



AUTHOR GUIDELINES FOR THE COMPOSITION OF A REVIEW

I. A review should preferably include two parts:

- The **first** concerns a detailed description of the work and its precise contextualization in the scientific context of reference;
- The **second** part contains the commentary and the critical section. Without compromising his/her critical approach, each reviewer is advised to exercise the **utmost historiographical and philosophical-theoretical caution** in the formulation of his/her review.

The division into the two above-described parts **is not exhaustive** and must not be blindly followed; each review is intended as a **broad-based philosophical or historical-philosophical discussion** in relation to the volume in question: therefore, it is not a strictly “editorial” review. For these reasons, while including the parts described above, the reviewer is not required to follow the proposed outline in an excessively schematic way.

2. The author of the review must send a short note regarding his/her *curriculum* and activity, specifying his/her e-mail address and institutional membership (if applicable).

3. The review must **not exceed 10,000-15,000 characters including spaces**. Reviews of national and international volumes are accepted in Italian, English, French, German and Spanish.

4. At the beginning of the review, the reviewer must provide the following bibliographical information: **Surname, name [(ed./eds.)], title in bold italics**, publisher, city year, [number of pages] pp., [Price in €].

5. If quotations from the reviewed text are included in the review, it is necessary to insert them between «» and to indicate the page (p.) from which the citations are drawn. In an Italian text, terms in a foreign language must always be placed in **italics**; the words or expressions which the reviewer wishes to **emphasize** must be *italicized*. For all other expressive forms, possibly including **more colloquial** or common expressions, the use of “” is acceptable.

Terms or quotations in ancient Greek, or in other ancient and modern languages that use different alphabets, must be typed in a Unicode font (for example, New Athena Unicode: <http://apagreek-keys.org/NAUdownload.html>) or transliterated into Latin characters **without accents**.

It is generally preferable not to include footnotes in the review.

6. Abbreviations:

cf. = compare;

(ed.) = when dealing with only one editor of a work, regardless of language;

(eds.) = when dealing with multiple editors of a work, regardless of language;

ibidem = when the quote also matches the page number;

Id. = to indicate the same author mentioned above, regardless of gender and number;

infra = to refer to subsequent pages in one's work;

ivi., p. = when you have a quote from the same work mentioned in the previous note, but with a different page;

f. = following (single page);

ff. = following (two or more pages);

p. = page;

pp. = pages;

sic = indicates the accentuation of a term or passage quoted to perhaps highlight an error, or data present in the original text;

spec. = especially;

supra = to refer to previous pages of one's work;

t. = tome;

v. = see;

vol. = volume;

vols. = volumes.

7. If other works are mentioned in the review, it is necessary to provide complete bibliographical information according to the following model: M. Rossi, *Mickey Mouse and Plato: Western Metaphysics from Mouseton to Athens Passing through Duckburg*, Laterza, Roma-Bari 1987. In the review, if a work is mentioned **a second time or several times**, use the usual form: M. Rossi, *op. cit.*, p. 38, or M. Rossi, *Mickey Mouse and Plato*, cit., p. 38; in the case of an article – which must be cited for the first time in full, as follows: N. Bianchi, *The Soul of Uncle Scrooge from Pythagoras to Galen*, «Bulletin of Monastic Studies» 39 (1969), pp. 3-28 – the formula *op. cit.* changes to *art. cit.*, although the following method of quotation can also be used: N. Bianchi, *The Soul of Uncle Scrooge*, cit. In the case of a contribution in a collective volume, use the following method of quotation: L. De Brilli, *The deliberative actions of Grandma Duck and the witch Magica De Spell: A Comparison*, in V. Rosi-B. De Sanctis (eds.), *Studies on Action and Behavior*, Bibliopolis, Naples 1996, pp.156-211.

8. The file containing the review **must be sent** in **doc/doc.x** format or possibly as a **PDF** (if non-Latin characters are used) to the following e-mail address: redazione@syzetesis.it **or** to one of the two editors:

Marco Tedeschini (marco.tedeschini@uniroma2.it);
Francesco Verde (francesco.verde@uniroma1.it).

The submission must be made strictly after a maximum of **90 days** from the actual delivery of the volume.

9. Reviewers are kindly invited to **strictly comply with** the above editorial rules and, in particular, to **respect delivery times**.

10. Despite being read and examined by the editorial staff, reviews will **not** be submitted to anonymous reviewers.

11. The **copyright** of the review belongs to the author. Each review is freely downloadable; the **only two conditions** for reproduction are:

- (1) clearly state that **the reproduced text is taken from** <http://www.syzetesis.it/rivista.html>;
- (2) cite the **full name and surname of the reviewer**.

12. All Associates and qualified interested parties who intend to review a volume that has been published recently (**at most in the two calendar years preceding the request**) by a national or international publishing house **must promptly request a copy-essay to be sent for review** by contacting Francesco Verde at the email address francesco.verde@uniroma1.it and clearly specifying all the references.

13. All the volumes requested will normally be sent by the publishing houses to the **registered office of the Philosophical Association** (Via dei Laterani n ° 36-00184, Rome); the reviewer will be **duly notified** of the arrival of the volume, which can then be obtained according to different and appropriate delivery methods.

Last updated: **November 2021**