INTRODUCTION: LECTURERS, DEBATERS, PREACHERS

In April 1229 the University of Paris went on strike. Although not the first time the Parisian masters had halted their academic labours to protest incursions upon their rights, on this occasion the consequences were especially momentous. By 1231, when Pope Gregory IX's promulgation of the bull *Parens scientiarum* concluded this strike, known to historians as the Great Dispersion, the university had managed to secure the renewed confirmation of the legal privileges granted to the teaching masters by papal and other authorities over the previous few decades. *Parens scientiarum* further confirmed a mandate for the university, and its theologians in particular, to serve as one of the chief vehicles whereby Christian doctrine would be disseminated to the entire universal church. In the eyes of one historian, this document even promoted a shift in the career patterns of Parisian theological masters in favour of long-term university teaching rather than ecclesiastical service.[1] The bull thus codified the institution's evolution from the numerous independent teachers active around the city in the twelfth century into the recognized corporation of masters with defined privileges and protections evident in the thirteenth. The masters' gambit had paid off and *Parens scientiarum* is often referred to as the *magna carta* of the University of Paris, laying the foundation for the successful development and health of this new institution.

When describing the immediate repercussions of the Great Dispersion upon the educational situation at Paris, the chronicler Matthew Paris, who pieced together his account of these events from a group of English masters and students who had vacated the French capital, reported that 'the teachers ceased teaching and the learners ceased learning, so that not a single famous man among them remained in the city'.[2] Matthew

[1] Reuven Avi-Yonah, 'Career Trends of Parisian Masters of Theology, 1200–1320', *History of Universities* 6 (1986–7), 47–64. I evaluate this conclusion in Chapter 2, below.

[2] Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. Henry Richards Luard, 7 vols., RS 57 (London, 1872–3), vol. 3, p. 168: 'cessante doctorum doctrina et discipulorum disciplina, ita quod nec unus famosus ex omnibus in civitate remanserit'.

even listed a handful of theologians who participated in the dispersion by name, such as John Blund and William of Durham, thereby confirming the impression that they acted in concert with the rest of their colleagues. Yet other evidence indicates that the response of the Parisian theologians, the most famous of all the masters at the university, to the events precipitating the Great Dispersion was not quite as uniform as the Benedictine chronicler suggested. While some theologians certainly departed the city and went on to engage in a variety of pursuits, others persisted in their local magisterial functions, continuing to preach and, in some exceptional cases, to lecture. Another chronicler, Alberic of Trois-Fontaines, signalled this fact in his own account of the dispersion, noting that 'a few remained in the city', though Alberic acknowledged that 'all others left, especially the more eminent masters'.[3] The multiplicity of reactions by theologians to the events of 1229–31 reveals some of the diversity that prevailed among the members of the university's most prestigious faculty. As the recipients and providers of theological learning, these university masters were active in determining the contents and shaping the character that would come to typify the standardized theological curriculum, as well as the professional standards and opportunities appropriate to this field of expertise. But there existed a range of opinions on these matters and many of the measures in *Parens scientiarum* did not represent the views of every member of the faculty of theology.

Among the recalcitrant masters was John of St Giles, a theologian who remained at Paris to preach and lecture throughout the dispersion and, in a manoeuvre that would have important consequences for the university's future, even joined the Dominican order in the interim. In a sermon given only a short time after he had donned the Preachers' habit, John warned his audience that scholars would face five questions when they arrived at the Last Judgement: how and for what purpose they studied; how they performed as lecturers (*quomodo legistis*); how they performed as preachers (*qualiter praedicatis*); how they performed as debaters (*qualiter disputatis*); and their level of zeal in pursuit of these tasks. Dismayed by the meagre devotion he felt those of his generation exhibited, especially when compared with such Old Testament luminaries as Phineas, Samuel or Elijah, the Preacher lamented that the Lord would in response have no zeal for them.[4] He accused his contemporaries of

[3] Alberic of Trois-Fontaines, *Chronica*, ed. P. Scheffert-Boichorst, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores 23 (Hanover, 1874), p. 923: 'paucis remanentibus in civitate, exierunt omnes alii, maxime eminentiores magistri'.

[4] The sermon is edited in Marie-Madeleine Davy, *Les Sermons universitaires parisiens de 1230–1231* (Paris, 1931), pp. 288–93, here p. 292: 'Et notandum quod quinque interrogationes faciet nobis

being chiefly preoccupied with ignoble pursuits like the accumulation of prebends and the philosophy of Aristotle instead of holding a righteous contempt for the world and bearing the cross of Christ as they ought. John worried that they were thus becoming distracted from their more important responsibilities in the classroom and, ultimately, towards the entire Church.

Those in attendance must have recognized something familiar about this measure of the worthiness of their lives, for it had already appeared in several guises in work produced in Parisian classrooms. Although John had altered the order slightly, the *lectio-disputatio-predicatio* schematic was more than a generation old, famously propounded by, among others, the late twelfth-century activist theologian Peter the Chanter in his handbook for preachers entitled *Verbum abbreviatum*. According to the Chanter's architectural metaphor, *lectio* provided the foundation; *disputatio* formed the walls; and *predicatio* the roof, or summit, of intellectual activity. All three, he claimed, needed to be 'in place so that we and our neighbours are protected from the heat, rain, hail and wind of vice'.[5] While some theologians at Paris, like Hugh of St Victor, Peter Comestor and Alan of Lille had offered alternative, though not altogether dissimilar, ways of viewing the relationship among these practices, other late twelfth-century theologians followed the Chanter in conceptualizing their academic responsibilities as consisting of the duties of lecturing, debating and preaching.[6] In the sermon he preached upon his elevation to the rank of master of theology in 1180, the Chanter's colleague Stephen Langton declared that 'when the word of the Lord is ground under the millstone of *lectio* and crushed by the pestle of *disputatio*, and is afterwards cooked in the pot of the mind through continuous meditation, it teaches, clarifies, corrects and educates, and, like oil, it nourishes, restores, heals and illuminates'.[7] Elsewhere, the future archbishop of Canterbury noted that at least two of these tasks – *lectio* and

Dominus in judicio. Prima erit: qualiter studuistis, aut quo fine? . . . Secunda erit: Quomodo legistis? . . . Tertia, qualiter praedicatis? . . . Quarta, qualiter disputatis? . . . Quinta, qualiter zelastis?'

[5] Peter the Chanter, *Verbum adbreviatum: textus conflatus*, ed. Monique Boutry, CCCM 196 (Turnhout, 2004), 1.1, p. 9. This passage is also emphasized in John W. Baldwin, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and his Circle*, 2 vols. (Princeton, NJ, 1970), vol. 1, pp. 90–1. I have used Baldwin's translation here.

[6] See the discussions in Franco Morenzoni, *Des écoles aux paroisses: Thomas de Chobham et la promotion de la prédication au début du XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1995), pp. 81–6 and Jean Châtillon, 'Le Mouvement théologique dans la France de Philippe Auguste', in Robert-Henri Bautier (ed.), *La France de Philippe Auguste: le temps des mutations* (Paris, 1982), pp. 881–904, here pp. 886–90.

[7] Phyllis B. Roberts (ed.), *Selected Sermons of Stephen Langton*, 1.19.26–30 (Toronto, 1980), pp. 17–34, here p. 28: 'Dum enim uerbum Domini mola lectionis comminuitur uel pilo disputacionis teritur et postmodum in olla mentis assidua meditacione dequoquitur, docet, arguit, corrigit et erudit, et ita more olei pascit, recreat, sanat et illuminat.' On these 'inception' sermons more

predicatio – contributed towards making the theologian professionally viable, though he believed the nature of this work was such that theologians were not to charge a fee for their services, like the Master of Arts or legal expert could, unless they were in a position of need.[8]

Thirteenth-century successors, like Thomas of Chobham and Walter of Château-Thierry, also expressly followed the Chanter. The former asserted in his treatise on the virtues and the vices that 'the duty of the theologian consists of three things: in lecturing, in disputing and in preaching', devoting the entire third chapter of the treatise to outlining what each of these tasks ought to involve.[9] Chobham further criticized some of the abuses he felt were detrimental to the fulfilment of the theologian's threefold mission, among them the profusion of glosses, the prideful seeking of personal glory and the praise of men, envy, and an interest in vain and needless subtleties. For his own part, Walter, who would become chancellor of the University of Paris in 1246 and bishop of Paris in 1249, also felt the need to reiterate that the responsibilities of the theologian were constituted by these three activities, with the office of preaching, pertaining in his mind to the right to teach doctrine,

generally, see Nancy Spatz, 'Evidence of Inception Ceremonies in the Twelfth-Century Schools of Paris', *History of Universities* 13 (1994), 3–19.

[8] The issue arose in the context of a *questio* on the subject of doing the work of God fraudulently (*De fraude in opere*) found in Cambridge, St John's College MS 57. The following transcription is from the Joseph N. Garvin Papers, Archives of the University of Notre Dame (hereafter cited as CGRV) 2/06 q. 234, pp. 3009–11: 'Ergo potest theologus vendere officium legendi, a simili et officium predicandi. Item, esto quod pauper sit, nonne potest ab auditoribus victum accipere et a simili collectam facere. A simili et quodcumque velit querere. Re: bene licet magistris artium collectas facere et patrono patrocinium vendere theologis non licet propter privilegium operis, si tamen indigeat licet ei accipere necessaria ab auditoribus suis sine expressa nominatione certe summe, et hoc propter scandalum'/'May a theologian sell the right to lecture or the right to preach. Item, suppose that he is a pauper, can he not accept food from his listeners or collect a fee from them. Also, [may he collect] anything else he might wish to seek. Response: It is all right for masters of arts to collect fees and to sell their services but this right does not extend to the theologians because of the privileged nature of their work. Nevertheless, if he is in need, it is all right for him to accept necessities from his listeners so long as he does not specify a certain amount lest a scandal arise.' Other issues discussed in this *questio* include whether lawyers are allowed to sell their services and whether the chancellor can collect a fee from masters in exchange for the right to lecture. On the collection of texts in the Garvin papers, see Kent Emery, Jr., Cheryl M. Jones, Andrew I. Irving and Victor Kotusenko, '*Quaestiones*, *Sententiae* and *Summae* from the Later Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries: The Joseph N. Garvin Papers (I)', *BPM* 47 (2005), 11–68 and Emery, Irving and Stephen M. Metzger, with Jones, '*Quaestiones*, *Sententiae* and *Summae* from the Later Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries: The Joseph N. Garvin Papers (II)', *BPM* 48 (2006), 15–81.

[9] Thomas of Chobham, *Summa de commendatione virtutum et extirpatione vitiorum* 3, ed. Franco Morenzoni, CCCM 82b (Turnhout, 1997), p. 87: 'officium theologi in tribus consistit: in lectione, in disputatione, in predicatione'. The best introduction to Thomas of Chobham's thought is Morenzoni, *Des écoles aux paroisses*.

being specifically forbidden to the laity.[10] The statutes promulgated by the papal legate and former master of theology Robert of Courson in 1215 clearly mentioned all three activities among its directives for academic life at the university.[11] The importance of these tasks would later appear in the statutes of other medieval universities,[12] recommend at least one theologian for sainthood,[13] and serve as a convenient outline for several modern scholars attempting to describe the intellectual culture of medieval universities.[14]

Most of John's fellow theologians would have found little to argue with in his articulation of the content of the scholar's responsibilities, even if they did not pursue all three of these tasks with equal vigour. Yet the newly avowed friar framed this threefold task with greater solemnity than had the Chanter or any of his other colleagues. According to John of St Giles, the performance of these three tasks, the motives behind

[10] In a *questio* debated in 1245, Walter of Château-Thierry declared: 'quia officium eorum est in tribus, scilicet in lectione, disputatione et predicatione'. Cited in Nicole Bériou, 'The Right of Women to Give Religious Instruction in the Thirteenth Century', in Beverly Mayne Kienzle and Pamela J. Walker (eds.), *Women Preachers and Prophets through Two Millenia of Christianity* (Berkeley, Calif., 1998), pp. 134–45, here p. 144, n. 23.

[11] *CUP*, vol. 1, pp. 78–80, no. 20. Robert gave the university as a whole the right to make rules (*obligationes et constitutiones*) about lectures and disputations (*de lectionibus et disputationibus*), among other things. Referring specifically to the theologians, he declared that no one should be admitted to give solemn lectures (*lectiones sollempnes*) or sermons (*predicationes*) at Paris unless he met the appropriate moral and intellectual standards. The presence of all three tasks in these statutes was observed by Jacques Verger, 'Des écoles à l'université: la mutation institutionnelle', in Bautier, *La France de Philippe Auguste*, pp. 817–46, here p. 828.

[12] Although 'opponere' and 'respondere' were used instead of 'disputare', see, for example, the late thirteenth-century statutes for theologians at Cambridge in *Documents Relating to the University and Colleges of Cambridge*, 3 vols. (London, 1852), vol. 1, p. 377 and at Oxford in Strickland Gibson (ed.), *Statuta antiqua Universitatis Oxoniensis* (Oxford, 1931), pp. 49–50. Comprehensive lists of various statutes dealing with each of these tasks are found in Palémon Glorieux, 'L'Enseignement au moyen âge: techniques et méthodes en usage à la faculté de théologie de Paris, au XIII^{e} siècle', *AHDLMA* 35 (1968), 65–186. See also the discussions in Damian Riehl Leader, *A History of the University of Cambridge*, vol. 1, *The University to 1546* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 174; Siegfried Wenzel, 'Academic Sermons at Oxford in the Early Fifteenth Century', *Speculum* 70 (1995), 305–29, esp. p. 305 and Phyllis B. Roberts, 'Medieval University Preaching: The Evidence in the Statutes', in Jacqueline Hamesse (ed.), *Medieval Sermons and Society: Cloister, City, University; Proceedings of International Symposia at Kalamazoo and New York* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1998), pp. 317–28.

[13] The diocese of Salisbury's letter to Gregory IX attesting to the holy life of Edmund of Abingdon took care to speak of his powers 'legendo et predicando'. See W. Rich Jones and W. Dunn Macray (eds.), *Charters and Documents Illustrating the History of the Cathedral, City, and Diocese of Salisbury* 232, RS 97 (London, 1891), pp. 272–3.

[14] Modern studies using this scheme as an explanatory framework include: Glorieux, 'L'Enseignement au moyen âge'; Baldwin, *Masters, Princes and Merchants*, vol. 1, pp. 88–116; Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3rd edn (Notre Dame, Ind., 1978), pp. 196–213; and Alfonso Maierù, *University Training in Medieval Europe*, trans. D. N. Pryds (Leiden, 1994), esp. pp. 36–71. Louis-Jacques Bataillon advocated for even better integration of these three tasks in future historical studies in his 'De la lectio à la praedicatio: commentaires bibliques et sermons au XIII^{e} siècle', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 70 (1986), 559–74.

embarking upon university study and the appropriate zeal for learning became for scholars a distinctive byway along the path they otherwise shared with every other earthly wayfarer. The salvific consequences of their scholastic endeavours thus urged a different way of viewing *lectio-disputatio-predicatio* as a prescriptive model for theological work. For John, it was not merely a matter of proper pedagogical practice but also of eternal expediency. Masters and students would be forever accountable before God for how they made use of their intellectual talents.

Some of John's other remarks were even more startling and strident. In John's mind, the best guide for scholars was none other than Christ himself. He declared that although Christ was immensely learned, his period of studies had been brief – a mere three days in the schools and only three and a half years as a master.[15] Moreover, the Lord had never abandoned his church for the schools, unlike those contemporaries who claimed (by virtue of the dispensation of residence allowance in pope Honorius III's 1219 bull entitled *Super speculam*) to have a licence to do so from their prelates. (Such contemporaries, he brusquely countered, also have a licence to go to hell!)[16] John argued that the purpose of the university was not to facilitate the vanity-filled pursuit of a lengthy and prestigious scholastic career. It was, instead, to serve as a brief training ground for those who would then take leading roles in the pastoral mission of the Church. John saw lectures, debates and sermons as the basic means of furthering this most significant end.

Preached in early 1231, shortly before the Great Dispersion was resolved, the precise timing behind this and the other extant sermons of John of St Giles, which together articulated something of his educational philosophy, is revealing. The Dominican master was, in fact, presenting only one possible version (in one of several possible media) of the professional, university-trained theologian. Indeed, divergent opinions on what attributes or commitments such a figure might possess had persisted since the emergence of the university around the turn of the previous century. Although the Great Dispersion of the University of Paris had, at its root, nothing to do with expressly determining the definition of a university theologian, it turned out to be a crucial moment

[15] Davy, *Les Sermons universitaires*, p. 292: 'Et notandum [est] quod mater Domini non permisit eum in scholis, nisi per tres dies, et non fuit magister, nisi per tres annos et dimidium.' The Franciscans limited their masters to a three-year regency. See Alain Boureau's introduction to his edition of Richard de Mediavilla, *Questions disputées. Introduction générale*, vol.1, *Questions 1–8: Le Premier Principe. L'Individuation* (Paris, 2012), p. xviii. Perhaps this was another dimension of Franciscan *imitatio Christi*? I thank Constant Mews for this reference and insight.

[16] Davy, *Les Sermons universitaires*, p. 289. The bull *Super speculam* is found in *CUP*, vol. 1, pp. 90–3, no. 32.

for the development of this role within Latin Christendom. Yet *Parens scientiarum* did not produce any landmark changes in the aims and goals of university theologians entirely contrary to, or independently of, their consent. Many of the ideals found in this papal document germinated, in whole or in part, in the memories, intellects and wills of men who had left their homes and travelled from all across Europe to pursue an education in the famous schools of Paris. We find evidence for this dynamism and disagreement within the faculty in university statutes and papal bulls, but also in the commentaries, disputed questions and sermons authored by this generation of theologians active at Paris around the time of *Parens scientiarum*. Drawing upon these various sources we can begin to appreciate what it meant to be a master of theology in the early years of the university and witness the construction of this identity by both the masters themselves and those external figures who took great interest in the possibilities of this new institution.

***

The French historian Jacques Verger has observed that this generation of theologians represents a decisive period in the history of the university. As he points out, in addition to creating this new identity of the university master of theology, these men also welcomed the mendicants to the university and interacted with them on both intellectual and spiritual levels; they were the generation of Parisian scholars most directly confronted by the various heretical currents within France perceived by ecclesiastical authorities; they made a number of pedagogical and curricular refinements; and they were the first group at Paris to incorporate Aristotelian natural philosophy into theology.[17] Yet although this period was pivotal for the development of the academic discipline of theology, as Verger and others have acknowledged, and despite the extraordinary popularity that the history of the medieval University of Paris, and particularly the history of theology at this institution, has generally enjoyed among scholars, only recently has it begun to command the sustained attention of historians. While other periods of this institution's earliest centuries have attracted a great deal of interest from scholars of history, philosophy and theology alike, the *Parens scientiarum* generation, which may be said to have lasted from the university statutes established by Robert of Courson in 1215 to the ascendance by mid-century of the mendicant orders in both institutional influence and intellectual eminence, has received comparatively little treatment. Indeed, little

[17] Jacques Verger, 'Conclusion', in Franco Morenzoni and Jean-Yves Tilliette (eds.), *Autour de Guillaume d'Auvergne (†1249)* (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 369–74.

more than a decade ago, the historian Peter Biller aptly characterized knowledge of early thirteenth-century Parisian thought as still 'quite dark'.[18] The first synthetic monograph on this generation, authored by Nathalie Gorochov, appeared only in 2012.[19]

Several factors account for the limited attention this period has heretofore received. The first, and most difficult, obstacle has been the limited availability of many key texts.[20] Only in recent years have many of the works from this period appeared in accessible critical editions.[21] This progress notwithstanding, a substantial amount of the theological work from this period remains either unedited or in need of new, updated critical editions.[22] Much interesting material from this generation still exists only in manuscripts. The collection of theological *questiones* on a diversity of theological subjects found in Douai, Bibliothèque municipal MS 434, for instance, remains a phenomenal resource with much untapped potential.[23] Yet this challenge also represents an exciting opportunity for scholars and many chances to harvest this field exist.

A second, less negotiable obstacle is the relative paucity of institutional documentation from this period, excepting those generated during moments of particular crisis, such as the Great Dispersion of 1229. This has resulted in little direct knowledge of conditions at the university during the earlier phases of its development. Consequently, many historians have operated under the assumption that legal codifications merely

[18] Peter Biller, *The Measure of Multitude: Population in Medieval Thought* (Oxford, 2000), p. 60.

[19] Nathalie Gorochov, *Naissance de l'université: les écoles de Paris d'Innocent III à Thomas d'Aquin (v.1200–v.1245)* (Paris, 2012). Gorochov's work appeared just as I was finishing the final draft of this book. While I was fortunate to see a copy shortly before this book went to press, and was able to draw upon some of her remarkable prosopographical work, I was unable to deal with the book's main arguments in any substantive way.

[20] Detailed in Fernand van Steenberghen, *La Philosophie au XIII^e siècle*, 2nd edn (Louvain, 1991), pp. 27–31. While progress has been made since this publication, much work remains to be done.

[21] Critical editions for the works of Alexander of Hales and Guy of Orchelles's *Summa de sacramentis* have existed for quite some time. Much more recent, however, are the editions of William of Auxerre's *Summa aurea*, Philip the Chancellor's *Summa de bono* and Guerric of St Quentin's *Quaestiones de quolibet*.

[22] The best examples of this are Hugh of St Cher's commentary on the *Sentences*, and much of William of Auvergne's *œuvre*. A list of those parts of Hugh's *Sentences* commentary that have been edited is available in Magdalena Bieniak, 'The *Sentences* Commentary of Hugh of St.-Cher', in Philipp W. Rosemann (ed.), *Mediaeval Commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 2 (Leiden, 2010), pp. 111–47, appendix, pp. 146–7. It should be acknowledged that Roland J. Teske has published several of William of Auvergne's works in English translations. These are restricted to those which he has found of philosophical interest. Many more works belonging to William remain unedited or untranslated. Franco Morenzoni has begun editing many of William's sermons in the Corpus christianorum continuatio mediaevalis series.

[23] The first two volumes of this three-volume manuscript contain 572 *questiones*, of which 130 have been published previously. For the list of published *questiones*, see Riccardo Quinto, 'Il codice 434 di Douai, Stefano Langton e Nicola di Tournai', *Sacris Erudiri* 36 (1996), 233–361, here pp. 243–6.

reflected long-entrenched practices, and have therefore looked at later (sometimes much later) statutes in their attempts to reconstruct earlier regulations, customs, procedures and intellectual exercises.[24] These later documents, however, do not always accurately reflect earlier practices, nor did these practices necessarily exist at every stage of the university's existence.[25] On the other hand, even contemporary and nearly contemporary documents were often crafted with the aim of reshaping the description of certain events to bring them into conformity with later political circumstances. Thus, for instance, the nature of the political conflict of the 1250s between the mendicant orders and the secular theologians determined in large measure how the Great Dispersion of two decades earlier was committed to the collective memory of later generations.[26]

Owing to these two factors, we remain under-informed about even many of the major theologians from this time. But perhaps more importantly we are also under-informed about how they helped to create the precise educational environment in which they, and future university theologians, thought, wrote, lectured, debated and preached. Adding the other, lesser-known theologians to our consideration only magnifies our ignorance. In short, we still know very little about how the Parisian theologians from this time operated as a faculty and engaged with the outside community on a day-to-day basis. Knowledge about how they engaged with one another is also imprecise. Yet the outcomes of these interactions played a crucial role in determining how the University of Paris would develop as an institution. Learned theology had become an essential feature of religious life in the high and later Middle Ages and the so-called 'queen of the sciences' was the most prestigious discipline at medieval universities.[27] Accordingly, theologians exerted an influence that was disproportionately large compared to their overall numbers. Their interests and ecclesiastical connections allowed them to be central actors in the crafting of many early pieces of university legislation. Their specific competencies in argumentation and their

[24] Note this assumption in Glorieux, 'L'Enseignement au moyen âge', 67.

[25] On this point, see Bernard C. Bazàn, John F. Wippel, Gérard Fransen and Danielle Jacquart, *Les Questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologie, de droit et de médicine* (Turnhout, 1985), esp. pp. 49–50.

[26] See A. G. Traver, 'Rewriting History? The Parisian Secular Masters' *Apologia* of 1254', *History of Universities* 15 (1997–9), 9–45.

[27] According to Charles Homer Haskins, the pre-eminence of theology as a discipline ensured the pre-eminence of Paris as a university. See his *The Rise of Universities* (New York, 1923; repr. Ithaca, NY and London, 1957), p. 19. The identification of theology as the medieval 'queen of the sciences' has recently been nuanced by Bernard McGinn, '*Regina quondam . . .*', *Speculum* 83 (2008), 817–39.

knowledge of both scripture and the teachings of the church Fathers made their services the frequent focus of external patrons, thereby also enabling their prominent involvement in the construction of medieval Christian orthodoxy. Moreover, many theologians served in important administrative positions, both ecclesiastical (in the form of bishops, cardinals and occasionally even popes) and secular (such as the advisory role to the French crown fulfilled by men like William of Auvergne and Robert of Sorbon). Like many other successful scholars during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, these men forged links between the schools and medieval systems of government that were, as R. W. Southern pointed out, as strong as they would be in any other period before the nineteenth century.[28] A better understanding of how theologians as members of the university were involved in the formative events of this institution is therefore vital for appreciating later trends there as well.

Other reasons for the neglect of this generation stem from the great emphasis previous scholars placed on its neighbouring periods, leading them to view the time frame between 1215 and 1248 as merely a time of transition between two more important eras. Leading up to 1215 was the age of Peter the Chanter and his circle, the so-called biblical-moral school.[29] Owing largely to the efforts of John Baldwin, we are acquainted with these theologians as having devoted much of their energy to practical moral questions as part of a broader effort to reform society.[30] That the Chanter's group consisted of such influential and activist churchmen as Pope Innocent III (known to Peter as Lothario di Segni), Stephen Langton, who later served as the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the cardinal-legate Robert of Courson has confirmed its significance for intellectual, political and social historians alike. Moreover, the involvement of several of these men in such a critical phase of the university's development – the time between Philip Augustus's royal confirmation of the scholars' right to ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the establishment of the earliest extant statutes of the University of Paris – and the influence of their work on matters outside of the university, has highlighted the impact that their intellectual labours had upon western Christian society. This influence culminated in 1215, several years after the Chanter's death, with the appearance of Courson's statutes for the University of Paris and

[28] R. W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe*, vol. 1, *Foundations* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 146–7.
[29] The term 'biblical-moral school' was coined by Martin Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, 2 vols. (Freiburg, 1909–11), vol. 2, pp. 476–501.
[30] Baldwin, *Masters, Princes and Merchants*.