

Continue



See also bluebook

Bluebook Rule (21st): 1.2(a) Law Review Typeface For Introductory Signals: Italics Signals indicating that the cited work is supportive of the author's text are the most commonly used type of signal. There are six supporting signals: [no signal] E.g., Accord See See also Cf. The most frequently used are probably [no signal], E.g., See, and See Also. [no signal] No signal is necessary if a cited authority directly states the proposition, identifies the source of a direct quotation, or identifies the source referred to in the text. E.g., "E.g.," is the abbreviation for the Latin phrase "exempli gratia," and can loosely be translated to mean "good example." "E.g." is used when the cited authority states the proposition and when citation to other authorities also stating the proposition would be unhelpful or unnecessary. NOTE: "E.g." can be combined with other signals, such as "See." When communed with another signal, the other signal should be given first, separated by an italicized comma but ending with a non-italicized comma: See, e.g., See See is probably the most frequently used (and abused) introductory signal. It is used when the cited authority clearly supports a proposition but there is an inferential step between the proposition as stated and the cited authority. Although not a catch-all signal, it is often inappropriately used as such. See also "See also" is used to cite to additional materials and authority that supports a proposition but when other authority has already been cited to using either See or [no signal]. An explanatory parenthetical stating the relevance of the additional material is strongly encouraged. NOTE: It is not appropriate to use See also for general background-reading materials; in that case, the signal "See generally" should be used (rule 1.2(d)). Again, an explanatory parenthetical explaining the relevance of the material is strongly encouraged. The first nine rules of The Bluebook are general rules covering such topics are introductory signals, quotations, and citations to subparts such as sections, paragraphs, or pages. These rules are general because they can apply in any given citation. (Rules 10-21 are specific rules because they cover citation issues related to specific types of authority, jurisdictions, or formats and will only apply when a specific type of authority falls under that rule.) Melanie Kalmanson is a commercial litigation attorney and former Florida Supreme Court law clerk. She is the author of the Bluebook Wednesday Tips Newsletter. Click here to subscribe to Melanie's newsletter. The introductory signals "see" and "see also" belong together. Do not start a new sentence with "see also." Reason: They are in the same category. All introductory signals in the same category go together in a string-cite. Rule 1.3; see Rule 1.2. : See Case X. See also Case Y. : See Case X; see also Case Y. But see Case Z. Bluebook Rule (21st): 1.4 Law Review Typeface: Varies By Document Type Rule 1.4 deals with the order of authorities within each signal. The main authority being cited, or whichever is most useful, if any, should always be cited first. Previous versions of Rule 1.4 provided exhaustive, almost prescriptive details for how various specific authority types (constitutions, statutes, treaties, etc.) should be ordered when they are equally relevant or important. The current version of Rule 1.4 in the 21st Edition of the Bluebook abandons that approach. Instead, it simply advises that authorities "should be ordered in a logical manner," and separated by a semicolon. Generally speaking, this will mean ordering the authorities based on three characteristics: 1) Type of authority; 2) Jurisdiction; and 3) Hierarchy and/or Chronology When in doubt, consider consulting prior versions of Rule 1.4 (Bluebook 20th Edition or earlier). Also keep this change in mind when reviewing older citations for guidance, as the order of authorities within older citations was driven by more specific requirements. Bluebook Rule (21st): 4.2(a) Law Review Typeface: Italics "Supra" may be used to refer to certain types of previously cited materials as well as internal cross-references. Rule 4.2 contains a complete, detailed list of which materials may and may not be cited to using "Supra." Note, however, that in general most forms of primary legal authority (cases, statutes, etc.) should not be referred to using "Supra." NOTE: This is also true for materials such as restatements, legislative documents (other than hearings), and model codes which typically have similar citation formats. "Supra" citations are most commonly used for secondary authority, such as books and periodicals. Therefore, the most common format for a Supra short form citation consists of the author's last name followed "supra," offset by a comma. Immediately after "supra" is the word "note" in ordinary type, followed by the number of the footnote in which the authority was first cited in full: 15. Philip D. O'Neill, Jr., Verification in an Age of Insecurity: The Future of Arms Control Compliance 45 (2010). 25. O'Neill, supra note 15. A pincite offset by a comma should indicate changes in what portion of the authority is being cited. An "at" is typically necessary to avoid confusion: 28. O'Neill, supra note 15, at 52. If a work has an institutional author, use the complete institutional name; works without an author may be cited to by the title, while unsigned student authored law journal works should be cited by the appropriate designation such as "Note" or "Comment." NOTE: The typeface convention from the original source should be used for the author name or title in a "supra" citation. Legal documents often contain citation signals that guide readers to additional sources, and understanding these signals is crucial for thorough legal research. Among them, "See Also" directs attention to related or supplementary materials. Role of See Also in Legal Documents The "See Also" signal points readers to additional resources that, while not directly on point, are still relevant. It is commonly used in legal briefs, judicial opinions, and scholarly articles to suggest further reading that provides broader context or supports an argument. For example, a court opinion citing a case with "See Also" may indicate that the case offers valuable insights or principles related to the legal issue at hand, even if it is not directly analogous. In legal research, "See Also" is particularly useful for exploring complex doctrines or multifaceted issues. It helps connect disparate cases or statutes, enriching the analysis. For instance, in antitrust litigation, a "See Also" citation might direct attention to cases discussing economic theories relevant to market competition, even if those cases do not involve the same parties or specific legal questions. This approach allows for a more comprehensive argument by incorporating a wider array of perspectives and precedents. The strategic use of "See Also" reflects the depth of legal argumentation. By pointing to additional authorities, attorneys demonstrate thorough research and bolster their credibility. This is especially important in appellate briefs, where presenting a broad spectrum of legal thought can be persuasive. Judges may also use "See Also" to suggest that while a particular case is not binding precedent, it provides reasoning that is applicable to the case at hand. Distinguishing See Also from Other Citation Signals In legal writing, citation signals clarify the weight and relevance of cited authorities. "See Also" is often compared with signals like "See" and "Cf." Each serves a distinct purpose. "See" directs readers to an authority that directly supports the point being made, while "See Also" suggests additional sources for broader context or supplementary insights. "Cf."—short for "confer," meaning "compare"—points to a source that contrasts with the cited material, encouraging consideration of differing perspectives. The distinctions between these signals are significant in judicial opinions and legal briefs. For example, in cases involving constitutional interpretation, "See" might reference a landmark Supreme Court decision directly addressing the issue, whereas "See Also" might point to a law review article providing historical context or comparative analysis from another jurisdiction. A well-placed "See Also" citation can add depth by inviting exploration of related legal theories or analogous circumstances. Understanding these differences is key to crafting persuasive arguments. In appellate courts, where judges seek a comprehensive understanding of the legal landscape, a strategic "See Also" citation can guide the court through a curated path of reasoning. By using "See Also" alongside other signals, attorneys enhance the persuasiveness of their arguments by presenting a more nuanced and well-rounded legal analysis. Usage in Court Filings In court filings, citation signals, including "See Also," shape legal arguments and influence outcomes. Attorneys use them to weave together precedents, statutes, and legal theories. "See Also" bolsters arguments by pointing to additional authorities that enhance understanding. For example, in a complex tort case, a lawyer might cite a primary case directly on point and use "See Also" to reference scholarly articles or secondary cases discussing broader implications or similar principles. This signal reflects the depth of research and the robustness of an argument. In appellate briefs, where thoroughness is paramount, "See Also" demonstrates diligence in exploring all facets of a legal question. By guiding courts to supplementary materials, attorneys underscore the multifaceted nature of legal issues and highlight diverse perspectives that may impact interpretation. Historical Development of Citation Signals The evolution of citation signals, including "See Also," is rooted in the development of legal writing and research methodologies. Historically, citation practices varied across jurisdictions and even individual courts. As legal literature expanded and the complexity of issues increased, the need for a more uniform system became apparent. The Bluebook: A Uniform System of Citation, first published in 1926, played a pivotal role in standardizing citation practices in the United States. It introduced a structured approach, including signals like "See Also," to guide readers through legal arguments effectively. The adoption of standardized citation signals has improved clarity in legal documents, allowing for more precise references to authorities. This development has been particularly significant in appellate courts, where the precision of legal arguments is critical. The evolution of citation signals reflects the legal profession's ongoing efforts to enhance the accessibility and organization of legal research, ensuring that arguments are supported by a coherent and well-structured body of authority.