

## The verbose-trad2 style

This is another traditional style which uses scholarly abbreviations like *ibidem* and *idem*. Despite its name, the ‘logic’ of this style is more closely related to styles like `verbose-ibid` and `verbose-inote` than to the rather special citation scheme implemented in the `verbose-trad1` style.

### Additional package options

#### The `ibidpage` option

The scholarly abbreviation *ibidem* is sometimes taken to mean both ‘same author + same title’ and ‘same author + same title + same page’ in traditional citation schemes. By default, this is not the case with this style because it may lead to ambiguous citations. With `ibidpage=true` a page range postnote will be suppressed in an *ibidem* citation if the last citation was to the same page range. With `ibidpage=false` the postnote is not omitted. Citations to different page ranges than the previous always produce the page ranges with either setting. The default setting is `ibidpage=false`.

Consider the following example citations

```
\cite[12]{cicero}  
\cite[12]{cicero}  
\cite[12]{worman}  
\cite[13]{worman}
```

If `ibidpage` is set to `true`, the citations come out – shortened – as

Cicero, *De natura deorum*, p. 12  
*ibid.*  
Worman, *The Cast of Character*, p. 12  
*ibid.*, p. 13

The shortened result for `ibidpage=false` is

Cicero, *De natura deorum*, p. 12  
*ibid.*, p. 12  
Worman, *The Cast of Character*, p. 12  
*ibid.*, p. 13

#### The dashed option

A case related to the definition of *ibidem* is the scope of the *ibidem* and *idem* replacements. By default, this style will only use such abbreviations if the respective citations are given in the same footnote or in consecutive footnotes. The point of this restriction is also to avoid potentially ambiguous citations. Here’s an example:

```
...\footcite{aristotle:anima}  
...\footcite{aristotle:anima}  
...\footnote{Averroes touches upon this issue in his \emph{Epistle  
on the Possibility of Conjunction}.}  
...\footcite{aristotle:anima}
```

This could be rendered as follows:

- 1 Aristotle. *De Anima*. Ed. by Robert Drew Hicks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Averroes touches upon this issue in his *Epistle on the Possibility of Conjunction*.
- 4 Ibid.

What does the *ibidem* in the last footnote refer to? The last formal citation, as given in the first and the second footnote (Aristotle), or the informal reference in the third one (Averroes)? Too avoid such citations, this style will only use *ibidem* and *idem* replacements if the respective citations are given in the same footnote or in consecutive footnotes:

- 1 Aristotle. *De Anima*. Ed. by Robert Drew Hicks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Averroes touches upon this issue in his *Epistle on the Possibility of Conjunction*.
- 4 Aristotle, *De Anima*, op. cit.

Depending on your writing and citing habits, however, you may prefer the less strict *ibidem* and *idem* handling. You can force that by setting the package option `strict=false` in the preamble. It is still possible to mark a manually inserted discursive citation with `\mancite` when required:

```
...\footcite{aristotle:anima}  
...\footnote{\mancite Averroes touches upon this issue in his  
               \emph{Epistle on the Possibility of Conjunction}.}  
...\footcite{aristotle:anima}
```

This will suppress the *ibidem* in the last footnote.

### The `citepages` option

Use this option to fine-tune the formatting of the `pages` and `pagetotal` fields in verbose citations. When an entry with a `pages` field is cited for the first time and the `postnote` is a page number or a page range, the citation will end with two page specifications:

Author. “Title.” In: *Book*, pp. 100–150, p. 125.

In this example, “125” is the `postnote` and “100–150” is the `pages` field (there are similar issues with the `pagetotal` field). This may be confusing to the reader. The `citepages` option controls how to deal with these fields in this case. The option works as follows, given these citations as an example:

```
\cite{key}  
\cite[a note]{key}  
\cite[125]{key}
```

`citepages=permit` allows duplicates, i.e., the style will print both the `pages/pagetotal` and the `postnote`. This is the default setting:

Author. “Title.” In: *Book*, pp. 100–150.  
 Author. “Title.” In: *Book*, pp. 100–150, a note.  
 Author. “Title.” In: *Book*, pp. 100–150, p. 125.

`citepages=suppress` unconditionally suppresses the `pages/pagetotal` fields in citations, regardless of the `postnote`:

Author. “Title.” In: *Book*.  
 Author. “Title.” In: *Book*, a note.  
 Author. “Title.” In: *Book*, p. 125.

`citepages=omit` suppresses the `pages/pagetotal` in the third case only. They are still printed if there is no `postnote` or if the `postnote` is not a number or range:

Author. “Title.” In: *Book*, pp. 100–150.  
 Author. “Title.” In: *Book*, pp. 100–150, a note.  
 Author. “Title.” In: *Book*, p. 125.

`citepages=separate` separates the `pages/pagetotal` from the `postnote` in the third case:

Author. “Title.” In: *Book*, pp. 100–150.  
 Author. “Title.” In: *Book*, pp. 100–150, a note.  
 Author. “Title.” In: *Book*, pp. 100–150, esp. p. 125.

The string “especially” in the third case is the bibliography string `thiscite`, which may be redefined.

### The dashed option

By default, this style replaces recurrent authors/editors in the bibliography by a dash so that items by the same author or editor are visually grouped. This feature is controlled by the package option `dashed`. Setting `dashed=false` in the preamble will disable this feature. The default setting is `dashed=true`.

### Hints

If you want terms such as *ibidem* to be printed in italics, redefine `\mkibid` as follows:

```
\renewcommand*{\mkibid}{\emph}
```

## \footcite examples

This is just filler text.<sup>1</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>2</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>3</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>4</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>5</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>6</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>7</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>8</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Aristotle. *De Anima*. Ed. by Robert Drew Hicks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907.

<sup>2</sup>Averroes. *The Epistle on the Possibility of Conjunction with the Active Intellect by Ibn Rushd with the Commentary of Moses Narboni*. Ed. and trans. by Kalman P. Bland. Moreshet: Studies in Jewish History, Literature and Thought 7. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1982.

<sup>3</sup>Aristotle, *De Anima*, op. cit., p. 26.

<sup>4</sup>Averroes, *Possibility of Conjunction*, op. cit., pp. 59–61.

<sup>5</sup>Aristotle. *Physics*. Trans. by P. H. Wicksteed and F. M. Cornford. New York: G. P. Putnam, 1929.

<sup>6</sup>Idem, *De Anima*, op. cit.

<sup>7</sup>Idem, *Physics*, op. cit., p. 55.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 25.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 25.

This is just filler text.<sup>10</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>11</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>12</sup>  
This is just filler text.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>Immanuel Kant. “Kritik der praktischen Vernunft.” In: *Kants Werke. Akademie Textausgabe*. Vol. 5: *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft. Kritik der Urtheilskraft*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968, pp. 1–163 (henceforth cited as KpV).

<sup>11</sup>Immanuel Kant. “Kritik der Urtheilskraft.” In: *Kants Werke. Akademie Textausgabe*. Vol. 5: *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft. Kritik der Urtheilskraft*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968, pp. 165–485 (henceforth cited as KU).

<sup>12</sup>KpV, p. 24.

<sup>13</sup>KU, pp. 59–63.

## `\autocite` examples

This is just filler text.<sup>14</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>15</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>16</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>17</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>18</sup> This is just filler text.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>Aristotle. *The Rhetoric of Aristotle with a commentary by the late Edward Meredith Cope*. Ed. and comm. by Edward Meredith Cope. 3 vols. Cambridge University Press, 1877.

<sup>15</sup>Averroes, *Possibility of Conjunction*, op. cit.

<sup>16</sup>Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, op. cit.

<sup>17</sup>Idem, *De Anima*, op. cit.

<sup>18</sup>Idem, *Physics*, op. cit.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

## References

- Aristotle. *De Anima*. Ed. by Robert Drew Hicks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907.
- *Physics*. Trans. by P. H. Wicksteed and F. M. Cornford. New York: G. P. Putnam, 1929.
- *The Rhetoric of Aristotle with a commentary by the late Edward Meredith Cope*. Ed. and comm. by Edward Meredith Cope. 3 vols. Cambridge University Press, 1877.
- Averroes. *The Epistle on the Possibility of Conjunction with the Active Intellect by Ibn Rushd with the Commentary of Moses Narboni*. Ed. and trans. by Kalman P. Bland. Moreshet: Studies in Jewish History, Literature and Thought 7. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1982.
- Kant, Immanuel. “Kritik der praktischen Vernunft.” In: *Kants Werke. Akademie Textausgabe*. Vol. 5: *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft. Kritik der Urtheilskraft*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968, pp. 1–163.
- “Kritik der Urtheilskraft.” In: *Kants Werke. Akademie Textausgabe*. Vol. 5: *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft. Kritik der Urtheilskraft*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968, pp. 165–485.