Tutorial Letter 301/4/2021

ALL MODULES

PLS1501	**PLS2607**	**PLS3705**	**PLS4802**
PLS1502	**PLS3701**	**PLS3709**	**PLS4803**
PLS2601	**PLS3702**	**HPPLS82**	**PLS4804**
PLS2602	**PLS3703**	**HRPLS81**	

Semesters 1 and 2

Department of Philosophy, Practical and Systematic Theology

This tutorial letter contains important information about your module.

BARCODE

CONTENTS

Page

Page

A THE DISCIPLINE OF PHILOSOPHY REFERENCE SYSTEM 5

1 WHY HAVE A REFERENCE TECHNIQUE? 5

1.1 Why we refer? 6

a. Intellectual integrity 6

b. Brevity 6

c. Following up 6

d. Authority 6

1.2 Why a standard system of reference? 6

2 WHAT IS REFERRED TO? 7

2.1 Monographs 7

2.2 Collections 7

2.3 Periodicals 8

2.4 Alphabetically ordered(reference) works 8

2.5 Internet sources 8

3 HOW DO WE REFER? 8

3.1 Source notes(in the body-text of your paper) 9

a. Direct quotation 9

b. Paraphrases 10

c. Sources notes: summary 11

3.2 Bibliography (at the end of assignment/paper/thesis) 11

a. Arrangement of the sources in the bibliography 11

b. Structure of items 11

(i) Monographs 12

-with one author 12

-with two authors 12

-with three authors 12

-with more than three authors 12

-bibliography of translated works 13

-modern editions of classical works 13

(ii) Collections 13

-An edited collection in general 13

- An article from an edited collection 13

(iii) Alphabetically ordered works 14

-Dictionary 14

-Encyclopedia 14

-Companions 14

(iv) Periodicals 14

1. Articles 14

2. Books reviews 14

(v) Other bibliographic entries 15

-Bibles 15

-Encyclical Letter 15

(vi) Internet sources 15

-website address 15

-e-mail address 15

c. Bibliographies in general 15

d. Special bibliographies 16

4 OTHER REFERENCES IN THE TEXT 16

4.1 Cross referencing 16

4.2 Notes 16

4.3 Important abbreviations 17

5 OTHER SYSTEMS 17

5.1 Numbered paragraphs 17

5.2 Original sources 18

6 IN CONCLUSION 18

B HINTS ON STUDYING PHILOSOPHY 18

1 LEVELS OF PHILOSOPHY UNDERSTANDING 18

2 HOW DOES ONE READ A PHILOSOPHICAL TEXT 20

3 HOW DOES ONE WRITE A PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAY 25

4 CONCLUSION 25

7 APPENDIX 27

A THE DISCIPLINE OF PHILOSOPHY REFERENCE SYSTEM

Dear Student,

For every assignment that you write and submit, our discipline requires the following:

(i) a well-written **bibliography** at the end of such a work, indicating all

the sources you have consulted in the writing of your assignment, including those that you did not cite in your body-text but which influenced your work

AND

(ii) carefully ordered **references** or **source notes** in the body-text of your work, indicating the name of the author(s) whose ideas you are referring to, the year in which the publication you are referring to was produced and the page number(s) in the publication from which the ideas are borrowed.

It is important for everyone concerned that such references in assignments have a uniform style. For us, uniformity of referencing has the advantage of facilitating supervision. For you, it means mastering a technique that could save you much trouble in later research and publishing. Philosophy authors, whether beginners, post-graduate students, or professional philosophers, sooner or later have to supply references. Also, those who read and study philosophy, must be familiar with reference systems so that they can understand the references and, if necessary, follow them up.

There are many different reference systems. The system used in the Discipline of Philosophy is the **Harvard System** (with slight modifications). The following publication, Burger, M. 1992, *Reference techniques*, 8th revision, Pretoria: Unisa, pp.1-76, forms the basis for these notes. This publication can be obtained from The Business Section, Publishing Services, Unisa, PO Box 392, UNISA, 0003.

In this tutorial letter we provide hints on the use of references in your own written work. Therefore we confine ourselves to a single system. However, in your readings you will come across different reference systems. We, therefore recommend very strongly that you take note of the different techniques discussed by Burger.

The appendix at the end of this tutorial letter provides a self-test on reference.

1 WHY HAVE A REFERENCE TECHNIQUE?

This raises two questions, namely, Why refer? and, Why have one fixed technique for referring?

1.1 Why refer?

There are four main reasons:

a. Intellectual integrity

The least that one can do is to give credit to others for any of their thoughts, insights and discoveries that one may use. Whether you are working out an assignment or preparing a publication, you will often want to make use of what others have said before you. Such "borrowings" must be acknowledged, whether they are in the form of a **direct quotation** or a **paraphrase**. Lack of such acknowledgement constitutes *plagiarism*, which may be defined as the "…wrongful attempt to pass off another's literary or musical work as one's own; act of copying without permission or acknowledgement." (Garmonsway 1991:551). Plagiarism is something, which not only reflects badly on the person of the writer and the acceptability of his/her work, but lays him/her open to lawsuits as well, and as a result it is unacceptable.

b. Brevity

Writers do not want to repeat themselves unnecessarily or be side-tracked from their main issues. By using cross-references to the work itself, and references to other works, writers can achieve the effects they desire without repetitions or long explanations.

c. Following up

A scientific study is read by people who are interested in the subject for various reasons, one of which may be the continuing search for truth. It frequently happens that a reader wishes to check something, or follow up something that the writer has mentioned, in order to verify it or refute it. References make it possible to do so. Thus references increase the research value of a piece of work.

d. Authority

Although in philosophy we try not to make appeals to authority in furthering our arguments, there are cases where reference to authorities is essential. Text interpretations and historical facts are obvious examples. If you are using ideas borrowed from Kant, for example, a crucial element is often how these ideas are interpreted, and not all interpreters are equally authoritative. Similarly, historical references can be important. Whether Berkeley (1685-1753) did in fact have any contact with Malebranche (1638-1715) is an important factor in the interpretation of his philosophy. In these cases, the ordinary student will have to depend upon authorities, and the reader must know upon whom the writer is depending. References can thus be used to back up a writer's case. But remember they should be used meaningfully and discriminatingly - the indiscriminate stringing together of quotations and references can easily have the effect of lowering the standard of a work rather than raising it.

1.2 Why a standard system of reference?

The answer lies in the user's aims. Referencing is done, as you will have gathered, for the benefit of the reader as well as the writer. A consistent, easily understood and recognised reference technique ensures that the readers will have access to all the information they may require, and that the work will help them to achieve their aims. Further, well-ordered references are an indication of the integrity and honesty of the writer, who also declares himself/herself open for the possible scrutiny of the readers.

Neat and consistent referencing is likely to make a good impression on the reader; no one feels inclined to read a piece of work that the writer himself has taken no trouble with.

2 WHAT IS REFERRED TO?

The form of a reference (whether in the bibliography or in the body-text of your assignment) depends on the type of source that is being referred to. The following are the sources that will occur most often in your philosophical studies:

2.1 Monographs

These are works that deal with a single unbroken theme. Such works may have one or several authors. Where a work is co-authored, note that this simply indicates a joint effort by two or more authors, often with no indication as to who produced what part of the monograph. There are exceptions. For instance, the work of Michael Stocker and Elizabeth Heggeman, "*Valuing emotions*", is a monograph in which it is specified which sections of the work each author wrote.

2.2 Collections

These are works or books collected, compiled or edited by one or more authors who, may themselves have been responsible for a number of different contributions in such works, in the form of chapters or sections. Please note also that some collections may have been compiled from publications or parts thereof, which have already appeared elsewhere. Like monographs, collected works may have been put together by one or several authors.

(a) Collected works by one author

(i) *When the author is himself/herself the compiler of the collection*

R.S. Peters, for example, collected a number of his own articles which had appeared in journals, and published them as a composite work, *Psychology and ethical development*.

(ii) *When another person acts as the compiler*

For example, Mary Morris collected various works by Leibniz,

translated them and published them under the title of *The philosophical*

writings of Leibniz.

(b) Works by different authors

(i) *Articles that appear for the first time in such a work:*

These are papers that are specially prepared for a collection and appear for the first time in that collection. Some examples are the articles in the following work edited by Jeanette Malherbe, *Colloquium on African philosophy: decolonising the mind*, and also in, *The encyclopedia of philosophy*, edited by P. Edwards.

(ii) *Collected articles from pre-existing works:*

Some articles in collective works are papers that have been taken from pre-existing works. This means that they are collections which have been taken from publications (or parts of publications) by various authors, and which have already appeared elsewhere. For example, the articles in P.H. Coetzee and A.P.J. Roux's, *Philosophy from Africa, 2nd edition*, and those in D.F. Gustafson's, *Essays in philosophical psychology*, are mainly articles from periodicals.

(iii) *Collected Essays in honour of someone (Liber Amicorum)*

These are essays written by scholars in honour of a colleague or friend, who is regarded as having made a substantial contribution in one field of study or another. For example:

Oguejiofor, J.O & Onah, G.I (eds). 2005. *African Philosophy and the hermeneutics of culture: Essays in honour of Theophilus Okere.* Munster: LIT Verlag.

2.3 Periodicals

Periodicals are also called "journals". This type of source concerns articles, or book reviews in periodicals. They are different from monographs in that the articles or essays they contain are shorter.

2.4 Alphabetically ordered reference works

These are basically reference works. They include **dictionaries** of different kinds, certain **encyclopaedias**, including works called "**Companions**" (in which the entries are short and the authors are not mentioned) and similar other works. Entries in such works are often ordered alphabetically.

2.5 Internet sources

Articles may be used from website and e-mail addresses. The Discipline asks that students use these materials (software) responsibly. This means, among others, that one should always acknowledge Internet sources.

3 HOW DO WE REFER?

As we have stated, references are necessary to acknowledge the ideas of others which we use, in one way or another, in our own work. It does not matter whether we agree with the other author's ideas and simply reproduce them, or whether we use the ideas as a foundation for the development of our own thoughts, or whether we cite them in order to criticise them. In all these cases, the source must be acknowledged.

3.1 Source notes in the body-text of your paper

Acknowledgements of borrowed ideas are indicated by a brief source note [e.g. (Ryle 1948:24)] in the text. These source notes comprise: the surname(s) of the author(s) of the source (Ryle), the date when the source was published (1948) and in most cases the number of the page referred to (24). Note that the colon divides the year from the page. These notes actually refer to the bibliography at the end of the chapter, book or paper where full particulars about each source are furnished.

The form and location of a particular source note depend on how the borrowed idea is presented. The nature of the source does not matter here - the order remains: author, date of source and page, chapter or section reference. Alphabetically ordered sources (e.g. dictionaries) do not require page numbers.

Borrowed ideas can be presented in one of two ways.

a. Direct quotation

Whenever you quote, that is whenever you rewrite the exact words of some author, you must indicate and acknowledge this. Quotation marks indicate that the exact words of another author have been reproduced.

A direct quotation from another work must be put in quotation marks, irrespective of how long the quotation is. A quotation must be an exact copy of the original. If there is a mistake in the original, copy it faithfully and put behind it "[sic]"; ("sic" = Latin for "so", "thus"). When you omit words from a quotation, indicate this by three dots (...), regardless of the length of the omission. Thus "In our ... world, ... the human being's continually renewable capacity to learn has been the least appreciated and least exploited human resource" (Wedemeyer 1981:3). The first "..." indicates the omission of "complex, interdependent, and increasingly overcrowded", and the second, "it is becoming evident that".

Sometimes it is necessary to insert a few words into a quotation. Suppose you quote someone's criticism of Ayer, in which the pronoun "he" occurs without obvious reference. You must supply the reference, and such an explanatory addition is put in square brackets, for example "he [Ayer] said that ...". If you wish to emphasise something that is not underlined or italicised in the original, underline it and state this in the source note before closing the brackets, for example "... the human being's continually renewable capacity to learn ..." (Wedemeyer 1981:3. My underlining).

Sometimes quotation marks are required within a quotation. In that case, single marks can then be used. For example, "In ordinary circumstances and uttered out of the blue ... we should have difficulty in understanding someone who says 'Move those muscles that do get moved in just the way in which they are moved when you raise your arm'" (Melden 1961:25).

It is customary to indent long quotations (3 lines or longer) in order to separate them from the rest of the text. An indented quotation should still be indicated by quotation marks. The acknowledgement of a quotation is achieved by giving the required information (the source note) in brackets. The placement of the source note is the same as for any quotation.

(i) If the quotation is given without any previous mention of the author,

then the source note appears at the end of the quotation as in the following

example:

In this regard we must remember, "the scientist is someone who is not only well-informed, but who practises his subject" (Meyer 1967:15).

(ii) If the name of the author has already been mentioned in the discussion it is not necessary to repeat it; only the date of publication,

and the page reference need be placed in brackets in the source note,

for example

A.M.T. Meyer (1967:15) has argued: "The scientist."

As a general rule, keep direct quotations to a minimum. There are situations in which you must quote directly, but too often quotations occur when something looks important and is difficult to understand, or to avoid the effort of putting something into your own words.

b. Paraphrases

Borrowed ideas may be reproduced in the writer's own words. This is called paraphrasing.

When you paraphrase someone else's ideas, the context (e.g. explanatory phrases and the apposite placing of the source note) should indicate what is not your own.

(i) When someone else's ideas are used without his or her name having been mentioned in the text, the source note and its placement are the same as in a.(i) above

(ii) If the author's name has already been mentioned in the text then the reference takes the form given in the following example:

A.M.T. Meyer (1967:15) has argued that the scientist

(iii) It sometimes happens in paraphrasing that it is not possible to give a precise page reference. In these cases just mention the year of publication, for example, (Meyer 1967) or A.M.T. Meyer (1967) ... . Sometimes it is necessary or desirable to refer to the ideas in a book a little more precisely, for example "(Meyer 1967, ch IV)" or "A.M.T. Meyer (1967, ch IV)". (NB. Sometimes you will find this kind of reference rather than a reference to a specific page: "... (Locke, Essay, II, 3, iv) ..." where the reference is to the book, chapter and paragraph. You might just as well stick to our system, that is, mention page number(s) to indicate location in the source.

(iv) Some academic journals, for example, the African Revue of Comparative and International Law, (in French abbreviated as RADIC) contain information to be found usually on the page pertaining to Editorial Board members subscriptions and submission of articles – under the rubric "method of citation". This is a prescription specifying how the particular journal should be cited. The prescription should be followed even though it may be a deviation from the norm.

c. Source notes: summary

(1) The full stop ending the sentence is placed after the bracket:

Thus: Ellis … (1959:52). And ~~not Ellis… (1959: 52.)~~

(2) There is no punctuation mark between the surname and the date: *Thus: (Moja 2004:20).*

And ~~not (Moja, 2004: 20).~~

(3) A colon is used to indicate a page number. In such a source note there is no further punctuation.

(4) The source reference remains the same when the quotation is not direct, but a paraphrase.

(5) The initials of the source author are necessary only if there is another author of the same name in the bibliography.

(6) Where there are more than two authors of a source, all the authors are named in the first note referring to that source. Thereafter, only the first author need be named, the words "et al." (Latin for “and others”) appearing after the name, for example, first reference: (Ellis, Bennett, Daniel & Rickert 1981:392); subsequent references: (Ellis et al. 1981:398).

3.2 Bibliography (at the end of assignment/paper/thesis)

Obviously the source notes alone will not enable the reader to trace a particular source. Much more information is needed for this, and this information is given in the bibliography. In other words the source notes really refer to the bibliography, in which full details of the source are given so that it can be traced and consulted. All source notes must therefore be reflected in the bibliography.

The bibliography is a list of books consulted, which appears at the end of a piece of work or article, after the notes, if there are any.

a. Arrangement of the sources in the bibliography

(i) The list is arranged in alphabetical order, according to the surnames of authors and compilers. Where there is more than one author, the first author's name determines the placing. The surname is followed by the author's initials, the publication date of the book/article and the title.

Note that we put books and articles together in one list, although there are separate lists in the 101 tutorial letters, for the sake of the library's technical requirements. For example:

Bubner, R. 1981. *Modern German philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hume, D. 1969. *A treatise of human nature*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Skinner, Q. 1984. The idea of negative liberty: philosophical and historical perspectives, in *Philosophy in history*, edited by R. Rorty, J.B. Schneewind & Q. Skinner, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984:193-221.

Winch, P. 1990. *The idea of a social science, 2nd edition*. London: Routledge.

(ii) If more than one work by the same author appears in the bibliography, these works are arranged according to date of publication, from the earliest to the latest, for example:

Copi, I.M. 1954. *Symbolic logic*. New York: Macmillan.

Copi, I.M. 1982. *Introduction to logic*. New York: Macmillan.

(iii) Where more than one work by the same author appeared in the same year, the works are arranged in alphabetical order according to the first main word of the title, and the letters a, b, c are placed after the publication date, thus

Peters, R.S. 1974a. *The development of reason*.

Peters, R.S. 1974b. *Moral development and moral learning*.

Peters, R.S. 1974c. *Personal understanding and personal relationships.*

The small letters must of course appear in the source notes too, for example (Peters 1974c:225).

NB. Titles of articles are not underlined. (We have omitted full particulars for the entries in this list.)

b. Structure of items

What information should be given in the bibliography and how should this be done? The easiest approach here is to give examples and then draw attention to certain points.

(i) Monographs

With one author:

Passmore, J. 1980. *A hundred years of philosophy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Author's name, comma, author's initials each followed by a full stop, date of publication, full stop, the complete title (as on the book's title page, with the first word capitalized and successive words with small letters except where punctuation demands capitals), full stop, place of issue (in the language of the book), colon, name of publisher, full stop.
Unisa guides are also specified in the above manner, except that the course code and guide number appear as the title, for example:
Macnamara, M. 1979. *PHL202-F: Guide 2*. Pretoria: University of South Africa

With two authors:

If there is more than one author, follow the above style. Where there are two authors, put "&" after the first one's initials, e.g. "Benn, S.J. & Peters, R.S." Note that the title of the book, the place of issue and the name of the publisher are entered in the same way as a monograph with one author.

With three authors:

You should put commas after the full stop after each last initial except where the last name is linked by means of an ampersand (&), e.g. "Meyer, A.M.T., Muller, A.D. & Maritz, F.A.". (The rest is the same as above.)

With more than three authors
Where there are more than three authors co-authoring one book,for example,

Ndebele, N. et al. …. (the rest is the same as above).

The “et al.” means “and others” in Latin.

Bibliographies of translated works

Hegel, G.W.F. 1967. *Philosophy of Right*. Trans. T.M. Knox. Oxford: University Press.

Bibliographies of modern editions of classical works

Aristotle. 1962. *The Politics*. Trans. T.A. Singlair. Hammondsworth: Penguin.

(Note that “1962” refers to the year in which the book by Aristotle, *The Politics,* was translated, not authored. The same can be said of Hegel’s book (*Philosophy of Right*) above.)

(ii) Collections

In the case of a composite work, the articles used as sources are referred to separately. The entry takes the following form: Author and date of publication of article, then the title of the article, comma, "in", then the title of the collective work in which the article is found (italicised), full stop, followed by “edited by,” and the names of the editors (initials, comma, then surname, full stop, place of issue (in the language of the book), colon, publisher, comma, and then the pages on which the article appears in the collection, full stop.

What follows are examples of bibliographic entries for different kinds of collections or articles appearing in collections:

An edited collection in general:

Whiteside, A. (ed). 1998. *Implications of AIDS for demography and policy in Southern Africa*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

An article from an edited collection:

Thomas, L. & Howard, J. 1998. AIDS and development planning, in *Implications of AIDS for demography and policy in Southern Africa*. Edited by L. Thomas & J. Howard. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 95-114.

("95-114" refers to the page numbers in the collected work in which the article is found.)

An edited collection or a compilation work may also be co-edited as is the case with a monograph. Example:

Coetzee, P.H. & Roux, A.P.J. (eds). 2002. *Philosophy from Africa: Text with Readings*. 2nd edition. Oxford/New York: University Press.

But if you are compiling a bibliographic entry for one article within this collection, you may write it as follows:

Ramose, M.B. 2002. Globalization and Ubuntu, in *Philosophy from Africa: Text with readings*. 2nd edition Oxford/New York: University Press, 626-649.

Note that the bibliographic entries for a compilation and a section from a compilation are written in the same way as an edited collection and a section from an edited collection, respectively.

(iii) Alphabetically ordered works

These refer to dictionaries of different kinds, certain encyclopaedias, and works known as "Companions," Examples:

Dictionary

The Cambridge dictionary of Philosophy. 1995. Cambridge: University Press.

Sometimes a dictionary may have general editor, and then the bibliographical entry would take the following form:

The concise Oxford English dictionary. 10th edition, 1999. Edited by Judy Pearsall. Oxford: University Press.

Encyclopaedia

The new encyclopaedia Britannica: micropaedia vol. vii, vols. 30. 1979. Chicago/London: Chicago University Press.

The concise encyclopaedia of Philosophy and Philosophers. 1960. Edited by J.O. Urmson. London: Hutchinson.

A bibliographic entry for an article within encyclopaedia may be written as follows:

Ryle, G. 1972. "Plato" in *The encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, edited by P. Edward. New York: Macmillan & Free Press.

Companions

Honderich, Ted (ed). 1995. *The Oxford companion to Philosophy.* Oxford: University Press.

(iv) Periodicals

1) Articles:

Meyerson, D. 1983. Base and superstructure. *South African journal of philosophy*, 2(1):106-109.

Surname of author, comma, initials of author, full stop, date of publication, full stop, and title of article, full stop (and not "in"), title of the periodical italicised (first word capitalized and the rest lower case except where punctuation demands otherwise), comma, followed by the volume number, followed by the number of that particular issue in brackets, colon, followed by the pages on which the article is to be found. (It is becoming increasingly common practice to abbreviate journal titles. We prefer you write out the full name of the journal. If you come across an abbreviated title which you do not understand, you can look it up in abstracts, e.g. *Philosophers' Index*. - The issue number may be omitted in cases where this does not cause confusion.)

2) Book reviews:

De Kadt, R. 1983. Review of "Reflexions on Marxism" by P. du Toit (ed.). *South African journal of philosophy*, 2(3):155-156.

Author and date of publication, "Review of" followed by the title of the work under review in quotation marks, "by" followed by the name of the author of the book under review (initials then surname), full stop. The rest is the same as for periodical articles.

(v) Other bibliographic entries:

As you write your assignments or papers, you may find yourself wanting to refer to the bible and the papal encyclical letters.

Bibles

Bible. *New Revised Standard Version.* 1989. London: Collins.

Bible. *The New American Bible.* 1991. (s.l.): World Catholic Press.

Note: (s.l.) refers to *sine loco.* This is Latin for *without a place.* This designation is used when it is not possible to determine where the book was published.

Encyclical Letters

These are pastoral letters that are written by the Roman Catholic pontiffs to all the members of the Catholic Church, expounding important teachings. Example:

John Paul II. 1987. *Redemptoris Mater.* Pastoral Action Series No. 44. Issued by the Southern African Bishops' Conference: Pretoria. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.

(vi) Internet sources

If you are using an article from a website, you must place the entire web page address (URL) in the bibliography. For instance,
- Source from website address:
Beach, E.A. 1995. The Ecole Initiative.
http://www.uwec.edu/philrel/beach.html

- Source from e-mail address:

More, M. 2004. *Transformation in institutions of higher learning.*

e-mail: psy@puc.co.za

c. Bibliographies in general

1) The title page and reverse in a work contain all the "personal particulars" of a book. Here you will obtain the information to be reproduced in the bibliography.

2) Sometimes it is necessary to stipulate which edition of a source was used. This is done as follows:

   Wollheim, R. 1981. Art and its objects. 2nd edition. New York: Macmillan.

3) Sometimes it is necessary to indicate when a work appeared for the first time. This date of first issue appears in brackets after the publication date of the edition you used, e.g.

Berkeley, G. 1949 (1710). The principles of human knowledge. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons.

d. Special bibliographies

In addition to bibliographies for reference purposes for a specific text or article, there are independent bibliographies meant as study sources or starting points. Examples are: extensive bibliographies on a specific author or subject, e.g. Kant, or the philosophy of mind; bibliographies of books or papers that appeared in a particular period, e.g. the yearly lists known as the Philosophers' Index; and pilot bibliographies.

A pilot bibliography is a brief list intended as a guideline for starting the study of a specific subject (including the oeuvre of a particular author, e.g. the subject may be "Kant's pre-Critique writings"). Since the list is to function as an orientation or starting point, it is generally brief (10-15 entries) and contains only the most important or essential items.

All bibliographies may be annotated if desired. This means that each entry is followed by a brief indication (one or two sentences, usually) of why it appears in the list, e.g. "This is an authoritative commentary on Aristotle's Metaphysics"; or "Contains helpful references for further study. What the entries say, depends on the purpose of the bibliography that is compiled, e.g. whether it is to be a full list of works on Kant, intended for Kant scholars; or is to form part of a thesis or project proposal; or is meant as a reading list for a study unit or assignment.

{Note: You are referring, in your source notes, to a certain source which you have consulted. A reference such as "(Plato 1981:92)" may look strange, because Plato lived in the 4th century B.C., but what is at issue here is not historical facts; it is rather the particular book to which you are referring.}

4 OTHER REFERENCES IN THE TEXT

Authors do not rely solely on references to acknowledge borrowings. We may also need the following:

4.1 Cross-referencing

Sometimes a writer will find it necessary to make cross-references within a particular work. An argument might give rise to two implications, for example, both of which cannot be considered at once, but the writer may want to alert his/her reader to where he/she is going to rejoin the argument. Or an author will refer to something he/she has stated before in order to avoid repetition. Here an anticipatory reference would be given (suppose that it is on p. 50 where the need to refer either backwards or forwards, occurs):

"As I shall show later (infra: 92), ..." (infra = Latin for "under"; : = page; 92 = the number of the page upon which the demonstration is made).

If this writer refers backwards:

"As has already been shown (supra: 32), we can never ..." (supra = Latin for "above". The comma is placed outside the bracket.)

4.2 Notes (contents notes)

Sometimes a writer will find it necessary to make aside remarks, e.g. to indicate further developments, to express criticism, to mention other possible interpretations. These remarks do not properly belong in the main body of the argument, and should appear at the end of the piece under the heading "Notes". In the text itself, an Arabic numeral above the line (e.g. ...^{2}) indicates where the remark is relevant, and the remark appears next to the corresponding number under the heading "Notes" at the end of the piece. The reader can therefore read and use these supplementary notes as it suits him.

For example, in a recent periodical article, an author wrote:

"It is not my intention to go into the question of systematic justification for Kant's conception of history.^{2}"

Under "notes" at the end of the article, we find:

"2. For this, refer to ..." and the author lists five titles of works in which this question, which he/she chooses to omit, is dealt with.

4.3 Important abbreviations

There are several significant Latin abbreviations related to bibliographies and references. Although the Harvard system does not generally use these abbreviations, we provide some of them below, so that you may understand their use if you come across them in your reading.

- *et. al.* (et alii)= “and others.” It is often used in connection with a work co-authored by more than three authors. Example: “Jones, et. al state that …” instead of mentioning the names of the other three co-authors with Jones.

- *ibid. (ibidem)*= “in the same work.” If the same reference is used twice or three times without an intervening reference, then *ibid.* is used. It means that the reference is identical to the one immediately preceding it in terms of the name of the work and the page number.

- *op.cit.(opere citato)* = “in the work cited.” It refers the reader to the author’s previously cited work, but to a different page of such a work. Example: “Wiredu (op. cit., 30), has shown that …”

In this case we have referred to the same work by Wiredu that we cited previously but only to a different place (page) of the same book.

- *sic.* = refers to a word that the writer may have quoted or copied from another author. It signifies that the quoted word is written exactly as it stands in the original text.

5 OTHER SYSTEMS

In your reading you may come across two other systems of which you should take note.

5.1 Numbered paragraphs

Works sometimes consist of short numbered pieces (e.g. certain of Wittgenstein's works), or sometimes an author numbers his or her paragraphs, as G. Berekeley does for example in *Principles of human knowledge*. In such cases it is desirable to have a more precise reference than "our" system affords, and you would refer to the relevant paragraph as follows: (Wittgenstein 1922, no. 2.901) or (Berkeley 1710, par. 24).

In giving the source-author's name, the same considerations as discussed before apply. Here, there is a comma after the author's name, the date of publication of the edition you are referring to (in many cases, you will find the title of the work, or an abbreviation of it, being used - we do not recommend this, because it makes the reading of source notes in conjunction with the bibliography very difficult), a comma, and then "no." or "par.", followed by the number of the part.

5.2 Original sources

You will notice that in translated editions of some classical works (e.g. Plato and Aristotle) the translator gives the page numbers of the original or standard edition of the same work in the margins. It is general practice to use these page numbers in references to the work. In the case of Kant's *Critique of pure reason* you would find "Kant, A178" or "Kant B169". The "A" and "B" refer to the original first and second editions and the page numbers in them. In all these cases you will find the reference system that we recommend equally effective. Stick to it. Take note of the "exceptions" above for the sake of your reading of material in which they might occur.

6 IN CONCLUSION

We recommend the system set out here for work in the Discipline of Philosophy; other disciplines have other recommendations. It is a field in which opinions differ, and the student will have to adapt to this. The golden rule, however, is to maintain coherence and consistency once you have chosen a particular method of citation.

B HINTS ON STUDYING PHILOSOPHY

The following pages were taken from a previous discipline study guide, written by Prof APJ Roux. They may be of some help in your philosophical reading and writing.

1 LEVELS OF PHILOSOPHICAL UNDERSTANDING

There is a wide variety of items in philosophical contexts of which it could be asked whether they are understood by someone. There are, amongst other things, terms (for example, “empirical” and “analytic”), certain distinctions (for example, that between first order and second order statements), more or less standard viewpoints (for example, determinism and indeterminism with regard to the freedom of the will), and arguments or clusters of arguments

(for example, arguments for the existence of God as the cause of the world from the existence and the features of the latter). Our intention is not to spell out a set of criteria for each type of item; the aim is only to give you an idea, in the light of a rather typical example, of what is practically involved in philosophical understanding so that you can use it as a guideline in your studies. We opt for the already familiar distinction between statements of the first order and statements of the second order, and pay attention to the facets revealed by its understanding.

What follows is a hierarchy of questions which can be asked to determine the extent to which someone's understanding of this distinction between first and second order statements has developed:

(1) Is he/she capable of identifying instances of the two types of statements which he/she encounters, and can he/she distinguish them from each other as well as from items which do not belong to either of them (for example, wishes and commands)?

(2) Is he/she capable of providing his/her own examples to illustrate the distinction?

(3) Is he/she capable of formulating the distinction in his/her own words?

(4) Is he/she capable of spelling out the implications of the distinction in the broad context in which it functions? Is he, for example, aware of the fact that this distinction makes it unnecessary to distinguish between the special sciences and philosophy in terms of a realm of special entities supposedly proprietary to the philosopher?

(5) Can he/she critically test the distinction in order to establish its acceptability? Can he/she provide counterexamples against the distinction, and/or arguments in favour of it?

(6) Is he/she capable of constructively using in his/her philosophising that which is correct in the distinction?

In line with these six questions, we can conveniently distinguish three levels of philosophical understanding with regard to the above distinction. The first level involves stating the distinction and is covered by questions (1)-(3). The second level involves critically evaluating or testing the distinction and is covered by the criteria embodied in questions (4) and (5). The third level involves the constructive utilisation of the distinction in, for example, applying it in new ways. An example of such an application of the distinction between first and second order statements occurs in psychology when certain problems about thinking and intelligence are identified as problems which can be solved only by way of conceptual analysis and not by experimental investigation. This level of understanding is tested by question (6). The following scheme provides a survey of the criteria applicable to each of the three levels:

Level 1: State

Stating the distinction.

- Identifying appropriate instances which are encountered.
- Providing one's own examples.
- Formulating the distinction in one's own words.

Level 2: Evaluate

The critical evaluation of the distinction.

- Unravelling the implications of the distinction in order to establish its full meaning.
- Enumerating arguments pro and contra. Possible counter-examples.

Level 3: Exploit

The constructive implementation of the distinction.

- The creative exploitation of what is correct in the distinction in making one's own moves.

It goes without saying that undergraduates cannot be expected to progress to the third level overnight. The emphasis falls initially on the first level; that is why many (although of course not all) of the questions and exercises in our study guides relate fairly directly to the expositions offered by it. Although philosophy is essentially a thinking subject and not an information subject, there still are some things which simply have to be learnt. One simply has to learn that, for example, there is a distinction between statements of the first order and statements of the second order, and understand what this distinction involves. As regards

the second level, beginners are initially heavily dependent on the critical

Countermoves of others, but they must consider these countermoves very carefully and make them their own. The ideal remains, however, to get, as it were, under the skin of the relevant distinction, argument, or viewpoint, so that new aspects of it, and new arguments for and against it, become apparent.

When you consider the criteria mentioned above, you will notice that they correspond with the conceptual and argumentative character of philosophising, its contextuality, the principle of reasonableness, examples and counterexamples, and criticism. The emphasis falls heavily on examples because any concept derives its meaning from its use, that is, from the instances to which it is applicable. This point will repeatedly be brought to your attention.

REFLECTION

(1) Distinguish the three levels of (philosophical) understanding.

(2) What levels of understanding are presupposed by the exploitation of the distinction between analytic and synthetic knowledge (statements)?

(3) To what level of understanding can you deal with the distinction between *a priori* and *a posteriori* knowledge at present?

2 HOW DOES ONE READ A PHILOSOPHICAL TEXT?

Although reading a philosophical text has its own peculiar problems, it remains a form of reading. It is therefore advisable first to say something about reading in general before looking at the problems which arise when reading a philosophical text.

2.1 How does one read?

For our purposes, it is necessary to distinguish between two sorts of reading, namely reading for relaxation and reading for information.

How do you read for relaxation? When you read a detective story, for example, you allow yourself to be led rather passively by the author. He/she has a story to tell, and you follow. Naturally, you are not entirely passive because you have, after all, to keep the thread so as to follow the development of the story. There is also the expectation on your part of what will happen next. At one stage it looks as if her friend has murdered the girl, but later the hotel manager becomes a more likely suspect. You may stop and wonder who really committed the murder, but the problem does not make you reach for pencil and paper. You do not question what you read. Having completed the story, you may find the solution more or less satisfying but when the story has ended that is quite literally the end of it. You do not try to reconstruct the story systematically, and there are no lessons to be learnt from it. Notes and summaries are out of place, and no special effort is made to retain what you have read. In short, stories are not read to gain information. Stories do not offer any information; they are neither true nor false, but, to a greater or lesser degree, interesting or exciting.

Reading for information is an entirely different matter. How does one read when the objective is to acquire information? Newspapers are read in order to keep abreast of local and international events. Knowing from experience that every newspaper sees the world from its own vantage point, we do not simply absorb the information presented to us; we look at it with a critical eye. Leading editorials and news commentaries, in particular, need to be taken with a pinch of salt. One of the secrets of journalism is that the style of writing should be simple. Few readers will be prepared to wade through a long and complicated article on Russian expansionism at sea after a hard day's work. Because people tend to accept as true what they readily understand (or think they understand), it is absolutely necessary for journalists to state their point in simple and easily readable language. For precisely this reason, one must not passively absorb what is presented in newspapers, but always be critical.

We have taken the reading of newspapers as an everyday example of reading aimed at acquiring information, and suggested that these sources ought to be read with the necessary critical attitude if we want to get to the facts. However, active, systematic and critical reading reaches its full development only in the reading of specialist publications, either in article or book form. Within the framework of our present objectives this is the most important kind of reading.

Why do people publish specialist literature? The purpose is to contribute to a certain field of study.

Such a contribution can be made in different ways. For our purpose we have to distinguish between (1) works by means of which the author(s) wish to introduce the readers to philosophy or aspects of it, and (2) primary philosophical works. The authors of introductory works are not primarily intent on developing an original philosophical position in their works; instead they merely wish to teach and describe their subject.

In contrast to this there are works in which philosophers tackle a philosophical problem, or several such problems, and try to offer a solution to them. Here philosophy is practised mainly with reference to a philosophy objective. Works in this category may be a long, unbroken discourse, or they may consist of just an essay or an article. These are primary philosophical works which have two broad objectives, the first residing in the fact that the author has some point to make, and he/she wants to do this in the light of certain considerations. He/she does not merely want to make some claim; he/she wants to make a claim which he/she bases on certain considerations. In other words, he/she comes to a certain conclusion by following a certain course. It can be regarded as an argument (with or without sub-arguments) the premisses of which provide grounds for the acceptability or correctness of the conclusion reached by the author. Hence, in order to understand what an author wants to say, we must establish (1) what his/her conclusion is and (2) on what grounds he/she bases it.

Reading to obtain information has the object of determining not only what someone has said about a particular matter, but whether the relevant pronouncement is correct. Introductions to philosophy have the further aim of instructing the reader in philosophy. The subject matter should therefore be critically examined throughout. A study of an original contribution to philosophy should be directed by the following three questions:

(1) What does the author want to tell us, in other words, what is his/her conclusion and on what is it based?

(2) Do his/her claims stand on their own feet, that is, are the grounds he/she provides acceptable and does his/her conclusion follow from them?

(3) In what ways can we use constructively that which has withstood critical examination?

A more general point to consider, however, is how any of these specialised publications should be studied in practical terms.

You are bound to have noticed that we leave the study of logic texts aside here. Apart from deciding what kind of book one is dealing with, a preliminary investigation is required.

(1) In the case of a book, pay attention to the title and the contents page. They ought to give you some idea of what the work is about.

(2) Then quickly read through the preface and the introduction (if these items appear in the work). Here the author normally gives a brief indication of his/her problem and the way in which he/she proposes to deal with it. If the work is concluded by a short summary at the end, it is also advisable to glance at it at this stage.

(3) By now you ought to have a reasonably good idea of what the work is about. You now have some sort of framework within which your study of the work can proceed. The next step is to explore the content. Skim the various chapters (if you have to study the whole book) in sequence, or the prescribed portion(s). In this way, you can fill in your framework with more detail. It is useful to jot down what you consider to be the main points in every subsection or chapter. There may well be many points which are not yet clear to you, and there may also be points where you might disagree with the author, but it is not advisable to get bogged down in detail at this stage. Jot down these points and read further. The main thing is to determine the general drift of the work by reading quickly through the body of the text. This step naturally becomes less necessary as your familiarity with the relevant subject matter increases. If you have completed the above steps you will have explored the field of our concern and be ready to study the work in depth.

(4) Read the subject matter (or the portion that you have to/want to study) sentence by sentence and keep a pen or pencil handy. This slow, methodical reading and the notes you make as you proceed are sustained by critical questions about the connection of thoughts and meanings. Join in the argument and accompany it all the way. Such questions as the following are important: Exactly what is the writer getting at and how does he/she substantiate it? How does it tie in with the rest? Are his/her arguments sound? Are there contrary examples that can be adduced to refute his/her claims? Are his/her examples acceptable? Are there considerations which he/she has not mentioned and which support his/her case? Does he/she make unacknowledged assumptions, and if so, are they in order? In short, does what he/she says withstand critical examination? What constructive contribution, if any, has the author made? How can it be used profitably in the further practice of the relevant discipline? What lessons can we learn from his/her work?

Although the hints just discussed ought to be useful when studying any academic work, it should be clear that they apply in particular to philosophy. The principle of reasonableness, the obstacle of preconceived ideas, the role of examples and counterexamples, the problem of relevance, and the function of criticism are all, so to speak, threads running right through the study of a philosophical text. This is only to be expected. We stressed the necessity of active participation in philosophising, and mentioned that to read a piece of philosophy properly, one has, as it were, to engage in a discussion with the author. Hence, what applies to philosophising in general, applies to philosophical reading in particular, since besides live philosophical discussion and philosophical writing, philosophical reading is the most important way of being philosophically engaged.

2.2 Special problems encountered in philosophical reading

Logical and conceptual aspects are important in philosophy; and the special problems encountered when reading a philosophical text are connected with this fact. We distinguish between two types of problem, namely terminological and logico-conceptual.

Philosophers are often accused of using “big” words, the meaning of which completely baffles the ordinary man. This accusation is unfortunately often quite justified, but in mitigation it must be stressed that the philosophical perspective is a unique perspective and therefore requires a vocabulary of its own. It must also be remembered that philosophers do not think and write in isolation; therefore it is to be expected that they will use the terminology of their predecessors and contemporaries. Nevertheless this does not relieve philosophers of the duty of expressing themselves as clearly as possible so as to make the testing of the acceptability or otherwise of their claims by others readily possible. People who hide behind jargon are not seriously interested in the attainment of insight. They are merely protecting vested interests.

There are four terminological problems which the beginner may encounter when reading philosophical studies. In the first place, there are certain technical terms such as “analytic” and “a priori” which may sound strange. Secondly, there are certain terms which are used with completely different meanings or with various shades of meaning. In the philosophy of Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) a meaning is attached to “categories” different from those found in the philosophy of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). The word “idea” appears in Plato (428-348 B.C.) and in John Locke (1632-1704) and, although in both cases it is related, in one way or another, to thinking and knowledge, a Platonic idea is an item which exists in a special, eternal realm, while a Lockean idea is an item in the human stream of consciousness, discovered and known by way of introspection. In the third place, there are what we may call traditional terms, i.e. terms the meaning of which is to be found within a particular tradition of thought.

To mention one example, René Descartes (1596-1650) uses, expressions such as “efficient cause”, “total cause”, “actual reality” and “formal reality”. These terms, used during the first half of the seventeenth century, are derived from medieval philosophy. In the fourth place, there are new terminological creations considered to be necessary by philosophers who believe they have entered new fields. Husserl (1859-1938), for example, in his attempt to account for the conceptual and radical import of philosophy, introduced terms such as “intentionality”, “noesis” and “noema”.

What advice can we offer in connection with these terminological problems encountered in studying philosophical texts? We provide two suggestions. The first is patiently to attempt to reconstruct the meaning of a term in the broader context in which it appears. To what uses does the author put the term? What examples does he/she mention to which it applies? What point does he/she seek to make with his/her contribution as a whole, and how can that term best be fitted into his/her project? If these procedures do not work, the only alternative is to consult appropriate reference works. These include subject dictionaries, encyclopaedias, and commentaries.

The second group of problems which can arise when reading a philosophical work are of a conceptual-logical nature. Here we can distinguish between two types. In the first place, there is the problem of making sense of an abstract claim in the absence of appropriate, concrete instances (examples). This problem is directly related to the temptation to deal with concrete claims independently of appropriate concrete instances. The second problem is related to the fact that concepts never function in isolation, and cannot therefore be separately examined, one by one. They have to be examined together as a group or team. What is thought about the nature of seeing, for example, inevitably expands to include, first, a view of humankind and, later, even a world-view. This interconnection of philosophical issues often results in its becoming difficult properly to reconstruct an author's argument (usually with a number of subarguments). What exactly is the conclusion he/she eventually arrives at? What are the grounds (premisses) on which he/she bases his/her decision? What are the hidden assumptions, if any, behind his/her argument?

The hints which can be given to overcome the above problems run parallel to those given in connection with the terminological problems. Try to reconstruct the argument on the basis of a thorough and patient study of the relevant work, that is, try to identify the conclusion and all the considerations which support it. If such a reconstruction proves impossible, consult an appropriate reference work or commentary.

In line with the principle of reasonableness, the hints just provided are intended to help you to understand a text as it stands. In other words, you must allow the author, that is the work itself, to speak to you. The author must be given the opportunity to state his/her case, and we must attend to it with the necessary patience and sympathy. However, we must never lose sight of the all-important fact that philosophy is inextricably related to the life-world. Therefore, making sense of an author is, in the final analysis, not just a matter of clearing up certain terminological and logico-conceptual problems peculiar to his/her work, but trying to relate his/her entire story to the life-world. It is no exaggeration to say that the biggest problem in understanding philosophy in general, and in understanding a particular philosophical author, is the problem of translating abstract claims into the cash value of the everyday life-world. When Plato presents his realm of ideas, Locke his analysis of knowledge in terms of “ideas in the mind”, and Husserl his scheme of “noesis” and “noema”, the following is a cardinal question: “How does what is offered relate, for example, to the here and now seeing of something, and to the here and now thinking of something?” Given the origin of philosophical reflection, the claims of the philosopher must always be related to the life-world. It is not only the correctness of his/her claims which is to be determined by the life-world, but their actual meaning, their intelligibility.

A philosophical claim which cannot be translated into the cash value of the everyday life-world, is literally alien to the world. It has gone off the track completely and, as far as gaining insight is concerned, it could have, at best, a negative value: it illustrates how not to go about the search for constructive results and insight. In other words, if an author, in line with the above hints, has been given full opportunity to put his/her case, and his/her reconstructed argument still appears to be groundless, then paying any further attention to him would be a sheer waste of time. He/she simply has no contribution to make. The rules for academic discourse and reading warn us not to "write off" an author summarily, but if, after careful consideration, it appears that he/she cannot contribute to our insight, we must not hesitate to make this point. Paper won't blush, and philosophy is and always remains open; but just as quacks who pose as "doctors" can and must be exposed, so must intellectual quacks who parade as "philosophers" be exposed to public contempt.

REFLECTION

(1) Name the three levels of philosophical understanding discussed in the previous subsection. Show how the three questions suggested as a guideline for the study of a philosophical text and for determining the contribution made by an author run parallel to the three levels of philosophical understanding.

(2) Take any of your texts prescribed for study this year and see to what extent you can get its general drift by applying only the first two steps mentioned with regard to reading specialist works.

(3) Name two difficulties, deriving from the logico-conceptual character of philosophy, which may be encountered when reading a philosophical text.

3 HOW DOES ONE WRITE A PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAY?

To be intellectually engaged is to give careful attention to the proper unpacking and ordering of one's thoughts. The best way of performing this task is to write one's thoughts down neatly and systematically. The written word is, of course parasitic upon the spoken word, but at the same time it must be acknowledged that the written word has a permanence which the spoken word cannot have. This permanence of the written word demands a more thorough consideration of one's thoughts. One tends to "think twice" when putting pen to paper.

What holds for the ordering of one's thoughts in general also holds for philosophising in particular. Throughout, we have emphasised the necessity of active participation if an appreciation of philosophy is to be developed. We have just seen that in perusing a philosophical argument, one should be active in the sense of reconstructing and testing the ideas of the author. However, philosophising reaches its climax when you yourself take the initiative. Then you lead the way and the others have to follow. Philosophical writing could therefore, be regarded as the culminating point of philosophising. That is why you have to learn to express yourself philosophically in writing. It is not only a question of learning a story, and having one; it is also very much a question of being able to convey it in writing.

3.1 Basic plan for a philosophical essay

One writes something with the intention that it should be read. In other words, you must write in such a way that your reader will have no difficulty in understanding what you want to say. Why you are saying it and what its importance is. This rule applies to all writing.

In line with this, we suggest the following pattern for a philosophical essay:

(1) Announce your story. Indicate your objectives by stating the main points. (All this is your introduction.)

(2) Tell your story. Elucidate the main points, and argue each separately. Say why they are valid points.

(3) Point out the importance of your story. Show what lessons can be learnt from it, and what its possibilities of application are.

(4) Sum up briefly (that is, write a conclusion).[1]

You will notice that this procedure corresponds with the levels of philosophical understanding distinguished earlier. If you follow this procedure, you make it easier for your reader to deal with your contribution, that is, to state your case, to evaluate it, and to exploit it where possible. The whole purpose of writing is to communicate and to initiate discussion; hence the importance of getting to the point directly.

4 CONCLUSION

Finally we sum up what was said above in the following schematic survey (page 33).

Levels of philosophical understanding	**Philosophical reading**	**Philosophical writing**
(1) State the case -Examples (a) identify those given (b) give your own examples - formulate it in …your own words	**(1) State the author's story** - What is his/her conclusion? - How does ..he/she argue it?	**(1) State your story** - Announce it - State the main .points

[1] Every essay (assignment) should include a bibliography of works consulted as well as an accepted, functional reference technique. Consult this tutorial letter in this regard.

(2)Evaluate/argue the case - What are the implications .(its full ..meaning)? - Is it correct?	**(2) Evaluate his/her story** - What are its full implications? - What …assumptions (preconceived ideas) play a role? - Does it hold …water?	**(2) Argue your story** - Explain and …argue every main point - Are there preconceived ideas?
(3) Exploit the case What lessons can we learn from it?	**(3) Exploit his/her story** Apply the lessons	**(3) Mention possibilities for application** What lessons can be learnt from it?

APPENDIX

TEST YOUR KNOWLEDGE

The answers to most of the following questions will be found in the first part of this tutorial letter. For numbers 19, 20, 21 and 23 you may need to consult a dictionary, refer to a few publications, or if necessary, consult a librarian. It is a good idea to have a dictionary within easy reach in any case.

1. Why do we refer?

2. Why do we need a reference technique?

3. What are:

   - monographs
   - collected works
   - periodicals or journals
   - alphabetically ordered works?
   - Internet sources?

   Give an example of each: name the titles.

4. Do we refer to all the types of sources mentioned in the previous question in the same way, or can you tell from the

   bibliographical reference which kind of source it is?

5. What are source notes? To what do they refer? (Think carefully before you answer.)

6. What kinds of source notes are used?

7. When do we use direct quotations? Do we use them often? Can we do without them?

8. What is the use of paraphrasing? When do we paraphrase?

9. Is it better to provide a paraphrase than a direct quotation?

10. In our Discipline, do we prefer to separate lists of sources: one for books and one for articles? If they are placed in the same alphabetical list, can one still tell whether an entry refers to a book or to an article?
11. How do we see whether an article has been taken from a book, or whether it comes from a periodical?

12. What kinds of bibliographies can you mention?

13. Does a pilot bibliography provide a complete list of references to its subject?

15. What is an annotated bibliography?

16. What is a cross-reference, and what is its purpose?

17. What is the difference between?

(a) Cross-references,

(b) Source notes, and

(c) Contents notes?

18. Is the date mentioned in a bibliographical reference the date when the source was written, or the date when it was published?

19. Where inside a book do we find:

- the title
- the author
- the publisher
- the date of issue
- the printer
- the contents page
- the index, if any?

20. What is a reprint? What is a new edition?

21. Not all reference systems are the same. Where might we have to look for the full bibliographical particulars:

- in footnotes?
- at the end of chapters?
- at the end of the book?

Are there books without bibliographies or source notes?

22. Suppose you want to use a direct quotation. How do you show:

(a) that you have left something out?

(b) that you have inserted something, or added something to the original?

23. What is a book ? How do we refer to reviews in a bibliography?