

From the Editor

Samuel Johnson once said that “writing dictionaries is dull work,” but he was no expert on true dullness: he never edited a law journal.

If the work is so dreary, then, what sustains the *SJLW*? For one thing, when you focus on what our contributors are saying, as opposed to their citation form, the ideas generate considerable intellectual electricity.

And then there are the occasional comments from readers who appreciate lively discussions of legal writing. Foremost among these are Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, who writes Professor Charles Alan Wright to say that “[t]he *Scribes Journal* is always good reading” (*post* at 102), and Justice Harry A. Blackmun, who records that Justice White discussed the *Journal* in conference one day last year (*post* at 100). And, of course, our last issue prompted an article by that paragon of legal journalists, David Margolick of *The New York Times*. With attention like that, perhaps any amount of dull work might seem tolerable.

This year, we received some fine help from my students at the Southern Methodist University School of Law: Cynthia Lòpez Beverage, Craig Mason, Cari M. Ogle, Laura C. Prager, D’Ann Rasmussen, and Lisa Schiffman. Each of these students in my Legal Editing seminar made several good editorial suggestions in specific pieces.

As always, we welcome contributions for upcoming issues and invite our readers to send us articles and essays of any length — but the shorter the piece, the fewer the footnotes, the fresher the thoughts, the bolder the style, the better.

—Bryan A. Garner

