

Kreitner's Guide to Scholarly Documentation

2001 Edition

The term “scholarly documentation” refers to footnotes, endnotes, bibliographies, and so forth: all the apparatus that scholars use in their writing to acknowledge debts to their predecessors. This kind of acknowledgement is one of the most essential and hallowed traditions of modern scholarship; it is what allows human knowledge to keep growing year by year. In this course you will be expected to take a professional attitude to scholarly documentation and to apply a consistent standard documentation form to all of your major papers.

But why, apart from my authoritarian edict, should you bother? It is easy for beginners to regard scholarly documentation as a waste of the time that you would like to spend on the real substance of your paper; as a meaningless badge of membership in a club you don't want to belong to; as just the sort of mind-numbing niggling task that separates musicologists and other anal-retentive types from normal people. I have some sympathy for this impression, if not for your opinion of my psychological profile, and I know that at three in the morning, when you're typing your paper, you may not be much moved by lofty talk about Standing on the Shoulders of Giants. But the fact remains that thorough and honest footnotes are not only an ethical necessity but, from your point of view, your best defense against charges of impropriety. Good footnotes are the easy way to use the writings of the scholars before you without committing, or being accused of, plagiarism.

What should you cite?

Any time you use another person's thoughts or work, you must acknowledge that debt somehow. Straightforward as this advice sounds, however, it is not always simple to apply. A few reasonably hard-and-fast rules are a good place to start:

- (1) Whenever you quote someone directly, you need to cite the source.
- (2) Whenever you use someone's original ideas, someone's personal theory about a piece of music, the documents someone has dug up about a composer's biography, you need to cite the source, even if you are not quoting directly. But—
- (3) You don't need to cite the source for facts that are matters of common knowledge; you don't need to cite the *New Grove* as proof that Bach died in 1750, or the current Princeton phone book as evidence that Milton Babbitt is still alive.

The problem, of course, is in separating between (2) and (3). How do you know, reading a *Grove* article for instance, what represents common knowledge and what will need a footnote? There is no definite answer to this question; your solution is part of the craft of scholarship. Sometimes you can get around it with a catchall footnote that begins, “The best introduction to Berlioz’s life and works remains ...” or “Unless otherwise specified, all biographical material here is taken from ...” or the like —remember that footnotes are also used for commentary and to suggest more reading, not only for citation. But there will always be gray areas, and all I can say is practice helps.

Style Manuals

Style manuals, despite their name, have little to do with literary style as we usually use the term. Rather a style manual is a compilation of the conventions used by an individual press or publishing institution; it is a way a certain press imposes consistency on its own publications. Students and teachers have, over the years, come to depend on these publishing style manuals as convenient collections of rules for ourselves to use: it is much easier on everybody (including the reader) to adopt a ready-made consistent system than to invent one’s own.

The problem is that different disciplines have adopted different style manuals. English and the other modern languages have adopted the manual of the Modern Language Association (MLA), whose system you may have learned in an English class. Psychology, education, etc. use the manual of the American Psychological Association, and presumably the other sciences have other conventions still. But music and the other humanities in the United States have generally accepted the conventions used by the University of Chicago Press, and this the system required by this department and for this course. The University of Chicago system is accessible in two books:

The 14th edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style*, prepared by the press in 1993 (actually the 13th edn. [1982] seems still to be okay as well); this bigish red book is available behind the desk at the music library.

The latest edition of Kate L. Turabian’s *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, also published by the University of Chicago Press. This too is available at the music library, but I would advise that you get your own copy at the bookstore. It’s less expensive than the Chicago Manual, a more convenient size, and ultimately probably more practical, concerning itself with student papers rather than the final published product.

Advanced music students may benefit from D. Kern Holoman’s *Writing about Music*, published by the Univ. of California Press in 1988 and also available behind the desk: it’s not quite Chicago style, alas, but it does solve a number of problems peculiar to music (italicizing titles, citing album notes, etc.).

Typewriters and Computers

Everything I say below is meant to apply to people using both word-processing computers and conventional typewriters. If you have a computer and can use *italics* for titles and the like, by all means do it; if not, underlining is understood, by convention, to mean the same thing. Also, if your word-processing program does slightly exotic things with footnotes (smaller typeface, indenting, etc.), that will be perfectly fine. If you have any doubt, please show stuff to me.

Author-Date System vs. Footnotes vs. Endnotes

There are three basic forms for scholarly citations. In the author-date system, an abbreviated citation consisting of the author's name, the date of the publication, and if necessary the page numbers (Fallows 1982, 121-25) is inserted into the text at the appropriate point, and the reader can look up the citation in a bibliography at the end. This seems simple, but in general it has not proven convenient in the humanities: the most prestigious American musicological journal, for example, tried it a few years ago, but has now gone back to footnotes. **The author-date system is not acceptable for this course; you have to use footnotes or endnotes.**

Footnotes and endnotes are essentially identical; the only difference between them is the position of the note—at the bottom of the page for footnotes, all together at the end of the paper for endnotes. Footnotes are easier for the reader to use, but endnotes are much easier to type. If you are using a computer, most decent word-processing programs will do the footnotes for you, keeping the numbers straight and placing them where they belong; so if you have a computer, please use footnotes. Otherwise, endnotes are fine. I'll use the terms interchangeably.

Each footnote or endnote consists of the following elements:

- A note number in the text, sometimes in the middle of a sentence¹ but more often at the end, after the period.² In published books, these numerals are often in a small typeface, and your computer may do this for you. Otherwise, it is acceptable to use the regular typeface of your typewriter; just roll the platen up half a space for the superscripting. Always number the notes consecutively from first to last; don't try crazy things like giving the same number to all notes that refer to the same source.
- The same note number at the beginning of the note itself. This can be either in the regular typeface, on the line and followed by a period, or superscripted without a period.
- The rest of the note, in which you provide full bibliographic information for the source, including page numbers when necessary.

Note Forms

Different types of source require different forms of note, and this is where the whole business becomes complicated. Turabian and the *Chicago Manual* cover a huge variety of possibilities, and you should by all means consult them in cases of doubt. But here are some basic note forms for the most frequently cited kinds of source.

Journal Articles: For most scholarly journals, which are paginated continuously throughout a yearly volume, you need the author, title, journal name, volume number, year, and page numbers. For magazines and journals in which each individual issue starts over again at p. 1, there are a number of possibilities: I would recommend the form in n. 4 below.

3. Curt Sachs, "Chromatic Trumpets in the Renaissance," *Musical Quarterly* 36 (1950): 62-66.

4. Winthrop Sargeant, "Past, Present, and Future," *New Yorker* 37 (April 7, 1962): 172-174.

Books: You need the author, title, place of publication, publisher, and publication date. If you are citing only certain pages rather than the entire book, put them at the end. (Notice that for books you use a comma where journal articles get a colon.) The place of publication is tricky: in general you don't need to include the state unless the city is so small that a reader, especially a foreigner, might not know. My own rule, not endorsed by any style manual, is that any city with a major-league team is big enough to stand alone, and even some small towns with major universities (Princeton, Chapel Hill) are probably safe too. Also, you may abbreviate publishers' names; you don't need to include "Inc.," "Ltd.," and so forth.

5. Lewis Lockwood, *Music in Renaissance Ferrara, 1400-1515: The Creation of a Musical Center in the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), 55-67.

6. Frank P. Donovan and Robert Selph Henry, eds., *Headlights and Markers: An Anthology of Railroad Stories* (San Marino, California: Golden West Books, 1968).

Article in a Book: Many scholarly articles come out in edited books rather than journals. These require a kind of hybrid form of note including bibliographical information for the article and the book both. Do not use this form for chapters in a book all by the same person.

7. Howard Mayer Brown, "Instruments and Voices in the Fifteenth-Century Chanson," in *Current Thought in Musicology*, ed. John W. Grubbs (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1976), 89-137.

Reference Works: Standard dictionaries and encyclopedias allow a shortcut, partly because they are so well known that they don't require lots of information, and partly because we usually look things up in them alphabetically rather than by page number, so we use the abbreviation "s.v.," for "sub verbo" or "under the word." If the work has long articles with individual authors, cite the author as in n. 8 below; if it has multiple editions, cite the edition number as in n. 9.

8. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, s.v. "Trombone," by Anthony C. Baines.

9. *Baker's Biographical Dictionary of Musicians*, 8th ed., s.v. "Corelli, Arcangelo."

Recordings and Liner Notes: Often we need to cite recordings or their liner notes (for example, for text translations). These are tricky because the amount of information varies a lot; the following two examples will show the general idea, but any good-faith effort you make along these lines will be acceptable.

10. Johann Sebastian Bach, *Brandenburg Concertos*, The Academy of Ancient Music, Christopher Hogwood, L'Oiseau-Lyre 414 187-2.

11. David Fallows, liner notes to Guillaume Dufay, *Missa Ecce Ancilla Domini*, Ensemble Gilles Binchois, Dominique Vellard, Virgin Classics CDC 5 45050 2.

Internet Sources: Internet sources are also tricky, for two reasons. First, a lot of them are crap: it is much easier to put your misinformation and half-baked opinions onto a webpage than to get a reputable journal or book publisher to accept an article or manuscript. And second, they are ephemeral: they won't reliably stay available, and your readers twenty years from now may not be able to look up your sources and reconstruct your thinking. At this writing, things are improving but still unsettled; it's probably fair to say we are all going to use online sources more in the years to come, but that right now, most serious scholars cite the internet rather seldom.

Online sources vary in their organization and the kind of bibliographic information they make available. To cite them, you should include (a) as much author, title, date, etc. material as you can, in a form as close as you can get to that of paper sources; (b) the web address, between <pointy brackets>; and (c) the date you looked at it, within (parentheses).

12. Franco of Cologne, *Ars cantus mensurabilis* (F-Pn lat. 16663), *Thema* (Music Theory of the Middle Ages), compiled by Sandra Pinegar [online], 28 December 1996, <<http://www.uga.edu/~thema/fra-jer.html>> (1 September 2001).

13. Translation by Walter Meyer, from <<http://www.recmusic.org/lieder/g/goethe/schoeck25.5.html>> (17 September 2001).

The online edition of the *New Grove* is one internet source we are all going to be citing a lot: at the moment it is largely identical to the paper edition that came out in early 2001, but because it plans to update articles, it promises to be preferable before long. It gets a citation form closer to that of a reference book than to an online source, but retaining the date of access.

14. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, online edition, s.v. "La Rue, Pierre de," by Honey Meconi (17 September 2001).

Second and Subsequent Notes

All of the above applies only to the first reference to a work. For all subsequent notes to that work, you need only a shorter reference consisting of the author's last name, an abbreviated form of the title, and individual page numbers if necessary.

15. Sachs, "Chromatic Trumpets."

16. Lockwood, *Music in Renaissance Ferrara*, 113-125.

If a subsequent citation is to the same work as the one previous, you can use "ibid." to indicate this. "Ibid." without any page numbers means that this reference refers to the same pages as cited in the previous note.

17. Ibid. [In this case means Lockwood's book, also pp. 113-125.]

18. Ibid., 141. [Means Lockwood's book, p. 141.]

Bibliographies

Some journals still require a separate alphabetical bibliography at the end of each article, and if you were writing a book you would definitely need to supply one. For the purposes of this course, however, you won't need a separate bibliography: the complete bibliographical information in your notes is enough. There: aren't you glad you read this far?

Final Thoughts

All of this seems, I know, like a lot to keep straight. And it will indeed drive you crazy for a little while. But trust me; keep this guide and a copy of Turabian at your elbow for a paper or two, and you will find yourself consulting them less and less. With a bit of practice, the rules of scholarly documentation quickly become second nature, an extension of your arm and hand and eye. And the sooner you allow this to happen, the happier you will be in your college career.

Kreitner's Manifesto on Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a serious business in this class. You can get thrown out of school for it, and even if you are allowed to stay, the charge will ruin your reputation with faculty and friends alike. Nobody wants to get involved with plagiarism; but in the minds of many students there is understandable concern over what it means and how it can be avoided.

Academic misconduct can take a number of forms—bringing surreptitious notes into a test, stealing a quiz ahead of time, etc.—but plagiarism is arguably both the most offensive, because it involves not just cheating but stealing another person's work, and the most elusive, because in some ways it closely resembles activities that we all do legitimately as part of our scholarly work. The university, in its online Student Handbook, defines plagiarism as

the use, by paraphrase or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work of another person without full or clear acknowledgement. It also includes the unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or agency engaged in the selling of term papers or other academic materials.

The second part of this definition is easy; don't buy any term papers, class notes, or other unauthorized academic materials from anybody. But the first part, which concerns the use of published materials (encyclopedias, books, periodicals, record jackets, etc.), is often a much tougher call. This is what most of us think of as the classic sort of plagiarism, and despite what you may have been told over the years, it is no simple crime—the concept and its daily reality are full of pitfalls and gray areas.

Reliance on other people's work is at the very center of academic life: it is what allows scholarship, and human knowledge, to advance year by year and not to have to keep starting over. When Lewis Lockwood wrote the *New Grove* article on Palestrina, he saved you a lot of tedious labor in the Vatican archives for your music history paper on the *Missa Brevis*. The use of Lockwood's materials is a great convenience and privilege, and it must be paid back by your full acknowledgement of his work. (He in turn has taken care to acknowledge his sources, and they theirs.) If you don't cite Lockwood's article as your source, you essentially imply that you have done the work yourself, which is of course dishonest, and you make it hard for the reader to find out more or to be assured that you have relied on the best information available.

Plagiarism comes in many forms, but four caricatures may make its dimensions clearer:

- **The Typing Exercise.** This is when you simply copy word for word from someone else's writing. It doesn't matter if you borrow half a sentence or five pages, and no number of footnotes will save you. If you copy word for word, you are presenting someone else's prose, written with great pain and deliberation, falsely for your own.
- **The Lame Rephrase.** This is a variant of the typing exercise in which just a few insignificant details of the prose are changed. It won't work: if the *New Grove* says, "The earlier part of Debussy's output of songs presents chronological problems," you can't say, "The earlier portion of Debussy's song output presents problems of chronology." Your own words means your own sentence and paragraph structure too.
- **The Collage of Quotations.** This is also similar, except that the copied portions have quotation marks around them and careful footnotes showing where they have been quoted from. Now there's nothing wrong with direct quotations, of course; the problem is that some students tend to use so many that their writing begins to look like a pastiche of other people's sentences. Strictly speaking, this doesn't count as plagiarism, since it doesn't contain

the essential element of deceit; but it is clearly a failure of work ethic and an error of literary style. There is no surer mark of the amateur than the constant habit of breaking into direct quotations for the explanation of commonplace facts and sentiments.

A good rule of thumb is to save direct quotation for *primary* sources (Beethoven's own words, or the recollection of one of his friends), and rephrase secondary sources in your own words unless the exact wording of a source (say, a definition you dispute) is important to your argument. You will be amazed at how easy this is, and how much stronger it makes your writing.

- **Not Enough Footnotes.** This is the most common problem, and it ranges from clear deception to carelessness to inexperienced misjudgement. We all know to footnote a direct quotation or someone's controversial opinion, and we know not to footnote matters of common knowledge. What's hard, especially using the standard reference works like the *New Grove* or the *Harvard Dictionary*, and writing about subjects you don't yet know inside and out, is how to tell for sure what's common knowledge and what needs a note. There is no explicit rule about this; it is part of the craft of scholarship, and as with any craft, you will learn it as you go along with our help.

One useful approach is the broad footnote. Say you're writing a paper on the *Symphonie fantastique* and including a biographical sketch. After the first sentence of the bio you can put a note like this:

1. Unless otherwise specified, all biographical information is taken from *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, s.v. "Berlioz, (Louis-) Hector," by Hugh MacDonald.

Then, whenever you use something from a different source, cite it separately. This will work for many subjects, and as long as it's perfectly clear, it's perfectly fine.

In some ways your high-school teachers (and conceivably some of your teachers here) may have contributed to the rash of plagiarism cases of the last few years. We have all, for example, taken tests where we had to reproduce definitions word-for-word from the textbook; whatever the pedagogical convenience of such exercises might be (and it is questionable at best), they seem to give some students a conviction that the source's exact words are fundamentally better than one's own. This is dead wrong. The School of Music wants you to learn the stuff, say it yourself, and make something new and better out of what has come before you.

Again, this is a serious business, and the trouble you can get into for it is just immense. But there is no need to live your life in terror of plagiarism. If you can maintain a clear sense of what you've read and what you've thought up yourself, an easy familiarity with the conventions of scholarly citation, a sensitivity to your reader's needs and probable reactions to every bit of your writing, and a basic credo of honesty and fair play, you will be just fine. Judgement calls are the essence of scholarship, and they will define your life after college. While you're here, you can rely on all the faculty to help you make them—and most of us are always only too glad to weigh in with an opinion. So ask, ask, ask. What we want from you above all, as you get a degree here, is a combination of skill and conscience.