

## REFERENCING

There are several systems for successful referencing, and I do not mind which you use so long as you are consistent. The important thing is to enable your reader to recover the source of the view or quotation you are citing or quoting. In the following passage from a draft of an as-yet-unpublished paper of mine on Newton, I make reference to a work by John Herivel, cited in a previous footnote (number 13), where I gave full bibliographic details: John Herivel, *The Background to Newton's 'Principia': A Study of Newton's Dynamical Researches in the years 1664-84* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965). I now give further references to it according to the requirements of the journal I am aiming to publish it in as follows:

Herivel, for instance, criticizes Newton for having apparently “fallen into the confusion” in the *Waste Book* of attempting to derive the dynamical rule for the composition of motions from the kinematical rule for resolving relative velocities.<sup>14</sup> He then interprets the absence of this confusion in Newton's formulation of the two rules in the later manuscript “The Lawes of Motion” (MS V) as “a possible indication of Galileo's influence on Newton.”<sup>15</sup>

But many journals prefer a system which minimizes footnotes by including references in the text, giving author and date. You would then have a bibliography at the end of the paper giving details, so that my passage would look something like this:

Herivel, for instance, criticizes Newton for having apparently “fallen into the confusion” in the *Waste Book* of attempting to derive the dynamical rule for the composition of motions from the kinematical rule for resolving relative velocities (Herivel 1965, 32, 39). He then interprets the absence of this confusion in Newton's formulation of the two rules in the later manuscript “The Lawes of Motion” (MS V) as “a possible indication of Galileo's influence on Newton” (1965, 32, 39-41).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Herivel, John (1965). *The Background to Newton's 'Principia': A Study of Newton's Dynamical Researches in the years 1664-84*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

---

<sup>14</sup> Herivel, *Background*, pp. 32, 39.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 32, 39-41.

Clearly, other systems are possible. Some would not tolerate the short form of the title in the first system, but would require something like “*op. cit.* fn. 13, pp. 32, 39” instead. I don't mind which you prefer, so long as it is complete and consistent.

Finally, I should stress that it is the AUTHOR who has to be given credit. So you cannot have merely (Jolley, 311) when the reference is to an article or chapter in a book edited by Nicholas Jolley, but authored by someone else, say Christia Mercer. Clearly Jolley cannot take credit or blame for what Mercer wrote, any more than an editor takes credit or blame for the opinions expressed in a syndicated column in her newspaper. Depending on the system you have adopted, you need to have either (Mercer 1988, 311) with the full title of the article or chapter in your bibliography under Mercer, Christia (1988), “title”, pp. 114-168 in (Jolley 1988); or the same information contained in a footnote.