

The Boulder School
for Students of the Urantia Book
P.O. Box 19135
Boulder, CO 80308
303/665/6829
FAX/665/5076

October 9, 1995

To: Endnote Committee Members

From: Merritt

Re: Some philosophical considerations

Dear Friends,

Harry suggested that I send to you before the meeting a letter outlining a number of issues that he and I have discussed over the phone of late and some of which I included in a brief letter to him last week. Because of the limited time we will have together, he believes it would be best to give everyone a chance to look over this material beforehand. I apologize for the unfinished state of what follows—it was my original intent to simply create some notes for myself in preparation for our discussions and I do not have the time to put them in a proper condition.

[Please note that none of what follows relates to EOL issues nor to spelling standardization. I have (reluctantly, I confess) dropped my objections to spelling standardization. What follows does relate to the much more critical issue of grammar, punctuation and capitalization "corrections" rather than spelling standardizations.]

I. Art and Standardization

Please consider the following: Call me Ishmael.

This is terribly non-standard and archaic. How about replacing it with one of the following:

My name is Ishmael. You can call me Ishmael. I am called Ishmael.
You should call me Ishmael. You could call me Ishmael. I prefer to be called Ishmael.
Ishmael is my name. I am Ishmael. Hi! I'm Ishmael!

They all mean the same, right? They all have the same impact! Which one would a committee choose?

Whenever we apply a standardization rule, we assume that the rule we have formulated is correct. But statistical analysis of creative works does not always reveal dependably the rules used by the artist in the creation of his or her work. If we were to apply such rules to Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, we would reject all non-standard occurrences of the "fate knocking at the door" phrase (and there are many). Would that be a faithful re-discovery of the composer's original intent? or simply the imposition of rules by lesser minds upon a genius's masterpiece?

Artists deserve to be allowed to choose their own expressions. Divine Counselors and Evening Stars no less than Melvilles or Beethovens.

II. General note on a Philosophy of editing:

My conversations with Harry have alerted me to a difference in philosophy which must be resolved prior to the consideration of particular texts because the decisions on specific texts must be guided by a philosophy—they cannot be made in a vacuum. If we do not resolve philosophy first, we must address it anew for every single "problem" in the text.

It will quickly become apparent that my approach to modifying the 1955 text of the *Urantia Book* is extremely conservative:

In my opinion, our editing is an effort to reconstruct the author's original text if we establish that that original has been corrupted at some point. I do not believe that simplification or clarification or standardization is our responsibility. Clarification, even simplification, may be the result of text reconstruction, but they are incidental (albeit desirable) resultants of the work; not themselves primary goals.

If reconstruction is the goal, any proposed "error" in the extant text (1955) must be explained by a plausible mechanism of corruption, and the reconstructed text must not only "make sense" but must be consistent with the reversal of the corruption mechanism.¹

I have taken this position on textual reconstruction because I feel that the following assumptions are correct and consistent with the available evidence:

1. The *Urantia Book* was actually written by the authors claimed in the text and by the process described in the text.
2. The revelators were actually guided by the language and concept guidelines that they say they were (give refs)
3. The quality of English usage in the text is acceptable proof that the revelators had the time and ability to learn proper English grammar, spelling and usage if they desired to.
4. They were capable of choosing words and phrasings that conveyed precise meanings from among many similar constructions or synonyms.
5. The revelators had reasons for using the linguistic constructions that they did. These reasons may variously be artistic, semantic, conceptual or spiritual, just as they may be for any author, but the writing of the Fifth Epochal Revelation was not careless or mindless. [They tell us the subtle considerations involved in overall structure; I cannot believe that they were less mindful of smaller scale textual considerations. ref...pg213?]
6. The revelators knew that their writing would be utilized for a period of time longer than 50 years or so.
7. Nothing touched by human hands can be perfect; therefore, mistakes may exist in the extant text of the *Urantia Book*.

¹For example, if a passage currently read: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God..." and I proposed that the text was corrupted and should read: "As soon as creation was complete, the Word was, and the Word was with God...", I could not plausibly propose that the error had been made by a typist or typesetter. Typists and typesetters make mistakes, but not like that. If, however, I proposed that the existing text was recorded from a mistaken memory some time after the event; if that explanation fit with the other circumstances of the provenance of the text, that could be reasonable and would deserve serious consideration.

With these assumptions as a point of beginning, it is necessary to review our reasons for thinking that anything at all needs to be done to the text. That should assist us in determining our subsequent direction.

Why do we think that anything in the text is a "mistake" rather than a "difficult passage"? We know from experience that many difficulties that appear to a new reader to be mistakes, are not in fact mistakes, but misunderstandings by the reader of the authors' meanings. How do we know that all such difficulties perceived by even the most advanced readers are not, in fact, the same type of misunderstanding?

We can know that some mistakes were made because there are 13 (by my count) incontrovertible (indefensible) spelling or typographical mistakes in the text:

1. #1 Amenomope (Amenemope)
2. #2 Ephriam (Ephraim)
3. #3 Gonid (Gonod)
4. #136 Badanon (Badonan)
5. #199 hesitate (hesitate)
6. #202 anniversay (anniversary)
7. #205 Tannach (Taanach)
8. #206 peformance (performance)
9. #221 Schecham (Shechem)
10. #335 Schechem (Shechem)
11. #355 Poutaenus (Pantaenus)
12. #435 Ocean (Ocean.) missing period
13. #451 ani malistic (ani-malistic) EOL hyphen

(There may be, by general agreement, a few more, but that does not affect the discussion points that follow.)

From the above list, we can prove conclusively that typographical errors could occur in the preparation of the text because we know beyond a doubt that 13 such errors did occur. We do not, however, thereby prove that even one additional typographical error did actually occur, nor do we know that any other type of error could have entered the text. All additional presumed errors require sufficient evidence to be presented that the type and substance of the proposed error is within the realm of possibility.

We know that 13 errors of a simple typographic nature occurred without question. Not one of these errors involves more than two letters or symbols. From this list we know that an incorrect letter or two might be substituted for the correct letters in a word, that letters might be reversed in order, that a letter or symbol might be left out entirely. All of these are very common typographical errors; that there are so incredibly few of them in the final text indicates that extraordinary care was taken to proof-read the text at every stage of preparation. Even with computers it will be difficult for us to attain that high a level of perfection. (Especially without a visual proof.)

Before we address a particular text, we must establish that the type of mistake that is hypothesized to create the error is within the realm of possibility. The fact that human hands have touched it does not mean that all potential methods of textual contamination are equally possible. We know conclusively of only one type; if others are postulated, they must pass muster on the scale of likelihood.

In the following discussion, I will utilize the concept of "error categories" in order to clarify (somewhat) my thinking. The categories I use are these:

- 1) simple typography (as in the 13 known examples)
- 2) more complex but common typographical errors (such as mistaken insertion of words from surrounding text, skipped words, transposition of words, etc.)
- 3) mistaken grammar or facts in the original text—whether originating from the author, Midway stenographer or human contact (if we propose that any of these mechanisms are reasonable sources of error)
- 4) mistaken correction of grammar or facts by human editors (if we propose that editing was done)
- 5) mistaken transcription from an oral dictation (if we propose that such oral dictation occurred)

It is important to note, that we have no incontrovertible evidence that any but the first type of error even exists in the text. (All of the 13 examples listed above fall into category 1.) What kind of evidence do we need that another type of error (numbers 2-5) might exist in the text? In my opinion, the only positive proof would be to find at least one example of such an error that could not be anything else, but short of such proof we would need to find data that, without circular argumentation, reasonably supports the existence of such a category.

While there are on the list many suggested problems that could only be caused by categories 2-5, what is the evidence that those classes exist aside from the need for them to exist to justify the existence of the problems they supposedly explain (a completely circular argument)?

Error categories 1, 2, 4 and 5 are compatible with all of the earlier stated assumptions. I am not aware of any evidence that any text was transmitted orally, which excludes error category 5 as a real possibility. I do not find category 3 compatible with assumptions 1-6. This leaves categories 1, 2, and 4.

Again, we know that category 1 exists, of the 545 suggestions, _____ could be in this group. (I do not regard the instances of massive mis-capitalization as falling into this group even though they involve only one letter, because they require multiple identical mistakes which I find highly unlikely, given the low incidence of this type of mistake in the first place. The multiple capitalization errors fall into category 4 if they are indeed mistakes.²)

Category 2 is likely to exist because it requires the same mechanisms as category 1 but permits of a slightly wider range of mistakes. _____ may fall into this group.

²While there is a tradition that the forum/contact commission could make capitalization decisions, (and we can therefore review them), we must be extremely cautious about applying rules which are not explicit in the text. Foremost among the reasons for caution is the fact that the original typist must have been working from a manuscript that contained capital and small case letters as appropriate (I am sure it was not in the style of ee cummings.) Occasionally, the typist might make a mistake that would be difficult to later detect in oral proofing, but I don't think that that type of error would occur with great regularity. (It should also be noted that it is much easier (on a 30's or 40's manual typewriter) to mistakenly type a small case in the place of a capital than the reverse; so the correction by capitalization of a currently uncapitalized word should be required more often than the reverse, yet that is not the case in the list of suggestions we have in front of us.)

ALL CAPS and italics (presumably italics were represented by underlining in the manuscript) are especially difficult to mistakenly type on an older typewriter, and are also easier to pick up in proofing.

Category 4 includes _____ references. We have no direct (non-circular) evidence of this type of problem in the 1955 text, but there is evidence external to the 1955 text that seems to suggest that there did exist at least one person (and perhaps more) who had the willingness and authority to change the text if they thought they detected internal contradictions in the text:

1) In the 1967 edition, "in the manger" was deleted (119:7.6) Since, of the Contact Commission, at least Dr. Sadler and Christy still worked at 533 and (presumably) had to approve such editing of the text, we may assume that such an edit was not completely inconsistent with postulated earlier editing activities. Although we cannot be certain that this case was not unique, its existence does increase the likelihood of the possibility of such an edit in the 1955 text.

2) Dr. Sadler's letter (quoted in excerpts of Christy's history entered as evidence in the Maaherraa case) stating that the Contact Commission (or Forum?) had the authority to standardize spelling and punctuation.

3) One of the early drafts of endnote material (not from Harry, and I cannot now locate it) included, in regard to Harry's number 142 a note from Christy that supported the spelling "Teuskwatawa" in the original text as consistent with certain religious reference works (I cannot recall which. Sorry.) This would seem to indicate (but does not prove) that the human editors looked up unfamiliar names and may have felt free to adjust the spelling (and capitalization or punctuation, if applicable) to then current usage. This would not normally be the case for words in standard English but might be reasonable for rare names and words.

4) Numerous edits in the second printing which appear to reflect the consummation of the process outlined in #3, such as T(t)en C(c)ommandments, Arabian D(d)esert and Gr(a)eco-Roman
 [It is interesting to note that all but three of the many edits made in the second printing are either of this type or simple typos of category 1.]

5) The massive edit in the fourth printing (while Christy was still (presumably) in charge), of Bethpage to Bethphage. This edit appears to be similar to #'s 3 and 4 above. Apparently, Christy (or others) felt free to change an internally standard Bethpage in the UB to the externally standard Bethphage. If Christy did not finally approve this edit, it has no evidentiary value in our considerations.

To summarize then, we know that category 1 mistakes exist. By extension, category 2 mistakes probably exist. There is evidence of processes that could lead to category 4 mistakes. I find no evidence for the existence of category 3 or 5 corruption.

Therefore, if a proposed "mistake" or reconstruction requires reliance on either category 3 or category 5 errors, I would first require non-circular evidence of the existence of those categories before I would consider "correcting the mistake".

We may not seem to be getting anywhere, but I think that you will see some progress shortly.

III. Applying the Philosophy to major capitalization and spelling "errors"

Him/him

Let's look at the Him/him class of "errors". The best way to explain the existence of so many identical "mistakes" would be to assign them to category 5 (mistaken transcription of an oral presentation), but absent any evidence, category 5 is not available to us. Taken as individual words, each of these could be a category 1 mistake (although it should be noted that among the proven category 1 errors there are no capitalization mistakes--which is remarkable given the number of possible obvious errors that could have occurred in a million-word text). However, it is implausible to assert that so many identical capitalization errors could have randomly occurred when no obvious non-random capitalization errors are known to exist. Such a large number of errors could only have occurred through human editorial error—category 4. The problem is that it seems unlikely (to me) that such a seemingly random subset of the hundreds of pronouns referring to deity could have been edited by the Contact Commission (or whoever). Further, Him/him does not fit into the known types of words that are reasonable candidates for editing. Why would an editor capitalize a few of the many, many occurrences of "him" when the apparent "rule" is that deity pronouns are not capitalized (even in the Bible passages from which a number of these are quoted)? And if an editor suggested such an odd thing, why would the rest of the group agree to it? (I assume that no single individual could make such changes prior to the death of all but Christy.)

So where does this get us? If I don't think it was an error, can I find some sense in the UB usage?

Yes, I believe that there is a perfectly reasonable descriptive rule for the observed instances of Him/His/Himself capitalizations (though I could not have followed the thread without a computer). This rule, though it can reasonably explain the choices of an author, would not be a reasonable proposal for an editor to impose upon a pre-existent text.

It appears that "Him", "His" and "Himself" are used:

- 1) When, as objects of a preposition or verb, they immediately precede the subject of another verb in the sentence (usually a pronoun referring back to "Him" (who or whom), and the referent of "Him" may be in doubt. In every case where "him" is found in this construction, the referent is clear—either having been stated previously in the sentence or, as on pages 832 and 1450, as the object of worship, God is clearly implied. This works for #9, 11, 16, 45, 67, 162, 200, 208, 209, 210, 242, 248, 255, 265, 266, 274, 282, 283, 284, 286, 289, 290, 293, 298, 305, 317, 318, 319, 328, 513 (Christ and Him [who was] Crucified. Even though "Christ" precedes "Him", capitalization makes certain that Paul is referring not to Christ and another person who was crucified, which is what "and" would normally imply.).
- 2) When capitalization is required to ensure that the reader knows to Whom the pronoun relates because the personal noun (Universal Father or Jesus) does not closely precede the pronoun and some confusion about the referent might be possible without the capitalization: #68, 69, 122, 320, 390, 514.

This 2-part rule appears, to me, to account for all of the capitalizations for which changes have been suggested. It also, to my observation, excludes the relevant uncapitalized examples in the text.

Is this a rule that might be adopted by an author? Yes. Its primary purpose is to prevent confusion on the

part of the reader about the referent of a personal pronoun when referring to deity; its implementation is, as far as I can tell, completely consistent throughout the text.

Is it a rule that could have been invented by Contact Commission editors and implemented with this level of success prior to computer technology? I don't think so.

Can I prove that I'm correct? No. But it seems to me that if we can propose a possible origin for supposed "errors" that is consistent with our assumptions about the text and its authors, with our knowledge and assumptions about the editorial and typographical processes, and that explains the problematic usages, even if it does so imperfectly, is much, much better than any alternatives which meet none of these requirements but have the virtue of "consistency".

This particular "problem" represents 36 of our 545 discussion points.

If a number of our problems can be resolved by this technique, does that mean that we must find satisfactory rules to explain all problems? No. Our confidence in the authors and the text should increase each time we discover a reasonably descriptive rule, so our inability to discover such a rule should, it seems to me, reflect more on our weaknesses than on the text. Simply because I cannot discover the rule followed by the revelators in the writing of the text, does that mean that there is no rule? Can we conclude that the author can never break or stretch a rule for artistic reasons? Does that mean that I can cover up the evidence of a rule or artistic flair by "standardizing" the usage? Does that mean that I can safely assume that no human will ever gain insight into this problem because I have failed? I hope that we are willing to answer "No" to these questions and leave the text alone if there is any possibility that it is correct as it stands.

I have also attempted to address several other recommendations that result in numerous changes to the text:

Reality

6. "Reality" (capitalized) is used elsewhere (even on the next page (7, line 10)) when it is used as an unmodified noun to indicate something like "the absolutely all-inclusive totality of existence and potential". This usage is, I believe, distinct from the many modified and uncapitalized uses of "reality". Even the possibility of a differential in meaning must prevent us from masking it with our editing. (See additional occurrences at pg/ll 7/10, 135/30approx (#3 in the series on this page), 645/35app-especially this one: "The Universal Father is the explanation of universal unity as it must be supremely, even ultimately, realized in the postultimate unity of absolute values and meanings--unqualified Reality.")

Providence

18 et al. "Providence" is normally found in its uncapitalized form, however, if you search, you will find that, of the 27 occurrences of the word, 10 are capitalized (and do not occur at the beginning of sentences). In attempting to determine the distinctions in usage, it is clear that Providence, as conceived historically, is an almost personalized, beneficent overcontroller distinct from God (analogous in its separation from Deity to the Greek concept of Fate), while used in its proper sense, as a function of God, and not as an independent force or being, it is not capitalized.

Interestingly enough, the capitalized usage is noted as definition #4 in Webster's '34:

"4. One who exercises providential power. Specif.: a [cap.] God, conceived of as guiding men as a race and as individuals to ends he has in view for them or as preserving individuals from danger through his prescience, loving care, or intervention. b One likened to Providence."

The two occurrences of "Providence" in this paper fit fairly well within the discovered usage guidelines (as do the many occurrences of "providence"), and therefore should not be changed.

Deliverer

230 et al. "Deliverer" is used when it is preceded by "the" and unmodified by any other word or phrase. There are only four exceptions to this rule (1440, 1791x2, 1746), rather than 25, and there may be a further distinction which allows their inclusion as well. There is one additional exception which is easily explained: 1409-8 (can't find a note to this) in which there is a series of titles which are all capitalized and "Deliverer of the worlds" is one of the series and the capitalized form is required for that reason.

"deliverer" is used in all other circumstances.

I do not feel that even the four exceptions to my rule should be changed, but we can discuss that later.

Bethpage

303 et al. Bethp(h)age. The 1955 text uses "Bethpage" in all 13 occurrences of this word. In the 4th printing, all were changed to "Bethphage" which is the standard form of this word in all English Bibles and reference works. Before going into the specifics of this case, it is important to note that whenever names are translated from one language into another, different transliterations are often chosen by different authors/authorities because it is usually difficult to translate sounds precisely. Some modern examples would be Peking/Beijing, Cambodia/Kampuchea and Ceylon/Sri Lanka. This phenomenon also occurs when translating ancient names to modern languages: Akenaton/Ikhnaton, Jerome/Hieronymus, Nimrod/Nimrud, Beth Shean/Beth Sha'an/Beth Shan, Khufu/Chefren, etc. The difficulty in transliterating Semitic languages like Hebrew or Egyptian is exacerbated by the fact that their written language included only consonants leaving the correct vowel sounds open to speculation. That is why, (except for our knowledge from the UB), we do not even know the way the ancient Hebrews pronounced the name of God: YHWH. Modern scholars generally agree on Yahweh, but there is no proof and the uncertainty gave rise, during the reformation, to the form "Jehovah".

The Greek form of the Aramaic or Hebrew name in question is Βηθφαγή. It is found in only 3 places in the New Testament (Mat. 21:1, Mk 11:1, Lk 19:29). Using standard transliteration principles, it would become Bethphage in English, and that is how it is found in the Bible. However, many words are not transliterated according to common principles, usually to allow speakers of the receiving language to speak the name easily or to conform more closely to actual pronunciation, standard rules notwithstanding. For instance, the word Καφαρναούμ, if transliterated by the same standard rules would be Capharnaum, but the UB and English Bibles use Capernaum instead. Why? Καφαρναούμ is found throughout the New Testament; it is hard to talk about Jesus without talking about Καφαρναούμ. So it is natural that translators would attend more carefully to accuracy of transliteration and to ease of vocalization in English. I believe that that is precisely what the authors of the UB did when they chose Bethpage over Bethphage. The former is both a more accurate approximation of the Greek original and much easier for English speakers to say.

A little historical comparison of the translation of Βηθφαγή and Καφαρναούμ may be helpful:

In Latin, "ph" was used to replace the Greek "φ" and was pronounced properly as an aspirated consonant. However, English speakers pronounced Greek "φ" and Latin "ph" as "f" because of a mistaken inference from Latin and Greek cognates such as *frater/φρατήρ*.³ And as you can see from the table below, the Bethp(h)age error was made not in the Greek/Latin transition, but in the Greek/English transition. (Tyndale and the King James translators were very familiar with and were influenced by, the Latin Bible, but made their translation from the Greek.

Greek New Testament pronunciation	Βηθφαγή bet'p'age*	Καφαρναούμ kap'arnaum
Latin Vulgate of Jerome pronunciation	Bethphage bet'p'age	Capharnaum kap'arnaum
Tyndale's first English edition pronunciation	Betphage betfage	Capernaum kapernaum
King James pronunciation	Bethphage bethfage	Capernaum kapernaum
Urantia Book pronunciation	Bethpage bethpage	Capernaum kapernaum

*(' is used to designate an aspiration θ=t'=th as in pothook; φ=p'=ph as in haphazard)

As in the case of Providence, Him, and Divinity, the likelihood of so many identical category 1 typographical errors is extremely slim. Unlike those words, the occurrences of Bethpage in the UB are unanimous in their support of this spelling. It is also unlikely that this is a type 4 error because there is no external support in English for this spelling so the human editors would have had no basis for an en masse editing of a hypothetical original Bethphage to the 1955 edition's Bethpage.

Divinity

This discussion of "Divinity" is more rambling and less conclusive—I haven't been able to edit it down yet—but I hope it will be helpful nonetheless.

I propose that "Divinity" (capitalized) is utilized in two primary ways:

1. It can refer to divine beings or forces which are not "Deity". Just as "Deity" and "deity" are both correct in context, so are "Divinity" and "divinity"—and in much the same circumstances. Also, "Divinity" is a substantive; "divinity" is usually an attribute.⁴

³This usage is ingrained in common English words such as philosophy and pharmacy, but is not accurate and certainly does not need to be adopted for an unfamiliar place name like Βηθφαγή; nor did common usage compel earlier translators to adopt Capharnaum rather than Capernaum.

⁴Despite the helpfulness of the definition of "divinity" in the Foreword, the Urantia Book does not limit itself to the restrictions of that definition which states that "divinity" indicates only certain qualities which may be attributed to various beings. For instance, from Page-471:

Notes number 382 and 383 would seem to illustrate this usage well. Use of "Deity" is not appropriate at 382 and 383 (where a distinction from Deity and personality is attempted but a generalized reference to qualities would not suffice, "Divinity presence" seems perfectly reasonable particularly when, in 383, the presence is specifically denominated "impersonal" and therefore cannot be termed "Deity").

2. "Divinity" is often used when a comparison is being made with "Deity" or another capitalized concept. In these cases, the capitalized form is used to clarify the identity of the items being compared. Meaning number 1 may also be applicable in some of these occurrences

The following use on page 64 (#380) serves as an excellent definition by example of the second use of "Divinity":

2. THE PRESENCE OF GOD

The physical presence of the Infinite is the reality of the material universe. The mind presence of Deity must be determined by the depth of individual intellectual experience and by the evolutionary personality level. The spiritual presence of Divinity must of necessity be differential in the universe. It is determined by the spiritual capacity of receptivity and by the degree of the consecration of the creature's will to the doing of the divine will.

In this use, we see the comparative, capitalized version paralleled with recognized capitalized uses of "Infinite" and "Deity."

IV. Applying the Philosophy to grammatical and punctuation "errors".

Apparent grammatical errors might arise from any of the error categories under discussion: category 1 if only a letter or two is involved such as "transit trio announce(s)" [#38] or category 2 if a short word is missing as in "Level of Values" [#144], but in the case of multiple identical "errors" such as "in charge of" [#61, 62, 105, 331, 340], or in situations that would require more complex grammatical reconstruction, such as "immediately they are competent" [#189], if an error exists it must be the result of earlier human editing—a category 4 error. In those cases we need to look not only at the correctness of the grammar as it stands, but also we must assess the likelihood of human editors making the choice of the phrase in question over a presumed original phrasing.

7. Monota. Energy is close of kin to divinity when it is Paradise energy. We incline to the belief that monota is the living, nonspirit energy of Paradise—an eternity counterpart of the living, spirit energy of the Original Son—hence the nonspiritual energy system of the Universal Father.

We cannot differentiate the nature of Paradise spirit and Paradise monota; they are apparently alike. They have different names, but you can hardly be told very much about a reality whose spiritual and whose nonspiritual manifestations are distinguishable only by name.

This sample shows that "divinity" is not always defined as qualities which inhere in a divine being, but may have reality apart from such divine beings just as energy does, indeed, on Paradise, energy and divinity are difficult to differentiate.

This usage is not capitalized, but it does not fit within the narrow definition of the Foreword.

In charge of

I believe that all of you have seen my comments on "in charge of" before, so I will not duplicate them, but I will note that: 1) since there are four examples of this usage and only three of "in the charge of", if we were to apply preponderant usage standardization we would change them all to "in charge of", not the reverse; 2) given that this is a category 4 problem, we would have to account for it as the result of incorrect editing which would require that earlier editors had changed these four from the more familiar "in the charge of" to this less familiar form. The likelihood of that scenario is, in my opinion, extremely low; therefore the phrasing as we have it is almost certainly exactly what the authors wrote. And since the grammar is correct, it should be left alone.

Immediately they are competent

Because the editing required to "fix" this apparent problem is so extensive that it cannot be a category 1 or 2 error, it must be category 4. Again, this means that this unfamiliar (though correct) phrasing would have to have been mistakenly inserted in the place of one of the constructions that Harry has suggested; that scenario seems extremely unlikely.

"Immediately" is used here as a conjunction (an ellipsis for "immediately that") meaning "as soon as" (not "right after"). To that degree your suggestion is on the right track. However, "immediately" has been used precisely as it is here as recorded in the *OED* (Compact ed. Vol I pg 1379 def 3b):

1839 Asa Gray *Lett.* I. 28 Immediately this was done I completed an arrangement with my publishers.

1856 *Q. Rev.* June 182 Immediately they came upon the ground, fourteen of them were netted.

1896 Welton *Manual of Logic* (ed. 2) II. iii. § 90 The diagrams..should be self-interpreting immediately the principle on which they are constructed is understood.

Again, as noted in 23 and elsewhere, it is not our job to simplify the correct but unfamiliar grammar of the revelators, though if we feel an explanatory note is appropriate, we could provide one.

Punctuation "Errors"

Because these errors tend to be non-repeating and involve a single keystroke, most fall into category 1 which requires no justification other than typing error. However, it should be noted that the number of obvious, unquestionable errors of this type is only two (a missing period and a missing EOL hyphen). Surely there are more, but the quality of proofing that must have occurred in order to leave only 1 missing period and 1 missing EOL hyphen in a text this long would have been exceptional. It is highly unlikely, in a text that was proofed so well that it had only one missing period, that there would be hundreds of mistaken commas, semi-colons and random mis-capitalizations. In a 2-person proof such as we performed and which must have been done by the original UB proofers, all of these punctuation points are explicitly read—nothing is assumed. Therefore, one missing period should have some statistical relationship to the number of other punctuation errors made. Whatever that relationship is, it is certainly not on the order of 50:1 or 100:1.

When the CU staff did our visual proof and it was subsequently computer cross-checked with Tim Young's text, we found that our proofers had made only about 10 errors (not including disagreements over hyphenations and other items that reflected my choice of text and not their quality of proofing). The level

of care required to attain that level of accuracy was, I am sure, comparable to that of the proofers of the first edition, and is incompatible with a large number of additional punctuation errors.

I cannot, by way of this comparison, determine which punctuation "errors" are real and which are perhaps artistic choices by the authors, but I do feel certain that the number of errors committed by the proofers represents a very small number of the proposed "errors" and that we must therefore "correct" only those punctuations which in their present state are unquestionably and significantly incorrect and which, in addition, cloud the text enough to create the real likelihood of misunderstanding by a reader.

This may seem like a very high standard, but I think that it is the only way to be reasonably certain that we are not "correcting" the accurately recorded words of the author.

I hope you've enjoyed this airline reading. See you soon.



Merritt