

The Academic Market and the Rise of Universities in Medieval and Early Modern Europe (1000-1800)

David de la Croix
Frédéric Docquier
Alice Fabre
Robert Stelter

WP 2022- Nr 09

The Academic Market and the Rise of Universities in Medieval and Early Modern Europe (1000-1800)*

David de la Croix,[†] Frédéric Docquier,[‡] Alice Fabre,[§] and Robert Stelter[¶]

April 13, 2022

Abstract

We argue that market forces shaped the geographic distribution of upper-tail human capital across Europe during the Middle Ages, and contributed to bolstering universities at the dawn of the Humanistic and Scientific Revolutions. We build a unique database of thousands of scholars from university sources covering all of Europe, construct an index of their ability, and map the academic market in the medieval and early modern periods. We show that scholars tended to concentrate in the best universities (agglomeration), that better scholars were more sensitive to the quality of the university (positive sorting) and migrated over greater distances (positive selection). Agglomeration, selection and sorting patterns testify to an integrated academic market, made possible by the use of a common language (Latin).

Keywords: Upper-Tail Human Capital, Universities, Discrete choice model, Scholars, Publications, Agglomeration.

JEL codes: N33, O15, I25.

*Technical help was obtained from Yves Croissant (the author of the package `mlogit`) and Alain Guillet (who reprogrammed the simulation command for a nested-logit model). The project benefited from detailed discussions with Ran Abramitzky, Thomas Baudin, Simone Bertoli, Matteo Cervellati, Gregory Clark, Zvi Eckstein, Sven Feldman, James Fenske, Martin Fernandez-Sanchez, Mattia Fochesato, Oded Galor, Paola Giuliano, Paula Gobbi, Simone Meraglia, Omer Moav, Simone Moriconi, Luca Pensieroso, Giovanni Peri, Itay Saporta, Yannay Spitzer, Gonzague Vannoorenberghe, Nico Voigtlaender, Romain Wacziarg, and Marlous van Waijenburg, and from comments at the following conferences and seminars: WEHC Boston, ULB Brussels, TSE Toulouse, University of Luxembourg, UAB Barcelona, LISER (5th workshop on Economics of Migration), PSE Paris (Conference on Culture, Institutions and Prosperity), NYU Abu Dhabi, Deep Rooted Factors of Growth (Brown), CEPR Economic History Workshop (Tarragona), CEMIR Workshop on Migration Research (Munich), 12th Migration and Development Conference (Madrid), U Bologna (1st workshop on Economic History), IDC (Herzliya), Tel Aviv, Hebrew U (Jerusalem), Lille, UCLA, UC Davis, and Stanford U. The first two authors acknowledge financial support from the EOS program of the Flemish (FWO) and French-speaking (FRS-FNRS) communities of Belgium (convention 30784531 on “Winners and Losers from Globalization and Market Integration: Insights from Micro-Data”). David de la Croix thanks the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 883033 “Did elite human capital trigger the rise of the West? Insights from a new database of European scholars.” Alice Fabre thanks financial support by the French National Research Agency Grant ANR-17-EURE-0020 and by the Excellence Initiative of Aix-Marseille University - A*MIDEX. Robert Stelter acknowledges financial support from the Max Geldner foundation.

[†]IRES/LIDAM, UCLouvain, Belgium; CEPR, London

[‡]LISER, Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg

[§]Aix-Marseille Univ, CNRS, AMSE, Marseille, France

[¶]University of Basel, Switzerland; Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock, Germany

I Introduction

Both scholars and universities are thought to have played a role in the Rise of the West (Mokyr 2016, Cantoni and Yuchtman 2014). We argue and establish empirically that an integrated academic market in the pre-industrial period was a powerful institution allowing them to operate together. This functioning market helped universities harness the potential of upper tail human capital at the dawn of the Humanistic and Scientific Revolutions as well as, to a lesser extent, during the subsequent European primacy. Our results shed light on the importance of medieval roots in fostering scientific output, confronting qualitative studies on the subject with unique data sources and sound estimates.

Universities are one of the most original creations of the Western Latin civilization during the Middle Ages, from the 11th century onwards.¹ They came into existence when society recognized that masters and students as a collective (*universitas* means community) had legal rights. Universities are voluntary, interest-based, and self-governed permanent associations (Greif 2006). As highlighted in Rashdall (1895), “such Guilds sprang into existence, like other Guilds, without any express authorisation of King, Pope, Prince, or Prelate. They were spontaneous products of the instinct of association that swept over the towns of Europe in the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.” A university was thus originally a guild of either students or masters. Near the end of the 12th century, foreign law students at Bologna formed a union for the purpose of protection from discrimination by the town against foreign residents. At about the same time, teachers in Paris formed a corporation. Universities then began to spread across Europe, either through secession from existing ones (Cambridge from Oxford, Padua from Bologna, Orléans from Paris, etc.), or through creation *ex nihilo*. Some universities were founded from scratch by a higher authority (the University of Naples was arguably the first of this kind), but all followed the guild-like organizational principles of Bologna and Paris. Even at the Imperial Moscow University (established in 1755, charter of 1804), the rector was elected by his peers, not nominated by the emperor.

The European academic world in the medieval and early modern era provides a rich background for identifying location patterns within the upper tail of the skill distribution. The use of Latin facilitated mobility and, despite the political fragmentation of Europe, medieval universities were recognized for their independence and intellectual unity. The integration of the academic market was even formalized via the *licentia ubique docendi* (licence to teach everywhere), granted by the Church to the universities at the end of the 13th century, and conferring the right to teach at every university in Europe once a doctoral degree had been awarded (Hermans and Nelissen 2005). Understanding the mobility of academic scholars in that period matters because it potentially influenced the creation of knowledge in pre-industrial times, as well as technological and institutional progress. Focusing on a period from 1000 CE to 1800 CE,² our paper investigates whether location decisions were associated with distance and with measures of individual and institutional quality. We distinguish three notions of quality. The *human capital of an academic scholar* is built from her/his achievements as seen today in the catalog of world libraries (Worldcat). The *notability of a university* in a given year

¹A few notable exceptions outside Europe: the Buddhist university of Nalanda in India, where both students and masters are known to come from distant places (Monroe 2000), and the University of Baghdad, which was destroyed by the Mongol invasion in 1258 CE.

²Although the official creation date of the first university (Bologna) is 1088 CE, many universities were active before they were formally recognized.

is built from the human capital of its five best scholars active just before that year. The *simulated output of a university* is the aggregation of the human capital of all scholars who were predicted to work there in a given year.

Although the economic literature has looked at the characteristics of migrant workers at different periods in history, little is known about the mobility of upper-tail human capital in general, and about the internationalization of medieval and early modern European universities in particular.³ To tackle this question, we develop a unique database that provides geolocalized information on the origin of thousands of academic scholars, on the location of universities, and on measures of individual human capital and institutional notability. We use it to estimate the effects of distance, the human capital of scholars, the notability of universities, and the attractiveness of European cities on location decisions. More specifically, we test (i) whether academic scholars tended to concentrate in the best universities in medieval Europe (*agglomeration*), (ii) whether those with more human capital were more likely to settle in more prestigious universities and/or in more attractive cities (*positive sorting*),⁴ and (iii) whether they were more mobile than others (*positive selection*).⁵ We finally use our estimated location choice model to compute the potential gains in the output of universities resulting from the agglomeration, positive sorting, and positive selection of academic scholars.

Our database builds on secondary sources (i.e. books and catalogues recovering information from institutional archives) and biographical dictionaries. It documents the mobility and the human capital of about 40,500 academic scholars over the whole period 1000-1800. Their location choice set varies across years, as new universities were created or disappeared over time. On average, each scholar selected his/her optimal place of work out of about 86 possible locations. After excluding scholars with an unknown birthplace and universities with partial coverage, the database used in our regression models includes about 2.7 million possible dyads (i.e. scholar–university pairs). By studying the mobility patterns of academic scholars at universities in the medieval and early modern periods, we capture a substantial part of upper-tail human capital. The two other – less numerous – groups were the members of scientific academies that developed in Europe in the 17th century (preceded by the Renaissance academies in Italy in the 16th century), and the scholars making a living at the courts of princes, kings, or bishops.

We estimate the mobility patterns using a multinomial logit model, and several variants accounting for sample biases, heterogeneous effects, and endogeneity issues. We show that agglomeration forces are at work: the destination choice of academic scholars depended on distance, on the notability of the university, on the size of the city (used as a proxy for its economic development), and on the communal freedom enjoyed by the city (used as a proxy for local democracy). We also find robust evidence that better scholars were less sensitive to distance (positive selection) and more sensitive to the attractiveness of the university (positive sorting). Agglomeration and sorting patterns testify to the existence of a functioning academic market in

³We do not observe a clear separation between local and international markets in academia, contrary to most other kinds of markets before the industrial revolution (Polanyi 1944).

⁴In its common meaning, sorting is any process of arranging items systematically, and has two common, yet distinct meanings: ordering (arranging items in a sequence ordered according to a criterion) and categorizing (grouping items with similar properties). In the migration literature, it means that individuals with better attributes tend to concentrate in regions where returns are higher.

⁵In biology, positive natural selection is the force that drives the increase in the prevalence of advantageous traits. In our location choice model, we test whether better scholars are less sensitive to the distance from their birthplace.

Europe.⁶

Among the forces we consider, agglomeration and positive sorting are the most emblematic forces witnessing the competition among universities to attract talent. By attracting the best scholars at the same place, the academic market is a powerful engine to exploit the complementarities between scholars in the production function of universities,⁷ and to foster knowledge growth. They played an important role when there were few universities. Agglomeration and sorting substantially helped universities to create knowledge at the dawn of the Scientific Revolution and during the subsequent European primacy. These effects became negligible later when the number of universities increased. By contrast, selection patterns tended to scatter talent across universities, and hardly influenced the aggregate production of knowledge.

Our paper speaks to three strands of literature. Firstly, we contribute to the literature on stagnation to growth and on the role of upper-tail human capital. Many authors have searched for the profound causes of the “Rise of the West” (e.g. Landes 1998; Maddison 2007; Galor and Moav 2002;⁸ Galor 2011; Mokyr 2010; Mokyr 2016). For most of them, the self-reinforcing dynamics of technological and institutional progress played a key role. In particular, De la Croix, Doepke, and Mokyr (2018) argue that superior institutions for the creation and dissemination of productive knowledge help explain the European advantage in the medieval and early modern periods. The outstanding debate concerns the key forces that made these virtuous circles possible. There are currently no global quantitative analyses of the historical effect of upper-tail human capital on the dynamics leading to the Industrial Revolution. Recent country-level studies include Dowey (2017) for England, Squicciarini and Voigtländer (2015) for France, and Dittmar and Meisenzahl (2019) and Cinnirella and Streb (2017) for Germany. Squicciarini and Voigtländer (2015) show that the number of people who subscribed to Diderot’s and d’Alembert’s *Grande Encyclopédie* in 18th-century France predicts economic development later on, both at the city and county levels. Dittmar and Meisenzahl (2019) show that German cities that adopted better institutions following the Reformation grew faster and had more people recorded as famous in the German biography database.

There is a debate about whether or not universities facilitated the Scientific Revolution. It is true that the new science developed in the 16th century came into conflict with the traditional Aristotelian approach taught at universities. Still, following Applebaum (2003), 87 percent of the scientists listed in the *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* born between 1450 and 1650 were university educated, and 45 percent of them were employed by universities. Beyond science, medieval universities may have contributed to the rise of the West through (i) the revival of Roman law, which was better suited to regulating complex economic transactions

⁶For Italy, historians, such as Cobban (1985) or Denley (2013a), have documented the existence of a competitive academic market. Denley (2013a), for instance, notes that the challenge for medieval Italian universities was “to attract sufficiently high-profile faculty (...) to remain open”. The transition to salaried teaching staff was a direct and early consequence of a competitive system with, what he calls, its own “transfer season”. In addition to the salary, several other mechanisms added to this competition, such as the privileges granted to scholars, copied from one institution to another, the organization of intellectual competitions, benefits in kind, etc.

⁷As in the O-Ring theory of development (Kremer 1993) but not necessarily that strong.

⁸Galor and Moav (2002) explicitly refer to the universities: “Further, unlike the existing literature, investment in human capital increased gradually in the Pre-Industrial Revolution era due to a gradual increase in the representation of individuals who have higher valuation for offspring’s quality. (...) In particular, in the Pre-Industrial Revolution era, the increase in the number and size of universities in Europe since the establishment of the first university in Bologna in the eleventh century had significantly outpaced the growth rate of population.”

than the prevailing customary law,⁹ (ii) the translation of philosophical and scientific works from Classical Arabic and Greek, (iii) the diffusion of scientific thinking in Europe (e.g. Ockham's parsimony principle, Duns Scotus's logic, or Roger Bacon's empiricism), and a certain universality of curricula (iv) the promotion by theologians of cultural norms such as the nuclear family, strict monogamy (De la Croix and Mariani 2015), and the education of children (Thomas Aquinas), and (v) the interest in the natural sciences, reflected in the establishment of botanical gardens next to medical faculties. A recent work by Dittmar (2019) lends credence to the idea of higher productivity of university scholars during the Renaissance. Dittmar computes the real wage of Italian professors during the Renaissance from archived payrolls, and shows that the premium of those involved in the new sciences increased after the adoption of the movable-type printing press. To our knowledge, this is the only paper other than ours focusing on university professors and using individual-level data. Closely related to our work, Schich et al. (2014) use birth and death locations of more than 150,000 notable individuals to investigate the cultural determinants of intellectual mobility and the dynamics of cultural centers over a period of 2,000 years.

Beyond the existence of universities (Cantoni and Yuchtman 2014) and the role of elites (Dittmar and Meisenzahl 2019), we stress what makes them operate better together, namely the integrated academic market. Higher education institutions and elites are present as soon as a civilization reaches a certain level of sophistication, but European universities were unique as they were bottom-up institutions operating in a continental market without many barriers (common language, political fragmentation of Europe, universality of curricula). This allowed top scholars to sort and concentrate, boosting thereby complementarities between them as well as the output of the whole academic system.

Secondly, our paper relates to the migration literature in general, and to historical migration in particular. Migration is a selective process, with some individuals choosing to leave their region of birth and others choosing to stay. Who moves and who stays depends on the costs and benefits of migration, which can vary across individuals for both systematic and idiosyncratic reasons. Two salient features of contemporary labor mobility are that well-educated people exhibit a much greater propensity to emigrate than the less educated, and they tend to agglomerate in countries/regions with high rewards to skill (Grogger and Hanson 2011; Beine, Docquier, and Ozden 2011; Kerr et al. 2017; Kerr et al. 2016). The geographic concentration of talent is stronger within the upper tail of the skill distribution and does not necessarily lead to a decline in returns to skills due to agglomeration spillovers. Skill-intensive clusters allow better technology exchanges, deeper labor market specialization, or strong complementarities (Stephan and Levin 2001; Kerr, Kerr, and Lincoln 2015a; Kerr, Kerr, and Lincoln 2015b; Franzoni, Scellato, and Stephan 2012). As far as positive selection is concerned, college-educated individuals are migrating three times more than the less-educated in the contemporary world. This ratio drastically varies with economic development at origin. It is slightly greater than one in high-income countries, while it reaches 20 in low-income countries (Deuster and Docquier 2019). Such positive selection results from both heterogeneity in incentives and capacity to migrate (Borjas 1987; Chiquiar and Hanson 2005; McKenzie and Rapoport 2007), and immigration policies that

⁹Cantoni and Yuchtman (2014) show that university training in Roman law played an important role in the establishment of markets during the "Commercial Revolution" in medieval Europe. To establish this, Cantoni and Yuchtman determined the enrollment rates of German students at the universities of Bologna, Paris, Padua, Orléans, Prague, Heidelberg, Cologne, and Erfurt.

favor education and skills.¹⁰

Migrant selection has also been examined in historical studies, most of them focused on the *Age of Mass Migration* to the United States, a period of unrestricted entry starting in 1850 and ending around 1920.¹¹ Abramitzky, Boustan, and Eriksson (2012 and 2014) and Spitzer and Zimran (2018) show that selection patterns are consistent with income-maximization models. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, migration to the U.S. was positively selected from some European countries and negatively selected from others. The differences in selection lined up with those in the relative returns to skill across sending countries, or with the easing or tightening of the liquidity constraints (Covarrubias, Lafortune, and Tessada 2015). Using data on servitude contracts from the 17th and 18th centuries, Abramitzky and Braggion (2006) found similar self-selection patterns (on health, physical strength, and literacy) of servants to the American colonies.

Thirdly, we shed light on the mobility patterns at the upper tail of the human capital distribution. Despite the potentially far-reaching implications for international knowledge creation and diffusion (Breschi and Lissoni 2009; Trippl 2013; Miguelez and Moreno 2013; Pierson and Cotgreave 2000), empirical evidence about the drivers and selection of scientists' mobility remains scarce. Existing studies show that, compared to college-educated migrants, scientists and inventors are less sensitive to distance and more sensitive to linguistic proximity, economic conditions, resources dedicated to R&D, and visa-related restrictions (Laudel 2003; Agrawal et al. 2011; Kerr 2008; Fink, Miguelez, and Raffo 2013; Moed, Aisati, and Plume 2013; Grogger and Hanson 2015; Zhao et al. 2022). They also show the importance of circular flows which are mostly governed by the existence of scientific collaborations. To the best of our knowledge, none of these studies have focused on the self-selection of scientists. One of the very few studies identifying selection effects among scientists is that of Gibson and McKenzie (2014). Using a survey on the mobility of researchers from the Pacific Islands, they show that current migrants produce substantially more research than similarly skilled return migrants and non-migrants. Hoisl (2007) also shows that mobility is generally found to be positively associated with inventor productivity as proxied, for example, by the education level of the inventor and the use of external sources of knowledge such as university research or scientific literature. Finally, Akcigit, Baslandze, and Stantcheva (2016) find that the international mobility of superstar inventors is influenced by tax policies. A change in one country's top tax rate affects the retention rate of domestic inventors, and has much greater effects on the country's capacity to attract foreign inventors in general and those at the top of the ability distribution in particular.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present the data sources and define the key concepts used in our analysis. In Section 3, we describe the micro-foundations of our empirical model, present our main findings, and discuss their robustness. In Section 4, we simulate the model to draw its implications for the humanistic and scientific revolutions. The conclusion is in Section 5.

¹⁰The structure of migration costs can give rise to many different migration patterns characterized by positive, negative, or intermediate selection. Chiquiar and Hanson (2005), however, observe that Mexican migrants to the United States are drawn from the middle rather than the low end of the Mexican skill distribution, although income inequality is higher in Mexico than in the United States. McKenzie and Rapoport (2007) confirm that Mexican migrants from rural areas mainly come from the middle class of the wealth distribution (those who have both the means and incentives to migrate), and that the intensity of selection decreases with the size of social networks abroad (in line with Beine, Docquier, and Ozden (2011)).

¹¹A few studies on intra-European migration support the positive selection hypothesis. Beltrán Tapia and de Miguel Salanova (2017) show that, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the literacy level was higher among internal migrants moving to the Spanish capital city than among those who remained in their provinces of origin.

2 Data and Concepts

We collect a large sample of academic scholars (denoted by $i = 1, \dots, I$) employed by the universities of Latin Europe over a time span that started around the year 1000 CE and lasted until 1800 CE.¹² The year 1800 CE is a convenient date to stop for several reasons. At a broad level, it spelled the end of the Malthusian pre-industrial era. At the university level, it corresponded to profound changes: all French universities were abolished by the Revolution in 1793, and would reappear in a different form later on. In Prussia, the Humboldt reform of 1810 was also a game changer.

In this section, we first describe the institutional data sources used to identify academic scholars and their place of work. Secondly, we present the bibliographical data sources used to characterize the lifetime and place of birth of each academic scholar. In the third and fourth parts, we define an index of individual ability or human capital for each scholar, and go into a little more detail with regard to scholars with multiple affiliations. We finally explain how we construct our proxies for institutional notability and quality.

Institutional secondary sources & quality of sampling. – The identification of academic scholars builds mostly on institutions’ secondary sources of different types (see Appendix D). Ideally, we aim to cover the universe of scholars involved in university teaching and research before 1800 in Latin Europe. Although this universe is more precisely defined than in other studies of European scholars (e.g. the universe of “famous people” in De la Croix and Licandro (2015), of “creative people” in Serafinelli and Tabellini (2017), or of “notable people” in Gergaud, Laouenan, and Wasmer (2017)), its boundaries remain somewhat flexible. For example, according to biographies of Nicolaus Copernicus, he delivered lectures as a professor of astronomy to numerous students while in Rome. It is unclear whether this teaching took place within the walls of the university of Rome (Sapienza), and how long it lasted. This appears however to be the only time Copernicus taught students. Should we count Copernicus when measuring the notability of the Sapienza? Probably not, as it would overestimate the attractiveness of Rome during this period. Should we include the decision of Copernicus to go to Rome in our study? We did, but it does not matter much as he is only one among thousands of scholars.

Another dimension of flexibility concerns how we define a university. This seems simple *a priori*. We can rely on Frijhoff (1996) who provides a list of institutions granting doctorate degrees, together with their official foundation date. It is however meaningful to extend this list in two directions. One extension is to include important learning institutions which were not formally universities. One example is the Herborn Academy (*Academia Nassauensis*) which was a Calvinist institution of higher learning in Herborn (Germany) from 1584 to 1817.¹³ In addition, another relevant extension is to consider that universities were active before their official creation. For example, the University of Amsterdam was officially founded in 1877, but its roots go back to 1632, when the *Athenaeum Illustre* was founded. For this reason, our period of analysis starts before the official creation date of the first university.

For each university, we first checked whether there is an online historical database of professors. For example, the list of professors at the University of Groningen has already been established. The *Catalogus Pro-*

¹²Latin Europe means Europe minus the Muslim world and the Byzantine world.

¹³Appendix D describes the institutions added to Frijhoff’s list.

fessorum Academiae Groninganae includes all full professors from 1614 onwards (see the website at <http://hoogleraren.ub.rug.nl/>). The website is still under development, but it shows the recent interest of universities themselves in looking at their past in a more systematic way. For those universities without such a database but with books of biographies of their professors, we encoded the contents of these books. For the remaining universities, we checked whether *matricula* (people registered at a given university) and *chartularia* (containing transcriptions of original documents related to the historical events of a university) exist. In some cases, the *matriculum* itself is of little use as the status of these people is not recorded (students, professors, etc.), but it follows the chronological succession of rectors, whose names are provided. As rectors were sometimes nominated every six months, their names provide good coverage of the universe of professors there (with some selection bias). We have built up a representative sample of professors from this information, and we are continually looking for other national biographies and other databases to complete the information needed. For example, for Jesuit universities, there is a biographical dictionary by Sommervogel (1890) listing all Jesuits having published material; as they are classified by place of activity, we can match the professors to the relevant universities. Moreover, for the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance, information can be retrieved from two recent projects, both aimed at collecting biographical and social data on those who graduated from medieval universities: the project “Repertorium Academicum Germanicum - The Graduated Scholars of the Holy Roman Empire between 1250 and 1550” and the project “Studium” for the University of Paris from the 12th century to the Renaissance. Both projects are currently under development.

We grouped universities into three categories, depending on the coverage of the sources (see Appendix D). We say the coverage is “comprehensive” when data collection was based on an existing website or book whose aim is to list all professors of a given institution. Coverage is “broad” when it is based on the combination of several sources, including books on the history of the university. The coverage is “partial” when the sample of scholars was informed by sources from other universities and general thematic biographies. Our benchmark analysis is based on universities with comprehensive and broad coverage. Notice that the quality of the coverage is not related to the prestige of the university. We have an excellent coverage of the University of Macerata – a small university in Italy, while there is no comprehensive list of professors for the University of Paris. A key requirement of our analysis is to cover almost all scholars with high human capital, and to include a large sample of unknown scholars as well. This requirement is met by encoding the academic scholars included in thematic biographies, such as Taisand (1721) for law, Eloy (1755) for medicine, Junius Institute (2013) for Protestant theology, Herbermann (1913) for important Catholic figures, and Applebaum (2003) for the key actors of the scientific revolution.

Over the whole time span 1000-1800, we identify 195 universities and teaching institutions. The heterogeneity in the quality and coverage of the institutional data implies that the number of scholars identified varies drastically across universities. In the econometric analysis, we eliminate institutions with fewer than 10 scholars or a coverage (total number of professors per year of existence) below 0.05, and thus obtain a working sample of 127 institutions (denoted by $k = 1, \dots, K$). Each university k is linked to a geo-referenced location. Accounting for the date of creation of each university, we estimate that these 195 institutions represent a total of 51,582 years of existence. A very comprehensive list of scholars can be obtained for the University of Heidelberg which includes 1,205 scholars over 414 years of existence. Note that Heidelberg is not the

largest university in our working sample; the data related to the University Bologna allow us to identify 3,290 scholars over the whole time span. However, Heidelberg is more representative of an average university than Bologna. Assuming Heidelberg is representative of all institutions, a back-of-the-envelope calculation suggests that the order of magnitude of the universe of academic scholars for the medieval and early modern periods is around 150,136 (i.e. $1,205/414$ scholars per year \times 51,582 years of existence). Observing that scholars taught in 1.14 universities on average, the universe has about 131,698 unique persons.

So far, our bibliographical searches have allowed us to identify 40,549 academic scholars. These include very well-known professors as well as obscure scholars. We thus estimate that our current sample covers around 30.8% of the universe (i.e. $40,549 \div 131,698$). This coverage is very likely to be higher for renowned scholars, as they are more likely to appear in the sources consulted, than for obscure scholars. Having obscure scholars in the sample is important to identify the characteristics of the famous ones – those who are more likely to play the academic market game. Including many obscure scholars in the analysis is thus a strength of our analysis.

Biographical individual data. – We match each scholar’s name with bio- and bibliographical dictionaries to identify their place of birth and, later, their quality. We exclude the small number of persons born outside a rectangle encompassing Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East (defined by latitudes $\in [28, 66]$ and longitudes $\in [-22, 51]$) because those would be outliers when computing distances. We also search online for Wikipedia and Worldcat pages to generate the ex-post indicators of human capital, as explained below.

One word about the quality of the bibliographical data. In many cases it is quite high, as the secondary sources used – biographical dictionaries and university sources – were often compiled from archive materials. We should however warn the reader that for the earlier periods, we have chosen to adopt some approximations. A good example is the oculist *Benevenutus Hierosolymitanus*, also called Benevenutus of Jerusalem. His life is totally unknown to historians, but his book, *Ars probatissima oculorum*, was immensely popular and influential – having been translated into four languages already in medieval times. From other writings citing his work, historians infer he lived between 1100 and 1290. Assigning Jerusalem as his place of birth is disputed, but seems the likeliest option, given the knowledge of Middle Eastern cultures displayed in his writings (remember that Jerusalem was for some time a Latin kingdom (1099–1187)). He was also obviously acquainted with the medical school of Salerno, and he likely taught there (being called the physician from Salerno in one manuscript, namely the *Besançon Manuscript*). The most intriguing part concerns his relation with Montpellier, another famous medical school. In 1921, the Faculty of Medicine in Montpellier placed a marble slab in its entrance hall listing him among its early faculty members. There are some arguments to link Benevenutus of Jerusalem to Montpellier, but there remains a “considerable disparity between the fragility of the documentary basis for the Montpellier inscription and the robustness of the stone on which it was engraved” (Kedar 1995).

Each individual at university k is characterized by at most five dates: year of birth, year of death, first year of observation at university k , last year of observation at university k , and approximate date of activity at university k (this corresponds to a date that is sometimes denoted by “fl.”, from the Latin verb *floruit* “s/he

flourished”).¹⁴ From these dates, we define two dates, t_i^b and t_i^f , which hypothetically bound the active life of each scholar. These dates are computed as follows:

$$t_i^b = \min \left\{ \max \left\{ \text{Year of Birth} + 30, \min_k [\text{first year of obs. at univ. } k], \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \min_k [\text{approximate date at univ. } k] \right\}, \min_k [\text{last year of obs. at univ. } k], \text{Year of Death} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

$$t_i^f = \max \left\{ \min \{ \text{Year of Birth} + 65, \text{Year of Death} \}, \max_k [\text{first year of obs. at univ. } k], \right. \\ \left. \max_k [\text{last year of obs. at univ. } k], \max_k [\text{approximate date at univ. } k] \right\}. \quad (2)$$

For simplicity of exposition of the stylized facts, we divide the whole observation window into eight periods, denoted by $\tau \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$, corresponding to major historical events: from the urban revolution to the first universities (1000–1199), from the official foundation of Paris and Oxford in 1200 to the Black Death (1200–1347), from the Black Death to the invention of the movable-type printing press (1348–1449), from the printing press to the rise of Protestantism (1450–1526),¹⁵ from Protestantism to the beginning of the Thirty Years’ War (1527–1617),¹⁶ from the Thirty Years’ War to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1618–1684), from this revocation to the rise of Enlightened universities (1685–1733),¹⁷ and from Enlightened universities to 1800 (1734–1800). We assign each scholar to a period τ based on t_i^b . The beginning date t_i^b should be seen as a time when the individual can make location choices. The final date t_i^f will be used to map the human capital achieved by a scholar to her universities. In the stylized facts, the period in which this end date falls determines the period for which we impute the quality of the scholar to their university.

Universities’ scholars were almost always male, but we found a few females: Trotula de Ruggiero (11th century) and a few others in Salerno, Maddalena Bonsignori, Clotilde Tambroni, Clotilde Zamboni, Bettina and Novella Calderini, and a few others in Bologna, Beatriz Galindo in Salamanca, Ekaterina Romanovna in Moscow, and Dorothea Christiane Erxleben in Halle. Female scholars were a rare exception though. Novella Calderini, for example, allegedly replaced her father repeatedly, teaching at Bologna veiled so that her beauty would not distract the students, according to the Italian Encyclopedia *Treccani*.¹⁸

Table I shows the number of scholars per period, with some of their characteristics. We also report the number of universities per period, which increases steadily except from periods 4 to 6, especially when French Protestant “academies” had to close (Bourchenin 1882). On average, institutional data and bibliographical dictionaries allow us to identify the birthplace of 71.2% of university professors. Hence, we can compute the cost distance d_{ik} associated with each possible scholar-university dyad. Such a cost is defined as

¹⁴The scholars for which we have no dates cannot be incorporated into the analysis.

¹⁵1527 corresponds to the foundation of the University of Marburg, the oldest Protestant university in the world.

¹⁶This war was of major importance for Germanic universities and the life expectancy of their scholars, as shown in Stelter, de la Croix, and Myrskylä (2021).

¹⁷In 1734, the University of Göttingen was founded to propagate the ideas of the European Enlightenment.

¹⁸See De la Croix and Vitale (2022) for details.

$d_{ik} = \ln(\text{cost}^{\min} + \text{cost}_{ij})$ where cost_{ij} is computed using Özak (2010, 2018)’s human mobility index and cost^{\min} is the minimum cost incurred when having a position in one’s own place of birth. The human mobility index is the cost-minimizing path between two locations. It depends on geographical, technological, topographic and terrain conditions, and performs better than standard great circle distance in gravity models. We assume cost^{\min} is equivalent to the cost of walking within the old city of Rome between the Vatican City and the Colosseum (3.5 km).

In addition, 22.0% of our identified scholars have a Wikipedia page, and 35.7% have at least one recorded publication in Worldcat. Overall, these shares increase from periods 0-1-2-3 (the Middle Ages) to periods 4-5-6-7 (early modern period). The least well documented period is 1348–1449, when we find many names of professors with no publications, either because they did not publish a lot, were never printed, or their publications did not survive.

Table 1: Summary statistics for scholars by period

Periods τ	Nb. obs.	Nb. univ.	Birthplace (%)	Wikipedia (%)	Worldcat(%)
0 (1000–1199)	289	17	73.4	49.8	49.5
1 (1200–1347)	1,874	33	63.8	20.5	19.9
2 (1348–1449)	4,404	49	70.2	9.6	9.1
3 (1450–1526)	6,447	69	66.4	11.1	15.5
4 (1527–1617)	8,242	140	73.1	22.6	37.5
5 (1618–1685)	6,861	154	71.7	22.7	41.8
6 (1686–1733)	5,036	148	69.1	23.5	46.2
7 (1734–1800)	7,396	159	76.8	35.9	57.9
Total	40,549	195	71.2	22.0	35.7

Notes: Col. (1) defines the period. Cols. (2) and (3) report the period-specific numbers of scholars and universities covered by the database. Col. (4) gives the fraction of scholars whose birthplace is known. Cols. (5) and (6) give the fraction of scholars who have a Wikipedia page and at least one recorded publication in Worldcat.

Figure 1 shows the university-scholar maps for all periods. Red dots correspond to universities. The top universities are labelled in bold. Blue dots represent scholars’ birthplaces and again we have labelled some prominent names. Small blue dots refer to obscure scholars whose normalized ability index is equal to zero (see below). The dashed lines link academic scholars to the university for which they taught. They represent the optimal (i.e. travel-time minimizing) route.

As the first two maps (1000–1199 and 1200–1347) show, universities emerged in the territory of the late Western Roman Empire. Paris clearly attracted scholars from all over Europe, from Portugal to Scotland and the south of Italy. The density of universities in Italy was already impressive. The period 1348–1449 saw a decline in the number of observations in France, probably due to the Hundred Years’ War, combined with the Black Death. West German universities started to play a role, while Italy was very active. We can also see Greek scholars such as John Argyropoulos fleeing the expected fall of the Byzantine Empire (from Harris (1995)). The next period (1450–1526) has the same characteristics, but with more observations in Spain, Scotland, and southern Germany. The number of observations over the period 1527–1617 is high, with good

coverage from Portugal to Poland: the portfolio of universities is expanding. The period 1618–1685 saw the development of Nordic universities, and a decline in movement in the south of Europe. A similar trend is observed for the period 1686–1733. The last period 1734–1800 is particularly rich in Germany, and universities expanded to the East. From Iceland comes Grímur Jónsson Thorkelin, who was professor of antiquities at Copenhagen University and is known for the first full translation of the poem Beowulf. On the whole, what can be seen on these eight maps corresponds closely to changes in economic primacy over time in Europe (Kindleberger 1996). More descriptive statistics (including barycenters) can be found in Appendices A, B and C.¹⁹

Using bibliographical data, we define two key concepts that characterize the notability of academic scholars and institutions, and can potentially influence location choices.


Scholars’ human capital. – Firstly, we construct an index of *ability or human capital of scholar i* , denoted by q_i . A standard way to measure human capital is to consider wages paid. While the latter might be the more standard measure of markets, it suffers from strong limitations. First, existing data on salaries are scarce, incomplete, or completely missing for several universities. Secondly, faculty compensation took a variety of forms, like payments directly from students, benefits in kind (rent, various expenses, allocations of wine and grain like in Heidelberg (Drüll 1991), among others), fixed salaries subject to contingencies (recessionary times, will of the prince, etc.) or prestige. In addition, theology professors were often not paid for their teaching, and received *prebends* outside the university (Post 1932; Paquet 1958). All these challenges make it impossible to have sufficient informative, individual wage data. We discuss these issues in more detail in Appendix F, where we have compiled available wage data.

As an alternative, we measure human capital by individual notability as seen today in contemporary sources, Worldcat and Wikipedia. Worldcat provides a comprehensive measure of scientific output and citations, as books about the person are included in the measure. Wikipedia completes this measure by putting more weight on the mission of academics called, on today’s terms, “service to society” (e.g. becoming an ambassador or a pope, or being canonized a saint). The distributions of Worldcat and Wikipedia indicators are heavily right skewed, with low levels featuring typically obscure scholars. Consequently, without loss of generality, we make two normalization assumptions for those who have no Wikipedia and/or Worldcat pages. We assume first that having no Wikipedia page or a very short Wikipedia page of 60 characters is the same in terms of human capital (the shortest Wikipedia page has 67 characters). Second, we assume that having one publication in one language held by one library worldwide is the same as having no publication at all. To combine the information provided by Worldcat and Wikipedia into one measure, we compute the first principal component of five indicators: (i) the log of the number of characters of the longest Wikipedia page across all languages²⁰ (ranging from a minimum of 60 to 259,435), (ii) the log of the number of languages in which a Wikipedia page exists (ranging from a minimum of 1 to 212), (iii) the log of the number of works (by

¹⁹We include a breakdown of scholars by broad fields of knowledge. We were surprised to see “theology” decline from 22% to 10.8% between period 0 and period 3 (The Renaissance) and surge again at the occasion of the Reformation, peaking at 21.5% during period 6. It is interesting to contrast this result with the idea that the Reformation led to a secularization of the society. This secularization process is shown in Cantoni, Dittmar, and Yuchtman (2018a) through the reallocation of students across fields in Germany (measured by degrees granted and first jobs). Such a reallocation did not seem to be matched by a similar process at the level of the teachers, or might be compensated by more theology in Catholic lands, under the lead of the Jesuits.

²⁰A correction for different languages length was performed, using the translations of the Gospel according to Saint Mark.

Figure 1: Maps of scholar-university dyads by period (1/4)




Period
1000-1199

Notes:

Places of top
universities in
bold


Includes
names
mentioned in
the text

Dashed lines:
cost-
minimizing
path



Period
1200-1347

Maps of scholar-university dyads by period (2/4)




Period
1348-1449

Notes:

Places of top
universities in
bold


Includes
names
mentioned in
the text

Dashed lines:
cost-
minimizing
path



Period
1450-1526

Maps of scholar-university dyads by period (3/4)




Period
1527-1617

Notes:

Places of top universities in bold


Includes names mentioned in the text

Dashed lines: cost-minimizing path



Period
1618-1685

Maps of scholar-university dyads by period (4/4)




Period
1686-1733

Notes:

Places of top
universities in
bold

Includes
names
mentioned in
the text

Dashed lines:
cost-
minimizing
path



Period
1734-1800

Table 2: First principal component of scholars' human capital

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Benchmark	No Wikipedia	Works by or about
Nb. characters of Wikipedia page	0.431	-	0.398
Nb. languages Wikipedia	0.393	-	0.380
Nb. works in Worldcat	0.471	0.584	-
Nb. languages in Worldcat	0.460	0.562	0.429
Nb. library holdings in Worldcat	0.476	0.585	0.384
Nb. publications by in Worldcat	-	-	0.420
Nb. publications about in Worldcat	-	-	0.435
Nb. Eigenvalues > 1	1	1	1
% variance explained by 1st PC	79.8%	93.4%	76.9%
S.E.	1.997	1.679	2.148
Corr. with (1)	1.000	0.964	0.992
Corr. with (2)	-	1.000	0.945
Corr. with (3)	-	-	1.000

Notes: Col. (1) gives the results of the PCA analysis conducted with two Wikipedia and three Worldcat indicators. The two Wikipedia indicators are removed in Col. (2). Col. (3) decomposes the number of works into two categories, namely works by and works about each scholar. The top panel gives the estimated weight of each component. The middle panel gives the number of eigenvalues greater than unity as well as the share of the variance explained by the first component. The bottom panel reports the correlation between the three indices of human capital.

or about) in Worldcat (ranging from a minimum of 1 to 79,523), (iv) the log of the number of publication languages in Worldcat (ranging from a minimum of 1 to 52), and (v) the log of the number of library holdings in Worldcat (ranging from a minimum of 1 to 1,092,667).

The results of this analysis are presented in col. (1) of Table 2. Usual heuristics used to identify relevant principal components is to keep those having eigenvalues above one and explaining at least 80% of the total variance. In our case, the first principal component alone satisfies these two conditions. We use it as an index of scholar's human capital. We finally subtract its minimum value from the first principal component in such a way that a person with no Wikipedia page and no Worldcat entry will have a human capital of zero ($q_i = 0$).

One could argue that a measure of human capital should be based on the works published while the author was still alive. What was published after the death of the person might reflect how the author gained popularity *post-mortem*, which might not be relevant to determining their market value when they were active. It is not possible to implement this because many first editions have not survived. For example, there is no doubt that Pierre Abélard (1079-1142) was a philosopher of great renown during his life.²¹ All his written output available in libraries today, from philosophical works to love letters, was published after 1600, and, in many cases, in the last 30 years (see <https://www.worldcat.org/identities/lccn-n79142562/>).

²¹Pierre Abélard is also known to the general public for his love affair and correspondence with his pupil Héloïse.

Our measure of q_i is very robust to changes in assumptions. Disregarding Wikipedia leads to col. (2) of Table 2. The correlation between the ability indices computed with and without Wikipedia equals 0.96. In col. (3), we separate the publications by and the publications about the person, and replace the number of works aggregating both types by these two indicators. There is little gain in doing this, and the new measure is correlated with the benchmark with a coefficient of 0.99.

The most famous scholars according to our measure are presented in Table 3 by period τ . The scholar with the all-time highest human capital is Martin Luther. He was not a scientist like Galileo Galilei, Isaac Newton, or Carl Linnaeus, but it is fair to recognize that he profoundly influenced institutional changes in Europe (Becker et al. 2020), and a shift of resources from religious to secular purpose as education and public administration (Cantoni, Dittmar, and Yuchtman 2018b). In the list of Table 3, there are some scholars who only have a weak link to a university, and are thus not used to compute the notability of the university. For example, Baruch Spinoza never taught at a university, but interacted with people at the University of Leiden; the same holds for Montaigne and his links with Bordeaux. There are also some who were actual teachers but are better known, at least nowadays, for non-scholarly reasons: François Rabelais, known for his novels, was also in fact a physician who taught at Montpellier; Enea SB Piccolomini (Pope Pius II) or Friedrich von Schiller (German poet) also fall in this category. Their celebrity, even if not strictly academic, was taken into account to compute the notability of the university.

In the same table, we also report the median value of q_i from the set of positive q_i (those with either a Wikipedia or Worldcat reference). It is surprising that there is no visible trend for this q_i over time, which implies that more recent scholars did not produce more than older ones. It may be more likely that the writings of medieval scholars were lost compared to those of scholars active in the early modern period, yet this loss is compensated for by the accumulation of citations and new editions over time. Let us also note that the particularly high median q_i for the first period, which probably reflects a selection phenomenon, and the low median after the Black Death. Finally, it is reassuring that the correlation between wages paid and q_i is positive – a finding that is in line with human capital theory and our understanding of early academic markets – but rather small, for the above reasons.

Scholars with multiple affiliations (repeat movers). Our database includes some scholars with multiple career spells or affiliations. Over the whole time span, 12.0% of our scholars are linked to more than one university, and the average number of affiliations per scholar equals 1.14.²² We denote by S_i the number of universities where scholar i spent time during her career (i.e. the number of career spells). With a record number of 7 recorded affiliations, Jean de Coras and Francisco Suarez are extreme examples of this feature. Jean de Coras (1513-1572) was a French jurist who taught at Padua, Toulouse, Ferrara, Valence, but also, according to Taisand (1721) at Orléans, Paris, and Angers (but we do not even know in which order).²³ Francisco Suarez (1548-1617) was a Spanish Jesuit philosopher and theologian who taught at Avila, Valladolid, Alcala, Salamanca, and Coimbra according to Herbermann (1913), but also at Paris and Rome according to Sommervogel (1890).

²²If a scholar left a position and came back to the same institution after a while, we consider it as only one affiliation.

²³Jean the Coras might be known to the international audience as he instructed the famous trial of Martin Guerre. He wrote its best-known record, which was the basis for the movie *The Return of Martin Guerre* with Gérard Depardieu, which was nominated for Best Foreign Language Film by the U.S. National Board of Review of Motion Pictures in 1983.

Table 3: Top 10 scholars by period with their q_i


Period τ	1000-1199	1200-1347	1348-1449	1450-1526
Med[$q_i q_i>0$]	4.70	3.40	2.19	2.61
1	Pierre Abélard (10.5)	Thomas Aquinas (12.1)	Giovanni Boccaccio (12.3)	Martin Luther (13.5)
2	Thomas Becket (10.3)	Ramon Llull (10.5)	Nicolas de Cusa (10.4)	Niccolo Machiavelli (12.5)
3	Domingo Guzman (9.3)	John Duns Scotus (10.4)	Johannes Hus (10.2)	Desiderius Erasmus (12.1)
4	Gerbert d'Aurillac (9.2)	Gioianni da Fidanza (10.3)	John Wycliffe (9.7)	Nicolaus Copernicus (11.3)
5	Pier Damiani (9.1)	Eckhart von Hochheim (10.2)	Lorenzo Valla (9.4)	François Villon (10.7)
6	Rolando Bandinelli (8.9)	Fernando Martins de Bulhoes (9.8)	Jean Gerson (9.4)	Ulrich Zwingli (10.3)
7	Jean de Salisbury (8.8)	William of Ockham (9.8)	Poggio Bracciolini (9.4)	Philipp Melanchthon (10.1)
8	Hugues de Saint-Victor (8.8)	Roger Bacon (9.5)	Georgius Gemistus Pletho (9.4)	Enea Silvio Piccolomini (10.1)
9	Eudes de Châtillon (8.5)	Marsilio de Padova (9.2)	Francesco della Rovere (9.2)	Sebastien Brant (9.7)
10	NA Gratian (8.4)	Albertus Magnus (9.2)	Leonardo Bruni (9.1)	G. Pico della Mirandola (9.7)
Period τ	1527-1617	1618-1684	1685-1739	1740-1800
Med[$q_i q_i>0$]	3.05	2.77	2.66	3.01
1	Galileo Galilei (12)	Isaac Newton (12.2)	John Wesley (11.2)	Friedrich von Schiller (12.9)
2	Johannes Calvin (11.8)	Baruch Spinoza (11.8)	George Berkeley (10.6)	Immanuel Kant (12.9)
3	Francis Bacon (11.7)	Baltasar Gracián (10.3)	Gianbattista Vico (10)	David Hume (11.8)
4	Michel de Montaigne (11.6)	Attanasio Kircher (10.3)	Ludvig Holberg (9.9)	Adam Smith (11.6)
5	François Rabelais (11.6)	Pierre Bayle (9.6)	Christian Wolff (9.3)	Johann Gottlieb Fichte (11.2)
6	Johan Kepler (11)	Samuel Pufendorf (9.5)	Hermann Boerhaave (9.2)	Carl Linnaeus (11.2)
7	Torquato Tasso (11)	Robert Hooke (9.3)	Johann Christoph Gottsched (8.8)	Leonhard Euler (10.9)
8	Giordano Bruno (10.9)	Thomas Browne (9.3)	Joseph Pitton de Tournefort (8.8)	Christoph Martin Wieland (10.3)
9	Tommaso Campanella (10.4)	Nicolas Steno (9.2)	Johann I Bernoulli (8.8)	Leclerc de Buffon (10.3)
10	Theophrastus von Hohenheim (10.3)	Jakob I. Bernoulli (9.1)	Daniel Bernoulli (8.7)	Jeremy Bentham (10.1)

Notes: Scholars' ranking by period based on the index of human capital computed in Col. (1) of Table 2.

We refer to multi-affiliation scholars as *repeat movers*, and to those who have been only employed by a single university, as *one-time movers*. It is difficult to make any statement on the reasons for multiple moves. However, there is clear evidence that repeat movers are more likely to belong to the top of the distribution of human capital. Repeat movers are performing better than others at both the extensive and intensive margins. On average, 76.4% of repeat movers have at least one recorded publication, as opposed to 41.2% for one time movers.²⁴ Focusing on scholars with at least one publication, the average q of repeat movers (4.074) is 25% greater than that of one-time movers (3.239). Combining both margins and keeping in mind that the minimal ability level is normalized to zero, the average ability index in the total population of repeat movers (3.138) is 2.3 times greater than the average ability index in the total population of one-time movers (1.365). The shares of repeat movers in the population in periods 0 to 7 are equal to 18%, 16%, 8%, 9%, 13%, 12%, 14% and 11%, respectively. The greatest shares, observed in the first two periods, are likely due to a lower coverage of the population of obscure scholars. As for the heterogeneity by place of birth, the share of repeat movers varies from 5% in Denmark to 18% in the Netherlands, and 17% in Great-Britain.

Institutional notability. – In theory, we can compute a measure of annual quality for each university using the observed location and ability levels of all scholars identified in our database. In particular, for each year t , we can define the set of scholars affiliated with university k as $\Lambda_{k,t} = \{i | \bar{p}_{ikt} = 1\}$ where \bar{p}_{ikt} is a dummy equal to one if scholar i was affiliated with university k at year t (implying that $t_i^b \leq t \leq t_i^f$), and equal to zero otherwise. Nevertheless, given that sampling varies from one institution to the other, computations based on the total number of observed scholars are not directly comparable across places. Taking the means or medians of individual human capital would also be biased in favor of the least well covered universities.

Figure 2: Computing the notability of the University of Louvain in 1500



Notes: For illustrative purpose, the computation of the notability of the University of Louvain in the year 1500 relies on the 5 Top scholars active in the 25 years before (from 1475 to 1499). Two scholars, Paulus Middleburgensis and Thomas Basin, are repeat movers.

Hence, we introduce the concept of *notability of university k* in year t as a CES combination of the ability or human capital of the top 5 academic scholars having spent time there in a 25 years window preceding t . Figure 2 shows an example. These top 5 scholars are extracted from the sets $\Lambda_{k,t-25} \dots \Lambda_{k,t-1}$ and should not belong to $\Lambda_{k,t}$. The notability index is denoted by Q_{kt} . To account for the partial presence of repeat movers, we weight the individual ability q_i by $(1/S_i)^\omega$ where S_i is the number of universities where scholar i spent

²⁴ Those shares are computed on the sample of scholars for whom the birth place is known.


time during their career, and we define the adjusted ability level as $\bar{q}_i \equiv q_i (1/S_i)^\omega$. In our descriptive tables and benchmark regressions, we assume $\omega = 1$ (i.e. the ability of each multi-destination scholar is divided by their number of career spells).²⁵ We then denote by $(\bar{q}_{1kt}, \bar{q}_{2kt}, \bar{q}_{3kt}, \bar{q}_{4kt}, \bar{q}_{5kt})$ the ability of the top 5 academic scholars of university k in year t , and we define the notability index as:

$$Q_{kt} = \left(\frac{1}{5} \bar{q}_{1kt}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} + \frac{1}{5} \bar{q}_{2kt}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} + \frac{1}{5} \bar{q}_{3kt}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} + \frac{1}{5} \bar{q}_{4kt}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} + \frac{1}{5} \bar{q}_{5kt}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}}, \quad (3)$$

where σ is the elasticity of substitution between scholars in producing notability.

We use Q_{kt} as a proxy for the attractiveness of the university. When making location decisions, it is unlikely that scholars were able to accurately quantify the quality of each university. However, they were aware of complementarity forces and they observed the highest ability scholars of each university belonging to their choice set. Figure 3 shows the evolution of institutional notability of 24 universities which topped the ranking of institutions during at least one year over the whole time span 1000-1800. The median notability indices of each university are provided in Appendix D. Compared with the full sample shown in Figure 1, we have removed universities with fewer than 10 scholars in total (as we need enough observations to identify university-specific fixed effects in our econometric analysis), and also those with extremely low coverage, i.e. fewer than 1 scholar per time window of 20 years on average.

Figure 3: Institutional notability of top universities over the whole time span 1000-1800



Note: We select 24 universities that topped the ranking during at least one year over the whole time span 1000-1800. We report the trajectory of their institutional notability, Q_{kt} , as computed from Equation (3).

Our ranking of the top institutions varies across the years. Prior to 1200, the cathedral schools of Reims, Liège, and Chartres, the monastery of Cluny, and the predecessors of the universities of Parma, Salerno and Angers share the lead. Another important place then is the Toledo's school of translators.²⁶ After 1200, not

²⁵We will show below that our results are robust to the choice of ω .

²⁶In the post-industrial times, book translations play a key role on the diffusion of ideas, norms and institutional changes

surprisingly, the leading positions are taken by the two emblematic universities of Paris and Bologna. From the Black Death to the rise of Protestantism, we see the universities of Florence, Prague, Rome, and Louvain. After the Reformation, Wittenberg appears as the most notorious, followed some time later by Padua, Leiden, Cambridge, and Oxford. In the last century, we find the Royal College in Paris, the universities of Halle, Uppsala, Copenhagen, and St Petersburg (a university attached to the academy there). The Royal Gardens in Paris comes at the end of the parade. This ranking contains a few surprises. For example, the University of Cambridge does very well in the eighteenth century, contradicting the view that it was “an intellectual desert, in which a solitary man constructed a system of the world” (see Manuel (1968) about Isaac Newton in Cambridge).

One can evaluate the relevance of our ranking of universities by comparing it with rankings obtained using different methods. The Casati Law (Italy, 1858) sets rules for accrediting the pre-existing universities into the new Italian University system (Cottini, Ghinetti, and Moriconi 2019). It ranked universities into three categories, A-B-C depending on their quality. We can compare this ranking with our estimate of Q_{kt} , averaged over the eighteenth century. The average for the 9 universities ranked A is 2.81. The average for the 8 universities ranked B is 0.64. And the two universities ranked C have a similar level of 0.53 (including the university of Macerata for which we harvested about 800 professors). This suggests that our approach is very likely to allow for a proper identification of the top institutions.

3 Empirical analysis

We now turn our attention to the empirical analysis of the determinants of location choices. Economists have long recognized that spatial mobility decisions play a key role in the career choices of workers (e.g. Keane and Wolpin 1997; Neal 1999). Two types of models, spatial search and location choice, have been used to link mobility decisions to career choices. Spatial search and matching models formalize job search decisions across geographically segmented labor markets; they shed light on the effect of distance on the efficiency of a job search, on spatial heterogeneity in search frictions, and on the persistence of labor market disparities between regions (e.g. Manning and Petrongolo 2017; Schmutz and Sidibe 2019). Ideally, the estimation of matching models requires observing a large number of repeat movers with match-specific outcomes such as individual levels of earnings or employer’s profit (e.g. Abowd, Kramarz, and Margolis 1999). This approach is unworkable for us, given the absence of data on match specific outcomes. Moreover, even if we had such outcomes, using only about 10% of the sample (the share of repeat movers) would be costly in terms of external validity of the analysis. Location choice models explain how different types of workers self-select into labor market areas by maximizing their current and expected future levels of income (e.g. Borjas 1987; Dahl 2002; Gallin 2004; Grogger and Hanson 2011). The latter framework is particularly relevant when focusing on the role of workers’ attributes, and when match-specific outcomes, demand-side factors and local matching frictions are unobservable. Hence, we opt for this type of framework.

In this section, we first explain the microfoundations and specificities of our location choice model (Section 3.1). We then estimate the determinants of location decisions with a standard multinomial logit model in (Abramitzky and Sin 2014).

Sections 3.2, and conduct a heterogeneity analysis in 3.3. The standard logit framework raises a number of econometric issues that might generate inconsistent estimates. Firstly and despite the fact that our database includes a large number of obscure scholars, renowned scholars are more likely to be recorded and information about place of birth is missing for a relatively large number of obscure scholars. In the benchmark regressions, these unknowns are eliminated from the sample. This raises sample selection issues that we address in Section 3.4. A related problem is due to the presence of scholars with multiple affiliations. Each (i, k) dyad appears as one observation in the database and is assimilated to a career spell. This means that scholars with seven affiliations appear seven times, while those with a single affiliation appear only once. This also induces possible sample biases and raises the question of the relevance to model scholar i 's choice at stage s independently from her other career spells s' . These issues are addressed in Section 3.5. Finally, the benchmark specification disregards the potential endogeneity of q_i , arising from the fact that the ability of scholar i is likely to be affected by her academic environment. We address this issue in Section 3.6.

3.1 A microfounded gravity model

We formalize the discrete location-choice problem of academic scholars in medieval and early modern Europe using a Random Utility Model (RUM), which provides the state-of-the-art microfoundations for most recent gravity models of migration. Our RUM leads to an empirical multinomial logit model which is in line with Akcigit, Baslandze, and Stantcheva (2016), who study the international mobility of superstar inventors since 1977. Standard location choice models assume that the demand-side of the market is perfectly elastic. In our context, this means that the demand for academic scholars (or equivalently, the supply of academic positions) adjusts perfectly to supply. Although most universities have a fixed number of chairs, they also offer a set of other positions which are easily adjusted (e.g. the fellows in Oxbridge, the *professores designati* in Copenhagen (Slottved 1978), the *survivanciers* (designated successor) in Montpellier (Dulieu 1979)). We account for potential demand-side factors by including “competition costs” whose size depends on the attractiveness of universities and cities as well as on the ability and “market value” of academic scholars.

Compared with the standard literature on the determinants of migration, and beyond the fact that we use unique micro-data, our approach has three specificities. Firstly, we use *geo-referenced* location data. Each scholar i is assigned to a geo-referenced place of birth, whereas each university k is linked to a geo-referenced position. Each scholar-university dyad is associated with a cost distance d_{ik} , measured with the human mobility index (see supra). Since the place of residence of academic scholars before moving to university k cannot be observed, the distance between the place of birth and the university may capture the separation from family and friends (i.e. homesickness), the travel distance *per se*, or the costs of obtaining information about remote places. A striking example of the importance of distance is provided by Eloy (1755) and Michaud (1811) about *Septalius* (Lodovico Settala, 1552-1633). Born and living in Milan, he taught medicine at the nearby University of Pavia and received offers from: the King of Spain, the Duke of Bavaria, the Duke of Tuscany, the city of Bologna, and the Senate of Venice, all offers above what any local citizen could have dreamed of receiving. He enjoyed receiving them as tokens of well-deserved honors, but accepted none. He preferred the company of his fourteen children to the luster of these foreign positions. Another clue to the preference for one's place of birth is the following. Among the 15,328 scholars with a known death place,

1,045 of them went back to their hometown before dying, although they held appointments in other places during their life. Another 2,939 were born, worked and died at the same place.

Secondly, we exploit the *unbalanced panel dimension* of our database as some scholars made multiple/repeated choices. We do not necessarily know the timing of choices, but our database links several universities to some scholars. We assume an academic career is made of a maximum of S spells indexed by s . At each stage of their career, each professor has to select their preferred location from the feasible university choice set. In practice, if scholar i taught at S_i universities, we include S_i dyadic matches in the database. Robustness checks will be conducted in Section 3.5 to assess the role of repeat movers.

Thirdly, our discrete choice model allows for *varying choice sets*. As new universities are created (or abandoned) over time, the choice sets are individual specific depending on the universities that existed during the active life of the scholar. Each university has a founding date t_0^k and an end date t_1^k , which we mostly take from Frijhoff (1996). Sometimes universities – or some schools which would later become universities – existed before this official date. For example, the University of Paris was officially founded in 1200, but colleges and cathedral schools existed before that date. Gerard Pucelle (1117-1184), an Anglo-French scholar in canon law, taught at Paris from 1156 to 1167 (Arabeyre, Halpérin, and Krynen 2007), before becoming the Bishop of Coventry. We should thus lower the initial date t_0^k for the University of Paris to match the first scholar who can be found there. More generally, the most ancient scholars in the database are Adelbold (965-1027), who taught, at the turn of the millennium, at the cathedral school in Liège, and Fulbert de Chartres (970-1029) who taught at the cathedral school in Chartres and at what would become the University of Angers (Rangard and Lemarchand 1868).²⁷ This explains why our time span starts in the year 1000 CE. As far as individuals are concerned, we use the time interval $[t_i^b, t_i^f]$ defined in Eqs. (1) and (2). Each scholar i makes location choices at the start of the career, in year $t(i) \equiv t_i^b$. The portfolio available to individual i is denoted by $K_{t(i)}$. We include a university k in the choice set of individual $K_{t(i)}$ if $t_0^k \leq t(i) \leq t_1^k$.

The utility that a professor i obtains from locating at university $k \in K_{t(i)}$ at the stage $s \in S$ of her career is given by:

$$U_{iskt(i)} = V_{ikt(i)} + \epsilon_{isk} = \beta \mathbf{x}_{ikt(i)} + \epsilon_{isk}, \quad (4)$$

where $V_{ikt(i)} = \beta \mathbf{x}_{ikt(i)}$ represents the deterministic component of the indirect utility (net of moving costs), which depends on a vector of observable variables, and ϵ_{isk} is a vector of person-specific random taste shocks representing the unobservable determinants which enter the utility function and are orthogonal to the deterministic component.

Assuming the random term ϵ_{isk} is independently and identically distributed as Extreme Value Type I (EVT-I), which implies that multiple career choices are independent, we can model the probability that university k represents the utility-maximizing choice for professor i at the stage s of her career as the outcome of a standard multinomial logit model (McFadden 1974):

$$p_{iskt(i)} \equiv \text{Prob} \left[U_{iskt(i)} = \text{Max}_{k' \in K_{t(i)}} U_{isk't(i)} \right] = \frac{\exp(\beta \mathbf{x}_{ikt(i)})}{\sum_{k' \in K_{t(i)}} \exp(\beta \mathbf{x}_{ik't(i)})}. \quad (5)$$

²⁷Both Liège and Chartres had cathedral schools which failed to morph into universities, see Jaeger (2013) on those early cathedral schools in Europe.

In this formula, the probability of going to a given place depends on the features of that place (the numerator) compared to the features of all the other places in the portfolio (the denominator). The property of the multinomial logit model is that the relative probability of choosing between two alternative options in $K_{t(i)}$ depends on the attractiveness of these two options only, i.e. $\ln p_{isk't(i)} - \ln p_{isk't(i)} = \beta \mathbf{x}_{ikt(i)} - \beta \mathbf{x}_{ik't(i)}$, and is independent of the presence of other alternatives (IIA: Independence of Irrelevant Alternatives). In addition, the choice probabilities are independent across career spells as long as ϵ_{isk} and $\epsilon_{is'k}$ are assumed to be independently distributed. The latter assumption will be relaxed later.

As in the literature on migration, in which the location choice of migrants conditional on the decision to migrate (Bertoli and Ruysen 2018) is studied, our estimations are conditional on the choice of having an academic career. As we cannot observe the universe of scholars, including those not choosing to teach at universities, we cannot model the *ex-ante* problem of choosing between universities and other activities. Notice that this choice is more complex than a binary choice, as many scholars combined positions at universities with other occupations (such as physician or astronomer to the monarch, bishop or judge). Our estimation thus rests on the independence of irrelevant alternatives property within the choice set $K_{t(i)}$, which implies that the relative probability of choosing between two alternative options in $K_{t(i)}$ depends exclusively on the attractiveness of these two options. Even if selection into academia would not affect the location choice of individuals having chosen to teach, it might affect our simulations if, for example, the total number of professors depends on the notability of universities. Hence it is fair to acknowledge that our results remain partial equilibrium results.

Estimating the multinomial logit (5) requires specifying the analytical form of the deterministic component of the utility function as a function of observable individual (q_i), institutional ($Q_{kt(i)}$), and dyadic characteristics (d_{ik}). In the benchmark model, we consider q_i as independent of her location choice. We also consider $Q_{kt(i)}$ as exogenous as it depends on scholars who are no longer active at t (as illustrated in Figure 2). The endogeneity of individual ability will be treated later.

The deterministic component of the utility function captures the average benefits and the average cost for i of locating at k , and is independent of the career spell s :

$$V_{ikt(i)} \equiv B_{ikt(i)}(\cdot) - C_{ikt(i)}(\cdot). \quad (6)$$

We model the benefits ($B_{ikt(i)}$) as an increasing function of the attractiveness of the city where the university is located (proxied by the population density, $P_{kt(i)}$, and by the indicator of local democracy from Bosker, Buringh, and Van Zanden (2013), $D_{kt(i)}$), as well as of the adjusted notability of the university ($Q_{kt(i)}$), as suggested by anecdotal evidence. For example, Navarro-Brotons (2006) discusses the case of Jeronimo Munoz, who moved from Valencia to Salamanca in 1578. Although Munoz was one of the best paid professors at the University of Valencia, his salary was considerably lower than those paid at universities in Castille. The prestige of the University of Salamanca, and its greater proximity to the seat of royal power, was probably also a factor in Munoz's decision to accept Salamanca's offer. Furthermore, the effect of $Q_{kt(i)}$ can vary with the ability of the professor as, for example, high-ability professors benefit more (or less) from expected interactions with high-ability colleagues (e.g. Stephan and Levin 2001; Kerr, Kerr, and Lincoln 2015a; Kerr, Kerr,

and Lincoln 2015b; Kerr et al. 2017). We assume the following specification:

$$B_{ikt(i)} = a_0 + a_1Q_{kt(i)} + a_2P_{kt(i)} + a_3D_{kt(i)} + a_4q_iQ_{kt(i)} \quad (7)$$

where all coefficients are predicted to be non-negative.

We model the cost of locating at university k ($C_{ikt(i)}$) as an increasing function of the cost distance from the place of birth (d_{ik}) and of the competition for finding a job at university k in year $t(i)$. The competition for finding a job reflects the demand side of the academic market. Again, anecdotal evidence suggests that the recruitment policy of the best universities included efforts to attract international talent. To give two examples, Eloy (1755) reports that Leonhart Fuchs (after whom the plant fuchsia was named), a professor at Ingolstadt in 1526, was offered six hundred gold coins by the Duke of Tuscany, Como, to teach at the University of Pisa. Nadal (1861) discusses the case of the University of Valence, which was searching for a renowned legal scholar in 1583. They sent a messenger to convince a famous lawyer in Grenoble, Jean-Antoine de Lescure, to join the university. The latter reported that he would be willing to come for a salary of 1,500 pounds, provided his moving and house rental costs were covered by the university. They finally agreed on 1,200 pounds plus the house, partly paid by four merchants of the city. Later on, his colleague François Josserand became jealous of Lescure's treatment, threatened to go elsewhere, and obtained a pay rise.

We reasonably assume that the ‘‘competition cost’’ incurred by a professor increases with the attractiveness of the city ($P_{kt(i)}$ and $D_{kt(i)}$), as well as with the (adjusted) notability of the university ($Q_{kt(i)}$). However, we also allow the latter ‘‘competition cost’’ to be negatively affected by the individual level of ability, as high-ability professors have a higher market value and receive more generous offers from top universities. In line with the literature on self-selection in migration (e.g. Grogger and Hanson 2011; Beine, Docquier, and Ozden 2011; Kerr et al. 2017; Kerr et al. 2016), we allow the cost of distance to be negatively affected by the individual level of ability. We assume the following specification:

$$C_{ikt(i)} = b_0 + b_1Q_{kt(i)} + b_2P_{kt(i)} + b_3D_{kt(i)} + b_4q_iQ_{kt(i)} + b_5d_{ik} + b_6d_{ik}q_i \quad (8)$$

where b_4 and b_6 are predicted to be negative, whereas the other b s are expected to be non-negative.

Plugging (7) and (8) into (6) gives the expression for the net benefit of an (i, k) employment match. However, in our empirical regressions, we extend the number of generic determinants of location choices ($\mathbf{x}_{ikt(i)}$) to account for the imperfect coverage of our database and for unobserved heterogeneity. We add a university fixed effect, γ_k , which captures both the unobserved pull factors associated with university/city k that do not vary across years and the quality and extent of the sources used for each university. This yields:

$$V_{ikt(i)} \equiv \beta \mathbf{x}_{ikt(i)} = \beta_0 + \underbrace{\beta_1Q_{kt(i)} + \beta_2P_{kt(i)} + \beta_3D_{kt(i)}}_{\text{Agglomeration}} + \underbrace{\beta_4q_iQ_{kt(i)}}_{\text{Sorting}} + \underbrace{\beta_5d_{ik}}_{\text{Distance}} + \underbrace{\beta_6d_{ik}q_i}_{\text{Selection}} + \gamma_k \quad (9)$$

where β is a set of parameters that are common to all individuals and that can be estimated. Unlike standard (linear) regression models, the specification of the multinomial logit model depicted in Equation (5)

implies that the individual probability to take a position in a university k depends on the characteristics of all universities and cities. Any change in one of these characteristics impacts the whole system.

Identification. In line with (7) and (8), the constant is given by $\beta_0 \equiv a_0 - b_0$. Coefficients $\beta_1 \equiv a_1 - b_1$, $\beta_2 \equiv a_2 - b_2$ and $\beta_3 \equiv a_3 - b_3$ can be positive or negative and reflect the *agglomeration* (or dispersion) effects resulting from the attractiveness and competition effects. As the university fixed effect captures the mean level of agglomeration/dispersion forces throughout the entire time span covered by our sample, our estimation of these coefficients exploits the within (or demeaned) variations over time in the notability of universities and in the attractiveness of cities. Coefficients β_1 , β_2 and β_3 are identified by the fact that the number of scholars who decide to take a position in university k decreases when this university becomes worse in terms of quality (e.g., Spanish universities in periods 6 and 7) and when a city loses its communal freedom (e.g., Northern Italian cities after the Renaissance); by contrast, it increases when a city becomes relatively bigger (e.g., Amsterdam in periods 6 and 7).

Just as $V_{ikt(i)}$, the other determinants of location choices are dyadic by construction (sorting and selection terms) or in nature (distance), which makes their identification and estimation possible. Coefficient $\beta_4 \equiv a_4 - b_4$ is positive if high-ability scholars tend to agglomerate at better universities (what we refer to as *positive sorting*) due to higher benefits or smaller costs; it is identified by the fact that the best scholars are more likely to take a position in university k when its quality increases. Coefficient $\beta_5 \equiv -b_5$ is the standard *Distance* term capturing the expected negative effect of remoteness; it is identified by the fact that a given university attracts more scholars born in its vicinity than born far away. As for $\beta_6 \equiv -b_6$, it is positive if high-ability individuals are more mobile than lower-ability ones (what we refer to as *positive selection*);²⁸ it is identified by the fact that renowned scholars are less sensitive to distance and are more likely to take a position in a remote university than obscure scholars.

Finally, the multinomial logit expression (5) implies that variables that are not specific to a destination k , directly or through their interaction with individual characteristics, cannot be identified, as they would affect the net benefit of all (i, k) employment matches symmetrically. This explains why our set of regressors in (9) includes neither purely personal characteristics (such as the ability of scholar i *per se*) nor purely temporal phenomena (such as time fixed effects).

3.2 Results from the multinomial logit model

Table 4 contains the results of a standard multinomial logit regressions for the whole time span 1000-1800. The sample includes scholars who have been members of universities with comprehensive and broad coverage (see Appendix D). The estimations are obtained by using the `mlogit` package of Croissant (2012), which allows for varying choice sets. These regressions characterize the location choices of 27,606 scholars with a mean number of career spells equal to 1.14, which gives a total of 31,478 individual observations. Denoting the number of elements in set S , by \overline{S} , the mean number of institutions is equal to $E_i \overline{K_i} = 86$ (the total number $\overline{\cup_i K_i} = 127$). Our database includes 2.7 million possible dyadic matches. We focus here on the sign and significance of the agglomeration, distance, selection, and sorting terms. In all regressions, we control

²⁸Positive selection and sorting can also arise if the utility function (4) is not additively separable.

for institution fixed effects. The sizes of cities, $P_{kt} = \log(1 + \text{thousands of inhabitants})$ are obtained from Bairoch, Batou, and Chevre (1988). The level of local democracy, D_{kt} , is obtained from Bosker, Buringh, and Van Zanden (2013) who created a binary variable equal to one when cities could organize themselves and claim a kind of self-rule that was often acknowledged by the sovereign in return for taxes or loyalty. The first occurrences of communal self-government were identified in the 11th and 12th centuries in Spain and Italy. They spread across the rest of Europe in the following centuries. For all dates t at which P_{kt} and D_{kt} are not available, we impute the closest available data (for example, for population in 1240, we impute population in 1200).

Table 4: Multinomial logit regressions: results from a standard logit model

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Distance:						
d_{ik}	-1.733*** (0.006)	-1.729*** (0.006)	-1.824*** (0.009)	-1.727*** (0.006)	-1.818*** (0.009)	-1.833*** (0.008)
Agglomeration:						
$Q_{kt(i)}$ (notability of k)		0.150*** (0.005)	0.152*** (0.005)	0.115*** (0.006)	0.119*** (0.006)	0.225*** (0.005)
$P_{kt(i)}$ (pop. in city k)		0.118*** (0.019)	0.116*** (0.019)	0.119*** (0.019)	0.117*** (0.019)	0.047*** (0.006)
$D_{kt(i)}$ (democracy in k)		0.171*** (0.035)	0.177*** (0.036)	0.165*** (0.035)	0.171*** (0.036)	0.046*** (0.017)
Selection:						
$d_{ik}q_i$			0.046*** (0.003)		0.045*** (0.003)	0.066*** (0.002)
Sorting:						
$Q_{kt(i)}q_i$				0.017*** (0.001)	0.015*** (0.001)	0.012*** (0.001)
k FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
N. Obs.	31,478	31,478	31,478	31,478	31,478	31,478
Log Likelihood	-67,847	-67,326	-67,166	-67,254	-67,106	-71,965

Notes: Estimation of the multinomial logit model involving Eqs. (5) and (9) using the package `mlogit` in R ($t - stat$ in parentheses). Cols. (1) to (5) include university fixed effects. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

The regression in col. (1) can be seen as a textbook gravity equation, including distance d_{ik} and mass (in the fixed effect γ_k). This standard gravity regression shows that the probability of observing a scholar-university match decreases with the cost distance between the birthplace and the university location. This effect remains strong in all specifications. The coefficient of distance is above unity, $\hat{b}_5 = -\hat{\beta}_5 > 1$, which is unsurprisingly greater than in the contemporary era. Focusing on the stock of international migrants in 2010, Beine, Docquier, and Ozden (2011) find a coefficient of 0.7 for all migrants and of 0.35 for college-educated migrants. Focusing on current academic researchers, Fink, Miguelez, and Raffo (2013) find a smaller coefficient around 0.2. Agglomeration forces are added in col. (2). Scholars are attracted by the notability of the university, the size of the city, and the level of local democracy. Notice that due to the presence of university fixed effects, the

agglomeration effects are identified through the variations in institutional notability, city size, and democracy over time, while the effect of distance is identified through the spatial variation in d_{ik} . In col. (3), we add the interaction between distance and individual human capital $d_{ik}q_i$. This term is positive, which suggests that the most notable professors were more mobile than others (*positive selection*). In col. (4), we interact the individual human capital index with the notability of the university. We find evidence of *positive sorting*: the most notable professors were more likely to settle in more prestigious universities. Putting all regressors together in col. (5) shows that agglomeration, selection, and sorting are all significant. Using the values of the log likelihoods, we can compute some simple LR tests: comparing (2) to (1), we can reject the null hypothesis that there is no agglomeration effect. Similarly, comparing (5) to (2), we reject the absence of selection and sorting. To illustrate, university fixed effects are excluded in col. (6); all results are similar with the exception of the local population effect, which becomes insignificant.

To determine whether the coefficient of distance is stable over time, we also ran a specification with distance interacted with a period (τ) dummy. This allows us to test whether the speed of travel improved before 1800. The eight estimated coefficients are: -1.225, -1.301, -1.684, -1.737, -1.698, -1.816, -1.843, and -1.850. The coefficient is thus quite stable over the last 5 periods, but lower during the Middle Ages, and especially during the periods before the Black Death. The other coefficients are unaffected, except the effect of communal freedom, which is reinforced. The unexpected non-decreasing pattern in this coefficient reflects that there was little progress in the quality of roads until the 18th century (Bogart 2011), and little innovation in traveling by boat before the invention of steamboats in the 19th century. The lower cost of moving during the Middle Ages may reflect weaker national states, and also the lower density of universities in this period.

The coefficient of the interaction term $Q_{kt(i)}q_i$ captures the fact that high-quality scholars are more sensitive to the reputation of the university when solving the location-decision problem that they face, and/or that higher-quality universities reward scholars' quality more (i.e. higher wages per unit of quality). Remember that the few wages we observe are generally positively correlated with q_i at different points in history (see Appendix F). This is in line with our assumption that a higher level of q_i usually translates into a higher level of remuneration.²⁹

In a non-linear model, the coefficients cannot be interpreted in terms of predicted probability as the effect of a change in a variable depends on the values of all variables in the model. To put it differently, the effect depends on where we evaluate it: the derivatives of the choice probabilities are given by $\frac{\partial p_{isk}}{x_{ik}} = \beta p_{isk}(1 - p_{isk})$, which is largest when $p_{isk} = 0.5$. For this reason, our coefficients β can only be interpreted as the effect of x_{ik} on indirect utility. This will be very clear at the beginning of the next section, where we will simulate the model with and without selection and sorting for a person with a high q_i , and compare with another

²⁹We may further want to include q_i among the determinants of location-specific utility, allowing its coefficient to vary across alternatives. This is standard in the estimation of a multinomial logit model with variables that are individual but not alternative specific. Still under the assumption that wages are proportional to q_i , it would purge the estimated coefficient of $Q_{kt(i)}q_i$ from the confounding effect of differences in wages across universities. Including these choice-specific terms, we obtain $\overline{U_i K_i} = 127$ more parameters to estimate. The estimated coefficients of these q_i s vary from one university to the other, as does the university fixed factor. They also sometimes have a negative value, which is hard to interpret in the context where scholars would be remunerated in proportion to their q_i . In this new specification, the interaction term $Q_{kt(i)}q_i$ is weakened but remains highly significant (0.007 (0.002) instead of 0.015 (0.001)) despite the inclusion of many terms correlated with q_i . The three agglomeration effects are barely affected.

one with a low q_i . The results in Table 4 also indicate that the effect of positive selection is relatively small, albeit non negligible: when q_i is around 10 (scholars at the top of the ability distribution), the utility loss due to distance is reduced by just 25%. By contrast, the effect of positive sorting is large: when q_i is around 10, sorting increases the gains from settling in a more prestigious university or in a more attractive city by a factor of 2.26 as compared with obscure scholars (i.e. $q_i = 0$). Besides the standard distance term, agglomeration and positive sorting are important forces governing the mobility decisions of academic scholars. Table E.6 in Appendix E shows that our estimation results are highly robust to the choice of σ and ω .

3.3 Heterogeneous effects

The benchmark assumption of a constant university fixed effect across fields of knowledge and across years (γ_k) is made for simplicity. In practice, the attractiveness of a university varied over time and across fields of study. To solve this problem, we separately re-estimate the multinomial logit (5) after excluding some periods (τ), some fields of study, and some regions of birth. As for the fields, we distinguish between Theology, Law, Medicine, and Science. The field(s) of a scholar are mostly identified through the courses taught. Law includes both canon and civil law. Medicine includes Anatomy, Surgery, and Pharmacy. Sciences include Mathematics, Logic, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Astronomy, Earth Science, Geography, and Botany. One should be aware that the distinction between these fields is a bit arbitrary, in particular when going back in time. For example, the theologians Thomas Aquinas and Albertus of Saxonia spent time reconciling the Aristotelian view of a finite world with the Christian view of an infinite God. In doing so, they contributed to the development of the mathematical notion of limit (Sergescu 1939). Pierre Gassendi (1592-1655) is known as an astronomer (a crater on the moon was named after him), but was a professor of theology at Aix-en-Provence.

In Table 5, we separately estimate the multinomial logit (a) for five periods (i.e. 1000 to 1526, 1200 to 1617, 1348 to 1685, 1450 to 1733, and 1527 to 1800), (b) after excluding one field at a time (i.e. Theology, Law, Medicine, and Science), and (c) after excluding one region of origin at a time. We successively exclude the Low Countries (Benelux), Germany (as of today), France (as of today), Italy, and the British Isles (currently the United Kingdom and Ireland). Our 14 sub-samples include smaller numbers of observations. In each of these sub-samples, the portfolio of possible universities differs. For example, when we exclude scholars born in Germany, some German universities cannot be included in the estimation as only German scholars worked there during their existence.

The effect of distance is always negative and highly significant. As far as agglomeration forces are concerned, the notability of the university is always positive and significant. The attracting effect of city size is always positive, with the exception of the first period. The effect of communal freedom, which is found to be important in general by Serafinelli and Tabellini (2017) in their study of the migration patterns (from birth to death) of creative people, is found to be significant in most sub-samples. The estimates by region show that Italy is key to identifying this effect, as communal freedom stops being significant when one removes Italian scholars from the sample. Italian cities are unique in that many lost their freedom during the Renaissance. This echoes the study of Buonanno et al. (2019) who show that territories with communal freedom in the Middle Ages display more positive features and attitudes today than territories without such freedom. As

Table 5: Multinomial logit regressions: heterogeneous effects

	Distance	Agglomeration			Selec	Sorting	Nb of obs.
	d_{ik}	$Q_{kt(i)}$	$P_{ikt(i)}$	$D_{ikt(i)}$	$d_{ik}q_i$	$Q_{kt(i)}q_i$	
Benchmark	-1.818***	0.119***	0.117***	0.171***	0.045***	0.015***	31,478
	By period (τ)						
1000-1526	-1.787***	0.216***	-0.019	0.545***	0.072***	0.006**	9,320
1200-1617	-1.819***	0.171***	0.118***	0.341***	0.065***	-0.004**	15,736
1348-1685	-1.837***	0.113***	0.117***	0.293***	0.051***	0.000	19,792
1450-1733	-1.849***	0.067***	0.258***	0.397***	0.047***	0.012***	20,471
1527-1800	-1.820***	0.027***	0.252***	0.461***	0.038***	0.025***	22,093
	By field						
W/o Theology	-1.819***	0.124***	0.172***	0.245***	0.047***	0.014***	25,017
W/o Law	-1.833***	0.106***	0.124***	0.093**	0.040***	0.018***	22,535
W/o Medicine	-1.797***	0.116***	0.126***	0.194***	0.041***	0.015***	26,753
W/o Sciences	-1.833***	0.131***	0.102***	0.173***	0.048***	0.012***	28,043
	By region of origin						
W/o Benelux	-1.799***	0.123***	0.089***	0.174***	0.045***	0.016***	29,818
W/o Germany	-1.782***	0.164***	0.073***	0.190***	0.041***	0.009***	23,655
W/o France	-1.772***	0.109***	0.098***	0.169***	0.039***	0.019***	27,838
W/o Italy	-1.774***	0.079***	0.241***	0.070	0.033***	0.020***	21,473
W/o UK/Irl	-1.808***	0.108***	0.063***	0.156***	0.053***	0.015***	29,827

Notes: Estimation of the multinomial logit model (Equation (5)) by period using the package `mlogit` in R ($t - stat$ in parentheses). All columns include university fixed effects. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

for positive selection, the effect is positive and significant in all cases, more prevalent for theology and sciences. Finally, the sorting term is positive and significant in most sub-samples as well. It is smaller and less significant in the first periods, when agglomeration forces are stronger. Overall, despite smaller numbers of observations, our results are fairly robust across sub-samples.

The results by period can be used to consider the effect of Protestantism on the academic market. The period 1000-1526 ends with the creation of the first Protestant university, Marburg. The period 1527-1800 covers a divided world, where many scholars had to change religions if they wanted to keep their positions, while others decided to migrate to a region where their religion was accepted. Others converted voluntarily and this changed their approach to science.³⁰ In the period before the Reformation, the agglomeration force attracting all scholars to the most notable universities is very strong (coefficient of $Q_{kt(i)}$ around 0.216). Positive sorting seems negligible then. In the post-Reformation period, it is the opposite. The agglomeration force weakens (the coefficient is about 0.027), but sorting is strong, indicating that the ability of top universities to attract professors became confined to top scholars. It is as if the Reformation slowed down the mobility

³⁰An example is Nicolas Steno (from Table 3). Born to a Lutheran family and known for his groundbreaking contributions to geology, he converted to Catholicism and moved away from the natural sciences to embrace theology.

of average scholars. This is confirmed by the increase in the coefficient associated with the cost of distance.

3.4 Sample selection

Our database does not include the universe of professors. This implies two sources of sample selection issues: (i) many obscure scholars are not included in the sample, and (ii) there is a considerable heterogeneity in the coverage of institutions. We assess whether our results are robust to sample selection. Results are reported in col. (2) and col. (3) of Table 6. We report our benchmark results in col. (1).

As far as scholars are concerned, some are included in the sample but data on their place of birth are missing. This is usually the case for less well known professors. Indeed, among the scholars with a known birthplace, 52% have a positive q_i . This proportion drops to 14% for those with an unknown birthplace. Hence, our sample is likely to overweight top-quality professors (high q_i) and underweight the less well known (low q_i). This is a limitation because the co-existence of professors who are famous and those who are not is key to identifying selection and sorting patterns. To measure the importance of sample selection, we re-estimate the multinomial logit (5) by making the sample less selective. To do so, we use the identified scholars of unknown origin, and assume that they were born in the city of their university, implying $d_{ik} = \ln(\text{cost}^{\min})$ for them.

Col. (2) shows the results obtained when assuming that all identified scholars from unknown origin are locals. This increases the sample size by one third, reinforces substantially the positive selection effect (almost doubling the corresponding coefficient), and increases the agglomeration terms; positive sorting is not much affected. These results suggest that if we had observed the whole universe of scholars, which contains many more unknown people born locally, positive selection would appear stronger while leaving sorting unaffected. Hence, our benchmark estimates might give a lower bound on selection.

As far as institutions are concerned, our benchmark regression sample excludes universities with fewer than 10 scholars in total and those with partial coverage. We relax the latter constraint in col. (3) of Table 6, which increases the sample by about 1,500 observations. Our empirical results are highly robust to these changes. In col. (4), we restrict our working sample to universities with at least 20 scholars (instead of 10 in the benchmark). This amounts to reduce the sample size (by 37%) as well as the choice set of every scholar by removing some small universities. We lose the significance of the population and communal freedom variables, probably because some important cities for identifying this effect were removed, but selection and sorting mechanisms are reinforced.

3.5 Treatment of repeat movers

Remember that 12.0% of our scholars are linked to more than one university and we count each dyadic match as one observation. This raises two potential issues. Firstly, the weight of repeat movers exceeds that of one-time movers. As the number of career spells increases with human capital, this reinforces the over-representation of renowned scholars in our database. Secondly, by assuming that career-spell-specific choices are independent, we ignore the possibility that movers may have had correlated preferences.

Table 6: Multinomial logit regressions: robustness to selection and coverage

	Benchm	Sample	Adding	Limited cov.
		Unknown	partial cov.	$\Lambda_{kt} \geq 20$
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
d_{ik}	-1.818*** (0.009)	-1.964*** (0.008)	-1.775*** (0.008)	-1.855*** (0.014)
$Q_{kt(i)}$	0.119*** (0.006)	0.136*** (0.006)	0.122*** (0.006)	0.064*** (0.009)
P_{kt}	0.117*** (0.019)	0.128*** (0.018)	0.138*** (0.018)	0.005 (0.031)
D_{kt}	0.171*** (0.036)	0.191*** (0.035)	0.152*** (0.034)	-0.065 (0.042)
$d_{ik}q_i$	0.045*** (0.003)	0.071*** (0.002)	0.039*** (0.002)	0.048*** (0.004)
$Q_{kt(i)}q_i$	0.015*** (0.001)	0.015*** (0.001)	0.012*** (0.001)	0.026*** (0.002)
FE	yes	yes	yes	yes
N. Obs.	31,478	42,597	32,918	19,728
Log Likelihood	-67,106	-69,416	-74,583	-31,560

Notes: Estimation of the multinomial logit model (Equation (5)) using the package `mlogit` in R (*t - stat* in parentheses). Col. (1) recalls the benchmark results. In Col. (2), scholars with unknown birthplace are assigned the minimal distance (3.5kms) from their university. In Col. (3), we include all universities with at least. In Col. (4), we exclude universities with less than 20 recorded scholars. All columns include university fixed effects. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 7: Robustness to Repeat Movers, Mixed and Nested logit

	Benchm	Removing	Repeat movers	Mixed	Nested
	(1)	repeat movers	linked to 1 univ.	logit	logit
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
d_{ik}	-1.818*** (0.009)	-1.953*** (0.011)	-1.873*** (0.009)	-2.103*** (0.014)	-1.370*** (0.011)
$Q_{kt(i)}$	0.119*** (0.006)	0.135*** (0.007)	0.146*** (0.006)	0.124*** (0.006)	0.084*** (0.005)
P_{kt}	0.117*** (0.019)	0.122*** (0.023)	0.118*** (0.021)	0.106*** (0.020)	0.075*** (0.014)
D_{kt}	0.171*** (0.036)	0.262*** (0.041)	0.272*** (0.039)	0.220*** (0.039)	0.129*** (0.028)
$d_{ik}q_i$	0.045*** (0.003)	0.015*** (0.004)	0.023*** (0.003)	0.050*** (0.003)	0.042*** (0.002)
$Q_{kt(i)}q_i$	0.015*** (0.001)	0.022*** (0.002)	0.011*** (0.002)	0.017*** (0.002)	0.010*** (0.001)
ψ_1 (low)					0.626*** (0.013)
ψ_2					0.618*** (0.008)
ψ_3					0.611*** (0.008)
ψ_4 (high)					0.694*** (0.008)
FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
N. Obs.	31,478	24,672	27,133	31,478	31,478
Log Likelihood	-67,106	-44,153	-54,074	-66,236	-66,424

Notes: Estimation of the multinomial logit model (Equation (5)) using the package `mlogit` in R ($t - stat$ in parentheses). Col. (1) recalls the benchmark results. In Col. (2), we exclude repeat movers. In Col. (3), we randomly assign repeat movers to a single university that they visited. In Col. (4), we estimate Equation (5) with a mixed logit; the six variance parameters are estimated as well, four of them exhibit a variance that significantly differs from zero (variance of the coefficients of d_{ik} , D_{kt} , $d_{ik}Q$, and $Q_{kt}Q$). In Col. (5), we estimate a nested logit model, with nest defined as quartiles of universities in terms of notability. The estimated coefficients ψ_m are the within-nest dissimilarity parameters. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

The first problem can be easily addressed by removing repeat movers from the regression sample, which eliminates many famous scholars, or by linking them to a single university. We do both and, when following the second option, randomly select one of their affiliations. Solving the problem of correlated career spells is more complicated. To account for it, we generalize the standard logit model by relaxing the hypothesis of independence of individual choices. The independence property can be unrealistic in many settings, especially in situations with repeated choices over time. We can expect unobserved factors that affect a decision maker to persist over time. In a multinomial logit, we cannot include individual fixed effects since they would not affect the probability that a university k dominates another university k' . A more general deterministic component of utility can be written $V_{ikt(i)} = \beta_i \mathbf{x}_{ikt(i)}$, where β_i is a vector of coefficients that is unobserved for each i and varies randomly across professors, representing their tastes. This specification is the same as for the logit except that now the coefficients β_i vary in the population rather than being fixed. In particular, the coefficient β_i can be expressed as the sum of a population mean, $\bar{\beta}$, and an individual deviation, η_i , such that their utility of moving to destination k is written $U_{iskt(i)} = \bar{\beta} \mathbf{x}_{ikt(i)} + \eta_i \mathbf{x}_{ikt(i)} + \epsilon_{isk}$. The last two terms of such a *Random-Parameter Logit* capture the unobserved portion of utility. In other words, the marginal effect on the latent dependent variable is individual specific. The same tastes are used by the decision maker for each career spell and the variance in β_i induces correlation in utility across destinations and career spells.

How these parameters vary across individuals is unknown. The mixed logit model assumes that these parameters vary according to the population PDF $g(\beta_i|\theta)$, where θ represents the moments of the distribution such as the mean and the variance, which must be estimated. A fully parametric mixed logit model arises once $g(\beta_i|\theta)$ is specified. We assume that the coefficient vector is independent and normally distributed, $\beta_i \sim N(\bar{\beta}, \sigma^2)$. The unobserved portion of utility is correlated across destinations and career stages due to the common influence of η_i , which violates the IIA property of the standard logit (Revelt and Train 1998). The full parametric model can be estimated using the simulated maximum-likelihood procedure (Sarrias et al. 2016).

In col. (2) of Table 7, we show that most of our results are highly robust to the exclusion of repeat movers. Compared to the benchmark specification of col. (1), removing repeat movers increases the magnitude of the agglomeration and gravity terms. As for sorting and selection, their identification relies on the difference between famous and obscure scholars in the sensitivity of location choices to institutional quality and distance. Remember repeat movers exhibit an average ability index that is 2.3 times greater than the mean; they account for 12% of our scholars and are linked to 2.4 universities, on average. Removing them from the sample decreases the number of observed dyads by 21.6% (from 31,478 to 24,672) and eliminates many famous scholars at the upper end of the ability distribution. The sorting term resists this change and its magnitude is drastically strengthened compared to the benchmark. This is important because we will see it is the effect that is driving our simulation results in Section 4. By contrast, the selection term is reduced by two thirds compared with the benchmark. Instead of removing entirely the repeat movers, we keep them but associate them with only one of their affiliations (randomly chosen) in col. (3). Compared with col. (2), the drop in selection term is less pronounced; the coefficient is equal to half of the level obtained in the benchmark regression. This demonstrates once again that including famous and obscure scholars is key to identifying sorting and selection patterns. In particular, the magnitude of the selection term are strongly governed by the fact that the location choices of (high-ability) repeat movers are less sensitive to distance than those of

lower-ability scholars.

In col. (4) of Table 7, we relax the assumption of independent career choices for multi-destination scholars, and estimate a mixed logit model with individual-specific vectors of coefficients drawn from a normal distribution. The agglomeration, selection, and sorting mechanisms are preserved. Although the mixed logit entails six additional parameters (the s.e. of the six coefficients – not reported), a likelihood ratio test would reject the benchmark formulation in favor of the mixed logit formulation. The mixed logit has a disadvantage though: the estimates are obtained by simulation, while in the multinomial logit, a likelihood function is maximized. In addition, the results depend on the assumption regarding the distribution of the random parameters.

3.6 Endogeneity of q_i

The most problematic endogeneity issue arises because the ability of each professor i is measured by an index of human capital observed a long time after the end of her career (q_i), which is likely to be influenced by the quality of the university that was chosen. This means that we should distinguish between \bar{q}_i , the innate/exogenous level of ability, and q_i , the ex-post level of notability. Let us denote by k^* the university chosen by a scholar. Ideally, we should use \bar{q}_i to estimate the multinomial logit (5). However, we only observe q_i , and this ex post level might be affected by $Q_{k^*t(i)}$, the notability of the chosen university. This implies that we do not observe the potential level of human capital if the individual had been working at a different university k . Assume for example that $q_i = \bar{q}_i + \theta Q_{k^*t(i)}$ and denote by $\bar{V}_{ikt(i)}$ the indirect utility level obtained after replacing q_i by \bar{q}_i in Eq. (9).

In theory, the multinomial logit implies that university k dominates university k' if $\bar{V}_{ikt(i)} + \epsilon_{isk} > \bar{V}_{ik't(i)} + \epsilon_{isk'}$, which only depends on the characteristics of individual i and universities k and k' . In practice, we are unable to model $\bar{V}_{ikt(i)}$ and $\bar{V}_{ik't(i)}$ properly because our measure of individual human capital is k^* -specific (i.e. influenced by $Q_{k^*t(i)}$). The endogeneity of q_i implies that the difference in utility is measured with additional noise: university k dominates university k' if

$$\bar{V}_{ikt(i)} + \epsilon_{isk} > \bar{V}_{ik't(i)} + \epsilon_{isk'} + \theta Q_{k^*t(i)} \Delta_{ikk't(i)}, \quad (10)$$

where $\Delta_{ikk't(i)} \equiv \beta_4 (Q_{kt(i)} - Q_{k't(i)}) + \beta_6 (d_{ik} - d_{ik'})$ results from the two interaction terms that are affected by our noisy measure of individual human capital in Eq. (9). The term $+\theta Q_{k^*t(i)} \Delta_{ikk't(i)}$ in Eq. (10) is correlated across destinations, due to the presence of $Q_{k^*t(i)}$. Hence, the inability to observe \bar{q}_i leads to the violation of the IIA property.

To mitigate this problem, we estimate a nested logit model (McFadden 1978) where nests are defined as groups of universities sharing similar levels of notability ($Q_{kt(i)} \approx Q_{k't(i)}$) during the years of activity of individual i . We partition the choice set $K_{t(i)}$ into four groups of alternatives, $K_{mt(i)}$ with $m = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ for the top, mid-high, mid-low, and bottom universities. Our partition is based on the notability index observed in the 4th and 5th periods. Each university belongs to exactly one nest. Building on Ortega and Peri (2013) and Bertoli and Moraga (2015), we assume that the individual random taste shock is a mixture of

a location-specific and a nest-specific term:

$$\epsilon_{isk} = \psi_m v_{isk} + (1 - \psi_m) v_{im},$$

where $\psi_m \in [0, 1]$ is the weight associated with the location-specific term, v_{isk} , which is assumed to be independently and identically distributed as EVT-I; and v_{im} is an error term that is specific to the m^{th} nest ($k \in K_{mt(i)}$), whose distribution depends on ψ such that the marginal distribution of ϵ_{isk} is also EVT-I (Cardell 1997). Parameter ψ_m also determines the mutual correlation in the realizations of the nest-specific error term. We have $\psi_m = \sqrt{1 - \rho_m}$, where ρ_m represents the correlation coefficient within nest m . Hence, ψ_m is a dissimilarity parameter. The higher ψ_m , the smaller the weight of the nest-specific component and the smaller the within-nest correlation of error term. When $\psi_m = 1$ for all m , the nested logit boils down to the standard multinomial logit ($\epsilon_{isk} = v_{isk}$).

The nested logit model assumes a generalized version of the EVT-I distribution, such that (i) the mean error varies across nests, and (ii) alternatives within a nest exhibit mutually correlated error terms (but the same mean). On the contrary, the error terms of two alternatives belonging to different nests are uncorrelated but have different means. In our context, this difference in the means captures the component of the error term $\theta Q_{k^*t(i)} \Delta_{ikk't(i)}$ and hence corrects for the endogeneity bias. It reflects the influence of the chosen university on individual quality. Within a nest, this component is close to zero because $\Delta_{ikk't(i)} \approx 0$. Notice that this technique to correct for the endogeneity bias is possible only because the q_i always appears interacted with a variable for which we can build nests, and never appears alone (it cannot explain location choice alone as it is not destination specific).

The probability of individual i choosing university $k \in K_{mt(i)}$ is equal to the product of the probability of choosing alternatives in nest $K_{mt(i)}$ and the probability of choosing exactly k in $K_{mt(i)}$ (Heiss et al. 2002). It is given by

$$p_{iskt(i)} = \frac{\exp(\beta \mathbf{x}_{ikt(i)} / \psi_m)}{\exp(IV_{mt(i)})} \times \frac{\exp(IV_{mt(i)} \psi_m)}{\sum_{m'} \exp(IV_{m't(i)} \psi_m)} \quad \forall t, \quad (\text{II})$$

where $I V_{mt(i)} = \ln \sum_{k' \in K_{mt(i)}} \exp(\beta \mathbf{x}_{ikt(i)} / \psi_m)$ is the inclusive value of each nest $K_{mt(i)}$, representing the rescaled measure of attractiveness of the nest for individual i (i.e. the expected value of the utility individual i obtains from the alternatives in nest $K_{mt(i)}$).

Results are provided in col. (5) of Table 7. Compared to the benchmark, the effects of agglomeration are weakened but still positive and highly significant; part of the agglomeration force is likely to be captured by the nest-specific error term. The selection coefficient is slightly greater. Sorting is weakened but remains highly significant and important compared to the agglomeration effect: when q_i is around 10, positive sorting increases the gains from settling in a more prestigious university by a factor of 2. Note that we reject the assumption of no nests, either through a likelihood ratio test ($\text{lr}=611.413$), or by testing whether the correlations within nests are zero, or equivalently $\psi_m = 1 \quad \forall n$ ($\text{Wald}=363.622$, $\text{p-val}=0.000$). We also reject that the degree of correlation inside each nest is the same, $\psi_m = \psi_{t(i)} \quad \forall m$ ($\text{Wald}=162.467$, $\text{p-val}=0.000$).

4 Implications for the Scientific Revolution

Firstly, we assess the estimated effect of the determinants of location decisions (x_{ikt}) on individual choice probabilities by comparing simulated outcomes with counterfactual experiments. We focus on the role of agglomeration, positive selection, and positive sorting for two scholars who were born in the same region in the first period (the period with the smallest choice set), but who exhibit different levels of human capital. We first consider Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), who was born in Roccasecca and taught theology at Paris for twenty years (1252-1272) and at Naples. Thomas Aquinas belongs to the very top of the ability distribution (ranked 9th, $q = 11.66$). Aquinas's choice set consists of 24 universities. We then consider Roffredus Beneventanus (1170-1243), who was born in Benevento, taught law at Naples (1170-1243), and is in the middle of the distribution ($q = 2.83$). As he was born 50 years before Thomas Aquinas, Roffredus Beneventanus's choice set consists of just 20 universities. In Table 8, we compare the predicted location probabilities of the full specification of Table 4, with those of a restricted model in which the coefficients of the selection and sorting terms are set to zero. For both scholars, the set of universities is ranked by decreasing order of the predicted probability generated by the full specification.

Unsurprisingly, positive selection implies a broader menu of effective options, whereas agglomeration forces and positive sorting increase the attractiveness of famous universities. The effects are balanced by the extent of each scholar's notability. Our estimated model shows that the most likely locations for Thomas Aquinas are Bologna (32.2%), Naples (17.7%), Paris (13.9%) and Padova (11.7%). Neutralizing the positive selection term increases the probability of choosing a good location closest to his birthplace (Naples) to the detriment of Bologna and Paris. Neutralizing the positive sorting and agglomeration term drastically decreases the attractiveness of Paris. Overall, the basic gravity model predicts a low probability of choosing Paris (0.9%). The combination of agglomeration, selection, and positive sorting increases this probability by a factor of 15, and increases the probability of choosing Bologna by a factor of 4.

For Roffredus Beneventanus, who has less human capital (q_i), the selection and sorting effects are weaker. Our estimated model shows that the most likely location is Naples (36.0%). Compared to Thomas Aquinas, Roffredus Beneventanus is more sensitive to distance, and less sensitive to the notability of the university or to agglomeration effects. Removing the sorting effect or the agglomeration effect increases the probability of choosing Padua, Salerno, and Pisa, at the expense of Bologna, Montpellier, and Paris. When removing the selection effect, similar changes are obtained. The basic gravity model also predicts that Naples and Padua are the two most attractive universities, for both Roffredus Beneventanus and Thomas Aquinas, and that the probability of choosing Paris or Bologna, the best universities in this period, are similar for both (a bit higher in fact for Beneventanus, because his choice set is more limited). However, unlike for Thomas Aquinas, the combination of agglomeration, positive selection, and positive sorting increases the probability of choosing Paris and Bologna by a factor of 4 to 2 only.³¹

³¹It is also interesting to consider the case of Adam Smith. He was very down on the universities of his time – with the exception of Scottish universities. His estimated choice probabilities are quite consistent with his opinion: out of 116 universities, the estimated “ranking” is: 1. University of Edinburgh (28.34%), 2. University of Cambridge (6.81%), 3. University of Oxford (4.57%), 4. University of Glasgow (3.84%), 5. University of Paris (3.54%), ..., 69. University of Toulouse (0.24%). He wrote about the university of Oxford, where he studied, that “the greater part of the public professors have, for these many years, given up altogether even the pretence of teaching” (Smith (1776), Book V, part III, chap. 1). Incentives to teach were too low. According

Table 8: Role of selection and sorting: two examples

	Estimated	No agglom	No selec.	No sorting	Gravity
Thomas Aquinas ($K_i= 24$)					
Ubologna-1088	32.2%	22.4%	27.7%	18.3%	8.1%
Unapoli-1224	17.7%	21.6%	34.1%	25.5%	44.7%
Uparis-1200	13.9%	6.2%	6.7%	5.6%	0.9%
Upadua-1222	11.7%	15.1%	10.7%	16.8%	14.7%
Upisa-1343	11.1%	14.4%	10.8%	16.2%	15.2%
Usalerno-1231	2.5%	4.4%	4.0%	3.6%	7.7%
Umontpellier-1289	1.6%	2.1%	1.0%	2.3%	1.4%
Others (13)	9.2%	13.9%	5.8%	11.7%	7.4%
Beneventanus Roffredus ($K_i= 20$)					
Unapoli-1224	36.0%	37.3%	38.5%	37.4%	40.9%
Usalerno-1231	24.0%	25.3%	27.2%	23.5%	27.7%
Ubologna-1088	12.5%	8.5%	10.9%	11.2%	6.5%
Upadua-1222	11.8%	12.9%	10.4%	12.3%	11.6%
Upisa-1343	8.5%	9.4%	7.5%	8.9%	8.4%
Uparis-1200	2.6%	1.1%	1.9%	2.1%	0.7%
Umontpellier-1289	1.3%	1.2%	1.0%	1.3%	1.0%
Others (10)	3.2%	4.2%	2.5%	3.4%	3.3%

Notes: For the two scholars concerned, we compare the predicted location probabilities of the full specification of Table 4 in Col. (1), with those of a restricted model in which the coefficients of the agglomeration (Col. (2)), selection (Col. (3)) and sorting (Col. (4)) terms are individual set to zero, or jointly set to zero (Col. (5)). In the latter case, the (gravity) model only includes distance and university fixed effects.

Secondly, we go beyond individual cases by using our estimated model to simulate the contribution of agglomeration, positive selection, and positive sorting to total university output by year. We construct a proxy for the total output of university k in year t , denoted by Y_{kt} , which is an aggregation of the human capital of all scholars predicted to work there. Denoting the number of active scholars in year t by $\Lambda_t = \{i | t_i^b \leq t \leq t_i^f\}$, we define Y_{kt} as a CES (constant elasticity of substitution) combination of the ability levels of its predicted members:

$$Y_{kt} = \left(\sum_{i \in \Lambda_t} \hat{p}_{ikt} q_i^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}}, \quad (12)$$

where \hat{p}_{ikt} is the weight given to professor i at university k in year t . We set it equal to the simulated probability that i goes to k from the multinomial logit model – like the probabilities shown in Table 8 for two cases. It

to Smith, it would have been better to have professors paid by students and not by the university. He was convinced that the governance and incentives offered by Scottish universities (a small fixed wage, plus fees paid by students) better guaranteed a high quality. This opinion did not prevent him from leaving in 1763 his chair at Glasgow university to become the tutor of the young Duke of Buccleugh during his trip to France (notably to Toulouse). This way, he more than doubled his salary in addition to a lifetime pension once his tutoring was over (Rae 1895); see also Appendix F.

differs from the actual probability \bar{p}_{ikt} , which is equal to one if scholar i was affiliated with university k at year t . Parameter σ represents the elasticity of substitution between academic scholars' human capital in producing scientific knowledge, assumed to be equal to the elasticity of substitution between the top-5 scholars in producing notability in Eq. (3).

The simulated output Y_{kt} should be interpreted as including advancement to knowledge, quality of teaching, and service to society (such as supplying cautious physicians, rigorous lawyers to the local courts, or well-educated priests and pastors to parishes). Then, we compare the total simulated output,

$$Y_t = \sum_k Y_{kt}, \quad (13)$$

in the benchmark – we use the term “benchmark” for the simulation and for the regression model – with the counterfactual output levels obtained after neutralizing the agglomeration, positive selection, and sorting terms (separately or jointly). Hence, the important point here is not the level of Y_t in itself, but the gap between Y_t with and without academic market forces. We define the university output gain due to market forces as the difference between the predicted academic output and the counterfactual level, expressed as percentage of deviation from the counterfactual level.

When the elasticity of substitution tends to infinity ($\sigma = \infty$), we have perfect substitutability between scholars. The total output is the sum of individual human capital, independent of location (represented by the $\hat{p}_{ikt(i)}$):


$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow \infty} Y_t = \sum_k \sum_{i \in \Lambda_t} \hat{p}_{ikt(i)} q_i = \sum_{i \in \Lambda_t} q_i.$$

Hence, there is no gain to expect from market forces. By contrast, when σ is finite, there is a complementarity relationship between academic scholars. The smaller σ , the greater the knowledge gain from agglomerating high-ability scholars at the same university, and the agglomeration of the highest ability scholars leads to output gains. In our benchmark regressions and simulations, we use a CES production function with $\sigma = 2$, in line with the definition of the notability of the university in Eq. (3).


Figure 4 shows the university output gains obtained with the benchmark model (i.e. standard multinomial logit (ML) model with $\sigma = 2$) in the top Panel (a), and with alternative estimates in the bottom Panel (b). In Panel (b), we compare the total output gain obtained with the benchmark model, with that obtained under the nested logit (NL) variant, and under the high-complementarity variant (i.e. multinomial logit model with $\sigma = 1.2$). Focusing on the benchmark model in Panel (a), the black curve shows the output gains from academic market forces (i.e., agglomeration, selection and sorting jointly). These gains are obtained after neutralizing the effect of agglomeration, positive selection, and positive sorting on $\hat{p}_{ikt(i)}$ in the multinomial logit model, while keeping the distance term and the university fixed effects (i.e. basic gravity). The other curves in gray show the gain from agglomeration, sorting and selection forces in isolation. We find that market forces increase the total output of Europe by about 55% before the Black Death (32 universities), by about 35% before the invention of the printing press (49 universities), and by 30% after the rise of Protestantism (140 universities), at the beginning of the Scientific Revolution.

It is worth noticing that academic market forces do not necessarily increase total simulated output, as ap-

Figure 4: University output gain from market forces by year (1000-1800)



(a) Effect of agglomeration, selection and sorting (benchmark ML with $\sigma = 2$)



(b) Gains from market forces (benchmark ML with $\sigma = 2$, NL with $\sigma = 2$, ML with $\sigma = 1.2$)

Note: The top panel shows the trajectory of the university output gain from market forces and the isolated effects of agglomeration, selection and sorting. Observed and counterfactual output levels are computed using Equation (13). The bottom panel shows the sensitivity of the total output gain to the estimation techniques. We compare the gain obtained under the benchmark multinomial logit (ML) with $\sigma = 2$, the nested logit with $\sigma = 2$, and the multinomial logit with $\sigma = 1.2$

peating in the first century. Their joint effect on output depends on the correlation between the notability of universities and the level of city/university amenities (captured, in our regressions, by the university fixed effect and the attractiveness of the city). When the correlation is high, the effects of notability and amenities point in the same direction; the best scholars agglomerate in the best universities. When the correlation is lower, agglomeration and sorting can result in the concentration of talent in second-best universities, which reduces total academic output. This is at least the case if the intensity of agglomeration and sorting forces is limited.

The effects of academic market forces become weaker after 1618. They increase total output by about 10-15% over this period. Overall, we find that agglomeration and sorting induce smaller output gains when the individual choice set is large. For this reason, their effect on academic output diminished in the 17th centuries, when the number of universities almost doubled. What is specific to this period is the presence of many universities with a large number of scholars having published something ($q_i > 0$) which was not highly influential. Shutting down agglomeration redistributes superstars to the advantage of these less prestigious universities, thus increasing the output of the many average people there.

When decomposing the total output gains in its three components, we find that agglomeration and positive sorting play an important role, especially in earlier times, when there are few universities. By contrast and in line with our empirical findings, positive selection hardly influences the total simulated output. We have seen in Table 8 that positive selection tends to scatter talents across universities by increasing the menu of options for the highest-ability scholars, but the total effect of this increased dispersion is small. It is worth noting that the sum of the three components taken in isolation significantly exceeds the total output gains in most years. This is because our model is non linear; the effect of positive sorting is greater when agglomeration forces are not accounted for, and vice versa.


The bottom panel of Figure 4 shows that very similar findings are obtained when using estimates from the nested logit model with $\sigma = 2$. By contrast, our results are quantitatively sensitive to the value of σ . As stated above, the gains from market forces would disappear if we had taken $\sigma = \infty$, as the allocation of scholars (represented by the $\hat{p}_{ik\tau(i)}$) across places would not matter. Although the benefits of sorting however only slightly exceed those obtained in the benchmark, the positive effects of agglomeration are magnified under the high-complementarity variant with $\sigma = 1.2$. In addition, with this variant, we find smaller variations in output gains across years. This means that the huge gains from agglomeration in the top universities are not compensated for by losses in average- and low-quality universities in the more recent periods. Overall, when combining all mechanisms, the simulated output increases by 90% in the 13th and 14th centuries, and by 80% in the first half of the 17th century.

To further understand the role of market forces, Figure 5 maps the winners (in green) and losers (in red) due to market forces in the period 1618-1685. The surface of each circle represents the difference in simulated output between the benchmark case and the basic gravity case. An easily understandable case is Lund vs Copenhagen. With market forces, scholars born in Sweden are more likely to locate in Copenhagen which has a high notability rather than in Lund, which is just average, while without agglomeration and sorting forces, they are content with Lund. We also note that Rinteln is a big loser in Germany, being surrounded by many good universities such as Leipzig and Jena. It is also noteworthy that the South of Europe is not

doing so poorly, although the bigger gains are in the North. Renowned Southern universities still attract talents (Salamanca, Padua, Bologna, and Rome). In a sense, without market forces, the fate of the South would have been worse.

When looking at universities which were permanently closed down over the period 1700-1900, many of them were losers from the market in the last 3 periods. Altdorf (closed in 1809), Bamberg (closed in 1803), Cahors (closed in 1751), Cervera (closed in 1821), Dorpat (closed in 1710), Harderwijk (closed in 1811), Pont-à-Mousson (closed in 1768), Rinteln (closed in 1809), Siguenza (closed in 1807), and Valence (closed in 1793) are in this category. A few winners were closed too: Erfurt (closed in 1816) and Frankfurt (Oder) (closed in 1811).

Figure 5: Winners (green) and Losers (red) from Market Forces in 1618-1685



Note: For each university, we use Equation (12) to compute the difference in simulated output between the benchmark case and the basic gravity case. The surface of each circle is proportional to this difference in absolute value, and the color indicates whether this difference is positive (winners in green) or negative (losers in red).

Overall, our results show that agglomeration and sorting effects in the academic market contribute to fostering university output. The sizes of the agglomeration and sorting effects before the middle of the 16th century are quantitatively significant. Thanks to these effects, university output increases by 50% when considering conservative complementarity forces, and almost doubles when considering greater complementarity forces. In addition, we do not model any cumulative effect of knowledge creation. Hence, our 50% should be understood as a lower bound.

Several economic historians claim that labor markets were relatively complete and competitive in Medieval Europe: “Given the low reproductive success of the urban population there had to be a constant flow of labor from the country to the city (Clark 2008). The records of a 1292 tax levied by Philip the Fair on the commoner

households of Paris show that 6 percent were foreigners: 2.1 percent English, 1.4 percent Italian, 0.8 percent German, 0.7 percent Flemish, 0.6 percent Jewish, and 0.4 percent Scottish” (Clark 2008, Sussman 2006). We can compare these numbers with the origin of the scholars of Paris University in the first two periods of our sample (1000-1347). Based on the 431 persons with known origin, we obtain that 57% of the scholars were born in France (in its 2020 limits), 20% are British, 3% are from Germany, 9% are from Italy, and 5% are from the Low Countries – the data for this period are mostly based on Courtenay (1999), Gorochoy (2012), and Genet (2019). Although the mobility of ordinary people seems quite high already, the mobility of university scholars is higher by an order of magnitude.

The importance of market forces seem particularly relevant in the years preceding and coinciding with the dawn of the Scientific Revolution, a period commonly defined as spanning Copernicus’s and Newton’s times, i.e. 1543-1687 (Applebaum 2003). In the last two centuries before the Industrial Revolution, these effects decrease significantly or even become non-existent. Hence, although we provide no causal evidence of such a link, our simulations lend credence to the hypothesis that universities might have been key to triggering the rise of this new science. This view is corroborated by the analysis of the gains from the market at the local level. In our simulations, the universities gaining the most from agglomeration and sorting forces in the period 1450-1526 are Rome, Bologna, Padua, Paris, and Louvain. In the period 1527-1617, one can add Cambridge and Leiden to the list. Those were indeed leading universities for the Scientific Revolution.

5 Conclusions

In European universities, students were educated by a plurality of masters, and schools were open to students and scholars from all parts of Europe. In this paper, we map the European academic market in the medieval and early modern times. We build an original database of thousands of scholars from university sources to study the location pattern of scholars over the time span 1000-1800. The quality of scholars is measured using information provided by Worldcat and Wikipedia. Using a multinomial logit, we show that scholars tend to agglomerate in the best universities, and that this phenomenon is more pronounced within the upper tail of the talent distribution: better scholars are more sensitive to the quality of the university (positive sorting), and migrate over greater distances (positive selection). Agglomeration and sorting patterns influenced the distribution of upper-tail human capital across Europe, and contributed to fostering university output at the dawn of the Scientific Revolution.

Agglomeration, sorting, and selection testify to market forces at work. They appear when there is a competition between universities to attract scholars, or among scholars to land the best positions available. This contrasts with a common but mistaken view that markets are a modern phenomenon, but our findings are in line with the qualitative evidence put forward by historians such as Denley (2013b) who describes the emergence in Italy of “an efficient and sometimes cut-throat academic market, with its own ‘transfer season,’ clearly defined hierarchies, rocketing salaries for the top players, and a mentality of academic celebrity that fed off it.” At the European level, two features may have helped the academic market to develop. First, political fragmentation, together with competition between church and state, prevented a centralized control by the political sphere of universities. Second, the use of Latin as a *lingua franca*, which persisted late

into the early modern period and allowed scholars to teach anywhere at low cost.

Our simulations suggest that the presence of a functioning academic market in Europe helped universities to produce more at the dawn of European primacy. This might have paved the way for the Enlightenment, humanistic, and scientific revolutions. We thus provide some quantitative support to the views developed by historians, such as Huff (2017)'s approach to the Scientific Revolution, comparing the West to China and the Islamic World. Huff suggests that the origins of the stronger support given to scientific inquiry in the West during the early modern period can be traced back to medieval times when European institutions were reconstructed. In this context, he sees the rise of European universities in the Middle Ages and their long-run contribution to the Scientific Revolution as highly significant.

Appendix

A Coverage

To show the current coverage of the database, Figure A.6 displays the place of origin of all identified scholars over the whole period.




Figure A.6: Coverage of the database: places of birth of scholars

B Barycenters

The top panel of Figure B.7 shows the barycenter, with coordinates R . If each scholar i is born in a space with coordinates r_i , the barycenter is such that:

$$\sum_i (r_i - R) = 0.$$

It gives equal mass to each scholar. Figure B.7 shows that the barycenter moves East then North as time passes.

The bottom panel of Figure B.7 shows the quality-adjusted barycenter, with coordinates R_q . It solves:

$$\sum_i q_i (r_i - R) = 0.$$

where q_i is the human capital of each scholar i . Adjusting for quality does not change the qualitative changes seen in the previous figure, but amplifies the movement towards the North.

C Allocation of Academic Scholars by Field of Knowledge

Our classification of academic scholars by scientific field is mostly based on teaching. A scholar may act in more than one “field”. Figure C.8 shows the share of fields by period.






Figure B.7: Barycenter of places of birth, by period. Top: unweighted. Bottom: quality weighted




Figure C.8: Fields of knowledge, periods 0 to 7

D Universities: Notability Indexes and Sources

We provide here some statistics for each university, classifying them according to the coverage offered by the sources: comprehensive, broad, partial. We also provide references to the sources used. We also indicate when the institution was not in the list provided by Frijhoff (1996).

D.1 Universities with Comprehensive Coverage

The coverage is defined as “comprehensive” when data collection is based on an existing website or book whose aim is to list all professors of a given institution.

- University of Bologna (1088): Mazzetti (1847). Uncertain foundation date. More details in De la Croix and Vitale (2021a).
- University of Salamanca (1218): Arteaga (1917), Vidal y Díaz et al. (1869). We know very little about the first century of the university.
- University of Padua (1222): Pesenti (1984), Casellato and Rea (2002), Facciolati (1757), Del Negro (2015). More details in De la Croix and Vitale (2021b).
- University of Valladolid (1280): Alcocer Martínéz (1918). More details in De la Croix and Karioun (2021d).
- University of Pisa (1343): Fabroni (1791).
- University of Pavia (1361): Raggi (1879), De Caro (1961).
- University of Cracow (1364): Baster (2017). More details in De la Croix and Spolverini (2022).
- University of Heidelberg (1386): Drüll (1991), Drüll (2002). Closed during the 30 Year War. More details in De la Croix and Stelter (2022).
- University of Leipzig (1409): von Hehl and Riechert (2017).
- University of Rostock (1419): Krüger (2019).
- University of Ingolstadt (1459): Sommervogel (1890), von Schrottenberg (1978), Wolff (1973). Suppressed in 1800 (transferred to Landshut).
- University of Copenhagen (1475): Slottved (1978). More details in De la Croix (2021c).
- University of Tübingen (1476): Conrad (1960).
- University of Mainz (1476): Benzing (1986). Suppressed in 1792.
- University of Aberdeen (old) - Kings college (1495): Anderson (1893). More details in De la Croix and Jay (2021).
- University of Compostella (1526): Cabeza de León and Fernández-Villamil (1947). More details in De la Croix and Spolverini (2021).
- University of Marburg (1527): Gundlach and Auerbach (1927).
- College of Bern (1528): DigiBern (2003). Not in Frijhoff (1996). Predecessor of the university founded in 1834.
- Royal College in Paris (1530): Collège de France (2007). Not a university, but a famous higher-education institution. Frijhoff (1996) makes it a part of the university of Paris, but it is a distinct institution. More details in De la Croix (2021b).
- University of Lausanne (1537): Kiener and Robert (2005). Not in Frijhoff (1996). Predecessor of the uni-

Key	Official start	Effect. start	End	Tot. nb. profs	known birth pl.	Share obscure	max Q_{kt}	median Q_{kt}
Ubologna-1088	1088	1088	1800	3281	3014	0.82	7.41	4.20
Usalamanca-1218	1218	1218	1800	767	362	0.44	6.35	3.22
Upadua-1222	1222	1200	1800	2280	1922	0.70	7.35	4.14
Uvalladolid-1280	1280	1280	1800	841	415	0.80	4.84	0.40
Upisa-1343	1343	1150	1800	1100	941	0.76	5.06	0.42
Upavia-1361	1361	1275	1800	1742	1515	0.84	5.51	1.74
Ucracow-1364	1364	1364	1800	1287	1014	0.67	4.88	2.82
Uheidelberg-1386	1386	1386	1800	1205	1167	0.70	6.82	3.32
Uleipzig-1409	1409	1409	1800	1079	484	0.26	6.68	4.80
Urostock-1419	1419	1419	1800	300	292	0.03	5.92	3.75
Uingolstadt-1459	1459	1459	1800	869	800	0.63	6.10	3.48
Ucopenhagen-1475	1475	1475	1800	337	272	0.06	7.54	5.27
Umainz-1476	1476	1476	1792	940	739	0.52	5.27	2.40
Utubingen-1477	1477	1477	1800	419	337	0.09	6.67	4.81
Uaberdeenold-1495	1495	1495	1800	197	40	0.30	4.76	1.07
Ucompostella-1526	1526	1526	1800	439	68	0.82	0.83	0.02
Umarburg-1527	1527	1527	1800	376	349	0.12	6.23	4.31
Ebern-1528	1528	1528	1800	94	87	0.18	3.30	1.44
CollegeFr-1530	1530	1530	1800	264	179	0.06	7.55	5.27
Ulausanne-1537	1537	1537	1800	143	100	0.28	4.53	2.10
Ustrasbourg-1621	1538	1523	1800	355	277	0.15	5.70	4.54
Unimes-1539	1539	1530	1663	99	31	0.32	3.49	0.72
Umacerata-1540	1540	1540	1800	718	684	0.92	2.43	0.82
UromGregoriana-1556	1556	1553	1800	431	232	0.35	6.37	4.24
Gdanzig-1558	1558	1558	1800	90	79	0.09	4.78	3.44
Ujena-1558	1558	1534	1800	371	353	0.07	6.19	5.21
Ugeneve-1559	1559	1536	1800	143	102	0.10	5.95	3.54
Cmadrid-1625	1560	1550	1767	389	358	0.76	5.18	1.24
Upontamousson-1572	1572	1572	1768	461	132	0.46	4.54	2.22
Uleiden-1575	1575	1575	1800	272	254	0.04	8.27	5.95
Uhelmstedt-1575	1575	1547	1800	289	280	0.04	5.79	4.73
Uedinburgh-1582	1582	1582	1800	160	90	0.07	7.43	3.66
Ugraz-1585	1585	1570	1800	115	110	0.27	5.15	1.91
Usaumur-1596	1596	1596	1685	54	32	0.34	5.36	1.98
Cgresham-1596	1596	1596	1800	99	61	0.26	5.45	2.30
Umontauban-1598	1598	1598	1659	39	21	0.19	1.53	1.17
Usedan-1599	1599	1571	1681	74	40	0.05	4.07	2.72
Udie-1601	1601	1600	1684	44	23	0.48	2.33	0.85

Table D.9: Universities with comprehensive coverage (1)

Key	Official start	Effect. start	End	Tot. nb. profs	known birth pl.	Share obscure	max Q_{kt}	median Q_{kt}
Ugiessen-1607	1607	1605	1800	298	284	0.10	5.48	4.07
Ugroningen-1612	1612	1590	1800	104	103	0.00	4.35	3.22
Umolsheim-1617	1617	1617	1765	172	86	0.40	0.68	0.30
Urinteln-1620	1620	1610	1800	160	156	0.09	4.21	3.28
Udorpat-1632	1632	1630	1710	54	53	0.09	3.11	2.59
Aamsterdam-1632	1632	1628	1800	73	73	0.03	6.19	4.23
Jplantes-1635	1635	1626	1793	89	79	0.08	6.29	4.44
Utrecht-1636	1636	1633	1800	115	114	0.03	6.34	4.75
Uharderwijk-1647	1647	1599	1800	114	102	0.04	5.81	3.29
Ubamberg-1648	1648	1618	1800	340	261	0.41	2.56	1.20
Ukiel-1652	1652	1652	1800	217	184	0.11	4.80	3.75
Uhalle-1694	1694	1691	1800	195	192	0.01	7.23	6.05
Ucervera-1714	1714	1714	1800	247	182	0.88	2.59	0.82
Ugottingen-1734	1734	1734	1800	341	241	0.02	7.85	6.39
Urennes-1735	1735	1735	1793	30	21	0.81	0.17	0.00
Uerlangen-1742	1742	1742	1800	129	127	0.10	5.23	3.72
Tubraunschweig-1745	1745	1745	1800	115	87	0.31	5.93	2.52
Umoscow-1755	1755	1722	1800	103	99	0.12	5.47	0.27
Ubutzow-1760	1760	1760	1789	31	30	0.03	2.15	1.18
Ufreiberg-1765	1765	1765	1800	16	11	0.00	1.44	0.14

Table D.10: Universities with Comprehensive coverage (2)

versity founded in 1890.

- University of Strasbourg (1523): Started as a higher education institution in 1523 (first professors), evolved into an official university in 1621. Berger-Levrault (1890).
- University of Nimes (1539): Bourchenin (1882). Suppressed in 1663.
- University of Macerata (1540): Serangeli (2010). More details in De la Croix and Spolverini (2021).
- University of Roma ‘Gregoriana’ (1556): Villoslada (1954). More details in De la Croix and Karioun (2021a).
- Gymnasium of Danzig (1558): Hirsch (1837). Not a university, not in Frijhoff (1996). A university level gymnasium.
- University of Jena (1558): Günther (1858). More details in De la Croix and Stelter (2021c).
- University of Geneve (1559): Borgeaud (1900). More details in Debois and De la Croix (2021b).
- Imperial College in Madrid (1560): Simón Díaz (1952). Not a university, but a university-level Jesuit college. More details in De la Croix and Karioun (2021b).
- University of Pont-à-Mousson (1572): Martin (1891). More details in De la Croix and Karioun (2021c). Suppressed in 1768 (transfer to Nancy).
- University of Leiden (1575): Leiden (2019). More details in De la Croix and Stelter (2021d).
- University of Helmstedt (1575): Gleixner (2019).
- University of Edinburgh (1582): Grant (1884).
- University of Graz (1585): Krones (1886), Sommervogel (1890).

- University of Saumur (1596): Bourchenin (1882). Suppressed in 1685.
- Gresham College (1596): Ward (1740). Not a university, not in Frijhoff (1996), but an important institution of higher learning. More details in Debois and De la Croix (2021a).
- University of Montauban (1598): Bourchenin (1882). Suppressed in 1685.
- University of Sedan (1599): Bourchenin (1882). Suppressed in 1685.
- University of Die (1601): Bourchenin (1882). Suppressed in 1685.
- University of Giessen (1607): Haupt and Lehnert (1907). More details in De la Croix and Stelter (2021a).
- University of Groningen (1612): Groningen (2014).
- University of Rinteln (1620): Hänsel (1971).
- Athenaeum Illustre of Amsterdam (1632): University of Amsterdam (2007). Not in Frijhoff (1996). Predecessor of the university founded in 1877.
- University of Dorpat (1632): Inno (1972).
- Athenaeum Illustre of Amsterdam (1632): University of Amsterdam (2007). Not in Frijhoff (1996). Predecessor of the university founded in 1877.
- Royal Gardens in Paris (1635): Jaussaud and Brygoo (2004). Not a University but a higher-education institution. Frijhoff (1996) makes it a part of the University of Paris, but it is a distinct institution. Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Utrecht (1636): Dorsman (2011).
- University of Harderwijk (1647): van Epen (1904).
- University of Bamberg (1648): Bamberg (2019).
- University of Kiel (1652): Volbehr and Weyl (1956).
- University of Halle (1694): Schopferer (2016).
- University of Cervera (1714): Rubio y Borrás (1914).
- University of Göttingen (1734): Ebel (1962). More details in De la Croix and Stelter (2021b).
- University of Rennes (1735): Chenon (1890). Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Erlangen (1742): Wachter (2009).
- Technical University of Braunschweig (1745): Albrecht and Gundler (1986).
- University of Moscow: Andreev and Tsygankov (2010).
- University of Butzow (1760): Krüger (2019). Temporary secession from the university of Rostock. Suppressed in 1789.
- Freiberg University of Mining and Technology: Appelt and Wulkow (2022).

D.2 Universities with Broad Coverage

Coverage is defined as “broad” when it is based on the combination of several sources, including books on the history of the university.

- Cathedral school of Chartres (1000): Herbermann (1913). One of the most famous cathedral school, already active before our sample starts. Did not transform into a university (not in Frijhoff (1996)).
- Cathedral school of Liège (1000): Renardy (1981). Another famous cathedral school, already active before our sample starts. Did not transform into a university (not in Frijhoff (1996)).

Key	Official start	Effect. start	End	Tot. nb. profs	known birth pl.	Share obscure	max Q_{kt}	median Q_{kt}
Echartres-1000	1000	1000	1190	14	12	0.00	4.62	0.29
Eliege-1000	1000	1000	1230	19	15	0.33	2.02	0.13
Ctoledo-1126	1126	1126	1284	27	25	0.04	3.38	1.17
Umodena-1175	1175	1175	1800	281	127	0.51	4.89	0.05
Uoxford-1200	1200	1113	1800	505	351	0.11	8.10	3.88
Uparis-1200	1200	1080	1793	1543	1228	0.50	8.72	5.91
Ucambridge-1209	1209	1209	1800	791	518	0.42	8.43	1.56
Unapoli-1224	1224	1214	1800	626	400	0.68	5.27	1.76
Utoulouse-1229	1229	1215	1793	687	208	0.39	5.02	1.47
Usalerno-1231	1231	1000	1800	198	128	0.67	3.56	0.10
Uorleans-1235	1235	1140	1793	220	100	0.42	4.22	0.18
Uangers-1250	1250	1010	1793	199	92	0.54	1.13	0.05
Umontpellier-1289	1289	1150	1793	479	310	0.50	5.49	1.46
Uavignon-1303	1303	1244	1793	455	227	0.63	3.35	0.78
Uroma-1303	1303	1303	1800	808	646	0.58	7.59	4.46
Uperugia-1308	1308	1300	1800	840	590	0.82	4.53	0.88
StudFlorence-1321	1321	1321	1800	340	298	0.50	6.93	3.24
Emallorca-1330	1330	1325	1500	21	13	0.38	1.67	0.23
Ucahors-1332	1332	1332	1751	135	27	0.26	2.39	0.09
Uprague-1348	1348	1348	1800	739	520	0.54	5.69	2.91
Uperpignan-1350	1350	1350	1793	98	36	0.28	2.84	0.00
Uvienna-1365	1365	1365	1800	301	286	0.46	7.31	1.15
Ucologne-1388	1388	1166	1798	657	227	0.50	5.43	0.92
Uwurzberg-1402	1402	1264	1800	340	262	0.35	3.90	0.39
Uaix-1409	1409	1240	1793	366	141	0.50	4.15	0.09
Ustandrews-1411	1411	1411	1800	80	58	0.25	4.17	0.26
Ulouvain-1425	1425	1425	1797	1138	701	0.55	7.40	4.22
Upoitiers-1431	1431	1431	1793	121	97	0.54	3.03	0.57
Ubordeaux-1441	1441	1271	1793	215	106	0.47	4.72	0.02
Ucatania-1444	1444	1444	1800	107	70	0.81	1.07	0.03
Uglasgow-1451	1451	1448	1800	71	62	0.07	4.96	0.26
Uvalence-1452	1452	1452	1793	233	87	0.53	2.76	0.07
Ugreifswald-1456	1456	1438	1800	245	226	0.00	4.97	3.67
Ufreiburg-1457	1457	1457	1800	263	164	0.31	5.37	1.63
Ubasel-1460	1460	1460	1800	316	189	0.09	7.34	4.58
Uzaragoza-1474	1474	1400	1800	87	77	0.42	4.01	0.12
Uppsala-1477	1477	1430	1800	238	193	0.02	7.16	1.00
Ualcala-1499	1499	1499	1800	108	97	0.25	5.69	1.54

Table D.11: Universities with broad coverage (1)

Key	Official start	Effect. start	End	Tot. nb. profs	known birth pl.	Share obscure	max Q_{kt}	median Q_{kt}
Uvalencia-1500	1500	1404	1800	166	46	0.17	4.22	0.13
Uwittenberg-1502	1502	1500	1800	211	208	0.03	8.25	5.57
Ufrankfurt-1506	1506	1505	1800	133	127	0.02	5.65	3.83
Cpoznan-1519	1519	1519	1780	193	89	0.40	1.90	0.83
Czurich-1525	1525	1525	1800	77	66	0.08	6.38	3.44
Ucoimbra-1308	1537	1533	1800	113	88	0.32	4.73	1.19
Ukonigsberg-1544	1544	1544	1800	246	210	0.09	6.20	3.03
Umessina-1548	1548	1548	1678	79	51	0.57	3.65	0.94
Ureims-1548	1548	1548	1793	65	60	0.32	3.22	0.54
Udillingen-1553	1553	1549	1800	103	83	0.19	4.93	1.44
Uevora-1558	1558	1558	1759	109	102	0.56	3.46	1.56
Udouai-1559	1559	1559	1793	171	145	0.38	5.75	2.38
Uolmutz-1570	1570	1566	1778	106	101	0.47	1.78	0.23
Ualtdorf-1578	1578	1576	1800	62	61	0.00	5.62	3.21
Upalermo-1578	1578	1550	1800	115	73	0.45	3.06	0.36
Uvilnius-1578	1578	1568	1800	113	99	0.35	5.03	2.19
Aherborn-1584	1584	1578	1800	23	23	0.04	4.93	0.24
Ufraneker-1585	1585	1585	1800	145	143	0.04	6.37	4.12
Udublin-1592	1592	1591	1800	141	118	0.32	4.84	3.24
Cwarsaw-1598	1598	1598	1773	40	36	0.33	1.12	0.03
Uaixbourbon-1603	1603	1580	1763	182	119	0.66	3.36	0.78
Ucagliari-1606	1606	1606	1800	106	56	0.79	1.09	0.03
Cpoznan-1611	1611	1571	1780	52	42	0.29	3.15	0.64
Usassari-1617	1617	1612	1800	68	53	0.85	0.51	0.00
Umantua-1625	1625	1588	1771	66	66	0.68	1.38	0.14
Utrnava-1635	1635	1560	1800	206	194	0.41	3.81	0.56
Uabo-1640	1640	1640	1800	115	96	0.02	5.90	4.11
Ukassa-1657	1657	1657	1773	96	92	0.47	1.34	0.27
Ulund-1666	1666	1666	1800	98	92	0.00	4.85	3.58
Ulinz-1674	1674	1670	1800	44	44	0.59	2.09	0.20
Ustpetersburg-1724	1724	1724	1800	64	59	0.00	8.38	5.93

Table D.12: Universities with broad coverage (2)

- Toledo School of Translators (1126): González (1998). A famous place of high learning. Did not transform into a university (not in Frijhoff (1996)).
- University of Modena (1175): Mor and Di Pietro (1975). For Frijhoff (1996), started as a Studium in 1682 only.
- University of Oxford (1200): Emden (1959), Foster (1891). Uncertain foundation date.
- University of Paris (1200): Antonetti (2013), Courtenay (1999), Hazon and Bertrand (1778), Feret (1904), Gorochov (2012), Genet (2019). Uncertain foundation date. Loose and complex university structure.

Suppressed in 1793.

- University of Cambridge (1209): Walker (1927), Venn (1922), Lamb and Masters (1831).
- University of Naples (1224): Origlia Paolino (1754).
- University of Toulouse (1229): Deloume (1890), Barbot (1905), Ferté (2013), Gilles (1992). Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Salerno (1231): De Renzi (1857), Sinno (1921). School of medicine active before official foundation date. Unequal coverage over time, continuation of university unclear for some periods.
- University of Orléans (1235): Bimbenet (1853), Duijnsteer (2010), Fournier (1892). Decent coverage of law faculty. Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Angers (1250): Rangeard and Lemarchand (1868), De Lens (1880), Denéchère and Matz (2012). Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Montpellier (1289): Astruc (1767), Dulieu (1975) (Dulieu (1975), Dulieu (1979), Dulieu (1983)), Germain (1874). Uncertain foundation date. Excellent coverage of faculty of medicine (the most renowned one) and law. Weak coverage of faculty of arts. Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Avignon (1303): Laval (1889), de Teule (1887), Fournier (1892), Bénézet (2003), Barjavel (1841), Duhamel (1895). Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Roma 'Sapienzia' (1303): Renazzi (1803).
- University of Perugia (1308): Frova, Catoni, and Renzi (2001), Zucchini (2008), Quaresima (2021). Comprehensive coverage of the medieval period. Broad coverage of the early modern period.
- Studium in Florence (1321): Prezziner (1810), Cerracchini (1738). No university status, but important and well documented.
- The Mallorcan School of Cartography (1330): Pastor and Camarero (1960). An informal institution of higher learning. Not in Frijhoff (1996).
- University of Cahors (1332): Ferté (1975), Baudel (1876). Suppressed in 1751.
- University of Prague (1348): Svatoš and Čornejová (1995), Čornejová and Fechtnerová (1986).
- University of Perpignan (1350): Carmignani (2017), Capelle (1914), Izarn (1991). Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Vienna (1365): Lackner (1976), Schwinges and Hesse (2019), von Aschbach (1865).
- University of Cologne (1388): Schwinges and Hesse (2019). Low coverage after 1550. Suppressed in 1798.
- University of Wurzburg (1402): Walter (2010), Sommervogel (1890). Disappeared quickly after foundation, resurrected with the Jesuits (1575).
- University of Aix-en-Provence (1409): Belin (1896), Belin (1905), Fleury and Dumas (1929), De la Croix and Fabre (2019). Several schools active before official creation of university. Suppressed in 1793. More details in De la Croix and Fabre (2021a).
- University of St Andrews (1411): Junius Institute (2013), Smart (2004). The first two centuries remain quite badly covered.
- University of Louvain (1425): Ram (1861), Nève (1856), Schwinges and Hesse (2019), Brants (1906), Lamberts and Roegiers (1990). Suppressed in 1797.
- University of Poitiers (1431): Boissonade (1932). Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Bordeaux (1441): Gaullieur (1874), Pery (1888). Low coverage and little hope to do better. Suppressed in 1793.

- University of Catania (1444): Sabbadini (1898), Carnazza Amari (1867).
- University of Valence (1452): Brun-Durand (1900), Nadal (1861). Suppressed in 1793. More details in De la Croix and Fabre (2021b).
- University of Greifswald (1456): Jensen (2018), Junius Institute (2013).
- University of Freiburg im Breisgau (1457): Bauer (1957), Kurrus (1977).
- University of Basel (1460): Herzog (1780), Schwinges and Hesse (2019), Rosen (1972).
- University of Zaragoza (1474): Catalán (1924), Borao (1853). First century of existence remains obscure.
- University of Uppsala (1477): Von Bahr (1945), Astro.uu.se (2011), Jensen (2018). The first century remains quite badly covered (but university was closed for some time).
- University of Alcalá (1499): Torrecilla, Arboniés, and Torres (2013).
- University of Valencia (1500): Piñero (2006), Guerau de Montmajor (1999), Office of the principal (2022). Unequal coverage.
- University of Wittenberg (1502): Kohnle and Kusche (2016). Excellent coverage of faculty of theology.
- University of Frankfurt (1506): No specific source so far.
- Lubransky Academy in Poznań (1519): Nowicki (2015). A university-level college, mentioned in Frijhoff (1996) as a colony of Cracow. More details in De la Croix (2021a).
- Collegium Carolinum in Zurich (1525): Junius Institute (2013), Godet, Türlér, and Attinger (1928).
- University of Coimbra (1537): Sommervogel (1890). More sources will be exploited.
- University of Königsberg (1544): Schwinges and Hesse (2019) for the beginning, Naragon (2006) for the end.
- University of Messina (1548): Collective (1900).
- University of Reims (1548): Sommervogel (1890). More sources will be exploited. Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Dillingen (1553): Fischer (1978), Sommervogel (1890).
- University of Évora (1558): Nunes and Silva (2009), Sommervogel (1890).
- University of Douai (1559): Soetaert and Soen (2018), Sommervogel (1890). Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Olmutz (1570): Sommervogel (1890). Suppressed in 1778.
- University of Altdorf (1578): Flessa (1969), Köbler (2019). Low coverage, except for medicine.
- University of Palermo (1578): Cancila (2006), Sommervogel (1890).
- University of Vilnius (1578): Bumblauskas et al. (2004), Sommervogel (1890).
- Herborn Academy (1584): Junius Institute (2013). Not a university, not in Frijhoff (1996), but an important institution of higher learning. Low coverage so far.
- University of Franeker (1585): Feenstra, Ahsmann, and Veen (2003), Napjus and Lindeboom (1985).
- University of Dublin (1592): Kirkpatrick (1912), Burtchaell and Sadleir (1924).
- College of Warsaw (1598): Sommervogel (1890). A Jesuit college providing university level education (not in Frijhoff (1996)).
- University of Aix-Bourbon (1603): Méchin (1890), Sommervogel (1890). Suppressed in 1763. More details in De la Croix and Fabre (2021a).
- University of Cagliari (1606): Pillosu (2017), Tola (1837). Low coverage.
- College of Poznań (1611): Sommervogel (1890). A Jesuit college providing university level education (not in Frijhoff (1996)).

- University of Sassari (1617): Mattone (2010).
- University of Mantua (1625): Grendler (2009), Sommervogel (1890).
- University of Trnava (1635): Sommervogel (1890).
- University of Abo (1640): Jensen (2018).
- University of Kassa (1657): Sommervogel (1890).
- University of Lund (1666): Delen and Weibull (1868). More details in De la Croix (2021d).
- University of Linz (1674): Sommervogel (1890).
- University of St Petersburg (1724): Shemivot (1873). A university created within the Academy of Sciences. More details in De la Croix and Doraghi (2021).

D.3 Universities with Partial Coverage

The coverage is defined as “partial” when the sample of scholars was informed by sources from other universities and general thematic biographies.

- Cluny Abbey (1000): a key center of knowledge. Lack of sources.
- University of Siena (1246): Frova, Catoni, and Renzi (2001). Low coverage after 1500.
- University of Lerida (Lleida) (1300): Lladonosa (1969), Lladonosa (1970), Esteve i Perendreu (2007). Suppressed in 1717.
- University of Grenoble (1339): Guénée (1981). Lack of sources. Suppressed / transferred to Valence in 1565.
- University of Erfurt (1379): Schwinges and Hesse (2019). Lower coverage after 1550.
- University of Ferrara (1391): Borsetti (1735), Pardi (1903). Not fully exploited yet.
- University of Torino (1404): Vallauri (1875).
- University of Parma (1412): Rizzi (1953). More details in Rolla and Vitale (2022).
- University of Dole (1422): Beaune and d’Arbaumont (1870). Transferred to Besançon in 1691.
- University of Caen (1432): de Pontville (1997), Boisard (1848). Guerrin (1932), Carel (1888). Coverage can be improved further. Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Barcelona (1450): no good source found yet. Suppressed in 1717.
- University of Trier (1454): Sommervogel (1890). Low coverage before the Jesuits came. Schwinges and Hesse (2019) not exploited yet. Suppressed in 1798.
- University of Nantes (1460): Chenon (1890), Grünblatt (1961).
- University of Bourges (1464): Arabeyre, Halpérin, and Krynen (2007), Fournier (1892). Decent coverage of top lawyers. Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Sigüenza (1489): Sanz Serrulla (1985).
- University of Gandia (1547): Sommervogel (1890).
- University of Milano (1556): Sommervogel (1890). Jesuit college of university status (Frijhoff 1996).
- College of Clermont / Louis-le-Grand (1563): Sommervogel (1890). Jesuit college of university status (not in (Frijhoff 1996)).
- University of Orange (1583): Bourchenin (1882). First university from 1362 to 1562 with almost no data. Second university founded in 1583. Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Oviedo (1574): Canella Secades (1873).

Key	Official start	Effect. start	End	Tot. nb. profs	known birth pl.	Share obscure	max Q_{kt}	median Q_{kt}
Ecluny-1000	1000	1000	1200	16	15	0.07	3.12	0.42
Usiena-1246	1246	1240	1800	319	160	0.54	2.59	0.37
Ulerida-1300	1300	1300	1717	116	40	0.55	0.83	0.03
Ugrenoble-1339	1339	1333	1565	17	14	0.29	1.57	0
Uerfurt-1379	1379	1379	1800	302	111	0.12	5.06	1.95
Uferrara-1391	1391	1389	1800	126	117	0.26	4.34	0.91
Utorino-1404	1404	1250	1800	81	75	0.39	4.03	0
Uparma-1412	1412	1035	1800	118	92	0.38	3.48	0.07
Udole-1422	1422	1422	1691	64	37	0.46	1.48	0.10
Ucaen-1432	1432	1432	1793	54	45	0.40	1.56	0.10
Ubarcelona-1450	1450	1450	1714	22	19	0.32	1.33	0
Utrier-1454	1454	1454	1798	73	62	0.32	3.27	0.37
Unantes-1460	1460	1460	1793	59	25	0.56	0.28	0
Ubourges-1464	1464	1464	1793	42	38	0.13	2.99	0.06
Usiguenza-1489	1489	1489	1800	32	22	0.68	0.91	0
Ugandia-1547	1547	1547	1767	26	25	0.72	0.26	0
Umilano-1556	1556	1556	1800	21	21	0.14	1.17	0.08
CClermontParis-1563	1563	1563	1800	18	18	0.11	3.53	0.26
Uorange-1365	1573	1573	1793	20	11	0.36	1.27	0
Uoviedo-1574	1574	1574	1800	146	25	0.76	0.91	0.03
Ufermo-1585	1585	1350	1800	135	124	0.81	1.69	0.03
Uaberdeennew-1593	1593	1593	1800	26	21	0	4.77	0.08
Cfleche-1603	1603	1603	1762	18	18	0	3.94	0.32
Cdauphin-1622	1622	1622	1763	10	10	0.40	1.10	0
Umunster-1622	1622	1595	1800	34	29	0.31	2.01	0.15
Unimes-1634	1634	1630	1795	15	15	0.47	0.81	0.05
Uduisburg-1654	1654	1652	1800	42	30	0.03	4.03	2.46
Unijmegen-1655	1655	1655	1679	16	13	0.08	1.11	0.41
Ulwow-1661	1661	1600	1800	40	33	0.30	2	0.19
Uinnsbruck-1668	1668	1600	1800	35	25	0.24	2.99	0
Ubesancon-1691	1691	1691	1793	12	10	0.30	1.30	0
Ubreslau-1702	1702	1650	1800	48	45	0.40	1.75	0.26
Ckassel-1709	1709	1708	1785	23	23	0	0.48	0
Ufulda-1732	1732	1578	1800	57	56	0.46	0.65	0
Cwarsaw-1740	1740	1740	1800	16	15	0	2.74	0

Table D.13: Universities with partial coverage

- University of Fermo (1585): Brizzi (2001), Curi (1880). More details in Di Caprio and Vitale (2021).
- University of Aberdeen (new) - Marishal College (1593): Anderson (1898).
- College La Fleche (1603): Sommervogel (1890). Jesuit college of university level.

- College Royal Dauphin (1622): Sommervogel (1890). Jesuit college of university status.
- University of Munster (1622): Sommervogel (1890).
- University of Nimes (1634): Sommervogel (1890).
- University of Duisburg (1654): (Junius Institute 2013), Köbler (2019). Low coverage.
- University of Nijmegen (1655): Suppressed in 1679.
- University of Lwow (1661): Sommervogel (1890).
- University of Innsbruck (1668): Sommervogel (1890). Low coverage which can be further improved.
- University of Besancon (1691): Beaune and d’Arbaumont (1870), Lavillat (1977). Suppressed in 1793.
- University of Breslau (1702): Fischer (1978), Sommervogel (1890).
- Collegium Carolinum in Kassel (1709): The university of Kassel (1633-1653) mentioned in Frijhoff (1996) had an ephemeral existence. More important is the Collegium Carolinum founded in 1709.
- University of Fulda (1732): Sommervogel (1890).
- Collegium Nobilium of Warsaw (1740): college of university level.

D.4 Acknowledgements

We thank the research assistants who have been contributing to this adventure: Basile Burnet, Guillaume Catoire, Valentine Debois, Giovanni Di Caprio, Mehrdaad Doraghi, Julie Duchêne, Clémence and Timothée de la Croix, Thomas Einsfeld, Maximilian Ganterer, Hugo Jay, Soraya Karioun, Victoire Michel, Annika Onemichl, Fabian Fischer, Gaia Spolverini, Baptiste Standaert, Mara Vitale, Stefanija Veljanoska, and Pascaline Zwarts.

E Additional Robustness Tests

In Table E.14, we assess the robustness of our results to two identifying assumptions. The benchmark results are repeated in col. (1). Then, in col. (2), we decrease σ from 2 to 1.2 (i.e. a stronger complementarity between top-5 scholars in the notability equation). This does not change the estimation results much (but this might be important for the simulations). In col. (3), we set $\omega = 0$, counting each repeat mover as contributing in full to the notability of their universities of destination.

	Benchmark		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
σ	2	1.2	2
ω	1	1	0
d_{ik}	-1.818***	-1.752***	-1.758***
Q_{kt}	0.119***	0.185***	0.201***
P_{kt}	0.117***	0.166***	0.167***
D_{kt}	0.171***	0.144***	0.076***
$d_{ik}q_i$	0.045***	0.030***	0.032***
$Q_{ik\tau(i)}q_i$	0.015***	0.014***	0.015***
FE	yes	yes	yes
N. Obs.	31,478	27,145	27,145
Log likelihood	-67,106	-58,984	-58,624

Table E.14: Multinomial logit regressions: Robustness to identifying assumptions

F Scholars' Human Capital and Salaries

There is considerable anecdotal evidence that compensations for academic contracts go well beyond paid salaries. They include payments from students, *prebends*,³² and many forms of in-kind benefits. Yet, it is interesting to examine the relationship between scholar's human capital (as measured by q_i) and existing data on monetary remunerations. In the two sub-sections below, we first review the available data on salaries, and argue that such data are poor proxies for the overall remuneration for academic services (i.e. the market value of a scholar). Keeping in mind such limitations, we then document a positive correlation between monetary income and scholar's human capital.

F.1 Data on Salaries: Availability and Relevance

Data availability. – Few data are available on academic scholars' earnings during the Middle Ages and the Early Modern period, Italy being an exception. As early as in the 13th century, the competition between Italian cities to attract students fostered the demand for renowned academic scholars. This competition

³²A *prebends* is a stipend paid by a cathedral or collegiate church to a clergyman in its chapter.

encouraged medieval Italian universities to pay high salaries to their staff in law and medicine (Verger 1998; Grendler 2002). Furthermore, the need to increase staff visibility encouraged Italian universities to publish rather comprehensive lists of professors. These records (*rotuli*) are still relatively well preserved today, and often document – even if not systematically – the salary received by ordinary professors. No such data are available for the myriad of extraordinary professors (Zanetti 1962). In the early northern European universities (e.g. Oxford, Paris, Louvain), teaching of theology was predominant. Monetary payments came directly from fees paid by students, of which little information has been recorded, or from *prebends* (Verger 1998; Grendler 2002). Furthermore, clergymen were paid little or nothing for their teaching (Post 1932; Paquet 1958).

For the Early Modern period, data on scholars' remuneration remain scarce, even though wage payments by the community or the Prince became the norm in most universities. For the majority of universities, financial records are incomplete or inexistent. Information on wages appears occasionally in deliberations or in dispute settlements (through notarial record or trial records, as in the case of French universities for example). In addition to Italian institutions, the universities of Ingolstadt and Basel – where there exists detailed annual accounts for the periods 1472–1676 and 1460–1531, respectively – provide wage data (Rosen 1972; von Schrottenberg 1978). In the national accounts documenting revenues and expenditures of the university of Basel, we have a comprehensive list of salaries as well as data on the share of expenditures for the university in total expenditures of the city over this period (Rosen 1972).

Relevance. – In addition to the loss/destruction of archives or the absence of systematic recording, the hybrid mode of remuneration of professors challenges a systematic use and analysis of salaries. This concerns the definition of the “salary”, as well as the direct comparisons between individuals and institutions. Professors are remunerated in a variety of ways:

- A) In monetary form as a fixed wage (like in Pavia for instance, see Zanetti 1962);
- B) Supplemented with fees from their students for attending classes and/or taking the exam (for Edinburgh, see Rae 1895);
- C) In kind (rent, various expenses, crop, wine) (see Drüll 1991 for Heidelberg);
- D) In the form of privileges or benefits (see Nadal 1861 for Valence, Evans 1992 for Oxford);
- E) Reputation and prestige, which are difficult to quantify.

Friedrich Spanheim, a well-known theologian, for instance, was paid in Guilder, corn and wine by the University of Heidelberg (Drüll 1991). In the Scottish system, the salary frequently constituted only a small part of the professor's emoluments, as reported by Adam Smith (Smith 1776). The greater part was received from the fees/dues of students, an incentive mechanism that seemed desirable to him. His regular income at Glasgow University (1751-1763) was estimated by John Rae to have been no more than £170 (£70 maximum for a fixed salary, £100 maximum in fees), plus the free use of a large manse on campus (Rae 1895). Adam Smith left his chair in Glasgow in 1763 to become the itinerant tutor of the young Duke of Buccleugh, with a wage of £300 per year, travel expenses abroad and a pension of £300 per year for life thereafter. It was not uncommon for an academic career to be a stepping stone to a better paid career, or to be conducted with another parallel activity (lawyers, doctors) or public office. Reputation and prestige were then the best forms of remuneration. As Zanetti (1962) notes, for the University of Pavia, the university gave prestige, not fortune.

Another difficulty is the lack of continuity of payments. Wage payments were subject to the hazards of history (black death, wars, etc.). It was not uncommon for payments to be interrupted. The university of Greifswald serves as an example for the unpleasant situation of scholars and universities during the Thirty Years' war. It was mainly due to the commitment of the (remaining) scholars that academic life could be sustained. Already at the beginning of the war, when academic life was unaltered, salaries were not continuously paid. In the second part of the war, the situation deteriorated further (Langer 2011).

F.2 Salaries and notability

The available wage data are too fragmented to be included in our econometric analysis. More importantly, wage data are very likely not representative for our universe and have limited relevance, as explained above. Another issue related to the use of wage data arises due to the timing of information. While our notability index is an ex-post indicator, salaries would be linked to scholars' historical notability and seniority. Thus, earning capacities of the same person changed over the life-cycle.

Nevertheless, we collected data on wages paid to professors from some Italian universities (Florence, Padua, Pavia, Perugia, Pisa), northern Alps universities (Basel, Ingolstadt, Louvain) and, with much more fragmented and scarce data, southern French universities (Aix, Bordeaux, Montpellier, Valence). Data are expressed in local currency and obtained from secondary sources compiled from archives materials. We focus on the highest monetary salary of each professor i , and compute the correlation with our index of *notability or human capital* (q_i) within each institution. We split data in short periods of 50 years to mitigate the role of changing prices.

Figure F.9 shows the correlation between q_i and salaries by periods of 50 years between 1350–1400 and 1750–1800. For each period, we select one university with a sufficient number of observations. Data for other universities with at least some wage data are summarized in Tables F.15 by period, which lists our main data sources.

All panels in Figure F.9 show a positive correlation between the recorded monetary salary and our notability index. This finding is consistent with human capital theory. We identify one exception (the university of Ingolstadt in 1450–1500) for which the correlation is slightly negative. In some cases, the sample is too small to be conclusive, as documented in Tab. F.15. Another challenge arises from the high share of scholars who did not leave any footprint on Wikipedia or Worldcat. The university of Perugia (faculty of law and medicine), before printing, exemplifies such a situation. Despite these limitations, the correlation remains positive, even if not highly significant.

Figure F.9: Correlation between monetary salary and q_i for selected universities and periods




Table F.15: Observations, correlations and sources of salary data

University	Period	Obs*	lin. Corr.	Main sources
Uaix-1409	1550-1600	6	–	Belin (1896)
Uaix-1409	1600-1650	4	0.70	Belin (1896)
Ubordeaux-1441	1600-1650	2	–	Pery (1888)
Ubordeaux-1441	1650-1700	7	0.87	Pery (1888)
Ubordeaux-1441	1700-1750	5	0.53	Pery (1888)
Umontpellier-1289	1580-1630	7	0.62	Faucillon (1862)
Uvalence-1452	1500-1550	2	1.00	Nadal (1861)
Ubasel-1460	1450-1500	36	0.14	Rosen (1972)
Ubasel-1460	1500-1550	33	0.20	Rosen (1972)
UIngolstadt-1472	1450-1500	49	-0.17	von Schrottenberg (1978)
UIngolstadt-1472	1500-1550	66	0.28	von Schrottenberg (1978)
UIngolstadt-1472	1550-1600	29	0.17	von Schrottenberg (1978)
UIngolstadt-1472	1600-1650	32	0.37	von Schrottenberg (1978)
UIngolstadt-1472	1650-1700	19	0.24	von Schrottenberg (1978)
Ulouvain-1425	1425-1450	31	0.50	Paquet (1958)
StudFlorence-1321	1350-1400	22	0.10	Gherardi (1881, Prezziner (1810)
StudFlorence-1321	1400-1450	25	0.39	Gherardi (1881)
StudFlorence-1321	1700-1750	33	0.20	Prezziner (1810)
StudFlorence-1321	1750-1800	33	0.20	Prezziner (1810)
Upadua-1222	1650-1700	5	0.79	Casellato and Rea (2002) Facciolati (1757)
Upadua-1222	1700-1750	14	0.14	Casellato and Rea (2002); Facciolati (1757)
Upadua-1222	1750-1800	11	0.28	Casellato and Rea (2002); Facciolati (1757)
Upavia-1361	1350-1400	4	0.40	Fourquet (1976)
Upavia-1361	1400-1450	3	0.76	Quaresima (2021); Rosso (2012); Zanetti (1962)
Upavia-1361	1450-1500	19	0.20	Quaresima (2021); Rosso (2012); Zanetti (1962)
Upavia-1361	1500-1550	21	0.26	Fazzo (1998); Zanetti (1962)
Uperugia-1308	1400-1450	165	0.22	Quaresima (2021); Zucchini (2008)
Uperugia-1308	1450-1500	76	0.00	Zucchini (2008)
Uperugia-1308	1450-1500	32	0.10	Zucchini (2008)
Upisa-1343	1450-1500	10	0.37	Fabroni (1791); Pesenti (1984); Rosso (2012)

Note: *Number of professors with a known wage

References

- Abowd, John, Francis Kramarz, and David Margolis. 1999. "High wage workers and high wage firms." *Econometrica* 67 (2): 251–333.
- Abramitzky, Ran, Leah Platt Boustan, and Katherine Eriksson. 2012. "Europe's tired, poor, huddled masses: Self-selection and economic outcomes in the age of mass migration." *American Economic Review* 102 (5): 1832–56.
- . 2014. "A nation of immigrants: Assimilation and economic outcomes in the age of mass migration." *Journal of Political Economy* 122 (3): 467–506.
- Abramitzky, Ran, and Fabio Braggion. 2006. "Migration and human capital: self-selection of indentured servants to the Americas." *Journal of Economic History* 66 (4): 882–905.
- Abramitzky, Ran, and Isabelle Sin. 2014. "Book Translations As Idea Flows: The Effects Of The Collapse Of Communism On The Diffusion Of Knowledge." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 12 (6): 1453–1520.
- Agrawal, Ajay, Devesh Kapur, John McHale, and Alexander Oettl. 2011. "Brain drain or brain bank? The impact of skilled emigration on poor-country innovation." *Journal of Urban Economics* 69 (1): 43–55.
- Akcigit, Ufuk, Salomé Baslandze, and Stefanie Stantcheva. 2016. "Taxation and the international mobility of inventors." *American Economic Review* 106 (10): 2930–2981.
- Albrecht, Helmuth, and Bettina Gundler. 1986. *Catalogus professorum der Technischen Universität Carol-Wilhelmina zu Braunschweig*. Braunschweigischen Hochschulbundes.
- Alcocer Martínéz, Mariano. 1918. *Historia de la Universidad de Valladolid – Expendientes de provisiones de catedras*. Valladolid: Imprenta Castellana.
- Anderson, Peter John. 1893. *Lists of Officers, University and King's College: Aberdeen, 1495-1860*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.
- . 1898. *Fasti Academiae Mariscallanae Aberdonensis. Selections from the Records of the Marischal College and University*. New Spalding Club.
- Andreev, A Yu, and DA Tsygankov. 2010. *Imperatorskiy Moskovskiy universitet, 1755-1917: entsiklopedicheskii slovar [Imperial Moscow University, 1755-1917: Encyclopedic Dictionary]*. Moscow: ROSSPeN.
- Antonetti, Guy. 2013. *Les professeurs de la faculté des droits de Paris 1679-1793*. Paris: Editions Pant'éon-Assas.
- Appelt, Joachim, and Annett Wulkow. 2022. "Professoren (bis 1945)." <https://tu-freiberg.de/ze/archiv/geschichte/professoren-1945>.
- Applebaum, Wilbur. 2003. *Encyclopedia of the scientific revolution: from Copernicus to Newton*. New York: Routledge.
- Arabeyre, Patrick, Jean-Louis Halpérin, and Jacques Krynen. 2007. *Dictionnaire historique des juristes français (XIIIe-XXe siècle)*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

- Arteaga, Enrique Esperabé. 1917. *Historia pragmática é interna de la Universidad de Salamanca: maestros y alumnos más distinguidos*. Imp. y Lib. de Francisco Núñez Izquierdo.
- Astro.uu.se. 2011. "History of astronomy in Uppsala." <http://www.astro.uu.se/history/>.
- Astruc, Jean. 1767. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la faculté de médecine de Montpellier, par feu M. Jean Astruc, ... revus et publiés par M. Lorry, ...* P.-G. Cavelier.
- Bairoch, Paul, Jean Batou, and Pierre Chevre. 1988. *Population des villes européennes de 800 à 1850: banque de données et analyse sommaire des résultats*. Librairie Droz.
- Bamberg, Universitätsarchiv. 2019. "Bamberger Professorinnen- und Professorenkatalog." mimeo.
- Barbot, Jules. 1905. *Les chroniques de la faculté de médecine de Toulouse*. Toulouse: Dirion.
- Barjavel, Casimir François Henri. 1841. *Dictionnaire historique, biographique et bibliographique du département de Vaucluse*. Devillaris.
- Baster, Marcin. 2017. "Corpus Academicum Cracoviense: database of students and professors of the University of Krakow (1364-1780)." Kraków: Towarzystwo Naukowe Societas Vistulana.
- Baudel, MJ. 1876. *Histoire de l'Université de Cahors*. Layton.
- Bauer, Johannes Joseph. 1957. *Zur Frühgeschichte der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Freiburg (1460-1620)*. Freiburg: Albert.
- Beaune, Henri, and Jules d'Arbaumont. 1870. *Les Universités de Franche-Comté: Gray, Dole, Besançon: documents inédits publiés avec une introduction historique*. J. Marchand.
- Becker, Sascha, Yuan Hsiao, Steven Pfaff, and Jared Rubin. 2020. "Multiplex Network Ties and the Spatial Diffusion of Radical Innovations: Martin Luther's Leadership in the Early Reformation." *American Sociological Review* 85 (5): 857–894.
- Beine, Michel, Frederic Docquier, and Caglar Ozden. 2011. "Diasporas." *Journal of Development Economics* 95 (1): 30–41.
- Belin, Ferdinand. 1896. *Histoire de l'ancienne université de Provence, ou Histoire de la fameuse univesité d'Aix: période. 1409-1679*. Paris: A. Picard et fils.
- . 1905. *Histoire de l'ancienne université de Provence, ou Histoire de la fameuse univesité d'Aix: d'après les manuscrits et les documents originaux*. A. Picard et fils.
- Beltrán Tapia, Francisco J, and Santiago de Miguel Salanova. 2017. "Migrants' self-selection in the early stages of modern economic growth, Spain (1880–1930)." *Economic History Review* 70 (1): 101–121.
- Bénézet, Brigitte. 2003. *L'Université d'Avignon: naissance & renaissance, 1303-2003*. Actes sud.
- Benzing, Josef. 1986. *Verzeichnis der Professoren der alten Univerität Mainz*. Mainz: Universitätsbibliothek Johannes Gutenberg-Unviersität.
- Berger-Levrault, Oscar. 1890. *Catalogus professorum Academiarum et Universitatum alsaticarum XVI-XVIII seculi*. Impr. de Berger-Levrault.
- Bertoli, Simone, and Jesús Fernández-Huertas Moraga. 2015. "The size of the cliff at the border." *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 51:1–6.

- Bertoli, Simone, and Ilse Ruyssen. 2018. "Networks and migrants' intended destination." *Journal of Economic Geography* 18 (4): 705–728 (03).
- Bimbenet, Jean Eugène. 1853. *Histoire de l'Université de lois d'Orléans*. Dumoulin.
- Bogart, Dan. 2011. "Did the Glorious Revolution contribute to the transport revolution? Evidence from investment in roads and rivers 1." *Economic History Review* 64 (4): 1073–1112.
- Boisard, François. 1848. *Notices, biographiques, littéraires et critiques sur les hommes du Calvados qui se sont fait remarquer par leurs actions ou par leurs ouvrages*. Pagny.
- Boissonade, Prosper. 1932. *Histoire de l'université de Poitiers: passé et présent (1432-1932)....* Poitiers: Imprimerie moderne, Nicolas, Renault & cie.
- Borao, Geronimo. 1853. *Opusculos Literarios: Catedratico de Literatura en la Universidad de Zaragoza*. Zaragoza: Mariano Peiró.
- Borgeaud, Charles. 1900. *Histoire de l'Université de Genève: L'Académie de Calvin, 1559-1798*. Geneva: Georg & Company.
- Borjas, George J. 1987. "Self-selection and the earnings of immigrants." *American Economic Review* 77 (4): 531–553.
- Borsetti, Ferrante. 1735. *Historia almi ferrariae gymnasii*. Typis Bernardini Pomatelli.
- Bosker, Maarten, Eltjo Buringh, and Jan Luiten Van Zanden. 2013. "From Baghdad to London: Unraveling urban development in Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa, 800–1800." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 95 (4): 1418–1437.
- Bourchenin, Pierre Daniel. 1882. *Étude sur les académies protestantes en France au XVIe et au XVIIe siècle*. Grassart.
- Brants, Victor. 1906. *La Faculté de droit de l'Université de Louvain a travers cinq siècles (1426-1906): esquisse historique*. Peeters.
- Breschi, Stefano, and Francesco Lissoni. 2009. "Mobility of skilled workers and co-invention networks: an anatomy of localized knowledge flows." *Journal of Economic Geography* 9 (4): 439–468.
- Brizzi, Gian Paolo. 2001. *L'antica Università di Fermo*. Milano-Fermo, Silvana.
- Brun-Durand, Justin. 1900. *Dictionnaire biographique et biblio-iconographique de la Drôme, contenant des notices sur toutes les personnes de ce département qui se sont fait remarquer par leurs actions ou leurs travaux, avec l'indication de leurs ouvrages et de leurs portraits*. Grenoble: H. Falque et F. Perrin.
- Bumblauskas, Alfredas, B Butkeviciene, Sigitas Jegelevičius, Paulius Manusadžianas, Vygintas Pšibilskis, Eligijus Raila, and Dalia Vitkauskaitė. 2004. *Universitas Vilnensis, 1579–2004*. Vilnius, Spauda.
- Buonanno, Paolo, Matteo Cervellati, Sara Lazzaroni, and Giovanni Prarolo. 2019. "Political Institutions, Culture and Cooperation: Medieval Social Contracts and their Legacy." Mimeo, University of Bologna.
- Burtchaell, George Dames, and Thomas Ulick Sadleir. 1924. *Alumni Dublinenses: A Register of the Students, Graduates, Professors, and Provosts of Trinity College, in the University of Dublin*. Williams and Norgate.

- Cabeza de León, Salvador, and Enrique Fernández-Villamil. 1947. *Historia de la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela*. Peón,.
- Cancila, Orazio. 2006. *Storia dell'Università di Palermo dalle origini al 1860*. Laterza.
- Canella Secades, Fermin. 1873. *Historia de la Universidad de Oviedo y noticias de los establecimientos de enseñanza de su distrito*. Oviedo: Eduardo Uria.
- Cantoni, Davide, Jeremiah Dittmar, and Noam Yuchtman. 2018a. "Religious competition and reallocation: the political economy of secularization in the Protestant Reformation." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 133 (4): 2037–2096.
- . 2018b. "Religious competition and reallocation: the political economy of secularization in the Protestant Reformation." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 133 (4): 2037–2096.
- Cantoni, Davide, and Noam Yuchtman. 2014. "Medieval universities, legal institutions, and the commercial revolution." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129 (2): 823–887.
- Capeille, Jean. 1914. *Dictionnaire de biographie rousillonnaises*. J. Comet.
- Cardell, N Scott. 1997. "Variance components structures for the extreme-value and logistic distributions with application to models of heterogeneity." *Econometric Theory* 13 (2): 185–213.
- Carel, Pierre. 1888. *Les medecins et les chirurgiens de Caen avant la Revolution*. Caen: Massif.
- Carmignani, Paul. 2017. *L'Université de Perpignan: L'une des plus anciennes universités d'Europe*. Presses universitaires de Perpignan.
- Carnazza Amari, Giuseppe. 1867. *Sul diritto che ha l'archiginnasio di Catania di essere riconosciuto università di prima classe 1867*. Catania: Stabilimento Tipografico Caronda.
- Casellato, Sandra, and Luciana Sitran Rea. 2002. *Professori e scienziati a Padova nel Settecento*. Padua: Antilia.
- Catalán, Manuel Jiménez. 1924. *Historia de la real y pontificia Universidad de Zaragoza*. La Académica.
- Cerracchini, Luca Giuseppe. 1738. *Fasti teologali ovvero notizie istoriche del collegio de'teologi della... universita fiorentina dalla sua fondazione sino all'anno 1738 (etc.)*. Francesco Moücke.
- Chenon, Emile. 1890. *Les anciennes Facultés des droits de Rennes (1735-1792)*. H. Caillière.
- Chiquiar, Daniel, and Gordon H Hanson. 2005. "International migration, self-selection, and the distribution of wages: Evidence from Mexico and the United States." *Journal of Political Economy* 113 (2): 239–281.
- Cinnirella, Francesco, and Jochen Streb. 2017. "The role of human capital and innovation in economic development: evidence from post-Malthusian Prussia." *Journal of Economic Growth* 22 (2): 193–227.
- Clark, Gregory. 2008. *A farewell to alms: a brief economic history of the world*. Princeton University Press.
- Cobban, Alan B. 1985. "Elective salaried lectureships in the universities of Southern Europe in the pre-Reformation era." *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, University of Manchester* 67 (2): 662–687.
- Collective. 1900. *CCCL anniversario della Università di Messina*. Messina: Trimarchi.

- Collège de France. 2007. “Liste des professeurs depuis la fondation du Collège de France en 1530.” Affaires culturelles et relations extérieures, Paris.
- Conrad, Ernst. 1960. “Die Lehrstühle der Universität Tübingen und ihre Inhaber (1477-1927).” Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen.
- Čornejová, Ivana, and Anna Fechtnerová. 1986. *Životopisný slovník Pražské Univerzity: Filozofická a Teologická Fakulta 1654 - 1773*. 1. vyd. Praha: Univ. Karlova.
- Cottini, Elena, Paolo Ghinetti, and Simone Moriconi. 2019. “Higher Education Supply, Neighbourhood Effects and Economic Welfare.” CESifo Working Paper.
- Courtenay, William J. 1999. *Parisian scholars in the early fourteenth century: a social portrait*. Volume 41. Cambridge University Press.
- Covarrubias, Matías, Jeanne Lafortune, and José Tessada. 2015. “Who Comes and Why? Determinants of Immigrants Skill Level in the Early XXth Century US.” *Journal of Demographic Economics* 81 (1): 115–155.
- Croissant, Yves. 2012. “Estimation of multinomial logit models in R: The mlogit Packages.” available from R-Forge.
- Curi, Vincenzo. 1880. *L'Università degli Studi di Fermo: notizie storiche*. Ancona, Ernesto Aurelj.
- Dahl, Gordon B. 2002. “Mobility and the return to education: Testing a Roy model with multiple markets.” *Econometrica* 70 (6): 2367–2420.
- De la Croix, David. 2021a. “Scholars and Literati at the Lubranski College in Poznań (1519–1780).” *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 4:45–51.
- . 2021b. “Scholars and Literati at the Royal College in Paris (1530–1800).” *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 1:19–24.
- . 2021c. “Scholars and Literati at the University of Copenhagen (1475–1800).” *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 2:21–29.
- . 2021d. “Scholars and Literati at the University of Lund (1666–1800).” *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 5:53–60.
- De la Croix, David, and Mehrdaad Doraghi. 2021. “Scholars and Literati at the Saint Petersburg Academy of Sciences (1724–1800).” *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 5:17–26.
- De la Croix, David, and Alice Fabre. 2019. “A la découverte des professeurs de l'ancienne université d'Aix, de ses origines à 1793.” *Annales du midi* 131:379–402.
- . 2021a. “Scholars and Literati at the Royal Bourbon College in Aix-en-Provence (1603–1763).” *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 3:43–50.
- . 2021b. “Scholars and Literati at the University of Valence (1452–1763).” *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 2:13–20.
- De la Croix, David, and Hugo Jay. 2021. “Scholars and Literati at the Old University of Aberdeen (1495–1800).” *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 4:27–34.

- De la Croix, David, and Soraya Karioun. 2021a. "Scholars and Literati at the Gregorian University in Rome (1551–1773)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 3:19–26.
- . 2021b. "Scholars and Literati at the Imperial College of Madrid (1560–1767)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 4:19–25.
- . 2021c. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Pont-à-Mousson (1572–1768)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 2:1–6.
- . 2021d. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Valladolid (1280–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 1:11–18.
- De la Croix, David, and Gaia Spolverini. 2021. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Santiago de Compostela (1526–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 3:27–32.
- De la Croix, David, and Gaia Spolverini. 2021. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Macerata (1540–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 2:39–45.
- De la Croix, David, and Gaia Spolverini. 2022. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Cracow (1364–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 6:35–42.
- De la Croix, David, and Robert Stelter. 2021a. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Gießen (1607–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 2:31–38.
- . 2021b. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Göttingen (1734–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 4:1–8.
- . 2021c. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Jena (1558–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 1:25–32.
- . 2021d. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Leiden (1575–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 5:9–16.
- . 2022. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Heidelberg (1386–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 6:25–34.
- De la Croix, David, and Mara Vitale. 2021a. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Bologna (1088–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 1:1–10.
- . 2021b. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Padua (1222–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 3:33–42.
- De la Croix, David, and Mara Vitale. 2022. "Women in European Academia before 1800 – Religion, Marriage, and Human Capital." IRES/LIDAM, UCLouvain.
- de Teule, Edilbert. 1887. *Chronologie des docteurs en droit civil de l'université d'Avignon (1303-1791)*. Lechevalier.
- Debois, Valentine, and David De la Croix. 2021a. "Scholars and Literati at Gresham College (1597–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 2:51–57.
- . 2021b. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Geneva (1559–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 1:41–47.

- De Caro, Luigi. 1961. *Discipline e maestri dell'Ateneo Pavese: Nel Sesto Centenario dello Studium Generale Pavese (1361-1961)*. Università di Pavia.
- De la Croix, David, Matthias Doepke, and Joel Mokyr. 2018. "Clans, Guilds, and Markets: Apprenticeship Institutions and Growth in the Preindustrial Economy." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 133 (1): 1–70.
- De la Croix, David, and Omar Licandro. 2015. "The longevity of famous people from Hammurabi to Einstein." *Journal of Economic Growth* 20 (3): 263–303.
- De la Croix, David, and Fabio Mariani. 2015. "From Polygyny to Serial Monogamy: A Unified Theory of Marriage Institutions." *Review of Economic Studies* 82 (2): 565–607.
- Delen, Första, and Martin Johan Julius Weibull. 1868. *Lunds Universitets Historia, 1668-1868*. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- De Lens, Louis. 1880. *Université d'Angers, du Xve siècle à la Révolution française*. Angers: Germain et Grassin.
- Del Negro, Piero. 2015. *Clariores: dizionario biografico dei docenti e degli studenti dell'Università di Padova*. Padova University Press.
- Deloume, Antonin. 1890. "Personnel de la Faculté de droit de Toulouse depuis la fondation de l'Université de Toulouse au XIIIe siècle." manuscript.
- Denéchère, Yves, and Jean-Michel Matz. 2012. *Histoire de l'Université d'Angers du Moyen Age à nos jours*. Presses universitaires de Rennes.
- Denley, Peter. 2013a. "'Medieval', 'Renaissance', 'modern'. Issues of periodization in Italian university history." *Renaissance Studies* 27 (4): 487–503.
- . 2013b. "'Medieval', 'Renaissance', 'modern'. Issues of periodization in Italian university history." *Renaissance Studies* 27 (4): 487–503.
- de Pontville, Michel. 1997. "Histoire de l'Académie de Caen." manuscript.
- De Renzi, Salvatore. 1857. *Storia documentata della Scuola medica di Salerno*. Nobile.
- Deuster, Christoph, and Frédéric Docquier. 2019. "International Migration and Human Capital Inequality: A Dyadic Approach." In *Global Education Monitoring Report*, 1–41. UNESCO.
- Di Caprio, Giovanni, and Mara Vitale. 2021. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Fermo (1585–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 5:27–34.
- DigiBern. 2003. "Dozenten der Universität Bern, 1584-1984." Universität Bern.
- Dittmar, Jeremiah. 2019. "Economic Origins of Modern Science: Technology, Institutions, and Markets." London School of Economics.
- Dittmar, Jeremiah, and Ralf Meisenzahl. 2019. "Public goods institutions, human capital, and growth: evidence from German history." *Review of Economic Studies*, 02.
- Dorsman, Leen. 2011. "Catalogus Professorum Academiae Rheno-Traiectinae." <http://profs.library.uu.nl/index.php/info/project>.

- Dowey, James. 2017. "Mind over matter: access to knowledge and the British Industrial Revolution." Ph.D. diss., The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE).
- Drüll, Dagmar. 1991. *Heidelberger Gelehrtenlexikon: 1652–1802*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- . 2002. *Heidelberger Gelehrtenlexikon 1386–1651*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg and Imprint and Springer.
- Duhamel, Leopold. 1895. "Liste des primiciers de l'Université d'Avignon." Archives du Vaucluse.
- Duijnsteer, Marguerite. 2010. "L'enseignement du droit civil à l'université d'Orléans du début de la guerre de Cent ans (1337) au siège de la ville (1428)." Ph.D. diss., Institute of Private Law, Faculty of Law, Leiden University.
- Dulieu, Louis. 1975. *La médecine à Montpellier, vol I: Le Moyen Âge*. Avignon: Les presses universelles.
- . 1979. *La médecine à Montpellier, vol II: La Renaissance*. Avignon: Les presses universelles.
- . 1983. *La médecine à Montpellier, vol III: L'âge classique*. Avignon: Les presses universelles.
- Ebel, Wilhelm, ed. 1962. *Catalogus professorum Göttingensium: 1734 - 1962*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht and Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek.
- Eloy, Nicolas FJ. 1755. *Dictionnaire Historique De La Médecine: Contenant Son Origine, Ses Progrès, ses Révolutions, ses Sectes & son Etat chez différents Peuples*. Bassompierre.
- Emden, Alfred Brotherston. 1959. *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to AD 1500*. Volume 3. Clarendon Press.
- Esteve i Perendreu, Francesc. 2007. *Mestrescoles i rectors de l'Estudi General de Lleida (1597-1717)*. Lleida: Universitat de Lleida.
- Evans, T.A.R. 1992. *College estates and university finances 1350–1500, The History of the University of Oxford (chapter 15)*. Volume Volume II: Late Medieval Oxford. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Fabroni, Angelo. 1791. *Historiae academiae pisanae*. Bologna: Forni.
- Facciolati, Jacopo. 1757. *Fasti Gymnasii Patavini Jacobi Facciolati studio atque opera collecti: Fasti gymnasii Patavini Jacobi Facciolati opera collecti ab anno 1517 quo restitutae scholae sunt ad 1756*. Volume 1. typis Seminarii.
- Faucillon, M. 1862. *Les professeurs de droit civil et canonique de la faculté de Montpellier*. Montpellier: Académie des Sciences.
- Fazzo, Silvia. 1998. "Ruoli delle scuole pubbliche a Milano nel cinquecento (1518-1563)." *Rivista di Storia della Filosofia* (1984-) 53 (4): 799–819.
- Feenstra, Robert, Margreet Ahsmann, and Theo Johannes Veen. 2003. *Bibliografie van hoogleraren in de rechten aan de Franeker Universiteit tot 1811*. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen.
- Feret, Pierre. 1904. *La faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres*. Picard.
- Ferté, Patrick. 1975. *L'université de Cahors au XVIIIe siècle: 1700-1751*. Saint-Sulpice-la-Pointe: Ferté.

- . 2013. “Toulouse, université hispanique. Des relations universitaires franco-espagnoles du Moyen Âge à l’Ilustración.” *Les Cahiers de Framespa. e-STORIA*, no. 14.
- Fink, Carsten, Ernest Miguelez, and Julio Raffo. 2013. “The global race for inventors.” mimeo.
- Fischer, Karl Franz Adolf. 1978. “Jesuiten-Mathematiker in der deutschen Assistenz bis 1773.” *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* 47:159–224.
- Flessa, Dorothee. 1969. “Die Professoren der Medizin zu Altdorf von 1580 - 1809.” Ph.D. diss., Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg.
- Fleury, Georges, and Auguste Dumas. 1929. *Histoire de l’ancienne Université d’Aix de 1730 à 1793: d’après des documents inédits*. Nicollet.
- Foster, Joseph. 1891. *Alumni Oxonienses: the members of the university of Oxford, 1500-1886*. London: Parker.
- Fournier, Marcel. 1892. *Histoire de la science du droit en France*. Librairie du recueil général des lois et des arrêts et du journal du palais.
- Fourquet, Émile. 1976. *Les hommes célèbres et les personnalités marquantes de Franche-Comté: du IV^e siècle à nos jours*. Laffitte.
- Franzoni, Chiara, Giuseppe Scellato, and Paula Stephan. 2012. “Foreign Born Scientists: Mobility Patterns for Sixteen Countries.” *Nature Biotechnology* 30 (12): 1250–1253.
- Frijhoff, Willem. 1996. “Patterns.” Chapter 2 of *A History of the University in Europe. Vol. II: Universities in Early Modern Europe (1500–1800)*, edited by Hilde de Ridder-Symoens. Cambridge University Press.
- Frova, Carla, Giuliano Catoni, and Paolo Renzi. 2001. “Maestri e scolari a Siena e Perugia 1250-1500.” <http://www3.unisi.it/docentes/index.html>.
- Gallin, Joshua Hojvat. 2004. “Net migration and state labor market dynamics.” *Journal of Labor Economics* 22 (1): 1–21.
- Galor, Oded. 2011. *Unified growth theory*. Princeton University Press.
- Galor, Oded, and Omer Moav. 2002. “Natural Selection and the Origin of Economic Growth.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 117 (4): 1133–1191.
- Gaullieur, Ernest. 1874. *Histoire du Collège de Guyenne d’après un grand nombre de documents inédits*. Paris: Sandoz et Fischbacher.
- Genet, Jean-Philippe. 2019. “Projet Studium Parisiense.” Université Paris 1.
- Gergaud, Olivier, Morgane Laouenan, and Etienne Wasmer. 2017. “A Brief History of Human Time. Exploring a database of ‘notable people’.” mimeo.
- Germain, Alexandre-Charles. 1874. *L’Ecole de Droit de Montpellier. 1160-1793*. Boehm et fils.
- Gherardi, Alessandro. 1881. *Statuti dell’Università e studio fiorentino dell’anno MCCCLXXXVII*. Volume 9. Forni editore.
- Gibson, John, and David McKenzie. 2014. “Scientific mobility and knowledge networks in high emigration countries: Evidence from the Pacific.” *Research Policy* 43 (9): 1486–1495.

- Gilles, H. 1992. *Université de Toulouse & enseignement du droit: XIIIe - XVIe siècles*. SEDUSS (Service des Editions de l'Université des sciences sociales).
- Gleixner, Ulrike. 2019. "Professorenkatalog." <http://uni-helmstedt.hab.de/index.php>.
- Godet, Marcel, Heinrich Türlér, and Victor Attinger. 1928. *Dictionnaire historique et biographique de la Suisse*. Neuchâtel: Attinger.
- González, Serafin Vegas. 1998. *La Escuela de Traductores de Toledo en la historia del pensamiento*. Toledo: Ayuntamiento de Toledo.
- Gorochoy, Nathalie. 2012. *Naissance de l'université. Les écoles de Paris d'Innocent III à Thomas d'Aquin (v. 1200-v. 1245)*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Grant, Alexander. 1884. *The story of the University of Edinburgh during its first three hundred years*. Volume 2. Longmans, Green, and Company.
- Greif, Avner. 2006. "Family Structure, Institutions, and Growth: The Origins and Implications of Western Corporations." *American Economic Review* 96 (2): 308–312.
- Grendler, Paul F. 2002. *The universities of the Italian Renaissance*. JHU Press.
- . 2009. *The University of Mantua, the Gonzaga, and the Jesuits, 1584–1630*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Grogger, Jeffrey, and Gordon H Hanson. 2011. "Income maximization and the selection and sorting of international migrants." *Journal of Development Economics* 95 (1): 42–57.
- . 2015. "Attracting talent: location choice of foreign-born PhDs in the United States." *Journal of Labor Economics* 33 (S1): 5–38.
- Groningen, Rijksuniversiteit. 2014. "Catalogus Professorum Academiae Groninganae." <https://hoogleraren.ub.rug.nl/>.
- Grünblatt, Serge. 1961. "Les chirurgiens de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Nantes sous l'ancien régime: Esquisse d'histoire de la médecine à Nantes au 18ème siècle." Ph.D. diss., Nantes.
- Guénée, Simone. 1981. *Bibliographie des universités françaises des origines à la Révolution, Généralités-Université de Paris, 1981*. Paris: Picard.
- Guerau de Montmajor, Gaspar. 1999. *Breu descripció dels mestres que anaren a besar les mans a sa majestat del rei don Felip al Real de la ciutat de València a 8 de febrer any 1586*. València: Universitat de València.
- Guerrin, M. 1932. *Université de Caen, son passé, son présent, 1432-1932*. Caen: Malherbe.
- Gundlach, Franz, and Inge Auerbach. 1927. *Catalogus professorum academiae Marburgensis; die akademischen Lehrer der Philipps-Universität in Marburg*. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung G. Braun.
- Günther, Johannes. 1858. *Lebensskizzen der Professoren der Universität Jena seit 1558 bis 1858*. Jena: Friedrich Mauke.
- Hänsel, Willy. 1971. *Catalogus Professorum Rintelensium*. Rinteln: Verlag.
- Harris, Jonathan. 1995. *Greek emigres in the West 1400-1520*. Porphyrogenitus.

- Haupt, Herman, and Georg Lehnert. 1907. *Chronik der Universität Giessen, 1607 bis 1907*. Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann.
- Hazon, Jacques Albert, and Thomas-Bernard Bertrand. 1778. *Notice des hommes les plus célèbres de la Faculté de Médecine en l'Université de Paris, depuis 1110, jusqu'en 1750 (inclusivement)*. chez Benoît Morin.
- Heiss, Florian, et al. 2002. "Structural choice analysis with nested logit models." *Stata Journal* 2 (3): 227–252.
- Herbermann, Charles George. 1913. *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Encyclopedia Press, Incorporated.
- Hermans, Jos MM, and Marc Nelissen. 2005. *Charters of foundation and early documents of the universities of the Coimbra Group*. Leuven University Press.
- Herzog, Johann Werner. 1780. *Adumbratio eruditorum basiliensium meritis apud exteros olim hodieque celeberrimum : apendicis loco Athenis Rauricis addita*. Basel: Serinus.
- Hirsch, Theodor. 1837. *Geschichte des akademischen Gymnasiums in Danzig, in ihren Hauptzügen dargestellt*. Volume 1. Wedelschen Hofbuchdruckerei.
- Hoisl, Karin. 2007. "Tracing mobile inventors—the causality between inventor mobility and inventor productivity." In *A Study of Inventors*, 65–119. Springer.
- Huff, Toby E. 2017. *The rise of early modern science: Islam, China, and the West*. Cambridge University Press.
- Inno, Karl. 1972. *Tartu University in Estonia during the Swedish rule (1632-1710)*. Vaba Eesti.
- Izarn, Pierre. 1991. "La faculté de médecine de Perpignan au XVIIIe siècle." *Bulletin mensuel de l'Académie des sciences et lettres de Montpellier* 22:81–107.
- Jaeger, C Stephen. 2013. *The envy of angels: Cathedral schools and social ideals in Medieval Europe, 950-1200*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jaussaud, Philippe, and Édouard-Raoul Brygoo. 2004. *Du Jardin au Muséum en 516 biographies*. Paris: Publications scientifiques du Muséum national d'histoire naturelle.
- Jensen, Mikkel Munthe. 2018. "From learned cosmopolitanism to scientific inter-nationalism: the patriotic transformation of Nordic academia and academic culture during the long eighteenth century." Ph.D. diss., European Institute.
- Junius Institute. 2013. "Post Reformation Digital Library – Scholastica." www.prd1.org.
- Keane, Michael P, and Kenneth I Wolpin. 1997. "The career decisions of young men." *Journal of Political Economy* 105 (3): 473–522.
- Kedar, Benjamin. 1995. "Benvenutus Grapheus of Jerusalem, an Oculist in the Era of the Crusades." *Korot* 11:14–41.
- Kerr, Sari Pekkala, William Kerr, Çağlar Özden, and Christopher Parsons. 2016. "Global talent flows." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30 (4): 83–106.

- . 2017. “High-skilled migration and agglomeration.” *Annual Review of Economics* 9:201–234.
- Kerr, Sari Pekkala, William R. Kerr, and William F. Lincoln. 2015a. “Firms and the economics of skilled immigration.” *Innovation Policy and the Economy* 15 (1): 115–152.
- . 2015b. “Skilled immigration and the employment structures of US firms.” *Journal of Labor Economics* 33 (S1): S147–S186.
- Kerr, William R. 2008. “Ethnic scientific communities and international technology diffusion.” *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 90 (3): 518–537.
- Kiener, Marc, and Olivier Robert. 2005. *Dictionnaire des professeurs de l'Académie de Lausanne (1537-1890)*. Université de Lausanne.
- Kindleberger, Charles P. 1996. *World economic primacy: 1500-1990*. Oxford University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, Thomas Percy Claude. 1912. *History of the medical teaching in Trinity College Dublin and of the School of Physic in Ireland*. Hanna and Neale.
- Köbler, Gerhard. 2019. “Zentrissimum integrativer europäischer Legistik - Rechtsfakultäten.” <http://www.koeblergerhard.de/Rechtsfakultaeten.htm>.
- Kohnle, Armin, and Beate Kusche. 2016. *Professorenbuch der theologischen Fakultät der Universität Wittenberg: 1502 bis 1815/17*. Leipzig: Leucorea-Studien zur Geschichte der Reformation und der Lutherischen Orthodoxie.
- Kremer, Michael. 1993. “The O-ring theory of economic development.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 108 (3): 551–575.
- Krones, Franz Xaver. 1886. *Geschichte der Karl Franzens-Universität in Graz*. Verlag der Karl Franzens-universität.
- Krüger, Kersten. 2019. “Catalogus Professorum Rostochiensium.” <http://cpr.uni-rostock.de/>.
- Kurrus, Theodor. 1977. *Die Jesuiten an der Universität Freiburg im Br. 1620 – 1773*. Alber.
- Lackner, Franz. 1976. *Die Jesuitenprofessoren an der philosophischen Fakultät der Wiener Universität (1712-1773)*. Volume 1. VWGÖ, Verb. d. Wissenschaftl. Gesellschaften Österreichs.
- Lamb, John, and Robert Masters. 1831. *Masters' History of the College of Corpus Christi and the Blessed Virgin Mary in the University of Cambridge*. John Smith.
- Lamberts, Emiel, and Jan Roegiers. 1990. *Leuven University, 1425-1985*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Landes, David S. 1998. *The wealth and poverty of nations: Why are some so rich and others so poor*. New York: WW Norton.
- Langer, Herbert. 2011. “Die Universität Greifswald im Dreißigjährigen Krieg.” *Militär und Gesellschaft in der frühen Neuzeit* 15 (1): 72–97.
- Laudel, Grit. 2003. “Studying the brain drain: Can bibliometric methods help?” *Scientometrics* 57 (2): 215–237.
- Laval, Victorin. 1889. *Histoire de la Faculté de Médecine d'Avignon. Ses origines, son organisation et son enseignement, 1303-1791*. Avignon: Seguin Frères.

- Lavillat, Bernard. 1977. *L'enseignement à Besançon au XVIIIe siècle*. Belles Lettres.
- Leiden, Universitaire Bibliotheek. 2019. "Leidse hoogleraren vanaf 1575." <https://hoogleraren.leidenuniv.nl/>.
- Lladonosa, Josep. 1969. *La Facultat de Medicina de l'antiga Universitat de Lleida*. Barcelona: Rafael Dalmau.
- . 1970. *L'Estudi General de Lleida del 1430 al 1524*. Institut d'Estudis Catalans.
- Maddison, Angus. 2007. *The world economy volume 1: A millennial perspective volume 2: Historical statistics*. Academic Foundation.
- Manning, Alan, and Barbara Petrongolo. 2017. "How local are labor markets? Evidence from a spatial job search model." *American Economic Review* 107 (10): 2877–2907.
- Manuel, Frank E. 1968. *A portrait of Isaac Newton*. Cambridge MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Martin, Eugène. 1891. *L'Université de Pont-à-Mousson (1572-1768)*. Paris–Nancy: Berger-Levrault.
- Mattone, Antonello. 2010. *Storia dell'Università di Sassari*. Ilisso.
- Mazzetti, Serafino. 1847. *Repertorio di tutti i Professori antichi e moderni della famosa Università, e del celebre Istituto delle Scienze di Bologna*. Bologna: tipografia di San Tommaso d'Aquino.
- McFadden, Daniel. 1974. "Conditional logit analysis of qualitative choice behavior." In *Frontiers in Econometrics (Chapter 2)*, 65–119. P. Zarembka, Academic Press: New York.
- . 1978. "Modeling the choice of residential location." *Transportation Research Record*, no. 673.
- McKenzie, David, and Hillel Rapoport. 2007. "Network effects and the dynamics of migration and inequality: theory and evidence from Mexico." *Journal of Development Economics* 84 (1): 1–24.
- Méchin, Édouard. 1890. *Annales du collège royal Bourbon d'Aix, depuis les premières démarches pour sa fondation jusqu'au 7 ventôse an III*. Marseille: J. Evesque.
- Michaud, Joseph-François. 1811. *Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne, 45 vols*. Paris: Bureau de la Biographie Universelle.
- Miguelez, Ernest, and Rosina Moreno. 2013. "Do Labour Mobility and Technological Collaborations Foster Geographical Knowledge Diffusion? The Case of European Regions." *Growth and Change* 44 (2): 321–354.
- Moed, Henk, M'hamed Aisati, and Andrew Plume. 2013. "Studying scientific migration in Scopus." *Scientometrics* 94:929–942.
- Mokyr, Joel. 2010. *The Enlightened economy: an economic history of Britain 1700-1850*. Yale University Press.
- . 2016. *A culture of growth: the origins of the modern economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Monroe, Paul. 2000. *Encyclopaedia of History of Education*. New Delhi: Cosmo.
- Mor, Carlo Guido, and Pericle Di Pietro. 1975. *Storia dell'università di Modena*. LS Olschki.
- Nadal, Joseph Cyprien. 1861. *Histoire de l'Université de Valence, et des autres établissements d'instruction de cette ville, etc*. Valence: Impr. E. Marc Aurel.

- Napjus, J. W., and Gerrit Arie Lindeboom. 1985. *De hoogleraren in de geneeskunde aan de Hogeschool en het Athenaeum te Franeker*. Nieuwe Nederlandse bijdragen tot de geschiedenis der geneeskunde en der natuurwetenschappen. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Naragon, Steve. 2006. "Kant in the Classroom: Materials to Aid the Study of Kant's Lectures." Manchester College. <http://www.manchester.edu/kant/Home/index.htm>.
- Navarro-Brotons, Victor. 2006. "The Cultivation of Astronomy in Spanish Universities in the Latter Half of the 16th Century." In *Universities and Science in the Early Modern Period*, 83–98. Springer.
- Neal, Derek. 1999. "The complexity of job mobility among young men." *Journal of Labor Economics* 17 (2): 237–261.
- Nève, Félix. 1856. *Mémoire historique et littéraire sur le Collège des trois-langues à l'Université de Louvain, en réponse a la question suivante: Faire l'histoire du collège des trois-langues a Louvain,[...]*. Hayez.
- Nowicki, Michał. 2015. *Akademia Lubrańskiego: organizacja szkoły i działalność wychowawcza*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DiG.
- Nunes, Maria de Fátima, and Augusto da Silva. 2009. *Da Europa para Évora e de Évora para o Mundo. A Universidade Jesuítica de Évora 1559-1759*. Evora: Instituto Superior Económico e Social de Évora.
- Office of the principal. 2022. "Principals of the University of Valencia since the founding of the institution in 1499." <https://www.uv.es/uvweb/office-principal/en/principal/former-principals-1285869254667.html>.
- Origlia Paolino, Giovanni Giuseppe. 1754. *Istoria dello studio di Napoli*. Torino: nella stamperia di Giovanni di Simone.
- Ortega, Francesc, and Giovanni Peri. 2013. "The effect of income and immigration policies on international migration." *Migration Studies* 1 (1): 47–74.
- Özak, Ömer. 2010. "The voyage of homo-economicus: Some economic measures of distance." Department of Economics, Brown University.
- . 2018. "Distance to the pre-industrial technological frontier and economic development." *Journal of Economic Growth* 23 (2): 175–221.
- Paquet, Jacques. 1958. "Salaires et prébendes des professeurs de l'université de Louvain au XVe siècle." *Studia universitatis "lovanium"* 2:1–36.
- Pardi, Giuseppe. 1903. *Lo studio di Ferrara nei secoli XV e XVI: con documenti inediti*. G. Zuffi.
- Pastor, Julio Rey, and Ernesto García Camarero. 1960. *La cartografía mallorquina*. Instituto Luis Vives.
- Pery, Guillaume Marie Auguste Georges. 1888. *Histoire de la Faculté de Médecine de Bordeaux et de l'enseignement médical dans cette ville 1441-1888*. Paris: O. Doin.
- Pesenti, Tiziana. 1984. *Professori e promotori di medicina nello studio di Padova dal 1405 al 1509*. Trieste: Lint.
- Pierson, Alice Sharp, and Peter Cotgreave. 2000. "Citation figures suggest that the UK brain drain is a genuine problem." *Nature* 407 (6800): 13.

- Pillosu, Francesco. 2017. "Libro de grados de Doctores comenzando del ano 1709 asta 1723." Università di Cagliari.
- Piñero, José M López. 2006. "The Faculty of Medicine of Valencia: Its Position in Renaissance Europe." In *Universities and science in the early modern period*, 65–82. Springer.
- Polanyi, Karl. 1944. *The great transformation*. Volume 2. Beacon Press Boston.
- Post, Gaines. 1932. "Masters' salaries and student-fees in the mediaeval universities." *Speculum* 7 (2): 181–198.
- Prezziner, Giovanni. 1810. *Storia del pubblico studio e delle società scientifiche e letterarie di Firenze*. Firenze: Carli.
- Quaresima, Giulio. 2021. "Onomasticon. Prosopografia dell'Università degli Studi di Perugia." <https://onomasticon.unipg.it/onomasticon/home.do>.
- Rae, John. 1895. *Life of Adam Smith*. Macmillan & Company.
- Raggi, A. 1879. Memorie e documenti per la storia dell'Università di Pavia e degli uomini piu illustri che vi insegnarono.
- Ram, Pierre François Xavier de. 1861. *Les quatorze livres sur l'histoire de la ville de Louvain du docteur et professeur en théologie Jean Molanus: Historiae lovaniensium*. Collection de chroniques belges inédites. Bruxelles: Hayez.
- Rangeard, Pierre, and Albert Lemarchand. 1868. *Histoire de l'Université d'Angers*. E. Barassé.
- Rashdall, Hastings. 1895. *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Renardy, Christine. 1981. *Les maîtres universitaires du diocèse de Liège: répertoire biographique, 1140-1350*. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres".
- Renazzi, Filippo Maria. 1803. *Storia dell'Università degli studi di Roma: detta comunemente la sapienza, che contiene anche un saggio storico della letteratura romana, dal principio del secolo XIII sino al declinare del secolo XVIII*. nella stamperia Pagliarini.
- Revelt, David, and Kenneth Train. 1998. "Mixed logit with repeated choices: households' choices of appliance efficiency level." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 80 (4): 647–657.
- Rizzi, Fortunato. 1953. *I professori dell'Università di Parma attraverso i secoli: note indicative bibliografiche*. Tip. fratelli Godi.
- Rolla, Cecilia, and Mara Vitale. 2022. "Scholars and Literati at the University of Parma (1412–1800)." *Repertorium Eruditorum totius Europae* 6:1–8.
- Rosen, Josef. 1972. *Die Universität Basel im Staatshaushalt 1460 bis 1535: die Gehälter der Dozenten*. Werner & Bischoff.
- Rosso, Paolo. 2012. "Professori, studenti e nationes." *Almum Studium Papiense. Storia dell'Università di Pavia* Vol. I, Dalle origini all'età spagnola (Tomo I, Origini e fondazione dello Studium generale): 383–414.

- Rubio y Borrás, Manuel. 1914. *Historia de la Real y Pontificia Universidad de Cervera, dos volúmenes*. Barcelona: Verdager.
- Sabbadini, Remigio. 1898. *Storia documentata della Regia Università di Catania*. Catania: Stabilimento Tipografico C. Galàtola.
- Sanz Serrulla, Francisco Javier. 1985. Historia de la Facultad de Medicina de la Universidad de Sigüenza.
- Sarrias, Mauricio, et al. 2016. “Discrete choice models with random parameters in R: The Rchoice Package.” *Journal of Statistical Software* 74 (10): 1–31.
- Schich, Maximilian, Chaoming Song, Yong-Yeol Ahn, Alexander Mirsky, Mauro Martino, Barabasi Albert-Laszlo, and Dirk Helbing. 2014. “A network framework of cultural history.” *Science* 345 (6196): 558–562.
- Schmutz, Benoit, and Modibo Sidibe. 2019. “Frictional Labour Mobility.” *Review of Economic Studies* 86 (4): 1779–1826.
- Schopferer, Julia. 2016. *Sozialgeschichte der halleschen Professoren 1694–1806: Lebenswege, Netzwerke und Raum als Strukturbedingungen von universitärer Wissenschaft und frühmoderner Gelehrtenexistenz*. Mitteldeutscher Verlag.
- Schwinges, Rainer Christoph, and Christian Hesse. 2019. “Repertorium Academicum Germanicum.” <https://en.rag-online.org/>.
- Serafinelli, Michel, and Guido Tabellini. 2017. “Creativity over time and space.” mimeo.
- Serangeli, Sandro. 2010. *I docenti dell'antica Università di Macerata:(1540-1824)*. Torino: G. Giappichelli.
- Sergescu, Petre. 1939. “Les mathématiques à Paris au moyen-âge.” *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France* 67:27–42.
- Shemivot, Vladimir Petrovich. 1873. “General list of members of the Academy of Sciences since its foundation.” St. Petersburg.
- Simón Díaz, José. 1952. *Historia del Colegio Imperial de Madrid*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Sinno, Andrea. 1921. *Diplomi di laurea dell'Almo Collegio salernitano*. Salerno: Stabilimento Tipografico Spadafora.
- Slottved, Ejvind. 1978. *Lærestole og lærere ved Københavns Universitet 1537-1977*. Copenhagen: Samfundet for dansk Genealogi og Personhistorie.
- Smart, Robert Noyes. 2004. *Biographical Register of the University of St. Andrews, 1747-1897*. University of St. Andrews Library.
- Smith, Adam. 1776. *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. London: printed for W. Strahan; and T. Cadell, 1776.
- Soetaert, Alexander, and Violet Soen. 2018. “Impressa Catholica Cameracensia.” <https://www.odis.be/hercules/search2.php?searchMethod=simple&search=douai>.
- Sommervogel, Carlos. 1890. *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*. Brussels: Oscar Schepens.

- Spitzer, Yannay, and Ariell Zimran. 2018. "Migrant self-selection: Anthropometric evidence from the mass migration of Italians to the United States, 1907–1925." *Journal of Development Economics* 134:226–247.
- Squicciarini, Mara P, and Nico Voigtländer. 2015. "Human capital and industrialization: evidence from the age of enlightenment." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 130 (4): 1825–1883.
- Stelter, Robert, David de la Croix, and Mikko Myrskylä. 2021. "Leaders and Laggards in Life Expectancy among European Scholars from the Sixteenth to the Early Twentieth Century." *Demography* 58:111–135.
- Stephan, Paula E., and Sharon G. Levin. 2001. "Exceptional contributions to US science by the foreign-born and foreign-educated." *Population Research and Policy Review* 20 (1-2): 59–79.
- Sussman, Nathan. 2006. "Income inequality in Paris in the heyday of the commercial revolution." Technical Report, DEGIT (Dynamic Economics, Growth, and International Trade).
- Svatoš, Michal, and Ivana Čornejová. 1995. *Dějiny Univerzity Karlovy: 1348-1990*. Karolinum.
- Taisand, Pierre. 1721. *Les vies des plus celebres jurisconsultes de toutes les nations, tant anciens que modernes, savoir, latins ou romains, francois, espagnols, italiens, allemans, anglois, hollandois*. Sevestre.
- Tola, Pasquale. 1837. *Dizionario biografico degli uomini illustri di Sardegna*. Chirio.
- Torrecilla, Luis Miguel Gutiérrez, Manuel Casado Arboniés, and Pedro L Ballesteros Torres. 2013. *Profesores y estudiantes: biografía colectiva de la Universidad de Alcalá (1508-1836)*. Universidad de Alcalá, Servicio de Publicaciones.
- Trippel, Michaela. 2013. "Scientific mobility and knowledge transfer at the interregional and intraregional level." *Regional Studies* 47 (10): 1653–1667.
- University of Amsterdam. 2007. "Album Academicum." <http://www.albumacademicum.uva.nl/>.
- Vallauri, Tommaso. 1875. *Storia delle università degli studi del Piemonte*. Stamperia reale di GB Paravia.
- van Epen, Didericus Gysbertus. 1904. *Album studiosorum Academiae gelro-zutphanicae MDCXLVIII-MDCCCXVIII*. The Hague: Jacobum Hoekstra.
- Venn, John. 1922. *Alumni Cantabrigienses: a biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge, from the earliest times to 1900*. Cambridge University Press.
- Verger, Jacques. 1998. *Les gens de savoir en Europe à la fin du Moyen Âge*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Vidal y Díaz, Alejandro, et al. 1869. *Memoria histórica de la Universidad de Salamanca*. Salamanca: Oliva y hermano.
- Villoslada, Ricardo García. 1954. *Storia del Collegio Romano dal suo inizio (1551) alla soppressione della Compagnia di Gesù (1773)*. Gregorian Biblical BookShop.
- Volbehrr, Friedrich, and Richard Weyl. 1956. *Professoren und Dozenten der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel: 1665 - 1954*. Kiel: Hirt.
- von Aschbach, Joseph Ritter. 1865. *Geschichte der Wiener Universität und Ihre Gelehrten*. Verlag der Universität.
- Von Bahr, Gunnar. 1945. *Medicinska fakulteten i Uppsala*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

- von Hehl, Ulrich, and Thomas Riechert. 2017. "Catalogus professorum lipsiensium." <https://research.uni-leipzig.de/catalogus-professorum-lipsiensium/>.
- von Schrottenberg, Hubertus. 1978. *Wissenschaftsfinanzierung (Professorenbesoldung) und das Problem der Vermögensselbstverwaltung an der Universität Ingolstadt (1472-1676)*. Munich: LMU München.
- Wachter, Clemens. 2009. *Philosophische Fakultät, Naturwissenschaftliche Fakultät*. Erlanger Forschungen Sonderreihe. Erlangen: Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen and Universitätsbund Erlangen-Nürnberg.
- Walker, Thomas Alfred. 1927. *A Biographical Register of Peterhouse Men*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walter, Ludwig K. 2010. *Dozenten und Graduierte der Theologischen Fakultät Würzburg 1402 bis 2002*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Bistums und Hochstifts Würzburg. Würzburg: Schön- ingh.
- Ward, John. 1740. *The lives of the professors of Gresham College*. John Moore.
- Wolff, Helmut. 1973. *Geschichte der Ingolstädter Juristenfakultät: 1472-1625*. Freiburg: Albert.
- Zanetti, Dante. 1962. "A l'université de Pavie au XVe siècle : les salaires des professeurs." *Annales ESC* 17 (3): 421–433.
- Zhao, Xinyi, Samin Aref, Emilio Zagheni, and Guy Stecklov. 2022. "Return migration of German-affiliated researchers: analyzing departure and return by gender, cohort, and discipline using Scopus bibliometric data 1996–2020." *Scientometrics*, vol. forthcoming.
- Zucchini, Stefania. 2008. *Universita e dottori nell'economia del Comune di Perugia: i registri dei Conservatori della moneta (secoli 14.-15.)*. Deputazione di storia patria per l'Umbria.