

and of student and faculty populations, and brief descriptions are provided of the major university libraries and their research collections. The problems facing the major libraries are reduced here primarily to a discussion of the inadequacy of research resources. One must turn to the final chapter for some indication of the strains placed on basic library resources and services by the growth of undergraduate-level populations both in these universities and in the surrounding junior and community colleges, and in some cases new universities, often founded with inadequate collections and facilities. Campbell also refers to increasing concern on the part of government and university administrations over mounting library costs, leading to proposals for sharing of resources, or "rationalization," such as that in Ontario. The results of these pressures can be seen in the increasing sophistication of library procedures, including some highly successful automated systems, and the development of regional cooperation in library services for higher education—voluntary or otherwise.

Campbell points to the coordination of library services at all levels—particularly with the strong lead taken by the National Library—as one of the emerging characteristics of what may be a distinctive Canadian "style." He rightly pays tribute to the debt Canada owes to foreign methods and ideas on which our earliest services were based, and to the expertise of the many Americans who were brought in as administrators during the formative years. But it is his attempt to identify and define for us what is distinctively Canadian—difficult though such a task may be—that gives this book its strength and unity.—*Anne Brearley Piternick, School of Librarianship, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.*

Copyright: A Selected Bibliography of Periodical Literature Relating to Literary Property in the United States. Matt Roberts. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1971. 416p. \$10.

This is a monumental work that should be of interest to all librarians. An understanding of literary property should be one of the more important attributes of librarianship, and I have always been puzzled by its omission from the library school curriculum.

The author defines literary property as that part of the law of copyright that deals with printed materials, and he excludes maps, designs, music, radio and television, and music. In other words, this is a bibliography of that part of copyright that most concerns college and research libraries—books.

This bibliography is limited to the periodical literature in English related to literary property in the United States and its international aspects. It contains 6,214 citations gathered from approximately 500 periodicals. With so many entries on one subject, a straight alphabetical listing would be too unwieldy. The author attempts to avoid this through classification. Thus, the law of literary property is divided into twenty-six classes (A-Z). Each article is listed only once in its most approximate class. The problems of placing an article with related subjects in any one class is supposedly avoided by placing at the end of each section "see" references to entries in other classes. This, at times, makes the bibliography awkward and time-consuming in its use. For example, most articles on the problem of photocopying in libraries are placed in Section V, "Fair Use," and Copyright. To find every article on this topic, one has to examine items in seventeen other classes, including 131 in Class E (Statutory Copyright in the United States—Domestic Legislation), 28 items in Class U (Copyright Infringement and Remedies), and 25 items in Class W (Copyright and the American Library).

While realizing the listing of articles in more than one class would nearly double the size of the book (and the price), an analytic subject index would have helped to eliminate much of this problem.

A spot check in the *Index to Legal Periodicals* and a few other bibliographies indicated that only very few articles have been overlooked by the author. I did find omitted such articles as "Revision of the Copyright Law: Statement of the American Council of Learned Secretaries on the Copyright Revision Bill" [*American Council of Learned Secretaries Newsletter* 16:1-15 (Dec. 1965)]; and Ernest Bruncken, "The Philosophy of Copyright" [*Musical Quarterly* 2:477-96 (1916)]. Admittedly, these are from obscure publications and no

bibliographer should ever be held to total perfection.

This publication, along with Henriette Mertz, "Copyright Bibliography for Checking Purposes" (Copyright Office, Library of Congress, 1950, 213p.) should be in every library. With them, adequate access to the literature of copyright and literary property will be assured.

Finally, it must be noted that although this work carries a 1971 copyright date, its cut-off date is 1968. It is to be hoped that the author is planning a supplement.—*J. Myron Jacobstein, Law Librarian and Professor of Law, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California.*

Harris, Jessica Lee. **Subject Analysis: Computer Implications of Rigorous Definition.** Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1970. 279p. \$7.50.

In order to comprehend and assess this volume as a unit, its subtitle must be taken seriously. Many who have read other works in the field of "subject analysis" will find Harris' book to be quite different from what they have come to expect. The work is not philosophical or expository in the tradition of Cutter, Mann, Pettee, Haykin, or Metcalfe. On a superficial level it could be "put down" (both literally and figuratively) as being stylistically a technical report rather than a treatise. Despite the paraphernalia of statistical analysis, however, and the formal hypothetical research terminology, Harris' work cannot be dismissed as just another library science dissertation.

Jessica Harris has already established something of a reputation in librarianship on the basis of her work with Theodore Hines, resulting in their 1966 publication, *Computer Filing of Index, Bibliographic, and Catalog Entries*, and as teacher at Columbia University's School of Library Service. Thus the appearance of her dissertation occasions perhaps more notice than would be accorded an unknown writer. Further, Americans have not in recent years written many entire books on subject analysis; thus, greater attention must be paid to the few that do emerge.

"Subject analysis" in Harris' work refers primarily to subject *headings*, and in particular, to those found in the *Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the*

Library of Congress, 7th edition. After reviewing some of the history of the development of subject headings in the United States under the aegis of Charles Cutter, Harris delineates four analyses of Library of Congress headings: (1) use of aspect subdivisions, (2) use of adjective-noun phrases, (3) relative scope of headings for use in different types of collections, and (4) use of form headings. For each of these, she designed a specific process of investigation, generally making use of sampling techniques and logical analysis to test a number of hypotheses. On the basis of her findings, she has projected certain adjustments in the form of Library of Congress subject headings which will enable them to be arranged by computer in a filing sequence acceptable for library use. Certain of the modifications are sufficiently formal in nature to be accomplished in a strictly mechanical fashion; others are more subtle, requiring complex judgments which must be implemented manually.

Harris could be charged with rewriting the Library of Congress headings in many cases. She believes, however, on the basis of her four studies, that the recommended adjustments are legitimate and express more accurately and consistently the intent of the headings. It might be noted that John C. Rather, in his "provisional version" (March 1971) of *Filing Arrangement in the Library of Congress Catalogs*, advocates making no such modifications, arguing, "It is illogical to construct a heading one way and then to file it as if it were constructed another way" (p.v).

Whether or not Harris' thesis is convincing, her reworking of the headings could produce a list which—especially in machine-readable form—would lend itself to a more intelligent analysis of the meaning and value of the various types of headings. For example, when inverted headings are changed to nouns with the adjective as a subdivision preceded by a dash, the resultant interfiling of "comma" and "dash" headings raises pertinent questions about the need for both punctuation patterns. From the standpoint of stimulating further research, Harris' suggestions have considerable merit, even though both theoreticians and practitioners may wish to quarrel with her about a number of points.