

PROLOGUE

Paris in the Year 1200

For the inhabitants of Paris, the calendar year 1200 began on Easter, 9 April, and ended on Holy Saturday, 24 March 1201, following the custom of the king's chancery. (To avoid confusion, however, I shall remain with the system of dating employed today.) The reigning monarch was Philip, the second of his name in the Capetian dynasty. The royal historiographer Rigord bestowed the sobriquet "Augustus" on him because the king had *augmented* the royal domain with the addition of Vermandois and because he was born in the month of August.

Born in Paris on 12 August 1165, Philip Augustus was thirty-five in 1200, and he had already benefited from two decades of political experience, having been crowned on 1 November 1179 at the tender age of fourteen. The year 1200 was, however, a moment of political transition in Western Europe. At Rome the aged Pope Celestine III had expired two years earlier, and the cardinals replaced him with Innocent III, a youthful successor. The leadership of the Empire to the east was contested by two candidates, Otto of Brunswick and Philip of Swabia, each crowned king of the Romans in 1198. To the west, King John had just succeeded his brother Richard the Lionheart, who died unexpectedly in 1199. He was not only king of England

now but also duke of Normandy, count of Anjou and duke of Aquitaine. Eudes de Sully, a first cousin of the king, had just replaced Maurice de Sully, whose long service as bishop of Paris ended in 1196. The royal administration of the city was confided to two prévôt-baillis (royal agents), Robert de Meulan and Pierre du Thillay, after the disgrace of a certain Thomas.

As with newspapers today, medieval chroniclers reported the memorable events of their day and arranged them in chronological order, year by year. Among the events that most affected the city of Paris in 1200, three were broadcast with banner headlines by both the French and English chroniclers. The first was a papal interdict on royal lands to discipline King Philip Augustus for his unlawful marriage; the second, a peace at Le Goulet negotiated between King Philip and the English King John over the latter's fiefs in France; and the third, a general strike by the students of Paris to protest infringements against their rights.

**ALL THE LAND OF THE FRENCH KING
IS PLACED UNDER AN INTERDICT.**

—Rigord de Saint-Denis.¹

On 13 January, Pope Innocent III closed the churches in Philip Augustus's lands to force the king to dismiss his concubine, Agnès de Méran (Andechs-Meranien), and to restore Queen Ingeborg of Denmark as his legitimate wife. Philip's first wife, Isabelle de Hainaut, died in 1190 on the eve of the Third Crusade, leaving Prince Louis as his only son—and sickly at that. Thus, on his return from the crusade in 1191, the king's urgent business was to remarry and reinforce the royal lineage.

Philip's second marriage, to the Danish princess Ingeborg, lasted only the wedding night of 14–15 August 1193. What happened on that fateful night may remain forever an enigma, but what is known is that the next morning Philip announced his intention to separate from her and refused her admittance to his bed. After obtaining an annulment from a church council composed entirely of his familiars and headed by his uncle Guillaume, archbishop of Reims, he married Agnès de Méran to leave no doubt about his intentions to make the separation permanent. Agnès pleased the king well because she delivered him a daughter, Marie, in 1198 and a son, Philippe, in 1200.

Ingeborg, however, refused to return to Denmark, as she was bidden, and instead appealed her case to the papacy. Pope Celestine III was slow to respond, but the energetic Innocent III, who succeeded him in 1198, made

the king's marital irregularity an urgent item of business. After encountering nothing but recalcitrance, Innocent finally levied the interdict that closed the churches to the faithful on the king's lands.

The French chroniclers detailed the people's sufferings when they were refused the sacraments, and churchmen endured the king's displeasure as well. Among the bishops of the kingdom under royal control, thirteen remained loyal to the king and refused to obey the papal command. These included the king's uncle, Guillaume, archbishop of Reims, as well as the abbots of Saint-Denis and Saint-Germain-des-Prés at Paris. At least six observed the interdict, though, most notably the bishops of Paris and nearby Senlis. Philip's agents ruthlessly despoiled the lands of these prelates, especially Eudes de Sully, bishop of Paris, who was punished more severely because he was a royal cousin.

The rigors of the interdict, however, did prompt the king to reopen negotiations. Philip argued that he had acted in good faith, believing that his marriage to Ingeborg had been annulled by the previous council. When the archbishop of Reims admitted that the oath declaring the annulment had been fraudulent, Philip made him the scapegoat for the aborted affair and upbraided him: "You were a fool for having pronounced such a judgment."

By September Philip agreed to a temporary reconciliation with Queen Ingeborg and to submit his plea for annulment to the judgment of the papal court. At these concessions, the pope lifted the interdict, but Philip swept Ingeborg off to his castle in Etampes to the south of Paris and sequestered her there. When Agnès died in 1201, thus removing the stigma of bigamy, the pope was further persuaded to legitimize the births of Marie and Philippe.

Despite the tribulations, Philip had finally attained his immediate goal, that of producing a second legitimate heir to the throne, but the scandal of his marriage had been broadcast by the interdict that closed down the churches in Paris, and it was publicized by the chroniclers. His erratic behavior jeopardized royal authority at a crucial moment when it was contested by two parties, the kings of England under John and the students of Paris.

**PEACE IS ESTABLISHED BETWEEN THE
FRENCH KING PHILIP AND KING JOHN OF ENGLAND.**

—Rigord de Saint-Denis.²

The greatest threat to the French king's authority arose from the dynastic inheritance of Henry II, the Angevin king of England. From his mother,

Henry had received Normandy, with overlordship over Brittany, from his father, Anjou, Maine and Touraine in the Loire valley, and from his wife, the vast duchy of Aquitaine to the southwest. Thus most of western France, encircling Paris and the royal domain on three sides, had passed intact to Henry's son, Richard the Lionheart.

Richard and Philip Augustus were persuaded to depart together on the Third Crusade in 1190, but their return the following year opened a decade of warfare during which Philip attacked and Richard defended his French lands. The more spectacular victories of the 1190s went to Richard. At Fréteval, for example, Philip lost his baggage train in an ambush, and at Courcelles-lès-Gisors a bridge collapsed under the weight of heavily armored troops. Twenty French knights were drowned, and Philip himself was fished out of the waters. Richard's determination to resist French aggression is made evident by the massive fortress he erected at Château-Gaillard on the Norman frontier between Rouen and Paris. Even the count of Flanders, the king's brother-in-law, allied himself with Richard. Intermittent truces and treaties had little effect in breaking the Angevin's stranglehold on Paris and the royal domain.

Then, on 6 April 1199, a totally unexpected event changed Philip's fortunes. Richard, the renowned warrior, was killed while besieging a castle in the southern province of the Limousin. At the age of forty-one and at the height of his powers, he had paid little attention to his own succession and thereby left the English-Angevin throne open to dispute. What followed was classic in such dynastic contests. There were two contenders. One was a younger brother, John, count of Mortain; the other was a nephew, Arthur, count of Brittany, the son of an older brother, Geoffrey. Who had precedence was not yet established in English law.

Philip's strategy was to support the claims of Arthur, the weaker of the two, just as he had previously supported John against Richard. A year after Richard's death, Philip found himself in position to strike a bargain with John. In return for recognizing John's disputed claim to the throne and for compelling Arthur to submit to his uncle as overlord, Philip was able to extract important concessions.

Already in January 1200, Philip had conceded lands to the count of Flanders in the treaty of Péronne, from which John benefited.³ Now John granted Philip the Norman county of Evreux, the contested parts of the Vexin, the borderland between Normandy and the Île-de-France, the considerable sum of 20,000 marks of silver and, most important, formal recognition that John held all of his continental lands as vassal of the king of

France. These terms were recorded in a “peace” sealed at Le Goulet in the Vexin on 22 May 1200.⁴

As was customary, this important agreement was confirmed by a marriage between the two families. In this case, it was between Louis, age nearly thirteen, eldest son and heir of Philip; and Blanche, age twelve, daughter of Alphonse VIII, king of Castille, and niece of John through his sister, Eleanor. On 23 May 1200 the nuptials were concluded in the Norman part of the Vexin at the village of Port-Mort, not, as might be expected, in Paris, because the bishop had closed the churches of the diocese of Paris during the interdict. John was given an open invitation, nonetheless, to visit the royal capital after the ban was lifted, and he took advantage of it, arriving the following Spring in Paris, where Philip entertained him regally at his palace.

SERIOUS DISCORD BETWEEN THE SCHOLARS AND BOURGEOISIE AT PARIS.

—Roger de Hoveden.⁵

Whatever hindrance the papal interdict posed to Philip Augustus in his maneuvers with King John and the count of Flanders, it must have severely restricted him in a police action in 1200 that involved the students of Paris.

Throughout the twelfth century, masters and students had flocked to the schools of the royal city, swelling the population on the Île-de-la-Cité and the Left Bank. Whether mature masters or youthful students, these men were *clerici*, thereby claiming clerical status that placed them under the exclusive jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical authorities. Signified by the tonsure, the shaving of the crown of the head, this status endowed clerics with two important privileges. The first, the *privilegium canonis*, protected their persons as sacrosanct. Any physical violence against their bodies would result in automatic excommunication for the perpetrator, a consequence that could be relieved only by severe penance. One did not treat a cleric roughly without serious consequences. The second was the *privilegium fori*, which placed them solely under the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts.

Guaranteeing immunity against the police and secular courts, these privileges were not clearly defined and did little to inhibit the unruly behavior of clerics. Philip Augustus was quoted as marveling at the bravery of clerics who entered *mêlées* brandishing swords but without armor or helmets. Little should he marvel, however, when the clean-shaved pate offered more protection than a helmet.

An incident occurred at Paris in February 1200 that was not unexpected in the pre-Lenten season and became a routine throughout the thirteenth century. Kindled by the abundance of wine, a riot broke out in a tavern. Fighting between a group of German students and the proprietors of the establishment left one of the latter close to death. The owners enlisted the royal prévôt, Thomas, and his agents to riposte against the students' hostel, provoking a *mêlée* in which five students were killed.

Outraged, the masters sought justice from the king, and he, fearing that the masters and students would depart from the city en masse, responded in July with a solemn charter that dealt with two major issues.⁶ The immediate one was punishment of the prévôt and his accomplices. The masters requested that the royal officer be whipped like a school boy, but the king had more severe measures in mind. The prévôt was kept in jail until he agreed to submit to an ordeal. If he lost, he was to be executed; if he was cleared, he must abjure all royal functions and renounce Paris. An inquest was ordered to ferret out and punish his accomplices.

With justice to the malefactors satisfied, Philip turned to the larger issue of police jurisdiction over masters and students who enjoyed clerical status. In careful detail, the two basic privileges of personal immunity and exclusive jurisdiction of the church courts were defined, reinforced and implemented. In effect, Philip's charter granted to the Parisian scholars the clerical liberties for which the martyred Thomas Becket, the English archbishop of Canterbury, had given his life, and in turn it refused the compromise that King Henry II had proposed in the Constitutions of Clarendon of 1164. We shall return to these issues later but simply note here that Philip's charter of 1200 was a clear victory at Paris for Becket's principle. The document concluded that on the first or second Sunday after a new prévôt took office, he and the Parisian townsmen were to swear in a church in the scholars' presence to observe the charter.

Philip's quick capitulation to Thomas Becket's unusual interpretation of the issue of criminous clerics was doubtlessly induced by his vulnerability under the interdict, but it was also reinforced by the masters' and students' threat to leave town, as the chronicler Roger de Hoveden asserted. With clerical masters and students constituting a significant proportion of the Parisian population, however, it compromised maintenance of law and order in the royal city. We shall see that, in effect, every cleric was allowed one major crime, free from corporal punishment. Once the king was in a stronger position in 1205,

however, he renegotiated the terms of the question and induced the clergy to accept the basic compromise of Henry II. By then Philip was no longer under threat of interdict, but the menace of a university strike and migration became a permanent condition in the royal capital of the thirteenth century.

. . .

On 3 September 1200 the Latin poet Gilles de Paris presented a book, titled the *Karolinus*, to Prince Louis just two days before his thirteenth birthday.⁷ (Miniatures in the manuscripts illustrate the poet presenting the work to the seated prince.) A canon of the church Saint-Marcel to the south of Paris, Gilles belonged to a small circle of court poets that included Guillaume le Breton, the royal historiographer, all of whom were inspired by the Vergilian verse of Gautier de Châtillon.

Gilles had been working on his book for two years, one in writing and the other in correcting the work. Just as Vergil had created the hero Aeneas to instruct the emperor Augustus, so Gilles aspired to promote the emperor Charlemagne as an exemplar for the young prince. One book each was devoted to the Frankish emperor's cultivation of the four cardinal virtues, and a fifth applied these teachings for Louis's benefit (*utilitas*). In a lengthy work (2,232 verses by Gilles's count), the elaborated style of the *Karolinus* might have been hard going for the young man, but it incorporated an educational program that included a thorough training in the liberal arts, a program that Philip Augustus undoubtedly desired for his son.

Since the *Karolinus* was written for an occasion, it was revised up to the last minute; a concluding section (the *captatio benevolencie*) was added after it was presented. A work of circumstance, it also acknowledged the three major events of the year that had attracted the chroniclers' attention. In various separate passages, Gilles returned to the scandal of the king's marriage. Although the interdict had been lifted by the time the *captatio* was composed, Gilles could not refrain from recalling the clergy's and the people's sufferings; the chants of the office were suspended, the prelates and clergy were expelled, and the land groaned under exploitation and taxation. The king, Gilles wrote, should renounce his concubine and return to his legitimate marital bed. In September, the young prince Louis had been married for little more than three months, thus recalling the treaty of Le Goulet with King John. Despite the turbulent times and the king's failings, Gilles nonetheless reaffirmed that France fared better under Philip's yoke than other lands fared with their kings. The king had defended the realm and extended

his power abroad, even to Acre in the Holy Land. Strong castles protected the borders against Normandy, where the church and people suffered under Richard the Lionheart, an impious king, rightfully slain. Now, the text concluded, the brother John seeks to make peace and to cede land, sealed by a marriage between his niece Blanche and the royal youth. (This portion of the text evidently had not yet been fully brought up to date.) Despite the father's marital scandals, Louis was nonetheless of pure royal blood, the heir of a chaste mother, Isabelle de Hainaut, and a good father—good fruit from a good tree. To illustrate the prince's dynastic heritage, Gilles appended to his poem a diagram of a genealogical tree in which Louis's major forebears were underscored in red.

No direct allusion was made to the great student strike of 1200, but the atmosphere of the Parisian schools thoroughly informed Gilles's captatio. Against the calumny of those who claimed that the city of Paris contained no learned men, he invoked the names of some sixteen celebrated scholars, including, of course, that of Guillaume le Breton, his former student and now a great teacher. "Let no one obscure the city's renown in so many teachers," he concluded. "Lutetia [that is, Paris] remains the fertile mother of so many poets." On completion of his verses for the young prince, however, Gilles announced his own intention to abandon the arts for the doctrines of faith and good works, the domain of theology, certainly the preeminent subject taught in the Parisian schools.

We shall return to these three events of 1200, but it is sufficient now to recognize that they signify important transitions. The events themselves were fortuitous: the consequences of a traumatic wedding night, an unforeseen death and a banal tavern brawl, all brilliantly illuminated by brief flashes of lightning. Nonetheless, they reveal that the royal power of the Capetians was expanding, that urbanization required better policing and that the schools were playing an increased role in the city's life. Equally important, Philip's matrimonial behavior suggests that, despite the inexorable momentum of institutions, there is always space for caprice, the unforeseeable and the inexplicable. The king's personal comportment defies any assessment of his character before and after the event. History that does not acknowledge the intervention of fortuity is not worthy of the name.

In the accounts of the contemporary French and English chroniclers, the decade preceding 1200 was a period of disappointment and setbacks for the ruler of Paris. It opened with an unglamorous crusade (in contrast to Richard's) and was punctuated by military reverses, Philip's messy marital

life, bad weather, famine and destruction. These gloomy events have conspired to conceal fundamental transformations that were also taking place. The royal domain was expanding, royal administration was improving, vast construction projects were undertaken, urbanization was progressing and the schools were transformed into the university—changes that altered the face of the city. The year 1200 itself was a brief moment of peace, when the clouds of war rolled back before they gathered again for the invasion of the Norman-Angevin lands. It was a fortuitous moment of sunlight, and it gives us a better view of the Capetian capital.

An obstacle that plagues historians of medieval Paris is the penury of sources. Often, enough material survives to raise one's expectations, but rarely is it enough to give satisfaction. I shall simply offer what is available and attempt to resist (not always successfully) the litany of what is missing and what I cannot know. The scarcity of sources and my efforts to avoid anachronism also preclude the genre of history that is generally called "the history of everyday life"—that is, how ordinary people lived, ate, clothed and housed themselves. Unfortunately, information for this kind of inquiry is rare before the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

The normal procedure for writing the history of Paris during the Middle Ages, therefore, is to select an extended period of two to three centuries, allowing one to benefit from the relative abundance of documentation that accumulates at the close of the period. This approach has been undertaken by Jacques Boussard (1976) and Raymond Cazelle (1994) in their authoritative volumes in the *Histoire générale de Paris* and recently and successfully by Simone Roux in her *Paris au moyen âge* (2003). Often, however, it succumbs to the temptation to read backwards from the late evidence to fill in the lacunae of the early period, thus committing the historical sin of anachronism. Historians of medieval Paris have long benefited from the riches found in the well-known *Livre des métiers* of Étienne Boileau (1268), the *Livre de taille* of 1297, the *Cris de Paris*, *Mesnagier de Paris* and the *Journal d'un bourgeois* (thirteenth to fifteenth centuries). Although continuity cannot be disregarded, these late texts have too often served to characterize the earlier period as well. Whenever we hear the phrase "In the Middle Ages one did such and such at Paris . . .," we may suspect that the late medieval period is again being privileged.

Rather than proposing a history of Paris over several centuries, my approach is completely different. I shall concentrate as much as possible on the year 1200 to sharpen and capture the significance of the historical moment.

The meager sources encompassed in one year, of course, offer a minimum of data. The date 1200 is therefore emblematic—indeed a code word. I have allowed myself a decade in either direction, occasionally succumbing to the need to include a little more, but my constant effort has been to tighten my inquiry as much as possible around the single year.

My project has been made possible by the appearance of new collections of sources that originated around the year 1200 in Paris and were in fact generated by the institutions in which I am interested. The Capetian monarchy, for example, began to record its financial accounts in 1190 (first extant copy 1202–1203), to establish archives at the royal palace in 1194 and to compile chancery registers in 1204. At the same time, Bishop Eudes de Sully began collecting the synodical statutes (1208) and drawing up a list (*pouillé*) in 1204 of all the churches in his diocese. The masters of theology began enlisting their students as *reportatores* to write down the lectures and disputations of their classrooms to be circulated in multiple copies. Thanks to these new collections, we are offered a sustained look at Paris for the first time in the city's history. To be sure, I have also made use of those sources that have traditionally served the historians of Paris: the chronicles written for the king and the churches, the mass of charters preserved in ecclesiastical cartularies, the notices in the obituaries and the corpus of royal documentation that has constituted the common patrimony for historians.⁸

My particular contribution, however, is to add to this traditional heritage another company of witnesses who have not been exploited for their testimony on the city. Drawing on my study *Masters, Princes and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and his Circle* (1970), I offer the testimony of the theologians who formed a circle around the figure of Pierre, chanter of Notre-Dame (d. 1197) one of the celebrated scholars of his time. An extended portrait will be offered of the Chanter in Chapter Two, but since the others of his circle are not as well known in a Parisian context I shall offer brief introductions here. They were (1) Stephen Langton (d. 1228), an Englishman, who was perhaps the Chanter's student, but certainly his colleague since the 1180s. He was prolific in commenting on the scriptures, in arguing disputations and preaching. In 1207, Pope Innocent III elevated him to the rank of cardinal and appointed him archbishop of Canterbury, which drew him into English politics. (2) Robert of Courson (d. 1219) was likewise English and the Chanter's chief student before he became canon of Noyon and Paris. His writings include a collection (*Summa*) of *questiones* that reorganized and completed the Chanter's own collection. Pope Innocent made

him a cardinal in 1212 and commissioned him as papal legate for France to prepare for the Lateran council of 1215. (3) Thomas of Chobham (d. 1233–1236) was a third Englishman who evidently studied with the Chanter at Paris before he returned to Salisbury as subdean. His *Summa confessorum*, a guide to confessors, adapted the discussions of the Chanter's school at Paris to be applied in England. (4) Pierre de Roissy (d. ca. 1213) first appears in 1198 in the company of the charismatic preacher and student of the Chanter, Foulques de Neuilly. Having spent years at Paris, he became chancellor of Chartres by 1208 and wrote a *Manuale de mysteriis ecclesie* that bears the imprint of the Chanter's and the Parisian influence.⁹ These masters were keenly interested in the sacrament of penance as it was applied in the confessional. Absorbed with identifying and curing sin, they sharpened their sensitivities to their surroundings and recorded, without inhibition, what they saw. Their lectures on the Bible, their classroom disputations, their sermons and moral treatises cast a penetrating light on the Paris of 1200 that they inhabited.¹⁰

The members of the Chanter's circle of theologians were not only perceptive observers; they were also convinced reformers who were sharply critical of their society. Conditioned by Pierre's French temperament, they could not resist the temptation to *faire la leçon* to their contemporaries. Although the history of medieval Paris is often treated as triumphal progress, this vision can be corrected by the criticism and doubt their perspective provides. Benefiting from this perspective, I shall not treat Paris in the year 1200 as the poet Dante viewed paradise, that is, as a heavenly choir of angels all singing in harmony. Rather, I shall consider the contentious issues that were raised at the time. For example, should money be expended on sumptuous architecture, such as Notre-Dame, when the poor are still going hungry? Is it reasonable to enforce celibacy on the lower and younger clergy when it promotes fornication and pederasty? Are ordeals the best way to arrive at judicial verdicts when they often produce false judgments? Is the death penalty appropriate—even for convicted heretics—when innocent victims may suffer? Is hereditary succession the best way to select kings, when it often produces immature and unsuitable candidates and when election by the people offers a viable alternative? Thanks to the sensitive conscience of these theological masters, important issues such as these will be raised as we consider Paris around the year 1200.

To approach the world of the laity, who were illiterate in Latin and understood only the vernacular, I have also explored the literature that was composed in French for their enjoyment. I have chosen the contemporary

romances of Jean Renart, who wrote between 1200 and 1209, but because his writings were devoted to the concerns of the aristocracy who lived outside of Paris I have enlisted them only occasionally.¹¹ For my purposes, therefore, the contemporary chroniclers, the ecclesiastical charters, the royal documentation and the treatises of the theologians serve as four powerful searchlights that sweep simultaneously across the terrain of the city and help illuminate its features during the night of history.

To capture Paris in the year 1200 aspires to the optimism of Jules Michelet, who fashioned history as “resurrection”—that is, to bring a historical moment back to life. Although all historical epochs are equal in the sight of God, as Leopold von Ranke famously maintained, some epochs have not commanded the same attention as others. In the twelfth century, for example, historians have been so seduced by the self-fashioning of an Abélard, a Suger, a Pierre the Venerable or a Bernard de Clairvaux that they close down the century by 1153 at Bernard’s death; in the thirteenth, the remarkable piety of St. Louis, the monumental ratiocinations of Thomas Aquinas and the traumas of Philip the Fair have likewise monopolized historians’ attention. Although Paris in 1200 has no stellar heroes to entrance the imagination, important forces were nonetheless at work. Like the half-completed construction of Notre-Dame or the walls surrounding the city, Paris was in transition. The full realization of its potential was yet to come, but enough can be perceived for us to anticipate the power of the future monarchy, the renown of the university and the influence of the church—including its architectural and musical triumphs—all to prepare for Paris’s eventual domination not only of the kingdom of France but of Western Europe as well.

To attempt this resurrection I shall first introduce the city itself and the majority of its inhabitants, the bourgeoisie, before I uncover the faces of its two leading figures in their respective spheres, Pierre the Chanter and Philip Augustus. Since they are both male, I shall also seek to discern the visages of women that remain stubbornly hidden behind the sources. I shall then turn to the major concerns of the city—the royal government, the church and the schools—and shall conclude with its contemporary delights and pleasures, balanced by its approaching fears and sorrows, before assessing its final achievements.

The recent millennial celebrations naturally prompted me to write *Paris, 1200*, but I have mentally inhabited the city of Pierre the Chanter and Philip Augustus for a half-century, it is from this familiarity that the idea grew. When I first arrived as a student in 1953, I encountered the formidable fig-

ure of the Chanter in the manuscript folios of his questiones at the Bibliothèque Nationale Richelieu. When my wife and I returned to take up residence in the city in 1997, we found ourselves drawn to an apartment on rue Charlemagne, which is protected by the largest surviving segment of Philip's wall. Between these two dates I have been happily occupied with numerous projects, all centered on the year 1200 and all focused in one way or another on the city of Paris. It would not be too much to say that the temptation to write *Paris, 1200* has been irresistible, arising, indeed, from the core of my being.

During the four years of writing this book, Caroline Bourlet has graciously included me in her Groupe de travail sur Paris au Moyen Âge at the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, where I have profited from the experience of colleagues in the later Middle Ages. Boris Bove, in particular, shared with me his research on the bourgeoisie before he published his important thesis. Good friends and colleagues have always responded to my questions, however importunate. Among those helpful on this project were Nicole Bériou, Françoise Bercé, Dany Sandron, Patricia Stirnemann and Michel Zink. Craig Wright lent me his indispensable book on Notre-Dame when the Johns Hopkins Library was so inconsiderate as to have lost its copy. And, as during the past half century, Jenny Jochens has been my first and last reader and my most dependable critic. To all I wish to record my gratitude.

On 13 November 2000 the Department of History at Johns Hopkins University, as is its custom, invited me to deliver a valedictory lecture on the occasion of my retirement from teaching—after forty years. In the spirit of the moment, I chose for my talk the title that has become the subject of this book, and I was overwhelmed by the number who attended. If I needed it, this response was final confirmation of how much I owe to my friends, colleagues and the great university that have encouraged and supported me over the past four decades. I trust that this book testifies to my heartfelt thanks.