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By Way of Preamble: Why Another Style Sheet?

Every publications program requires a style sheet to ensure uniformity in its productions. There is no one style sheet that is in universal use. So the question is “why not simply choose among the major established styles and let it go at that?”

Let us start with Gilson’s assumption that history is to philosophy what the laboratory is to science. One needs a broad awareness of the consequences of ideas in order to judiciously evaluate philosophical doctrines. There is one element essential to good philosophy that no existing style sheet promotes, and that is an explicit awareness focused on the historicity of human discourse.

So why not attempt a style sheet that makes the historical layers an explicit, focused component of authorial awareness, while yet incorporating all that is best in the main existing styles? This new style would make explicit two factors: 1) the historical levels on which any given discourse draws; and 2) the relation of any text or edition used to the original source work actually produced in the lifetime of each author cited.

A style sheet which directly contributes to or in some measure compels such a consciousness (without losing anything of the information required by the more established styles) should merit universal adoption.

Any writing prepared in accordance with this historically layered Center Style can easily convert into every other major style. But no existing style easily converts to this style, for the simple reason that this is the only style that requires you to have an explicit consciousness of the relation of source to lifetime of the source. Pure gain without loss is the rationale of the Center Style Sheet, the economy in particular of all the information pertinent to each source located in one, consistent, easy-to-find place: the final list of references, the “bookshelf” on which the work draws.

If we simply mandated, say, the Chicago style, we would not be doing our students and authors any favor, for not even the Chicago style requires information fully compatible with every other style. This Center style aims at just that.

One amusing anecdote. The historical layering principle was first incorporated in 1981 in a style sheet for interdisciplinary publications in the Semiotic Society of America: relate any work cited to the lifetime of whoever produced it. Simple enough, indeed! But, dealing with about sixty authors from twenty different countries and as many different disciplines each year over the next five years produced some interesting “questions of detail”. Out of the answers to those questions raised by authors grew the style manual finally published in The American Journal of Semiotics 4.3–4 (1986), 193–215, which is here further refined for Center use. Finally, one author wrote: “You know, I write for six different professional journals, and each has their own style. But now I find that if I have prepared a paper using historical layering, I can easily adapt that paper (by degrading the information as well as the clarity with which it is presented) to any one of the other six styles. But if I have prepared the paper first in any one of those other styles, in order to convert the paper to historically layering, I have to go through the library.” Q.E.D.

-Q.E.D.-
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STYLE SHEET

FOR THE PUBLICATIONS PROGRAM OF THE CENTER FOR THOMISTIC STUDIES

University of St Thomas, Houston

1. THE DISTINCTIVE PRINCIPLE OF CENTER STYLE

The publications program of the Center for Thomistic Studies requires a standard reference style for the preparation of the works it sponsors for publication. The main existing styles in use in the United States today are the University of Chicago Manual of Style and the style sheet of the Modern Languages Association. The Center Style Sheet draws on both these major authorities, but adds to them one distinctive feature, namely, the principle of the historical layering of sources. This principle requires that the principal reference date for each work cited be taken from within the lifetime of the work’s author. By this device, then, the historical layers of the discourse are placed in the foreground, as the layers of rock reveal to the geologist’s eye the historical strata of earth, or the rings of a tree reveal to the botanist the age of the plant under scrutiny.

The advantage of such a reference style in publications that deal with many historical periods should be obvious, not least among them the establishment of reference entries that remain invariant across the later editions and periods drawn on, as will become apparent in discussion of the details of the Style Sheet.

2. MANUSCRIPT PREPARATION: OVERVIEW

It is essential that the general format be adhered to in manuscripts submitted for inclusion in the Center’s publications. In simplest terms, the general format for manuscripts consists of Text and Notes thereon (including Line Drawings or Figures and Tables, and Photographs), and References keyed to a principal year from within the lifetime of the source. Specifics of this general format follow.

Set the Tab Indent for every ¼ inch (rather than ½ inch). Manuscripts are to be typed double-spaced throughout the Text and Notes (the References will be discussed further below) using system default 1-inch margins left, top, right, and bottom. For the Text use 11 point type size, with extracts (indented quotations) in 10 point; for the Notes (and running heads) use 9 point type size; for the References use 10 point type size. Printing (or typing) is to be done on one side of standard typing paper (but please avoid erasable bond). Manuscripts may be divided as appropriate into sections with headings, or numbers, or both, as long as consistency is maintained throughout.

The title of the manuscript is to be at the top of the first page, all in capitals. The author’s name, and affiliation if desired, is to be entered beginning two lines below the title. The text of the manuscript proper begins three lines below the author/affiliation information.
3. Difference between Source Works and Access Works

The refinement of historical layering requires simply the paying of explicit attention to and making systematic use of the distinction between source works and access works. An access work is a publication actually used in the preparation of one’s manuscript, whereas a source work is the work actually authored by the person cited in the manuscript one is preparing. Source works and access works may be one and the same, or they may be distinct.

When source and access works are distinct, throughout the Text and Notes of a manuscript, page references are given to the access volume, but the reference year is always to be that of the source work. In addition, the relation of access work to source work — including any discrepancy of dates and publishers, any mediator between source and access where there is the added discrepancy of language (i.e., the special case of translations), and whatever additional information or glosses seem useful — is given in the list of References at the end of the manuscript as part of the individual author entry. In particular, especially in works covering earlier historical periods, it is often useful to include the life dates of authors in parentheses after their name.

To give a simple illustration of the case (with life dates included):
a) Where source and access volume differ:

DARWIN, Charles (1809–1882).

The work in question would be cited as Darwin 1859: 296, where 296 designates the page in the access volume on the basis of which citation is made of the actual source.

b) Where source and access volume coincide:

MAYR, Ernst (1904– ).

The accuracy in the utilization of sources gained by this method might also be attained without the jarring of joining page numbers from an access volume to the source work of another year and publisher, by providing a double date at the point of citation, thus: Darwin 1859/1937: 296. This is an acceptable alternative method, provided the full information on the relation of access to source is given in the list of references at the end of the manuscript, as before.

We recommend the use of the single date of actual source year as first preference, for reasons of economy: Since the relation of source work to access work must be given in either case in the References at the end of the manuscript, it is both more intrusive and redundant to cite double dates in the Text and Notes of the manuscript. Since the final References are integral to the Text and Notes of the manuscript as a whole, it is more elegant to avoid repetition beyond necessity of information given in the final list.

In the rest of the Style Sheet, we will scrutinize in detail various special cases that have been considered in arriving at the official version of our style. These details provide the answers to technical difficulties or misunderstandings commonly encountered in the application of the source/access distinction to works prepared under the requirement of historical layering.

4. DETAILS OF HISTORICAL LAYERING

In general, the principle of historical layering which the source/access distinction embodies may be summarized thus: all sources must be cited according to the original year(s) of publication (in the case of modern authors) or composition (in the case of ancient authors); if modern editions of a later publication date or translations are used, this information is to be included in the References at the end of the submission, but the reference date used for citations and given first after the author’s name in the alphabetical end listing of References must invariably be the date of the original source as best this can be determined. (Sometimes a work will go through second and third editions which are expanded or modified, as against mere reprints. In such cases, the second or third edition becomes the primary date of reference, if that modified edition was the primary source.) Thus, such absurdities as “Aristotle 1941”, “Dante 1963”, “Rousseau 1966”, will be replaced by, e.g., “Aristotle c.341BC”, “Dante 1315” or “Dante i.1300–1321”, “Rousseau 1754”, etc., with the information pertinent, respectively, to the 1941, 1963, and 1966 New York editions in translation given only in the final list of References at the end of the paper (AD can be presupposed with the date unless otherwise indicated).
Supplying this full bibliographical information is each author’s responsibility, and is essential. It must be well understood that, in the manuscript as submitted, each author is expected to provide full and proper information in the list of References, and to have employed the reference style properly and consistently throughout the Text and Notes of the manuscript submitted.

For the convenience of authors, therefore, we provide here details illustrating the application of the style sheet, answering, as has been said, the technical difficulties or misunderstanding commonly encountered in the preparation of papers over the years during which the Style Sheet was developed.

4.1. Citations within the Text or Notes. Author citations are normally made by surname and year. If a specific page or pages are cited, the number(s) should follow a colon and space after the year. In other words, notes to the main text, in this style of reference (unlike the older MLA or University of Chicago Style Sheets, which are sometimes redundant and cumbersome in the presentation of bibliographical information, and frequently unclear as to source year), are used mainly for substantive comments that gloss the text or give extensive research information, but never for providing the full reference information of a direct citation: that information will be given in full only once, in the final Reference list. This makes for both economy and clarity, while bringing to the fore the historical epoch from which the source is drawn, an always significant point of information that is often inaccessible and never ready-to-hand in principle in the use of other existing styles.

Note that where block quotations are made within a text, the author reference, whether in parenthetical or footnote style, needs to precede the extract rather than be a part of the extract itself at its conclusion.

4.1.1. Parenthetically incorporating citations into the text. These citations can be in footnote form, as will be discussed next; but writers often deem it more economical for the citation to be incorporated into the narrative at the point where they are made, according to the following style:

... (Jakobson 1975: 20) ....

Note that there is to be one space but no punctuation after the name, and one space between the colon and the page number(s). Variations — e.g., (Jakobson, 1975: 20) or (Jakobson 1975, p. 20), etc. — are unacceptable. It is acceptable, where appropriate in the flow of narrative, to leave the author’s name outside the parentheses — e.g.,

... where Jakobson (1975: 20) argues that ....

Or even to separate by one or a (very) few words the parentheses form the author referred to — e.g.,

... Eschbach’s “self-reflexive” view (1983: 28) that ....

Ferguson’s seminal presentation of the original diglossia model (1959) treats it as ....

4.1.2. Footnoting citations as they occur. Some feel that the economy achieved by the method of parenthetical incorporation of citations into the text is more than outweighed by the intrusiveness these parentheses make in the flow of the narrative. A considerable multiplication in the number of footnotes results, but authors are always free to remove the parenthetical information into footnotes instead, as follows:
... where Jakobson argues\textsuperscript{1} that ....

Or again:

... Eschbach’s “self-reflexive” view\textsuperscript{2} that ....

Ferguson’s seminal presentation of the original diglossia model\textsuperscript{3} treats it as ....

When adopting this footnote alternative for citations, always include the author’s name in the footnote, even when it occurs also in the text; never give only year or year and page number in a footnote. The reason for this is to keep the note as a fully self-contained link to the full Reference list at the end of the work.

Note also that in no case are endnotes to be used for citations. The old excuse for endnoting — less cost in typesetting — has been rendered nugatory with the advances in electronic typesetting.


In general, these Annual Proceedings volumes provide a good contrast of the parenthetical incorporation vis-à-vis footnoting variations, in that from 1980 through 1999 only parenthetical was used, with the footnote alternative introduced beginning with the *Semiotics 2000* volume. Both variants occur, but with the footnote use preponderant, in John Deely’s *Four Ages of Understanding* postmodern survey of the history of philosophy.

4.1.3. An advantage in footnoting citations, and the case of edition-independent citations. The advantage of incorporating references into the text is economy. But, if footnotes are preferred, besides the reference to author and year, it may be considered helpful to include also the title of the work cited, thus:

... Sommers’ “Appendix” of abbreviations\textsuperscript{1} is quite useful in this regard ....

... the discussion of analogy occurs in several places in Knasas\textsuperscript{2}

Inclusion of such information is essential in the case of older works which are normally cited in page-independent fashion, such as the works of Aristotle, Aquinas, and hundreds of other authors who wrote before the development of the book in the modern sense. A mere year and page number, in such cases, is to

\textsuperscript{1} Jakobson 1975: 20.
\textsuperscript{2} Eschbach 1983: 28.
\textsuperscript{3} Ferguson 1955.
\textsuperscript{1} Sommers 2001: 51, in “Imaging the Contemplative Life in Thomas Aquinas”.
\textsuperscript{2} Knasas 2003: passim, *Being & Some Twentieth-Century Thomists*. 
be always eschewed in favor of the standard form of reference which enables any reader to find the passage in question relatively independently of the pagination, thus:

... the notion of “being as first known” in Aquinas\(^3\) cannot be reduced to \textit{ens reale} ....

or again:

... Aristotle’s third attempt at defining relation\(^4\) illustrates the point ....

4.2. Placing of Punctuation Marks Relative to Quotation Marks. The following rule applies to all the parts of submitted papers — Text, Notes, and References: \textit{Punctuation marks which are part of the cited material as such go inside the quotation marks, otherwise outside}. In other words, a comma, period, colon, semicolon, etc. would fall inside a quotation mark only if it is a part of the text or title itself, not if it belongs rather to textual articulation over and above the directly cited matter.

4.3. Capitalization in Titles. Librarians in the United States are pressing for a custom of capitalizing only the first word of titles proper and of alternate or parallel titles, using lower case thereafter “except where linguistic custom dictates otherwise:; as in proper names, nouns in German, etc.

Of course, linguistic custom in English heretofore has generally dictated that the “main words” — usually everything save prepositions and articles — in titles are each to have their initial letter capitalized.

It can also be argued that titles in fact are themselves a form of proper name, so that, if proper names should be capitalized, then every word without exception in a title should be capitalized. This argument is the simplest and perhaps the most sound, at least in the sense of avoiding anomalies. In the new system of the librarians, for example, the publisher would be capitalized (proper name), while the title of the book published would be in lower case, despite its greater importance.

Linguistic customs in this area are so heterogeneous across languages and periods that it is unlikely that any rule save the above proposed one based on titles being proper names could be adopted without generating more semiotic anomalies than it resolved. Fortunately, however, for the main purpose of our style sheet, which is to establish the historical accuracy of reference dates, nothing is evidently at stake on the matter of capitalization in titles, for which reason we have decided for the time being to adopt no policy of our own for such capitalization. Our own examples in this style sheet will mainly follow the best established custom in English of retaining capitals for “main words”, though in some European examples we will follow rather the usage of the language in which the book is entered. Authors should therefore feel free to conform in this restricted area to the custom they prefer or that seems best indicated by the sources with which they are working. (\textit{We insist absolutely only on the proper use of source dates}, especially relative to modern editions of earlier works — our so-called “historical layering” of sources.)

4.4. Reference List: Mechanics. Within the list of References, authors should be listed alphabetically by last name first, typed in capitals, followed by a comma and the first name with only the first letter capitalized, and/or initials, as appropriate, and a period. Each author’s name is to be on a line by itself.

\(^3\) E.g., Aquinas 1271: \textit{Summa theologiae} I–II, Q. 94, art. 2c.

\(^4\) Aristotle c.335-322BC: \textit{Categories}, ch. 7, esp. 8a28-34
The original dates of the primary sources used must be placed on the line under the name, with the first number of the year beginning on a tab set. A period should follow the date, with a hanging indent used for the title of the entry together with glosses thereon, if any. If the date entry takes less than four digits (e.g., the year 271), the title following the date will still begin at the hanging indent tab; while if the date entry requires more than four digits (e.g., 1631–1635, or I.1269–1272a), the title will begin after the space following the period concluding the date entry with second and subsequent lines of the entry aligned with the hanging indent tab. Illustrations of both such cases are given in examples appearing later in this style sheet.

In the case of multiple author entries, only the author according to whose name the entry is alphabetized is to be given in reverse order (last name first): the names of the other authors (or editors) are not to be inverted, although all the surnames are to be typed in capitals. Notice that when the list of multiple authors or editors requires more than one line, the second (third, etc.) lines begin on the space where the hanging indent tab is set. Thus:

ANDERSON, Myrdene, John DEELY, Martin KRAMPEN, Joseph RANSDELL, Thomas A. SEBEOK, and Thure von UEXKULL.


CHATMAN, Seymour, Umberto ECO, and Jean-Marie KLINKENBERG, eds.


If, for a given author, there are more entries than one in the same year, all entries for a given year after the first entry introducing that year are to be distinguished by placing an “a”, “b”, “c”, etc. directly after the last numeral of the year, followed by a period and a tab to the indent, then the title of the entry. But notice that the first entry may be identified simply by the year itself (followed by a period and hanging indent tab) without the suffix “a”. (Note also from the following examples that the designation “p.” or “pp.” is ordinarily not to be used before page numbers whether of journal articles or of parts of books or anthologies, unless in an author’s judgment the role of the unadorned numbers would not be sufficiently evident in some special context.) Examples:

MARTIN, Christopher.


In every case, the second and all subsequent lines of the Reference entries begin on a hanging indent tab.

These remarks on spacing and basic format apply even if the entry is an art work, such as a film, a painting, a sculpture, and the like: works of art are referred to by artist and year in parentheses in the text, and are entered in the final list of References alphabetically by artist, right along with authors of written works. The name of the work is to be placed within quotation marks, with the pertinent information as to type of work and location or ‘sponsor’ placed within parentheses following the title or name. Additional comments may be added as a gloss on the basic information, as seems useful. Examples:

ALLEN, Woody.

BEYDLER, Gary.

CARRACCI, Annibale.
1600? “Perseus and Medusa” (fresco; Rome: Farnese palace).

DISNEY, Walt.
1938. “Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs” (animated film; Burbank, CA: Walt Disney Productions).

MATISSE, Henri.

SEAWRIGHT, James.

If the entry is a book, the title should be underlined (italicized) and the translator indicated, if applicable, then city and publisher are given within parentheses after the book’s title. If the edition used is a second or third etc. edition, this should be indicated within the parentheses before the city. The year of the actual edition or revision used is to be taken as the primary year of reference. Be sure, in every case, that the edition actually used is clearly identified. Mere reprint edition dates, as distinguished form revised or corrected edition dates, are to be ignored. Titles of books are to be capitalized according to the usage of the language in which the book was published, within the context of the remarks in Section 4.3, above. Examples:

GILSON, Etienne.

KNASAS, John F. X.
MacCANNELL, Dean and Juliet Flower.

MERRELL, Floyd.

OSBORNE, Thomas M.

*If the entry is a journal article,* the title should be cited within double quotations marks capitalized according to the usage of the journal in which it appears, with the name of the journal in italics or underlined, followed by a single space without punctuation and the volume number (arabic or roman numerals, as the journal itself uses) and issue number (optional) separated from the volume by a period with no space, then a comma, a single space, and the page numbers of the complete article. If other information regarding the journal is given (e.g., “Fall”), this information is put in parentheses separated by a space from the volume or issue number, before the page numbers.

BAER, Eugen.

CANNON, Walter B.

KESSEL, Edward.

KNASAS, John F. X.

OEHLER, Klaus.

RASMUSSEN, Douglas B.

*If the entry is from an anthology or a specific chapter or section within a book,* the entry’s title should be placed within quotation marks and capitalized according to the usage of the source from which it is taken, followed by the title of the book from which it is cited and the name(s) of the translator(s) and/or of the editor(s), then, in parentheses, the city and name of the publisher and a year of publication only if different from the date used for the cited entry, and finally, outside the parentheses, after a comma and single space, the complete page numbers. Examples:
HEIDEGGER, Martin.

HOUSER, Rollen E.

SAVAN, David.

In citing parts of books whose contents are of a heterogeneous nature, such as many anthologies and even collections of essays by a given author, it is important to identify clearly the specific part of the book which is being used as a source, with its proper date. Example:

AQUINAS, Thomas.

DEWEY, John.
1899. “‘Consciousness’ and Experience”, as reprinted with minor excisions from the University Chronicle of the University of California (August), in The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy and Other Essays (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1910), 242–270.

In particular it is essential that editorial parts of a book (introduction, commentaries, notes, etc.) be clearly separated in citations and the References from source materials in the edited volume, particularly as these materials are often of a different date. Examples:

Simmel, Georg.

MARTIN, Christopher.

WOLFF, Kurt H.

This brings us to the point, mentioned earlier, that, in many cases, the date of the access volume used will be different from the original source date. In such cases, the original date remains the Reference date.
for citations, but the date of the specific version used must be included before closing the parentheses containing the publication information; and, where translations are used, their relation to the original language source must be indicated, including the original title if possible. Examples:

BECKER, Carl.

HEIDEGGER, Martin.

KRISTEVA, Julia.

LOCKE, John.

MARITAIN, Jacques.

PEIRCE, Charles Sanders.

1907. Untitled letter to the editor of The Nation, which appears in the Collected Papers 5.464–496 under a title supplied by the editors of the volume, “A Survey of Pragmatism”. This letter is MS 318 of the Peirce Edition Project.

RUSSELL, Bertrand.

SOMMERS, Mary Catherine.
Be sure that the pagination of the access volumes cited is clearly indicated where it differs from that of the original publication, as in the Heidegger 1927, Kristeva 1979, Maritain 1938, Peirce 1891, and Russell 1905 examples above.

In a small number of cases, often involving bilingual or polylingual authors, the reference to an earlier original appearance of a given source may be reasonably unknown to the one making use of the source. In such instances, faute de mieux, the date of the language versions used must perforce be given as the Reference date for citations. Example:

MARITAIN, Jacques.

[This essay also appears in the 1956 ed. of Maritain’s Quatre essais sur l’esprit dans sa condition charnelle (Paris: Alsatia) as an “Annexe au Chapitre II”, 113–124, but it is not clear whether the English or the French version is the primary source, since Maritain in this period wrote in both languages (so perhaps the two texts are on a par), and the existence this French text is not a matter the passing reader of the English essay could be expected to know — unless, of course, he or she had the advantage of access to a historically layered bibliography covering this work — since no mention is made of it in the Anshen book.]

Instances such as this will be reduced (asymptotically) as the method of this style sheet comes into wider use, and we have here in any event a difficulty that pertains only to cases where an (unknown to the user) original publication and an alternate language version both exist(ed) within the lifetime of the primary author.

In the case of posthumous editions and translations of works whose authorship or time or origin are known, it is under no circumstances acceptable to use a posthumous date as the primary date for citations and References. Even when the language of a translation is the only text consulted or cited, its relation to the original source must be expressly made clear, and the date of the original source must be used as the Reference date for citations — e.g.:

PORPHYRY.

c.271. Porphyrii Isagoge et in Aristotelis Categorias Commentarium (Greek text), ed. A. Busse (Berlin, 1887). The English trans. by Edward W. Warren, Porphyry the Phoenician: Isagoge (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1975), was alone used in this work.

Approximate datings are often unavoidable. In dealing with some authors, of course, particularly ones from earlier historical periods, it is not always possible to provide exact dates. Sometimes it is necessary to specify an approximate period or interval within an author’s lifetime, rather than a single date. In such cases, resort is to be made to the following system of prefixes is to be used in connection with the assigned dates:

- **a. = ante or “before”;**
- **c. = circa or “approximately”**;
- **fl. = floruit or “the prime of life”, “the time of flourishing”;**
- **i. = inter or “between”;**
- **p. = post or “after”;**
- **r. = the beginning of the period of occupation of an office, so = regnat or “rules”;**
u. = *usque* or “until”, “up to the time of”: used to indicate the outside date on which an author worked on a ms. left uncompleted.

Within references, the following abbreviations are used:

- cf. = confer or consult;
- q.v. = *quod vide* or “which see”, a cross-reference.

Examples:

**AQUINAS, Thomas.**


**ARISTOTLE.**


**AUGUSTINE of Hippo.**


**AVERROES.**


**BOETHIUS, Anicius Manlius Severinus.**

The presentations of Boethius’ works in Migne p. 1844 (q.v.), PL Vol. 64, is here chronologized and evaluated textually according to Cappuyns 1937, q.v.


**BURLEY, Walter.**

*Note*. A full discussion of the dating of this work is in the “Introduction”, pp. 6–9.


**CAPPUYNS, Maïeul.**


**PAULUS VENETUS (“Paul of Venice”).**

SCOTUS, John Duns.

Notice throughout these examples that the first digit of the main reference year is always on the fourth space in. The prefixes to the dates are accommodated in the second and third space. Notice also that the ‘suffixes’ “a.”, “b.”, etc. still apply. The distinction between the prefixes “c.” and “i.” could be used for most hyphenated dates, with “i” being given preference when the boundaries of the period itself are considered to be more certain. Where the boundary dates are completely certain, of course, neither “c.” nor “i.” should be used — e.g.:

POINSOT, Joannes.

*In citing unpublished material*, reference should be made to the year of completion, unless there are special reasons for being more specific about the composition period proper — e.g.:

RANSDELL, Joseph.

HOLLISTER, C. Warren.

*Citations from newspapers or popular magazines* should be handled in the same manner as journal entries — e.g.:

ECO, Umberto.

   [This is the form that would be used if one were citing from the ‘interview’ sections of Mitgang’s publication. If one were citing rather from the ‘review’ passages, of course, the entry would be instead under MITGANG, etc.]

Intervening advertisements often make the exact specification of pages in popular journals impractical. In such cases only, specification of the initial page followed by the abbreviation “ff.” would suffice. Examples:


SEBEOK, Thomas A., and Jean UMIKER-SEBEOK.
One final technicality. The abbreviation “q.v.” (quod vide — literally: “which see”) followed solely by a name entered alphabetically as a main Reference entry in its own right, with the specific year, may be used to avoid duplication of information in the list as a whole. Examples:

FERREIRA GOMES, Joaquim.

The entry to which the q.v. here refers would be:

FONSECA, Petrus (“Pedro da”)

PELC, Jerzy.

[The Chatman q.v. appears as an example of a multi-author entry in Section 4.4, above.]

4.5. Some miscellaneous points. Authors are to include in their References all and only works actually cited in their Text and Notes. In the final list, annotations may be added to the entry, as seems useful. But no work may be mentioned in the Text or Notes that is not listed in the References, and no work may be listed in the References that is not mentioned in the Text or Notes. If an exception is deemed truly useful to the reader — for example, as a rich source for ancillary research — then such an entry may be made with a gloss clearly expressing the nature and reason for the exception. Where specific quotations are cited in the Text or Notes, the exact page reference(s) of the citation should be given.

In general, where details in this Style Sheet are not otherwise specified, the general narrative practices in customary force are to be followed — e.g., square brackets are to be used for a parenthesis within a parenthesis already set off by parentheses marks; square brackets are to be used instead of parentheses when editorial comment is introduced within a direct quotation; no quotation marks are to be used at the opening or close of a direct quotation already identified as such by a block format; etc.

4.6. Limit Cases. In the great majority of cases, when one’s access to a source is mediated by a secondary volume, it is fairly easy to establish the relation of that secondary access volume to the primary source text and date, and to construct one’s Reference entry to exhibit this relation with little need of gloss or comment. What follows, therefore, may be safely skipped by those unconcerned with the theoretical side of the Style Sheet, unless they encounter special problems, particularly in the handling of ancient and of posthumous materials. The paragraphs in this section deal with such problems, and are intended as considerations rather than as legislations of detail. Note well: In speaking of limit cases, we are also speaking of the point of diminishing returns, where each author has the freedom to decide in the light of his or her own intentions how much detail over and above the bare minimum source date/access date is pertinent to the reason for making a particular reference in the first place.

The aim of the Style Sheet as organized according to the principle of historical layering is, ideally, to tie all sources to the actual individual(s) and linguistic communities primarily responsible for authorship, and, more specifically, to tie the sources to primary dates, i.e., dates falling within the lifetime of the primary
individual(s). The role of secondary figures — editors, translators, publishers, etc. — must also be made clear within the Reference entry, but always in relation to and as sign of the primary role of the source. Such is the twofold intention and tendency of historical layering: to establish isomorphism between primary source text and primary source date, and to clearly exhibit the dependency of whatever is derivative from and mediative of that source (translations, selections, republications, etc.), even when, as frequently happens, the person using derivative material has no other access to or further interest in the primary source.

This intention is sometimes impossible to realize, and can lead to a conflict of sorts between composition dates and publication dates. This impossibility, on the one hand, and conflict on the other, provide in effect the “cases limiting” applicability of the principle of historical layering. How should referencing be handled when one comes up against such a case? It is a practical question, admitting no perfect theoretical answer, and requiring some ad hoc judgments in the event. Consideration of the sort of difficulties creating the limit case suggest some guidelines for adequate, if not perfect, solution of such cases.

The case of impossibility, of course, is always strictly relative to our state of knowledge, since no author is unknowable in principle, but only in fact. The most interesting cases of this sort of situation often occur in relation to ancient works, especially those of collective authorship, such as the “sacred scriptures” of the various religions, or the commentaries related thereto. If the authorship is collective and unknown, then the work must be alphabetized by its title, all in capitals, the fact of its being a title being indicated by the use of italics (underlining).

MIDRASH RABBAH.


Note here a general rule: when a given work has as its primary reference date a “year” determined by a calendrical system other than the Gregorian, the Gregorian equivalent is either to be substituted as the primary reference date, with the non-Gregorian date placed in parentheses immediately following; or, if the non-Gregorian date is to be retained for purposes of primary reference, then the Gregorian date is to be provided in parentheses immediately following. The case here of the “Common Era” is a matter of simple equivalence; but of course there are more complicated cases, e.g. — to choose an instance especially relevant to late modernity — the “Note on Russian Dating” from Thomas J. Shaw, The Transliteration of Modern Russian for English-Language Publications (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), p. 15:

The Julian (Old Style) Calendar was used in Russia until 1918. To convert Old Style dates to New Style (according to the Gregorian Calendar), add 10 days in the years between 1582 and 1700, 11 days during the eighteenth century, 12 days during the nineteenth, and 13 days during the twentieth. In the Soviet Union, February 14, 1918 (New Style), followed January 31, 1918 (Old Style).

In Russia, the system of dating ‘from the creation of the world’ was used until the beginning of the eighteenth century. The creation of the world was thought of as having taken place on March 21, 5509 B.C. To change dates ‘from the creation of the world’ to our system, subtract 5508.

The first date of March was considered the first day of the year in Russia until about 1492; and after that, September 1, until the year 1700, when January 1 was decreed the first day of the year.

The Islamic system of “AH” (Anno Hegirae = 16 July 622AD) dating represents a situation of intermediate complexity; and of course there are others.

The rule is: all references are to be identified in the Gregorian system of dating.
If the authorship of a given work is unknown but probably not collective, or if the collective aspect is at least not integral to the structure of the work, it is to be referred to in the Text as, e.g., (anon. c.1390), and entered into the References proper accordingly:

**ANONYMOUS.**  

(In case of citing more than one anonymous author with writings of the same date, further specification of “anon. 1” and “anon. 2” etc. would become necessary.) Still other works are by design of collective authorship and so named. These works may be referred to as such — e.g.,

**CONIMBRICENSES.**  

or further identified in the particular case — e.g.,

**FR. DOMINIC OF ST. THERESA.**  

as is dictated by the intent and scholarship of the particular paper in which the source is cited. We may mention also the limit case of collections or “anthologies” which enter into history under the hand of an editor so skillful that the collection comes to be used as a kind of primary source in its own right. In such a case, the collection is entered into the References under the Collector’s name, e.g.,

**LOMBARD, Peter.**  

But internal reference to such a work, e.g., to Lombard’s selections from Augustine, should be further entered into the References under the proper author — “Augustine”, in our example — and historically layered accordingly, with the specific reference to the edited collection being included as part of the Reference entry gloss (on the model of the discussion of anthologies in Section 4, p. [199ff.] above.

**Conflict between composition dates and publication dates** is to be resolved generally in favor of original publication date where both dates occur within the lifetime of the given author (unless of course the period of composition is of special concern as the point at issue, as in the Burks Bibliography of Peirce, or Jaeg er’s book on Aristotle). Discrepancies such as that shown in the following example are of no importance to the Style Sheet per se, choice between them being a matter determined by the individual interest and intentions of a given paper.

Example:
PEIRCE, Charles Sanders (1839–1914).


Both dates being within Peirce’s life span, this entry could just as well be made in terms of the 1906 publication date, it being well understood that, perforce, works are composed prior to their publication.

PEIRCE, Charles Sanders.

1906. “Prolegomena to an Apology for Pragmaticism”, *The Monist* 16 (October), 492–546. Reprinted in CP 4.530 etc. [as seems useful or needed for the particular paper].

Here, the difference between period of composition and date of publication is carried to a point of refinement that belies general interest entirely, having importance only within a most rarefied context of specialization. Beyond that context, this difference amounts to a quibble — unlike the difference between Galen 183 and Galen 1993. The only general merit to such a refined discrimination of composition versus actual publication in a modern author might be that with an author as complex as Peirce whose writings have been subjected to so much dismemberment and fictional arrangement, the enormous effort of reconstruction of the actual order of his projects and writings might justify the universal adoption of an established chronology of composition as the Reference date for each part of his literary corpus, on the pattern we see within the new Peirce Edition begun by Max Fisch. In most cases, in short, discrimination this fine serves no purpose, and the straightforward use of the simple primary publication date is best.

In the case of ancient authors — defined generally as all who wrote before the invention of printing — the composition date, so far as it can reasonably be determined within the author’s actual lifetime, is obligatory as the primary reference date; but this is only for want of an alternative. Authors dealing with ancient sources who encounter difficulties in applying the style sheet may usefully consult the book by Ralph Austin Powell, *Freely Chosen Reality* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1983), which makes extensive use throughout of Latin, Greek, and foreign modern language sources according to the principles of historical layering and the basic scientific practice of reference which such layering incorporates. The most extensive bibliography prepared over the whole history of philosophy is that found in John Deely, *Four Ages of Understanding* (Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2001). The “Gloss on the References” in this last work (pp. 835–836) provides a summary statement of the whole style sheet.

An interesting limit case occurs with modern authors whose works come to publication only posthumously. In such cases, should the original publication date be used, or must a composition date be determined? The answer is that, without qualification, a date from within the author’s lifetime has to be determined and employed as the reference date, with the relation of that date to the posthumous publication date explained in a gloss on the Reference list proper at the end of the paper.

Ferdinand de Saussure provides a striking example at this margin. His *Course in General Linguistics* was never actually written by him, but was composed from class notes taken by students from three lecture courses given at the University of Geneva between 1906 and 1911. The composed work was published in 1915, about three years after Saussure’s demise. The proper form of reference in this case is, accordingly:
de SAUSSURE, Ferdinand (1857–1913).
i.1906–1911. Lectures delivered at the University of Geneva and published from auditors’ notes by
Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye under the title Cours de Linguistique Generale (Paris: Payot, 1915),
trans. into English with annotations by Roy Harris as Course in General Linguistics (London: Duckworth,
1983). This English edition includes the page numbers of the French original in square brackets in the
margins. References in this work are to this bracketed pagination.

A similar example may be taken from the posthumous publication of some of Collingwood’s
manuscripts:

COLLINGWOOD, R. G. (1889–1943)
i.1933–1934. The Idea of Nature, R. T. Knox’s editing of material developed by Collingwood between

Where the first publication of a modern author’s work is separated by many years or — as sometimes
happens — centuries from the author’s death, it is outright misleading to use directly the publication date
as the primary reference date, for the same reasons that make this practice unacceptable in the citing of
ancient authors. The rule for all cases of posthumous publications is strictly that the primary reference
date (i.e., the date cited in the text proper) is to be taken from the period of composition within the author’s
lifetime rather than from the posthumous publication. Example:

LEIBNIZ, G. W. F. (1646–1716)
1704. Nouveaux Essais sur l’entendement humain (first published posthumously in Amsterdam, 1765), English

These remarks on the handling of limiting cases for purposes of the Style Sheet may be summarized in
a formal rule: Original date of publication is normally to be used for modern authors in preference to
composition dates as the primary reference date whenever that publication falls within the author’s
lifetime; in all other cases, for modern authors as for ancient authors, a date or period of composition
must be determined and used in the Text as the primary reference date, the relation of this date to the
date of volumes, translations, or editions used being clarified in the list of References proper given at the end
of the text.

*   *   *   *   *

In conclusion, we provide for quick reference a synopsis of the Style Sheet and an Index of the Technical
Points.

SYNOPSIS OF ESSENTIAL POINTS

The principle of historical layering, embodied in the systematically applied distinction between source
and access works, is the one unique feature and the reason for being of this Style Sheet.

Practically speaking, the application in question reduces to three essentials:
1. Only references explicitly made in one’s text or notes can be included in one’s reference list at the end.

2. The reference date for all authors, in the text and in the notes as well as in the final reference list, must include a date within the author’s lifetime when the source work was primarily (for modern authors) published or (for ancient authors) composed.

3. If the access work differs from the source work, i.e., if a modern edition of an ancient author or any edition other than an original edition was used, then the editor and/or translator, as well as the publisher and copyright year, of this later or “access” edition, must be included as part of the complete reference list given at the end.

**In sum:** the work’s original author is always used to alphabetize an entry, the year of basic original appearance of a work is always the reference date (reference years are keyed to the source work, even though page references are to the access work), and completed bibliographical information — the full relation to the original source of any modern edition or translation used (editor, translator, original title, etc., publisher, year) — is to be provided.
APPENDIX 1

Detail of Layering Layout

as specified by the Center Style Sheet
REFERENCES

1965. "Editorial Afterword" (EA, 391-415), Semiotic Markers, notes, and indices to Pointers 1632a (q.v.), including an exhaustive discussion of the "nationality" and proper name of this author.


DELBRÜCK, Max, J. DEGENKOLBE, and K. H. LESTER.


DELBRÜCK, Max, A. KATZIR, and David PRESTI.


DERIDA, Jacques.


DESCARTES, René.


DELS, Hermann, ed.

1905. Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. The 1973 ed. of this work by Walther Kranz (Zürich: Weidmann) was used.

DIETZE, Gontfried.


DOBZHANSKY, Theodosius.


DODDS, John H., and Michael A. HALL.


DOYLE, Arthur Conan.


DOYLE, John P.


DRYSCH, K.


DU ROULAY, J.


DUBOIS, Jean.

APPENDIX 2

Gauthier’s Layering Table for the Works of Aristotle

“Tableau chronologique des œuvres d’Aristote”,

from L’Éthique à Nicomaque,

par René Gauthier, O.P., et Jean Yves Jolif, O.P.,

(1st ed.; Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1958), p. 36*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIE (âge)</th>
<th>DIALOGUES (exotériques)</th>
<th>ŒUVRES</th>
<th>COURS (ésotériques)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>384/3 SAGIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357/6 ATHÈNES 17</td>
<td>Gryllos</td>
<td>Logique</td>
<td>MÉTAPHYSIQUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>PHYSIQUE</td>
<td>ETHIQUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>BIONIQUE</td>
<td>POLITIQUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topiques</td>
<td>HISTORIQUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De la philosophie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des idées</td>
<td>Réfutations Soph. (Physique VII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348/7 ASSOS 36</td>
<td>I Analytiques</td>
<td>PHR. I, VI, VIII</td>
<td>MÉTAPHYSIQUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II Analytiques</td>
<td>Du ciel</td>
<td>ETHIQUE A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De la génération et</td>
<td>EUDÈME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>de la corruption</td>
<td>VII-VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345/4 MYTILÈNE 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1ère cours :</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Histoire des animaux</td>
<td>(II-III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De la marche des</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>animaux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2ème cours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De la respiration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des parties des</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>animaux (II-IV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De la jeunesse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De la vie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Du sommeil (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des rêves (2 et 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(De la longueur de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>la vie)</td>
<td>Recueil de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>constitutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343/2 MIÉZA 41</td>
<td>Difficultés homére.</td>
<td>ETHIQUE A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Des poètes</td>
<td></td>
<td>POLITIQUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De la royauté</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV-VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Hymne en l'honneur d'Hermias)</td>
<td></td>
<td>POÉTIQUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>MÉTÉOROLOGIQUES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HISTORIQUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335/4 ATHÈNES 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3ème cours :</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des parties des</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>animaux I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DE L'ÂME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De la sensation</td>
<td>Z-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De la mémoire</td>
<td>Θ-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Du sommeil (1)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des songes (1)</td>
<td>M (1-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De la génération</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>des animaux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3

Chronological List of the Works of Thomas Aquinas
Chronology of Aquinas’ writings Based on:

TORRELL, Jean-Pierre.


Numbers in square brackets in the far right column refer to the pages in Torrell’s book where the identified work is glossed.

* * * * *

1244–45. detention at Roccasecca, age 20. Up until p.1900, two logical treatises, now deemed inauthentic, were assigned to this period: *De fallaciis* and *De propositionibus modalibus* [359]

1251 or earlier?. *De principiis naturae* (stars Averroes) [349]

1251 a. *Expositio super Isaiam ad litteram* [337]

b. *Super Ieremia et Threnos* [337]

1252/56a. *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum* [332]

b. *De ente et essentia* (stars Avicenna) [348]

1256 a. between 3 March and June 17:


2. *Resumptio* (response to inaugural events on the first day of class following): *Hic est liber mandatorum Dei* [338]

b. *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem* [346]

c. *Quodlibet 7* [337]

1256–59. *Quaestiones disputatae de veritate* [334]

1257. *Quodlibeta 8 & 9* [337]

1257/8 or 1259. *Super Boetium De Trinitate* [345]

1258. *Quodlibet 10* [337]

1259 a. *Expositio libri Boetii De ebdomadibus (“De Hebdomadibus”)* [345]

b. *Quodlibet 11* [337]

1261–65. *Expositio super Iob ad litteram* [338]

1261–65 (Orvieto) or 1265–68 (Rome). *Super Librum Dionysii De divinis nominibus* [346]

1261–68, 1273? *Collationes in decem praecepta* (homilies on the Ten Commandments given by St. Thomas in Italian; collected by Peter of Andria [357]

p.1261–a.1265. *Expositio super primam et secundam Decretalem ad Archdiaconum Tudertinum* [352]

p.1261–a.1270. *De articulis fidei et ecclesiae sacramentis ad archiepiscopum Panormitanum* [352]

1262. *De emptione et venditione ad tempus (“On credit buying and selling”)* [351]
1263–64. *Contra errores Graecorum* [351]
1263–68. “Catena Aurea” seu Glossa continua super Evangelia [338]
   a. catena on Matthew: 1263–64
1264. *Officinum de festo Corporis Christi ad mandatum Urbani IV Papi* [357]
   De rationibus fidei ad Cantorem Antiochenum [351]
   c.1265.
1265/66a. *Quaestiones disputatae De potentia* [335]
   b. *Quaestiones disputatae De anima* [335]
1265/67a. *Compendium theologiae seu brevis compilatio theologiae ad fratem Raynaldum Ia Pars. De fide* (246 chs.); *Iia Pars. De spe* (10 chs., incomplete; this part may date from Naples, 1272–73)
   b. *Responsio ad magistrum Ioannem de Vercellis de 108 articulis* (examination of 108 propositions taken from *Commentary on the Sentences* by Peter of Tarantaise, later Pope Innocent V)
1265–73a. *Expositio et Lectura super Epistolas Pauli Apostoli* [340]
   1. 1265–68 (Rome): Corinthians, Hebrews
   2. 1272–73 (Naples): Romans
   b. *Summa theologiae* [333]
      1. 1266–68. *Prima Pars*
      2. 1271. *Prima Secundae*
      3. 1272. *Secunda Secundae*
      4. 1272–73. *Tertia Pars*
1267. *De regno ad regem Cypri (“De regimine principum”), complete to Ch. II, par. 8* [350]
1267/68a. *Sentencia Libri De Anima* [341]
   b. *Sententia super Physicam* [342]
i.1268–72 (Paris). *De operationibus occultis naturae ad quendam militem ultramontanum* (letter of 56 lines) [356]
1268–72 (Paris), 1273 (Naples)? *Collationes in orationem dominicam, in Symbolum Apostolorum, in salutationem angelicam* [358]
1269 a. February 22: *De forma absolutionis* [353]
   b. *De secreto* (commission report in which Aquinas participates) [353]
   c. *Quodlibeta 1 & 2* [353]
   d. *Sententia super Meteora* (incomplete) [342]
1269/70a. *De perfectione spiritualis vitae* (response to Gerard of Abbeville’s *Contra adversarium perfectionis christianae of 1269*)
   b. *Lectura super Matthaueum* [339]
1269/72. *Sententia Libri Politicorum* to Book III, 6 [344]
i.1269/72. *De iudiciis astrorum* (letter of less than 56 lines) [356]
c. 1270.  *De mixtione elementorum ad magistrum Philippum de Castro Caeli*  [355]

1270  
a. *Tabula Libri Ethicorum*  [343]  
b. *De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas*  [348]  

1270–71a.  *Quodlibeta 2 & 6*  [337]  

b. between Dec. 1270 and Oct. 1271:  *Expositio Libri Peryermenias* (incomplete)  [342]  
c. summer of either year:  *Liber De Sortibus ad dominum Iacobum de Tonengo*  [353]  
(examines the motives, aims, modes, and efficacy of recourse to casting lots)  

1270–71/2.  *Sententia super Metaphysicorum*  [344]

1270/72a.  *Quaestiones disputatae De Malo*  [336]  

1. Qq. 1–15: 1270  
2. Q. 16: 1272  

b. *Lectura super Ioannem*  [339]  

*c. 1271.*  *Responsio ad lectorem Bisuntinum de 6 articulis*  [354]  

(moral: avoid frivolous and useless details of piety)  

1271  
a. *Epistola ad comitassam Flandriae* (also “*ad ducissam Brabantiae*” and,  
improperly, “*De regimine Iudaeorum*”)  [355]  
b. between Lent and Christmas:  *Contra doctrinam retrahentium a religione*  (also called “*Contra retrahentes*”)  [347]  
c. *De aeternitate mundi*  [348]  
d. late 1271, Paris or Naples:  *De substantiis separatis*  [350]  
e. *Quodlibeta 4 & 5*  [337]  
f. 2 April:  *Responsio ad magistrum Ioannem de Vercellis de 43 articulis*  [354]  
(John of Vercelli, Dominican Master General at the time, solicited opinions  
concerning matters considered to be of faith which have bearings on cosmology — see p. 168n25)  
g. around April:  *Responsiones ad lectorem Venetum de 30 et 36 articulis*  [354]  

1271/72a.  *Expositio Libri Posteriorum*  [343]  

b. *Sententia Libri Ethicorum*  [343]  
c. *Quaestiones disputatae De virtutibus*  [336]  

1272  
a. *Super Librum De Causis*  [346]  

b. *Quaestio disputata De unione uerbi incarnati*  [336]  

1272/73a.  *Sententia super librum De caelo et mundo*  [344]  

b. *Sententia super libros De generatione et corruptione*  [345]  

1273  
a. *De motu cordis ad magistrum Philippum de Castro Caeli*  [355]  

b. Sept.–Oct.:  *Postilla super Psalmos*  [340]  

1274  
a. *Super Cantica Canticorum*  [341]  

b. Hymn, “*Adoro Te*”  [357]  
c. *Epistola ad Bernardum abbatem casinensam*  [356]
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“Gloss on the References”

from *Four Ages of Understanding*, pp. 835–836

summarizing the principles of historical layering

in a work that applied them over the whole history of philosophy
Gloss on the References

The reference section of this book has been constructed using the principle of “historical layering of sources” first outlined in the *Style Manual* of the Semiotic Society of America, a principle which merits universal bibliographical adoption, because it makes explicit the historical levels on which any given discourse draws while at the same time making explicit the relation of any text or edition used to the original source work actually produced within the lifetime of each author cited. For the details of this style sheet, I refer readers to its full published form, “Semiotic Society of America Style Sheet”, *The American Journal of Semiotics* 4.3–4 (1986), 193–215.

In this application of the SSA Style, I have added lifedates in parentheses after the name of authors when we were able to find this information. Simple absence of a death date after a birth date indicates a presumption that, as this book went to press, the author was yet living. Birth dates with only a question-mark in place of a death date indicate a presumption that the author is no longer living, though we were not able to find the death date. The general presumption regarding names without dates (mostly contemporary writers), according to the principle of historical layering as explained above, is that they were alive at least as of the date used in citation of their work.

Here I wish mainly to direct attention to the fact that, under the authors of cited sources arranged alphabetically, the dates when those sources first came into existence can be seen at a glance, like geological layers in a rock or the age rings in a tree trunk. For an historical work the advantage of this system should be obvious at once. But in fact human understanding itself is an historical achievement, and the value of this bibliographical principle is just as great even in purely speculative and theoretical works in any field.

With the exception of two cases that come to mind, Plotinus and Sextus Empiricus, where the internal organization of the reference itself makes necessary the full citation of the works of the author, and the cases of Boethius and Ockham, again because of dating difficulties, I have aimed to restrict this list of References to those works actually cited in the course of the chapters; and, without exception, the works included in this final list are the books and articles which I had in hand as the book was written and its bibliography compiled. I have tried so to record them that the interested researcher could easily take in hand exactly what I had in hand, and go from there. Eschewing bibliography for bibliography’s sake, the list is not a list of secondary sources relied on third-hand, nor an inflated list of works known, but an effort to provide the reader with an inventory of the actual bookshelf, as it were, utilized in order to write this particular book. The intention is to provide the interested reader with as accurate a basis as possible for evaluating the sources the author employed, without prejudging other works which the reader might find useful or necessary in further research into topics touched upon.

The specific conventions concerning the dating of works and authors that can be assigned only an approximate timeframe needs to be made explicit. In such cases the following prefixes are attached to assigned dates:

- r. = ante or “before”;
- c. = circa or “approximately”;
- fl. = floruit or “the prime of life”, “the time of flourishing”;
- i. = inter or “between”; p. = post or “after”;
- r. = the beginning of the period of occupation of an office, so = regnat or “rules”;
- s. = usque or “until”, “up to the time of”: used to indicate the outside date on which an author worked on a ms. left uncompleted.

Within references, the following abbreviations are used:

- cf. = confer or consult;
- q.v. = quod vide or “which see”, a cross-reference.

Finally, in addition to the historical layering of works cited, birth and death dates have been included for authors when we were able to find this information. Simple absence of a death date after a birth date indicates a presumption that, as this book went to press, the author was yet living. Birth dates with only a question-mark in place of a death date indicate a presumption that the author is no longer living, though we were not able to find the death date. The general presumption regarding names without dates (mostly contemporary writers), according to the principle of historical layering as explained above, is that they were alive at least as of the date according to which citation is made of their work.
APPENDIX 5

Style Sheet, Brief Version
STYLE SHEET, BRIEF VERSION

For the convenience of authors, we provide here a brief version of the official Style Sheet, covering the essential points of its application. Authors whose work requires more detailed discussion of these points should consult the full version. In this brief version, we elaborate only on the principle unique to and differentiative of the Center Style Sheet, the principle of the historical layering of sources.

Manuscripts are to be typed double-spaced throughout the text, notes and references, with at least 1 inch top, bottom, and right margins. The typing is to be on one side of standard typing paper. Manuscripts may be divided as appropriate into sections with headings, not numbers alone. All pages of the manuscript are to have the last name of the author and the page number. Single quotes are to be used within double quotes; brackets within parentheses; single underlining or italics for emphasized expressions.

Line drawings (called “Figures” in the text) and photographs (glossies, not negatives; also called “Figures” in the text) are to be reproducible originals submitted on separate sheets, carefully numbered and labeled. Captions are to be typed on a separate sheet and placed at the end of the manuscript.

Tables should be numbered consecutively and titled, and must be referred to in the Text. Avoid referring to the ‘preceding’ or ‘following’ table, since the original position may be shifted in the final camera-ready preparation.

Notes should be kept to an absolute minimum, typed on a separate sheet of paper (double-spaced throughout) and included at the end of the text, but before the references. If a wordprocessing program is used, footnoting is preferred.

References are to add to the current scientific practice the refinement of historical layering. That is to say, References should be cited in the text by giving, all within parentheses: the name of the author(s) and the year according to which the work cited from—called the source work—is properly located within the lifetime of the author who produced it, followed by a colon, a space, and the specific page number(s) of the actual volume according to which the citation is made—called the access volume—when these are called for. The most extensive bibliography prepared in this style and covering the whole history of philosophy is found in John Deely, Four Ages of Understanding (Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2001). The “Gloss on the References” in this last work (pp. 835–836) provides a summary statement of the whole style sheet.

Paying explicit and systematic attention to this distinction between source works and access works is all that is meant by the “PRINCIPLE OF HISTORICAL LAYERING”, and is the essence of the Style Sheet.

Accordingly, in those cases where source work and access volume differ, the relation of the two — including any discrepancy of dates and publishers, and mediator between source and access where there is the added discrepancy of language (i.e., the special case of translations), and whatever additional information or glosses seem useful — is given in the list of References at the end of the manuscript. This list is to be arranged alphabetically by last name of authors, all in capital letters.

Illustrative examples where source work and access volume differ (author life dates are discretionary):

AQUINAS, Thomas (1224/5–1274).


DARWIN, Charles (1809–1882).


Examples where source work and access volume coincide:
Examples where the source being used or discussed depends essentially on a specific posthumous edition of a source:

FRASER, Alexander Campbell, Editor.

LOCKE, John.
1690. *An Essay Concerning Humane Understanding* (London: Printed by Elizabeth Holt for Thomas Basset). Editions by Fraser 1894 and Campbell 1975 were used in this work, both of which editions drop the “e” from “Humane” in Locke’s original title.

NIDDITCH, Peter H., Editor.


The rule is simply that primary reference dates must be taken from within the lifetime of the author of the source work cited.

As long as a publication date falls within the lifetime of the author of the source work cited, that publication date is normally to be preferred as the primary reference date; otherwise, it is necessary to use a composition or period of composition date as the primary reference date.

The reason for the rule is that only by structuring references in this way is it possible to establish a reference base that is invariant across historical and linguistic lines, something very useful for all scholarship, but especially within a field such as semiotics which embraces in principle scholarly work from all disciplines. The point is to make scholarly judgments in the use of sources an explicit rather than a tacit or ignored point.

The principle on which the Style Sheet rests is quite simple. It was chosen for its simplicity compatible with the informational content demanded by all existing reference styles, while improving upon other styles by uniquely establishing an invariant reference base across all the disciplines.

Conformity of reference to the Style Sheet is the primary responsibility of individual authors. Authors who encounter technical difficulties in referencing are asked to consult the full Style Sheet, where detailed discussion of special cases can be found, including limit cases and the handling of non-Gregorian systems of dating. In general, final submissions must be presumed to be conscientiously prepared by their author according to the guidelines, and to be complete as far as the scholarly intent and state of the knowledge of a field allows.

Note regarding punctuation. The Style Sheet does not follow the standardized but arbitrary practice of putting all punctuation marks inside of quotation marks. Instead, respecting the purpose of quotation marks, which is to show what was actually said or written, the rule is: punctuation which belongs to the source cited belongs inside quotation marks; otherwise punctuation belongs after the closing of the quotation marks. Please note this well, for, as Peirce best noted, logic is required for thought to be disciplined, especially in matters where an arbitrary bad habit of ignoring logic has taken root.