

BOOK WORM
NEWSLETTER OF THE SOCIETY OF EDITORS (WA) INC.
August 2001

FROM THE CHAIR

Bouquets all round

Those members who were able to attend the joint SOEWA/WIP function in August, 'What Makes a Good Web Site?', would, I'm sure, agree that it was an outstanding success. An account of the evening will appear in next month's Book Worm. It remains for me to thank, on your behalf, all those who made the function possible:

- our excellent moderator, Russ Davis;
- the four panel members who offered the fruits of their experience, from a range of perspectives: Rhonda Bracey, Richard Joyce, Michelle Jansen and Brian Ward;
- the organisers: Richelle Moran, Maggie Schwann and Vida Corbett, with input from Brian Ward in the early stages (special thanks must go to Richelle for handling the role of principal organiser with such flair and expertise);
- other SOEWA and WIP members who assisted the organisers, with good humour and willing hands, on the night: Susan Green, Michèle Drouart and Robin Bower;
- the Small Business Development Corporation for kindly providing the venue.

Please note that as the joint function took the place of SOEWA's regular August meeting, our next meeting is coming up very soon (see below).

Standards

Hard copies of the Australian Standards for Editing Practice have been distributed to all members, and the committee is putting together a mailing list (limited, because of the number of copies available) of clients and educational institutions to whom a copy should be sent. (The reason for the delay is that we wanted to include, with the Standards, an announcement of the society's new web site.) Please send us details of anyone who you think should receive a copy. But don't forget, either, that the Standards are also available via the SOEWA web site. Clients, potential clients, potential members, students and anyone else interested may download a PDF or HTML copy from the site, and it may be reproduced in accordance with the copyright statement:

This publication may be reproduced without charge or written permission provided it is copied in total and without any change, and that appropriate acknowledgment is made of the source.

I encourage all members to publicise the existence of the Standards as widely as possible as a 'calling card' for the editing profession.

Amanda Curtin

SEPTEMBER MEETING

Magazine Publishing

Guest speaker: David Hogan, *Scoop* magazine

When: 7.30 p.m., Tuesday, 4 September 2001

Where: Tresillian Community Centre, 21 Tyrell Street, Nedlands (street parking)

Cover charge: \$2

AUSTRALIAN STANDARDS FOR EDITING PRACTICE:

WHERE TO FROM HERE?

This paper, by Janet Mackenzie, was delivered to the AGM of the Society of Editors (Victoria) in July. It is reproduced with the permission of the author.

The Australian Standards for Editing Practice have emerged at a critical time for the editing profession. We are at a crossroads. Either editors go forward to a bright future, with greater status and pay than we have ever had; or else we slip quietly into oblivion along with other casualties of a rapidly changing world, like Latin teachers and shorthand typists.

Three things arise from the Standards. The first and most obvious is the urgent need to press on with accreditation. Unless we can say, according to objective criteria, who is a competent practitioner and who is not, we can't expect to be taken seriously as a profession. Accreditation must be our top priority.

Secondly, the process of producing the Standards has exposed a structural weakness in the organisation of our profession: we have no effective, continuing national presence. CASE, the Council of Australian Societies of Editors, does its best, and of course I am not criticising individuals here. But CASE is made up of people who have many claims on their time: they have families and jobs, and they are also presidents of their state societies, so naturally CASE comes at the bottom of the list — a sort of lower CASE. We have to devise a means of presenting the editing profession effectively at a national level, even if it means levying ourselves and paying a part-time salary. This should be the first step towards a National Institute. I also urge individuals to develop a national awareness of the matters that concern the profession by periodically checking the other societies' web sites, which generally show their newsletters.

Thirdly, I would like to see the Standards used as a launching pad for a major publicity campaign. We should do it properly: hire professional PR people as well as exploiting all our media contacts. But there is a difficulty here. The editing profession actually selects against people who like to put themselves forward. Editors are generally persons of a modest and retiring nature — it's part of our charm. But we're going to have to conquer our reluctance and blow our own trumpet and give ourselves a profile, so that everyone knows what an editor does and how extremely valuable and wonderful we are.

There's lots of scope for a PR campaign. Editing can be tied in with several issues that are matters of public debate: with literacy, with education, with the Knowledge Nation and the Knowledge Society, with the plain English campaign, with business productivity, and with all the problems of presenting information effectively on screen. There's plenty to

work with. The world is awash with information, and editors are the people who can add value to that information and make it useful. We have to let the world know what we can do.

I have thought of two suggestions that might be incorporated into the PR campaign. One is the Australia Day Awards. I think these are a bit silly, but if people can get awards for services to football, and public servants can get awards just for doing their job, I reckon we should get a piece of the action. Each state society should put up a name or two each year — for services to the printed word, or the English language, or educational publishing, or whatever — and we should keep putting names forward until we get a few gongs.

The second PR idea requires more work, but it would be a lot more fun: a national prize for the Worst-Edited Publication of the Year. Everyone says that good editing is invisible, but bad editing — or no editing — sticks out a mile. So let's be a bit confrontationist, and name and shame the organisations that are producing reader-hostile material, the ones that aren't employing us. We could have various categories — print and screen, and so on. The prize wouldn't focus so much on typos and grammar — everyone knows we do those — but on headings and captions and things that should be there but aren't, like a glossary or a map. The Standards provide a ready-made list of the knowledge that should be applied. If we do the whole thing with a sense of humour, the media will love it. Anyone interested in taking this idea further, please speak to me afterwards.

So those are the three things that arise from the Standards: the need for accreditation; the need for a national presence; and the need to raise our profile. To conclude, I'll just tell you about the profession of information architect. As far as I can work out, information architects do everything that editors do to ensure that a publication is suitable for the end user — chunking information, providing suitable headings and cross-references, integrating the illustrations, and so on. In fact, I can detect only two differences between information architects and editors. First, they don't know any spelling or grammar; and second, their starting salary is about \$90,000 a year.

So that is where I hope the Standards will take us from here.

BUZZWORD CALCULATOR

The Buzzword Calculator has dropped out of the sky. It is your first weapon in the battle against the Jargonauts. Think of a three-digit number anywhere between 000 and 999. The first digit refers to a word in Column A, the second to a word in Column B and the third to a word in Column C.

COLUMN A	COLUMN B	COLUMN C
1 integrated	1 management	1 options
2 definitive	2 organisational	2 parameters
3 responsive	3 real-time	3 capability
4 optimised	4 reciprocal	4 payback
5 effective	5 digital	5 programming
6 deductive	6 logic	6 concepts
7 proactive	7 strategic	7 framework

8 customised	8 incremental	8 projections
9 task-led	9 systems	9 objectives
0 ongoing	0 sustainable	0 contingency

Thus, for example, 123 gives you ‘integrated organisational capability’, whereas 321 provides ‘responsive organisational options’ (which is probably the result of integrated organisational capability if you think about it). No. On second thoughts, don’t think about it: you might start believing in all this stuff.

Next month we’ll bring you the Jargon Emulation Tables. With this even more sophisticated tool you will be able to create sentences — and ultimately complete reports — that sound good despite being utterly meaningless.

‘LISTEN TO THE SONG IN THE WORK’

At the May meeting of the Canberra Society of Editors, Gail MacCallum and Ashley Hay joined a large gathering for a lively discussion of authors, editing and publishing. Here Alexa McLaughlin summarises the talk, which was called ‘Show me a critic without prejudices and I’ll show you a case of arrested development: an editor’s lament’. It was published originally in the group’s newsletter, *The Canberra Editor* (Volume 10, Number 5, June 2001), and is reproduced with the author’s permission.

Gail is senior commissioning editor at the small innovative publisher Duffy & Snellgrove and she edited Ashley’s last book, *The Secret*, about Lord Byron’s marriage. Ashley also has a day job as an assistant editor of the *Bulletin*. Speaking about editors, Gail pointed out that editors have been accused of having no respect for true writing, not caring about linguistic flights of fancy, and believing in the essential nature of mundane terms such as ‘the’ and ‘and’. She suggested that ‘they really like punctuation, they censor, they nitpick, they may be vampires’.

She relayed the views of Sue Hines of Allen & Unwin, expressed at the recent *Canberra Word Festival*, that American editors see themselves as ‘quarterbacks, generals going into war’. Gail sees this as a defence against authors charging towards editors with difficult manuscripts.

Speaking about authors, Gail likened them to children, although she said that even children see reason eventually. She feels authors have a ‘stubbornness which is unseen anywhere in the rest of the universe, clinging onto special protected pieces of interesting grammar, strange narrative’.

She amused us with an example from *The Secret*, where Ashley insisted on including a number of references to a hippo, against her own vehement opposition. However, there’s one left — on page 217.

Many authors benefit greatly from editing. Gail cited the crime writer Raymond Carver, whose initial drafts contained long involved sentences. It was his editor who whipped them into the readable stories we know. She said: ‘Authors are shockingly jealous, stropky, rude about each other. They’re clearly able to see their own skills but unable to see the art of

anyone else.’

Gail identified that some authors will accept an editor’s word as law, especially keen first-time authors, and there are those who quibble over every word. But the best ones are those who listen, query and discuss, which is easier for the editor.

Her advice to editors was to ‘listen to the song in the work’ to understand what the work is about, then communicate that back to the author and build more reasonableness into the process.

Ashley pointed out how much authors depend on editors, and that appropriate thanks are acknowledgments in their books. She suggested that good editing is about avoiding red ink, and that, instead, a good editor should convince authors that she (or he) likes them and their work. Then the authors may follow editors’ advice and trust them, especially about where to stop reworking. Ashley believes that the best editing is where the end product has only the author’s ‘voice’, even though the editor may have had an impact on every sentence. She likened a good author–editor relationship to a ‘good martini’, an alchemical mix of two things that should make you fall over but is actually quite nice to experience. She especially enjoys the structural editing conversation.

Speaking about publishing, Gail described the way Duffy & Snellgrove works, retaining editing, design and now publicity in-house. She and Michael Duffy read each book that is being seriously considered for publication, and one of them has to love it, and the other not hate it, for it to be published. Gail considers there’s little market research on the book market in Australia. There’s a sense that ‘what sells, works’. There’s also a short sales period in Australia — around two months. In the US and UK, approximately 50 per cent of a publisher’s income is from its backlist, while in Australia that income is only around 10 per cent. The average print run in Australia is around four thousand copies and there’s a long lead- time from commissioning, through advertising, to printing and publication. Because the advertising precedes publication, it’s damaging to delay release dates.

Duffy & Snellgrove actively publishes poetry because Gail considers it to be the ‘most readable form of writing’, though she isn’t able to edit it herself. She feels it may be endangered now that poets are being mainly read by other poets and not reaching a wider audience. Duffy & Snellgrove actually receives a large amount of unsolicited poetry, fiction and memoirs. Asked whether many memoirs should not be published, Gail reported comments she gives to young writers’ groups. She distinguishes self-expression and communication in writing. She says: ‘The question is not whether it’s good or bad but whether it’s powerful enough’.

When assessing a manuscript, Gail is looking for good writing, and she may not read more than ten or twelve pages unless impressed. Where the writing’s good, she may commission on only a good idea. So she asks for a sample of the writing and the idea for a story. Books always have to have a good story and Gail finds it important that a book is specifically located, no matter where. For non-fiction works, she suggests providing a chapter, a synopsis and a vision statement of what the author wants to achieve with the work. While authors sometimes cherry-pick the best writing from all over a work to submit, she prefers to see the first sixty pages, rather than discontinuous sections, to see how the work

flows. Gail was critical of self-publishing because it often falls down on editing, layout and design, and has such small print runs that not enough review copies are distributed, and marketing is inadequate.

She cited Susan Wyndham of the *Sydney Morning Herald* saying that it would have to be an extraordinary circumstance for them to review a self-published book because their readers would have to be able to purchase it readily, which is often not the case. It's not surprising that the subject of authors editing themselves as authors arose at an editors' meeting. Gail was vehement that no authors can edit their own work — a statement with which Ashley didn't completely agree. Gail believes that authors have to let go of critical analysis in order to write effectively, particularly first-time authors. Ashley said that she feels able to edit other people's journalism, but has less confidence about editing her own work.

I've given you many of Gail's colourful descriptions but few of the witty asides and literary quotes which evoked our mirth. At the end of her talk I felt we had been warmly entertained and gently informed about the world of writing.

NEW MEMBERS

We are pleased to welcome the following new members:

Fiona Hillary

Maureen MacDuff

Samantha Wilson

A CHANCE TO ADVERTISE

The attached PDF is an invitation to advertise your editorial services in the November edition of the *Australian Bookseller & Publisher*. If you are unable to open it, get in touch with the editor at <allanwatson@bigfoot.com> after noting that the cost is \$250.

UP FOR GRABS: TAX-FREE EDITORIAL JOB IN TROPICAL PARADISE

The Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) invites applications for the position of Editor (English) in the Publications Section (Noumea). Applicants should have at least five years' editing experience. The closing date for applications is 28 September 2001.

The SPC is an independent intergovernmental agency providing technical advice, assistance, training and research in the service of the twenty-two Pacific Island countries and territories of Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia. It currently has a staff of more than 230. SPC is officially bilingual, with English and French being the working languages. The salary is CFP 477,493 francs per month in the SPC PO5 salary grade (the current exchange rate is approximately USD 1.00 = 142 francs CFP). In addition, an Establishment Grant will be payable to non-residents of New Caledonia. SPC emoluments are not subject to income tax in New Caledonia at the present time. For a job description, and more information about SPC, visit the web site: <http://www.spc.int>

AUSTRALIANSTYLEWATCH CONTINUED

The editor rants again . . .

The sub-banner of *Australian Style* reads 'Issues in Australian style and the use of English in Australia', which has a neat logical fit with the name of the publication. But how logical is the fit of the actual contents to either? In the current issue, volume 9, number 1, the

articles are on:

Family naming practices

Style Council

Reform of English spelling

Pronunciation (2)

Post-colonial Englishes

Australian English

Absorption of American words

— along with the editor's page and the puzzle page

It would be pushing things to say that as many as half are about style. Arguably all the others could be of interest to editors and others concerned with style, but perhaps a different name would be more appropriate.

One ongoing feature of *Australian Style* is that no attempt is made to impose a house style on the contributions. As a note on page 2 puts it, '... styles chosen are those of the authors indicated'. Leaving aside the question of whether that statement itself might be in need of editing, what are we to think about the policy? Couldn't an even better case be made for putting it all through the mill of the Australian Style Manual? After all, the mag is sponsored by AusInfo, the manual's publisher, and most Australian editors (or am I wrong about this?) take it very seriously.

The result is especially grating when we confront on facing pages, 8 and 9, starkly different ways of handling the bibliographical details of the two books reviewed. Bearing in mind this editorial stance, it is very puzzling that not one of the contributors to the last several editions has used single quotes. Has an editorial hand been at work after all? Why just in this respect? (Why not capitalisation of headings, for instance?) And why double quotes rather than single, considering the Style Manual favours the latter? Accepting for the moment that allowing authors their own style is at least defensible, shouldn't we expect that the articles be internally consistent? And free of gross errors? The following comments relate to this new edition.

Inconsistencies

Why English spelling resists reform (page 4). Spaced en dash and spaced hyphen both used for dash.

From the Editor (page 6). Names of newspapers/journals italicised in some cases, not in others.

Who's Centric Now? (page 8). Col. 1, para 2, no initial cap for first word of subtitle; col. 3, para 1, cap used. Col. 2, para 2, within the same quotation 'make up' and 'make-up' both used substantively — surely a case for 'silent' correction if it was thus in the original.

The Dinkum Dictionary (page 9). Col. 1, para 3, 'W.S. Ramson'; col. 2, para 1, 'W S Ramson'. Feedback Report (page 10). Col. 2, para 1, line 4, word broken at end of line; elsewhere (even where desperately needed), not. This has, of course, nothing to do with the author's intentions, and appears to be just a slip-up in implementation of an editorial decision not to bother breaking words. The appearance of the publication has suffered drastically as a result (compare with previous edition). But, with more and more book publishers opting for this approach, what can be said about the producers of a small specialist journal doing

the same?

Errors

Style Council Report (page 3). In author acknowledgment, ‘secretary’ misspelt; space between ‘Singapore’ and comma.

From the Editor (page 6). Col. 3, para 1, two instances of closing quotation mark used instead of opening quotation mark (“dialing” etc.). Col. 3, para 2, ‘Australian Labor party’ for ‘Australian Labor Party’; ‘latter day’ for ‘latter-day’; ‘– or spellings’ substituted for some unknown word or group of words in two instances.

Letters to the Editor (page 7). Col. 1, para 3, two word definitions in quick succession, one beginning with a capital and the other not. Col. 3, para 2, two mistakes in the first sentence — ‘In the late ‘50s I accepted from an English insurance company, a transfer to London . . .’ — ‘50s’ needing an apostrophe rather than an opening quotation mark in front of it and the comma needing to be paired up with another (after ‘accepted’) or dropped. Col. 3, para 5, one unjustified line.

Who’s Centric Now? (page 8). Col. 1, para 2, line 5, ‘market’ instead of ‘marker’. Col. 2, para 2, last line, ‘the’ instead of ‘them’. Col. 2, para 3, one word (Singlish) in single quotes. Col. 3, para 2, apart from there being two unpaired commas, the Chief Editor of the Oxford English Dictionary is quoted as spelling ‘centre’ as ‘center’, which is either a misprint or a fact so curious as surely to demand editorial comment. Second para of continuation of story on page 9, ‘issuessuch’.

The Dinkum Dictionary (page 9). Author acknowledgment, ‘Linguistics department’ for ‘Linguistics Department’ (could there be any argument about that?). And can a sentence like the last one in the article be accepted under the rubric of authorial style? — ‘Genial in tone and interesting in substance it qualifies handsomely as a very good deal.’

Feedback 17 (page 11). Opening paragraph, huge space after ‘twentieth’ in line 2, and no space after ‘characteristics.’ in line 4.

Some of these mistakes are of course trivial, and I wouldn’t bother to comment if all we were confronted with were a few such misdemeanours. But I would contend once again that the editorial standards of this publication are well below an acceptable level, especially for one that purports, by implication at least, to be concerned about them.

STYLES: THE GOLLUM OF ON-SCREEN EDITING

This article originally appeared in the March edition of the newsletter of the Society of Editors (Victoria). It is by Brett Lockwood (brett@WordBytes.com.au; www.WordBytes.com.au), who is a freelance editor and training officer for the Society of Editors (Victoria). It is reproduced with his permission and that of the society.

Deciding to work with styles in MS Word document editing is something of a false start. In Word you are always working with styles. If you open a new (empty) document using File, New . . . and begin keying text, Word automatically uses the Normal style (by default 10-point Times New Roman for Word 97/98 and 12-point Times New Roman for Word 2000/2001) as its base style for text formatting, and any document you receive from elsewhere will almost certainly have the Normal style as its base style too. Insert an endnote, and Word uses the Endnote Reference style to format the superscript numeral

denoting the endnote, and the Endnote Text style to format the note text. Insert a Word comment and the same process occurs; the Comment Reference style and Comment Text style are automatically used. If you use headers and footers, the Header style and Footer style are used.

This type of 'automatic' style use makes sense. Text must be constructed from text attributes of one type or another, even if these attributes are only a font name and a point size. Such styling ensures formatting consistency for elements like endnotes, comments and so on. You can see the styles applied to a document by using Tools, Options . . . (Preferences for the Mac), View, and entering, say, 2 cm as the Style area width: setting. Scrolling through a document in this view mode is a valuable way of checking your styles and proofing them. You must be in Normal view or Outline view to do this. You then realise that you cannot have text in Word that is not set in a style. So it makes more sense to say that, when you decide to work with styles, what is really meant is controlling and exploiting them.

The particular style names mentioned above are some of Word's built-in styles. There are about ninety of them in Word 97/98 and a hundred in Word 2000/2001. If you open a new (empty) document and go to the 'All styles' list in the Styles dialog box, you are looking at a pristine listing of all the styles currently available for use, and they are all built-in styles. Built-in styles cannot be deleted from Word; that is, they cannot be deleted from the 'All styles' list (which equates to the styles in Word), though many can be deleted from the 'Styles in use' list (which equates to the styles in the active (or current) Word document). This is one problem area, as editors are sometimes asked to 'delete unused styles' when submitting a completed document. This is often not possible, or only partially so, and can cause a lot of frustration. Also, it is commonly documented that built-in styles cannot be renamed. This is incorrect. It is true that built-in styles cannot be completely renamed, but their names can be added to (augmented) as an editorial aid. This is called using an alias. Then there are user-defined styles. These we create, and we name and define them, and we can modify and delete them. Our user-defined styles are viewable as a subset by opening the Style dialog box and choosing 'User-defined styles' from the List: area. The other two options here are 'All styles' (all the styles available to the document: built-in styles and user-defined styles — if present — combined) and 'Styles in use'.

The 'Styles in use' list is also problematic. The label 'styles in use' does not accurately reflect the content of this subset. Choosing 'Styles in use' in the Style dialog box presents the following styles:

1. Built-in styles currently applied to text.
2. Built-in styles that have been modified (including only name modifications), regardless of whether they are currently applied to text.
3. All user-defined styles, regardless of whether they are currently applied to text.
4. Any style that has been applied to text and then removed (replaced or overwritten with another style).

The causes of the components of 2 and 3 where styles are not currently applied I can only arrive at via interpolation: when you modify a built-in style or create a style, Word

assumes you have not done this for nothing, that you are going to use it, and puts it in the 'Styles in use' group. The cause of 4 is probably a programming bug. I have not seen these issues documented anywhere but they apply to my installations of Word 97 and Word 2000 (the PC releases of Word), so I guess they apply to yours. Also, I assume the same goes for Macintosh Word. So this means that what you see in the 'Styles in use' list may not be there in the text.

To move on, the content of the 'Styles in use' list in the Style dialog box corresponds to the content of the Style Preview drop-down list on the formatting toolbar. Well, almost. A new (empty) document contains the Heading 1 through to Heading 3 styles in the Style Preview list. This is Word's way of trying to get users off to a good start! However, aside from this anomaly the correspondence between these two listings is complete and is worth remembering. A lot of Word documentation states that Style Preview lists all styles available to the document. This is correct, but only if you use the SHIFT key while clicking on the Style Preview drop-down list. The distinction is an important one to note.

A good way to start with a document, if you really want to identify the styles currently in use, is to use File, Print . . ., and in the Print what: drop-down list choose 'Styles'. This prints the styles (plus their descriptions) listed in 'Styles in use'. You could then check the document with Style area width: activated and see if there are styles in your print that are not on the screen (you can do this in Normal view but Outline view can be easier). If there are, and they are user-defined styles, you can delete them using the Delete button in the Styles dialog box. This will help clean up your 'Styles in use' list. If some of the styles that are in your print, but not on the screen, are any of the built-in styles from Heading 1 to Heading 9, you're stuck with them in the 'Styles in use' list. You cannot delete these built-in styles from this list once they are in it. If the document is huge and scrolling appears ludicrous, use the Find function to search for all the styles you have printed out. This can be done quickly. The styles that are not found are the ones to mark on your print. All the unmarked styles in your print then correspond accurately to the styles applied to the document text.

A technique used by some on-screen editors to remove bogus styles from received documents is to select and copy the content of the entire document and paste this into a new (empty) document. This technique will remove bogus styles. However, it can also, and probably will, result in automatic modifications to at least some of the remaining styles, because the Normal style in the originating document does not copy over. It is the Normal style in the new document that is used. Modifications to other styles can result if you use this copy and paste method because document styles are often based on the Normal style; that is, they draw some of their attributes from the Normal style. If the Normal style then changes, they change. Thus copying 10 or 15 or 20 styles across from one document to another document can result in extensive changes to these styles if the Normal style in the source document is different in any way from the Normal style in the target document. If you have a good understanding of style attributes and you can ensure that the Normal style in the target document has identical attributes to that in the source document, you should be able to use this copy and paste solution without error.

What happens, then, if the 'Styles in use' list is important in your work and this problem

hits you and you aren't aware of the issues involved? At a minimum it is likely to cause a loss of confidence, both in your document's contents and in how your document is being formatted. No desktop editor likes to be there. Thus it is handy to remember that 'Styles in use' usually doesn't mean styles in use. The author has been tapping away, applying styles and then replacing them, and creating styles that aren't used. Phantom styles accumulate in the 'Styles in use' list, so you might have to deal with them. This is one answer to the issue of deleting unused styles mentioned above. Deleting all unused styles from a document is often not possible. But a print of the document's styles, with the phantom styles struck out, can accompany your returned document. This print comprises a true listing of the styles in use.

Working with only user-defined styles is attractive. If you can do this, the 'User-defined styles' list in the Style dialog box comes into full swing, a lot easier than having to regularly scroll up and down the 'All styles' or 'Styles in use' listings, trying to identify the built-in styles you are using. These two lists do not identify the built-in styles actually in use. The issue here, of course, is that built-in styles are so useful. For a start, documents styled using Heading 1 through Heading 9 styles can fully exploit Word's Document Map, a great way to navigate around a document and become familiar with its content and heading structure. The Document Map looks for these styles and uses them very nicely. So how can you use built-in styles in a manner where you can easily distinguish the ones you are using from the ones you are not?

It is not widely known that you can rename built-in styles, but if you go into the Style dialog box, click on the Heading 1 style to select it, then click the Modify button, the Modify Style dialog box opens with the style name (Heading 1) selected. Delete this name and key in the letter 'A'. Click the OK button, and you have renamed the Heading 1 style to 'Heading 1,A'. The 'A' you have keyed in is known as an alias, and it has been appended to the end of this built-in style name, with a comma automatically placed by Word as a separator, and the style name is now listed as 'Heading 1,A' in the style group listings (Style dialog box). It is also listed as 'Heading 1,A' in Style Preview, in the Style area width: facility, and it prints as 'Heading 1,A' if you print out your styles. It is also used by the Document Map, which sees it as Heading 1, and if you add it to a toolbar it also retains its unmodified name (Heading 1). You have given yourself the means of easily identifying a used built-in style from those ninety or more styles in the 'All styles' list, and also easily identifying a used built-in style in the 'Styles in use' list.

As far as I can determine, you can perform this renaming trick with any built-in style. The key is that Word, internally, sees the appended name component as the actual style name when you modify this name. Part of this procedure is keeping in mind that you cannot have two styles with the same name in Word (for obvious reasons). So Word won't allow you to rename 'Heading 1' as 'Heading 1,X' and 'Heading 2' as 'Heading 2,X'. It sees both these styles as having the name 'X'. But you can rename these built-in styles to 'Heading 1,A', 'Heading 2,B', 'Heading 3,C' and so on. This is not a problem for you as the user. After all, you are merely seeking to apply a unique identifier. If you try this, you may find that, when examining the 'All styles' list and 'Styles in use' list, you are happily identifying the built-in styles you are actually using.

So what happens if you use this renaming method to facilitate your work and then you want to revert to using the original style names? You simply apply what is almost the reverse procedure. Click, for example, 'Heading 5,E' in the Styles: list in the Style dialog box, click the Modify button, click inside the Name: text box, delete the appended characters ',E' and click the OK button. If you do something you didn't want to, click the Undo button on the standard toolbar. I love the Undo button.

While we're playing with all this styles stuff: remember that if you are copying text from one document to another, it matters very much whether you select the paragraph text without its paragraph mark or you select the text and the paragraph mark. If you select the paragraph mark, the style of the paragraph is copied into your document too. This is one reason why working with Word's nonprinting characters displayed can be important (nonprinting characters — paragraph marks, tab marks, manual line break symbols etc. are toggled on and off by using the Show/Hide button (¶) on the standard toolbar). I see styles as the Gollum* of desktop editing. They are extremely useful, malleable and sometimes deceptive. They invoke suspicion and mistrust, arouse our ambivalence, but give in when we get the jump on them. We can't shake them. An indispensable part of the plot!

I would appreciate comments about all this. I am interested in understanding undocumented aspects of Word that might help editors and squeezing editing-related procedures to see what pops.

*Allan Watson writes: Neither Amanda nor I knew about Gollums, and perhaps we're not the only ones in that predicament, so (having researched the point) I advise that a Gollum is a shapeless rubbery creature that trails the Hobbits on their expeditions.

DEADLINE FOR NEXT EDITION: Friday, 21 September 2001

CONTACTING SOEWA

President

Amanda Curtin, 9377 2091, curtin@highway1.com.au

Vice-President

James Hansen, 9293 1972, jehansen@starwon.com.au

Treasurer

Jean Argyle, 9382 4874, jean@mypostbox.com

Secretaries

Susan Green (minutes), 9335 8071, greens@opera.iinet.net.au

Betty Durston, 9386 2103, bdurston@iinet.net.au

General Committee Members

Wendy Bulgin, 9243 5660

Michèle Drouart, 9382 2930, mdrouart@hotmail.com.au

Jill Durey, 9370 6308, j.durey@cowan.edu.au

Newsletter

Allan Watson, 9381 3732, allanwatson@bigfoot.com

Lorna de Courtenay, 9386 5766, ldecourt@echidna.id.au

SOEWA Web Site: www.editorswa.iinet.net.au

Brian Ward, 9443 6229, wardb@cbs.curtin.edu.au