

FAQ of the Chicago Manual of Style,
15th Edition

University of Chicago Press Staff*

February 14, 2005

Contents

| | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Contents | i |
| 1 New Questions and Answers | 1 |
| 2 Abbreviations | 13 |

*<http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/cmosfaq.html>

CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| 3 | Alphabetizing | 23 |
| 4 | Ampersands | 27 |
| 5 | Capitalization, Titles | 29 |
| 6 | CMS | 51 |
| 7 | Commas | 59 |
| 8 | Compounds | 71 |
| 9 | Documentation | 79 |

Abstract

In the 1890s, a proofreader at the University of Chicago Press prepared a single sheet of typographic fundamentals intended as a guide for the University community. That sheet grew into a pamphlet, and the pamphlet grew into a book—the first edition of the *Manual of Style*, published in 1906. Now in its fifteenth edition, *The Chicago Manual of Style*—the essential reference for authors, editors, proofreaders, indexers, copywriters, designers, and publishers in any field—is more comprehensive and easier to use than ever before.

Those who work with words know how dramatically publishing has changed in the past decade, with technology now informing and influencing every stage of the writing and publishing process. In creating the fifteenth edition of the *Manual*, Chicago's renowned editorial staff drew on direct experience of these changes, as well as on the recommendations of

the Manual's first advisory board, composed of a distinguished group of scholars, authors, and professionals from a wide range of publishing and business environments.

Every aspect of coverage has been examined and brought up to date—from publishing formats to editorial style and method, from documentation of electronic sources to book design and production, and everything in between. In addition to books, the Manual now also treats journals and electronic publications. All chapters are written for the electronic age, with advice on how to prepare and edit manuscripts online, handle copyright and permissions issues raised by technology, use new methods of preparing mathematical copy, and cite electronic and online sources.

A new chapter covers American English grammar and usage, outlining the grammatical structure of English, showing how to put words and phrases together to achieve clarity, and identifying common errors. The two chapters on documentation have been reorganized and updated: the first now describes the two main systems preferred by Chicago, and the second discusses specific elements and subject matter, with examples of both systems. Coverage of design and manufacturing has been streamlined to reflect what writers and editors need to know about current procedures. And, to make it easier to search for information, each numbered paragraph throughout the Manual is now introduced by a descriptive heading.

Clear, concise, and replete with commonsense advice, *The Chicago Manual of Style*, fifteenth edition, offers the wisdom of a hundred years of editorial practice while including a wealth of new topics and updated


CONTENTS


perspectives. For anyone who works with words, whether on a page or computer screen, this continues to be the one reference book you simply must have.

What's new in the Fifteenth Edition:

- Updated material throughout to reflect current style, technology, and professional practice
- Scope expanded to include journals and electronic publications
- Comprehensive new chapter on American English grammar and usage by Bryan A. Garner (author of *A Dictionary of Modern American Usage*)
- Updated and rewritten chapter on preparing mathematical copy
- Reorganized and updated chapters on documentation, including guidance on citing electronic sources
- Streamlined coverage of current design and production processes, with a glossary of key terms
- Descriptive headings on all numbered paragraphs for ease of reference
- New diagrams of the editing and production processes for both books and journals, keyed to chapter discussions
- New, expanded Web site with special tools and features for Manual users. Sign up at www.chicagomanualofstyle.org for information and special discounts on future electronic Manual of Style products.

New Questions and Answers

 How does one go about preparing an index? Any web page I can go to?

 I typed “preparing an index Chicago” into Google and found many sites that offer guidelines. Here are a couple:

http://www.psupress.org/author/indexing_guidelines.pdf (Penn State University Press, “For Authors: Index Preparation”)

<http://unp.unl.edu/press/prepindex.jsp> (University of Nebraska Press, “Publishing with the Press: Preparing Your Index”)

1. NEW QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

And of course CMS chapter 18 tells you all you need to know and more.

Q Trying to sound scientific, students love to use the phrase “as evidenced.” This strikes me as grammatically correct but stylistically atrocious. Am I alone with this feeling?


A I don’t think it’s atrocious, since the phrase is conventional in scientific and legal contexts. I think it’s kind of cute. How can you keep from smiling when your students say it?


Q How should the sentence “Guess what” be punctuated? I realize that it’s technically an imperative sentence, which should end with a period (or exclamation point), but in many contexts it’s used as if it were interrogatory, and thus it’s often punctuated with a question mark rather than a period. Is this simply incorrect?


A I think the question mark is incorrect when the imperative is intended, although as you say it is common and accepted. The reason I would quibble is that using the question mark for the statement or exclamation doesn’t allow us a way to differentiate the actual question when it is called for, as in the following examples.


“Go ahead and guess,” she challenged. “Guess what?” I asked.

“Guess which variable’s value is estimated as a function of the independent variables,” demanded the professor. “Guess what?” I stammered.

 An ellipsis is defined by three dots. Is there a particular reason that it is limited to three dots? I am looking to understand what the ellipsis signifies!


 How many dots would you like? You can have as many as four if you put an ellipsis after a period. I don’t know of any significance behind the choice of three. Perhaps the number gradually came to be popular and then was standardized in style sheets and grammar for the sake of consistency, as well as to prevent silliness.


 I’m editing a series of reports that use abbreviated forms of the sometimes lengthy titles in the footer. Are there any recommended guidelines for abbreviating titles for this purpose (e.g., use of acronyms, elimination of less important prepositional phrases), or is this at the discretion of the author or editor?

 CMS doesn’t offer advice on this subject, so I would advise you to keep the reader in mind and phrase running feet or heads in a way that will be most helpful. In some books, this means using a chapter subtitle instead of the title (especially when


1. NEW QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS


the actual title is so vague it doesn't tell you what's in the chapter, leaving the specifics to the subtitle). Acronyms are fine, as is the elimination of less important words. And yes, the editor should specify rather than leave the chopping to the typesetter.


 What exactly does the phrase “in terms of” mean? I hear it used constantly, but try to avoid using it myself. I think it's a trite phrase that doesn't actually mean anything or have any purpose except to annoy me, actually. I know you've used it before, but what's the best way to avoid using such a common phrase? I want to include it in my company's style guide as a phrase not to use, and would like to offer an alternative. I've used “as far as” but I don't like that either.

 Dictionaries are good at answering questions about meanings. Webster's 11th Collegiate says “in terms of” means “with respect to” or “in relation to” and gives the example “He thinks of everything in terms of money.” I know that sometimes we fixate on phrases that sound like just so much throat-clearing or blather, but we probably wouldn't be comfortable either if everyone wrote and spoke with perfectly stripped-down precision. Although little transitions like “in terms of” might be eliminated or reduced to monosyllables, they can also add rhythm or just stall for time. In the Webster's example, the phrase is doing honest


work; I can't think of a better way to express the point. It would be a shame to banish the phrase in your style book. I hope as a general policy you'll keep the prohibitions to a minimum. Writers need flexibility to produce clear and elegant writing.

 I seem to be alone in my habit of including a comma in e-mail greetings that begin with a salutation (e.g., “Hi, Mom!”). Most people, perhaps inspired by the more formal “Dear Mom,” seem to think it should be without comma. What do you think?


 You are right: in formal writing, direct address takes a comma before the person's name. One could argue, however, that e-mails aren't formal, and that there's little harm in streamlining for the sake of efficiency—and I think I can speak for moms everywhere in saying that we'll take whatever we get in this regard.


 When I was working on my graduate degree in English, I was told by a professor that the rule had changed for plurals of numbers (written as numbers) and letters (3s rather than 3's or As rather than A's). For the past 15 years I have been teaching it that way. Another colleague just recently saw that rule change somewhere online. Our new textbooks, however, do not teach it that way. We are currently working on a new handbook and would like to know if the rule has been changed or not. Thanks.

1. NEW QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS


 Chicago style omits the apostrophe, but the thing about style is, there is no single great arbiter who makes rules that everyone follows. Different houses use different styles. Following a particular style allows a person to be consistent within a given document, but it really doesn't matter which style you choose.


September Q&A

 Would you hyphenate “less skilled workers” or “more efficient method”? Section 7.90 of CMS 15 (subsection 1: adverb not ending in ly + participle or adverb) indicates that compounds with “least” and “most” are usually open. If you would hyphenate, or if you wouldn't, what is the reason? A colleague and I do not hyphenate such compounds, and we haven't for years, but we can't quite say why. Any insight you can provide would be appreciated.

 The hyphen can help clarify meaning in ambiguous phrases. For instance, there is a difference in meaning between “Smith Company has the most skilled workers” (the largest number of skilled workers) and “Brown Company has the most-skilled workers” (the workers with the highest skills). Where there is no danger of confusion, the hyphen may be safely omitted. “Less skilled workers” needs no hyphen (since, if numbers were meant, we would write “fewer skilled workers”); likewise, “more efficient method”


is clear without a hyphen.


 I work in a bookstore. Usually keeping my section in perfect order is a lost cause, but when trying to alphabetize I sometimes have questions about special situations. First of all, would you put O'Shaughnessy before Omartian because it has an apostrophe, or would you pretend the apostrophe isn't there for purposes of alphabetization? (I have been assuming that an apostrophe would count as a letter just before A in the alphabet.) I would also appreciate it if you could enlighten me as to whether there is an order for punctuation—if apostrophes come before hyphens and whatnot. In alphabetizing names that have abbreviations in them, should I treat author St. George as “Saint George” or “S-T-period-space-George”? It makes a big difference as to whether to put him in the STs or the SAs. Thank you for your attention.

 The answers to your questions depend on whether you are using letter-by-letter alphabetization or word-by-word, and I'm afraid the two systems are a bit too complicated to type out here. But I'm sure your store has a copy of CMS, so check out section 18.59, where the two systems are compared side by side. I'm wondering, though, whether there's much point in your sticking rigorously to one system or other. It seems to me that whether

1. NEW QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

you put “St.” in the SA or ST section, half of your browsers will probably look in one place first, and half in the other. In any case, you have my respect.

 I’m copyediting a novel in which the author has gone hyphen-mad. She is fond of such terms as “horse-yard,” “juniper-wood,” “yard-gate,” “cedar-grove,” and so on. I want to defer to an author’s stylistic preferences, but I feel too much is too much. In most cases, the meaning seems perfectly clear without a hyphen. What can I say to this author?

 Are you working for a publisher? If so, they will have guidelines that you can wave at the author. (Here, we follow Webster.) If not, you should let her know what source you follow for hyphenated compounds and ask if she has any objections. If you need to justify your method to the author, try to find cases where she’s inconsistent and explain that in order to arbitrate, you’ll be using a dictionary. Most authors are in favor of consistency, and will understand that following a reference book is the best guarantee of this. Point out that an abundance of hyphens can give a jittery feel to a narration. (A fiction writer will fear that.) Finally, make sure she understands that the same phrase can appear with and without a hyphen depending on its use as a noun or adjective, and that you’ll be marking them accordingly.

Q We can't seem to resolve this question and are hoping you can help. Which sentence is correct: "I just wish she was still alive" or "I just wish she were still alive"? As I understand it, "were" is used with a singular subject as a subjunctive to express an unreal condition. "If she were alive today . . ." My vote is with the second sentence, but we have some dissent because it doesn't sound right to others in this office. Can you help put this to rest? Thanks in advance.


A You are right; it's a subjunctive. And if it doesn't sound right to your colleagues, is it because they are under thirty? (I have a feeling nobody teaches the subjunctive anymore.)


Q I work for a technical magazine. I've always been taught that when it comes to acronyms, the rule is you spell out the words first followed by the acronym in parentheses, and then use the acronym for later references in the copy. If there are no other mentions of the acronym later in the copy, then you just spell it out without the acronym in parentheses. Is this correct? My coworker is debating this with me. Thanks!!!!!!


A Yes, that's a good system. Sometimes it's helpful to repeat the full name in later chapters as a reminder. Occasionally, too, it makes sense to use the acronym first and put the full name


1. NEW QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

in parentheses, if the acronym in question is so familiar to your expected audience that it almost goes without explication.

 We are alphabetizing a list of Broadway musical titles and are wondering how we should deal with titles in French that begin with articles (La Cage aux Folles and Les Miserables). We are leaning toward alphabetizing under the article as you suggest for place names.

 You could make an argument for that, especially since most musical buffs would probably think of these titles with their articles (La Cage, Les Miz). However, Chicago style is to ignore the articles that begin titles (in English and in other languages) when alphabetizing (see 18.48, 18.51, 18.52 for details). If your list is a long one, you might consider cross-referencing.


 In 8.208, CMS 15 indicates that titles of exhibitions should be neither italicized nor put in quotation marks. But in 17.240, you use quotation marks around an exhibition title. Which is it? It seems to me that the quotation marks are helpful.


 You're right. Almost nobody likes our idea to use headline caps alone. In fact, I just edited an art history book where the author and I decided to ignore the new rule. A boycott! If you organize one, I'll join.

Q I am working on a book about writing. May I quote briefly from the published work of other writers, with full attribution? By “briefly,” I mean no more than two sentences. Thank you.

A Yes, you may. But if you are writing a book about writing, you should run to the nearest library or bookstore and read as much as you can on the complex matters of documentation and permissions. It’s your responsibility. If you goof up in this regard, at best no agent or editor will take you seriously; at worst, you could end up in legal trouble.


Abbreviations


 I work for a technical magazine. I've always been taught that when it comes to acronyms, the rule is you spell out the words first followed by the acronym in parentheses, and then use the acronym for later references in the copy. If there are no other mentions of the acronym later in the copy, then you just spell it out without the acronym in parentheses. Is this correct? My coworker is debating this with me. Thanks!!!!!!

 Yes, that's a good system. Sometimes it's helpful to repeat

2. ABBREVIATIONS

the full name in later chapters as a reminder. Occasionally, too, it makes sense to use the acronym first and put the full name in parentheses, if the acronym in question is so familiar to your expected audience that it almost goes without explication.


 Would you please explain when to use “e.g.” and when to use “i.e.?” Thank you.

 Certainly. Both are abbreviations for Latin phrases: *id est* (“that is”) and *exempli gratia* (“for the sake of example”). So use “i.e.” when you want to rephrase something you’ve already said, and use “e.g.” when you want to offer an example. Put a comma before and after; avoid using both in the same sentence; and try not to use either in formal prose. And (a bonus tip) if you start a list with “e.g.,” there’s no need to put “etc.” at the end.

If the applicant is currently one of our tuition-paying clients, i.e., a student, the fee may be waived.

The best ingredients for pizza are green, e.g., spinach, artichokes, and green peppers.

The best ingredients for pizza are green: spinach, olives, etc.

 We have a new employee who holds two PhDs. She insists on having her name listed as “Jane Doe, PhD, PhD.” We are in a university environment and agree that degrees are important,

but doesn't this seem a bit much?


N Yes. It's probably immodest and certainly irrational and superfluous. Maybe modesty must be cast aside in today's competitive, promotional environment, but there's no question about irrational and superfluous: Jane Doe can only be one doctor of philosophy (a PhD following someone's name doesn't mean "I have one and only one PhD degree," it means "I'm a doctor of philosophy"—having achieved that status in one or more than one field). Moreover, now that PPL Therapeutics, the company that cloned Dolly, has announced that it is selling its assets and closing its doors, it is not very likely that Dr. Doe will become Drs. Doe any time soon.


Q More often in bibliographic citations, I am seeing the abbreviations s.l. and s.n. in place of n.p. where the place and/or publisher are unknown. What do these abbreviations mean, and are they likely to take over n.p.?


A The abbreviations "s.l." and "s.n." stand for the Latin terms *sine loco* (without place [of publication]) and *sine nomine* (without name [of publisher]). They also happen to coincide with French bibliographic apparatus, standing for, respectively, *sans lieu* (de publication) and *sans nom* (de maison d'édition). They might also stand for Spanish *sin lugar* and *sin nombre*. These are


2. ABBREVIATIONS


perhaps superior to the English “n.p.,” which must stand equally for “no place,” “no publisher,” or “no page,” but in English publications “n.p.,” used correctly, is more likely to be understood; CMS, therefore, recommends “n.p.” Note that “n.p.” can stand in for both publisher and place, if neither is known.

 I am trying to find out when you write if you say “an MBA” or “a MB


 ” Here is the example I’m trying to figure out: He earned an MBA from Harvard Business School and a BS from the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania.


 Write what you say. MBA is an initialism, pronounced “em be ay” (or something like that). It begins, then, with a vowel sound: write “an MB

 ” On the other hand, write “a master of business administration degree.” Initialisms and acronyms are generally intended to be read as such, whereas abbreviations (e.g., 5th St., read “fifth street”) are often meant to conjure the full form.

 I am a graduate of the U of C and working in an environment surrounded by colleagues with Oxon and Cantab after their degrees (Oxon and Cantab being abbreviations for the


Latinized forms for Oxford and Cambridge; see section 15.45 of CMS 15). Here is my stupid question: Is there a Latinized form for “Chicago” that I could use similarly? Although the word Chicago is certainly not of Indo-European origin, that certainly would not deter someone from its Latinization.


 I consulted one of my colleagues, a sort of manuscript editor emerita at the press with a good knowledge of Latin. She pointed out the word “Chicagoensis,” “a rather low-tech Latin genitive form.” Based on this I did some looking around, finding out that the inscription on the seal of the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago (adopted in 1904) is “Sigillum Diocesis Chicagoensis AD 1835—fide parta, fide aucta” (conceived in faith, by faith achieved). My colleague in any case went on to point out that “Chicago” would be a proper form of abbreviation but “rather a disappointment, as its connection with Latin does not at once appear.” Another option is “Chicagiensis,” with an i, the form apparently preferred by the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago. The abbreviation “Chicagi,” however, especially given the proximity of the i to the o on a QWERTY keyboard, will probably just look like a typo. That’s what you get for attending the Universitas Chicagoensis.

 I had always understood the term acronym to mean an ab-

2. ABBREVIATIONS

breviation that spells a word, such as *snafu* (per Webster's), but in your manual [the fourteenth edition, 1993] the two terms are used interchangeably. Can you tell me where you get your definition of acronym?

 Since 1993, we've realized that we needed to be more precise. In the fifteenth edition, therefore, we distinguish between acronyms, initialisms, and contractions, all under the umbrella of abbreviation, as follows: acronym refers only to terms based on the initial letters of their various elements and read as single words (NATO, AIDS); initialism to terms read as a series of letters (BBC, ATM); and contraction to abbreviations that include the first and last letters of the full word (Mr., amt.). These distinctions can also be found in the multivolume work *Acronyms, Initialisms, and Abbreviations Dictionary*, edited by Mary Rose Bonk and published in its twenty-seventh edition in 2000 by Gale Research Incorporated.

 I hope you can resolve a dispute between me and my editor. After introducing an acronym, e.g., "Bureau of Land Management," to "BLM," I like to drop the "the" in introducing it. For example, I think the least awkward way is to say "BLM is charged with the oversight of . . ." as opposed to "The BLM is . . ." Do you have any rule that covers this issue?

F Generally, if “the” is part of the name, but not absorbed by the abbreviation, one should use “the” as if the abbreviation were spelled out:

The NFL comprises thirty-one teams.

NFL games rarely get postponed owing to inclement weather.

In its ninety-two years, the NAACP has been a cornerstone of American civil liberties organizations.

NAACP membership is open to all who can afford it.

Advertisers for AT&T made a splash by incorporating the wah-wah pedal into recent advertisements for high-bandwidth cable.

Do you listen to the BBC?

In other words, “the” is necessary unless the abbreviation is used as an adjective or unless the abbreviation spelled out wouldn’t take a definite article (as is the case for American Telephone and Telegraph, though I think the company has more or less dropped the antecedent to its initials).


The BLM’s own documentation demonstrates this usage.


Q Do you recommend the use of BCE (Before the Common Era) and CE (Common Era) instead of BC and AD? Has the debate about these been settled or is it still in flux?


A We are not aware of any intense debate. The choice between one or the other is up to the writer and should be flagged


2. ABBREVIATIONS

only if the customs of a specific field or community seem to be in danger of being (unwittingly) violated. Many authors use BC and AD because they are familiar and conventionally understood. Those who want to avoid reference to Christianity are free to do so.


 We want to know the usage of “etc.” at the END of a sentence, that is, as the last word of a sentence. Is it spelled out?


 The expression “et cetera” is rarely used. Its abbreviation “etc.” is discouraged in formal writing; CMS recommends that, if used, it should be confined to parenthetical material or lists and tables. There is, however, no difference between the abbreviation and the two-word Latin expression it represents, and the position in a sentence has no bearing on which is more appropriate. For the use of commas with “etc.” and some of its English equivalents, see paragraph 6.22 in the fifteenth edition of CMS.

 How should we handle file extensions like PDF (portable document format, an Adobe Acrobat file)—lowercase, preceded by a period, or all uppercase? Other examples are GIF and JPG (or JPEG).

 We consider these to be initialisms or acronyms, as the case may be, when they are not doing duty as file extensions ap-

pended to a file name: so PDF, JPG, GIF.

 In running text, what is the preferred way to write “Washington, D.C.”?

 When using the traditional form of abbreviation—that is, with periods, D.C.—use commas:

Washington, D.C., was built on what was essentially swampland.

When using the abbreviations recommended by the US Postal Service, commas may be omitted:

To me, Washington DC is first and foremost the home of the Smithsonian.


Alphabetizing




I work in a bookstore. Usually keeping my section in perfect order is a lost cause, but when trying to alphabetize I sometimes have questions about special situations. First of all, would you put O'Shaughnessy before Omartian because it has an apostrophe, or would you pretend the apostrophe isn't there for purposes of alphabetization? (I have been assuming that an apostrophe would count as a letter just before A in the alphabet.) I would also appreciate it if you could enlighten me as to

3. ALPHABETIZING

whether there is an order for punctuation—if apostrophes come before hyphens and whatnot. In alphabetizing names that have abbreviations in them, should I treat author St. George as “Saint George” or “S-T-period-space-George”? It makes a big difference as to whether to put him in the STs or the SAs. Thank you for your attention.


 The answers to your questions depend on whether you are using letter-by-letter alphabetization or word-by-word, and I’m afraid the two systems are a bit too complicated to type out here. But I’m sure your store has a copy of CMS, so check out section 18.59, where the two systems are compared side by side. I’m wondering, though, whether there’s much point in your sticking rigorously to one system or other. It seems to me that whether you put “St.” in the SA or ST section, half of your browsers will probably look in one place first, and half in the other. In any case, you have my respect.


 We are alphabetizing a list of Broadway musical titles and are wondering how we should deal with titles in French that begin with articles (La Cage aux Folles and Les Miserables). We are leaning toward alphabetizing under the article as you suggest for place names.

 You could make an argument for that, especially since most

musical buffs would probably think of these titles with their articles (La Cage, Les Miz). However, Chicago style is to ignore the articles that begin titles (in English and in other languages) when alphabetizing (see 18.48, 18.51, 18.52 for details). If your list is a long one, you might consider cross-referencing.

Ampersands

 I have an author who is hot under the collar because we replaced all of the ampersands in company names with “and,” per CMS 14.12. The author insists that this is incorrect and that the ampersand is part of the legal name of the company. Can you help me?

 Your interpretation of the fourteenth edition is correct: CMS 14 regards ampersands as abbreviations that may be changed to “and” in running text. Exceptions include expressions like “R&D”

4. AMPERSANDS

and names of corporations that are generally abbreviated, such as AT&T, where it would be odd to spell out “and” but not the rest of the abbreviation.


That said, there seems to be an increasing tendency to want to reproduce a company name exactly as it is represented by the company itself. And the fifteenth edition of CMS leans toward allowing ampersands in corporate names—though they are better limited to such apparatus as notes, bibliographies, and tables (see paragraph 15.24), where other abbreviations are customary and where space might be at a premium.


I doubt this is a legal matter. The line has to be drawn somewhere, and as with all lines, there will be some disagreement as to where. Is an author obligated to reproduce a company’s logotype in running text, right down to the latest corporate specifications (e.g., a certain typeface, in a certain color, all lowercase, at certain sizes)? Of course not. And CMS continues to favor spelling out ampersands in formal text. An ampersand means “and” just as “Co.” means “Company.”

Capitalization, Titles

Q In 8.208, CMS 15 indicates that titles of exhibitions should be neither italicized nor put in quotation marks. But in 17.240, you use quotation marks around an exhibition title. Which is it? It seems to me that the quotation marks are helpful.

A You're right. Almost nobody likes our idea to use headline caps alone. In fact, I just edited an art history book where the author and I decided to ignore the new rule. A boycott! If you organize one, I'll join.

 Hello, my name is Brett and I work for a law enforcement agency in Arizona. My colleagues and I were having a discussion about what does and does not get capitalized in our reports pertaining to laws and arrest charges. I am seeking your guidance on this subject. Could you tell me what gets capitalized and what does not get capitalized in the following sentence: “John Doe was arrested for ADC Parole Violation Warrant 03W3250, Theft of Means of Transportation and Unlawful Flight from Law Enforcement.” Some say the sentence is correct as is; however, others say that the letters in the arrest charges should not be capitalized. Could you please assist me in this matter? Thank you for your help.

 It’s heartwarming that Arizona law enforcers are taking care with capitalization! Your sentence is fine as it is, although it wouldn’t be wrong to lowercase everything. If you and your colleagues feel there should be consistency in these matters, you could agree on a house style and keep a list of examples. While Chicago style tends to prefer lowercasing in general, there are good reasons to uppercase the titles of laws and charges—it helps the reader know where the title begins and ends and makes it stand out in the text, so it’s quickly found if someone is skimming for it.

Q CMS, 14th edition, paragraph 7.19, mentions that titles are commonly lowercase (president of the United States) but that there is an exception with the title of Speaker. There is debate in my office over the titles of archivist of the United States, Smithsonian secretary, and librarian of Congress. If they do not precede a name, do they remain lowercase?

A Yes, lowercase the titles. After all, how fair would it be to lowercase the president and uppercase the librarian? The Speaker gets special treatment, though, probably because in an institution like the House, where everyone wants to talk and all the talk is recorded for posterity, it has to be clear whether the reference is to the presiding officer (the Speaker) or the person currently blabbing away (the speaker).

Q When referring to a movie or book title while posting to Internet newsgroups, it's generally impossible to indicate with italics or underscoring. I usually use all upper-case letters (THE LORD OF THE RINGS, FIDDLER ON THE ROOF, for example). What does CMS suggest?


A Notwithstanding the tradition among publishers of presenting book titles in full capitals in industry correspondence, interdepartmental memos, and the like—the practice was popu-


5. CAPITALIZATION, TITLES

lar because it saved time on typewriters that required extra keystrokes for underscoring—we recommend avoiding all capitals to express titles that would otherwise be italicized. Instead, use the underscore key (type Shift plus the hyphen key on standard keyboards) when italic type is unavailable:


When I first read *The History of the Siege of Lisbon*, I was so grateful to discover a book about a proofreader that Saramago's hypnotic stringing together of sentences nearly sent me into an ecstatic trance.


Sometimes asterisks rather than the underscore key are used to express emphasis (e.g., I can't *stand* one more day of separation from you), but asterisks can be more strictly interpreted as indicating boldface.

 In the fourteenth edition “history department” is given at 7.60. However, in the fifteenth edition, only “Department of History” is given. Is “history department” (no caps) still recommended?


 Although section 8.73 of the new edition rephrases slightly, our style has not changed. When referring to the official name of a department, use caps; when referring to a department more generally or with a phrase that varies from its official title, lowercase: Charlene is now the Sophonisba Breckinridge Profes-


sor of Demographic Studies in the University of Des Moines Department of Sociology. She has wanted to work in that sociology department since she was eight years old.


 Related to the headings and subheadings of a work, should the c in “o’clock” be capitalized in headline style? Is the proper title “The Origins of Our Three O’clock Prayer” or “The Origins of Our Three O’Clock Prayer”? I think it should appear with a small c. Help!


 Your question highlights just how very arbitrary any set of recommendations for “headline style” capitalization can be. O’clock is a contraction, so you might treat it like one word, capitalizing only the first o. But it works okay too as o’Clock, because it reads more like a phrase than a single word, and the first o stands for “of the,” words that wouldn’t be capitalized in the middle of a headline. Finally, O’Clock tends to look right—a brief survey of titles of news programs and book covers suggests O’Clock is in the majority, and, though the contraction isn’t Irish, it certainly looks right in an English-language world full of O’Caseys and O’Neills. Arbitrary situations, however, call out for definite rules: we recommend O’clock, treating the contraction as what it is—a single word.

5. CAPITALIZATION, TITLES

 Besides italicization, does “ceteris paribus” require an initial C? In an article of mine, I wrote: “With this notation, the ceteris paribus cost relevant to the source . . .” The copyeditor capitalized “ceteris” but not “paribus.” Why would that be?

 I can only imagine that your copyeditor thought that “ceteris paribus” was some sort of species of the animal kingdom, perhaps a distant relative of the wood pigeon (*Columba palumbus*). Note also that, all things being equal, CMS doesn’t recommend italicizing any Latin phrase common enough to be included in a dictionary like *American Heritage* or *Merriam-Webster’s*.

 Are there any exceptions to paragraph 8.180 in CMS 15, which states that the “the” in newspaper and magazine titles should be lowercase and roman? I’ve seen some publications keep the article uppercase (i.e., *The New Yorker*). Thanks for your insight.

 It has been our policy for decades to recommend that any initial “the” in the titles of periodicals (journals, magazines, and newspapers) be subsumed by the surrounding text or simply dropped, depending on circumstances.

The *New Yorker’s* cartoons are great for people on the go, like me. I can justify the subscription without having to feel bad about not reading the articles.


When I read the *Times*, I pretend not to see the crossword puzzle.


I have enough work to do as it is.


In notes and bibliographies, an initial “the” is omitted:

Korte, Tim. “Jordan Lifts Wizards” (AP), *Washington Post*, March 27, 2003.


Publications like *The Chicago Manual of Style*—in other words, books—are not subject to this rule.

 When I refer to the government of the United States in text, should it be U.S. Federal Government or U.S. federal government?

 The government of the United States is not a single official entity. Nor is it when it is referred to as the federal government or the U.S. government or the U.S. federal government. It’s just a government, which, like those in all countries, has some official bodies that act and operate in the name of government: the Congress, the Senate, the Department of State, etc.

 My colleagues and I are perplexed by the format of film series titles. According to paragraph 8.186, book series are not italicized. Television series, according to 8.196, are italicized. My inclination is to call the Tolkien adaptations “the Lord of the Rings series,” but to call the Rowling adaptations “the Harry Potter series.” One colleague says both series titles should be roman; an-

other wonders whether both should be italicized. And then there's the pesky matter of the initial article, which I think modifies series in this case and should not be considered part of the title.


 Paragraph 8.186 refers to titles of series under which a number of more or less related books, often by different authors, have been published. Our decision to use roman type was made, presumably, so that the titles of these series would not be mistaken for the title of a book itself.


Your two examples are rather different. *The Lord of the Rings*—in book and movie media—is the name of a single work (often presented in the form of a trilogy), not a series. In the same way, Paul Scott's *Raj Quartet* is the name of a quartet, not a series. *The Raj Quartet* is a book—a book in four books. *The Jewel in the Crown* is the name of Granada television's multiepisode adaptation of *The Raj Quartet*. Phoenix Fiction, on the other hand, is a number of books (including *The Raj Quartet*) published by the series editors for Phoenix Fiction. These books are only loosely related (in this case, they are republications of often overlooked or out-of-print novelists), and to italicize Phoenix Fiction would give the false indication of a single coherent work of some sort.


Harry Potter is both the protagonist and part of each of the titles in the series so far. Harry Potter, as a name, characterizes the Harry Potter series. To write "Harry Potter series" might indicate that there's some sort of work out there known as Harry Potter,

which, as far as I know, is inaccurate.

This is all a long way of saying I agree with you—even down to the “the”: when it’s grammatically convenient, an initial “the” in a title can be subsumed by the surrounding sentence.


 What is the proper way to capitalize (or not capitalize) “generation X”? Merriam-Webster lists “baby boom” and “baby boomer,” which I would normally take as a precedent, but it seems that “generation” should be capitalized because it precedes a single letter. Has this been decided?


 Your instincts agree with American Heritage, the fourth edition of which (available through <http://www.bartleby.com/>) includes for this epithet the capitalized entry “Generation X” (as well as “Generation Y”).


 Every institution for which I have worked seems to have a different practice relating to the capitalization of college or university when referring to the specific institution while dropping the proper name. I used to work for Cornell University’s admissions office. That office insisted on not capitalizing university when using the word without Cornell but still referring to CU specifically. For example,
Once I visited Cornell, there was no choice left for me to make. I

fell in love with the university—the people were so friendly and helpful. It didn't hurt that the campus was gorgeous either!

I had previously been told that one should capitalize university or college when referring to a specific institution. If Cornell's practice is correct, could you please explain why?


 Cornell's practice strictly follows the recommendations set forth in *The Chicago Manual of Style*. Most institutions (including the University of Chicago itself) do not follow our rule, however. The purpose of a university's literature about itself is to promote itself. Each university is, to itself, the only University in the entire world that matters. That's fine. The recommendations in CMS are intended to promote objective analytical writing—a mission that's not always convenient in promotional settings. I would suggest that universities (including ours) follow the example of Cornell—especially if they want to attract more prospective copyeditors.


 I hope you can definitively answer this question. Should the word following a colon in a sentence be capitalized or not?

 When a colon is used within a sentence, the first word following the colon is lowercased unless it is a proper name. When a colon introduces two or more sentences, or when it introduces speech in dialogue or an extract, the first word following it is cap-

italized.

That's a little more cut and dried than what we've advised in the past, but we've found that it's just not practical to make separate distinctions based on criteria like degree of emphasis or formality of the statement that follows the colon. Besides, a second initial capital in a single sentence—colon or no colon—can be distracting.

 For rock fans, such as myself, it is sometimes important to know whether one is to capitalize the “the” preceding a rock group’s name. For instance, the group “the Who.” In the middle of a sentence, do I say “the Who” or “The Who,” given that the “the” is an integral part of the title and furthermore is the first word in the title?

 When the name of a band requires the definite article, lowercase it in running text:

When I first saw the Who, they had short hair; when I last saw them, that was again true.

I can't believe the Rolling Stones didn't retire with all their money years ago.

The day I was introduced to the The was the day I learned that irony was finished.

It is true that “the” often gets capitalized on album covers, but

5. CAPITALIZATION, TITLES

our rule is to capitalize the first and last word in any title, which fits in with that practice (the *The* has usually employed a lowercase “the” nested above an uppercase “The” on its covers). Exceptions to the proper the rule are names that are captured within italics or quotation marks within running text. Hence,


Have you ever heard “The Real Me,” that song by the Who?

I have three copies of *The Soft Parade*, one of the Doors’ lesser-known albums.

but

Hey! Where did you put my *Soft Parade* LP?

The very last example illustrates the dropping of the article when it is grammatically subsumed by the rest of the sentence. Now what about that much newer group called *tha Eastsidaz*—capital *Tha Eastsidaz*? Probably best. On a final note, future bands may want to choose their names more wisely than did the *The* and the *Who*. There’s a tendency for search engines to ignore articles and common pronouns.

 When referring to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, in saying “the Corps of Engineers” and “the Corps,” how should the shortened forms be capitalized? Should “the Corps of Engineers” be in initial caps and “the corps” be in lowercase?


 The Chicago Manual of Style includes the following examples

among the forty or so examples listed at paragraph 8.120:
Army Corps of Engineers; the corps
United States (or U.S.) Army; the army
United States Coast Guard; the Coast Guard or the coast guard
United States Marine Corps; the Marine Corps; the U.S. Marines;
a marine
United States Navy; the navy
United States Signal Corps; the Signal Corps or the signal corps
The terms “army” and “navy” when used alone are considered to be generic, whereas, for example, the “Army Corps of Engineers” (or “Corps of Engineers”) and the “Marine Corps” are more specialized by virtue of being unique subbranches within the U.S. armed forces. “Coast Guard” and “Signal Corps,” on the same principle, are often capitalized, but they may be lowercased if used alone. “Corps” becomes generic when used by itself.



I am having a discussion/argument with my author's editor over the presentation of *Pizza and its Variations: Beyond Two Pi R*, the title [changed for this forum] of a forthcoming book edited by myself. The title is so presented in the UK edition, and the American publisher is insisting that this is incorrect (or at any rate in defiance of normal convention), and “Its” should be used, despite the fact that the lowercase version appears in the book (whose text will be the same in both editions). Quite apart from


the question of consistency, I feel that in the case of this particular title a capital I' would take the eye away from the two important words, "Pizza" and "Variations." Do you have a (quick, please!) view?


 Correct headline-style capitalization as defined by The Chicago Manual of Style would call for capital "Its." All nouns—pronouns included—get capitalized according to our rule (see paragraph 8.167). And while we are flattered that the American publisher is following our guidelines to a tee, I do see your point. Rules are by nature inflexible. And for this particular rule, there's certainly no loophole such as "but that word's not important." An opposite problem was encountered with our own publication of the novel *A River Runs Through It* by Norman Maclean (yes, the lowercase "l" is how he spelled his name). According to our rules at the time, "through," a preposition, would not get a capital "t" in titles. Somebody here wisely objected to this, so we capitalized it. We've since added an exception for prepositions that are stressed or used adjectivally or adverbially.

Sometimes I see other titles—John Updike's *Rabbit Is Rich* comes to mind—for which I'd rather break the rule. It seems that it should be, for example, *Rabbit is Rich*, "is" playing its almost invisible linking role, nothing more. And at least one paperback edition of that book featured lowercase "is" on its cover. (Perhaps the goal was to emphasize the two R words in keeping with

the rest of Updike's tetralogy: *Rabbit, Run*; *Rabbit Redux*; and *Rabbit at Rest*.) But I came late to CMS (that is, a couple of years after I'd reached the age of majority); years of copyediting have since knocked down (or flogged out) most of my objections to following a title-capitalization rule based on parts of speech. I now secretly thrill as I capitalize, for example, errant instances of "it" as I comb through a bibliography.


Keep in mind, finally, that the rule was more than likely imposed to allow copyeditors and authors to make quick, consistent, logical, and reasonable decisions about capitalization when writing or fixing the sometimes immense number of titles mentioned in academic monographs. At some point, considerations of meaning and aesthetics can probably be let in—especially on the cover of a book, and especially for a work of fiction.


 When referring to a specific conference, would the word "conference" be capitalized when used alone? For example, "I attended the Western Region Writing Style Conference earlier this year. During the Conference I learned . . ."

 "Conference" should be capitalized only if it is in fact part of the official title of the conference. So, the Fifteenth Computers and Writing Conference; the conference; that conference on computers and writing

5. CAPITALIZATION, TITLES

Official titles are capitalized, whereas generic terms used to talk about the official conference are not.

 People Seem to Have Capitalitis These Days. I am editing our company directory and wondering if all titles must be capitalized. My column headings include “Name” and “Title.” Under “Name,” I have Joe Smith. Under “Title,” which is correct: “Customer Service” or “customer service”?


 You may be happy to know that the University of Chicago Press considers almost all titles to be generic unless they are used as part of a name. Practically no one gets special treatment—neither the pope nor the president of the United States. But in something like a company directory, people may decide that they prefer capitals, as a sign of respect, for example. The recommendations in *The Chicago Manual of Style* apply for the most part to descriptive and analytical texts. Excess capitalization hinders an argument’s clarity.


Your directory, however, might be an exception to our general recommendations. See paragraph 8.22 of the fifteenth edition of the manual:


In formal contexts as opposed to running text, such as a displayed list of donors in the front matter of a book or a list of corporate officers in an annual report, titles are usually capitalized


even when following a personal name. Exceptions may also be called for in promotional or other contexts for reasons of courtesy or politics.


So though we at the press share your disdain for capitalization, please consider the exceptions and decide where your directory fits.


 I'm confused why CMS suggests leaving "cold war" lowercase in rule 8.81. It seems to me that it should be capped, because it's a clear historical period. Pleeeaaaze help.

 Yes, the fifteenth edition of CMS, paragraph 8.81, lists "cold war" as an exception to those major historical events and projects that are capitalized. It has always been my understanding that the reason we do not capitalize "cold war" (which our manual first addressed in the twelfth edition, 1969) has something to do with its general, descriptive nature. There was, for about four and a half decades, a state of global political tension that was described not quite as war but rather as "cold war." Some would argue, however, especially after the events of 1989 and 1991, that there had been a real war, on the level of a war like the Second World War, specifically between the United States and the Soviet Union, and that this war should be capitalized. We will consider adding this distinction to future editions of the manual.

 I am unable to find a ruling on state nicknames in my Chicago manual. Am I overlooking it? Is it “aloha state,” “Aloha state,” or “Aloha State”?

 I think it’s safe to capitalize it as the Aloha State. It’s essentially a proper name because it is a nickname for the proper entity Hawaii (nicknames for people are capitalized). And according to paragraph 8.51, popular names for places and epithets are usually capitalized. See that paragraph for examples.

 Do you capitalize Scotch when it’s used singularly as a noun, or only in a proper name situation: Let’s have a scotch. I drink Scotch whisky and Irish coffee. Thank you!

 According to CMS, 15th ed., 8.65, Personal, national, or geographical names, and words derived from such names, are often lowercased when used with a non-literal meaning. For example, “an excellent Swiss gruyere” refers to a cheese made in Switzerland, whereas “swiss cheese” is an American cheese with holes in it. Among the examples included at 8.65 is “scotch whisky.” But in your example, you are right to capitalize “Scotch” in “Scotch whisky” because you are opposing “Scotch” to “Irish.”

Q I am writing a text and need help with one thing. I checked your Q&A and didn't see anything on this so I'll ask here. Do government offices and bureaus need to be capitalized? For example, the Wireless Bureau of the FCC, or can it be listed in a sentence as the wireless bureau of the FCC? Thanks!

A According to the examples given in CMS 8.68, official names of administrative bodies are capitalized, whereas just part of the name is not. So, in your example, it would be like this:

The FCC's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau today set guidelines for broadcast frequencies at the 2002 Olympic Games in Salt Lake City, Utah. The bureau plans to publish these guidelines on the World Wide Web within the next seven days.

Note that subsequent mentions of "the bureau" are lowercased. You might also do this:

The FCC's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (WTB) today set guidelines for broadcast frequencies at the 2002 Olympic Games in Salt Lake City, Utah. The WTB plans to publish these guidelines on the World Wide Web within the next seven days.

Note also that the official name is the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau. If you were to refer simply to the "wireless bureau of the FCC," it would have to be lowercase, as when you say only "the bureau," because you are not giving the official title of the organization.

5. CAPITALIZATION, TITLES

Q In the phrase “federal constitutional law,” should the “c” in “constitutional” be capitalized? I say no, but a coworker says yes.


A You are right. The “Constitution,” referring to the U.S. Constitution, is capitalized. The adjective “constitutional” is never capitalized.


Q Dear CMS, As a religious writer I am struggling with a recent (apparent) change. With the advent of computer spell-checkers, the term “biblical” when referring to the Holy Scriptures is no longer capitalized. Turabian seems to indicate that proper adjectives should be capitalized, whereas even older editions of the Oxford American Unabridged Dictionary (for instance) do not. It would seem to me, since the term “bible” when not capitalized can refer to a number of authoritative books in various fields, that the reference to the Holy Bible as a proper noun should be capitalized in its adjectival form. What say you? Thank you.

A CMS does not capitalize “biblical,” and hasn’t as far back as I can check in our library here (the 11th edition, 1949), so I don’t think we can consider this a recent change. Although I’m sure some publications, especially religious ones, would cap it as part of their house style, CMS tends to lowercase whenever


possible. We lowercase the president, the pope, and the queen—words that you will often see capped elsewhere. Even when we uppercase a proper noun, like Congress or Senate, we might lowercase the adjective: congressional or senatorial.


When setting style, we always consider whether a rule will create confusion. Since the word “biblical” is rarely used other than in reference to a book of sacred scriptures, I doubt that readers would misconstrue its meaning, especially in a religious context. If you find that lowercasing it in your writing results in ambiguity, however, then by all means uppercase it.

 Dear CMS: In paragraph 8.50 of CMS 15, you indicate that I need to capitalize regions in the United States such as the Northwest, East Coast, etc. What do I do when attempting to indicate specific regions in a particular county of a state? Do I write the North Central region of Contra Costa County, or do I lowercase north central, etc.? I believe that it should be the latter form, but I am not sure. Can you shed some light on this problem? P.S. I think you are gods! (If that will help get a quick response!! Thanks for your help :-)

 (Make that “goddesses” and it will definitely get you a quicker reply.) Yes, you are right. We would lowercase regions within counties.


CMS


 Dear Staff, Is there a CD version of Chicago for sale? It would be wonderful to be able to use a search feature when looking up specific words of interest. I thank you for this wonderful book and for your time.


 We're working on it! Keep an eye on our Web site in the next few months for news of the electronic edition. Meanwhile, I assume you've discovered the "Search the Manual" feature on this page. It's a useful concordance to the paper edition of CMS

6. CMS


15.


 Are there plans to update Turabian? My daughter's school insists that the students adhere to it, despite the lack of information about citing online sources—which as you can imagine make up a good portion of the sources that junior high students want to cite. The teachers appear not to have heard of CMS, and if I allow my daughter to use CMS 15 instead of Turabian she may be penalized for “not following the rules.” Please don't suggest another school.


 A revision of Turabian is in progress, but the book is at least a year away. You can check our Web site periodically to see if the new edition has been announced. Sometimes teachers prefer that their students avoid online sources and get comfortable with conventional research methods until they learn to judge the quality of information they find on the Internet, so I wouldn't assume that your daughter's teacher is being unreasonable. In any case, Turabian gives examples of online source citations in sections 8.141 and 11.57.

 Our department's editorial manual includes a list of cities in the United States and other countries that can be referred to in display type or running text without giving the state or country

designation. This list has apparently been in use for many years, but none of our current staff can be sure of its source! Does CMS include an authoritative list of these cities?

 We don't have such a list; rather, we rely entirely on editorial judgment. Can Paris stand alone? Usually, but not in an article about Paris, Texas. Can Rome stand alone? Usually. Chicago? Of course: nobody even knows for certain what "Chicago" means, and few have been tempted to copy it. But your departmental list is a great idea. Whereas we do not feel that our manual can speak definitively to the entire English-speaking world on this issue, a single department or publication can gain efficiency by agreeing on specific guidelines.

 Which manual of style is the oldest in the world? Is it The Chicago Manual of Style? I'm a Brazilian teacher, and I am doing a paper about style books.

 The Chicago Manual of Style is perhaps one of the oldest American manuals of style. But it is certainly not the oldest in the world. In 1848, B. H. Smart's *Manual of rhetoric: with exercises for the improvement of style or diction, subjects for narratives, familiar letters, school orations, &c.:* being one of two sequels to "Grammar on its true basis" was published by Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. Smart wrote manuals about

6. CMS

elocution, logic, thesis writing, and grammar. In 1892, William Minto's *Manual of English Prose Literature* was published in Boston. The United States Government Printing Office has been publishing a manual since 1900 that is very similar to Chicago's: *Manual of style governing composition and proof reading in the Government printing office*, together with decisions of the Board on geographic names. This information is based on a search of OCLC's FirstSearch database and is probably the tip of the iceberg, though this date-restricted search seems to indicate that the first truly broad style manuals aimed at publishers began to be popular starting about 1900. The first Chicago "manual of style" was published in 1906. It was called *A Manual of Style* and included type specimens.



I have always regarded your publication with respect and awe. It seems almost sacrilegious to mention this, but I have found an error on p. 734 of the fourteenth edition, fourth printing. The information on indexes lists "Truman, Bess (Mrs. Harry S.)" as an example. Harry Truman had no middle name, and so the letter S has no period, since it does not represent anything longer than itself. Whenever his name is written, it is Harry S Truman. I imagine the same would apply even as an oblique reference describing his "better half." Keep up the good work!

F Please see paragraph 15.12 of the fifteenth edition, which (in line with 14.4 in the fourteenth), states the following:


Initials standing for given names are followed by a period and a word space. A period is normally used even if the middle initial does not stand for a name (as in Harry S. Truman).


Note the word “normally”; purists are free to remain purists (and the world would be a lesser place without them).


Q While proofreading a colleague’s work today I referred to page 306, section 8.48 of the fourteenth edition of CMS, which shows examples of abbreviations for divisions of the day. The example I intended to point out is the third one, “12:00 P.M. (midnight).” My colleague showed me her CMS (same edition) and asked me to point out the example. In her copy, only the first of the five examples is the same as in my copy. The others are different. Other than the two sets of examples, we can find nothing that differentiates the two copies of the book; nor can we find any indication of which copy was printed more recently. Which version has the correct examples? Are there any other differences that we might encounter? Thanks in advance for your response.

F Don’t you just love a good mystery? Your colleague’s book is correct, and is a more recent printing than yours. If you look at p. iv, at the line just below “Printed in the United States


of America,” you can see what printing your book is by checking the number at the very end of the line. Over the years, we issued about ten printings of the fourteenth edition. Each time we reprinted, we corrected errors that had been pointed out since the last printing. In section 8.48 we wanted to eliminate two examples that seemed more confusing than helpful (and 12:00 P.M. is in fact noon). For the fifteenth edition, we have made several clarifications, including the recommendation that numerals not be used for midnight and noon except in the twenty-four-hour system. Note also that the fifteenth recommends writing “a.m.” and “p.m.,” though the more traditional small capitals are still accepted (but now without periods: AM and PM).

 Does your manual include the standard format for business letters? That is, alignment on page, where date and address appear, spacing, signature line, etc. I’m having trouble locating the format that is used in the industry today. Thanks.

 Manuals that are specifically devoted to business writing can cover such topics much more thoroughly than CMS. You might check the reference section of your local bookstore or library for books on business writing or business etiquette.

 Dear “My New Best Friend” (copyeditor): Is there a “Cliff

Notes” version of the Chicago Manual of Style or any quick reference type of document with the general rules?? (I have the fourteenth edition.) I do appreciate your assistance. Long life to you as a copyeditor. P.S. I am doing a doctoral dissertation and would like to get the style correct in the beginning.


 Yes—we hear that Cliffs is going to work on CMS as soon as they finish with their version of the Chicago Yellow Pages. In the meantime, you might check out Kate L. Turabian’s *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, a much smaller style guide than CMS, especially tailored for student research projects. (Turabian will tell you how to cite all the Cliffs Notes you used for your dissertation.)


Commas

DI seem to be alone in my habit of including a comma in e-mail greetings that begin with a salutation (e.g., “Hi, Mom!”). Most people, perhaps inspired by the more formal “Dear Mom,” seem to think it should be without comma. What do you think?

FYou are right: in formal writing, direct address takes a comma before the person’s name. One could argue, however, that e-mails aren’t formal, and that there’s little harm in streamlining for the sake of efficiency?and I think I can speak for moms every-

where in saying that we'll take whatever we get in this regard.

 Are phrases regarding the location of something deemed restrictive or not? Must one know whether only one exists in order to insert commas? I know it is always “the White House, in Washington, D.C.” But must it also then be “Bob’s Hardware in Dallas” when I do not know if there are other places that go by the same name? If I encountered “Bob’s upstairs neighbor Bill,” and didn’t know if he lived below one person or on the second floor of a ten-story building, I would have to make it restrictive, yes? So wouldn’t the same rule apply here? I work for a weekly magazine without a research department and this question has been preying on my frazzled mind for some time? please help!

 I must admit that this problem has never crossed my mind? probably because copy editors rarely have the time and resources to check every fact they read and must therefore allow a certain amount of ambiguity in order to get through the day. When the facts are unknown, I would treat the phrase as though it were restrictive, with the reasoning that it’s cleaner and easier to omit the commas. In fact, in informal prose, CMS sanctions this treatment in phrases that are technically nonrestrictive (e.g., Ursula’s husband Clifford; see CMS 6.43).

Q I think I have a pretty clear understanding of restrictive and nonrestrictive adjective clauses, but CMS 6.36 applies the terms “restrictive” and “nonrestrictive” to what I have been calling adverb clauses (clauses beginning with when, because, if, so that, and many more), and I’m all confused. The “comma for a pause” rule frustrates me because I have no idea whether you and I pause alike. Where can I find guidance about the meaning of “restrictive” and “nonrestrictive” in respect to adverb clauses?

A You can find explanations in our Q&A archive (just type “restrictive” in the search box). The meaning is the same for adverb and adjective phrases. If a chunk of sentence (whatever it is) delimits or defines a subject or verb or main clause, it’s restrictive; if it merely tacks on some extra information, it’s nonrestrictive. As for commas and pauses, that’s the great thing about writing: you get to write in your voice and I get to write in mine. I hope you pause in different places?it makes us both special.

Q I totally agree with Chicago’s use of the serial comma. However, I am creating a style guide for a company that does not use the serial comma. For the sake of consistency, I am considering stating in the guide that the serial comma is not to be used at all (yikes!). My question is: Is it better to be consistent (and not use the serial comma at all) OR to add in the serial comma ONLY

when it is necessary to prevent ambiguity? I wish that I could just DEMAND the use of the serial comma at all times, but alas, I am just a lowly intern. Thanks a lot for your help!

N Well, if you don't allow it at all, you will at times be stuck with situations like the following hypothetical dedication page that our managing editor likes to cite: "With gratitude to my parents, Mother Teresa and the pope." (Maybe that example will help you change your company's policy.)

Q Please help clarify a debate over what I see as a groundless but persistent carryover from high-school English classes: the comma-before-too "rule." The rule goes something like this: When "too" is used in the sense of "also," use a comma before and after "too" in the middle of a sentence and a comma before "too" at the end of a sentence. I am editing a work of fiction in which the author has rigidly applied the rule. I have just as rigidly deleted the commas. My managing editor believes that a comma is needed when "too" refers to an item in a list and has the sense of "in addition" (e.g., "I like apples and bananas, too."), but she would omit the comma when "too" refers to the subject of the sentence (e.g., "Oh, you like apples and bananas? I like apples and bananas too."). My managing editor's rule helps make a useful distinction, but I am still wondering whether the comma is

ever grammatically justified.

FA comma can do some work in making the meaning of a sentence clear, but to claim two different meanings for I like apples and bananas too with and without a comma before too puts too much pressure on the comma. Out of context, neither version would be perfectly clear. To make the different meanings more apparent, short of additional context, you'd have to be more explicit:

I too like apples and bananas. I like not only apples but bananas too.

Use commas with too only when you want to emphasize an abrupt change of thought:

He didn't know at first what hit him, but then, too, he hadn't ever walked in a field strewn with garden rakes.

In most other cases, commas with this short adverb are unnecessary (an exception being sentences that begin with too?in the sense of also?a construction some writers would avoid as being too awkward).

QWhat is a "restrictive" appositive? I have read paragraphs 5.29 and 6.31, but I do not understand the difference between the two types of examples, distinguishing the use of commas by this term. Please advise . . . my client wants to know the "why"

behind my editorial source.

N “Restrictive” appositives cannot be removed from a sentence without obscuring the identity of the word or phrase that the appositive is intended to identify. Take the following two sentences:

My cat Philby is fat. [I have two cats.] My cat, Philby, is fat. [I have one cat.]

Note the similarities; if you study the two sentences closely, you will see that they are in fact identical?except for the commas. The problem is that if you take “Philby” away from the first sentence?whereas you know I have two cats?you’d have no way of knowing, assuming no additional context, which of my two cats I was talking about. If you take “Philby” away from the second sentence?knowing that I have just one cat?you’d still know it’s Philby that has the weight problem. The commas serve to set off what is essentially ancillary?or nonrestrictive?information.

Q In our international magazine mailings, we always include the country name; however, we would like to know the correct procedure for including “USA” after the city/state/ZIP. Is there a comma after the ZIP code or not? Your assistance would greatly reduce the amount of tension/dissension among the writers and editor and proofreader.

There should be no comma before or after a zip code:
1427 E. 60th St., Chicago, IL 60637 USA

Note also that commas may be omitted between the city and the two-letter abbreviations preferred by the U.S. Postal Service (see paragraph 15.31 in the fifteenth edition).

Q If you say “so-and-so is vice president, finance, of such and such,” should there be a comma after “finance”? My boss and I are in disagreement. I think there should be a comma but she says no. I can’t find a specific reference to this anywhere, though.

A If you look at The Chicago Manual of Style’s recommendations on comma usage?throughout chapter 6 of the fifteenth edition?you will see that there is a general rule of parity: anything that is set off from all or part of a sentence requires two commas, unless the word or phrase being set off is at the beginning or end of the sentence, in which case only one comma is required. Some analogous examples:

January 4, 1844, was a day like any other.

The suburbs of Baltimore, Maryland, eventually intersect with those of Washington, D.C. [or “Washington DC”; see paragraph 15.31]

The University of California, Berkeley, has a beautiful campus.

7. COMMAS

Your options are as follows, in order of preference:

So and so is vice president, finance, of such and such . . .

So and so is vice president?finance of such and such . . .

So and so is vice president (finance) of such and such . . .

I would not go so far as to write “vice president finance of such and such.”

Note the en dash in the second example (?); an en dash is midway in length between a hyphen (-) and an em dash (?) and can join a modifier (in this case “finance”) to an open compound (“vice president”).



Can you help me out with a question? Do you use a comma after the abbreviation of the word incorporated? For example, in the sentence “Today, ABC Company, Inc., announced that their earnings have increased 50 percent in the past year,” we have been told to use a comma after the word “Inc.” when used in a sentence. This has caused an uproar within the company because we did not learn this rule. Help!



CMS favors the following rule (paragraph 6.50):

Commas are not required around Inc., Ltd., and such as part of a company’s name. As with Jr., however, if commas are used, they must appear both before and after the element.

The president of Millennial Products Inc. was the first speaker.

or

The president of Millennial Products, Inc., was the first speaker. With company names, it is often assumed that the official name has or doesn't have a comma before "Inc."?but the rule stated above assumes that it is optional for any company. If a company insists that the comma, for example, is an inviolable part of the name, I can see an argument for not using a second comma?for efficiency and as long as this is done consistently. But I'd still advise following the manual's recommendations.



Dear CMS, Perhaps you can help resolve a raging debate I have been having with my coauthor. This debate, which is perilously close to becoming a very ugly brawl, concerns the all too underused phrase "nobody, but nobody." I say that "but nobody" is a parenthetical expression and should be set off in commas, as in "Nobody, but nobody, should trifle with the Etiquette Grrls." She insists vehemently that the commas absolutely, positively, MUST go, no arguments about it, and I have been unable to persuade her to change her mind. I think it looks simply dreadful without the commas, and besides, the meaning is then altered to "nobody EXCEPT FOR nobody," isn't it? (Rather than simply emphasizing the first "nobody.") Who is correct? Thank you ever so much. Also, may I say that I simply adore your Q&A page? (I'm a Grammar Geek, I guess . . . what can

7. COMMAS

one say?) I had no idea that such things as style could be so witty! Thanks again! Yours sincerely, Honore Ervin, The Etiquette Grrls Are Crusading for Polite Behavior in a Tacky, Rude World.
<http://www.etiquettegrrls.com>

A Dear Ms. Ervin: I'm glad you wrote in time for me to prevent the Etiquette Grrls from engaging in a very ugly brawl. The fact is, both constructions are just fine. If you want to imply a pause for emphasis, use the commas. If you want to say that nobody except for nobody does something (a weirdly reasonable thing to say), omit the commas. Now shake hands and stop fussing.

Q When a city and a state are mentioned in a sentence, am I correct in placing commas after the state name as well as before the state name? "Mary traveled to Seattle, Washington, before going on to California." And when "Jr." follows a name in a sentence, is it necessary to add a comma before it? How about after it?

A Yes. No. Only if you put one before it. (That is, the commas around "Jr." are optional.)

Q Hello. In the sentence "I went to the store to buy eggs, milk and cheese" do you put a comma after "milk"? What is the

standard now for comma usage after the second-to-last item? I have seen such sentences both with and without the comma. Thanks.

A Chicago style is to put a comma there (it's called a "serial" comma). There are times when that comma is necessary to avoid awkwardness or ambiguity: "My favorite combinations are green and yellow, blue and purple and black and red." Since it is sometimes needed, and is never wrong, the simplest way to impose consistency without having to stop and think about each instance is to form a habit of adding the serial comma.

Q My question relates to the proper use of the comma when using a subordinate clause introduced by the pronoun "which" or "who." My impression is that a comma to set off the clause is proper sometimes but not always. For example, if I say, "I have a car which has four doors," a comma introducing the clause is not appropriate. However, if I say, "My car, which has four doors, is blue," the comma is proper. I am not quite sure how to articulate the rule for when the comma is proper and when not. Can you help me?

A Your instincts are right about the comma for nonrestrictive clauses: that is, clauses that are not necessary to the meaning of the sentence but are parenthetical. A good test is to put

7. COMMAS

parentheses around the clause in question and see if any meaning is lost: if there is any change in the gist of the sentence, then you should not use the commas. When the clause is restrictive (that is, restricting or modifying the meaning of the subject, rather than simply adding to it), it is properly followed not by “which” but by “that”: I have a car that has four doors. Although this rule has now been relaxed almost out of existence, if you can get used to using “which” and “that” correctly, then you can follow the somewhat oversimplified guideline that “which” takes a comma.

Compounds

August Q&A



I am editing a medical index using the “word-by-word” system, and having some trouble with hyphenated words. Some terms, like “non-ionic,” feature a hyphenated word that is not a compound word. Does “non-ionic” come before “nonclostridial?” Also, do hyphenated compound words like “arterial-gas” come before or after a non-hyphenated compound word like “arterial oxygen?” Thanks?this is giving me a headache!

8. COMPOUNDS


N Ignore the hyphen after a prefix when indexing. “Non-ionic” should be alphabetized as though it were “nonionic,” in the way that the hyphenated compound “new-fangled” comes between “newel” and “Newfoundland” in CMS 18.59 in the “Word by Word” column. (Note, however, that Chicago style does not normally hyphenate prefixes, following Webster, and would thus avoid that problem.) Hyphenated compounds come after all the open ones. (Again, see 18.59, where “new-fangled” comes after “new town,” etc.)


S I am a consultant in the information systems industry. I am aware that the common utilization of technical tools has widely affected formal English grammar. One of the challenges I face when presenting my analysis to clients is the proper use of compounds. For example, “filesystem,” which I understand from research is not properly one word, but I see elsewhere that “hardware” and “software” are. I believe these latter are compounds simply by the fact of their commonality in day-to-day conversation. Am I simply waiting for the day that “file system” will be part of normal vernacular and blessed by CMS to be “filesystems”? Can you clear up my confusion?


N The compound “file system,” regardless of its growing application with computers, is a poor candidate for becoming


a single word. Any efficacy in making it a single word in some technical settings is outweighed in everyday prose by the bad fit between the two words. Though it is not an easy matter to predict such things, compounds formed of two separate words must have something going for them if they hope to form an intimate relationship. One thing that helps is analogous antecedents. A perusal of a couple of dictionaries reveals that among compounds in which “file” is the first word, only “filefish” (a relative of the triggerfish) has become one word (though it remains “file-fish” in the OED; such hyphenation is more common in British than American English). By contrast, the preexistence of “hardware” (since ca. 1515, according to Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate 11th ed.) virtually guaranteed one-word status for “software” (which was born, according to Webster’s, the same year Madonna was). Words also must sound as if they belong together, which is why “website” will almost certainly knock down the formalities in “Web site” (as it already has in American Heritage, though not in Webster’s or our own CMS). Note that Microsoft, to its credit, seems to prefer “file system” in its documentation?even though, for example, specific procedures might invoke and require the syntax FileSystem or filesystem. Finally, a caveat: as our own preference for “copyeditor” has shown (Webster’s lists “copyedit” [v.] but “copy editor” [n.]), it is not always easy for a specialist community to impose its own usage on the rest of the world.

8. COMPOUNDS

 With words such as “PowerPoint,” the capital letters are retained when the words are melded. Is there a label for this category of words?

 A word with a capital letter in the middle of it is said to have a “midcap”; such a word itself can also, by means of synecdoche, be referred to as a midcap. The name seems especially apt, given that corporations seem to be responsible for most such constructions. The word “midcap” does double duty in Standard & Poor’s MidCap 400?in which “MidCap” not only refers to a class of medium-sized companies but is itself a midcap.

 I have an online content editor who says “mental health official” should be hyphenated: e.g., “he placed three county mental-health officials on administrative leave.” As a mental health professional, I say no. What say you?

 In general, a compound modifier comprising an adjective plus a noun and preceding the word or words it modifies should be hyphenated:

deep-dish pizza

first-floor record store

“Mental” is an adjective and “health” is a noun. Without the hyphen, the phrase “mental health official” could be misread as,

to take one of several possible misreadings, a health official who is pretty mad or upset?as opposed to the intended meaning of an official of mental health. But that's a rather ridiculous and unlikely, not to mention slang, misreading. There are a few compounds that, in addition to being ubiquitous as open compounds, always seem to go together and are completely unambiguous in any position without the hyphen. Aside from "mental health," another example might be "physical therapy." A "physical therapy expert" would tend not to be misread as a skilled psychiatrist who tends toward vigorous bodily movement. In sum, any compound modifier that is not traditionally hyphenated and would not be misread may be left unhyphenated in any position.




I noticed that, in your answer to a question regarding the spelling of health care vs. health-care vs. healthcare, you state the following:

For the answers to questions about word definitions and spellings, we recommend that you use a dictionary. (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, eleventh edition, is a favorite of ours.) Since "health care" is now listed as two words in Webster's, we would follow suit. Webster's also notes that the compound is "usually hyphenated when used attributively."

However, I find in my American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (my favorite) that healthcare, without the hyphen,

8. COMPOUNDS

is the second spelling for the noun form of the word. Health care and health-care are listed as the spellings for the adjectival form of the word. Who to believe, who to believe?! However, you did resolve a disagreement about the use of hyphens with such prefixes as non-nonverbal, in this case. (I won, by the way). Thanks.

 Our recommendation is generally to apply only one dictionary as arbiter for a given book or project in order to impose uniform, consistent spelling.

But there is nothing wrong with preferring one as an author especially one reasonable spelling over another. There is also nothing wrong with preferring one dictionary over another. Chicago recommends Webster's, but we also like American Heritage and Random House.

Finally, I would bet that instances of "health care" in print in one form or another must have grown exponentially in the last half of the twentieth century; instances of the compound were certainly off the charts during the 1992-93 attempt by the government to overhaul the American system of care. And whenever a compound becomes common currency, there's a chance it will evolve to become one word. American Heritage seems to recognize this.




What style do you recommend for the words "health care,"


two words or one? If two words are preferred, do you hyphenate it when it appears as an adjective, as in health-care company? Thanks.

F For the answers to questions about word definitions and spellings, we recommend that you use a dictionary. (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, eleventh edition, is a favorite of ours.) Since "health care" is now listed as two words in Webster's, we would follow suit. Webster's also notes that the compound is "usu[ually] hyphenated when used attributively."

Q I haven't paid much attention to style until recently when I had to begin doing some editing of copy again. Now I find that "copyeditor" is one word. What about people who edit books? Are they bookeditors? What about newspaper editors? Are they newspapereditors? Please justify. Thanks from Ice Age copy editor.

F Dear Ice Age: Webster's agrees with you and still lists "copy editor," although it gives the verb as "copyedit," and this is probably the justification for the spelling "copyeditor." I rather like it—at least I'd rather conserve my spleen for worse stuff. (For instance, have you noticed that nobody uses the word "who" as a relative pronoun anymore? "The parents that threw the party were arrested." Tsk?)

 There's a club for people who've worked at my office for twenty-five or more years. It is called the Twenty-Five Year Club. I am wondering why they never added a hyphen between "five" and "year" and also if it's okay to retain the capital letters for all the words that are hyphenated. I don't want to rock the boat around here for a club that's been in existence longer than all of us have been in the Publications Office. We are preparing the program for their annual dinner and latest round of inductees. Should we let them retain their old name? Has this come up in other places?


 Yes, it often comes up in the titles of works. Chicago style would be Twenty-Five-Year Club. (Normally we would lowercase the "five" in "twenty-five" in a title, but it would look wrong here because of the hyphens.) As for rocking the boat, I don't feel qualified to advise you? maybe Dear Abby has a Web site.

Documentation




I am confused about how to cite a video recording of a live performance (an opera). It was originally performed and recorded by a Metropolitan Opera Television production in 1991, but a 2000 version (a rerelease in DVD format) is being distributed by another organization. It also comes in the 1991 version in the VHS format. It is important to distinguish between the two for a variety of reasons, especially if someone were looking for the DVD. The 2000 DVD is in German, but can have subtitles


in English, Chinese, and French. How would I cite the 2000 DVD?

 CMS gives several examples of how to cite musical recordings at 17.268. Probably the closest to your example would be the following:


Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. *Le nozze di Figaro*. Vienna Philharmonic. Riccardo Muti. With Thomas Allen, Margaret Price, Jorma Hynninen, Ann Murray, Kurt Rydl, and the Konzertvereinigung Wiener Staatsoperchor. 1987. Original sound recording made by EMI Records Ltd. CDS 7 47978 8 (3 compact discs).


In styling your citation, write the 2000 information first, following the Mozart example (composer, title of opera, orchestra, conductor, principal artists, date, DVD format, etc.) and then add the information about the original 1991 VHS recording (without repeating the information that's the same for both). When you have extra bits of information that don't appear in one of our examples, include everything you think your readers will want or need. State the facts clearly without worrying too much about how to style them. For instance, to your DVD citation you could add *In German*. Includes subtitles in English, Chinese, and French. Try to style all similar citations in the same way.


 What is the proper way to reference an e-mail in a report?

 To cite any form of personal correspondence, give the per-


sons name, the medium of the correspondence (letter, fax, e-mail), and the date. For the sake of privacy, do not cite the senders address (home or e-mail). See CMS 17.208.

 When writing an academic paper that is based on the analysis of one book, do you need to footnote each sentence that paraphrases an idea from the book or does the fact that it is known and stated that the entire paper is an analysis of the books themes sufficient?

 You should be very careful to cite the page references to every idea you use from another source. You dont have to create a whole new footnote for each one. In the first footnote, where you give a complete citation, you can add Hereafter cited in the text. Then you can cite further page references in parentheses in the text (Jones, Methods, 312). See CMS 11.75?76 for more ideas on how to treat frequent references to a single source.

 I have a number of federal government publications to cite in endnotes, and it seems I have more information about the publication than I know where to put. For example, is it better to cite the authors listed or the publishing government agency as the author? If I list the specific individuals, should I list the agency in the publication information, i.e., (Washington, DC: US


Department of Health and Human Services, 1985)? And if the agency is best listed under publication information, which level of the agency is best to cite? For example, one document was published by the Department of HHS, Centers for Disease Control, National Center for Health Statistics, National Vital Statistics System, Division of Vital Statistics. (These are the hierarchy levels.) Finally, if publication numbers are available for these documents, should I include them? If so, where? After the title, and before publication information? Thanks in advance for your help.


 Even as our taxpaying hearts swell with pride, it is easy to be overwhelmed by the amount of information presented by a single source like this. The most important guideline in deciding what to include is that you want a reader to be able to understand the reference well enough to find the source for herself. If an authors name is given, start the citation with that. If not, let the department title stand in for the author. (Use the one at the top of the hierarchy. Sometimes this will mean repeating the department name in the publication information.) Publication numbers are extremely helpful; sometimes they can take a reader directly to the complete online text when typed into a search engine. Put the number where it makes sense, usually right before the publication information.

If there are many such references in your document and they all

must be cited in full, consider using a list of abbreviations in order to shorten them. In the example above, DVS could be used to stand for the Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control, National Center for Health Statistics, National Vital Statistics System, Division of Vital Statistics.


Finally, there are many university Web sites that give guidelines for citing government publications (type citing government publications into your search engine). You might also look at Diane L. Garner and Diane H. Smith, eds., *The Complete Guide to Citing Government Information Resources: A Manual for Writers and Librarians*.


 How would you treat Web page citations where access to the Web pages is restricted?


 So much Internet content?after connection costs and the price of hardware and software?still seems to be free. But before this age of free access to thousands of newspapers and scores of ancient, out-of-copyright works, you could still cite, for example, the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, a subscription to which has probably never been free. And just as we dont recommend including costs and availability in citations to books or journals, we dont require or recommend any statement related to accessibility when citing an Internet source. For one thing,

9. DOCUMENTATION


the status and location of online material is so often subject to change that any such information is likely to become obsolete and possibly misleading. And, as has long been the case, libraries can provide access to many materials that may not be available to individuals.

 How do you determine which publisher to cite if the book has had more than one publisher over time, and which publication date do you use: the latest edition/publication date, or when the book was first published?

 Generally, cite the source you've consulted. Pagination and content may vary across different editions (or printings or postings) of the same work; citing an edition you did not consult could render your citation inaccurate. In any case, a full source citation to one edition of a work will generally be enough to lead readers to any other editions of a work. In some cases, especially for older or classic works, an original publication date is useful; it may be included, preferably in square brackets, before the date of the edition cited.


 It is not uncommon in the literature of film studies today to have epigraphs that feature a choice bit of dialog from one of the characters in a film, and often the author of the screen-

play is not given, but only the film title, characters name, sometimes parenthetically the actor who played the part, and year of the films release. Similarly if one wants to quote a choice bit of dialog from fiction, say, one of Sherlock Holmes admonitions to Watson, does one credit Holmes and/or Conan Doyle? CMS is mute on such attributions in the context of epigraphs.

 You have a lot of leeway with epigraphs; for example:

Unhappy that I am, I cannot heave My heart into my mouth.
?Cordelia to her father, King Lear 1.1.91?92

King Lear can stand on its own (unless you are one of those who like to insist on an author other than Shakespeare). You might just cite King Lear 1.1.91?92 as the source; those who dont know the play will have to read it and figure out that its Cordelia who speaks those lines, then ponder what it all means. The point is that you are not obligated to cite more than the barest minimum of a source in an epigraph.

 I am attempting to help someone out with their bibliography and I, of course, have received all the difficult entries. I have a three-page document that is an Executive Summary; it is not a published work, nor does it have any publisher information, but it does list authors. How would I cite this? Would I follow the rules for citing an unpublished, duplicated piece?

NI assume that an executive summary is a type of corporate report; pamphlets, corporate reports, brochures, and other freestanding publications are treated essentially as books. Data on author and publisher may not fit the normal pattern, but sufficient information should be given to identify the document. So, Dean, James, and Brenda Starr. High- and Low-Density Lipoproteins. NIH Advisory Panel, Executive Summary, June 2001.

In other words, you should include the author, any title, the organization under whose auspices the summary has been written, the fact that it is an executive summary, and the date. If something doesn't seem to fit any parameters, be descriptive and ask yourself if the citation would either lead the interested reader to the source or let the reader know exactly who was responsible for what, and when.

QIm in the process of finalizing my Ph.D. dissertation, and Im struggling with two minor stylistic issues: (1) How should I handle citations within a parenthesis when it begins with e.g.? Should the year be enclosed in parentheses or not? That is, . . . (e.g., Porter (1987)) or (e.g., Porter 1987). (2) Is there an elegant way to refer to a page or section in the current document so that the cross-reference is not confused with an external reference. For example, the text may read: According to Porter (1987), strategy can be defined as. . . . This definition is used in the current

research (see also p. 49). This reference could be interpreted as page 49 in Porter (1987) or as page 49 in the dissertation.

N If your citation is to the work and not to the author and secondarily to the work, then the correct form is (e.g., Porter 1987). If you were citing the author, that would change:

Many authors have discussed this point (e.g., Porter [1987]).

But it is preferable to avoid the rather awkward nesting of brackets within parentheses whenever you can. That could be done for the above example by avoiding e.g.:

Many authors have discussed this point (see Porter 1987).


Your second question is difficult because Chicago discourages cross-references to specific pages in your own work. If you do this, however, you must be explicit, as you clearly understand. But too explicit is inelegant, as you also clearly understand.

What I've done most often in the past is to use below or above when it is a matter of making sure that the internal nature of the cross-reference is clear. So: (see also p. 49 above).

Other than that, I can't think of a really elegant way. I hope this is, if not an answer, a step in the right direction.

Q Perhaps you can help me. How do I format a second footnote for an article in an edited anthology (more than two editors), when the anthology already has been cited fully in an


other footnote for a different article in the same anthology? Must I write the complete citation for the anthology for every article contained within it?

 Once the full facts of publication for the anthology have been presented, you may use the short form (N.B.: my example is partly made up; I don't have the anthology handy):

17. Emily Dickinson, *After Great Pain a Formal Feeling Comes*, in *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*, ed. Nina Baym (New York: Norton, 1998), 1:33-38.

24. James Russell Lowell, *To the Dandelion*, in Baym, *Norton Anthology of American Literature*, 1:77.

For a discussion of short forms of titles, see paragraph 16.45 of the fifteenth edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style*. It was once a common practice to repeat the full facts of publication for the first mention of a source in each new chapter, but this is seldom necessary.

 My fifteenth edition of CMS indicates that there should be quotation marks around journal article titles in bibliographies, but I noticed that in some of your answers here, you do not include the quotation marks in sample citations. Is it acceptable to leave out the quotation marks around journal article titles in bibliographies?

A The examples you refer to are in author-date format. That form—once used exclusively in the hard sciences but now also favored by social scientists—differs from the more traditional humanities style of documentation. For a full discussion of the two systems and their differences, see chapter 16 in the fifteenth edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style*.


Q I have searched for the answer to this question but have not found it discussed in your text. I am writing a dissertation in the social sciences. I cite to references in parentheses in the text in the format (Smith 1999) with full citations contained in a bibliography. I sometimes cite to the same reference a few sentences later. I am wondering if I can use the abbreviation (*ibid.*) instead of repeating the exact same citation (Smith 1999)?


A Chicago considers an in-text parenthetical author-date citation to already be in a short form and therefore discourages *ibid.* as a substitute. If you must use *ibid.*, just be careful that no intervening sources creep into the text. It does mean in the same place [as the last item cited], but it requires that the reader see or recall the last source, an inconvenience we feel outweighs the minor space gain.


Q I am using the Chicago style to cite a magazine article. If

9. DOCUMENTATION

there is a ? at the end of the article title, do I still need to use a period before the quotation marks?


 The question mark suffices? no comma or period, as the case may be, is needed in addition.


 I am attempting to proofread and fix the style of the endnotes of a book on communications for a generally humanities audience. My problem is that the author of the book is a lawyer and has cited many law review articles that he considers governed by the Bluebook style. Should I use the general style for citing periodicals in the fifteenth edition of CMS (paragraphs 17.148-98) for the legal articles? As it is, the humanities articles are in CMS format and the law review articles are in Bluebook format. This hybrid style doesn't seem acceptable to me. Please help.

 I agree that only one style should prevail for journal articles. If the audience were primarily legal scholars, I would advocate following Bluebook style for all citations, journal articles and otherwise; in this case Chicago style is preferable since the intended audience is general. Following Chicago style will require a bit more research on the author's part since Chicago recommends that the page range of the entire article be provided whereas Bluebook requires only the first page of the article.

Q Hi. Im creating a handout for students thats kind of a quick guide to simple kinds of citations following CMS and referring them to their copies of CMS for more info. Im having trouble finding your preference for television show citations. I can find info on citing them within a text or for citing reviews, but how about citing the actual program in a bibliography?

A Here goes:
Friends. Episode no. 153, first broadcast 16 November 2000 by NBC. Directed by David Schwimmer and written by Scott Silveri. This gives very basic, but fundamental information (information thats often readily available on the Web, but its a good idea to verify the accuracy of such information by checking several sources): Which episode? When did it first air (because it has aired again and again and again, in this case)? Who wrote the teleplay? Who directed it? What network was it produced for? I did not include the nature of the material (television show) because I am imagining a hypothetical readership that would be familiar with, if not Friends in particular, NBC broadcasts in general. I also did not include how long the episode is; if that information were vital for some reason, it could be included. The facts necessary to retrieve it from an Internet source such as <http://epguides.com/> are simply Friends and either the episode number or the (original) broadcast date.

 I have a question that I hope you will answer for me. In an academic book, how does one cite a quote that is taken from a book of quotations (such as Bartlett's)? Does one cite the quotes original source? Bartlett's provides scant information about its quotes sources? Does one cite Bartlett's, which seems awkward to me, or are quotes found in books of quotations considered to be part of the public domain and, therefore, not in need of citation? Also, are there different rules for whether the quote is placed above the chapter title (a chapter epigraph) or part of the body of a chapter? I am working under a tight deadline and would, therefore, greatly appreciate a prompt response, if possible.


 In an epigraph, just the name of the author of the quotation is generally sufficient. Membership in Bartlett's guarantees such status. Add the date, if it is interesting, and the work from which the quotation is drawn, if that seems interesting as well. In text, you also need only credit the name of the speaker, but if you feel a reader might benefit from knowing more, it is appropriate to cite the work as well in the bibliographic apparatus. You can cite Bartlett's, like this:


13. From William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Nights Dream*. Quoted in *Familiar Quotations: Being an Attempt to Trace to Their Sources Passages and Phrases in Common Use*, by John Bartlett (Boston: Little, Brown, 1886), 44.

Or you can track down the original source in order to check accu-

racy and cite the full publication facts of that source. Its really a matter of which source you, as an author or an editor, feel would be more relevant given the context of the work in question. But outside the familiar world of Bartletts, its usually best to avoid citing something quoted in another work; always go to the original work if possible.

An epigraph generally goes after the chapter title and before the beginning of the text of the chapter (but before a leading sub-head, if there is one), but an innovative designer could conceivably depart from that rule with success.


 I have looked high and low for some reference to citing television ads in your manual, and have not found a single one. How would one cite a television commercial as part of an articles running text, and in the references section as well?


 There is no provision for citing television advertisements in The Chicago Manual of Style. TV ads are in a sense part of the public experience and a matter of historical record. Say you are describing the advertisement for the Volkswagen Golf that features the Styx song Mr. Roboto. It is a piece of popular media that you are describing and need not be cited?description suffices. It is not a matter of leading a reader to a specific source that can be obtained from a public archive. Should there be an


occasion on which you did need to provide a reference citation, you could do something like this:

Volkswagen. Crazy Guy. Television advertisement. Arnold Communications, Inc., directed by Phil Morrison, 2000.


But you would have to have that information (the ad won an ANDY, and information about it became readily available online, from a variety of reputable sources).

 I would very much like to have software that would automatically format text for Chicago style. Does such a thing exist? Where would I find it? Thank you.

 Readers have mentioned to us a program called EndNote that they say is very helpful in formatting notes and bibliographies to CMS style. Unfortunately (fortunately, for us), software has not yet progressed to the point where it can correct spelling, style, or grammar intelligently, and nothing we read leads us to believe it will in the near future. Someday copyeditors may become obsolete, but were planning on working a few more years before that happens.

 In a citation of a journal article, where do you put the title and editors names if it is a special issue? And roughly the same question: where do you put the title of a symposium and editors

thereof if the symposium takes up only part of the journal issue?

 See paragraph 17.170 in the fifteenth edition of the manual, which describes how to cite special issues?either as a whole or individual articles therein. A symposium that takes up part of a journal issue might be cited as though it were an article:

Williams, Joe, ed. 1980. Symposium: Zamboni repair in your home. *Entrepreneur* 75: 32?99.

You could also begin with the title of the article:

Symposium: Zamboni repair in your home. 1980. Ed. Joe Williams. *Entrepreneur* 75: 32?99.