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