

Berryman, and Robert Lowell during the twentieth century. And it is this very aspect of Stanwood's monograph that readers will most appreciate. After the explosion of theory and the rise of the culture wars, the new critics are largely remembered for their scholarship, not their poetry. Stanwood, however, gently refocuses our attention, reminding us of a story that is often no longer told, let alone heard.

Jennifer Summit. *Memory's Library: Medieval Books in Early Modern England*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2008. x + 336 pp. + 8 illus. \$35.00. Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL, THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH.

Jennifer Summit has done for the early modern English library what Anthony Grafton and Meagan Williams recently have done for the early Christian library of Caesarea. While their study explores the pioneering organizational bibliographic techniques of Origen and Eusebius later emulated by Jerome, Bede, and Erasmus, Summit focuses on the Reformation and how we are the inheritors of textual practices that developed between the two centuries bookended by Duke Humphrey and Robert Cotton. This painstaking study of the place of medieval manuscripts in the formation of the important libraries of England provides fresh insight into how primary sources have come down to us and gives us new ways to consider their origins.

While interest for readers of this journal initially may reside in Summit's treatment of Cotton's instrumentality in the generation of seventeenth-century prose and in Bacon's close connection to Thomas Bodley, there are many other insights to be found in the chapters leading up to her analysis of "premodern ideas about libraries as a place of active making" (237). Bacon, for example, is situated at the end of a long line of writers beginning with Lydgate and including More, Elyot, Spenser, and Camden, "for whom writing about libraries was a way of theorizing and imagining the objects, shapes, and limitations, of human knowledge" (201). Along the way we encounter a series of case studies that highlight the contributions of Higden, Stow, Speed, Weever, Selden, and Ussher. Throughout Summit scrupulously clarifies the extent to which libraries are to be considered narrative-producing

institutions, indeed “ideological lightning rods” (9). As such they symbolize the complex “place” of reading and writing in relation to a culture’s other institutions.

After all, as has long been acknowledged, much of what we know about medieval history and literary culture is due to Cotton’s assiduous amassing of original sources. What Summit shows us further is how Cotton actively was engaged in shaping that knowledge. The same applies to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, whose book donations led directly to the founding of Oxford’s library. Humphrey’s library was a place of active literary production, encouraging both the writing of new books and new ways of reading old ones. His patronage of Lydgate promoted the “larger effort to respond to a recent history of popular unrest and monarchical instability by reclaiming literacy as a tool of rulers over the ruled” (49). Humphrey combated Lollard actions and ideas on the field as well as in the library. Thus seeing more in Humphrey’s project than an effort to imitate the seigniorial libraries in Italy and treating him as being more than an influential appreciator of humanism, Summit demonstrates how his commissioning of a monk from Bury St. Edmunds, John Lydgate, to produce *The Fall of Princes* brings into focus the symbiosis of clerical literacy and secular authority which, in turn, was “mobilized for political ends by applying clerical literary practices” (29).

Apropos of this claim for mobilization, and given Summit’s careful attention to language in this jargon-free analysis of the English struggle to redefine the past by redefining the cultural place, function, and identity of libraries, it is not out of place to comment on her use of “ize” and “ization” suffixes. Indeed, it is worth recording some of the more stunning contentions articulated by means of “ize” and “ization” endings insofar as they can be read as emblematic encapsulations of the book’s fundamental aims. Doing so will bring out the main claims of this ambitious and well-researched study which succeeds in bridging, as the author announces in her introduction, “the bibliographical disciplines, particularly that of library history, and the disciplines of the academic humanities, particularly that of literary history” (5). Therefore the remaining quotations from *Memory’s Library* all contain uses of this suffix that turns nouns and adjectives

into verbs—and in Summit’s case they are verbs of action connoting transformational, often volatile, activity.

In her discussion of how the emergence of the early modern private library marked a paradigm shift in the social and cultural place of literacy, Summit argues that Thomas More “epitomized the laicization of literacy and its privileges” (53). As she goes on to observe astutely, this was an important precondition of English humanism. Her case studies include careful scrutiny of More’s *Life of Pico* and *Utopia*, as well as the interlibrary loans of Henry VIII’s chief minister and architect of the dissolution of the monasteries and the dispersion, sometimes, destruction, of their libraries, Thomas Cromwell, an “energetic patron of an Anglicanized active humanism” (79). Cromwell cultivated a coterie of educated laymen, most notably Starkey and Elyot, whose biblioclastic reforms she discusses in detail. For example, Summit adduces that Elyot’s famous *Dictionary*, created from the royal collections, resembles a library on many levels, especially in its use of an alphabetical order to structure the project and because licit and illicit sources are found side by side. Elyot’s efforts are seen as reflecting the larger Reformation challenge of imposing religious and political unity on the nation.

Summit also evinces a subtle argument for “the monasticization of the laity”; namely, that vernacular books of devotion had the effect of strengthening, rather than eroding, the monastery’s literary authority “by externalizing monastic models” (60). Far from seeing this as an organic or seamless flow of cultural influence though, it is figured as a battle between competing models of literacy and knowledge. The English library at the time of More, like his oeuvre, is more crucible than conduit.

The chapter on Spenser situates the poet as part of the circle of Matthew Parker, who was commissioned to catalogue surviving books from the former monastic libraries, and who gave nearly 600 books to Corpus Christi College when Spenser was a student at Cambridge. Spenser makes the library into a center of Protestant memory, a place where the past actively was remade. Summit’s treatment of the allegory of the turret in the Castle of Alma episode of *The Faerie Queene* clarifies that while Spenser’s library of Memory may recall the monastic library and scriptorium “it Protestantizes their memorial

function by banishing ‘visions, sooth-sayes, and prophesies’” to “the realm of imagination, classifying them under the rubric of ‘all that fained is, as leasings, tales, and lies’” (131). With the English library thus concerned more with castigating error than recovering positive knowledge, *The Faerie Queene* emerges, according to Summit, as the first work after the Reformation to be written for its shelves.

The seventeenth-century regard for the right ordering of knowledge, Summit contends, fueled a parallel development in nonfiction prose, a literary movement unthinkable without Robert Cotton. A compelling case is made that the Reformation project of desanctifying hagiography is “continued and advanced through Cotton’s archivization of medieval manuscripts” (172). Whereas Higdon’s *Polychronicon* ordered history in terms of six ages, the chronology organizing Cotton’s material “is based on a post-Reformation periodization that separates the medieval age of belief from the modern age of knowledge” (173). The Reformation thereby becomes a master narrative both of historical change and also a process of transformation that is carried out in the Cotton Library itself. The first users of that library generated protocols concerning the use of medieval manuscripts seen as truth bearing vessels, a view fundamental to much modern scholarship. And yet, as Summit shows, this was made possible only by readers engaged in active struggles with their sources, often effacing the original contexts and drastically altering the protocols of reading from which those manuscripts first drew their meaning. It is here that Summit goes into Cotton’s unbinding of manuscripts to reorganize them, sometimes deliberately cutting off later margin commentaries.

As with the manuscripts Cotton collected, so too the material artifacts, relics, and remains in his cabinet of curiosities which likewise were valued as objects of historical knowledge. Becket’s skull fragment, for example, no longer was an object of belief but a specimen in the history of belief. Camden’s skeptical and adversarial approach to documentary sources led him to strip away the fabulous accretions of miracle stories to reveal the solid ground of historical fact. In transforming hagiography into epitaph, he commemorates rather than sanctifies. The same holds for John Weever, “who proposes to replace Becket with Oldcastle, condemning the tomb of the former

(‘this mocke-ape toy, this vaine alurement’) while calling for some ‘immortal verse’ to memorialize the latter’s ‘entombleth worth’” (183).

With nearly eighty pages of notes, despite the fifteen-page index, it is unfortunate that the choice was made not to include a bibliography—at least a list of the primary sources would have been welcomed. Still, *Memory’s Library* is a very important book that should be standard reading for scholars of literary and intellectual history. It establishes a critical agenda for studies in the history of the book for generations to come.

Bruce R. Smith. *The Key of Green: Passion and Perception in Renaissance Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009. v + 326 pp. + 55 illus. \$39.00. Review by IRA CLARK, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA.

The Key of Green “picks one of the locks that shut us off from the past. It gives us access to a surprisingly wide range of cultural experience on the other side, and like the coded key to a map it helps us interpret what we find there” (3). It extends to another sensory impression, Bruce R. Smith’s *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England*. The book, however, has ambitions beyond this thesis: hearing and especially seeing connote knowing, understanding, grasping, so that impression becomes apprehension, not reception but interaction. It elaborates on its precursor, exhorting us to witness a spectrum of colors, not only the black and white binaries of absorption and reflection of all colors. Green’s appeal for Smith lies in its boundlessness, its plenitude of related and antithetical meanings, its position between poles of the color spectrum. For him it becomes a “relationship” interpreters actively engage. Thus he urges interpreting philosophical, ethical, poetic, dramatic language as well as paintings, furnishings, gardens, landscapes through “green spectacles” just as he urges *Attending to the O-Factor*.

Admirably, Smith lays out presuppositions, frames, and intentions in his “Introduction: About Green.” *Passion and Perception in Renaissance Culture* constitutes a cultural history of material objects between 1575 and 1700 because Smith puts crucial emphasis on the shift he sees wrought by Descartes and Newton. The Cartesian shift