for sustainable development. Standardization and co-ordination at the national level appear to be a major strength of the metadata evolution and application in China.

The book offers good coverage of a complex theme, important for content producers and managers, information practitioners and technologists. The subject of metadata has affected the various information professions in many ways, shaking old assumptions and principles, broadening the scope of information management problems by eliciting discussions among different professional communities. Very often such discussions have highlighted bias, contradictions, and lack of understanding among various information management cultures. This is reflected in the book itself. The publication of this book, on the other hand, is a sign that we are coming to a stage where the hype of metadata is already giving way to a more mature perception of the problems at stake.

Maria Inês Cordero, Art Library, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon, Portugal

Attributing Authorship: An Introduction.
£16.99 (paperback).

This excellent book, written from a literary perspective, aims to mediate between the relatively new computer-based work on attribution studies and the much older traditional methods. Its strength throughout lies in its abundant supply of examples and case studies drawn from across the humanities; the author has clearly done his homework!

In the opening chapters, Love states that, although the will to 'deindividualise' has stood at the centre of most literary thinking over the past forty years, he personally has no difficulty with the axiom in attributional studies that every author has a verifiably unique style. After a detailed history of the many attempts, traditional and non-traditional, that have been made in order to detect with certainty such unique styles, Love stresses that this work aims to concern itself with broader questions such as the nature and logic of attributional reasoning rather than with solely practical matters of authorship attribution. Looking at how the processes of authorship may be distinguished, he warns that collaborative authorship is so common and so often disguised as to constitute a central concern of attribution studies. It may be more helpful to define authorship in relation to a series of linked activities performed during the creation of the work rather than as a single, coherent activity. A detailed examination follows of authorial functions: 'precursory authorship' (significant contribution from an earlier writer), 'executive authorship' (the compiler of the verbal text up to the point where it is judged suitable for publication), 'declarative authorship' (the validator or the owner of the work), and 'revisionary authorship' (where idiosyncratic aspects of style are erased and replaced by more conventional ones).
Chapter 4 looks at the nature of external evidence of authorship, evidence from the social world within which the work was created, promulgated, and read which allows us to locate the work’s genesis in its time, place, culture, and immediate environment. Love notes that the balance of confidence has shifted in favour of internal evidence, e.g. stylometry, but solid evidence of both kinds should point to the same attribution. Internal evidence, where close attention is paid to every word or phrase, is considered in Chapter 5. Here Love argues that literary ‘quality’ is a genuine attribute of writing and one that can be recognized. The problem is how it may be established since no quantitative test can help here. It is, however, the first judgement we make, e.g. the poor quality of *A Funeral Elegy*, but consensus is far from universal.

In Chapter 6 Love turns to stylistic evidence, a systematic examination of the hopefully strong characteristic physical features of a verbal or written message that has no need to resort to statistical processing. He reviews several ways of identifying authorship: synonym preference, rare and unusual words, syntax and grammar, prosody and metre, spelling and contractions. The difficulty for attribution studies lies in finding a way to conceptualize linguistic individuality in such a way that it can be directly modeled and tested, yet a stylistic explanation is always to be preferred to a stylometric one, Love argues, which does not show us how authors write. Chapter 7 looks at the fascinating field of gender and authorship. Are there intrinsic differences between female and male writings, drawn perhaps, from differences in the brain structure, development of language behaviour in infancy, or different kinds of socialization? Little work has been done on this topic and new quantitative studies on large samples are needed.

Stylistics passes into stylometry in Chapter 8. A survey of stylometric developments shows that, after four decades of energetic experimentation, there is still no general acceptance of stylometry as a reliable indicator of authorship. Certainly, stylometric methods alone cannot tell us conclusively whether a group of anonymous works are by the same or different authors. Love gives a full account of the problems faced by stylometry, in particular those shown up in poorly executed analyses. He emphasizes that data needs to be assembled with the highest possible care. No shortcuts can be taken, there must be a relentless questioning of results and more concern with the linguistic causes of quantitative distinctions. Love argues that stylometry should not be regarded as a science, more a ‘mathematisation of stylistics’, Perhaps Love could have dwelt more on some of stylometry’s successes here, e.g. *Primary Colors, The Consolato*, and how many scholars in the humanities now view it as a valuable tool, but this is a sensible chapter which rightly cautions against stylometric studies being conducted in isolation. Attributional stylometrists should remember who their customers are! Evidence gained from quantitative analyses has to submit itself to a broader, rhetorically conducted system of assessment.

Love’s review of the various types of evidence continues into Chapter 9, where he looks at bibliographical evidence. Authorial fingerprints
Reviews

should not be looked for in texts that rest on a reporter’s transcript or have been composed by a reviser. The credentials of a source should always be examined, he warns. Important evidence may lie concealed in those parts of the literary heritage that did not survive the drafting stage. In his chapter on Forgery and Attribution Love provides many fascinating examples, showing how fakes are such a serious challenge to attribution studies. An extensive coverage of the authorship controversy surrounding the works of Shakespeare follows, a chapter that should be compulsory reading for serious scholars engaged in such debates and who might have used evidence of the types discussed by Love above to put forth their own arguments.

In summary, this book puts a rein on the momentum behind the recent proliferation in quantitative studies, rightly urging caution and reminding practitioners that their voice should be only one of several voices that need to be listened to in any serious attributional study. In this alone, Love has done authorship attribution a timely service.

David Holmes, The College of New Jersey, USA

Digital Futures: Strategies for the Information Age.

This book, by two eminent experts in the field of digitization, presents a rounded overview of strategic issues facing library managers regarding digital information provision, access, and preservation. The book is divided into ten chapters (though one, curiously, is unnumbered) covering the current context, why digitize, collection development, economic issues, resource discovery, sharing digital resources, portals, preservation, digital libraries, and the future. The book is supported by a select (in my view, a bit too select!) bibliography of further references and useful URLs, and a good index.

My overall impression of the book was one of admiration for a masterly and well-written overview of the key strategic issues facing library managers today. The book complements very nicely Christine Borgmann’s Beyond Gutenberg and Bill Arms’ Digital Libraries. It complements them not just in subject matter but also in focus, as Deegan and Tanner tend to take a UK/European view.

There were some minor quibbles. I do wonder if ‘new books call for more readers’ rather than the other way around, and the difference between electronic library, digital library, and hybrid library is not clearly enough explained. The text was, I felt, too much in awe of Vannevar Bush, failing to take into account recent revisionist works that demonstrate that Bush had little interest in his Memex idea and whose track record of developing hardware was poor. The discussion on Nicholson Baker’s critique of digitization of newspapers was superficial. There is no discussion of the pros and cons of the ‘big deal’ beloved of Elsevier, Academic
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