

April 2011

People Profile: Sanford G. Thatcher

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(2011) "People Profile: Sanford G. Thatcher," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 23: Iss. 2, Article 18.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.5795>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

or fluency. The copyeditor also corrected some inconsistencies between citations in the text and entries in the bibliography, in names or dates, but also missed a couple of these, which remained as mistakes in the version of record. The results for the article published in *The Journal of Consumer Affairs* were very similar, with the majority of problems being minor errors of formatting that were corrected for the version of record. **Ms. Hunt** also discovered a couple of mistakes in quotations and references that were not caught by the copyeditor and remain in the version of record.

My contribution was to compare the Green OA and published versions of two articles in political philosophy, one by a senior professor of philosophy appearing in *Philosophy and Public Affairs* and the other by a junior professor of political science in *Political Theory*. As I subscribe to both journals, I was able to pull the issues off my shelf and read them in parallel with the versions posted at DASH. In the case of the former journal, which I helped found at **Princeton University Press**, I even had the advantage of knowing who the copyeditor was, as he had been a former colleague of mine at the **Press** who now teaches philosophy at **St. John's College** in New Mexico; he was not only a very fine copyeditor but also had a Ph.D. in philosophy, giving him the ability to catch errors of substance that might elude a less well-trained mind. I would myself give high marks to these two authors for the clarity of their prose and organization of their argument. Thus the need for copyediting was minimal. Interestingly, neither copyeditor chose to make the effort to introduce the that/which distinction into the author's writing, which would have resulted in a lot of additional changes beyond the ones they did make.

For the senior author, the copyediting amounted to a very few minor stylistic improvements plus a number of basic formatting changes. I checked the quotations she drew from classic works by **David Hume** and **Henry Sidgwick**, and they were accurate — though the latter was truncated by a few words left out without ellipses indicating any omission. A somewhat longer quotation from **John Stuart Mill's** *On Liberty* differs from the original edition by omitting or changing six punctuation marks, mostly commas, but these do not change the meaning at all, nor can I be sure that the edition the author consulted (published by **Bobbs-Merrill**) had not already changed this punctuation silently for its edition, which I do not have at hand.

For the junior author, copyediting was also done very lightly, with most of it aimed at converting everything to the publisher's house style. No changes of any substantive kind were made, nor any affecting meaning. More problematic for this author, however, was his accuracy in quotation. This article focused on the work of **John Rawls** and quotes frequently from the revised edition of *A Theory of Justice*. I checked every quote from that source against the original and found a number of

against the grain people profile

Sanford G. Thatcher

Director Emeritus, Penn State University Press
8201 Edgewater Drive, Frisco, TX 75034

Phone: (214) 705-1939 • <sandy.thatcher@alumni.princeton.edu>
<http://www.psupress.org/news/SandyThatchersWritings.html>

BORN AND LIVED: Washington, DC 8/4/43. Lived in NE Pennsylvania from age four until college.

EARLY LIFE: Attended **Wyoming Seminary** (prep school) in Kingston, PA, and **Princeton University**; took two years of graduate study, in philosophy, at **Columbia** and then **Princeton** again.

PROFESSIONAL CAREER AND ACTIVITIES: 22 years at **Princeton U.P.** (MS Editor, Social Science Editor, Assistant Director, Editor-in-Chief), 1967-1989; 20 years at **Penn State U.P.** (Director), 1989-2009

FAMILY: Wife **Robin**, who has three children, and two children of my own from a previous marriage.

IN MY SPARE TIME: Masters swimming, jazz/rock drumming, sailing.

FAVORITE BOOKS: **David Copperfield**; *Brothers Karamazov*, *Lorna Doone*, *The Passions and the Interests* (**Albert O. Hirschman**); *Personal Destinies* (**David L. Norton**); Greek mythology; *Iliad*, *Odyssey*.

PET PEEVES: People who say "less" when they should say "few."

PHILOSOPHY: Sound mind in a sound body (the Greek ideal).

MOST MEMORABLE CAREER ACHIEVEMENT: Winning the **AAUP's Constituency Award** for my work on copyright.

GOAL I HOPE TO ACHIEVE FIVE YEARS FROM NOW: Making it into the Top Ten national ranking in at least one masters swimming event.

HOW/WHERE DO I SEE THE INDUSTRY IN FIVE YEARS: Moving ever more quickly toward OA (as PDA hastens the death of market-based university press publishing). 🐼



errors, which included giving the wrong page number in one instance, eliding two quotations that are separated in the text, omitting a phrase from another quotation without using ellipses, dropping a word from another quotation, using "affective" instead of "effective" (though the original text should have used "affective" as that was the meaning intended), quoting "lack certain fundamental attitudes" when the original text reads "lacks certain natural attitudes," adding a comma in two instances where none exists in the original, and dropping a word at the beginning of a sentence. All of these errors remain in the version of record because the copyeditor had not compared the quotations in the article with **Rawls's** book. It must be admitted that copyeditors rarely do take the time to check the accuracy of quotations in this way unless they have special reason to be suspicious, though with the availability of many works in the public domain now through **Project Gutenberg**, **Google**, and other readily searchable sites the effort needed to do so is far less than it used to be in the pre-Internet age.

What may we conclude from this analysis? By and large, the copyediting did not result in any major improvements of the manuscripts as they appear at the DASH site. As with the technical editing done for STM journals by

people like **Joe Fineman**, the vast majority of changes made were for the sake of enforcing a house formatting style and cleaning up a variety of inconsistencies and infelicities, none of which reached into the substance of the writing or affected the meaning other than by adding a bit more clarity here and there. Thus it would appear that the DASH versions are probably "good enough" for use by scholars seeking new ideas and information and wishing to keep up with the literature and by teachers who may want to have their students read these versions as class assignments.

More problematic from the viewpoint of scholarly rigor are the errors in citation and inaccuracies in quotation. As noted in my earlier article, mistakes like these have a way of being repeated since people will often not take the trouble to go back to the original texts but merely trust the authors of these articles to have given the right information about page numbers, dates of publication, authors' names, and the like and to have accurately transcribed passages from the sources used. Unfortunately, these are just the kinds of errors that are seldom caught by copyeditors either because the extra work involved in discovering them to be errors is usually not considered to be justified by

continued on page 34