



Project
MUSE[®]
Scholarly journals online

Doheny segments the book into chapters that consider Finley's most important contributions to American history and culture. This construction does not create the most readable book—I noted numerous redundancies of information in chapters that overlapped in chronological time frame—but it does allow the sections to function somewhat independently from one another. This will prove helpful to scholars with specific interests but discourages reading of the entire book.

This failing is particularly unfortunate because Doheny resoundingly proves that David Finley was a man we should know more about. Had he accomplished only one of the projects he began he would deserve recognition. That he was a participant on so many fronts, however, deserves both recognition and emulation. During World War II the Roberts Commission, which Finley organized and ran for Justice Owen J. Roberts, placed monuments officers with American troops to identify important cultural artifacts in the areas of their operations, thus avoiding unnecessary destruction. In later years Finley worked with Jackie Kennedy to save many of the buildings around Lafayette Square from demolition to make way for a new federal office building. He also saved the old U.S. Patent building from becoming a surface parking lot; today it is home to the National Portrait Gallery and Smithsonian American Art Museum.

Doheny's biography has many merits. It is a compelling history of many of the United States' most significant cultural institutions. More importantly, it provides us in David Finley a model for activism and success through persistence, undying energy, and diplomacy. Anyone interested in the arts or historical preservation would do well to learn from the pattern of his success.

Rowena Houghton Dasch, University of Texas at Austin

Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University. By William Clark. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006. 662 pp. \$45.00. ISBN 0-226-10921-6.

Using Max Weber to explain the role of rationalization, bureaucracy, and charisma in academic life, William Clark's *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* examines European universities in medieval society and their emergence in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as modern state-administered research institutions. This transformation occurred largely in Protestant German lands and is now the model for the academic institutions throughout much of the world.

Early modern academic regimes reflected the "juridico-ecclesiastical" power of medieval church and state. By contrast, modern institutions were reconfigured by the political-economic imperatives of the secular "policing" state—by the ministry and the market—or what is now managerial and bureaucratic capitalism. Clark describes these changes in the academic order through the material practices associated with an "armory of little tools—catalogues, charts, tables (of paper), reports, questionnaires, dossiers and so on" (6). The impact of the ministry and the market on academic practices was pronounced, although never total, as Jesuit universities and the Oxbridge colleges in England opted to retain certain medieval practices well into the modern period.

Clark traces the valorization of charismatic authority in academic life in a variety of contexts. In the traditional university, he says, authority inhered in the cloistered academic collective and was manifested in external signs and rituals. These consisted of clothing, collegial voting prerogatives, books and furniture, a static body of texts, and nepotism and patronage. Charisma and authority in the modern research university are split, with the individual professor seen as the embodiment of rationally administered authority that resides outside of the advisory collegial body. In the modern regime authority resides with the sovereign and his or her minister and later on with a provost and board of overseers who manage an administrative echelon. The professor in the modern academic collective thus achieves success and legitimacy according to meritocratic criteria; in theory, at least, this process endorses a degree of anonymity and objectivity in accordance with administrative imperatives and goals.

The medieval academician operated in a relatively homogeneous cultural space in which public and private roles were fused. By contrast, the modern research university, a site of increased ideological and bureaucratic surveillance, intensifies the modern schizoid split between public and private roles. Charisma in the medieval academic regime was rooted in speech, tradition, and orthodoxy; in the modern order charisma inheres primarily in publishing, originality, and innovation. But real changes in academic life have taken hold. Regulations governing academic appointments, for example, have provided a check on the ancient practice of nepotism and its convoluted subterfuges. The institution of academic calendars and the replacement of private endowments by public funding have meant that professors can no longer take decades to give a public lecture on two or three texts.

Clark's chapter on the evolution of the college library catalog neatly encapsulates his theme of the medieval university in transition. He observes that during the Baroque period universities "did not consistently distinguish between libraries, museums, cabinets, and often not between those and archives and treasuries" (298). As an aside, his description of early modern archives is enough to make today's archivists cringe.

In medieval libraries books were chained to desks and referenced according to their donor (the collector's "juridical estate"), often housed in "treasure rooms" or cabinets, without further classification. Shelf lists simply described the physical locations of books that had been acquired in a haphazard manner. In the early modern library catalog an epistemic tension therefore developed between collector and academic discipline. In the Enlightenment catalog this tension in epistemic library regimes resurfaces, this time regarding the systematic catalog versus the author catalog, with nineteenth-century Romantic ideology privileging the author. Wilhelm von Humboldt's vision of a comprehensive, unified academic order at the University of Berlin (ca. 1810) had parallels in library theory and practice, culminating in the unified library catalog that was searchable by both academic discipline and author. Thus, by way of Gesner, Naudé, Leibnitz, and Panizzi, the order of books and the order of knowledge eventually coalesced in the modern library catalog as a simulacrum of the library collection that evolves independently of the collection's scope and physical location.

The book's genealogical approach reveals interesting details. The academic "chair," for instance, was modeled on medieval canonries and was granted to impecunious humanists who couldn't raise fees from poorly attended classes that

weren't part of the degree examination. The inflexible rule of "publish or perish" was first mandated by the Prussian ministry in 1749, academic authorship constituting a visible form of capital recognizable through peer-reviewed "applause." Medieval lecturing was rooted in ecclesiastical theater, while the disputation and examination—forms of jousting and the trial—both arose from a legal gloss on Roman law and athletic heroics. Disciplinary specialization is glimpsed when a doctoral candidate lodged a protest over irrelevant questions during her examination at Göttingen University in 1787. The research seminar grew out of "professorial tables," private academic societies and medieval *convictoria* (communal living arrangements), developing under state supervision into "an institutionalized technique for the formation of normalized but individualized academic personae" whose combination of diligence, research, and scholarly productivity culminated in the late eighteenth century in the dissertation and doctor of philosophy degree (181).

Recalling the split between public and private roles, the medieval academic guild molded an orthodox and pious functionary called the baccalaureate; by the mid-eighteenth century the research university produced a graduate who had "been effectively dematerialized, disembodied, and spiritualized as pure intellectual capacity" (237). Previously, degree candidates were judged by their proximity to the academic guild as defined by corporeal and social fitness and legitimacy of birth and religious aura. Entry-level academic appointments were sometimes gotten by marrying the daughter of an already ensconced senior colleague (for a contemporary twist on this theme see the film *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*). In the modern era demonstrated merit and scholarly productivity began to erode academic phrenology and entrenched nepotism but with partial success and only then with the aid of public disclosure laws.

Clark has written a readable and thoroughly researched account of crucial changes in the medieval university that resulted in the modern academy. He describes these shifts with humor and insight, illuminating traditions and rituals that would otherwise remain lost in time or cloaked in mystery. Whether academic life will ever be fully explicable is another matter entirely.

Robert N. Matuzozzi, Washington State University, Pullman

Memory Practices in the Sciences. By Geoffrey C. Bowker. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2005. xi, 261 pp. \$34.95. ISBN 0-262-02589-2.

Memory, not only in the sciences, is Geoffrey C. Bowker's touchstone in his far-ranging consideration of memory practices of the past two hundred years. Memory requires classifications—slots into which things to be memorized can be put for storage, whether in an individual mind, a shared cultural archive, or an electronic database. The present classifies and maintains its information with an eye to what the future might need, so memory is deeply involved with ways of knowing and with perception of the things to be remembered and of self and with time. Time can be and has been conceived of in a variety of ways—the synchronic and diachronic do not exhaust the possibilities. Technologies for memory shape storage, maintenance, and recall. Recall is not the inevitable or even desirable end of stored memory; forgetting can be the goal, enabled by storage.