

The Medieval Academy and Medieval Studies in North America

LUKE WENGER

THE HISTORY OF the Medieval Academy of America is part of the history of medieval studies in North America.* Since 1925 the Academy has provided a common ground on which medievalists might meet, and its growth and development reflect the changes in medieval studies in the last fifty-five years. The program of the Academy's founders was ambitious enough to comprehend all aspects of medieval studies—research, publication, teaching—and therefore, perhaps, too ambitious, extending as it did to embrace the wide variety of disciplines whose subject matter, from music to science, from literature to economic and political institutions, from archeology to philosophy, is in part medieval.

In the course of its history the Academy's resources have been applied somewhat variously to the three components enshrined in its charter. Publication, particularly of the journal *Speculum*, soon became central to the Academy's activities, and it has remained so. Research and teaching have never been entirely neglected, but the Academy's role in these areas has been less direct and less constant. The Committee on Research represented for many years a significant effort to coordinate and support research projects, some of which yielded books that the Academy itself published, but its importance declined after the late 1940's. Beeson's *Primer* and Paetow's *Guide* were early projects that gave evidence of a concern for teaching, but teaching nevertheless failed to gain a prominent place on the Academy's program until the Committee on Centers and Regional Associations was formed in 1969. These shifts in emphasis were in large measure a consequence of the postwar expansion of American higher education, in which medieval studies did not fail to participate.

HOWEVER DEFINED, medieval studies are a child of the universities. To be sure, medieval courses and programs are now well represented in the colleges, and the basic linguistic tools that a medievalist must acquire are still to some extent taught in the schools. The fact remains that the specialized training needed for advanced work in the medieval field is offered only in the universities, and only in universities that maintain large graduate schools in the humanities. When the Medieval Academy was founded, the number of such institutions was quite small, as was the number of active medievalists. Even so, it was by that time possible to note with satisfaction a substantial growth in medieval studies in the preceding half century, as did C. W. David in a paper read at the fiftieth anniversary meeting of the American Historical Association in 1934,¹ and the founding of the Academy was itself a reflection of this growth. It was no longer imperative, if still desirable, for medievalists to obtain their advanced training in Europe. From the perspective of 1981, however, these gains were quite modest, only a faint foreshadowing of the expansion that medieval studies were to experience after World War II.

At the end of its first year (1926), the Academy had 761 members, which was surely many more than the number of scholars and teachers whose activity centered primarily in medieval fields. The clerk's report for the following year indicates that only 504 of the Academy's then 853 members were scholars or educators,² and in 1932 J. F. Willard counted some five hundred active medievalists,³ by which time the Academy's membership had risen to 1,041. It is apparent, then, that the Academy was drawing on a constituency larger than that of "professional" medievalists.

This larger constituency included both scholars whose interests were not chiefly medieval and a very substantial number of “amateurs,” those who were interested in and supported medieval studies but were not scholars or teachers. Two of the Academy’s founders, Ralph Adams Cram and John Nicholas Brown, belonged to this group. From the beginning it was recognized that the Academy would need to attract the interested amateur if it was to survive, a fact not without impact on the character of *Speculum*, as some members noted with dissatisfaction.⁴

Until 1945, this situation did not change very much. Membership remained at about one thousand (give or take fifty). The size of *Speculum*, though subject to larger fluctuations, generally remained between five and six hundred pages per year (average: 537). Behind this picture of apparent stability, however, an important change lies concealed. According to a survey of dissertations in progress in the years between 1927 and 1949, the number of Ph.D. candidates in medieval and Renaissance studies in North American universities increased considerably in the years before the war, from 120 in 1927 to 250 in 1941.⁵ During the same period, the number of institutions willing to accept Ph.D. candidates also increased. Harvard and Columbia had dominated the field in 1927, with little competition. Chicago soon joined them in reporting large numbers of advanced graduate students, and these three institutions overshadowed all others in the prewar years. Nevertheless, in the course of the 1930’s a growing list of other institutions could claim significant numbers of Ph.D. candidates, and many new institutions were admitting at least a few. The compiler of the survey, S. Harrison Thomson, was moved to speak of a “revolutionary dispersion of the best scholarship,” a trend that he greeted with some ambivalence, especially since the postwar figures showed a striking decline in the number of Ph.D. candidates at Harvard and Chicago.⁶ George R. Coffman, one of the founders of the Medieval Academy, was still in 1947 able to speak of Harvard and Chicago as centers of the “humane spirit” that fostered the interests represented by the Academy, but he lamented the post-war emphasis on the sciences at these universities.⁷

One would like to know how many doctorates in medieval studies were actually awarded before the war, and by which institutions. Certainly the increase in the number of advanced graduate students in the 1930’s had little impact on the size of the Academy’s membership, which in 1945 was in fact a bit smaller than it had been from 1929 to 1932. Immediately after the war, however, the Academy’s membership began to climb steadily at the rate of some fifty additional members per year. In 1955 there were 1,438 members, and by 1965 this number had increased to 2,035. After 1965 the curve begins to rise much more rapidly, with increments of more than one hundred a year: in 1970 the figure was 2,914, by 1975 it had risen to 3,677, and in 1978 it reached a peak of 3,901. Declines of about fifty members a year were recorded in 1979 and 1980 (of the 3,795 members reported in 1980, about 3,500 were resident in the United States and Canada). Subscriptions to *Speculum* by libraries and other institutions followed a more or less parallel course, although the increases after 1965 were very modest when compared with the increase in membership in those years.

The rapid growth in the Academy’s membership after the mid 1960’s was a direct consequence of the expansion of graduate studies that began early in the decade. Figures for Ph.D. degrees awarded in medieval history,⁸ for example, show a peak of thirty in 1966/67 followed by a fluctuating upward curve that reaches its highest point (fifty-four doctorates, awarded by thirty institutions) in 1972/73. Thereafter the trend is downward, although forty-nine doctorates were awarded in 1975/76, and in the following two years the count still stood at thirty-four. In all, some seventy-seven institutions in the United States awarded doctorates in medieval history in the years between 1960 and 1978. Wisconsin clearly tops the list (forty). Columbia is second (twenty-eight), followed closely by Berkeley and UCLA (twenty-five), Chicago (twenty-four), and Princeton and

Yale (twenty-three). Twelve institutions awarded between twenty-one and ten doctorates; fifty-eight awarded nine or fewer. These figures confirm, at least for medieval history, the “dispersion of scholarship” observed by Thomson in the 1930’s. Noteworthy is the rise of Wisconsin, Berkeley, and UCLA, to which list Toronto should certainly be added (seventy-three doctorates in all fields were awarded by the Centre for Medieval Studies between 1968 and 1978).

Statistical analyses of medieval studies are necessarily tentative; comprehensive data on graduate study or even on degrees awarded have not been compiled, a task made difficult by the variety of disciplinary and departmental territories in which medievalists are to be found. The Academy’s membership list is uninformative; no effort has been made to maintain files on the status of individual members, which consequently can only be guessed at. The increasing “professionalization” of scholarship no doubt means that the percentage of members without academic affiliation has declined. At the same time, and this can be said more securely, members of the Medieval Academy have come to represent a smaller percentage of those academics who think of themselves as medievalists. As of the fall of 1981, a comprehensive register of North American medievalists compiled by the Medieval Institute at Western Michigan University (under the auspices of the Academy’s Committee on Centers and Regional Associations) contained some eight thousand names, or roughly twice the number of Academy members.

If when the Academy was founded in 1925 medieval studies were concentrated in a few institutions, notably Harvard, Columbia, and Chicago, with scatterings elsewhere, it is now easier to speak of geographical areas within which there are concentrations of institutions: New England and the Middle Atlantic states (with an extension to the Southeast), the Great Lakes region, and California. The Midwest, the South/Southwest, and the Rocky Mountain states are less densely represented. But to say this is to do little more than map the demographics of American higher education. The expansion in the number of institutions capable of supporting specialized graduate study in medieval fields is more significant than the regions in which such institutions happen to be concentrated.

GEORGE R. COFFMAN is the central figure in the movement that led to the foundation of the Medieval Academy as an independent organization.⁹ His own account of that movement, published in the first issue of *Speculum*,¹⁰ credits John M. Manly’s presidential address to the Modern Language Association in December 1920 with setting into motion a series of events that led almost inexorably to the incorporation of The Medieval Academy of America in Boston on 23 December 1925.

Manly had complained of the MLA’s failure to inspire and support cooperative research by members working on closely related subjects. Scholars working in medieval Latin studies felt themselves to be such a group, and by the spring of 1922 they had organized a committee with E. K. Rand as general or advisory chairman and Coffman as executive secretary. Discussions, meanwhile, had already produced the outline of a program somewhat larger than that suggested by Manly’s complaint; Coffman and Rand, at least, found themselves in agreement on the desirability of entrusting this program to an “Academy of Mediaeval-Latin Culture.”¹¹ Instruction as well as research in medieval Latin was one of their concerns, and C. H. Beeson had been put to compiling an anthology for use in introductory courses (his *Primer of Medieval Latin* was published in 1925).

A second stage was reached by the end of 1922. It had become apparent that an MLA committee would not be adequate to the task, and a new Committee on Mediaeval Latin Studies was organized under the aegis of the fledgling American Council of Learned Societies, whose chairman

was C. H. Haskins. For the moment, the possibility of forming an independent organization was shelved, but the new committee, again with Rand as chairman and Coffman as executive secretary, rapidly accumulated additional and wide-ranging proposals, prominent among them publications—a medieval Latin dictionary, texts and translations, bibliographies, and a journal. Cooperation with British scholars was sought, and a bulletin explaining the committee’s work was mailed to nearly four hundred persons.

All this by the end of 1923. Apart from the continuing emphasis on medieval Latin, the elements of what was to become the Academy’s statement of purpose were then already in view, and the way was prepared for the culminating events of 1925. Plans for a journal reached fruition in January of that year. With John Nicholas Brown’s gift of \$3,000 in hand, the Committee on Mediaeval Latin Studies appointed the editorial and advisory boards, secured the approval of the American Council of Learned Societies, and voted to name the new publication *Speculum: A Journal of Mediaeval Studies*. By the summer John Nicholas Brown and Ralph Adams Cram were urging that an academy be founded without delay, that its scope encompass all aspects of medieval civilization, and that *Speculum* be one of its projects. Medieval Latin was to be the center of the Academy’s (and *Speculum*’s) interests, but not its circumference,¹² a development that was implicit in the progressively expanding fields represented by the Committee on Mediaeval Latin Studies and the editorial and advisory boards of *Speculum*. By November the Committee on Mediaeval Latin Studies had agreed to the organizational structure of the Academy and its incorporation in Massachusetts.¹³ A statement of purpose and bylaws were circulated and approved early in December, and legal incorporation was accomplished in Boston on 23 December 1925.

The name of the organization had been a matter of some discussion. None of the other possibilities—society, association, and institute—met with wide approval, and *academy*, which Coffman and Rand had been using from the start and which Brown was known particularly to favor, became the unanimous choice. That *academy* carried with it connotations deriving from honorific European bodies of that name could not have escaped notice, even as it was apparent that the Academy was meant to be a working organization that differed notably in purpose and character from such as the Académie Française. Some of the founders appear nevertheless to have harbored hopes of borrowing from the éclat of the European academies. The Medieval Academy was after all to have honorary Fellows, “those who in their published works have made notable contribution to our knowledge of mediaeval affairs.”¹⁴ Among the Fellows elected in 1926 was Ralph Adams Cram, who in his role as chairman of the Committee on Ceremonial and Insignia was for some years to campaign for “due observance of form, ceremony, and ritual” at the Academy’s official meetings, especially on the occasion of the induction of Fellows, but with only modest success.¹⁵ The Fellows seemed little inclined to exploit their position of dignity, whether by way of ceremonial trappings or of influence as a body on Academy affairs. Recognizing that they were an honorary body with no prescribed duties, they were content to contribute to the Academy as individuals and to act as an advisory body when called upon.¹⁶

The vision of the founders was certainly expansive, but only with respect to the Academy’s role in promoting medieval studies; institutional grandeur seems never to have offered a very serious temptation. The character of the Academy was shaped by its own history and by the history of medieval studies. In its own history, several matters were crucial: the projects that were undertaken, and the financial and administrative means that were developed to realize them.

FUND RAISING proved to be a more difficult task than anyone had suspected. Having outlined the activities that the Academy hoped to pursue, Coffman noted in 1926 that “for all these projects

money is needed. Conservative estimate places the minimum requirement at one million dollars.”¹⁷ He believed that it was not unrealistic to think in these terms. Manly had told the MLA in 1920 that “there is plenty of money in the world, and the men and women who control it are ready to give it freely for visions—visions of all kinds....” Coffman agreed. The Academy should accept Manly’s challenge and offer “men and women of wealth a vision of the wonderful possibilities of this new Mediaeval Academy of America.”¹⁸ By 1930 Manly, in his presidential address to the Academy, was sounding somewhat less hopeful, and there was a defensive note in his complaint that medievalists did not seem able to match even other fields within the humanities in attracting publicity and funds.¹⁹ Funds were raised for the Academy’s operations, often on an ad hoc basis and just as often by way of gifts from John Nicholas Brown, and a permanent endowment fund was established. That fund has yet to reach one million dollars, even with the help of a fiftieth anniversary fund drive (to which Brown again was by far the largest contributor).

A combination of frugality, donated services, and John Nicholas Brown carried the Academy through the 1930’s and 1940’s. In the 1950’s and 1960’s, with the availability of new resources from private foundations and the federal government, some of what the Academy had expected to do, particularly in the area of sponsoring research, was receiving support elsewhere. The Academy did not itself very often call on these new sources of funds. The publication of *Speculum* and a modest book series was supported largely by membership dues, endowment income, and publication sales, and outside funding was requested only for the occasional special project. Such projects became more frequent in the 1970’s, an inflationary period which in any case placed strains on the budget. Once again fund raising became the important concern that it is likely to remain in the next decade.

That the Academy should be self-supporting is a common theme in the records, as is the concern “to render the general membership and the administration of the Academy as representative as possible, both topically and geographically.”²⁰ The two matters were not unrelated. If the Academy was to fulfill its ambitions, it needed the support, financial and otherwise, of medievalists throughout North America. The elected officers and councillors, as well as the appointed members of the *Speculum* advisory board, accordingly were drawn from the pool of active medievalists throughout the continent, although in the prewar years Harvard (Rand, Haskins, and J. D. M. Ford) and Chicago (Manly and Beeson) provided all of the Academy’s presidents with the exception of D. C. Munro of Princeton and Ralph Adams Cram, then in private architectural practice in Boston.

In the same period, two committees were particularly important in overseeing the Academy’s operations: the Executive Committee and the Advisory Committee on Research. Although in 1930 Manly had already seen the need for a paid administrative staff, particularly a full-time Executive Secretary,²¹ administrative duties fell to the two volunteer committees and a part-time Executive Secretary at least until 1946, when Charles R. D. Miller combined the duties of Executive Secretary and Editor of *Speculum* to become the Academy’s first full-time professional administrator. Thereafter, both the Executive Committee and the Committee on Research, which in any case had been meeting with decreasing frequency since the late 1930’s, became less important. Coffman’s presidential address in 1947, “The Mediaeval Academy: Evaluation and Reevaluation,”²² is thus a very useful description of the Academy’s organization and work, summarizing as it does the first period in the Academy’s history, a time of relative stability prior to the expansion of medieval studies in the 1950’s and 1960’s.

Not that there was a decisive and dramatic shift from administration by committee to administration more nearly centralized in the office of the Executive Secretary; the Executive Com-

mittee continued to meet regularly well into the 1960's. What had changed more decisively was the Academy's role. The attempt to comprehend and orchestrate research activities in medieval studies was largely abandoned after the war in favor of concentration on the publication of *Speculum* and the monograph series, of which *Speculum* was decidedly the more important. The Academy continued to sponsor a number of projects that had begun before the war, including Kenneth Conant's excavations at Cluny, the Averroes series, the revision by Edgar Graves of Gross's *Sources and Literature of English History*, and the revision by Gray Boyce of Paetow's *Guide to the Study of Medieval History*, but no major new projects were added until the 1960's.

Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies began publication with its first quarterly issue in January 1926 and has appeared without interruption since that time. The first Editor-in-Chief was E. K. Rand (1925–29), who was followed by J. D. M. Ford (1929–36). During that period much of the editorial work was done by the Managing Editor (F. P. Magoun, Jr., 1925–31; S. H. Cross, 1931–36) and one or two assistants, to the extent that in 1936 Ford informed the Council that his position had become nominal and should be abolished. Since that time the editorial staff has consisted of an Editor and two or more Assistant Editors.

Until 1936 there were two boards, an Editorial Board whose members criticized and approved manuscripts and a much larger Advisory Board whose members were called on when their particular expertise was required, but this system was found to be too cumbersome. Apparently the Managing Editor and his assistants, all of whom were then at Harvard and thus convenient to the Academy office, had soon ceased to be merely copy editors and proofreaders and had taken on responsibilities for the content of the journal. The two boards were therefore combined in 1936 to form a single, smaller Advisory Board, and editorial control of the journal was lodged with the Editor and his assistants.

S. H. Cross was Editor from 1936 to 1946. When Cross died in 1946, Charles R. D. Miller, the incumbent Executive Secretary, took on the additional responsibility of the editorship. This dual position he filled until his death in 1964. Miller did not hold an academic position; his joint Academy positions were a full-time responsibility. The same has been true for all his successor Editors/Executive Secretaries: Van Courtlandt Elliott (1965–70), Paul Meyvaert (1971–81), and Luke Wenger (1981–).

Something of the change in *Speculum* between 1926 and the present is evident in the following comparisons:

	1926	1980
Number of pages	467	891
Number of articles	42	25
Number of reviews	37	272
Cost (printing and mailing)	\$5,961	\$66,721
Members receiving <i>Speculum</i>	761	3,795
Institutional subscribers	91	2,012

The size of *Speculum* did not rise at all steadily. Conditioned by the material on hand and the availability of funds, the page count rose and fell in irregular fashion, but the overall trend was decidedly upward. Because of changes in type size introduced in 1977, the amount of material printed in an average year has in fact more than doubled since the war. Much of this difference is accounted for by the increased space devoted to reviews, the number of which has risen dramatically. The space devoted to articles has not increased nearly so much, and the average number of articles has

actually declined (short articles and notes were considerably more common in the early years than they are now).

It is uncertain whether the founders thought of *Speculum* as the centerpiece of the Academy's many proposed enterprises. The journal certainly came to fill that position very early. After ten years, Cram stated that *Speculum* was the most important single activity of the Academy. It has become, he said, steadily more representative of all disciplines concerned with the Middle Ages. It "early won and has steadily maintained a position in the front rank of learned journals of all countries."²³ To balance this tone of self-congratulation, it should be noted that the editors informed the Council in the following year that they had decided to adopt a stricter policy with regard to the standard of acceptable articles, in order to improve the quality of the journal. Nevertheless, they refused to apologize for having accepted on occasion articles which "may not invariably accord with ideal requirements of method and originality."²⁴ In view of the Academy's desire to encourage interest in medieval studies, they felt that it was important to be receptive to the work of young scholars and those at institutions remote from the established centers of such studies.

The editors had been concerned for some time "to encourage contributions from interested scholars in all sections of the United States," as J. D. M. Ford noted in his editor's report in 1931, and the extent to which this goal had been achieved was "ample testimony to the growth and vitality of mediaeval studies throughout this country."²⁵ They had also been concerned to publish at least some articles of general interest, "non-technical articles representing the observations of mature scholars of broader vision upon comparatively large fields of intellectual, social, or political activity." But "significant articles of this sort are extraordinarily difficult to secure," as a consequence of which *Speculum* had been publishing for the most part studies that were "of greatest use to the best scholars."²⁶

The editors did not abandon the hope of publishing articles of a more popular or general nature, but S. H. Cross complained in 1937 that despite the repeated urgings of the Executive Committee and the Advisory Committee on Research for the inclusion of such articles, his own "Mediaeval Russian Contacts with the West," H. O. Taylor's "Placing the Middle Ages," and Amy Kelly's "Eleanor of Aquitaine" had received rather mixed notices. While some correspondents asked for more material of this sort, others were sharply critical, among them a reader who referred to Kelly's piece as "Sunday supplement material." Cross defended such essays, which were in his estimation more widely read than the specialized articles, and he noted that the size of the Academy's membership depended on *Speculum*'s ability to interest the amateur. Although a learned journal "should really be learned, we are obligated not to confine our publication to the scholarly soporific."²⁷ Cross went on to express his dismay, furthermore, at the pressure on young scholars to get quickly into print. The effect of this, he believed, was to encourage a flood of minor studies, devoted to the minutiae of research rather than to thoughtful synthesis. This kind of work threatened indeed to become habit-forming, the persistent mode especially of scholars in the more populous fields.

Later remarks on the same order by Cross (in 1941 with particular attention to Chaucerians) and his successors are not uncommon. Nevertheless, articles of wide-ranging synthesis were rare even in Cross's time, and they have become rarer still since then. It may well be that Cross's "parcellation of scholarship" is a nearly inevitable feature of medieval studies, however much medievalists are fond of citing the interdisciplinary nature of their work. Karl Morrison, in his recent analysis of research in medieval history, was compelled to conclude as much, saying that "the methods of analysis seem at odds with the goal of wholeness," that a "common level of discourse" is perhaps "destined, like so many ideals, never to be realized in practice."²⁸

Speculum has published articles representing the fruits of research in a wide variety of disciplines. Medieval Latin studies were particularly prominent in the beginning, a position they have long since lost. Literary studies are now dominated by the vernacular languages and literatures, particularly English. Historians have sometimes complained of a relative scarcity of historical articles as against literary articles of all sorts, and the balance in a particular issue may indeed seem weighted to favor one or the other of these two main categories. In the course of a year or several years, however, the more genuine difficulty would be to represent all of the smaller fields and subfields. If specialization once meant that scholars spoke only to scholars, it now seems to mean that they speak increasingly for the benefit only of those working on the same particular topic. Statistics on the distribution within the broader fields are, therefore, somewhat misleading as a description of the number of articles a scholar in a particular field might choose to read.

The genre of the learned article, to judge from what has been published in *Speculum*, has in fact become less inclusive. Notes on work in progress (often followed by rejoinders and further notes), speculative essays, and studies ranging beyond the boundaries of the medieval period have all but disappeared in favor of carefully circumscribed articles that claim to treat a topic to some degree fully and definitively. In a crowded field, scholars are less inclined, no doubt, to commit speculations to print, and editors are less inclined to publish what looks like a trial run in advance of fuller publication elsewhere.

One indication of the expansion of medieval studies is provided by the "Bibliography of American Periodical Literature," which was published in *Speculum* from 1934 until 1972, when it was abandoned because it could no longer hope to be complete.²⁹ Similarly, the book review section has grown to the extent that it threatens to exceed *Speculum*'s capacity (two unusually large issues were required in 1977 to cope with a growing backlog of reviews awaiting publication). Because space in *Speculum* is at a premium, announcements and other ephemera have mostly been relegated to the Academy's newsletter, and reports of Academy business are no longer printed in full. A series like B. J. Whiting's reviews of historical novels, published in the 1950's, is unlikely now to find a place in *Speculum*, a circumstance to sadden editors and readers alike.

MEDIEVAL ACADEMY BOOKS, a series that now numbers ninety-one titles, was begun in 1928, at a time when scholars were often expected to pay for the publication of their own books. The Academy's entry into book publication was, therefore, particularly welcome to those working on editions and reference books that would be complicated and expensive to produce, although the series was by no means limited to books of this type. Among the books published before 1945, for example, were E. K. Rand's *Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours* (1929), Florence Edler's *Glossary of Mediaeval Terms of Business* (1934), and Lynn Thorndike and Pearl Kibre's *Catalogue of Incipits of Mediaeval Scientific Writings in Latin* (1937; revised ed., 1963), but also shorter monographs such as J. R. Strayer's *Administration of Normandy under Saint Louis* (1932) and Carl Stephenson's *Borough and Town: A Study of Urban Origins in England* (1933), and the first edition of Willi Apel's *Notation of Polyphonic Music, 900–1600* (1942), a book that through subsequent editions has maintained its value as a textbook in courses on medieval music.

Funds for these books frequently came directly or indirectly from the ACLS, through which the Academy also received in 1929 a gift of \$25,000 from the Carnegie Corporation of New York for the establishment of a revolving publication fund. This fund was invested and kept intact, and in recent years it has produced enough income, along with sales of the backlist, to support the continued publication of the series, although special subventions are still required for some of the more expensive books.

At least until the 1950's the normal path to publication of a book by the Academy was through the Committee on Research, inasmuch as that group was concerned both with research projects and with the resulting publications. Kenneth Conant's excavations at Cluny, for example, were supported by Academy funds, a series of interim reports was published in *Speculum*, and *Cluny: Les églises et la maison du chef d'ordre* was published by the Academy in 1968. Another example of the same sort was W. E. Lunt's *Financial Relations of the Papacy with England* (2 vols.; 1939, 1962). A project initiated and sponsored by the Academy resulted in the publication of the three-volume *English Government at Work* (1940, 1947, 1950), a cooperative work by J. F. Willard, W. A. Morris, J. R. Strayer, and W. H. Dunham, Jr.

Not all of the projects aided or sponsored by the Academy through its Committee on Research led to books published by the Academy. Dom André Wilmart received several small grants to work on the script of the school of Autun, as did L. A. Lowe for the preparation of the *Codices latini antiquiores*. Grants of this sort, however, were infrequent and soon had to be abandoned for lack of funds.³⁰ Even a project as important to the Academy as J. F. Willard's bulletin, *Progress of Medieval (and Renaissance) Studies in the United States and Canada*, was no longer supported after 1938, although the Academy's annual reports had been published there rather than in *Speculum*.³¹

Retrenchment in the Academy's funding of special projects becomes evident after 1936, when the ACLS announced that it no longer had funds for new projects.³² Thereafter the Academy's support tended to be short-lived, as during the war when it assisted Henri Grégoire in the publication in the United States of the journal *Byzantion* and undertook an emergency microfilming project in Great Britain (with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation),³³ or to involve no financial obligation, as in a plan to cooperate with the University of Chicago in the publication of medieval texts.³⁴ Nothing came of the latter project, or of a plan for an internationally sponsored medieval dictionary that was much discussed after the war, or of the proposed edition of Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum maius*.

Fortunately for the advancement of medieval studies, the university presses became a major resource for publication in the medieval field in the postwar period. Although the Academy added steadily to its list of monographs, it did not expand its role as a book publisher until the mid-1970's, when the boom in medieval studies in the universities was beginning to show signs of leveling off.

THE DEGREE TO WHICH the Academy benefitted in increased membership from the expansion of medieval studies in the 1960's and 1970's has already been outlined. Other aspects of this expansion—the proliferation of new journals, medieval conferences, regional associations, and interdisciplinary centers and programs in the colleges and universities—are discussed elsewhere in this volume. The Academy was not responsible for these developments, but it could not fail to react to them. The means by which it did so was the establishment in 1969 of a standing committee, the Committee on Centers and Regional Associations (CARA).

Preceded by the Association of Centers of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, an independent group organized by Francis L. Utley, Jr., of Ohio State University, CARA was heir to the interests of a group of medievalists who had taken the lead in organizing ways of accommodating medieval studies within the traditionally departmental structure of the universities. The first three chairmen of CARA, John Leyerle of Toronto, Stanley Kahrl of Ohio State, and Elizabeth Kennan of Catholic University, were themselves directors of flourishing medieval centers. The members of CARA, representing both university-connected centers of this sort and independent regional asso-

ciations, brought to the Academy renewed attention to teaching, and they embodied the geographical expansion of medieval studies throughout the United States and Canada. Directly or indirectly, CARA inspired a number of new projects, and the 1970's marked for the Academy a period of revitalization and expanding horizons.³⁵

The Academy's 50th anniversary, in 1975, offered the occasion for a fund drive, the proceeds of which were sufficient to support the establishment of a new book series. *Speculum Anniversary Monographs* was announced in the anniversary year, and it has since published seven books, all of them short monographs or editions of a sort that the university presses are increasingly reluctant to publish.

Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching (MART), another new series, grew directly out of a survey undertaken by CARA to determine the dimensions of a problem—the growing list of books allowed by their publishers to go out of print but needed by teachers for assignment in undergraduate courses. Jointly with the University of Toronto Press, MART has reprinted ten such books in inexpensive paperback editions and has lobbied effectively with publishers for a return to their lists of a number of others. That teaching is once again an important item on the Academy's agenda is also evident from the appointment by CARA in 1980 of the Committee on Teaching Medieval Studies (TEAMS), which has already begun to take a broad look at the tools and resources available or lacking to teachers of medieval courses at the secondary and college levels.

The 1970's saw expansion of another kind by the Academy. Annual meetings are now scheduled on a traveling circuit throughout North America, frequently in conjunction with meetings of centers or regional associations. Not surprisingly, these meetings are larger by far, and their programs and participants more diverse, than those of earlier years. Geographical dispersal has become a fact for the Academy, as it earlier did for medieval studies.

THE MEDIEVAL ACADEMY OF AMERICA cannot in 1981 pretend to comprehend anything like the full variety and diversity of medieval studies as they are pursued in North America. The founders had wanted the Academy to do so in 1925, but they could not have foreseen the expansion either of higher education or of medieval studies, which brought in its train other resources to which medievalists could turn for support. Even in its own day the vision of the founders was larger than the financial resources they were able to assemble. What they managed nevertheless to accomplish, having learned to adjust their activities to the means at hand, was far from insignificant.

Building on these accomplishments, the Medieval Academy, if it can no longer expect to embrace the whole of medieval studies, is still in a position to represent and support the interests of medievalists in North America. *Speculum*, which enjoys a circulation that is the envy of medieval journals in Europe, can indeed hope to mirror at least the center of those things defined as medieval, and a good part of all the subjects within the wider circumference of medieval studies. With its books and with other projects, the Academy can speak to other constituencies, some larger, some smaller. For the future of medieval studies, they are all important.

NOTES

*The author is grateful to Larry Benson, Jacqueline Tarrant, and Emily Vogt for advice and research assistance in the preparation of this essay.

¹ "American Historiography of the Middle Ages, 1884–1934." *Speculum*, 10 (1935), 125–37.

² In addition to scholars and educators, the membership included 111 clergymen, 47 other professionals (lawyers, doctors, architects, artists, editors, and musicians), 113 men in other occupations, and 78 women in other occupations. Of the total of 853, 748 were from the United States, 6 from Canada, and 99 from countries outside North America.

³ "A List of Medievalists and Their Publications during the Period January 1, 1932–December 31, 1932," *Progress of Medieval Studies in the United States of America and Canada*, Bulletin no. 11 (1933), 11–44. Willard's list was compiled independently of the Academy's membership list, using the American Historical Association's directory and information provided by other medievalists.

⁴ For this see S. H. Cross's editor's report in 1937, which is summarized below.

⁵ S. Harrison Thomson, "A Note on American Doctoral Dissertations," *Progress of Medieval and Renaissance Studies in the United States and Canada*, Bulletin no. 20 (1949), 52–56.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

⁷ "The Mediaeval Academy: Evaluation and Revaluation," *Speculum*, 22 (1947), 446. This was Coffman's presidential address, delivered at the Academy's annual meeting in Cambridge on 26 April 1947.

⁸ Karl F. Morrison, "Fragmentation and Unity in 'American Medievalism,'" in *The Past before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States*, ed. Michael Kammen (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1980), pp. 49–77. Morrison's figures are based on published information and may not be complete. Degrees awarded by Canadian universities are not included.

⁹ E. K. Rand's judgment, in his Editor's Preface to the first issue of *Speculum* (*Speculum*, I [1926], 3): "The history of the movement that has led to the establishment of the Academy is presented in the following pages by Professor Coffman, who has been, from the start, the life of the undertaking."

¹⁰ "The Mediaeval Academy of America: Historical Background and Prospect," *Speculum*, I (1926), 5–18.

¹¹ Coffman, *ibid.*, p. 7, quoting his own letter to Manly written early in 1922. Coffman, *ibid.*, p. 8, also quotes a letter written to him by Rand shortly thereafter: "The idea which you suggest of an Academy of Mediaeval Culture is certainly a splendid goal to look forward to. I can even imagine in the future that with the help of my friend, Ralph Adams Cram, the Academy will be locally situated in a Gothic monastery." Whether or not it was seriously intended, the latter suggestion was never acted upon.

¹² Rand, Editor's Preface, pp. 3–4: "But while Mediaeval Latin is still the centre of our interests, it is not the circumference. The new Academy would include in its scope the entire civilization of the Middle Ages."

¹³ Coffman's memorandum of 13 October 1925 to the Committee on Mediaeval Latin Studies indicates that Washington, D.C., and New York City were also considered as possible locations for the Academy's headquarters. Legal difficulties spoke against Washington and to some extent against New York, although the latter was felt to have the advantage of greater national appeal than Boston. The vote of the committee, reported in another memorandum dated 7 November, was unanimous on all points but this one. James Westfall Thompson did not want to decide on the place of incorporation until the availability of New York was scrutinized more thoroughly. New York was again considered in 1945, when the director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art proposed that the Academy move its headquarters to The Cloisters.

¹⁴ Proposed in these terms in Coffman's memorandum of 13 October 1925 and accepted by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Mediaeval Latin Studies. Thirty Fellows were elected in January 1926.

¹⁵ The minutes of the meeting of the Council on 26 April 1935 report that the Council agreed to Cram's suggestion that the officers wear academic costume at the corporation meeting in 1935, but no decision was made about following this practice at any future meetings. Cram was President of the Academy from 1933 to 1936.

¹⁶ Report of the Committee on Function, Place, and Duties of the Fellows, adopted at their meeting on 30 April 1927.

¹⁷ "Historical Background and Prospect," pp. 17–18.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹⁹ "Humanistic Studies and Science," *Speculum*, 5 (1930), 249–50.

²⁰ From the outline of Cram's presidential address to the tenth annual meeting in 1936, preserved in the Academy's files.

²¹ "Humanistic Studies," p. 250.

²² *Speculum*, 22 (1947), 446–57.

²³ Outline of his presidential address in 1936.

²⁴ S. H. Cross's report to the Council, 23 April 1937.

²⁵ Report to the Council on 24 April 1931.

²⁶ Report of the Managing Editor, F. P. Magoun, Jr., to the Council on 27 April 1928.

²⁷ Report to the Council on 23 April 1937.

²⁸ "Fragmentation and Unity," p. 74

²⁹ *Speculum*, 47 (1972), 826.

³⁰ Dom Wilmart received \$600 in 1926 (gifts from Brown and Cram), and Lowe received \$500 in 1928 (gift from Samuel Sachs). In 1927 the Bollandists were given \$3,550 (their president, Hippolyte Delehaye, was a Corresponding Fellow of the Academy), again from special gifts for this purpose. In 1932, however, when Etienne Gilson and J. F. Kenney requested funds to support the publication programs of the Institutes of Mediaeval Studies at Toronto and Ottawa, the Council informed them that it had no funds that might be used for this purpose.

³¹ Coffman, "Evaluation and Revaluation," p. 449.

³² Report of the Clerk, 25 April 1936.

³³ Report of the Clerk, 26 April 1941.

³⁴ Report of the Clerk, 24 April 1943.

³⁵ The Academy's By-Laws were revised in 1969 and again in 1980, in both cases taking into account defacto changes in the Academy's operations and changes in the Academy's relationship to the expanded field of medieval studies.