Assignment Presentation: Style Guide

Semester 2, 2018
Begin Here!

How not to use this Style Guide:

Don’t attempt to read it through in one go. It’s not designed for it.

If the whole subject of references and footnotes is new to you, do read the “Introduction” item which is first in the Table of Contents. Then read “When to give References”.

If you’re familiar with the concept of references and footnotes, start with “Different reasons to use References”, and then read “Choosing a Referencing Style”.

For the details of styles accepted by the Ancient History Department, with examples, see “How to give References” and its subsections. To help you see the advantages and disadvantages of different styles, see “Detailed examples”.

“Glossary of terms” and “Abbreviations” should be self-explanatory.

If all you want is a quick reminder of the details, see the “Quick Reference Guide”.
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Giving References in Assignments: the Ancient History Departmental Style Guide

A. Introduction: What are references for, and why are they necessary?

In nearly any assignment you are asked to do in an Ancient History subject, you will need to give references showing where the ideas in the assignment have come from. Any assignment is a combination of your own original ideas, things you heard in lectures and tutorials, and things you learned from your own reading and research. As a general rule, if an idea is your own, you will need to give evidence to support it, and if it is not your own, you will need to say where you came across the idea, and why you believe it (or don’t). Showing where an idea came from, and what the evidence supporting the idea is, is one of the main jobs of references.

Broadly speaking, supporting evidence is of two kinds. First there is ancient evidence, which is either statements by ancient writers (or simple deductions based on such statements), or ancient objects or artefacts (or simple observations about such objects). Second, there is modern scholarly opinion (which should be based, directly or indirectly, on ancient evidence). You will need to keep the distinction between ancient evidence and modern scholarly opinion clear in your mind, because there are different conventions for referring to each of these.

When you give a reference either to a piece of ancient evidence or to a modern scholarly opinion or opinions, the essential reasons for doing so are

1. intellectual honesty (admitting the idea was not your own original idea), and

2. providing the reader with the tools to check your work for themselves by showing what the evidence is and where to find it.

You will soon learn how important this is to you in your own research. There is nothing more frustrating than a modern historian making a significant claim (one you want to make use of!), but not telling you what the evidence for the claim actually is! In the same way, the reader of your assignment (who will usually be your marker) wants to know not simply what you think, but also why you think it, and the evidence, ancient or modern, which led you to your conclusion. That is what references are for: telling the reader where the claims in your work are coming from.

There are many different styles of referencing. Here we will give you basic details about three different styles, each of which is appropriate in particular circumstances. Different publishers make use of different styles. Sometimes your lecturer will have a preference in relation to a particular assignment. Sometimes you can decide which style suits a particular assignment. But don’t mix and match within an assignment: stick to one style!

Please note: the Library has a number of online resources to help you with referencing. An introduction to the topic can be found here; information about reference management software can be found here.
B. What basic kinds of references are there?

There are three basic kinds of referencing, which need to be combined in most assignments. There are

1. **Brief In-text references**

or

2. **Footnotes or Endnotes** (we prefer that you use Footnotes. Modern word processors handle footnotes very well, and they are easier to keep track of when you’re reading the assignment than are endnotes).

and

3. **Bibliographies**.

C. Different reasons to use references, and the different kinds of references:

There are two basic reasons for using references in an assignment:

1. As above, they can be used to make it clear where a quotation, an idea or an argument came from.

2. They can also be used to explain or qualify a point made in the main text, or to qualify, or give further details of an argument which would unnecessarily break up your main text.

If you only need to give references of the first type (to show where a quotation, an idea or an argument came from, or to refer to ancient evidence or a modern scholarly opinion), then you can either use simple “*In-text referencing*”, or you can use formal footnotes. Footnotes can be in “*author-date*” (“Harvard”) format, or extended “*author-title*” (“Traditional”) format. The difference will be explained below.

If you need to give references of the second type (giving further details or qualifying your argument), you will have to use formal footnotes of one of the two kinds. Since there is no point mixing up the two kinds of references together, if you are ever going to need formal footnotes in an assignment, use them the whole way through the assignment for all your references.

Whichever form of referencing you use, you will usually also need to give a **Bibliography** at the end of the assignment. The Bibliography should include only works you have actually referred to in the assignment (i.e. not ones you just have a feeling you should have!). The Bibliography should usually be divided into ancient authors you have referred to, and the works of modern scholars you have used, listed separately. Each list should be sorted *alphabetically* by the name of the primary author. (Works by more than one author or editor should be listed under the name which comes first alphabetically.)

Because Bibliographies are organised alphabetically, you should give the surname of the author first, followed by their first name. (In In-text references and in footnotes you will normally give the author’s first name or first initial first. See the examples given below.)

The only cases where you will not need a Bibliography are likely to be those where you have been provided with all the necessary references in your Unit materials.
The choice between the three recommended referencing styles basically comes down to three factors:

1. Does your lecturer or Department have a preferred style for this assignment?

2. How much information about your references will the reader need to be able to pick up “at a glance”?

3. Does the variety of assignment mean you will need to give lots of explanatory comments or qualifications to the argument in your main text?

If your lecturer or Department require a particular style, you should obviously go with that.

“Author-date” styles of referencing generally work to keep the amount of referencing information on the page to a minimum: just the author, the date of writing, and a page reference. All the other detail, like the title of the work and where it was published, is kept for the Bibliography at the end. In some cases this works very well. “Author-title” styles put more information on the page, and so take up more space and may distract from the main text.

If you will be referring to a small number of well-known works, without detailed interaction with their opinions, you can use In-text notes in author-date style. But don't forget to include precise page references, and the full Bibliography at the end of the assignment!

If you will be adding explanatory comments or qualifications to the argument in you main text, you will need to use formal footnotes so those comments and qualifications don't break up the flow of your argument. Author-date or author-title style? That depends on other factors.

If you will be interacting with a relatively small number of well-known works, you would be better off using formal footnotes, but could use the author-date style. Again, don't forget page references, and the Bibliography at the end, in the same style.

If you will be referring to a wide range of material, so that constantly having to cross-check with the Bibliography would be frustrating for the reader, you would be best to use formal footnotes and the author-title system. It takes a little more work, but it gives the reader more information “at a glance”, without having to turn to the Bibliography, and perhaps lose their place in the main text. There may turn out to be other factors in particular cases as well.

As you begin to build up a body of works you regularly refer to, you should consider making use of reference-management software. Such software keeps a database of all the relevant information about each work on your list, and can output references in a wide range of formal styles. This means you can easily re-use items from one assignment's Bibliography in a second or third context. Over your University career you could build up quite a large database, and save yourself a considerable amount of time.

For further information about reference-management software such as Mendeley and Zotero, see this page of this Guide, and the Library's online resource page, here. The University provides students with free licences for this software, if you decide to make use of it.
E. How do you know when you should give a reference?

As a rule of thumb, if you know where an idea came from, you need to give a reference saying so. Unless there is a good reason to put it earlier, in mid-sentence, a reference will normally come at the end of the relevant sentence.

1. If the words you use are a direct quotation, whether from an ancient author or a modern scholar, you need to give a reference (quotations also need to be in quotation marks!). Quotations should be brief. In rare cases where you need to quote more than three lines of text, put the quotation in its own paragraph and inset it from the margin with a “hanging indent”.

2. If the idea is your own, no reference is necessary, though you may still need to say where you found the evidence that suggested the idea.

3. If the idea was given by staff in lectures or tutorials, there is no need to reference it: everyone else in the class heard it as well (or should have!), so it’s “common property”.

   If you read the idea in one place, you need to say what that place was. If you read it in two or more places, you need to give a reference to at least one of them. Referring to more than one may strengthen your argument. If you read it in almost everything you read for the assignment, you probably only need to refer to one item.

   If you refer to an idea more than once, you only need to give a reference the first time. References normally count towards the word limit of your assignment: don’t let them get too long or repetitious! *(Note: for Undergraduate assignments references normally do count: Bibliographies don’t. In Higher Degree Research, confusingly, none of them count.)*

   If you refer to the same book or article more than once, you only need to give the full details the first time (even if you’re using the fuller “author-title” style). The second, third and subsequent times, you can give the author’s name and an abbreviation of the title of the work, and the different page number. There’s no need to give the full details over and over. Once again, references count towards the word limit!

If you don’t know where the idea came from, you haven’t been keeping careful notes of your reading! One of the most basic habits of effective study is keeping track of where you notice ideas! And don’t just keep track of the author, or the book or article: keep track of the page reference as well. There is nothing more frustrating than knowing there was a great idea somewhere in your reading, but not being able to remember where.

In brief:

1. If you directly quote either an ancient author or a modern scholar, you must set it within quotation marks, and you must give a reference, and

2. If you make use of an idea which you know is not your own, even if your paraphrase it in your own words, you must give a reference.

3. Rather than give multiple footnotes in the one sentence, it is usually best to combine them into one footnote. If necessary you can add brief explanatory comments in the note.
F. Referencing: how to do it.

1. Brief In-text references (author-date format) plus Bibliography.

For ancient authors, give the name of the ancient author, followed by the Book, Chapter and Section number/s of the passage, or the Line numbers. If the ancient author is only known for one work, you can simply give his name: e.g. “Polybius, Histories 12.27” can be abbreviated to “Polybius (12.27)”. Example:

According to Polybius (12.27) Timaeus was an unreliable researcher …

For modern authors, give the surname of the author or authors of the work you are referring to (if it’s a work with different chapters by different authors, with an overall editor, make sure you give the name of your author), and then the date of publication of the whole work, followed by the page reference. Example:

Badian argues that the Roman aristocracy made use of their foreign clients to influence internal Roman politics (Badian 1958: 163) …

Then, in the Bibliography at the end of the assignment, give the full publication details which will allow the reader to track down the works in question. Normally you should divide your list into Ancient and Modern authors, and then give each list alphabetically by the name of the authors. You do not need to give chapter or page references here. Example:

Bibliography
(a) Ancient authors:

(b) Modern authors:

2. Footnotes (author-date format)

Footnotes using author-date format work exactly the same as the references above. But instead of being placed in brackets in the text itself, they are indicated by a super-scripted number in the text, with a matching number in the footnote area at the foot of each page. Example:

According to Polybius 12.27¹, Timaeus was an unreliable researcher …

Badian argues that the Roman aristocracy made use of their foreign clients to influence internal Roman politics. ²

Footnotes:

1. Polybius 12.27, trans. Waterfield, 2010: 442. (you might want to include a sentence of the translation here to illustrate or reinforce your point: footnotes allow for that flexibility. But keep such quotations as brief as possible.)


The Bibliography will be identical to that which goes with In-text author-date references, above.

For author-title footnotes see over the page.
3. Footnotes (extended author-title format)

Footnotes using author-title format work similarly to the author-date footnotes above. They are indicated by a super-scripted number in the text, with a matching number in the footnote area at the foot of each page. The difference is that the first time you refer to an ancient author, modern book, journal article or other work, you give the full details (for which see below). In subsequent references to the same work you give only abbreviated details. In all cases you give precise page references. Example:

According to Polybius 12.27¹, Timaeus was an unreliable researcher … Polybius claims this was due to his lack of practical political and military experience² …

Badian argues that the Roman aristocracy made use of their foreign clients to influence internal Roman politics.³ He suggests this phenomenon is particularly noticeable in the career of Pompey the Great.⁴

¹. Polybius 12.27, from Polybius, The Histories, trans. R. Waterfield (Oxford: Oxford U.P.), 2010, p. 442. (you might want to include a sentence of the translation here to illustrate or reinforce your point: footnotes allow for that flexibility. But keep such quotations as brief as possible.)


4. Bibliographies

Bibliographies are (in most ways) the most detailed references, but they are not where you say which specific passages you referred to in particular footnotes. They are where you list every work you referred to with its full publishing details. They should be divided into Ancient Evidence and Modern Sources, each sorted alphabetically by author’s name, all in the one place at the end of the assignment. Because Bibliographies are organised alphabetically, you should give the surname of the author first, followed by their first name or initial. Otherwise Bibliographies should follow the conventions of their style: they should begin with the author and title, or the author and date, of the work in question. Author-date style has been illustrated on the previous page: here is how an author-title Bibliography should be laid out.

Example:

Bibliography

(a) Ancient Authors

(b) Modern Authors
G. Types of References in more detail. Using “author-title” style.

How to refer to

1. a passage from an ancient author

Normally give the ancient author’s name, and either the full title, or the standard abbreviation for the title of the work (in italics). Then give the Book, Chapter and Section number/s of the passage, or the Line numbers. If the author is only known for one work, you can simply give his name: e.g. “Polybius, Histories 12.32” can be abbreviated to “Polybius 12.32”.

(Book, Chapter, Section and Line numbers vary between ancient authors. For Greek and Roman authors, if you can, use the system found in the Loeb Classical Library (available in the Library both in hard copy and Online). Penguin translations and Oxford World's Classics will normally use the same system; sometimes they put the numbers in the margins or at the top of the page. Not all online translations will have book, chapter and section numbers. The Perseus Project translations do. Avoid those which do not.)

Then give the name of the translator (e.g. “trans. M. Staniforth”), and the publication details of the translation (place of publication, publisher, date). Last you can give the page reference in the translation you are using. But note: that’s no use without the other details: different translations will have quite different pagination!

Only give the full details the first time you refer to the item. Then add something like the following: “All passages from (the author's name) are taken from the translation of (the translation you used) unless otherwise noted.” Then in subsequent references you can simply give the author's name, the abbreviated form of the name of the work, and the book, chapter and section number (or page number).

Examples:


- Cicero, On Divination (or: de Divinatione, or Div.) 2.29, trans. W.A. Falconer (Cambridge, MA: Harvard U.P.), 1923 p. 441 (LCL). Cicero, On Divination (or: de Divinatione, or Div.) 2.29 (p. 441, LCL)

Standard abbreviations

Standard translations such as the Penguin and the Loeb Classical Library, and the phrase “University Press,” can be abbreviated like this.)

1. Ancient verse texts, such as Homer’s Iliad and dramas such as those of Sophocles, are often referenced using line numbers, which are sometimes abbreviated to (e.g.) “l. 370” or “ll. 370–385.”
2. An object or artefact from the ancient world

Normally you will find these in printed or online Museum or Exhibition catalogues, or in other places which refer to such catalogues.

If it’s a printed catalogue, give the full publication details of the catalogue, starting with its editor, its title and (if relevant) the museum or exhibition it’s a catalogue of. Make sure you include figure numbers and/or plate numbers as well as page numbers.

If the catalogue is online, give the name of the editor and the title, the details of the museum or exhibition it is a catalogue of, and the full URL (in angle brackets) and the date you accessed it.

If you can't find such details, give the full reference to the work (journal article, book, website or whatever) in which you located the object or artefact.

Only give the full details the first time you refer to the item. Then in subsequent references you can simply give the abbreviated form of the name of the work (catalogue, journal article, book, website or whatever) in which you located the object or artefact.

Examples:


Subsequent reference→ Junker, *Gīza* V, 33, fig. 4a.


3. An academic journal article

Give the author's name or names, the full title of the article (in quotation marks), the name of the journal (in italics), the volume number (or volume and sub-part number), and the year of publication. The give the full page range of the article, and if you are quoting a particular passage, the exact page reference.

Only give the full details the first time you refer to the item. In subsequent references give the author's name or names and an abbreviated form of the title (still in quotation marks), and then the relevant page reference.

If you accessed the journal article online (say on eReserve or via JStor or a similar service), do not give the URL: give the details of the printed version, as above.

Examples:


Subsequent reference→ McKechnie, “Greek Mercenary Troops”, p. 301.


4. A printed book by one or more authors

Give the author's or editor's name or names (with initials), the full title of the volume (in italics), the place of publication and publisher (in brackets), the date of publication and the page or pages to which you referred.

Only give the full details the first time you refer to the item. Then in subsequent references you can simply give the author's or editor's name or names, the abbreviated form of the name of the book (in italics), and the page reference.

If you used an eBook, give the details (if you can) of the printed version, including the page reference. If that is unavailable in the eBook you used, give the full URL and the date you accessed it.

Examples:


5. A chapter by one or more authors in an edited volume

Give the name of the author (or authors) of the chapter first, then the full name of the chapter (in quotation marks), followed by the name of the editor (or editors) of the volume, the full title of the volume (in italics), the place of publication and publisher (in brackets), the date of publication and the page range of the particular chapter, and the exact page reference.

Only give the full details the first time you refer to the item. Then in subsequent references you can simply give the author’s name, the abbreviated form of the name of the chapter, and the page reference.

If you used an eBook, give the details of the printed version if you can, including the page reference. If that is unavailable in the eBook you used, give the full URL and the date you accessed it.

Examples:

First reference:→

Subsequent reference→
Woods, “A Date”, p. 305.

First reference:→

Subsequent reference→

First reference:→

Subsequent reference→

6. A website

The general rule for referring to material from an internet site is to give the name of the individual or organisational author (if known), the date of writing or of last editing (if known: not all websites will tell you), the page heading, the section number (or similar) if the site has them, the complete URL (copy and paste it directly from your browser's address bar) set between angle brackets (like this: <http://www...>), and the date you accessed the site.

As with the examples above, only give the full details the first time you refer to the item. Then in subsequent references you can simply give the author or site's name, the abbreviated form of the page heading, and the section number (if available).

Examples:

First reference:→

Subsequent reference→
The Tomb of Horemheb, Theban Mapping Project.

First reference:→

Subsequent reference→
Polyaenus, Stratagems 5.48, Attalus.org.

First reference:→

Subsequent reference→
Res Gestae 9, Lacus Curtius.
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1(a): In-text references, author-date system:

The stone-built mastaba of the dwarf Seneb was discovered by H. Junker in 1927 and is positioned in the West Field at Giza. The tomb consists of a rectangular mastaba with two false door niches and an external chapel (PM III/2, 101-103, plans 7, 13, 27; Junker 1934-1955: V, 3-128, figs. 1-32, pls. 1-9). Several stone elements are incorporated into the tomb's architectural design and include: an inscribed lintel and drum positioned above the doorway of the external chapel (Figure 1; Junker 1934-1955: V, 33, 4a); Seneb's false door and two side panels from the chapel (Figures 2-6; Junker 1934-1955: V, 33-98, figs. 4-8, 14-26, pls. 4-6); a granite offering stone (Figure 7; Junker 1934-1955: V, 100-104, fig. 28, pl. 7b-c) and the remains of the false door of his wife, Senet-ites, in the northern niche (Figure 8; Junker, 1934-1955: V, 98, 100, fig. 27). Other items associated with the tomb complex are: the famous double statue of the tomb owner and his family discovered in the northern serdab (Figure 9; Russmann 1989: 39-41) and the limestone chest in which it was found (Junker 1933-1955: V, 104-105, pl. 8d-f, pl. 20a); a small wooden shrine and statue as well as a limestone chest found in the southern serdab (Martin-Pardey 1978: 95-98); a fragment of a granite statue base belonging to Seneb (Figure 10; Martin-Pardey 1977: 155-157, 158-159) and the limestone sarcophagus in Seneb's burial chamber (Junker 1933-1955: V, 122-124, fig. 30, pl. 7a; Leipzig Museum Inventory 3695).

(Note how in this case In-text referencing makes the paragraph less informative, and makes the text harder to follow.)

1(b): Footnotes, author-date system

The stone-built mastaba of the dwarf Seneb was discovered by H. Junker in 1927 and is positioned in the West Field at Giza. The tomb consists of a rectangular mastaba with two false door niches and an external chapel.\(^1\) Several stone elements are incorporated into the tomb's architectural design and include: an inscribed lintel and drum positioned above the doorway of the external chapel (Figure 1);\(^2\) Seneb's false door and two side panels from the chapel (Figures 2-6);\(^3\) a granite offering stone (Figure 7);\(^4\) and the remains of the false door of his wife, Senet-ites, in the northern niche (Figure 8).\(^5\) Other items associated with the tomb complex are: the famous double statue of the tomb owner and his family discovered in the northern serdab (Figure 9)\(^6\) and the limestone chest in which it was found;\(^7\) a small wooden shrine and statue as well as a limestone chest found in the southern serdab;\(^8\) a fragment of a granite statue base belonging to Seneb (Figure 10);\(^9\) and the limestone sarcophagus in Seneb's burial chamber.\(^10\)

(Note how in this case Footnoting plus “author-date” references make it much easier to follow the text, but a reader would still need to refer regularly to the Bibliography, because the authors’ names alone are not very informative.)

3. Junker 1934-1955: V, 33-98, figs. 4-8, 14-26, pls. 4-6.
5. Junker 1934-1955: V, 98, 100, fig. 27.
1(c): Footnotes, author-title system

The stone-built mastaba of the dwarf Seneb was discovered by H. Junker in 1927 and is positioned in the West Field at Giza. The tomb consists of a rectangular mastaba with two false door niches and an external chapel. \(^1\) Several stone elements are incorporated into the tomb's architectural design and include: an inscribed lintel and drum positioned above the doorway of the external chapel (Figure 1); \(^2\) Seneb's false door and two side panels from the chapel (Figures 2-6); \(^3\) a granite offering stone (Figure 7); \(^4\) and the remains of the false door of his wife, Senet-ites, in the northern niche (Figure 8). \(^5\) Other items associated with the tomb complex are: the famous double statue of the tomb owner and his family discovered in the northern serdab (Figure 9) \(^6\) and the limestone chest in which it was found; \(^7\) a small wooden shrine and statue as well as a limestone chest found in the southern serdab; \(^8\) a fragment of a granite statue base belonging to Seneb (Figure 10); \(^9\) and the limestone sarcophagus in Seneb's burial chamber. \(^10\)

(Note how Junker is only cited fully the first time; subsequent references are abbreviated. The same pattern is followed for Martin-Pardey vol. 2. Then the first time volume 1 is cited, the full reference is given, and then subsequent references are abbreviated.)

3. False door: JE 51297 (Junker, *Gîza* V, 33-98, figs. 4-8, 14-26, pls. 4-6). For the fragments of the granite architrave, panel and lower lintel see Junker, *Gîza* V, 33-34, fig. 4b.
4. CG 57026 (Junker, *Gîza* V, 100-104, fig. 28, pl. 7b-c).
5. Junker, *Gîza* V, 98, 100, fig. 27.
7. JE 51281 (Junker, *Gîza* V, 104-105, pl. 8d-f). Behind the shoulder of the statue, several alabaster vessels were discovered (2 bowls and 13 vases), along with a flat alabaster table, green eye paint, carnelian beads and an agate splitter (Junker, *Gîza* V, pl. 20a).
10. Junker, *Gîza* V, 122-124, fig. 30, pl. 7a; Leipzig Museum Inventory 3695.

2(a): In-text references, author-date system:

David Whitehead's article “Who Equipped Mercenary Troops in Classical Greece?”, in a recent volume of this journal (Whitehead 1991: 105–113), expresses disagreement with an argument I have put forward to the effect that employers of mercenaries in fourth-century Greece would “often – perhaps even usually – equip them.” (McKechnie 1985: 85.) Some further comment is required, both to clarify my own case and to question Whitehead's line of argument against it; and since “general considerations which tell, explicitly or implicitly, a different story” (Whitehead 1991: 105) form an important element in Whitehead's analysis, I shall take the opportunity of sketching the situation a bit more broadly than I did before. It is common ground that earlier scholars, particularly H.W. Parke, (Parke 1935: e.g. at 106) have assumed without argument that mercenaries must usually have provided their own arms and armour. Whitehead describes this assumption as an orthodoxy (Whitehead 1991: 110), but I think that may run the risk of dignifying it with a status that it does not really have. It is simply a question that nobody has thought about much. Instances where an employer did provide the equipment are recognised by both of us: the chief ones are Cyrus and the army he recruited to attack his brother King Artaxerxes II, and Dionysius I and his mercenary army in Sicily (Whitehead 1991: 107–108). The issue is whether any generalization from them is possible.

(Note how in this case the relatively sparse “In-text” references work quite well.)

2(b): Footnotes, author-date system

David Whitehead's article “Who Equipped Mercenary Troops in Classical Greece?”, in a recent volume of this journal, expresses disagreement with an argument I have put forward to the effect that employers of mercenaries in fourth-century Greece would “often – perhaps even usually – equip them.” Some further comment is required, both to clarify my own case and to question Whitehead's line of argument against it; and since “general considerations which tell, explicitly or implicitly, a different story” form an important element in Whitehead's analysis, I shall take the opportunity of sketching the situation a bit more broadly than I did before. It is common ground that earlier scholars, particularly H.W. Parke, have assumed without argument that mercenaries must usually have provided their own arms and armour. Whitehead describes this assumption as an orthodoxy, but I think that may run the risk of dignifying it with a status that it does not really have. It is simply a question that nobody has thought about much. Instances where an employer did provide the equipment are recognised by both of us: the chief ones are Cyrus and the army he recruited to attack his brother King Artaxerxes II, and Dionysius I and his mercenary army in Sicily. The issue is whether any generalization from them is possible.

4. Parke 1935: e.g. at p. 106.
David Whitehead's article “Who Equipped Mercenary Troops in Classical Greece?”, in a recent volume of this journal, expresses disagreement with an argument I have put forward to the effect that employers of mercenaries in fourth-century Greece would “often – perhaps even usually – equip them.” Some further comment is required, both to clarify my own case and to question Whitehead's line of argument against it; and since “general considerations which tell, explicitly or implicitly, a different story” form an important element in Whitehead's analysis, I shall take the opportunity of sketching the situation a bit more broadly than I did before. It is common ground that earlier scholars, particularly H.W. Parke, have assumed without argument that mercenaries must usually have provided their own arms and armour. Whitehead describes this assumption as an orthodoxy, but I think that may run the risk of dignifying it with a status that it does not really have. It is simply a question that nobody has thought about much. Instances where an employer did provide the equipment are recognised by both of us: the chief ones are Cyrus and the army he recruited to attack his brother King Artaxerxes II, and Dionysius I and his mercenary army in Sicily. The issue is whether any generalization from them is possible.

(Note how in this case the author-title system gives much more information without the reader needing to turn to the Bibliography.)

4. H.W. Parke, Greek Mercenary Soldiers (Oxford, 1935), e.g. at p. 106.

3(a): In-text references, author-date system:
The ideological superstructure, though still favouring Rome’s traditional leaders, was under threat from the social realities of an increasingly enriched, and thus empowered, commercial sector. (Various episodes make clear a growing rift between those who determined the stages and the pace of expansion and those who would commercially profit from it; cf. Badian 1972: 26–47; Hill 1952: 87–90.)

Such internal politics, one can speculate, also played a part in foreign policy. Following the third Macedonian war, ten senatorial legati were sent out to Macedonia and five to Illyria to assist the commanders in settling affairs (Livy 45.17.1), but Rome did not annex either. In Macedonia it instituted four autonomous republics, under severe restrictions. Some modern scholarship has put this down to practical considerations; Rome, it is thought, lacked the manpower to occupy another foreign territory permanently (Harris 1979/1991: 143–6, 160–2). Ideologically, too, Rome’s new Mediterranean stature demanded justification. Rome could claim to have brought freedom … In this last instance, if Livy can be trusted, it was actually observed that, where there were publicani, there could be no libertas for ‘the allies’ (as the Macedonians were now cast: 45.18.4). The decision can be seen as ideological, but it directly denied access to commercial interests—and this, in the immediate context, can be seen as serving narrower senatorial interests (a theme explored by Badian 1972: 40–3).

It might be said that the above arrangements were annexation without the name. What had been Macedonian and Illyrian realms became virtually Roman appanages supplying a steady revenue to Rome and thus contributing to the fundamental transformation of Rome’s economy. Yet Macedonia was not a Roman ‘province’ (For this argued at length, Kallet-Marx 1995: 11–21; cf. Gruen 1984: 423–9). It is therefore better perhaps to characterise Rome’s expanding sway in three stages: penetration, exploitation, and occupation (avoiding the more problematic ‘annexation’). (Note how the concise notes work well in this example.)

3(b): Footnotes, author-date system

The ideological superstructure, though still favouring Rome’s traditional leaders, was under threat from the social realities of an increasingly enriched, and thus empowered, commercial sector.¹

Such internal politics, one can speculate, also played a part in foreign policy. Following the third Macedonian war, ten senatorial legati were sent out to Macedonia and five to Illyria to assist the commanders in settling affairs (Livy 45.17.1), but Rome did not annex either. In Macedonia it instituted four autonomous republics, under severe restrictions. Some modern scholarship has put this down to practical considerations; Rome, it is thought, lacked the manpower to occupy another foreign territory permanently.² Ideologically, too, Rome’s new Mediterranean stature demanded justification. Rome could claim to have brought freedom … In this last instance, if Livy can be trusted, it was actually observed that, where there were publicani, there could be no libertas for ‘the allies’ (as the Macedonians were now cast: 45.18.4). The decision can be seen as ideological, but it directly denied access to commercial interests—and this, in the immediate context, can be seen as serving narrower senatorial interests.³

It might be said that the above arrangements were annexation without the name. What had been Macedonian and Illyrian realms became virtually Roman appanages supplying a steady revenue to Rome and thus contributing to the fundamental transformation of Rome’s economy. Yet Macedonia was not a Roman ‘province’.⁴ It is therefore better perhaps to characterise Rome’s expanding sway in three stages: penetration, exploitation, and occupation (avoiding the more problematic ‘annexation’).

The ideological superstructure, though still favouring Rome’s traditional leaders, was under threat from the social realities of an increasingly enriched, and thus empowered, commercial sector.¹

Such internal politics, one can speculate, also played a part in foreign policy. Following the third Macedonian war, ten senatorial legati were sent out to Macedonia and five to Illyria to assist the commanders in settling affairs (Livy 45.17.1), but Rome did not annex either. In Macedonia it instituted four autonomous republics, under severe restrictions. Some modern scholarship has put this down to practical considerations; Rome, it is thought, lacked the manpower to occupy another foreign territory permanently.² Ideologically, too, Rome’s new Mediterranean stature demanded justification. Rome could claim to have brought freedom … In this last instance, if Livy can be trusted, it was actually observed that, where there were publicani, there could be no libertas for ‘the allies’ (as the Macedonians were now cast: 45.18.4). The decision can be seen as ideological, but it directly denied access to commercial interests—and this, in the immediate context, can be seen as serving narrower senatorial interests.³

It might be said that the above arrangements were annexation without the name. What had been Macedonian and Illyrian realms became virtually Roman appanages supplying a steady revenue to Rome and thus contributing to the fundamental transformation of Rome’s economy. Yet Macedonia was not a Roman ‘province’.⁴ It is therefore better perhaps to characterise Rome’s expanding sway in three stages: penetration, exploitation, and occupation (avoiding the more problematic ‘annexation’).

---


Reference Management Software

A variety of software packages are available which are designed to make the task of giving consistent, accurate references easier. In essence, all such software helps you set up and maintain a database of the books, articles and websites you use, and helps you standardise the way you refer to them. It then integrates with your word processor, allowing you to insert references from your database when you need to. The database can be stored on your own computer, on a memory stick, “in the cloud”, or all of the above. More sophisticated programs also help you locate the full details (metadata) of books, articles, etc. online, even when you only have basic information about the work in question. (You may know only the title, or the author: good software should make it easy to access the publisher, date of publication, ISBN or ISSN, etc.) The Library’s Multisearch system and Google Books are two useful sources of metadata; there are many others online.

Though software can be helpful, you need to remember the most basic rule of computer use: *GIGO* (“Garbage in, Garbage out”). If the information in your database is entered carelessly, any mistake will be copied exactly into your assignment, every time. In other words, you still have to take responsibility for verifying the details of each work you include in your database. But when the information in your database is correct, the references the software inserts into your assignment should be fault-free as well. Over time, as you add to it and correct it, your database will become steadily more useful.

The greatest benefits of good Reference Management software come when you have a piece of work all set up and ready, and then discover that the lecturer in charge of your Unit insists on a particular referencing style, and it’s not the one you used. If all your references are in Harvard style and the lecturer wants Chicago, or Oxford, or APA (or something more obscure), what do you do? Answer: simply tell your Reference Management software to redo the references, but in the new style. (Most Reference Managers know about a growing range of pre-defined styles.) Usually within moments you have a new version of your assignment ready to submit. (Of course, you should always do a quick manual check through your work to see nothing has gone wrong.) And database information from one Reference Manager can usually be transferred to a different one quite easily, so it’s possible to share the details of a particular work with someone using different software, or keep your database even if you need, for some reason, to change software.

The University officially supports two commercial reference manager apps, EndNote and Mendeley. You can download and install these from the Library website, while you are enrolled at Macquarie. It also supports Zotero, which is freely available for anybody. For a comparison of their features (including what they offer when you are no longer a Macquarie student) see here. Our own testing suggests that Mendeley is the system best suited for most Ancient History students. However, if your work includes elaborate non-European character sets (Egyptologists, this means you!) Zotero will give you better results. *We do not recommend EndNote.*

The pre-defined style which is closest to the Author-Title style we recommend is the *Chicago Manual of Style 17th edition (full note).* It is well supported by both Mendeley and Zotero.

Both Mendeley and Zotero work well with Windows, MacOS and Linux operating systems, and with MS Word and the freeware LibreOffice word processor. For other systems you will need to make further inquiries yourself, starting with the Library feature comparison page (above).
Glossary of Technical Terms:

Bibliography: a complete listing, sorted alphabetically by author’s surname, of all the works referred to in an assignment. Often divided into “Ancient sources” and “Modern works”. Whereas in notes authors are usually referred to by initial and then surname (e.g. “E. Badian”) in bibliographies (because they are alphabetical) authors are referred to by surname first, followed by the initial (e.g. “Badian, E.”).

(ed.) abbreviation for “editor” of a multi-author volume (e.g. “P. Green (ed.), Hellenistic History and Culture (Berkeley: U. Cal. Press), 1993”).

Endnotes: references linked to the text of the assignment, placed at the end of the main text, often on their own page. This style is common in collected volumes where each chapter is its own complete work, but is not recommended for assignments. Use footnotes instead.

et al. Latin abbreviation for “and others”, used to save space when a work has more than three authors (or editors). Normally it is used as follows: “E. Badian et al., (name of volume or article), (other details).”

Footnotes: references linked to super-scripted numbers in the text of the assignment, with the notes themselves placed at the bottom of each page, and numbered sequentially, usually continuously throughout the assignment.

f. & ff. Abbreviation for “and the following page” or “and the following pages”. We normally recommend specifying the precise pages you are using instead, e.g. “17–24”.

art. cit. Latin abbreviation, sometimes italicised, for “the most recent article cited that is by the same author”, to save repeating all the publication details in second and later references to the same article. Usually only the page number has to be added. Example: “Badian, art. cit., 134.” We do not recommend using this abbreviation, but you will need to understand it. Use “Author, abbreviated title, page” instead.

op. cit. Latin abbreviation, sometimes italicised, for “the most recent work cited that is by the same author”, to save repeating all the publication details in second and later references to the same book or collection. Usually only the page number has to be added. Example: “Badian, op. cit., 134.” We do not recommend using this abbreviation, but you will need to understand it. Use “Author, abbreviated title, page” instead.

loc. cit. Latin abbreviation, sometimes italicised, for “the most recent location (i.e. in a reference work like a dictionary) cited that is by the same author”, to save repeating all the publication details in second and later references to the same location. Example: “Badian, loc. cit.” We do not recommend using this abbreviation, but you will need to understand it.

Ibid. Latin abbreviation for “the same (place, or reference) again”. Only use this if the reference is identical to the previous one.

p. & pp. Abbreviations for “page” and “pages”.
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Abbreviations:

Each sub-disciplinary area (Egypt, the Ancient Near East, Biblical Studies, Greece, Rome) has sets of standard abbreviations for ancient works and/or works of reference. You need to begin to recognise these, and you should use them where possible, particularly in repeated references.

For abbreviations for Egyptian sources and works of reference, you can use those in this brief list, from I. Shaw & P. Nicholson, British Museum Dictionary of Ancient Egypt (London: BCA), 1996, p. 328, or the comprehensive listing of B. Mathieu, Abréviations des périodiques et collections en usage à l'IFAO (5th ed., Cairo, 2010), available here.

For abbreviations used in Biblical and related studies, see the listings in the SBL Handbook of Style (2nd ed.), in the Library both in print and in electronic form.

For abbreviations for Greek and Roman sources, you can use those in the Loeb Classical Library volumes (in print or online), in the introduction of the OCD (the Oxford Classical Dictionary, in print or online) or in L'Année Philologique (again in print or online). Abbreviations used in standard Greek or Latin dictionaries are also acceptable.
# Quick Reference Guide:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In-text notes (Harvard)</th>
<th>Author-date footnotes</th>
<th>Author-title footnotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Remember that Bibliographies don’t differ much from style to style, except in the order in which they present information, and in their punctuation. Remember to split them into Ancient and Modern authors where appropriate, and sort both lists alphabetically by author’s surname.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bibliography for assignments</th>
<th>using In-text notes (“Harvard”)</th>
<th>using Author-date footnotes</th>
<th>using Author-title footnotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object/Artefact</td>
<td>Give details of the volume or website where you found the object or artefact.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: the Library has a number of online resources to help you with referencing. An introduction to the topic can be found [here](#); information about reference management software can be found [here](#).