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Abstract—The German word Festschrift has become the universally accepted term for a published collection of legal essays written by several authors to honour a distinguished jurist or mark a significant legal event. The genre dates back to the mid-19th century on the Continent, but until recently it has made little impression on the literature of the common law. Less than a dozen legal Festschriften had been published in the United Kingdom up to 1968, but since then more than a hundred legal Festschriften have appeared. This article traces the rise of the legal Festschrift in the United Kingdom, and attempts to account for its recent popularity. The nature of legal Festschriften, and the processes and problems of their production, are addressed. Emphasis is placed on the systemic failure to index contributions to legal Festschriften. This gap in the bibliographic resources of the common law consigns an enormous amount of scholarship to oblivion; hence the reference in the title to ‘graveyards of scholarship’. An indication of the magnitude of this problem is that the total number of contributions to legal Festschriften between 1969 and 2000 almost equals the total number of articles published in three leading British law reviews over the same period. The article concludes that the failure to index contributions to legal Festschriften by author and subject matter is lamentable, and undercuts the reasons for publishing legal Festschriften in the first place.

This article is prompted by the appearance of an ever-increasing number of books of essays honouring distinguished common lawyers. As a genre of legal writing it is of recent origin in the common law world, but it follows a much longer Continental tradition. Up to 1968 there are fewer than a dozen such books published in the United Kingdom—the comparable figure in Germany alone being 70 times that—whereas today they are pouring forth in spate in the
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home of the common law.1 This essay explores the strengths and weaknesses of the genre, and speculates on why this explosion of legal writing is occurring and what needs to be done about it.

1. The Festschrift Tradition

There is a long tradition on the Continent of collections of essays honouring distinguished jurists or institutions. In Germany these go by the name Festschrift (singular) or Festschriften (plural), and mark an event (retirement or the attainment of a certain age) of a distinguished jurist (which in the Continental tradition almost always means academic lawyer, rather than judge or practitioner) or, less frequently, the anniversary of an event or institution. Over the last century the German word has become the internationally accepted designation for such homage publications.2 It is not correct, however, to view the genre as a Teutonic institution or of German origin.3

To a scholar, the gift of the scholarship of others is a most appropriate one. Festschriften, according to Rounds and Dow, are intended to serve ‘the grand object of all scholarly devotion, namely the increase of scholarly interest and knowledge’, while simultaneously paying ‘a public and tangible tribute to one scholar by other scholars’.4

Beyond the literal translation of the German—Fest meaning ‘celebration’ and Schrift meaning ‘writing’—the features of a legal Festschrift derive from convention. Lilly M. Roberts defined legal Festschriften as published collections of legal essays by different authors, specifically written to honour an individual, institution or an event.6 She included memorial publications as well as special


3 R. Pick, ‘Some Thoughts on Festschriften and a Projected Subject Index’ (1959) 12 German Life & Letters N.S. 204, 204–5.


issues of law reviews, but excluded publications that did not reveal ‘their homage’ in the title. For my purpose here, I have excluded from the category of legal Festschriften the special issue of a law review or journal honouring a person, event or institution. First, as Roberts acknowledged, they are difficult to locate. After the covers are removed to bind the volume, a special issue may be very difficult to detect except by laboriously thumbing every volume of every journal. Second, and this is more to the point developed below, those contributions to scholarship will be indexed in the usual way and hence will be accessible through standard bibliographic reference works. They will not be lost or buried. Third, there is something more significant, weighty and permanent about a stand-alone tome. This is not to disparage the practice, most common in the United States, of dedicating a law review issue to a distinguished lawyer. Such dedicated issues simply lack the gravitas of a stand-alone Festschrift.

I take issue with Roberts’ criterion that the person, event or institution honoured must be mentioned in the title for it to qualify as a Festschrift. The verdict from practice supports her view, but I would not want to exclude those works that satisfy all other criteria for inclusion. However, it hardly seems wise to omit mention of the honorand in the title and somewhat defeats the purpose. Occasionally the honorand dies before publication, necessitating a change in title to celebration or tribute. Some volumes are organized either immediately or some time after an honorand’s (usually) unexpected death.

One especially valuable feature of Festschriften is the customary inclusion of a complete bibliography of the honorand’s published work. The honorand can help with this but should not be relied upon as the exclusive source. This is very important because a surprising number of eminent jurists do not maintain complete

---

8 As a consequence I have not included in the list of common law Festschriften in the Appendix any special issues of law reviews republished in book form.
10 On the positive side, however, such special issues offer the contributors and the honorand wider circulation (often within the honorand’s field of speciality) and better bibliographic referencing: E.S. Gleaves, ‘A Watch and Chain and a Jeweled Sword; or, The Graveyard of Scholarship: The Festschrift and Librarianship’ (1984) 24 RQ 466, 470. See also T. Weir, Book Review [1984] CLJ 176.
11 In an earlier article she described them as ‘hidden’ Festschriften and pointed out the difficulty for library cataloguers, but did not exclude them from the class: Roberts, above n 7 at 55.
12 Those few that I have found are identified in the Appendix by the addition of square brackets after the citation, indicating who or what the volume honours.
14 See, e.g. G.M. Wilner (ed.), Jux Et Societas: Essays in Tribute to Wolfgang Friedmann (Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, 1979). Wolfgang Friedmann (1907–72) was born and educated in Germany, fled the Nazis and was a student and then a law teacher at the University of London, before moving on to the Universities of Melbourne, Toronto and Columbia University. He was murdered during a mugging in New York city.
or accurate lists of their writings. After a long, productive and successful career, it can be very time-consuming, not to say frustrating, to compile a complete publications list. The assistance of a professional law librarian is often essential.

Another feature of Festschriften is the inclusion of biographical details about the person honoured. As the editors of an American legal Festschrift said: ‘Without Hamlet, what is the play?’ Understandably, however, there is a good deal of variation in the depth of coverage and the matters covered. Allowance must be made for the wishes and sensibilities of the honorand, and the editors. Not every honorand wants a trumpet blown and nor would every editor want to do it. The travail of a Festschrift might be considered homage enough.

An awkwardness for contributors is to know how to acknowledge—if at all—the fact that the piece was written for the honorand. To a considerable extent, it seems to depend on the degree of acquaintanceship and the personalities involved. Does one start out with the salute in the first line, or in the last, or is it placed below the Plimsoll line in a note? Or should one pretend it is a non-commissioned law review article?

An occasional lapse is the absence of a centralized list of contributors and their institutional affiliations. It is irritating when this is combined with a laissez-faire policy of allowing each individual contributor to decide whether or not to indicate institutional affiliation at the foot of each contribution. Who the contributors are and whence they come is part of the story the Festschrift should tell. It is also a matter of regret that legal Festschriften seldom have tables of cases and legislation or adequate indexes.

The norm is one Festschrift per jurist. The exceptions usually concern persons who bestride countries, legal systems, and disciplines—or are truly profound scholars. The German convention of taking certain ages as markers for Festschriften, usually turning 60, 70 or 80 years old, mean that the long-lived scholar might enjoy two or more. The Continental jurist appears to find no embarrassment in multiple Festschriften for the same person. The common law Festschrift tradition is so young that it is hardly a problem yet. Early on, W.W. Buckland received two, and in the period covered here Otto Kahn-Freund, Alan Watson, H.L.A. Hart and Tony Honore received two each, and David Daube three.

17 An early review of the genre outside law found that half of all Festschriften celebrated sixtieth or seventieth birthdays: S.G. Morley, ‘The Development of the Homage-Volume’ (1929) 8 Philological Quarterly 61, 64.
18 One was shared with two other scholars and the other was a special issue of an American law review (which I exclude from the category). See Roberts, above n 1 at 14.
There is an understanding that pieces commissioned for a Festschrift are written specifically for it and will not be republished elsewhere. This has both human and financial aspects. The human side is that the exclusivity accentuates the generosity of giving something of one’s self to the person honoured, and which will only appear in a book with the honorand’s name on the cover. Re-publication tarnishes the lustre of a Festschrift. The financial aspect is that the publisher does not want sales undercut by some or all of the pieces being ‘free-to-air’ in other fora. There is frequently a contractual undertaking to that effect. Special arrangements are no doubt made, but even then, it may be difficult to suppress the feeling of ‘breaking ranks’ when some deny themselves while others do not. As we will see, the temptation to break ranks and re-publish stems from the fact that contributions to Festschriften are relatively inaccessible to many.

2. Selection of the Honorand and Contributors

To be worthy of a Festschrift it should go without saying that the person is distinguished. Can distinction be gainsaid? Will any honorand of a common law Festschrift suffer the indignity of the honorand of an historical one, the review of which said the honorand was unworthy, had supervised no graduate students and was insignificant in the discipline. Nor did the inclusion of eminent contributors to this volume ward off a vicious review. The contributions of many were described by the reviewer as ‘slight’—mere shavings from their workbenches—and that of the renowned J.G.A. Pocock was described as ‘sawdust’.

For there to be a Festschrift, one or more persons (almost invariably academics) have to be ready, willing and able to go to considerable effort and trouble to honour the person. These persons—the putative editors—must have the desire to mark that person’s influence and accomplishments. The editors will then approach other like-minded persons, most of them well-established in the field, to contribute. As explained below, the more high-powered the line-up the better. At some point potential publishers will be approached. Some honorands are so deserving and some editors so trustworthy that a publisher may sign a contract with the editors without prior commitment by contributors. In other cases, a fully-developed proposal may be necessary.


21 Ibid, 305.

22 See Gleaves, above n 10 at 468.
The issues of who is chosen to be honoured, the self-selection of editors and who is approached to contribute can raise sensitive issues. Why are some eminent scholars honoured in this way but not other, seemingly equally worthy scholars? Why was there no (posthumous) Festschrift for the great but tragically cut-down Stanley de Smith but there is for the happily long-lived Sir William Wade—both pioneers in the field of administrative law? Sticking to the administrative law field, there are Festschriften for W.A. Robson, J.A.G. Griffith and J.D.B. Mitchell but not, for example, for Harry Street or Gabriele Ganz.23

Indeed, in the short history of the common law Festschriften not one woman has been honoured. Of the 197 editors of the 106 common law Festschriften listed in the Appendix, only 18 (or 9.14%) are women.24 That may explain why the preponderance of invited contributors, in some instances exclusively so, are men. The percentage of essays written by women for common law Festschriften (including co-authored contributions) amounts to a fraction over 10%.25 If an invitation to contribute to a Festschrift is seen as an honour and a privilege (as I think it should be) then one can see where these academic spoils are going. From the point of view of women legal scholars that does not seem to be a cause for celebration.26 It may be only a matter of time, of course.27

There is a discernible element of self-perpetuation in legal Festschriften of both civilian and common law varieties. Many of the editors of, and contributors to, Festschriften are in turn honoured by homage volumes themselves.28 Some hardy souls have edited more than one common law Festschrift.29

---

23 It is invidious to name names. There may be many reasons why some are honoured in this way but other scholars are not. Some may discourage the idea. See Morley, above n 17 at 65. Others may not appreciate the thought, or misunderstand the motivation. R.G. Collingwood, the Oxford polymath, described a Festschrift as ‘the last humiliation of an aged scholar, when his juniors conspire to print a volume of essays and offer it to him as a sign that they now consider him senile’: R.G. Collingwood, *An Autobiography* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1939; rep. 1978) 119. (Thanks to Tony Weir for this reference.) It appears Collingwood never suffered that humiliation. Of course, there is more than one way to honour a distinguished jurist. I note that there are annual lecture series named after Harry Street (at Manchester) and Gabriele Ganz (at Southampton).

24 Only three women have edited common law Festschriften solo—Carol Harlow (1986), Ruth Gavison (1987) and Caroline Bridge (1997). The others jointly edited Festschriften with men. Only one common law Festschrift so far has more women contributors than men: C. Bridge (ed.), *Family Law towards the Millennium: Essays for P.M. Bromley* (Butterworths, London, 1997). Due to the difficulty of discovering gender when initials are used instead of first name(s) or when the first name(s) are not of English origin, the figure of 18 women editors may be on the low side.

25 The ratio is 167 out of 1663 contributions (counting jointly written contributions once only) or 10.04%. Of those 167 contributions by women to Festschriften, 13 contributions (or 7.78%) were jointly authored, all with men.


27 This is not unique to legal Festschriften. See R. Lewis, ‘Festschriften Honor Exceptional Scientific Careers, Scholarly Influence’ (1996) 10 (17) *Scientist* 15 (2 Sept. 1996). See also Roberts, above n 7 at 51, n 32. The list of editors who subsequently became honorands includes Ian Brownlie, David Daube, John Griffith, Georg Schwarzenberger, Kenneth Simmonds, Alan Watson, Lord Wedderburn. Gareth Jones edited one after he received his own. Many more contributors to Festschriften have become honorands subsequently. In fact, very few honorands have not contributed previously to Festschriften honouring other scholars.

3. Publishing and Publicizing Festschriften

The books are usually handsomely produced. The appearance of the book, as well as the content, has to be pleasing.\(^{30}\) This makes Festschriften more expensive to produce than some other types of law books. Often the unit price is high in order to recoup costs, as anticipated sales are low and consequently the print run is small. This can become a self-fulfilling prophecy.\(^ {31}\) Small sales figures inevitably restrict immediate access by researchers outside centres with large and well-resourced law libraries.

It appears to be the case that many law books are sold on the basis of book reviews. Festschriften, by definition, honour what we can compendiously describe as ‘the great and the good’. One might suppose that a book honouring one of that circle should sell widely simply on name recognition and law librarians’ desire for the ‘complete works’ of, and on, so-and-so. But this does not appear to be the case.\(^ {32}\) Law book requesters and law book buyers may not systematically trawl each and every book publishers’ catalogue. Even if they do, remarkably, publishers’ blurbs sometimes give little or no clue as to content or contributors. Moreover, some Festschriften are published by lesser known law publishing houses. This is particularly true of the institutional or ‘event’ Festschriften. Also the comparatively high cost of Festschriften will be an important factor for many libraries. So book reviews remain a major source of information and publicity, and a litmus test of value for money. Many libraries have a policy of awaiting reviews before making purchasing decisions.

Some Festschriften are not reviewed at all, and this alone can consign the Festschrift, and all the scholarship contained in it, to the grave, to be disinterred, if at all, only by luck or by the truly determined. Of course, the contributors may in future refer to their own or other contributions, and that may ensure some publicity and impact.\(^ {33}\)

But how does one review a Festschrift? First, we must go back a step to survey the art of reviewing law books; itself a neglected topic. There are no rules about reviewing law books, except that if a reviewer writes for long enough it is ‘upgraded’ to a review essay. When that occurs the reviewer is expected to be ‘original’, and in any case is taken more seriously. A review essay counts as a ‘real’ publication, the equivalent of an article, in contrast to a mere review, which attracts almost no academic credit. The equation of quality with length is

\(^{30}\) See J.G. Rogers, Book Review, 48 Harv LR 1455, 1459 (1935) (‘[i]n quality and dignity the [Festschrift under review] is what it ought to be, the crest of scholarship and format’).

\(^{31}\) Gleaves described this as the ‘vicious circle’ of ‘limited circulation’: above n 10 at 470–71.

\(^{32}\) A search of the catalogues of 20 leading UK research libraries using www.copac.ac.uk disclosed remarkable, and often unexpected, variation in the number and geographic location of holdings for the common law Festschriften listed in the Appendix.

\(^{33}\) There is also the avenue of republication of one’s own articles and papers in a collection: a sort of Festschrift to one’s self. This was popular in the first half of the 20th century before the advent of the photocopier, and was an excellent way of making work first published in less-than-accessible places available to a wider audience. This genre has had a revival in the last 20 or so years, with the welcome consequence that some of the English language contributions of leading common lawyers to foreign-sourced Festschriften is somewhat easier to access. But these solo author collections of essays are no better treated bibliographically than Festschriften. It should be noted that the standard definitions of Festschrift exclude a collection of a single author’s articles in one volume.
misguided, of course, but endemic. This is just the most obvious way in which book reviewing is systematically marginalized in academic culture.  

It is notoriously difficult to persuade academics to review any type of law book. A perverse form of free ridership operates. Everyone acknowledges that a review can be very significant in terms of sales and advancement for the author(s), but few want to do it. The incentives are to write your own book and not to delay by reviewing those of others, all the while hoping that someone will review your book when it is published. Many academics free ride in that way.

In my view, reviewing a book is, in part, an act of generosity and a public service. Ideally, a reviewer reads the book and then more attentively than might otherwise be the case. Book reviews, however, are largely disregarded in terms of publication credit, and, unless witheringly negative, are quickly forgotten by readers (but seldom by the author or editor of the book reviewed).

But the review format not only attracts the selfless and the public spirited, the law book reviewing menagerie includes the axe-grinders, the nitpickers, the sadists, the back-scratchers, the duellists, the bibliophiles and so on. This classic list, sorely in need of updating, is in Graham Parker’s *A Field Guide to Book Reviewing.* There is a curious aspect of reviews that has always intrigued me. Generally speaking, book reviews are overwhelmingly negative in tone. In this they reflect the academic enterprise. Reviewers find fault more easily than they bestow praise. Perhaps it is thought there is little mileage in raving about a wonderful book. Or is it that unqualified acclaim of another’s work provides others with a yardstick to measure one’s own ability, acumen, judgement, etc? Safer to express doubts, quibbles, reservations, grand disagreements—all frightening away the principle of charity.

So much for law book reviewing in general. There are obvious and special difficulties in reviewing legal Festschriften. There is the ‘everyone-who-is-anyone-in-the-field-contributed-to-the-book’ problem. Not only are many of the obvious choices of reviewer ruled out because they are contributors to the volume, but people who are not contributors often do not want to advertise the fact. Also, the array of luminaries might well put off all but the lion-hearted or the malevolent from undertaking a review. Sometimes all that can be hoped for is the ‘non-review’, where a reviewer simply brings the book to the notice of others while heaping more glory on the honorand. This is more like a book notice, an even lower form of life on the intellectual food chain. At least, the ‘non-review’ serves

---

38 K. Lipstein, Book Review [1993] CLJ 179 (‘How to review a Festschrift is a problem which has never been solved successfully’).
the useful function of advertising the book, but often does not identify all of the contents.

If a reviewer can be found and does decide to engage with the contributions, they may be defeated still by the unthematic or eclectic nature of some Festschriften. Can a reviewer focus on some of the contributions without seeming to cast aspersions on the rest? Even if the collection has a focus or foci the reviewer may not feel competent, or want to commit the time, to review all the parts. This runs the risk of the ‘lopsided’ review, with certain contributions getting all of the (often critical) attention.

There remains the option, little exercised today, of the ‘full Monty’ review, whereby every single contribution is commented upon seriatim. The classic example is a review by Max Rheinstein of a collection in honour of Hessel E. Yntema published in the American Journal of Comparative Law under the hopefully tongue-in-cheek title ‘How to Review a Festschrift’. In 38 pages the reviewer lays bare the same number of individual contributions to the volume. ‘The result’, said Rheinstein, ‘may be tedious to the reader . . . [b]ut any other method would fail to present the richness of the book . . . [a]nd it would also have implied possible invidious distinction’.

That particular review illustrates also perhaps the potential difficulty of reviewing the work of others with whom one is or has been associated. The volume was commissioned by the Board of Editors of the American Journal of Comparative Law, and was edited on the Board’s behalf by three of its number in honour of that journal’s editor-in-chief. The reviewer was also on the editorial board. But, in fairness, the reviewer was critical of one of the themes in the collection (which included a contribution by one of the editors), the reading of which had permitted Rheinstein to put his finger on the cause of his unease with American conflict of laws scholarship. But, he noted knowingly, ‘a book review is not the best place to express ideas believed to be new. As a matter of fact, it may constitute a sure way to hide them from the attention of those whom one hopes to reach’. As noted above, we—the academic we, here—expect ideas and insights to be packaged in larger parcels than book reviews to be noteworthy.

Although it is more difficult to find reviewers for Festschriften, once a review is in—as with any other type of law book—it matters who reviewed it, where the review appears and what it says. A review in the right place might be enough to rescue the volume from oblivion. The Festschrift for Kurt Lipstein (a conflict of laws scholar who taught at Cambridge) was published in Germany, although many of the contributions are in English. The only timely English language review it attracted was a well-judged and warm one in the Law Quarterly

41 Ibid, 633.
43 In an early article it was suggested that the quality of reviews of (general) Festschriften was poor overall. See Rounds and Dow, above n 4 at 295. That is not my impression of reviews of common law Festschriften.
Review by Ronald Graveson, an elder statesman among conflict of laws scholars.44 The only other English language review I know of is a notice by Tony Weir, full of bonhomie and his characteristic wit.45

But book reviews will not always succeed in ensuring visibility of a Festschrift. An example of this is the Festschrift for J.A.G. Griffith entitled Public Law and Politics.46 This attracted one-and-a-half book reviews, but it is rarely referred to in the public law literature.47 The most obvious reason for this obscurity is that the title did not refer to J.A.G. Griffith by name. Mention is made of the fact that the book honours him only in the preface, not on the title page.48 It appears that omission may have proved fatal in terms of impact or influence.49

4. Anti-Festschriften and the Middle Ground

This counter-genre deserves a mention.50 Far less numerous but no less worthy for that, these are attacks on the work and philosophy of the ‘great man’, deprecating his baleful influence. Philosophers and philosopher-kings seem particularly susceptible to this fate. H.L.A. Hart, the subject of two Festschriften, was the subject of an anti-Festschrift.51 At a lower level of abstraction, so was Lord Denning, which levelled the score.52

In between the Festschrift and the anti-Festschrift is a book of essays by several authors examining the work and ideas of a particular jurist, which is neither celebratory in the sense of a Festschrift nor as unrelentingly critical as an anti-Festschrift. The person’s work is taken seriously, explored and usually built upon. It is easier to illustrate by way of example than describe this category in the abstract because there is no clear cutting line at either end. There is not yet a

---

44 R.H. Graveson, Book Review (1981) 97 LQR 493. Graveson, who contributed to many Festschriften and also co-edited a German one for Imre Zittay, never received one himself.
45 T. Weir, Book Review [1984] CLJ 176: ‘Like the Ph.D and the Christmas tree, the Festschrift is a German import. As a stimulus to output, indeed, it is like a combination of them, but like them, the Festschrift has its unfortunate aspects also’.
46 C. Harlow (ed.), Public Law and Politics (Sweet & Maxwell, London, 1986). In the ‘Preface’ it is said that ‘[t]he book is not and never was intended as a formal collection of essays “in honour of” John Griffith. It is a small gift from a few of the people who share . . . [his] interests and have enjoyed talking and working with him . . . The theme was chosen in the hope of giving pleasure to John Griffith’ (p. v). This is a Festschrift in my book.
48 For some this would rule the book out of the Festschrift category: Roberts, above n 1 at ix. Martin Loughlin bemoaned the fact that it was not a Festschrift in his review: above n 47.
49 See Pick, above n 3 at 207: ‘By omitting a name [from the title page] editors needlessly reduce what slender chances of survival [the Festschrift] has in a technical age; they also put superfluous difficulties in the way of readers, bibliographers and librarians’.
50 This term is coined by H. Lücke, Book Review (1985–86) 10 Adelaide LR 267.
52 Compare P. Robson and P. Watchman (eds), Justice, Lord Denning and the Constitution (Gower, Farnborough, 1981) and J.L. Jowell and J.P.W.B. McAuslan (eds), Lord Denning: The Judge and the Law (Sweet & Maxwell, London, 1984). As Simon Lee noted, Lord Denning was the subject of many books, most of which he wrote himself: Judging Judges (Faber & Faber, London, 1988) at 127.
Festschrift as such for Ronald Dworkin, but there are several books with Dworkin’s name in the title examining his thought and contribution to jurisprudence. 53 One reason for uncertainty in this regard is that, although the common law has imported the genre, it has not adopted the name Festschrift in book titles. A German writer has praised the English for giving homage volumes straightforward titles, such as ‘Essays in Honour . . .’; thereby easing the tasks of librarians and users. 54 But editors of common law Festschriften pay homage mostly in the sub-(or even sub-sub-) title, and by and large have not resisted the Continental practice of vague, esoteric, evocative or catchy main titles. 55 The tendency of cataloguers, reviewers, law review editors and writers to prune citations means that the sub-titles are often ignored and the homage aspect lost from sight.

There is a related difficulty of determining who is within the discipline of law for the purpose of inclusion in a list of common law or legal Festschriften. Economists, historians and philosophers cause the most hand wringing. Roberts attempted to overcome the interdisciplinary difficulty by stipulating that the essays had to be ‘predominantly legal’. 56 That excludes, for example, the Festschriften for Friedrich von Hayek, who had lots to say about law. 57 Much depends on what one conceives of as law.

5. Other Collections of Legal Essays

By focusing on legal Festschriften in this essay I do not want to be taken necessarily to imply there is a difference in kind between them and other collections of legal essays either commissioned by editors or arising out of conferences and the like. The raison d’être of these collections is not honouring one individual or institution, but rather a conference, gathering or exploration of a theme. These collections have yet to be dignified by a name. Tony Weir has recently proposed the unflattering term ‘bookette’. 58 The reasons for the vast increase in the number of these collections seem to me likely to differ from those suggested below for the explosion of common law Festschriften, although I cannot take up that matter here. Casual empiricism suggests that there is a greater unevenness of quality of contribution to these other essay collections than with Festschriften. These collections share, however, the bibliographic fate of Festschriften. However, the weight of that tombstone is not discouraging the would-be editors and publishers driving the phenomenal growth in the number of these collections.

54 Pick, above n 3 at 207.
55 Gleaves, above n 10 at 469.
56 Roberts, above n 1 at x.
6. Gardens of Scholarship?

In theory, common law *Festschriften* should be gardens of scholarship. If the very best scholars are being honoured by the presentation of original work by carefully selected experts, who give this work priority over everything else, then how can the resultant collage be anything other than stellar. But like a garden, a *Festschrift* needs careful planting and tending to be first class.

Who then tends the garden? It is the editors who conceive and execute the idea, get a publisher on board, gather the contributors and try to keep them on the straight and narrow to publication. They are usually close friends and/or colleagues of the honorand or otherwise have a special reason for wanting to undertake the relatively thankless task (affiliation with institution, etc). The more distinguished the editors are themselves the better, for that reflects more glory upon the honorand, and likely generates a more star-studded cast of contributors and attracts a more prestigious publisher.

Publishers know that ‘big names’ and high name-recognition sells law books. That is true of the person honoured and is true also of the editors and the contributors. So usually editors try to assemble the most distinguished group of contributors possible, who are of like mind in wanting to honour the person concerned. How distinction is gauged will depend in part on the honorand’s, the editors’ and the publisher’s preferences, the subject-matter or themes (if any) of the collection, and geographical and other considerations. A significant feature of *Festschriften* in the Continental tradition is their international character, and, of course, many common lawyers have contributed to them, both before and after the genre transplanted into the common law.

Seeking out ‘big name’ contributors can have a downside, however. The fact is that the greater the reputation of the persons asked to contribute, the greater the likely demands on their time. Unless every contributor makes a conscientious effort to prioritize researching and completing high-quality work for a *Festschrift*, it is possible for the garden to contain less than the best blooms. This matters less in graveyards, of course, because few find and smell them. Even the casual reader of *Festschriften* will recognize this phenomenon: no names, no pack-drill!

There is also the invisible, ‘no-show’ factor. These are the contributors, often lined up many months in advance, who simply cannot meet the final deadline (in some cases, one thinks in exasperation, any deadline). How long editors are prepared to wait depends on a number of factors, but it is clear that delinquent contributors can delay publication to the annoyance of editors, publishers, and, not least, the other contributors who submitted papers on time. This sort of unreliability can lead to the ‘airline booking’ problem, whereby

---

59 I use the plural—editors—throughout this article, in recognition that a large number of *Festschriften* are jointly edited. This contrasts with the editorship of other collections of essays, which more frequently have a sole editor.

60 In a recent instance all the contributors were former postgraduate students of the honorand, but this is uncommon: G.S. Goodwin-Gill and S. Talmon (eds), *The Reality of International Law: Essays in Honour of Ian Brownlie* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1999).

61 Roberts, above n 7 at 53.
more contributions are sought than the publisher or editors want or need, thereby allowing for ‘slippage’. Publishers have the same problems as airlines when surprisingly everyone turns up on time, but the consequence for the former will be a bigger book than that budgeted for, and hence a more expensive one than anticipated.

Does cost matter? How elastic is the demand/supply curve for Festschriften? Other factors may intrude here. It depends in part on the motivation of the publisher. Several publishers (especially the long-established University Presses) accept responsibility for publishing Festschriften honouring persons who have been successful authors for the Press over a long period or who are otherwise distinguished within the University under whose auspices the Press operates. It is less clear whether this commitment extends to the cross-subsidization of publication costs. The relatively high market cost of Festschriften—compared, say, to the cost of other collections of essays—suggests not. In the Continental tradition such books were often paid for in part or whole by subscription among friends or colleagues or by other forms of subvention, but this is not a feature of common law Festschriften. The high market cost of many common law Festschriften must reflect a prediction of low sales by the publisher. No doubt, that is based in part on past experience and may reflect the view that the market for Festschriften is largely law libraries. This exacerbates problems of physical access to the volumes by researchers.

The most common failings of Festschriften—and the staple of any reviews—are the lack of theme(s), insufficient evidence of strong editorial hands at work and uneven quality throughout the collection. Lilly Roberts wrote the following nearly 40 years ago, and it still rings far too true today for comfort:

The main objections against homage volumes are that they are miscellany of uneven value and often covering scattered subjects; furthermore that they are issued in small editions and available only at large libraries; that for these reasons their contents remain unknown and they are rarely used.

Obviously, contributions to a Festschrift are commissioned by the editors. It is extremely difficult and awkward to reject commissioned pieces once submitted. It is embarrassing all round. In those instances when a piece is not up to scratch the burden falls on the editors to make it so. The editors are the book’s conscience in this regard but in a work of this nature they will seldom feel they have an entirely free hand, even in the editing process. Whatever the failings of the blind refereeing process used in law reviews, they pale in comparison to quality-control efforts by editors of Festschriften.

62 Ibid. Recently, Tony Weir said of Festschriften that they ‘normally pressurize contributors with nothing particular to say into writing pieces which then go irretrievably into the limbo of a volume coherent only through thread and glue’: Book Review [1998] 594.

Of course, that does not mean that the quality of contributions is not as good as, or even better than, that in leading law reviews.\textsuperscript{64} I doubt whether it can be proved one way or the other, and I have not attempted to do so. My point is simply that there are fewer formal and independent processes in place to ensure consistent quality throughout the Festschrift. It all depends on the editors and possibly in extremis the publishers. After publication accountability rests upon such reviews as the Festschrift garners, the judgement of the honorand, the reaction of the marketplace and professional opinion.

7. Or Graveyards?

One factor, however, that does lessen somewhat the incentive to place excellent work in Festschriften is the notorious obscurity and lack of impact of the scholarship contained therein. As noted more than 30 years ago: \textsuperscript{65}

Festschriften, or homage publications, present peculiar problems to the legal researcher and to the law librarian. There is no uniformity in methods of cataloguing, no ready means of tracing contributions by particular authors, and no ready means of identifying the subject matter of a particular volume, or of contributions within it. Hence the apt description of Festschriften as ‘graveyards of scholarship’.\textsuperscript{66} Once the Festschrift is launched the contributions to it can sink from view. As noted above, Festschriften are difficult to review and hence are less frequently reviewed than other types of law books. If scholars place their best work in Festschriften—which is certainly the expectation of the audience, the editors and publishers, and the point of the exercise—then it can disappear from view, and not have the impact that conventional law review publication might have. This is entirely counter-productive, indeed it perverts the primary purposes in producing Festschriften. As was noted nearly 50 years ago: \textsuperscript{67}

The problem is to ensure that . . . [Festschriften] are designed and published in such a way as actually to serve the ends of scholarship instead of defeating them. It is a poor reward for [the honorand’s] scholarship that buries what [other] scholars write [in his or her honour] and makes scholarship more difficult for everyone.

Of course, Festschriften are graveyards only because the most commonly used bibliographic resources do not list common law Festschriften or index individual contributions to them.\textsuperscript{68} Nor are library catalogue listings as much help as one might expect. It can be a hit-or-miss exercise as the titles can be ‘too vague or catchy to be helpful’\textsuperscript{69} and seldom is there a subject catalogue entry for Festschriften

\textsuperscript{64} For a brief discussion of how contributions to Festschriften differ from law review articles, see Roberts, above n 7 at 54. See generally Gleaves, above n 10, and Rounds and Dow, above n 4 at 292–93.

\textsuperscript{65} Roberts, above n 1, back cover of book.


\textsuperscript{67} Rounds and Dow, above n 4 at 292.

\textsuperscript{68} I have in mind Current Law, Index to Legal Periodicals, Current Law Index and Legal Journals Index. For an overview see R.G. Logan, ‘British Legal Bibliography’ (1989) 81 Law Library Journal 691.

\textsuperscript{69} Gleaves, above n 10 at 469.
or the like. Again, there is no listing or indexing of contributions to Festschriften in most library catalogues. This gap in legal bibliography has been acknowledged for many years, but little has been done to improve the situation. Indeed, matters have got worse rather than better, as some of the sources that used to provide this information have disappeared and others are now out-of-date.

The only English-language research tool I know of that consistently lists legal Festschriften, as well as itemizing the contributions, is the Index to Foreign Legal Periodicals. Understandably, given its remit, that Index generally only collects foreign-sourced Festschriften, and is selective. References are sometimes made to comparative or international law Festschriften published in the United States. Common law Festschriften published by British presses are not usually included.

English language contributions to German, Swiss and Austrian Festschriften can be tracked down by contributor’s name in Helmut Dau’s multi-volume Bibliography of Legal Festschriften Titles and Contents. The daunting Bibliography on Foreign and Comparative Law, compiled and edited by Charles Szladit for many years, covered English language articles dealing with non-common law legal systems and comparative law, and included contributions to some Festschriften. Since 1984 this publication (now named after its founder) covers both common law and other legal systems, and has a entry for ‘Collections of essays, festschriften and mélanges’, which is extremely useful but by no means comprehensive.

For the years from 1961–81 the Harvard Annual Legal Bibliography was a valuable source of citations to legal Festschriften in general, and the emerging common law variety in particular. Also the Index to Legal Essays, compiled for the British and Irish Association of Law Librarians under the editorship of Barbara Tearle, is excellent but limited to collections of essays (including Festschriften) published between 1975–79. The enormous gaps left have not been adequately filled.

The starting point for book research in the United Kingdom is often Donald Raistrick’s Lawyers’ Law Books which lists some common law Festschriften under subject headings. The collection, however, is not complete, and, of course, there is no listing of the individual contributions. There is also no subject heading for Festschriften or the like.

---

73 See above n 68.
The bibliographic databases are not much help either. The OCLC World Cat, RLIN or CURL databases cannot identify *Festschriften* and are no more reliable than library card catalogues in picking up common law *Festschriften*. Even if a *Festschrift* is found, often there is no list of contents.

The dream of an international index to legal *Festschriften* remains just that. There is an urgent need for the most commonly used bibliographic resources to systematically list common law *Festschriften* and to index the contributions under subject and author headings. The omission to do so might have been justifiable a generation or two ago when this ‘foreign element’ was a rarity in the common law, and they clustered around Roman law, comparative law and international law, but the avalanche of common law *Festschriften* in recent years and the broadening of subject-matter demands inclusion in the most commonly used bibliographic resources.

Just how much scholarship in common law *Festschriften* is not indexed is shown by a comparison of the number of ‘substantive’ contributions to *Festschriften* between 1969 and 2000 and the number of full length articles published in leading United Kingdom law reviews over the same period. The total number of articles that appeared in the *Cambridge Law Journal*, *Law Quarterly Review* and *Modern Law Review* between 1969 and 2000 is 1812. The total number of substantive contributions to common law *Festschriften* over the same period is 1672 (or 92.27%). So the number of contributions to common law *Festschriften* almost equals the total number of articles published in these three leading United Kingdom law reviews over the last 30 years or so. Indeed, in the 1990s the number of contributions to common law *Festschriften* outstripped the total number of articles appearing in the same three law reviews. Much of this scholarship in *Festschriften* disappears without trace for want of title, author and subject indexing. It is a scandalous state of affairs.

### 8. Finding and Footnoting Festschriften

In these days of rampant computer-driven research and (increasing) student-assisted research, research often goes along well-worn paths. As we have seen, the chaotic state of legal bibliography in the common law world as regards...

---

75 I am indebted to Barbara Tearle, Bodleian Law Librarian at Oxford, for the information in this paragraph, and for much other assistance.

76 Roberts, aboven1a t viii.


78 The count of contributions to common law *Festschriften* excludes personal tributes and the like, and bibliographies.

79 The individual figures are *Cambridge Law Journal* (393), *Law Quarterly Review* (596) and *Modern Law Review* (823). I have put to one side the *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* as it began in 1981. However, in case any one is interested, between 1981-2000, 329 articles have appeared in this Journal.

80 The number of contributions to common law *Festschriften* between 1990–99 (743) well exceeds the total number of articles published in the *Cambridge Law Journal*, *Law Quarterly Review* and *Modern Law Review* (596) over that period.
Festschriften (and other collections of essays) stymies easy access to these gardens of scholarship. I do not think this is a good thing, but as long as this situation persists there are plaudits to be won by the determined. Such influence and references will differentiate the work product of some scholars from others.81

Finding the roses in the Festschriften gardens requires determination, curiosity and access to good law libraries. A reasonably good memory or the habit of taking notes over time helps. Years of serendipitous research pays off, finding more in the book next to the book you went looking for in the law library. (Remember the days when law libraries were about books rather than terminals, and when books were stacked on open shelves and one could browse.)

Furthermore, even when citations are unearthed, the books will often be held somewhere else and have to be sent for, often at some cost in terms of effort, time and money. This inaccessibility (in both senses) makes references to contributions in Festschriften harder won than references to journal articles or standard texts. If it is true that only the best blooms appear in the gardens of Festschriften then access will give a considerable research edge. At the very least, people will envy the industry evident in the footnotes and perhaps seek out that material also. As John Kenneth Galbraith once said: 'Footnotes . . . provide an exceedingly good index of the care with which a subject has been researched'.82

In the absence of reliable bibliographic resources for Festschriften this form of copycat referencing is the most common way knowledge of the scholarship spreads.83

9. The Increase and an Explanation

As noted at the beginning, there were fewer than a dozen common law Festschriften published up to 1968. In the Appendix there is an incomplete list of those published since then that exceeds 100. In the 1970s there was a gradual build-up, augmented by foreign-sourced Festschriften honouring distinguished émigré legal academics like the likes of F.A. Mann, Ernst Cohn, Clive Schmitthoff and Otto Kahn-Freund84 with higher-than-usual numbers of common lawyers contributing. In this, as in many other respects, these scholars enriched the common law of

81 On one view this is what footnotes are all about. See A.D. Austin, 'Footnotes as Product Differentiation' (1987) 40 Vanderbilt LR 1131.
83 Another way is wide-spread offprint distribution. A form of self-promotion that improbably has survived the ages of the photocopier and e-mail.
themselves adopted country. The trickle built to a substantial stream in the 1980s and the floodgates opened in the 1990s, with no evidence of abatement in the new millennium.

So why the massive increase in the number of common law Festschriften? Are there more brilliant lawyers in the last 30 or so years than previously? Or are we more into hero-worship than our predecessors, or simply less reserved in demonstrating admiration or adulation? It is impossible to know. There is certainly a greater number of academics to assist in producing Festschriften. And these academics, by and large, are a more professional lot, and more dependant than ever upon publication for their own advancement and for that of their institutions. The research assessment exercise fuels this, but it does not seem to be driving the production of common law Festschriften. The greater availability of publishing outlets must be a factor, as must the increase in size of the law book market nationally and internationally. The much talked about ‘Europeanization’ of British law and legal education may be accelerating the trend towards adopting European academic trappings.

While no doubt there are multiple and complex causes, the association of the genre with Germany is an important clue to at least one cause. The emergent group of English academic common lawyers (from the 1870s onwards) envied the exalted place of the jurist in German legal circles, and this extended to Festschriften. In 1895 Sir Frederick Pollock commented that the issue of the Harvard Law Review honouring Christopher Columbus Langdell ‘need not fear any comparison with the festival collection of essays produced at any German

---

85 See T.H. Bingham, ‘“There is a World Elsewhere”: The Changing Perspectives of English Law’ (1992) 41 ICLQ 513, 527. It has been said that scientists fleeing Hitler's Germany brought the genre to the United States: Lewis, above n 27. This seems an appropriate place to record my indebtedness to Lilly Melchior Roberts, whose writings about legal Festschriften have proved invaluable in preparing this article. She was educated in Germany and was an appellate court judge in Berlin before leaving Germany in the 1930s. She worked first as a research assistant at Michigan Law School from 1940–45 and from then until her death in 1966 she worked in the Michigan Law School Library. The corps of distinguished German émigré academic lawyers had its counterpart in law librarianship. Perhaps not entirely coincidentally, from the outset the University of Michigan was receptive to German ideas of scholarship. See P.D. Carrington, ‘Influences of Continental Law on American Legal Education and Legal Institutions, 1776–1933’ in Towards Comparative Law in the 21st Century: The 50th anniversary of The Institute of Comparative Law in Japan, Chuo University (Chuo University Press, Chuo, 1998) at 1037, 1045.

86 The small number of UK-sourced Festschriften in any discipline in the first half of the 20th century (see Rounds and Dow, above n 4 at 290) was explained by Griswold Morley in terms of 'English individualism, or Anglo-Saxon reserve' (above n 17 at 62).


89 For discussion in the (general) Festschriften literature about the importance of the German tag and its limitations, see Pick, above n 3 at 206–7.

90 Common law scholars of this period were fascinated by the idea, prevalent in Germany, of law as a science. See M. Reimann, ‘Nineteenth Century German Legal Science’ 31 Boston College LR 837 (1990). See generally E. Campbell, ‘German Influences in English Legal Education and Jurisprudence in the 19th Century’ (1959) 4 UWALR 357 and M. Grazidei, ‘Changing Images of the Law in XIX Century English Legal Thought (The Continental Impulse)’ in M. Reimann (ed.), The Reception of Continental Ideas in the Common Law World 1820–1920 (Duncker and Humbolt, Berlin, 1993) at 115.

91 Lilly M. Roberts traced the first legal Festschrift back to 1868: Roberts, above n 1 at vii and 9 (entry under ‘Bethmann-Hollweg’).
university’. In other words’, says Mathias Reimann, ‘it was like a German
“Festschrift”, and at least for Pollock that was praise enough.

The English tradition, of course, differs markedly from the German. The
academic role has not been as glorious, central or appreciated. In contrast to
the ‘strong tradition of legal scholarship in Europe’, John Merryman observed
years ago, ‘the tradition of legal scholarship in the common-law world is neither
very old nor very strong’. Furthermore, as Carol Harlow felicitously put it,
‘(i)n the English variant of the common law tradition . . . scholars may not be
judges and judges have seldom been scholars’. The barricades between the
academy and the profession were real, and were constructed on both sides. They
have not been completely removed today, but they are diminishing.

Festschriften not only honour the distinguished academic, but boost the import-
ance of the academic enterprise generally. And when academics (and judges)
are not honouring distinguished academics, who do academics (for they are
invariably the editors and prime-movers of Festschriften) select to honour? No
surprise that it turns out to be judges, but only those of scholarly disposition
and/or those most hospitable to academic writing and hence influence. There
is, of course, nothing wrong with mutual admiration, this is the very stu-
f of Festschriften. But the timing of the emergence of this genre in the literature
of the common law is not unrelated, in my view, to the search for greater legitimacy
and influence by academic lawyers. Have we finally caught up with the Germans?

92 Quoted in M. Reimann, ‘Career in Itself: The German Professoriate as a Model for American Legal Academia’ in
Reimann, above n 90 at 165, 172.
93 Ibid. In the 1890s ‘festival’ writing or ‘festival’ collection meant Festschrift. See the entry under ‘Festschrift’
401.
94 F.H. Lawson, A Common Lawyer looks at the Civil Law (University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1993) at
69–76.
95 Compare P. Birks, ‘Adjudication and Interpretation in the Common Law: A Century of Change’ in B.S.
Marlesin (ed.), The Clifford Chance Lectures: Volume 1- Bridging the Channel (Oxford University Press, Oxford,
Owen and D.B. Walters (eds), Lawyers and Laymen: Studies in the History of Law presented to Professor Dafydd
(ed.), Scots Law into the 21st Century: Essays in Honour of W.A. Wilson (W. Green/Sweet & Maxwell, Edinburgh,
1996) at 39.
96 J.H. Merryman, The Loneliness of the Comparative Lawyer And Other Essays in Foreign and Comparative Law
(Kluwer Law International, The Hague, 1999) at 75, 80–81 (reprinted from a contribution to a Festschrift published
in 1966). Merryman has been the subject of a Festschrift himself. See D.S. Clark (ed.), Comparative and Private
International Law: Essays in Honor of John Henry Merryman on his Seventieth Birthday (Duncker & Humblot, Berlin,
97 C. Harlow, ‘Changing the Mindset: The Place of Theory in English Administrative Law’ (1994) 14 OJLS
419, 420.
99 Of the 88 common law Festschriften honouring individualists listed in the Appendix only 5 honour judges—namely,
Lords Denning, Cooke, Goff, Slynn and Wilberforce. Lord Denning was ‘one of the biggest supporters of citing
academic articles in reasons for judgment’; R. Smyth, ‘Academic Writing and the Courts: A Quantitative Study
Lord Goff was once an academic and his praise of academic work, both judicial and extra-judicial, is well-known.
All have impressive academic credentials. For example, Richard Wilberforce stood in the first rank at Oxford
alongside a distinguished group, including Richard Crossman (later Sir Richard), Quintin Hogg (later Lord
Hailsham), and John Willis (a brilliant administrative lawyer who moved to Canada and made his academic career
there). See Oxford University Calendar for the year 1930.
10. Conclusion

I have come neither to praise nor bury common law Festschriften, but simply to draw attention to the fact that the genre is here and needs to be properly accommodated in the common law tradition and accounted for in its bibliographic resources. In so far as any legal writing outside standard, practitioner-orientated textbooks can influence the development of legal thought and doctrine, one can reasonably assume contributions to common law Festschriften should be amongst the most influential. These contributions are intended to be the best current work (by convention, not displayed elsewhere) from the workbenches of handpicked lawyers honouring distinguished jurists. That work product should be worth indexing, cataloguing, collecting, reading and engaging with. If not, it will be like a ‘bouquet’ that wilts and dies soon after been laid at the feet of the honoree.

APPENDIX

A list of common law Festschriften published since 1969.

Individuals

J.A. Andrews (ed.), Welsh Studies in Public Law (University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1970) [To mark the services to Welsh legal education of D.J. Llewellyn Davies]


100 For a sceptical American view see P.D. Carrington, ‘Aftermath’ in P. Cane and J. Stapleton (eds), Essays for Patrick Atiyah (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1991) at 113. This essay is an example of a frustratingly obscure title that gives the researcher little, if any, clue as to what the contribution covers. Only the high quality of Carrington’s work and the controversy his work sometimes engenders would lead one to give such an unhelpfully titled piece the time of day. It would be even more difficult evaluating it from the entry or entries (under which heading(s)?) in an index. If a Festschrift can be a graveyard then such titled contributions are the equivalent of the unmarked grave!

101 See Morley, above n 17 at 64 (likening a Festschrift to ‘a bouquet laid on a teacher’s desk’).

102 The year 1969 is chosen to dovetail with Lilly Roberts’ collection: above n 1. Generally, I have restricted the catchment to common law Festschriften published in the UK or where the honoree is or was associated closely with the UK legal scene. This excludes almost all common law Festschriften from other parts of the Commonwealth and the USA. In a few instances, however, I have included common law Festschriften from elsewhere honouring those whose specialties or reputations transcend common law jurisdictions. Admittedly, this is somewhat arbitrary. The list does not pretend to completeness. I would be grateful to learn of omissions. The capitalization and punctuation in the titles varies considerably. An attempt has been made to impose some standardization.
A.G. Chloros and K.H. Neumayer (eds), Liber Amicorum Ernst J. Cohn: Festschrift für Ernst J. Cohn zum 70 (Verlagsgesellschaft Recht und Wirtschaft, Heidelberg, 1975)\textsuperscript{103}


P. Feuerstein and C. Parry (eds), Multum Non Multa: Festschrift für Kurt Lipstein aus Anlass seines 70 (C.F. Müller, Juristischer Verlag, Heidelberg, 1980)


\textsuperscript{103} Ernst Cohn was a German Jew émigré law professor who retrained in England and became a very successful practitioner, part-time teacher and influential writer.


R. White and B. Smythe (eds), *Current Issues in European and International Law: Essays in Memory of Frank Dowrick* (Sweet & Maxwell, London, 1990)


---

104 This may be thought a doubtful inclusion but the British origins of both the honorand and his successful book—*Law Officers of the Crown: A Study of the Offices of Attorney-General and Solicitor-General of England with an account of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions* (Sweet & Maxwell, London, 1964)—justify inclusion.


C. Bridge (ed.), Family Law towards the Millennium: Essays for P.M. Bromley (Butterworths, London, 1997)


B.A.K. Rider (ed.), The Corporate Dimension: An exploration of developing areas of company and commercial law. Published in Honour of Professor A.J. Boyle (Jordan, Bristol, 1998)


Geoffrey Marshall’s writings on law justify the inclusion of a political scientist in this list.
SUMMER 2002  Festschriften in the Literature of the Common Law  251


Institutions/Events


Then and Now 1799–1974: Commemorating 175 Years of Law Bookselling and Publishing (Sweet & Maxwell, London, 1974)


D. Lasok, A.J.E. Jaffey, D.L. Perrott and C. Sachs (eds), Fundamental Duties: A volume of essays by present and former members of the Law Faculty of the University of Exeter to commemorate the Silver Jubilee of the University (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1980)


D.C. Hoath (ed.), 75 Years of Law at Sheffield 1909–1984 (University of Sheffield, Sheffield, 1985)


106 The dust jacket declares the book to be Essays in Honour of Alan Watson but the title page makes no mention of this and the book is simply dedicated to him.

107 For the earlier jubilee anniversary volume, see O.R. Marshall (ed.), The Jubilee Lectures of the Faculty of Law, University of Sheffield (Stevens, London, 1960).

F. Patfield and R. White (eds), *The Changing Law* (Leicester University Press, Leicester, 1990) [To mark the Silver Jubilee of the Law School at Leicester University]

G. Kolilinye and P.K. Menon (eds), *Commonwealth Caribbean Legal Studies: A Volume of Essays to Commemorate the 21st Anniversary of the Faculty of Law in the University of the West Indies* (Butterworth, London, 1992)

B.S. Jackson and D. McGoldrick (eds), *Legal Visions of the New Europe: Essays Celebrating the Centenary of The Faculty of Law University of Liverpool* (Graham & Trotman/Martimus Nijhoff, London, 1993)


*City University Centenary Lectures in Law* (Blackstone Press, London, 1996)


