Abstract: In recent years there is a growing interest in historiography by the universities that developed in territories of the Roman Church at the end of the Middle Ages. Although we can affirm that universities that developed in this area during the modern age are "Pope's universities", this was not the case in the Middle Ages. The works on the University of Perugia, also on the University of Rome, reveal the dualism between city and curia, between academic work and papal tutelage, between municipal management, city life and the presence of the Church. And if we focus on the financing of the University of Rome, questions also arise related to the role of municipal governments in determining the financial policies of the university. This article

Resumen: Se aprecia en los últimos años un interés creciente en la historiografía por las universidades que se desarrollaron en territorios de la Iglesia Romana a finales de la Edad Media. Si bien podemos afirmar que existieron universidades papales en la edad moderna no fue así en la Edad Media. Los trabajos sobre la universidad de Perugia, también sobre la universidad de Roma, dejan ver el dualismo entre ciudad y curia, entre el trabajo académico y la tutela papal, entre la gestión municipal, la vida de la ciudad y la presencia de la iglesia. Y, si nos centramos en la financiación de la Universidad de Roma, también surgen cuestiones relacionadas con el papel de los gobiernos municipales en la determinación de las políticas financieras de
In recent years, among historians who deal with Italian universities in the late Middle Ages, interest has increased in those universities that developed in territories under the dominion of the Roman Church. Can we therefore define them anyway as “universities of the Pope”? Certainly yes in the modern age\(^1\). For the Middle Ages it is not really like that. In the works dealing with the university of Perugia, from the classical book of Giuseppe Ermini to the most recent research, the Perugia Study appears first and foremost as a “city university”, and this remains to some extent true even when, in the 15th century, the management of universities, like all aspects of public administration, is strongly referred to the center of the State\(^2\). In the case of Rome, the dualism between the city and the Curia, one of the great themes of the city’s history, leaves room for opposing interpretations. Also with regard to the university, the debate is always open. In the monumental work of Brigide Schwarz (2013) the city plays almost no role in the history of the university.

---

\(^1\) I would like to express here warm thanks to Professor Hermenegildo Fernandes and to his colleagues and collaborators in Lisbon. A first oral version of this paper was presented at the VIII Héloïse workshop that they organized precisely in Lisbon on 22-23 October 2018. It was thanks to this initiative that we had the opportunity to debate an issue, the funding of universities, which Portuguese scholars have had the merit to put on the agenda of the research in history of universities. In fact, for some time now their works has been providing us with important documentary data and valuable methodical suggestions on this topic.


founded in 1303 by Boniface VIII: the *Studium Urbis* appears to be almost as a filiation of the *Studium Curie*, the university of the papal court founded in 1245 by Innocent IV. On the contrary, in the recent work by Dario Internullo on the cultural life in Rome in the fourteenth century, the *Studium Urbis*, clearly distinct from the *Studium Curiae*, is presented in all respects as a city university, or rather as the university of the *Commune Romanum* (we can say that such a municipal government was present in Rome from the end of the 12th century until at least 1378). In dealing with the financing of the University of Rome we will also find ourselves faced with the question: which is the role municipal governments played in determining the financial policies for the university?

I will only speak here of the funding and management of the *Studium Urbis* by public authorities, even if the theme that our Portuguese colleagues launched under the title *Oeconomia Studii* is much larger, as they themselves have shown during our workshops and by various papers.

**Something about the sources**

Which documents can we refer to for a research on the financing of *Studium Urbis*? The panorama of the sources, too, has the Curia and the city as the two poles of reference:

1. In the papal archives we will have to interrogate both the tradition of the chancellery (which mainly provides us with normative documents) and that of the Apostolic Chamber (which preserves financial documents).
2. The archives of the Roman commune have undergone remarkable losses, starting from the sack of the city in 1527: we have no archi-
val series such as *Consilia* or *Reformantiae*, so useful for reconstructing the history of municipal Studies in other cities, given that they document day by day the activity of municipal governing bodies. An important normative document survives, the municipal statutes of 1363 (reformed by Paul II in 1469); and, for accounting aspects, few registers reporting payments of professors in the second half of the fifteenth century, which were kept in the *Camera Urbis*, the office that was responsible for managing municipal finances.

3. The archives of the doctoral colleges do not contain, for the period that I will discuss, any material useful for our research. The archive of the college of *Advocati Consistoriales* (consistorial lawyers), the corporative body which has always played an important role in the direction and administration of the Studio, especially starting from Sixtus IV, retains the roles of the professors, but the first one that has survived as an original is dated 1539. Thanks to a late eighteenth-century edition we can fortunately read in copy the roll of 1514. My analysis stops on this date, that is at the pontificate of Leo X.

---


7 Statuti della città di Roma, ed. Camillo Re (Roma, Tipografia della Pace, 1880) for the statutes of the fourteenth century; Statuta urbis Romae [Rome, Ulrich Han (Udalricus Gallus), about 1471] (istc is00722300) for the statutes of Paul II; cfr. Paola Pavan, “Il comune romano e lo Studium Urbis tra XV e XVI secolo”, in *Roma e lo Studium Urbis. Spazio urbano e cultura dal Quattro al Seicento*. Atti del Convegno Roma 7-10 giugno 1989, ed. Paolo Cherubini (Roma, Ministero per i beni culturali e ambientali, Ufficio centrale per i beni archivistici, 1992), 88-100; Andreas Rehberg, “Innocenzo VI, lo status popularis e gli statuti di Roma”, *Bullettino dell’Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo*, 110 (2008), 237-278.


11 Gaetano Marini, *Lettera al chiarissimo Monsignor Giuseppe Muti Papazzurri già Casali nella quale s’illustra il ruolo de’ professori dell’Archiginnasio romano per l’anno MDXIV* (Roma, Michele Puccinelli, 1797).
Studium Urbis and Commune

The period from the foundation to the 30s of the fifteenth century can only be reconstructed in the main lines\(^{12}\). About 15 years after the bulls of the popes (Boniface VIII and John XXII) which gave the Studio its original form, we have documentary evidence that the task of choosing professors and setting their salaries was entrusted to the *Romana Fraternitas*\(^{13}\), an organism that associated the local clergy of the city\(^{14}\). In addition to the *syndici* and *rectores* of this brotherhood, the budget of the Studio was administered, during the fourteenth century, by the *Conservatores Camerae Urbis*, which were, with the Senator, the highest elected officials in the municipality of Rome\(^{15}\), the *Camera Urbis* being, as we have said, the city’s financial department. The university management was therefore entrusted to two bodies that represent very well the municipal identity of Rome, from both an ecclesiastical and a secular point of view. And these are the authorities we see engaged in the government of the *Studium Urbis* for almost the entire fourteenth century, during the long absence of the popes from Rome.

The city university is financed with the money paid by the city of Tivoli and the castle of Rispampani: a *civitas* and a *castrum* that were subjected to Rome during the expansion of the city in the countryside and so obliged to pay an annual tribute to the *Urbis* Chamber. In addition, from the very beginning, we find mentioned the income deriving from the duty imposed on goods that entered Rome through the Tiber river, a fiscal income which,  

\(^{12}\) Filippo Maria Renazzi, *Storia dell’Università degli Studi di Roma detta comunemente la Sapienza* (Roma, Pagliarini, 1803-1806, repr: Bologna, Forni, 1971). In addition to the work of Renazzi, for a recent overall illustration of this period see Lidia Capo, "I primi due secoli dello Studium Urbis", in *Storia della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia de “La Sapienza”*, eds. Lidia Capo and Maria Rosa Di Simone (Roma, Viella, 2000), 3-34.

\(^{13}\) On October 15, 1319, at the request of a group of students (all mentioned by name) the *rectores* and *syndici* of the *Fraternitas* elect Matteo canon of S. Crisogono to read the Decretals in the academic year 1319-1320. The salary, of one hundred florins, will be provided «tam a Tyburtinis, quam etiam a tenentibus arcem Respanpani, et etiam a Ripariis»: Renazzi, Storia, I, 261-263: 262, doc. xxv.


more precisely regulated, will later be fundamental for the financing of the university\textsuperscript{16}.

The budget was spent almost exclusively on the salaries of the professors, since the Studium had at the time no buildings to be maintained, and a very little non-teaching staff to be payed (perhaps only a bedellus). But for the first half of the fourteenth century, and beyond, documents give us only fragmentary information. On the contrary, the profile of the Studium Urbis appears well defined in the Statutes of 1363, which fix the number of lectures in each discipline and the maximum amount of professors’ fees. In book III, chapter 87(86) of this document, the staff of professors lecturing during each academic year is described as follows. Two professors are required in the disciplinary area of civil and canon law; they must necessarily have a doctoral degree and each of them will receive up to 200 gold florins per year as a salary. 150 florins are the maximum salary for the professor of medicine, and 40 for the teacher of grammar and logic: these two do not have to be doctors, but they must prove to be experts and capable in their respective disciplines\textsuperscript{17}. Five teaching posts, for a maximum total budget of 750 florins: it is certainly not the project of a large university – and then, to what extent has it actually been applied? The statute of 1363 expresses in any case the interest of the municipal government in providing Rome with an institution of higher education. With regards to management, in these statutes the Romana fraternitas no longer appears, while the Conservatores are now flanked.

\textsuperscript{16} See above, n. 13. The term riparii, which occurs in the document, indicates the custom officers, and derives from ripae, the moorings for boats located along the Tiber river were the tax collection was carried out. Cfr. Maria Luisa Lombardo, La dogana di Ripa e Ripetta nel sistema dell’ordinamento tributario a Roma dal medioevo al sec. XV (Roma, Centro di ricerca, 1978).

\textsuperscript{17} This description of the teaching staff is based on the text of the statutes published by Camillo Re (see above, n. 7). In reality, the tradition of the text of the statutes, of which four manuscripts survived, leaves some problems open. In particular it is possible that there was only one professor of canon law, and two of civil law; some manuscripts add a lectura of Digestum vetus, but do not mention that of the Codex; it is also surprising that there is no teaching of the Decretum Gratiani. In this regard see some observations in Schwarz, Kurienuniversität, where however the importance of the city statutes for the history of the Studium Urbis is underestimated. Cfr. Andreas Rehberg, and Anna Modigliani, Cola di Rienzo e il comune di Roma, II. Anna Modigliani, L’eredità di Cola di Rienzo. Gli statuti del Comune di popolo e la riforma di Paolo II (Roma, Roma nel Rinascimento, 2004); Paola Pavan, “Intorno agli Statuti di Roma del 1363”, Bollettino della Deputazione di storia patria per l’Umbria, 112 (2015), 367-388; Sandro Notari, “Statuti di Roma tra governo repubblicano e signoria pontificia”, in Roma 1347-1527. Linee di un’evoluzione, Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi Roma 13-15 novembre 2017, eds. Massimo Miglio, and Isa Lori Sanfilippo (Roma, Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 2020), 157-176.
by another city magistrature, the *Executores iustitiae*, by four councilors, by thirteen whorty men chosen to represent the districts of the city and by four students of law¹⁸. As for the money with which the wages must be paid (in two installments), it comes from the tribute of the city of Tivoli and from the income of the customs levy of *Ripa Romea*, on the Tiber river; nothing more is said of the tribute of the *Castrum Rispampani*¹⁹.

The fourteenth-century statutes are the clearest evidence of the Roman municipality’s desire to place the *Studium* under its own authority: in this sense they reveal numerous similarities with the statutes of other Italian cities that hosted a municipal *Studium*, for example Bologna (were however the statutes deal with the *materia Studii* much more widely), or Perugia²⁰. But, in Rome, the project that inspired the fourteenth-century statutes did not last long. The return of the popes from Avignon would soon radically change the balance of power within the city.

*The Popes and the management of the Studium Urbis in the fifteenth century*

During the period of the Schism, we have no evidence of significant innovations in the management of the *Studium Urbis*. At the beginning of the fourteenth century, Innocent VII promoted a reform that focused on cultural aspects, opening the university to the humanistic revolution; but he did not deal, as far as we know, with economic matters²¹. Martin V was very active in university politics on a European scale: specifically on economic issues he intervened to allocate to the universities shares of income from ecclesiastical properties (e.g., in Italy, for Turin, Siena, Florence); as regards the granting of

---


¹⁹ «[...] quod salarium debeat eis solvi de pecunia quae per Tyburtinos solvetur in principio mensis novembris et de pecunia redivus et proventus Ripa Romee, videlicet medietas in principio mensis novembris et alia medietas in festo Resurrexionis Domini»: *Statuti della città di Roma*, 245.


benefits, its bull of June 7, 1419, which extended the possibility of enjoying the benefits to clerics who studied all the disciplines, was perceived as an important turning point, particularly in Bologna; but no such measures are known for the university of Rome\textsuperscript{22}. Certainly, however, the reform of the offices of the Curia, which this pope carried out decisively, laid the foundations for a centralization of the administrative offices that also interested the university\textsuperscript{23}. By the early 1430s, the cardinal chamberlain (\textit{Camerarius}), head of the Apostolic Chamber in the papacy’s financial administration, gained the control of the city as a whole, while the \textit{Camera Urbis} was in practice closely supervised by papal authority\textsuperscript{24}.

A radical revolution in the financing of the university took place with Eugene IV (1431-1447), whom university tradition considers the re-founder of the Studium Urbis\textsuperscript{25}. On 10 October 1431, within a few months of his accession, the Venetian Pope addressed to some high members of the Roman clergy and to the municipal authorities a letter, which in the first part reissued the foundation bull of Boniface VIII, but in the second contained a provision entirely new\textsuperscript{26}. To finance the \textit{Studium}, instead of the tribute paid by the Tiburtini (evidently an unreliable resource, given the recurrent rebellions of this city), a new tax was imposed, or rather a surcharge on the tax paid on imported wine, the \textit{gabella vini forensis}. The tax rate was set at 20 percent, while the previous was 3.7 percent. The money collected is intended to provide the \textit{Studium} with a budget which in the documented years is estimated at around 2,000 florins per year. We have to consider that the \textit{gabella} on the imported

\textsuperscript{22} Carla Frova, ”Martino V e l’Università”, in \textit{Alle origini della nuova Roma. Martino V (1417-1431)}. Atti del Convegno Roma 2-5 marzo 1992, eds. Myriam Chiabò et al. (Roma, Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo – Associazione Roma nel Rinascimento, 1992), 187-203.

\textsuperscript{23} Brigide Schwarz, ”L’organizzazione curiale di Martino V ed i problemi derivanti dallo Scisma”, in \textit{Alle origini della nuova Roma}, 327-345.


\textsuperscript{25} Alfonsus Ciaconius, \textit{Vitae et gesta summorum Pontificum […] necnon S.R.E Cardinalium} (Rome, apud Stephanum Paulinum, 1601), 906.

\textsuperscript{26} Renazzi, \textit{Storia}, I, 117-118 and 274-276 (edition); Schwarz, ”Produkte der päpstlichen Kanzlei…”, 1-33 describes the complicated \textit{iter} of the document in the papal chancellery and underlines the importance of this analysis in interpreting it correctly.
wine or *gabella Studii* constituted a relevant quota (around a third) of the indirect taxes collected in Rome\(^\text{27}\). To give an example, let’s see how much the funding of the *Studium Urbis* weighed on this tax income in 1479.

Revenues of indirect taxes collected by the Camera Urbis in 1479

a) *gabella vini forensis* or *gabella Studii* (tax on imported wine, to be used for the financing of the *Studium*);

b) *gabella vini* (tax on wine produced within the territory of Rome);

c) Other *gabellae*.


In a financing system that has acquired a certain stability – apparently for the first time –, it was possible to foresee the eventuality that a residual asset would occur at the annual closing of the budget. In a second bull of February 7, 1432 the pope disposes as follows:\(^\text{28}\) after having paid the salaries of the professors and all other expenses that were needed for the functioning of the *Studium*, the *Reformatores* must use the residuals for the purpose of building and operating a college for poor students\(^\text{29}\). The bull stresses that the consent of the city authorities – *Conservatores* and three of the *Capitaregionum*\(^\text{30}\) – is always required in all decisions relating, such as this, to the allocation of the university funds. Even in a phase of advanced centralization of papal power, it is important that the legal formalities to be observed and the language of the chancellery continue to present the *Studium Urbis* as an institution strongly linked to the municipal authorities. As for the forecast of a budget surplus, this too is probably a propaganda motive: in fact we have no


\(^{29}\) «[...] domum seu habitationem aut collegium pro pauperibus inibi collocandis scholaribus construui, aedificari, possessionesque et domos vel alia immobilia bona ad ipsius domus seu collegii opus emere». Carafa, *De Gymnasio Romano*, II, 578-579.

\(^{30}\) The *capitaregionum* headed the 13 administrative districts into which the city was divided; for the *conservatores* see above, n. 15.
proof that a university college ever worked in those years. It is true, however, that at this point, disposing the allocation of university funds, the pope no longer thinks only of the salaries of the professors. Reissuing 37 years later the bull of 1432, Paul II will remember that during the pontificate of Eugene IV buildings to be used as schools were bought near the church of S. Eustachio «at the expense of the aforementioned Studium»31. The idea that the city university should have a permanent home is thus connected with its regular funding; at the same time those buildings must be the visible sign, in the city space, of the importance of this institution. An institution to which, from several points of view, Eugene IV’s project aims to ensure in the first place stability.

In fact, however, discontinuity will long remain one of the characteristics of the Studium Urbis - as indeed many other aspects of the life of a city whose government depends on the alternation of pontificates. We do not know whether Eugene IV’s successor, Nicholas V, further increased the university’s funding, as he claims he did in a document dated July 15, 144732. This statement is actually intended to justify his decision to relieve the canons of St. Peter from the obligation to finance the studies abroad of young Romans, but it is not supported by documentary evidence33.

The history of the Roman university under successive popes shows that Eugene IV’s reforms had not definitively resolved the problem of funding. At the time of Pius II, the Capitoline Chamber, burdened with many expenses, was unable to ensure an adequate salary for professors, who consequently neglected or abandoned teaching. The Conservatores address a petition to the pope, who finds no other solution than to reduce the number of chairs34. Sixtus IV is consigned to the history of the University of Rome as the pope who systematically stole resources from the Studium to finance wars and above all the grandiose building sites destined to profoundly transform the face of the city. According to the chronicler Stefano Infessura - who gives voice to a widespread sentiment in the milieu of municipal Rome - this pope

---

31 Renazzi, Storia, I, 126.
33 The only other document of Nicholas V dealing with the Studium Urbis is a confirmation of the Bonifacius VIII’s foundation bull. Renazzi, Storia, I, 277-278.
34 Renazzi, Storia, I, 192; the breve of 1458 is edited at p. 280 doc. ix. Paul II, publishing in 1469 a new edition of the statutes of Rome (see above, at n. 7), confirms all the provisions of Eugene IV concerning the Studio, explicitly mentioning those relating to financing.
showed great greed and utter lack of speech in financial matters. The most mistreated were the university professors, who were repeatedly denied the salary promised to them by the pope together with the Camerarius and the Reformatores. In reality, the source itself suggests that the pope was rather reproached for not remedying the chronic insufficiency of ordinary funding for the Studio with extraordinary donations. On the other hand, it is precisely during the pontificate of Sixtus IV that we have some of the rare extant evidences of how the financing of the Studium actually worked in order to ensure the payment of professors. Among the registers of the Camera Urbis, a series of accounting records kept in the State Archives of Rome, only five, in the fifteenth century, account for the payments of professors from the gabella Studii: three of them concern the years 1473-1474 and 1481-1484. In these years the funding ranged from 2,000 to 3,000 florins. Little is known about the economic situation of the Studium under the successor of Sixtus IV; however, we know that at least on one occasion Innocent VIII did what his predecessor had refused to do: draw on the funds of the Apostolic Chamber to remedy the difficulties of the Camera Urbis. An important change in the spending strategies of the university funds occurred with Alexander VI. As we have seen, Eugene IV had already thought of allocating some resources to the construction of buildings for university schools. Now the Borgia pope spends a huge amount of money on the project of a new grandiose building. Between the end of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the new century, work started on what, completed and modified over the centuries, we still know today as the “Palazzo della Sapienza”. The financial aspects of the enterprise are documented by two motuproprio of the pope; these documents prove that the money (one thousand ducats in 1497 and another thousand the year after) came from the university’s usual financing system, i.e. from the tax levied on the proceeds from the sale of the imported

35 In Infessura’s opinion, the pope’s behavior was particularly unfair towards the professors «quibus per eum una cum camerario et reformatoribus salaria statuta sunt. Ipse promisit se velle omminno solvere, et postquam ab eis servitium recept, in fine anni non puduit eos decipere et insolutos dimittere, et pecunias debitas ad illud exercitium ac per eum sepissime promissas illis denegare et in alios usus convertere»: Stefano Infessura, Diario della città di Roma, ed. Oreste Tommasini (Roma, Forzani e C. 1890), 158. It should be noted that Infessura taught civil law for a long time in the Studium Urbis under Sixtus IV: Dorati da Empoli, “I lettori...”, 117.

36 Bibliography above, n. 8.

37 Archivio di Stato di Roma, Camera Urbis, regg. 118, 123, 124. The other two registers (125 and 126) concern the pontificate of Alexander VI (years 1495 and 1496): Dorati da Empoli, “I lettori...”.

38 Renazzi, Storia, I, 196.
wine in Roman taverns. We have no documentary evidence of a piece of information that is provided by a literary source: the money to finance the Sapienza building came also - it is said - from a tax imposed on the Jews. Julius II showed some interest in the Studium Urbis only towards the end of the pontificate, and always dealing with financial matters. In a brief dated March 28, 1512, he confirmed the provisions of Eugene IV, canceling however the disposition relating to the financing of a student college; in a second one, on April 27 of the same year, he intervened to increase the budget of the Studio, dictating rules for its administration by the municipal officials and allocating the surpluses to the restoration of the walls and to other public works.

Before concluding, let me just briefly mention the financial aspects of the reform of the university of Rome promoted by Leo X. Shortly after the coronation, the Medici pope presents himself as the re-founder of the University of Rome in a bull of November, 5, 1513, in which financial problems are carefully considered. In this subject, he reconfirms all the provisions of Eugene IV: the same will happen shortly afterwards for Bologna (bull of December, 10). In both cases the bull clearly expresses the idea that the success of a Studium depends primarily on the financial commitment with which it is supported. Less than a year later Leo X reconfirms the same con-

---

39 «de pecuniis vini ad minutum dicti Studii»: boths documents are edited by Renazzi, Storia, I, 281, docs. xi and xii; cfr.197-199.

40 Paulus Cortesius, De cardinalatu, ([Senis], Symeon Nicolai Nardi, 1510), 104r. Does Cortesi, who writes shortly after the events, under Julius II, refer to the tax charged to the Roman Jews, which financed the city’s Carnival celebrations, or to the vigesima imposed on Jews residing in the papal states? No tax imposed on the Jews by Alexander VI results in the volume of Kenneth R. Stow, Community and State. The Jews and the Fiscal Foundations of Early Modern Papal State (Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1982). On the contrary Shlomo Simonssohn, The Apostolic See and the Jews. Documents: 1564-1521 (Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1990), 1455-1460 points out some documents with which Alexander VI requires the vigesima to the Jews of the Papal State, but among the purposes of the levy there is no funding of the university. Here are no references to Cortesi’s information in Anna Bedon, Il palazzo della Sapienza di Roma ((Roma, Roma nel Rinascimento, 2016).

41 Renazzi, Storia, I, 199-201.


43 The bull is edited in Carafa, De Gymnasio Romano, II, 582-589; cfr. I, 198-200; Renazzi, Storia, II, 30-31. In the opinion of Brigide Schwarz, «eine grundlegende Konstitution zur Stadtuiversität, als die sie immer angesehen wird, ist dies nicht»: Schwarz, Kurienuniversität, 387.

44 Serafino Mazzetti, Memorie storiche sopra l’Università e l’Istituto delle Scienze di Bologna (Bologna, tipi di S. Tommaso d’Aquino, 1840), 24. Also in this case Leo X refers to a document of Eugene IV.
viction in a bull of September 20, 1514. Rejoicing at the sudden and extraordinary flowering of the *Studium* that took place following the provisions of 1513, the pope attributes it to the fact that it was richly funded, and that precise rules for the administration of the budget have been established\(^\text{45}\). With a similar commitment, he now intends to restart work on the Palazzo della Sapienza: most of this second bull is dedicated to this topic. But the most representative monument of Leo X’s university policy is the *rotulus professorum* for the year 1514. The role is the result and the implementation tool of a grandiose project of restoration of the *Studium Urbis*\(^\text{46}\). We can not dwell on this document here: a first impression can be obtained if one compares the funding of the professorships in 1514 and in the years of Sixtus IV: the number of teachers is almost the same (101 in 1514 and, e.g., 107 in 1473-1474); but while with Sixtus IV, as far as we know, the budget never exceeded 3,000 florins, in 1514 it amounts to 12,250 florins. As regards the role of Leo X, the graphs below allow to evaluate the criteria by which salaries were established in the various disciplinary areas:

\[\text{Number of teachers in the different disciplinary areas in the rotulus of 1514.}\]

\[\text{Funding of the different disciplinary areas in the rotulus of 1514.}\]

According to Paolo Giovio, a Leo’s biographer, the enormous financial effort that the pope decided to face enabled the *Studium Urbis* to compete


\(^{46}\) Gaetano Marini, *Lettera*.
with the most famous Italian universities of the time, Bologna and Padua. Giovio is a man of letters who works within the papal court, and his judgment on the state of the Roman university is obviously not entirely reliable. More importantly, the happy moment the Studium experienced under Leo X was in any case an ephemeral episode. In reality, the pope did not succeed (and perhaps did not even intend to) endow the Studium with financial stability. Its measures appear rather as acts of a demanding undertaking of cultural patronage, which, despite declaring themselves motivated by concern for the utilitas orbis christiani and the profectus incolarum Urbis et circumpositae regionis, have as very evident objectives both the promotion of cultural interests which Giovanni de Medici has cultivated since childhood and which he shares with a refined court, and the magnification of the person of the pope, of his family and of his pontificate.

Research perspectives

I conclude with a brief reference to the commitments that await us for the future.

The research, in my opinion, must continue in two directions:

1. The registers of the gabelle. First of all, it is necessary to prepare a complete and reliable edition of those parts of the registers concerning the payments of the doctors. And then to exploit them more in depth as documents for the Studium’s economic and social history. They were studied in the past century, in the pioneering works of David Chambers, Egmont Lee, Cristina Dorati da Empoli, especially with the aim of enriching the knowledge of the intellectual milieux of Rome during the second half of the fifteenth century. More recently they have provided material for the study of some very interesting aspects of the economic life of Rome: the activity of the merchants who contracted the collection of the gabella, which were in

---


48 Dorati da Empoli, "I lettori...".
many cases great financial entrepreneurs⁴⁹; and recently the wine trade⁵⁰. It is now necessary to continue working on the prosopography that the registers allow us to build (as we have seen numbers, for a small university, are quite high), with two aims: to better place the problem of funding the university in the context of the city’s economy, and to analyze, for each of the doctors that will be possible to identify, what importance the teaching profession had in determining its economic profile and its social location.

2. Second resource to be valued: the Diversa Cameralia of the Vatican Archives. The work of Cristina Mantegna, who edited a small number of documents from this series, has opened a road that remains still largely to be covered⁵¹. Among the documents of the Diversa Cameralia, many are payment orders, with which the Camerarius of the Apostolic Chamber instructs the officers of the gabella Studii to pay the salary to a single doctor. These allow us to enrich the prosopography of the teaching staff (unfortunately multiple mandates, concerning not one but more doctors, have not yet been so far found for Rome). We can also see the same Camerarius or minor officers responding to petitions sent by individual professors, by municipal authorities, by the Reformatores of the Studium. From this kind of sources the many financial problems that afflict the Studium and its members emerge clairly, perhaps a bit magnified: poorly paid teachers (typically the grammarians) can barely survive: those who are paid irregularly complain, and threaten to suspend teaching; a lucky teacher obtains an ad personam payment from the pope; or again: the contractors of the gabelle commit irregularities or even thieves in the money management; or the pope assigns the resources of the university for other use, provoking the grievances of the academic authorities.

A final remark. As these sources testify, economic issues have great importance in the dialectic between the Curia and the city which we have said of at the beginning. This situation, mutatis mutandis, can be found in many Italian states of the late Middle Ages, where the signore or prince is often faced with municipal claims that make a banner of the defense of the local universi-

⁴⁹ Ait, “Il finanziamento...”, 35-54.
⁵⁰ Lombardi, Dalla dogana alla taverna.
ty and its “municipal” tradition. This gives rise to conflicts that require repeated mediations. In Roma those mediations were certainly very difficult for the city component of the university. Because the tradition of the city university was not so strong: the municipal phase of the history of the Studium (the fourteenth century, the century of a city “without a pope”) had not been, somme toute, very brilliant. And also for an institutional particularity: in Rome, that, we must admit it, is not really a city like any other, happens what can not happen in any other university: the chancellor of the Studio is here, from the origins, the Camerarius (or the Vicecamerarius), that is the highest authority of the Apostolic Chamber and summit of the whole papal administration52.
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