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The problem of the origins

The origin of universities is a topic that sparks interest among scholars like few others. While medieval historiography tends to shy away from this issue (in an attempt to dodge the quicksand of myth), on a regular basis it is forced to come back to the initial phases of what is considered, and rightly so, one of the most significant inventions of the Middle Ages. In the scientific literature, these periodic investigations are no longer driven by the search for anachronistic records, nor aimed at idle, complacent claims of quality. Rather, despite the rarity of early historical accounts, they seek to provide a better insight, on a case-by-case basis, into the forces and patterns that jointly ushered in institutional forms clearly identifiable as such.

This seems especially the case with regard to the university of Bologna, which together with the university of Paris is recognized as the oldest university, and, more importantly, as a university that came into existence spontaneously – thus, the lack of a deed of foundation (regardless of the value that this might actually have in terms of implementation) makes it harder to explore its origins. In the case of Bologna, this led historiography to focus on the aura of glory surrounding the birth of law schools, for which Bologna has become famous since the Middle Ages – and while this context keeps giving rise to questions and various interpretations, its importance seems widely recognized and does not require further investigations.

Instead, we will consider the field of medicine, with some reference to the world of liberal arts, to which the teaching of medicine in Bologna was tightly connected, both from a curricular and institutional standpoint and in terms of doctrine – a field that, leaving aside specialized studies, is less directly associated with the name of Bologna, and, partly for chronological reasons, less directly linked to the debate about the origin of universities. This approach owes much especially to the early development and fame of the law Studium, but is also endorsed by important scholars in the field, such as Jacques Verger, Les universités au Moyen Âge (Paris: PUF, 2013), chapter 1. A comprehensive overview of the context before and after the birth of the university has been recently provided by Ronald G. Witt, The Two Latin Cultures and the Foundation of Renaissance Humanism in Medieval Italy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 229-317, 351-382; David A. Lines, “The University and the City: Cultural Interactions”, in A Companion to Medieval and Renaissance Bologna, ed. Sarah Rubin Blanshei (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 436-473.
as Hastings Rashdall, who argues that in Bologna the institutions for arts and medicine ended up being “mere imitations of the corresponding institutions among the jurists”\(^3\). While on some interpretations this view retains a good deal of plausibility, it has probably been detrimental to the investigation into the birth of the medical “faculty”. This issue has attracted the attention of historians of medicine, rather than of historians of universities, as the former, being less concerned by the lack of originality (or novelty) of the institutional forms of the “second Studium”, tended to focus at greater length on the developments of the doctrine, though these are closely related to the first developments of those new academic institutions. I am referring in particular to Nancy G. Siraisi’s famous work on Taddeo Alderotti and his pupils\(^4\), which drew the attention of the international scientific community to the (institutional and doctrinal) developments of the medical school of Bologna, thus opening up new research paths that still prove quite fruitful. Moreover, in the last decades of the 20\(^{th}\) century the growing historiographic interest in the (doctrinal, institutional and professional) development of medicine in medieval Europe created new opportunities to compare and identify existing networks related to the process of institutionalization of medical teaching – also in Bologna.

Since our point is not to claim the uniqueness of these institutions, let alone their absolute novelty, we can stress from the outset that in Bologna the university of medicine was established relatively late – if compared to its sister school of law, of course, but also with respect to other academic institutions. Essentially, in Bologna the teaching of medicine began to be organized as an academic institution during Taddeo Alderotti’s teaching activity. More specifically, this period spans from 1260 to 1316, when an autonomous association of students of arts and medicine was officially recognized by the commune of Bologna (we will return to this point below).

These cursory notes hint at a number of problems that confirm the fluidity of spontaneous births, even in contexts in which, as in our case, some academic institutions already existed:

a) The problem of definitions: can we talk about universities only from the moment in which historical accounts report the existence of ins-


titutions that display some features somehow shared across Europe? Or can we also refer to the reorganization of existing forms of transmission of knowledge? In other words: should we give priority to the existence of institutionalized associations or to the new educational and doctrinal developments? And did these aspects (which of course are not mutually exclusive) play the same role in every medieval university until the 13th century?

b) The problem of spontaneity: according to scholars, and as shown by Alderotti’s case, the first institutional accounts mentioned above do not coincide with the birth of the teaching of medicine at university level. Consequently, this “Alerottian” phase must be interpreted as a period in which the school of medicine was assuming a curricular form – and certainly thanks to the contribution of several lecturers. But is this enough to identify a clear-cut *terminus post quem*? Which was, then, the disciplinary context within which the first forms of university teaching (or, as some would call it, proto-university5 or pre-university6 teaching) emerged?

c) The problem of documents: we cannot automatically view sources as able to track new developments in real time, especially when it comes to institutions that came into existence spontaneously (as in the case of the birth and development of Italian communes), for this would presuppose that the first accounts could acknowledge a new state of affairs that had already come about when they were being drawn up.

Clearly, all these questions have to do with the issue of the context within which universities developed – an issue that concerns every university, but that becomes particularly pressing with respect to those that came into existence spontaneously, for in this case the development of the new institution was spurred first and foremost by the cultural milieu7: this is essentially the issue of the shift “from schools to universities” in an informal context8. As Jacques Verger suggests, we should resist the temptation of lap-

---


8 Jacques Verger, “Des écoles à l’université: la mutation institutionnelle”, in *La France de
sing into skepticism (which would lead us to forgo any analysis of the first academic developments, on the grounds that this would take us the domain of the unknowable and of the inexpressible), but, at the same time, we should equally avoid the opposite error of embracing a teleological view that, as is typical of the complacent historiography that we mentioned above, tends to backdate facts uncritically — thus, once again, it seems that the problem is not limited to the context, but has also to do with definitions.

Even Rashdall began his massive research by stressing the crucial importance of definitions, as he emphasized the fluidity of the term *Studium*, and ultimately of the term *Studium generale* itself for the period before the 14th century. Pierre Michaud-Quantin, instead, has elaborated on the breadth of the concept of *universitas*, while Olga Weijers has conducted some equally important research on academic terminology. Today, most scholars tend to favor a strictly institutional answer to the question of when universities can be identified as such – an approach that, again following Verger, focuses on the recognition of the imperativeness, collectivity and stability of these institutions. On this interpretation, then, the teaching of a given discipline, however “higher”, cannot be labelled as academic unless it was accompanied by an organized association that, as a community, regulated individual and collective privileges as well as the teaching schedule, and hence aimed to bring the various forms of teaching under the umbrella of a uniform system, with consistent academic programs, degrees to be earned, etc. Although this interpretation has some undeniable advantages, for instance in terms of methodological clarity, it may prove too narrow for some contexts, as confirmed by the overabundance of distinctions and periphrases especially in the descriptions of the early developments of universities. This takes us back to the distinction between *universitas* and *Studium* (though this is not always

---


11 Verger, “Que sait-on des institutions universitaires parisienes avant 1245?”, 31.
a clear-cut one either): the fact that this distinction is dominant in Italian historiography seems to speak in favor of the assumption that a strictly institutional interpretation may do justice to the situation of Paris, but is less apt to describe environments such as Bologna (although we should be wary of reviving the old and today less evident difference between these two organization models). How can the assumptions of the “institutional interpretation” account for the “self-organization of work” in contexts in which the universitas (or the association) was or was becoming an association of students, and in which, consequently, teaching activities were not self-regulated, but rather depended on “another form of autonomy”, i.e. on the autonomy of student associations? We may also question the assumption of an overarching institution that, despite some differences in terms of social roles (masters and teachers) and disciplines (faculties), tends to organize the entire academic community. For how can this assumption square with the fact that the various fields of knowledge and organizations, though obviously related to each other, did not seem to be backed by a comprehensive institutional framework? After all, in Bologna the law Studium and the Studium of arts and medicine were separated, and, apart from the archdeacon’s authority to confer doctorates and some jurisdictional (and, later, teaching-related) interference of the commune, they did not share much at the institutional level.

While it is true, as some have rightly pointed out, that the existence of higher education schools is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the existence of a university, we must not forget that the concept of Studium did not necessarily refer to schools institutionally recognizable as such. Even the “private” dimension of pre-institutional schools, as long as these come into existence spontaneously, is of little help in clarifying the issue; moreover, it is not necessarily inconsistent with universities understood as institutions. This does not necessarily mean that we cannot attribute to such schools the academic status of Studium (though not that of universitas). This can help explain, for instance, the different views concerning the origins of

---

12 In his The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, I, 233, Rashdall already denied any institutional link between the two components of the university of Bologna.


the law Studium of Bologna: these should be dated back to 1180 (when the associations of students were first reported) if we favor the institutional view, or to some decades earlier if we focus on the quality and methods of teaching and on the continuity of forms of knowledge transmission and teaching that led to an idea of schools that goes beyond the town.\(^{15}\)

As mentioned above, the three “problems” that we briefly sketched point to the importance of the context, which, as some recent studies confirm\(^ {16}\), must be necessarily taken into account in order to get a clearer picture of the local substrate within which concurring factors gave rise to an academic institution – a substrate that for the Studium of medicine of Bologna cannot be explained exclusively by the obvious relevance of the law Studium for the creation of a new university (and universitas).

**A comparative overview of medical Studia during the 13th century**

Before turning to the first historical accounts of the Studium of medicine of Bologna, it may be useful to provide a brief overview of the origins of the teaching of medicine in other universities of the 13th century.\(^ {17}\) In fact, despite the peculiarities of each single case, and leaving aside the issue of the exact dates of institutionalization, a comparative perspective shows that in the 13th century medicine came to enjoy a new status, which was spurred both by the further developments of the doctrine and by the needs of a growing society – and this, in turn, laid the basis for academic forms of medical teaching.

We know that the school of Salerno, whose teaching programs failed to grow more complex and institutionalized, and whose base of knowledge had become rather outdated at the end of the 12th century (though it would affect the teaching programs of all later faculties of medicine)\(^ {18}\), can no lon-

---

\(^{15}\) Nicolaj, “Forme di Studi medioevali. Spunti di riflessione”, 62.

\(^{16}\) I am referring in particular to two recently published volumes that come back to the issue of the teaching of medicine, art and philosophy at university level from both an institutional and a disciplinary perspective (which in one case is not even referred exclusively to Bologna): La filosofia in Italia al tempo di Dante, ed. Carla Casagrande and Gianfranco Fioravanti (Bologna: il Mulino, 2016), especially Andrea Tabarroni’s paper “La nascita dello Studio di Medicina e Arti a Bologna”, 25-36; Joël Chandelier, Avicenne et la médecine en Italie. Le Canon dans les universités (1200-1350) (Paris: Champion, 2017).

\(^{17}\) For a general overview see Nancy G. Siraisi, “The faculty of medicine”, in Universities in the Middle Ages, ed. Hilde de Ridder-Symoens (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 360-387.

\(^{18}\) In addition to the general studies listed in the following note, for the curricular trans-
ger be considered a university\textsuperscript{19}, but rather a medical branch of the \textit{Studium} established in 1224 in Naples by Frederick II. Therefore, we will focus in particular on the \textit{Studia} that in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century became the main medical teaching centers, namely Montpellier and Paris, which, together with Bologna and (from the 14\textsuperscript{th} century) Padua, were considered medical universities par excellence throughout the Middle Ages.

In Montpellier, schools of medicine were reported since the 1130s, and thrived under favorable political conditions, as in 1181 William VIII famously allowed all physicians to establish a school and lecture there. While at the turn of the century the disciplinary context is not entirely clear, at the institutional level we can depict a more precise picture: in 1120, cardinal legate Conrad of Urach enacted the statutes that elevated the schools of medicine of Montpellier to the status of \textit{Studium}; apparently, however, the teaching programs were defined only in 1309 by Pope Clement V, with a papal bull inspired by three renowned masters (William of Brescia, Jean d’Alès and Arnold of Villanova)\textsuperscript{20}.

For the sake of a comparison with Bologna, the case of Paris is more interesting, for here the faculty of medicine saw the light of day in a prestigious educational and academic environment. The dominant institutional interpretation of the birth of the \textit{Studium} of Paris focuses on the years 1270-74, when the masters of medicine drew up the first statutes, thereby establishing the faculty of medicine. Clearly, though, if we delve deeper into how medicine was taught in Paris before those years we will discover a multifaceted flurry of activity, which, albeit in itself insufficient to push back in time the origin of those institutions, does witness the existence of a significant teaching tradition, which in turn makes the foundation of faculties appear less groundbreaking. The situation remains unclear mainly because we lack the evidence needed to establish a link between masters of medicine authors


of written works and academic institutions\textsuperscript{21}. Although it is difficult to provide a clear picture of the early stages of schools, which were mostly private, their first developments should be dated back to the early 12\textsuperscript{th} century: as he recalled the courses he attended in Paris from 1179 to 1195, Alexander Neckam already witnessed teaching programs that revolved around the texts of the *Articella*\textsuperscript{22}, as well as the existence of four faculties, to be understood more as subject areas rather as actual institutions. In 1194, Gilles de Corbeil established his own school of medicine, which he directed until his death in 1224. Further accounts from the years 1220s mention the Dominican scholar Giles of Santarem, Gerard of Berry (who, upon request of some of his *socii*, authored a commentary on Constantine’s *Viaticum* to fill some of the gaps left by his predecessors), and the Dominican scholar Roland of Cremona, who moved to Paris in 1228 to study theology, after teaching medicine (it would seem) in Bologna\textsuperscript{23}. In 1213, instead, the first four groups of masters were reported, who thanks to bishop Pierre de Nemours played a role in granting the *licentia docendi*, and would then evolve into faculties. In his papal bull *Parens scientiarum* (1231), Gregory IX extended to “artium et physicae facultatis magistris” the right to lecture in Paris, although in this case the term *physica* might refer to natural philosophy rather than to medicine. In 1251, finally, a faculty of medicine is mentioned in a letter of Queen Blanche\textsuperscript{24}. Although at the time the term *facultas* would still indicate a discipline and not an institutional organization, it seems in any event plausible to claim that academic teaching arose in the first half of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century. This,


in turn, undermines the idea endorsed by some scholars according to which the period before 1270 was characterized by a “quasi-absence” of medical teaching, while it lends plausibility to the weaker claim that what was missing was simply an institution clearly identified as such.\textsuperscript{25}

In this respect, the Italian scenario appears more complicated, since the disciplines of arts, philosophy and medicine were considered akin to each other, and eventually merged in institutions that, as is well known, were organized as universities of arts and medicine. One difficulty has to do with the question of how far back in time one wishes to push the intimate connection between these two subject areas in terms of teaching. As I understand it, Nancy Siraisi’s study on the University of Padua before 1350\textsuperscript{26} shows that this connection dates back to relatively old times, also in terms of teaching practice, as witnessed by the fact that the terms \textit{physicus} and \textit{medicus} were often used as synonyms. The \textit{Studium} of Padua was established following a migration of students from Bologna in 1222, and, consequently, was wedded from the outset to the study of law. Even in Padua, in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century no relationship is reported between lecturers associated with the \textit{Studium} and lecturers of one of the arts of the \textit{quadrivium}. But in Padua, which in this respect differs from the case of Paris, in order to find clues of an institutionalization process we must focus on associations of students rather than of masters. As regards teaching, we are led to believe that in the years 1220s e 1230s there were no schools of medicine and surgery (in northern Italy, an area that must also be taken into account, as we will see in greater detail with reference to Bologna). However, some first instances of medical teaching can be spotted in the years of Ezzelino III da Romano’s rule (from 1237). This is the context in which, in 1252, Bruno of Longobucco completed his \textit{Chirurgia magna}. And although scholars disagree on his involvement as a lecturer, the rationale and the structure of his work seem to indicate a certain affinity with an educational environment, and it is in any event certain that his work became a textbook for surgery classes in the university programs of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century. Forms of organization appeared only in the years 1260s, when the \textit{Studium} of Padua resumed its activities, also thanks to a new migration from Bologna in 1262. At the time, according to Siraisi, students of arts and medicine had to gather as an association, though this was still an informal one. In 1259, a communal statute refers to \textit{conventati et approbati} masters of grammar, which seems to

\textsuperscript{25} This is, I believe, a possible interpretation of Moulinier-Brogi’s claim that “Deux ou trois choses que l’on sait d’elle: la faculté de médecine parisienne et ses débuts”, 391.

\textsuperscript{26} Siraisi, \textit{Arts and sciences at Padua. The Studium of Padua before 1350}. 
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suggest the existence of a board of art doctors. In 1262, Rolandino of Padua’s *Chronica* was publicly read in front of all doctors and masters of arts and in the presence of the “societas laudabilis bazallariorum et scollarium liberalium arcium” – and although no reference is made to medicine, the public reading was also attended by three masters of “physica et scientia naturalis”27.

An overview of “minor” *Studia* can also provide some insights. In Italy, the short-lived University of Vicenza, which was established in 1204 when some students migrated from Bologna following an agreement with the commune, and then closed in 1209, had appointed *magister* Roberto de Anglia, whose area of specialization is however unknown, whereas the presence of Boncompagno of Signa seems to suggest that the university focused more on art rather than on medicine narrowly construed28.

The case of the *Studium* of Arezzo is more germane to our discussion. This *Studium* was established in 1215 when the school of jurist Roffredo Epifanio of Benevento left Bologna, and apart from a certain Guido *doctor* or *magister physicus*29, apparently no other teachers of medicine were reported in the early stages of this university. However, the 1255 statutes, which regulated the *universitas* of masters (but also became the statutes of the *Studium* as such after they were endorsed by the representatives of the students), were signed not only by jurists, but also by art lecturers (master Orlandus and master Benrecevutus, who had been working as a lecturer since 1241), and especially by teachers of medicine: we thus find *magister* Tebaldus, whose son Ubertus followed in his father’s footsteps, and *magister* Rossellus, to whom William of Moerbeke dedicated his translation of one of Galen’s works. Further, this text regulated the teaching of arts and medicine, and stated that lecturers without a *licentia docendi* were not authorized to teach *ordinarie* in those disciplines30.

When in 1224 Frederick II established the university of Naples, he summoned to the *Regnum* not only jurists and theologians, but also masters “quarumlibet artium liberalium”. Moreover, in 1231 he regulated the teaching programs of the school of Salerno, which thus became the “faculty of medicine” of the *Studium* of Naples, and officially monopolized the teaching of medicine in the entire kingdom – a monopoly later upheld by Manfredi in

---

1258\textsuperscript{31}. The king also provided that students of medicine should have previously studied logic for three years\textsuperscript{32}.

In 1228, the commune of Vercelli reached an agreement with some students from Padua to encourage them to move to Vercelli. According to the agreement, 500 accommodations would be offered, along with a salary for the lecturers of the new Studium (including two physicians). As shown by Carla Frova, at the time the cultural background of Vercelli was still dominated by religious institutions, and between the 12\textsuperscript{th} and the 13\textsuperscript{th} century it was home to several canons the were also magistri (sometimes also in physica)\textsuperscript{33}.

In Siena, the first accounts of university teaching date back to the years 1240s. In 1241, grammarian Tebaldo supported the offer made to Giovanni di Mordente of Faenza to lecture “in arte medicine”. In 1245 we find the first indications of the presence of Petrus Hispanus, who in his De oculo had already called himself an artis medicine professor, and in the following years had been recruiting students for the university of Siena throughout Tuscia\textsuperscript{34}.

Outside Italy, in Toulouse, the institution founded by the papacy in 1229 offered courses of medicine\textsuperscript{35}. When in 1254 Alfonso X established the Studium of Salamanca, he required two posts for masters “en física”\textsuperscript{36}. Before the University of Lisbon was founded in 1290, the Portuguese intellectual scene was attracted to medicine\textsuperscript{37}, while Roger French has shown that English universities became interested in medicine relatively late, although medical knowledge was indirectly circulated through natural philosophy and arts\textsuperscript{38}.

\textsuperscript{31} Girolamo Arnaldi, “Fondazione e rifondazione dello Studio di Napoli in età sveva”, in Università e società nei secoli XII e XVI (Pistoia: Centro italiano di studi di storia e d’arte, 1982), 81-105.
\textsuperscript{32} Vern L. Bullough, The development of medicine as a profession. The contribution of the medieval university to modern medicine (New York: Hafner distr, 1966), 50.
\textsuperscript{33} Carla Frova, “Città e Studium a Vercelli (secoli XII e XIII)”, in Luoghi e metodi di insegnamento nell’Italia medioevale, secoli XII-XV, ed. Luciano Gargan and Oronzo Limone (Galatina: Congedo, 1989), 85-99.
\textsuperscript{34} Paolo Nardi, L’insegnamento superiore a Siena nei secoli XI-XIV. Tentativi e realizzazioni dalle origini alla fondazione dello Studio generale (Milan: Giuffrè, 1996), 51-63.
\textsuperscript{35} Marcel Fournier, Les statuts et privilèges des Universités françaises depuis leur fondation jusqu’ en 1789, I (Paris: L. Larose et Forcel, 1890), 440.
\textsuperscript{36} La Universidad de Salamanca en el siglo XIII. Constituit scholas fieri Salamanticae (Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 2011), 68.
\textsuperscript{37} McCleery, “Opportunities for Teaching and Studying Medicine in Medieval Portugal before the Foundation of the University of Lisbon (1290)".
Especially in the case of founded *Studia*, the founder usually expected the *Studium* to cover all fields of knowledge of the time\(^{39}\): leaving aside the question of whether and when this goal was accomplished in each specific case, it is worth noting that in the mid-13\(^{th}\) century medicine had generally achieved the status of university subject. Once again, I believe that this general tendency should be analyzed within the framework of the intellectual context immediately preceding the dates in which academic institutions of medicine were documented.

*The origins of the Studium of medicine of Bologna*

Now let us turn to Bologna. Before evolving into a *Studium*, in Bologna the teaching of medicine was most probably not only private, but closely related to professional practice\(^{40}\) – and in this respect, it presents no peculiarities. Medicine had long been considered an *ars mechanica*, and, more importantly, it served a practical purpose: it was needed first and foremost to train professionals. This form of teaching, which the emergence of universities did not eliminate, bears some resemblance to apprenticeship in the crafts\(^{41}\). We can imagine it as a largely practice-oriented and visual training, which, as such, somehow paved the way for those forms of professional apprenticeship that students of medicine were required to complete in order to earn their titles (whether this was formally required, as in Montpellier, or documented as a common practice, as in Bologna).

Some initial (though vague) clues, however, lend some plausibility to the view that medicine was becoming a more theoretical subject, and consequently, that the teaching of medicine no longer boiled down to a list of possible therapeutic strategies, but rather started to be construed as part of a broader framework – and with greater reliance “on the books”, as it were. This facet of the issue should not, I think, be understood in opposition to professional training, but rather as a possible evolution of it – nor should it be viewed as entailing a purely theoretical teaching that lost sight of practical and therapeutic applications.

---

\(^{39}\) Arnaldi, “Fondazione e rifondazione dello Studio di Napoli in età sveva”, 96.


\(^{41}\) Witt, *The Two Latin Cultures and the Foundation of Renaissance Humanism in Medieval Italy*, 461-462 believes that before the mid-13\(^{th}\) century this was the only form of medical teaching.
Leaving aside those scholarly traditions that fueled a special kind of academic and scholastic mythology (which even goes so far as to claim, quite imaginatively, that in Bologna a board of medical doctors existed already in 423), scholars have shown that in the 12th century Bologna hosted several physicians (a line of thought spurred by Mauro Sarti’s problematic, outdated but still “scientifically” plausible work). The presence of these physicians comes as no surprise, and, after all, it should not be considered as a precedent of higher education; still, it is relevant to the issue of how their titles were documented. For while in the 12th century physicians were referred to as having the title of medicus, and hence could be clearly identified as “simple” professionals, 13th-century sources witness the introduction of new terms, which were often used interchangeably without any apparent explanation, such as magister or physicus. The former is often to be considered in its “scholastic” meaning, that is to say, as hinting at a teaching activity, or at the fact that the magister had some form of education (though not necessarily an institutionalized one). In the medical context, by contrast, this term is less likely to indicate a “simple” health care professional (who would be generally called a medicus). The use of the term physicus is more nuanced, since physica appears both as a synonym of medicina and in its original meaning of natural philosophy. In Bologna, as previously in Salerno, the first meaning seems more common, and physici are often referred to also as magistri medicinae. Rather than to a form of teaching, the culturally sophisticated nuance of the term may refer to an intellectual milieu within which medicine had achieved or was about to achieve the status of scientia, which, in turn, laid the basis for its later institutionalization as an academic subject, thus freeing it from a learning “by trial and error”.

---

42 Mauro Sarti-Mauro Fattorini, De claris archigymnasii Bononiensis professoribus: a saeculo XI usque ad saeculum XIV, ed. Cesare Albicini and Carlo Malagola (Bologna: Officina Fratelli Merlani, 1888), I, 519-529; his interpretation of Honorius III’s Super speculam, according to which the bull was addressed to the bishop of Bologna, gave rise to a rhapsodic tradition that viewed the bull as evidence of a Studium of medicine in Bologna; this view is still endorsed by Albano Sorbelli, Storia della università di Bologna. I, Il medioevo (secoli IX-XV) (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1940), 108.


44 The term physicus started to be referred to physicians from the early 12th century in Salerno and Orléans, i.e. in higher education milieus, and not in professional contexts (Pesenti, “Arti e medicina: la formazione del curriculum medico”, 158-159).

The existence of “higher” education in Bologna at the end of the 12th century would seem confirmed by John of Salisbury, who in his *Metalogicon* notes that in Paris he studied under a certain *magister Albericus*, who as a lecturer travelled between Paris and Bologna, and in Bologna may have established a school of medicine. It is questionable whether he actually taught medicine in Bologna, as some interpretations may suggest. While we should be wary of the rumors circulated in the 18th century about a translation from Greek of Hippocrates’ *Aphorisms* allegedly authored by *magister Albericus* in 1160, it is equally difficult, though not impossible, to imagine that he could decide to open a school of medicine in the absence of a favorable milieu. These problems can be avoided if we assume that he was a lecturer of logic. After all, Bologna was internationally recognized for its law schools and courses of *ars dictaminis*, and thus offered an excellent scholastic environment. Certainly, however, higher-level medicine attracted widespread attention, which, in turn, probably resulted in a greater interest in schools of medicine that made some room for theoretical knowledge. The substantial medical knowledge boasted by an intellectual such as Boncompagno of Signa may be evidence of this.

As regards Paris, we should also mention the English scholar Nicolas de Fernham, who, according to Matthew Paris, after working as a lecturer of arts in Paris “deinde in arte medicinae Bononiae” (where it joined the Franciscan *Studium* to teach theology) and in 1241 returned to England under the episcopate of Durham. Of course, this kind of higher-level medical knowledge was pursued by scholars with a philosophical-artistic or even

---

46 This is Pesenti’s interpretation, presented in “Arti e medicina: la formazione del curriculum medico”, 165-166, while according to Witt, *The Two Latin Cultures and the Foundation of Renaissance Humanism in Medieval Italy*, 262, 385, in Bologna Alberico taught only logic.

47 Pellegrino Antonio Orlandi, *Notizie degli scrittori bolognesi e dell’opere loro stampate e manoscritte* (Bologna: Costantino Pisarri all’insegna di S. Michele, 1714), 40.

48 See Boncompagno da Signa, *De malo senectutis et senii*, ed. Paolo Garbini (Florence: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004), XXIX-LI.


theological background. These include also Roland of Cremona, who was reportedly in Bologna before 1218 as a “celebris et excellens in philosophicis” and then joined the Dominican Order in 1219, after which he set off for a long *peregrinatio* in France and Italy, which, at the latest in 1258, took him back to Bologna, where he was appointed as a lecturer in the Dominican *Studium*. Joël Chandelier has called into question the traditional assumption according to which Roland taught medicine in Bologna. Nonetheless, Chandelier confirms that in his *Summa* (probably drawn up between 1229 and 1234) Roland displayed some medical knowledge, and does not rule out the possibility that he may have even worked as a physician\textsuperscript{51}.

Indeed, in addition to fostering an intellectual exchange with Paris, the *Studia* of the two mendicant orders played most probably a key role in promoting not only the teaching of philosophy and arts, but also the diffusion of medical knowledge\textsuperscript{52}. Especially in the case of Dominicans (whose *Studium* in Bologna was established in 1218 and became a *Studium generale* in 1248), this interest in medicine was also conducive to preaching, as shown by Angela Montford – for medicine proved rich in examples and allegories to build upon, which, in turn, as Montford rightly points out, presupposed an audience able to understand them, and hence more familiar with medical culture broadly construed than hitherto assumed. The relationship between academic medicine and the Franciscan *Studium* of Bologna would seem to have appeared slightly later – it can probably be dated back to the 1220s, but is certainly confirmed in 1236. This relationship, whose importance has been emphasized by Siraisi starting from the case of Taddeo Alderotti, turned into an extremely intimate connection in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{53}, when the *universitas* of arts and medicine was moved to the cathedral. Even regular and cathedral canons were involved in the study and practice of medicine, although we are unable to determine whether they also held teaching positions. It is not accidental that the first physicians reported both in Bologna and elsewhere were mostly related to religious institutions, or were even


\textsuperscript{52} Witt, *The Two Latin Cultures and the Foundation of Renaissance Humanism in Medieval Italy*, 405-410.

canons themselves – though of course this may in part depend on the different ways in which documents were archived and preserved\(^{54}\). These canons include for example *Niger medicus*, a cathedral canon reported in 1194, *Jaco-bus Britonoriensis*, canon of S. Giovanni in Monte (1199), and, later, cathedral canon *Sinigardus Aretinus*, reported between 1260 and 1274 and referred to as a *physice professor* at least in one occasion\(^{55}\).

In Bologna, another leading Dominican figure of the 13\(^{th}\) century was Theodoric Borgognoni, a renowned surgeon who followed in the footsteps of his father Ugo and later became bishop of Bitonto and Cervia. In the last decades, scholars have paid particular attention to the field of surgery, which appears particularly lively and characterized by well-educated figures, who gradually adopted the idea that surgery should not be based exclusively on empirical learning, but also on theoretical studies – an idea captured by Michael McVaugh’s notion of a “rational surgery”\(^{56}\).

In northern Italy, we witness a growing interesting in surgery at least from the second half of the 12\(^{th}\) century, probably due to the possible applications that this might offer for military purposes\(^{57}\). At the turn of the century, two traditions found their way into Bologna. The first tradition was brought from Parma to Bologna through the work of Roland of Parma, who in his so-called *Rolandina* elaborated and commented upon the doctrine of his teacher Roger Frugardo, who at the end of the 12\(^{th}\) century had tentatively attempted to lay the basis for a rationalization of surgical practice. Apparently, Roland moved to Bologna to teach arts, but this account should be examined in greater detail, since it is based on those genealogies of the masters of the *Studium* of Bologna about which, again, we should be wary\(^{58}\).

\(^{54}\) Witt, *The Two Latin Cultures and the Foundation of Renaissance Humanism in Medieval Italy*, 330 f.


\(^{56}\) McVaugh, *The rational surgery of the Middle Ages*.


The second tradition that found its way into Bologna in the early 13th century originated in Tuscany, and more precisely in Lucca, from which it reached Bologna when the commune concluded a contract with surgeon Ugo Borgognoni, who had probably followed his relative Rodolfo Borgognoni, who became podestà of Bologna in 1214, the same year in which the presence of Ugo in Bologna was reported for the first time. Thus, the importance of Ugo is mostly related to his contract with the commune, which required him to serve as a town physician, and, if needed, as a physician in the city army (as in 1218, when the contingent from Bologna was deployed in the siege of Damietta). While we know that he held this position at least until 1259, his activities as a lecturer are far less clear. He is traditionally viewed as a *magister*, and in a way as a pioneer of medical studies in Bologna, in which a school of surgery and even a municipal school were named after him. However, all we know about his discipline is what is reported by Theodoric, his most famous son. The work of this Dominican scholar (who remained in Bologna even as a bishop, and probably continued practicing surgery) illustrates the therapeutic strategies adopted by his father, whom, incidentally, Theodoric always calls his teacher, and never his father. Looking at the matter from the perspective of the progressive rationalization of surgery, McVaugh has illustrated in a chronological fashion the various steps of Theodoric's work on surgery, which was drawn up in three different versions, each of which built upon and updated the previous one: *Vulnera* in 1240, *Tractaturi* in 1250, and *Venerabili* in 1260. In a nutshell, the idea was to elevate surgery to the status of science, which of course entailed no denial of its manual and practical component, but rather suggested that theory and practice were increasingly seen as two sides of the same coin. It is not accidental, then, that in his introduction to *Tractaturi* Theodoric specifies that Book I deals with the techniques of *ars*, while Book II, being concerned with original causes, sets foot in the domain of the *scientia*.

This approach was further honed by William of Saliceto, who apparently moved to Bologna in 1230, where he is traditionally thought to have studied under Ugo Borgognoni. His *Chirurgia*, whose first edition dates back to 1268 and for the first time includes a book on anatomy (which was

---

bound to have an impact on the later developments of academic medicine in Bologna), places greater emphasis on the rationality of surgery, and, more interestingly to us, stresses that his work is “ad utilitatem studentium”. William, who claims to have studied for four years in Bologna, where Lanfranc of Milan figured among his students (though we cannot clearly determine in which institutional context), gravitates toward an essentially scholastic (if not academic) milieu. Masters and students of the Studium are often cited to vouch for the efficacy of his therapeutic strategies, and he uses the same vocabulary as the academic textbooks of medicine of the time, drawing both on the “new Galen” and on Aristotle’s physics while adopting the conciliation method that was typical of academic exegesis.

Although in the 13th century the Bolognese culture of surgery (perhaps with the exception of William) was not yet unequivocally linked to a Studium, it did present a culturally innovative and modern environment (with references to the “new Galen”, and especially to Avicenna’s Canon), as well as a debate that was concomitant of the parallel and at the time still ongoing debate about the elevation of physica to the status of scientia.

As witnessed in other university settings, it is from the mid-13th century that in Bologna we start finding some (initially scattered, but later increasingly convincing) evidence that the teaching of medicine was undergoing a process of organization, which would later usher in a process of institutionalization. The first corpora of statutes of the commune of Bologna (1245-1267) provide some first valuable insight, though they are still rather vague. Surprisingly enough, in the sections that list the privileges granted by the commune to lecturers and students we discover that these privileges were not reserved exclusively to lecturers and students of law, but extended to the academic community at large. In fact, the privilege granted in 1250 to doctors of law was considered valid also “de magistris gramaticie, dialetice et fisice”. It is also worth mentioning another (though vaguer) concession made in 1250 and later upheld, which addressed students “in civili iure seu qualibet alia litterarum scientia seu facultate”. As we stressed above, these indications confirm the authorities’ intention to cover all areas of knowledge. Undeniably, however, the authors of the statutes had

---


in mind fields that either existed or were about to develop in the near future. Therefore, although at this stage we cannot yet talk about academic institutions for medical teaching, it is nonetheless true that the regulation did not address only schools of law, *ars notaria* or *dictamen*. Once again, we should bear in mind that since these institutions came into existence spontaneously, they could only be the outcome of a longer process, which despite its fragmented and shaky origins is crucial to fully understanding their eventual development.

This is confirmed by later accounts – we already mentioned Alderotti’s teaching activity, considered as the “driving force” behind the institutionalization of the teaching of medicine (and arts) in Bologna. Taddeo had been educated mostly in Bologna, although some recent studies tend to highlight his earlier education in Florence, his native town. Especially in Bologna, it is unlikely that his teachers had exclusively an apprenticeship background. The first years of Alderotti’s teaching activity were also the years of the first “institutional” accounts of the medical *Studium* of Bologna, which were equally shaky, but nonetheless of paramount importance. From 1265, the *Chartularium Studii Bononiensis* lists not only *medici* and *magistri*, but also *professores* and *doctores*: Raulle in 1265; Daniele *qd. Petri*, Sinigardo, Pellegrino Cristiani, Angelerio da Prato, Domenico di frate Egidio and Tommasino da Cortona in 1268; and Amedeo *qd. Alberici*, Michele *qd. Lamberti de Montebono* and Bartolo in 1269. Although in some cases the simpler title of *magister* appears more frequently than that of *medicus*, it is undeniable that an essentially academic vocabulary was gaining currency. More importantly, in 1268 we find the first degree in medicine: in the deed, which was drawn up at Alderotti’s house, Palmerio of Messina promises to his teacher Lapo of Florence a vest worth 25. The formulations used (“publica in medicina”), as well as the fee,
are clear references to an academic environment. To be sure, this terminology might simply echo the legal academic jargon. As argued by Andrea Tabarroni, we cannot rule out the possibility that the title was just another “private”, unofficial deed. The conferral of degrees is considered as one of the most reliable parameters to determine the existence of a university. It must be stressed, however, that the early history of the licentia is hard to reconstruct (as is well known, in Bologna this was officially documented for the first time by the privilege granted by Honorius III to archdeacon Grazia in 1219). Consequently, the assumption does not work the other way around: even if we lacked evidence that degrees were conferred, this would not automatically substantiate the claim that no Studium had been established.

The most systematic communal regulation is the tractatus scholarium, which appears in Book VIII of the communal statutes of 1288, and which according to Augusto Gaudenzi should be dated back to the years immediately after 1273. In these statutes, which often address the universitas of students in the singular (thus addressing the community of students at large rather than their institutionalized associations), arts and medicine are listed together with law. The regulations also include the privileges granted to Alderotti, who for the first time is referred to as doctor (a title traditionally reserved to law lecturers), as well as to his students and to the students “aliorum doctorum fixice”, who were officially given the same status as students of civil and canon law. Further, it is provided that foreign students of medicine (and here the reference to universitates is evident) should elect and have a given number of lecturers: three of medicine, one of whom had to teach practical medicine, one of phylloxofia dicte scientie, and one of astrology. All these masters, as well as doctor of rhetoric Bertolinus de Canollo, were entitled to a salary paid by the commune.

According to historical accounts, in 1281 former notary and bookseller Citadelus de Camaçariis de Nuçera was hired as a janitor “omnium magistrorum et scolariorum bononiensium studentium in artibus”. The appointment of a janitor suggests the existence of a common organization, in which masters and pupils still appeared together, and which perhaps was the same organization as that of the early law schools. In 1299 and in 1301, as a “bedelus universitatis scolarium medicine”, his brother Puccio made a promise to
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70 Augusto Gaudenzi, “Gli Statuti dello Studio di Bologna”, Bulletino dell’Istituto Storico Italiano, 6 (1888): 117-137: 118. A full version of the statutes has been published in Statuti di Bologna dell’anno 1288, ed. Gina Fasoli and Pietro Sella (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1937-1939); here, the following rubricae were considered: I, VII, X, XI, XVII, XX.
the deans\textsuperscript{71}: at the time, masters had gradually lost their centrality as a result of the evolution of the \textit{universitas} of law. It may be useful to stress that one of these two documents referred to arts while the other one referred to medicine, which may suggest that in the early forms of spontaneous organization these two subject areas were separated. It was perhaps the conflict with jurists that led them to join forces: in 1295, law students had filed a claim asking the commune to withdraw the extension for \textit{physici}, and to ensure that law students could have their own dean and their own organization\textsuperscript{72}.

The first dean, Galvano of Ferrara, was in fact reported in 1291. A student of medicine, he demanded an oath from pupils “animo turbandi studium Bononie in medicina” in order to move the \textit{Studium} elsewhere – a last resort that revealed tense relationships, but that yielded no results\textsuperscript{73}. A proto-board of doctors seems to appear in 1292, when a dispute between professors Taddeo Alderotti and Bartolomeo da Varignana was settled by means of arbitration in the presence of their colleagues. Although we lack the information needed to claim that this was a full-fledged, institutionalized board, even in this case we find evidence of some form of self-regulating organization\textsuperscript{74}.

In 1295 another contract was signed at Taddeo Alderotti’s house. The contract, guaranteed by Alderotti himself and concluded between Gentile da Cingoli, who had returned from Paris, and logic lecturer Guglielmo of Dassara, laid the basis for first truly philosophical course ever taught in the \textit{Studium} of Bologna. The fact that the courses of Gentile and Guglielmo were attended by students of medicine is evidence of an increasingly close relation between arts and medicine, which eventually would be officially consecrated in the two-fold qualification of the \textit{universitas}\textsuperscript{75}.

In 1298, four masters of medicine (Bartolomeo da Varignana, John of Parma, Liuzzo Liuzzi and Maglio Sullimani) swore allegiance to the ar-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{71} Frank Soetermeer, “Utrumque ius in peciis”. \textit{Aspetti della produzione libraria a Bologna fra Due e Trecento} (Milan: Giuffrè, 1997), 379-381.
\item \textsuperscript{72} Cherubino Ghirardacci, \textit{Della Historia di Bologna}, I (Sala Bolognese: Forni, 1973), 328-329.
\item \textsuperscript{73} Guido Rossi, “«Universitas scholarium» e comune (sec. XII-XIV)”, \textit{Studi e memorie per la storia dell’Università di Bologna}, n.s. 1 (1956), 173-266; 238.
\item \textsuperscript{75} Fioravanti, “Morte e rinascita della filosofia. Da Parigi a Bologna”, 17-19.
\end{itemize}
chdeacon. Given the academic authority of the archdeacon, Tabarroni has pointed out that everything in this deed reminds us of an official teaching appointment76.

When in 1316, following a jurisdictional dispute between university and commune, the deans of students moved to Argenta and announced that they would relocate the Studium, the commune appointed canonist Giovanni d'Andrea to start a negotiation, in an effort to prevent a further escalation. The agreement, which essentially aimed to transfer the jurisdiction over students from the podestà to the people's captain, expressly addressed also the dean and the students of the universitas of medicine. This is traditionally indicated as the date in which this was officially recognized by the commune and (after the tensions of the previous years) by civil law lecturers, who on that occasion chose to side with physicians and artists to join forces against the commune77.

Now we can address the question of whether or not in the fifty years spanning from the first accounts to 1316 there were some autonomous organizations of masters and students. If what we have in mind is a properly official organization, then the answer is no. As we saw, however, our sources witness some occasional experiments that indicated a self-organization process – a process that was a necessary step in the path toward an official recognition. Moreover, we should not view these masters and students as individuals without common commitments: the statutes from the mid-13th century already hint at some form of communal recognition. However, we can broaden our perspective by considering some other elements.

As regards pupils, the fact that the commune addressed the universitas of students at large, without making distinctions among them, suggests a lack of disciplinary differentiation78. Based on a comparison with other contexts, some scholars have suggested that, before the creation of their own organization, students of arts and medicine were included in the two universitates of cismontane and ultramontane students, two associations based on geographical (as opposed to disciplinary) criteria79. The fact that Bolognese citizenship was not the main requirement for eligibility is further confirmed by the

76 Tabarroni, “La nascita dello Studio di Medicina e Arti a Bologna”, 31-32.
77 Rossi, “«Universitas scholarium» e comune (sec. XII-XIV)”, 247-252.
78 In this sense, the commune seems to attach to the term universitas the same general and etymological meaning as found in papal documents. See Verger, “Que sait-on des institutions universitaires parisiennes avant 1245?”, 32.
79 Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, I: Salerno, Bologna, Paris, 233; Sorbelli, Storia della università di Bologna. I, Il medioevo (secoli IX-XV), 111.
concessions made by the statutes of 1288, which addressed foreign students of medicine. Less numerous and less prestigious, the students of medicine were apparently part of the two universitates, but arguably at extremely unfavorable conditions, which eventually led them to abandon the protection offered by jurists – and this, in turn, offers a more coherent explanation as to why jurists opposed the elements of novelty introduced by physicians.

Moreover, in Bologna a board of doctors, judges and lawyers was established between 1265 and 1274. Although this was a town body, and not an academic institution, as an association it also included town doctores – and apparently all of them, and not only the doctores of law, as indirectly confirmed by the fact that the communal statute of 1357 barred notaries, prosecutors and physicians from joining the board. This prohibition seems to imply that those categories of professionals were previously admitted, and may be evidence of a stronger categorization of professions based on disciplinary criteria.

Following the covenants of 1316, new statutes were drawn up for the universitas of law – the first statutes of which we have the full version (and although it is possible that the universitas of arts and medicine revised its one statutes during the same period, all is left today is the edition of 1405). In these statutes, associations of students were identified based on disciplinary criteria, rather than on geographical ones, since the statutes of jurists addressed all foreign students of law (although the cismontane-ultramontane divide was still in place). It therefore seems that in the first decades of the 14th century the local academic environment was not only characterized by more pervasive and consistent teaching activities, but also divided and organized around disciplinary areas – a process that seems to bear some resemblance to the division into different facultates that took place in Paris, although in Bologna it was never institutionalized. Against this background, physicians and artists could finally be recognized as a category with a more specific identity.

---
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