

# STYLE SHEET

FOR USE BY *REALITY: A JOURNAL FOR PHILOSOPHICAL DISCOURSE* AND IN PUBLICATIONS AND PAPERS BY MEMBERS OF THE LYCEUM INSTITUTE

The Style Sheet included herein gives readers a recommended approach for formatting and finalizing their documents in a way which uses certain conventions and principles to make the composition clear and useful for the author and reader alike.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

There exist a plurality of Style Sheets or Style Guides in common use for the English language. Most common are the Modern Language Association (MLA), the Chicago Manual of Style (CMOS or CMS), the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), the American Medical Association (AMA), and the American Psychological Association (APA). Different institutions or organizations will require those writing or publishing with them to use either one of these or another, similar style sheet for publication. There are many differences between them, some obvious, some subtle, and often strict adherence to their dictates is required of the writer rather than provided by the editor. Each Style Sheet suffers from certain incongruities, however, which undermine the purpose of a system for regulating reference and punctuation.

In 2004, John Deely proposed—after years of development (1981-1986) and use by the Semiotic Society of America in *The American Journal of Semiotics*—a Style Sheet for the publications program of the Center for Thomistic Studies (CTS) at the University of St. Thomas, in Houston TX. Though it never quite caught on, there are some notable improvements that it makes over the others commonly used. As he wrote in the “preamble”:<sup>1</sup>

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 [Étienne] Gilson’s assumption that history is to philosophy what the laboratory is to science. One needs a broad awareness of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Deely 2004: *Style Sheet for the Publications Program of the Center for Thomistic Studies*, iii.

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.

The Style Sheet presented here—which is also the Style Sheet for the Lyceum Institute and *Reality: a journal for philosophical discourse* and known as the Lyceum Institute Style Sheet (LI Style Sheet or LISS)—adopts the major principles of Deely’s work with minor adjustments.

## 2. PRINCIPLES

In adoption of the CTS Style Sheet, the LISS makes central the principle of **historical layering**: that is, the requirement that the principal reference date for each work cited be taken from within the lifetime of the author(s) of the work. In short, we might say that no one writes after death, and thus there is a certain absurdity in, for instance, citing a work of Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) with a date of the twentieth-century. If we are looking to understand thought in its context, which is always historical, then the date of a work’s composition should be the date most immediately referenced. Oftentimes, such a date is not accessible or precise in the case of works authored in Latin or Ancient antiquity, for which this Style Sheet makes accommodations. While the date of publication of the volume which one used to access the work *is* important, this may be relegated to a secondary position.

As a secondary principle, the LISS adopts *reasonable accommodation*. That is, the style sheet is a guideline for typical or average best practices in producing a clear, readable, scholarly-useful composition. But the work itself dictates what will be the best practice; if there is good reason to prefer a larger size paper—say, to accommodate diagrams, images, artwork, a multiple-column layout, or any other such—then one should adjust the paper size, and from that, margins, font-sizes, and so on, to create a rightly-proportioned work.

## 3. PREPARATION OF MANUSCRIPTS

Whenever one prepares a manuscript for submission to a journal or other publications’ program, it is prudent to learn their preferred Style Sheet. The Lyceum Institute and

*Reality: a journal for philosophical discourse* do not require rigid adherence (believing such to belong to an editor's responsibilities), but it is strongly encouraged that these format settings be used (as the editors will set to these eventually regardless):

- **Identification:** The manuscript should be clearly titled on the first page, along with the author's name, any institutional affiliation (or "independent scholar" if no such affiliation is had). Alignment of this text will vary by publication. Pages should be numbered in the bottom-right of the footer along with the author's last name.
- **Font Face and Size:** Preferred fonts for text and footnotes are Times New Roman, Calibri, or Adobe Caslon Pro\*. For the main body text, font should be 10.5pt; blockquotes, footnotes, appendices, and reference text should be 9.5pt size. Footnotes in appendices should be 9pt font size. \*Note that Adobe Caslon Pro, by default, has broader spacing between lines. See Paragraphs below.
- **Page Size and Margins:** All published content of *Reality: a journal for philosophical discourse* is to be set to a custom paper size of 9.21" x 6.14". Margins are to be set to 1" for top and bottom and 0.72" for right and left.
- **Paragraphs:** Paragraphs should have *no indentation*, on the first or any other line. All paragraphs should have a *justified* alignment, unless being placed stylistically (epigraphs, poetic quotes, etc.). Blockquotes should be indented 0.25" from both left and right sides. Paragraphs are to be *single-spaced* with an 11pt space after each paragraph in the body text, and 6pt in the References. Footnotes should have no indentation, and if a footnote spans multiple paragraphs, there should be a 3pt space between them. This format allows digital and print editions to remain consistent. \*For Adobe Caslon Pro, paragraphs should be set to *multiple* spacing at 0.9.
- **Punctuation Conventions:** Blockquotes should not be enclosed within quotation marks, while all other quotes should be enclosed within "double quotes" (and 'single quotes' are to be used within double when the source quoted itself uses *either* double or single quotes). Punctuation should be included within quotation marks *only if* it belongs to the source being quoted.
- **Emphasis:** Underlines should *not* be used in any circumstance. Non-English words left untranslated should be *italicized*, as should titles of books or journals, while **bold** should be used for emphasis.
- **References:** Scholarship stands as a basic necessity for any philosophical publication, and therefore accurate and *useful* citations must be used in any manuscript. This means that, even if one does not conform fully to the style of historical layering, a submitted manuscript ought to include citations with the author's name, preferably the year of original composition, the correct page(s),

and the title or an abbreviated title of the work, with full bibliographic information accessible in the References section of the document.

## 4. SOURCE WORKS AND ACCESS WORKS

To distinguish between *original* publication and publication used in reference, we use the terminology, respectively, of **source** and **access** works. Sometimes source and access works are the same, and sometimes they are not: if citing an author before the twentieth-century, it is likely the two will be different. If citing a work which has been translated from one language into another, and the second has been the work accessed, they will also be different.

When source and access are distinct, the page number in any citation is to be given from the access work, while the year is given from the source work. Any additional information which may help the reader parse the distinction between source and access should be included in the References section of the document. To give a footnote example, first, suppose I quote Martin Heidegger's *Being and Time*, where he writes, "The space which is thus disclosed with the worldhood of the world still lacks the pure multiplicity of the three dimensions."<sup>2</sup> Note that I included the original language, the German, as well as the page numbers for **both** the German original (first) and the English translation (second), and a future abbreviation. This provision is not always necessary but *is* if one provides his own translations or if one believes the original language is somehow important. Were I to cite the work again, or to reference a particular page or point *without* quoting, the footnote would look like this.<sup>3</sup>

To include this work in the References section, it would be written thus:

HEIDEGGER, Martin (26 September 1889—1976 May 26).

1927. *Sein und Zeit* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2006), originally published in the *Jahrbuch für Phänomenologie und phänomenologische Forschung*, ed. E. Husserl. English translation by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson, *Being and Time* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963).

As we see (ignoring for now the biographical information of the author), we have much information contained here: 1927, the original year of *Sein und Zeit*'s publication in the *Jahrbuch für Phänomenologie und phänomenologische Forschung*, edited by Edmund

---

<sup>2</sup> Heidegger 1927: *Sein und Zeit*, in the English translation by Macquarrie and Robinson, *Being and Time*, (SZ hereafter) 110/145: "Der so mit der Weltlichkeit der Welt erschlossene Raum hat noch nichts von der reinen Mannigfaltigkeit der drei Dimensionem."

<sup>3</sup> Heidegger 1927: SZ 111/146.

Husserl, in its more recent version published by Max Niemeyer Verlag in 2006, and translated in 1963 by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson under the title of *Being and Time*, which English translation is here used.

Where the source and access work is the same, we might have a quotation such as this of John Deely: “All objects present themselves in a relation to the cognizing organism.”<sup>4</sup> The bibliographic information would appear thus:

DEELY, John (26 April 1942—2017 January 7).

2002.            *What Distinguishes Human Understanding* (South Bend, IN: St. Augustine’s Press).

There may arise many discrepancies between source works and access works, navigating which can be difficult but highly informative both for yourself, as an author and for your readers as they are scholars. In the age of *information access* present through the internet, much of the necessary research can be performed with a few taps of the keys. At times, you may find yourself unable to discover fully adequate source material absent a well-furnished research library. In such cases, we must do the best we can to approximate, but should not hold up our submissions for such inconveniences.

## 5. DETAILS OF STYLE CONVENTIONS

Language in the concrete always requires certain stipulations, which stipulations, once adopted, become conventions. This section of the LISS indicates the preferred conventions for citation and intra-text formatting. Following these conventions helps to produce regularity and increase ease of access.

### 5.1. FOOTNOTES

Though many other conventions for citation have common approval, it is the preferred method of this style sheet to exclusively use footnotes, with the **sole exception** of Biblical references, for which parenthetical citation in the universally standard form of book, chapter, and verse. The *exception to the exception* is if one wishes to include another language, especially Latin or Greek, in which case a footnote is recommended for this purpose.

In addition to citations, footnotes are to be used for including original languages where appropriate (especially if you yourself have provided the translation into English—a practice strongly encouraged), as well as for indicating issues that are relevant and important to the points being discussed in the body text but which would either 1) cause too significant a deviation from the main topic or 2) would require more exposition than

---

<sup>4</sup> Deely 2002: *What Distinguishes Human Understanding?* 77.

the document affords. In this latter case, one ought to point to other sources or texts which address the difficulty with the thoroughness that one cannot here provide. Promissory notes—those of the flavor, “I intend to write...”—are permitted but not recommended, given how rarely such notes are fulfilled.

### 5.1.1. PLACEMENT OF FOOTNOTES

Footnotes are to be placed in the main text either at the **end** of an in-line quotation, **before** a blockquote, or otherwise that it seems appropriate to direct the reader’s attention to the source or commentary. For examples, if I might quote R.E. Houser’s claim that, “For the ancient philosophers a nominal definition gives us enough preliminary knowledge of the meaning of a term to go further and study it in depth.”<sup>5</sup> Because this quote runs fewer than four lines of my page, I cite it in-line rather than as a blockquote. Were I to cite a longer passage, say this concerning descriptive definitions, I would do it in this manner:<sup>6</sup>

Such definitions are widespread and very helpful. The reason why is that it is often difficult to come to understand the essence or the causes of something. The normal human approach to understanding things is to proceed from effect to cause, rather than cause to effect, because effects are normally much more evident to us.

Note also the use of “*ibid*”, a common abbreviation of the Latin “*ibidem*”, meaning “in the same place”. You are encouraged to use this in *final* drafts of your writing. I say final drafts only, for it signifies the same source as the previous footnote, and in revisions, you may find yourself adding other footnotes between, referencing other works—and if you forget to change your “*ibid*”, you are now misleading readers!

When referencing a work without quoting it in your body text, so as to direct the reader’s attention, it should be appended to the clause or word most pertinent to the source’s influence. Were I to direct your attention here, for instance, to Sr. Miriam Joseph’s distinction of collective and distributive terms,<sup>7</sup> I would place the footnote at the end of the previous clause. Were I to allude to an author’s thoughts on a subject without directly citing or referencing the author, I would use a “*cf*”: short for “*confer*”.<sup>8</sup>

### 5.1.2. FORMATTING OF FOOTNOTES

Footnotes, like body text, should use a justified alignment, with a 9.5 point size font. The general format of a citation should be author’s name (which may be omitted if mentioned in the body text), followed by source date, a colon, title(s) of the work, as

---

<sup>5</sup> Houser 2020: *Logic as a Liberal Art: An Introduction to Rhetoric & Reasoning*, 142.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*, 142-43.

<sup>7</sup> Joseph 1937: *The Trivium: The Liberal Arts of Logic, Grammar, and Rhetoric*, 75.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Deely 2004: *Style Sheet for the Publications Program of the Center for Thomistic Studies*, 13.

well as volume or issue information if in a journal or other multi-issue source, a common, and then the page number. If there is a quotation included, a colon should follow the page number, with the quotation enclosed in “double-quote” marks. In subsequent citations of a work previously cited, you may abbreviate the title to something recognizable but shorter. There is no need to include bibliographic information such as publisher or publication date of the access work if you have a references section. Translator should be mentioned in the first citation of a translated work if there are known to be multiple published translations of the work in question.

Ancient sources, particularly those composed before the advent of the printing press and the regularization of “book” formats, may be cited more appropriately to different methods than page number. The work of a scholastic author in a disputed question format, for instance, may be best cited as to question number, article number, and then part of the text, i.e., as to objection, response, *sed contra*, etc. References to Plato and Aristotle should be to Stephanus and Bekker numbers, respectively, (though book number and chapter should be used with reference to Aristotle as well).

### 5.1.3. ANCIENT AND AMBIGUOUSLY DATED SOURCES

Often, ancient sources, very large volumes, posthumously-edited works, or collected papers and works constituted from scattered sources, such as class notes, do not have a precise date of composition or publication. There are several ways in which such ambiguity may be handled. For works written over a span of time and only later collated into a singular volume, the *range* of composition dates is to be indicated. For instance, it is known that Thomas Aquinas composed the *prima pars* of his *Summa theologiae* continually between 1266 and 1268. Thus, citing the bilingual edition recently published by the Aquinas Institute, I may write my footnote in this manner.<sup>9</sup> Additionally, you will note that I added an indication of the abbreviation to be used in future citations. This is good common courtesy to your reader.

Other works, however, may be written *sometime* between two dates, but not continually. Ferdinand de Saussure’s lectures compiled and published under the title *Cours de Linguistique Generale*, for instance, were delivered between 1906-1911. In consequence, in a footnote, they would be referenced in this manner, using a lowercase “i” to indicate “interim”.<sup>10</sup> When the year of composition is approximate, or a guess, one uses a “c.” to indicate “circa”, such as one finds in many of the undated manuscripts of Charles Sanders Peirce.<sup>11</sup> If the work is estimated to have been written in one or another year (but not more than those two), the possible years should be indicated by

---

<sup>9</sup> Thomas Aquinas 1266-68: *Summa theologiae prima pars*, (ST Ia hereafter) q.44, a.3, ad.1.

<sup>10</sup> Saussure i.1906-11: *Cours de Linguistique Generale*, in the English translation by Wade Baskin, *Course in General Linguistics*, 13.

<sup>11</sup> Peirce c.1902: “The Nature of Symbols” in *Collected Papers (CP hereafter)* vol.2: 292-302.

use of a backslash (/), as, for instance, the *Summa contra Gentiles* of Aquinas<sup>12</sup> or this work of Peirce.<sup>13</sup>

#### 5.1.4. ONLINE SOURCES

Where possible, use print sources or published PDFs over websites, which may and often do change. When citing a source available only on a website, however, you ought to include the date of retrieval, and, if possible, to use the Archive.org “Save Page Now” feature to ensure future retrievability of the site in question. Though this will not perfectly preserve all elements of the page in question, it will likely preserve the key texts and give you a permanent link to access it. For instance, citing my essay on the “Tradition of Questioning” in *Reality*, I can either reference the link directly<sup>14</sup> or the Archive.org capture.<sup>15</sup> Note that this latter citation, because of the unbroken nature of the URL string, constitutes an exception to the rule for a justified alignment.

## 5.2. CAPITALIZATION

As a general rule, proper names, personal or official titles, and all categorematic words in titles should be capitalized, unless clearly specified otherwise in the preferred stylization of the publication in question. For instance, *Reality*'s subtitle, “a journal for philosophical discourse”, is not capitalized. However, *The Intersection of Semiotics and Phenomenology* receives distinction as a title, on the one hand, insofar as it is italicized, but is distinguished from other italicized words by the capitalization convention. This convention is inessential but will be followed in any application of this style sheet.

## 5.3. HEADINGS

For the sake of clear organization, it is recommended that documents make use of headings where applicable. The longer the composition, the more useful these become. Similarly, the more segmented one's subject matter, the more headings may be useful as well—such as in this appendix. Headings should be sequentially numbered, with additional points used to signify a hierarchical structure (e.g., 1. Introduction; 2. Second heading; 2.1. First subheading; 2.1.1. First sub-subheading; 2.1.2. Second sub-subheading; 2.2. Second subheading; etc.). It is preferred that headings be in either

---

<sup>12</sup> Thomas Aquinas 1259/65: *Summa contra Gentiles*.

<sup>13</sup> Peirce: 1906/07: “Prolegomena to an Apology for Pragmatism” in *CP.4*: 530-72.

<sup>14</sup> Kemple 29 August 2020: “The Tradition of Questioning” in *Reality: a journal for philosophical discourse*, online <<https://realityjournal.org/2020/08/29/essay-tradition-of-questioning/>>. Retrieved 31 October 2021.

<sup>15</sup> Kemple 29 August 2020: “The Tradition of Questioning” in *Reality: a journal for philosophical discourse*, online <<https://web.archive.org/web/20211031175505/https://realityjournal.org/2020/08/29/essay-tradition-of-questioning/>>. Retrieved 31 October 2021.



Trajan Pro or Century Gothic, using the “small caps” font setting. Headings 1 and 2 should have a 18 point “before” and 6 point “after” spacing in its paragraph settings, while Heading 3 should have 10 point before, 4 point after. Heading 1 should be 14 point font, Heading 2 should be 12, and heading 3 should be 10.

## 5.4. PUNCTUATION

Punctuation should be kept standardized throughout every publication. There should be a preference for em dashes for parenthetical interjections, a sparsity of exclamation points, careful attention to semi-colons and commas, and there should only be use of “double-quotes”, with ‘single-quotes’ used only within double, unless as a clearly-stated signifier of some other intended use. For instance, if one wishes to distinguish between the *object*, the *concept*, and the *sign-vehicle itself*, one might do so by having no textual modification when signifying the object, *italics* when signifying the concept, and ‘single-quotes’ when signifying the sign-vehicle of the word itself.

Perhaps most important of all, this Style Sheet adheres to a convention of including punctuation within quoted text only if it appears within the original source being quoted. For instance, if one is ending the quote before the end of the source material’s sentence, a period *absolutely should not appear within the quote*, nor should a comma. The rationale of this decision is simple: the purpose of quotation marks is to indicate what the author being quoted has said or written. Including spurious punctuation may alter the meaning of the author or indicate an intent not the author’s own.

There may be exceptions in dealing with works of antiquity which did not originally have punctuation, *if you can justify* your editorial insertion of a punctuation mark. A work of Thomas Aquinas, for instance, has only punctuation added by a later editor—to which point, if one can justify removing or changing some punctuation, this too may be appropriate.<sup>16</sup>

## 6. HISTORICAL LAYERING OF REFERENCES

In this section, we will detail the various common kinds of sources which may be referenced. This list is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather to give the basics from which a reasonable author can infer to the appropriate reference for any kind of work *not* exemplified here.

Bibliographic entries are to be listed alphabetically by author’s last name, while works by that author or authors are to be listed in ascending chronological order, from earliest

---

<sup>16</sup> As a caveat, however, if one *does not read* the original language of such an author, it is highly unlikely that one has the linguistic mastery to make such a decision.

to latest. Authors dates of birth and death (where known and applicable) should be given to the fullest detail possible. The same principle concerning uncertainty of the date of texts' compositions is to be applied to dates of birth and death.

Whenever an author has *more than one* publication in a single year, these references should be identified by an appended lowercase letter. E.g., if someone has four publications in 2016, these should be noted as "2016", "2016a", "2016b", and "2016c". These identifications will help readers distinguish works more clearly when they are cited (as these letters ought to be used in footnotes as well) in corresponding to the reference text.

## 6.1. BOOKS

Books with a single author are likely to be the most frequent reference for those consulting this style guide: for most work in the humanities of profound significance has been composed by a single author. The date is indented 0.25" and the body text of the entry 1". Last names are to be typed in all capitals and given first. We have already seen a few such examples given above, but to give a more thorough set of examples, comprising those with different source and access works, consider the following list:

DEELY, John (26 April 1942—2017 January 7).

- 1971. *The Tradition via Heidegger: An Essay on the Meaning of Being in the Philosophy of Martin Heidegger* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff).
- 1982. *Introducing Semiotic: Its History and Doctrine* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press).
- 1994. *The Human Use of Signs or: Elements of Anthroposemiosis* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, Inc).

KEMPLE, Brian (31 May 1986—).

- 2017. *Ens Primum Cognitum in Thomas Aquinas and the Tradition: The Philosophy of Being as First Known* (Boston: Brill).
- 2019. *The Intersection of Semiotics and Phenomenology: Peirce and Heidegger in Dialogue* (Boston: Mouton de Gruyter).

SOKOLOWSKI, Robert (3 May 1934—).

- 2000. *Introduction to Phenomenology* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

2008. *Phenomenology of the Human Person* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

WATSON, John B. (9 January 1878—1958 September 25).

1924. *Psychology from the Standpoint of a Behaviorist*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company).

### 6.1.1. WITH MORE THAN ONE AUTHOR

In the case of entries with multiple authors, give only the first author with the name in reverse order (last name first), though continue to type last names in all capitals. You may omit dates of birth and death unless you judge the details particularly salient to the reader's knowledge.

### 6.1.2. SECTION IN A BOOK

In citing parts of books constituted by heterogeneous parts—whether by multiple authors or by the same, as in a collection of essays published elsewhere or written for other purposes but now comprised under the same title—it is important to distinguish the part of the book being used as a source with the proper date of composition. Some examples:

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (13 April 1925—2018 April 15).

1986. "Language, Learning and 'Educational Knowledge'", a lecture originally given at the National University of Singapore, in *Aspects of Language and Learning*, ed. Jonathan J. Webster (New York: Springer 2016), 1-16.

MARITAIN, Jacques (18 November 1882—1973 April 28).

1956. "Language and the Theory of Sign", originally appearing in English as c.5 of *Language: An Enquiry into Its Meaning and Function*, ed. Ruth Nanda Ashen (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), 86-101. Reprinted in *Frontiers in Semiotics* eds. John Deely, Brooke Williams, and Felicia E. Kruse (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986), 51-62.

SHORT, Thomas L. (1940—).

1982. "Life among the Legisigns" in *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 18.4: 285-310. Reprinted in *Frontiers in Semiotics* eds. John Deely, Brooke Williams, and Felicia E. Kruse (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1986), 105-19.

If the date is the same as that of publication, one may indicate the section but omit a distinct access work date. This includes distinguishing editorial parts of the book that do not form the main body text, such as introductions, commentaries, etc. E.g.:

DEELY, John (26 April 1942—2017 January 7).

1973. "Preface" to *The Problem of Evolution: A Study of the Philosophical Repercussions of Evolutionary Science*, John Deely and Raymond Nogar (New York: Meredith Corporation), vii-x.

1973. "The Emergence of Man" in *The Problem of Evolution: A Study of the Philosophical Repercussions of Evolutionary Science*, John Deely and Raymond Nogar (New York: Meredith Corporation), 119-146.

KASTER, Robert A. (1948—).

2020. "Introduction" in *Cicero: Brutus and Orator*, a translation and commentary on Cicero's *Brutus* and *Orator* both composed c.46BC (New York: Oxford University Press).

### 6.1.3. COLLECTED WORKS OF A SINGLE AUTHOR

When dealing with the collected works of a single author, or group of authors identified collectively, one should provide as much bibliographic reference as possible, including potential cross-references. References to the collection should be explained prior to specific access work information if possible, especially if there exist multiple collections in which the same source works may be found. For example, the works of C.S. Peirce—rather disorganized in themselves and therefore compiled in many different ways—often receive this treatment:

PEIRCE, Charles Sanders (10 September 1839—1914 April 19).

Note. References of Charles Sanders Peirce are to three distinct editions of collected works: *CP* refers to Peirce, Charles Sanders, *Collected Papers*, vols. 1-6 edited by Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss; vols. 7-8 edited by A.W. Burks (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1958-1966). This is also available in a digital edition, located on the IntelLex Past Masters Online Catalog <[www.nlx.com](http://www.nlx.com)>. Citations of the format *CP.1.100* refer to the edition, volume, and paragraph number, respectively.

*EP* refers to the two-volume set of the Peirce Edition Project, *The Essential Peirce*, where *EP.1* covers 1867-1892 and *EP.2* covers 1893-1913 (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1992 and 1998). References of the format *EP.2: 260-62* refer to edition, volume, and page numbers, respectively.

*W* refers to the *Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition*, vols.1-8 (out of a planned 30) edited by Edward C. Moore, Max H. Fisch, Christian J.W. Kloesel, Don D. Roberts, and Lynn A. Ziegler (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1982—).

- 1865. "Logic of the Sciences" in *W.1*: 322-36.
- 1867. "On a New List of the Categories" in *EP.1*: 1-10.
- 1877. "The Fixation of Belief" in *EP.1*: 109-23.
- 1893. "The grammatical theory of judgment and inference" in *CP.2*.235-44.

One could similarly identify, for instance, the Marietti or Leonine versions of the writings of Thomas Aquinas, or the recent bilingual editions published by the Aquinas Institute. Identifying these sources in an introductory section below the author's name allows for cutting down on unnecessary repetition in individual source work entries.

#### 6.1.4. TRANSLATIONS

Because every work of translation is also a work of interpretation, it is crucial to indicate the original language of the source work in our references. If the access work is the translation, indicate this in any manner where it is clear to the reader. For two such examples:

PIEPER, Josef (4 May 1904—1997 November 6).

- 1946. *Muße und Kult* (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1948) in the English translation by Alexander Dru, *Leisure: The Basis of Culture* together with *The Philosophical Act* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2009).
- 1966. *Verteidigungsrede für die Philosophie* (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, GmbH & Co.), in the English translation by Lothar Krauth, *In Defense of Philosophy: Classical Wisdom Stands up to Modern Challenges* (San Francisco: St. Ignatius Press, 1992).

VAN STEENBERGEN, Fernand (1904—1993).

- 1946. *Ontologie* (Paris: Louvain Éditions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie). References to the English translation by Martin J. Flynn, *Ontology* (New York: Joseph B. Wagner, Inc., 1952).
- 1947. *Épistémologie* (Paris: Louvain Éditions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie). References to the English translation by Martin J. Flynn, *Epistemology* (New York: Joseph B. Wagner, Inc., 1949).

## 6.2. ARTICLES

Second most frequent among the works cited by readers of this style guide will be the academic article. The particularities and variations from one publication to the next, and so one must, as always, employ the principle of reasonable accommodation.

### 6.2.1. IN JOURNALS

Journals often but not always have a **volume** and an **issue**. These should be presented after the journal title in the format of “#. #”. Some journals will mark issues within volumes by the month of publication, which should be indicated in the format of “# (Month)”. Page numbers are to be indicated after the volume and issue with a colon for separation.

DEELY, John (26 April 1942—2017 January 7).

- 2013. “The Quasi-Error of the External World: an essay for Thomas A. Sebeok, in memoriam” in *Cybernetics And Human Knowing*, 10.1: 25-46.
- 2015. “Cognitive and cathectic dimensions of semiosis” in *Cognitive Semiotics* 8.1: 19-38.
- 2015a. “Building a Scaffold: Semiosis in Nature and Culture” in *Biosemiotics* 8: 341-60.

FURTON, Edward J.

- 1997. “The Constitution of the Object in Immanuel Kant and John Poinset” in *The Review of Metaphysics* 51 (September): 55-75.

MOSER, Robbie

- 2011. “Thomas Aquinas, *Esse Intentionale*, and the Cognitive as Such” in *The Review of Metaphysics* 64 (June): 763-88.

OSBORNE, Thomas

- 2010. “The concept as a formal sign” in *Semiotica* 179-1/4: 1-21.

### 6.2.2. IN PROCEEDINGS

The format of proceedings should largely follow that of journals, with the exception that original date and location of presentation should be given where that information can

feasibly be retrieved. For instance, most conferences held after 2010 will have some archival information online, such that a search engine query can turn up the needed information. Details for the proceedings of older conferences may be more difficult to discern.

KOTERSKI, Joseph (28 November 1953—2021 August 9).

2019. "Nature and Ethics" in the *Proceedings of the ACPA*, 93: 61-70. Originally presented as a plenary lecture at the annual meeting of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, 21-24 November 2019.

HAUBER, Ulrich A. (28 June 1885—1956 July 1).

1938. "Mechanism and Teleology in Current Biology" in the *Proceedings of the ACPA* 14: 45-69.

MCLAUGHLIN, Thomas

2019. "A Defense of Natural Place in a Contemporary Scientific Context" in the *Proceedings of the ACPA*, 93: 101-15. Originally presented in a contributed papers session at the annual meeting of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, 21-24 November 2019.

RENTMEESTER, Casey

2021. "Beyond Bestand: A Heideggerian Path to Sustainability" in *Heidegger Circle Proceedings* 55: 30-46. Originally presented in a virtual meeting held by Gonzaga University for the annual meeting of the Heidegger Circle, 7-15 May 2021.

### 6.3. REFERENCE WORKS

With regard to reference works of no definite authorship, especially those of a collective effort (such as, e.g., the dictionary), entries should be formatted as such:

WEBSTER'S NEW UNIVERSAL UNABRIDGED DICTIONARY

1994. A collective work based on *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* (New York: dilithium Press, Ltd.).

One will likely need to make various reasonable accommodations for the accurate referencing of such materials. Whenever possible, if there is a clear editor, use this information instead of the book's title for the principle identifier.

## 6.4. ONLINE SOURCES

Online sources should be treated according to their appropriate source material—that is, as a book or an article—with the addition of the source’s URL and/or the Archive.org URL, as noted above in 5.1.4.

### 6.4.1. DIGITAL OBJECT IDENTIFIERS

In the digital age, there are increasing numbers of sources which may be found only online; simultaneously, it is increasing easy to discover such sources online. One such tool being employed to this end is the **Digital Object Identifier (DOI)**, a unique and persistent identifying number for any document available online. These are assigned for a nominal fee by the DOI System according to the International Organization for Standardization. Whether one chooses to include DOI numbers in citations or references is left to the discretion of the author—with the caveat that, in addition to making these sources more easily discovered, it also makes them more easily acquired through piracy.