><td>Dir.</td></tr> <tr><td>Economic, local, y</td><td>Econ.</td></tr> <tr><td>Equality</td><td>Equal.</td></tr> <tr><td>Examiner</td><td>Exam'r</td></tr> <tr><td>Medical, incl</td><td>Med.</td></tr> <tr><td>Memorial</td><td>Mem'l</td></tr> <tr><td>Pharmaceuticals, all</td><td>Pharm.</td></tr> <tr><td>Professional</td><td>Prof'l</td></tr> <tr><td>Publishing</td><td>Publ'g</td></tr> <tr><td>Regional</td><td>Reg'l</td></tr> <tr><td>Social</td><td>Soc.</td></tr> <tr><td>Subcommittee</td><td>Subcommn.</td></tr> <tr><td>Technology</td><td>Tech.</td></tr> <tr><td>Telecommunication</td><td>Telecommn.</td></tr> <tr><td>Temporary</td><td>Temp.</td></tr> <tr><td>Transcontinental</td><td>Transcon.</td></tr> <tr><td>Uniform</td><td>Unif.</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Word	Abbreviation	Advertising	Adver.	Bankruptcy	Bankr.	Broadcasting	Broad.	Casualty	Cas.	Center, re	Chr.	Director	Dir.	Economic, local, y	Econ.	Equality	Equal.	Examiner	Exam'r	Medical, incl	Med.	Memorial	Mem'l	Pharmaceuticals, all	Pharm.	Professional	Prof'l	Publishing	Publ'g	Regional	Reg'l	Social	Soc.	Subcommittee	Subcommn.	Technology	Tech.	Telecommunication	Telecommn.	Temporary	Temp.	Transcontinental	Transcon.	Uniform	Unif.
Word	Abbreviation																																															
Advertising	Adver.																																															
Bankruptcy	Bankr.																																															
Broadcasting	Broad.																																															
Casualty	Cas.																																															
Center, re	Chr.																																															
Director	Dir.																																															
Economic, local, y	Econ.																																															
Equality	Equal.																																															
Examiner	Exam'r																																															
Medical, incl	Med.																																															
Memorial	Mem'l																																															
Pharmaceuticals, all	Pharm.																																															
Professional	Prof'l																																															
Publishing	Publ'g																																															
Regional	Reg'l																																															
Social	Soc.																																															
Subcommittee	Subcommn.																																															
Technology	Tech.																																															
Telecommunication	Telecommn.																																															
Temporary	Temp.																																															
Transcontinental	Transcon.																																															
Uniform	Unif.																																															
<p>Table 7</p>	<p>Court Names</p>	<p>The following court names and abbreviations were added in the Sixteenth Edition:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Court Name</th> <th>Abbreviation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals</td><td>A.S.B.C.A.</td></tr> <tr><td>Bankruptcy Appellate Panel</td><td>B.A.P.</td></tr> <tr><td>Board of Immigration Appeals</td><td>B.I.A.</td></tr> <tr><td>Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces</td><td>C.A.A.F.</td></tr> <tr><td>Prerogative Court</td><td>Prerog. Ct.</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The following court has a new abbreviation:</p> <table border="0"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Special Court Regional Rail Reorganization Act</td> <td>Reg'l Rail Reorg. Ct. (formerly Regional Rail Reorg. Ct.)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Court Name	Abbreviation	Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals	A.S.B.C.A.	Bankruptcy Appellate Panel	B.A.P.	Board of Immigration Appeals	B.I.A.	Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	C.A.A.F.	Prerogative Court	Prerog. Ct.	Special Court Regional Rail Reorganization Act	Reg'l Rail Reorg. Ct. (formerly Regional Rail Reorg. Ct.)																																
Court Name	Abbreviation																																															
Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals	A.S.B.C.A.																																															
Bankruptcy Appellate Panel	B.A.P.																																															
Board of Immigration Appeals	B.I.A.																																															
Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	C.A.A.F.																																															
Prerogative Court	Prerog. Ct.																																															
Special Court Regional Rail Reorganization Act	Reg'l Rail Reorg. Ct. (formerly Regional Rail Reorg. Ct.)																																															
<p>Table 8</p>	<p>Court Documents</p>	<p>No changes.</p>																																														

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION																																																										
Table 9	Explanatory Phrases	<p>The table now references rule 2.1(G), instead of 2.2(c). In addition, the following phrases were added in the Sixteenth Edition:</p> <p><i>affid by an equally divided court,</i> <i>appeal docketed,</i> <i>enforced,</i> <i>vacating as moot</i></p>																																																										
Table 10	Geographical Terms	<p>The following foreign countries and their abbreviations were added in the Sixteenth Edition:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Country</th> <th>Abbreviation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Angola</td><td>Angl.</td></tr> <tr><td>Armenia</td><td>Arm.</td></tr> <tr><td>Azerbaijan</td><td>Azer.</td></tr> <tr><td>Belarus</td><td>Belr.</td></tr> <tr><td>Bosnia & Herzegovina</td><td>Bosn. & Herz.</td></tr> <tr><td>Croatia</td><td>Croat.</td></tr> <tr><td>Czech Republic</td><td>Czech Rep.</td></tr> <tr><td>Eritrea</td><td>Eri.</td></tr> <tr><td>Estonia</td><td>Est.</td></tr> <tr><td>Kazakhstan</td><td>Kaz.</td></tr> <tr><td>Latvia</td><td>Lat.</td></tr> <tr><td>Lithuania</td><td>Lith.</td></tr> <tr><td>Macedonia</td><td>Maced.</td></tr> <tr><td>Marshall Islands</td><td>Marsh. Is.</td></tr> <tr><td>Micronesia</td><td>Micr.</td></tr> <tr><td>Moldova</td><td>Mold.³⁴⁶</td></tr> <tr><td>Myanmar</td><td>Myan.</td></tr> <tr><td>North Korea</td><td>N. Korea</td></tr> <tr><td>Russia</td><td>Russ.</td></tr> <tr><td>St. Kitts & Nevis</td><td>St. Kitts & Nevis</td></tr> <tr><td>St. Vincent & the Grenadines</td><td>St. Vincent</td></tr> <tr><td>Slovakia</td><td>Slovk.</td></tr> <tr><td>Slovenia</td><td>Slovn.</td></tr> <tr><td>South Korea</td><td>S. Korea</td></tr> <tr><td>Tajikistan</td><td>Taj.</td></tr> <tr><td>Turkmenistan</td><td>Turkmen.</td></tr> <tr><td>Ukraine</td><td>Ukr.</td></tr> <tr><td>Uzbekistan</td><td>Uzb.</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Country	Abbreviation	Angola	Angl.	Armenia	Arm.	Azerbaijan	Azer.	Belarus	Belr.	Bosnia & Herzegovina	Bosn. & Herz.	Croatia	Croat.	Czech Republic	Czech Rep.	Eritrea	Eri.	Estonia	Est.	Kazakhstan	Kaz.	Latvia	Lat.	Lithuania	Lith.	Macedonia	Maced.	Marshall Islands	Marsh. Is.	Micronesia	Micr.	Moldova	Mold. ³⁴⁶	Myanmar	Myan.	North Korea	N. Korea	Russia	Russ.	St. Kitts & Nevis	St. Kitts & Nevis	St. Vincent & the Grenadines	St. Vincent	Slovakia	Slovk.	Slovenia	Slovn.	South Korea	S. Korea	Tajikistan	Taj.	Turkmenistan	Turkmen.	Ukraine	Ukr.	Uzbekistan	Uzb.
Country	Abbreviation																																																											
Angola	Angl.																																																											
Armenia	Arm.																																																											
Azerbaijan	Azer.																																																											
Belarus	Belr.																																																											
Bosnia & Herzegovina	Bosn. & Herz.																																																											
Croatia	Croat.																																																											
Czech Republic	Czech Rep.																																																											
Eritrea	Eri.																																																											
Estonia	Est.																																																											
Kazakhstan	Kaz.																																																											
Latvia	Lat.																																																											
Lithuania	Lith.																																																											
Macedonia	Maced.																																																											
Marshall Islands	Marsh. Is.																																																											
Micronesia	Micr.																																																											
Moldova	Mold. ³⁴⁶																																																											
Myanmar	Myan.																																																											
North Korea	N. Korea																																																											
Russia	Russ.																																																											
St. Kitts & Nevis	St. Kitts & Nevis																																																											
St. Vincent & the Grenadines	St. Vincent																																																											
Slovakia	Slovk.																																																											
Slovenia	Slovn.																																																											
South Korea	S. Korea																																																											
Tajikistan	Taj.																																																											
Turkmenistan	Turkmen.																																																											
Ukraine	Ukr.																																																											
Uzbekistan	Uzb.																																																											

³⁴⁶Moldovians surely will be honored by this abbreviation.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Table 10 (cont'd)	Geographical Terms	<p>The following countries were given new abbreviations in the Sixteenth Edition:</p> <p>Cayman Is.³⁷ Falkland Is. Pitcairn Is.</p> <p>The following countries were removed from the Sixteenth Edition:</p> <p>Czechoslovakia Germany, Democratic Republic of St. Christopher (Kitts)-Nevis South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands USSR</p> <p>The term "State" was also removed from the Sixteenth Edition.</p>
Table 11	Judges and Officials	No changes.
Table 12	Months	No changes.

³⁷The word "island" was not abbreviated in the Fifteenth Edition.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION																																																				
Table 13	Periodicals	<p>In the introduction, the Sixteenth Edition now refers to rules 19.1.3 (instead of 19.2.3) and 19.6 (instead of 19.7). In addition, the reference to old Table 14 was removed.</p> <p>The following periodicals and their abbreviations were added in the Sixteenth Edition:²⁸²</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Periodical</th> <th>Abbreviation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>American Journal of Comparative Law</td> <td>AM. J. COMP. L.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>American Journal of International Law</td> <td>AM. J. INT'L L.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>American Journal of Legal History</td> <td>AM. J. LEGAL HIST.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>American University Journal of Gender and the Law</td> <td>AM. U. J. GENDER & L.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Behavioral Sciences and the Law</td> <td>BEHAV. SCI. & L.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law²⁸³</td> <td>BERKELEY J. EMP. & LAB. L.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cardozo Arts and Entertainment Law Journal</td> <td>CARDOZO ARTS & ENT. L.J.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cleveland-Marshall Law Review²⁸⁴</td> <td>CLEV.-MARSHALL L. REV.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy</td> <td>COLO. J. INT'L ENVTL. L. & POLY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Connecticut Probate Law Journal</td> <td>CONN. PROB. L.J.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy</td> <td>CORNELL J.L. & PUB. POLY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Criminal Law Review</td> <td>CRIM. L. REV.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>District of Columbia Law Review</td> <td>D.C. L. REV.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Family Law Quarterly</td> <td>FAM. L.Q.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Federal Probation</td> <td>FED. PROBATION</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fordham Environmental Law Journal</td> <td>FORDHAM ENVTL. L.J.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fordham Intellectual Property, Media & Entertainment Law Journal</td> <td>FORDHAM INTEL. PROP. MEDIA & ENT. L.J.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>George Mason University Civil Rights Law Review</td> <td>GEO. MASON U. CIV. RTS. L.J.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hamline Journal of Public Law and Policy</td> <td>HAMLIN J. PUB. L. & POLY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Harvard Journal of Law and Technology</td> <td>HARV. J.L. & TECH.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IDEA: The Journal of Law and Technology Independent</td> <td>IDEA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interdisciplinary</td> <td>INDEP.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>International Journal of Law and Psychiatry</td> <td>INT'L J.L. & PSYCHIATRY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Journal of International Law and Practice</td> <td>J. INT'L L. & PRAC.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Journal of Law and Economics</td> <td>J.L. & ECON.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Periodical	Abbreviation	American Journal of Comparative Law	AM. J. COMP. L.	American Journal of International Law	AM. J. INT'L L.	American Journal of Legal History	AM. J. LEGAL HIST.	American University Journal of Gender and the Law	AM. U. J. GENDER & L.	Behavioral Sciences and the Law	BEHAV. SCI. & L.	Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law ²⁸³	BERKELEY J. EMP. & LAB. L.	Cardozo Arts and Entertainment Law Journal	CARDOZO ARTS & ENT. L.J.	Cleveland-Marshall Law Review ²⁸⁴	CLEV.-MARSHALL L. REV.	Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy	COLO. J. INT'L ENVTL. L. & POLY	Connecticut Probate Law Journal	CONN. PROB. L.J.	Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy	CORNELL J.L. & PUB. POLY	Criminal Law Review	CRIM. L. REV.	District of Columbia Law Review	D.C. L. REV.	Family Law Quarterly	FAM. L.Q.	Federal Probation	FED. PROBATION	Fordham Environmental Law Journal	FORDHAM ENVTL. L.J.	Fordham Intellectual Property, Media & Entertainment Law Journal	FORDHAM INTEL. PROP. MEDIA & ENT. L.J.	George Mason University Civil Rights Law Review	GEO. MASON U. CIV. RTS. L.J.	Hamline Journal of Public Law and Policy	HAMLIN J. PUB. L. & POLY	Harvard Journal of Law and Technology	HARV. J.L. & TECH.	IDEA: The Journal of Law and Technology Independent	IDEA	Interdisciplinary	INDEP.	International Journal of Law and Psychiatry	INT'L J.L. & PSYCHIATRY	Journal of International Law and Practice	J. INT'L L. & PRAC.	Journal of Law and Economics	J.L. & ECON.
Periodical	Abbreviation																																																					
American Journal of Comparative Law	AM. J. COMP. L.																																																					
American Journal of International Law	AM. J. INT'L L.																																																					
American Journal of Legal History	AM. J. LEGAL HIST.																																																					
American University Journal of Gender and the Law	AM. U. J. GENDER & L.																																																					
Behavioral Sciences and the Law	BEHAV. SCI. & L.																																																					
Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law ²⁸³	BERKELEY J. EMP. & LAB. L.																																																					
Cardozo Arts and Entertainment Law Journal	CARDOZO ARTS & ENT. L.J.																																																					
Cleveland-Marshall Law Review ²⁸⁴	CLEV.-MARSHALL L. REV.																																																					
Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy	COLO. J. INT'L ENVTL. L. & POLY																																																					
Connecticut Probate Law Journal	CONN. PROB. L.J.																																																					
Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy	CORNELL J.L. & PUB. POLY																																																					
Criminal Law Review	CRIM. L. REV.																																																					
District of Columbia Law Review	D.C. L. REV.																																																					
Family Law Quarterly	FAM. L.Q.																																																					
Federal Probation	FED. PROBATION																																																					
Fordham Environmental Law Journal	FORDHAM ENVTL. L.J.																																																					
Fordham Intellectual Property, Media & Entertainment Law Journal	FORDHAM INTEL. PROP. MEDIA & ENT. L.J.																																																					
George Mason University Civil Rights Law Review	GEO. MASON U. CIV. RTS. L.J.																																																					
Hamline Journal of Public Law and Policy	HAMLIN J. PUB. L. & POLY																																																					
Harvard Journal of Law and Technology	HARV. J.L. & TECH.																																																					
IDEA: The Journal of Law and Technology Independent	IDEA																																																					
Interdisciplinary	INDEP.																																																					
International Journal of Law and Psychiatry	INT'L J.L. & PSYCHIATRY																																																					
Journal of International Law and Practice	J. INT'L L. & PRAC.																																																					
Journal of Law and Economics	J.L. & ECON.																																																					

²⁸²As with the Fifteenth Edition, the Sixteenth Edition includes many specialty journals. According to one former *Harvard Law Review* editor, "[a]ppearing in the *Bluebook* list 'legitimates' these specialty law reviews." Chen, *supra* note 14, at 1538.

²⁸³This review was formerly called the *Industrial Relations Law Journal*.

²⁸⁴This review was formerly the *Cleveland State Law Review*. Table 13 still lists *Cleveland State Law Review*. See SIXTEENTH EDITION T.13, at 302.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Table 13 (cont'd)	Periodicals	<p>Law and Social Inquiry Law and Society Review Law Library Journal Loyola of Los Angeles Entertainment Law Journal Maryland Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues Minnesota Journal of Global Trade North Carolina Journal of International Law and Commercial Regulation Ocean and Coastal Law Journal³⁴¹ Organization Pacific Rim Law & Policy Journal Preview of United States Supreme Court Cases Public Land and Resources Law Review Quinnipiac Law Review³⁴² Reform St. Thomas Law Review Santa Clara Computer and High Technology Law Journal Seattle University Law Review³⁴³ South Carolina Environmental Law Journal Temple International and Comparative Law Journal University of Baltimore Journal of Environmental Law Urban Lawyer Virginia Journal of Social Policy and the Law</p> <p>L. & SOC. INQUIRY L. & SOC'Y REV. L. LIBR. J. LOY. L.A. ENT. L.J. MD. J. CONTEMP. LEGAL ISSUES MINN. J. GLOBAL TRADE N.C. J. INT'L L. & COM. REG. OCEAN & COASTAL L.J.³⁴¹ ORG. PAC. RIM L. & POL'Y J. PREVIEW U.S. SUP. CT. CAS. PUB. LAND & RESOURCES L. REV. QUINNIPAC L. REV. REFORM³⁴² ST. THOMAS L. REV. SANTA CLARA COMPUTER & HIGH TECH. L.J. SEATTLE U. L. REV. S.C. ENVTL. L.J. TEMP. INT'L & COMP. L.J. U. BALT. J. ENVTL. L. URB. LAWYER VA. J. SOC. POLY & L.</p>

³⁴⁰This journal was formerly called *Territorial Sea Journal*. It is published by the Marine Law Institute, University of Maine School of Law.

³⁴¹One has to wonder whether this journal is "commonly cited or difficult to abbreviate." See SIXTEENTH EDITION T.13, at 299.

³⁴²In 1991, the University of Bridgeport School of Law seceded from the main college and affiliated with Quinnipiac, a liberal arts college in Hamden, Connecticut. See George Judson, *Bar Group Approves Transfer of U. of Bridgeport Law School*, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 13, 1992, at B7, col. 1.

³⁴³Again, why is a word included in the abbreviation table when it is not abbreviated?

³⁴⁴In August 1994, the ABA approved the sale of the University of Puget Sound Law School to Seattle University. See *The Area Briefly—Tacoma: Bar Association OKs Sale of UPS Law School*, NEWS TRIBUNE, Aug. 11, 1994, at B2.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION																														
Table 13 (cont'd)	Periodicals	<p>The following abbreviations were changed in the Sixteenth Edition:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Periodical</th> <th>New Abbreviation</th> <th>Former Abbreviation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Brigham Young University Law Review</td> <td>BYU L. REV.</td> <td>B.Y.U. L. REV.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>George Mason Law Review</td> <td>GEO. MASON L. REV.</td> <td>GEO. MASON U. L. REV.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South Texas Law Review⁵⁶</td> <td>S. TEX. L. REV.</td> <td>S. TEX. L.J.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Suffolk Transnational Law Review⁵⁷</td> <td>SUFFOLK TRANSNAT'L L. REV.</td> <td>SUFFOLK TRANSNAT'L L.J.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Thomas M. Cooley Law Review⁵⁸</td> <td>T.M. COOLEY L. REV.</td> <td>COOLEY L. REV.⁵⁹</td> </tr> <tr> <td>University of Kansas Law Review</td> <td>U. KAN. L. REV.</td> <td>KAN. L. REV.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>University of Detroit Mercy Law Review⁶⁰</td> <td>U. DET. MERCY L. REV.</td> <td>U. DET. L. REV.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>University of Memphis Law Review⁶¹</td> <td>U. MEM. L. REV.</td> <td>MEM. ST. U. L. REV.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform</td> <td>U. MICH. J.L. REFORM</td> <td>U. MICH. J.L. REF.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Periodical	New Abbreviation	Former Abbreviation	Brigham Young University Law Review	BYU L. REV.	B.Y.U. L. REV.	George Mason Law Review	GEO. MASON L. REV.	GEO. MASON U. L. REV.	South Texas Law Review ⁵⁶	S. TEX. L. REV.	S. TEX. L.J.	Suffolk Transnational Law Review ⁵⁷	SUFFOLK TRANSNAT'L L. REV.	SUFFOLK TRANSNAT'L L.J.	Thomas M. Cooley Law Review ⁵⁸	T.M. COOLEY L. REV.	COOLEY L. REV. ⁵⁹	University of Kansas Law Review	U. KAN. L. REV.	KAN. L. REV.	University of Detroit Mercy Law Review ⁶⁰	U. DET. MERCY L. REV.	U. DET. L. REV.	University of Memphis Law Review ⁶¹	U. MEM. L. REV.	MEM. ST. U. L. REV.	University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform	U. MICH. J.L. REFORM	U. MICH. J.L. REF.
Periodical	New Abbreviation	Former Abbreviation																														
Brigham Young University Law Review	BYU L. REV.	B.Y.U. L. REV.																														
George Mason Law Review	GEO. MASON L. REV.	GEO. MASON U. L. REV.																														
South Texas Law Review ⁵⁶	S. TEX. L. REV.	S. TEX. L.J.																														
Suffolk Transnational Law Review ⁵⁷	SUFFOLK TRANSNAT'L L. REV.	SUFFOLK TRANSNAT'L L.J.																														
Thomas M. Cooley Law Review ⁵⁸	T.M. COOLEY L. REV.	COOLEY L. REV. ⁵⁹																														
University of Kansas Law Review	U. KAN. L. REV.	KAN. L. REV.																														
University of Detroit Mercy Law Review ⁶⁰	U. DET. MERCY L. REV.	U. DET. L. REV.																														
University of Memphis Law Review ⁶¹	U. MEM. L. REV.	MEM. ST. U. L. REV.																														
University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform	U. MICH. J.L. REFORM	U. MICH. J.L. REF.																														

⁵⁶This review changed names with Volume 27 in 1985.

⁵⁷This review changed names with Volume 16 in 1992.

⁵⁸This review changed names with Volume 8 in 1991.

⁵⁹Table 13 still lists the abbreviation "COOLEY L. REV." See SIXTEENTH EDITION T.13, at 303.

⁶⁰In July 1990, the University of Detroit and Mercy College merged to become the University of Detroit Mercy. See *U-D and Mercy to Merge*, U.P.I., June 19, 1990 (LEXIS, NEWS Library).

⁶¹On July 1, 1994, Memphis State University changed its name to the University of Memphis. See John Beifuss, *The Last MSU Class*, COM. APPEAL, May 14, 1994, at 1B.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Table 13 (cont'd)	Periodicals	<p>The following periodicals were dropped from the Sixteenth Edition:³⁷²</p> <p>Industrial Relations Law Journal³⁷³ Journal of Law and Technology³⁷⁴ Stanford Journal of Law, Gender, & Sexual Orientation³⁷⁵ Temple Law Quarterly³⁷⁶ Territorial Sea Journal³⁷⁷ University of Bridgeport Law Review³⁷⁸ University of Puget Sound Law Review³⁷⁹</p>
Table 14	Publishing Terms	<p>In the Fifteenth Edition, this table was numbered Table 15. However, former Table 14, "Periodicals in Foreign Languages," was deleted and all remaining tables were renumbered. No publishing terms were added or changed.</p>

³⁷²Readers should note that Table 13 is not an exhaustive list of all legal periodicals. See SIXTEENTH EDITION T.13, at 299 (indicating that "[t]he following alphabetical list gives abbreviations for the names of English language periodicals that are commonly cited or difficult to abbreviate and for many words commonly found in periodical titles" and describing how to cite a periodical not found on the list). According to a former *Harvard Law Review* editor: "The sheer volume of letters that Harvard received from law reviews not listed in the fourteenth edition suggests that this table confers some sort of legitimacy. At least one law review insisted that its funding depended on being listed." Chen, *supra* note 14, at 1638.

³⁷³See *supra* note 359.

³⁷⁴This review was published by an organization at Georgetown University Law Center from 1986-90. OCLC Database (accessed Sept. 6, 1996).

³⁷⁵According to references librarians at Stanford Law School, this publication was never officially started. Telephone Interview by Michele Stephenson with Reference Librarian, Stanford Law School (Oct. 16, 1996). This leads one to wonder why the entry was included in the Fifteenth Edition - especially when many established reviews and journals were omitted.

³⁷⁶*Temple Law Quarterly* changed its name to *Temple Law Review* in 1988, with volume 61. The editors did not explain why this publication was omitted.

³⁷⁷See *supra* note 361.

³⁷⁸See *supra* note 363 (concerning University of Bridgeport School of Law's transfer).

³⁷⁹See *supra* note 365 (concerning the law school's sale to Seattle University).

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION																
Table 16	Services	<p>Services and their abbreviations are now in Table 15 (as opposed to Table 16). Table 16 is replete with changes. First, the initial list of publishers has been amended to replace Callaghan & Co. with Clark Boardman Callaghan (CBC). Also, Prentice-Hall (P-H) has been dropped and Research Institute of America (RIA) has been added.</p> <p>Second, the table now omits "the subdivision(s) by which the service is cited."³²</p> <p>Third, the abbreviations for many services have been altered to reflect a new series,³³ a new publisher,³⁴ or a change in the service's name.³⁵</p> <p>Next, the abbreviation for at least one publisher has changed. Research Institute of American is now abbreviated RIA; the prior abbreviations were Research Inst. Am. and Res. Inst. Am.³⁶</p> <p>In addition, several new services were added to the table:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Service</th> <th>Abbreviation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Banking Reporter</td> <td>Banking Rep. (BNA)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BioLaw</td> <td>BioLaw (Univ. Pub. Am.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Communications Regulations</td> <td>Communications Reg. (P&F)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Daily Labor Report</td> <td>Daily Lab. Rep. (BNA)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Employment Testing: Law & Policy Reporter</td> <td>Empl. Testing (Univ. Pub. Am.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Human Resources Management OSHA Compliance Guide</td> <td>OSHA Comp. Guide (CCH)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>U.S. Tax Reporter</td> <td>U.S. Tax Rep. (RIA)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Service	Abbreviation	Banking Reporter	Banking Rep. (BNA)	BioLaw	BioLaw (Univ. Pub. Am.)	Communications Regulations	Communications Reg. (P&F)	Daily Labor Report	Daily Lab. Rep. (BNA)	Employment Testing: Law & Policy Reporter	Empl. Testing (Univ. Pub. Am.)	Human Resources Management OSHA Compliance Guide	OSHA Comp. Guide (CCH)	U.S. Tax Reporter	U.S. Tax Rep. (RIA)
Service	Abbreviation																	
Banking Reporter	Banking Rep. (BNA)																	
BioLaw	BioLaw (Univ. Pub. Am.)																	
Communications Regulations	Communications Reg. (P&F)																	
Daily Labor Report	Daily Lab. Rep. (BNA)																	
Employment Testing: Law & Policy Reporter	Empl. Testing (Univ. Pub. Am.)																	
Human Resources Management OSHA Compliance Guide	OSHA Comp. Guide (CCH)																	
U.S. Tax Reporter	U.S. Tax Rep. (RIA)																	

³²Rule 18, however, still requires services to be cited "by paragraph or section number if possible, otherwise by page number." SIXTEENTH EDITION rule 18.1(c).

³³For example, *Administrative Law* is now in the third series and *Radio Regulation* is in the second series. SIXTEENTH EDITION T.16, at 319, 323.

³⁴For example, Aspen Law & Business now publishes *Corporation Guide*, which was formerly published by Prentice-Hall. *Id.* at 320.

³⁵For example, the title of *Employee Coordinator* is now *Employee Benefits Compliance Coordinator* and the name of *Energy Management* is now *Energy Management & Federal Energy Guidelines*. *See id.* at 320, 321.

³⁶Compare SIXTEENTH EDITION T.15, at 320 with FIFTEENTH EDITION T.16, at 299, 299.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Table 15 (cont'd)	Services	<p>The following services were dropped from the Sixteenth Edition:³⁵</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Automobile Law Reports³⁶ British Columbia Tax Reporter Canadian Sales Tax Reports³⁷ Corporation Law Guide³⁸ Education Law Reporter Energy Users Report³⁹ Environment Regulation Handbook⁴⁰ Executive Disclosure Guide Federal Power Service Federal Regulation of Employment Service⁴¹ Federal Taxes⁴² Indian Law Reporter Industrial Relations Guide Internal Memoranda of the IRS⁴³ Manitoba & Saskatchewan Tax Reporter

³⁵Several of these services are CCH publications, which might now be published under different names.

³⁶This publication ceased in 1993.

³⁷This publication ceased in 1993.

³⁸This service is no longer printed.

³⁹This service is now entitled *Energy Report*.

⁴⁰This service has been discontinued.

⁴¹This service is now called *Employment Coordinator*.

⁴²This service is now *Federal Taxes 2d*.

⁴³This service reporter is now called *I.R.S. Memorandum*.

RULE	TOPIC	CHANGES FROM THE FIFTEENTH EDITION TO THE SIXTEENTH EDITION
Table 16 (cont'd)	Services	Maritime Law Reporter Military Law Reporter Mine Safety and Health Reporter Ontario Tax Reporter OSHA Compliance Guide Pollution Control Guide** Quebec Tax Reporter Securities Regulation Guide State Motor Carrier Guide** State Tax Cases Reports Stock Transfer Guide** Washington Financial Reports** Wills, Estates and Trust Service
Table 16	Subdivisions	No changes, except that the table is now numbered 16 (as opposed to 17).

**This service ceased publication in 1985.

**This service was discontinued in 1992.

**This service is now called *Corporate Secretary's Guide*.

**In 1987, this service was renamed *Banking Report*.

APPENDIX B-1

APPENDIX B-1

Compendium of State Court Rules Concerning Citation Format³⁹⁸

STATE	RULE(S)
Alabama	No separate rules.
Alaska	Appellate briefs must contain "citations to the official reports and editions where they may be found References to decisions of the United States Supreme Court shall be made by citations to both the U.S. Reports and the Lawyers' Edition of the United States Supreme Court Reports." ALASKA SUP. CT. R. 11(a)(1).
Arizona	"Citations of authorities shall be to the volume and page number of the official reports and also when possible to the unofficial reporters and selected cases." ARIZ. R. CIV. APP. P. 13(a)(6). ³⁹⁹
Arkansas	"Citations of decisions of the Court which are officially reported must be from the official reports. All citations of decisions of any court must state the style of the case and the book and page in which the case is found. If the case is also reported by one or more unofficial publishers, these should also be cited, if possible." ARR. SUP. CT. R. 4-2(a)(7).

³⁹⁸Although this compendium lists court rules and state statutes concerning citation rules, to be safe when submitting documents in a foreign jurisdiction, consult with the court clerk or local practitioners. Some jurisdictions have not reduced local traditions to writing. In other jurisdictions, judges have developed style sheets or style manuals, which although not mandatory for practitioners, reflect the style the judges prefer. In addition, many statutes contain provisions indicating how authorities should be cited.

³⁹⁹On other matters, Arizona appears to follow the *Bluebook*. See ARIZONA LEGAL RESEARCH GUIDE 42-43, 138, 203 (Kathy Shimpoek-Vieweg & Marianne Sidorski Alcorn eds. 1992) (referring to the *Bluebook* when showing examples of proper citation format).

STATE	RULE(S)
California	<p>"A case citation shall include the official report volume and page number and year of decision. No other citations shall be required."</p> <p>"The style used in a memorandum of points and authorities shall be that set forth in the California Style Manual, or that set forth in the most recent edition of the Uniform System of Citation, at the option of the party filing the document. The same style shall be used consistently throughout the memorandum."</p> <p>CAL. R. CT. 313(c) & (e).⁴⁰</p>

⁴⁰See CALIFORNIA STYLE MANUAL (Robert E. Formichi 3d ed. 1986) (containing 232 pages of information about California style and citations). This publication is distributed by the Department of General Services, Publications Section, P.O. Box 1015, North Highlands, CA 95660. Some California law reviews also have their own citation and style manuals or supplements. In addition, many California state courts have their own citation form. See Appendix B-2 for several examples. Finally, California is considering a vendor-neutral citation format. Practitioners should check regularly to determine whether a vendor-neutral format has been adopted. See *supra* note 108 and accompanying text.

STATE	RULE(S)								
Colorado	<p>Although a separate style is not mandated by statute or court rule, the following information from a 1994 <i>Colorado Lawyer</i> article⁴⁰³ is instructive:</p> <p>"As a general rule, <i>Bluebook</i> form is appropriate for documents submitted to the Colorado Supreme Court. According to Mac V. Danford, Clerk of the Colorado Supreme Court, the supreme court advises attorneys to submit documents in <i>Bluebook</i> form because that form can be easily found and is easily recognizable. However, Danford admitted that the court, in writing its own decisions, uses citation form for many Colorado legal sources that differs from standard <i>Bluebook</i> form. Former Justice Quinn provided me with a two-page sheet, titled, 'Uniform Citation Forms' and dated May 1984, which has been incorporated into the supreme court's manual for its law clerks and is still used to conform citation form in Colorado Supreme Court decisions. This sheet is the basis for most of the Colorado Supreme Court discrepancies from <i>Bluebook</i> form listed below.</p> <p>Leo Smith, Reporter of Decisions to the Colorado Court of Appeals, provided me with the citation form used by that court. Aside from the variations listed below, and a few others, Smith advised me that the Court of Appeals generally follows the citation form in the fourteenth edition of <i>The Bluebook</i></p> <p>***</p> <p>Colorado Statutes</p> <p><i>Bluebook</i>: Colo. Rev. Stat. § 16-11-301 (1986 & Supp. 1993). <i>Supreme Court</i>: § 16-11-301, 8A C.R.S. (1986 & 1993 Supp.). <i>Court of Appeals</i>: §16-11-301, C.R.S. (1986 Repl. Vol. 8A) or §16-11-301(3) (1993 Cum. Supp.). . . .</p> <p>***</p> <p>Rules of Procedure</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><i>Bluebook</i></td> <td><i>Colorado Courts</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Colo. Ct. C.P.R. 52(a)</td> <td>C.R.C.P. 52(a)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Colo. R. Crim. P. 60</td> <td>Crim. P. 60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Colo. R. App. P. 58</td> <td>C.A.R. 58</td> </tr> </table> <p>***</p>	<i>Bluebook</i>	<i>Colorado Courts</i>	Colo. Ct. C.P.R. 52(a)	C.R.C.P. 52(a)	Colo. R. Crim. P. 60	Crim. P. 60	Colo. R. App. P. 58	C.A.R. 58
<i>Bluebook</i>	<i>Colorado Courts</i>								
Colo. Ct. C.P.R. 52(a)	C.R.C.P. 52(a)								
Colo. R. Crim. P. 60	Crim. P. 60								
Colo. R. App. P. 58	C.A.R. 58								

⁴⁰³K.K. DuVivier, *Are You Practicing an Uninformed System of Citation?*, 23 COLO. LAW. 27 (1994).

STATE	RULE(S)
Colorado (cont'd)	<p>Colorado Cases Reported Only in The Pacific Reporter</p> <p><i>Bluebook: State Dept of Highways v. Denver & R. G. W. R.R., 757 P.2d 181 (Colo. Ct. App. 1988).</i> <i>Supreme Court:</i> Case citations were not included in the citation form sheet from Justice Quinn. Although the Colorado Supreme Court seems to follow <i>Bluebook</i> form generally, the most common court designation used is 'Colo. App.' instead of 'Colo. Ct. App.' <i>Court of Appeals:</i> State Department of Highways v. Denver & Rio Grande Western R.R., 623 P.2d 418 (Colo. App. 1980).⁴⁰²</p> <p>In addition, in May 1994, the Colorado Supreme Court ordered that its decisions be numbered by paragraph, stating that the paragraph numbers would constitute acceptable pinpoint citations to West's Pacific Reporter page numbers. See <i>supra</i> note 105.</p>
Connecticut	<p>No separate rules. However, a table of Connecticut abbreviations can be found in: LAWRENCE G. CHEESEMAN & ARLENE C. BIELEFIELD, <i>THE CONNECTICUT LEGAL RESEARCH HANDBOOK</i> 175 (1992).</p>

⁴⁰²DuVivier, *supra* note 401, at 27-28 (footnotes omitted). In her footnotes, Prof. DuVivier explains that:

- "Both Danford and Smith advised me that the courts are not eager to adopt some of the changes in the fifteenth edition, such as the elimination of citations to official reporters when available." *Id.* at 28 n.6.
- "The 'Colo. Ct. App.' designation was first introduced in the thirteenth edition of *The Bluebook*, which was published in 1981. . . . Because the designation first appeared in a 1984 Colorado Supreme Court opinion, one can only speculate that some clerks, schooled as first-year law students with the changes in the 1981 *Bluebook*, introduced the new form to those court opinions immediately after graduation." *Id.* n.8.
- "The Colorado Court of Appeals has never used the 'Colo. Ct. App.' form designated by *The Bluebook* for that court. The clerks in the federal courts in Colorado ordinarily use '(Colo. App.)' as recognition of the standard practice in Colorado courts. However, this is not a universal rule because different judges place differing emphasis on *Bluebook* form." *Id.* n.10.

STATE	RULE(S)
Delaware	<p>"Except as provided below, citations will be deemed to be in acceptable form if made in accordance with the 'Uniform System of Citation' published and distributed from time to time by the Harvard Law Review Association. The style of citation of all Delaware opinions which are reported in any series of the Atlantic Reporter shall be as set forth in the following examples:</p> <p>Melson v. Allman, Del. Supr., 244 A.2d 85 (1968)</p> <p>Prince v. Bensinger, Del. Ch., 244 A.2d 89 (1968)</p> <p>State v. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Del. Super., 244 A.2d 80 (1968) .</p> <p>All further references to the previous State Reporter System shall be omitted. The citation of reported opinions of other jurisdictions shall similarly designate the court, the National Reporter System citation and the date, omitting reference to any state reporter system."</p> <p>DEL. SUP. CT. R. 14(g). DEL. SUPER. CT. CIV. R. 107(c)(4). DEL. CH. CT. R. 171(g). Del. Ct. C. P. Civ. R. 107(c)(4).</p> <p>"Citations will be deemed to be in acceptable form if made in accordance with 'A Uniform System of Citation' published and distributed from time to time by the Harvard Law Review Association. State reporter citations may be omitted but citations to the National Reporter System must be included except as to U.S. Supreme Court decisions where the official citation shall be used."</p> <p>DEL. CIV. PRAC. L.R. 7.1.3(a)(5).</p>

STATE	RULE(S)
Delaware (family court)	<p>“Except as provided below, citations will be deemed to be in acceptable form if made in accordance with the Uniform System of Citation’ published and distributed from time to time by the Harvard Law Review Association. The style of citation of all Delaware opinions which are reported in any series of the Atlantic Reporter shall be as set forth in the following examples:</p> <p>Melson v. Allman, Del.Supr., 244 A.2d 85 (1968)</p> <p>Prince v. Binsinger, Del.Ch., 244 A.2d 89 (1968)</p> <p>State v. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Del.Super., 244 A.2d 80 (1968)</p> <p>Jones v. Jones, Del.Fam., 244 A.2d 78 (1968)</p> <p>The style of citation of all Delaware opinions and orders which are unreported shall be as set forth in the following examples:</p> <p>Gregory J. M. v. Carolyn A. M., Del.Supr., No. 77, 1981, Herrmann, C.J. (Mar. 12, 1982)</p> <p>Iona H. B. v. Edmund O. B., Del.Supr., No. 22, 1981, Herrmann, C.J. (Nov. 12, 1981)</p> <p>(ORDER)</p> <p>Schreiber v. Carney, Del.Ch., C.A. No. 6202, Hartnett, V.A. (Dec. 8, 1982)</p> <p>Hashorva Twer v. Hashorva, Del.Super., C.A. No. 78A-OC-6, Bifferato, J. (Oct. 21, 1980)</p> <p>G. v. G., Del.Fam., File No. C-589, Poppiti, J. (May 27, 1980)</p> <p>All further references to the previous State Reporter System shall be omitted. The citation of reported opinions of other jurisdictions shall similarly designate the court, the National Reporter System citation and the date, omitting references to any State Reporter System.”</p> <p>DEL. FAM. CT. CIV. R. 107(c) (5).</p>

STATE	RULE(S)
District of Columbia	<p>"All citations to cases decided by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall include the volume number and page of both U.S. App. D.C. and the Federal Reporter."</p> <p>D.C. SUPER. CT. CIV. P.R. 12-1(e). D.C. SUPER. CT. SMALL CLAIMS R. 13(a). D.C. SUPER. CT. LAND. & TEN. R. 13(a). D.C. SUPER. CT. CRIM. P.R. 47-1(b). D.C. SUPER. CT. DOM. REL. P.R. 7(V). D.C. SUPER. CT. JUV. P.R. 47. D.C. SUPER. CT. NEG. P.R. 28. D.C. SUPER. CT. TAX P.R. 9(b).</p>

STATE	RULE(S)
Florida	<p>"This rule applies to all legal documents, including court opinions. Except for citations to case reporters, all citation forms should be spelled out in full if used as an integral part of a sentence either in the text or in footnotes. Abbreviated forms as shown in this rule should be used if the citation is intended to stand alone either in the text or in footnotes.</p> <p>(a) Florida Supreme Court.</p> <p>(1) 1846-1886: <i>Livingston v. L'Engle</i>, 22 Fla. 427 (1886).</p> <p>(2) 1887-1948: <i>Hanna v. Martin</i>, 160 Fla. 967, 37 So. 2d 579 (1948). (This is the last case for parallel citation.)</p> <p>(3) 1948-date: <i>Fenelon v. State</i>, 594 So. 2d 292 (Fla. 1992).</p> <p>(4) For recent opinions not yet published in <i>Southern Reporter</i>, cite to <i>Florida Law Weekly</i>: <i>Traylor v. State</i>, 17 Fla. L. Weekly S42 (Fla. Jan. 16, 1992). If not therein, cite to the slip opinion: <i>Traylor v. State</i>, No. 70,051 (Fla. Jan. 16, 1992).</p> <p>(b) Florida District Courts of Appeal.</p> <p>(1) <i>Sotolongo v. State</i>, 530 So. 2d 514 (Fla. 2d DCA 1988); <i>Buncayo v. Dribin</i>, 533 So. 2d 935 (Fla. 3d DCA 1988).</p> <p>(2) For recent opinions not yet published in <i>Southern Reporter</i>, cite to <i>Florida Law Weekly</i>: <i>Myers v. State</i>, 16 Fla. L. Weekly D1507 (Fla. 4th DCA June 5, 1991). If not therein, cite to the slip opinion: <i>Myers v. State</i>, No. 90-1092 (Fla. 4th DCA June 5, 1991).</p> <p>(c) Florida Circuit Courts and County Courts.</p> <p>(1) <i>Whidden v. Francis</i>, 27 Fla. Supp. 80 (Fla. 11th Cir. Ct. 1966).</p> <p>(2) <i>State v. Alvarez</i>, 42 Fla. Supp. 83 (Fla. Dade Cty. Ct. 1975).</p> <p>(3) For opinions not published in <i>Florida Supplement</i>, cite to <i>Florida Law Weekly</i>: <i>State v. Campeau</i>, 16 Fla. L. Weekly C65 (Fla. 9th Cir. Ct. Nov. 7, 1990). If not therein, cite to the slip opinion: <i>State v. Campeau</i>, No. 90-4363 (Fla. 9th Cir. Ct. Nov. 7, 1990).</p> <p>(d) Florida Administrative Agencies. (Cite if not in <i>Southern Reporter</i>.)</p> <p>(1) For decisions of the <i>Public Employees Relations Commission</i>: <i>Indian River Educ. Ass'n v. School Bd.</i>, 4 F.P.E.R. ¶ 4262 (1978).</p> <p>(2) For decisions of the <i>Florida Public Service Commission</i>: <i>In re Application of Tampa Elec. Co.</i>, 81 F.P.S.C. 2:120 (1981).</p>

STATE	RULE(S)
Florida (cont'd)	<p>(e) Florida Constitution. (Year of adoption should be given if necessary to avoid confusion.) Art. V, § 3(b)(3), Fla. Const.</p> <p>(f) Florida Statutes (Official). § 350.34, Fla. Stat. (1973). § 120.53, Fla. Stat. (Supp. 1974).</p> <p>(g) Florida Statutes Annotated. (To be used only for court-adopted rules, or references to other nonstatutory materials that do not appear in an official publication.) 32 Fla. Stat. Ann. 116 (Supp. 1975).</p> <p>(h) Florida Laws. (Cite if not in Fla. Stat. or if desired for clarity or adoption reference.)</p> <p>(1) After 1956: Ch. 74-177, § 5, at 473, Laws of Fla.</p> <p>(2) Before 1957: Ch. 22000, Laws of Fla. (1943).</p> <p>(i) Florida Rules.</p> <p>Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.180.</p> <p>Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.035.</p> <p>Fla. R. Crim. P. 3.850.</p> <p>Fla. R. Work. Comp. P. 4.113.</p> <p>Fla. Prob. R. 5.120.</p> <p>Fla. R. Traf. Ct. 6.165.</p> <p>Fla. Sm. Cl. R. 7.070.</p> <p>Fla. R. Juv. P. 8.070.</p> <p>Fla. R. App. P. 9.100.</p> <p>Fla. Admin. Code R. 8HF-3.02.</p> <p>Fla. Code Jud. Conduct, Canon 5B.</p> <p>Fla. Bar Code Prof. Resp., D.R. 1-101(A).</p> <p>R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4-1.10.</p>

STATE	RULE(S)
Florida (cont'd)	<p>Fla. Bar Code Prof. Resp. D.R. 1-101(A).</p> <p>R. Regulating Fla. Bar 4-1.10.</p> <p>Fla. Bar Found. By-Laws, art. 2-18(b).</p> <p>Fla. Bar Found, Charter, art. 3.4.</p> <p>Fla. Bar Integr. R., art XI, rule 11.09.</p> <p>Fla. Bd. Bar Exam. R. III.</p> <p>Fla. Jud. Qual. Comm'n R. 9.</p> <p>Fla. Std. Jury Instr. (Civ.) 6.4(c).</p> <p>Fla. Std. Jury Instr. (Crim) [page number].</p> <p>Fla. Stds. Imposing Law. Sancs. 9.3.</p> <p>Fla. Stds. Imposing Law. Sancs. (Drug Cases) 3.</p> <p>Fla. Bar Admiss. R., art. III.</p>

STATE	RULE(S)
<p>Florida (cont'd)</p>	<p>(j) Florida Attorney General Opinions. Op. Atty Gen. Fla. 73-178 (1973).</p> <p>(k) United States Supreme Court. <i>Sansone v. United States</i>, 380 U.S. 343, 85 S. Ct. 1004, 13 L. Ed. 2d 882 (1965). (The first time a case is mentioned, cite to <i>United States Reports</i>, <i>Supreme Court Reporter</i>, and <i>Lawyer's Edition</i>. All subsequent citations to the same case, as well as pinpoint citations, shall be to the <i>United States Reports</i> only. For opinions not published in these reporters or in <i>United States Law Week</i>, cite to <i>Florida Law Weekly Federal: California v. Hodart D.</i>, 13 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S249 (U.S. Apr. 23, 1991).</p> <p>(l) Federal Courts of Appeals. <i>Gulf Oil Corp. v. Bivins</i>, 276 F. 2d 763 (5th Cir. 1960). For opinions not published in the <i>Federal Reporter</i>, cite to <i>Florida Law Weekly Federal: Cunningham v. Zant</i>, 13 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. C591 (11th Cir. March 27, 1991).</p> <p>(m) Federal District Courts. <i>Pugh v. Rainwater</i>, 332 F. Supp. 1107 (S.D. Fla. 1971). For opinions not published in the <i>Federal Supplement</i>, cite to <i>Florida Law Weekly Federal: Wasco v. Dugger</i>, 13 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. D183 (S.D. Fla. Apr. 2, 1991).</p> <p>(n) Other Citations. . . . All other citations shall be in the form prescribed by the latest edition of <i>The Bluebook: A Uniform System of Citation</i>, The Harvard Law Review Association, Gannett House, Cambridge, Mass. 02138. Citations not covered in this rule or in <i>The Bluebook</i> shall be in the form prescribed by the <i>Florida Style Manual</i> published by the Florida State University Law Review, Tallahassee, Fla. 32306.⁴⁰³</p> <p>(o) Case Names. Case names shall be underscored (or italicized) in text and in footnotes.⁴⁰⁴</p> <p>FLA. R. APP. P. 9-800.</p>

⁴⁰³See also *Florida State University Law Review, Florida Style Manual*, 19 FLA. ST. U. L. REV. 525 (1991) (indicating that "[t]he Florida Style Manual supplements the standard citation authority for American legal journals, *The Bluebook: A Uniform System of Citation* . . . [T]he editors realized that citations to many Florida-specific sources . . . would be rendered almost meaningless if conventional *Bluebook* citation forms were followed. Other Florida sources were not addressed at all by the *Bluebook*.").

STATE	RULE(S)
Georgia	<p>"All citations of authority must be full and complete. Georgia citations must include the volume and page number of the official Georgia reporters (Harrison or Darby). The enumeration of errors shall be deemed to include and present for review all judgments necessary for a determination of the errors specified."</p> <p>GA. SUP. CT. R. 22.</p> <p>"All citations of cases shall be by name of the case as well as by volume and page of the Official Report (Harrison or Darby)."</p> <p>GA. CT. APP. R. 23(c).</p>
Hawaii	<p>"Hawaii cases since statehood shall be cited to both the state and national reporters. Foreign cases may be cited to only the national reporters."</p> <p>HAW. R. ANN. 28.</p> <p>"A subject index of the matter in the brief with page references, and a table of authorities listing the cases, alphabetically arranged, text books, articles, statutes, regulations and rules cited, with reference to the pages in the brief where they are cited. Hawaii cases since statehood shall be cited to both the state and national reporters. Foreign cases may be cited to only the national reporters."</p> <p>HAW. R. APP. P. 28(b)(1).</p>
Idaho	No separate rules.
Illinois	<p>"Citations to cases must be by title, to the pages of the volume where the case begins, and to the pages upon which the pertinent matter appears in at least one of the reporters cited. It is not sufficient to use only supra or infra. Citation of Illinois cases shall be to the official reports, but the citation to the North Eastern Reporter and/or the Illinois Decisions may be added. Quotations may be cited from either the official reports or the North Eastern Reporter or the Illinois Decisions. Citation of cases from other jurisdictions shall include the date and may be to either the official State reports or the National Reporter System, or both. If only the National Reporter System citation is used, the court rendering the decision shall also be identified. Textbook citations shall include the date of publication and the edition. Illinois statutes shall generally be cited to the Illinois Compiled Statutes (ILCS) but citations to the session laws of Illinois shall be made when appropriate. Prior to January 1, 1997, statutory citations may be made to the Illinois Revised Statutes instead of or in addition to the Illinois Compiled Statutes."</p> <p>ILL. SUP. CT. R. 6.</p>

STATE	RULE(S)		
Indiana	<p>"(B) Proper Form and Citation. In order to ensure uniformity and consistency, the following rules of form and citation shall be followed by counsel in the preparation of the briefs:</p> <p>(1) <i>Citation to Cases.</i> Citations to cases should follow the format put forth in the current edition of a Uniform System of Citation (Bluebook). Thus, cases decided prior to May 5, 1981, in the Indiana Supreme Court and November 7, 1979, in the Indiana Court of Appeals shall be cited by giving the title of the case followed by the volume and page of the state report, the volume and page of the regional reporter, and the year of final disposition. [E.g., <i>Warren v. Indiana Tel. Co.</i>, 217 Ind. 93, 26 N.E.2d 399 (1940).] Cases decided after the above noted dates shall be cited by giving the title of the case, followed by the volume and page of the regional reporter, the Court of disposition, and the year of final disposition. [E.g., <i>Condon v. Patel</i>, 459 N.E.2d 1205 (Ind. Ct.App.1984).]</p> <p>(2) <i>Citations to Authorities Other Than Cases.</i> It is recommended that when briefs contain references to authoritative sources such as scholarly treatises, law journals, statutes, etc., citations should follow the form prescribed by the current edition of a Uniform System of Citation (Bluebook). Citation to Indiana court rules should be in accordance with the following citation format for initial mention of each rule and for subsequent references thereto:</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>(Initial)</p> <p>Ind.Trial Rule 56 Ind.Crim.Rule 4(B)(1) Ind.Post-Conviction Rule 2(2)(b) Ind.Appellate Rule 8.2(B)(1) Ind.Original Action Rule 3(A) Ind.Child Support Rule 2 Ind.Child Support Guideline 3(D) Ind.Small Claims Rule 8(A) Ind.Tax Court Rule 9 Ind.Administrative Rule 7(A) Ind.Judicial Conduct Canon 2(A) Ind.Professional Conduct Rule 6.1 Ind.Alternative Dispute Resolution Rule 2 Ind.Admission and Discipline Rule 23(2)(a) Ind.Evidence Rule 301</p> </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>(Subsequent)</p> <p>T.R. 56 Crim.R. 4(B)(1) P-C.R. 2(2)(b) App.R. 8.2(B)(1) Orig.Act.R. 3(A) Child Supp.R. 2 Child Supp.G. 3(D) S.C.F. 8(A) Tax Ct.R. 9 Admin.R. 7(A) Jud.Canon 2(A) Prof.Cond.R. 6.1 A.D.R. 2 Admis.Disc.R. 23(2)(a) Evid.R. 301^r</p> </td> </tr> </table> <p style="text-align: right;">IND. R. APP. P. 8.2(B).</p>	<p>(Initial)</p> <p>Ind.Trial Rule 56 Ind.Crim.Rule 4(B)(1) Ind.Post-Conviction Rule 2(2)(b) Ind.Appellate Rule 8.2(B)(1) Ind.Original Action Rule 3(A) Ind.Child Support Rule 2 Ind.Child Support Guideline 3(D) Ind.Small Claims Rule 8(A) Ind.Tax Court Rule 9 Ind.Administrative Rule 7(A) Ind.Judicial Conduct Canon 2(A) Ind.Professional Conduct Rule 6.1 Ind.Alternative Dispute Resolution Rule 2 Ind.Admission and Discipline Rule 23(2)(a) Ind.Evidence Rule 301</p>	<p>(Subsequent)</p> <p>T.R. 56 Crim.R. 4(B)(1) P-C.R. 2(2)(b) App.R. 8.2(B)(1) Orig.Act.R. 3(A) Child Supp.R. 2 Child Supp.G. 3(D) S.C.F. 8(A) Tax Ct.R. 9 Admin.R. 7(A) Jud.Canon 2(A) Prof.Cond.R. 6.1 A.D.R. 2 Admis.Disc.R. 23(2)(a) Evid.R. 301^r</p>
<p>(Initial)</p> <p>Ind.Trial Rule 56 Ind.Crim.Rule 4(B)(1) Ind.Post-Conviction Rule 2(2)(b) Ind.Appellate Rule 8.2(B)(1) Ind.Original Action Rule 3(A) Ind.Child Support Rule 2 Ind.Child Support Guideline 3(D) Ind.Small Claims Rule 8(A) Ind.Tax Court Rule 9 Ind.Administrative Rule 7(A) Ind.Judicial Conduct Canon 2(A) Ind.Professional Conduct Rule 6.1 Ind.Alternative Dispute Resolution Rule 2 Ind.Admission and Discipline Rule 23(2)(a) Ind.Evidence Rule 301</p>	<p>(Subsequent)</p> <p>T.R. 56 Crim.R. 4(B)(1) P-C.R. 2(2)(b) App.R. 8.2(B)(1) Orig.Act.R. 3(A) Child Supp.R. 2 Child Supp.G. 3(D) S.C.F. 8(A) Tax Ct.R. 9 Admin.R. 7(A) Jud.Canon 2(A) Prof.Cond.R. 6.1 A.D.R. 2 Admis.Disc.R. 23(2)(a) Evid.R. 301^r</p>		

STATE	RULE(S)
Iowa	<p>"In citing cases the names of parties must be given. In citing Iowa cases, reference must be made to the volume and page where the case may be found in the Iowa Reports, if reported therein, and in the North Western Reporter, if reported therein. In citing cases reference must be made to the court that rendered the opinion and the volume and page where the same may be found in the National Reporter System, if reported therein. E.g., ___ Iowa ___, ___ N.W. ___ (19___); ___ N.W.2d ___ (Iowa 19___); ___ F.2d ___ (___ Cir. 19___); ___ F.Supp. ___ (S.D. Cal. 19___). When quoting from authorities or referring to a specific point within an authority, the specific page or pages quoted or relied upon shall be given in addition to the required page references. Unpublished opinions of the Iowa appellate courts or of any other court may not be cited as authority. When treatises or textbooks are cited, the edition must be designated. In citing authorities other than cases, references shall be made as follows: Codes, to section number; treatises, textbooks and encyclopedias, to section and page; all others, to page or pages. Use of the 'supra' and 'infra' forms of citation is discouraged."</p> <p>IOWA R. APP. P. 14(e).</p>
Kansas	<p>"References to court cases shall be by the official citations followed by any generally recognized reporter system citations."</p> <p>KAN. SUP. CT. R. 6.08.</p>
Kentucky	<p>"All citations of Kentucky Statutes shall be made from the official edition of the Kentucky Revised Statutes and may be abbreviated 'KRS.' The citation of Kentucky cases reported after January 1, 1951, shall be in the following form for decisions of the Supreme Court and its predecessor court: Doe v. Roe, Ky., ___ S.W.2d ___ (date), or for reported decisions of the present Court of Appeals, Doe v. Roe, Ky. App., ___ S.W.2d ___ (date). For cases reported prior thereto both Kentucky Reports and Southwestern citations shall be given."</p> <p>KY. R. CIV. P. 76.12(g).</p>

STATE	RULE(S)
Louisiana	<p>"A. The following rules of citation of Louisiana appellate court decisions shall apply:</p> <p>(1) Opinions and actions issued by the Supreme Court of Louisiana and the Louisiana Courts of Appeal following December 31, 1993 shall be cited according to a uniform public domain citation form with a parallel citation to West's Southern Reporter:</p> <p>(a) The uniform public domain citation form shall consist of the case name, docket number excluding letters, court abbreviation, and month, day and year of issue, and be followed by a parallel citation to West's Southern Reporter, e.g.: <i>Smith v. Jones</i>, 93-2345 (La. 7/15/94); 650 So.2d 500, or <i>Smith v. Jones</i>, 93-2345 (La.App. 1 Cir. 7/15/94), 660 So.2d 400</p> <p>(b) If a pinpoint public domain citation is needed, the page number designated by the court shall follow the docket number and be set off with a comma and the abbreviation 'p.', and may be followed by a parallel pinpoint citation to West's Southern Reporter, e.g.: <i>Smith v. Jones</i>, 94-2345, p. 7 (La. 7/15/94); 650 S.2d 500, 504</p> <p>(2) Opinions issued by the Supreme Court of Louisiana for the period between December 31, 1972 and January 1, 1994, and all opinions issued by the Courts of Appeal from the beginning of their inclusion in West's Southern Reporter in 1928 until January 1, 1994, shall be cited according to the form in West's Southern Reporter:</p> <p>(a) The citation will consist of the case name, Southern Reporter volume number, title abbreviation, page number, court designation, and year, e.g.: <i>Smith v. Jones</i>, 645 So.2d 321 (La. 990)</p> <p>(b) A parallel public domain citation following the same format as that for post-January 1, 1994 opinions may be added after the Southern Reporter citation, but is not required.</p> <p>(3) Opinions issued by the Supreme Court of Louisiana prior to the discontinuation of the official Louisiana Reports in 1972 and opinions issued by the Courts of Appeal prior to their inclusion in the Southern Reporter in 1928 shall be cited in accordance with pre-1994 practice, as follows:</p> <p>(a) Cite to Louisiana Reports, Louisiana Annual Reports, Robinson, Martin, Reports of the Louisiana Courts of Appeal, Peltier, Teisser, or McGloin if therein, and to the Southern Reporter or Southern 2d therein.</p> <p>(b) A parallel public domain citation following the same format as that for post-January 1, 1994 opinions may be added, but is not required.</p>

STATE	RULE(S)
Louisiana (cont'd)	<p>B. These rules shall apply to all published actions of the Supreme Court of Louisiana and the Louisiana Courts of Appeal issued after December 31, 1993. Citation under these rules in court documents shall become mandatory for all documents filed after July 1, 1994."</p> <p>LA. SUP. CT. GEN. ADMIN. R. § 8.⁴⁴</p> <p>"Citation of other cases shall be to volume and page of the official reports (and when possible to the unofficial reports). It is recommended that where United States Supreme Court cases are cited, all three reports be cited, e.g., <i>Miranda v. Arizona</i>, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S.Ct. 1602, 16 L.Ed.2d 694 (1966)."</p> <p>LA. UNIF. R. CT. APP. 2-12.4.</p> <p>In addition, as of January 1, 1994, Louisiana adopted a public domain citation format. See SIXTEENTH EDITION T.1, at 188; <i>id.</i> rule 10.3.1; see also <i>supra</i> note 104.</p>
Maine	No separate rules.
Maryland	<p>"When a reported Maryland case is cited, the citation shall include a reference to the official Report."</p> <p>MD. R. APP. REV. 8-504(a).</p>

⁴⁴See also WIN-SHIN S. CHIANG, LOUISIANA LEGAL RESEARCH app. M (1990) (cataloging commonly used Louisiana legal abbreviations); *Louisiana Law Review Streamlined Citation Manual*, 60 LA. L. REV. 197 (1989) (indicating that "[t]he rules listed below are to be followed in all articles submitted for publication in the Louisiana Law Review. Exclusive of the Streamlined Citation Manual (SCM) rules, the format provided in A Uniform System of Citation . . . will govern the correct citation format. Certain rules of the SCM will follow the Bluebook format."):

STATE	RULE(S)
Massachusetts	<p>"Massachusetts Reports between 17 Massachusetts and 97 Massachusetts shall be cited by the name of the reporter. Any other citation shall include, wherever reasonably possible, a reference to any official report of the case or to the official publication containing statutory or similar material. References to decisions and other authorities should include, in addition to the page at which the decision or section begins, a page reference to the particular material therein upon which reliance is placed, and the year of the decision; as, for example: 334 Mass. 593, 597-598 (1986). Quotations of Massachusetts statutory material shall include a citation to either the Acts and Resolves of Massachusetts or to the current edition of the General Laws published pursuant to a resolve of the General Court."</p> <p>MASS. R. APP. P. 16(g). MASS. DIST. & MUN. APP. DIV. R. 16(g).</p>
Michigan	<p>"Parallel citations of Michigan statutes are required"</p> <p>MICH. APP. R. 7.212(C)(3).</p> <p>In addition, citations must conform with the Michigan Uniform System of Citation, which is too lengthy to reprint in this Article. The Michigan System is reprinted in the <i>Michigan Rules of Court: State</i> (West 1996). For matters not covered in the Michigan Uniform System of Citation, attorneys should refer to the <i>Bluebook</i>.</p>
Minnesota	<p>No separate rules. As two Minnesota law librarians explained:</p> <p>The most commonly used citation forms are listed in <i>A Uniform System of Citation</i>, generally followed in law review writing. <i>Citation Manual</i>, published by the Minnesota Supreme Court in 1979, concerns only case citing. Often, suggested citation forms will be included in the front pages of a particular source. . . .</p> <p>ARLETTE M. SODERBERG & BARBARA L. GOLDEN, MINNESOTA LEGAL RESEARCH GUIDE § 531 (1985).</p>
Mississippi	<p>"[A]ll Mississippi cases shall be cited to both the Southern Reporter and, in cases decided prior to 1967, the official Mississippi Reports."</p> <p>MISS. R. APP. P. 28(e).</p>
Missouri	<p>No separate rules.</p>
Montana	<p>No separate rules.</p>

STATE	RULE(S)
Nebraska	<p>"(4) Every reference to a reported case shall set forth the title thereof, the volume and page where found, the tribunal deciding the case, and the year decided. If the cited opinion is long, it shall also refer to the page where the pertinent portion of the opinion is found. Nebraska cases shall be cited by the state reports, but may include citation to such other reports as may contain such cases.</p> <p>(5) If a current statute is relied upon, it must be cited from the last published revision or compilation of the statutes, or supplement thereto, if contained therein; if not contained therein, to the session laws wherein contained, or the legislative bill as enacted.</p> <p>(6) Citations to textbooks, encyclopedias, and other works shall give the title, edition, year of publication, volume number, section, and page where found."</p> <p>NEB. SUP. CT. R. 9(O).</p> <p>"Citation to authorities shall conform to generally accepted uniform standards of citation; citation of Nebraska cases shall include both the Nebraska Reports and North Western Reporter citation."</p> <p>NEB. UNIF. DIST. CT. R. 5(C).</p>
Nevada	<p>"Nevada Revised Statutes and its component parts may be cited as follows:</p> <p>(a) Nevada Revised Statutes: NRS (b) A Title: Title 00 of NRS (c) A chapter: chapter 000 of NRS (d) A section: NRS 000.000."</p> <p>NEV. REV. STAT. 220.170(4) (1996).</p>
New Hampshire	<p>"Citations to Supreme Court of the United States cases that cannot be made to the official <i>United States Reports</i> or to the <i>Supreme Court Reporter</i> shall include the month, day, and year of decision or a reference to <i>United States Law Week</i>. Citations to other federal decisions not presently reported shall identify the court, docket number, and date.</p> <p>Citations to the decisions of this court may be to the <i>New Hampshire Reports</i> only but citations to other State court decisions should be to the official report and to the West Reporter system, with the year of decision. If the only citation available is to the West Reporter, the citation should identify the State court by name or level, and should mention the year of decision."</p> <p>N.H. SUP. CT. R. 16(9).</p>

STATE	RULE(S)
New Jersey	<p>"New Jersey decisions shall be cited to the official New Jersey reports by volume number but if not officially reported that fact shall be stated and unofficial citation made. All other state court decisions shall be cited to the National Reporter System, if reported therein and, if not, to the official report. In the citation of all cases the court and year shall be indicated in parentheses except that the year alone shall be given in citing the official reports of the United States Supreme Court, the Supreme Court of New Jersey, and the highest court of any other jurisdiction."</p> <p>N.J. R. APP. PRAC. 2:6(A)(5).⁴⁰⁵</p>

⁴⁰⁵As one author observed:

There is sometimes a wide divergence in the abbreviations suggested for frequently cited New Jersey legal authority. Currently there are two major systems of citation that must be considered by the writer in New Jersey law:

A Uniform System of Citation
(the "Harvard Bluebook"). . . .

This system is particularly suitable when writing is intended for a non-local readership; it sometimes appears to supply superfluous information when the writing is primarily for a narrowly local market. In that situation, the following may be more appropriately used:

Manual on Style (Revised)
Trenton, N.J. Admin. Office of the Courts, 1979
approved by the N.J. Supreme Court, December, 1979
conveniently available in:
105 *N.J.L.J.* 57, 65 (24 Jan. 1980)

This manual is for the use of judges and secretaries in preparing opinions that will be submitted to the Committee on Opinions for possible publication. . . . To the extent applicable, this manual may be used in the preparation of briefs. . . .
A Uniform System of Citation . . . may be consulted in situations not dealt with herein. However, should there be a conflict in recommendations, this manual controls over the Harvard publication.

CAMERON ALLEN, A GUIDE TO NEW JERSEY LEGAL BIBLIOGRAPHY AND LEGAL HISTORY xxi-xxii (1984).

STATE	RULE(S)
New Mexico	<p>"All New Mexico cases shall be cited from the official reports, with parallel citations if available. As to other authorities, any consistent method or form which adequately identifies the authority may be used."</p> <p>N.M. R. APP. P. 12-213(E).</p> <p>"Any consistent method or form which adequately identifies the cited authority and aids the court may be used."</p> <p>N.M. CIV. P. METRO CT. R. 9-709(E).</p>
New York	<p>"Where New York authorities are cited, <i>New York Official Law Report</i> citations must be included."</p> <p>N.Y. CT. APP. R. 500.5(d)(9).</p> <p>"Where New York authorities are cited in any paper, New York Official Law Report citations must be included."</p> <p>N.Y. CT. APP. R. 500.1.⁶⁶</p>
North Carolina	<p>"Citations should be made according to <i>A Uniform System of Citation</i> (14th ed.)."</p> <p>N.C. R. App. P. Appx. B.⁶⁷</p>

⁶⁶The *St. John's Law Review* recently published a third edition of the *New York Rules of Citation*, which is

an effort to systemize the citation of New York legal materials. To this end, the judicial structure of New York State—including both current and discontinued courts—has been explained in detail with each court description accompanied by an example of its proper citation. Current and discontinued reporters are treated in a similar manner. Also included in this edition are rules for the citation of a broad range of legislative as well as administrative materials. Finally, miscellaneous citation forms are set out for materials ranging from periodicals to condominium filings.

69 ST. JOHN'S L. REV. inside front cover (Summer-Fall 1995) (unbound paper volume).

⁶⁷The reference to the Fourteenth Edition appears to be an oversight. According to the Coordinator of Opinion Drafting at the North Carolina Supreme Court, that court has compiled its own list of uniform citations; some items on that list still conform to the Fourteenth Edition, some conform to the Fifteenth Edition. An updated list will be prepared when the court receives the Sixteenth Edition (which it had not as of late September 1996). Practitioners are urged to examine current North Carolina Supreme Court opinions for examples of how to cite North Carolina authority. Attorneys submitting briefs in North Carolina appellate courts should (1) include citations to both official and unofficial reporters, if both exist; (2) always quote from official reporters, because, in that court's experience, the regional reporters do not always include changes to opinions; and (3) cite to the North Carolina administrative code in the manner specified by that code, not as abbreviated in the Sixteenth Edition. Individuals from North Carolina have sent letters to the *Bluebook* editors (continued...)

STATE	RULE(S)
North Dakota	No separate rules.
Ohio (local district court rules)	<p>"(1) Published.</p> <p>(a) All citations to reported Ohio cases in briefs or memoranda shall recite the date, volume and page of the official Ohio report and the parallel citation, where the same exists, to the Northeastern Reporter, e.g., <i>W.T. Grant Co. v. Lindley</i> (1977), 50 Ohio St. 2d 7, 361 N.E. 2d 454; <i>State v. Durham</i> (1976), 49 Ohio App. 2d 231, 360 N.E. 2d 743; <i>State v. Gastown, Inc.</i> (1975), 40 Ohio Misc. 29, 360 N.E. 2d 970.</p> <p>(b) All citations to the United States Supreme Court cases in briefs or memoranda shall cite the date, volume and page of the official report and parallel citation to the Supreme Court Reporter, e.g., <i>Jones v. United States</i> (1960), 362 U.S. 257, 80 S. Ct. 725."</p> <p>OHIO 1ST DIST. CT. APP. LOC. R. 6(d)(1).</p> <p>"All briefs must contain citations from official volumes when a case is found in the official reports."</p> <p>OHIO 9TH DIST. CT. APP. LOC. R. 6.</p> <p>"All citations to reported Ohio cases in briefs or memoranda shall recite the date, volume and page of the official Ohio report and the parallel citation, where the same exists, to the Northeastern Reporter, e.g., <i>W.T. Grant Co. v. Lindley</i> (1977), 50 Ohio St. 2d 7, 361 N.E. 2d 454; <i>State v. Durham</i> (1976), 49 Ohio App. 2d 231, 360 N.E. 2d 743; <i>State v. Gastown, Inc.</i> (M.C. 1975), 49 Ohio Misc. 29, 360 N.E. 2d 970. Citations to United States Supreme Court cases shall appear in the same form as above, with citations to United States Reports and parallel citations to the United States Supreme Court Reporter, e.g., <i>Paul v. Davis</i> (1976), 424 U.S. 693, 96 S.Ct. 1155, rehearing denied (1977), 425 U.S. 985, 96 S.Ct. 2194."</p> <p>OHIO 12TH DIST. CT. APP. LOC. R. 11(c).⁴⁸⁸</p>

⁴⁸⁷(...continued)

requesting changes in how North Carolina authorities are listed in Table 1. Telephone call to Pam Britt, Coordinator of Opinion Drafting, North Carolina Supreme Court (Sept. 20, 1996) (copies of letters are also on file with the *Stetson Law Review*).

⁴⁸⁸*Ohio Northern University Law Review* has produced a *Style Manual* -- which is designed primarily for internal use -- that contains additional information about Ohio sources.

STATE	RULE(S)
Oklahoma	<p>"The citation of authorities shall be to the volume and page of the National Reporter System or some selected case system, if practical."</p> <p>OKLA. SUP. CT. R. 21.</p> <p>"The citation of Oklahoma criminal cases shall conform to the following: ____ v. ____, ____ P.2d ____, ____ (Okla.Cr.Year). . . . Citation to opinions of the United States Supreme Court shall include each of the following: ____ U.S. ____, ____ S.Ct. ____, ____ L.Ed. ____, ____ (year)."</p> <p>OKLA. CRIM. APP. R. 3.5(c)(1) & (c)(3).</p>
Oregon	<p>"In all matters submitted to the circuit or district courts, Oregon cases must be cited by reference to the Oregon Reports as: <i>Blank v. Blank</i>, ____ Or ____ (year) or as <i>State v. Blank</i>, ____ Or App ____ (year). Parallel citations may be added."</p> <p>OR. UNIF. TRIAL CT. R. 2.010(13).⁴⁰⁹</p>
Pennsylvania	<p>"There shall be appended to the petition the verbatim texts of the pertinent provisions of constitutional provisions, statutes, ordinances, regulations or other similar enactments which the case involves, and the citation to the volume and page where they are published, including the official edition, if any."</p> <p>PA. R. APP. P. 1115(a)(7).</p> <p>"Citations of uncodified statutes shall make reference to the book and page of the Laws of Pennsylvania (Pamphlet Laws) or other official edition, and also to a standard digest, where the statutes may be found. Citations of provisions of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes may be in the form: 1 Pa.C.S. § 1928 (rule of strict and liberal construction) and the official codifications of other jurisdictions may be cited similarly. Quotations from authorities or statutes shall also set forth the pages from which they are taken. Opinions of an appellate court of this or another jurisdiction shall be cited from the National Reporter System, if published therein, and to the official reports of Pennsylvania appellate courts, if published therein."</p> <p>PA. R. APP. P. 2119(b).⁴¹⁰</p>
Rhode Island	No separate rules.

⁴⁰⁹Oregon Rule of Appellate Procedure 5.25, which concerned citation of authority, was deleted effective January 1, 1996.

⁴¹⁰See also ERWIN C. SURRENCY, RESEARCH IN PENNSYLVANIA LAW (2d ed. 1965) (containing Pennsylvania abbreviations not included in the *Bluebook*).

STATE	RULE(S)
<p>South Carolina</p>	<p>"To provide guidance on citing South Carolina authority, the following forms of citation are given. Once cited in the form given, the authority may thereafter be cited in an abbreviated form. Additional guidance on citation of authority may be found in <i>A Uniform System Of Citation</i> published by the Harvard Law Review Association, <i>A Guide To South Carolina Legal Research and Citation</i> published by the S.C. Bar C.L.E. Division, or other publications.</p> <p>(a) South Carolina Constitution. The South Carolina Constitution should be cited in the following manner: S.C. Const. art. IV, § 4.</p> <p>(b) Statutes and Regulations.</p> <p>(1) Statutes which appear in a hardbound volume of the Code of Laws of South Carolina should be cited in the following form: S.C.Code Ann. § 1-2-345 (1976). Where the statute appears in a replacement hard bound volume, the citation should include the date appearing on the spine of the volume or the copyright date of the volume in the following form: S.C.Code Ann. § 11-35-1210 (1986). Statutes which appear in the supplement to the Code of Laws of South Carolina should be cited in the following form: S.C.Code Ann. § 6-7-890 (Supp.1988).</p> <p>(2) Statutes which have not yet been codified should be cited by the number of the Act, and the year and page number where it appears in the South Carolina Acts and Joint Resolutions in the following form: Act No. 100, 1985 S.C. Acts 277.</p> <p>(3) Regulations which appear in the Code of Laws of South Carolina should be cited in the following manner: 23 S.C.Code Ann.Regs. 19-501 (1976). Regulations which appear in the supplement to the Code of Laws of South Carolina should be cited in the following manner: 24A S.C.Code Ann.Regs. 61-40 (Supp.1988). The date used in the citation shall be the latest copyright date of the volume or supplement.</p> <p>(c) Court Rules. Court rules should be cited by the rule number and the abbreviations shown:</p> <p>(1) South Carolina Appellate Court Rules: Rule ___, SCACR.</p> <p>(2) South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure: Rule ___, SCRCP.</p> <p>(3) South Carolina Rules of Criminal Procedure: Rule ___, SCRCrImP.</p> <p>(4) South Carolina Rules of Family Court: Rule ___, SCRFC.</p> <p>(5) South Carolina Rules of Probate Court: Rule ___, SCRPC.</p> <p>(6) South Carolina Administrative and Procedural Rules for Magistrate's Court: Rule ___, SCORMC.</p> <p>(7) South Carolina Rules of Evidence: Rule ___, SCRE.</p>

STATE	RULE(S)																																
<p>South Carolina (cont'd)</p>	<p>(d) Appellate Court Decisions.</p> <p>(1) Published opinions or orders of the Supreme Court or Court of Appeals should be cited in the following manner: <u>State v. Williams</u>, 297 S.C. 404, 377 S.E.2d 309 (1989); <u>Andrews v. Piedmont Air Lines</u>, 297 S.C. 367, 377 S.E.2d 127 (Ct.App. 1989). If a published opinion does not appear in a reporter, it should be cited in the following manner: <u>Donahue v. Donahue</u>, Op. No. 23083 (S.C.Sup.Ct. filed Sept. 25, 1989); <u>Satcher v. Barry</u>, Op. No. 1383 (S.C.Ct.App. filed July 31, 1989). Further, if the opinion has been published in the Advance Sheets published by the Supreme Court, the opinion should be cited in the following manner: <u>State v. Victor</u>, Op. No. 23118 (S.C.Sup.Ct. filed Dec. 11, 1989) (<u>Davis Adv.Sh. No. 29 at 6</u>). If a published order does not appear in a reporter, it should be cited by its order number: <u>State v. Smith</u>, 89-OR-25 (S.C.Ct.App. dated March 1, 1989), or by reference to the date of the order if no order number has been assigned: <u>State v. Smith</u>, S.C.Sup.Ct. Order dated March 1, 1989. Further, if the order has been published on the front of the Advance Sheets the order should be cited in the following manner: <u>State v. Foster</u>, S.C.Sup.Ct. Order dated June 9, 1989 (<u>Davis Adv.Sh. No. 14</u>).</p> <p>(2) Memorandum opinions and unpublished orders have no precedential value and should not be cited except in proceedings in which they are directly involved. Memorandum opinions may be cited in the following form: <u>Burns v. Burns</u>, Op. No. 89-MO-110 (S.C.Ct.App. filed July 31, 1989). Unpublished orders may be cited in a similar manner as provided for published orders under Rule 239(d)(1).</p> <p>(3) The South Carolina Equity Reports, beginning with 1 Desausure Equity and ending with 14 Richardson Equity should be cited in the following manner: <u>Taylor v. Taylor</u>, 4 S.C.Eq. (4 Des.Eq.) 165 (1811). The following table of cross references is provided:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reporter</th> <th>Citation to be Used</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 Desausure</td> <td>1 S.C.Eq. (1 Des.Eq.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 Desausure</td> <td>2 S.C.Eq. (2 Des.Eq.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 Desausure</td> <td>3 S.C.Eq. (3 Des.Eq.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 Desausure</td> <td>4 S.C.Eq. (4 Des.Eq.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Harper</td> <td>5 S.C.Eq. (Harp.Eq.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 McCord</td> <td>6 S.C.Eq. (1 McCord Eq.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 McCord</td> <td>7 S.C.Eq. (2 McCord Eq.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bailey</td> <td>8 S.C.Eq. (Bail.Eq.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Richardson's Cases</td> <td>9 S.C.Eq. (Rich.Cas.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 Hill</td> <td>10 S.C.Eq. (1 Hill Eq.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 Hill</td> <td>11 S.C.Eq. (2 Hill Eq.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Riley</td> <td>12 S.C.Eq. (Ril.Eq.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dudley</td> <td>13 S.C.Eq. (Dud.Eq.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rice</td> <td>14 S.C.Eq. (Rice Eq.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cheves</td> <td>15 S.C.Eq. (Chev.Eq.)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Reporter	Citation to be Used	1 Desausure	1 S.C.Eq. (1 Des.Eq.)	2 Desausure	2 S.C.Eq. (2 Des.Eq.)	3 Desausure	3 S.C.Eq. (3 Des.Eq.)	4 Desausure	4 S.C.Eq. (4 Des.Eq.)	Harper	5 S.C.Eq. (Harp.Eq.)	1 McCord	6 S.C.Eq. (1 McCord Eq.)	2 McCord	7 S.C.Eq. (2 McCord Eq.)	Bailey	8 S.C.Eq. (Bail.Eq.)	Richardson's Cases	9 S.C.Eq. (Rich.Cas.)	1 Hill	10 S.C.Eq. (1 Hill Eq.)	2 Hill	11 S.C.Eq. (2 Hill Eq.)	Riley	12 S.C.Eq. (Ril.Eq.)	Dudley	13 S.C.Eq. (Dud.Eq.)	Rice	14 S.C.Eq. (Rice Eq.)	Cheves	15 S.C.Eq. (Chev.Eq.)
Reporter	Citation to be Used																																
1 Desausure	1 S.C.Eq. (1 Des.Eq.)																																
2 Desausure	2 S.C.Eq. (2 Des.Eq.)																																
3 Desausure	3 S.C.Eq. (3 Des.Eq.)																																
4 Desausure	4 S.C.Eq. (4 Des.Eq.)																																
Harper	5 S.C.Eq. (Harp.Eq.)																																
1 McCord	6 S.C.Eq. (1 McCord Eq.)																																
2 McCord	7 S.C.Eq. (2 McCord Eq.)																																
Bailey	8 S.C.Eq. (Bail.Eq.)																																
Richardson's Cases	9 S.C.Eq. (Rich.Cas.)																																
1 Hill	10 S.C.Eq. (1 Hill Eq.)																																
2 Hill	11 S.C.Eq. (2 Hill Eq.)																																
Riley	12 S.C.Eq. (Ril.Eq.)																																
Dudley	13 S.C.Eq. (Dud.Eq.)																																
Rice	14 S.C.Eq. (Rice Eq.)																																
Cheves	15 S.C.Eq. (Chev.Eq.)																																

STATE	RULE(S)
South Carolina (cont'd)	<p>Speers 1 Richardson 2 Richardson 1 Strobhart 2 Strobhart 3 Strobhart 4 Strobhart 3 Richardson 4 Richardson 5 Richardson 6 Richardson 7 Richardson 8 Richardson 9 Richardson 10 Richardson 11 Richardson 12 Richardson 13 Richardson 14 Richardson</p> <p>17 S.C.Eq. (Speers Eq.) 18 S.C.Eq. (1 Rich.Eq.) 19 S.C.Eq. (2 Rich.Eq.) 20 S.C.Eq. (1 Strob.Eq.) 21 S.C.Eq. (2 Strob.Eq.) 22 S.C.Eq. (3 Strob.Eq.) 23 S.C.Eq. (4 Strob.Eq.) 24 S.C.Eq. (3 Rich.Eq.) 25 S.C.Eq. (4 Rich.Eq.) 26 S.C.Eq. (6 Rich.Eq.) 27 S.C.Eq. (6 Rich.Eq.) 28 S.C.Eq. (7 Rich.Eq.) 29 S.C.Eq. (8 Rich.Eq.) 30 S.C.Eq. (9 Rich.Eq.) 31 S.C.Eq. (10 Rich.Eq.) 32 S.C.Eq. (11 Rich.Eq.) 33 S.C.Eq. (12 Rich.Eq.) 34 S.C.Eq. (13 Rich.Eq.) 35 S.C.Eq. (14 Rich.Eq.)</p>
	<p>(4) The South Carolina Law Reports beginning with 1 Bay and ending with 15 Richardson should be cited in the following manner: <u>Roche v. Chaplin</u>, 17 S.C.L. (1 Bail.) 419 (1830). The following table of cross references is provided:</p>

STATE	RULE(S)	Citation to be Used
South Carolina (cont'd)	Reporter	
	1 Bay	1 S.C.L. (1 Bay)
	2 Bay	2 S.C.L. (2 Bay)
	1 Brevard	3 S.C.L. (1 Brev.)
	2 Brevard	4 S.C.L. (2 Brev.)
	3 Brevard	5 S.C.L. (3 Brev.)
	1 Treadway	6 S.C.L. (1 Tread.)
	2 Treadway	7 S.C.L. (2 Tread.)
	1 Mill (Constitutional)	8 S.C.L. (1 Mill)
	2 Mill (Constitutional)	9 S.C.L. (2 Mill)
	1 Nott and McCord	10 S.C.L. (1 Nott & McC.)
	2 Nott and McCord	11 S.C.L. (2 Nott & McC.)
	1 McCord	12 S.C.L. (1 McCord)
	2 McCord	13 S.C.L. (2 McCord)
	3 McCord	14 S.C.L. (3 McCord)
	4 McCord	15 S.C.L. (4 McCord)
	Harper	16 S.C.L. (Harp.)
	1 Bailey	17 S.C.L. (1 Bail.)
	2 Bailey	18 S.C.L. (2 Bail.)
	1 Hill	19 S.C.L. (1 Hill)
	2 Hill	20 S.C.L. (2 Hill)
	3 Hill	21 S.C.L. (3 Hill)
	Riley	22 S.C.L. (Ril.)
	Dudley	23 S.C.L. (Dud.)
	Rice	24 S.C.L. (Rice)
	Cheves	25 S.C.L. (Chev.)
	1 McMullen	26 S.C.L. (1 McMul.)
	2 McMullen	27 S.C.L. (2 McMul.)
	1 Speers	28 S.C.L. (1 Speers)
	2 Speers	29 S.C.L. (2 Speers)
	1 Richardson	30 S.C.L. (1 Rich.)
	2 Richardson	31 S.C.L. (2 Rich.)
	1 Strobhart	32 S.C.L. (1 Strob.)
	2 Strobhart	33 S.C.L. (2 Strob.)
	3 Strobhart	34 S.C.L. (3 Strob.)
	4 Strobhart	35 S.C.L. (4 Strob.)
5 Strobhart	36 S.C.L. (5 Strob.)	
3 Richardson	37 S.C.L. (3 Rich.)	
4 Richardson	38 S.C.L. (4 Rich.)	

STATE	RULE(S)
<p>South Carolina (cont'd)</p>	<p>5 Richardson 6 Richardson 7 Richardson 8 Richardson 9 Richardson 10 Richardson 11 Richardson 12 Richardson 13 Richardson 14 Richardson 15 Richardson</p> <p>39 S.C.L. (6 Rich.) 40 S.C.L. (6 Rich.) 41 S.C.L. (7 Rich.) 42 S.C.L. (8 Rich.) 43 S.C.L. (9 Rich.) 44 S.C.L. (10 Rich.) 45 S.C.L. (11 Rich.) 46 S.C.L. (12 Rich.) 47 S.C.L. (13 Rich.) 48 S.C.L. (14 Rich.) 49 S.C.L. (15 Rich.)^v</p> <p>S.C. APP. CT. R. 239.</p>
<p>South Dakota</p>	<p>"(1) The initial citation of any published opinion of the Supreme Court released prior to January 1, 1996, in a brief, memorandum, or other document filed with the Court and the citation in the table of cases in a brief shall include a reference to the volume and page number of the South Dakota Reports or North Western Reporter in which the opinion is published. Subsequent citations in the brief, document, or memorandum shall include the page number and sufficient references to identify the initial citation.</p> <p>(2) The initial citation of any published opinion of the Supreme Court released on or after January 1, 1996, in a brief, memorandum, or other document filed with the Court and the citation in the table of cases in a brief shall include a reference to the calendar year in which the decision was announced, the Court designation of 'SD', and a sequential number assigned by the Clerk of the Supreme Court. Citation to specific portions of the opinion shall be made to the paragraph number assigned by the Clerk of the Supreme Court. A paragraph citation should be placed immediately following the sequential number assigned to the case. Subsequent citations within the brief, document, or memorandum shall include the paragraph number and sufficient references to identify the initial citation.</p> <p>When available, initial citations shall include the volume and initial page number of the North Western Reporter in which the opinion is published."</p> <p>S.D. R. APP. P. § 15-26A-69.1.</p>

STATE	RULE(S)
Tennessee	<p>"Citation of cases must be by title, to the page of the volume where the case begins, and to the pages upon which the pertinent matter appears in at least one of the reporters cited. It is not sufficient to use only <i>supra</i> or <i>infra</i> without referring to the page of the brief at which the complete citation may be found. Citation of Tennessee cases may be to the official or South Western Reporter or both. Citation of cases from other jurisdictions must be to the National Reporter System or both the official state reports and National Reporter System. If only the National Reporter System citation is used, the court rendering the decision must also be identified. All citations to cases shall include the year of decision. Citation of textbooks shall be to the section, if any, and page upon which the pertinent matter appears and shall include the year of publication and edition if not the first edition. Tennessee statutes shall generally be cited to the Tennessee Code Annotated, Official Edition, but citations to the session laws of Tennessee shall be made when appropriate. Citations of supplements to the Tennessee Code Annotated shall so indicate and shall include the year of publication of the supplement."</p> <p>TENN. R. APP. P. 27(b).</p>
Texas	<p>"Proper citation forms as provided by the latest editions of A Uniform System of Citation by Harvard Law Review, and <i>Texas Rules of Form</i> by Texas Law Review should be observed."</p> <p>TEX. LOC. R. 5TH CT. APP. 174(a).</p> <p>"Proper citation form as outlined in <i>A Uniform System of Citation</i> and <i>Texas Rules of Form</i> shall be used in all briefs. Writ, petition, and certiorari histories shall be included. Specific page citations to relevant holdings and quotations within a case (ump cites) shall be incorporated."</p> <p>TEX. LOC. R. 8TH CT. APP. 74-1(b).⁴¹</p>
Utah	No separate rules.
Vermont	No separate rules.

⁴¹See TEXAS LAW REVIEW, TEXAS RULES OF FORM (6th ed. 1988). The Foreword to this publication indicates:

Basic rules of form are found in the Harvard Law Review Association's *A Uniform System of Citation* . . . Except as modified herein, the rules set forth in the Bluebook should be rigorously followed. The *Texas Rules of Form* (the "Greenbook") is intended primarily as a supplement to the Bluebook to address citation problems unique to Texas; in cases of conflict, the *Rules of Form* should be followed in citing Texas authorities.

Id. at 2. The *Rules of Form* are too lengthy to reprint in this Article. Copies may be obtained from the Texas Law Review Business Office (512-471-3164).

STATE	RULE(S)
Virginia	<p>The petition or brief must contain "(1)(a) A subject index and table of citations with cases alphabetically arranged. Citations of Virginia cases shall be to the Virginia Reports and the Southeastern Reporter. Citations of all authorities shall include the year thereof."</p> <p>VA. SUP. CT. R. 5A:17; accord <i>id.</i> 5:28. VA. SUP. CT. R. 5A:20 (appellant's brief). VA. SUP. CT. R. 5A:21 (appellee's brief).⁴¹²</p>
Washington	<p>"Citations must be in conformity with the form used in current volumes of the Washington Reports. Decisions of the Supreme Court and of the Court of Appeals must be cited to the official report thereof and should include the national reporter citation and the year of the decision. The citation of other state court decisions should include both the state and national reporter citations. The citation of a United States Supreme Court decision should include the United States Reports, the United States Supreme Court Reports Lawyers Edition, and the Supreme Court Reporter. The citation of a decision of any other federal court should include the federal reporter citation and the district of the district court or circuit of the court of appeals deciding the case. Any citation should include the year decided and a reference to and citation of any subsequent decision of the same case."</p> <p>WASH. R. APP. P. 10-4(g).</p>
West Virginia	<p>No separate rules.</p>

⁴¹²According to a publication prepared by the Young Lawyers Section of The Virginia Bar Association and the Committee on Continuing Legal Education of the Virginia Bar Foundation:

The only citation rule contained in the rules of the Virginia Supreme Court is the command that citations to Virginia cases include both VIRGINIA REPORTS and SOUTHEASTERN REPORTER. Rules 5:27(a) and 5A:20(a) of the Supreme Court of Virginia. Beyond that, the most widely accepted system of citation is that contained in the Harvard Law Review Association's *A Uniform System of Citation* (commonly referred to as the "Blue Book") While in earlier times idiosyncratic systems of citation were common, the general acceptance of the Blue Book now renders suspect a formal legal document that fails to adhere substantially. Of course, among the principal aims of any citation are identification of the source being cited and assistance to the reader in locating the source. If accomplishing these goals requires providing more information than the Blue Book calls for, the additional information should be given.

COMMITTEE ON CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION, VIRGINIA LAW FOUNDATION, A GUIDE TO LEGAL RESEARCH IN VIRGINIA § 1.3 (John D. Euro ed. 1989). The book does, however, provide "examples of suggested citation form for some Virginia materials." *Id.* However, "[w]hen no form is suggested, the rules and examples in the *Blue Book* should be followed." *Id.*

STATE	RULE(S)
Wisconsin	<p>"An argument, arranged in the order of the statement of issues presented. The argument on each issue must be preceded by a one sentence summary of the argument and is to contain the contention of the appellant, the reasons therefor, with citations to the authorities, statutes and parts of the record relied on as set forth in the Uniform System of Citation and SCR 80.02."</p> <p>Wis. APP. P.R. § 808.19(e).</p> <p>"The citation of any published opinion of the court of appeals or the supreme court in the table of cases in a brief and the initial citation in a memorandum or other document filed with the court of appeals or the supreme court shall include a reference to the volume and page number of the Wisconsin Reports and of the North Western Reporter in which the opinion is published. Subsequent citations shall include references to the volume and page number of at least one of these publications and shall be internally consistent."</p> <p>Wis. SUP. CT. R. 80.02.⁴³</p>
Wyoming	No separate rules.

⁴³Wisconsin is in the process of considering a vendor-neutral format for case citations. See *supra* note 106 and accompanying text.

APPENDIX B-2

APPENDIX B-2

Selected California State, County, and Municipal Rules Concerning Citation Format

COURT	RULE
Contra Costa	<p>"Case citations, statutory and administrative authority:</p> <p>a. California State Court authority: citation must give the official reported citation, the decision year and the specific pages involved.</p> <p>b. California statute: citation must indicate the Code name and section number."</p> <p>CONTRA COSTA CO., CAL. SUPER. CT. R. 7(C)(5).</p>
Desert	<p>"All citations of authority shall include the official reporter citation and the West Publishing (unofficial) citation."</p> <p>DESERT JUD. DIST., CAL. MUN. CT. LOC. R. 205(II).</p>
Imperial	<p>"Citation of California cases should be by reference to both the official and California reports, and should indicate the volume number, the first page of the case and the year of such decision."</p> <p>IMPERIAL CO., CAL. SUPER. CT. R. 4(I).</p> <p>"All citations to authority shall include the official reporter citation."</p> <p>IMPERIAL CO., CAL. SUPER. CT. R. 303 (III).</p>
Los Angeles	<p>"All citations of authority shall include the official reporter citation and the West Publishing (unofficial) citation."</p> <p>NEWHALL JUD. DIST., CAL. MUN. CT. LOC. R. 301 (II).</p>
Orange	<p>"A. In all briefs, points and authorities, jury instructions and other papers submitted to the Court, all citation to California cases shall include the proper citation by volume and page to the Official California Reports and California Appellate Reports.</p> <p>B. Violation of this Rule shall be sufficient grounds for the Court to refuse to consider the case cited."</p> <p>ORANGE CO., CAL. SUPER. CT. R. 314.</p>

COURT	RULE
Placer	<p>"Citations to California cases must be by reference to the official reports and should indicate the year of the decision, the volume number, the first page of the case, and the specific page or pages on which the pertinent matters appear."</p> <p>PLACER CO., CAL. SUPER. & MUN. CT. LOC. R. 20.3.4(C).</p>
Riverside	<p>"Citation of California cases must be by reference to the Official Reports and include the specific page or pages on which the pertinent matters appear in the Official Reports."</p> <p>RIVERSIDE CO., CAL. SUPER. & MUN. CTS. CONSOL. R. 20015(F)(II).</p>
Sacramento	<p>"Citations to California cases must be by reference to the official reports and should indicate the year of the decision, the volume number, the first page of the case, and the specific page or pages on which the pertinent matters appear."</p> <p>SACRAMENTO, CAL. SUPER. & MUN. CT. LOC. R. 3.05(F).</p>
San Bernardino	<p>"All citations to California cases shall give both the California Report or Appellate Report citation and the California Reporter citation."</p> <p>SAN BERNARDINO CO., CAL. (CD) MUN. CT. R. 581.2.</p>
San Diego	<p>"Citations of cases shall be by reference to the official reports, and shall indicate the volume number, the first page of the case, and the specific page or pages on which the pertinent matters appear in the official reports, and the year of the decision. Citation of federal cases, cases from jurisdictions other than California, and on-line legal services for which no official reporter citation exists at the time of filing the pleading containing the citation must be supported by a copy of the entire opinion. Citation of legislation shall include the title of the code, the code section, and the date of any amendment which is effective for the issue pertinent to the matter then before the court. Citations of other than California legislation must be supported by a copy of the legislation."</p> <p>SAN DIEGO CAL. SUPER. CT., DIV. IV. LOC. R. 1.8(f).</p> <p>"Citations of cases shall be by reference to the official reports, and shall indicate the volume number, the first page of the case, and the specific page or pages on which the pertinent matters appear in the official reports, and the year of the decision. citation of federal cases, cases from jurisdictions other than California, and on-line legal services for which no official reporter citation exists at the time of filing the pleading containing the citation must be supported by a copy of the entire opinion. Citation of legislation shall include the title of the code, the code section, and the date of any amendment which is effective for the issue pertinent to the matter then before the court."</p> <p>SAN DIEGO CAL. SUPER. CT. R. 4.1(f).</p>

COURT	RULE
San Diego	<p>"Citations to cases shall be by reference to the official reporter, and shall indicate the volume number, the first page of the case, and the specific page or pages on which the pertinent matters appear in the official reporter, and the year of decision. Citations to legislation shall include the title of the code, the code section, and the date of any amendment which is effective for the issue pertinent to the matter then before the court."</p> <p>SAN DIEGO CAL. SUPER. CT. R. 4.12(b).</p>
San Diego County (El Cajon Dist.)	<p>"Citation of California cases shall be by reference to the official reports, not California Reporter and should indicate the volume number, the first page of the case and the specific page or pages on which the pertinent matters appear in the official reports and the year of such decision."</p> <p>EL CAJON JUD. DIST., CAL. MUN. CT. LOC. R. 308 & 605.</p>
San Francisco	<p>"(c) Cases. Citation of California cases must be by reference to the Official Reports, and should indicate the year of the decision, the volume number, the first page of the case, and the specific page or pages on which the pertinent matters appear in the Official Reports. (See, Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 313(c).)</p> <p>(d) Statutes. Citation of California legislation should include the title of the code and the code section (e.g., Code Civ.Proc., section 437c).</p> <p>(e) Authority From Other Jurisdictions. If counsel offers authority from jurisdictions other than California in support of a position, counsel must attach a copy of any statute or case upon which counsel primarily relies.</p> <p>(f) Citation of Authority.</p> <p>(1) It is better practice to set forth a brief summary or quotation of the relevant substance of the cited authority and to point out in what way it bears on the matter before the Court. It is not necessary to provide a plethora of citations; a single case on point may be sufficient. The value of points and authorities lies in their current relevancy and not in their quantity. Copying of head notes is bad practice.</p> <p>(2) Each case cited for other than preliminary or elementary matters should be discussed in terms of its relationship to the case at bar. Cases believed to bear strongly upon the decision of a particular matter should be discussed at length, commencing with any California cases believed to be applicable. Counsel should refer to and use the California Style Manual prepared by the Reporter of Decisions of the Supreme Court of California and printed by the State Printing Office."</p> <p>SAN FRANCISCO CAL. SUPER. CT. R. 4.</p>

COURT	RULE
San Francisco	<p>"Citation of California legislation should include the name of the Code, the section number and the effective date of enactment or the last amendment. . . . All citations shall include the Official Reports volume, page number, and year of decision."</p> <p>SAN FRANCISCO CO., CAL. SUPER. CT. DISC. MAN. § 324(C) & (D).</p> <p>"Citation of California cases must be by reference to the Official Reports and should indicate the volume number, the first page of the case and the specific page or pages on which the pertinent matters appear in the Official Reports, and the year of such decision."</p> <p>SAN FRANCISCO CO., CAL. SUPER. CT. MANUAL FOR THE CONDUCT OF PRE-TRIAL PROCEEDINGS IN CLASS ACTIONS § 424, II 7.</p>
San Luis Obispo	<p>"In memoranda of points and authorities, citations to California cases shall include the proper citation by volume and page to the official reports."</p> <p>SAN LUIS OBISPO CO., CAL. SUPER. CT. R. 7.03(c).</p> <p>SAN LUIS OBISPO MUN. CT. R. 303(d).</p> <p>"All citations of authority shall include the official reporter citation and the West Publishing (unofficial) citation."</p> <p>SAN LUIS OBISPO CO., MUN. CT. LOC. R. 205(b)</p>
Santa Barbara	<p>"Citations of cases in points and authorities filed with the court shall include the official citation and, where applicable, parallel citations to West's California Reporter and West's Supreme Court Reporter."</p> <p>SANTA BARBARA, CAL. SUPER. CT. R. 202.</p>
Santa Clara	<p>"All citations to California cases shall include the proper citation by volume and page number to the Official California Reports and Official California Appellate Reports in the format set out in California Rule of Court 313(e)."</p> <p>SANTA CLARA CO., CAL. SUPER. CT. R.2.5(11)(c).</p> <p>"All citations to California cases shall include the proper citation by volume and page number to the Official California Reports and Official California Appellate Reports in the format set out in California Rule of Court 313(e)."</p> <p>SANTA CLARA CO., CAL. SUPER. CT. LOC. R. 2, § 2.5(c)</p>

COURT	RULE
Sonoma	<p>"Citations to California cases must be by reference to the official reports and should indicate the year of the decision, the volume number, the first page of the case, and the specific page or pages on which the pertinent matters appear."</p> <p>SONOMA CO., CAL. SUPER. CT. LOC. R. 8.7. SONOMA CO., CAL. MUN. CIV. CT. R. 11.3(c).</p>

APPENDIX B-3

APPENDIX B-3⁴¹⁴

*Compendium of
Federal Court Rules Concerning Citation Format*

COURT	RULES
U.S. S. Ct.	<p>Give "[a] reference to the official and unofficial reports of opinions delivered in the case by other courts or administrative agencies."</p> <p>U.S. S. Ct. RULE 14.1(d).</p>
D.C. Cir.	<p>"Citations to decisions of this court shall be to the Federal Reporter. Dual or parallel citation of cases is not required. Citations of state court decisions included in the National Reporter System shall be to that system in both the text and the table of authorities. Citations to all federal statutes, including those statutes applicable to the District of Columbia, shall refer to the current official code or its supplement, or if there is no current official code, to a current unofficial code or its supplement. Citation to the official session laws is not required unless there is no code citation."</p> <p>D.C. CIR. R. 28(b).</p>
1st Cir.	<p>"All citations to State or Commonwealth Courts shall include both the official state court citation and the National Reporter System citation when such decisions have been published in both reports; e.g., <i>Corey v. Commonwealth</i>, 364 Mass. 137, 301 N.E. 2d 450 (1973). Law review or other articles unpublished at the time a brief or memorandum is filed may not be cited therein, except with permission of the court."</p> <p>1ST CIR. R. 28.1.</p>

⁴¹⁴If a court is not listed, then it has not published special citation forms as part of its local rules. This Appendix does not include rules concerning citation of unpublished authority, citation of the record of other pleadings, or citation of supplemental authority. Practitioners should contact the specific court clerk or judge to verify that no standing orders or special preferences exist.

COURT	RULES
3d Cir.	<p>"In the argument section of the brief required by FRAP 28(a)(6), citations to federal opinions that have been reported shall be to the United States Reports, the Federal Reporter, the Federal Supplement or the Federal Rules Decisions, and shall identify the Judicial Circuit or District, and year of decision. Citations to the United States Supreme Court opinions that have not yet appeared in the official reports may be to the Supreme Court Reporter, the Lawyer's Edition or United States Law Week in that order of preference. Citations to United States Law Week shall include the month, day and year of the decision. Citations to federal decisions that have not been formally reported shall identify the court, docket number and date, or refer to the electronically transmitted decision. Citations to services and topical reports, whether permanent or looseleaf, and to electronic citation systems, shall not be used if the text of the case cited has been reported in the United States Reports, the Federal Reporter, the Federal Supplement, or the Federal Rules Decisions. Citations to state court decisions should include the West Reporter system whenever possible, with an identification of the state court."</p> <p>3D CIR. R. 28.3(a).</p>
6th Cir.	<p>On January 1, 1994, the United States Court of Appeals adopted an optional parallel electronic citation form. See <i>supra</i> note 103 and accompanying text.</p>
11th Cir.	<p>"Citations of authority in the brief shall comply with the rules of citation in the latest edition of <i>A Uniform System of Citation</i>. Citations shall reference the specific page number(s) which relate to the proposition for which the case is cited. For state reported cases the national reporter series should be cross referenced (e.g., Southern Reporter, Southern Reporter, Southeast Reporter)."</p> <p>11TH CIR. R. 28-2(k).</p>
Fed. Cir.	<p>"It is preferred that opinions of this court and its predecessors be cited as found in the Federal Reporter, Second Series, and, if reasonably available, the United States Patents Quarterly and the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit Int'l Trade Cases. Parallel citations to any other reports are discouraged. Examples of acceptable citations follow:</p> <p><i>Guotos v. United States</i>, 552 F.2d 992 (Ct. Cl. 1976).</p> <p>In re <i>Sponnable</i>, 405 F.2d 578, 160 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1969).</p> <p><i>South Corporation v. United States</i>, 690 F.2d 1368, 215 USPQ 657 (Fed. Cir. 1982) (in banc).</p> <p><i>United States v. Atkinson</i>, 748 F.2d 659, 3 Fed. Cir. (T) 15 (1984).</p> <p><i>Doe v. Roe</i>, No. 12-345, slip op. (Fed. Cir. Oct. 1, 1982)."</p> <p>FED. CIR. R. 28(e).</p>
Armed Services	<p>"Citations shall conform with the Uniform System of Citation."</p> <p>U.S. CT. APP. ARMED SERVICES R. PRAC. & PROC. 24(c)(3).</p>

COURT	RULES
<p>Vet. App.</p>	<p>"Commonly understood abbreviations may be used." VET. APP. R. 28(d).</p>
<p>U.S. Tax Court</p>	<p>"All citations of case names shall be underscored when typewritten and shall be in italics when printed." U.S. TAX CT. R. 151(e)(1).⁴⁵</p>
<p>C.D. Cal.</p>	<p>"3.9 Citations. 3.9.1 Citations; Acts of Congress. All citations to Acts of Congress shall include a parallel citation to the United States Code by title and section. 3.9.2 Citations; regulations. All citations to regulations shall include a citation to the Code of Federal Regulations by title and section, and the date of promulgation of the regulation. 3.9.3 Citations; cases. Initial citation of any United States Supreme Court case shall include parallel citations to United States Reports, Lawyer's Edition, and Supreme Court Reporter, Federal Reporter, Federal Supplement or Federal Rules Decisions citations shall be used where available. Initial state court citations shall include both the official reports and any regional reporter published by West Publishing Company. California parallel citations may be limited to the official reports and California Reporter." LOCAL RULE 3.9.</p>

⁴⁵Tax practitioners may also want to consult the *Citation and Style Manual* prepared by the United States Department of Justice, Tax Division.

COURT	RULES
<p>Bankr. C.D. Cal.</p>	<p>"(9) Citations.</p> <p>(a) <i>Acts of Congress.</i> All citations to Acts of Congress shall include a parallel citation to the United States Code by title and section.</p> <p>(b) <i>Regulations.</i> All citations to federal regulations shall include a citation to the Code of Federal Regulations by title and section, and the date of promulgation of the regulation.</p> <p>(c) <i>Cases.</i> Initial citation of any United States Supreme Court cases shall include parallel citations to United States Reports, and Supreme Court Reporter, Federal Reporter, Federal Supplement or Federal Rules Decisions citations shall be used where available. Initial state court citations shall include both the official reports and any regional reporter published by West Publishing Company. California parallel citations may be limited to the official reports and California Reporter. Citation to bankruptcy cases shall be to West's Bankruptcy Reporter, where available. Where a Bankruptcy Reporter citation is not available, the party citing the case must provide the Court with an unmarked copy of the case."</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 103(9).</p>
<p>E.D. Cal.</p>	<p>"Citations of federal cases shall be to the United States Supreme Court Reports, Federal Reports, Federal Supplement, or Federal Rules Decisions, if so reported, and shall indicate the court and year of decision. Citations to federal statutes shall be to the United States Code, if so codified. Citations to federal administrative rules shall be to the Code of Federal Regulations, if so codified, or to the Federal Register, if published therein. Citations of California cases shall be to the official California Reports. Citations of other state cases shall be to the National Reporter System, showing state and year of decision. Other citations may be added. If case, statutory, or regulatory authority is relied upon which has not been reported, published, or codified in any of the foregoing references, a copy of that authority shall be appended to the brief or other document in which it is cited. This requirement shall include, but not be limited to, the Statutes at Large, the Public Laws of the United States, the California Administrative Code, administrative regulations not contained in the Code of Federal Regulations or the Federal Register, and decisions and other matters published in specialized reporter services."</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 134(d).</p>

COURT	RULES
Bankr. E.D. Cal.	<p>"Citations of federal case shall be to the United States Supreme Court Reports, Federal Reporter, Federal Supplement, Federal Rules Decisions, Bankruptcy Reporter, Bankruptcy Court Decisions, Collier Bankruptcy Cases, or Bankruptcy Law Reporter, if so reported, and shall indicate the court and year of decision. Citations to federal statutes shall be to the United States Code, if so codified. Citations to federal administrative rules shall be to the Code of Federal Regulations, if so codified, or to the Federal Register, if published therein. Citations of California cases shall be to the official California Reports. Citations of other state cases shall be to the National Reporter System, showing state and year of decision. Other citations may be added. If case, statutory, or regulatory authority is relied upon which has not been reported, published, or codified in any of the foregoing references, a copy of that authority shall be appended to the brief or other document in which it is cited. This requirement shall include, but not be limited to, the Statutes at Large, the Public Laws of the United States, the California Administrative Code, administrative regulations not contained in the Code of Federal Regulations or the Federal Register, and decisions and other matters published in specialized reporter services."</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 904(c).</p>
N.D. Cal.	<p>"Unless otherwise directed by the assigned judge, citation to authorities in any paper shall include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) In any citation to Acts of Congress, a parallel citation to the United States Code by title and section; (2) In any citation to U.S. regulations, a citation to the Code of Federal Regulations by title and section, and the date of promulgation of the regulation; (3) In any citation to a U.S. Supreme Court Case, a citation to either United States Reports, or Lawyers' Edition or Supreme Court Reporter should be used. If the case is not yet available in those formats but is available on electronic databases, citation should indicate the database, year and any screen or page numbers, if assigned; (4) In any citation to other federal courts, unless an alternate reporting service is widely available, a citation to the Federal Reporter, Federal Supplement or Federal Rules Decisions should be used; and (5) In any citation to a state court, citations should include both the official reports and any widely available alternate reporting service (e.g., West Publishing)." <p>LOCAL RULE 3-4(d).</p>
D. Del.	<p>"Form of citations. Citations will be deemed to be in acceptable form if made in accordance with 'A Uniform System of Citation' published and distributed from time to time by the Harvard Law Review Association. State reporter citations may be omitted but citations to the National Reporter System must be included except as to U.S. Supreme Court decisions where the official citation shall be used."</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 7.1.3(5).</p>

COURT	RULES
Bankr. D. Del.	The Bankruptcy Court has adopted the local rules of the United States District Court for the District Court of Delaware, except to the extent they are inconsistent with the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rules. General Order 9(B).
N.D. Ga.	"Citations. When Acts of Congress or sections thereof are cited, counsel shall include the corresponding United States Code citation. When citing regulations, counsel shall give all Code of Federal Regulations references and the date of promulgation. All citations shall include the specific page or pages upon which the cited matters appear." LOCAL RULE 200-1(c).
N.D. Iowa S.D. Iowa	"All citations to statutes in pleadings or other requests for court action shall refer to the United States Code or to the appropriate State Code." LOCAL RULE 10(f).
Bankr. N.D. Iowa	"Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure shall be referred to in these local bankruptcy rules as 'Bankruptcy Rule'. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall be referred to as 'FRCP'." LOCAL RULE 1(E).
Bankr. S.D. Iowa	Rule 10 of the Local Rules for the United States District Court for the Northern and Southern Districts of Iowa apply in this court. LOCAL RULE 10.
E.D. Ky. W.D. Ky.	"All briefs, pleadings and memoranda shall use a generally accepted manner of citation." LOCAL RULE 7(d).
S.D. Miss.	"If any brief or other paper submitted in support of a legal argument in any case cites or relies upon any authority other than a Mississippi statute, Federal statute, Federal Rule, United States Supreme Court case, or a case reported in the Southern Reporter, Southern Reporter Second, Federal Supplement, Federal Reporter, Federal Reporter Second, or Federal Rules Decisions, a copy of such authority must accompany the brief or other paper citing it." LOCAL RULE 7(c).

COURT	RULES
D. Mont.	<p>"(a) All documents filed with the Court shall follow the citation form described in the current edition of 'A Uniform System of Citation,' published by The Harvard Law Review Association (commonly referred to as the 'Harvard Citator'). The use of internal citations, referring to a particular page of a cited authority, is strongly encouraged.</p> <p>(b) All citations to federal acts, such as the various Securities Acts, Bankruptcy Act, Fair Standards Act, Clayton Act, Sherman Act, etc., must be accompanied by a parallel citation to the United States Code, United States Code Services or the United States Code Annotated. Reference to a United States Code citation, without reference to any section within an Act, is acceptable.</p> <p>(c) For any violation of the rules stated in (a) or (b) above, the Court in its discretion may return the document for correction."</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 120-5.</p>
Bankr. D. Mont.	<p>The Bankruptcy Court has adopted Rule 120-5 of the United States District Court for the District of Montana.</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 2.</p>
D. Nev.	<p>"(a) In all cases where an act of Congress is cited, the United States Code citation, if available, shall be given. When a federal regulation is cited, the Code of Federal Regulations reference, title, section, page and year shall be given.</p> <p>(b) When a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States is cited, the citation of the United States Reports shall be given. Whenever a decision of a court of appeals or a district court or other court of the United States has been reported in the Federal Reporter System, that citation shall be given. Whenever a decision of an appellate court of one of the states has been reported in West's National Reporter System, that citation shall be given. All citations shall include the specific page or pages upon which the pertinent language appears."</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 130-4.</p>
D. N. Mar. I.	<p>"Citation form. All citations shall be in a generally recognized form, preferably as found in A Uniform System of Citation (15th ed.), enabling both the Court and opposing counsel to locate the cited work."</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 130-5.</p>

COURT	RULES
E.D.N.C.	<p>"Published decisions cited should include parallel citations, the year of the decision, and the court deciding the case. The following are illustrations:</p> <p>(1) State Court Citation: Rawls v. Smith, 238 N.C. 162, 77 S.E. 2d 701 (1953).</p> <p>(2) District Court Citation: Smith v. Jones, 141 F. Supp. 248 (E.D.N.C. 1956).</p> <p>(3) Court of Appeals Citation: Smith v. Jones, 237 F. 2d 597 (4th Cir. 1956).</p> <p>(4) United States Supreme Court Citation: Smith v. Jones, 325 U.S. 196, 65 S. Ct. 1120, 89 L. Ed. 1154 (1956). If a petition for certiorari or an appeal was filed in the United States Supreme Court, the disposition of the case in that court should always be shown with parallel citations. For example: Carson v. Warlick, 238 F. 2d 724 (4th Cir. 1956), cert. denied, 353 U.S. 910, 77 S. Ct. 665, 1 L. Ed. 2d 664 (1957).</p> <p>Decisions published outside the West Federal Reporter System, the official North Carolina reports and the official United States Supreme Court reports (e.g., CCH Tax Reports, Labor Reports, U.S.P.Q., reported decisions of other states or other specialized reporting services) may be cited if the decision is furnished to the court and to opposing parties or their counsel when the memorandum is filed."</p> <p>LOCAL RULES 5.02 & 5.03.</p>
M.D.N.C.	<p>"Cases cited should include parallel citations, the year of the decision, and the court deciding the case. If a petition for certiorari was filed in the United States Supreme Court, disposition of the case should be shown with three parallel citations (e.g., Carson v. Warlick, 238 F.2d 724 (4th Cir. 1956), cert. denied, 353 U.S. 910, 77 S.Ct. 665, 1 L.Ed.2d 664 (1957)). . . . Decisions published in reports other than the West Federal Reporter System, the official North Carolina reports and the official United States Supreme Court reports (e.g., C.C.H. Reports, Labor Reports, U.S.P.Q., reported decisions of other states or other specialized reporting services) may be cited only if the decision is furnished to the court and to opposing parties or their counsel when the brief is filed."</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 107(b) & (d).</p>
E.D. Okla.	<p>"Citations of federal cases shall be to the United States Supreme Court Reports, and Law Edition, Federal Reporter, Federal Supplement, or Federal Rules Decisions, if so reported, and shall indicate the Court and year of decision."</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 13(e).</p>
W.D. Okla.	<p>"Citations of federal cases shall be to the United States Supreme Court Reports and Law Edition, Federal Reporter, Federal Supplement, or Federal Rules Decisions, if so reported, and shall indicate the court and year of decision. Citations of federal statutes shall be to the United States Code. Citations of federal administrative rules shall be to the Code of Federal Regulations."</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 13(e).</p>

COURT	RULES
Bankr. M.D. Pa. (Northern Tier)	<p>"Briefs shall contain complete citations to all authorities relied upon, including, whenever practicable, citations both to official and unofficial reporters."</p> <p>Bankr. Prac. Order & Forms, N. Tier, M.D. Pa. ¶ 7056-1(c) (1995).</p>
Bankr. D.R.I.	<p>"Citations to Bankruptcy Code and Rules sections are often omitted or cited inaccurately in motions, complaints, and memoranda . . . [Thus,] applicable Bankruptcy Code and Rules sections must be cited in all memoranda."</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 10 cmt.</p>
E.D. Tenn.	<p>"Citation to decisions of the United States Supreme Court shall include citations to the United States Reports, Supreme Court Reporter, and to the United States Supreme Court Reports, Lawyers' Edition, where such citations exist. For more recent decisions, United States Law Week citations or computer assisted legal research citations will be accepted. Citations to any federal court decision or administrative opinion not fully reported in one of the publications of the West Publishing Company, or citations to any decisions of a state court other than Tennessee, shall be accompanied by a copy of the entire text of the decision. Citations to federal statutes shall include at least the title and the section designation as the statute appears in the United States Code. Citations to reported state cases shall include at least the 'official' state reporter citation and the regional reporter when available. The court will NOT consider improperly cited authority."</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 7.4.</p>
Bankr. M.D. Tenn.	<p>"(2) Citations to United States Supreme Court decisions shall include 'triple cites' (U.S. Reports, Supreme Court Reporter and Lawyer's Edition) where such citations exist. For more recent decisions, United States Law Week citations are acceptable.</p> <p>(3) Citations to reported state cases shall include at least the 'official' state reporter CITATION and the regional reporter CITATION where available. Any citation to state cases other than Tennessee cases shall be accompanied by a copy of the entire text of the opinion.</p> <p>(4) Citations to federal statutes shall include at least the title and section designation as the statute appears in the United States Code.</p> <p>(5) Citations to any federal court decision or administrative opinion not reported in one of the publications of the West Publishing Company shall be accompanied by a copy of the entire text of the decision."</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 8(c)(2).</p>
Bankr. W.D. Tenn.	<p>"Provisions of the United States Bankruptcy Code, Title 11 of the U.S. Code, are cited herein as '§ ____.' Provisions of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure are cited herein as 'F.R.B.P. ____.' These Local Bankruptcy Rules are cited herein as 'Local Rule ____.' The Local Bankruptcy Forms are cited herein as 'Local Form ____.'"</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 1(b).</p>

COURT	RULES
Bankr. S.D. Tex.	<p>“(T)he Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure may be cited as ‘FRBP,’ ‘BR,’ or ‘Bankruptcy Rules.’”</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 1001(c).</p>
E.D. Wash.	<p>“Citations to cases in briefs shall include volume, page and year as follows:</p> <p>Washington cases: Cite Washington Reports and year of decision.</p> <p>Federal cases: For decisions of the United States Supreme Court, cite United States Reports, or if not yet published therein, Supreme Court Reporter, or if not yet published therein, United States Law Week. For all other federal cases, cite Federal Reporter, Federal Supplement, Federal Rules Decisions, or Bankruptcy Reporter including the district or circuit and year of the decision.”</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 7(g).</p>
Bankr. E.D. Wash.	<p>“Citations to Washington cases in a memorandum of authorities shall be to the Washington Reports. Citation to cases from other states shall be to the National Reporter System. Citations to federal cases shall be to the United States Reports, Federal Reporter, or Federal Supplement. Citation to bankruptcy cases shall be to West’s Bankruptcy Reporter, Collier’s Bankruptcy Cases or Bankruptcy Court Decisions.”</p> <p>LOCAL RULE 92(b).</p>

APPENDIX C-1

APPENDIX C-1

Introductory Signals: Seventh Through Fourteenth Editions⁴⁸

Signals Indicating Support

	No signal	Accord	See	See (no italics)	See also	E.g.	Cf.
Seventh	"For a square holding, cite the case at the page on which it begins." Page 11.	"For a holding which, although it may be distinguishable, substantially upholds the proposition stated, put 'accord,' before the name of the case. . . . A slighter distinction is indicated by 'accord' than by 'cf.'" Page 13.	"For dictum, put 'see' before the name of the case. . . . 'See' is not used in the footnote if the name of the case has been given in the text and only the report is cited in the footnote. Also omit 'see' when indicating pages on which a direct quotation in the text is found. Dissenting and concurring opinions are cited similarly to dicta. . . ." Page 12.	Not mentioned.	Not mentioned.	"Where a proposition is supported by a large number of holdings or dicta, examples are cited by us of 'E.g.', 'e.g.', and 'See', 'e.g.' followed by commands. Pages 14-16.	"If the case is parallel to the proposition for which it is cited but contains facts materially different, put 'cf.' before the name of the case. . . . Note that this is not the proper method of citing a case which is to be compared with another in the same string. . . . A dictum may also be compared with or distinguished from the point under discussion by the insertion of dicta pages." Page 13.

⁴⁸Table 1, *supra*, describes the introductory signals contained in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Editions. The first five editions did not contain information about introductory signals. Note from Colleen Verner, *Harvard Law Review Business Office*, to Prof. Darby Dickerson (mailed but received Sept. 16, 1990) (copy on file with the *Stetson Law Review*).

<p>Eighth</p>	<p>No signal</p> <p>"No signal" is used: (a) for a square case holding, or a statute directly supporting the proposition for which it is cited. . . . (b) to introduce citations to secondary material if the citation is to a statement of fact or is merely to buttress for what is an obvious, conceded, or otherwise well-established proposition. (c) In the footnote if the name of the case has been given and only the report is cited in the footnote. . . . (d) when indicating pages on which a direct quotation in the text is found. . . . Page 12.</p>	<p>Accord</p> <p>"Accord" is used for a holding which, although it may be distinguishable, substantially upholds the proposition stated. . . . A slighter distinction is indicated by "accord" than by "cf." Pages 12-13.</p>	<p>See</p> <p>"See" (in <i>italics</i>) is used: (a) for a dictum (except when indicating pages on which a direct quotation in the text is found. . . . or when the name of the case has been given in the text and only the report is cited in the footnote. . . . or where the appropriate signal is <i>cf.</i>), . . . (b) for dissenting and concurring opinions. . . . Pages 13-14.</p>	<p>See (no <i>italics</i>)</p> <p>"See" (in roman type) is used: (a) to introduce a citation by the subject matter of which illustrates the proposition (other than a proposition of law) for which it is cited. . . . (b) to introduce citations to secondary material when the reference is to an argument, conclusion, or similar debatable contention of the author. . . . "See" is never italicized when used before secondary sources. . . . (c) where "see" is used in its ordinary, non-signal sense." Pages 13-14.</p>	<p>See also</p> <p>Not mentioned.</p>	<p>E.g.,</p> <p>"Where a proposition is supported or opposed by a large number of holdings or dicta, examples are cited by the use of <i>e.g.</i>; this is italicized, even when it introduces secondary material; it is always followed by a comma; and it is preceded by a comma when it follows another signal." Pages 15-16.</p>	<p>Cf.</p> <p>"Cf." is used: (a) for a case that is parallel to the proposition for which it is cited but contains facts materially different. . . . (b) for a dictum that is to be compared with or distinguished from the point under discussion; here, insert dicta pages. . . . Note that <i>cf.</i> is not the proper way to cite a case that is to be compared with another in the same string. . . . Page 13.</p>
----------------------	---	--	---	--	--	---	---

<p>Ninth</p>	<p>No signal "(c) No signal is used before a case (whether a holding or dictum, or simply a statement in majority, concurring, or dissenting opinion), statute, or secondary source: (i) which directly upholds the statement of law in text. . . . This rule covers authorities (such as dicta in cases, or secondaries) which explicitly make the statement on the state of the law which is reproduced in text. Note that where a dictum or a concurring or dissenting opinion is cited, this fact must be noted. . . . (ii) which explicitly makes the statement of fact presented in text. . . . (iii) which identifies or specifies the subject of the statement in text. . . . Statements of fact in text which refer to legal principles fall within this rule. . . ." Page 39.</p>	<p>Accord "Accord" is used before a case which, although it may be distinguishable on its facts, substantially upholds the statement of law in text. . . . Note that accord is not used in a supplementary sense." Page 39.</p>	<p>See Not mentioned.</p>	<p>See (in italics) "See" (in roman) is used before a case, statute, or secondary which is the basic source material on which the author relies to support the own opinion or conclusion of law or fact. . . . Citations supporting statements of law or fact tentatively presented by the author are always introduced by "see" or <i>q.</i> "See" is also used to introduce purely supplementary material." Pages 39-40.</p>	<p>See also Not mentioned.</p>	<p>E.g., "E.g." is used where the case, statute, or secondary cited is only one of a number of like authorities." Page 41.</p>	<p>Cf. "Cf." is used before a case, statute, or secondary expressing a legal proposition which, while only analogous, lends some support to the statement, conclusion, or opinion of law in text. . . ." Page 40.</p>
--------------	---	--	---	---	--	---	--

<p>Tenth</p>	<p>No signal</p> <p>"No signal is used to introduce any authority which directly upholds a proposition of either law or fact which is stated by the text. Only authorities which unequivocally hold the stated proposition of law or explicitly make the statement or conclusion of law or fact which is made by the text should be cited as support without a signal."</p> <p>Page 85.</p>	<p>Accord</p> <p>"<i>Accord</i> (followed by a comma) is used to introduce any authority which directly upholds the same proposition of law as that advanced in a textual statement but which is factually distinguishable. The use of <i>accord</i> is most frequently appropriate when two cases are directly in point but the text quotes from or states the facts of one of the cases; citation of the other would be introduced by <i>accord</i>." Similarly, the law of one jurisdiction may be cited as in accord with that of another if the law is exactly the same."</p> <p>Page 85.</p>	<p>See</p> <p>Not mentioned.</p>	<p>See (no <i>italics</i>)</p> <p>"<i>See</i> (in roman) is used to introduce any authority which constitutes basic source material supporting an opinion or conclusion of either law or fact drawn in a textual statement. It indicates that the asserted opinion or conclusion will be suggested by an examination of the cited authority rather than that the opinion or conclusion is stated by the cited authority. An opinion or conclusion stated in text, especially statements of law of fact such as 'it seems,' 'it is arguable,' or 'it may be,' can never be supported by citations without introductory signal. <i>See</i> is usually appropriate for introduction of such support."</p> <p><i>See</i> is never used to introduce purely supplementary material except in its nonsignal usage as part of a sentence."</p> <p>Pages 85-86.</p>	<p>See also</p> <p>Not mentioned.</p>	<p>E.g.</p> <p>"<i>E.g.</i> (set off by commas) is used to avoid extra- vagan citation by indicating that the authorities cited are exemplary of numerous like authorities. <i>E.g.</i> is used without an introductory signal in citation . . . to indicate that the authorities cited are typical of the class described by a textual statement such as 'it is often held.' It is also used with no signal or with <i>Contra</i> in citation of only a sample of the authorities that unequivocally hold or oppose the stated proposition of law . . ."</p> <p>"<i>E.g.</i> is also used in citations introduced by <i>see</i> or <i>but see</i> . . . to indicate that only a portion of the basic source materials supporting or opposing the author's assertion are cited. <i>E.g.</i> is never used in citation of authorities introduced by any other signal, since it conveys no useful information to the reader in the context of the other types of support or contravention."</p> <p>Pages 87-88.</p>	<p>Cf.</p> <p>"<i>Cf.</i> is used to introduce any authority which supports a statement, conclusion, or opinion of law different from that in text but sufficiently analogous to lend some support to the text. <i>Cf.</i> is never used to support a statement of fact."</p> <p>"<i>Cf.</i>, rather than <i>accord</i>, is appropriate whenever a factual distinction between the text and the authority is of such legal significance that the propositional must be materially different. <i>Cf.</i>, rather than <i>see</i>, is appropriate whenever the proposition supported by the authority is not relevant directly to that advanced by text but only analogous to it."</p> <p>Page 86.</p>
---------------------	--	---	---	--	--	--	---

⁴⁰The Tenth Edition adds:

"*E.g.* is never used, however, to indicate that authorities other than those cited merely make the same statement of law or fact as that made in text or its converse. Thus, *z.g.* cannot be used when the text bases its conclusion only on assertions by others, such as those in treatises, which do not have legal authority.

	<i>No signal</i>	<i>Accord</i>	<i>See</i>	<i>See (no italics)</i>	<i>See also</i>	<i>E.g.</i>	<i>Cf.</i>
Eleventh	"Cited authority directly supports statement in text." Page 86.	"Cited authority directly supports statement although facts are different. The use of 'accord' is most frequently appropriate directly in point but the text quotes from or states the facts of one of the cases; citation of the other would be introduced by 'accord'. Similarly, the law of one jurisdiction may be cited as in accord with that of another if the law is exactly the same." Page 87.	"Cited authority constitutes basic source material supporting an opinion or conclusion of either law or fact drawn in a textual statement. It indicates that the asserted opinion or conclusion will be suggested by an examination of the cited authority rather than that the opinion or conclusion is stated by the cited authority." Page 87.	Not mentioned.	"Cited authority is broader in scope than, or develops a question analogous to, discussion in text without lending support to proposition asserted, but can profitably be compared with it." ⁴⁸ Page 86.	"There are other examples, but citation to them would not be helpful." Page 86.	"Cited authority supports a statement, opinion, or conclusion of law different from that in text but sufficiently analogous to lend some support to the text." Pages 87.
Twelfth	"Cited authority (i) directly supports statement in text, (ii) identifies source of a quotation, or (iii) identifies an authority referred to in text." Page 6.	"Cited authority directly supports statement, but in a slightly different way than the authority(s) first cited. 'Accord' is commonly used when two or more cases are on point but the text refers to only one; the others are then introduced by 'accord'. Similarly, the law of one jurisdiction may be cited as in accord with that of another." Page 6.	"Cited authority constitutes basic source material that supports the proposition. 'See' is used instead of 'no signal' when the proposition is not stated by the cited authority but follows from it." Pages 6-7.	Not mentioned.	"Cited authority provides background to a question analogous to that examined in text, which can profitably be compared with it." ⁴⁹ Page 7.	"There are other examples directly supporting statement in text, but citation to them would not be helpful. '(E.g., may also be used in combination with other signals, preceded by a comma: 'See, e.g.,' 'But see, e.g.,'." Page 6.	"Cited authority supports a proposition different from that in text but sufficiently analogous to lend support. Literally, 'cf.' means 'compare.' 'Cf.' should not be used without an explanatory parenthetical." Page 7.

⁴⁸In the Eleventh Edition, "see also" and "see generally" are listed together and have the same definition. See ELEVENTH EDITION at 89.

⁴⁹In both the Eleventh and Twelfth Editions, "see also" is listed as a signal indicating background material. See *id.*, TWELFTH EDITION at 7.

<p>Thirteenth</p>	<p>No signal</p> <p>"Cited authority (i) states the proposition, (ii) identifies the source of a quotation, or (iii) identifies an authority referred to in text." Page 8.</p>	<p>Accord</p> <p>"Cited authority directly supports the proposition, but in a slightly different way than the authority(ies) first cited. 'Accord' is commonly used when two or more cases are on point but the text refers to only one; the others are then introduced by 'accord.' Similarly, the law of one jurisdiction may be cited as in accord with that of another." Page 8.</p>	<p>See</p> <p>"Cited authority directly supports the proposition. 'See' is used instead of 'no signal' when the proposition is not stated by the cited authority but follows from it." Page 8.</p>	<p>See (no <i>italics</i>)</p> <p>Not mentioned.</p>	<p>See also</p> <p>"Cited authority constitutes additional source material that supports the proposition. 'See also' is commonly used to cite an authority supporting a proposition when authorities that state or directly support the proposition have already been cited or discussed." Pages 8-9.</p>	<p>E.g.</p> <p>"Cited authority states the proposition; other authorities also state the proposition, but citation to them would not be helpful. 'E.g.' may also be used in combination with other signals, preceded by a comma: See, e.g., But see, e.g.," Page 8.</p>	<p>Cf.</p> <p>"Cited authority supports a proposition different from the main proposition but sufficiently analogous to lend support. Literally, 'cf.' means 'compare.' The citation's relevance will usually be clear to the reader only if it is explained." Page 9.</p>
<p>Fourteenth</p>	<p>"Cited authority (i) states the proposition, (ii) identifies the source of a quotation, or (iii) identifies an authority referred to in text." Page 8.</p>	<p>"'Accord' is commonly used when two or more cases state or directly support the proposition but the text quotes or refers to only one; the others are then introduced by 'accord.' Similarly, the law of one jurisdiction may be cited as in accord with that of another." Page 8.</p>	<p>"Cited authority directly supports the proposition. See is used instead of 'no signal' when the proposition is not stated by the cited authority but follows from it." Page 8.</p>	<p>Not mentioned.</p>	<p>"Cited authority constitutes additional source material that supports the proposition. 'See also' is commonly used to cite an authority supporting a proposition when authorities that state or directly support the proposition have already been cited or discussed." Pages 8-9.</p>	<p>"Cited authority states the proposition; other authorities also state the proposition, but citation to them would not be helpful. 'E.g.' may also be used in combination with other signals, preceded by a comma: See, e.g., But see, e.g.," Page 8.</p>	<p>"Cited authority supports a proposition different from the main proposition but sufficiently analogous to lend support. Literally, 'cf.' means 'compare.' The citation's relevance will usually be clear to the reader only if it is explained." Page 9.</p>

APPENDIX C-2

APPENDIX C-2

Introductory Signals: Seventh Through Fourteenth Editions
 Signals Indicating Comparison, Contradiction, or Background Information

<p>Seventh</p>	<p>Compare . . . with "Where one case is to be compared with another rather than with the text, use the form: 'Compare . . . with . . .'" Page 13.</p>	<p>Contra "For a square holding to the opposite effect, precede the citation with 'Contra' . . . Note that the 'Contra' sign always begins a new sentence, that it is followed by a colon, and that both the sign and the colon are italicized." Pages 13-14.</p>	<p>But see "For a dictum <i>contra</i>, precede the citation with 'But see.' Page 14.</p>	<p>But cf. "But cf.' is used for a decision reaching the opposite result which, although distinguishable, is to be compared with or distinguished from the point under discussion. . . . A distinguishable dictum <i>contra</i> cited with 'But cf.' using dicta pages." Page 14.</p>	<p>See generally Not mentioned.</p>
<p>Eighth</p>	<p>"Compare . . . with . . . ' is used where one fully cited case is to be compared with another such case rather than with the text." Pages 14-15.</p>	<p>"Contra' is used for a square holding to the opposite effect." Page 15.</p>	<p>"But see' is used for a dictum contrary to the proposition with which it is cited; use dicta pages. . . . 'But see' is set in roman type when used to introduce secondary materials." Page 15.</p>	<p>"But cf.' is used: (a) for a decision reaching the opposite result which, although distinguishable, is to be compared with or distinguished from the point under discussion. . . . (b) for a distinguishable dictum; <i>contra</i> the point under discussion; use dicta pages." Page 15.</p>	<p>Not mentioned.</p>
<p>Ninth</p>	<p>"Compare . . . with . . . ' is used where one fully cited authority is to be compared with another authority rather than with the text. . . . Do not use 'cf.' in this situation." Pages 40-41.</p>	<p>"Contra' is used before a case, statute, or secondary: (I) which is directly opposed to a statement of <i>law</i> in text. . . . (II) which contains an explicit statement directly opposed to a statement of <i>fact</i> in text." Page 41.</p>	<p>"But see' is used before a case, statute, or secondary, directly related to the opinion or conclusion of <i>law</i> or <i>fact</i> in text, which casts doubt upon but does not directly <i>contravene</i> it." Page 41.</p>	<p>"But cf.' is used before a case, statute, or secondary, related only by way of analogy to the statement of <i>law</i> in text, which suggests a contrary result." Page 41.</p>	<p>Not mentioned.</p>

	Compare . . . with	Contra	But see	But cf.	See generally
Tenth⁶⁰	"Compare . . . with . . . ' is used whenever one fully identified authority (not a cross reference) is to be compared with another such authority rather than with the text." Page 89.	"Contra' (followed by a comma) is used to introduce any authority that directly contradicts a statement of either law or fact or which unequivocally holds the opposite proposition of law. 'Contra' is also used to introduce any authority which directly opposes the proposition of law advanced by the text, despite a legally insignificant factual distinction between the text and the authority (for example, when text contains a description of the facts of one case or a quotation from one case)." Page 87.	"But see' (always italicized) is used to introduce any authority that is directly related to the opinion, conclusion, or statement of either law or fact by the text and that casts doubt upon the latter or contravenes one application of it but does not directly contravene the conclusion as a whole." Page 87.	"But cf.' is used to introduce any authority that supports a position on a question of law different from the question of law considered by the text, but sufficiently analogous to it to suggest a result contrary to that endorsed by the textual statement, conclusion, or opinion of law." Page 87.	"See generally' is used to introduce any authority which is not cited as authority for the specific proposition of law or fact advanced by the text, but rather for a full development of a subject summarized or tangentially referred to in the text." Page 86.
Eleventh	"Authorities cited, taken together, offer some support for statement in text." Page 87.	"Cited authority directly contradicts statement although facts may be different." Page 87.	"Cited authority strongly suggests a contrary proposition. (N.B. 'But' should be dropped from all contrary signals following the first.)" Page 87.	"Cited authority supports a position different from the statement in text, but sufficiently analogous to it to suggest a contrary conclusion." Page 87.	"Cited authority is broader in scope than, or develops a question analogous to, discussion in text without lending support to proposition asserted, but can profitably be compared with it." Page 86.
Twelfth	"Comparison of authorities cited will offer support for or illustrate a statement in text." Page 7.	"Cited authority directly supports a contrary statement. 'Contra,' is used where '[no signal]' would be used for support." Page 7.	"Cited authority suggests a contrary statement. 'But see' is used where 'see' would be used for support." Page 7.	"Cited authority supports a position analogous to the contrary of the position stated in text." Page 7.	"Cited authority provides background to question examined in text, without providing support for the specific conclusion reached." Page 7.

⁶⁰The Tenth Edition also explains:

"Contra," "But see," and "But cf." citations are the converse respectively of direct (no-signal) and "second," "see," and "cf." citations. The distinctions between them are the same; and type and persuasiveness of the authority are similarly irrelevant to choice of signal. The appropriateness of contrary signals is always governed by the relation of the authority to the text, not to the preceding supporting citation. Note that the first contrary citation is always capitalized and the "But" is dropped from all contrary citation signals following the first such signal.

	<i>Compare . . . with</i>	<i>Contra</i>	<i>But see</i>	<i>But cf.</i>	<i>See generally</i>
Thirteenth	"Comparison of the authorities cited will offer support for or illustrate the proposition. The commentator's relevance will usually be clear to the reader only if it is explained." Page 9.	"Cited authority states the contrary of the proposition. 'Contra' is used where [no signal] would be used for support." Page 9.	"Cited authority directly contradicts the proposition. 'But see' is used where 'see' would be used for support." Page 9.	"Cited authority supports a proposition analogous to the contrary of the main proposition." Page 9.	"Cited authority presents helpful background material related to the proposition." Page 9.
Fourteenth	"Comparison of the authorities cited will offer support for or illustrate the proposition. The commentator's relevance will usually be clear to the reader only if it is explained." Page 9.	"Cited authority states the contrary of the proposition. 'Contra' is used where [no signal] would be used for support." Page 9.	"Cited authority directly contradicts the proposition. 'But see' is used where 'see' would be used for support." Page 9.	"Cited authority supports a proposition analogous to the contrary of the main proposition." Page 9.	"Cited authority presents helpful background material related to the proposition." Page 9.

APPENDIX D

Introductory Notes and Prefaces

EDITION AND YEAR	BLUEBOOK'S PURPOSE
First Edition (1926)	"This pamphlet does not pretend to include a complete list of abbreviations or all the necessary data as to form. It aims to deal with the more common abbreviations and forms to which one has occasion to refer. In general, unless otherwise indicated, the forms in the examples are those to be employed in leading articles." (Foreword)
Second Edition (1928)	"This pamphlet is not intended to include a complete list of abbreviations or all the necessary data as to form. Its purpose is to indicate the more common abbreviations and forms to which constant reference is made. In general, unless otherwise indicated, the forms in the examples are those to be employed in leading articles." (Foreword)
Third Edition (1931)	"This pamphlet is not intended to include a complete list of abbreviations or all the necessary data as to form. Its purpose is to indicate the more common abbreviations and forms to which constant reference is made. In general, unless otherwise indicated, the forms in the examples are those to be employed in leading articles." (Foreword)
Fourth Edition (1934)	"This booklet is not intended to include a complete list of abbreviations or all the necessary data as to form. Its purpose is to indicate the more common abbreviations and to give enough examples of the forms to which constant reference is made to constitute a complete citation system. In general, unless otherwise indicated, the forms in the examples are those to be employed in leading articles." (Foreword)
Fifth Edition (1936)	"This booklet is not intended to include a complete list of abbreviations or all the necessary data as to form. Its purpose is to indicate the more common abbreviations and to give enough examples of the forms to which constant reference is made to constitute a basis for a complete citation system. In general, unless otherwise indicated, the forms in the examples are those to be employed in leading articles." (Foreword)
Sixth Edition (1939)	"This booklet is not intended to include a complete list of abbreviations or all the necessary data as to form. Its purpose is to indicate the more common abbreviations and to give enough examples of the forms to which constant reference is made to constitute a basis for a complete citation system. In general, unless otherwise indicated, the forms in the examples are those to be employed in Leading Articles." (Foreword)

EDITION AND YEAR	BLUEBOOK'S PURPOSE
Seventh (1947)	"This booklet is not intended to include a complete list of abbreviations or all the necessary data as to form. Its purpose is to indicate the more common abbreviations and to give enough examples of the forms to which constant reference is made to constitute a basis for a complete citation system. In general, the forms in the examples are those to be employed in Leading Articles." (Foreword)
Eighth (1949)	"This booklet is not intended to include a complete list of abbreviations or all the necessary data as to form. Its purpose is to indicate the more common abbreviations and to give enough examples of the forms to which constant reference is made to constitute a basis for a complete citation system." (Foreword)
Ninth (1955)	"This booklet is not intended to include a complete list of abbreviations or all the necessary data as to form. Its purpose is to indicate the more common abbreviations and to give enough examples of commonly used citations to constitute the basis for a complete citation system." (Foreword)
Tenth (1958)	"This booklet is not intended to include a complete list of abbreviations or all necessary rules of form. Its purpose is to indicate the more common abbreviations and to give enough examples of commonly used citations to constitute the basis for a complete citation system." (Foreword)
Eleventh (1967)	"The purpose of this uniform system of citation is to ensure that the authorities cited in legal writing can be identified and found by most readers. Thus if the use of a rule in this booklet would prove confusing in the citation of a particular authority, a clearer citation form should be substituted." (Note)
Twelfth (1976)	<p>"This booklet is divided into three parts: The first includes general rules of citation and style and is intended to serve as a self-contained introduction to principles of legal citation. The second collects technical rules of citation relating to cases, statutes, periodicals, and other specific forms of authority. The final section contains lists—divided by country and state—of reporters, codes, session laws, and other sources, and their abbreviations." (Note)</p> <p>"The following uniform system of citation has been designed for use in all forms of legal writing." (p.1)</p>
Thirteenth (1981)	<p>"Because of the ever-increasing range of authorities cited in legal writing, neither this nor any other system of citation can be comprehensive." (Note)</p> <p>"The citation forms in this book have been designed for use in all types of legal writing." (p. 3)</p>

EDITION AND YEAR	BLUEBOOK'S PURPOSE
Fourteenth (1986)	"Because of the ever-increasing range of authorities cited in legal writing, neither this nor any other system of citation can be comprehensive." (p. iv) "The citation forms in this book have been designed for use in all types of legal writing." (p. 3)
Fifteenth (1991)	"The <i>Bluebook</i> . . . sets forth general standards of citation and style to be used throughout legal writing." (p. 3)
Sixteenth (1996)	"The <i>Bluebook</i> . . . sets forth general standards of citation and style to be used throughout legal writing." (p. 3)