different romanic languages are not much different, although they are not identical. A usual phenomenon in this sense, at least in the case of Catalan and Spanish, is the palatalization into \( |\lambda| \) of words derived from vulgar Latin. This palatalization is represented by ‘\( /l/ \)’ in Catalan and Spanish and by ‘gli’ in Italian. This phenomenon, however, does not occur in words of Classical Latin origin, although in some languages (Catalan and Italian, among others) there is a duplication or gemination which is what is represented by ‘\( /l/ \)’ in Catalan, while it is represented by ‘\( /l/ \)’ in Italian. These words are also written with ‘\( /l/ \)’ in French, although there seems to be no difference in pronunciation, while in Spanish it is written ‘\( /l/ \)’ and pronounced ‘\( /l/ \)’.

For instance, the word INTELLIGENTIA, which is of Classical Latin origin, derives into Catalan intel‘l\( /l/ \)ncia, pronounced ‘\( /l/ \)’, into Italian intelligenza, pronounced ‘\( /l/ \)l\( /l/ \)’, into French intelligence, pronounced ‘\( /l/ \)’, and into Spanish inteligencia, pronounced ‘\( /l/ \)l’.

We hope to have clarified our statements with this discussion. Although Valiente Feruglio’s second family name contains the trigraph ‘gli’, which corresponds to the \( |\lambda| \) phoneme, there is no record of Roman ancestors with that family name known to the authors, while Valiente Feruglio’s last Italian ancestor was born in Ramanzacco, in the province of Udine, in 1861, and died in Santa Fe (Argentina) in 1937. As it turns out, however, having Italian ancestors does not guarantee a good knowledge of the Italian language, for Valiente Feruglio does not speak fluent Italian…yet.

---

Book Reviews

Book review: Math into \TeX

Nico Poppelier


Even though document-preparation packages of the WYSIWYG type become better and better every year, the majority of mathematicians, computer scientists and physicists still use \TeX, in any of its many flavours. In 1982 the American Mathematical Society released \AMS-\TeX, which has certainly contributed to the popularity of \TeX in mathematician’s circles. Around 1990, the macros of \AMS-\TeX were made available for the expanding community of \LaTeX users in the form of \AMS-\LaTeX. And now, finally, there is a book that describes this useful but complex extension to \LaTeX for beginners.

George Grätzer teaches mathematics at the University of Manitoba (Canada), and has tried to write a book “from a user’s point of view”. His book consists of three parts. In part I, A short course, he explains how to install \AMS-\LaTeX on an IBM-compatible PC under DOS, and on an Apple Macintosh, and then explains the basics of \AMS-\LaTeX. In part II, A leisurely course, he goes back to the fundamentals of typing text and formulas in \TeX, and then explains all a mathematician, or engineer or scientist, needs to know about \AMS-\LaTeX. Finally, part III is about customizing.

Math into \TeX was written with the basic idea behind the design of \LaTeX nestled firmly in the mind of the author. Mr. Grätzer emphasizes proper usage of \LaTeX while writing papers and books. His approach is didactically very good, he takes his time explaining things, and gives enough examples. Math into \TeX is not a book about \LaTeX itself, so the author does not cover all of \LaTeX. Nevertheless, he treats tables (briefly) and Bib\LaTeX, which makes the book a useful introductory text as well as a handy reference for authors who do not want to know more about \TeX and its flavours than is necessary for writing a research paper.

Even though many people, including several well versed in \TeX and \LaTeX, read draft versions of Math into \TeX, the book contains a lot of errors. One of the more interesting ones is this one: in section 3-4.8, on hyphenation, the author gives the following example
I often wish that \TeX{} could do tricks like this, but alas!

These errors will be removed in a second, revised edition I assume (if enough people buy the book), and then I can say in all truth that \emph{Math into \TeX{}} is a welcome addition to the growing collection of books about \TeX{} and related topics.

---

**Book review:** \TeX{} in Practice

T. L. (Frank) Pappas


My first encounter with \TeX{} in Practice was more than five years ago when I purchased a preliminary draft. Although it was far from complete --- many sections were "to be completed" --- TIP seemed to promise a complete introduction to \TeX{}. Although I found TIP unusable at the time, I assumed its shortcomings were due to its preliminary status.

My second encounter with TIP occurred more than a year ago when I received a copy from von Bechtolsheim. With just a few "minor" changes, this was to be the camera-ready copy that his publisher, Springer-Verlag, would receive. I found the copy extremely difficult to handle since about 1,000 of the pages were printed one to an 8.5×11 sheet. Still, I scanned through the material and again came away with the impression that TIP was going to play a significant role in making \TeX{} more accessible. Although I was less enthused than the first time, I again assumed that my discomfort with TIP would go away when I could look at the published result.

My third encounter with \TeX{} in Practice occurred this past Fall, when I received a copy directly from Springer-Verlag. TIP is published as an 1800+ page, four volume set: Volume I: Basics; Volume II: Paragraphs, Math, and Fonts; Volume III: Tokens, Macros; and Volume IV: Output Routines, Tables.

---

**A word from the publisher**

Now that I have seen the final product, my impression of TIP has changed drastically, but before explaining why, let me share with you the following comp.text.tex post from Dave Rogers that appeared on 27 Oct 1993:

As some of you have perhaps noted, I am the Editor of the Monographs in Visual Communication Series for Springer-Verlag which includes \TeX{} in Practice by Stephan von Bechtolsheim. The forward [sic] in the volume is not what I wrote. It was modified by Stephan without my concurrence. The unmodified version is given below. I think the second paragraph is particularly interesting as I have noticed a significant dichotomy in the way different people approach \TeX{}.

Further, I take no responsibility for the quality of the typesetting of the book nor for the quality of the English or the proofreading. I consider the book a prime example of a very poor design and typesetting job. The English is atrocious and the proofreading is nearly non-existent. Both the editorial and production departments at Springer-Verlag and I tried to get these defects corrected but with little success.

Having said that why did we publish the book? Basically because it contains very valuable information about the use of \TeX{}. Information that the \TeX{} community very much needs. After all, the fundamental purpose of a book is to convey information. So the decision was made to ignore the defects and publish it anyway.

I trust that you can ignore the presentation defects in the book and concentrate on the information.

Dave Rogers

---

**Blame the publisher!**

Although I agree with Dave Rogers' criticism of TIP, I think von Bechtolsheim is less to blame in this than Springer-Verlag. Rogers' writes, "After all, the fundamental purpose of a book is to convey information. So the decision was made to ignore the defects and publish it anyway." While this is true, Springer-Verlag already has a means of publishing such material in its lecture notes series such as Lecture Notes in Computer Science. With that series readers know they are purchasing books that