
Review by Ann Blair, Harvard University.

James Farge presents here in an excellent diplomatic edition two registers from the University of Paris dated July 1512 - Easter 1513 and March 1513 - Easter 1515. These are unique documents because they inaugurated a new form of record-keeping at the level of the University (rather than the Nation) of which no later exemplars survive. The registers record the grounds on which certificates of university study were issued to those who requested them, notably when applying for ecclesiastical benefices reserved for university graduates. Each entry consists of one or more paragraphs in which one or more teachers attest to the student having attended lectures usually over a period of three and a half years working toward to a master's degree. When the student stayed at the University for a full five years the record includes attestation of his teaching and further study during the additional eighteen months. These registers do not contain the actual certificates issued to the students which would have been elegantly produced. Instead they are a record kept for internal purposes in a rapid cursive hand including corrections, additions and occasional bits that remain illegible even to a seasoned expert like Farge. Thanks to this edition these difficult sources are available for use by a broad range of historians and suggest multiple purposes to which they can be put.

Farge anticipates especially the use of this volume by those interested in the students and teachers at the University of Paris in what he calls the generation of 1500. The registers contain 1062 entries for individual students and more than one thousand masters of the University of Paris appear in the attestations, many of whom left their signatures in the register. The documents produced in these registers between 1512 and 1515 often recorded study completed years earlier, sometimes even before 1500. These registers thus offer a view of a “generation” of students and teachers spanning ca 1500-1515. The view is only partial, however, since it does not include students who did not request a certificate of completion of study, e.g., if they did not seek an ecclesiastical office that required one.

Nonetheless, some observations can be made about the college affiliations, the geographical origins and teachers of the students who did request a certificate because these pieces of information are included consistently in each entry. Farge offers a number of indexes designed to aid prosopographical and biographical study. The exhaustive index of persons comes with a number of supplements keyed to it: indexes by geographical origin and by college affiliation and lists of the students who continued in theology, canon and civil law, and medicine; he also provides helpful
translations of French names of colleges and places into Latin. Farge warns, too, of the risks inherent in seeking to count and identify individuals from these records; given the multiple forms and common repetitions of names in Latin and the vernacular it is possible to create multiple persons where one existed and conversely to conflate two separate people. In any case many of the leading intellectual figures of the day, whether scholastic- or humanist-, orthodox- or reformist-leaning appear in these pages, including for example Jérôme Clichtove, Charles de Bovelles, Jacques Lefèvre d’Etaples and François Vatable.

Farge compares these documents to our current academic transcripts and notes that they offer only limited information about the studies undertaken since these were usually standard. It strikes me that these documents also resemble in some ways our letters of recommendation. Farge has made a point of transcribing each entry in full. Although the purpose of each attestation was the same and the formulations are repetitive, the entries are not strictly formulaic but offer rich variations on the same theme. They include words of praise for the masters and the students named, and various details, e.g., about dates, illnesses or other interruptions of study. The full text invites historians to analyze the specific words and phrases used to describe so many personal relationships between master and student.

In their regular mention of dates these registers also reveal interesting aspects of university life and schedule. The entries document the lag between the request for a certificate and its issuance or between the testimonies of different masters. These gaps were usually only of a few days, but in #361 (which also falls outside the time frame of the neighboring entries of November 1512) the student supplicated on 7 August and 15 January before the attestation was recorded on 17 January 1515 with a supplemental entry dated 12 February. The records may also cluster in certain seasons or days of the week, giving clues to the rhythms both of academic life and of ecclesiastical appointments. Farge explains for example that the Concordat of Bologna (1516) reserved to university graduates all benefices which fell vacant during four months of each—January, April, July and October. Although the Concordat post-dated these registers, these provisions suggest that the schedule of ecclesiastical appointments was carefully monitored.

Most interestingly the registers record which masters appeared before the registrar with whom and when and which instead submitted a letter attesting to the student’s work. As Farge notes, these details give interesting clues about relationships among and between students and masters. In some cases the teacher himself did not testify, but only fellow students who had since become masters: for example in #170, 171 and 172 Michel Reusse, Louis Roger and Charles Borel all vouched for one another on August 7, 1512 while their teacher Nicolas Muriel did not contribute to the records at all—since he is not described as dead he was perhaps an early example of the delinquent recommender. But in most cases more than one master signed in person in the register with a flourish. I couldn’t stop wondering how a student managed to round up his masters to come to the registrar at all, let alone in a group, as was often the case. Was it perhaps with the promise of a drink or a meal? What was the significance accorded to this bureaucratic ritual, when a letter could (and in some cases did) suffice? These registers promise to enhance our understanding of the texture of academic life at Paris, especially when used in conjunction with other surviving sources.

Finally, this volume invites reflection more generally about the practice of record-keeping. How did the University of Paris institute a new kind of paperwork? In this
case the University started keeping records which had previously been kept by each Nation separately. Almost all the records were made by Simon Le Roux, including even the attestation of his own university study (#147). But another (likely later) hand has entered student surnames as catchwords in the margin, which indicates a perceived need to use the registers on a consultation basis. Only one page from the registers has been reproduced at the front of the volume presenting the entries for Clarembaud Cannet, #12 and Richard Tourmente #13. It is apparent from that page that one of Cannet’s professors came later than the others and his paragraph of attestation had to be squeezed into the margin at the end of the regular entry. Also, since the second paragraph for Tourmente does not follow the format of the previous one, it too might have been added later in space left for the purpose. These and other examples suggest that records were not always kept in strictly chronological order, and that masters could come at separate times to offer their attestation or submit a letter, as Simon Le Roux records regularly.

The register also includes about a dozen reports on regular faculty meetings, at which rectors were elected and various masters made supplications. Farge marks these entries, which interrupt the succession of the usual attestations, with an “A.” Some of these entries were left incomplete, with a half page or so left blank to be filled in later. Farge notes that the full records of these meetings are better preserved in other records.

James Farge brings a deep expertise and commitment to this painstaking and difficult work. He has published many University of Paris records already: in the Registre des procès-verbaux de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris 1524-33 (1990), Le parti conservateur au XVIe siècle: Université et Parlement de Paris à l’époque de la Renaissance et de la Réforme (1992), the Registre des conclusions de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris 1533-50 (1994) and, collaboratively, the Index de l’Université de Paris (1985). This new volume is an even more imposing contribution of the highest caliber which will be of great value to graduate students and scholars interested in the Paris ‘generation of 1500’ and in the history of universities and of record-keeping in early modern Europe more generally.
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