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assume that the monks wanted nothing to do with women is the product of the myth about the early years of the order. To cite the lack of references for the incorporation of nunneries does not make the convents any less Cistercian. No such standard is required to prove affiliated status for monasteries of men.

In conclusion, Berman promotes a revision to the historical argument about how the Cistercian Order came into being. It will be interesting to see if her findings are accepted, since she uses only the monasteries in southern France to prove her filiation theory.

JOHN A. NICHOLS
Slippery Rock University


Sometime toward the end of 1329, the arts student Jean le Fourbeur was imprisoned on the charge of raping a woman named Symonette. Although he claimed to be innocent, he was convicted by the episcopal court and sentenced to pay a substantial fine. Quite soon after the money had been paid, however, Fourbeur raised the question of papal immunity of university members from monetary fines, which had been granted in 1231 by Pope Gregory IX (Parens scientiarum). The university brought a lawsuit against the bishop of Paris, because it believed that its exemption had been undermined. Since in those days, just as today, the expenses of litigation were high, the university held a collection (collecta) among the university population in order to generate the necessary funds. As is clear from other documents, such collections were an instrument that was invoked occasionally to meet some special financial need of the entire university community. What makes this particular collection interesting is that it created a unique financial account, a computus, which has the potential of helping us reconstruct a social portrait of the University of Paris of the year 1329–1330.

The financial record in question was edited a long time ago in the Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, that indispensable collection of documents pertinent to the medieval University of Paris. Neither its editors, however, nor other scholars were aware of how this document could substantially add to our knowledge of one of the least studied aspects of the University of Paris: namely, its topography and the social composition of its community. The publication of William J. Courtenay’s book has now fundamentally changed this situation. By recognizing the true origin and nature of this unique financial record, by attaching a more precise date to it, and by linking it to a biographical register, compiled on the basis of other evidence, Courtenay has provided us with the 1329–1330 edition of the Yellow Pages of the Paris university district.

Part one (chapters one through three) of the book deals with the context of the document. In chapter one, Courtenay corrects two mistakes of the editors of the Chartularium. First, he convincingly explains that the folios of the original document were incorrectly arranged (a new edition of the document, reorganized according to the correct binding, is given in Appendix 1). Second, he narrows down the old dating of between 1329 and 1336 to 1329–1330. Furthermore, Courtenay lays the groundwork for the general claims that are made in part two of the book, when he argues that this record reflects a representative cross section of university membership at this particular point in time. The author estimates that the document covers approximately two-thirds of the Parisian university population of about three thousand members, not including those who belonged to the four mendicant orders and the Cistercians, since they were exempt from the money collection. More importantly, those who were recorded by name constitute over three quarters of the more prominent members of that community. Chapter two discusses the phenomenon of university collections, and chapter three deals with the discovery of the tragic event, mentioned above, which generated this document.

Part two of the book (chapters four through seven) presents the topographical and sociological analysis, which is based on the 1329–1330 record and on an accompanying biographical register. In chapter four, Courtenay leads the reader by the hand through the streets of Paris, in pursuit of the route that the collectors took in their street-by-street survey. He tells us who used to live in each house. Four clear maps indicate the area and parishes where the majority of the masters and students resided. At the end of this itinerary, the reader has an address book of those who “mattered” in the year when this financial record originated. One can learn, for instance, that William, son and heir apparent of the count of Hainaut, Holland, and Zeeland, was studying in Paris and was living in a private mansion on the rue St.-Etienne-des-Grez. One can also understand why it is uncertain that John Buridan, if indeed he is to be identified with the “magister Johannes Birendan,” really lived on the rue St. Victor as other scholars have assumed.

Chapter five provides an analysis of the residential structure of the larger part of the Parisian academic community; chapter six of its sociological background; and chapter seven of its geographical distribution. One of the patterns that emerges is that the largest number of Parisian masters and students came from northern France, with almost none from the South and Southwest. Another noteworthy trend is the existence of master-students households, associated through regional ties, in which teaching may have continued outside the classroom. For these and many more conclusions, Courtenay’s study will be of great interest also to scholars who, so far, have been focusing on the
organizational structure, curriculum, or intellectual output of the University of Paris.

J. M. M. H. THUISSEN
University of Nijmegen


The title of this book could refer to a number of very different subjects; in the event, it turns out to be a densely researched monograph devoted to a particular genre of late medieval art: the illustrations of those late medieval calendars that are commonly known as “Labors of the Months.” Bridget Ann Henisch has hunted down most if not all of the surviving examples and richly illustrates her text with reproductions. She demonstrates beyond any doubt both the conventions of the art form and their significance and so makes a noteworthy contribution to the study of medieval culture.

One of the most important messages of the book is how much the calendar illustrations did not show. They included almost no scenes or motifs of a religious character, very few women or children, very few episodes in which the differing ranks of society are shown in interaction, and very few processes of marketing and retailing of produce. While most of their subject matter concerned farming activities, the range of these was itself constricted by convention: great prominence was given to the production of major cereal crops, hay, and wine (even in northern Europe). The making of beer or cider, or the cultivation of peas, beans, and cabbages, were not considered fit subjects; proper crops and products were those that were most prestigious and, above all, had sacramental significance.

At the core of this tradition, Henisch makes clear, was the desire to invest both labor and the cycle of the year with a feel-good quality. None of the discomforts consequent upon extreme heat, cold, or moisture, or the perils attendant upon productive processes, were ever shown. The work is always carried on by dignified, purposeful, and successful figures and relieved by rhythmic interludes of refreshment and play. Workers are proficient, cheerful, and self-motivated; the weather is good; and produce is ample. A few people are sufficient to accomplish major processes. The scenes embody not merely a well-regulated society but a peaceful and benevolent cosmos, in which people, time, and nature move together in harmony to achieve the best results for humanity.

Henisch has read widely into the social and cultural context of these images, and her analysis of them makes frequent points concerning the wider attitudes of the society that produced them: the symbolism of childhood, gardens, shepherds, and crops, receives particular attention. She also shows how, in the course of the fifteenth century, the genre began to diversify, bringing in more frequent representation of hitherto marginal phenomena such as women, children, pasto-ral farming, gardens, and the sale of produce. These developments were associated in part with the growth of other genres of calendar art, such as that which related the human life cycle to the annual one.

The sheer quantity of research behind the writing, and the number of topics covered, make it easy at times to forget how many basic questions about the subject this book fails to ask, let alone answer. The reader is given no systematic information upon when or how this artistic tradition developed, who produced it, where, for whom, or how it came to an end. Instead, the author’s fancy plays upon the images and interprets those aspects of them that catch her interest to produce a result that, like its material, charms, comforts, and cheers while leaving much unnoticed.

RONALD HUTTON
University of Bristol

EUROPE: EARLY MODERN AND MODERN


This collection of essays is one of seven volumes on the origins of the modern state in Europe from the thirteenth to the eighteenth century, the proceedings of a series of conferences sponsored by the European Science Foundation from 1989 to 1992. The conferences sought to examine the topic in new ways and to be both interdisciplinary and international. About one-half the scholars represented in the present volume are historians, and there is one professor of rhetoric; the remainder, including Allan Ellenius, are art historians. All the contributors make extensive use of material written by historians, and the historians concentrate on visual representations of rulership.

The first of the book’s five parts begins with Kurt Johannesson’s study of the portrait of the prince as a rhetorical genre. Tracing the development of the Färsenspiegel into the sixteenth century, Johannesson draws on examples of the rhetoric of rulership concerning Gustavus Vasa to show that the intent of rhetorical praise was not to instruct the prince but to help him set a moral example for his subjects. Friedrich Polleross’s study shows how the classical figure of Hercules came to be transformed from a representation of virtue in the fifteenth century to a figure depicting the monarch’s apotheosis in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; the French Revolution essentially ended the use of imagery that had been extensively employed in France. Matthias Winner studies the orb as symbol of the state in Peter Paul Rubens’s famous paintings of the life of Marie des Médicis in the Louvre; as he does so, he explains the meaning of two of the most puzzling canvases in the series, “The Apotheosis of Henry IV” and “The Proclamation of the Regency.”