TODAY'S MEDIEVAL UNIVERSITY

M. J. Toswell

PAST IMPERFECT
ARC HUMANITIES PRESS

TODAY'S MEDIEVAL UNIVERSITY

PAST IMPERFECT

Past Imperfect presents concise critical overviews of the latest research by the world's leading scholars. Subjects cross the full range of fields in the period ca. 400—1500 CE which, in a European context, is known as the Middle Ages. Anyone interested in this period will be enthralled and enlightened by these overviews, written in provocative but accessible language. These affordable paperbacks prove that the era still retains a powerful resonance and impact throughout the world today.

TODAY'S MEDIEVAL UNIVERSITY

M. J. Toswell

ARC HUMANITIES PRESS

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-1-942401-17-9
e-ISBN 978-1-942401-18-6

mip-archumanitiespress.org

To the Academic Senate of the University of Western Ontario. This book is dedicated to the thoughtful and intelligent colleagues (on all sides of the issues) who demonstrated, in spring 2015, that good governance and academic integrity are the muscles of the university. Muscles atrophy when insufficiently used. We used ours correctly. The real issue is whether we will continue so to do.

Contents

Preface

I want to thank Erin T. Dailey for pushing me enthusiastically to write this piece back when it was a slightly odd thought at Leeds 2015, and Simon Forde, Ruth Kennedy, and Shannon Cunningham for curating its arrival to the press, and progress through publication. Angela Weisl considerably sharpened the focus, especially of the second and third chapters, and I am grateful for her perspicacious eye and gracious review. Some of the material here first saw the light of critical engagement at the October 2015 conference in Pittsburgh of the ISSM (International Society for Studies in Medievalism), and I am also grateful for encouragement offered there.

University governance has been a special field of study for me, mostly as a *practicum*, for over thirty years. I'm going to skip past all the details, because they're more than a bit depressing, but, yes, I'm a university governance junkie. I have discussed university governance issues with uncounted numbers of colleagues both at Western and at many other universities, at conferences and at coffeehouses, on buses and on trains, and I'm a real menace at dinner parties and formal hall meals. I am very grateful to all those who have talked with me, argued with me, debated with me, and shouted at me in various institutional locations—I will leave you all blessedly anonymous. I will take full credit for all the

errors and misconceptions, as well as the occasional serendipitous thought, in the following.

Given the parameters of this series, and in order to make my argument as clear as possible, I have used the terminology of the medieval university only where it is genuinely necessary, and I have either translated myself or made use of available translations for statutes, regulations, and scholarship not in English. This has been handy in many ways, as the principal texts about how the medieval university worked were written in an age in which footnotes could be very brief, and quite aggravating, and in fact the best stories have no references at all. I've had to give up on some good anecdotes that I could not verify (the supposed medieval endowment to give Merton College a continental chef comes briefly to mind), but I hope I've kept enough detail to help with the argument.

September 29, 2016

Introduction

Given the complexities of the interlocking pieces, universities function surprisingly well. Professors teach and accomplish their research, and some of them engage in devoted service to the institution, to their own field, or even to the academy more generally. Students learn and grow up, and begin to engage with the world as independent operators. Some of them choose to go on to graduate schools, including more detailed studies in a discipline or professional schools of various kinds. They complete their programs of study successfully and they advance to their futures with baccalaureates, master's degrees, and doctorates. Staff members and administrators successfully organize degrees, reports, materials, and faculties; other staff members and administrators face up to problems of parking, buildings, grounds, housing, food, transport, and that great bugbear of universities: deferred maintenance. Senior administrators face outwards to governments and donors, and inwards to coordinate and set policy and direction for the university entrusted to their care. Alumni engage in various kinds of intervention and work. Mostly, they find themselves appreciated for their donations and naming opportunities, and mostly underappreciated for their willingness to intervene in current events with remembrances and reminiscences.

They also return to their *alma mater* for major events and celebrations. Research happens. Teaching happens.

While universities are seldom well-oiled machines, they get the job done. In fact, many would argue, and have argued, that the crankiness inherent in the university system is perhaps its greatest strength. Courses can, in the hands of different faculty members, offer quite extraordinarily different experiences for those taking them and those offering them: one might be a highly interactive and tense experience in the classroom, with questions zinging and responses queried; another might offer podcasts of the lectures with a flipped classroom investigating details or solving problems; and another might split the class up into groups investigating a given problem not just in the classroom but for its application in the community, or indeed in a different community or country. Each of these learning experiences is equally valid, will appeal more to some students than others, and will challenge some students to a greater degree than others. Each experience offers some utility, some knowledge, some opportunity for growth and development to the individual student and to the community. The great strength of a university is that it can encompass them all, and faculty members who engage properly with their academic responsibilities will pursue what they see as the best approach. A similar ethos ought, of course, to apply to the research accomplished in a university by the many layers of individuals involved, from technicians to graduate and undergraduate interns and work-experience contributors, to post-graduate and post-doctoral researchers, to faculty members and team leaders. The single individual working alone in an office trying to think new thoughts should have the time and space necessary for that work, as should the heavy-hitting scientist leading three major research teams and managing a multi-million-dollar budget, as should the health sciences researcher managing projects

in the community, the hospital, and in another country with partnership grants and private-sector support. That is, the sheer range and scope of approaches at a university demonstrate the inherent elasticity, the flexibility of the university construct. A small liberal-arts college or a university located in a distant region of the country offers essentially the same structure and approach as the large metropolitan university, the high-end privately endowed collegiate university, or the state-founded and state-funded educational institution established where there is tremendous room to grow in its own vast donated lands. Every institution offers a disparate collection of ways to learn, to teach, and to research, and the majority of those institutions are governed by a mixture of faculty, administrators, volunteers from the community and the alumni, and the students (often nowadays called the clients or even the stake-holders, a term that lumps them together with every other worker on the campus who is not a senior administrator). Somehow, this unexpected mix of actors and re-actors, professors and students, individuals and groups, young and old, scientists and artsies, men and women get the job done. Bluntly put, universities function.

Individual universities perforce have exceptionalist tendencies. They draw attention to fine differences in the behaviour patterns, niche programmes that are hallmarks of the individual institution, governance structures, culture, quality of the student body, excellence and engagement of the faculty. Some have local traditions and celebrations by which they set inordinate store, and by which they identify themselves as unique and special. Every university, whether it wishes to or not, has a brand, a public image that changes little but that marks its perception for its graduates, its potential students, and the general public. Universities foster and develop their brand equity, since the public perception of a university is enduring, inelastic, and usually slow to change. In itself, that public perception of the enduring use of a

university is often the single greatest asset of the system of universities in most countries. If university budgets included a reporting line for goodwill, it would in most cases be an enormous, off-the-charts asset. Even the smallest liberal college in a small town generates goodwill and brand equity far beyond what its relative size would suggest. The general public is proud of its universities, and thinks of them with a kind of fond pride. Of course, this general sense of approbation also carries with it a willingness to blame individual universities, sometimes in quite shocking terms, for their political correctness, their financial irresponsibility, their pointless research, or their leftwing tendencies as foisted holus-bolus upon their students. Somehow, however, these attacks on universities do not contribute to any generalized diminution in the reverence and pleasure taken in the idea of having a local university. Universities are a public good, as recognized by the public.

The differences among universities are as a rule surprisingly minor. The basic structure of a university is surprisingly robust. Further, a very great strength of the collegiate decision-making of a university is its well-known slowness to change. A joke often told, with rueful pride, in the university system is that an innovation adopted in the business sector in a couple of months and the government sector in a year or eighteen months will take several years to wend its way through the roadblocks and systems of a given university, let alone the whole university sector. Universities are ponderous entities, not prone to rapid change or instant decision-making. My project here is to consider some of the parameters of that imperviousness, that rather monolithic lack of nimble dance moves in the pavane that is the post-secondary education sector as originated in western Europe, exported to North America and Australasia, and more recently to the globe. The focus will be something of a fuzzy set, universities from medieval Europe or founded

along similar lines. At some points in my argument, the fuzzy set will include virtually all the universities with this Western-inflected structure, and at others the set may identify a somewhat narrower group. At the outset it seems best to take a broad view, and let the more specific ones develop as they must.

This fuzzy set does, however, begin with the foundation of the European universities at the end of the eleventh century or the beginning of the twelfth century in Bologna, Salerno, Paris, Oxford, and shortly thereafter in many locations in the rest of Europe. A development from the cathedral schools and the monasteries, the first universities were closely tied both to the hierarchy of the Christian church and to the monarchies and empires of the day. Their structures, their set texts, their rituals: all these elements were established in one university and replicated in all the others so rapidly that in most cases the origin of a given element can only rarely be traced. At the turn of the thirteenth century the main elements of the medieval university were already in place, and by the turn of the fourteenth century the pattern of the Western university was largely set. It began with the *studium generale*, the set curriculum intended for senior scholars, but which came to refer to the entity which is a *universitas*, a guild of the whole, those who are engaged in teaching and studying the *studium generale*. Students arrived young, already trained in the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, logic) and the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy), generally to towns or cities, and took up their advanced studies with a master directly, and more indirectly in paid lectures with other masters. Initially a group of students would align with a particular regent master in a college, while subscribing also to the *universitas* and its structure of examinations, organized lectures, and discipline. Buildings came later, and unsurprisingly they reflected the ecclesiastical patterning behind much of the early university system.

The architecture of masters and students living close to one another was directly comparable to the architecture in a monastery or nunnery with avowed monastics and oblates. By the end of the fourteenth century, the monastic architecture of the nascent university had altered into the college cloister and the university lecture hall and administrative offices, sometimes overlapping with each other and sometimes not. This was never a comfortable and easy development, however, and it was heavily influenced by local conditions of culture, economy, and governance. Universities were greatly desired by many cities and towns, and were seen as a benefit to the local economy and to local prestige. They were meeting places for scholars, nexus points where the municipal, ecclesiastical, and noble or royal desires all intersected to create cooperative new endeavours.

After the initial establishment of a *universitas*, however, great variations in development occurred. Some withered and collapsed or nearly collapsed under the weight of funding problems or town and gown conflicts; others developed specialist faculties rather than the *studium generale*; some flourished with excellent teachers and students; some had trouble acquiring funds to establish buildings and develop the treasuries needed to fund their expansion or indeed their existence. Funding and ethos were always already in crisis. Problems and challenges of this sort are still around today. As Jaroslav Pelikan, the eminent public intellectual and medievalist writes in his study of the idea of the university, revivifying and reconsidering John Henry Newman's famous attempt at defining the role of the university in the nineteenth century, "A modern society is unthinkable without the university," but a few lines later "the university is in a state of crisis and is in danger of losing credibility."[1] In other words, the university is a fixture in Western society, but a fixture that requires extensive renovation. At the same time, in Pelikan's view, that renovation must maintain a sense of

the history of the institution, taking what is of value from that tradition, and must always look back before rushing forward into the twenty-first century. The university, or the *universitas*, was wholly an invention of the European Middle Ages; it has no precedents in antiquity, in the Graeco-Roman tradition, nor any clear parallel in the Islamic states or the Far East. Universities arose out of concerns of the Church and the state in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in western Europe. From the beginning, they were fixtures, and from the beginning, they needed extensive renovation. And yet, even despite this absolute certainty, universities have remained monolithic and static entities, renovating themselves just enough—but never more than enough—to avoid massive interventions by the state, the Church, or other elements in the system. Like parliamentary democracies, they function just well enough that while feelings of despair are frequent, and anticipation of imminent collapse constant, they continue. Some would say that they just limp along, and others would say they just carry on, because fundamentally they are strong and functional institutions.

Bill Readings, the Canadian academic who encapsulates the opposing point of view, argues that the role of the intellectual, which for him is the role of the university, is in doubt and failing at the end of the twentieth century.[2] The university as he constructs it arose from nineteenth-century Germany, from Wilhelm von Humboldt's idea that the purpose of the university was to inculcate a sense of culture both as a set of knowledge to be gained and a process to be implemented. That is, a university is a means of economic production, an engine for social change, a place of liberal enlightenment. In the modern era, Readings argues, the university is losing—or has lost—this purpose at its core, in favour of an instrumentalist production of graduates on the one hand and individual research in a set of silos on the other. It is time to acknowledge that the university is now

posthistorical, a community of dissensus, a place where we think beside one another but with no integration into a community, into a *universitas*, into a joint understanding and consensus that will move us forward into the next generation of the university. Many would agree. I am not so sure. I wonder if there is not some value, as universities face a new set of challenges, in pondering the medieval university, the origin stories for the modern university, and the continuities that exist as much as do the fractures. Moreover, those continuities go back well beyond the Humboldtian notion of the originary construction of the university in nineteenth-century Germany, spreading from there very rapidly to North America. Where Readings follows Humboldt and sees only a rupture with Enlightenment and Rationalist traditions, I wonder if there are not underlying continuities with medieval origins and structures.

Parameters of this Study

The historical study of the university is not a particularly active field in the present day. Histories of individual universities do continue to be written, but in most cases they consider recent establishments, or they begin where a previous history left the story. The great tale of the medieval university remains the three magisterial volumes by Hastings Rashdall on *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, supplemented ably by Charles Homer Haskins, the historian who recuperated the twelfth century for modern study, in his *The Rise of Universities*.[3] A new general history in three (eventually to be four) volumes also offers a totalizing approach that begins in the Middle Ages in the first volume, and arrives at the Second World War with the third.[4] Most universities and colleges also have a faculty member or graduate who has devoted significant time to writing articles and books about the local history of that institution. That is,

individual institutions tend to have useful analyses, at least up to the 1980s, when this subgenre perhaps peaked, but serious study of the university as an historical institution is nowadays scarce.

Moreover, the more general field of studying how universities developed in the Middle Ages has vanishingly few participants today. The absence of studies of the medieval university in current scholarship, however, is amply balanced by the astounding wealth of modern analyses of the state of the field. These analyses have three main trajectories: scholars in the field of education or one of the social sciences considering issues of policy, curriculum, and approach; former administrators offering fulsome considerations of their own approaches and sometimes more general analysis (most famously Clark Kerr and Derek Bok); and disgruntled or even furious faculty members offering views about the loss of academic freedom, the rise of the corporate university, the sufferings of contract faculty, the loss of faculty involvement in university governance, the failure of the liberal arts, the rise of neoliberalism, and the future of the humanities. These are all weighty and important issues, and they merit attention, but their proponents generally are not interested in how universities came to exist and to have the structure and function that they do today. Recent contributions in this field have also addressed the role of the MOOC (Massive Open Online Course); the shift to experiential learning, cooperative learning, work internships, and skills-based training; and the changing nature of student engagement in learning given the multitasking they engage in and the kinds of approaches to learning they nowadays find useful. The field itself has a great deal of internal debate and much passionate discussion. That said, however, the issue of university governance and the role of the university in society remains a specialist question in most modern societies. Only a few works in the field have gathered anything like a popular

following. Whereas the health system and the school system up to the age of sixteen or seventeen are matters of broad public interest that receive frequent and passionate engagement in society at large, higher education still remains something of a closed book, a world known in pieces—its own highly personal and nostalgic pieces, as far as most students and former students are concerned—by those who attended a given institution or two, but not one broadly understood across society. If there is unrest at a particular university, only the students and alumni of that university, and perhaps the inhabitants of the town or city it is in, pay close attention. An outbreak of disease or a security issue in an elementary school draw much more attention from the media. A university's procedures and behaviour patterns are deeply encoded and more deeply codified, so that media professionals are usually stymied in their attempts to learn whether a particular issue might have general relevance or could be extrapolated to other universities or institutions. Where academics will happily talk about the health system or the environment or their scientific discoveries or pedagogy in the schools, they will generally not discuss their own institutions. Students will, and do, but their interventions are evanescent. In many nations and cultures the existence of a local, provincial, or national university will be a source of fierce pride, but one whose practices and approaches exist inside a black box. Taxi drivers point to the university as they drive tourists into town, and they indicate some of its buildings, but if they do speak of its quality of instruction or research, it is only ever in absolutely laudatory terms. In this respect, universities are remarkably medieval even today.

However, one thing that universities do have is a deep-seated sense of the medieval, whether recognized or not. In the modern day, the intellectual discipline known as medievalism is most often associated in the popular imagination with films, television shows, video games, and

graphic novels with swashbuckling heroes, demure princesses, assorted nobility and royalty in chainmail or silks and satins, various monks and nuns delivering orders and messages, tournaments, castles, courtly love, medieval weaponry and warfare, and a general sense of the supposedly chaotic and colourful Middle Ages as the backdrop for the romance narrative unfolding in the text. The scholars who study medievalism, the reception of the Middle Ages, do tend often to focus on these more obvious signs of the medieval as it lives today. That is, the institutions and ideas that were at the core of medieval thinking are less flashy, and less likely to garner attention, even from scholars of medievalism. The study of medieval institutions and ideas is thus left largely to scholars of medieval studies, who tend to stop their work at the end of the Middle Ages.[5] Rare indeed is the sociologist, anthropologist, or historian of the university as an institution who begins as far back as its medieval origins and gradually moves forward to investigate the modern. Those who do this are mostly medievalists themselves: John Henry Newman (Cardinal Newman) in the nineteenth century, Jaroslav Pelikan, Astrik Gabriel, and Herbert Edward Salter in the twentieth century, and William Clark in the twenty-first century.[6]

Medievalism as a discipline is a relatively recent invention, and one with a good deal of ferment as it sorts out its main lines of argument and approach. There remains much disagreement, some of it productive and some of it simply fearful of being overrun by the cultural studies side of the house, which investigates the many modern medievalisms and neomedievalisms (following on initially from Tolkien studies, but now including J. K. Rowling, George R. R. Martin, and many modern fantasy writers and dreamers in software, manga, and videogames). In one noteworthy respect medievalism agrees with my approach here to universities. Because the study of the Middle Ages was largely undertaken during the nineteenth century, with the first editing

of medieval manuscripts and the first synthesizing studies written about the Middle Ages all over Europe, medievalism involves awareness that our study of the Middle Ages is always implicated by the fact that we look through a lens that was first focused in the nineteenth century. We bring a romanticized view to the Middle Ages, because we are seeing them for ourselves but also through the lens brought to bear by the brothers Wilhelm and Jakob Grimm, William Morris, Gaston Paris, John Kemble, and other Romantic and Victorian figures. For example, our thinking about the Middle Ages in terms of nationalism, separating out the German tribes from the Frankish ones and both from the Norse, replicates nineteenth-century views of nationalism and ethnicity. Similarly, thinking about the modern university always nowadays starts with Humboldt and the rise of the research university in Germany, with its pattern being rapidly replicated around the world. Scholars of medievalism tend overwhelmingly to work on literary texts (and especially Anglo-American literary texts), although a strong minority addresses art history, religion, and science. There are indeed scholars of medievalism who address institutions, but their focus tends to be on physical or spiritual institutions: churches, monasteries, banks, the survival of Christian monastic orders, and the like. Few scholars today think seriously about the inherent medievalism in modern institutions, and none save Clark does so explicitly in terms of universities.[7]

My approach here will therefore involve a combination of medieval studies with medievalism; sometimes I will conflate the two, sometimes concatenate them, sometimes use medieval studies, and sometimes use medievalism. Perhaps some explanation of this complexity of approach will help. Occasionally elements of the medieval university survive to the present day, and sometimes elements of the modern university offer a kind of revivified medieval. These elements enact, consciously or unconsciously, a simulacrum of

the medieval—a copy of an original medieval behaviour or structure that never existed. For example, the rituals of the modern university have a great deal of medieval panoply associated with them, especially including academic regalia. The regalia (robes, hoods, headgear) are often given great historical significance, and yet in most cases these insignia and other markers of university graduates—especially those achieving the academic heights of a doctorate—were actually developed in the nineteenth or even the twentieth century as something that ought to have been developed in the Middle Ages. The collection of academic peacocks at university convocations is a simulacrum, a copy of a medieval original that never existed. At other times medieval elements appear in the modern university by happenstance, simply a result of similarities in the patterns of human thought and behaviour. For example, students in modern universities declaring their agency and centrality to the university structure as purchasers of the services offered by the faculty, as clients, are replicating one of the medieval models of a university, that of the University of Bologna, perhaps founded in 1098. Moreover, they often combine forces with senior administrators in order to advance their agenda. These two groups wield similar kinds of executive power in the university structure, and they tend to want to leave similar kinds of legacies in the institution. The result, in the Middle Ages and the modern day, might be new playing fields for a sports team, new regulations about course offerings, career counselling centres, a new student centre for innovation and entrepreneurship (the last two perhaps more modern than medieval), or some other development in which their interests coincide. However, for my purposes here that coincidence of interests is not properly a feature of medievalism, but a simple replication of a medieval model. As a result, there will be considerable overlap here between the academic study of the medieval university, the academic

study of the reception and reinstantiation of elements of the medieval university in the modern day, and the study of replicating patterns from the Middle Ages in the twenty-first century.

The principal question of this study—just how medieval is the modern university?—is not a simple one. Elements of the universities founded in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in Europe survive in the modern university. Other apparently medieval elements have developed over the ages as a result of a medievalizing impulse. Disentangling these will not always be possible, but it will perhaps be possible to determine the ways in which the modern university maintains a fundamentally medieval structure and approach. In chapter 1, I will begin with issues of ritual and liturgy. Medieval or medievalist ceremonies abound in the modern university, as do the trappings of the medieval world. Universities have gonfalons and banners, coats of arms, and charming private traditions. They retain chancellors as their academic visitors or honorary leaders, and they delight in convocation ceremonies of great pomp and circumstance. The chapter will consider these rituals as elements of the liturgical structure of the university, and will address both the longstanding traditions of the Western university and the new rituals under development on a daily basis. Chapter 2 will turn to the structure of the university and consider ways in which it follows on from the medieval university, and ways in which it is returning to a medieval approach. The role of patrons, for example, is rich with medieval implications in the modern university as governments cut back their subsidies and insist that tuition charges must be matched by universities with massive scholarship options to ensure equality of access for all qualified students. As a result, the fundraising and advancement portfolios of a modern university have much in common with medieval donors and founders, and their ability to dictate elements of the colleges and universities they endowed. The

roles of various senior figures in the modern university and the tricky political paths they must tread amongst academic senates and various structures of governing bodies also require examination from this point of view. Universities follow medieval ecclesiastical architecture, even in their newest buildings, and maintain an infrastructure that exactly replicates the push–pull of wanting to be a part of the community and wanting to maintain full autonomy as an independent institution. That is, the governance and physical structure of a university campus remains highly medieval in its approach and focus. Finally, chapter 3 will consider issues of teaching and the curriculum, considering the role of the student body and of the alumni. For example, recently the various European countries came together to attempt to ensure comparability in their degrees and in the quality of their education, producing famously a set of regulations known as the Bologna accords. One unintended consequence of the Bologna accords on teaching and learning in the university world has been a surprising sameness of curriculum, a smoothing out of difference. Governments around the world are attempting to establish transferability of credit. One reason for this is that students want that portability. Another reason is that if students can organize attendance at cheaper institutions of post-secondary education for part of a university degree program, that will allow governments to save considerable sums of money on their tuition and funding packages, and on their capital and operating budget transfers to the more expensive research universities, which might no longer be needed to teach first- or second-year students. The early results of the process have been a move in the direction of learning and program outcomes that are remarkably similar at every institution of higher education, and a potential return to the medieval model of portability, of courses taken at several different institutions with the degree taken at the most convenient final university. A second example

with respect to the actual delivery of a university education is the issue of discipline and student welfare. To this day universities function as something of a world apart, subject to their own rules about behaviour and their own standards for health and welfare. The result can be an unexpected quantity of friction, as universities for privacy reasons cannot release to parents and relatives information about the mental or emotional state of a student, and often choose not to release information about punishment levied for various kinds of academic infractions or failures to live up to a university code of conduct. In this final chapter, then, I will consider some of the ways in which the putatively independent world of the modern university is steadily being eroded by quite medieval issues about discipline, conduct, and the curriculum.

Universities offer a fascinating lens on what society considers important. If a given society sends its best and brightest to its institutions of higher education, it presumably expects that those students will emerge at the other end of their studies fully inculcated with that society's values and ideals, aware of how to employ that society's beliefs and approaches, and knowledgeable about how to live well in that world. Not only should we consider the role of the university in every society, we should consider how that role has instantiated itself over many generations, and even over nearly one millennium. The extent to which the modern university is medieval offers, I will suggest, both cause for hope and cause for concern.

Notes

[1] Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Idea of the University: A Reexamination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 13.

[2] Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), p. 3 and *passim*.

[3] See Hastings Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, rev. ed. F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden, 3 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936), and Charles Homer Haskins, *The Rise of Universities* (Ithaca: Great Seal Books, 1957). For smaller scale works that address more specific issues, see Robert Sangster Rait, *Life in the Medieval University* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), Helene Wieruszowski, *The Medieval University: Masters, Students, Learning* (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1966), and Nathan Schachner, *The Mediaeval Universities*, rev. ed. (New York: Barnes, 1962).

[4] See *A History of the University in Europe*, vols. 1 and 2, ed. Hilde de Ridder-Symoens (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, 1996); vol. 3, ed. Walter Rüegg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, online only); vol. 4 is forthcoming.

[5] For the relationship between medieval studies and medievalism, and their interaction with each other, see Kathleen Biddick, *The Shock of Medievalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), and Umberto Eco, *Travels in Hyperreality* (New York: Harcourt, 1986).

[6] See William Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006); Clark (not himself a medievalist by training) focuses on the material culture enacted by university lecturers, including disputations, card catalogues, lectures and lecture lists, appointment documents, and the rise of the doctorate, all in service of an argument tracing the role of the ascetic and charismatic professor, from Abelard onwards, but mostly from nineteenth-century Prussia, which for Clark is the origin of the genius entrepreneur-professor.

[7] Alice Chandler did, in *A Dream of Order: The Medieval Ideal in Nineteenth-Century English Literature* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970); she considers Henry Adams and his *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres* as both "the culminating work of the medieval revival; it is also the bitterest proof of its failure" (pp. 233–34). Two surveys of medievalism and its issues are Michael Alexander, *Medievalism: The Middle Ages in Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), and David Matthews, *Medievalism: A Critical History* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2015); for some sense of the range of issues see *Medievalism: Key Critical Terms*, ed. Elizabeth Emery and Richard Utz (Cambridge: Brewer, 2014).