

Studia Antiqua Guidelines for Submissions

Length: Submissions should not exceed 20 pages double spaced. (excluding cover page and bibliography)

Format: 12 pt font (Times New Roman), double spaced, 1 inch margins, papers must be typed. For foreign language fonts (Greek and Hebrew) please use Unicode. Free Greek and Hebrew Unicode fonts can be downloaded from the SBL website: <https://www.sbl-site.org/educational/biblicalfonts.aspx>

Use footnotes using Arabic numerals (e.g. 1, 2, 3, . . .) and include a separate bibliography at end of paper. Follow footnote style, journal abbreviations, abbreviations of ancient texts, as well as other kinds of general abbreviations follow those given in *The SBL Handbook of Style (Second Edition): For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).

Plagiarism is the unacknowledged use of someone else's ideas or words. Plagiarized papers will be rejected. If you use the words of someone else they **must** be enclosed in quotation marks and a footnote given. In order to avoid plagiarism it is not sufficient simply to substitute a few synonyms in the original; that still amounts to theft of the author's argument and ideas.

A good submission should have the following elements:

1. It should begin with a clear and succinct statement of the *problem or issue* to be addressed, and a brief outline of the text or texts relevant to the problem. This statement will not come easily and requires a good deal of thought; but the clearer you are able to state the *issue*, the easier it will be to determine the appropriate *method* for addressing the issue, and the more intelligible will be the relationship of the various parts of the paper one to another.
2. *Status quaestionis*: The paper should provide a *succinct* account of the scholarly positions that have, up to now, been taken on the problem. You can do this by organizing the *status quaestionis* historically or chronologically (i.e., by tracing the history of the debate on the problem); or you can proceed analytically, breaking the problem down into its logical components and aligning scholarly opinion on this template.
3. A discussion of relevant *background issues* (e.g., legal issues; literary antecedents; issues of historicity; heuristic definitions of relevant phenomena; etc.),
4. An *analysis* of the texts identified in #1 in light of the history of scholarship (#2) and the relevant background issues (#3).
5. A conclusion indicating which of the available interpretive options seems to be the most cogent (and *why*). A representative bibliography. The bibliography can be classified, and the longer and more diverse it is, the more helpful classification is. It is sometimes useful to distinguish primary texts from secondary treatments; some writers also separate *Hilfsmittel* (lexicas, concordances, etc.) from primary and secondary texts. It is imperative, however, that your citations be *complete, consistent* and *accurate*.

