In the course of making indexes it is useful to stop and assess one's own work. Anne-Marie Arnold's paper, 'Evaluating an index', begins by saying that such an evaluation is both complex and problematic. There is no single set of guidelines for making an index. Subject matter is various, terminology multifarious, users only to be guessed at. She lists the different criteria that have been adopted in the few studies of index evaluation that exist. She also adumbrates the expectation of the different groups of people concerned with an index and the constraints that may be put upon the indexer, namely users, individuals mentioned in the index, authors, publishers and the standards and guidelines. She ends by pointing to the benefits that may be derived from index evaluation, such as assessing the competence of students and of training courses and of indexers seeking recognition.

The final paper, read by Marlene Burger, is entitled 'Indexing software: MACREX as exemplar'. She lists the ways in which software can assist the indexer: displaying related entries, arranging entries in various ways, cumulating and updating, and generating a printed layout. She gives advice on how to choose appropriate software, mentioning in particular CINDEX, MACREX and SKY, and ends by giving a brief overview of MACREX and her own experience of using it.

Mary Piggott, *formerly University College London*

Indexing aids

The Cambridge grammar of the English language. Rodney Huddleston and Geoffrey K. Pullum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. xvii, 1842 pp. 25 cm. Bibliog., indexes. ISBN 0-521-43146-8 (hbk): £100.00 ($150.00)

We have been waiting for the 'Cambridge grammar' for a long time. I recall visiting Rodney Huddleston in Australia five years ago, during which he bemoaned the problems he was having in maintaining the momentum of this huge project, at that time already five years underway. It is at last finished, thanks to the collaboration of Geoffrey Pullum, who joins him as the co-author of the book, and eleven other reinforcements. At 1842 pages it is longer and heavier than the previous record-holder, *A comprehensive grammar of the English language* (1985) by Randolph Quirk *et al*. We evidently have to extend our notion of 'comprehensive'.

Huddleston and Pullum have a right to be named as 'authors', as opposed to 'compilers' or 'editors'. Huddleston has written seven of the 20 chapters himself and collaborated in all the others. Pullum has been involved in six of them. Nine of the chapters use further authors. Tom Mylne is named in the preface as playing a major part in the index compilation.

The authors describe the book as 'a synchronic, descriptive grammar of general-purpose, present-day, international Standard English' (p. 2), and as such it falls within the tradition of 20th-century reference grammars which goes back through Quirk to Otto Jespersen. Huddleston and Pullum acknowledge the Quirk grammar as the one which 'pointed the way' for their own work (p.xvi), calling it the 'fullest and most influential grammar' of the period. Indeed, one of the motivations for producing yet another such work was their desire to re-analyse areas of English reference grammar considered in need of rethinking, especially in the light of the generative approaches to linguistics which developed in the second half of the 20th century.

The book is not, accordingly, a historical account or a usage guide. Nor, the authors say, is it an account of the grammar associated with special varieties of English, such as newspaper headlines, science, or poetry (a disclaimer not to be taken too literally, for they do make references to special usage when they need to, as in the discussion of the 'timeless' present tense in stage directions). But in this respect it is certainly more restricted in its stylistic range than Quirk et al. or the other big reference grammar of recent years by Douglas Biber *et al.* (1999).

What the 'Cambridge' may lack in stylistic range, however, it more than makes up for in depth. A great deal of space, identified by blue-tinted 'asides', is devoted to a discussion of the reasons for

analytic decisions. These are usually quite short, but sometimes (as in the arguments for alternative analyses of comparative constructions) can be four pages or so. This convention alone takes reference grammars in a new direction, making the 'Cambridge' the most theoretically aware work of its kind to have appeared. The contributors repeatedly bring their reasoning to the forefront, making the reader see why decisions are made, and thus fostering a critical response. This can only be a good thing, given that so much popular thinking about grammar during the past 200 years has been swallowed uncritically whole.

The book follows the Quirk approach in being fairly eclectic; there is no 'single theory' here. For example, alongside several notions whose intellectual history derives from generative grammar we find central use being made of the notion of 'clause'. But for those used to the Quirk approach, there are major differences both in analysis and terminology. For instance, the concept of preposition is given a more central role, analysed as the head of a phrase in its own right, and thus allowed to include virtually all of what are traditionally called subordinate conjunctions. People used to a SVO (subject–verb–object) analysis of a clause must get used to SPO (where P = 'predicator') or CPC (where C = 'complement of the predicator'). Some of the newer grammatical terms could have done with clearer definition at times: for instance, 'percolation' turns up repeatedly, but is exemplified rather than defined. Those yearning for the old days will be happy to note that the terms 'accusative' and 'gerund' turn up from time to time.

The 'Cambridge' is a fascinating mixture of developed and underdeveloped topics – full of insights and fresh perspectives, yet sometimes unexpectedly thin. Several illuminating notions from recent linguistics are given a clear and full presentation – such as the concept of a 'light' verb (*gave* in *She gave us advice* is 'lighter' in content than the corresponding verb in *She advised us*). And there is far more on semantics and pragmatics (the meaning and use of sentences) than previous reference grammars have included. On the other hand, some topics are treated very briefly, such as minor clause types (e.g. *Careful!, So be it*) and parenthetical expressions. I missed a full treatment of the expressions which the Quirk grammar calls 'comment clauses' – *you know, you see, mind you*, etc.

Life may be too short to master two reference grammars in intimate detail, and it is the Quirk grammar which (having compiled its index) has occupied a worryingly large proportion of my own life. So it is a pity that, having acknowledged the particular influence of the Quirk approach, the authors did not draw readers' attention to the specific points at which their analysis diverges. They are scrupulous in contrasting their approach with 'traditional' (i.e. pre-linguistics) analyses, but it seems perverse for a book which presumably sees itself as providing an alternative to Quirk not to draw attention explicitly to the alternatives it is proposing. Linguists, teachers, and other language professionals would have been much helped by this additional perspective. If the Quirk grammar has 'pointed the way', it would have been most helpful to have the various crossroads identified where Huddleston and Pullum found it necessary to travel along a different way.

The index takes up 62 pages – 3 per cent, which is a bit light for such a large book (it was 6 per cent in the Quirk grammar). There are two indexes, in fact – a very full 32-page index of lexical items, and a somewhat less full conceptual index. For the most part the indexes are user-friendly, though some entries (e.g. *ambiguity, be, stress, style restrictions*) are too long and cry out for a breakdown into sub-entries. Alphabetical order is word-by-word, but sub-entries ignore the function word, so that X 'as clause' precedes X 'and coordination'. This produces some strange-looking sequences, which users might well find confusing, such as

agreement
    aspectual 270
    in case 459
    determiner-head 334 (etc.)
determiner 24–5, 54–5, 330, **354–8**, 386–99 passim
    basic 355–8
    and coordination 1326
    and countability 57, (etc.)

These illustrations also show the use of bold-face for primary references within an entry, and also the way the conceptual index uses bold for 'major headings' above a list of sub-entries. The latter practice may be more intrusive than helpful, given that the notion of 'major' reflects an authorial view of absolute importance, whereas the person using the index may be operating with a different set of priorities. But on the whole the index does its job well enough.

One thing is clear: this book will take its place alongside the two other reference grammars of recent years, to give students a foundation for the study of English grammar that they have never had before.

References

Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sidney, Leech, Geoffrey and Svartvik, Jan (1985) *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Biber, Douglas, Johansson, Stig, Leech, Geoffrey, Conrad, Susan and Finegan, Edward (1999) *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.

David Crystal, *honorary professor of linguistics, University of Wales, Bangor*

The Oxford guide to style. Robert Ritter. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. xi, 623 pp. 24 cm. Bibliog., index. ISBN 0-19-869175-0: £16.99.

'*Hart's Rules* enters the 21st century', we are told by the publishers, who clearly intend to convey a sense of continuity. But *The Oxford guide to style* (OGS) is not merely a 'rewritten and expanded version' of *Hart's rules for compositors and readers at the University Press, Oxford*. Originally compiled by Horace Hart, MA, Printer to the University, in 1893, *Hart's rules* has not seen a new edition since the thirty-ninth (reviewed by Hazel Bell in *The Indexer* 13(4), October 1983).

Like its companion volume, *The Oxford dictionary for writers and editors*, *Hart's Rules* was conveniently pocket-sized. But while the 2000 edition of *ODWE* is recognizably the same book as before, though thoroughly revised and published in a larger format, *OGS* is essentially an entirely new book. It is substantial in every way, not only in size. It contains authoritative and extensive treatment of topics only lightly touched upon by *Hart's rules*, such as the setting of scientific and mathematical texts, and the handling of legal documents. The chapter on languages, far from being restricted to French, German, Greek, Italian, 'Oriental languages', Russian and Spanish, ranges widely, taking in Icelandic and Faeroese, Brythonic and Goidelic, Athabaskan and Eskimo-Aleut. Here you can learn the principles of hyphenation in Hebrew and word division in Welsh. There is also, very usefully, a lengthy discussion of American English. Moreover, electronic media are dealt with; the chapter on 'specialist subjects' includes a discussion on how to deal with collections of correspondence, translations and transliterations, and sacred works (Christian, Jewish and Muslim); and there is a whole new chapter on 'copyright and other publishing responsibilities'. Also welcome are a number of useful lists and tables, for example the International Phonetic Alphabet, paper sizes, proofreading marks, chemical elements and their symbols, logic and mathematical symbols, and American terms with their British equivalents. All these features make this an invaluable reference book for editors and others.

That is the good news. Now for some disappointments. It is disheartening with a book of this nature to have to start by correcting by hand nearly every page number in the table of contents. Moreover, there is a dismaying profusion of typos in what follows. Opening the book at random, I found on page 103: 'So if, for example, Señor Roberto Caballero Diaz marries Señorita Isabel Fuentes Lopez, their son might be Jaime Cabellero [*sic*] Fuentes... 'and 'the full name of Cervantes' was Miguel de Cervantes Saaverda.' That should be 'Saavedra', and the apostrophe after the first 'Cervantes' is superfluous. That makes three

errors just on one page. Some of these may be copyediting errors rather than typos in the strict sense. Other typos include 'longer then necessary' on page 30; 'cinnamon & raison and onion bagels' (to illustrate the use of the ampersand) on page 60; 'Saints's names can be problematic' (indeed), on page 85; 'hypen' on page 141; 'editions's' on page 477; and on page 95, 'Fräulein' has lost her umlaut.

In an exchange on SfEPline (the email discussion group of the Society for Editors and Proofreaders) in March 2002 it was suggested by one writer that the high proportion of errors was the fault of the typesetters, but others pointed out that the responsibility lay rather with those charged with the design, copyediting and proofreading of the book. In May, an SfEP member reported that OUP had informed her that a planned reprint had been slightly delayed 'due to major corrective work', and was due in July – unfortunately too late for the purposes of this review.* There is no glossary, which would have been useful for terms such as 'kerning', which first appears on page 17, but is not explained until page 51 ('the adjustment of spacing between characters').

The final chapter is on indexing, a topic not found in *Hart's rules*. It is generally sound if, perhaps, unduly prescriptive, and includes helpful advice. Authors who compile their own indexes may need to be told 'There is usually no need to augment an entry's heading with supplementary information from the text, particularly for an item with only a single page reference' – a trap sometimes fallen into by authors who try to reproduce the book in the index. In addition to this chapter, there are frequent references to indexing scattered throughout the text. It is encouraging to read, in the chapter on capitalization and treatment of names, that 'authors should clarify titles and names altered by marriage or any other means [if] only to avoid confusion (particularly if someone else is compiling the index)'.

What of the index to this book? It has a number of strings of 8, 9 or 10 page references – not that I personally regard this as a hanging offence, but it is inconsistent with the advice given in the text, which, pointing out that 'lengthy strings of page numbers' are 'tiresome and unhelpful to the reader', recommends that 'any string ideally should be reduced to six or fewer numbers'. For one subheading there is a string of 13, but to break this down would have meant sub-subheadings, which are frowned upon in this book. I found one or two incorrect page references. But the index, if not perfect (what index is perfect?), is generally well structured, and proved serviceable enough in use.

Christine Shuttleworth, *freelance indexer*

*At the time of going to press with this issue of *The Indexer*, the publishers were expecting to have the corrected version ready by the end of November 2002.

Information technology

The Internet: a writer's guide, 2nd edn. Jane Dorner. London: A. & C. Black, 2001. viii, 196 pp. 22 cm. Index. ISBN 0-7136-6126-7 (pbk): £10.99. (1st edn reviewed in *The Indexer* 22(2) Oct. 2000, pp. 108–9.)

Jane Dorner's comprehensive and practical book was reviewed in these pages only two years ago. The main change in this new version is that it contains fully revised web listings. There have been many dotcom births, deaths and marriages but – unsurprisingly – the most noticeable difference in the online resources section (Part 2) is in the listing of electronic imprints, which has more or less doubled in size.

Technology, inevitably, continues to move on, and there are other amendments to take this into account (for example, the author now has an ADSL (asymmetrical digital subscriber line) so can speak from her experience of using it). Some sections have been streamlined and reorganized, and information that dates especially quickly has been removed altogether.

Although the book is aimed at writers, there is much information useful to anybody who uses the Internet; for example, on using