

1	3	5	7	9	11	13	15	17	19
1	4	7	10	13	16	19	22	25	28
1	5	9	13	17	21	25	29	33	37
1	6	11	16	21	26	31	36	41	46
1	7	13	19	25	31	37	43	49	55
1	8	15	22	29	36	43	50	57	64
1	9	17	25	33	41	49	57	65	73
1	10	19	28	37	46	55	64	73	82
1	11	21	31	41	51	61	71	81	91
1	12	23	34	45	56	67	78	89	100

Figure 1: Infinite Rectangular Array

```

\cline{1-1}
1      &\m{4} &\m{7} & ... &\m{28} \\
\cline{1-2}
1      &5      &\m{9} & ... &\m{37} \\
...
\cline{1-9}
1      &12      &23      & ... &
          \m{\makebox[0pt]{r}{100}} \\
\cline{1-10}
\end{array}
\end{displaymath}

```

An experienced L^AT_EX user could further reduce typing by means of smarter definitions, but this is not the point. I suppose that also T_EX users could do the same, since after all both `\multicolumn` and `\cline` are made up essentially with `\multispan`.

In spite of this let us thank Kevin Carmody for drawing our attention to the facilities offered by P_TC_TE_X for typesetting something unusual.

◊ Claudio Beccari
 Dipartimento di Elettronica
 Politecnico di Torino
 Turin, Italy
 beccari@polito.it

Letters

On the review of *T_EX in Practice*

I was interested to read Frank Pappas's review of T_EX in Practice by Stephan von Bechtolsheim. I recently purchased a copy of the series and could not help but react to the quality problems myself. However, Pappas was a bit too quick to remove responsibility from the author and lay it all on Springer-Verlag. As a compositor/typesetter for over 30 technical books for various publishers, I would like to share some thoughts with the TUG community.

1. Technical authors, particularly those of us who are T_EXnicians, tend to equate knowledge of T_EX with knowledge of bookmaking. T_EX in Practice is only one of many T_EX books that suffer from poor writing, ugly design, lack of attention to composition details, or typesetting errors.

2. Technical authors believe, and publishers are too quick to accept, that a book authored with T_EX is "just going to typeset itself." There is nothing about electronic manuscripts or T_EX that eliminates the traditional needs for copyediting, proofreading, manual page make-up, hand-crafted tables, and so forth.

3. Publishers desire to save money by deferring many aspects of book production to the author. This has come to include complete coding of source files, creation or alteration of style files, art preparation, proofreading, page make-up, and indexing. In the old days, publishers did not believe that authors could do these things, possibly because the authors did not know how to handle hot lead. Why, in the age of desktop publishing, do authors suddenly know any more about such crafts? We may be "empowered," but we are not necessarily enlightened.

At the risk of appearing self-serving, I admonish authors and publishers alike: nothing has changed from traditional bookmaking, except that manuscripts are now provided in electronic files. Authors, you don't know all that much about bookmaking. Publishers, do not trust that authors know all that much about bookmaking. Just as an author expects her publisher to listen carefully regarding the content of the book, so also should she expect advice from the publisher on book production, and then heed that advice.

Paul C. Anagnostopoulos
 Windfall Software
 433 Rutland Street
 Carlisle, MA 01741
 508 371-2316