for Sinclair Lewis’ peregrinations from Harper to Holt to Harcourt to Doubleday to Random House. In those few instances where there is, in fact, a seemingly unjustifiable lack of balance, it appears to have been a matter of Madison’s not wanting to waste material at hand.

The decline from the gentleman-publisher of the nineteenth century, who characteristically represented to the author both patron, business manager, confidant, and artistic midwife, to today’s seven-figure maneuvering of conglomerate and literary agent is roundly regretted by Madison. This the reader may regard as rather gratuitous moralizing. It is, however, easy—and valuable—to see in the case of any number of the writers Madison treats—most notably Fitzgerald and Wolfe, both of whom had highly personal problems that demanded an editor with the perception and stamina of a Maxwell Perkins—that the final shape of the literary product depended to a greater degree than we might otherwise realize on the quality of the author–publisher relationship. In documenting this point, Irving to Irving offers its own modest contribution to literary criticism as well as to publishing history.

While there is a substantial, and unfortunately unfootnoted, reliance on other published materials, the use of much previously unpublished correspondence and Madison’s own recollections from fifty years in the publishing trade make this clearly more than a cut-and-paste history. One might wish it were less selective: the names of Faulkner, Hemingway, and Whitman, for example, do not even appear in the book. Withal, however, Irving to Irving is a fascinating work and well worth any library’s acquisition.—Charles Helzer, University of Chicago Library, Chicago, Illinois.


The compilers were some of the members of the Ohio Library Association Library Development Committee in 1972. They began with this definition: “Total Library Service meets the needs of people for knowledge and ideas through access to organized collections of all media; develops an awareness among all people of their need for research, informational, recreational and educational resources, utilizes a system of acquisition, storage, and transmission of information.” On that basis, the group points to the undoubted need of performance evaluation that calls upon the user, present and potential, to have input to library management.

Documents dated 1966–72 representing nineteen measuring techniques, some with comments by the compilers, are followed by ten documents which are recommendations for action based on research. Eight of these are conclusions from the earlier techniques. For the ten, criteria for inclusion include “creativity, non-standard nature of content, or pointing in new direction.” The third section is a seventeen-item, briefly annotated, background bibliography. As one can see from the index, there are selections for all types of libraries, but not for all types of users; e.g., children, as the January 1974 Library Trends did. There are no indexed notations for such known measuring techniques as MBO, operations research, or even systems analysis.

Section I presents “a survey of some of the methods currently in use to measure the quality of library service . . . applicable in a variety of kinds of libraries and situations.” Hard criteria are lacking for selections in this and the bibliography. One wonders, for example, why R. W. Trueswell and M. K. Buckland were excluded.

Necessary printing techniques make the text hard to follow; compilers’ comments are difficult to differentiate. Nevertheless, the compilers and publisher are to be commended for adding impetus to the difficult task that faces all libraries. This handbook may give some of us a place to start in finding ways to allow our users (and our potential users through community surveys) to keep our service institutions viable. With continuing application, and necessary feedback, there will be further editions. One hopes these editions will correct the failure of not telling us why particular items were selected or suggesting which technique
might be best used in particular circumstances.—Robert K. Bruce, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota.


This gift to Guy Lyle of twelve essays that describe the academic library scene serves several purposes. First, of course, it is a beautiful tribute that reflects the warmth and respect of Mr. Lyle's colleagues and friends. But beyond that, the volume serves as an exact and accurate image of where academic libraries are in 1975. Some librarians will be surprised, perhaps, that the library "establishment" is concerned and aware of the problems that they confront daily. But administrators will be heartened by this confirmation that their problems are universal academic library problems.

So this volume becomes both handbook and inventory as written by members of the academic community. Service, recently rediscovered as the academic library problem of the seventies, is highlighted in Evan Ira Farber's "College Librarians and the University Library Syndrome" and in Ruth Walling's survey of attempts at "... Quantitative Reference Standards." Eldred Smith's "Impact of the Subject Specialist Librarian..." does not directly address the service problems but acknowledges that as collections grow, some direct and personal way must be found to link the user with the complexities of collection development.

Academic library administrative problems are addressed in David Kaser's "Dialectic for Planning in Academic Libraries" and Jerrold Orne's "Future Academic Library Administration." Four other essays reflect concern with interlibrary cooperation and faculty-library relationships. The ever present problem of the library and the library school is described in Jack Dalton's essay.

The "Core Collection" concept is examined carefully by Paul Bixler. His article, while it may not solve the problem of the undergraduate library that has become a small research library, does refocus on objectives and goals and becomes an incisive outline for those who may wish to rethink Core Collection implementation.

The Academic Library may have raised more issues than it settles. One feels the tension of being on the edge of "breakthrough" without a sense that resolution will follow quickly.

An example is the article by Irwin Simpkins, "The National Collection: Its Growth and Accessibility," which strongly defends a fee system for interlibrary loan. (This kind of move toward corporate thinking and "self-sustaining" service units could lead, in the extreme, to catalog departments selling catalog cards to the reference department.) Mr. Simpkins suggests that a fee system will help libraries limit the demand for interlibrary lending. Is there a "proper" quantity of interlibrary lending beyond which libraries should not respond? Who will determine a "right" price for service or a "proper" quantity of service?

Questions are raised, also, in the discussion of the "university library syndrome." Will we ever be in a position to question the validity of that syndrome in the university library? It isn't difficult to follow Farber to his conclusion that the university library syndrome has eroded the mission of the college library. The "breakthrough" may come when we can recognize that what Farber describes is also destructive to the university library.

It would seem that these and other issues must be addressed with a commitment to conclude that change is both desirable and urgent. The Academic Library is the place from which we can start.—Nina Cohen, Associate Director, University of Washington Libraries, Seattle.


After a literary scholar has written a piece of criticism, he or she faces the hurdle of deciding where to submit it for publication. Beyond PMLA and a few other well-known general journals, and after exhausting certain specialized titles concentrating