

Advice for Writers in Judeo-Christian Studies (Beta)

© 2010 by J. David Stark under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 United States License. For further writing resources, please see <http://j davidstark.com/student-resources/writing/>.

Contents

[Contents](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Rhetoric in Academic Writing](#)
[Specific Kinds of Writing](#)
 [Book Reviews](#)
 [Interpretive Essays](#)
 [Introduction](#)
 [Thesis Statement and Body](#)
 [Conclusion](#)
[Composition and Style](#)
[Common Editorial Marks](#)
[A Brief Bibliography of Writing Resources](#)

Introduction

*“The Preacher sought to find words of delight,
and uprightly he wrote words of truth” (Eccl 12:10 ESV).*

Good, academic, theological writing makes a sound argument, and it does so winsomely. To make an argument, an author must convey a certain amount of information. Merely conveying information, however, is insufficient—the information must be shaped into an argument. To be sound, this argument must account for all the relevant data and coherently relate them to each other. Yet, even presenting a valid argument (“words of truth”), can look like a tangled mess of words and phrases unless the valid argument is presented winsomely—that is, in “words of delight.”

While this handout contains a few comments on crafting a sound argument, its main goal is to provide guidance about presenting an argument winsomely. As such, these observations do provide not a technical treatise but a practical guide toward forming academic prose that will avoid impeding an audience’s enjoyment and comprehension of an argument (cf. Crider 2005, 73–78). After a brief introduction to academic writing as a rhetorical endeavor, attention is given to basic issues of composition, and some suggestions are made about good, academic English

style.

Finally, attention is given to the format and bibliography of the academic, theological paper. The *Society of Biblical Literature Handbook of Style* already provides a great number of examples and instructions for special cases that theological students may encounter. This Handbook derives from and adapts much material in the *Chicago Manual of Style* (Alexander et al. 1999, 1), which Kate Turabian's *Manual for Writers* condenses without adaptation (Turabian 2007, xi). This more modest, condensing impulse of Turabian's *Manual* renders this book a valuable reference about Chicago style that is, perhaps, more accessible than the full Chicago Manual. For students who use Turabian's *Manual*, however, clear guidance for its application in specific cases that students in Judeo-Christian Studies frequently face can sometimes be difficult to obtain. Therefore, this last section seeks to provide this guidance and seeks to clarify the *Manual's* prescriptions for these difficult instances. Consequently, this final section essentially attempts to do for students in Judeo-Christian Studies with Turabian's *Manual* what Turabian did for the *Chicago Manual*.

As with all academic endeavors, this handout itself is a work in progress. Those who find errors or who have suggestions for improvement are encouraged to visit the webpage listed at the beginning of this document and post their comments. A WordPress account is required to comment, and one of these accounts can be obtained for free with or without a WordPress blog. Please note that the webpage noted at the beginning of this document on the cover sheet *cannot* function as a help forum. For assistance through this kind of medium, students are encouraged to visit a dedicated, academic writing forum site like the Essay Forum (<http://www.essayforum.com/>). Additionally, students should note that this handout will only be revised as time allows, but input about what changes would be most beneficial would be a great asset in the revision process.

Rhetoric in Academic Writing

Writing academically is writing rhetorically—writing to convince one's audience (e.g., a course professor, one's academic peers) about truth (Crider 2005, 4, 119). Although rhetoric involves certain formulas, it is primarily a mental faculty (Crider 2005, 5–7). Having truth as its goal, fully formed rhetoric, “in its finest and fullest manifestation[,] is a form of love” (Crider 2005, 12). In addition to discovering means for persuading one's audience toward truth, the writer as rhetor carefully attends to what arguments will function best in a given situation to lead the audience and the rhetor to truth (Crider 2005, 7–9, 59).

Rhetoric begins with invention, some conception of an argument, and invention commonly has five topics: definition, comparison, relationship, circumstance, and testimony (Crider 2005, 29). Once the rhetor has identified a coherent thesis (the main assertion that the essay will make, or the primary interpretation for which the essay will argue), the rhetor can use these topics to chart a course toward demonstrating the thesis (Crider 2005, 30): What terms or concepts need to be defined? What similarities exist in the material relevant for the argument? What has other

research shown about this issue and other, similar issues? The additional, subsidiary arguments that such questions demonstrate and the manner in which these arguments are drawn together toward the thesis are best organized according to an “immanent design,” or an arrangement suggested by the arguments themselves (Crider 2005, 43–47).

Even if written to people who have similar interests, an argument’s introduction should convince its audience that the argument is worth reading (Crider 2005, 49). This introduction calls for a certain degree of creativity to find some way of painting the argument’s substance in a way that will please and intrigue the audience; if a rhetor succeeds in this task, the audience will be more willing to spend the time and effort to ponder the argument proper (Crider 2005, 53). The introduction should also briefly outline the essential contours of the argument that the rhetor intends to prosecute; doing so aids the argument’s rhetoric by providing the audience a concrete set of expectations, which the rhetor can attempt to meet (Crider 2005, 55–56). Along the way to meeting these expectations, the rhetor should consider and account for possible counter-arguments (Crider 2005, 59): What weaknesses in the argument do these potential contraventions suggest? How can these weaknesses best be remedied? After prosecuting the argument, the rhetor should briefly conclude (Crider 2005, 61–62). Conclusions frequently summarize, but they may also suggest additional implications that the central argument has, emotionally move the audience, or return to a theme or idea included in the introduction (Crider 2005, 62–63).

Throughout the introduction, argument, and conclusion, the rhetor must use an appropriate style of language because an inappropriate style will hamper the audience’s reception of the argument (Crider 2005, 73–74, 77–78, 84). Particularly apt for academic writing is a kind of “middle style” that steers a course between the colloquialism of conversational language and the elevation of highly stylized discourse (Crider 2005, 74–77). This middle style includes conventions about word choice, sentence construction, figures of speech, and formatting (Crider 2005, 79–104), and some of these features are described later in this document. Together, a rhetor’s use of these elements suggest certain things about that rhetor and give the audience a certain picture of who the rhetor is—a picture that may aid or inhibit the rhetor’s persuasive task (Crider 2005, 77–78, 84–87).

Once constructed, an academic essay needs a second look that does more than seek opportunities to make editorial changes (Crider 2005, 109). The writing needs to be evaluated in terms of how well it fulfills its objectives while also considering how sharp is the essay’s focus, how clear its thesis, how developed its logic, and how complete its explanations. The piece should then be edited accordingly (Crider 2005, 110). Such revision allows a rhetor to enhance the craftsmanship that the argument exhibits and to increase the argument’s ability to move its audience toward truth (Crider 2005, 118).

Specific Kinds of Writing

Book Reviews

One effective plan for a book review is to dedicate about the first half of the review to: (1) briefly introducing the work, (2) clearly identify book's thesis, and (3) sketching the book's argument for this thesis. Then, you may dedicate roughly the second half of your review to: (1) clearly stating your own thesis that somehow relates to the book you are reviewing, (2) sketching a coherent argument for this thesis, and (3) concluding your review in a way that somehow reflects the nature of book under consideration.

Interpretive Essays

Introduction

The introduction should seek to establish a connection with your audience and interest them in reading your essay. You can often do these kinds of things by asking an insightful question, briefly narrating a relevant illustration, or including a relevant quotation. The main point here is to lead the audience into the essay and up to the thesis statement at the end of the introduction in such a way that shows how or why the essay is significant for the argument it makes in itself rather than simply as content to fulfill a particular assignment's requirements in a particular course. When an introduction does frame the essay's significance in this way, once the audience has read the introduction, then they should be much more ready to follow the essay's argument as a whole and, if the argument is well-made, even to come to agree with the position(s) that you take throughout your essay.

Thesis Statement and Body

The essay's thesis is the main argument, position, or standpoint that you are taking about your essay's topic. Rhetorically, placing a thesis statement at the end of your introductory paragraph or section identifies for your audience the position that they can expect you to demonstrate in the rest of the essay. Simply by identifying this position, you prepare your audience to receive the argument that you will present, and you make it that much easier for them to accept your argument and come to the same position that you hold about your essay's topic. Situating the thesis statement at the end of your introduction allows your introduction the opportunity to frame the thesis statement's significance and describe the context of the problem or question to which your thesis statement responds.

For an "interpretive essay," this topic already has some boundaries—namely, the interpretation of some source. Within Judeo-Christian Studies, this "source" is often to be taken from a canonical biblical text. Because the essay's nature is interpretive, the essay will somehow address this text's meaning. Therefore, if you have trouble developing a thesis statement for a given biblical text, you can try giving yourself a bit of a running start by beginning a sentence with "This text [argues, asserts, shows, teaches, or synonyms] that . . ."

When you complete this sentence, whatever follows the "that" represent your interpretive essay's thesis, or its central assertion. When you write the thesis statement into the essay, you

will particularly want to be sure that the thesis is specific enough for the essay you intend to write. The more specific you can make your thesis statement, the more it will help clarify in your audience's minds the argument that you are wanting your essay to make. Consequently, as a practical matter, your thesis statement should clearly (1) identify the particular biblical text that your essay will discuss and (2) state the interpretation that your essay will argue for this text.

If you are working with a narrative text, your thesis statement should do more than restate the text's plot. For example, consider Aesop's fable about the lion and the mouse. In this story, the lion spares the life of a mouse that he could have eaten. Later, the lion becomes trapped and is rescued by the same mouse whose life he spared. These things are the characters and events *within* the story, but they are not the *meaning* of the story. Rather, the meaning of the story is something like "Be kind to everyone because you may end up needing someone else to be kind to you." As with this illustration from one of Aesop's fables, if a biblical narrative is designed to teach wisdom, then its meaning, or what the story teaches, may be something like a moral principle. If the story is designed to report a point of salvation history, then the narrative may have its primary meaning in describing a particular scene within this salvation-historical drama. For instance, in Rom 4, Paul draws from Genesis' narrative about Abraham not precisely a moral point but a portrait of the identity of the people of Israel's God.

When composing your thesis statement, try to structure it as "advanced organizer" for the balance of your essay. Doing so will help your audience see how your essay's argument develops to demonstrate your thesis. For instance, a rough thesis statement for your essay could go something like "[1] Paul prosecutes his argument in Romans 9–11 by highlighting election as a divinely-established reality that is shaped by both corporate and individual dynamics. [2] When the church attends properly to this interplay, Romans 9–11 provides her a more robust resource for her theological and missiological formation." In this example, the first part of the essay would then demonstrate [1], and the second part would demonstrate [2].

Particularly in interpretive or exegetical essays, it can be tempting to structure the argument according to some step-by-step hermeneutical method or verse-by-verse through the text. Yet, the essay's structure (i.e., the organization of its argument) will appear most coherent and make the strongest argument to the audience if it matches the structure of the thesis statement. Consequently, it may be advantageous to handle certain steps or texts "out of order" in the essay in order to show the audience more clearly the interpretation that you are arguing for a particular pericope.

Conclusion

Your conclusion is your opportunity to give one last push for your thesis—one last appeal for your audience to adopt your position on your essay's topic. With this goal in mind, wrapping a conclusion back to the thesis statement is often an effective way of developing a conclusion. Although you will not typically want to repeat your thesis or your earlier argument(s) needlessly or verbatim in your conclusion, echoing or paraphrasing your thesis, perhaps in conjunction with some of your major arguments can be a very effective concluding technique. Additional, helpful suggestions on writing conclusions are available in the [Smarthinking Writer's Handbook](#).

Composition and Style

The following composition and stylistic suggestions are intended to replicate the advice of the latest edition of Turabian's *Manual* specifically as it applies to writing in Judeo-Christian Studies:

1. Use appropriate punctuation. Some common oversights in punctuation are:
 - a. Omitting commas:
 - i. After an introductory word or phrase (e.g., In the garage, Jack fixed the car.). For brief introductory words or phrases, a comma is not always necessary (cf. Strunk Jr. and White 2000, 2), but the longer and more complex that an introductory phrase (or clause) becomes, the more that delimiting this phrase with a comma will help the reader follow the sentence's flow. To assess whether a comma would be beneficial in a specific case, an author can often read the sentence aloud. If a pause naturally falls in the reading after the introductory phrase, a comma may be used. If no pause naturally falls after the introductory phrase, a comma may be omitted.
 - ii. Around non-essential, sentence elements.
 1. For example, the sentence "Jack, who works as a mechanic, fixed his own car" would require commas enclosing the non-essential clause "who works as a mechanic" because Jack's name sufficiently identifies him. On the other hand, the sentence "The man who works as a mechanic fixed his own car" requires the clause "who works as a mechanic." In the first sentence, the dependent clause describes Jack further; in the second sentence, the reader does not know which man the writer means without the dependent clause (Chapman 1996, 172). Determining whether a given sentence element is essential or non-essential can sometimes be a matter of judgment, but the more ambiguous a sentence is without a given part of it, the more essential that part is to the sentence.
 2. Other non-essential, sentence elements may simply interrupt the flow of a sentence by providing additional, parenthetical information. For instance, in the sentence "Jack would argue, therefore, that one should fix cars in a garage," the word "therefore" interrupts the normal flow of the clause in which it stands (i.e., "Jack would argue . . . that"). Readers will find these bracketing commas helpful in understanding a sentence's flow, especially when the interrupting information constitutes one or more phrases or even its own clause.
 - iii. Around adverbial, participial phrases. Without commas, the sentence "The mechanics waiting for the necessary parts to arrive complained

about how slow the delivery man was” describes mechanics who were “waiting.” The phrase “waiting for the necessary parts to arrive” would, therefore, be adjectival. By contrast, the sentence “The mechanics, waiting for the necessary parts to arrive, complained about how slow the delivery man was” states that the mechanics complained in a way that was connected with their “waiting.” Commas around adverbial, participial phrases may, therefore, play a significant role in clarifying precisely what these phrases modify.

- iv. Before a conjunction that coordinates two independent clauses within the same sentence (Strunk Jr. and White 2000, 5). Without a comma, “Jack works as a mechanic and he fixes his own car” is a run-on sentence because the coordinating conjunction “and” does not sufficiently join the two clauses “John works as a mechanic” and “he fixes his own car.” Adding a comma before the conjunction (e.g., “Jack works as a mechanic, and he fixes his own car”) clearly coordinates the sentence’s two main clauses.
 - v. Before the last item in a list (Turabian 2007, 23.4.2). Preferences may differ in some contexts, but unless one is writing journalism, the conjunction that denotes the final item in a list will generally have a comma before it. Consequently, for biblical and theological studies, the punctuation “At the store, Jack bought tires, sponges, and oil” would normally be preferable to “At the store, Jack bought tires, sponges and oil.”
 - vi. Between adjectives that modify the same noun and are not coordinated by a comma. Thus, “Jack used the big, red wrench to fix the car” would be appropriate.
 1. In some cases, however, an adjective and the noun it modifies may form a “stock phrase.” In these cases, the adjective-noun combination should be treated as a single noun in relation to this punctuation principle. Consequently, “Christian higher education” would be preferable to “Christian, higher education” because “higher education” forms a stock phrase that designates any education after high school. Therefore, in such cases, unless an author wishes to draw a special distinction in a given context, the stock phrase is generally counted as a single noun when punctuating the text.
 2. Similarly, adjectives that denote quantity (e.g., “many,” “one,” “three,” “several”) also do not generally take a comma between them and another adjective that modifies a noun (e.g., “five black tires”).
- b. Placing punctuation before parenthetical references. For instance,

Scripture teaches that God loves the world, (John 3:16) but it also

teaches that God hates sinners. (Ps 11:5)

would be incorrect, but

Scripture teaches that God loves the world (John 3:16), but it also teaches that God hates sinners (Ps 11:5).

would be correct (Turabian 2007, 21.11.2).

- c. Inappropriately punctuating multiple parts of a parenthetical reference. Inside parenthetical references (as well as footnotes), use semicolons to separate individual citations. For instance, “Scripture teaches that God loves the world (John 3:16), but it also teaches that God hates sinners (Ps 11:5; cf. Prov 6:16–19).”
- d. Misordering punctuation and quotation marks (e.g., Jack said, “I wish this car would start”). Although conventions differ in other English-speaking countries, for standard, American English, commas and periods typically appear before a closing quotation mark, and colons and semicolons always appear after a closing quotation mark. Exclamation points (which should be rare in academic writing) and question marks appear before a final quotation mark if they are part of the original quotation; otherwise, they appear after the final quotation mark (Turabian 2007, 21.11.2).
- e. Omitting italics when discussing a word or phrase as such. Thus, for clarity’s sake, when discussing the word *word* or the phrase *in this phrase* you would typically use italics to set off from the main text the word or phrase under discussion (Turabian 2007, 22.2.2).
- f. Using hyphens (-) instead of en dashes (–) in number ranges. Sometimes an en dash is called a hyphen, but a noticeable typographic distinction exists between the two punctuation marks. When using an en dash to signal a range, do not include a space on either side of the dash (so: 50–52 not 50 – 52; see Turabian 2007, 21.7.2n1, 23.2.4). Please see your computer software’s help sections for assistance with adding hyphens and en dashes to your documents. Steps that will work for some common software platforms, however, appear below:
 - i. For Windows users, an en dash may be inserted by turning on the Num Lock, holding down the Alt key, typing 0150 on the keypad, and releasing the Alt key.
 - ii. Microsoft Word (XP, 2003) users can construct a keystroke shortcut by clicking the Insert menu > Symbol... > Special Characters > En Dash > Shortcut Key. Hold down the desired shortcut key combination (e.g., Alt + n), release the key combination, and click Assign.
 - iii. OpenOffice.org (3.1) users can construct a keystroke shortcut under Microsoft Windows by clicking the Tools menu > Macros > Record Macro. Hold down the Alt key, type 0150 on the keypad, and release the Alt key. Click Stop Recording, name the macro appropriately (e.g., EnDash), and click close. Click the Tools menu > Customize > Keyboard. Select the

desired key combination (e.g., Ctrl + N). Under Functions in the Category box, click OpenOffice.org macros > user > Standard > Module1, and choose the new macro (e.g., EnDash). Click the Modify button, and click OK.

- g. Using semicolons rather than commas to list page numbers. As with other series, page a list of page numbers in a citation should be joined with commas, but no conjunction should appear before the final page number listed (e.g., 2, 10–15, 32; Turabian 2007, 21.2.2, 23.2.4).
 - h. Printing ellipses with inconsistent spacing. Some word processors automatically change three successive periods into an ellipsis character (e.g., ...), but this character may not accurately space the ellipsis dots so that, in context (e.g., “Jack forgot ... his screwdriver.”), a spacing difference can be noticeable. In such a case, to achieve a uniform appearance, simply type three periods separated from each other by one space (cf. Turabian 2007, 25.3.2). Ellipses are generally omitted at the beginning or ending of a quotation (Turabian 2007, 25.3.2).
 - i. Using a mixture of “straight” and “smart” (or curled) quotes. Choose one style of quotation marks and use it consistently.
 - j. Failing to nest quotation marks properly. When including within quotation marks any material that itself contains quotation marks, the outermost quotation marks should be double (“ ”), the next outermost quotation marks should be single (‘ ’), and subsequent levels of quotation marks should alternate between the two (Turabian 2007, 25.2.1, Special Punctuation; University of Chicago 2010, 13.28).
2. Use correct capitalization.
 - a. Titles of works in footnotes and bibliography items should be printed with headline-style capitalization (see Turabian 2007, 22.3.1, Headline-style Capitalization, for details).
 - b. Consult a standard dictionary for information on individual words. One common mistake is capitalizing “city” when used with a city name (“city of Jerusalem” not “City of Jerusalem”).
 3. Use correlating conjunctions together. When using the correlating conjunctions (either/or, neither/nor, both/and, not only/but also), use both parts of the correlating pair, and place them appropriately so that each one correlates the same kind of grammatical structure(s) as the other does (cf. §).
 4. Use quotation marks to indicate direct quotations. Paraphrased material, by contrast, should not be enclosed in quotation marks, but its source(s) must still be cited. Additionally, each opening quotation mark must have a corresponding closing quotation mark, and vice versa.
 5. Avoid sentence fragments. Each sentence must have a subject and a verb in an independent clause. Sentences with transitive verbs (i.e., verbs require an object to make sense) must also have an object (Chapman 1996, 14).
 6. Avoid dangling prepositions. Sometimes, a dangling preposition can simply be deleted. For example, “Jack does not know where his wrench is at” should be changed to “Jack does not know where his wrench is.” Other times, a sentence needs to be restructured to

give a dangling preposition an appropriate object. For instance, “Jack wondered who he could borrow a wrench from” should be revised to “Jack wondered from whom he could borrow a wrench.” See a standard dictionary if uncertainty exists about whether a word is a preposition or not.

7. Avoid split infinitives. A split infinitive occurs whenever the infinitive verb form (e.g., “do”) is not immediately preceded by the preposition “to” as in the phrase “to do.” To remedy the split infinitive, the interrupting word or phrase can often be relocated easily to one of three locations: (1) before the word “to,” (2) after the infinitive verb form, or (3) the end of the clause. When relocating a modifying word or phrase to the end of the clause, however, be especially careful not to create a misplaced modifier.
8. Use “were” instead of “was” in the “if” clause of an unreal condition. For example, “If Jack was a woman, he would not be a man” is incorrect, but “If Jack were a woman, he would not be a man” is correct.
9. Use the correct case of a noun or pronoun with a gerund or present participle. Although the gerund and present participle have the same form (e.g., “taking”), a gerund would take the possessive case. For example, “Jack’s taking the test before March 1 allowed him to graduate.” That is, the fact that Jack took the test before March 1 allowed him to graduate. By contrast, a present participle would take the objective case, as in the sentence, “Jill saw Jack taking his test before March 1 in order to graduate.” In other words, Jill saw Jack while he was taking his test that would allow him to graduate (Strunk Jr. and White 2000, 12–13).
10. Be clear. Clarity and simplicity often go together in writing, but simplicity does not entail compositional roughness. Rather, clarity and simplicity entail removing language that attempts to impress the reader by its obscurity and including language that communicates meaning as efficiently as possible.
 - a. Often, authors may use pronouns whose antecedents are ambiguous (e.g., “When Jack went to walk the dog, he ran away”). In these cases, use a noun in place of the pronoun, or add the appropriate qualification (e.g., “When Jack went to walk the dog, the dog ran away”). Particularly, long strings of pronouns can hamper clarity, albeit sometimes humorously, as the number of possible antecedents increases (e.g., “Jack and Jill caught some fish, and they ate them”). When using a pronoun, students should always check whether the pronoun’s antecedent is ambiguous. If a pronoun is ambiguous in this way, the pronoun can be replaced with a noun, or the sentence can be recast.
 - b. Shifts in number between an antecedent and a following pronoun should be avoided. For example, “When anyone tells Jack how to fix a car, they should avoid telling Jack what he already knows” would be incorrect, but “When anyone tells Jack how to fix a car, that person should avoid telling Jack what he already knows” would be correct.
 - c. Sometimes, indirect discourse may be reported without being introduced by “that” [e.g., “Jack said (that) he needed to go to the auto-parts store”]. Other times, including “that” to introduce the indirect discourse can greatly increase a sentence’s clarity.

- d. A sentence's parts must exhibit unity. To do so, they should: (1) be closely related, (2) be clear, and (3) express a single, overarching thought (Chapman 1996, 91). A paragraph's sentences must also exhibit unity by developing only the idea of the paragraph's topic sentence (Chapman 1996, 196). Sentences developing other ideas belong in other paragraphs.
 - e. Similar to unity is coherence. To be coherent, a paragraph's components must be arranged in a logical order (e.g., chronology, space, importance) and create a sense of continuity by employing appropriate devices (e.g., pronoun reference, repetition, and transitional expressions) (Chapman 1996, 198; see also Turabian 2007, 9.2).
 - f. Avoid using short-hand constructions like "and/or." For example, "Jack wondered whether to fix the car and/or mow the lawn." This sentence's clarity can be increased by reworking the sentence into the following form: "Jack wondered whether to fix the car, mow the law, or do both" (Strunk 40).
11. Be concise. When one word is at least as clear as two, use one. Some common ways to increase conciseness are to translate constructions like: (1) "the basis of this argument," into constructions like "this argument's basis," (2) "during the time which" > "when," (3) "in which" > "where," (3) "the reason . . . is because" > "because," (4) "he is a man who does" > "he does" (Strunk Jr. and White 2000, 23–24, 48).
12. Choose the best word. Words are the basis of communication. Without them, there can be no sentences, and with the wrong words, sentences will not mean to their readers what their authors intend them to mean.
13. Use words and phrases appropriately.
- a. Although usage conventions differ in other English-speaking communities, standard, American English calls for "a" before a voiced "h" (e.g., "a healthy desire") and "an" before an unvoiced "h" followed by a vowel sound (e.g., "an honorable mention").
 - b. The words "and" and "but" should not appear at the beginning of a sentence, but they may appear at the beginning of a clause within a sentence.
 - c. One useful, though frequently neglected, stylistic convention employs the word "however" at the beginning of a clause to express indefinite means or extent (e.g., "However Jack decides to repair my car, I will simply be glad to have it fixed."). As a synonym for "but," "however" may be advantageously relocated to some logical break in the clause it coordinates with the preceding material (e.g., "Jack wanted to have the car repaired yesterday; as the day progressed, however, he realized he had too much other work to do.") (Strunk Jr. and White 2000, 48–49).
 - d. When using "one" as a pronoun, avoid subsequently using the pronouns "he," "she," or some combination of the two. Gendered pronouns are becoming increasingly out-of-fashion in American English for indefinitely gendered instances of the third person singular. The use of "one" as a pronoun, in many cases, provides a viable gender-neutral substitute for the gender-specific third person pronouns "he" and "she." When using "one" as a pronoun, however, an

author should avoid following it with gender-specific pronouns. Moreover, ad hoc pronoun combinations (e.g., “he or she,” “he/she,” and “s/he”) are cumbersome and should be avoided (Strunk Jr. and White 2000, 54–55, 60–61).

- e. American usage prefers the preposition “toward” (e.g., “toward the sea”) while British usage prefers “towards” (Chapman 1996, 153). The word “as” may be used as a synonym for “like,” but “as” can sound odd when used with something other than a full clause. In general, therefore, the safer route is to use “like” to compare nouns and pronouns and “as” to compare phrases and clauses (cf. Strunk Jr. and White 2000, 51–52).
 - f. Choosing between “that” (as a relative pronoun) and “which” can often be difficult. “That” may refer to persons or things; “which” refers to things (Chapman 1996, 153). “That” seems to flow more smoothly in a wider variety of cases, whereas “which,” in some instances, can sound stilted and awkward (cf. Strunk Jr. and White 2000, 59).
 - g. When writing ordinal numbers, be consistent in omitting or including the “-ly” ending (e.g., “first,” “firstly”). Omitting this ending is generally preferred (Strunk Jr. and White 2000, 57).
 - h. Avoid writing “as to” (e.g., “Jack spoke as to the nature of the argument”), which may be pretentious. Instead, be simpler and more concise with a word like “about” or “concerning” (e.g., “Jack spoke about the nature of the argument”).
 - i. Avoid using “etc.,” which is inexact. In academic writing, if something is important enough to merit an “etc.,” that thing is important enough to name explicitly (Strunk Jr. and White 2000, 45).
 - j. Use “Bible” to refer to the scriptures of the Judeo-Christian tradition and “biblical” to describe a particular text(s) as falling within this class of scriptures.
 - k. Use “Gospel” to refer to an early Christian narrative about Jesus’ life (e.g., Matthew–John) and “gospel” to refer to the Christian message about Jesus.
 - l. Generally prefer the “literary” present tense when discussing the message of a text or an action of an author through his or her text. Thus, “In his book, Jack says” would typically be preferable to “In his book, Jack *said*” if the message of the book rather than its situation in a historical sequence is the primary focus.
14. Avoid widows and orphans. Generally, any paragraph should have at least one full line on the page where it begins and at least one full line on the page where it ends (University of Chicago 2010, 2.113). Many word processing programs can perform this task automatically. For specific instructions about this feature, see the help files for the individual programs.
15. Strive for balance and parallelism. When coordinating two or more phrases or clauses, an author should place conjunctions properly so that each conjunction coordinates the same grammatical structure as the others. For instance, the phrases “in both his theology and in his political views” lack balance because the first conjunction (“both”) coordinates only the object of the first preposition (“in”), but the second conjunction (“and”) coordinates the whole second, prepositional phrase (“in his political views”). To correct this imbalance, the author has two options. First, the author can relocate an

imbalanced element to a more appropriate position (“both in his theology and in his political views”). Second, the author can eliminate an unbalancing element (“in both his theology and his political views”). The author may decide which solution to adopt based on which construction will fit the context best.

16. Avoid awkward wordings. Unclear phrases, ambiguous phrases, and unintentionally idiomatic phrases particularly increase a sentence’s awkwardness. Sometimes ambiguity or lack of clarity can be reduced or eliminated by using additional punctuation to guide the reader about how to divide the sentence. A careful reader, especially one who is not a technical scholar in the field in which a given paper is written, can often identify awkward wordings, which the author might not have noticed and which require revision.
17. Avoid claiming more than the argument or cited evidence demonstrates. Global claims with words like “all,” “every,” “each,” “always,” or “never” and claims about a majority (with a word like “most”) are particularly suspicious in this regard. Whatever claims and conclusions an author makes must be supported by: (1) his own argument, (2) the works he cites, or (3) a combination of both.
18. Avoid using the first person. This rule includes avoiding the use of the first-person, singular and plural pronouns. Using these pronouns is not grammatically wrong. But, in academic writing, it is a stylistically less effective option. Academic writing requires that authors stress the logic and evidence that support the arguments being made. By contrast, first-person references tend to draw attention away from logic (*logos*) and evidence and toward the author’s own competence with the subject matter (*ethos*). Recognized experts in particular subjects can sometimes argue effectively from their authorial *ethos*, but even here, such arguments would generally be still more effective if they focused on carefully outlining an appeal from *logos* that the expert’s special knowledge of the field identifies as particularly meriting consideration (cf. Crider 2005, 16–18, 33–35).
19. Avoid using the second person. Directly addressing the reader is generally inappropriate for academic writing.
20. Avoid misplaced modifiers. A misplaced modifier is any modifying word, phrase, or clause, which does not modify what the author intended it to modify from its current position in the sentence. Additionally, modifiers may sometimes be ambiguously placed so that their connections to the rest of the sentence are unclear. For example, “Jack told his wife how he had fixed the car after dinner” means something very different from “After dinner, Jack told his wife how he had fixed the car.”
21. Avoid short paragraphs of fewer than three sentences. A one- or two-sentence paragraph should typically be expanded or reworked and combined with the preceding or following paragraph. Very short paragraphs can result in a choppy text and suggest that you have given insufficiently careful thought to that paragraph’s topic.
22. Avoid run-on sentences. Run-on sentences often occur when long sentences have insufficient subordination or coordination of their clauses. Rework a run-on sentence’s subordination or coordination, or divide a run-on sentence into one or more, shorter sentences. To aid a sentence that has insufficient coordination, consider adding a comma with a coordinating conjunction where independent clauses join each other.

Additionally, a semi-colon can join two independent clauses by itself and does not generally take a coordinating conjunction when used in this capacity.

23. Avoid choppy sentences. While sentences can be too long, they can also be too short, especially when several short sentences occur in sequence. Choppy sentences can be combined as long as run-ons do not result.
24. Avoid contractions.
25. Avoid “prop” phrases like “it is interesting that.” Instead of saying that something is interesting, interest the reader in it by demonstrating its significance (Strunk Jr. and White 2000, 50).
26. Avoid numerous and lengthy quotations. In general, directly quote only texts that are essential to proving an argument; merely cite others in the appropriate format (Crider 2005, 36). Doing so well can help strengthen your authorial *ethos*.
 - a. When quoting any material, the quotation should develop logically from what precedes it, and contribute toward your argument’s further demonstration. Simply quoting a particular author or scholar as articulating a particular position does not necessarily make the quotation contribute effectively to the argument into which it is inserted. Especially when quoting secondary sources, you must establish (1) whether the author(s) you have quoted is actually correct in what they assert and (2) what this correct assertion contributes to your own argument.
 - b. In an interpretive essay on a biblical text, the text being handled should generally not be quoted in full. Instead, the audience for such an essay may generally be presumed to be familiar with the text or able to refer to it with sufficient ease. In this case, your space is best spent arguing your interpretation of your text rather than quoting it at length.
27. Format and Bibliography
 - a. Use at least one-inch margins on all sides of the page, perhaps leaving a larger left margin of 1.5 inches for a thesis or dissertation so that it can be properly bound (Turabian 2007, A.1.1). Although Turabian gives some flexibility with margin size, using its specified minimum margin width of 1 inch on all sides of the page is fairly standard as a local guideline.
 - b. Unless text is centered (e.g., headings), use left rather than full justification (Turabian 2007, 20.4.1). For example, in a typical paragraph, the first line should be indented, the rest of the lines should be flush with the left margin, and the right margin should be “ragged.”
 - c. Use a standard font face and size consistently throughout your document; random changes in font face and size should be scrupulously avoided. Typically, Times New Roman is the standard font face of choice for academic essays, although another similar font face might be usable. A font size of 12 points is preferable for a document’s main text, but a 10-point font size may be used as an alternative. The font size used for footnotes should not be larger than that used in the main text and should typically not be smaller than 10 points. So, if the document’s main text uses a 12-point font, footnotes may use either 10- or 12-point font. On the other hand, if the document’s main text uses a 10-point font,

footnotes should also use a 10-point font (Turabian 2007, A.1.2).

- d. Place page numbers appropriately. Place no page number on the title page, number front matter with Roman numerals beginning with “ii” on the page after the title page, and number document’s main text with Arabic numerals beginning with “1” on the first page of the paper’s body. Normally, for term papers, page numbers will appear in the upper, right-hand corner on all pages except the title page (Turabian 2007, A.2). Conventionally, neither front nor back matter counts toward satisfying an assignment’s length requirement. The technical steps required to create this page numbering can take some practice, but reviewing your word processor’s relevant help articles should clarify the steps required (e.g., [LibreOffice 3 \[pgs. 39–42\]](#); Microsoft Word [2003](#), [2007](#), [2010](#); [OpenOffice.org 3](#)).
- e. Consistently use appropriate heading formatting. See the Turabian manual for its suggested section heading formats, and do not print a heading at the bottom of a page (Turabian 2007, A.2.2).
- f. Do not include a space between a punctuation mark and a footnote number. A footnote number in a paper’s main text should appear immediately after a terminal punctuation mark with no intervening spacing.
- g. Use only one blank line between paragraphs. The body of a paper should be double-spaced throughout (except for block quotations). No extra line should be added between paragraphs (Turabian 2007, A.1.3, fig. A.9).
- h. Use only one space between a terminal punctuation mark and the beginning of the next sentence (Turabian 2007, 21.1, 21.5–21.6, A.1.3).
- i. Ensure that you consistently use the proper citation format. Turabian includes two separate citation styles: notes-bibliography (Turabian 2007, 16–17) and parenthetical citation-reference list (Turabian 2007, 18–19). Placement of the in-text citations in a footnote or a parenthetical reference easily distinguishes the two styles in this respect. Nevertheless, the two citation styles also have two different bibliography formats that may more easily be confused. For writers in Judeo-Christian Studies, the notes-bibliography format is standard, but local guidelines may prescribe differently in particular cases.
- j. Format footnotes appropriately.
 - i. Indent the first line of a footnote (including the note number) by the same amount as you indent the first line of a regular paragraph. Tabs or other firm formatting measures, rather than spaces, should be used to achieve the necessary indentation (Turabian 2007, 16.1.7, A.1.3).
 - ii. Do not italicize footnote numbers.
 - iii. Use single spacing inside each footnote, but put a blank line between each footnote and any immediately following footnote on the same page (Turabian 2007, 16.3.4, figs. A.9–A.10, A.12).
 - iv. Omit a blank line between the footnote rule and the first footnote on a page, but do not indent the footnote rule as you do with the first line of a footnote. The footnote rule should always start at the left margin

(Turabian 2007, figs. A.9–A.10, A.12).

- v. Note the place of publication properly (see Turabian 2007, 17.1.6). For works with multiple places of publication and possibly multiple publishers listed, cite the work according to the first-listed place of publication and the publisher's name appropriate for that location. When a place of publication is well-known, use only the city name. When a place of publication is not well-known or might easily be confused with another place with a similar name:
 1. If the place is within the United States, use the format: [City], [Standard, two-letter postal abbreviation].
 2. If the place is outside the United States, use the format: [City], [Appropriate local governmental entity, such as state or province]. For still greater specificity if necessary, the string ", [Country]" may be added to the end of this list after the appropriate local governmental entity.
- vi. To conserve space, authors may omit an initial "The" and abbreviations like "Co.," "Inc.," and "Publishing Co." in publishers' names (Turabian 2007, 17.1.6). Turabian does not mandate this practice, but writers in Judeo-Christian studies typically observe it.
- vii. When citing an edited volume with the editor's name before the title, place a comma after the abbreviation "ed."
- viii. Format authors' names appropriately.
 1. When citing or referring to an author with an academic or professional title (e.g., "Dr.," "M. D.," "Rev."), writers in Judeo-Christian Studies will generally omit this title and use only the author's name. When referring to an author in the text of a paper, the author's first and last name (e.g., "John Piper") or last name and initial(s) (e.g., "N. T. Wright") are generally only used for the first reference to that author.
 2. When citing or referring an author whose name includes two or more initials, use the initials as the author does, and place a non-breaking space after each initial (e.g., N. T. Wright, F. F. Bruce, J. B. Lightfoot; Turabian 2007, 24.2.1).
 3. When mentioning an author whose name contains an *Umlaut*, you should represent the *Umlaut* as part of that name's particular spelling. In many cases, a word processor or character map can be used to insert a symbol or special character that will properly display the *Umlaut* over the correct vowel. Representing an *Umlaut* as such is the preferred method. If you are not able to insert a single character that combines a particular vowel with an *Umlaut*, however, you should represent the *Umlaut* by adding an "e" after the vowel over which the *Umlaut* would normally appear. Thus, for example, "Andreas Köstenberger" or "Andreas

Koestenberger” would be appropriate, but not “Andreas Kostenberger.” Similarly, one might write “W. G. Kümmel” or “W. G. Kummel” but should not write “W. G. Kummel.”

4. Subsequent references to the same author in the paper’s main text should typically refer to that author only by the author’s last name (e.g., “Piper,” “Wright”; Turabian 2007, 24.2.1).
 5. When referring to authors in bibliographies, Turabian style requires that the family (or last) name be put first and that a comma and the given (or first) name or initials should follow. Thus, in a bibliography, one would have “Piper, John.” The period after the author’s last-listed given name or initial should not be doubled. Thus, “Wright, N. T.” would be appropriate but not “Wright, N. T..” (e.g., Turabian 2007, 17.1.1).
- ix. For the first use of a given source, employ the individual citation format most applicable to that source. Examples of important categories of sources for writers in Judeo-Christian Studies are given here according to the discipline’s standard notes-bibliography citation style preference. Please see your local guidelines to confirm whether this standard preference applies in your particular situation.
1. Standard books with one author and no editors, editions, or translators (Turabian 2007, 17.1.1)
 1. Craig L. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990), 17.
 3. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 17.

Blomberg, Craig L. *Interpreting the Parables*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990.
 2. Books with multiple authors or editors (Turabian 2007, 17.1.1)
 1. Walter C. Kaiser and Moisés Silva, *An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994), 75.
 3. Kaiser and Silva, *Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics*, 75.

Kaiser, Walter C., and Moisés Silva. *An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994.
 3. Books listed under an editor(s) instead of an author(s) (Turabian

2007, 17.1.1)

1. Moisés Silva, ed., *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996), 377.

3. Silva, *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation*, 377.

Silva, Moisés, ed. *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation*.
Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996.

4. Books listed under an editor(s) instead of an author(s) and found in an electronic database (Turabian 2007, 17.1.10)

1. Philip R. Davies, ed., *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures*, Library of Ancient Israel (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 36, <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=41120&site=ehost-live&scope=site&ebv=1> (accessed July 21, 2012).

3. Davies, *Scribes and Schools*, 36.

Davies, Philip R., ed. *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures*. Library of Ancient Israel. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.
<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=41120&site=ehost-live&scope=site&ebv=1> (accessed July 21, 2012).

5. Books with an author(s) and an editor(s) (Turabian 2007, 17.1.1)

1. Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*, ed. Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams, 7th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 59.

3. Turabian, *Manual for Writers*, 59.

Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*. Edited by Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams. 7th ed. Chicago:

University of Chicago Press, 2007.

6. Books with an author(s) and a translator(s) (Turabian 2007, 17.1.1)

1. Thomas Aquinas, *A Summa of the Summa*, ed. Peter Kreeft, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1990), 254.

3. Aquinas, *Summa*, 254.

Aquinas, Thomas. *A Summa of the Summa*. Edited by Peter Kreeft. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1990.

7. Specific editions of works (Turabian 2007, 17.1.3)

1. Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*, ed. Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams, 7th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 59.

3. Turabian, *Manual for Writers*, 59.

Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*. Edited by Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams. 7th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

8. Titled sections of edited collections (Turabian 2007, 17.1.8)

1. J. Maxwell Miller, "Reading the Bible Historically: The Historian's Approach," in *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*, ed. Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes, rev. ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), 17–34.

3. Miller, "Reading the Bible Historically," 17–34.

Miller, J. Maxwell. "Reading the Bible Historically: The Historian's Approach." In *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*, edited by Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes, 17–34. Rev. ed.

Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999.

9. Signed dictionary articles (Turabian 17.1.8)

1. James H. Charlesworth, "Apocrypha: Old Testament Apocrypha," in vol. 1 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman et al. (New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1992), 292–94.

3. Charlesworth, "Old Testament Apocrypha," 292–94.

Charlesworth, James H. "Apocrypha: Old Testament Apocrypha." In vol. 1 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, edited by David Noel Freedman, Astrid B. Beck, Gary A. Herion, David F. Graf, John David Pliens, Phillip C. Schmitz, and Leslie Barkley, 292–94. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1992.

10. Unsigned dictionary articles (Turabian 2007, 17.5.3)

1. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed., s.v. "καί."

3. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, s.v. "καί."

Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by Frederick W. Danker. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

11. Journal articles (Turabian 2007, 17.2.4)

1. Gabriel Barzalai, "Incidental Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Scrolls and Its Importance for the Study of the Second Temple Period," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14, no. 1 (2007): 15.

3. Barzalai, "Incidental Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Scrolls," 15.

Barzalai, Gabriel. "Incidental Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Scrolls and Its Importance for the Study of the Second Temple Period." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14, no. 1 (2007): 1–24.

12. Journal articles obtained from an electronic database (Turabian 2007, 17.2.7)

1. George J. Brooke, "Qumran Peshet: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre," *Revue de Qumran* 10, no. 4 (1981): 488, <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rft&AN=ATLA0000794502&site=ehost-live> (accessed September 22, 2009).

3. Brooke, "Qumran Peshet," 503.

Brooke, George J. "Qumran Peshet: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre." *Revue de Qumran* 10, no. 4 (1981): 483–503. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rft&AN=ATLA0000794502&site=ehost-live> (accessed September 22, 2009).

13. Journal articles from special issues (Turabian 2007, 17.2.6)

1. Michael W. Casey, "An Era of Controversy and Division: The Origins of the Broadway Church of Christ, Paducah, Kentucky," in "Perspectives on Division, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) and Churches of Christ," ed. Thomas H. Olbricht, special issue, *Restoration Quarterly* 27, no. 1 (1984): 14.

3. Casey, "An Era of Controversy and Division," 18.

Casey, Michael W. "An Era of Controversy and Division: The Origins of the Broadway Church of Christ, Paducah, Kentucky." In "Perspectives on Division, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) and Churches of Christ," ed. Thomas H. Olbricht. Special issue, *Restoration Quarterly* 27, no. 1. (1984): 2–22.

14. CD- or DVD-ROM resources (Turabian 2007, 17.5.8)

1. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, eds., *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, CD-ROM, Libronix Digital Library System, version 3.0g (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2007), 165.

3. Beale and Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 165.

Beale, G. K., and D. A. Carson, eds. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. CD-ROM, Libronix Digital Library System, version 3.0g. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2007.

15. Multi-volume works (Turabian 2007, 17.1.4)

1. John Lightfoot, *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica, Matthew–1 Corinthians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1859; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989), 2:100.

3. Lightfoot, *Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica*, 3:65.

Lightfoot, John. *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica, Matthew–1 Corinthians*. 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1859; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1989.

16. A titled volume in a multi-volume work (Turabian 2007, 17.1.4)

1. William Baird, *From Deism to Tübingen*, vol. 1 of *History of New Testament Research* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992), 176.

3. Baird, *From Deism to Tübingen*, 176.

Baird, William. *From Deism to Tübingen*. Vol. 1 of *History of New Testament Research*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992.

17. A titled volume in a series (Turabian 2013, 17.1.5)

1. James D. G. Dunn, *Romans*, Word Biblical Commentary, ed. Bruce M. Metzger et al., vol. 38 (Dallas: Word, 1988), 463.

3. Dunn, *Romans*, 325.

Dunn, James D. G. *Romans*. Word Biblical Commentary. Edited by Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, Ralf P. Martin, and Lynn Allan Losie, vol. 38. Dallas: Word, 1988.

18. A thesis or dissertation (Turabian 2007, 17.6.1)

1. J. David Stark, "The Hermeneutical Roles of the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus of Nazareth in the Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts and the Epistle to the Romans" (PhD diss., Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011), 125.

3. Stark, "The Hermeneutical Roles of the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus of Nazareth," 125.

Stark, J. David. "The Hermeneutical Roles of the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus of Nazareth in the Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts and the Epistle to the Romans." PhD diss., Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011.

19. Reprints (Turabian 2007, 17.1.3, 19.1.4)

1. John Lightfoot, *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica, Matthew–1 Corinthians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1859; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1989), 2:100.

3. Lightfoot, *Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica*, 3:65.

Lightfoot, John. *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica, Matthew–1 Corinthians*. 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1859; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1989.

20. Lectures obtained from an electronic database (Turabian 2007, 17.2.7, 17.6.2)

1. J. R. Davila, "The War Rule" (lecture, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, Scotland, February 22, 2005), http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/~www_sd/warrule.html (accessed February 21, 2008).

3. Davila, "The War Rule."

Davila, J. R. "The War Rule." Lecture, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, Scotland, February 22, 2005. http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/~www_sd/warrule.html (accessed February 21, 2008).

21. Electronic books (*Chicago Manual of Style* 2010, 14.166)

a. If print-equivalent pagination is available:

1. Eric Metaxas, *Bonhoeffer: Pastor, Martyr, Prophet, Spy*. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2010), Kindle edition, 358.

3. Metaxas, *Bonhoeffer*, 358.

Metaxas, Eric. *Bonhoeffer: Pastor, Martyr, Prophet, Spy*.
Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2010. Kindle edition.

b. If print-equivalent pagination is not available:

1. Eric Metaxas, *Bonhoeffer: Pastor, Martyr, Prophet, Spy*.
(Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2010), Kindle edition, chap. 23.

3. Metaxas, *Bonhoeffer*, chap. 23.

Metaxas, Eric. *Bonhoeffer: Pastor, Martyr, Prophet, Spy*.
Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2010. Kindle edition.

- x. Use abbreviated footnotes when appropriate. For a subsequent reference to a given source, use the short note format (Turabian 2007, 16.4.1) unless the immediately preceding citation comes from the same source. In this case, use the citation format “Ibid., [page number].” If the source and page number(s) in one citation are both identical to the source and page number(s) in the immediately preceding citation, simply use the abbreviation “Ibid.” in the second footnote (Turabian 2007, 16.4.2).
- k. Format the title page properly (Turabian 2007, figure A.1).
- l. Format the bibliography properly (Turabian 2007, 16.1.7, A.1.3, A.2.3, Bibliography or Reference List; figs. A.15, A.16).
 - i. In the notes-bibliography citation style, bibliography entries should not be numbered but should be arranged in alphabetical order according to the first term(s) present in a particular bibliography item’s text (e.g., the last name of the work’s first-listed author or editor). For essays, the whole bibliography is typically presented as a single list without additional categorization into subcategories of different, related items.
 - ii. Each bibliography item should be single spaced with a blank line between it and the next bibliography item listed on the same page. Each bibliography item should be indented the same amount as a normal paragraph, but the indentation should be in the hanging rather than first-line format. In this way, only the first line of a given bibliography entry will be touching the left margin. All other lines will be indented by the same amount as a normal paragraph is indented. Rather than spaces, tabs or other firm formatting measures, rather than spaces, should be employed to achieve the necessary indentation.
 - iii. If your bibliography lists two works consecutively that are alphabetized under the same author or editor’s name, after the first entry for this author or editor’s name, you should replace the name with three consecutive em dashes (one: —; three: ———; for an example, see Turabian 2007, fig. A.16).

1. For Windows users, an em dash may be inserted by turning on the Num Lock, holding down the Alt key, typing 0151 on the keypad, and releasing the Alt key.
 2. Microsoft Word (XP, 2003) users can construct a keystroke shortcut by clicking the Insert menu > Symbol... > Special Characters > Em Dash > Shortcut Key. Hold down the desired shortcut key combination (e.g., Alt + m), release the key combination, and click Assign.
 3. OpenOffice.org (3.1) users can construct a keystroke shortcut under Microsoft Windows by clicking the Tools menu > Macros > Record Macro. Hold down the Alt key, type 0151 on the keypad, and release the Alt key. Click Stop Recording, name the macro appropriately (e.g., EmDash), and click close. Click the Tools menu > Customize > Keyboard. Select the desired key combination (e.g., Ctrl + M). Under Functions in the Category box, click OpenOffice.org macros > user > Standard > Module1, and choose the new macro (e.g., EmDash). Click the Modify button, and click OK.
- m. Format quotations of five lines or more into block quotations. Block quotations should omit quotation marks around them but should be presented (a) single-spaced and (b) indented on all lines as far as the first line of a normal paragraph (Turabian 2007, 25.2.2).
 - n. When using Arabic numerals to designate page ranges, use complete numbers or abbreviate them consistently. A given range's minimum and maximum number may be written out in full in Arabic numerals at all times. Or, the range's maximum may be abbreviated in certain ways and at certain times (Turabian 2007, 23.2.4). Please see your local guideline's preferences for how these range maximums are to be displayed.
 - o. Use correct era abbreviations in the correct places. An author should choose either the BC/AD or the BCE/CE abbreviation set and follow that choice consistently. No periods should be used with either abbreviation set (i.e., "BCE" not "B.C.E."). For the BCE/CE pair, the abbreviation always follows the year (e.g., 70 CE). For the BC/AD set, BC follows the year (e.g., 150 BC), but AD precedes the year (e.g., AD 70; Turabian 2007, 23.3.2).
 - p. Type biblical languages properly, and generally cite the lexical form of a given word unless citing that word in context with a larger phrase in the biblical text.
 - i. For Greek, change a grave accent to an acute when the word with the grave is not followed immediately by another Greek word. Thus, write δέ rather than δέ̄, but write ὁ δέ̄ κύριος. Additionally, be sure to type a final sigma (ς) when a sigma ends a word. For Greek miniscules, always include the appropriate diacritics (i.e., accents, breathing marks).
 - ii. For Hebrew and Aramaic, omit vowel points and Massoretic cantillation marks unless they are relevant to the argument being made.

- iii. The line spacing for biblical language fonts may be larger than the line spacing for the Times New Roman font. Thus, a line with 12-point, Times New Roman font English text and 12-point, SBL Greek font text may appear to have more space between itself and the lines around it than it would if the line contained only Times New Roman text. To compensate for this typographical quirk, decrease the font size of the biblical language text enough so that the line spacing returns approximately to what it would be with only Times New Roman text, but do not decrease the biblical language font size so much that the Greek text becomes difficult to read on a printed page.
- q. Abbreviate biblical citations consistently.
 - i. Never write out a verse reference (e.g., John, chapter one, verse one). Instead, always use the abbreviated citation form with Arabic numerals (e.g., John 1:1).
 - ii. Choose one set of book name abbreviations that the Turabian manual provides, and employ that set consistently when citing a book with a chapter and verse number (see Turabian 24.6.3). Note, however, that book names that begin sentences should always be spelled fully (e.g., “In Phlm 1:1, Paul and Timothy address the letter to its recipient. First Thessalonians 1:1 also includes Silvanus in the letter’s list of senders.”) Additionally, when citing a book and chapter without a verse number or range, spell out the name of the book (Turabian 2007, 24.6).
 - iii. Whenever spelling out a book name in full, however, use the concise form of the book name. Consequently, instead of something like “the Book of the Prophet Isaiah 1,” prefer simply “Isaiah 1,” and in place of “the Revelation of Saint John the Divine 5,” write simply “Revelation 5.”
 - iv. When using an English Bible translation, cite the translation abbreviation (see Turabian 24.6.4) with the text quoted. Alternatively, if only or mainly one translation is used, a footnote may be placed at the translation’s first use explaining that, unless otherwise noted, all English Bible citations are taken from this primary translation. Bible translations, however, are not typically included in bibliographies (Turabian 17.5.2).
- r. Italicize non-English words in Roman alphabets or transliterations.

Common Editorial Marks

| | | | |
|--------------|---|--------------|---|
| ab | abbreviations, 37 | num | use of numbers, 38 |
| agr | agreement, 9 | p | error in punctuation, 42 |
| appr | appropriateness, 28 | par | error in parallelism, 22 |
| awk | awkward construction | pass | ineffective use of passive voice, 10.38 |
| ca | wrong case, 11 | pv | unnecessary shift in point of view, 23 |
| cap | use a capital letter, 41 | R | rewrite page or portion indicated |
| coh | coherence, 44.5 | ref | faulty pronoun reference, 20 |
| comp | faulty comparison, 12 | rep | unnecessary repetition |
| coord | faulty coordination, 16 | ro | run-on sentence, 14 |
| dict | see your dictionary | sp | error in spelling |
| div | division of words, 39 | sub | faulty subordination, 17 |
| dm | dangling modifier, 19 | t | error in tense, 10.18–10.30 |
| emph | emphasis, 25, 44.6 | trite | triteness, 33 |
| ex | exactness and vividness, 29 | u | lack of unity, 15, 44.4 |
| fig | figurative language, 30 | var | lack of variety, 26 |
| frag | sentence fragment, 13 | vf | wrong verb form, 10.7–10.17 |
| gl | glossary of diction, 35 | wdy | wordiness, 24, 34 |
| gr | error in grammar | ww | wrong word |
| id | idioms, 31 | X | obvious fault |
| il | illegible writing | ¶ | begin a new paragraph |
| jarg | jargon and gobbledegook, 32 | No ¶ | no new paragraph |
| lc | use lower case, no capital, 41 | ^ | omission of necessary words |
| logic | illogical construction, 21 | ⊕ | join the words |
| m | wrong mood, 10.39–10.44 | # | space between the words |
| mm | misplaced modifier, 18 | | |
| mod | modifier misused, 12 | | |
| ms | manuscript form, 36 | | |
| nc | not clear, 21 (also used to indicate general lack of clarity) | | |

Some other, editorial marks that may appear are:

- ~ = reverse the order of the marked elements
- (,), or O = a suggestion has been made on a similar issue elsewhere
- AW = this document, Advice for Writers in Judeo-Christian Studies
- cit = add a citation
- col = colloquial
- cs = comma splice

¹ For this table, see Chapman 1996, inside back cover.

- i = italicize
- inform = informal
- IS = [Identifying Sources for a Scholarly Bibliography](#)
- LG(s) = local guideline(s)
- mw = missing word
- ni = do not italicize
- secel = the identified portion or section's relevance to the main argument bears further clarification
- si = split infinitive
- SW = see Strunk and White
- T = see Turabian's *Manual*
- wc = questionable word choice

A Brief Bibliography of Writing Resources

Alexander, Patrick H., John F. Kutsko, James D. Ernest, Shirley Decker-Lucke, and David L. Petersen, eds. 1999. *The SBL Handbook of Style for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.

Baskervill, William Malone, and James Witt Sewell. 1895. *An English Grammar for the Use of High School, Academy, and College Classes*. New York: American.
<http://books.google.com/books?id=KCJKAAAAIAAJ>.

Bilsky, Manuel, McRea Hazlett, Robert E. Streeter, and Richard M. Weaver. 1953. "Looking for an Argument." *College English* 14, no. 4: 210–16.

Blount, Alma, and Clark Sutherland Northup. 1914. "An English Grammar for Use in High and Normal Schools and in Colleges." Vol. 4. *Progressive Studies in English*. New York: Henry Holt. <http://books.google.com/books?id=4OAAAAAYAAJ>.

Browne, M. Neil. 2007. *Asking the Right Questions: A Guide to Critical Thinking*. 8th ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Carpenter, George Rice. 1902. *Principles of English Grammar for the Use of Schools. Text-Books on English*. New York/London: MacMillan.
<http://books.google.com/books?id=YgFMAAAAMAAJ>.

Chapman, James A. 1996. *A Handbook of Grammar and Composition*. 3rd ed. Pensacola, Fla.: A Beka Book.

Corbett, Edward P. J., and Rosa A. Eberly. 2000. *The Elements of Reasoning*. 2nd ed. The Elements of Composition Series. Needham Heights, Mass.: Pearson.

Crider, Scott F. 2005. *Office of Assertion: An Art of Rhetoric for the Academic Essay*.

- Wilmington, Del.: Intercollegiate Studies Institute.
- Donald, Robert B. 1996. *Word Power*. In *Writing Clear Essays*, 31ff. 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2005. *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Huddleston, Rodney D. 1988. *English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
<http://books.google.com/books?id=R4gl7uo7QTMC>.
- Huddleston, Rodney D., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Koopman, Harry Lyman. 1896. *The Mastery of Books: Hints on Reading and the Use of Libraries*. New York: American. <http://books.google.com/books?id=EjI-AAAAIAAJ>.
- Leedy, Paul D., and Jeanne E. Ormrod. 2010. *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. 9th ed. MyEducationLab. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Merriam-Webster. 1994. *Concise Dictionary of English Usage*. 1st ed. Springfield, Mass.: Merriam-Webster. <http://books.google.com/books?id=2yJusP0vrdgC>.
- Strunk Jr., William, and E. B. White. 2000. *The Elements of Style*. 4th ed. New York: Longman.
- Turabian, Kate L. 2007. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*. Ed. Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams. 7th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Weston, Anthony. 2000. *A Rulebook for Arguments*. 3rd ed. Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett.
- Williams, Joseph M. 1995. *Style: Toward Clarity and Grace*. Chicago: University of Chicago.