

SEMIOTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA STYLE SHEET*

for the preparation of papers to be published by the Semiotic Society of America

Note to authors:

*SSA Style differs from existing styles in one particular, namely,
in requiring that the References apply the principle of “historically layering”,
i.e., use Source Dates from the lifetime of the author cited, based on the fact that no one writes after they die.
Access Dates, of course, in contrast to Source Dates, may come from any period;
when the Access Date differs from the Source Date it must be included in the final References list,
as is clear below.*

Overview:

The publications program of the Semiotic Society of America is currently twofold, a quarterly journal, *The American Journal of Semiotics (TAJS)*, whose editorial and publication policies are explained in the short “Style Guide and Information for Authors” at the end of each issue of the journal; and a Proceedings Volume which results from the SSA Annual Meeting, based on the papers presented each year. This series

* The SSA Style Sheet was prepared, in collaboration with the contributors to the SSA Annual Proceedings volumes, between 1981 and 1986. The SSA Style Sheet was first published in *The American Journal of Semiotics (TAJS)* 4.3–4 (1986), 193–215.
Outline of main points:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Overview.</i> | 1 |
| 1. Page Citation. | 4 |
| 2. Placing of punctuation. | 5 |
| 3. Capitalization. | 5 |
| 4. Reference list mechanics. | 5 |
| for multiple author entries. | 6 |
| for works of art. | 6 |
| for books. | 7 |
| for journals. | 7 |
| for anthologies or collections. | 8 |
| for heterogeneous parts of works. | 8 |
| for access texts of different date form originals. | 2, 9 |
| for posthumous editions, translations. | 10, 16–17 |
| for ancient sources. | 10 |
| for unpublished material. | 12 |
| for newspapers and magazines. | 12 |
| for legal documents (court cases). | 12 |
| use of “q.v.” abbreviation. | 13 |
| 5. Miscellany. | 13 |
| — include only works actually cited | |
| — brackets, block quotes, etc. | |
| 6. Limit cases. | 13 |
| works of unknown origin or collective authorship. | 14 |
| rule for non-Gregorian dating systems. | 14 |
| conflict between publication dates and composition dates. | 14 |
| rule for cases of posthumous publications. | 17 |
| rule for choosing between publication and composition dates. | 17 |
| <i>Synopsis.</i> | 17–18 |

of volumes began with the 1980 fifth annual meeting, and bears the title each year of *Semiotics 1980*, *Semiotics 1981*, etc.; *The American Journal of Semiotics* commenced in 1982.

Beginning with the Semiotics 1982 Proceedings volume, a uniform reference style was undertaken for adoption by the Society in its publications program, a project which has reached sufficient maturity for publication here for the convenience and reference of contributors to the publications. It is essential that the general format be adhered to in manuscripts submitted for inclusion in the Society's publications. In simplest terms, the general format for SSA 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.

Manuscripts are to be typed double-spaced throughout in the Text, with Footnotes preferred over Endnotes. The References section ("Bibliography") will be discussed further below. Using 1-inch margins all around, the main text should be 11-point, extracts (indented quotations within the text of 3 or more lines) 10-point, footnotes 9-point, and references (bibliography) at end 10-point. The 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.

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.

All pages of the manuscript subsequent to the first page are to carry the author's last name followed by a dash and the page number, at the upper left corner of each page (e.g., Shank — 13). Use "double quotes" throughout the paper, and 'single quotes' only within double. Emphasized expressions should be marked by *italic* text. Manuscripts for the Annual Proceedings volumes, including the Text, Notes, and References, should be between a minimum of 8 and a maximum of 17 pages in length (papers submitted below or above these limits risk being excluded from the volume). Manuscripts for the Journal are normally of greater length, subject to the policies and discretion of the editors.

Please note in every case that, besides the Text of the paper proper, the References is to be treated as a distinct major part. Footnotes are preferred to Endnotes; but if Endnotes are used in the submission, the Notes section, as also the References section, is to begin on a new page; and in no case should either Endnotes or References begin on the same page ending the previous section

Line drawings (called "Figures" in the text) and **photographs** (glossies, not negatives, called "Plates" in the text) must be reproducible originals and should be submitted on separate sheets, carefully numbered and labeled. Electronic copies of figures or photographs must be scanned at least with 300dpi. Captions should be typed on a separate sheet and placed at the end of the manuscript.

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

Footnotes (or Endnotes) should be kept to a minimum. If endnotes are used, they should be typed on a separate sheet of paper (double-spaced throughout) and included at the end of the Text, but before the References.

References should conform to basic scientific practice, i.e., they should be cited in the Text by giving the name of the author(s) and the year of the work cited from (in parentheses), followed by a colon, a space, and the specific page number(s) (all within the parentheses) when these are called for. Moreover, since semiotics by nature is not only disciplinary but transdisciplinary, and this both synchronically and

diachronically, references as cited for Society publications must **add to current scientific practice the refinement of historical layering** of references (based on the principle that no one writes posthumously). (*Important aside:* all and only sources *actually referred to* or cited in the text and notes are to be included in the final References section.)

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 text as 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 date is distinct from access date*, throughout the Text and Notes of a manuscript, *page references* are given to the access volume, but the *reference year* is to be that of the source work. 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.

To give a simple illustration of the case:

a) Where source and access volume differ:

DARWIN, Charles.

1859. *The Origin of Species* (New York: The Modern Library, 1937).

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.

1963. *Animal Species and Evolution* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

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 formulation of the SSA Style. These details provide the answers to technical difficulties or misunderstandings commonly encountered in the application of the Source/Access distinction to papers prepared for the SSA Proceedings or TAJIS between 1982 and the present.

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 than the original, or if 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 reprintings. 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 for Society publication over the years during which the present Style Sheet was developed.

1. Page Citations within the Text or Notes. books are 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 from 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... .

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), are used only for substantive

comments that gloss the text or give extensive research information, rather than for providing the reference information of a direct citation, *which will be given in full only once, in the final Reference list.*

2. *Placing of Punctuation Marks Relative to Quotation Marks.* The following rule applies to all the parts of submitted papers — Text, Notes, and References: *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. (We are trying to have logic trump custom on this point!)

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. (*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. *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.

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 the fourth space in to the right, followed by a period and a double space, then the title of the entry. If the date entry takes less than four digits (e.g., the year 271), the title following the date will still begin on the eleventh space; 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. 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 eleventh space, not on the first. Thus:

ANDERSON, Myrdene, John DEELY, Martin KRAMPEN, Joseph RANDELL, Thomas A. SEBOK, and Thure von UEXKÜLL.

1984. *A Semiotic Perspective on the Sciences: Steps Toward a New Paradigm* (University of Toronto: Toronto Semiotic Circle Monograph Series).

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

1974. *Panorama Semiotique/A Semiotic Landscape*, Proceedings of the International Association for Semiotic Studies, Milan, June 1974 (The Hague: Mouton, 1979).

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 single space, then the title of the entry. *But notice that the first entry is identified simply by the year itself (followed by a period and two spaces) without the suffix “a”.* (Note also from the following example that the designation “p” or “pp” *is 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:

RANDELL, Joseph.

1979. “Semiotic Objectivity”, *Semiotica* 26.3–4, 261–288.

1979a. “The Epistemic Function of Iconicity in Perception”, in *Peirce Studies I*, ed. K. Ketner, J. Ransdell, et al. (Lubbock, Texas: Institute for Studies in Pragmaticism), 1–56.

In every case [*note: this remark is dated, since it envisioned a non-proportional spaced typescript; but the idea of the paragraph remains valid; the tab-setting point may need adjustment*], the second and all subsequent lines of the Reference entries begin on the eleventh space. **Practically, this means that, if you hit the space bar on your keyboard three times and set the tab, then hit the space bar an additional seven times and tab again, you will have your correct spacing.**

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.

1973. “Sleeper” (film; New York: United Artists).

BEYDLER, Gary.

1976. “20 Minutes in April” (color photograph; New York; Museum of Modern Art).

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.

1919–1921? “Nude in Interior” (painting; Toronto: Art Gallery of Ontario).

SEAWRIGHT, James.

1984. “Mirror I” (construction; Hartford, CT: Wadsworth Atheneum).

If the entry is a book, the title should be italicized and the translator indicated, if applicable, then city and publisher are given within parentheses after the book’s title. If the edition use is a second or third etc. edition, this should be indicated within the parentheses before the city. The year of the last revised edition used is to be taken as the primary year of reference (with the original edition year mentioned afterward). Mere reprint edition dates, as distinguished from 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 3, above. Examples:

GILSON, Etienne.

1952. *La philosophie au moyen age. Des origines patristiques à la fin du XIVe siècle* (2nd ed., rev. et aug.; Paris: Payot).

MacCANNELL, Dean and Juliet Flower.

1982. *The Time of the Sign. A Semiotic Interpretation of Modern Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

MERRELL, Floyd.

1985. *Deconstruction Reframed* (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press).

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.

1982. "The Medical Symptom: Phylogeny and Ontogeny", *American Journal of Semiotics* 1.3, 17–34.

CANNON, Walter B.

1942. "'Voodoo' Death", *American Anthropologist* 44, 169–181.

KESSEL, Edward.

1955. "The Mating Activities of Balloon Flies", *Systematic Zoology* 4, 96–104.

OEHLER, Klaus.

1982. "Die Aktualität der antiken Semiotik", *Zeitschrift für Semiotik* 4, 215–219.

RASMUSSEN, Douglas B.

1977. "Logical Possibility, Iron Bars, and Necessary Truth", *The New Scholasticism* LI (Winter), 117–122.

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.

1963. "Vorwort" to William J. Richardson, *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought*, original German with facing English trans. By Richardson (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff), VIII–XXIII.

SAVAN, David.

1980. "Abduction and Semiotics", in *The Signifying Animal*, ed. Irmengard Rauch and Gerald F. Carr (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), 252–262.

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:

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.

1923. "The Isolated Individual and the Dyad", excerpt from *Soziologie, Untersuchung über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung* (3rd rev. ed. Of 1908 orig. publ.; Leipzig: Verlag von Duncker & Humblot), 54–75, trans.

Kurt H. Wolff in *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, ed. Kurt H. Wolff (New York: The Free Press, 1950), 118–144.

WOLFF, Kurt H.

1950. “Introduction” to *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, trans. and ed. Kurt H. Wolff (New York: The Free Press, 1950), xvii–lxiv.

This brings us to the point 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.

1926. “What is the Historical Fact?”, paper read at the 41st Annual Meeting (December) of the American Historical Association at Rochester, New York, subsequently published as “What Are Historical Facts?”, *Western Political Quarterly* VII (1955), 327–340.

HEIDEGGER, Martin.

1927. *Sein und Zeit*, in the *Jahrbuch für Phänomenologie und phänomenologische Forschung*, ed. Edmund Husserl. Page references in the present article are to the English trans. by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson, *Being and Time* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963).

KRISTEVA, Julia.

1979. “Le Temps des femmes”, 33/34: *Cahiers de recherche de sciences des textes et documents*, no. 5 (Winter), 5–19, trans. as “Women’s Time” by Alice Jardine and Harry Blake, in *Feminist Theory, A Critique of Ideology*, ed. Nannerl O. Keohane, Michelle Z. Rosaldo, and Barbara C. Gelpi (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982), 31–35. Page references in this article are to the English translation.

LOCKE, John.

1690. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Alexander Campbell Fraser (New York: Dover, 1955), in 2 vols.

MARITAIN, Jacques.

1938. “Signe et Symbole”, *Revue Thomiste* XLIV (April), 299–300, trans. as “Sign and Symbol” by H.L. Binsse, in *Redeeming the Time* by Maritain (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1943), 191–224 (text), 268–276 (notes). Page references in the present article are to the English trans.

PEIRCE, Charles Sanders.

1891. “The Architecture of Theories”, *The Monist* 1 (January), 161–176, reprinted in the *Collected Papers* 6.7–6.34. Page reference in the present essay is to the CP reprint.
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 Pragmaticism”. This letter is MS 318 of the Peirce Edition Project.

RUSSELL, Bertrand.

1905. “On Denoting”, *Mind* XIV, 479–493. Reprinted in the collection of Russell’s essays from 1901–1905 ed. Robert C. Marsh. *Logic and Knowledge* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1956), 41–56. Page references in the present article are to this 1956 reprint.

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.

1957. “Language and the Theory of Sign”, in *Language: An Inquiry into Its Meaning and Function*, ed. Ruth Nanda Anshen (New York: Harper), 86–101.

[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 (or “source”) 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.

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. The prefix “a.” before a date means *ante* or “before”; “c.” before a date means *circa* or “approximately”; “I.” means *inter* or “between” (“in the interval”); “p.” means *post* or “after”. Examples:

AQUINAS, Thomas.

i.1269–1272. *The libros posteriorum analyticorum expositio*, cum textu et recensione leonina cura et studio R. M. Spiazzi (Turin: Marietti, 1955).

i.1269–1272a. *Summa theologiae pars prima secundae*, ed. P. Carmello cum textu ex recensione leonina (Turin: Marietti, 1952).

ARISTOTLE.

c.360BC *Categories*, Edghill trans. In *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. R. McKeon (New York: Random House, 1941), 1–37.

AUGUSTINE of Hippo.

i.397–426. *De doctrina christiana libri quattor* (“On Christian Doctrine”) in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, ed. J.P. Migne, Series Latina (P.L.), Volume 34, cols. 15–122.

AVERROES.

p.1181. *Commentarium Magnum in Aristotelis De Anima Libros*, ed. F. Stuart Crawford (Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953).

BOETHIUS, Anicius Manlius Severinus. (The presentations of Boethius’ works in Migne p. 1844 [q.v.], P.L. Vol. 64, is here chronologized and evaluated textually according to Cappuyns 1937, q.v.)

a.509AD. *Dialogi in Porphyrium a Victorini [a.363] translati*.

CAPPUYNS, Dom Maïeul (1901–1968).

1937. Entry “Boèce” in *Dictionnaire d’Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques*, tome neuvième (Paris: Librairie Letouzey), columns 347–380.

PAULUS VENETUS (“Paul of Venice”).

p.1393. *Logica Magna Prima Pars Tractatus de Terminis*, ed. Norman Kretzman with an English trans. and notes (Oxford: The British Academy, 1979).

SCOTUS, John Duns.

c.1302–1303. *Ordinatio, Liber Primus*, Vol. III of the *Opera Omnia*, ed. P. Carolus Balic (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1954).

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, John (1589–1644).

1631–1635. *Cursus Philosophicus* (Alcalá, Spain); critical ed. by Martin Walter, “Introductory Remarks” by John Deely (based on the 1948 corrected 2nd impression of this work as entitled *Cursus Philosophicus*

Thomisticus and ed. by B. Reiser, printed Turin: Marietti; Walter edition printed Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2008).

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.

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.

1966. *Charles Peirce: The Idea of Representation* (New York: Columbia University, unpublished doctoral dissertation).

HOLLISTER, C. Warren.

1983. Personal letter of 2 September 1983.

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

ECO, Umberto.

1983. “A Sly Scholar”, interview and book review by Herbert Mitgang, in *The New York Times Book Review*, 17 July 1983, 31.

[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. In such cases only, specification of the *initial page* followed by the abbreviation “ff.” would suffice. Examples:

SEBEOK, Thomas A.

1979. “Performing Animals: Tricks of the Trade”, *Psychology Today* 13:6, 78ff.

1978. “‘Talking’ with Animals: Zoosemiotics Explained”, *Animals* 111:6 (December), 20ff.

SEBEOK, Thomas A., and Jean UMIKER-SEBEOK.

1979. “Performing Animals: Tricks of the Trade”, *Psychology Today* 13:6, 78ff.

Legal documents are to be entered alphabetically in capitals by the title of the case (as if it were a proper last name), thus:

GLOBAL REINSURANCE CORPORATION V. ARGONAUT INSURANCE COMPANY

2008. 548 F. Supp. 2d 104 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 18).

GREEN TREE FINANCIAL CORP. OF ALABAMA v. RANDOLPH.
2000. 531 U. S. 79–97.

One final technicality. The abbreviation “q.v.” (*quod vide* — lit.: “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.

1964. “Introdução” Estabelecimento do Texto, Tradução e Notas for Fonseca 1564, q.v.

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

FONSECA, Petrus (“Pedro da”)

1564. *Instituicoes Dialecticas (Institutionum dialecticarum libri octo)*, 2 Vols., ed. with facing Portuguese trans. by Joaquim Ferreira Gomes (Instituto de Estudos Filosoficos da Universidad de Coimbra, 1964).

PELC, Jerzy.

1979. “Semiotics and Logic”, in Chatman et al. 1979 (q.v.), 41–51.

[The Chatman q.v. appears as an example of a multi-author entry in Section 4, p. 6 above.]

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.

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. 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.

i.300–499CE (=AD). Collection of Biblical homilies by many authors, here referred to by date of assemblage; edited and translated by H. Freedman (London: Soncino Press, 1939).

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 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 semiotics — 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 622) 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.

- c.1390. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, ed. J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon, 1925; 2nd rev. ed. by Norman Davis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967).

(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. This works may be referred to as such — e.g.,

CONIMBRICENSES.

1606. *Commentarii Collegii Conimbricensis et Societatis Jesu. In Universam Dialecticam Aristotelis Stagiritae. Secunda Pars.* (Lugduni: Sumptibus Horatii Carson, 1607).

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

FR. DOMINIC OF ST. THERESA.

1644. “De Spe (a quaestione 17 II–II)”, Tractatus 18 in the Commentary of the Salmanticenses, Vol. 11 of the Palmé ed. (Paris: 1879), 440–619.

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.

- c.1150. *Libri Quattuor Sententiarum* (“The Four Books of the Sentences”), in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, ed. J. P. Migne, *Series Latina* (P.L.), Vol. 192, cols. 522–963.

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 above).

Conflict between composition dates dan 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 Jaeger’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.

1905. “Prolegomena to an Apology for Pragmaticism”, *The Monist* 16 (October 1906), 492–546, reprinted under this title in CP 4.530–572: Burks p. 297.

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.

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 (26 November 1857–1913 February 22).

- 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, 1916), 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.

i. 1933–1934. *The Idea of Nature*, R. T. Knox's editing of material developed by Collingwood between August 1933 and September 1934, revised September 1939 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945).

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.

1704. *Nouveaux Essais sur l'entendement humain* (first published posthumously in Amsterdam, 1765), English trans. by A. G. Langley as *New Essays Concerning Human Understanding* (Chicago: Open Court, 1916).

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.

* * * *

Synopsis of Essential Points

In conclusion, we provide for quick reference a Synopsis of Essential Points of the Style Sheet.

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.