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John of Salisbury (c.1120-1180):
The career and attitudes of a schoolman in church politics

Chapter 1 (Introduction) sets out the aims, approach and sources used in the thesis. The aim of this thesis is to examine the career and attitudes of John of Salisbury (c.1120-1180) as a case-study of a highly-trained schoolman involved in church politics.

Chapter 2 (Schoolmen and Monks) examines a) the purpose and audience of John's *Metalogicon*, his defence of specialised studies and b) how John entered the household of archbishop Theobald. It is argued that one of the main purposes of the *Metalogicon* was to justify specialised studies to a monastic audience, including Peter of Celle. It is also shown that John entered Theobald's household with the assistance of Peter of Celle and Peter's contacts in the circle of Bernard of Clairvaux.

Chapter 3 (The *Historia Pontificum*: a defence of the papacy?) examines the authorship, date, use of first hand accounts and intention of the *Historia Pontificum*, usually attributed to John of Salisbury. John's authorship is confirmed. It is argued that the *Historia* was not intended as a defence of papal privileges but can be better understood as an apologia for Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury (1135-1161).

Chapter 4 (Links with the papal curia) examines John's links with members of the papal curia. It is argued that, contrary to the accepted view, John had relatively few contacts at the curia. The few contacts he had there or in southern Italy were mainly Englishmen such as pope Adrian IV or Robert of Selby, the chancellor of Roger II of Sicily. It is shown that John was particularly hostile to the negotiatores, the cardinal-politicians whose assistance was essential for the successful prosecution of cases at the curia.

Chapter 5 (Canterbury and Rome) assesses relations between Canterbury and Rome during the years c.1154-1161 and assesses John's activities as a person linking the household of Theobald with the papal curia. It is argued that during this period there was disquiet at Canterbury about the appeals system and that John shared this disquiet.

Chapter 6 (John's views on papal authority) reassesses the view, deeply entrenched in secondary literature, that John was 'papalist', that is had a strong, uncompromising commitment to increasing the authority of the pope over secular rulers and bishops. The views of Paul Gennrich, Walter Ullmann and Beryl Smalley are scrutinised. John's use of the allegory of the two swords is examined to assess his views on the relationship between pope and secular rulers. His use of allusions to the Petrine commission is examined to assess his views on the relationship between pope and bishops. The conclusion is that John was 'sacerdotalist' rather than papalist. He was strongly committed to the view that secular authority was derived from - and therefore subject to - the church. He did not, however, argue that secular power derived from the pope, nor did he advance claims for increased papal authority over secular rulers or bishops.

Chapter 7 (John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket) concentrates on two questions: a) how closely did John identify with Becket's cause in the early phase of the dispute with Henry II (1162-66); and b) how did he present Becket's cause? For the years 1162-64, John's *Vita Sancti Anselmi* (written in 1163) is analysed as a source and its political implications assessed. It is argued that already at this stage, John, like members of Becket's household, viewed the earliest clashes between Henry II and Becket in terms of church liberty versus tyranny. For the years 1164-66, the use of 'persecution' themes in John's letters is explored to argue that at first he was not committed to Becket's policy but that in 1166 he found himself obliged by circumstances to do so.

Chapter 8 (John, Becket and the papal curia) considers a) how John assisted Becket in lobbying the papal curia; b) the kind of advice which he gave to Becket; c) the extent to which he differed from Becket on tactics and policy. It is argued that John was not prominent in the Becket circle's lobbying of the curia, and that he did not have extensive contacts or sources of information there. Instead he concentrated on lobbying English churchmen.

Chapter 9 (John, Becket and the English church) concentrates on John's contacts with Canterbury and Exeter and his methods of lobbying.

Chapter 10 (John and the cult of Thomas Becket) examines two topics which are of historical importance but which have not been analysed in detail before: a) John's presentation of the death and miracles of Becket with particular attention to the reliability of his account and its probable influence on Becket's other early biographers; b) whether, or to what extent, Becket's behaviour in December 1170 was influenced by the themes of persecution and sacrifice which had been used by his propagandists throughout the 1160s.

Chapter 11 (Conclusions) reviews the main findings of the thesis and considers the implications of these for research into the effect of the schools in twelfth century politics and administration.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The educational revolution of the twelfth century has attracted the attention of numerous historians. But their interest has centred almost exclusively on the intellectual achievements of the schools - on what individual masters taught and how particular problems of logic or theology were tackled by schoolmen. Relatively little attention has been given to the effect which the schools had on politics and administration in the twelfth century. Yet it is striking that an increasing number of magistri - highly trained schoolmen - were being recruited into royal, baronial and ecclesiastical households, as legal advisers and administrators. Occasional stabs have been made at analysing aspects of this development. The most impressive of these is Beryl Smalley's, The Becket conflict and the Schools: A study of intellectuals in politics, which analyses the training and attitudes


2 For this trend see R. W. Southern, 'The Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres', in Renaissance and renewal pp 113-137 at pp 134-5 (Appendix 2: 'Masters in government'); J. W. Baldwin, 'Masters at Paris from 1179 to 1215: A social perspective', ibid pp 138-72 (esp pp 151-63 on the employment and professional identity of graduates); the stimulating article by G. Duby 'The culture of the knightly class: Audience and patronage', ibid pp 248-262, sets these trends in a broader context. For the presence of magistri in episcopal (Footnote continued)
of the churchmen involved in the Becket dispute, including John of Salisbury. The aim of this dissertation, more narrowly focussed, to take John of Salisbury (c. 1120-1180) as a case study of a schoolman who was actively involved in church politics, and to assess his attitudes, his loyalties and his impact on those around him. The intention therefore is not simply to throw light on John of Salisbury as an individual, but to reach conclusions and raise questions which could be tested against the careers of other twelfth-century schoolmen involved in politics and administration.

The name John of Salisbury is familiar to medieval historians. Since 1862, when Johann Schaarschmidt published the first detailed and critical account of John's career and writings, there has been an ever-growing John of Salisbury industry. Detailed attention has been given to the chronology of his career, his political philosophy, his use of classical sources, his attitudes to scholastic studies, his

2 (continued)
households, see C. R. Cheney, English bishops' chanceries 1100-1250 (Manchester 1950) pp 11-15. A general account dealing with the growth of the schools, recruitment of schoolmen into administration, and the conflict between the academic and 'courtly' (höflich) values, see P. Classen, 'Die höhen Schulen und die Gesellschaft im 12. Jahrhundert', Archiv für Kulturgeschichte (Köln-Graz) 48 (1966) 155-180; for John of Salisbury and the academic-courtly tension, see ibid pp 166-7.

3 Oxford 1973; Chap IV (pp 87-108) deals with John of Salisbury.

4 Johannes Saresberiensis nach Leben und Studien, Schriften und Philosophie (Leipzig 1862) was the first detailed analysis of John's career, writing and thought. It is a rigorous and perceptive work and though overtaken in many respects by the findings of more recent research it is still very useful, providing the best detailed overview of John. There were earlier, briefer studies of John: Bigerius Thorlacius, De Johanne Sarisberiensi ..., 3 parts published by Københavens Universitet (Copenhagen 1819-20). Hermann Reuter, Johannes von Salisbury: Zur Geschichte der christlichen Wissenschaft im zwolften Jahrhundert (Berlin 1842). Schaarschmidt (p 85 n) is very critical of Thorlacius' scholarship and refers (ibid) to J. Schmidt, Joannes Parvus Sarisberiensis quomodo inter aequales antiquarum literarum studio excelluerit quaeritur (dissertation Wratislaw 1838) which I have not seen.
'humanism', his theory of knowledge, his 'papalism' and more. His writings have also been quarried extensively by historians whose interests lie in other areas such as the twelfth century schools and philosophy, the reign of Henry II of England, the papacy in the mid-twelfth century, the Becket dispute, church-state relations, the history of political thought.

The remarkable interest in John of Salisbury has two sources - the intrinsic significance of his career and the historical value of his writings. Throughout his career he worked with, advised and was in touch with some of the leading persons of his period: during the 1130s and 1140s he was a pupil of Abelard, Gilbert of Poitiers and other leading masters of the schools of northern France; he was a protégé of Bernard of Clairvaux and a friend of pope Adrian IV; during the 1150s he was a leading adviser to archbishop Theobald of Canterbury, and built up a network of contacts and friends within the


6 See for example Poole, Illustrations pp 176-98, 204-10; (Footnote continued)
English church; during the Becket dispute he operated as a propagandist on Becket’s behalf. Fortunately John was an enthusiastic and skillful writer, and his writings throw light on the significant developments, individuals and institutions with which he was involved. His extant writings provide one of the most extensive and varied sets of sources we have for the career and attitudes of any twelfth-century schoolman. They consist of two letter collections and a couple of stray letters amounting to 325 letters, of which 212 were written in John’s own name; the Metalogicon, a defence of specialised studies; the Policraticus, a critique of government and society; the Entheticus, a satirical account of scholastic studies and of John’s contemporaries; the Historia pontificalis, an account of the papal curia and of archbishop Theobald’s activities during the years 1148 to 1153; the Vita Sancti Anselmi and the Vita Sancti Thomae. These certainly represent all of John’s major works, for neither he nor his

(continued)


See chap 2:3 pp 113-22 below.

See chap 4:1 pp 185-88 below.

For John’s role as a link between the papal curia and Canterbury see chap 5 below; for John’s network of friends in England see H. Hohenleutner, Studien zur Briefsammlung und zur Kirchenpolitik des Johannes von Salisbury, Inaugural-Dissertation, Ludwig-Maximilians Universität zu München 1953 (copy in British Library: 4571.g.15) pp 56-70; for John’s exploitation of these contacts during the Becket dispute see chap 9 below.

See Table 1 at the end of this chapter, which lists the recipients of John’s letters. For the number of letters see Table 1 n 3. The Letters of John of Salisbury 1; The Early Letters (1153-1161), ed W. J. Millor, H. E. Butler, rev C. N. L. Brooke, NMT (Footnote continued)
contemporaries refer to any other writings. They are particularly valuable as historical sources because they are so varied in purpose and genre, and therefore allow us to see different aspects of John's activities and thinking.

In its approach this dissertation differs sharply from other secondary works on John of Salisbury. Much of what has been written about him sets out with the intention of trying to distil consistent sets of views from his very diverse works. However John's views expressed at different times, in different contexts, for different audiences, and written in very different genres cannot simply be gathered together to create consistent views on, say, ecclesiastical authority, papal authority, the nature of royal power, church-state relations. One needs to be very much aware that John was a skilful writer who had the ability to write what was expected of him by his employer. As a church politician and - during the Becket dispute - a

11(continued)


15 Vita Sancti Anselmi ed H. Wharton, PL 199 cols 1009-1040.

16 Vita Sancti Thomae, MB 2 pp 301-22.

17 Thus H. Liebeschütz's impressive study, Mediaeval Humanism in (Footnote continued)
propagandist, we might expect him to tailor his statements to meet immediate political needs and to suit his audience. When, for example, one is trying to build up a picture of John’s attitudes to papal authority, one needs to bear in mind that pro-Becket letters written in the heat of the dispute would tend to emphasise the universality of papal authority, because of the Becket circle’s strategy of trying to identify the archbishop’s cause with the interests of the papacy. Statements on papal or ecclesiastical authority occurring in these letters cannot be read simply as statements of John’s own views. To circumvent the difficulties inherent in the sources the following approach is used:

1. The emphasis is on John’s activities as a church politician, rather than on building up a complex structure of consistent views supposedly held by him.

2. His activities and attitudes are analysed in the context of the main groups within which he operated.

3. Special attention is paid to the status of John’s writings as sources, with weight being given to their date, context, readership, structure, rhetorical genre and rhetorical devices used.

The decision to emphasise activities rather than consistent views is justified by the fact that John’s historical importance does not lie

17 (continued)
the life and writings of John of Salisbury (Studies of the Warburg Institute 17, London 1950) concentrates on text rather than context. Attempts to re-construct a consistent political philosophy from John’s works include: Carlyle and Carlyle, History ... political theory (see n 6 above); W. Ullmann, The growth of papal government ... (see n 6 above); G. Miczka, Das Bild der Kirche ... (see n 5 above).

18 See chap 6 pp 381-88 below for John’s letters during the Becket dispute referring to the Petrine commission; for the Becket circle’s lobbying of the papacy see chap 7:3, chap 8:1 below.
in great originality of thought. While it may be argued that in his handling of some themes, such as tyrannicide and the body-state metaphor, he was original, it has to be noted that the occasional flashes of great originality - if they were such - are outweighed by the fact that John did not formulate his views in purely theoretical terms. In all of his writings we see him trying to make a practical or didactic rather than purely intellectual impact on his audience. John's historical importance lies therefore not in great originality of thought, but in the fact that he was an articulate writer and publicist who played an important role in church politics. Any intelligible account of John's views must therefore be firmly founded on his activities.

In turn, John's activities must be placed in the context of the groups within which he operated. In a general sense, this is self-evident: political views and loyalties are shaped by interaction with family, friends, employers; most political - and indeed many other - statements are understandable only if we know fully the audience they were aimed at; and all forms of political activity involve building up alliances and trying to influence others. The churchman engaged in political activity cannot, therefore, be analysed as if he were simply an individual, but must be seen as an individual operating within different groups. Some recent research has shown the importance of examining the political and polemical activities of medieval churchmen in the context of the groups within which they operated. I. S. Robinson has shown how Gregory VII built up a friendship-network for political purposes, and more recently has shown

---

19 On the question of tyrannicide see J. van Laarhoven, 'Thou shalt not slay a tyrant! The so-called theory of John of Salisbury', World JS pp 319-41, and the references cited there. For the body-metaphor see 'The importance of the organism in the political theory of John of Salisbury', ibid pp 303-17.
the importance of links between the churchmen in South Germany who supported Gregory VII's policies. In John's case it is particularly apt to view his activities in the context of the groups within which he operated. From an early age he deliberately cultivated a network of friends: in a letter to William de Diceia, written probably in 1168, he says of vera amicitia:

Huic ab ineunte aetate operam dedi, meque multos obsequiis promeruisse credideram, sperans quod in affectione dilectionis michi referrent vicem.

In his deployment of the language of friendship John was drawing on a very old and rich tradition. Although the term amicitia had a wide spectrum of meanings including goodwill, acquaintance, alliance, it is nevertheless clear that John did not regard amicitia as vague or purely rhetorical. Amicitia was pragmatic and involved mutual obligations and obsequium (service). John frequently speaks of

21 LL ep 254 p 512.
22 A detailed and comparative analysis of how John and his contemporaries used the language of friendship (including keywords such as amicitia, amor, caritas, obsequium, and rhetorical devices such as absence topoi and word-play) is a project which I hope to pursue in the future. There is no single account of the concepts of amicitia which John was drawing on. The most wide-ranging treatment of these matters is to be found in Adele M. Fiske, Friends and friendship in the monastic tradition, Cidoc Cuaderno 51 (Cuernavaca, Mexico 1970) which reprints her articles on the subject, and includes within its ambit Jerome's dependence on Cicero, Augustine, Cassian, Alcuin, Bernard of Clairvaux and Aelred of Rievaulx. Fiske's interest lies entirely in the concepts, not the practice of amicitia. An excellent discussion of twelfth century monastic friendship is in R. W. Southern, Saint Anselm and his biographer: A study in monastic life and thought 1059-c.1130 (Cambridge 1963) pp 67-76. See also J. Leclercq 'L'amitié dans les lettres au moyen age: autour d'un manuscrit de la bibliothèque de Petrarque', Revue du Moyen Age Latin 1 (1945) 391-410; idem Monks and love in twelfth-century France (Oxford 1979).
the officia amicitiae and of the importance of giving practical effect to amicitia. In the Early Letters we find him using ties of amicitia to obtain employment, legal advice, shelter for friends. Throughout his career John exploited ties of amicitia to exercise 'indirect influence'. He used such ties to obtain employment as a member of the household of archbishop Theobald; he later used friends to put pressure on other people during the Becket dispute; after Becket's death he worked through William archbishop of Sens to gain the support of the papal curia for Becket's canonisation.

We can draw up a list of 55 persons whom John regarded as amici, by looking at whether John addressed them as carissimi or amici, appealed to obligations of friendship, used in-jokes and humorous wordplay, and used the tu rather than vos form. This information is summarised in Table I below.

John's links with individuals are set out in Christopher Brooke's edition of the Letters, while John's involvement with different groups in the English church has been discussed by Heinrich Hohenleutner. Since there is no point in tramping over

23 For amicitia in sense of alliance e.g. 'amici et fideles regis' (EL ep 30 p 48); in the sense of goodwill e.g. LL ep 223 p 386 where John urges Becket to write tactfully to William of Pavia and retain him 'in amicitia'.

24 For instance explicit references to officia at: LL ep 262 p 530 ('Intermissionem officii' etc); LL ep 264 p 534 ('Plura sunt ... quae ... officiorum sedilitatem, sine qua virtus amicitiae non subsistit ...'); LL ep 273 p 370 ('... in officiis amicitiae'). Other references to obligations are EL ep 39 p 72 ('Amicorum tunc imploravit' etc); LL ep 263 P 534 ('Affectus ab effectu convincit' etc).

25 See instances noted in Table 1 below, column 'Uses of friendship'.

26 See chap 2:3 pp 113-20 below.

27 See chap 9 pp 443-7, 476-81.

28 See chap 10 pp 507-18 below.
well-known territory, this study uses the groups within which John operated as a framework, only to the extent that this helps us to understand his key attitudes and activities as a schoolman involved in church politics. Thus considerable attention is given to his links with the papal curia as this is an area in which there has been more assumption than analysis. It has been decided not to include a section on John's relationship with the court of Henry II as it would necessarily have entailed lengthy analysis of John's critique of courtiers, secular rulers and Henry II, which could not be done adequately within the scale of this project.  

The special attention paid to the status of John's writings as sources, is not seen as an end in itself, but is exploited to throw light on John's activities and views. For details of manuscript transmission of John's major works, the findings of editors of the main works have been accepted as a secure basis to work from. For the date, structure and contents of John's Letters and Policraticus it has been possible to make use of the editorial introductions of Christopher Brooke and C. C. J. Webb; and the detailed discussions of the Policraticus by Max Kerner and Janet Martin. The

29 Studien zur Briefsammlung (see n 10 above) chap 2 pp 40-85.


investigations by Janet Martin into John’s use - particularly in the
Policraticus - of classical authors have radically altered perceptions
of John’s techniques of writing and his attitudes. Martin’s argument
that John delighted in falsifying and even inventing classical sources
is accepted here as conclusive and is frequently referred to
throughout this dissertation. In the case of the Letters particular
attention is paid throughout to ways in which John deployed the
rhetorical devices of medieval letter-writings. Some of John’s
works are subjected to a more extended analysis as sources: the
rhetorical strategy of the Metalogicon is examined in order to
establish the audience and intention of the work. The Historia
pontificalis is re-examined in toto as to date, authorship, value as
historical source and intention, as this has never been done in detail
before. John’s two extant vitae - the Vita Sancti Anselmi and the
Vita Sancti Thomae-are examined in detail as to content and purpose.

33 ‘John of Salisbury and the classics’, thesis abstract in Harvard
Studies in Classical Philology 73 (1969) 319-21; idem ‘John of
Salisbury’s manuscripts of Frontinus and Gellius’, Journal of the
Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 40 (1977) 1-26; idem, ‘Uses of
tradition: Gellius, Petronius and John of Salisbury’, Viator 10 (1979)
57-76; idem, ‘John of Salisbury as classical scholar’, World JS
pp 179-201.

34 See articles cited n 33 above. For the debate on the Institutio
Traiani cited in Policraticus see the following which argue it was
fabricated by John: Martin, ‘John of Salisbury’s manuscripts’, pp 1-5,
19-20; idem, ‘Uses of tradition’ p 66; H. Liebeschütz, ‘John of
Salisbury and the Pseudo-Plutarch’, Journal of the Warburg and
Courtauld Institutes 6 (1943) 33-9; idem Med Hum pp 23-6. For
opposing viewpoints see: S. Desideri La Institutio Traiani, Università
di Genova, Facoltà di lettere: Pubblicazioni dell’Istituto di
Filologia Classica 12 (Genoa 1958); M. Kerner ‘Zur Enstehungs-
geschichte der Institutio Traiani’, Deutsches Archiv 32 (1976) 558-71;
idem, John von Salisbury und die logische Struktur seines Policraticus
(Wiesbaden 1977) pp 180-1; idem, ‘Randbemerkungen zur Institutio

35 For medieval rhetoric the main textbook is James J. Murphy,
Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint
TABLE 1: Correspondents and friends: The evidence in John of Salisbury's letter collections

1. Set out are:
   
   **List A:** Recipients of letters written in John's name.
   
   There are 213 letters addressed to 92 such recipients.
   
   **List B:** Recipients of letters written in other persons’ names.
   
   There are 112 letters addressed to 36 such recipients.

   The 12 persons occurring on both lists are cross-referenced.

   One of the main aims of the Table is to indicate who John’s amici were (see chap 1 above). In List A the passages cited under the heading ‘categories of friendship-references used’ are not exhaustive, but are intended simply as evidence supporting the identification of 55 recipients as amici; of these 41 were based in England (at least when the correspondence began - some like John of Canterbury moved), 6 in France, 5 in Henry II’s continental lands, 2 at the papacy (including the Englishman Adrian IV), and the location of 1 is unknown.

2. The letters dealt with in these tables consist of 325 letters:
   EL epp 1-134, EL ep 99a, LL epp 135-325 (less ep 231 which is not a letter but a report of the meeting of Gisors-Trie, 18 November 1167). All but two of these letters occur either in MSS collections of John’s letters or in the Becket collections (See EL pp ix-xii, lvii-lxii, LL pp xlvi-lvi, lviii-1xiii). The exceptions are epp 323, 325 (see LL p 794n, p 802n).

3. The use of tu/vos:

   It should be noted that John consistently addressed intimates with the tu form, unless they are office holders senior to him (in which case vos is used). A similar pattern appears in the letters of Gilbert Foliot and Bernard of Clairvaux (The Letters and charters of Gilbert Foliot ... ed A. Morey, C. N. L. Brooke, Cambridge 1967 [= GFL]; Bernard of Clairvaux, Epistolae, PL 182 cols 67-662; Bernard, Op Omn vol 8.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Details of letters</th>
<th>No of letters received</th>
<th>1. Group or location of recipient</th>
<th>Tu/vos form used?</th>
<th>Amicus? (=-A)</th>
<th>What categories of friendship refs used?</th>
<th>Uses of friendship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Use of words <em>amor</em>, <em>amicitia</em>, <em>caritas</em>, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Wordplay, jokes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Personal allusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Reference to obligations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Previous companionship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Discussing/exchanging MSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. References to <em>philosophi</em>, <em>grammatici</em>, implying same values and belonging to a learned elite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Allusions to classical sources of friendship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Ep. Numbers</td>
<td>Main Theme or Biography</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam abbot Evesham</td>
<td>ep 199</td>
<td>1. Monk, V, A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Urges <strong>familiaritas</strong> with third person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Schools (LL p 286)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Request for prayers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Previous companionship</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Becket dispute - gen refs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Seeks help in regaining King’s favour (ep 30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Acting as go-between, seeking restoration of A’s favour to bp of Ely (ep 40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prob Adrian IV</td>
<td>epp 21, 46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See also List B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert, card-pr</td>
<td>epp 234, 316</td>
<td>1. Papacy, V</td>
<td>1 (joint)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Laurence in Lucina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*
- **V** stands for 'Vita'
- **A** stands for 'Acta'
- **Fam** stands for 'Familiaritas'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander III (Roland Bandinelli)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Papacy</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>epp 213, 219, 313, 324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(See also List B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred of Chard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>England (poss Exeter)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1. <em>caritas</em> (p 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ep 154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. <em>obsequia</em> (p 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1. <em>affectus, amare</em> (p 532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ep 263</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Gen ref to Becket dispute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Seeks MS of Quintilian (p 534)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Baldwin, advn Totnes | 11 | 1. Exeter | T | A | 1. fides  
(ep 170 p 120) | See chap 9:3 below |
|----------------------|----|------------|---|---|-------------------|------------------|
| epp 170, 187, 238, 241, 249, 272, 273, 280, 281, 289, 298 | 2. Schoolman  
(see eg ref to nominales  
ep 238 p 450) |  |  |  | caritas  
(ep 170 p 120)  
(ep 272 p 552) |
|  | 4. Had some link  
with Canterbury  
(see ep 241  
p 462 ref to amici at Canterbury  
and 'ius societatis antique' linking them to B) |  |  |  |  
|  |  |  |  |  | beneficia  
(ep 249 p 502,  
ep 273 p 570) |
|  |  |  |  |  | officia amicitiae  
(ep 273 p 570) |

| Baldwin de Valle Darlii | 1 | Canterbury | T | A | 2. Jokes, teasing  
(p 546) |
|-------------------------|---|------------|---|---|------------------|
| ep 270 |  |  |  |  | 6. Asks B to press  
William Brito for  
letters of St Jerome  
(p 546) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baldwin of Boulogne, adcn Sudbury</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>dioc Norwich</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>3. B had honoured J with the cingulum militare (pp 456-8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ep 240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew adcn later bp Exeter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. qui nobis fraternitate caritatis iunguntur (= circle of friends and their family at Exeter; ep 118 p 195)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epp 118, 133, 150, 168, 171, 174, 288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dilectissime amicorum (ep 133 p 240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>affectuosius (ep 168 p 100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>caritas (ep 168 p 100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. obligation (ep 174 p 138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boso, card-pr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Papacy</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Pudentiana</td>
<td>ep 315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, Christ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1. <em>dilecti</em>, <em>dilectissimi</em>&lt;br&gt;ep 300 pp 700, 704&lt;br&gt;amici&lt;br&gt;ep 303 p 714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church community and/or obedientiaries</td>
<td>ep 205 (Wibert and Odo priors), 244, 292, 295, 300, 303, 323 (to Odo prior, William sub-prior etc), 325 (Richard abp etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See also List B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engelbert, pr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monk-Fr</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1. <em>amici</em>&lt;br&gt;(ep 286 p 628)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Saint-Pierre</td>
<td>ep 183, 206, 286 (and to Simon pr Mont-Dieu)</td>
<td>1 (joint)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Ep.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernulf, Master</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Royal court (clerk to Becket as chancellor)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>'amico karissimo'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'de vestra ... familiaritate praemunens'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obsequium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Seeks help in recovering King's favour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey, Master, of St Edmunds</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>dioc Norwich (ep 95) = V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>'amico karissimo'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ep 95 p 146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epp 95, 161, 162, 193, 268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assists (via Walter de Insula) G's son Richard regain pax regis (ep 161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'amicitia fidem'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ep 95 p 148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'caritas'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ep 268 p 542)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard, cellarer of Norwich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dioc Norwich = V &amp; T (ep 161)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>caritas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gen ref to Becket dispute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Request for prayers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gerard Pucelle, Master  
France - schools

1. *dilectio vestra*  
   (ep 158 p 68, ep 184 p 210)

   *dilectissime*  
   (ep 226 p 394)

   *caritas*  
   (ep 184 p 212)

   *amor*  
   (ep 184 p 212)

   *amicus*  
   (ep 184 p 222)

   *amicitia*  
   (ep 185 p 222)

4. Obligations: *officium*  
   (ep 184 p 212)

   *exhibitio obsequiorum*  
   (ep 184 p 212)

7. Role of *philosophi*  
   (ep 158 pp 68-70,  
   ep 185 p 224, ep 277 p 598)

ep 158, 184, 185, 186,  
226, 277, 297
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Personalization</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gratian, papal notary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Papacy</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. 'dilectione vestrae' (p 780)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Recommending election of Richard of Ilchester as bp Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy bp Châlons-sur-Marne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>via Peter of Celle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. veritas (p 692)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry count of Champagne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry de Beaumont</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bp Bayeux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>epp 137, 138, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry of Blois,</td>
<td></td>
<td>English bp</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bp Winchester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See also List B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert, Master</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. <em>caritas</em> (p 682)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>dilectio vestra</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p 684)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary bp Chichester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See also List B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Go-between advising Hilary on how to proceed on dispute between sees of Canterbury and Chichester over jurisdiction of certain parishes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hugh, abbot Bury St Edmunds</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>dioc Norwich</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>1. caritas (ep 163 p 82)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. obligation (ep 163 p 82, ep 192 p 264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. ep 192 pp 262, 264, ep 283 p 622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hugh de Gant</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Canterbury</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>1. affectus (p 658)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humbald card-bp of Ostia</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Papacy</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| ep 163, 192, 283 | ep 290 | ep 317 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humphrey Bos, Master</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1. Bayeux</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>1. amice (ep 190 p 256)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>epp 139, 190</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. (poss Salisbury link see LL p 20-21, n1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Seeks advice (ep 139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Asks help in regaining reconciliation; H to influence his amici, including Henry bp Bayeux, to help (ep 190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelin de Bohun, bp Salisbury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4. Note that J of S describes himself as a debtor of Jocelin's (ep 278 p 600, 'Ceterum nostis' etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Canterbury, treasr York, later bp Poitiers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. devotio, fides (ep 39 p 71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sincera affectio (ep 212 p 342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>caritas ep 236 p 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* For recipient see LL p 406 n 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John pr Norwich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. caritas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>karissime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Saracen, Master</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ep 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Tilbury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. tua dlectio (p 516)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(household of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>abp Theobald)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Role of philosophi (pp 516-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence, Master</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poitiers</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. dilectio vestra (ep 222 p 382) 'communem amicum nostrum' (ep 221 p 380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ep 221,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombardus, Master</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Becket circle</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ep 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milo bp Therouanne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1. France</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epp 142, 214</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Connection with Canterbury (Theobald supported M's election, 1159; see EL ep 108 p 172)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicholas of Norwich, Master</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Norwich</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>epp 159, 178, 282</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. affectus (ep 159 p 72; ep 178 p 186)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Commends brother Richard to N (ep 159 p 74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>caritas (ep 159 p 72; ep 282 pp 618-20)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Indicates arrangements for bp Norwich to pay 3 marks to JS (ep 159 p 74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>amantes (ep 282 p 618)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>officium (ep 159 p 72)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. officium (ep 159 p 72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cicero, De amicitia (ep 282 p 618)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Cicero, De amicitia (ep 282 p 618)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Place/Title</td>
<td>T/A</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Decanus, sheriff of Essex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Royal court?</td>
<td>T/A</td>
<td>1. 'de tuo et amicorum certiorari desidero' (p 544) affectio (p 544)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas de Sigillo, adcn Huntington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Royal court (see LL p xxv n 2)</td>
<td>V/A</td>
<td>1. amor (p 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. offers service (ad honorem et obsequium vestrum and affectum (p 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas of Mont Saint-Jacques, Rouen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rouen (Aug. priory and leper hospital of St Jacques)</td>
<td>T/A</td>
<td>1. caritas (ep 188 p 252)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. beneficii obsequium, and amor (ep 188 p 250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel, Master</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>T/A</td>
<td>1. fides, amicitia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odo, Master</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osbert of Faversham, Master</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 195, 267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peter of Celle 10 1. Monk V A 1. karissime (ep 32 p 53)
ep 19, 31, 32, 33, + 1 2. Schools (poss) - N France
devotio (ep 35 p 62)
34, 35, 111, 112, 304, amor (ep 35 p 65)
310;
amicitia (ep 111 p 180)
Also prob ep 97, caritas as
which Poole, Studies reflection of
p 270 thought was to P. paradise (ep 304 p 724)
The evidence of Durham 'Domino suo unico
Library MS A.IV.8 shows suus Iohannes ...'
that in a now lost (ep 310 p 754)
manuscript [d] of the 2. Witty account of
Becket correspondence, different types of
this letter had the rubric: wine, in response to
'domino cellensi' P's spiritual tract
(A. Piper in World JS De Panibus (ep 33 pp 57-8)
pp 439-444 at p 443). Extended wordplay and
Brooke's objection to P. personal allusions
being the recipient, is that (ep 112)
the reference to a flying
visit 'in pursuance of a hateful
cause', could hardly apply to a
place as far away as Celle.
However this may be taking J's text
too literally; it is quite
possible that John was
exaggerating the brevity
of his visit.
4. J’s debt for help in the past (see chap 2:3 below)

6. Letters of St Bernard and anthology of writings of Master Gebuin. (ep 31 p 51); Bernard’s letters (ep 32 p 54); a commentary of Hugh of St Victor (ep 34 p 62).

8. Chalcidius (ep 111 p 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peter Scriptor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Canterbury</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>1. affectio (ep 225 p 390)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>epp 225, 250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>caritas (ep 225 p 390)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ralph of Lisieux, Master

1. Lisieux  T  A
   1. 'Amico et socio suo karissimo'
      (ep 110 p 175)
   John describes self as amicus of R's household
   (ep 110 p 176)
   'amicorum karissime'
   (ep 155 p 60)
   caritas (ep 155 p 60)
   affectio
   (ep 155 p 62)
   'amicos nostros'
   (ep 202 p 300)
   'frater amantissime'
   (ep 203 p 300)

2. Canterbury
   - Theobald's household

epp 110, 155, 202, 203, 204
2. Wordplay and conceit on theme of mixing wine (ep 110 p 175).

Teases R. about the fluency of people of Lisieux (ep 110 p 176).

Pun on cautela meaning
a) precaution,
b) trick, stratagem (ep 155 p 60)

5. 'quamdam initiae societatis et devotionis in prosperis acceptae et benedictionis exhibitae in adversis' (ep 203 p 600)

7. 'Hoc in philosophia nutritus' etc (ep 204 p 304)

9. Refs and humorous rebuttal of points made by R. (ep 110 pp 177-9)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ep</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ralph of Sarre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rheims</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. 'Amicissimo suo magistro suus Johannes ...' (p 204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury - household abp Theobald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph pr Worcester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. caritas, affectus (p 280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pro-Becket version of present negotiations (p 282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph de Beaumont, Master</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Court of Henry II</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. 'mi Radulfe' p 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. contrasts saecularis philosophia and vera sapientia (p 338); role of philosophus (p 340); J. and R. philosophi rather than curiales (p 340)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Niger, Master</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. caritas (ep 181 p 198)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fides et devotio (ep 182 p 204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>epp 181, 182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advice on how to deal with excommunicates (ep 181 pp 202-4, ep 182 pp 206-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph of Arundel, monk of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. amare (p 492)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Church Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ep 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph of Wingham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. 'dilectissime frater' (p 522)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 'fraternae caritatis' ... munus' (pp 522-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ep 258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Raymond, Master, chanc. of Poitiers, epp 166, 167, 224, 232, 276 (and to John of Canterbury).

1. Poitiers V A

1. fides et caritas
   (ep 167 p 92)

   affectio
   (ep 167 p 100)

   caritas
   (ep 232 p 422)

6. Asks R. to encourage John Saracen to translate and correct the rest of Celestial Hierarchies; ref to draft of first book being circulated in Francia (ep 166 p 92)

   Seeks recovery of libri which Master Walter of Rheims had lent to Master Peter Helias (ep 167 p 94)

   Asks R. to get Master John Saracen to send Pseudo-Dionysius, De Ecclesiasticae Hierarchiae and De Divinis Nominibus
   (ep 232 p 424)

1. Asks for safe conduct for self and the Becket exiles to meet cardinal legates, if R. and others agree; seeks information on king and royal court (ep 224 p 388)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reginald abbot Pershore</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Worcester</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>4. 'fidei munus et et caritatis officium' (p 290)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ep 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Memor ergo contractae inter amicitiae ...' (p 290)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reginald, adcn Salisbury</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Salisbury</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>1. 'Sapientiores amici ...' p 366 (But this falls far short of declaration of amicitia)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ep 217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rheims, treasr of</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Rheims</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>1. amici (p 312)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ep 208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Urges Treasurer to resist abp of Rheims' plans for appointment of sub-treasurer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richard (J of S's brother)</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Exeter</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>1. affectus (ep 164 p 84)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>epp 164, 169, 172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. request for prayers (ep 164 p 86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>caritas (ep 164 p 84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sends greeting to amici (ep 164 p 86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard de Bohun, bp Coutances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coutances, Normandy</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard, pr Dover, later abp of Canterbury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Dover</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1. <em>amice dilectissime</em> (p 378)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Monk at Canterbury;</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2. <em>debitor, obsequium</em> (p 378)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chaplain to abp Theobald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Schools 1140s, one of</td>
<td></td>
<td>on Mark, glosses (notulæ) on more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John's masters</td>
<td></td>
<td>difficult points of Aristotle (p 294)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard of Ilchester, adcn Poitiers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Court of Henry II</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1. Seeks R's advice and information about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obtaining personal reconciliation with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert pr Merton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In LL ep 265 p 536, 1. Request for prayers (ep 151 p 50; ep 156 p 62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epp 151, 156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>written after R's death, J. asserts that he was one of R's closest friends ('inter primos karissimos')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert sacrist, Christ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. devotio, caritas (p 698)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. obsequium (p 698)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert, vice-adcn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of obligation: John says that he is not bound by obsequium but acting 'ex caritate'. As there is no other indication of friendship in the letter, the relationship is unclear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. amicitia, amicus (p 524)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert de Limeseia ep 259</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Winchester (chaplain of bp)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert son of Egidia (John’s half-brother) epp 145, 146, 147, 148</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. affectio fraterna (ep 145 p 36) amare (ep 145 p 40) affectus (ep 146 p 42) caritas (ep 147 p 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger bp Worcester</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. <em>amicus, caritas</em> (p 276)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'in vera amicitiae consulo fide' (p 278)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|Roger of Sidbury| Exeter| T  | A  | 1. *dilectissime* (p 56) |
|ep 153           |        |    |    | 'amor' (p 58) |

|Sens, member of chapter of| Sens| T  | A  | 1. *amice* (p 28) |
|ep 17             |        |    |    | 'animum veteri amici' (p 29) |

1. Advises on how to handle a legal case which has gone to papal court

|Silvester, Master, treasr Lisieux| Lisieux| T  | -  | 1. *dilectissime* (p 356) |
|ep 215                     |        |    |    | *amantissimus* (p 358) |

1. Gives Becket version of negotiations in early 1167 (p 358)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon, pr Mont Dieu</td>
<td>1 (joint)</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1. 'Venerabilibus dominis et amicis' (p 628)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 286 (also to Engelbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr Val-Sainte-Pierre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Lovel, Master</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1. <em>dilectio, dilectissime</em> (p 284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Asks S. to commend bearer of letter to bp of Worcester (p 284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodwin, card-pr</td>
<td>1 (joint)</td>
<td>Papacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Vitale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 316 (and to Albert card-pr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Becket</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1. devotio (ep 28 p 45)</td>
<td>1. Wants B. to help him regain favour at royal court (ep 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 28, 128, 136, 144, 152, 173, 175, 176, 179, 227, 228, 278, 301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See chap 7:1 below</td>
<td>2. J. and William de Sidlis require two royal writs according to the form of petitions which John is sending TB (ep 128 p 223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>antiqua familiaritas (ep 28 p 45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>spectatae amicitiae (ep 28 p 45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dilectio vestra (ep 28 p 46, ep 128 p 221)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thomas, provost of Celle</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Celle - France</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>1. At T’s request, J. has committed T’s uncle to care of Becket (p 33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ep 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thurstan of Acolt 1 prob Kent T A 1. 'amicæ' (p 534) 1. Warns T. to avoid contact with excommunicates with whom T. is reputed to have familiaritas

virtus amicitiae (p 534) familiaritas (p 534)

4. 'initia iura societatis' (p 534)

Walkelin adcn Suffolk 1 Norwich V - -

ep 253 (cf EL pp 22-5 for hostile reference to W)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ep</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter bp Rochester</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1. Rochester</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Canterbury:</td>
<td>previously adcn of Cant.; brother of abp Theobald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'officium ... debitae, caritatis'</td>
<td>(p 520)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter, card-bp Albano</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Papacy</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see chap 8:3:d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter de Insula, Master</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Court of Henry II</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 180, 189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **fides** (ep 180 p 194)
   - *caritas* (ep 180 p 194)
   - 'dilecte' (ep 180 p 194)
   - 'salutationis et devotionis munus' (ep 180 p 196)
   - *amicus* (ep 189 p 254)
   - *affectio* (ep 189 p 254)
   - *devotio* (ep 189 p 254)

4. **obsequendi opportunitatem, debitor** (ep 180 p 192)
   - 'exibere officia caritatis' (ep 189 p 254)
   - 'obnoxius sum ut magistro et domino' (ep 189 p 254)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William, Master (?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- 1. Briefs W, who is at papal curia, on bp of Ely's case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Request for letters of St Jerome (ep 245 p 490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Reports that he is defending W. from accusations being made before Becket (ep 245 pp 488-90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Personal allusions (ep 243 p 482)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Request for letters of St Jerome (ep 245 p 490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>epp 242, 243, 245, 247, 293, 294 (See chap 9:3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Obtained concession for W. to ignore any summons from Becket (ep 242 p 478)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William abp Sens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1. Sends 'promptissimae devotionis obsequium' (ep 308 p 748)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Venerabili domino et patri karissimo' (ep 314 p 770)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See also List B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>William de Diceia</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>A 1. caritas, vera amicitia, affectio, (p 512)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Since an early age J. has cultivated caritas (p 512)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>William, pr Merton</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Merton</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>A 1. 'domino meo et amico' (ep 265 p 536)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Request for prayers (ep 265 p 536)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Recommends Becket's struggle (ep 266 p 538)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epp 265, 266 (and to canons of Merton)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Turbe bp Norwich</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>epp 13, 160, 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(See also List B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 'pater', caritas, obsequium, fidelis (ep 160 p 74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Seeks payment of his redditus to brother Richard (ep 160 pp 74-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. '... ut praemuniam dominum meum et expleam officium debitae caritatis.' (ep 262 p 532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 'Intermissionem officii, quod me vobis debere profiteor...' (ep 262 p 530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of Northolt</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ep 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. diligere (p 514)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Canterbury - in abp Theobald’s household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'de te et aliis amicis' (p 514)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of Pavia, card-pr,</td>
<td>Papacy</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ep 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter ad Vincula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(See chap 8:3:b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1. ’pater’ (p 143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a bishop or monastic superior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep 94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST B: Recipients of letters written in other persons' names

Adelis abbess Barking

From abp Theobald: ep 69. Total: 1

Adrian IV

From abp Theobald: epp 7, 8, 12, 14, 16, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 40, prob 45, 48, 49, prob 57, 108. Total: 16
(See also List A)

Alexander III/Roland Bandinelli

From abp Theobald: epp 9, 131, 132. From pr and monks of Christ Church Canterbury: 311, 320. From Bartholomew bp Exeter: epp 312, 319, 321. From Bartholomew et al: 322. Total: 9 (See also List A)

Alfred bp Winchester

From abp Theobald: epp 98, 99. Total: 2

Amesbury, abbess of

From abp Theobald: epp 114, 115. Total: 2
Arrouaise, general chapter of
From abp Theobald: ep 105. Total: 1

Bartholomew bp Exeter
From Henry II: epp 302, 309. Total: 2 (See also List A)

Boso card, papal chamberlain
From abp Theobald: ep 11. Total: 1 (See also List A)

Boxley, monks of
From abp Theobald: ep 82. Total: 1

Christ Church Canterbury, monks of
From abp Theobald: ep 1. Total: 1 (See also List A)
Evesham, monks of
From abp Theobald: ep 109. Total: 1

Exeter, chapter of
From abp Theobald: ep 117. Total: 1

General (All faithful, bps etc)
From abp Theobald: epp 5, 130, 134. Total: 3

Henry II
From abp Theobald: epp 88, 101, 116, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 135. Total: 11

Henry of Blois bp Winchester
From abp Theobald: epp 36, 37, 38. Total: 3 (See also List A)
Hilary bp Chichester
From abp Theobald: epp 44; prob ep 61. Total: 2 (See also List A)

Hugh du Puiset, bp Durham
From abp Theobald: ep 90. From Roger abp York: ep 306 (also addressed to dean and chapter of York). Total: 2

John of Sutri, card-pr St Peter and St Paul
From abp Theobald: ep 10. Total: 1

Nicholas of Mont-St Jacques, Rouen
From Becket: ep 157. Total: 1 (See also List A)

Plympton, canons of (?)
From abp Theobald: ep 119. Total: 1
Pope (uncertain but most prob to Adrian IV)
From abp Theobald: epp 2, 3, 4, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 102, 113. **Total: 33**

Richard de Belmeis, bp London
From abp Theobald: ep 70. **Total: 1**

Robert adcn Chester (?)
From abp Theobald: ep 107. **Total: 1**

Robert bp Lincoln
From abp Theobald: epp 67, 99a. **Total: 2**

Robert adcn Lincoln (?)
From abp Theobald: ep 100. **Total: 1**
Robert Warelwast, bp Exeter (?)  
From abp Theobald: ep 6.  Total: 1

Roger adcn Norfolk (?)  
From abp Theobald: ep 79.  Total: 1

Roger Pont L'Eveque, abp York  
From abp Theobald: ep 103.  Total: 1

Saint-Amand, abbot of  
From Peter of Celle: ep 143.  Total: 1

Saint-Medard, abbot of  
From Peter of Celle (?): ep 207.  Total: 1
Thomas Becket
From abp Theobald; epp 22, 129. Total: 2 (See also List A)

Walter Durdent, bp Chester and Coventry (?)
From abp Theobald: ep 104. Total: 1

Waverley, abbots of daughter-houses of
From abp Theobald: ep 106. Total: 1

William abp Sens
From clerks of Becket: ep 307. Total: 1 (See also List A)

William Turbe bp Norwich
From abp Theobald: ep 78. Total: 1 (See also List A)
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CHAPTER 2: MONKS AND SCHOOLMEN

1: INTRODUCTION

John of Salisbury spent almost twelve years in the schools of northern France. His autobiographical chapter 2:10 in the Metalogicon in which he recounts his experience of his different masters, has been frequently quoted and closely analysed. It shows John to have been committed to scholarly activity: initially, like many contemporaries talking up the study of dialectic, in his case under Masters Peter Abelard, Alberic and Robert of Melun (1136-38). He then took the decision to specialise in ‘grammar’, that is the study of language and literature, possibly against the advice of some of his circle. After studying grammar with William of Conches for three years, he returned to study logic and divinity with Master Gilbert of Poitiers, and then theology under Robert Pullen and Master Simon of Poissy.

1 For secondary literature on the schools of northern France in the mid-twelfth century, see Renaissance and Renewal pp 136-7, 163-4, and the other refs cited in chap 1 n 1 above.


3 Met p 77/31 - 79/29.

4 Met p 79/29 onwards. The decision to spend a period studying grammar marked a sharp break in his academic career which otherwise centred on dialectic and logic. John’s comments justifying the three years studying grammar sound mildly defensive, as if he were answering criticism which had been made of his decision: ‘Interim legi plura, nec me unquam penitebit temporis eius.’ (Met p 80/2-3).

5 Met p 82/6-8: ‘Reversus itaque in fine triennii repperi magistrum Gilebertum, ipsumque audivi in logicis et divinis .’

6 Met p 82/8-11.
John's account of his years in the schools has been dragged into a wider discussion on whether or not Chartres really was a leading intellectual centre in the twelfth century. In 1970 Richard Southern in a remarkably iconoclastic article, dismissed as myth the notion of Chartres as a major centre. This brief demolition of long-held assumptions provoked heated debate and rejoinder, involving as leading opponents of the Southern thesis, Niklaus Häring and Peter Dronke.

At the periphery of this debate is the assumption by earlier historians of John's career, that John left Paris, to study grammar at Chartres. Southern showed that there was no compelling evidence for this interpretation. He argued that instead John could have gone down from the schools of logic on Mont St Geneviève to Paris. To date, none of those involved in the debate have succeeded in producing clinching evidence on whether the location of John's literary studies was in Paris, Chartres or somewhere else in northern France. The question must remain open.

The most rigorous analysis of the chronology of John's years in Paris is Olga Weijer's 1980 study. A summary of her findings can be set out thus:

1136-38
Studied logic at Mont Sainte-Geneviève under Abelard, Alberic of Paris, Robert of Melun.

7 See n 1 above.


9 'Humanism and ... Chartres', p 73. For the geography of Paris at this period see R-H. Bautier, 'Paris au temps d'Abélard', in Abélard en son temps: Actes du colloque international ... (Paris 1981) pp 21-81, and the refs cited there.

10 See n 1 above.
1138-41

Studied under William of Conches and others at uncertain location.

1141-46/47

Studied at Paris under Richard L'Évêque, Peter Hellias; Gilbert of Poitiers; Robert Pullen, Simon of Poissy.

Although only 5 of John's 55 known amici can be described as schoolmen, John's years at the school shaped the attitudes that were to last throughout his career. While working as a secretary to archbishop Theobald of Canterbury, he completed in 1159 his Metalogicon, a review of teaching methods and - as argued later - a defence of specialised studies. His letters are peppered with references to himself and his friends being philosophers. While in exile during the 1160s, he pursued his studies of Biblical exegesis, and addressed a letter of detailed and scholarly scriptural commentary to Henry count of Champagne.

This chapter looks at two aspects of John's years in northern France from 1136 to c.1147. First it examines the purpose and audience of John's Metalogicon and argues that one of the main purposes of the work was to justify specialised studies to a monastic audience. Secondly, the chapter looks at how John ended this phase of his career, by entering the household of archbishop Theobald. It will be shown that John entered Theobald's employ with the assistance of monastic contacts - his friend the Benedictine Peter of Celle working

---

11 See Table 1 n 3 for the number of John's amici; the schoolmen amici were Adam of Evesham (school-trained), Baldwin of Exeter, Gerard Pucelle, John of Tilbury, Ralph Niger, Raymond of Poitiers.

12 LL ep 209; for a discussion of John's exegetical interests see A. Saltman, 'John of Salisbury and the world of the Old Testament', World JS pp 343-63. For John's use of scriptural allusion for propaganda see chap 7:3 below.
through contacts in the circle of Bernard of Clairvaux.

2: THE WRITING OF THE METALOGICON

a: The argument

To understand why John of Salisbury wrote the *Metalogicon* and to establish what audience the work was directed at, we must look at the figure of 'Cornificius'. John tells us in the Prologue that he has entitled his work the *Metalogicon* because 'in it I have undertaken the protection of logic'. Reluctantly, John has been drawn into conflict with a certain 'improbus litigator' who has resurrected 'an ancient calumny condemned by our ancestors'. This calumny is that *eloquentia*, i.e. the arts of the trivium: grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric, should not be studied since nature alone bestows eloquence, and that although 'the gift of nature may be strengthened by training' the toil involved far outweighs the benefits. The early chapters of the *Metalogicon* contain a sustained attack on the calumniator and enemy (emulus) who is assaulting the arts of the trivium.

John dubs his opponent 'Cornificius'. But why does he do so? Webb, in his edition of the *Metalogicon*, simply states that Cornificius was one of the detractors of Vergil who are listed in the *Vita Vergilii* which prefaces Donatus' commentary on Vergil. Cornificius is not however mentioned in the standard editions of Donatus' *Vita Vergilii*. I know only one reference to Cornificius: in

---

13 Met Prol p 3/16-7
14 Met 1:1 p 5/7-9.
15 Met 1:1 p 6/30 - p 7/1.
16 Met 1:1 p 8/1.
the ninth century Vita Vossiana edited by H. R. Upson. This composition is one of the large group of Carolingian Vitae Vergilianae which were written as an aid to teaching and understanding the poet's work. It may be significant that lines 51-2 read that the 'enemies of Virgil were Baxius, Maevius and Cornificius', while eight lines later we find:

Three parts of philosophy are found in his writings: Physics, that is natural philosophy in the Bucolics; Ethics, moral philosophy, in the Georgics; and Logic, rational philosophy, in the Aeneid.

It may well be that by the twelfth century the inimici of Virgil had become a byword for the enemies of the three parts of philosophy. That, however, is entirely speculative and would require confirmation by other research.

An extensive secondary literature has grown around John's use of 'Cornificius'. Was he a real individual? If so, was he a schoolman, and if a schoolman was he influential? Does 'Cornificius' represent a specific group within the schools? The answers to these questions are crucial to understanding not only the Metalogicon but also the schools of the northern France from the 1130s to the 1150s. For a large number of historians have seen 'Cornificius' as an individual schoolman, while others have seen the 'Cornificians' as an influential movement within the schools. In the nineteenth-century Biographie universelle 'Cornificius' was castigated as 'un méprisable sophiste'. The concept of a widespread 'Cornifician' movement has penetrated both general works, such as R. Lloyd's The golden Middle

18 Biographie universelle, ancienne et moderne ... 81 vols (Paris 1811-57).
Age (1939) and specialist writings such as J. R. William's discussion of the authorship of the *Moralium dogma philosophorum*. Most recently J. O. Ward has written about the 'Cornifician attack on the liberal arts'.

The aim of this section is to assess the purpose and audience of *Metalogicon*. The approach used is to re-examine the assumptions that 'Cornificius' represented a real individual, and the 'Cornificians' represented a real movement in the schools. It will be shown that the secondary literature has produced no satisfactory proofs that 'Cornificus' represents an individual (2:b). It will be argued that the primary purpose of the *Metalogicon* was to defend specialised studies and the activities of modern masters (2:c). It will then be argued (2:d) that in the *Metalogicon*, John was attacking two utterly distinct groups: firstly, the 'misguided logicians' - specialists led astray by their studies; and secondly, the 'Cornificians' who were detractors of specialised studies. The distinction between these two groups has often been blurred. Then an alternative interpretation is put forward (2:e) that 'Cornificius' was simply a rhetorical device, which John used in his attempt to persuade a conservative and probably monastic audience of the value of specialised studies undertaken by 'radical' masters Peter Abelard, Gilbert of Poitiers and Thierry of Chartres.

19 pp 92-102.

20 'The authorship of the *Moralium dogma philosophorum*', Speculum 6 (1931) 392-411, at p 408 for the view that there was hostility between William of Conches and the 'Cornificians'.

21 'The date of the commentary on Cicero's *De inventione* by Thierry of Chartres and the Cornifician attack on the liberal arts', *Viator* 3 (1972) 219-73.
b: In search of 'Cornificius'

The majority of commentators have assumed that beneath the pseudonym of 'Cornificius' is a real individual awaiting discovery. So deeply entrenched is this view that opinions to the contrary have always been phrased in the most cautious and tentative of terms. Two commentators, H. Liebeschütz and M. Bride, have suggested with great hesitancy that 'Cornificius' personifies certain tendencies in the schools and certain attitudes towards scholastic studies. Liebeschütz for instance comments:

But John does not hint at his real name nor does he give us any clear idea of his appearance such as might enable us to recognise him and distinguish him from others of his class whom he represents and who form the real object of attack in the Metalogicon.

At this stage we shall only look at those attempts to identify the person hiding under the pseudonym of 'Cornificius'. The question of a 'Cornifician' movement is quite separate and can be tackled satisfactorily only after scrutinising those references in the Metalogicon and in other scholastic writings which have usually been adduced as evidence that a lively 'Cornifician' movement, group, or sect flourished in the Paris schools.

Carl von Prantl in his magisterial work Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande argued that 'Cornificius' is none other than the Reginaldus Monachus which is mentioned in the Metamorphoses Goliae:

---

22 H. Liebeschütz, Mediaeval Humanism in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury (1950) p 50. Cf. ibid p 118.

23 See also M. Bride, John of Salisbury on the arts of language in the Trivium (Dissertation, Catholic University of America 1958) pp 34-5.


25 ed R. B. C. Huygens, Studi Medievali (Spoleto), ser 3, 3 (1962), 764-772.
Reginaldus monachus clamose contendit
Et obliquis singulos verbis comprehendit,
Hos ethos redarguit, nec in se descendit
Que nostrum Porphyrium laqueo suspendit.

This identification was also favoured by B. Haureau and by G. Robert in Les écoles et l’enseignement de la théologie.

Another candidate is the sophist Gualo. This interpretation, first postulated in P. Mandonnet’s Siger de Brabant, was more recently revived by L. M. De Rijk in 1966. Gualo is mentioned in two well-known references. Alexander of Neckham (1157-1217) lists him in the Laudes divine sapiencie as one of the Paris logicians. In one distich we find linked together:

En Porretanus, Albricus, Petrus Alardi,
Terricus monachus, Gualo sophista potens.

The second and better-known reference to Gualo is in a letter from Wibald of Stavelot to Master Manegold of Paderborn. Written in 1149, this letter refers to certain ‘arguments and casuistic quibblings which are called gualidicae after a certain Gualo’. De Rijk has recently found references to ‘quidam Galielli’ and ‘quidam Waldilli’ in two logical tracts which he has linked with the schools of Mont St.

28 P. Mandonnet, Siger de Brabant et l'averroïsme latin au xiii e siècle, 1911 edn, p 122 n 5.
29 'Some new evidence on twelfth century Logic: Alberic and the School of Mont Ste Geneviève (Montani)', Vivarium 4 (1966) 1-57.
30 This distich is quoted by A. Vernet, 'Une épitaphe inédite de Thierry de Chartres', Recueil de travaux offert à M. Clovis Brunel, 2 vols Paris 1955; vol 2 pp 660-70 at p 666 citing the Paris Ms of the Laudes sapiencie divine, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 11867, fol 230 v.
Geneviève. According to De Rijk, both tracts are versions of the same treatise and were composed between 1121 and 1142.\(^{31}\)

Reginaldus and Gualo are shadowy figures whose biographies are almost non-existent and it is understandable that some historians should seek to flesh out the biographies of these ciphers by linking them with 'Cornificius', a person for whom we have an abundance of detail generously provided by John in the early vituperative chapters of the Metalogicon. However, the arguments that link Reginaldus or Gualo with 'Cornificius' are, frankly, unconvincing. For sources such as the Metamorphoses Goliae, the Laudes divine sapiencie and the Metalogicon cannot be treated as though these were straightforward historical sources from which we can draw accurate biographical data. The Metamorphoses are savagely satirical and the Laudes are tinged with a detached amusement; the Metalogicon is patently argumentative. Each of these draws on polemical devices and phrases. When dialecticians indulged in ad hominem arguments, they readily described their opponents as sophists, fools (insipientes), and incompetents (inepti). The word ineptus was long established as a term of abuse.\(^{32}\)

Two other commonplaces of polemic were: verbosity and being a false monk. John describes 'Cornificius' as a flatulent windbag whose ideas emerge from the 'swollen bellows of his windy lungs' (tumenti

31 For evidence of dating, see De Rijk pp 4, 8-9.

32 Thus Eusebius of Bruno in a letter to Berengar says: 'You have written, saying that according to reliable witnesses, Geoffrey Marini has publicly praised and lent his support to the incompetence and madness (ineptiae et insaniae) of Lanfranc.' (PL 147 col 1202). The words ineptia and insania make a perfect couple, but by the mid-twelfth century schoolmen seem generally to have dropped the term insania, preferring to accuse their opponents of ineptitude and stupidity. By the 1140s the highly emotive term insania was wielded mainly, it seems, by conservative and monastic polemicists. Bernard says of Abelard: et nunc in Scriptis sanctis insanit ('and now he brings his madness to the study of Sacred Scripture'; PL 182 col 1055B).
ventosi pulmonis folle). He is verbose rather than fluent (non facundus sed verbosus).\(^{33}\) 'Cornificius', it seems, relied on the same methods of polemic when he castigates logic as the professio verbosorum.\(^{34}\) When one's opponent was a monk or even a cleric, a frequent allegation was that he was not a true religious. Thus the 'Cornificians' supposedly allege that followers of Alberic of Rheims and Simon of Paris are not even clerics:

not only do they allege that the followers of these masters are not philosophers, but they cannot even accept them as clerics, or even as fellow human beings.\(^{35}\)

A little later John turns the same allegation against the paterfamilias of the 'Cornificians' who has assumed, at least externally, the guise of religion, but God knows and will judge his motives.\(^{36}\) Likewise Bernard of Clairvaux in his campaign against Abelard in 1139-40, describes his opponent as:

a most doubtful character, having nothing of the monk about him except the name and habit.\(^{37}\)

Given that there was a rich terminology of scholastic polemic and that schoolmen readily engaged in ad hominem attacks, it is unhelpful to dig up references such as 'Reginaldus monachus clamose contendit', or 'Gualo sophista' as pointers to the real identity of 'Cornificius'. Such references have little value; at most they may indicate the author's hostility to a particular schoolman. Even this

\(^{33}\) Met 1:3 p 9/19-30.
\(^{34}\) Met 1:9 p 26/27-28.
\(^{35}\) Met 1:5 p 18/6-8.
\(^{36}\) Met 1:5 p 20/2-3.
cannot be deduced from Alexander of Neckham's *Laudes sapiencie*, which seems to have been written several decades after the masters whom they list had flourished. At most, these writings may indicate that at the time of composition a certain Reginaldus had gained a reputation for verbosity, or that a certain Gualo had gained a reputation for sophistry. The reference in the *Laudes* may simply echo the prejudices of the masters who taught Alexander of Neckham.

The identification of 'Gaulo sophista' with 'Cornificius' is particularly surprising, for nowhere in the *Metalogicon* does John describe 'Cornificius' as a sophist. 'Cornificius', in fact, the very opposite: a detractor of logic who despises the art in each of its three forms: demonstrative logic, probable logic, and sophistry. For the 'Cornificians' logic is an erroneous occupation indulged in by verbose persons who have nothing better to do ('fallax professio verbosorum'). It is an activity which has destroyed the minds of many ('que multorum consumpsit ingenia'). Not only is logic futile, it is a positive hindrance, say the 'Cornificians' to any understanding of philosophy. The 'Cornifician' attitude can hardly be that of a person involved in the schools, and it is certainly not the attitude of a person connected with the study of logic. If 'Cornificius' had been involved in the schools of logic, John would have exploited the obvious term of abuse: 'sophist'. But instead, John relies on the other commonplaces of medieval polemical literature: false cleric, inept, foolish, grossly immoral.

While we must reject, on fundamental grounds, these attempts to identify 'Cornificius', the Gualo-'Cornificius' identification

---

38 For the dating of the *Metamorphoses Goliae* (c.1150) cf H. Brinkmann, 'Die Metamorphosis Goliae' Zeitschrift für deutschen Altertum, neue Folge 50 (1925) 27-36.

requires attention. De Rijk’s revival of this theory is the most thorough attempt to find the true ‘Cornificius’. But since De Rijk’s argument is based on a closely-knit pattern of fact and speculation, we need to scrutinise its details. Having used two logic manuscripts and the letter of Wibald of Stavelot to establish that there was a sophist called Gualo, De Rijk then proceeds to create a biography for Gualo. He notes that shortly after Abelard’s departure from Paris in the 1120s, a certain Parisian master Gualo became embroiled with Algrin, the chancellor of Paris.\textsuperscript{40} This Gualo gained the support of Rainald of Martigny (Archbishop of Rheims, 1124-38), Henry of Sanglier (Bishop of Sens, 1122-42), and Marechal Stephan of Garlandia. This weighty support was of no avail, for the Bishop of Paris, Stephan of Senlis, gained the support of Pope Honorius II (1124-30) and in 1126 deprived Gualo of all his scholares. Although the ruling was later revoked by Pope Innocent II, we get no further references to this master Gualo.

De Rijk argues that ‘Gualo sophista’ is this troublesome Master Gualo. This would certainly accord with the chronology provided by the ‘montani’ tracts and by Wibald of Stavelot’s letter. The tracts, written between 1121 and 1142, use phrases which suggest that Gualo was no longer teaching in the schools. There is no reference to Gualo in person, but only references to his followers, ‘quidam Galilei’ or ‘quidam Waldilli’. Nor in Wibald’s letter, dated 1149, is there any suggestion that ‘Gualo sophista’ is active in the schools; the Gualidican sophisms are named after a certain Gualo. The chronology fits De Rijk’s thesis, but the evidence is tenuous indeed.

\textsuperscript{40} De Rijk p 6. The course of the dispute is dealt with by E. Lesne, Les écoles de la fin du 8e siècle à la fin du 12e siècle (Lille, 1940), pp 208-09. Two letters from Stephen, bishop of Paris, written in 1126, are to be found in Recueil des historiens de Gaules et de la France 16 (Paris 1814) p 329.
It is essential to De Rijk's thesis that all these references to Guaio should point to a single individual: 'Guaio sophisma'. For then De Rijk can speculate that Guaio and his followers were among the 'pseudo-philosophers' whom Abelard berated in Book 3 of the Theologia Christiana. 41 De Rijk's line of argument is that Guaio and the other dialecticians of the same brand were attacked in the 1120s, that Guaio withdrew from the schools in 1126, and that later he, or his ideas, once again became influential in the schools. This resurgence of an old doctrine, so the argument goes, alarmed schoolmen such as Wibald of Stavelot and John of Salisbury.

Even if we accept De Rijk's speculative construction of Guaio's biography, there is no question of Wibald or John reacting to a 'Guaionic' upsurge. From the Metalogicon it is clear that John is responding to the criticisms of persons who have little or no contact with the schools of logic. 42 Nor was Wibald reacting with disquiet to a movement in the schools. It is obvious from Wibald's letter to Manegold of Paderborn that the 'argutiae et sophisticae conclusiunculae gualidicae' are not subversive sophisms concocted by perverse logicians. They are well known verbal jokes derived from Seneca (ep 49.8):

```
quod non perdisti habes; cornua autem non perdisti; cornua habes.
what you have not lost you still have; you have not lost horns; therefore you have horns.

mus syllaba est; syllaba autem caesium non rodit; ergo mus caesium non rodit;
mouse is a syllable; but a syllable does not eat cheese; therefore a mouse does not eat cheese.
```

41 PL 178 cols 1215-18; cf Petri Abaelardi Opera Theologica CC 12:2 p 195 onwards.
42 For arguments supporting this interpretation see section d:ii pp 83-7 below.
In his letter Wibald is amused, not outraged, at these sophisms; he uses these sophisms as a device for poking fun at dialecticians. In this way he catches the mock-serious tone of Seneca's text. This tone is well represented in Letter 48 where Seneca wrote:

'Mouse is a syllable. Now a mouse eats cheese; therefore a syllable eats cheese.' Suppose now that I cannot solve the problem; see what peril hangs over my head as a result of such ignorance! What a scrape I shall be in: Without doubt I must beware, or some day I shall be catching syllables in a mouse-trap, or, if I grow careless, a book my devour my cheese.

John of Salisbury, with his fondness for word-play and with his sympathetic attitude towards sophistry, would probably have been mildly amused at these Senecan tags. Schoolmen of the twelfth century were not entirely humourless.

This then constitutes the external evidence which De Rijk deploys. But his argument also draws on three snippets from the Metalogicon.

1) In Metalogicon 1:2 John makes an apparent allusion to the mus sophism which Wibald attributes to Gualo:

nichilque turpius quam cum sententia displicet aut opinio
rodere nomen auctoris ...

when a person’s judgement or opinion displeases you, there is nothing more shameful than to attack his reputation ...

If this is an echo of the mus sophism it is remarkably faint, for here John is using the verb rodere not in the sense of 'to gnaw, to eat', but in its secondary meaning, 'to backbite, to slander' (e.g. Horace, ep 48.6, Loeb trans.

Met 1:2 p 8/16-7.
Satirae 1.4.81: ‘absentem amicum rodere’).

(2) In the Prologue to the *Metalogicon*, John, when speaking of the possible success of his work, cites the lines of Martial: 45

Egisti nichil, inquis, et a te perdita causa est; tanto plus debes, Sexte, quod erubui.

‘You have achieved nothing,’ you say, ‘and by you the case is lost.’
Then all the more O Sextus are you in my debt since I have been shamed.

De Rijk, who had not examined the *Metalogicon* codices, misunderstands the critical apparatus in Webb’s edition and he asserts that the A manus of the A MS (British Library MS Royal 13.D.IV) reads *Ganto* for *Sexte*. 46 De Rijk suggests that a careful reading of the line would probably show *Gaulo* or *Gualo* instead of Webb’s reading *Ganto*. This could then be regarded as a clumsy gloss by someone who thought that John was alluding to the ‘Cornifician’/Gualonian perdita causa. However, an examination of the A MS shows that *Ganto* is substituted for *tanto*, not for *Sexte*. The word is distinctly *Ganto*, and not *Gualo* or *Gaulo*. The capital *G* has been superimposed on the letter *t*, an alteration which is, frankly, puzzling.

(3) In *Metalogicon* 1:22 John tells us that ‘Cornificius’ seeks to defend his error by quoting from Seneca. De Rijk believes that this corroborates the identification of ‘Cornificius’ with Gualo, since the Gualonian sophisms listed by Wibald all derive from Seneca. In fact here John is referring to Seneca’s statement that the liberal arts do not make a man good (‘quod discipline liberales virum bonum non

45  *Met Prol.* p 2/16-17.

The internal evidence of the Metalogicon which De Rijk calls forth to strengthen his case proves to be little more than a broken reed. Thus even the most detailed attempt to find an identity for 'Cornificius' must, like previous attempts, be rejected.

c: The Metalogicon - a defence of the moderni

The Metalogicon, as we have seen, was designed as a defence of logic. John's definition of logic is a broad one which comprehends the whole range of precepts and rules which were traditionally considered as belonging to the three arts of the trivium: grammar, dialect, and rhetoric. 'Logic in its broadest sense,' says John, 'is the science of speaking and arguing. But sometimes the word is used in a more restricted sense to mean the rules of disputation.' This dual concept of logic, John inherited from Hugh of St. Victor who divided logic into two categories: linguistic (sermocinalis), which is the equivalent of grammar; and argumentative (rationalis), the equivalent of dialectic and rhetoric. In this broad sense logic is the equivalent of what William of Conches termed eloquentia. Hence when John refers to eloquentia throughout the Metalogicon he is not referring to rhetoric (as M. Bride believes) but the whole range of skills, verbal and argumentative, which are provided by the trivium.

47 The title of Met 1:22 is: Quod auctoritate Senecae suum tueatur errorrem. The allusion is to Seneca ep 88.1-2.
48 Met 1:10, p 27/8-11.
49 Didascalicon 1:1 (ed C. H. Buttimer, Washington 1939) p 59 [Hereafter Did].
50 H. R. Lemay, 'Guillaume de Conches' division of philosophy in the Accessus ad Macrobiurn', Mediaevalia 1 (1975) 115-29 at p 122.
In the Middle Ages there were two distinct ways of viewing philosophia. First, it could be viewed as the sum of the seven liberal arts, the arts of the trivium (grammar, dialectic, rhetoric) and the arts of the quadrivium (geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, music). The alternative scheme was that of dividing philosophia into three facultates: physica (or philosophia naturalis), ethica (or philosophia moralis), and logica (or philosophia rationalis). The division of philosophia into seven liberal arts carried considerable authority but bore little relationship to the realities of the medieval curriculum. By the mid-twelfth century, rhetoric had shrunk to a mere appendage of grammar and dialectic. The scheme of the liberal arts also omitted those areas of research which absorbed the interest of the early scholastics: ethica and theologia, and relegated logic to the status of a minor art amongst a host of other arts. John’s references to the trivium and quadrivium are occasional and are little more than lip-service to a scheme hallowed by tradition.

John prefers the division of philosophy into three faculties, for this gives logic a central role. John’s strongly argued assertion in the Metalogicon is that the study of physica or ethica is worthless unless one has a thorough training in logic. Logic is the gateway to philosophy. Borrowing a metaphor from physiology, John declares that logic is the vital force which animates and organises other studies, just as the spiritus animalium quickens and regulates the humours necessary for vita animalium. And just as the spiritus animalium may be weakened by poisonous substances, so logic may be undermined by inertia and ignorance (inertia et ignorantia).  

It is logic in this broad sense that John advocates. He proposes that the basics of grammar and of literary criticism should

---

52 Met 2:11 p 83/16-23.
be fully inculcated in the young student. Once these precepts have been mastered, the student should proceed to the *ars disserendi* (the art of discourse), which consists of three sections: demonstrative logic, probable logic, and sophistry. It is the second of these which John most strongly advocates, for it provides methods (*rationes*) which may be easily exploited in questions of moral or natural philosophy. Demonstrative logic, which demands necessary rather than probable proofs, has a very limited value, and is only useful in the mathematical sciences, in which John has little interest. John speaks affectionately of sophistry. He would be loath, he tells us, to condemn the knowledge of sophistry as useless, for it provides considerable mental exercise and harms only those who are too ignorant to recognise it.53 After mastering the three categories of the *ars disserendi* the student is fully qualified to proceed to advanced studies.

This broadly based curriculum comprising the *ars loquendi* and the *ars disserendi* was a plan, an ideal, far removed from the practice of scholastic life. We can see from John's autobiographical chapter in the *Metalogicon*54 that the study of the arts was haphazard and rarely taken in any clearly defined order. After studying the *ars disserendi* for two years, John proceeded to study grammar. His knowledge of rhetoric and of the quadrivium was gleaned from a variety of masters. Then, armed with his knowledge of grammar and of dialectic, John studied 'logic and divinity' with Gilbert of Poitiers, and later theology with Robert Pullen and Simon of Poissy. The comprehensive curriculum proposed in the *Metalogicon* was not taught by any of John's masters. The closest we get to it is in the course of

53 Met 2:10 p 68/21-23.
54 Met 2:10.
studies which Thierry of Chartres outlined in his Heptateuchon, a collection of extracts culled from all the arts of the trivium and quadrivium. Thierry, like John, placed great stress on grammar. But where John and Thierry part company is in Thierry’s enthusiasm for the arts of the quadrivium in which John had little interest.

The one master who may have inspired John’s curriculum was Gilbert of Poitiers. John quotes Gilbert as deriding those students who potter ineffectually around the schools for a few years and then scurry off in search of more lucrative or more secure occupations. The only trade for which they were suited, said Gilbert, was baking - an occupation which in Gilbert’s native Poitou welcomed all those who were unemployed and unskilled. Gilbert’s own writings were orientated towards dialectic and theology, but he placed great importance on the artes liberales, as John demonstrates in the Historia pontificalis. At the Council of Rheims, Bernard sought the condemnation of Gilbert’s commentary on the De Trinitate of Boethius. Afterwards, Bernard suggested that the two men should meet ‘in some religious house in Poitou, or France, or Burgundy, wherever he preferred, to discuss the writings of Blessed Hilary amicably and without rancour’. Gilbert replied contemptuously that ‘they had already disputed sufficiently on the matter and if the abbot wished to reach a full understanding of Hilary he should first seek further instruction in the liberal and other preliminary studies’. Elsewhere in the Historia pontificalis John says that Gilbert is ‘the most literate man of our age’ (‘vir etate nostra litteratissimus’) and

56 Met 1:5 p 16.
57 HP chaps 8-14. This incident is described in chap 12 p 26.
that in *seculares litterae* no-one surpassed him.\(^{59}\)

John’s curriculum composed of literary and dialectical studies is more than just an educational proposal or just a defence of John’s own views on the arts. The curriculum is the means by which John can defend the views, methods, and reputations of four of his masters: Gilbert of Poitiers, Abelard, William of Conches, and Thierry of Chartres. These are the masters whom John praises most profusely throughout the *Metalogicon* and whom he links together as the *amatores litterarum* who attempted to counteract those masters offering superficial and rapid courses in philosophy.\(^{60}\) There were good reasons why John should want to defend these masters. Each had a reputation for being obscure, and each had been accused of expressing dubious theological views. Their works seemed to be laced through with profane novelties. John tells us that ‘now several terms are hackneyed in the schools’ which, when Gilbert introduced them, had been viewed as prophanæ novitates.\(^{61}\)

John has sometimes been cited, incorrectly, as an opponent of the growing specialisation in logic. It is true that he censures those students and masters who waste their lives in quibbling over obscure and unimportant matters,\(^{62}\) but he does see the *ars disserendi* as crucially important for anyone wishing to pursue advanced studies. We should note that half the *Metalogicon* - Books III and IV - is

---

\(^{58}\) HP p 15.

\(^{59}\) HP p 27.

\(^{60}\) Met 1:5 p 16.

\(^{61}\) HP, p 17. Note also Clarenbiad of Arras’ gibe that Gilbert ‘induced shadowy obscurity with his roundabout way of talking (*multo verborum circuitu tenebrosam obscuritatem inducit*)’. As quoted by R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of medieval thought and learning*, (2 edn, London 1920) p 321.

\(^{62}\) Met 2:10 pp 82-3.
devoted to summarising the Organon of Aristotle. As one of the earliest schoolmen to use the Organon extensively, John must be regarded as a strong proponent of the logica moderna. In Metalogicon 4:27 John argues that although Aristotle erred on many matters he is pre-eminent in logic. John then remarks that much could be said against those who, veterum favores potiores, exclude Aristotle from their studies and content themselves with Boethius' Categories and Interpretation. 63

The key-note of the Metalogicon is the defence of the modern and of the newly available Aristotelian works. In the Prologue we read:

Nor have I been ashamed to cite the views of contemporaries (modernorum), whom in many matters I prefer to the ancient authors. I hope that posterity will celebrate the fame of those who live in this age, for I admire the noble minds (nobilia ingenia) of many of them; I admire the subtlety of their research (investigandisubtilitatem), the diligence of their study (diligentia studii), the skill of their memories (felicitatem memorie); their fertile minds, their fluent tongues, their skill in words. 64

John's sympathy for the 'radical masters' and for the skills of the moderni, his fascination with Aristotelian logic, his defence of specialised studies in logic - all these must colour our explanation as to why John wrote the Metalogicon and for whom he wrote it. A cluster of questions come to mind. Did John write the Metalogicon in response to an attack, and if so was the attack from a schoolman? Was the Metalogicon written in the heat of controversy or was it composed in the tranquil atmosphere of friendly discussion? Was John seeking to persuade his readers or was he preaching to the faithful? It is possible that John may have used the language of polemic simply to

63 Met p 193/21-3.
provide a rhetorical framework for a wide-ranging discourse on logic. If John was indeed trying to persuade his audience, then who were they - administrators, schoolmen, conservative churchmen, monks?

To uncover the purpose and the audience of the *Metalogicon* we need to establish John's attitudes to several groups: radical schoolmen, conservative schoolmen, educated persons who despised scholastic studies. In the *Metalogicon* John distinguishes sharply between four groups: 1) misguided logicians; 2) the 'Cornificians'; 3) the radical masters; 4) the 'conservative' masters. By scrutinising John's comments on each group we can move closer to discovering his motives in writing the *Metalogicon*.

d: 'Misguided logicians' and 'Cornificians'

i: Introduction

Into the *Metalogicon* John has woven a number of themes: the value of literary studies, faith and the limits of reason, the misguided logicians, the detractors of logic and so on. He allows these themes to appear and reappear in different parts of the *Metalogicon*. The result is often confusing, so it is no surprise to find that numerous historians have equated two entirely different groups whom John attacked in the *Metalogicon*: the 'misguided logicians' and the 'Cornificians', who were detractors of logic. Thus J. O. Ward in his discussion of the 'Cornifician attack on the liberal arts', shows that he is aware that the 'Cornificians' were outside the schools when he describes them as 'tertiary-trained "job-hunters"'. Yet a little later he describes the apparent sophistry of William of Soissons as typically 'Cornifician'.65 C. N. L. Brooke describes 'Cornificius' as

65 'Date of the commentary on ... De inventione', *Viator* 3 (1972) 219-73 at pp 224, 228.
'the twelfth-century logical positivist - who seems to stand for specialised logic wherever it may be found'.

Likewise G. R. Evans, in her account of how John used Boethius' *Arithmetica*, assumes that John's attack in *Metalogicon* 1:3 on the masters who tried to find new laws for every study, was directed against the 'Cornificians'.

It is argued here that the 'Cornificians' must be sharply distinguished from the 'misguided logicians' whom John attacks. This distinction was first suggested by E. K. Tolan in 1968, but has not made any impact on secondary literature. The aim here is to transform Tolan's suggestion into a detailed argument.

ii: The 'misguided logicians'

By the time that John wrote the *Metalogicon* the study of logic had become highly specialised and from John's remarks at *Metalogicon* 2:10 it is clear that some masters could devote their entire lives to the profession of logic. To conservative churchmen this trend was disturbing for the new schoolmen seemed to view *philosophia* as an end in itself, and not as a stepping-stone to the study of Sacred Scripture.

For Christians there had always been more fundamental doubts about the value of specialised studies and about the pursuit of philosophy. The earliest of Christian apologists struggled to make their religion intellectually respectable and they were willing to

66 *EL* pp xliii-xliv.

67 'John of Salisbury and Boethius on arithmetic', *World JS* pp 161-67. The reference to *Met* 1:3 p 12/2-6 is discussed p 91-2 below.

present Christianity as a 'philosophical school'. They were at pains to show that Christianity was not a debased oriental cult or ignorant superstition but that it was a true philosophy, a rational option, a pathway to genuine piety. But the alliance with secular learning was always uneasy. Augustine regarded the liberal arts as a mixed blessing for, as he believed, they originated in Egypt where they were often abused. In *De doctrina Christiana* he observes that dialectic is a very great aid to discovering the meaning of Scripture and its redemptive truth. But he cautions us against believing that once we have mastered dialectic we have the secret of a happy life. The greatest danger for the dialectician is thinking that dialectic is the highest circle of perfection.

The Christian stance may be summed up in two Scriptural quotations. The first, from Ecclesiastes 7, shows the Christian yearning to understand God and His ways:

*I applied mine heart to know, and to search, and to seek out wisdom and the reason of things.*

The second quotation is from I Timothy 6 when the Christian is warned to avoid:

...profane and vain babbling and opposition of science, falsely so called.

---


70 *De doctrina christiana*, II: XL-XLII CC 32 pp 73-77. See also P. H. Baker, 'Liberal arts as philosophical liberation: St Augustine's *De Magistro*, Arts libéraux et philosophie au moyen age: IVe congrès international de philosophie médiévale ... (Paris 1969) pp 469-79.

71 The ambivalent attitude towards dialectic was only part of the wider unease about the pagan inheritance. Helen Waddell (The wandering scholars, Pelican edn 1954, pp 15-18) lists several quotations which
In the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries the revolution in dialectic and grammar generated a whole class of specialists, a class of men who would devote their careers to detailed and seemingly obscure studies. It was not at all clear that such studies were necessary or even helpful for an understanding of the divina pagina.

In the Metalogicon John is defending schoolmen and he was a pupil and friend of certain masters who had earned a reputation for being obscure. So it is revealing to see how John handles the stereotype of the argumentative, sterile schoolman. John admits that some of his friends - the followers of Abelard, William of Soissons, and Adam du Petit Pont - are rather obscure. The followers of Abelard, he says:

are my friends, even though they torture the captive the letter to such a degree that even the hardest heart would be moved to tears.

To someone outside the schools the views of John's pupil William of Soissons must have appeared as little better than absurd casuistry. For William devised an argument showing that the same conclusion may be inferred from either of two contradictory propositions. As for Adam du Petit Pont, his Ars Disserendi was a turgid but tightly argued tract. John's comment:

Would that he had expressed well the good things he said. Although his friends and followers attribute his obscurity to subtlety, many critics have judged that it stems from folly or from envy or vanity. Nevertheless, we should be grateful to the authors, for their works are a fountain from which we may drink, and thus be enriched by the labours of others.

71 (continued) illustrate the longevity and persistence of this attitude.
72 Met 2:17 p 92/7-9.
73 Met 2:10 pp 81-2.
Though willing to admit the shortcomings of these masters, John is loath to condemn their activities. In fact he reserves his harshest words for the less competent practitioners of logic and particularly for those teachers who use inept and confusing methods of teaching. Too often they use a multiplicity of arguments and authorities:

They analyse and press on tender ears everything that anyone has ever said or done.

This failure to be selective goes against all the advice given by Aristotle. What John strongly objects to is the tendency of masters to present excessively complex problems to their students. For instance one deplorable custom was to use Porphyry's introductory work the Isagoge as a springboard for difficult and often tendentious discussions on the nature of universals.

It seems likely that in the twelfth-century schools there was a demand from students themselves that more profound questions might be taught. After all, who wished to waste money and time studying foundation courses which might be thorough but unexciting? Students came to Paris to be stimulated and to enter the great debates of the age. But John and numbers of other masters were sharply aware of the risks that must accompany the provision of lectures on esoteric and complex matters. First, the outstanding student might be lured into a career of obscure and endless disputation. He might all too easily be sidetracked into matters of minor philosophical importance. But there

74 Met 4:3. For this passage D. D. McGarry's trans (Metalogicon, Berkeley 1955) has been followed (= Webb ed p 167/20-29).

75 Met 2:17 p 91/13-5.

76 Met 2:16 p 91/4-8; see also Met 2:17 p 91/25 - p 92/1; and Met 2:19 p 97.
was a second risk: advanced courses tended to leave many ordinary students without any real training. In fact as William of Conches says in the second version of his glosses on Priscian:

Sometimes on account of the obscurity of our teachings, the pupils view the arts with hatred. Certain of them, in whom there may be detected an innate love of learning acquire understanding slowly and with great difficulty. Swiftly and without difficulty would they learn if we were only to lecture them diligently.

John expresses the view that:

Simplicity, brevity, and easy subject matter are, so far as is possible, appropriate in introductory studies. This is so true that it is permissible to expound many difficult matters in a simpler way than their nature strictly requires. Thus much that we have learned in our youth must be amended in more advanced philosophical studies.\(^7\)

John's criticism of the misguided logicians appears to be sincere, and not rhetorical. His comments are precise and restrained, lacking the rhetoric and exuberance of his diatribe against 'Cornificius'. In fact we cannot truly speak of an 'attack' against the misguided logicians, but rather a series of precise and well-considered criticisms. But written into John's sincerity is a deliberate strategy: by admitting that some logicians are either obscure or misguided, he implies that true logicians are lucid and concern themselves with matters of real philosophical importance. And hence logic is a valuable occupation which ought not to be condemned simply because some of its practitioners have been led astray.

\(^7\) Based on J. O. Ward's translation in 'The date of the commentary on Cicero's De inventione by Thierry of Chartres and the Cornifician attack on the liberal arts', Viator 3 (1972) 219-73 at p 236.

\(^8\) McGarry trans (= Webb, p 91/20-25).
iii: The 'Cornificians': detractors of logic

The aim of the 'Cornificians', according to John, was to do away with eloquentia:

What has eloquence got to do with philosophy? One deals with words, the other investigates and defines the ways of wisdom which it sometimes apprehends through diligent study. Clearly the precepts of eloquence confer neither wisdom nor love of wisdom. In most cases eloquence provides no help at all. For philosophy (or its objective, wisdom) seeks the thing not the word. Hence it is clear that the precepts of eloquence have no connection with philosophy.

As we have already seen, John uses the term eloquentia in its broad 'Chartrian' sense to mean the arts of the trivium. The 'Cornifician' family, so John tells us, do not deny that one should be eloquent, but they argue that the arts which promise eloquence are useless (inutiles). The 'Cornifician' answer is to get rid of the study of logic ('ut de medio logicam tollat'). The objective of the 'Cornificians' is dramatically described in the opening lines of Metalogicon 1:10:

Behold their plan of action becomes clear: to wage war on logic and to persecute with equal fury all the paths which lead to philosophia. They need to start somewhere. Where better than with that art which is more well-known than others and which is most familiar to the sect?

In these lines we see clearly the tactic John is using; the 'Cornificians' are depicted not simply as opponents of logic but as intending to subvert the whole structure of philosophy. John uses a similar device in Metalogicon 1:1 when he alleges that the 'Cornificians' are not just opposed to eloquence, but would subvert all liberal studies, would slander the whole of philosophy, would cut

---

79 Met 1:6 p 21/19-27.
80 Met 1:6 p 27/1 onwards.
the very bonds of society. But behind the tactic used in chapter 1:10 is the less dramatic but more convincing accusation that the 'Cornificians' despise logic.

The 'Cornificians' were those who had been trained in the schools and had been alienated by the obscure and primitive methods used by their teachers. John supplies rich detail of what the schools were like when 'Cornificius' was a student. By describing 'Cornificius' as a senex insulsus, John implies that the 'Cornificians' studied in the schools in the 1130s or earlier.

At Metalogicon 1:3, 'Cornificius' is described as a teacher who pastures his flock of listeners on 'worthless fables (fabellis et nugis)', promising to make them eloquent and to turn them into philosophers with the minimum of effort. What he now teaches his disciples he originally learned from his own masters. John devotes a whole chapter (1:3) to discussing the standards of teaching and disputation that prevailed in the early twelfth-century schools. The purpose of his discussion is indicated clearly in the title of the chapter: 'When, how, and by whom Cornificius was taught'. In other words John is seeking to discover the origins of the 'Cornifician' error.

The schools in 'Cornificius' youth were dominated by dialectic to the exclusion of all literary studies:

The historians and poets were regarded as disreputable, and if someone applied themselves to the writings of the ancients, he was not only regarded as slower than the Arcadian ass, but was derided by all as more obtuse than lead or stone.

81 Met p 7.
82 Met 1:13 p 12/18.
83 Met 1:13 p 10/4-7.
84 Met 1:3 p 11/11-5.
Yet the dialectical methods used were extremely primitive; John suggests that masters and pupils alike delighted in making their propositions unnecessarily complex. In part, John’s description is patently ludicrous and distorted. He alleges that in those days the schools of philosophy had been concerned with such matters as whether a pig which was being taken to market was being led by the man or by the rope. Another matter of great concern to such masters was whether a person who buys a full cloak (cappa integra) also buys the hood (capucium). The whole of John’s account is written in a tone of jest. We are told that the arguments used in disputation were so full of double negatives, triple negatives, and multiple negatives that in order to follow a dispute the prudent listener would bring a bag of beans and peas which he could then lay out as the argument proceeded.

But underlying this flippant account of the early schools are several serious assertions. Firstly, a very primitive form of logic dominated the schools. Arguments were dismissed as invalid unless they resounded with such terms as ratio, argumentum, conveniens, inconveniens. Secondly, there was no system in their studies. John, like Hugh of St. Victor, stresses that there must be an ordo in all studies, each art having its own appropriate methods, and that sloppy thought is generated by using methods that are inappropriate.

One symptom of this lack of ordo was the failure of schoolmen to

85 Met 1:3 p 10.
86 Met 1:3 pp 10-11.
87 Met 1:3 p 10.
88 Hugh discusses the ordo needed in the different disciplines, in reading books, in narration, and in exposition (Did. 3:8, Taylor trans p 91). See also Did. 3:5, Taylor trans p 89.
distinguish between acting ex arte and de arte (ex arte et de arte agere idem erat). That is, they made no distinction between the practice of an art and the theory of an art. This distinction, made by Hugh of St. Victor, came to have a central part in the twelfth-century accessus to the arts. John caustically observes that such schoolmen would probably hold that a poet cannot versify unless he names his metre, and that a carpenter cannot make a wooden bench without forming on his lips the words 'wood' and 'bench'.

A third characteristic of the schools was the quest for novelty and individuality. The key word used by John is 'novel' (novus). The teachers, called by John novi doctores, rejected authority and pursued their own pet ideas. They could tolerate nothing traditional, dismissing older ideas and methods as rudis, incultis, vetus, and obsoletus. They completely renewed all studies and overhauled the whole of grammar. Instead of using the rules of their predecessors (regulae priorum) they offered new methods ('novas vias') for the whole of the quadrivium. Grammar was recast in a new form (innovabatur), dialectic was changed (immutabatur), and rhetoric was despised (contemnebatur). For these wholesale changes the teachers could adduce no authority but, John observes, they drew their methods 'from the hidden sanctuaries of philosophy (de ipsis philosophie aditis)'. What John depicts is a pernicious type of intellectual

89 Met 1:3, p 12/4.
91 Met 1:3 p 12/14-20.
93 Met 1:3 p 12/1-5.
anarchy that had spread throughout the schools; everyone upheld his own inventions (inventa) or those of his masters. Students would briefly espouse the notions of their masters but rapidly they found themselves swept along in the flood of error, and despising even what they had heard from their masters, they invented new sects and coined new errors.

A fourth characteristic of the schools was that students who arrived there barely literate were speedily transformed into the most accomplished of philosophers. Students remained in the schools hardly much longer than it takes a young bird to grow its feathers. Young masters fresh from the schools (recentes magistri e scolis) remained at their studies for just as long as fledglings remain in their nests, and like fledglings they quickly flew away.

John's critique of the early twelfth-century schools combines absurd stereotypes with genuine criticism. The core of John's critique is that the early schools, using primitive and sterile methods, generated a wide-spread reaction against scholasticism - a reaction which John dubbed the 'Cornifician error'. It is striking that we are given more details about the early schools than about the career of 'Cornificius' or his companions. The reason is simple: there was no 'Cornificius', nor any 'Cornifician movement'. The name 'Cornificius' is a convenient device through which John could severely attack those persons who, alienated from the schools, despised the aims and practice of scholastic research.

In Metalogicon 1:4, John appears to trace the careers of 'Cornificius' and his companions after they left the schools. But

---

94 Met 1:3 p 12/6.
96 Met 1:3 p 11/19-24 for the substance of this paragraph.
this account is largely rhetorical and gives us no real information. John tells us that four options awaited such 'overnight philosophers' (repentini philosophi): to enter a religious order, to practice medicine, to work as a secretary or administrator, or to enter the world of commerce. These careers, which, conveniently, are four in number, John dubs the quasi quadrivium. The whole point of this chapter is that it allows John to contrast the quasi quadrivium of non-scholastic pursuits with the true quadrivium:

These overnight philosophers used to hasten to this quasi-quadrivium which they regarded as indispensable; and with Cornificius they despised not only our trivium but also the whole of the quadrivium.

This chapter, then, provides the emphatic demonstration that 'Cornificius' sees the pursuit of wealth and career as far superior to the sterile erudition of the magistri.

The four-fold division of careers gives John the opportunity to pass his own satirical remarks on several professions. What John is doing belongs to the genre of social and religious satire which was growing in the twelfth century. In his discussion of the religious orders, John suggests that all is not well. Within the cloister flourishes the pride of Moab (superbia Moab) but so intensified that Moab’s arrogance surpasses his courage. St. Benedict would be astounded that through his own fault wolves lurk in the skins of lambs. John’s comments on the medical profession are even more pointed. The twelfth-century physician is depicted as a

97 Met 1:4 p 15/25.
98 Met 1:4 p 15/24-6.
100 Met 1:4 p 13/14 - p 15/5.
money-grabber, a charlatan who, armed with fallacious rules and impressive aphorisms, is a serious hazard to one's health. Such physicians live by two maxims: 'Where there is indigence one ought not to labour' (i.e. do not visit the poor), and 'Take your fee while the patient is still in pain'. The first maxim is a distortion of Hippocrates' statement that a fasting man should not labour; the second is drawn from the twelfth-century medical treatise, the Regimen Sanitatis Salernitana.  

The third profession listed by John is that of courtier who acts as secretary, administrator, or messenger. Here John restrains his tongue for, as he points out, he has already discussed the matter in the Poliorcaticus. Finally there are those who gravitate towards popular and profane professions. Such persons have only one objective: 'Make money, by fair means if possible, but otherwise in any way at all' (Horace, Ep. i.i.65,66). They lend out cash at interest, and increase even numbers to odd numbers, and odd to even.  

In Metalogicon 1:4 we are given what might seem like biographical data relating to 'Cornificius':

Others like 'Cornificius' gravitated to the popular and profane professions, caring little for what philosophy might recommend or reject...

This might suggest that 'Cornificius' entered commerce, but in fact in Metalogicon 1:5 we are told that 'Cornificius' has donned the garb of

101 Met 1:4 p 13/26 - p 14: 'Ubi, inquit, indigentia non oportet laborare.'
102 See references given by Webb, ibid p 14n.
103 Met 1:4 p 15/5-11.
104 Met 1:4 p 15/11 onwards.
105 Met 1:4 p 15/11-4.
a religious so that he may pursue his activities with impunity. If 'Cornificius' was an individual known to John then these contradictory details would not have been supplied. The details are not in any sense biographical, they are drawn from the vocabulary of polemic. As we have seen, it was a commonplace of medieval controversy to denounce one's opponent as a false monk or priest to allege that he was motivated by sordid greed.

There are clues scattered throughout the Metalogicon which betray the fact that 'Cornificius' is not a particular individual who expounds a precise doctrine. At Metalogicon 1:3 it is alleged that 'Cornificius' promises his followers that he will,

make them eloquent without the benefit of an art and will turn them into philosophers by a speedy shortcut.

But the idea that 'Cornificius' will actually make his followers eloquent ('faciet eloquentes') directly contradicts John's other statements that the 'Cornificians' believe that eloquence is bestowed by nature and that no master or art can create or aid eloquence. How then can 'Cornificius' make his followers eloquent? This imprecision on John's part is understandable only if we assume, firstly, that 'Cornificius' was not a real individual; and secondly that 'Cornificius' does not represent a particular group or movement in the schools. If John had been rebutting a particular grouping then we would expect a reasonably precise and consistent picture to have emerged. The vagueness and the internal contradictions in John's portrait of 'Cornificius' suggest that 'Cornificius' is a convenient rhetorical device through which John can assail various attitudes

106 p 20/2-4.
107 Met 1:3 p 10/4 onwards.
towards logic and scholastic learning.

e: An alternative view

i: 'Cornificius' as rhetorical device

The key to understanding 'Cornificius' is to remember that John was writing in the didascalic tradition - tradition of educational treatises pioneered by Honorius Augustodunensis (d. 1136) and Hugh of St. Victor (1097-1141). Throughout the Metalogicon there are sharp and distinct echoes of Hugh's Didascalicon. In his detailed account of the teaching methods of Bernard of Chartres, John displays an enthusiasm for the classical prose authors and for detailed training in rhetoric. Here John is seeking to rebut Hugh's opinion of the prose authors:

whom today we commonly call 'philosophers' ... are always taking some small matter and dragging it out through long verbal detours, obscuring a simple meaning in confused discourse - who, lumping together even dissimilar things, make, as it were, a single 'picture' from a multitude of 'colours' and forms.

But more often John is in close agreement with Hugh. At one point John reveals his admiration of Hugh:

A certain man of outstanding wisdom says (and I am grateful to him for this maxim): 'Aptitude arises from nature, is improved by use, is blunted by excessive work,


110 Did. 3:4, (tr Taylor p 88).
and is sharpened by temperate exercise. 111

The 'man of outstanding wisdom' is Hugh, for John is quoting from the third book of the Didascalicon.

John's treatment of 'Cornificius' is laced through with commonplaces drawn from the Didascalicon. The quotation cited above is crucial, for John uses it to batter the 'Cornifician' argument that eloquence is a natural endowment that cannot be aided by the arts of the trivium. In the Didascalicon Hugh bemoans the worldly interests of contemporary students and masters:

'A fat belly,' as the saying goes, 'does not produce a fine perception. But what will students be able to say for themselves on this point? Not only do they despise frugality in the course of their studies, but they even labour to appear rich beyond what they are. Each one boasts not of what he has learned but of what he has spent. But perhaps the explanation of this lies in their wish to imitate their masters, concerning whom I find nothing worthy to say. 112

In this passage we find three attributes of the 'Cornificians': greed, pride, and the theme 'like master, like student'. Elsewhere Hugh stresses the value of humility and the dangers of pride:

Now the beginning of discipline is humility ... 113

For the vice of an inflated ego attacks some men because they pay too much attention to their own knowledge, and when they seem to themselves to have become something, they think that others whom they do not even know can neither be nor become great. 114

Associated with pride is the unwillingness to learn from other men.

111 Met 1:11 p 30/12-5. The quotation is drawn from Did. 3:7 (tr Taylor p 91).
112 Did. 3:18, (tr Taylor p 100).
113 Did. 3:12, (tr Taylor p 94).
114 Did. 3:13, (tr Taylor p 96).
The true student, says Hugh, will be humble and 'will blush to learn from no man'. In the Metalogicon, John depicts the 'Cornificians' as the epitome of pride; they persisted in their madness, preferring to remain foolish (desipere) than to learn faithfully from the humble to whom God gives grace. Those who had arrogantly presumed to act as masters, now blushed to sit on the pupil's bench.

The false masters in the Didascalicon revel in their own theories, just like 'Cornificius' and his masters:

So it is in our days certain peddlers of trifles come fuming forth; glorying in I know not what, they ... suppose that wisdom, having been born with themselves, will with themselves die.

John also echoes Hugh's statement:

Unpraiseworthy is learning stained by a shameless life. Therefore let him who would seek learning take care above all that he does not neglect discipline.

John's description of 'Cornificius' is an exaggerated and garishly coloured variant of Hugh's censures against false masters. The attributes of pride, depravity and greed are all there:

\[
\begin{align*}
tumor ventris et mentis & \quad \text{bloated in mind and belly} \\
oris impudicitia & \quad \text{foul-mouthed} \\
rapacitas manuum & \quad \text{grasping and greedy} \\
gestus levitatem & \quad \text{lewd in manner} \\
feditas morum quos tota vicina despuit & \quad \text{the stench of his habits which disgust all his}
\end{align*}
\]

116 Did. 3:13, (tr Taylor p 96).
117 Did. 3:12 (tr Taylor p 94).
118 Met 1:2 p 9/4-9.
There is no reason why we should believe that this high-flown rhetoric is directed against a real individual. From what we know of John's personality, this proposition is utterly improbable; a master in irony and wit, an adept in the quiet, destructive phrase, John seems always to have had a respect for his opponents. It is difficult to believe that the skilful diplomat, the person who befriended Bernard of Clairvaux and Gilbert of Poitiers at one and the same time, should resort to the clumsy and crude rhetoric that degrades his opponent. Not even his later vitriolic attacks on Frederick Barbarossa or on Gilbert Foliot are so crude.\(^{119}\) It makes far more sense to see 'Cornificius' as a rhetorical device which, at most, may refer to certain trends in the schools, but which certainly does not represent either a particular individual or a particular group.

In giving shape to his argument, John was drawing not just from the didascalic tradition and also from the rhetoric based on Roman law. To give verve and colour to what might otherwise have been a bone-dry treatise on logic, John casts the *Metalogicon* into the shape of a court case. John is defending logic ("logice suscepi patrocinium")\(^ {120}\) against an improbus litigator who is making a slanderous allegation (calumnia) which has been previously condemned.

\(^{119}\) For John's attacks on Frederick Barbarossa see T. Reuter, 'John of Salisbury and the Germans', *World JS* pp 415-25. For the attacks on Foliot see *LL* ep 175 pp 152, 156; ep 181 p 202.

\(^{120}\) *Met Prol.* p 3/16-7.
by the judgement (iudicium) of our ancestors. John’s use of legal terminology is more precise than most commentators have realised. 'Cornificius' is bringing a calumnia against defenceless Logic. The term calumnia carries the general sense of 'slanderous allegation', as well as trickery or deception in legal transactions or in the interpretations of legal norms. In a more technical sense it can refer to civil suits or to criminal cases. In civil matters a calumnia is a malicious vexation (vexare) of a person with suits (litibus) which are 'brought merely in order to trouble the adversary and with the hope for success through a mistake or injustice of the judge'.

In criminal law the term calumnia meant an accusation brought in the full knowledge that the accused person was innocent. In either its criminal or civil senses the term calumnia aptly characterises the nefarious activities of 'Cornificius'. The fiction of a court case is maintained throughout: 'Cornificius' deserves to be censured as a public enemy to all ('ut hostis omnium publicius merito censeatur'); although he seems to prosecute (persequi) logic, in fact he impugns (impugnat) the whole of philosophy; and although logic has been acquitted (absoluta est logica), 'Cornificius' all the more impudently slanders (criminatur) the art. In these passages John is using terms that carried a precise meaning in Roman law: hostis (an individual who is declared an enemy of the state and who may be killed on Roman territory by any citizen with full impunity); censere (used for resolutions of the senate, e.g. senatus censuit); persequi (to claim one's rights through judicial proceedings, or to sue for a thing or

---

121 Met i:i p 5/7-9.

122 The definitions used in the following discussion are drawn from Adolf Berger, Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law, American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia 1953).
private penalty); absolvere (to absolve the defendant in a civil trial or the accused in a criminal one).

The fiction of the court case has two functions: first, it gives direction to a treatise which, in some respects, is a ragbag of John’s own reminiscences and personal opinions, mixed up with clichés and commonplaces about the arts, snippets of advice for young students, and so on. Secondly, the drama of a court case seizes the reader’s attention and rapidly carries the reader along; before he or she realises what is happening, the reader is pitched headlong into a detailed discourse on grammar.

The rhetorical device of ‘Cornificius’ is inseparable from the fiction of the court case. The legalistic language and the references to the arch-enemy of Logic, are all piled into the early chapters of the Metalogicon. Later they fade out when John knuckles down to the business of discussing grammar, logic and the newly-translated works of Aristotle’s Organon. Two questions come to mind: why did John use the device of ‘Cornificius’, and how does ‘Cornificius’ fit into the main line of John’s argument? These are questions that will resolve themselves after we have uncovered John’s motives in writing the Metalogicon. For this we must examine the theme of ‘radical masters and conservative masters’.

ii: Radicals and conservatives

In Metalogicon 1:5 John distinguishes two groups of masters. The first are those amatores litterarum who struggled to undo the damage created by inept and superficial masters (i.e. by the masters of ‘Cornificius’): Thierry of Chartres (‘a most studious researcher in the arts’); Abelard (‘whose reputation in logic was so outstanding

---

123 Met 1:5 p 16/7 - p 17/10.
that his contemporaries thought that he alone understood Aristotle’); William of Conches (‘the most distinguished grammarian since Bernard of Chartres’); and Gilbert of Poitiers. These four masters were not entirely successful in their struggle against error:

while resisting folly they themselves become foolish and for a while they fell into error while trying to destroy error.

\[
\text{insipientes itaque facti sunt, dum insipientie resistebant; et errorei diutius habiti, dum obviare nitebantur errori) \text{\textsuperscript{124}}}
\]

The second group of masters mentioned in Metalogicon 1:5 are those masters who are attacked by the ‘Cornificians’: Anselm and Ralph of Laon, Alberic of Rheims, Simon of Paris, William of Champeaux, Hugh of St. Victor, and Robert Pullen. These were all relatively conservative masters who had a theological slant to their writings. It is revealing that one of John’s masters in logic, the sharp witted and formidable Robert of Melun, is found in neither list. Robert was regarded as a ‘safe’ theologian and might have been listed with the conservative masters, had he not been the author of a most vitriolic tract against the denigrators of Abelard. \textsuperscript{125}

It is noteworthy that three of the seven conservative masters - Anselm of Laon, Alberic of Rheims, William of Champeaux - had been embroiled in heated conflict with Abelard and were savagely attacked in his autobiographical Historia calamitatum. \textsuperscript{126} Abelard directed a

\textsuperscript{124} Met 1:5 p 17/5-7.

\textsuperscript{125} See Luscombe, School pp 287-90.

particularly scathing passage of invective against Anselm, deriding his intellectual abilities.\(^{127}\)

It is therefore remarkable to find John saying that Anselm and Ralph 'displeased only heretics and those sunk in shameful crime'.\(^{128}\) John and his readers must have known the animosity that existed between Abelard and Anselm.

The chapter which lists the two groups is ingeniously designed to prove that Abelard and the other 'radical' masters were not really opposed to the 'conservatives'. John has to admit that the 'radicals' fell into error, they 'inclined towards error' (erronei habit).\(^{129}\) The use of the term erroneus is significant since in some contexts it carries the sense of 'sinner, heretic'.\(^{130}\) There is the hint then that the 'radical' masters threatened matters of faith. But John is determined to maintain that the 'radical error' was a temporary delusion, a failing easily forgiven in those who sought to destroy error. The real danger to faith came not from the 'radicals' but from those masters who used pernicious and obscure methods. John argues that before the radicals emerged, primitive methods of disputation prevailed (as symbolised by masters who taught 'Cornificius'). The 'radicals' sought to change matters by 're-instating the arts', that is by encouraging the systematic study of grammar and dialectic. In the place of rapid, superficial courses, they introduced courses that were lengthy and thorough. The attack on the 'conservative' masters,

\(^{127}\) Monfrin ed p 68; J. T. Muckle ed p 180.

\(^{128}\) Met 1:5 p 18/3-4.

\(^{129}\) Met p 17/5-9.

\(^{130}\) Du Cange does not list the word erroneus, but A. Souter (A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D., Oxford 1949) defines the word as: 'Sinner, heretic'; of evil spirits it means 'leading into error'; also 'false'. 
according to John, came from those who were alienated from scholastic studies and who were hostile to any worthwhile intellectual pursuits.

John's attempt to whitewash the 'radicals' suggests that he was writing for an audience who had profound doubts about the 'radical' masters. This essay in persuasion - and not the figure of 'Cornificius' - is the key to the *Metalogicon*. The spicy attacks on 'Cornificius' are used to liven up the early chapters; but, significantly, the *Metalogicon* does not end with an attack on 'Cornificius'. The final chapters are:

4:40 What should be the goal of the Peripatetics and of all true philosophers; and the obstacles to understanding.

4:41 (has no title but deals with the limitations of reason and the function of faith.)

4:42 Visible proofs that the world is subjected to vanity; and the reason why the book ends here.

The last chapter is merely a rhetorical *conclusio* in which John casts a sad eye on current affairs - the death of Pope Adrian, the schism in the Church, the war between the English and French kings - and then begs the reader and audience to pray for him. 131

The argument of the *Metalogicon* ends at 4:41 on the note of reconciling faith and reason. This chapter is constructed around *Ecclesiasticus* 3:22-26. The sacred writer, says John, restrains the rashness of those who with irreverent garrulity discuss the secrets of the Divine Trinity - a clear reference to Abelard, Gilbert, Thierry, and their respective followers, whose writings and speculation on the nature of the Trinity had caused alarm among conservative churchmen such as Bernard of Clairvaux. 132 It is difficult to know whether John

131 Met p 219/14-5.

132 For Abelard's doctrine of the Trinity see E. M. Buytaert, 'Abelard's Trinitarian doctrine', *Peter Abelard: Proceedings of the* (Footnote continued)
really believed that speculation on the Trinity was so very dangerous, or whether he was simply pandering to his obviously conservative audience. Whichever is the case, the Trinitarian speculations - and, presumably, other forms of risqué theology - constitute the 'radical error'; they are the wild conjectures that have led many persons astray (Ecclesiasticus 3:26).

At a glance we can see John's purpose in quoting excerpts from Ecclesiasticus: to admonish those who have the audacity to 'stick their nose into everything and want to account for all things'. But if we turn to the Glossa ordinaria - the best guide to the standard interpretations of scripture known to, and accepted by, twelfth-century schoolmen and exegetes - we discover a further dimension: the warnings against idle curiosity and vain conjecture are seen as references to heresy. For the line, 'Multos enim supplantavit suspicio eorum', we find that the interlinear gloss on eorum is given as haereticorum. Rabanus, commenting on Ecclesiasticus 3:24-26, also

132 (continued)


picks out the allusion to heresy:

that is, do not scrutinise unnecessary matters, which reasoning cannot understand ... It is best to have a rather sober understanding of things, an understanding which refreshes the soul, but does not weigh heavily on the mind ... Heretics are formed in two ways, that is to say, wrangling excessively about the Creator or about Creation, they fall into error and move far from the truth.

As these are standard and traditional commentaries, the staple diet of all students learning their Scripture, John's readers would have immediately picked up the allusions to heresy and to matters of faith.

In this chapter John puts the finishing touches to the arguments which he has been developing throughout the *Metalogicon*. Having discussed the different forms of reasoning, the different methods of establishing the truth, and the different paths to knowledge, John has to admit that reason is not enough:

Since not only man's senses but even his reason frequently err, God has made faith the primary and fundamental prerequisite for the understanding of the truth. \(^{134}\)

Now, this may look like a rhetorical flourish, a platitudinous comment designed to send the reader away happy in the knowledge that John has, in some way or other, reconciled the claims of faith and reason, and that he has, in the process, proved himself a 'safe' logician. But that interpretation is unconvincing, for chapter 4:41 is fully integrated into the main arguments of the *Metalogicon*. As H. P. Hendley has convincingly argued, John is preoccupied throughout the book with the problem of how reliable human knowledge is. \(^{135}\) How

\(^{134}\) Met 1:41 p 216/13-4.

do we know that things are the way we think they are? How reliable are forms of logic (demonstrative, probable, and sophistic) for establishing the truth? John is always at pains to point out the inadequacies of these methods:

The great difficulty with demonstration is that the demonstrator is always seeking arguments based on necessity and cannot admit of any exceptions to the principles of truth which he professes... Demonstration, therefore, is utterly useless in matters of nature (I speak of corporeal and changeable things); but in mathematics it recovers its strength.

For most matters, probable logic is the most trustworthy system of reasoning; but even this cannot provide us with absolute truths. If no form of reasoning can give us absolute assurance, must we then retreat into despair or scepticism? John's answer is that reason is ultimately inadequate and that for the more obscure problems of philosophy and theology we must fall back on faith, which is transmitted through Scripture and through the Church. In the search for truth, reason (i.e. logic) has a vital but nevertheless limited role to play. By thus mapping out the limits of reason, John proves to his readers that logic is important and that in matters of faith it is safe.

John's use of Scriptural references at chapter 4:41 is remarkable, for elsewhere in the Metalogicon such references are scant indeed. Only at one other point does John draw so intensively on the Bible: chapters 1:22-23. Here, as in chapter 4:41, he is directly answering the criticisms that we might expect from a conservative audience. This cluster of Biblical references occurs at a strategic point in the first book of the Metalogicon. John has been discussing grammar and grammatical precepts at length (chapters 1:13 - 1:20). At

I:21 John abandons his discursive tone and once again he assumes an argumentative stance, asserting that:

those who would abandon or condemn grammar are in effect trying to pretend that the blind and deaf are more fit for philosophical studies than those who by nature's gift have received and still enjoy all their senses.

In this chapter and in those immediately following we get the impression that John has turned aside from discourse and is talking directly to his audience. The titles of chapters I:22 and I:23 show what John is up to:

I:22 That he (Cornificius) would defend his error with the authority of Seneca.

I:23 What is needed for the development of philosophy and virtue.

This is an instance of John's device of 'twin-chapters', the first dealing with, and perhaps challenging, the views of an opponent, the second setting out John's own views. In I:22 John says that he is answering the 'Cornifician' misuse of Seneca's maxim: that liberal studies do not make a person good. In fact John is answering conservative critics of the arts, for almost immediately he quotes the one line of Scripture that could be used to justify the most hostile attacks on the arts: 'Knowledge puffeth up, it is charity alone which makes one good', (1 Cor 8:1). He then states that although the arts do not, of themselves, create virtue, they are fundamental to philosophia, the love of truth. In the next chapter (I:23) John develops this theme by discussing the aids which are necessary to philosophical inquiry and to virtue. In this indirect way John lulls us into accepting the equation that 'philosophical inquiry = virtue'.

137 Met 1:21; McGarvy's trans (= Webb ed p 51/8-11).
In his short treatment of the four prerequisite aids — lectio, doctrina, meditatio, and assiduitas operis — John hurls in as many Scriptural phrases as he can. Here he is not drawing arguments from Scripture but is simply playing around with words and phrases. The cumulative effect is to give this chapter an unusually moralistic and Scriptural tone.

The general impression that John is in these chapters addressing a conservative audience, is strengthened by the references to Seneca. For Seneca is the kind of auctor that would appeal to a conservative, monastic audience. In the first place he had a lively contempt for the arts, though John disingenuously denies this;¹³₈ even in his style Seneca ignored the elaborate rules of rhetoric.¹³⁹ More importantly, Seneca was admired in the Middle Ages as the greatest of the moral philosophers. His professed love of retirement, solitude, and meditation together with his exaltation of poverty and the simple life turned him into an advocate of asceticism.¹⁴₀

In these chapters (1:22-23, 4:41) where John has set aside detailed discussion and abandoned the pretence of attacking 'Cornificus' we find a surprising wealth of Scriptural allusions, a determination to show that the arts can lead to virtue and that logical studies do not threaten religious belief. All of this

¹³⁸ John says that while Seneca deflates the arts he does not exclude them utterly from the field of philosophy. But the tone and content of Seneca's letters belie John's glib contention. That this off-hand approach to classical sources is characteristic of John has been demonstrated by J. Martin; see chap 1 nn 33-4.

¹³⁹ Quintilian complained that Seneca breaks down long periods into brief points; Institutio oratoria x,1.125 ff.

suggests that John is seeking to persuade a conservative and monastic audience rather than a scholastic one. If we accept this argument, then we are faced with two options: either John was writing a polemical tract, a contribution to the current controversy between conservative monastics and Abelardian apologists; or the Metalogicon grew out of discussions among friends.

The early chapters, so vindictive in tone, might seem like polemic, but rapidly this harsh, jarring note fades away as John settles down to the real business of the Metalogicon: the arts of language and discourse. For effective polemic we would expect a tightly argued tract; but in the Metalogicon John is self-indulgent, allowing himself to discourse and digress on those topics which catch his interest. If this is polemic, it is very feeble indeed. The more convincing alternative is that the book was inspired by discussions among friends, and that John intended the Metalogicon for a small group of friends. In the strategic chapters where John is speaking directly to his audience (chapters 1:22-23, 4:41) the tone is persuasive not polemical. John is working hard to persuade an audience who are at least willing to listen. The prolonged discourses which we find elsewhere in the Metalogicon cannot have been directed at an audience who were entirely hostile to the arts.

The paucity of manuscripts strongly suggests that the work passed among a very small group. The most plausible explanation for the writing of the Metalogicon is that among John's friends there was a dialogue as to the value of specialised and logical studies. John responded by writing a defence of logic. In one of Peter of Celle's letters we catch a glimpse of this dialogue:

... where bodily pleasure is greater and fuller, there indeed is exile of the soul. And where luxury reigns, there the soul is miserably enslaved and punished. O Paris how skillful you are at catching and ensnaring souls! In you the nets of vice, in you the shares of sin,
in you the arrows of hell which transfix the hearts of the foolish (insipientium). This, John, is what I call exile ... 

Peter goes on to speak of the blessed school (beata schola) where Christ teaches our hearts with the word of his virtue. This blessed school, which is the homeland of the soul, lies in the next life, but our journey there can be aided by listening carefully to the word of Christ. The ultimate vanity of specialised studies is implied when Peter says of the beata schola:

There, no book is bought, no writing master is needed. There, all questions are clearly determined, all reasons and arguments fully understood. There are no circuitous disputes, no intricate sophisms. The life (vita) means more than reading (lectio); simplicity (simplicitas) is more profitable than quibbling (cavillatio).

Here the conservative or monastic outlook is clearly stated: the life (vita) of the soul is more important than vain argument; and holy simplicity is holier than sterile disputation. The notion of sancta simplicitas was by this time deeply imbedded in monastic literature. It was a notion that could easily be scorned by schoolmen, but John has to be more circumspect. At one point he pokes fun at the idea:

Admittedly, speechless wisdom can be a solace to one's conscience, but it is hardly of much practical use.

But at Metalogicon 1:4 John carefully indicates that he does not entirely spurn the notion of sancta simplicitas. Some of those 'Cornificians' who entered the cloister as monks or clerics came in due course to recognise that their training in the schools had been

---

141 PL 202 ep 73 col 519
142 PL 202 col 520.
143 Met 1:1 p 7/5-7.
the 'vanity of vanities'. But some:

bloated with long-standing perversity, persisted in their madness (insania), preferring to remain foolish (desipere) than to learn faithfully from the humble to whom God gives grace.

Through the pride of these 'Cornificians' and,

under the mask of philosophy a spirit of fallacious elation has crept in.

By suggesting that those who scorn the humble and simple are motivated by pride and foolishness, and by depicting their efforts as subversive and fallacious, John deftly insinuates himself into the favour of his audience.

Conclusions

In recent times critics of literature have been forced to recognise that there is no such entity as 'the author's mind' which lies hidden in the text awaiting discovery or reconstruction. Nor, in most cases, can we speak of 'the author's purpose' as if this were single and coherent in design. Usually a piece of writing operates on several levels, for the author is trying to answer several questions which are not always related. And even as he writes he may be seeking to formulate his questions. John's Metalogicon certainly operates on several levels. Structured as an essay in persuasion, it seeks to defend the 'radical' masters and the practice of specialised logic. But throughout, John speaks in several voices: there is the voice of the meticulous schoolman genuinely exasperated at the incompetence of his fellows; and then there is the voice of the didascalic writer

144  Met 1:4 p 12/28 - p 13/3.
145  Met 1:5 p 13/12-3.
advising his young and enthusiastic student; and the voice of the
logician zestfully summarising the Organon. At times John is drawn
into attacking a variety of targets: the masters who belittle grammar
and literary studies, the men of commerce and politics who despise all
studies.

For too long, commentators have been distracted by John's
rhetoric and have seen 'Cornificius' as actually representing either
an individual or a group within the schools. Writing for friends John
could not give a polemical edge to the book, but he did need a
structure, a frame which would hold the disparate parts together.
This structure John found by creating a 'man of straw': 'Cornificius'.
Through the figure of 'Cornificius' John is able to answer some of the
criticisms that might be expressed by his audience. With the aid of
this 'man of straw' he never needs to attack directly the opinions of
his audience. This assessment of 'Cornificius' has implications for
research into the twelfth-century schools: no longer should
commentators try to explain complex trends by resorting to the glib
label: 'Cornifician movement'.

Our assessment of the Metalogicon shows John aligning himself
with the schoolmen and specialists; it shows that John, though
immersed in administration and ecclesiastical politics, saw himself as
a schoolman, a philosophus.

3: 1147-1148: FROM CELLE TO CANTERBURY

From John's own remarks we know that the year 1147-48 was a turning
point in his career, when he moved from being a schoolman to being an
administrator. In the Metalogicon he tells us that in 1136 he entered
the schools of northern France and that he spent almost twelve years
(fere duodennium) in studies. In the prologue to the Policraticus,
written in 1159, John again uses the phrase 'fere duodennium' when he says that he has spent almost twelve years in the worthless activities of court and administration.\textsuperscript{147} Even allowing for the possibility that John may have been using the phrase \textit{fere duodennium} very loosely, these remarks indicate that in 1147 or 48 he took the critical step of becoming an administrator.

The problem of what John did in the years immediately after leaving the schools has engaged the attention of several scholars: C. Schaarschmidt,\textsuperscript{148} P. Gennrich,\textsuperscript{149} R. L. Poole,\textsuperscript{150} M. Chibnall,\textsuperscript{151} C. N. L. Brooke\textsuperscript{152} and A. Saltman.\textsuperscript{153} The researches of Brooke and Saltman have effectively demolished Poole's view that between c.1147 and 1154 John worked as a clerk at the papal curia, and have reinstated Schaarschmidt's view that c.1147 John became a member of archbishop Theobald's household. Saltman has shown that during the years c.1147-54 John witnessed at least four of Theobald's \textit{acta}: these can be dated to 1147, 1148-9, 1150-53, 1150-54.\textsuperscript{154} The earliest of these \textit{acta} was a notification by Theobald of a grant to the canons of Leeds and was witnessed by John at Maidstone. In itself witnessing a

\textsuperscript{146} Met 2:10 p 82/12-3.
\textsuperscript{147} Webb 1 p 14/7-11.
\textsuperscript{148} Johannes Saresberiensis nach Leben und Studien, Schriften und Philosophie (Leipzig 1862) pp 24-8.
\textsuperscript{149} 'Zur Chronologie des Lebens Johanns von Salisbury', Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 13 (Gotha 1892) 544-51.
\textsuperscript{150} 'John of Salisbury at the papal court', EHR 38 (1923) 321-30.
\textsuperscript{151} HP pp xix-xxiv.
\textsuperscript{152} EL pp xiv-xix and App 1 pp 253-56.
\textsuperscript{154} ibid charter nos 147 (p 369), 57 (p 283), 255 (p 477), 10 (p 242).
charter is no proof that John was a member of Theobald's household at this stage, but the cumulative evidence of (1) the two charters witnessed by John between 1147 and 1149; (2) John's remarks about the fere duodennium of studies which must have ended in 1147-8; and (3) the detailed and sympathetic notices of Theobald's activities in 1148 and 1149 which John provides in the Historia pontificalis, makes it quite clear that John entered the household of archbishop Theobald in 1147 or 1148.

On the basis of Brooke's and Saltman's analyses, the sequence of John's activities after leaving the schools can be set out thus:

(1) c.1146-7 John who was then in severe penury, stayed with his friend Peter of Celle, abbot of Montier-la-Celle on the outskirts of Troyes;

(2) at some stage, probably in 1147 or 1148, John obtained from Bernard of Clairvaux a letter of commendation to archbishop Theobald;

(3) sometime in 1147 John was at Maidstone with the household of archbishop Theobald and was probably a member of the household at this stage; but if not a member he must have joined in the following year.

The aim of the following discussion is to look more closely at

155 See chap 3:5:b pp 162-9 below.


157 See EL pp xv-xvi.
Bernard’s letter of commendation and the circumstances surrounding it. It will be argued that Peter of Celle played a crucial role in assisting John to enter Theobald’s household.

In the collections of Bernard of Clairvaux’s letters there is a letter from Bernard to Theobald commending the bearer ’Ioannem, amicum meum et amicum meorum’. The letter stresses John’s extreme poverty and urges Theobald to provide for him. The text of the letter does not say that this Ioannes was John of Salisbury. However there are three grounds for believing that he is the subject of the letter. Firstly in some manuscripts the heading to the letter states that it was written ’pro Ioanne Salesberiensi’. Secondly, we know that by 1148 John had close links with Bernard’s circle for at the Council of Rheims held in March of that year, he acted as an intermediary between Bernard and Gilbert of Poitiers. Thirdly, the circumstances fit John of Salisbury, but do not match those of any other clerk in Theobald’s household.

Bernard’s letter gives no explicit reference as to when it was written but a clue is provided by Bernard’s remark that previously he had commended John to Theobald in person but now does so in writing: ’Praesens vobis commendaveram eum; sed nunc absens multo magnam commendem ... ’ There are three possible dates for the occasion when Bernard met Theobald and recommended John to him:

(1) June 1144 at the consecration of the abbey church of St Denis;

159 See Bernard, Op Omn vol 8 p 307 nn.
The date of June 1144 is improbable for the text of the letter shows that it must have been written and used not very long after Bernard and Theobald met. Bernard makes it clear that he himself did not know John but was acting on the advice of his filii, that is, his monks at Clairvaux:

Testimonium enim bonum habet a bonis, quod non minus vita, quam litteratura promeruit. Nec hoc didici ab illis qui verba sicut verba iactare noverunt, sed a filiis, qui mecum sunt, quorum verbis credo, sicut crederem oculis meis.

What this indicates is that Bernard was approached by some members of his inner circle and asked to commend John when he met Theobald. Whether directly or indirectly, these monks close to Bernard must have been acting on John's wishes. As Bernard was so prestigious and influential any attempt to obtain a testimonial from him had to be a serious undertaking. The fact that John did so, suggests that he was very short of money and was anxious to enter Theobald's household as soon as possible. In these circumstances he would have followed up his request for a verbal commendation quite rapidly by asking for a written one, and then by going with his letter of commendation to England. If Bernard and Theobald had met in June 1144 then John must have had the letter by early 1145. Yet we know from John's own remarks that he did not enter administration until two years later. Such a delay is implausible for a person short of money and anxiously looking for employment. However we need to bear in mind that the date

---

162 These dates discussed by Brooke, EL p xv n 3.
163 Op Omn vol 8 p 308 (= PL 182:1 col 562 C).
of June 1144 for the meeting cannot be ruled out entirely for people do sometimes behave in ways we might not expect of them, and also sometimes delay on occasions when promptness might appear to be the best policy.

A more plausible case can be made for the dates May 1147 and March 1148. If Theobald and Bernard met in Paris in May 1147, then it follows that within a few months John obtained the letter of commendation from Bernard, brought it to archbishop Theobald and was a member of Theobald’s household before the end of the year. If however Theobald and Bernard met in March 1148 at the Council of Rheims, then the sequence of events was: in 1147 John was at Theobald’s curia, not as member of the archbishop’s household but was perhaps looking for employment or doing business for someone else; influenced perhaps by his experience at Theobald’s curia, he managed to get Bernard to speak on his behalf to Theobald at Rheims and to issue the letter of commendation a little later. Chibnall has suggested that John may have got the letter in late April 1148, for in the Historia pontificalis John provides a vivid account of how Eugenius III, while at Clairvaux on his way back to Italy refused the petitions of the congregation of Clairvaux and of the Cistercian order, to restore Philip, formerly bishop of Tours, to priestly orders. Chibnall’s suggestion is that after the Council of Rheims John travelled with the papal entourage to Clairvaux, obtained the letter of commendation and travelled to St. Omer where he entered the household of Theobald, who had been exiled after a brief return to England. This would certainly fit the evidence, but must remain entirely speculative for John could easily have heard afterwards of the incident at Clairvaux from contacts at the papal curia.

164 HP pp xxii-xxiii, 50 (chap 21).
On the date of the meeting between Bernard and Theobald the conclusion is: June 1144 is possible but improbable; the dates of May 1147 and March 1148 are of equal probability.

When the evidence of Bernard’s letter is combined with that of John’s letter Non est novum, written to Peter of Celle in the late 1150s, it becomes clear that Peter of Celle played a crucial role in assisting John to enter the household of archbishop Theobald; it was he who commended John to Bernard or to his closest advisers. In his account of John’s chronology, Paul Gennrich pointed this out briefly. The following discussion develops Gennrich’s point and argues for the importance of Nicholas of Clairvaux as an intermediary between Peter of Celle and Bernard.

In the opening lines to Non est novum John recalls how Peter assisted him when he was poor and in a foreign land (sic meam in terra aliena paupertatem exceptit). He then goes on to say:

It is thanks to you that I returned to the land of my birth; it is thanks to you that I have made acquaintance with the great and won the favour and friendship of many ......

(Vestrum namque munus est quod reversus sum in terram nativitatis meae; vestrum munus est quod principium virorum asecipus sum notitiam, familiaritatem gratiamque multorum ....)

The only occasion in John’s career when Peter could have helped him return to England was in 1147-8 when John entered Theobald’s household. There is no evidence that Peter had a close friendship with archbishop Theobald; the only surviving letter from Peter to Theobald was written after 1150. We do know however that

---

165 EL ep 33.
166 EL p 55.
167 PL 202 ep 12 cols 414-5.
throughout his career Peter had close contacts with Clairvaux and with the Cistercian order in general. After his election as bishop of Chartres in 1182, Peter wrote to the chapter of Citeaux and described himself as an *alumnus* of Bernard:

Recolat igitur sanctissimum vestrum collegium, unum me esse de alumnis beatissimi Bernardi ...

The term *alumnus* is very striking and appears to imply that, although Peter was all his religious life a Benedictine monk, he received at some stage practical guidance or support from Bernard. The collection of Peter’s correspondence shows that while abbot of Montier-la-Celle (from before 1145 to 1161) he had close contacts with Clairvaux. There is a letter from Rualenus, prior of Clairvaux, to Henry bishop of Troyes, recommending Peter. There are two letters from Peter to ‘R’ of Clairvaux, three to Nicholas of Clairvaux, who was Bernard’s secretary from 1145 to 1151, six letters from Nicholas to Peter;

---

168 Robert of Torigny, *Chronique* ed L. Delisle 3 vols (Rouen 1872 - ) 2 p 103 (gives 1182); see Cartulaire de Notre Dame de Chartres 1 p xxxviii.

169 PL 202 ep 174 col 632 D.

170 Lalore 6 pp 204-6, 41-2, 260-1; GC 9 col 234 B.


172 ibid epp 58-9 cols 485-7.


174 PL 202 epp 50 (cols 474-5), 52 (col 476-9), 60 (cols 483-89), 62-3 (cols 490-5), 65 (cols 498-505).
and one letter from Girard monk of Clairvaux to Peter.  

The very close ties between Peter and the monastery of Clairvaux are made apparent in the letter of prior Rualenus. Speaking of the familiaritas which bound Peter and Rualenus, he says:

Omnia nostra, sua sunt; et suo nostra; nos illo et ipse in nobis unus est de ordine suo, in suo domino abbati nostro, amico vestro multum complacuit.

A piece of evidence which strengthens the view that John was introduced by Peter to the circle of Bernard of Clairvaux, is to be found at the end of one of Nicholas of Clairvaux’s letters to Peter of Celle:

In fine eius commendo vobis magistrum Joannem, qui os suo pectori et altius et arctius impressit; quem propter vos singulariter diligimus cum et proper se specialiter diligendē sit, valete.

The magister Joannes fits the circumstances of John of Salisbury and the letter appears to have been written in the period 1145-51. Although Nicholas says he is commending John to Peter, it is clear from his comment ‘quem propter vos singulariter diligimus’ that Peter had introduced John to Nicholas. In view of the close friendship between Peter and Nicholas, this reference to John suggests the possibility that it was Nicholas acting at Peter’s request, who assisted John to win Bernard of Clairvaux’s support. Nicholas’ letter also seems to imply that sometime between 1145 and 1151 John made an

---

175 ibid ep 49 col 474.
176 ibid ep 51 col 476 B.
177 ibid col 479 C.
178 Nicholas’ comment ‘nonne vestri Clareuallenses vobiscum sunt, ante quorum faciem vel stare nedum loqui audebunt?’ must have been written when Nicholas was secretary to Bernard (1145-51).
otherwise unknown visit to Clairvaux before travelling to Celle.

The evidence from John's letter *Non est novum* and the intimacy of Peter's links with the community of Clairvaux lead to the conclusion that Peter assisted John to gain employment by working through his contacts at Clairvaux. Since Bernard speaks of having received advice from several 'filii', it seems that Peter asked friends at Clairvaux to persuade Bernard to commend John to archbishop Theobald.

In obtaining John's first job, both Peter and John exploited personal contacts to exercise indirect influence over Bernard and Theobald. For a person like John of Salisbury, with no high-level family connections but only his own skills to advance him in his career, the fullest use of personal contacts was crucial. At the very beginning of his career he exploited ties of friendship and the tactics of 'indirect influence', methods which he was to use throughout his career.
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CHAPTER 3: THE HISTORIA PONTIFICALIS: A DEFENCE OF THE PAPACY?

1: INTORODUCTION

The Historia pontificalis is a work of extraordinary vividness describing events from papal history over a four year period, 1148-52.¹ Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the Historia is the series of character descriptions scattered throughout the text; succinct, elegant and ironic, these seem to bring a whole range of twelfth-century personalities to life: Eugenius III, impulsive, emotive, suspicious of his advisers but also shrewd and witty;² Bernard of Clairvaux 'a man of God' but also a man greatly experienced and highly effective in 'transacting business';³ Gilbert of Poitiers 'slow to be roused' but if attacked he 'became fuller and intelligible in his argument';⁴ Henry, brother of Louis VII who wished to give up the bishopric of Beauvais, travelled to Rome to plead his case, and on his return to France could not recall whether the pope had in fact dispensed him from his bishopric;⁵ Guy of Florence, one of the papal legates on the Second Crusade, who seems to have been a delightful companion but a useless leader: 'a lover of letters and insatiable

¹ The edition cited here as HP is Historia pontificalis ed and trans M. Chibnall, NMT (London 1956). R. L.'s Poole's edition (Oxford 1927) is also useful particularly for its introduction and appendices. For the manuscript of the Historia (Bern Bürgerbibliothek 367) see p 128 n 24 below.
² See pp 177-80 below.
³ HP 7 p 15: 'unde verbo viri Dei creditur amplius'; HP 8 p 16: 'homo tantae sanctitatis'; HP 12 p 27 contrasting Bernard with Gilbert of Poitiers: 'sed abbas negociis expediendis exercitator et efficacior'.
⁴ HP 12 p 27.
⁵ HP 35.
bookworm, who hated crowds, delighted in learned dis­putations, and welcomed any chance of threshing out dialectical and philosophical quibbles.6

The vividness of the work derives partly from John's sharp perception, his interest in personality and the pleasure he got from ironic and witty description and partly from the fact that most of his accounts are either eye-wit­ness or they are based on the accounts of well-placed informants. This feature of the Historia was first noted by Giesebrecht in 1873 in his work on Arnold of Brescia and was explored in detail by Pauli in 1881.7 In the prologue John claims that everything he described was either observed by himself or was based on reliable testimony:

In what I am going to relate I shall, by the help of God, with nothing but what I myself have seen and heard and know to be true, or have on good authority from the testimony or writings of reliable men (probabilium virorum).

This claim accords with the conventional view found in Isidore of Seville's Etymologiae that among the ancients ('apud veteres') history had been written only by those who had been present at the events described.9

John was present at the Council of Rheims and saw many of the events he describes. He attended a meeting of leading churchmen.

---

6 HP 24 p 55.
8 HP p 4.
convened in Bernard of Clairvaux's lodgings, as well as the public proceedings against Gilbert, and acted as intermediary between Bernard and Gilbert. Later in the Historia, John's account of events which took place at the papal curia in the period 1149-51, shows that he himself was there. Another remarkable feature of the Historia is its apparent impartiality; in describing the motivation of individuals it uses cautious, temperate language, and at times offers alternative explanations. Chibnall has depicted this feature as 'impartiality'; and Brooke in a general reference to John's attitudes, explains these features as John 'having the best of both worlds, cutting everyone down to size, while preserving a reasonable respect and sympathy for almost all men he describes'. Ray has argued that there were two sources for John's 'impartiality'. First he was using the tradition of classical rhetoric which emphasised 'impartiality' and 'detachment' as techniques of persuasion; and secondly, as a self-styled 'Academic' John was conscious of the complexity of events and he recognised how difficult it was to make plausible statements, let alone absolute ones, about human affairs.

---

10 HP 8 p 17: 'Quod vidi loquor et scribo ...'
11 HP 11 p 25: 'Unde eadem capitula licet ea audierem ...'
12 HP 12 p 26: 'Memini me ipsum ex parte abbatis episcopum sollicitasse ...'
13 See section 4 below.
14 HP p xxxvii.
15 'John of Salisbury and his world' in World JS pp 1-20 at p 2.
16 I wish to thank Dr Roger Ray for generously giving me a copy of his unpublished paper 'Rhetorical scepticism and verisimilar narrative in John of Salisbury's Historia pontificalis'.
17 ibid.
18 ibid.
The vividness of description and the impartiality of tone make the Historia remarkable by the standards of twelfth-century historiography. John’s aims and methods as an historian have been discussed by Spörl, Chibnall and Ray; its historical value has been assessed by Chibnall. Modern historians have quarried it for the information it supplies on the process against Gilbert of Poitiers, on Arnold of Brescia and on the Second Crusade. While it is by no means clear that the Historia contains information which should substantially influence our interpretations of the papacy c.1150, it does allow us to build up a more intelligible picture of the papacy, its personnel, its policies and its relations with the English Church. It conveys a very clear impression of the mood and the pressures at the curia. The Historia is also one of the keys to understanding John of Salisbury. It reveals John’s attitudes on the conflict between monastic and scholastic values, his relationship with Peter of Celle and the Rheims circle during the 1160s, his assessment of Eugenius, Bernard of Clairvaux and individual cardinals, and his attitudes to


20 HP pp xl-xlvi.


22 B. Kügler, Studien zur Geschichte des zweiten Kreuzzuges (Stuttgart 1866) p 185 n 17, 201 n 63; G. Constable, ‘The Second Crusade as seen by contemporaries’, Traditio 9 (1953) 213-79 discusses John’s account at pp 274-5.
the papal curia.

2: AUTHORSHIP

The Historia pontificalis survives in a single manuscript, Bern Bürgerbibliothek 367, a late thirteenth-century manuscript from the Benedictine monastery of Fleury. In manuscript, the Historia is without title and appears as an anonymous second continuation to the Chronica Sigeberti. When first published by Wilhelm Arndt in 1868 its authorship was still unknown. In 1873 Wilhelm Giesebrecht argued that the Historia was composed by John of Salisbury. Giesebrecht’s proof was amplified in 1881 by Reinhold Pauli, who argued that some of the descriptions of events at the papal curia are so vivid that they must have been witnessed by John himself.

As the discussions by Giesebrecht and Pauli are so brief, it is essential to reconsider the evidence for John’s authorship. In what follows there is necessarily an overlap with their accounts but the approach and arrangement are different. The structure of the argument is as follows:

(1) Date; proximity of author and recipient.
(2) The author had been a clerk of archbishop Theobald of Canterbury.
(3) Presence of the author at the Council of Rheims in 1148.
(4) The author was interested in theological matters and had a high regard for Gilbert of Poitiers.
(5) The author was with papal curia either continuously or intermittently during the period April 1149 - Summer 1151.
   (a) Divorce case of Hugh of Molise.
   (b) Henry of Winchester in Rome.
   (c) The curia and Sicily.

For a description of the manuscript and its transmission see Poole ed Historia pontificalis pp lxxxii-xci.

MGH SS 20:515-45.

See n 7 above.

See n 7 above.
(d) Conclusions: John's presence at the papal curia:
   (i) John's presence in Apulia in the summer of 1150.
   (ii) John was at Ferentino between November 1150 and 1151.
(6) Verbal coincidence between the Historia pontificalis and the Policraticus.

(1) Date, proximity of author and recipient

(a) The Historia was addressed to a person called Peter: the opening words of Chapter 1 are 'Ut itaque, mi Petre'. This Peter probably held an ecclesiastical office, as abbot or prior, for in the Prologue he is addressed as 'dominorum amicorumque karissime'.

In the twelfth-century usage the word dominus applies almost exclusively to secular lords and to ecclesiastical office holders and in the Historia the word very clearly carries these meanings. With the exception of Dominus for Lord God, the word dominus or domnus is applied in the Historia only to the pope, as in dominus papa, in domini Eugenii regesto; to prelates as in dominus Cantuariensis, domini Henrici Wintoniensis episcopi, dominus Papiensis; and to abbots, as in domnus Bernardus abbas, a domno G. Autisidorensi. On one occasion

---

28 HP p 3.
29 This form is used on two occasions, see n 35 below.
30 HP passim.
31 HP p 25.
32 HP pp 7, 11, 41-2, 45, 51, 78, 85.
33 HP p 42.
34 HP p 68.
35 HP pp 14, 24.
36 HP p 43.
the word is applied to a person who had previously held office: Philip the former bishop of Tours who had been degraded from the priesthood for having been ordained and consecrated by the anti-pope Anacletus II. On another occasion it is applied to Hyacinth, later cardinal-deacon of St. Mary in Cosmedin: Arnold of Brescia is described as working *cum domino Iacinto, qui nunc cardinalis est*.

b) The work in its present form was composed between 1164 and 1170.

c) The work was probably written for someone living not far from the author. This emerges from the chatty, conversational tone in which the author addresses the recipient and from the absence of any distance loci which in the twelfth century were normally used in letters and in the *exordia* of works being despatched some distance. In letters the most recurrent loci of this kind were exclamations of sorrow at the absence of the beloved reader and declarations that the recipient though absent was ever in the heart and mind of the writer. In the *exordia* of more substantial works the loci of distance often included the 'envoi', the command given to a book to seek out its recipient.

---

37 HP p 63.

38 See discussion of dating sect 3 pp 146-54 below.

39 John's *Entheticus* in *Policraticum* which precedes the *Policraticus* opens with the *envoi* theme: 'Si michi crederis, linguam cohibebis, et aulae/Limina non intret pes tuus: esto domi./ Aspectus hominum cautus vitare memento/Et tibi commissas claude, libelle, notas.' (Pol Webbed 1/1-4). For an unusual elaboration of the *envoi* theme see R. M. Thomson, 'What is the *Entheticus*?', *World JS* pp 287-301 at p 294. A good example of a poem structured around the *envoi* locus is Alcuin's *Pro amicis poetae* which opens 'Cartula, perge cito pelago trans aequora cursu' (*Poetae Latini Carolini Aevi*, Berlin 1881-1923, vol 1 p 220).
In itself the absence of the distance loci might not be persuasive but combined with the informal tone of address, it strongly suggests that both author and recipient were living not far apart. The informal tone is indicated in two of the three occasions the author addresses the recipient. The first chapter opens with a casualness and enthusiasm which is very striking:

Ut itaque, mi Petre, cui sicut apostolo future virtutis presagio, quodam a fidei soliditate nomen inditum est.\(^{40}\)

Chapter 15 opens in an equally casual way:

I have dwelt on these matters, my dearest friend, longer perhaps than the nature of the subject required: but I was anxious to give you a fuller picture of the man (Gilbert of Poitiers) whom you had the good fortune to know, though not to hear, and to obey your request by explaining to the best of my ability the bishop's interpretation of these propositions. Now I must return to papal history.\(^{41}\)

(2) The author had been a clerk of archbishop Theobald of Canterbury

A major theme of the Historia is the affairs of England and Normandy with a special emphasis given to the activities of archbishop Theobald.

This can be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Part, most or whole of chapter deals with England-Norman theme</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Dispute between pope and King Stephen. Stephen would have been excommunicated but for Theobald's intervention (Council of Rheims 1148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Theobald in exile at St. Omer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{40}\) HP p 4.

\(^{41}\) p 41.
| 17 | Whole | Milo bishop of Thérouanne goes to England on behalf of Geoffrey of Anjou. |
| 18 | Whole | Theobald obtains papal approval for interdict against England (1148) |
| 19 | Whole | Election of Gilbert Foliot as bishop of Hereford. |
| 20 | Whole | Theobald returns to England (1148) |
| 22 | Whole | Punishment of monks of St. Augustine’s for having ignored interdict |
| 40 | Part | Henry of Winchester at the papal curia |
| 42 | Whole | Eugenius’ refusal to permit coronation of Stephen’s son Eustace. Flashback to dispute between Stephen and Matilda |
| 43 | Whole | Election of Silvester abbot of St Augustine’s |
| 45 | Whole | Election of Richard bishop of London |
| 46 | (Fragment of section) | Stephen’s foundation at Faversham |

The 'Theobald theme' is prominent and Theobald’s activities are depicted with sympathy. Theobald is presented as saintlike and loyal to the papacy. Thus when Theobald interceded with the pope at the Council of Rheims not to excommunicate Stephen, the pope is reported as declaring:

"My brethren, behold this man who enacts the gospel"
in our own time by loving his enemies and never ceasing to pray for his persecutors.\textsuperscript{43}

In chapter 15 the author claims that Theobald's two periods of exile were caused by his obedience to the papacy.\textsuperscript{44} The detailed and sympathetic treatment given to Theobald points to the work having been written by someone in Theobald's familia. It is unlikely that so sympathetic an account would have been written by a monk of Christ Church Canterbury, which had uneasy and strained relations with Theobald.

(3) Presence of the author at the Council of Rheims in 1148

Apart from the wealth of detail in the account of the Council of Rheims there are three occasions on which the author indicates his presence:\textsuperscript{45}

(i) Chapter 8:

'I speak and write of what I myself have seen' etc.

(ii) Chapter 11:

'I have never been able to find these propositions either among the records of the council or in the register of Pope Eugenius, though I was present (ut pote qui presens aderam) and heard them published.'

(iii) Chapter 12:

'I recall that I myself on behalf of the abbot entreated the bishop to meet him in some religious house in Poitou or France or Burgundy, wherever he preferred.'

From Policraticus 2:22 it is clear that John, like the author of

\textsuperscript{43} HP 2 p 7.

\textsuperscript{44} HP p 42: 'pro obediencia Romane ecclesie'.

\textsuperscript{45} HP pp 17, 25, 26.
the Historia, was present at the Council of Rheims. Stating the principle that actions which are described in the past tense 'should not be added to things of the past' John remarks:

Nec tamen quaecumque praeteriti verbi significatione clauduntur, rebus sunt aggreganda praeteritis. Nec si me vixisse profitear florente Peripatetico Palatino, ideo mihi vitam elapsam aut praeteritam esse confiteor. Aut si ab Arrianis Eugenio praesidente dissensi, non ob praeteriti temporis gratiam a fidei et confessionis illius integritate diverti.46

This is clearly a reference to Gilbert of Poitiers' professions of orthodoxy at the Council of Rheims. At the Council Bernard of Clairvaux was challenging the orthodoxy of statements on the Trinity which Gilbert had made in his commentary on the De Trinitate of Boethius.47 One of the four propositions to which Gilbert gave his assent was:

We believe that that divinity, whether it is called divine substance or essence, is incarnate, but only in the Son.48

This was a rejection of the Arian heresy that the Son was neither co-eternal and co-substantial with the Father, nor divine. In the revised preface to his commentary on Boethius, written after the Council, Gilbert insisted that his statements on the Trinity were not heretical and that he rejected the Arian heresy together with Sabellianism (the denial of the separate persons of the Trinity).49

46 Webb ed 1 p 124/18-25.
47 HP 8 p 15.
48 HP 11 p 24.
49 Note John's resumé pp HP 28-31.
The author was interested in theological matters and had a high regard for Gilbert of Poitiers.

The interest of the author and his readers in theological matters is made clear by the two chapters 13 and 14, which discuss in detail Gilbert of Poitiers' trinitarian doctrines. His admiration for Gilbert surfaces throughout the discussion. Gilbert is 'vir etate nostra litteratissimus'. He was a man of such prudence and learning 'tante gravitatis et litterature' that he would not 'commit to writing anything whose meaning was not clear to him, however obscure it might seem to others'. He was so learned in the liberal arts that no one could surpass him in all subjects; rather he was held to surpass all in every subject.

On the impressiveness of Gilbert's learning the author comments:

I cannot recall that anyone boasted there of having read anything he had not read.

The account represents Gilbert as sincere and orthodox and as vindicated by the proceedings at Rheims.

Like the author of the Historia, John was an admirer of Gilbert. In Metalogicon 2:10, he regrets that Gilbert, who taught him 'logical and divine studies', left all too soon.

In the Prologue to Book 3 of the Metalogicon John vigorously

50 HP 8 p 15.
51 HP 8 p 16.
52 HP 8 p 16.
53 HP 10 p 21.
54 Met 2:10 p 82/7-8.
defends the 'moderns' against 'foolish and ungrateful' critics. 55

The same sort of person will reject a proposition because it has been put forward by Gilbert or Abelard or our Adam. I am certainly not one of those who hate the good things of their times and are unwilling to commend their contemporaries to posterity. 56

(5) The author was with the papal curia either continuously or intermittently during the period April 1149 - summer 1151.

He gives detailed accounts of events that took place in the curia during this period; and is especially precise about events which took place while the curia was in southern Italy:

Chapter 31: Negotiations between the pope and Romans (1149) and background

Chapter 27: The citizens of Rome seize political control of the city; Eugenius III hastens southwards to Tusculum (April 1149)

Chapter 28: Arrival of Louis VII and Eleanor in Sicily (29 July 1149)

Chapter 29: At Ceprano on the border between papal territories and the kingdom of Sicily, papal representatives meet Louis and escort him to Tusculum (9 October 1149)

Chapter 40: Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester, at the papal curia; on journey homewards buys statues in Rome (between mid-1149 and February 1150)

Chapter 37: Guy of Florence papal legate in East (1149): bishop-elect of Tripoli comes to curia to plead his case (?)1150

55 Met 3 Prol p 118/25-6: 'Quis autem, nisi insulsus aut gratus' etc.

56 Met 3 Prol p 119/1-4: 'Et illud idem reprobabit eo quod a Gileberto, Abailardo, et Adam nostro sit prolatum. Utique non sum ex eis qui bona temporis sui oderunt et coetaneos suos invideant commendare posteritati.'
Chapter 32: Eugenius sets south for Anagni for peace negotiations with ambassadors of the king of Sicily (June 1150)

Chapter 41: Presence at divorce proceedings of Hugh of Molise (probably summer 1150)

Chapters 38-9: Cardinal legates Octavian of St Cecilia and Jordan of St. Susanna go to Empire to prepare for Conrad's Romzug (1150-1)

Chapter 35: Henry of Beauvais arrives at papal curia in Ferentino (1151), and after returning to France receives a letter from the pope (11 March 1151)

Chapter 36: Promotion of cardinals (March 1151). John Paparo's refusal to be promoted to the rank of cardinal-priest

(a) Divorce case of Hugh of Molise

The detailed and vivid accounts in these chapters point to the author's presence at the curia in these years. He states that he himself was present ('Hiis presens interfui') at the divorce proceedings of Hugh count of Molise. The account does not state where the proceedings took place but they evidently took place in or near the kingdom of Sicily.

We are told that since Hugh 'had long' been striving to secure a separation from his wife ('cum diu elaborasset ab uxor diuertere') he presented himself to the pope bringing with him catapans of the Sicilian king and other officials and nobles from Apulia and Calabria to obtain a dissolution of the marriage.

The contrast between Hugh's unsuccessful efforts over a long period to obtain a separation, and his action in presenting himself to the pope, suggests that Hugh was seizing an

57 HP chap 41 p 82.
58 HP p 80.
opportunity which he had not had before: the presence of the pope in his own region. The contingent of supporters from Apulia and Calabria whom Hugh brought along to the papal curia also strengthens the impression that the incident occurred close to the Sicilian kingdom. It is very unlikely that a contingent of this type would have been brought a great distance to the curia. The event witnessed by the author is likely to have occurred in or near the kingdom of Sicily.

(b) Henry of Winchester in Rome

In chapter 40 there is a description of Henry of Winchester buying up ancient statues in Rome. Henry had come to the curia to forestall the grant of a legateship to Theobald; on failing to do this or to win an exemption from Theobald’s jurisdiction, Henry received the pope’s permission to buy old statues at Rome while returning homewards (‘accepta licentia rediens veteres statuas emit Rome’).

Brooke has suggested that the incident described must have happened between November 1149 and February 1150 because (i) between 1145 and 1152 the only period when the curia was at Rome was between November 1149 and June 1150; and (ii) Theobald obtained the legateship between October 1149 and March 1150.

Brooke’s dating of this incident is based on the assumption that Henry attended the curia at Rome, an assumption shared by Chibnall. However, the passage does allow a different
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interpretation. The comment that 'accepta licentia rediens veteres statuas emit Rome' gives the impression that Henry bought the statues at Rome while on his homeward journey. It is possible, therefore, that Henry visited the curia while it was still south of Rome before November 1149. 64

The standard interpretation of this chapter is that it is an eyewitness account. This cannot be substantiated, but it sounds as if it is based on either personal recollection or on the retelling of someone's story. When Henry was about to return to England he obtained permission to buy old statues ('veteres statuas') at Rome. We are then told that a certain grammarian ('gramaticus quidam') directed two jests at Henry and mockingly defended the bishop's statue - collecting with the argument that Henry had been doing his best to deprive the Romans of their gods to prevent them restoring the ancient rites of worship, as they seemed all too ready to do, since their inborn, inveterate and ineradicable avarice already made them idol-worshippers in spirit. 66

The identification of the 'gramaticus quidam' with the author is by no means certain, not even when we identify the author as John of Salisbury, a trained grammarian and proud of his grammatical training.

(c) The curia and Sicily

The discussion of relations between Eugenius III and Roger II of Sicily in chapters 32-4 is so detailed, so precise,

64 The curia was at Tusculum between 8 April and 25 November 1149 (JL 9331-9358).
65 HP pp 79-80.
66 HP p 80.
that it must be based on information picked up at the curia about this date. The author describes Roger's policy of forbidding papal legates to his territory and of 'disposing of all ecclesiastical offices like palace appointments'. But the author knew enough about conditions in Sicily to add the comment:

It is true that in making appointments to churches he was held guiltless of open simony, and took pride in presenting decent men (probos... viros) wherever they might be found.

The account of the conference between Eugenius and Roger at Ceprano in July 1150, contains the precise descriptive details which are absent from some of the other accounts in the Historia of papal proceedings (e.g. the account of the Council of Cremona in chapter 21). We are told that Roger flung himself at the feet of the pope ('accedens ad pedes eius'). A short account is given of Roger's speech and the agreement reached.

In the next chapter (33), we get a precise resume of the privilege in which Eugenius granted to Hugh archbishop-elect of Palermo the pallium even though the see had no suffragans. The author must either have been in the curia at the time, or had access to the papal register at a later stage. The first alternative is more probable for the author was familiar with the immediate political consequences of the privileges, which he discusses in the next chapter. According to the privilegium

---
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some sees receive the dignity of the pallium 'because they
preside over chief cities of certain peoples, and are privileged
by the papacy to make princes for their own people (principes in
gente sua creare).’
Roger seized the opportunity provided by
this wording and had his son William consecrated without
consulting the pope, a proceeding which the author regarded as
illegal. The account of the consecration ceremony contains
the sort of detail which must have been obtained at the curia
about this period.

But before consecration he (William) solemnly
undertook in a public assembly at his father’s
precept that he would preserve peace and justice all
his days, show reverence for the church of God, and
throughout his father’s life obey him as his lord.

If the author had not a good knowledge of the consecration it is
hard to see why he would have added a detail like this.

In this chapter on the papal curia the author conveys the
mood of Eugenius’ curia. At the end of chapter 34 we are told
that Eugenius had to tolerate the consecration of King Roger’s
son William:

The pope took it ill, but oppressed by the evil of
the time could offer no resistance.

The same mood is conveyed in chapter 32, when we are told that
Eugenius refused to accept any gifts from those Sicilian bishops
whom he accepted for consecration:
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For he was afraid of giving the crafty (versutus) king of Sicily, who perpetually tried to catch the church in some fault, any plausible grounds for the accusation.

The same feeling that the papacy was being hemmed in and threatened is also conveyed in chapter 38 when Eugenius advises the cardinals, Octavian of St Cecilian and Jordan of St. Susanna, who are about to set out as legates for the Empire:

that they should be more careful to avoid exactions than if they were being sent to the king of Sicily, for the Germans were always most treacherous to the papacy and ready to oppress it on the slightest pretext. 76

(d) Conclusions

The detailed recording of events at the papal curia between April 1149 and March 1151, and the convincing evocation of the mood of the curia indicate that the author was with the curia during this period. There is one error of fact which might throw this hypothesis into question. In the opening paragraph of chapter 31 we are told that Theodwin, cardinal bishop of Porto died in the east. 77 A date of 1149-50 seems to be implied, for the preceding three chapters deal with events in the second half of 1149; and the rest of chapter 31 itself deals with the year 1149 and with the background to Arnold of Brescia's activities (1141-9). But as Chibnall and Poole have noted in their editions, Theodwin returned to Italy in 1150. Wibald of Stavelot, writing in the spring of 1150 mentions
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77 HP p 62: 'Thadwinus episcopus Portuensis obiit in oriente'.
letters received from Theodwin in Sicily on his way home. 78

The explanation for this must be that the work was written a long time after the event it describes, and the author could easily have misplaced Theodwin’s date by a year or so. We do not know when Theodwin died; but he could have returned to Palestine and died there in 1150 or 1151. There is a similar error of dating in the account of John Paparo’s legation to Ireland. The author seems to be under the impression that John Paparo had already been appointed papal legate a latere to Ireland before the Council of Rheims and had been refused permission by Stephen to travel via England. 79 This is incorrect and the event probably did not occur until 1150. This uncertainty about the chronology of events in 1148 would not, however, lead us to question the unassailable evidence that the author was at the council of Rheims. These errors simply reflect the inaccuracy that occurs when anyone tries to recall, without the aid of diaries or similar records, what happened many years previously.

The presence of the author at the papal curia during the years 1149-51 fits exactly what we know of John of Salisbury’s activities during these years. Like the author, John was in Apulia in the summer of 1150; and was in Ferentino sometime between November 1150 and July 1151 as the author probably was.

(i) John’s presence in Apulia in the summer of 1150: In the prologue to Book 3 of the Metalogicon, completed in 1159, John stated that he had travelled to Apulia twice. 80 We know that

78 Wibald ep 250 ed P. Jaffe in Monumenta Corbeiensia (Berlin 1864) p 377.
79 HP 2 p 6 n 1.
his second stay in Apulia was for three months sometime between November 1155 and June 1156. 81 The date of John's first visit to Apulia can be deduced as being the summer of 1150. In ep 33, written in 1157 to Peter of Celle, John wrote that he would prefer any wine to:

the wine of Falerno or Palermo or of Greece, which the chancellor of the king of Sicily used to give me to the peril of my life and salvation. 82

This must have occurred on one of John's visits to Apulia. It could hardly have happened on the second visit for between November 1155 and June 1156 hostilities existed between Adrian IV and William I king of Sicily. 83 The only other occasion on which a visitor to the curia at Apulia would have been brought into contact with the Sicilian court was in the summer of 1150 when Eugenius and Roger II of Sicily met. 84 This date of summer 1150 at Apulia fits in with a reference which John makes in the Policraticus to Robert of Selby, who was chancellor to Roger of Sicily until October 1151. 85 The incident shows how Robert outwitted and exposed three simoniacs - an abbot, an archdeacon and a layman. John's knowledge of and evident admiration for Robert in this passage fit in with the interpretation that it was Robert who was the 'chancellor of the king of Sicily' who treated John to such strong wines. 86

80 Met p 117/13.
82 EL ep 33 pp 57-8.
83 Peace was made on 18 June 1156 (JL 10193).
84 HP 32 pp 65-7.
(ii) John was at Ferentino between November 1150 and July 1151: In *Policraticus* 6:24, John tells of how Guy Dens cardinal priest of Saint Pudentiana raged against him in the presence of Eugenius at Ferentino. The one time that Eugenius was at Ferentino was between November 1150 and July 1151.

John's presence at Ferentino during this time is also recalled in *ep* 289 to Baldwin, archdeacon of Totnes.

Verbal coincidence between the *Historia pontificalis* and the *Policraticus*

At *Historia pontificalis* 38 the cardinal-legates Octavian and Jordan are described thus:

Concuciebant innocentiam, loculos excitiebant, tortores hominum, peccunie extortores.

At *Policraticus* 8:17 legates a latere are satirised thus:

ut ita dicam ... sequantur retributiones, provincias concuicunt ut excitant, loculos, exinaniant alienos ut solident suos ...

The verbal echoes indicate (a) that either the author of both works was the same; or (b) that the author of the *Historia* used the *Policraticus*; or (c) that the two were drawing on a common source. A common source, however, has not been noted by Webb in

---

86 The reminiscence of an enormous feast at which John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury were present (Pol 8:7 Webb 2 p 270/22 - p 271/11) probably belongs to the same period; the scale of the feast and the range of delicacies being served reminds one of John's great drinking sessions with 'the chancellor of the king of Sicily'.

87 Pol 6:24 Webb 2 p 69/2-10; see chap 4 pp 190-92 below.

88 LL p 650; see chap 4 pp 192-94 below.
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his critical apparatus to the *Policraticus*, nor by Poole or Chibnall, in their editions of the *Historia*.

It would be straining the limits of plausibility to accept that besides John of Salisbury there was another person who was a clerk of the archbishop Theobald, spent some years with a friend called Peter, who was an abbot, prior or other ecclesiastical office holder; and that this second clerk made visits to the papal curia at the same time as John did, was probably familiar with John's *Policraticus*, and, to cap it all, that this second clerk has left no discernible trace in John's letters or in the sources relating to the household of archbishop Theobald.

3: DATE

In its present form the *Historia pontificalis* was composed between 1164 and 1170; for it mentions the consecration of Robert of Melun as bishop of Hereford, an event which took place in December 1163: 91 and it mentions Thomas Becket as one of those 'qui adhuc supersunt' who had attended a meeting of leading churchmen convened by Bernard of Clairvaux as part of the campaign against Gilbert of Poitiers. 92 Both date-references occur in chapter 8, which implies that at least this chapter of the *Historia* was written in the period 1164-70. A reference in chapter 11 to Geoffrey of Auxerre as 'qui postmodum Clarevallensis abbas a sancto Bernardo quartus effectus est' is compatible with this dating, as Geoffrey became abbot in 1162. 93

References in chapter 35 appear at first sight to conflict with

---
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For in his account of Henry of France, bishop of Beauvais from 1149 to 1162 and archbishop of Rheims from 1162 onwards, he does not describe Henry as 'now archbishop of Rheims'. This however is not a serious objection; for in this chapter Henry's title is never referred to. He is described as if he were simply an obscure monk ('Henricus monachus Clarevallensis') who was appointed bishop simply because he was brother of the king of France. This dismissive put down of Henry fits well with the humorous intent of this chapter.  

But if the Historia simply consists of different segments composed at different stages, then it is possible that other parts of the Historia were composed either before or after the period 1164-70. If the Historia was not revised it is possible that chapters of the Historia could have been added after 1170. However there is nothing in the text to suggest that substantial parts of it were written after Becket's death. There is a factor which strongly militates against a post-1170 date for any part of the work. If John had returned in the 1170s to the manuscript of the Historia to make additions, it is likely that he would have revised the text at least in part. It is hard to believe that he would have allowed the reference to Becket as one of those 'qui adhuc supersunt', either in the period 1170-76 when John's life was dominated by the campaign to canonise Becket and by the collection of materials for the Life and Miracles of Becket; or in the years 1176-80 when John as bishop of Chartres described himself 'divina dignatione et meritis beati martiris Thomae, Carnotensis ecclesiae minister humilis'.

---

94 I wish to thank Professor Brooke for challenging me on this point. For the humour of chapter 35 see pp 174-77 below.

95 See chap 10 below.

96 LL ep 325 p 802.
On these grounds 1170 must stand as the terminus ad quem. But could parts of the Historia have been written before 1164? It has been suggested by Chibnall that in composing the Historia in 1164 John may have worked from 'a volume of notes' or a diary. This however must remain in the region of speculation. The only substantial part of the Historia which could have stood in its own right as a short work, and which might therefore have been composed at a different time from the rest of the Historia, is the detailed discussion of Gilbert's views on the Trinity (chapters 13 and 14). These chapters are more detailed than the earlier discussion (chapters 8-12) of the process against Gilbert and concentrate on the philosophical issues rather than on the personal interest of the proceedings. As Chibnall has indicated they rely heavily on written sources, in contrast to the rest of the Historia which is drawn mainly from personal recollections.

These chapters give the impression that they were inserted into the Historia. This could mean that they were written before the rest of the Historia. On the other hand it is possible that the two chapters were written about the same time as the rest of the Historia, although they were unlikely to have been conceived as part of the work.

Chibnall has suggested that these two chapters and the Prologue have common characteristics which suggest that they were written about the same time. Both sections are marked by detailed quotation or reference to other authorities. However the treatment of sources in the Prologue is entirely different from that in chapters 13
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and 14. In the Prologue John refers by name to a whole range of histories: the Old Testament Book of Chronicles, the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the historical works of Eusebius of Caesarea; Cassiodorus, Orosius, Isidore, Bede and in 'our own age' the writings of Hugh of St Victor and Sigebert of Gembloux. This name-dropping is very different from quotation and detailed allusion which occurs in chapters 13 and 14, where John mentions and quotes from Hilary De Trinitate, Ambrose De Fide, Boethius De Trinitate, Plato Timaeus, Aristotle De Interpretatione, Augustine De Trinitate, and Hilary De Synodis. There are unacknowledged allusions to Boethius De Arithmetica, and Boethius' translations of the Categories and the De Interpretatione of Aristotle. There is one statement from Augustine's De Libero Arbitrio which John attributes to the pseudo-Augustinian Hypognosticon.

100 HP pp 1-2.
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111 HP p 31: 'Sequens tamen Augustinum et quosdam alios doctores usque in novissimum diem vite rationes quasdam esse docuit sempiternas, ut nec habuerint initium nec finem haviture sint, tanta (Footnote continued)
cannot tell us whether the chapters were written about the same time as the Prologue.

Chibnall points out that John's incorrect attribution of a reference to the Hypognosticon does suggest that these chapters were written when John did not have access to his usual collection of books, for in the Metalogicon, composed at Canterbury in 1159, the statement is correctly attributed to De Libero Arbitrio.\footnote{112} In the earliest phase (1164-6) of his exile John was without any of his books. In late 1163 he left England with few possessions and little money\footnote{113} but by the summer of 1165 we find John writing to Bartholomew bishop of Exeter: 'If God open the path of return to me, please write back whether I should come with my books and all my baggage. If so I shall need more horses and many other things I lack as yet.'\footnote{114} However it is conceivable that the section could have been drafted at a later stage in haste and without detailed recourse to authorities and without the checking of references.

Whatever about the relative dating, it is clear that chapters 13 and 14 were not originally conceived as part of the Historia, for in the Prologue John says that he will write 'omissis aliis ea quae ad pontificalem hystoriam'.\footnote{115} The 'omissis aliis' is striking and suggests that John intended to exclude long digressions or detailed philosophical discussions. This implies that the decision to include

\footnote{111}{(continued)}

\[\text{quidem veritatis necessitate subnixe ut etsi totus mundus intereat, ille tamen nequeant interire. Hoc profecto et in Ypognosticon et in plerisque operibus suis astruit ...'}

\footnote{112}{Met 2:17 p 94.}
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chapters 13 and 14 was made after the writing of the Prologue. The opening lines of Chapter 15 confirm this impression:

I have dwelt on these matters, my dearest friend, longer perhaps than the nature of the subject required: but I was anxious to give you a fuller picture of the man whom you had the good fortune to see though not to hear and to obey your request by explaining to the best of my ability the bishop’s interpretation of these propositions. Now we must return to pontifical history.

Here John indicates that these were two separate projects: the exposition of Gilbert’s teaching and the composition of a ‘pontifical history’. But in the course of writing he decided to merge the two. In justifying this decision he recalled the Prologue and used similar phrases: ‘tue satisfacerem’ for ‘voluntate’ ‘tue ... acquiescens’ ‘... ad pontificalem redeamus hystoriam’ for ‘ea que ad pontificalem pertinent’. But John forgot about the precise wording of the Prologue and allowed the works ‘omissis aliis’ to remain. This confirms that these chapters were not conceived as part of the Historia and indicates that at least the opening lines of chapter 15, quoted above, were drafted some time after the drafting of the Prologue.

Chibnall and Ray have offered more precise dating than 1164-70. Chibnall suggests that the bulk of the work was written in 1164, but this is offered tentatively, as an impression rather than as a well-substantiated argument. Ray has given two reasons for thinking that the Historia was composed c.1164: the tone of the work and the description of Bernard as sanctus. Ray remarks:

It is empty of the brooding and even despairing attitude towards politics and society that notably marks the correspondence of 1165 and the remaining years of exile.

116 HP p 41.
117 HP p xxx.
118 See n 16 above.
The narrative is laced with humour and in general seems close to the spirit of the Early Letters, not to mention that of his more famous works the *Metalogicon* and the *Policraticus* both completed in 1159.

The tone of the *Historia* however is not a secure basis for establishing date. For participants, politics is essentially a humourless activity with little room for light and playful irony. It is possible that John might have deployed a 'brooding' and 'despairing' tone in letters which dealt with the problems and anxieties of the Becket dispute, while at the same time using a cheerful, humorous tone in writing the *Historia*. For the *Historia* is a reflective work dealing with events which had occurred over a decade previously and it is addressed to John's closest friend Peter of Celle. The writing of such a work could have been a pleasant relief during the bitterest days of the Becket dispute.

Nor can the description of Bernard as 'sanctus' be used as an indication of date. There are four occasions on which John refers to Bernard's sanctity:

(1) Chapter 8: 'Set mihi persuaderi non potest quod homo tante sanctitatis non haberit zelum Dei ...' (p 16)

(2) Chapter 8: 'Et arbitror nunc ab abbatis et aliorum sententia non discordat, quia simul semper optatam inspiciunt veritatem.' (pp 16-17)

(3) Chapter 11: '... a domno G. Autisiodorensi, qui postmodum Clareuallensis abbas a sancto Bernardo quartus effectus est ...' (p 24)

(4) Chapter 11: Hoc autem certum est, quod contra episcopum sepe locutus est palam memoratus ille sanctissimus abbas ... (p 25)'

Ray suggests that this may indicate a date of not later than 1164,
for in 1163 an appeal had been made for Bernard's canonisation. John's use of the term sanctus may reflect the opinion, strong in northern France in 1163-4, that the abbot's sainthood needed nothing but official recognition. In the Early Letters there are two references to Bernard as beatus. In itself this might support Ray's suggestion: however on the two occasions on which John refers to Bernard in the Policraticus (written in 1159) he uses the word sanctus rather than beatus. Both references occur in the final passage of Book 5 chapter 16. John did not use the word sanctus in the restricted sense of referring to a person who had been or was about to be canonised. In the Policraticus he refers to Eugenius on one occasion as sanctus, on another as beatus. In the Later Letters Eugenius is referred to on one occasion as 'sanctae recordationis' and on other occasions as beatus. In a letter written in 1167, eight years after Adrian's death, John describes Adrian as 'sanctissimus'. The conclusion to be drawn from John's use of sanctus is that he did not make a sharp distinction between the words beatus and sanctus and that it carried a sense very similar to beatae memoriae or bonae memoriae.

The efforts to find a precise date for the Historia are not supported by a sufficiently strong body of evidence. We must
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therefore fall back on the dates 1164-70 for the composition of the work. This means that in seeking the motives behind the Historia we have two significant contexts: schism and the Becket dispute. But we cannot link the aims of the Historia to more precise events within these contexts.

4: FIRSTHAND ACCOUNTS

The vividness of John's accounts of incidents and personalities in the Historia made such an impression on Pauli, writing in 1881, that he emphasised John's importance as eye-witness to many of the incidents which he described. However the vividness of John's accounts is no guarantee that they are eye-witness accounts. For John was a skilful writer and storyteller who evidently enjoyed giving witty and sharply ironic accounts of how individuals behaved. He would certainly have had little difficulty in creating lively and vivid stories out of information gleaned from well-placed informants.

An instance of this is John's precise account of Arnold of Brescia's reconciliation with Eugenius III in autumn 1146. As Chibnall points out John was not at the curia at this early date and must have obtained his information from cardinals or papal clerks who had been present at the reconciliation. Chibnall also points out that John's accounts of incidents during 1148-9 cannot all be firsthand, for he mentions Theobald's brief return to England in April 1148 and Eugenius' journey to Clairvaux in the same month; later he mentions Theobald's absolution of the monks of St Augustine's at
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Northfleet on 11 or 12 March, and Eugenius' passage through Rome on his way to Tusculum where he arrived not later than 30 March. Given that the Historia pontificalis is a significant source for the papal curia and for relations between the papacy and Canterbury at this period, it is worth tabulating which chapters are certainly firsthand, which are possibly firsthand and which are probably not firsthand. In the following table attention is paid to (i) chapters containing incidents which could conceivably be firsthand and (ii) chapters containing incidents which, though certainly not firsthand, show that John must have been present at the curia about the same time.

130 HP chap 22 pp 51-2, chap 27 pp 59-60.
### TABLE 2: Firsthand accounts in the *Historia pontificalis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTERS</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) <strong>Firsthand:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>The Council of Rheims (March 1148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>The process against Gilbert (March 1148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Eugenius sets out for Anagni for peace negotiations with King of Sicily (June 1150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>The divorce proceedings of Hugh of Molise (probably Summer 1150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) <strong>Not necessarily firsthand but indicating that John was at the curia about this time and had access to detailed information:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester at the curia and in the city of Rome (between mid-1149 and February 1150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-9</td>
<td>The activities of the cardinal-legates to the Empire, Octavian of St Cecilia and Jordan of St Susanna (1150-51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The promotion of cardinals and John Paparo's refusal to be promoted to the rank of cardinal-priest (March 1151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Guy of Florence papal legate in East (1149); bishop-elect of Tripoli comes to curia to plead his case (?1150). This chapter indicates that John was present at the curia about this time or not long afterwards: for the incident, which is described in detail, was not a major historical event (such as the arrival of Louis VII and Eleanor in southern Italy, described in chapters 28-9) about which John might easily have received information at a much later date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) <strong>Not necessarily firsthand and not necessarily indicating that John was at the curia about this time:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eugenius III at Clairvaux (24-26 April 1148). Chibnall suggests that the precise description of how Eugenius, acting on the advice of his cardinals, rejected the request from the community of Clairvaux to restore Philip, formerly bishop of Tours, to priestly orders. However this is the sort of story which John could easily have picked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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up from his contacts within the circle of Bernard of Clairvaux. Alternatively he may have heard about the incident on one of his early visits to the papal curia. John's reason for including the incident in the Historia was probably in order to provide another illustration of how Eugenius found himself caught between the conflicting demands of the cardinals and of his fellow-Cistercians.  

These chapters deal with events that were of such major interest - Eugenius' political problems at Rome and the activities of (and rumours about) Louis and Eleanor - that John could well have decided to include them, even if he was relying on information collected long afterwards.

(4) Probably not firsthand:

CHARTERS DETAILS

21 Council of Cremona (7 July 1148). Chibnall points out that John's 'notices of the council are brief and factual and could easily be secondhand' and she provides a convincing reason for thinking that John was not in Italy at the time:

If he travelled to Italy with Eugenius, it is difficult to see why he says so little of the business before him except when the envoys of Theobald found him at Brescia (between 15 July and 8 September), and yet gives such warm personal comment on Theobald's sojourn at St. Omer and later return to England (c. October).  

(5) Outside papal curia: possibly firsthand.

15 Theobald's brief return to England (April 1148) and

134 cf HP 9 p 20 for the hostility of the cardinals to Bernard of Clairvaux.
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136 ibid; for dates see JL 9281-9293; GFL p 505 and A. Saltman, Theobald archbishop of Canterbury (London 1956) pp 28, 30.
his exile. This could be firsthand but is not very detailed. The bulk of the account deals with Theobald’s previous period of proscription (1141) and in general terms with the miseries of exile.\textsuperscript{137}

The foundation of church of Faversham (1148). This chapter consists only of a fragment of a sentence and may have originally have described the consecration of abbot Clarembald (11 November 1148).\textsuperscript{138}
5: INTENTION

a: Introduction

The Prologue to the Historia must be the starting point for any exploration of John's intentions in writing the work. John opens his work by placing the Historia in the tradition of Christian historical writing. He lists the long line of earlier histories from the Old Testament Book of Chronicles and the four gospels, right through to the works of historians of 'our own age', Hugh of St. Victor and Sigebert monk of Gembloux. After thus establishing the place of the Historia within this tradition John then turns his attention to attacking the inadequacy of 'Sigebert's' account and hints at sinister motives on 'Sigebert's' part. John was under the impression that the Chronica Sigeberti (covering the years 381-1111) and its continuations covering the years 1112 to 1148 formed a single work and were compiled by Sigebert of Gembloux. This shows that John had seen or heard of a manuscript (or manuscripts) containing the Chronica Sigeberti (381-1111), the Anselmi Gemblacensis continuatio (1112-1135) and Continuatio Gemblacensis (1136-1148), for among the 63 manuscripts of the Chronica which are known to have existed, these form the only combination which end in 1148. At the beginning of his attack on 'Sigebert' John asserts:
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140 Sigeberti Gemblacensis chronica cum continuationibus ed D. L. C. Bethmann, MGH SS 6 pp 268-474. In the following discussion Sigebert's work is called simply Chronica Sigeberti, a title found in the record of John's bequest of books to the cathedral of Chartres; see n 148 below.

141 Chronica Sigeberti ibid pp 300-374; Anselmi Gemblacensis continuatio ibid pp 375-85; Continuatio Gemblacensis ibid pp 385-90. The MSS of the Chronica and continuations are described ibid pp 284-97: for the number of MSS see p 284; for a table showing the different continuations see p 285. The continuations are also discussed briefly in Poole ed Historia pontificalis pp lxxxvi-lxxvii.
Sigebert, however, did not describe everything that took place in the time of Pope Innocent; he was silent on important points, either because they had escaped his notice, or for some other reason.\(^{142}\)

John alleges that 'Sigebert's' pro-German bias distorted his handling of the papacy:

Out of zeal for them he seems (visus est) to have inserted some things into his chronicle which seem (videntur) contrary to the privileges of the Roman church (ecclesie Romane privilegiis) and the tradition of the holy fathers (sanctorum traditionibus patrum).\(^{143}\)

The attack on 'Sigebert' is the turning point in John's prologue; for he then switches tone and sets out in more conventional terms the aims of the Historia: to make clear the invisibilia Dei by those things which are done (ea quae facta); to provide exempla which will make men more zealous in the fear of God and the pursuit of justice; and to provide evidence (noticia) for future generations by which customs (prescriptiones) and privileges (privilegia) might be strengthened or weakened.\(^{144}\)

Should we see John's attack on 'Sigebert' as genuine and as a real indication of his motives in writing the Historia pontificalis? Or should we view it as little more than a rhetorical device, an attack in exordio? In the prologue of his work, the medieval writer was expected to win the interest and good will of his listeners and readers and to justify the writing of his work. As we have seen in our discussion of the Metalogicon, one of the most effective ways of doing this was to attack an opponent, real or imaginary. If the
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attack on 'Sigebert' is genuine then the main aim of the Historia was to write in defence of the papacy.

There appear to be no obvious anti-papal or pro-imperial distortions in the Anselmi Gemblacensis continuatio (1112-1135) or in the Continuatio Gemblacensis (1136-1148). This strengthens the possibility that John was simply using 'Sigebert' as an easy target which could be used to catch and hold the attention of the audience. John's implication that he was writing in defence of the papacy cannot be taken at face value but needs to be tested against the evidence of the text itself.

It has been suggested by Ray that John may never have read the Chronica Sigeberti and its continuations. This is quite possible for there appears to be no link between the Historia and the Chronica either in the text or in the sources used. However, the Chronica was widely circulated in Flanders and northern France. Among the twelfth-century manuscripts were three from within the province of Rheims: Corby, Laon and Beauvais. At the end of his life John owned a copy of the Chronica, for a copy was included among the books which he left to the cathedral church of Notre Dame of Chartres. It is quite conceivable that at the time he wrote the Historia he had not read Sigebert's chronicle and its continuations or at most had
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given them a cursory glance. This would fit in with the fact that John sometimes 'improved' his sources or even invented them in order to make a polemical point or to tell a good story. There is not enough evidence, however, to establish whether John did in fact read the Chronica Sigeberti.

b: Political purpose

The date of composition of the Historia - between 1164 and 1170 - would fit the interpretation that John wrote the Historia as a defence of the prestige and rights of the papacy. For during these years the schism, backed by Frederick Barbarossa, showed no sign of abating. In 1164 the election of Guy of Crema as 'Paschal III' to succeed the antipope 'Victor IV', indicated that Frederick Barbarossa was committed to a protracted conflict with Alexander III. However the schism does not run even as an undercurrent in the Historia. The allegation of bribery and corruption which John made against cardinals Octavian of St. Cecilia (late 'Victor IV') and Guy of Crema ('Paschal III') might at first glance seem to be explained by the fact that by the time the Historia was completed, both men had played their leading parts as schismatic antipopes. But John made similar allegations against other cardinals who had died before schism broke out: John Paparo, Gregory of St. Angelo and Jordan of St. Susanna.

Nor do we find strongly anti-imperial sentiments in the Historia. We are shown that the papacy was threatened by the hostility of the Germans but this was no different from his hostility towards Roger of Sicily who, like the Germans, was quick to seize any

149 See refs in chap 1 n 34 above.
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opportunity to outwit the papacy.  

In a work defending the papacy, or exalting its powers we might expect to find 1) claims which emphasised the primacy of Rome over other churches and 2) assertions of papal authority over secular rulers. We do find reference to the primacy of Rome in chapter 37 where Eugenius rebukes the bishop-elect of Tripoli for obeying an order by the patriarch of Jerusalem rather than obeying the papal legate in Palestine:

Lecta sunt tam in historiis principum, quam in decretis et gestis conciliorum, de primatu sedis apostolice privilegia multa et manifesta in auribus electi stantis in conspectu omnium.  

On the relationship of the pope to secular rulers we find the claim that 'all Sicily belongs to the patrimony of the Roman church'. These two statements are however isolated, and it cannot be argued that the exaltation of papal authority is an object of the Historia.

The contents of the Historia, then, will not sustain the interpretation that one of John's motives in writing the work was to uphold the reputation and interests of the papacy in the face of schism. The impression given by John in the Prologue that he was going to write a strongly pro-papal work which would contrast with 'Sigebert's' chronicles, must be seen as a lively rhetorical move designed to seize the attention and sympathy of John's audience.

In chapter 20 relations between Theobald and the papacy are once more touched upon. We are told that after spending some months in
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St. Omer, Theobald returned to England on the advice of wise men. He had received no support from Rome: 'Ecclesia Romana quod promittebat iugiter differebat afferre subsidium'. This contrast between Canterbury's loyalty to Rome, and Rome's failure to repay this loyalty, is a recurring theme in John's letters throughout the Becket dispute, particularly in the early phase (1164-66). Thus at the beginning of 1164 John wrote from Paris, warning Becket that he could expect little help from Rome, either in his dispute with St. Augustine's or with the king:

But indeed, what we can do there, I do not clearly see. For many things make against us there: few are in your favour. Great men will come - rich men, prodigal with money, which Rome never spurned .......

A little later in the letter John reiterated his pessimism about the chances of obtaining aid from the papacy: 'God can make whole, but the Roman church will not bring aid ('sed ecclesia Romana non feret opem'). Besides failing to give active support, there were several occasions during the dispute, when the papacy took measures which were strongly opposed by the Becket circle. Thus late in 1166 Alexander III absolved King Henry's adviser, John of Oxford, from the sentence of excommunication which Becket had imposed on him and confirmed his appointment as dean of Salisbury. In the final years of the Becket dispute, probably in 1169, Alexander rebuked Becket for issuing sentences against 'quaslibet personas regni' and urged him to suspend the sentences. The recurrent friction between the Becket circle
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and the papacy means that at any stage of the Becket dispute readers of the Historia would have appreciated the topicality of John's comments on the lack of support given by the papacy to Theobald. John was also making a polemical point, a criticism of Henry II, when he states that in neither period of exile did king Stephen proscribe or drive into exile any of the archbishop's friends or supporters ('aliquis amicorum vel fidelium') 'not even those who chose to share their master's exile rather than remain in their own country'. The observation had a particular relevance to John's own situation. For John, like a large number of other Becket clerks and their families, was exiled and the revenues from his benefices sequestrated. During the early phase of the dispute, 1164-66, John made vigorous efforts to obtain for himself a personal reconciliation with Henry II, independently of the negotiations which were in progress for a reconciliation of Henry and Becket.

Theobald is not depicted as strongly pro-Angevin, even though the whole tone of the Historia is pro-Angevin, or at least hostile to Stephen. Stephen is depicted as faithless; Geoffrey of Anjou knew of the perfidia regis. Elsewhere we are reminded that Stephen had broken the oath he made to Henry I:

For the King had frequently been charged with usurpation of the kingdom, which everyone knew he had seized regardless of his oath to king Henry.

Stephen is presented as a persecutor of the church, who had defied the
papacy by blocking the travel of legates through his territories and by forbidding Theobald to attend the Council of Rheims, and who in 1149-50 oppressed the church with 'fresh tumults'.

In chapter 17 we are given an account of how Milo bishop of Thérouanne acted as Geoffrey of Anjou's ambassador to Stephen. The passage is favourable to Geoffrey since his ambassador is 'sanctus episcopus Milo' and since there is no criticism of Geoffrey's refusal to take his dispute with Stephen to the papal curia. The account of the litigation between Matilda and Stephen at the papal curia c.1139 is sympathetic to the Angevin case: it is designed to show why Eugenius III refused in 1151 to establish the succession in Stephen's family. John hints that the success which Stephen had achieved at the curia in 1139 was partly attributable to bribery:

acting against the advice of certain cardinals, especially Guy, cardinal priest of St. Mark, he [pope Innocent II] accepted king Stephen's gifts and in friendly letters confirmed his occupation of the kingdom of England and the duchy of Normandy.

We can glean fragments of information in the Historia which show Theobald's sympathy for the Angevins. This emerges from the account of the consecration in St. Omer of Gilbert Foliot as bishop of Hereford in 1148. Three of Theobald's suffragan bishops - Robert of London, Jocelin of Salisbury and Hilary of Chichester who had been summoned by the papal legate to the consecration refused to take
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They ... refused to obey, protesting their fealty to the king (Stephen) and alleging that it was contrary to ancient custom for anyone to be consecrated outside the kingdom, especially if he had not received the royal assent or done fealty to the king.

Theobald however carried out the consecration with Nicholas of Cambrai, Milo of Thérouanne and other French bishops. Theobald’s willingness to oppose Stephen’s wishes is evident.

But even though we can glean this implication from the passage, it is not a point that is emphasised here or elaborated elsewhere in the Historia. What is emphasised throughout the Historia is that Theobald always acted with propriety in his relations with Stephen. Thus we are told that Theobald was the last of the English prelates to receive the Empress (April 1141) and had done it at the urgent request (‘urgente mandato’) of Henry, bishop of Winchester, ‘then exercising the office of legate in England’. The insistence that in breaking with Stephen and declaring for Matilda, Theobald was acting with propriety can also be seen in John’s comment that Theobald’s first exile ‘pro obediencia romane ecclesie’ was precipitated by this incident.

John also shows that in refusing to crown king Stephen’s son, Eustace, Theobald was not acting out of malice but in accordance with papal mandates. In chapter 42 John states that Celestine II and his successors Lucius II and Eugenius III had written to Theobald forbidding him to allow any change to be made in the position of the English crown, since the transfer of it had been justly denounced, and the matter was still under
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dispute. 172

At an earlier stage in the Historia, Theobald is depicted as an intermediary between pope and Stephen. 173 At the Council of Rheims Eugenius intended to excommunicate Stephen because of his refusal to allow a papal legate to travel through England and because of his refusal to allow Theobald to attend the Council. The ceremony of excommunication had begun. 'The candles had been lighted' says John 174 when Theobald 'most movingly (affectuosissime) begged for mercy'.

In wonder, Eugenius praised Theobald as an apostolic and saintly man: '... behold this man who enacts the gospel in our own time by loving his enemies and never ceasing to pray for his persecutors.' 175

The presentation of Theobald not as a strongly pro-Angevin supporter, but as acting with propriety in all his relations with Stephen might seem surprising. Might John not have taken the opportunity to show that there was a vigorous tradition at Canterbury of loyalty to the Angevins and to suggest that the loyalty displayed by Canterbury had been ill-repaid by Henry II? We cannot be certain why John avoided this line, and developed instead the image of Theobald as acting with due propriety towards Stephen. His reason for doing so was probably that he wished to show the close relationship which existed between a king of England and an archbishop of Canterbury; he wanted to show that an archbishop could, through obedience to the papacy, oppose the evil actions of a king and yet remain loyal to him. These were points which would have been apparent

172 HP pp 85-6.
173 HP 2 pp 6-8.
174 HP 2 p 7.
175 HP 2 p 7.
to John's readers, who in comparing Theobald with Becket, would also compare Stephen with Henry.

The political slant of the Historia was not shaped by the schism but by the Becket dispute; and in the Historia John was not aiming to create a defence of papal claims; he was presenting an apologia for Theobald and, in the process, emphasising the loyalty of Canterbury both to Rome and to the English king.

c: Non-Political intentions

In the Prologue to the Historia John declares aims which are not political. After the attack on 'Sigebert' John states that he will give 'a short account of events touching pontifical history, omitting all else (omissis aliis, ea que ad pontificalem hystoriam pertinent ... perstringere curabo'). The reason (propositum) for doing this is a moral one: to profit contemporaries and future generations. For all chronicles have the common purpose (uniformis intentio) of 1) relating noteworthy matters (scitu digna) 'so that the invisible things of God may be clearly seen by the things that are done'; and 2) providing exempla of reward or punishment (premii vel pene) so that men may become more zealous 'in timore Dei et cultu iustitie'.

To these pious reasons for writing history John adds two pragmatic ones: we learn from the lives of others and, moreover, the records of the chronicles are valuable for establishing or abolishing customs, for strengthening or
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destroying privileges. 180

The first two aims which John ascribed to writers of history are commonplace. There is little evidence that they were factors which shaped the content or structure of the Historia.

There is no observable effort in the Historia to achieve the first aim, the revelation of the invisibilia Dei. There are only three instances of the second aim, to provide exempla.

In chapter 37 the bishop-elect of Tripoli is severely rebuked and humiliated in consistorio for having obeyed the patriarch of Jerusalem rather than a legate of the Roman church. 181 The story is designed to show the primacy of the Roman church and the obedience which all bishops owe it. The other two exempla show divine punishment at work. Thus in 1148 when Ralph, count of Vermandois obtained a divorce, Bernard of Clairvaux predicted a dire fate for the children of Ralph and his second wife:

He (Bernard) knowing that count Ralph had scandalized the church for many years and was still living in a concubinage condemned by three popes, declared in the hearing of many still alive ... that no issue springing from that bed would bear worthy fruit among the people of God, and they themselves would not enjoy each other for long. 182

Bernard's prophecy came true as Ralph's second wife died shortly afterwards. The son she bore him became a leper in boyhood; and the two daughters she bore are, says John, still without offspring.

The second instance of divine punishment occurs in the account of the Second Crusade. Thierry, count of Flanders, was eager to leave
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Palestine and return home to assist his son Baldwin. As a friend (familiaris) and supporter of Conrad king of the Germans, Thierry managed to persuade Conrad to abandon the crusade.

And because the count alleged that he was moved by love of his son Baldwin, and the welfare of the Eastern church suffered thereby, the same Baldwin died in Flanders shortly afterwards by God's will, and the father's succession devolved on Philip, his younger son.

The theme of providing exempla of 'reward or punishment' occurs only occasionally and cannot be regarded as a major objective in the Historia. Of the pragmatic reasons for writing the history, the first, 'that we learn from the lives of others', probably does reflect John's attitudes, for John had an inveterate interest in what people did, what their motives were, what were the driving forces in their personality; he was interested in understanding as well as judging. But, as with the two religious aims which John mentioned, there is nothing in the Historia to suggest that this was a motive in writing the work. These 'aims' should be regarded as general statements justifying the writing of history, and not as clues to the aims of this particular work.

The final reason which John offered for writing history was that 'the records of chronicles' provide information for 'establishing or abolishing customs, for strengthening or destroying privileges'. This certainly was one of the main objectives of the Historia. The objective is restated in the opening lines of Chapter I. John says that he will begin his chronicle where 'Sigebert' ended his at the

---
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Council of Rheims. But, says John:

I will add the things he omitted which may be useful to those who have the conduct of church affairs (et ecclesiasticis negotiis adminiculare posse creduntur).

John then launches into an account of the different claims of primacy and jurisdiction which were made by the archbishops of Lyons, Vienne, Bourges and Canterbury, Treves, Sens, and the bishops of Paris and Autun. All of these claims were countered by the civil law principle prescriptio longissimi temporis and by the protest that one person affected by these claims had not been legally summoned to defend his rights, ('et quod ad hoc vocati non venerant'). None of these competing claims settled at Rheims. John does not record them in order to back particular claims. This emerges from his account of Eugenius' astute handling of Canterbury's claim to primacy over York:

Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury appealed against Henry of York who had taken up his seat in the north as though he were of equal dignity. To this however the pope replied that one who had as yet no seat (sedes) could not supersede, which was true enough since Stephen, king of the English, had deprived archbishop Henry of his seat on account of his election against the king's wishes, indeed against his express prohibition, and his consecration by the pope at Auxerre.

From this passage one would not guess that the author was a clerk from
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Canterbury who considered that as of right Canterbury had primacy over York. In early 1164 John addressed Thomas Becket as ("Dei gratia Cantuariensi et Anglorum primati") even though at this stage Becket's primacy had not been confirmed by the pope. In listing these different claims to primacy and jurisdiction, John's objective seems not to have been judgement but record. By recording the claims John was providing evidence for future generations that the claims had not been abandoned.

In all there are seven passages in the Historia which record conciliar and papal decisions, and diplomatic settlements, which would be useful to future generations for 'establishing or abolishing customs, for strengthening or destroying privileges'. These are:

1) Council of Rheims: claims of primacy and jurisdiction
2) Council of Rheims: decrees
3) Council of Cremona: episcopal claims of precedence and jurisdiction; promulgation of decrees.
4) Terms of peace agreement between pope and Roger of Sicily at Ceprano July 1150.
5) Eugenius' decree on the right to have the pallium.
6) Metropolitan claims of St. Andrews; the assertion that in the past bishops of St. Andrews had been willing to give obedience to Canterbury rather than York.
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7) The competing claims of Stephen and Matilda to rule England; decision of the papacy on this issue.

The prominence given to these matters indicates that providing information useful for 'the establishing or abolishing of customs, for strengthening or destroying of privileges' was one of the major objectives of the Historia. The Historia was written with several aims in mind. Besides those of providing an apologia for archbishop Theobald and providing extracts of synodal claims and decrees and diplomatic agreements, we need to consider several others: the defence of Gilbert of Poitiers, the desire to write for Peter a work which was gossipy and entertaining as well as informative; and the aim of composing a historia in the tradition of classical rhetoric. The long section of the Historia pontificalis on Gilbert and the detailed discussion of his teachings on the Trinity were written for Peter of Celle evidently because Peter was interested in learning about Gilbert and his views. After the two detailed chapters, 13 and 14, on Gilbert's views, John says to Peter:

I have dwelt on these matters, my dearest friend, longer perhaps than the nature of the subject required: but I was anxious to give you a fuller picture of the man whom you had the good fortune to know but not to hear, and to obey your request by explaining to the best of my ability the bishop's interpretation of these propositions.

An aim which should not be underestimated was John's desire to write an entertaining, gossipy account for Peter of Celle and his circle at Rheims about persons and incidents which were known to the circle of Rheims and which would interest it. This aim is confirmed in a number of ways.

As Ray has suggested, John's account of Henry of Rheims (at the
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time of the story, bishop of Beauvais) was certainly designed to amuse Peter and his circle.  

John tells of how Henry travelled to Ferentino to beg the pope to relieve him of the bishopric of Beauvais; but on returning home he forgot entirely what advice Eugenius had given him, and had to write back asking whether or not he still held office. This improbable anecdote would certainly have amused Peter and his associates. We know that John had a low opinion of Henry, and during the Becket dispute we find him in a plot to prevent one of Henry's nominees being appointed sub-treasurer at Rheims.  

John opens the account of Henry of Rheims with a sharp stab at Henry's abilities:

On the death of the bishop of Beauvais, a monk of Clairvaux succeeded him because he was a brother of the king of the Franks.

John's account of Henry's personality is both scathing and entertaining:

he pleaded to be allowed to give up the bishopric, though whether from inconstancy of character, religious zeal or knowledge of his own character is uncertain. But his prayer was not heard, either because he was believed to be inspired by the love of God, or through fear of scandal, for if he returned to Clairvaux he might be engulfed in unendurable difficulties or might begin law suits undermining the validity of his dispensation.

The same desire to entertain is found in chapter 45 where John makes fun of Eugenius' instructions to the clergy of London on the election of a successor to Robert bishop of London. In the original
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instructions Eugenius ordered the clergy to elect a man *religionis habitu decoratum*. The chapter, alarmed that this might exclude one of their own number, sent to Rome and brought back papal letters ('in literis apostolicis') which explained that:

'secular' might be described as 'clad in the habit of religion'; for when anyone received the clerical tonsure - as the words of consecration explain - he straightway puts on the garb of holy religion.

In the curia some people (nonnulli) argued that this interpretation was foolish ('ineptam') or that the clause in the first mandate was superfluous ('unless by chance the pope feared that the Londoners intended to elect some layman as bishop'). The gibe reflects John's interest in the precise meaning of words and the pleasure which he gained from the ambiguity of words. If the nonnulli is not just a cover for John himself; then it shows the impression that the quip made on John and that it appealed to his sense of humour.

Even when writing the account of the process against Gilbert, John could not resist using an ironic turn of phrase to describe Bernard:

\[\text{Erat enim vir potens in opere et sermone coram ut creditur, et ut publice notum est, coram hominibus.}\]

This suggests that John's irony was more than just a means of entertaining Peter and his companions. It was part of John's outlook. He enjoyed the ironic phrase, the sharp quip, the quick repartee. Therefore, quite apart from the objective of entertaining Peter and his companions, we must see John's sense of humour and delight in
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irony as one of the factors influencing the treatment of topics in the Historia. Other influencing factors which require some comment are John's interest in personality and his interest in accurately assessing and describing political realities.

John's fascination with personality was closely linked to his sense of humour. John regarded all behaviour as comic. Thus in the Policraticus John describes life as 'comedia vel tragedia'. Referring to Job 7:1 John comments:

'The life of man upon earth is a warfare' says Job. But if the prophetic spirit had conceived our times, it would be truly (egregie) said that the life of man on earth is a comedy, where everyone, forgetful of himself expresses another personality (persona).

The thrust of this passage is the contrast between genuine struggle towards God (militia) and the role-playing, deception, and retreat from reality which characterises modern times ('nostra tempora'). But the passage also conveys John's sense of amusement and irony at the whole range of human behaviour. This was an attitude which John would have learned from his reading of classical authors. But it was also an attitude which became deeply embedded in John's personality and his outlook. The impression we get from the Historia is that John was entertained by other people's behaviour and that he took an interest in trying to epitomise their behaviour in vivid epigram.

Among the numerous vivid portraits of personality which occur in the Historia, the most extended is that of Eugenius. The representation of Eugenius is scattered throughout the Historia. The impression we get of his personality is a clear one: impulsive, emotive, suspicious of his advisers, but having the positive qualities...
of firmly insisting on the primacy of Rome over other churches, 210 and of being shrewd and witty. 211 Eugenius’ impulsive and emotive nature is conveyed in chapter 29 when Eugenius greeted Louis VII and Eleanor at Tusculum in October 1149. Their marriage had almost collapsed during the recent Crusade and there was talk of imminent divorce. 212 Eugenius greeted them with ‘tanta humanitate et devotione’ that he seemed to be an ‘angel of the Lord’ rather than a mortal. 213 He forbade any talk of consanguinity and then ordered the couple to sleep in the same bed. During their stay at Tusculum, Eugenius strove by friendly discourse (‘familia colloquio’) to restore love (caritas) between them.

John’s account of the stay at Tusculum, may be more than just an account of Eugenius’ impulsive, emotive nature. It contains an irony that would have struck John’s readers and listeners with some force: Eugenius’ reconciliation was unsuccessful and within three years Eleanor was married to Henry of Anjou. 214 There is the suggestion of naïveté as well as enthusiasm on Eugenius’ part. It is difficult to know whether John regarded this naïveté as a shortcoming and a sign of foolishness or whether he regarded it as a sign of Eugenius’ goodness, his holy simplicitas. The quality of simplicitas is one that is likely to have been held in high regard by John’s monastic audience, particularly as it had close links with Bernard of Clairvaux and the Cistercians who placed great value on the quality. 215
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A second example of Eugenius’ impulsiveness also relates to a marriage reconciliation. When Hugh count of Molise arrived at the papal curia with the object of obtaining a divorce Eugenius entreated them to remain together; bursting into tears he rose from his seat and threw himself before the count

... so utterly that his mitre slipping from his head and rolling in the dust, was found after the bishops and cardinals had raised him under the feet of the astonished count. Then he made an extraordinary offer to Hugh: if Hugh would take back his wife, Eugenius would undertake the burden of all the sins which Hugh had so far committed, and be answerable for them on the day of judgement.

The emotive behaviour and the magnanimous gesture of bearing the load of another man’s sins, looks like a demonstration of the kind of emotive piety of which the Cistercians approved. Whether or not John was poking fun at Cistercian piety is not clear. Unfortunately we do not know whether Hugh of Molise’s marriage survived or not. If like the marriage of Louis and Eleanor, it had later collapsed we would have good grounds for thinking that John was ridiculing Cistercian piety.

Even if John was making fun of Cistercian ideals, the impression of Eugenius’ impulsiveness and emotiveness fits in with his assessment

215 On Peter of Celle’s links with the Cistercians see P. G. Wellstein, ‘Die freundschaftlichen Beziehungen des Benediktiners Petrus Cellensis zu den Cisterciensern’ Cistercienser-Chronik 38 (1926) 213-52; and chap 2:3 pp 213-20 above.

216 HP 41 pp 80-1.

217 HP pp 81-2 (variation of Chibnall’s translation).

218 For evidence which suggests that the reconciliation may have been shortlived see HP App V p 99.
- in chapter 21 of Historia - of why so many of Eugenius' judgements were so easily revoked ('facile retractentur') by his successors. He offers two reasons. First, that Eugenius was very willing to revoke decisions made by his predecessors: 'decessorum sententias facile retractabae'. Secondly, because Eugenius was extremely suspicious (suspiciosissimus) 'he was too ready to rely on his personal opinion in imposing sentences'. The suspicion was partly the result of Eugenius' character (ex infirmitate nature) and partly the result of his 'consciousness of the failings' of his counsellors.

In these passages John builds up an image of Eugenius, his personality and his relationship to those around him. The representation of Eugenius must have seemed reasonably credible, as Peter and his companions would have known about Eugenius' activities and personality and would probably have been sympathetic to Eugenius, the Cistercian pope.

In addition to the two influencing factors in the Historia which we have examined - John's sense of humour and his fascination with people - we must consider a third: his interest in political realities. In assessing political situations he was more interested in accuracy than in moral judgement. This is a point worth emphasising for it stands in contrast to John's other well-known persona: the mordant satirist and severe moralist of the Policraticus. The interest in obtaining accurate information about political situations, emerges quite clearly in the letters which John wrote during the Becket dispute. While many of his letters were propagandist and emotive and provided information which was distorted, it is obvious from the letters in which John asks for information and

219 HP p 51.
220 See chap 9 below passim.
in the letters in which he offers advice to Becket, that he was interested in obtaining accurate information on the likelihood of obtaining support from particular individuals and on the pressures being used by Henry's supporters. In these assessments and in the advice which he offered Becket, John's interest in accuracy was rarely obscured by prejudice.

In the Historia John did not write a polemic for the papacy or an apologia for Eugenius. But he conveys the realities of curial politics in the period 1148-51. We get an impression of some of the pressures within the curia. There were the tensions between the cardinals and Bernard of Clarivaux. At the council of Rheims the cardinals were infuriated by Bernard's attempts to preempt the decision of the Council, by canvassing support from leading churchmen. The cardinals regarded this behaviour as threatening and intolerable:

They suspected or made a show of suspecting, that the abbot wished to win the English and Gallic parts of the church to his side and induce them to follow him ... They considered that Bernard had called together the leading churchmen 'for the express purpose of forcing the papacy to accept the abbot's views under threat of schism'. John comments that this claim by the cardinals was in his view a false one. It sounds like the type of exaggerated rumour which circulates when there is ill-will and mistrust between different cliques, and it reveals the degree of hostility with which Bernard was viewed at the curia. John states that this view of Bernard was held by almost every cardinal:

\[ 221 \text{ HP 9 pp 19-20; cf HP 8 pp 17-9.} \]
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As far as I recall there was not a single cardinal except Alberic bishop of Ostia of holy memory who was not wholeheartedly opposed to the abbot in spirit and deed.

A similar conflict between Bernard and the cardinals is described in chapter 16. On his return journey to Italy after the Council of Rheims, Eugenius stopped at Clairvaux (24-26 April 1148). There Bernard and the community of Clairvaux urged Eugenius to restore the priestly rank to Philip, formerly bishop of Tours who had been degraded for receiving ordination and consecration from the antipope 'Anacletus II'. But despite all the pleas of Bernard and the community of Clairvaux, Eugenius deferred to the judgement of the cardinals who were implacably opposed to Philip's re-instatement.

Besides conveying the tension between Bernard and the cardinals and the pressures which this brought on Eugenius, John also conveys the mood of the curia in these years. As noted earlier, the mood was one of the papacy being hemmed in by strong and hostile secular powers, the kingdom of Sicily to the south and the Empire to the north; it was a situation in which the papacy was politically weak and had to operate with considerable caution.

d: Conclusions

The Historia was a work of mixed objectives: 1) to present an apologia for Theobald, an attempt to show that the church of Canterbury had a tradition of being loyal both to king and pope - a clear reference to the Becket dispute; 2) to provide accurate information which would

224 HP p 20.
225 HP p 43.
226 See pp 141-2 above.
benefit future generations in 'establishing or abolishing customs' and in 'strengthening or destroying privileges; 3) to inform Peter of Celle about the process against Gilbert in 1148, and to defend Gilbert's reputation; 4) to entertain and to inform Peter and his circle with accounts of incidents and personalities which would interest them. The factors which shaped John's handling of the topics in the Historia, were his ironic sense of humour, his interest in personality, and his interest in assessing and describing the realities of political power.

Primacy must be given to the fact that the Historia was written for John's companions at Rheims: Peter of Celle and the community of St. Rémi. It was a chatty, informal book written at Peter's request. Despite the conditions of schism and of the Becket dispute it was not composed as polemic. It is particularly intriguing that even in these conditions John, generally depicted as a trenchant 'papalist', produced a work which was neither pro-papal polemic nor a forthright statement of the papacy's powers over secular rulers or over the church. It was a work which tended rather to stress the political weakness of the papacy.
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CHAPTER 4: LINKS WITH THE PAPAL CURIA

1: INTRODUCTION

It is clear that John of Salisbury's dealings with the papal curia were frequent. Writing in 1159 he spoke of having crossed the Alps ten times in the course of carrying out business there.¹ The dates of six of his periods at the curia have been established by C. N. L. Brooke.² It is clear that during the years 1150 to 1153 John spent a lot of time with the curia in southern Italy.

During visits to the curia he built up a close friendship with Nicholas Breakspear, cardinal-bishop of Albano (1150-1154) later pope Adrian IV (1154-59).³ In letters written to Adrian John speaks of the amor and caritas linking the two men.⁴ There are six occasions during the 1150s when we find John using his ties of friendship with Adrian to advance petitions of his friends at the curia.⁵

An indication of the close relationship between John and Adrian is that after his three-month stay with Adrian in Benevento in the winter of 1155-56 John appears to have returned to England imbued with Adrian's determination to defend and advance the rights of the papacy. Giles Constable has argued that the reason John fell into disgrace

1 Met 3 Prol p 117.
2 See pp 189-90 below.
4 EL epp 15, 18.
5 EL epp 15, 18, 41, 50, 51, 52.
with Henry II in 1156 was that he was involved in obtaining for Henry the papal grant of Ireland, which contained the assertion - derived from civil law and the *Constitutum Constantini* - that all islands pertained to the pope. The implication of the grant, therefore, was that England, like Ireland, pertained to the papacy.

There has, however, been no attempt in the secondary literature to investigate how extensive John's contacts at the papal curia were. In this chapter the aim is to consider who John's contacts at the papal curia were; how extensive they were; how John used them; and what links he - and his circle at Canterbury - had with particular groups within the cardinalate. It will be argued that John's range of contacts at the *curia* was in fact very limited.

The evidence for John's links with the papal curia is not extensive, consisting of letters which John wrote to individuals within the *curia*, the *Historia pontificalis* and occasional references scattered throughout John's other writings. In all there are nine extant letters addressed to *curiales*, but these represent only a fraction of those originally written. We know for instance that in early 1164 he wrote to Henry of Pisa, the cardinal-priest of SS Nereus and Achilleus, and to William of Pavia, cardinal-priest of St Peter ad Vincula; neither letter survives.

The surviving letters to *curiales* can be divided into three groups of three; the letters within each particular group are similar in date and content and occur close to one another in manuscript. Thus in the early collection (c.1154-61) the three letters addressed

7 LL ep 136 p 9.
8 epp 9-11.
to papal curiales were all written in early 1156 and belong to Theobald's campaign to regain the goodwill of Adrian IV. In the two manuscripts of the Early Letters these letters form a continuous sequence. For the Becket dispute the three surviving letters to cardinals were written in late 1167, and were part of the campaign to counteract Henry II's successes at the papal curia. In the Q and A manuscripts deriving from John's own collection of letters, these three letters occur within a sequence of letters all written in the period from autumn 1167 to January 1168. Two of the letters occur next to each other. For the period after Becket's murder we have three letters to cardinals and one to the papal notary, Gratian. All were composed in 1173-4 and deal with the elections at Canterbury and Winchester. In the Q manuscript these letters are found close to one another. The letters which John wrote in support of Richard of Ilchester's candidature to Winchester (epp 316-8) are found in a sequence of letters dealing with the same topic and which includes letters from Bartholomew of Exeter and the monks of Canterbury.

---

9 In MS P they occur in a sequence of 5 letters which were written in 1156 and which deal with the tense relations between Theobald and Canterbury: MS P nos 102-6 = EL epp 8-12. In MS C they occur in a sequence of 4 letters: MS C nos 102-5 = EL epp 8-11. (See EL Tables B and C, pp lxvi-lxvii; and Table 3 chap 5 below.)

10 epp 229, 234, 235.

11 A sequence of 10 letters: MS Q nos 90-99; MS A nos 90-'98'. (See LL Table 3 p lxxv.)

12 LL epp 234, 235 = MS Q nos 98, 87 respectively = MS A nos '97', '96' respectively.

13 epp 315-7.

14 ep 318.

15 See LL Table 3 p lxxvi for what follows. The sequence in A consists of: a) nos '159'-'163' (=LL epp 316-20) dealing with the Winchester election; b) no '164' (=LL ep 321) dealing with the election of Robert Foliot to the see of Hereford, 1173-4; c) nos '165'-'169' (=LL epp 312-4) dealing with the election to Canterbury.
John's letters in support of Richard of Dover's candidature to the archbishopric of Canterbury are found in a similar sequence of letters.

Because John's letters to persons in the curia are so few and because they relate to a handful of unrelated incidents we cannot take them as representative of the nature or extent of John's links with the curia. Nevertheless they must be scrutinised and their significance teased out.

Although this is the first time that a systematic attempt has been made to analyse John's links with the curia, this chapter is firmly based on the researches of other historians such as Marjorie Chibnall, Christopher Brooke and Avrom Saltman who have investigated the chronology of John's career for the years 1147-54, and J. M. Brixius, B. Zenker, and Helena Tillmann who have examined the personnel of the curia.

2: EARLY CONTACTS c. 1147-1156

a: Introduction

In looking at John's contacts with the papal curia, the years from c.1147 to 1156 can be regarded as a single phase. During these years he established and consolidated his links with the curia. We know

16 HP pp xix-xxiv (Chibnall); EL pp xiv-xix and App.1 (pp 253-56)(Brooke); Saltman, Theobald pp 169-74.

17 Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums von 1130-1181, (Berlin 1912).


that on at least six occasions he was at the curia:

- March-April 1148 at the Council of Rheims;
- between mid-
- 1149 and February 1150 in southern Italy or Rome;
- the summer of 1150 in Apulia;
- between November 1150 and summer of 1151 at Ferentino;
- the spring of 1152 at Segni;
- between November 1155 and June 1156 at Benevento.

Brooke has also suggested that John was at the papal curia at Rome in December 1153 when Anastasius IV issued a privilegium to the monastery of Celle confirming its burial rights at Chantemerle. For in a letter to John, Peter speaks of the role which John played in framing the

privilegium: ‘privilegium Anastasii papae, quod tu vidisti, et partim fabricasti’. As Brooke points out, the most straightforward explanation for Peter’s remarks is that John was present at the curia representing the interests of Celle, and that he produced or contributed to the draft privilegium which was submitted to the papal chancery. However John need not have been at the curia to have 'partly composed' the privilegium and he might well have seen it not at the time it was issued but at some later stage. Therefore while it is possible that John was at the curia in December 1153, the evidence

---

20 See EL App i (pp 253-56)
21 C. N. L. Brooke suggests that this visit was made between November 1149 and February 1150 (ibid p 253), but see chap 3 pp 138-9 above.
22 See chap 3 p 143-5.
23 See pp 190-4 below.
24 See pp 196-7 below.
25 EL p 255; JL 9777 (10 December 1153); also noted by C. Lalore ed Collection des principaux cartulaires du diocese de Troyes, 7 vols (Paris-Troyes 1875-90) vol 6 p xiii.
26 PL 202 ep 72 col 519 B.
27 EL p 255.
is not the 'positive proof' which Brooke suggests it is.

Since John entered the household of archbishop Theobald in 1147 or 1148 the main purpose of his visits to the curia from 1149 onwards must have been to represent the interests of Canterbury. He seems also to have carried out legal business on behalf of his friends.

From references in John’s letters, Policraticus and Historia pontificalis it is possible to build up an impression of John’s early contacts within the curia. These references can be divided into 1) occasional references which are found in the letters and the Policraticus; and 2) the comments which John makes about cardinals in the Historia pontificalis.

b: Occasional references

i: Reminiscences

Aside from the Historia pontificalis John makes five references to his periods at the papal curia:

1) Policraticus 2:22 refers briefly to John’s presence at the Council of Rheims but contains no information about his contacts at the curia.

2) Policraticus 6:24 refers to John’s presence at the curia in Ferentino sometime in the period November 1150 - summer 1151. John says that at Ferentino Guy cardinal-priest of St Pudentiana had declared before Eugenius and his fellow cardinals that in the Roman

29 For John’s entry into Theobald’s household see chap 2:3 above.
30 Met 3 Prol p 117/13-14: ‘dominorum et amicorum negotia in Ecclesia Romana sepius gessi’.
31 Webb 1 p 124/18-25.
32 Webb 2 p 69/2-10.
church were to be found the 'root of duplicity and the spur of avarice'. John himself was present and appears to have been the target of Guy's anger:

Neque id quidem in angulo sed considentibus fratribus sancto Eugenio praesidente, quando adversus innocentiam meam Ferentim gratis excanduerat, hoc publice protestatus est.

The passage gives no indication as to why John had incurred Guy's anger, but it does allow us to deduce what John's relationship with Guy was. There is an inconsistency between Guy attacking the corruption of the Roman church and at the same time raging without justification against John. This suggests that John was being ironic when he wrote:


If these words are to be interpreted as irony then the point that John was making in this passage was that even someone like Guy of St Pudentiana had to admit that the Roman church was corrupt. If this interpretation is correct, then John was presenting Guy's outburst before Eugenius not as an example of moral indignation but as an unwitting truth spoken in anger. This would suggest that little love was lost between John and Guy and possibly that John regarded Guy as one of the corrupt cardinals. John's only other reference to Guy is in the Historia pontificalis where we are told that Eugenius III placed 'Guidonem cognomento Puellam' in command of the papal forces which attacked the city of Rome in 1149.  

---

33 Webb 2 p 69/7-10.
34 Webb 2 p 69/2-4.
comment on the involvement of churchmen in warfare but he clearly regarded the attack as an error of judgement: 'Ecclesia namque fecit sumptus maximos et profectum minimum.' It is unlikely however that John viewed Guy as particularly culpable in this incident, for as John points out it was Eugenius who issued the order to attack Rome.36

Our assessment of John's relationship with Guy must be that while there is a hint in the passage in Policraticus 6:24 that John had little affection for Guy, the evidence is too slight to be more definite than that. John's reference to Guy in the Historia pontificalis gives us no further clue to the relationship between the two men.

3) Later Letters ep 289: In this letter written to Baldwin archdeacon of Totnes late in the Becket dispute - probably in late August 1169 - there is evidence of two friendships which John may have formed in the curia at Ferentino in the period November 1150-summer 1151. In the opening part of the letter John says that he has confidence in Gratian the papal notary and nephew of Eugenius III who has been chosen to act as legate in settling the dispute between Becket and Henry II.37 John explains his confidence by jokingly pointing out that Gratian is his own namesake, an allusion to the definition found in Jerome's De nominibus hebraicis that 'Iohannan' means 'gratia vel Domini gratia'.38 John then reminds Baldwin:

... Gratian, whom you will remember you yourself were appointed tutor (institutor) by Pope Eugenius of holy memory at Ferentino.39

35 HP 27 p 60.
36 ibid: '... conductis militibus decrevit infestare Romanos. Milicie prefecit cardinalem Guidonem ...'
37 LL p 650.
38 CC 72 p 136; cf ibid pp 146, 155.
The implication is that John and Baldwin, and possibly Gratian, were in Ferentino with the curia of Eugenius III. The only time that Eugenius was at Ferentino was between November 1150 and the summer of 1151. The details of Baldwin's early career are obscure but he may have been trained in the schools of northern France. The most likely reason for his presence at the curia is that he was conducting business there for someone. This is the kind of temporary, free-lance employment which we might expect of a schoolman who had only recently left the schools and was looking out for more permanent employment and patronage.

The post of institutor to the pope's nephew would certainly have been a prestigious one, and to obtain it Baldwin must have been recommended by someone who was influential and who had Eugenius' confidence. Two persons who could have recommended Baldwin were Bernard of Clairvaux, who was willing to give his backing to individual schoolmen who impressed him; and Baldwin's fellow

39 LL p 650.
40 JL 9415 (23 November 1150) - JL 9491 (May 1151).
41 The location of Baldwin's studies is unclear. Baldwin's scholarly skills were recognised by contemporaries; e.g. Gerald of Wales, Vita Sancti Remigii, RS 21:7 pp 67-73. E. Rathbone, The influence of bishops and of members of cathedral bodies in the intellectual life of England, 1066-1216 (PhD thesis, London 1936) suggested (p 105) that Baldwin may have been a pupil of Hubert of Bourges (later pope Urban III). However, the evidence for this is not persuasive: in a letter congratulating Urban on his election as pope in 1185, Baldwin (then archbishop of Canterbury) declared: 'Ego enim vir videns paupertatem meam prae munificentia et magnificentia indultae mihi gratiae vestrae, me vobis debere profiteor, quidquid debere servus domino, magistro discipulus, filius patri potest' (PL 202 col 1534B). Rather than referring to an old relationship, Baldwin appears simply to be using the 'master-student' metaphor as one of several metaphors to emphasise his obedience to the pope.
Englishman, Nicholas Breakspear (the future Adrian IV), cardinal-bishop of Albano, who was with the curia at Ferentino in 1150-51. However we know too little about Baldwin and his connections and too little about the networks of personal contacts and patronage which operated at the curia to know how likely it was that Bernard or Nicholas rather than anyone else had recommended Baldwin. What can be gleaned from this passage is that Baldwin and John knew each other as friends at the curia in 1150-51, and that Baldwin must have had influential contacts.

In the same passage John also speaks of the common ties of loyalty which bind him and Gratian: '... cum quo michi fidei et societatis sunt iura communia ...' We cannot be certain exactly whether John established his friendship with Gratian during one of his early visits to the curia or later.

4) Early Letters ep 52: In this letter written to Adrian IV sometime between 1154 and 1159, John was seeking a papal dispensation for a friend who wished to enter a stricter religious order. He states that he is confident of Adrian's kindness and then reminds Adrian that at Ferentino he gave John a ring (anulum) and a belt (balteus) as a pledge of things to come ('arram futurorum'). Poole thought that this referred to Adrian's grant of Ireland to Henry II for in the final chapter of the Metalogicon, John says that when the

43 Note Bernard's letter of commending John to archbishop Theobald (ep 361 PL 182:1 col 562) although Bernard probably did not know John directly (see chap 2:3 above). For Bernard's support of Robert Pullen see ep 205, PL 182:1 cols 372-3.

44 For subscriptions see PL 180 cols 1431B, 1434C, 1436C, 1443B, 1451A, 1454B, 1461D, 1466C, 1467C, 1474C.

45 LL p 650.

46 EL p 90.

47 Studies p 267 n 3.
grant was made, Adrian sent Henry a gold ring set with an emerald as a sign that he was investing him with the authority to rule Ireland.\(^{48}\)

However the text of ep 52 makes it clear that John was talking about a personal and not a public event. In order to strengthen his petition on behalf of a friend John was reminding Adrian of the special ties which bound John and Adrian and of the promise which Adrian had evidently given to help John in the future (‘arram futurorum’). To have spoken about the grant of Ireland in this context would have been meaningless.

Two possible dates have been offered for this incident. Poole considered that it occurred about 30 September 1155, the only time in this pontificate that Adrian spent at Ferentino.\(^{49}\) If this is correct then the incident occurred just a few weeks before the three month period which John spent with Adrian at Benevento in 1155-56 (discussed below). G. Constable and C. N. L. Brooke suggest that the incident occurred in the period November 1150 - summer 1151 when we know that John and the future Adrian IV, then Nicholas Breakspear cardinal-bishop of Albano, were at the curia.\(^{50}\) No grounds are offered by Poole, Constable or Brooke for accepting one date rather than the other. There are two reasons however for thinking that the earlier date is more probable; first, we know that John was at Ferentino between November 1150 and summer 1151,\(^{51}\) while we have no evidence for his being there in late September 1155. Secondly, John’s

\(^{48}\) Met p 218/2-5.

\(^{49}\) Studies p 267 n 3.

\(^{50}\) G. Constable, 'The alleged disgrace of John of Salisbury in 1159', EHR 69 (1954) 67-76 at p 68 suggests the earlier date as a possibility; Brooke suggests the earlier date as being the more likely (EL p 90 n 1).

\(^{51}\) See pp 190-4 above.
comment in *Policraticus* 6:24 that he travelled to Apulia ("profectum in Apuliam") and stayed with Adrian at Benevento for almost three months, suggests that he joined the *curia* in Apulia rather than at Ferentino (see no 5 below). These arguments are not conclusive, for the first is an argument from silence, and the second may be a case of John having sacrificed accuracy for style; in recalling his visit to Apulia John might have thought it irrelevant and clumsy to point out that he had actually joined the *curia* somewhat earlier, at Ferentino. But taken together the arguments suggest that the earlier date of 1150-51 is marginally more probable than the later one.

5) In *Policraticus* 6:24 John recalls that he stayed with Adrian IV for almost three months at Benevento:  

Memini me causa visitandi dominum Adrianum pontificem quartum qui me in ulteriorem familiaritatem admiserat, profectum in Apuliam, mansique cum eo Beneventi ferme tres menses.

The only period when Adrian spent so long as pope at Benevento was between November 1155 and July 1156. The period within which John made his visit can be narrowed down slightly: to the period between November 1155 and June 1156. For by July 1156 John had returned to England and written a letter to William Turba bishop of Norwich.

In the rest of the passage John gives details of a conversation which he claims to have had with Adrian at this time. When Adrian asked John about how people regarded the *ecclesia Romana*, John replied frankly by saying that in many lands ("in diversis provinciis") people

52 Webb 2 p 67/6 - p 73/6.
53 ibid p 67/6-9.
54 JL 10097 - 10197.
55 See EL headnote to ep 13 p 21.
regarded members of the Roman curia as oppressive and avaricious, as 'Scribes and Pharisees placing insupportable burdens on the shoulders of men'. After John spoke on this theme, Adrian supposedly replied with the fable (drawn from Florus and ultimately from Livy) about the conspiracy of the different parts of the body against the stomach.

Even if the conversation between John and Adrian seems too contrived to be accepted at face value, John's assertion that Adrian admitted him 'in ulteriorem familiaritatem' indicates clearly 1) that John and Adrian were on close terms of familiaritas before 1155-56 and 2) that 1155-56 was a particularly important period for the strengthening of their friendship.

In these reminiscences of the papal curia John mentions five people: Eugenius III, Nicholas Breakspear cardinal-bishop of Albano and later pope Adrian IV, Guy cardinal-priest of St Pudentiana, Gratian and Master Baldwin. What is striking is that the two people with whom John definitely had friendly contacts were fellow Englishmen, Nicholas Breakspear and Master Baldwin. A similar impression of contacts with fellow Englishmen is found among John's references to stays in Apulia. John made two visits to Apulia before 1159: the first in the summer of 1150, the second between November 1155 and June 1156. On both occasions John was with the papal curia. Aside from the Historia pontificalis John makes three references to visits to Apulia; the only people he alludes to in these references are an obscure and otherwise unknown 'Stoic' named Ludowicus, Robert of Selby the chancellor of king Roger of Sicily,
and John of Canterbury who was with John of Salisbury at an enormous feast held in Apulia.  

ii: References to cardinals

In the Policraticus, apart from the reference to Guy Puella cited above, there are four references to cardinals. In Policraticus 8:23 John gives Giles cardinal-bishop of Tusculum and Peter of Pisa cardinal-priest of St Susanna, as examples of illustrious men who had been dragged by the ambitions of Peter Leonis, the antipope 'Anacletus II':

Nonne et stellarum pætem secum traxit ruina eius? Quis nescit Egidium Tusculanum? Quis Petrum Pisanum, cui nullus aut vix similis alter erat in curia?

John would not have known either cardinal, for Giles had died between 1139 and 1142, and Peter in 1144-45.  Both however would have been well known to churchmen outside the curia for they were monks of good repute who had backed 'Anacletus' until his death in 1138, but who afterwards recognised Innocent II. Giles was among the 'Anacletan' cardinals restored to their original titles at the Lateran Council of 1139.  Peter was restored to his title a few years later.  

60 EL ep 33 pp 57-8; the allusion is to Robert of Selby although he is not named.  
64 For Giles see Brixius pp 31, 71; Zenker pp 43-44. For Peter see Brixius pp 38-9, 82; Zenker pp 103-4. For their deaths: the last extant papal document containing Giles' subscription is JL 7950 (1 March 1139); the earliest subscription of his successor is JL 8225 (19 April 1142). Peter's last subscription is dated 24 February 1144 (see Zenker p 103); his successor first subscribes on 31 December 1145 (JL 8813).  
65 Zenker p 44.
reference to cardinals Giles and Peter is intended as an exemplum warning of the pernicious effects of ambition. It provides, unfortunately, no clue as to the groups at the curia with which John had contacts or which he favoured.

The other two cardinals to whom John refers were Cistercian monks from Clairvaux: Bernard of Rennes cardinal-deacon of SS Cosmas and Damian, and Martin cardinal-priest of St Stephan in Celio monte. Both are cited in Policraticus 5:15 along with Cicero, Eugenius III and Geoffrey bishop of Chartres, as exemplary judges who refused to accept gifts. John would not have known Martin who had died in 1142 while John was still in the schools, but he could have known Bernard of Rennes who was appointed as cardinal-deacon in 1152 and died probably in the following year. It is intriguing to see that the two cardinals whom John names in the Policraticus as being upright and not susceptible to bribery, were Cistercians from Clairvaux. In the Historia pontificalis John pointed out very succintly that there was considerable hostility between the majority of Eugenius' cardinals and Bernard of Clairvaux. John's representation of cardinals Martin and Bernard makes it clear that John did not share the cardinals' unease about Bernard's influence at the curia. Instead John's representation

66 Zenker p 104.
68 The title of the chapter is 'Quae pertineant ad religionem proconsulum praesidum et ordinariorum iudicum, et quatenus exenia protendi liceat; et de Cicerone, Bernardo, Martino, Gaufrido Carnotensi' (Webb 1 p 344/4-7); see ibid p 346/25 - p 347/12 (Cicero); ibid p 347/12-20 (Eugenius); ibid p 347/20 - p 348/4 (Bernard of Rennes); ibid p 348/4-13 (Martin); ibid p 348/13 - p 349/6.
69 See Zenker pp 134, 149.
70 HP 9 p 20; ibid 16 p 43 also points to conflicting demands which could be made on Eugenius by the cardinals and the Cistercians.
of the two cardinals and of Eugenius III implies that he saw Bernard's influence as beneficial, for he presents these three protégés of Bernard's as honest men in a largely corrupt and avaricious institution.

c:  The Historia pontificalis

i:  Groups of cardinals

As a source for reconstructing John's early contacts at the curia the Historia pontificalis has a serious shortcoming: nowhere in it does John explicitly state what contacts he made among the cardinals or administrative staff of the curia.

In the absence of explicit references it is necessary to tease out the significance of all that John has to say about individual cardinals. In the Historia there are references to 17 cardinals who were active during the years 1148 to 1156. These can be divided into three groups. The first consists of four cardinals about whom John makes no comment as to personality, motives or loyalties. The second group consists of seven cardinals on whom John does pass some comment: Hyacinth cardinal-deacon of St Mary in Cosmedin, Alberic cardinal-bishop of Ostia, Gilbert cardinal-priest of St Mark, Guy cardinal-priest of St Chrysogonus, Guy of Summa cardinal-bishop of Ostia from 1149, Guy of Crema (later anti-pope 'Paschal III') cardinal-priest of St Mary in Portico, and Theodwin cardinal-bishop of Porto. The comments, however, which John makes about these cardinals give us no real clue about the contacts which John made at the curia.

We are told for instance that when Arnold of Brescia went to France

71 Roland cardinal-priest of St Mark (HP 36 p 71), Henry of Pisa subdeacon, later cardinal-priest of SS Nereus and Achilleus (HP 10 p 21), Guy Puella cardinal-priest of St Pudentiana (HP 27 p 60, Girard cardinal-deacon of St Mary in Via Lata (HP 36 p 71).
(1139) he became a disciple of Peter Abelard and worked zealously with 'Master Hyacinth, who is now a cardinal' to foster Abelard's cause 'against the abbot of Clairvaux'. We are told that at the Council of Rheims Alberic bishop of Ostia was the only cardinal 'who was not wholeheartedly opposed' to Bernard 'in spirit and deed'. Gilbert of St Mark, a strongly pro-Angevin cardinal, is recorded as giving Geoffrey of Anjou the practical advice that 'kingdoms should be defended not by law-suits but by the sword'.

In the account of the Second Crusade John provides sharp and entertaining character sketches of Theodwin bishop of Porto and Guy cardinal-priest of St Chrysogonus but again there are no clues as to John's contacts at the curia. It is possible that John could have met Theodwin, for between 1148 and his death in 1151 Theodwin spent a short period in the curia. John may have met Guy who returned from the east in 1153 and remained at the curia until his death in 1157. Even if John did meet these cardinals and based his character sketches on direct observation, his comments tell us nothing of his relationship with them. The last two cardinals in this group are Guy Summa whom John describes as being sympathetic to Henry of Winchester ('favore domini Wintoniensis') and Guy of Crema. Here we do get a glimpse of curial politics and loyalties. In the summer of 1148 archbishop Theobald's messengers arrived at Brescia to obtain

---

72 HP 31 p 63.
73 HP 9 p 20.
74 HP 17 p 44.
75 HP 24 p 55.
76 Zenker p 28.
77 Zenker p 64.
78 HP 18 p 45.
Eugenius' backing for Theobald's next moves in the dispute with king Stephen. The messengers succeeded in persuading the pope to issue a mandate ordering the English bishops to admonish Stephen and if Stephen failed to make amends, to place the kingdom under interdict. Theobald's messengers were moderately (modestius) opposed by Guy of Summa and more vigorously by two cardinals who claimed to be kinsmen (cognati) of king Stephen: Octavian of St Cecilia (see below) and Guy of Crema. Later in the Historia John alleges that Guy of Summa became involved in a scheme - probably in 1148-50 - to secure for Henry of Winchester a pallium and to have him appointed as archbishop of western England, or else to obtain for Henry the office of legate in England, or failing this at least to ensure that the see of Winchester should be free from the jurisdiction of Canterbury.

The third group of cardinals dealt with in the Historia consists of five cardinals whom John sharply criticises: Octavian cardinal-priest of St Cecilia who later became antipope 'Victor IV' (1159-64); Jordan cardinal-priest of St Susanna; John Paparo cardinal-deacon of St Adrian, later cardinal-priest of St Laurence in Damaso; Gregory cardinal-deacon of St Angelo; Cencius cardinal-deacon of St Mary in Aquiro (and subsequently cardinal-priest of St Laurence in Lucina and cardinal-bishop of Porto). John's treatment of this group gives us an insight into his early involvement in the curia and his attitudes towards it. He alleges that Octavian and Jordan were guilty of gross extortion while on legation. John Paparo is

79 Eugenius was present at Brescia from 15 July to 8 September 1148 (JL 9281-9292).
80 HP 40 p 78.
81 Details and references pp 204-14 below.
82 HP 38 pp 75-77.
depicted as an astute and corrupt politician. He is accused of having threatened to stir up the Roman populace against Eugenius and to create a new pope. In the Historia he is linked to Gregory of St Angelo whom John seems to have seen as the epitome of corruption. Paparo is described as 'efficacissimus institutor' to Gregory in political scheming ('in calliditatibus excogitandis'). John also implies that Paparo and Gregory of St Angelo took bribes in Ralph of Vermandois' divorce case; they had acted, John tells us, 'non sine suspitione intervenientis peccunie'. Cencius is described as an even more accomplished political operator than John Paparo. These allegations against the cardinals are worth exploring further because of what they may tell us about John's attitudes to the papal curia, to individual cardinals and to groups of cardinals. Are the allegations valid and if not are they coloured by political considerations, such as the attitudes of individual cardinals to Canterbury, towards the dispute between king Stephen and Matilda, or towards rapprochement with the Empire? Did the cardinals whom John attacked form a distinct group within the curia? The answers will necessarily be tentative for although Brixius, Zenker and Tillmann have amassed and collated the surviving biographical information on cardinals for this period, no picture emerges from them or from other secondary sources as to what factions and patterns of patronage existed in the curia.

83 HP 36 p 71.
84 ibid.
85 HP 6 p 12.
86 HP 36 p 71 where we are told that John Paparo 'post Chencium efficacissimus institutor Gregorii de sancto Angelo'.
87 See nn 17-9 above.
In chapter 38 of the Historia John claims that Octavian and Jordan were guilty of gross misconduct on their legation to Germany in 1151. Conrad III wished to be consecrated emperor and was making preparations for his Romzug. According to John he asked Eugenius to send legates a latere 'who might advise him on the settlement of his kingdom and judge ecclesiastical cases by papal authority'. In John's account the two legates quarrelled continuously with each other and offered conflicting judgements, thus forcing litigants to appeal directly to Rome and in the process undermining the whole purpose of the legation. There are apparently no other extant references to this conflict, but it may well be true. John's description of the personalities of the two cardinals suggests that there may have been substantial grounds for friction. Jordan, the papal chamberlain, was - according to John - severe in manner and speech; he dressed wretchedly in the garb of a Carthusian and penny-pinched at every opportunity. Octavian in contrast was: 'genere nobilior et affatu benignior et beneficentia liberalior'.

John levels a second charge at the two cardinals. Not only were they in constant conflict, but they were also extortionate and avaricious in their conduct of the legation:

Each was at heart a wolf in sheep's clothing. Tormentors of men and extorters of money, they oppressed the innocent and emptied coffers.

88 For Octavian see Brixius pp 45, 92; Zenker pp 66-70. For Jordan see Brixius pp 52, 104; Zenker pp 104-6.
89 HP p 75.
90 HP p 76.
91 HP p 75.
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In reality the cardinals seem to have made a favourable impression in Germany. In his Commentarius in Psalmum 65\(^\text{94}\) Gerhoch of Reichersberg includes the text of a letter which he had previously sent to Eugenius III who had asked Gerhoch for a report on how Octavian had conducted his legation. As Zenker\(^\text{95}\) has pointed out, the fact that Eugenius asked for this report suggests that some unfavourable rumours had been circulating about Octavian’s handling of the 1151 legation. The text of Gerhoch’s letter indicates however that Octavian was neither extortionate nor avaricious in his handling of the legation. The impression was that Octavian was harsh and perhaps over-zealous:

\[
\text{Quia ergo legatus vester ivit et fructum adtulit, vobis, pater, incumbit providere, ne fructus hic depereat, sed maneat stante sententia contra clericos impudicos, usurarios ac sacerdotum filios canonice deprompta, nisi quantum relaxari deposcit longa et secundum canones ordinata pentitentia.}
\]

The impression of zealoucness is confirmed by a letter from Adam abbot of Ebrach.\(^\text{97}\)

For a legate who is supposed to have been so avaricious and extortionate, Octavian made a remarkably good impression within the Empire in 1151. The concluding lines of John’s account show that John felt it necessary to explain away this good impression. We are told that Octavian made a pact of mutual aid and counsel (auxilio et

\(^{93}\) HP p 76.
\(^{94}\) MGH LL 3 p 494/6 - p 495.
\(^{95}\) p 68.
\(^{96}\) loc cit p 495/39-42.
consilio mutua obligatione) with the German magnates, and that Octavian obtained from the magnates letters of recommendation (commendaticiae) addressed to the pope. John implies that Octavian bought off German criticism and in return for the letters of commendation he undertook to represent German interests at the curia:

Ab illo tempore semper in curia patronus extitit Teutonicorum.

This explanation for the apparently good impression which Octavian left in Germany, was a shrewd tactic on John’s part. For Octavian's career showed him undoubtedly to be an amator Teutonicorum: he opposed the 'Sicilian policy', favoured greater rapprochement with the Empire, and after being elected as antipope 'Victor IV' in 1159, he rapidly gained the support of Frederick Barbarossa. However the weakness in John’s account is that if Octavian had indeed been as heavy handed and corrupt a legate as John suggests, then it seems extremely unlikely that he could have managed to enter a mutua obligatio with the German magnates.

Why then did John make the allegations against Octavian? One reason must be that John wanted to tell an amusing tale. Evidently John knew of some of the appeals which were made against Octavian's rulings and which Gerhoch had referred to in the Commentarius. Since Octavian had disgraced himself by becoming anti-pope, John could safely afford to weave the memory of these appeals into an

98 HP pp 76-77.
99 HP p 77.
100 Gesta Alberonis archiepiscopi (MGH SS 8 p 255/10-11) describes Octavian as 'specialis amator Theutonicorum'.
101 P. F. Kehr, 'Zur Geschichte Viktors IV. (Octavian von Monticelli)', Neues Archiv 46 (1926) 53-85 at p 64.
Did John have particular grounds for his hostility to Octavian? One possible reason is that Octavian was prominent in the pro-imperial faction of cardinals who believed that Adrian IV was needlessly seeking confrontation with the emperor. Given John's intimate friendship with Adrian and his commitment to the superiority of church over state, we would expect John to be hostile to the pro-imperial faction. A second ground for John's hostility - and one which also seems to underly his hostility to John Paparo and Gregory of St Angelo - is that Octavian was a powerful and effective force at the curia. Belonging to a leading Roman noble family, the Monticelli, Octavian was very much involved in the politics of Rome and in the promotion of family and friends. His involvement in the election of Ramo abbot of Subiaco suggests that he was willing to bargain and take bribes in return for his support at the curia. According to the Chronicon Sublacense, the thirty-fourth abbot of Subiaco, Odo 'vir honestus valde', was deposed within ten days of his election by relatives (cognati) of the previous abbot. They placed one of their number Ramo, who was also a monk of Subiaco, in the abbacy. Through the aid of two cardinals, Octavian and Gregory of St Angelo, they got Eugenius III to consecrate Ramo. In return for this support Octavian's brother (germanus) was given the fief of Cerreto. Eventually Ramo and his kinsmen overreached themselves by alienating possessions of the abbey.

102 For John's views on ecclesiastical, and in particular papal, authority, see chap 6 below.

103 Kehr's 'Zur Geschichte Viktors IV,' deals with Octavian's family background; for corrections to Kehr see Tillmann 'Ricerche ... II/I' 26 (1972) pp 337-8.

Rumours of their activities reached the papal curia. Eugenius reprehended Ramo and despatched cardinal Gregory who excommunicated Ramo, laid siege to the fortress of Subiaco, and at last captured and imprisoned the recalcitrant Ramo. In the final settlement the fief of Cerreto was removed from Octavian's brother and given to Petrus de Jacinto the brother of Gregory.

There is no reason to think that Octavian was more or less corrupt than his fellow cardinals. He offered his services and support at a price. This was probably acceptable within Italian circles but to outsiders like John and Theobald it was offensive. For in critical issues it meant that access to fair judgement was blocked unless one played by the rules of patronage which prevailed at the curia.

John's attack on Jordan may have been more justified. After his account of the legation to Germany John devotes a chapter to Jordan's activities in France and his confrontation with the prior of Mondaye. After the completion of the legation Jordan did not return directly to Italy but travelled to France and visited the Carthusian house of Mondaye where he had been novice. As he was about to depart from the priory he 'offered the holy prior Hugh twenty marks of his ill-gotten gains for the expenses of his house'. Hugh refused and rebuked Jordan in words that echoed St Peter's reproof to Simon Magus: 'Keep thy money to thyself, to perish with thee, since thou hast no part in this lot, nor will we, God willing, have any part in yours.' These allegations would certainly have been known to John's audience: Peter of Celle and his companions at Rheims. For Peter had close contacts with the house of Mondaye. Peter would

105 HP 39 pp 77-78.
106 HP p 77.
probably also have known of the incident from his connections with Clairvaux, for Bernard wrote on behalf of the prior of Mondaye to Eugenius III and directed some remarkable invective against Jordan:

He committed his foul crimes everywhere; carried away the spoils of churches. Whenever he could, he promoted pretty young boys to ecclesiastical office; and even when he could not do so, he wished to.

The accusations against Jordan cannot be dismissed, though John’s concluding remark that Jordan was severely reprimanded by Eugenius must be regarded as little more than a rhetorical flourish. The reprimand was not severe enough to prevent Jordan being appointed as one of the legates to Verona in 1153.

iii: Gregory of St Angelo

The allegations of bribery that John brings against Gregory of St Angelo are convincing and are supported by other evidence. In the Historia John alleges that while Louis VII failed, Gregory and John Paparo succeeded in obtaining a divorce for Ralph of Vermandois. There was, John states, a suspicion of bribery. Later John links Gregory with Paparo and Cencius, with the clear implication that all three were adept schemers and politicians, and with the possible implication that they took bribes and were involved in ‘fixing’ judicial decisions. John claims that Gregory was one of the

107 For Peter’s correspondence with the Carthusians of Mondaye see PL 202 epp 40-48 (cols 453-74).
108 PL 182 ep 290 col 496 B.
110 Brixius pp 49, 97; Zenker pp 48-50; Tillmann, 'Ricerche ... II/1' 26 (1972) pp 344-7.
111 HP 6 p 12.
cardinals plotting in 1149-50 to get a pallium or at least a legateship for Henry of Winchester.  

In one of John's later letters, ep 367, from the clerks of Thomas Becket (miseri Cantuarienses) to William archbishop of Sens in early 1172, it is alleged that during the pontificate of Eugenius, Roger archbishop of York enrolled the assistance of Gregory in order to be cleared of entirely justified charges of unnatural practices and murder:

... [He] went to Rome to that well-known man of business ('famosissimum negotiatorem') whom your soul has always hated, Gregory cardinal of St Angelo, who secured for him, with the help of a multitude of gifts scattered round the curia, that he returned to his home 'justified' ...

It is not certain to what extent John was involved in drafting this letter. It was not transmitted through the Q, A or C manuscripts which are considered to represent John's own collection of later letters. It has been transmitted only through the X group of manuscripts which represent different recensions of Alan of Tewkesbury's collection of Becket correspondence. Whether or not John drafted the letter, it is clear that the recipient of the letter, William of Sens, must have regarded Gregory of St Angelo as a particularly disreputable character.

112 HP 36 p 71.
113 HP 40 p 78.
114 LL p 746: 'Eratis in Anglia cum' etc.
116 M. Chibnall questions whether this letter should be attributed to John; see her review of LL in Medium Aevum 50 (1981) p 123. For Brooke's discussion of the authenticity of the letter see LL p xlv. For the Q, A and C MSS see LL pp xlvii-xlxi. For the X group of MSS see ibid pp 1-1i. Also: ibid pp liii-liv. See also Duggan TB:TH, chap 3 esp pp 94-8.
John provides us with no account of Gregory's performance as a legate, for his legateship to Germany in 1153 falls outside the period covered by the Historia. In De quarta vigilia noctis, however, Gerhoch of Reichersberg makes a blistering attack on Gregory's performance as a legate. He alleges that in the monastery of St Alban in Mainz, Gregory was so annoyed that the meal provided for himself and his retinue was 'not as exquisite as he wished (minus laute quam voluit)', that he placed the abbot under interdict until the abbot had paid a hundred marks to Gregory and his companions. As with many allegations against cardinal-legates it is difficult to know whether we are really dealing with a case of harshness and severity or a case of extortion.

iv: Cencius

Of the five cardinals whom John attacked, we know least about Cencius who rose rapidly within the curia between 1151 and 1154. He was

---

117 Zenker p 49.
118 MGH LL 3 p 513 lines 1-7.
119 On Cencius see Brixius pp 53-4, 106; Zenker p 29, Tillmann 'Ricerche ... II/2' 29 (1975) pp 363-5. Brixius (pp 51, 53, 106) and Zenker (pp 29, 188) appear to have confused two different cardinals: 1) a Cinthius who appears occasionally as 'diac. card. sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae' in 1145 and whose first subscription is on 19 January 1145 (JL 8707); other subscriptions for this cardinal are to be found at PL 180 cols 1017A, 1040C, 1056D, 1071C, 1072B, 1089B, 1091C, 1106B, 1115C, 1137A, 1145A, 1172C. It is also possible that this Cinthius may have been the Cinthius cardinal-deacon of SS Sergius and Bacchus who subscribed between 10 October 1145 (JL 8786) and 23 December 1146 (JL 8972; see Brixius p 107 and Zenker p 156 who gives the final subscription as 7 December 1147, JL 9162); and 2) a Cencius who appears on 31 March 1151 (JL 9469) as a cardinal-deacon without title and who from 10 May (JL 9481) onwards is found with the title of St Mary of Aquiro; this cardinal rose through the ranks of cardinal-deacon and priest to become bishop of Porto in 1154 (Zenker p 29). Zenker thinks that the cardinal-deacon 'Cencius' who appears without title at the end of March 1151 is the same as the 'Cinthius' who appears without title on witness lists in 1145. This is improbable on two grounds: the earlier 'Cinthius' without title disappeared from the records in 1145. His sudden and unique
among the persons promoted to the rank of cardinal-deacon in March 1151. He appears as a witness on 30 March 1151 with the subscription 'Cencius diac. card. S. Romanae Ecclesiae'. On 18 May he is described as 'Cencius diac. card. S. Mariae in Aquiro'. The following year he was promoted to the rank of cardinal-priest of St Laurence in Lucina and in 1154 he became cardinal-bishop of Porto. Apart from Hubald cardinal-bishop of Ostia he was the only person during the period 1130-1159 who was promoted to each of the ranks of cardinal.120

The rapid promotion of Cencius over a period of three years suggests a person of remarkable abilities. The paucity of sources about him, then, is something of a puzzle. As Zenker suggests, one reason for the lack of information is that Cencius worked as a colleague of the pope and was not active on legations.121 Most of our information about Octavian of St Cecilia, Gregory of St Angelo, Jordan of St Susanna and John Paparo is related to their activities as legates. John's comment on Cencius needs to be noted carefully. He alleges that Cencius, even more than John Paparo, was a highly effective instructor (efficacissimus institutor) of Gregory of St Angelo,122 whom John regarded as notoriously corrupt. This clearly carries the implication that Cencius, like Gregory, sold his support on a large scale. It may also carry the implication that

119 (continued)
appearance in March 1151 is difficult to believe. The second ground is one of orthography: the earlier 'Cinthius' is consistently spelt 'Cinthius', and 'Cintius'; the cardinal who appears without title on 31 March 1151 and who rose so rapidly through the cardinalate from 1151 to 1154 consistently referred to as 'Centius' or 'Cencius' (see PL 180 cols 1466 C, 1474 D, 1488 B). On balance, then, it must be concluded that the 'Cencius' who appears on 31 March 1151 is not the earlier 'Cinthius'.

120 Zenker p 29.
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122 HP 36 p 71.
Cencius, like Paparo, was an accomplished politician and successful schemer.

v: John Paparo

John's criticism of John Paparo is the least convincing of his attacks on cardinals - and also the most revealing. John's two criticisms are that he was guilty of bribery and that he was an accomplished schemer, who was concerned with his own interests and who was disobedient to the pope. John is vague in his allegations of bribery. As we have seen, in the Vermandois case John alleges that Ralph of Vermandois obtained his divorce through the assistance of Paparo and Gregory of St Angelo 'non sine suspitione intervenientie peccunie'. In the account of how Paparo refused to become a cardinal-priest, John describes Paparo as being the most effective instructor (efficacissimus institutor), after Cencius, of Gregory of St Angelo, a comment that seems to imply that Paparo - like Gregory - took bribes on a large scale.

In his second allegation - that Paparo was a political schemer - John is more explicit: 'erat enim artifex in calliditatibus excogitandis'. This comment is made in the context of Paparo's manoeuvres to avoid being promoted from the rank of cardinal-deacon to cardinal-priest. In order to avoid promotion Paparo threatened to rouse the Roman populace against Eugenius and to incite them to create another pope. Although John may be exaggerating here, there must be

123 Brixius pp 50, 99-100; Zenker pp 79-82; Tillmann 'Ricerche ... II/1' 26 (1972) pp 347-50.
124 HP 6 p 12.
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at least a kernel of truth: that Paparo was unwilling to be promoted to the rank of cardinal-priest and that he was active and influential in the politics of Rome.

However, it cannot be accepted that Paparo was as notorious a cardinal as John alleges. Bernard of Clairvaux had words of high praise for Paparo in the very same letter in which he attacked Jordan of St Susanna:

Non sic dominus Ioannes Paperous, non sic: cuius laus est in Ecclesia, quippe honorificantis ubique ministerium suum.\(^{127}\)

It is difficult to believe that Bernard would praise in such clear terms a cardinal who was as notorious as John suggests.

vi: John and the negotiatores

Why did John attack Paparo? The real nub of John's criticisms is that Paparo was, like Octavian and Gregory, a negotiator\(^ {128} \) - a politician or man of business - at the papal curia. Like Octavian he belonged to a leading Roman family; both men were, John tells us, nobilis.\(^ {129} \) It is reasonable to suggest that he was intimately involved in curial politics, the promotion of family interests and in the politics of the city of Rome. If John's account of the Vermandois case is correct, then Paparo was certainly an influential force within the curia. Cardinals like John Paparo, Octavian of St Cecilia, Gregory of St Angelo and Cencius were professional politicians with considerable

\(^{127}\) PL 182 ep 290 col 496 C.

\(^{128}\) The term which is used to describe Gregory of St Angelo in LL ep 307 p 748.

\(^{129}\) Zenker p 79; HP 36 p 71 (Paparo: 'quia nobilis erat'); HP 38 p 75 (Octavian is contrasted with Jordan of St Susanna: 'genere nobilior').
influence at the curia. The successful outcome of major cases could sometimes depend on having the backing of such negotiatores. Their influence and activities showed quite blatantly the absurdity of appealing to the church of Rome, as 'the fountain of justice'. John's attacks on this group of cardinals is essentially an attack on negotiatores. Three of the cardinals form a definite sub-group: Paparo, Gregory and Octavian seem to have been recruited into the curia in the late 1130s. From 1138 Paparo is mentioned as a sub-deacon in the Roman church; in 1143 he became cardinal-deacon of St Adrian. Gregory first subscribed as cardinal-deacon of St Angelo on 30 December 1143. Octavian was sub-deacon and rector in Benevento in 1137; the following year he was appointed cardinal-deacon of St Nicholas in carcere Tulliano. Besides entering the curia about the same time, it is striking that they were what we might term 'long-term deacons'. Paparo and Octavian were promoted to the priesthood in 1151, while Gregory was never promoted. In this context Paparo's unwillingness to be promoted to the rank of cardinal-priest becomes more interesting. As a cardinal-deacon, Paparo already had considerable political influence. Evidently he saw no advantage to himself in being promoted.

John's hostility to the negotiatores was vehement. In taking up this attitude he was being far more extreme than Bernard of Clairvaux, who at least saw Paparo as a laudable, exemplary cardinal. John's intense hostility must have grown out of his experience of bringing cases to the curia and frequently encountering the power of the politician-cardinals.

---

130 For John Paparo's career see n 123 above.
131 For Gregory's career see n 110 above.
132 See n 88 above.
Apart from letters addressed to popes Adrian IV and Alexander III, only three of the Early Letters are addressed to persons in the papal curia: Roland Bandinelli before he was elected pope Alexander III; John of Sutri, cardinal-priest of SS John and Paul; and Boso the papal chamberlain. These are business letters written during the spring of 1156 in the name of Theobald and they concern the efforts to improve the strained relations which had developed between Rome and Canterbury the previous winter. These do not throw light on John's personal contacts with the papacy, and although they come from the collection of John's letters we cannot be certain whether he actually drafted them. For John spent three months with Adrian in the winter 1155-56 and we do not know when precisely he returned to England, although it must have been before July 1156.

However the three letters are worth considering for they provide some clue to the relations which existed between Theobald's circle and particular cardinals. What is distinctive about these recipients is that they were all recruited by Eugenius about 1148.

It seems that Roland's earliest connection with the papacy was in the autumn of 1148 when Eugenius stayed in Pisa. According to the Liber pontificalis:

133 For John's letters to Adrian IV see pp 185-6 above. The letters to Alexander III as pope are epp 131-2.
134 EL epp 9-11.
135 See chap 5:3 pp 235-40 below.
136 The three letters can be dated no more precisely than spring 1156. For John's return see: EL Appendix 2. John returned to England before July for he wrote in his own name to William bishop of Norwich about the scutage for Henry II's campaign against his brother Geoffrey. The campaign lasted from c. February to c. July (see EL p 21 introductory note).
When he was a clerk of outstanding reputation in Pisa and was held in high regard by everyone, he was called to the Roman church by pope Eugenius.  

It has been suggested by Pacaut that Roland may at first have been a canon and subdeacon of the Lateran. The earliest evidence for Roland as a cardinal comes in late 1150 when he witnessed papal letters as cardinal-deacon of SS Cosmas and Damian. The following year he was promoted to the rank of cardinal-priest. His rapid promotion and the suggestion that he was 'called' by Eugenius places him among the 'new men' whom Eugenius drafted into the Sacred College.

For this period it is extremely difficult to build up a complete picture of the policies and pressures that influenced the appointment of cardinals. To do that we would need to know the background of all or most of the cardinals, and in particular whether they had previously worked - as clerks, legal advisers, chaplains and so on - in the papal curia or in the households of cardinals. In the absence of such evidence we must use the appointments of cardinal-bishops and cardinal-priests as a rough guide. In her lists of cardinals whom the different popes recruited Zenker has included the names of cardinal-deacons. However the cardinal-deacons cannot be included in any survey of how many newcomers recruited, for, as the lowest rank in the sacred College they were all by definition 'newcomers'. The appointment of cardinal-bishops and cardinal-priests shows clearly

137 Zenker p 86 n 209; Liber pontificalis 2 p 397/9-11. For Roland's career before entering the curia, see J. T. Noonan 'Who was Rolandus?' in R. Somerville and K. Pennington ed, Law, church and society pp 21-48.

138 Alexander III p 77.

139 23 October 1150 (JL 9405) - 17 December (JL 9426).

140 pp 196-7.
that Eugenius III was actively recruiting 'newcomers': of the fifteen appointments he made, all but five were 'newcomers',\(^{141}\) that is persons who were drawn from outside the Sacred College or whom Eugenius himself had appointed as cardinal-deacons. The pattern was not unusual for the twelfth century. Innocent II had been forced by circumstances of schism to recruit a large number of 'newcomers' from the early years of his pontificate.\(^{142}\) But the pattern of Eugenius' appointments differed sharply from that of Adrian IV; of the ten cardinal-priests and cardinal-bishops whom Adrian appointed only four were 'newcomers'.\(^{143}\)

John of Sutri\(^{144}\) seems also to have been one of the outsiders recruited by Eugenius. Like Roland he had a reputation for learning; he was *vir admodum litteratus* according to William of Tyre.\(^{145}\) Between May 1149 and April 1151 he became cardinal-priest. There is no evidence that he had been a cardinal-deacon before this.

\(^{141}\) The ten 'newcomers' whom Eugenius appointed were: the cardinal-bishops Hugh of Ostia and Nicholas (Breakspear) of Albano, and the cardinal-priests Roland of St Mark, John (de Morrone) of SS Martin and Silvester, Henry of SS Nereus and Achilleus, Guy (Puella) of St Pudentiana, Bernard of St Clement, Cencius of St Laurence in Lucina, Gerard of St Stephen in Celio Monte and John (of Sutri) of SS John and Paul. The five 'insiders' were: Guy (of Pisa) cardinal-bishop of Ostia, and the priests Octavian of St Cecilia, John (of Naples) of St Laurence in Damaso, Astaldus of SS Prisca and Aquila, Jordan of St Susanna.

\(^{142}\) All of Innocent's appointees to the rank of cardinal-bishop were 'newcomers'. Of the 30 cardinal-priests whom he appointed, 25 were 'newcomers', 5 had been cardinal-deacons before 1130. There is a bias in these figures; they exaggerate the extent to which Innocent recruited 'newcomers'. For Innocent had a long pontificate (1130-1143) and therefore in his final years, as the supply of pre-1130 deacons shrank, all his appointees were 'newcomers' as we define them (i.e. recruited from outside the Sacred College or recruited from among the cardinal-deacons appointed by the same pope).

\(^{143}\) The four 'newcomers' whom Adrian appointed were: the cardinal-bishop Walter of Albano and the cardinal-priests Bonadies of St Chrysogonus, Hubald of St Laurence in Lucina, and Albert of St Laurence in Lucina. The six 'insiders' were: the cardinal-bishops Bernard of Porto and Julius of Palestrina, and the cardinal-priests Guy (of Crema) of St Mary in Trastavere, John (of Naples) of...
The letters to Roland and to John of Sutri give us some idea of
the attitudes which Theobald's circle had towards the two cardinals.
The arenga of Theobald's letter to Roland must be viewed as
rhetorical:

It is impossible for me to repay my debt of gratitude in
full, but I thank your paternity as best I can for the
honours and benefits (pro honoris et beneficiis) which you
have always conferred on me.\textsuperscript{146}

This is an example of the topos of indebtedness, which is a frequent
feature of twelfth-century letter-writing and which is repeated almost
word for word in the arenga of ep 21 from Theobald to Adrian IV in
late 1156.\textsuperscript{147} But the rest of the arenga indicates a real debt of
gratitude:

You alone among many, to whom my devotion was once known,
have been at pains in the letters which you have sent me
by hand of my messengers to give me both consolation and
instruction (consolatione curastis instruere).\textsuperscript{148}

What distinguished this from mere rhetoric is that Theobald specifies
the assistance which he received from Roland: letters of consolation.

The letter to John of Sutri gives no clue to a friendly
relationship with Canterbury. If there had been a close relationship
between John of Sutri and Theobald or his personnel, then Theobald
would certainly have exploited the language of friendship or service

\textsuperscript{143}(continued)
St Anastasia, Hildebrand Crassus of Twelve Apostles, and William of
St Peter ad Vincula.

\textsuperscript{144} Zenker pp 137-9.

\textsuperscript{145} PL 201 col 741.

\textsuperscript{146} EL p 15.

\textsuperscript{147} Noted by Brooke, ep 9 n 2; ep 21 n 2.

\textsuperscript{148} EL p 15.
or indebtedness. The letter simply indicates that John of Sutri was one of the few cardinals whom Theobald felt that he might be able to trust during the period 1155-56 when relations between Rome and Canterbury were at low ebb:

Let this my petition be furthered by your hands, for there are certain persons who have given an indifferent welcome to the letters carried by my messengers. 149

The third cardinal to whom Theobald wrote in the spring of 1156 was Boso the papal chamberlain. 150 Boso's involvement in the curia went back as far as 1135, when he was one of the clerks who attended Guy of Pisa cardinal of SS Cosmas and Damian on his mission to Spain in 1143. 151 By 1148 Boso was one of the clerks of the pope and went to Spain to summon clergy to the Council of Rheims. 152 It was only after the death of Guy of Pisa in 1149 that Boso entered the highest levels of administration. From 6 November 1149 to 3 May 1152 he is recorded as acting as chancellor - in succession to Guy who had been chancellor 1146-49 - and carried the title of scriptor. 153 When Nicholas Breakspear was elected pope in 1154 he appointed Boso as camerarius a post which placed him next in importance to the chancellor. 154 But he entered the Sacred College only in 1156 and is recorded as having the title of cardinal-deacon of SS Cosmas and Damian from January 1157. 155 Boso's long career as clerk attached to

149 EL p 17.
150 Zenker pp 149-52.
151 ibid p 149.
152 ibid p 150.
153 JL 9359 - JL 9570; Zenker p 150.
154 Zenker p 150.
155 JL 10240 (4 January 1157).
the household of Guy of Pisa and as an administrator to Eugenius, coupled with his rapid promotion by Adrian IV, place him quite clearly as a person who was 'inside' the papal curia. Nevertheless as an administrator and as a person who was not even a cardinal when Theobald wrote to him in 1156, Boso stands apart from the group of cardinal-deacons whom John detested.

Boso's connection with the church of Canterbury goes back to 1144-45 according to John in a letter written in 1173-4 to Boso, then cardinal-priest of St Pudentiana:

You have, dear father, from the days of Pope Lucius, always shown friendship (dilectio vestra) to the people of Canterbury. 156

In 1156 the connection between Theobald and Boso was one of amicitia, for Theobald wrote:

... because it is right that friends (amici) should unbosom themselves to each other, I will briefly disclose to you what it is that torments my soul ... 157

This is in sharp contrast to the letters to Roland and to John of Sutri which make no mention of amicitia.

4: THE BECKET DISPUTE

With the death of Adrian IV in 1159, Canterbury lost its most important link in the papacy, as John indicates in ep 136, written in early 1164. Speaking about Alexander III's attitude to the dispute between Becket and St Augustine's, John comments:

Indeed the pope has always been against us in this affair, and has not ceased to regret what was done for us by Adrian, who cared for the church of Canterbury

156 LL ep 315 p 775; see the refs cited there by Brooke.
157 EL p 18.
Adrian's death was a particularly serious blow for Canterbury, since it appears from the Later Letters and from the Becket correspondence that the Becket circle had few contacts high up the papacy. Among the 44 letters from Becket to 18 curiales (cardinals and two administrators, Master Gratian and Vivian), there is evidence for Becket having strong support from only eight. There are only three extant letters from John to members of the papal curia during the Becket dispute: ep 229 to William of Pavia, cardinal-priest of St Peter ad Vincula; ep 234 to Albert, the papal chancellor and cardinal-priest of St Laurence in Lucina; and ep 235 to Walter cardinal-bishop of Albano. These are discussed in the context of the Becket dispute in a later chapter, where it is suggested that John had no previous close contacts with William or Albert, and that his links with Walter were tenuous.

5: CONTACTS AFTER THE BECKET DISPUTE

In the period after Becket's murder John's correspondence with the papal curia is represented by the survival of five letters: one to Alexander III, three letters to cardinals and a letter to Gratian, the papal notary. These letters written in 1173-4 provide a

158 LL p 8.
159 See chap 8 pp 282-3 and Table 6 below.
160 For two letters, now lost, to Henry of Pisa, cardinal priest of SS Nereus and Achilleus and to William of Pavia, see LL ep 136 p 9.
161 See chap 8 pp 412-22 below.
162 ep 313.
163 epp 315-7.
164 ep 318.
vivid picture of the difficulties surrounding the election of Richard of Dover as archbishop of Canterbury and the election of Richard of Ilchester as bishop of Winchester. In the case of the election to Canterbury, which was being challenged by the young king Henry, John in conjunction with the monks of Christ Church Canterbury and with Bartholomew of Exeter, campaigned to prove that Richard of Dover was an exemplary candidate and had the support of the monks of Canterbury and of the bishops of the province of Canterbury. John wrote three letters in support of Richard of Dover, one to Alexander III, one to Boso, and another to William archbishop of Sens.

In the case of the Winchester election we see the same parties at work: the monks of Christ Church, Bartholomew and John. John's three letters to cardinals and the letter to Gratian, the papal notary, belong to the campaign in support of Richard of Ilchester's election. This degree of co-operation in support given to the candidature of a royal clerk who had been one of the king's chief advisers throughout the Becket dispute and who had been regarded with extreme hostility by the Becket circle, is the strong evidence of the

165 epp 313-5.
166 See ep 311.
167 See ep 312.
168 Thus the monks of Christ Church: '... zelus Christi succensus in corde eius ...' (p 762). Bartholomew: 'cui vita ad conscientiam et exemplum, litterarum eruditio ad formam vitae et ad doctrinam suffragatur' (p 766).
169 LL pp 762, 766 (ep 312), 768-70 (ep 313).
170 epp 313-5.
171 ep 320.
172 ep 319.
desire within the English church to 'restore harmony',\textsuperscript{173} between regnum and sacerdotium. John's assertions that Richard was 'devotissimus ecclesiae Romanae filius',\textsuperscript{174} and 'homo devotus ... apostolicae sedi',\textsuperscript{175} would have seemed unimaginable to the Becket circle during the years of conflict.

While the five letters written by John to the curia in 1173-4 do reveal something of the conditions facing the English church and while they also indicate the increased involvement which the papacy and its legates had in the confirmation of episcopal elections in these years,\textsuperscript{176} they provide us with limited evidence of John's contacts at the papal curia. Ep 315 written to cardinal Boso underlines the long-standing friendship which existed between Boso and Canterbury:

\begin{quote}
Familiaritas, quam a diebus domini Lucii Cantuariensisbus diletio vestra semper exhibit ...
\end{quote}

In ep 316 John addresses the cardinal-legates Albert of St Laurence in Lucina and Theodwin of St Vitale. John had already been in contact with Albert in the Becket dispute.\textsuperscript{178} The salutatio in this letter indicates the contact which John already had with the two cardinals:

\begin{quote}
... I(ohannes) de Saresberia, sanctitatis eorum servus, salutem et promptae devotionis et reverentiae famulatum.
\end{quote}

By describing himself as the servus of the cardinals and by offering

\begin{enumerate}
\item[173] See Warren, Henry II chap 14 'The restoration of harmony'.
\item[174] LL p 776.
\item[175] ibid p 780.
\item[176] Cf ep 321 (Bartholomew of Exeter to Alexander III in support of Robert Foliot's election to the see of Hereford).
\item[177] LL p 774 (my italicisation).
\item[178] See chap 8 pp 412-9 below.
\end{enumerate}
without comment or elaboration his service, John indicates that the preliminaries of establishing a relationship had already been carried out on an earlier occasion. This is confirmed in the captatio benevolentiae where John does not resort to the Ver~eor ... nisi topos ('I would be afraid to approach you but for your kindness' etc).

In ep 317 the absence of any reference to John being a servus or being bound to Humbald, \(^{179}\) suggests that no relationship had been established between the two. In this letter John makes no attempt to build up a relationship, for the letter is a once-off effort written with only one object, to gain support for the candidature of Richard of Ilchester.

John had already been on good terms with Gratian, the papal notary, during the Becket dispute and may even have known him from c.1150. \(^{180}\) From ep 318 it is clear that John and the papal notary Gratian had established some kind of friendship. For in recommending Richard, John undertakes the role of establishing a familiaritas between Gratian and Richard:

\[ ... cuius familiaritas honoris vestro valeat inservire. Et quidem desiderat ut sedulitas eius vobis officiosa possit esse in aliquo, magnique censebit instar munus, si ei quicquam iniungere voluerit dilectio vestra. \]

The evidence of the letters from the years 1173-4 shows John not building up new contacts - though he does write to Humbald with whom he seems to have had no previous connections - but relying on old ones.

---

\(^{179}\) For Humbald's career: Zenker pp 22-5.

\(^{180}\) See ep LL 289 p 650, and pp 191-3 above.

\(^{181}\) LL p 780.
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CHAPTER 5: CANTERBURY AND ROME c.1154-1161

1: INTRODUCTION

The aims of this chapter are to assess relations between Canterbury and Rome during the years c.1154-1161 and to assess John of Salisbury’s activities as a person linking the household of archbishop Theobald with the papal curia. The years covered, c.1154-1161, are those in which John was a leading member of Theobald’s household and for which we have the detailed evidence of John’s Early Letters. The chapter concentrates mainly on the system of appeals to Rome which was developing in England during Theobald’s pontificate (1139-61). The use of appeals as a normal procedure in ecclesiastical suits may have been introduced into England by Henry of Winchester during his legation of 1139-1143, but it was Theobald as metropolitan and as legate (from 1150 onwards) who was most intimately involved in

1 For the dates of this collection see EL pp lii-lix, LL p x n 5.


For the development of the judge-delegate system in twelfth-century England see A. Morey, Bartholomew of Exeter, bishop and canonist (Cambridge 1937) pp 44-78; M. G. Cheney, Roger bishop of Worcester 1164-1179 (Oxford 1980) chap. 4. Other aspects of the spread of canon law are dealt with by G. Barracough in EHR 53 (1938) 492-5 (review article of S. Kuttner Repertorium der Kanonistik, 1140-1234, Studi e Testi 71; Vatican 1937); S. Kuttner and E. Rathbone ‘Anglo-Norman canonists of the twelfth century: An introductory study’, Traditio 7 (1949-51) 279-58; introduction to W. Holtzmann and E. W. Kemp eds Papal decretales relating to the diocese of Lincoln in the twelfth century, Lincoln Record Society 47 (1954); C. Duggan, Twelfth-century (Footnote continued)
developing links with the papal curia and in operating the appeals system.

The relationship between the English church and Rome is of interest in a wider context because from the 1120s onwards the papacy was strengthening its jurisdiction over other churches, and the papal curia was growing in importance as a court of first instance and appeal in ecclesiastical cases. The main lines of this development are well-known but there are numbers of questions which require more detailed analysis. For instance: how consistently and in what ways did the papacy try to strengthen its jurisdiction? What were the reactions of metropolitans and bishops? To what extent did they welcome these changes and to what extent did they resist them, or at least remain ambivalent towards them? Satisfactory answers to these questions would need to be based on detailed case-studies of particular metropolitans, provinces and bishops as well as on studies of the papal curia itself. One corner of this theme can be explored through the sources for Theobald’s pontificate.

The collection of John of Salisbury’s early letters is an unique and important source for the study of the appeals system for it contains the largest dossier on appeals which we have for any diocese or province of the mid-twelfth century. In the collection are 43
decretal collections and their importance in English history (London 1963).


reports of appeals made to the papal curia and references to another six appeals. It has been suggested by C. N. L. Brooke that without this collection one would be unable to amass even a dozen examples of appeals from England to the papal curia for the years 1154-61. Between the 43 reports of appeals and the six references to appeals in the Early Letters, and the evidence of six more appeals which Brooke has noted from the Papsturkunden in England, we know of 55 appeals in which Theobald’s court was in some way involved. There is unfortunately no way of establishing what proportion this represents of all the appeals dealt with by Theobald and his court. It is clear from the Early Letters that the procedures for appealing to Rome were well known and that litigants were well able to take advantage of the system. Nevertheless the system of appeals was still evolving and there were occasions when Theobald had to admit uncertainty about points of procedure.

2: JOHN, CANTERBURY AND ROME

During the later years (c.1154-1161) of Theobald’s pontificate John of Salisbury was clearly a key-figure in relations between Canterbury and Rome. While he probably had very few contacts within the papal

5 See Brooke intro EL p xxxii.
6 For the 43 reports see pp 240-52 below; for the other 6 appeals see EL ep 7, 8-12 (St. Augustine’s against Theobald), 14, 46, 47, 86.
7 EL p xxxii n 1.
8 ibid; references to Papsturkunden in England, ed W. Holtzmann, 3 vols, Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen (1930-1, 1935-6, 1952) vol 1 nos 60-61, 84, 90, 96, 100.
9 See EL p xxxii n 1.
10 See for example the cases described in sect 4 pp 240-52 below.
11 e.g. ep 84 p 132 on the legality of a third appeal.
curia, nevertheless he was a close friend of Adrian IV and it is evident from the Early Letters that he was able to use his close friendship with Adrian to obtain favours for his own friends. The real advantage of this friendship was that it enabled John to bring his own requests, and presumably those of Canterbury, to the very top and to evade the whole system of patronage and lobbying operated by the 'negotiatores' - officials and cardinals with political influence at the curia.

After his three-month stay at Benevento in 1155-6, John may have made further visits to the papal curia. If so, these could have occurred only between early 1158 and mid-1159, the one period in the years 1156-61 to which no dateable letters can be assigned. However John's importance as a link between Canterbury and Rome lay not in the visits which he made to the papal curia but in the special responsibility which he evidently had for cases being appealed to Rome. That John had responsibility for appeals and for matters relating to the curia is suggested by the fact that 43 of the 136 letters from the early collection deal with appeals and 59 are addressed to the pope. It is unlikely that John's responsibility was exclusively for matters of papal interest. He was evidently a dictator, dictating the precise wording of letters sent out in

---

12 See chap 4 passim, see esp pp 195.
13 See chap 4:1 above.
14 For John's hostility to negotiatores see chap 4 pp 214-5 above.
15 See Brooke's comments EL Appendix I p 256. See also ibid p 275 (Index: 'Dates of the letters').
16 See Brooke's comments EL pp xxix-xxx.
17 See sect 4 pp 240-52 below. EL has 135 letters, but no. 99 is in fact two separate letters (see LL p xv corrigendum to LL p 156).
18 See EL p 282 (Index: 'Recipients of the letters').
Theobald’s name. We cannot assess what proportion of Theobald’s letters John was responsible for dictating, but as a skilled rhetorician he would have been given responsibility for letters addressed to distinguished persons and for letters which involved tricky points of law. For some letters he may have received very full instructions from Theobald.

As John was one of the key figures in relations between Canterbury and Rome, did he also play a critical role in shaping Theobald’s policies towards the papacy? R. W. Southern has argued that when John returned from the curia in early 1156, he had instructions from Adrian IV to bring Canterbury more firmly under the ambit of papal control. If John was given such a task was he successful in redirecting Canterbury policy?

When John returned to England in early 1156 he was certainly imbued with Adrian’s enthusiasm for strengthening papal jurisdiction.

---

19 The word could also carry more specific meanings: a teacher of rhetoric, a professional scribe (particularly a layman); see J. J. Murphy Rhetoric in the Middle Ages (Berkeley, U.S.A. - London 1974), pp 213, 219 and passim. The activities and the officials of episcopal chanceries are discussed with particular reference to Canterbury in C. R. Cheney, English bishops’ chanceries 1100-1250 (Manchester 1950) chap II; John’s role in the chancery at Canterbury is discussed ibid p 24.

20 For the range of distinguished recipients note EL p 282 (‘Recipient of the letters’).

21 Brooke remarks (EL p xx) ‘John of Salisbury, most emphatically, was not a jurist. Legal subtleties had no appeal for him.’ Neither of John’s collections contains any letter giving detailed legal advice of the sort that Gilbert Foliot was inclined to give (e.g. GFL no 110). Nevertheless John was well acquainted with civil and canon law (see EL pp xxii-xxiii), and several of the early letters are concerned with clarifying points of law (e.g. ep 99, which is in fact two letters, see corrigenda LL p xv).

22 This is difficult to assess. See EL p xxxviii and D. Knowles in Tablet 206 (24 December 1955) p 634 for differing interpretations of the role which John played in drafting Theobald’s final letters.

23 Medieval humanism and other studies (Oxford 1970), pp 247-8. Southern states that John as Adrian’s ‘friend and agent in England (Footnote continued)
and defending ecclesiastical liberties against lay intrusion. During his stay at Benevento in the winter of 1155-6 John was on very close terms with Adrian IV, and by his own account, obtained from Adrian the grant of Ireland to Henry II. A few months after his return from the curia John incurred the king’s anger, apparently for encouraging appeals to Rome and for actively defending the freedom of ecclesiastical elections and the church’s right to jurisdiction in causis ecclesiasticis. However it would be misleading to think of John as an agent of the papacy. He did not simply transmit papal policies to Canterbury. John was by inclination a critic of institutions and the men who ran them. He was just as critical of papal curiales as he was of the curiales of the king. On the matter of appeals and papal jurisdiction John was independent and critical in his views. A hint of this is to be found in the Historia pontificalis where there is an illuminating difference between John’s treatment of William king of Sicily and Geoffrey of Anjou. William receives severe criticism: acting more tyrannorum he reduced the church in his kingdom to slavery, and instead of allowing any freedom of election named in advance the candidate to be elected, so disposing of all ecclesiastical offices like palace appointments.

A little later John adds that ‘As an added injury, the king would

---

23 (continued)
pressed the papal claims’, p 248.

24 See chap 4:1 above.

25 See Met 4:42 p 218/2-5.

26 ep 19 p 32.

27 For candid criticism of the papal curia and for Adrian IV’s response see Pol 6:24 (Webb ed 2 pp 67-73). For John’s hostility towards the negotiatores, see chap 4 pp 214-5 above.

28 HP 32 p 65.
suffer no papal legate to enter his territory', but he makes no
comment on the matter.

In describing Geoffrey of Anjou's refusal to allow papal legates
to enter his land, John is quite sanguine and feels no need to condemn
or deplore Geoffrey's actions. He simply states:

he [Geoffrey] knew that he had aroused the enmity of the
Roman church by refusing to allow either the pope himself
or any legate to enter his lands. 30

These accounts of William of Sicily and of Geoffrey of Anjou
suggest that John placed a higher priority on freedom of elections
than on the right of the papacy to send legates into different
kingdoms. It might be argued that John's failure to condemn Geoffrey
is not significant, firstly because the comments are made in passing
in a chapter in which John was explaining why Geoffrey had refused to
accept king Stephen's terms for arbitration at the papal curia;
secondly because Geoffrey was highly regarded by contemporary
churchmen as a defender of churches and as a strong ruler, qualities
which were considered to outweigh his failings; 31 and thirdly because
John and the Canterbury circle were always anxious to emphasise their
loyalty to the Angevins. 32 While these points carry some weight,
nevertheless John's unperturbed description of Geoffrey suggests that
he was no doctrinaire exponent of papal authority over rulers or over
local churches.

29 ibid p 66.
30 HP 17 p 44.
31 For Geoffrey's relationship with the church see Josephe
Chartrou, L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151: Foulque de Jerusalem et Geoffroi
Plantegenet (Paris 1928) pp 199-201; for a wider discussion of the
church in Anjou see ibid chap 6.
32 For the relationship between Canterbury and the Angevins, see
passim chap 3 pp 162-9 above.
That John was independent and sharply critical in his attitude to the appeals system is brought out clearly in ep 51 which John wrote to Adrian sometime after late 1158. In this letter John recommends the case of the bearer, William, who had twice been dragged to the papal curia by a malicious adversary. John asserts that by a new form of tergiversatio the adversary:


teaches our people to appeal to the pope and to the king or queen alike, in order that on account of the reverence in which you are held he may escape the hands of bishops and kindle the indignation of the king or queen to crush the innocent.

It is worth noticing the seriousness of John's assertion: that malicious appeals can undermine the authority of bishops.

John says of the adversary:

fautor curiae, persecutor ecclesiae, suffragio saecul'rium potestatum catholicae unitatis robur nititur enervare.

The suggestion that the 'adversary' is trying to undermine 'catholic unity' is meaningless. No litigant appealing to the papal curia posed a real threat to the unity of the universal church. So why did John use the phrase? There are two compatible answers. First John wished to emphasise his strong disapproval of the 'adversary's' tactic of appealing to the papal curia, while at the same time not casting any doubt on the pope's right to deal with such appeals. Secondly by mentioning the threat to 'catholic unity' he wished to

33 The letter refers to litigants appealing to the king and queen. The two periods when Queen Eleanor was in England acting as regent were late 1158 and 31 Dec 1159 - September 1160; see Eyton Itinerary pp 40-3, 49-51.
34 EL p 89: 'ad sedem apostolicam adversarii sui malitia trahitur'.
35 ibid
36 ibid
suggest that appeals of this type could put a strain on relations between the papacy and local churches.

It is certainly true that the papacy itself was aware that the appeals system could be abused. In the Early Letters we see the emergence of delegation *appellatione remota*, that is the procedure by which the papacy removed all right of further appeal in cases which it had delegated to local judges. However in developing this procedure the papacy was not primarily concerned with safeguarding the authority of bishops nor with restricting access to the papal curia; its purpose was simply to make the decisions of judges - delegate binding and effective.

3: **THE CRISIS OF 1155-6**

In the winter of 1155-6, about the same time that John was in Benevento, relations between Theobald and the papacy became very strained. There were two grounds for strain: the success which St Augustine's Canterbury were having in their dispute against Theobald and the question of appeals from the court of Canterbury to Rome.

The first indication of a confrontation over appeals occurs in Adrian's letter *Quanto magis sacrosancta*, issued on 23 January 1156. In this Adrian launched a scathing attack on Theobald, accusing him of conniving with the king to block appeals to Rome and of seeking to 'diminish the power of Peter and the dignity of the apostolic see':

Indeed it has come to our attention that before you and before the king of England an appeal will be blocked

---

37 See Brooke's comments pp xxxiv-xxxv.

38 For the chronology of this dispute see EL Appendix III. Also: Saltman *Theobald* pp 73-5, 150-51.

because there is no-one who dares in your presence or his to appeal to the apostolic see ... Do you seek to diminish the dignity and honour of the apostolic see?

Adrian goes on to accuse Theobald of being 'indifferent and negligent' (tepídus ... ac remissus) in all matters in which justice should be done, and of being so attentive to the king's interests and so frightened by the king that he ignores papal mandates 'to do justice' (consequatur justitiam). The language of the letter is severe and scathing; particularly serious was the implication that Theobald had failed in his duties as a prelate:

You ought to obey God rather than man. For the sake of justice you should not flee from the sharp edges of swords, nor fear the cruelty and onslaught of laymen.

The lengthy attack on Theobald forms an extended arenga, preparing the way for a brief volumus clause, in which Adrian declares that the abbot of St Augustine's, Canterbury, is to make a profession of obedience, only if his predecessors have always done so canonice et legitime. This provides us with a problem of interpretation: when using such severe language against Theobald, did Adrian intend merely to show his disapproval of Theobald's handling of relations with St Augustine's, or was he attacking Theobald's policy on appeals? M. G. Cheney has commented:

This letter was written at the prompting of the monks of St Augustine's, then in dispute with their archbishop ... It illustrates nicely the way in which a prelate might be

40 Historia S. Augustini p 412 upper: Ad notitiam siquidem etc.
41 ibid. The word tepidus was standard in papal reprimands of bishops who had been tardy in executing papal mandates. See for instance M. G. Cheney, Roger, bishop of Worcester 1164-1179 ... (Oxford 1980) p 158.
42 Historia S. Augustini p 412.
43 ibid.
However it is difficult to believe that Adrian would have used such severity of language unless he considered that there were some grounds for the allegations. A few years previously Theobald had acted in a particularly high-handed way, trying to block appeals from Christ Church Canterbury to Rome. In August 1151 the archbishop’s guards had intercepted and imprisoned envoys who had just set out from Christ Church for the papal curia. Commenting on Theobald’s remarkable actions, Saltman has stated:

Although Theobald was noted for his obedience to the apostolic see, he never appeared to recognise the right of the Christ Church monks to appeal to the pope against him.

The curia was evidently displeased with Theobald’s actions on this occasion and he suffered the indignity of having his case judged by one of his suffragans, Henry of Winchester. In the winter of 1155-6 Theobald was subjected to a similar indignity in his dispute with St Augustine as he complained in ep 8 to Adrian:

As for me, I am carried before a tribunal of my suffragans by your mandate, even against my will, whenever they may choose.

The similarities between the Christ Church case (1150-1) and the St Augustine’s case, and the severity of Adrian’s language in Quanto magis sacrosancta, suggest that the curia was becoming impatient of...
Theobald's high handed way of blocking at least some appeals which should have been going to Rome.

From the five letters (epp 8-12) which Theobald sent to the curia in early 1156 it is clear that he had fallen from papal favour and was trying to regain it. The letters resound with protestations of Theobald's loyalty and obedience and of his willingness to suffer imprisonment or even death for the apostolic see. Nevertheless, Theobald made no attempt to deny the allegations which had been made against him. Indeed once we set aside the declarations of loyalty, we see Theobald on the offensive, alleging that he was being misrepresented by enemies at the curia and that he had been unfairly treated by Adrian. The tone is often sharp and reproachful. In ep 8 addressed to Adrian, Theobald asks for more frequent letters from the pope:

so that the postponement of our longing may not seem to indicate (if not to us, at any rate to others) that you scorn our service (servitus) or that your favour (gratia) is withdrawn from us or that you have forgotten an old friendship (veteris amicitia).

That this is not just a rhetorical flourish is indicated by the final section of the letter in which Theobald complains that his opponent, the abbot of St Augustine's, has received numerous letters unfavourable to Theobald, while Theobald has only received one letter

49 ep 8: 'parati semper apostolicis obedire mandatis, sed apostolatus vestri tempore paratissimi' (p 13); ep 9: 'longi laboris et iugis obedientiae praemium' etc (p 16); ep 10: 'michi voluptas erat et gloria meam singulis annis aut saeptius devotionem sedi apostolicae praesentare' (p 17); ep 11: 'Ex quo promutus sum in episcopum sanctae Romanae ecclesiae studui totis viribus inservire' (p 18).

50 ep 8: 'Nos ... a fide ecclesiae, ab obedientiae famulatu, non carcer non gladius, non si qua gravior est persecutio separabit' (p 13 upper).

51 EL p 13.
in his favour and even this was far from satisfactory:

As to the only letter in our favour ... I have not thought fit to show it to anyone - out of my reverence for you and for your honour, which I desire always to be kept untarnished.

Although Theobald's letter resounds with protestations of loyalty to Rome, the sharpness of tone is clear. Not only was Theobald angry at the lack of success which his case was encountering at the curia, but he was also willing to state quite baldly that if necessary he would block or ignore papal letters.

In a letter written several months later in the summer or autumn of 1156 (ep 12) the fulsome declarations of loyalty and the extreme sharpness of tone are absent, suggesting that relations between Canterbury and Rome had improved somewhat. Nevertheless there is still a residue of bitterness:

the monks of St Augustine's are plotting to steal from us the churches that are situated on their lands, and because they have found favour in the eyes of the Roman Church, if you decide that we or our church are to have any safety left to us, do not any longer accept their petitions to our loss.

The question still rankles with Theobald who considers that the appeals system is being abused by persons escaping from justice:

Moreover we would remind you that it is free for all to appeal, which you in a position to realise from the fact that some who fly to you for refuge owe their escape to this sole remedy (hoc solo remedio evaserunt).

Adrian's letter of reproof and Theobald's letters written in his

52 ibid p 15.
53 ibid p 20.
54 ibid p 20.
own defence indicate the gap which existed between Rome's policy and
Canterbury's policy on appeals. Adrian was determined that the right
of appeal to Rome should be upheld and in no way diminished. Theobald
in contrast evidently took the view that as archbishop of Canterbury
and as papal legate he should, when necessary, block cases from being
appealed from his court to the papal curia. Did Canterbury's policy
on appeals change after 1156 and if so did John have any role in
effecting this change?

4: APPEALS AND THE EVASION OF JUSTICE 1156-61

Henry II's concern at litigants appealing to the papal curia in cases
which fell within royal jurisdiction is well known. The cause célèbre
in which Henry reacted angrily against appeals to the papacy was the
Battle case, between Hilary bishop of Chichester and the monks of
Battle abbey. Henry expressed anger at the fact that Hilary had
already preempted the king's judgement by obtaining papal mandates.
The Battle case did not involve a clash between the jurisdictions of
the king and the English church. Henry's anger was directed not at
the English church but at the ease with which litigants could appeal
and evade royal jurisdiction. The possibility that litigants could
frustrate justice by appealing to a different jurisdiction struck at
the authority, effectiveness and profitability of royal justice.

55 L. B. Radford, Thomas of London before his consecration,
Cambridge Historical Essays VII (Cambridge 1894) pp 105 ff; Warren
Henry II pp 429-32. See E. Searle ed and trans The chronicle of
Battle Abbey OMT (Oxford 1980) pp 176-208. The case and its
background is discussed in E. Searle, Lordship and Community: Battle
Abbey and its banlieu 1066-1538, Pontifical Institute of Medieval

56 Searle, Chronicle p 204.

57 See also the case of St Albans, Gesta abbatum monasterii Sancti
Albani ed H. T. Riley (RS 28:4) vol 1 pp 144-5.
But this anxiety about 'escape' was not restricted to the king. Theobald too was anxious to prevent cases escaping from his jurisdiction. The business letters which John preserved from the 1150s provide clear evidence of the concern with which Theobald and his advisers viewed the ability of litigants to appeal to the king or to the pope in order to forestall or frustrate judicial decisions at Canterbury.

The evidence suggests that rather than placing the king on one side and the pope and Canterbury on the other, we should view Canterbury as an independent jurisdiction whose interests were sometimes close to those of king or pope, and sometimes opposed.

Of the 43\textsuperscript{58} early letters dealing with appeals to Rome, 12\textsuperscript{59} contain some reference to litigants exploiting appeals in order to evade justice. This remarkably high proportion requires further investigation.

1) Ep 85: Theobald to the pope; no date,\textsuperscript{60} points a general problem posed by appeals. This is a letter recommending the case of the monks of Tewkesbury against a certain knight who 'is scheming to rob them of

\textsuperscript{58} epp 2-5, 16, 23-4, 29, 45, 48, 50-1, 53-60, 62-6, 68, 71-77, 80-5, 102-3, 113, 131, 132. This includes reports on appeals being made from Canterbury to Rome, letters seeking clarification of a papal mandate (e.g. epp 23-4, 29), a mandate from Theobald as judge-delegate to the archbishop of York, and appeals which do not seem to have come via Canterbury (epp 48, 50-1). Not included are letters reporting matters of punishment, discipline or dispensation which were referred to the pope (e.g. epp 86, 89): nor Theobald's letters (epp 8-12) to the curia in early 1156, although these have references to appeals made by St Augustine against Theobald.

\textsuperscript{59} epp 51, 53, 56, 58, 62-5, 73, 77, 84-5. Not included is ep 59 in which one of the litigants, Ralph of Durham, looks as if he may have appealed in order to escape an unfavourable decision by an independent arbitrator. However there is not enough evidence to be certain, and Theobald gives no hint of disapproval.

\textsuperscript{60} p 133
a church of which they have held undisturbed possession for forty years'. Theobald goes on to assert that this knight like other English laymen uses the claim of advowson to the grave detriment of the church. Such laymen are attracted to the Apostolic See, as if they could bring with them from the place whence all law springs an intolerable harvest of wrongs!

These are enlightening remarks because they are not simply aimed at an individual; they point to a general problem of laymen using appeals in a way which displeased Theobald.

In four of the letters Theobald indicates strong disapproval of the appeal being made to the papal curia.

2) Ep 84: Theobald to the pope; no date. This outlines the background of an appeal to the papal court by William of Sturminster. It is quite clear that William was exploiting the appeals system to its fullest. In the court of the archdeacon of Dorset, when his opponent was about to prove by witnesses that certain parochial dues and tithes had been adjudged and resigned to him, William appealed to Theobald's court. When the case came before Theobald, William was not sufficiently prepared. So Theobald referred it to Jocelin of Salisbury, their diocesan. When Jocelin was about to give judgement in sinodo, William once again appealed to Theobald, and when Theobald was about to give judgement, William then appealed to the pope.

Theobald indicated clear disapproval of the appellant:

William without alleging any hardship (absque ullius gravaminis allegatione) and illegally as it seemed to us, made a third appeal to your most excellent consistory.
3) Ep 63: Theobald to the pope; no date. This summarises information about an appeal which arose from a dispute between two priests, Baldwin and Swein, concerning the church of Childerditch. There is no comment on the case itself, but Theobald does indicate that he was unhappy with the appeal being made to Rome. In Theobald’s court Baldwin had asserted that his reason for appealing to Canterbury was that on the same day that Richard of London had given a judgement favourable to his opponent Swein, there had been two other false judgements from the same court. At this assertion Swein appealed to the papal praesentia. Theobald indicates his disapproval in the observation that Swein’s appeal to Rome was made:

\[\text{cum tamen utrique parati essemus omnem iustitiam exhibere.}\]

4) Ep 65: Theobald to the pope; no date. This letter deals with a dispute over an unnamed church between parties named as G. and R. The letter implies that G. is the better party; he alleges that during the reign of Stephen he was violently expelled from his church by R. and was forced under threat of death to renounce his claim. The strength of G.’s case is implied by the fact that in the court of Theobald, he was ready to produce two priests as witness; whereas R. in contrast relied on the legal skill of his advocates (‘Modo de patronorum peritia confisus, modo ad legum subtilitatem confugiens’). Eventually R. interposed an appeal to the papal curia; and Theobald indicates his sharp disapproval:

When we proceeded to make closer inquiry into the truth of

- p 132.
- p 110.
- p 107.
the matter, in order to elucidate the exact legal position, R. interposed his appeal to which we must defer (cui deferre habemus) ...

5) Ep 64: Theobald to the pope; no date. This letter recommends the case of the bearer, a certain Berengar, who has been appealed by Roger of Pickworth to the holy see. Theobald points out that a long drawn out dispute between the two had been settled in a compact which Theobald had arranged and which had been confirmed by a solemn promise and oath. However Roger did not abide by the compact and was condemned by Theobald to be suspended. Roger however managed to evade punishment by promising to made suitable satisfaction. Later he began to shift his ground and then 'to escape from our hands' (ut manus nostras evaderet) he appealed to Rome.

In four letters Theobald's disapproval of the appeal is implicit:

6) Ep 53: Theobald to the pope; c.1154-c.1159. This provides a good example of how a litigant could use royal mandate and appeals to Rome in order to block the execution of justice. Ralph Mansell in his dispute with Richard, a clerk, regarding the church of Prestbury, managed to obtain a royal mandate of adjournment which he used in the synod at Chester just as his opponent Richard was about to produce his evidence and seven witnesses. Richard appealed to Canterbury and just as he was about to offer his evidence there, Ralph once again stalled proceeding by entering an exceptio which seems far-fetched.

---

64 p 108.
65 p 106.
66 p 91.
He alleged that one of the witnesses was a homicide, robber and false coiner and that another was a murderer. But when Theobald demanded a security from Ralph to ensure that the exceptio was not purely malicious and when he refused to give Ralph the long delay he sought, Ralph appealed to Rome. Theobald makes no comment on the rights of the case, but implies quite clearly that Ralph was unwilling to obtain justice at the court of Canterbury.

7) Ep 56: Theobald to the pope; c.1154-59. This is a well-known letter dealing with the dispute between Master Jordan Fantosme and Master John Joichel. In this dispute Jordan Fantosme was apparently in the right: Theobald states that, reserving the pope's discretion of judgement, he had found Jordan's claim to the Winchester schools to be indisputable. After consulting with the bishops of Chichester, Hereford and Worcester, he gave orders to the bishop of Winchester that Jordan should no longer be harassed by John Joichel and if John persisted in resisting 'your authority and ours' that he should be declared excommunicate. However John Joichel was successfully able to delay the execution of this judgement, for he made an appeal to the papal curia and named a very long term, from early December to the feast of St Michael, that is nine to ten months. Within a few days the two litigants were back in court, Jordan complaining that John had once more seized the schools and had thus incurred the sentence of anathema. John rejoined by denying the charge, refusing to accept a day and by claiming that he was just on the point of departing for Rome.

As in other letters Theobald is careful to avoid expressing an opinion on the final settlement of the case and thus encroaching on
the pope's authority. However it is indicated that John Joichel is
the troublesome party and that so far as the main issue is concerned
he was in the wrong. There is a note of resignation in Theobald's
final sentence: 'Vos autem auctore Deo litigiiis eorum finem debitum
imponetis.'

8) Ep 62: Theobald to the pope; no date. This deals with a
dispute between the monks of Crowland and a certain Halden over the
church of Sutterton and certain tithes. The case had been decided by
Theobald acting on the mandate of 'Pope Eugenius of happy memory' in
favour of the monks and restitution of 15 marks by Halden had been
ordered. Despite this, the monks were unsuccessful in their attempts
to obtain from Halden the restitution of 15 marks. When the monks
brought their case for execution of the restitution before the
diocesan, the bishop of Lincoln, Halden appealed at Canterbury. At
Canterbury he received the original case 'which had long been decided
(causam diu diffinitam)'. When the monks of Crowland reiterated
their claim for the restitution of 15 marks, Halden appealed to the
pope. Theobald's presentation of the case and his comment that it had
been long decided, indicate that he regarded Halden's appeal as
unjustified.

9) Ep 73: Theobald to the pope; no date. This belongs to a file of
letters on the Wakering dispute. Here we see a clear case of
'escape' from ecclesiastical justice. The monks of Prittlewell
connived with a certain Robert to eject Richard of Ambli from the
church of Wakering. A judgement was made in the court of the bishop

68 p 96.
69 p 103 only.
70 cf epp 74-5; GFL no 113.
of London even though Richard of Ambli was never summoned. The case was appealed to Canterbury by Richard’s clerks. When Theobald was about to adjourn the case for further investigation, Richard’s opponent Robert appealed to the apostolic see.

From Theobald’s comments in this letter and the other letters dealing with the case, it seems clear that Robert and the monks of Prittlewell had acted improperly. Robert’s case in the court of the bishop of London was brought not against Richard of Ambli but against the monks of Prittlewell, who were quite willing to lose the case as they wished to remove Richard of Ambli from their church of Wakering. Theobald describes Robert as arriving in the court of Canterbury ‘cum monachis sibi faventibus’. 71 Robert’s probity and the strength of his case was seriously undermined when he produced two documents to back up his claims: one was marked with clear signs of dishonesty (‘manifestae turpitudinis praeditum est’), the other was obviously a forgery (‘alterum falsitatis arguitur’). 72

There are two letters in which Theobald makes no comment at all on the merits of the appeal, but in which, nevertheless, it is clear that one of the parties is exploiting the appeals system to evade justice.

10) Ep 58: Theobald to the pope; no date. This is a case of a litigant obviously in the wrong and blatantly exploiting the appeals system in order to frustrate justice. In this dispute over certain tithes of the church of Wichling, the case of one of the parties, Andrew clerk of Lenham, was particularly strong. Andrew had presented

---

71 EL p 117.
72 ibid.
himself when summoned to appear in Theobald's court, while his opponent, G. priest of Wichling, resorted to frustratory delays: 'tergiversando ad frustratorias dilationes',\(^73\) which had no force in law. G.'s case was further weakened when the lord of the fee, who had been supporting G., withdrew his support. G. then declared that he would not contest the case, but just as Theobald was about to deliver judgement in favour of Andrew, G. changed his mind and appealed to the papal curia. By stating these circumstances, Theobald provides a clear indication to the pope that G.'s case should not receive papal favour. However the letter gives no evidence that Theobald was especially anxious or unhappy about this particular evasion of justice.

11) Ep\(^{77}\): Theobald to the pope; no date. This outlines the background to an appeal by Martin of Waltham, who was in dispute with the monks of Holy Trinity, Aldgate. Martin was another litigant who was adept at exploiting the appeals system to its fullest. The case had dragged out in the court of the bishop of London and had eventually been appealed to Canterbury. Martin succeeded in obtaining several adjournments. Finally when an interlocutory judgement was made in the archbishop's court that Martin's exceptio did not justify an adjournment (dilatio) and that he should be compelled to continue in the suit, Martin appealed to the pope.\(^74\)

Although the letter shows Martin to be the obstructive party determined to use every means to hold on to the tithes of the church of Walthamstow, Theobald makes no comment on whether Martin was justified in appealing.

---

\(^73\) ibid p 99.

\(^74\) ibid p 122.
To these letters we may add a twelfth, John’s letter on appeals. From each of these twelve letters it is clear that the appeals system was being abused, although in only one of the letters (no 1, ep 85) does Theobald refer to the problem of widespread abuses. This group of 12 letters represents a high proportion of the letters in the early collection which deal with appeals to the papal curia: 12 out of 43. In contrast, Gilbert Foliot’s letter collection - the only comparable letter-collection for this period - contains no references to abuses of the appeals system.

If we want to establish whether Canterbury’s policies, or alternatively its attitudes, on appeals changed after 1156 through the activities of John and Adrian, then we must attempt to date the twelve letters.

None of the letters can be given a precise date. Brooke has dated three of them, epp 51, 53 and 56 (i.e. John’s letter on appeals, and nos 6 and 7 above) to Adrian’s pontificate. The other nine letters contain no internal evidence as to date. Another way of trying to get an approximate date for the letters is to look at their location in MS P, the manuscript which contains all the early letters including ones of purely personal interest, and which clearly derives from a private collection made by John himself. MS C, which contains only 75 letters - mainly business rather than private ones, is of no use when trying to date letters by their location in manuscript. The letters in C are arranged more or less in order of

---

75 ep 51 discussed above.

76 For Brooke’s principles of dating see EL pp lii-liv. For the dating of epp 51, 56 see the introductory note to each.

77 Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale MS latin 8625. See EL pp lvii-lviii.

78 MS Cambridge University Library II.2.31. See EL pp lviii-lx.
dignity of the recipient, and no chronological order is discernible.\textsuperscript{79} (For the following discussion reference should be made to Table 3 below. This sets out the letters which occur in MS P, their recipient and date.)

In MS P however there is some semblance of chronological order. Four of the letters which we are considering - epp 58, 85, 73, 62 - occur in quire D of the manuscript.\textsuperscript{80} This was originally the first quire;\textsuperscript{81} it contains 43 letters, of which the 24 dateable ones fall within the years 1156-7. The four letters, therefore, almost certainly belong to these years. In quire A, originally the third quire, occur seven of the letters, epp 51, 53, 56, 63, 64, 65, 84. As noted already, the first three of these have been dated by Brooke to the years of Adrian's pontificate. This quire consists of 47 letters, but should be considered as two separate series. Six of the letters which we are dealing with fall within the first series. Quire A nos 1-22 consists of 22 letters all addressed to the pope. Most of these are reports on appeals. Of these 22 only 3 can be given a date that is accurate to within a year or two: epp 4\textsuperscript{82} (c.1154), 2\textsuperscript{83} (c.1154) and 40\textsuperscript{84} (c. December 1157). The other letters which contain less precise evidence about dating, all fall within the period c.1154-61. As all the dateable letters fall within Adrian's pontificate, a similar date can probably be assigned to the six letters. The seventh

\textsuperscript{79} See EL p lviii, Poole 'Early Correspondence' pp 29-30; Southern, EHR 72 (1957) p 496.
\textsuperscript{80} See EL pp lvii-lviii.
\textsuperscript{81} ibid.
\textsuperscript{82} no 9 in MS. p.
\textsuperscript{83} no 10 in MS. p.
\textsuperscript{84} no 14 in MS. p.
letter from this quire (ep 51, John's letter on appeals) occurs as the third in a sequence of eight letters which can probably be dated to 1156-7 (Quire A nos 27-34). In this sequence the five dateable letters fall within the period from summer 1156 to mid-December 1157 (Quire A nos 27, 30-2, 34). The seventh letter probably belongs to period 1156-7.

In quire C, originally the fourth quire, occurs the last of the letters which we are trying to date: ep 77. This quire of 21 letters contains 9 letters which are dateable to 1159-61, 3 which were composed in late 1157 or later, and one which Brooke dates as 'probably 1155-8'. Since this is a broad range of dates and since ep 77 does not fall within a run of dateable letters, it is not possible to assign a precise date to ep 77.

The attempt to assign dates to the twelve letters which refer to abuses of the appeals system, then, provides tentative results:

probably 1156-7 epp 51, 58, 62, 73.
c. 1154-9 epp 53, 56, 63, 64, 65, 84.
c. 1154-61 ep 77.

It is reasonable to assume that all of these letters were written between c.1154 and 1161, because:

1) no letters can be assigned a probable date of earlier than 1153-4; 85
2) of the 89 letters which can be assigned a date, whether precise or approximate, only 5 can be dated to before 1156; 86

85 See EL p 275 (Index: 'Dates of the letters'). Note Brooke's comments on the dates of the collection ibid pp lii-liv. But note that in LL p xiv (corrigendum to LL p 1) Brooke suggests the possibility that ep 1 may have been written as early as 1152-3. On the dating of letters in EL see also Brooke's comments in LL p x n 5.
86 These figures are based on EL p 275 ('Dates of the letters'). (Footnote continued)
3) It is certain that no letters were composed after 1161. 87

If Southern's thesis is correct, 88 that John returned from the papal curia with instructions to bring Canterbury under greater papal control, and if John had been completely successful in his mission, then we would expect that all or most of the group of 12 letters would have been written before 1156-7. However the broad range of possible dates for these letters will not allow us to make such an assertion. Indeed it seems extremely unlikely, as the bulk of the collection was composed after 1156. If on the other hand, John's supposed mission was not successful and if feeling at Canterbury continued to be hostile to appeals, then we would expect that all or most of the group of 12 letters were written after 1156. While this cannot be proved either, because the range of possible dates is so broad, it is nevertheless the more likely option because the bulk of the letter collection is post-1156.

The expressions of unease in these letters suggest that at Canterbury between 1156 and 1161 there was considerable disquiet at how easily litigants could evade or frustrate justice by appealing to the curia. What cannot be assessed is whether the volume of appeals increased after 1156.

86 (continued)
The five letters pre-1156 are epp 1, 2, 5-7.
87 EL p 275.
88 Southern, Medieval humanism ... pp 247-8.
TABLE 3: The Early Letters in MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale
Lat 8625

The information tabulated here is based on EL Table B (p lxvi) and on the critical apparatus of EL. The table is intended as an aid to the discussions in the preceding pages. For reference it has also been noted whether letters occur in MS C, i.e. Cambridge University Library MS li.2.31 (see EL pp lvii-lxix, and ibid Table C p lxvii).

MS P consists of four quires, ABCD. It has been shown by R. A. B. Mynors (EL pp lvii-lviii) that the original order of the quires was DBAC.

Abbreviations

Adr IV = Adrian IV
archdcn = archdeacon
bp = bishop
CC Cant = Christ Church Canterbury
E = Early
L = Late
P of C = Peter of Celle

(Names of English dioceses have been shortened.)

Quire D - originally first quire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in MS</th>
<th>No. in EL</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>From John?</th>
<th>In MS C?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>L '56</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Monks of Boxley</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Wm bp Norwich</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Master Geoffrey</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>bp Salisbury</td>
<td>?J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1-8 Apr '57</td>
<td>P of C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Jul-Aug '57</td>
<td>P of C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. in MS</td>
<td>No. in EL</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>From MS John?</td>
<td>In C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>L ’57</td>
<td>Henry bp Winch</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>’57 - ’58</td>
<td>”</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>c.’54 - c.’57</td>
<td>?Adr IV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>’57-8</td>
<td>Henry bp Winch</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Spring ’56</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>”</td>
<td>Cardinal Roland Bandinelli</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>”</td>
<td>Cardinal John of Sutri</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>”</td>
<td>Boso</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Summer-Aut ’56</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>c.’54-’59 (?c.’57)</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Aut ’56</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>c.Dec-Jan ’56/7</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>”</td>
<td>”</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>”</td>
<td>Master Ernulf</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>”</td>
<td>Becket</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Aut ’56</td>
<td>member of chapter of Sens</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>”</td>
<td>P of C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>”</td>
<td>Thomas provost of Celle</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Summer ’56</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89 For the evidence from MS d (Durham Cathedral Library MS A.IV.8) that this letter may have been addressed to Boso, see A. Piper 'New evidence for the Becket correspondence and John of Salisbury's letters', World JS pp 439-44.
TABLE 3 (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in MS</th>
<th>No. in EL</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>From John?</th>
<th>In MS C?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>E '57</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>'56</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope 90</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>'56-7</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spr-Summ '56</td>
<td>Wm bp Norwich</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>'54-9 (prob late)</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>abbess of Barking</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quire B - originally second quire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>From John?</th>
<th>In MS C?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>May-Jun '60</td>
<td>Henry II</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>L '56</td>
<td>Becket</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>?57-61</td>
<td>abp of York</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>a friend</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>c. Mar-Apr '60</td>
<td>chapter of Exeter</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Apr '61</td>
<td>Henry II</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90 ibid: according to MS d, addressed to Adrian.
### Table 3 (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in MS</th>
<th>No. in EL</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>From John?</th>
<th>In MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>'52-4</td>
<td>monks of CC Cant</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>before '55?</td>
<td>?Robert Warelwast bp Exeter</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>'58-61</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Richard bp London</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Jun-Jul '60</td>
<td>Ralph of Sarre</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Jul-Aug '59</td>
<td>Ralph of Lisieux</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Henry II</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>May-Jun '60</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64*</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Jun-Jul '60</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64**</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>c.Aug '60</td>
<td>Bps and faithful</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Hilary bp Chichester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>99 &amp; 99a</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Alfred bp Worc bp Lincoln</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>bp Lincoln</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>'59-'61</td>
<td>?archdcn Chester</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quire A - originally third quire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No. in Quire A</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>c.'54 - c.'59</td>
<td>Pope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91 See LL p xv corrigendum to EL p 156.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in MS</th>
<th>No. in EL</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>From John?</th>
<th>In MS C?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>'56-'61</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>c. '54</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>c. '54</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>c.'54 - c.'59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>?'57-8</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>c. Dec '57</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>'54-9</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>c. '54 - c. '59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>'58-9</td>
<td>Alfred bp Worc</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>'56-61</td>
<td>Henry II</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Hugh bp Durham</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>? a bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Summ '56</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>'54-9</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>mid Dec '57</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. in MS</td>
<td>No. in EL</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>From John?</td>
<td>In MS C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>John of Cant</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Roger archdcn Norf</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>c. Nov '57</td>
<td>John of Cant</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>c.'54</td>
<td>All faithful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>c.'55</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>May-Jun '59</td>
<td>monks of Evesham</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>'54-9</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>'59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>'54-9</td>
<td>Adr IV</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>General chapter order of Arrouaise</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>E '60</td>
<td>Henry II</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>'54 - '61</td>
<td>daughter houses of Waverley</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>?'56-7</td>
<td>Hilary of Chich</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>?Walter bp Coventry</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quire C - originally fourth quire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>In MS C?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>'60</td>
<td>Henry II</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>c. Sept '60</td>
<td>Becket</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>before 22 Aug '60</td>
<td>abbess of Amesbury</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>a friend&lt;sup&gt;92&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>before 22 Aug '60</td>
<td>abbess of Amesbury</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Oct '57 or later</td>
<td>P of C</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>92</sup> According to MS d, addressed to 'domino cellensi'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. in MS</th>
<th>No. in EL</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>In MS</th>
<th>John?</th>
<th>C?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>c. Dec '57 or later</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>unknown petitioner</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>c. Sept '60</td>
<td>Becket</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>'60-1</td>
<td>?canons of Plympton</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>'60-1</td>
<td>Bartholomew archdcn of Exeter</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Aut '59</td>
<td>P of C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>?'59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>?Robert bp Linc</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Aut '57 or later</td>
<td>P of C</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>'55-8</td>
<td>?archdcn Winch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>L '60</td>
<td>Alexander III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>?Hilary bp Chich 93</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Oct-Nov '60</td>
<td>Alexander III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>E '61</td>
<td>Bartholomew archdcn of Exeter</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

93  No heading in MS P. The heading in MS C is 'Hylario Cicestrensi episcopo' but the headings of C are full of inaccuracies; see n 125 below.
Throughout his pontificate Theobald worked assiduously to maintain close links between Canterbury and Rome. During the first years of his pontificate Theobald's authority had been overshadowed by Henry of Winchester's activities as papal legate (1139-43), but when Henry's legatine office lapsed with the death of Innocent II in 1143, Theobald acted rapidly to win the favour of Innocent's successor: about Christmas of that year he set out for the papal curia. In the succeeding years successful lobbying at the curia led to Eugenius III granting Theobald primacy in May 1147. In March 1148 Theobald made a dramatic declaration of his loyalty to the papacy by ignoring the commands of king Stephen to remain in England, evading royal officials and escaping to attend the Council of Rheims.

The year 1150 had marked the beginning of a new phase in relations between Canterbury and Rome. For in that year Theobald had been appointed papal legate, an office which he obtained probably after considerable lobbying and on which he evidently placed considerable importance. It is from Theobald's period as papal legate, from 1150 until his death in 1161, that we get evidence of Theobald twice over-reaching himself in blocking appeals: in 1150-1 against Christ Church and in 1155-6 against St Augustine's. These

---

94 For Henry of Winchester's legation see H. Voss, Heinrich von Blois, Bischof von Winchester (1129-71), Historische Studien 210 (Berlin 1932) esp appendices VII, VIIIa, IXh, i, I.

95 See Saltman pp 20-1.

96 PUE 2 no 43, cf no 52.

97 Theobald had been making efforts from as early as 1143 to gain the legateship. See Saltman pp 30-2. According to HP 40, in 1149-50 Henry of Winchester was in the curia plotting either to obtain the pallium or to be granted legatine office (ibid p 78). This suggests that the grant of the legateship had a background of active lobbying from both Canterbury and Winchester. For Theobald's legateship see Councils and Synods 1:2 pp 820-1 and the references cited there.
actions together with the expressions of unease at the appeals system, suggest that in Theobald’s mind, the office of papal legate should have carried greater powers of discretion than were allowed by the papacy.

Concern with the appeals system, however, was not restricted to Canterbury. During the 1160s and 1170s we get two hints that English prelates - particularly those who acted as judges-delegate - were dissatisfied with aspects of the system. Thus at a date probably before the Council of Westminster in May 1175, Roger of Worcester obtained from the pope a ruling that in particular circumstances men who had left their wives for other women, should lose their right of appeal. At the Council of Westminster a proposal was made that in all such cases the right of appeal should be removed. The proposal does not appear to have been accepted - probably because it had no basis in existing canon law - but was referred to the pope who agreed to the proposal in a decretal addressed to the archbishop and his suffragans. In the late 1160s Roger of Worcester tried but without success to obtain a papal ruling restricting appeals in trivial cases. Alexander III’s refusal to restrict such appeals may have been dictated by the circumstances of the Becket dispute, for any restriction might lend support to Henry II’s own attempts to restrict appeals to the papal curia. About twenty years later Gregory VIII in effect reversed Alexander’s decision by issuing a general constitution forbidding appeals on minor issues. It is possible that Roger’s

---

98 Discussed sect 3 pp 235-40 above.
99 Cheney Roger ... of Worcester pp 181-2.
100 ibid p 182.
101 JL 13823.
102 Cheney Roger ... of Worcester pp 175-6.
request, like Alexander’s refusal, was determined by the circumstances of the Becket dispute. About the same time of Roger’s request, Henry was said to have forbidden appeals ‘for the benefit of the poor clerks’. M. G. Cheney has suggested the possibility that Roger was trying to counter this particular criticism of the appeals system. But given Roger’s integrity and independence of character, we can be reasonably sure that he genuinely believed in the case he was making, and that he saw the appeals on trivial cases as a problem which needed to be resolved.

The two references from the 1160s and 1170s dealing with problems of appeals, point to some degree of dissatisfaction with particular aspects of the appeals system. It must have been galling for bishops like Roger of Worcester to find that appeals on trivial matters were sometimes impeding the enforcement of swift and effective justice in their own diocesan courts. And clearly it was unsatisfactory that in some circumstances a person who was manifestly in the wrong could avoid correction by appealing to the papal curia. However it seems likely that in the period 1156-61, Theobald’s disquiet over appeals was more than just an occasional irritation. In the first place the high proportion of letters containing some reference to abuses of the appeals system is remarkable. Secondly, there are the references in Theobald’s letters and in one of John’s letters which carry the implication that easy access to papal appeals was a threat to episcopal authority. In ep 64 Theobald commented that

103 JL 16056; see Cheney Roger ... of Worcester p 176.
104 Cheney ibid p 175.
105 ibid p 175.
106 Note references to Roger’s behaviour in Cheney, Roger pp 20, 23-4, 26-7, 37-44, 47-9; see also Knowles’ comments EC pp 22-3.
a litigant had appealed to the papal curia 'ut manus nostras evaderet', and in ep 5 he asserted that numerous laymen were 'attracted to the Holy See' in the hope of obtaining false judgements. In 1156 Theobald referred testily to the parties who escaped by appealing to the apostolic see ('hoc solo remedio evaserunt'). In ep 51 John asserted that a particular litigant was teaching the English people to appeal to the royal court and to the pope 'ut episcoporum manus effugiat'. Theobald's acute anxieties about the appeals system are understandable for, as metropolitan and as papal legate, he had far more to lose than had any of his fellow English bishops.

Although Theobald was strongly orientated towards the papacy and had a high regard for papal authority, his policy towards appeals and towards the papal curia in general were shaped by three considerations: 1) the interests of Canterbury, and linked with this a tradition of 'near-independence' from Rome; 2) the special relationship which always existed between an archbishop of Canterbury and the king; 3) Theobald's profound commitment to enforcing church discipline.

From Lanfranc's pontificate onwards the protection of Canterbury's interests and the extension of its rights and privileges played an important part in shaping Canterbury's relations with the papacy. Thus one of the recurrent themes in relations between Canterbury and Rome was the question of Canterbury's primacy over York. Successive archbishops from Lanfranc to Thomas Becket sought

107 p 106 (discussed in sect 4 pp 240-52 above).
108 ep 85 p 133 (discussed in sect 4 above).
109 ep 12 p 20.
110 ep 51 p 89 (discussed in sect 4 above).
papal support for the establishment of an effective and permanent primacy over York. Southern has suggested that in the early years of Henry I’s reign Anselm’s representatives at the papal curia placed at least as much importance on the question of primacy as on the question of investitures. Over half a century later, during the early phase of the Becket dispute the question of primacy and the continuing disputes with St Augustine’s emerged as major concerns of the Becket circle.

Archbishops of Canterbury were willing to be loyal to the apostolic see, but in return they expected to benefit in prestige and authority within the English church. In return for their loyalty they sought to win papal support for Canterbury’s primatial claims not just over York but over the whole of the British Isles, and they sought to prevent the appointment of papal legates a latere, seeking instead to have themselves appointed as legates over the English church.


113 For the conflicts with St Augustine’s see LL ep 136 pp 8-11. For the primacy: ibid p 218, and Councils and Synods 1:2 pp 846, 848, 873 n4.

114 There is still a need for a detailed study of Canterbury’s primatial claims over the churches of Britain and Ireland. Brief accounts are provided by Southern, Anselm and his biographer pp 132-42; and R. Foreville, 'Royaumes, métropolitains et conciles provinciaux: France, Grand-Bretagne, Peninsule ibérique', Le istituzioni ecclesiastiche della 'societas christiana' dei secoli XI-XII: Papato, cardinalato ed episcopato ... (Milan 1974) pp 272-315, esp pp 284-91; Barlow, The English church pp 40-44. The claims over the Welsh church have been explored in detail: M. Richter, 'Professions of obedience and the metropolitan claim of St Davids', (Footnote continued)
The emphasis given to Canterbury interests made Canterbury regard itself as almost independent in its relations with the papacy. Z. N. Brooke argued that the popes 'had always expected something more from England than the normal obedience which they claimed from the Church as a whole'.\(^{116}\) The English church, and particularly Canterbury owed its foundation and organisation to the Roman church; and Rome was always willing to remind the English church of the special debt it owed the apostolic see. At Canterbury, however, the relationship between the archbishop and the pope was presented in a very different light. There was a tradition that the archbishop was the 'apostle and patriarch' of the alter orbis, that is he had jurisdiction over the churches of England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland.\(^{117}\) Thus Eadmer has pope Urban II greet Anselm as a near equal:

\[\text{et quasi comparem velut alterius orbis apostolicum et patriarcham iure venerandum censeamus.}\]

Here Eadmer was not just showing that Canterbury was loyal to Rome or that Anselm was highly regarded at Rome. He was emphasising that the papacy was fully aware of the importance, prestige and independence of the see. The notion that the archbishop of Canterbury was alterius

\(^{114}\) (continued)


\(^{116}\) The English church and the papacy p 177; see discussion ibid pp 177-9.

\(^{117}\) See Southern, Anselm and his biographer p 129.

orbis apostolicus et patriarcha was not as far-fetched as it may seem, for Canterbury could claim to be the most ancient and most distinguished metropolitan see within the British Isles. The most practicable and most vigorously pursued part of Canterbury’s primatial claims was the attempt to assert primacy over York. If the archbishops of Canterbury had succeeded in achieving this they would have had at least nominal leadership over one of the largest and most prestigious ecclesiastical regions in Western Europe.\(^{119}\)

In practice the idea of near-equality or semi-independence meant that for all their protestations of loyalty the archbishops of Canterbury vigorously resisted any attempts by the papacy to extend its authority at the expense of Canterbury’s. As we have already seen, Theobald in his disputes with Christ Church and St Augustine’s was willing to go to considerable lengths to block appeals. Like his predecessors he set definite limits to the authority of the pope.

The second force shaping Theobald’s policy towards the papacy was the special relationship which in practice existed between the archbishop of Canterbury and the king. This special relationship existed even during pontificates of archbishops like Anselm and William of Corbeil who had no special flair for administration and politics, and who remained uninvolved in the machinery of royal government.\(^{120}\) It broke down during Stephen’s reign but was re-instituted after Theobald had given his consistent support to the Angevin cause and had played an active part in backing Henry II’s

---

\(^{119}\) Similar primatial claims over large regions were being pursued by Lyons (over Rouen, Sens and Tours) and Vienne (over Bourges); see HP I pp 4-5. In terms of area the primacy claimed by Canterbury was surpassed by the primacy over the kingdom of Spain granted to the archbishop of Toledo by Urban II; for this grant and resistance to it see Z. N. Brooke, English church and the papacy p 172, and R. Foreville, ‘Royaumes, métropolitains et conciles’ p 298.

\(^{120}\) See Brett pp 70-71.
accession to the crown. In the final years of Theobald’s pontificate this special relationship was once again in tatters; but until 1159-60 relations between king and archbishop were marked by amiability and co-operation. For the years 1154 to 1159, therefore, we must consider the special relationship between king and archbishop to be another element influencing Canterbury in its relations with the papal curia.

A third force shaping Theobald’s policies towards the papacy was his concern with enforcing ecclesiastical discipline. In viewing the relationship between Canterbury and Rome it is easy to forget that both parties, Canterbury and Rome, had a multitude of other priorities, relationships, day-to-day activities. For Theobald, relations with Rome and the processing of appeals represented a fraction of his activities. Concerns which were more immediate and which were almost ever-present were the administration of the lordship of Canterbury, the carrying out of pastoral duties, the administration of the see, the enforcement of discipline as diocesan and as metropolitan. It is hard to believe that this range of activities would not have influenced Theobald’s perception of relations with the papacy. The Early Letters show that Theobald gave considerable attention to the enforcement of discipline within religious orders, to the correction of misdemeanours by archdeacons and clergy in other

121 Brooke notes (EL p xxxviii n 1) that: 'From the appointment of Becket as chancellor (1154-5) to the election of Bartholomew to Exeter (1160-61) Henry seems to have been inclined to follow Theobald’s advice - perhaps with growing reluctance, and impatient to be rid of the old man to whom he owed so much.' The argument for relations remaining amicable between Theobald and Henry II is set out in Warren, Henry II pp 442-6. Instances of co-operation between king and archbishop are to be found in EL epp 13 (p 21), 36-8, 98 (pp 151-2, 104 (p 165), 115 (p 189).

122 epp 105-6. For Theobald’s relations with English monasteries, see Saltman Theobald chap 2.
sees, particularly in periods when sees were vacant, and more occasionally to the overseeing of his suffragan bishops. These activities taught Theobald the importance of swift and effective action against persons guilty of manifest crimes. In Theobald's view numerous appeals coming from a diocese indicated a failure to enforce justice. In ep 61 Theobald reproved a suffragan, possibly Hilary of Chichester, for the large number of cases being appealed from his diocese to Canterbury:

That disputes (controversiae) within your jurisdiction find their way to us, is a sign of weakness or negligence ....

Theobald goes on to remind the bishop of the canon law principle that anyone discovered in manifest acts (manifesto crimine) of disobedience or any other crime should be punished out of hand:

so that others may tremble and remember the reasons for which a strong judicial system has been publicly established.

---

123 ep 107.
124 The paucity of evidence suggests that Theobald's intervention in the affairs of suffragans was infrequent and only the result of specific appeals (e.g. ep 78, p 123, where Theobald reprimands William Turbe bishop of Norwich for giving way to royal pressure in a case of advowson).
125 This letter carries no heading in MS P. In MS C it carries the heading 'idem Hylario Cicstrensi'. Unfortunately the headings in MS C are extremely unreliable (see the notes to epp 67, 78-9, 82, 90, 100, 107) and therefore prevent us from making a neat contrast between Hilary, the causidicus interested in legal subtleties and tactics, and Theobald, the experienced administrator and politician who was more interested in the effective enforcement of justice.
126 EL p 102.
127 See Gratian Decretum C.2, q.1 cc. 15-6, 21 and post dictum c.20. It is used in GFL pp 46, 88-9, 104.
128 EL p 102.
The same concern with swift, effective justice is to be seen in ep 90 from Theobald to Hugh bishop of Durham. Hugh had excommunicated a person 'on account of his atrocious crime' 129 but had evidently been criticised either by the archbishop of York, the bishops of the northern province or by the 'multi et magni viri', 130 who supported the excommunicate. Theobald offers Hugh very mild criticism:

According to your report, brother bishop, there is something in what you have done which calls for our criticism. For in accordance with the injunctions of the sacred canons you ought to have announced to your fellow bishops that you had ... excommunicated from your church the sinner of whom your letter gave a portrait. 131

However, although Hugh had strayed from the 'injunctions of the sacred canons' (constitutione sacrorum canonum), Theobald implies that this was not serious and indeed he ends the letter with warm praise for Hugh:

we are glad that in the midst of barbarians you still keep your zeal for justice (zelum iustitiae), and we shall ratify whatever sentence you, under God, may pass upon those who still persecute Christ crucified, to Whom the adoration of the Church is due. 132

Theobald's own zelum iustitiae is strongly stated in the letter:

By the mercy of God we do not desire to protect criminals but rather to take vengeance on them ... 133

Theobald's concern with swift, effective justice should not be judged as purely administrative. In a letter probably addressed to

129 ibid p 139.
130 ibid.
131 ibid.
132 ibid p 140.
133 ibid pp 139-40.
the archdeacon of Chester, Theobald commented:

If we consent to the offences of our subjects, we are involved in their guilt; and unless we make it our study to correct their evil deeds when it is in our power to do so, we stand at the judgement seat of God.\textsuperscript{132}

It was of course a commonplace idea, that prelates were personally answerable to God for the way in which they discharged their office, and here Theobald was using the commonplace to strengthen his condemnation of what he regarded as a most foul and simoniacal practice: compelling vicars to pay 12 pence each year in order to secure admittance to churches.\textsuperscript{135} The remarks are likely to represent Theobald’s own attitudes. For, although Theobald appears to have had no outstanding reputation for piety among his contemporaries, he had received a monastic training which emphasised the search for personal salvation. In the 1150s, an old man frequently ill, Theobald’s anxieties about his own salvation are likely to have increased. We see something of these anxieties in his efforts to remove whatever unjust exactions, including the archdeacon’s ‘second aids’, which had grown up during his pontificate.\textsuperscript{136} We need not think of Theobald as constantly anxious about his own soul, and allowing this anxiety to shape his policies as judge and administrator. Theobald was too pragmatic a politician for that interpretation to stand. Nevertheless we should bear in mind that Theobald’s commitment to the enforcement, his \textit{zelum iustitiae}, was not a purely administrative commitment; it was also a religious one. This must have prevented Theobald from viewing with equanimity or indifference the ease with which litigants

\textsuperscript{134} EL ep 107 p 169.
\textsuperscript{135} EL p 169.
\textsuperscript{136} See EL epp 22, 28.
could evade and frustrate justice by appealing to Rome.

The forces which we have considered - the interests of Canterbury, the tradition of independence, the special relationship between king and archbishop, and the commitment to enforcing effective justice - formed the basis of Theobald’s policies towards Rome. Since Lanfranc’s pontificate the papacy had been well aware of the strong elements of independence and self-interest which infused Canterbury’s loyalty to Rome, and was not willing to repay Canterbury excessively for its loyalty. From the period of the ‘Gregorian’ reform onwards the papacy was following a policy of weakening the authority of primates and metropolitans, in order to make its own authority over the episcopate more effective and more direct. In this context there was little sympathy at the papal curia for Canterbury’s claims to jurisdiction over the church of York, let alone its claims to primacy over the British Isles. Thus the primacy of Canterbury over York which Lanfranc had established in 1072, was not confirmed by the papacy until 1103, and even this confirmation was only for the lifetime of Anselm.

By the 1150s papal control over the universal church was more extensive and more effective than it had been in Anselm’s day; the number of appeals to the papal curia was growing and an increasing number of legates a latere were being appointed. In this context short shrift would be given to a metropolitan and legate who tried to operate with some degree of independence. During the 1150s there appear to have been a number of influential cardinals who were

139 See references in n 4 above.
particularly critical of Theobald's handling of disputes with Christ Church and St Augustine's. In the winter of 1155-6 a group of cardinals had evidently been advising the abbot of St Augustine's to persist in his refusal to make a profession of obedience to Theobald, for Theobald remarks in ep 11 to Boso:

he [Adrian] simply wrote that profession should be made, whereas the lord cardinals on the contrary in their letters instructed the abbot to appeal.\textsuperscript{140}

One of the cardinals critical of Canterbury was Roland Bandinelli, for writing in early 1164 and probably referring to the dispute between Becket and St Augustine's, John states:

Indeed the Pope has always been against us in this affair, and has not ceased to regret what was done for us by Adrian, who cared for the church of Canterbury ...\textsuperscript{141}

These cardinals had evidently not only been supporting St Augustine's but had taken the view that Theobald's activities were encroaching on papal authority. For in ep 9, after reiterating his loyalty to the apostolic see in full-blown terms, Theobald then explains:

I say this because I hear that certain of my lords the cardinals cherish feelings against me which do no good either to myself or to my church.\textsuperscript{142}

It may have been this group of cardinals critical of Theobald's actions who played the crucial role in twice subjecting Theobald to the indignity of having his disputes with St Augustine's and Christ Church judged by suffragans.

\textsuperscript{140} EL p 19.
\textsuperscript{141} LL ep 136 p 9.
\textsuperscript{142} ibid p 16.
The clash between Theobald and Adrian in the winter of 1155-6 and the unease about appeals which existed at Canterbury, went deeper than just minor frictions or frustrations which were bound to occur in a legal system that had grown rapidly and in which procedures were still being developed and defined. The policy of Adrian and his advisers was shaped by a determination to see that the jurisdiction of the apostolic see was in no way diminished. Theobald’s views were shaped by his experience and knowledge of the practicalities and problems of enforcing justice at a local level. At issue was the degree of independence which the Canterbury could exercise in its relations with the papacy.

6: CONCLUSIONS

We cannot be sure whether the volume of appeals going to Rome from England and Canterbury increased or remained much the same after John’s return from the curia in 1156. But it does seem clear that throughout the period 1154-61 there was disquiet at Canterbury about the appeals system and that John shared this disquiet. John may have returned to Canterbury in 1156 enthusiastic about increasing appeals to Rome and about energetically defending the rights of free election and the extent of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Nevertheless he had to work within the framework of policies at Canterbury. These were policies which were influenced by the realities of close co-operation with the king and by the need for effective church discipline at a local level. They were also policies which emphasised independence from, as well as loyalty to, Rome.
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CHAPTER 6: JOHN’S VIEWS ON PAPAL AUTHORITY

1: INTRODUCTION

The image of John of Salisbury as an active exponent of papal authority over secular rulers and over other churches, is deeply entrenched in the secondary sources. Paul Gennrich writing in 1894 described John as ‘Gregorian’;\(^1\) Walter Ullmann described him as ‘papal-hierocratic’;\(^2\) and in her essay on John in The Becket Conflict and the schools ..., Beryl Smalley described him as papalist, high-church and anti-imperialist.\(^3\) Smalley’s term ‘papalist’ will be used in the following discussion and will be taken to mean placing a strong, uncompromising emphasis on asserting and increasing the authority of the pope over secular rulers and over bishops.

Terms like ‘papalist’ and ‘papalism’ need to be handled with some care. Like the terms ‘hierocratic’ and ‘dualist’, which have bedevilled many of the discussions of papal political theory, they are vague and open to a wide variety of meanings.\(^4\) Nevertheless John’s ‘papalism’ can be tested, for there is a well-established view that John’s attitudes were in some way ‘papalist’ (or ‘Gregorian’ or ‘hierocratic papalist’ as one prefers). We can start by testing the views of Gennrich, Ullmann and Smalley and establishing to what extent the evidence they have cited supports their arguments. The next stage

---

\(^1\) Paul Gennrich, Die Staats- und Kirchenlehre Johanns von Salisbury (Gotha 1894).
\(^3\) The Becket conflict and the schools: A study of intellectuals in politics (Oxford 1973) p 108.
\(^4\) For the difficulties posed by the terms ‘hierocratic’ and ‘dualist’ see B. Tierney, ‘The continuity of papal political theory in the thirteenth century: Some methodological considerations’, Mediaeval Studies 27 (1965) 227-245.
is to explore the extent and the limits of John's 'papalism' by looking at John's presentation of the relationship between the pope and secular rulers; his presentation of the relationship between the pope and bishops; and his remarks on the pope as legislator.

The reassessment of John's views on papal authority contained in this chapter is intended as a contribution to the wider debate, which has taken place during the last forty years on the political theories of medieval - and in particular twelfth and thirteenth century - popes, canonists and publicists. Since about 1950 there has been a radical shift of interpretation in this area. Before then the prevalent view was that medieval popes had actively pursued a policy of establishing a universal temporal monarchy. This interpretation received its most erudite and detailed exposition in Walter Ullmann's *Medieval papalism: The political theories of medieval canonists* (1949) and his *The growth of papal government in the Middle Ages ...* (1955). Ullmann's aim in the latter was to show that from the early middle ages to the thirteenth century, the papacy had consistently pursued a 'papal-hierocratic' policy. The central assertion of the policy was that all authority - both secular and spiritual - derived from, and was subject to, the authority of the pope. According to Ullmann the 'papal-hierocratic' view received its most extreme exposition from a number of twelfth-century writers: John of Salisbury, Honorius Augustodunensis, Hugh of Saint Victor and Bernard of Clairvaux. Ullmann's views became the centre of heated controversy, and were severely criticised by A. M. Stickler in a review of *Medieval papalism ...* His interpretation of Bernard of Clairvaux's political doctrines

---

5 The best survey of debate on thirteenth-century papal theory is B. Tierney, 'The continuity of papal political theory ...'.

6 Papal government pp 413-446.
was challenged by E. Kennan in 1967. His interpretation of Innocent III as a vigorous exponent of the doctrine of papal monarchy was attacked by M. Maccarone, S. Mochi Onory, F. Kempf and Helene Tillmann—who argued that Innocent's political theory 'was based on a cautious discrimination between the spheres of action of spiritual and secular rulers'. In broad terms that interpretation has been adopted and refined by more recent commentators such as Brian Tierney, John Watt and Kenneth Pennington. Most recently Pennington has argued for a similar reinterpretation of the views expressed by popes and canonists on the relationship between papal and episcopal authority. In Pennington's view the canonists and theologians of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries did not make claims of absolute power for the pope, but in fact limited it considerably by attaching weight to the rights of other jurisdictions, both lay and episcopal.

7 'Concerning the political theories of the medieval canonists', Traditio 7 (1949-51) 450-63. For Stickler's interpretation of papal political theory in the twelfth century see the articles cited n 65 below. For an attack on Ullmann's approach see F. Oakley, 'Celestial hierarchies revisited: Walter Ullmann's vision of medieval politics', Past and Present 60 (1973) 3-48. For similar issues in the later middle ages see W. D. McCready, 'Papalists and anti-papalists: Aspects of the Church/State controversy in the later Middle Ages', Viator 6 (1975) 241-73.

8 'The "De consideratione" of St Bernard of Clairvaux and the papacy in the mid-twelfth century', Traditio 23 (1967) 73-115.

9 Tierney, 'Continuity' p 228; M. Maccarone, Chiesa e stato nella dottrina di papa Innocenzo III, Lateranum ns 6 (Rome 1940); S. Mochi Onory, Fonti canoniche dell' idea moderna dello stato (Milan 1951); F. Kempf, Papsttum und Kaisertum bei Innocenz III, Miscellanea Historiae Pontificae 19 (Rome 1954) esp part 3, (p 181 ff) which also contains important surveys of the political doctrines of the church and of canonists in the eleventh and twelfth centuries; H. Tillmann, Papst Innocenz III (Bonn 1954; see App.1 pp 321-332 in trans W. Sax Pope Innocent III, Amsterdam-New York-Oxford 1980).

10 'Continuity of papal political theory' cited n 3 above.

The view of John as a 'papalist' was argued with great cogency by Paul Gennrich in Die Staats- und Kirchenlehre Johannis von Salisbury (1894). Gennrich took the view that there was a distinctly 'Gregorian' outlook whose evolution could be traced from Gregory VII through Honorius Augustodunensis, John of Salisbury, Gerhoch of Reichersberg and right up to Boniface VIII. The central doctrine of 'Gregorianism' was, according to Gennrich, the concept of a 'papal universal monarchy'.

The supremacy of priests over rulers was expressed in terms of the authority of the pope. The doctrine emphasised the monarchical aspects of the papacy, its power over bishops and over lay rulers.

Gennrich argued that John's opinions on the relationship between regnum and sacerdotium were grounded on 'Gregorian' assertions of papal supremacy:

die Bedeutung des von Johannes von Salisbury auf philosophisch - theologischer Grundlage aufgebauten Versuchs einer systematischen Darstellung des Zusammenhangs von Kirche und Staat im Sinne des päpstlichen Absolutismus ...  

Gennrich did not bring forward evidence to back his assertion that John's 'sacerdotalism' - his insistence that the church should be independent of and superior to lay jurisdiction was grounded on 'papalism'. Gennrich assumed there was a connection between

---


13 Pope and bishops: The papal monarchy in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (Pennsylvania 1986) pp 190-5, esp 192.

14 Thus Gennrich (p 150) states that Master Gratian and John of Salisbury mark the end of a preliminary stage in the idea of papal monarchy: 'Damit ist ein vorläufiger Abschluss in der Entwicklung der Idee der - sagen wir kurz - päpstlichen Universalmonarchie erreicht.'

15 Ibid p 150.
'sacerdotalism' and 'papalism'. In a brief work which covers over 200 years of papal theory this is hardly surprising. However even Gennrich admits that in the Policraticus, when John asserts the supremacy of sacerdotal power he does not rely on the loci used by Gregory VII - such as Matthew 16:17-19 or John 21:15-19 - which emphasise the Roman and Petrine supremacy. Instead John used a very different foundation: Deuteronomy 17 which is concerned with the theocratic ordering of Israel. The crucial chapters in the Policraticus (Book 4 chapters 4-9) which deal with the duties of the prince and his subjection to divine law and to the clergy, are structured around the exposition of kingship found in Deuteronomy 17:14.

Gennrich's depiction of John of Salisbury as a 'Gregorian' was echoed five years later by Heinrich Böhmer in Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im XI. und XII. Jahrhundert. John was in Böhmer's view 'der radikalste Gregorianer, den wir kennen'.

Gennrich's assumption that John's 'sacerdotalism' was inextricably linked to 'papalism', underlies much of the secondary literature on John's attitudes, and general works on the Becket dispute have tended to make similar assumptions about Becket's attitudes. Thus in describing Becket's behaviour on being appointed archbishop, G. O. Sayles has written:

Immediately, Becket made himself the uncompromising champion of the most extreme clerical pretensions, upholding the independence of the church and the sovereignty of the papacy.

16 ibid p 151.
17 John's use of Deuteronomy is discussed by Liebeschütz, Med Hum pp 23-6.
18 Leipzig 1899, p 428. There is a brief survey of John's political views ibid pp 420-6.
It will be argued later that in assessing John's attitudes, 'papalism' and 'sacerdotalism' must be distinguished from each other.

Gennrich's main assumption that John's views on church and state were built around an exalted view of papal power, was developed in Walter Ullmann's *The growth of papal government in the Middle Ages* ..., (1955). Since Ullmann's views have provoked considerable discussion and have profound implications for the interpretation of papal history, it is worth examining in detail what he says about John. In *The growth of papal government* Ullmann devotes six pages to John of Salisbury, of which two deal with his 'papalism'. Four key points can be extracted from Ullmann's remarks.

1) Ullmann opens his discussion by stating that John was operating with the 'concept of the all-embracing, comprehensive respublica consisting of all Christians acknowledging the primacy of the Church of Rome'. This 'Christian republic' was not an 'ideal state but a living organism ... the congregation of the faithful in its corporate nature'. John himself does not speak of the 'Christian republic'. His occasional references to the Christian *imperium* are vague and do not reveal the concept of a 'Christian republic' under the leadership of Rome. Thus in *Policraticus* 6:8 John remarks 'Duos gladios sufficere imperio Christiano Evangeli sacra testatur historia ...'. In John's writings the term *res publica* almost always means the political and secular organisation of society. Sometimes it means public, as

---

20 *op cit* pp 420-26; pp 420-22 deal with 'papalist' attitudes.
21 *ibid* p 420.
opposed to private, affairs. Frequently John links *res publica* with princeps; sometimes in connection with a particular ruler; but never in connection with the Roman church or with the pope. Nor in chapters of the *Policraticus* dealing with the relationship between prince and church, and with the ordering of Christian society, does he make any reference to papal supremacy over other churches or over secular rulers. The concept of an 'all-embracing Republic' under the direction of Rome is then absent from John's writings. The discussion is purely in terms of the relationship which ought to exist between prince (princeps) and priests (sacerdotium).

Ullmann's opening assertion then is not based directly on what John says.

2) Ullmann goes on to argue that within the Christian republic:

The priests function as the transmitters of divine mandates as expounded by the Head of the Roman Church.

---

24 Pol 4:7 Webb 1 p 261/18-22; Pol 6:20 Webb 2 p 58/28 - p 59/3: about the *artes mecanicae*: '... serviles quoque obsecundationes et multiplices victus adquirendi vitaeque sustentandae aut rem familiarem amplificandae formae, quae nec ad praesidendi pertinent auctoritatem et universitati rei publicae usquequaque proficiunt.'


26 *Pol 4:3*.

27 *Pol 5:1-13*.

28 *ibid* p 420.
Again this is something that John himself never states. It is true that for John the priests were in some sense 'transmitters' of divine law as expounded by the pope:

a) In the *Policraticus* John states that in matters of *doctrina*, everyone is subject to the pope, and that whoever disobeys *doctrina* as expounded by the pope is guilty of heresy.\(^{29}\)

b) That priests had a particular obligation of obedience to the pope, is indicated by the frequent references in John's letters to *Romana ecclesia* being the *caput*, *mater* and superior of all other churches: \(^{30}\) and by John's description of the pope's *audientia* as 'cui specialiter mandata est omnium sacerdotalium decisio causarum'. \(^{31}\)

c) The priesthood had a special role in advising the prince how to govern his kingdom and how to formulate laws that were in keeping with divine law. \(^{32}\)

It is, however, misleading to argue on these grounds that John regarded priests as agents within the 'Christian Republic' transmitting 'divine mandates as expounded by the Head of the Roman

---

\(^{29}\) *Pol* 6:24 (Webb 2 p 70/7-11). See pp 315-6 below.

\(^{30}\) On *obedientia* in John's writing see Georg Miczka, *Das Bild der Kirche bei Johannes von Salisbury*, Bonner Historische Forschungen 34 (Bonn 1970) p 153; for the papacy as *caput ecclesiae* see ibid p 85, and as *mater*, ibid p 97.

\(^{31}\) *LL* ep 187 p 242.

\(^{32}\) The theme of the supremacy of priests over princes is set out in *Pol*. 4:3 (Webb 2 p 239) entitled 'Quod princeps minister est sacerdotum et minor eis; et quid ministerium principatus fideliter gerere'. In *Pol* 5:2 (Webb 2 p 282/17-9) in the extended body-metaphor of the state, priests are described as quasi *anima corporis*, 'Princeps vero capitis in re publica obtinet locum uni subjectus Deo, et his qui vices illius agunt in term, quonidum et in corpore humano ab anima vegetatur caput et regitur'. For the body-metaphor of the state, see n 38 below.
Church'. Stated thus, we get the false impression that John depicted priests as mere functionaries of the pope, operating within a super-state. But as we have noted, the chapters in the Poliorcetricus dealing with the ordering of Christian society contain no reference to papal authority; the entire emphasis is on the authority of the priesthood. John certainly did not regard the episcopate as mere functionaries of the pope. In ep 269 (to Nicholas Decanus, 1164-6), John states that the bishops 'are called by the Pope to exercise pastoral care (in partem sollicitudinis) in order to wield the spiritual sword'. They are, says John, like the comites whom the king calls 'in ensis materialis communionem' This clearly points to the pope as a leader and director of the episcopate, but it also emphasises the 'companionship' and 'fellowship' of the pope and bishops, for John compares the praesules with comites who have earned their name 'a societatis participatione'. The idea that the bishops were companions, co-episcopi with the pope was so well-established that it could not be obliterated by the growing emphasis on the primacy of the papacy which occurred during and after the Investiture Contest. By using the phrase 'in par tem sollicitudinis ... evocantur' John was referring to the formula that the pope had 'plenitudo potestatis' whereas bishops had 'pars sollicitudinis'. As Kenneth

This interpretation is shared by Georg Miczka, Bild der Kirche pp 168-9: 'Wollte man aus dieser Stelle herauslesen, Johannes gestehe dem Amt des Bischofs keine Eigentümlich zu, sondern betrachte den Bischof nur als den Delegaten des Papstes, so würde man die Aussagekraft der Stelle sicherlich überschätzen'.

LL p 544.

For the historical development of this formula see R. L. Benson, 'Plenitudo potestatis: Evolution of a formula from Gregory IV to Gratian', Collectanea Stephan Kuttner, Studia Gratiana 14 (1967) 195-217; A. M. Stickler 'La "sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum" nella canonistica classica', Communio 13 (1972) 547-86. See also K. Pennington, Pope and bishops: The papal monarchy in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (Pennsylvania 1986) pp 59-60.
Pennington has noted, this formula was never used by the lawyers and canonists of the twelfth century to mean that bishops derived their jurisdiction from the pope.  

3) The pope alone is set by the Lord over nations and kingdoms - 'a domino constitutus super gentes et regna' and is therefore Ruler of the whole Christian body.

John never describes the pope as being 'Ruler of the whole Christian body'. He speaks of the priesthood being the soul, the invigorating spirit, of the 'body' of society. But the head of society (res publica) is the prince. John implies that in a similar way the pope is head of the church, for in Policraticus 6:24 he applies the body metaphor to the church. The references which Ullmann offers to support his statement are curious. The first is to ep 242 where John quotes the vaticinium Ieremiae (Jeremiah 1:10): 'Ecce constitutum te hodie super gentes et super regna'. However here John does not use the allusion as a statement on the constitutional arrangement of Christendom. Writing to William Brito in late 1167 he speaks of the setbacks recently endured by Frederick Barbarossa, and he claims, either mistakenly or disingenuously, that the pope had recently deposed Frederick Barbarossa:

The Pope waited long and patiently for any sign that the

36 Pope and bishops pp 60-1.  
37 Papal government p 421.  
38 For the princeps as caput of the res publica see Pol 5:3 Webb 1 pp 282-3; the body metaphor for the res publica is set out ibid p 282/25 - p 283/22, and elaborating throughout Pol 5. For differing views on John's claim that the metaphor was drawn from a work by Plutarch, the Institutio Traiani see the refs cited in chap 1 n 34 above.  
39 Webb 2 p 71/19 p 72.  
40 LL p 472.
German tyrant might even then be turned to repentance. But the schismatic abused his patience ... and so Peter's Vicar, set by God over peoples and kingdoms, freed the people of Italy (Italos) and all who were tied to him by their oaths on account of his imperial and royal authority from their fealty to him (qui ei ex causa imperii et regni religione iuris iuris stricti, a fidelitate eius absolvit) ....

The claim that the pope could depose the emperor represented a strong assertion of the pope's authority, and in stating it, John was well aware that he was following a trenchant 'Gregorian' line:

In this he has followed the example of his predecessor Gregory VII, who in our own era condemned the Emperor Henry for destroying the Church's privileges (ecclesiae privilegia) and deposed him with a similar judgement in a Council in Rome ....

But it should be emphasised that the grounds were very limited: schism and attacks on the church universal. John's letter opens with the statement

The Church universal, by God's help, begins to flourish once more; the schismatics' attack has been checked and the pride of Moab grows weaker day by day ....

John goes on to depict Frederick Barbarossa as Teutonicus tyrannus and scismaticus, attacking the privileges of the church. It is implied that the deposition of the emperor should take place only under extraordinary conditions when the unity of the church is under threat. In times of extreme danger to the church the act of deposition is a last resort when all other measures have failed.

---

42 LL p 475.
43 LL p 473.
44 LL p 472.
John's use of the *vaticinium Ieremiae* does not provide the basis for Ullmann's assertion that the pope was 'therefore the true ruler of the whole Christian body'. Nor should the *vaticinium Ieremiae* be seen as the basis of papal 'rule' over Christendom. In fact in ep 187 (to Baldwin, in late 1166), John used the text to indicate the powers granted to the whole priesthood.

Was it not said to Jeremiah, as representing the priesthood - for this the doctors of the church have reliably handed down - 'See I have this day set thee over the nations and kingdoms'...

The second reference which Ullmann uses to back up his statement that John regarded the pope as the 'ruler' of the 'Christian body' is John's statement in ep 67 that the pope *ecclesiam regit, corrigit, et dirigit universam*. This reference gives no support to Ullmann's statement unless one insists that for John *ecclesia* was identical with *Christianitas*. However as Miczka has shown the word *ecclesia* carries various meanings and it cannot be equated simply with *Christianitas*.

As the ruler of the whole Christian body, the pope:

is Judge of all the faithful - "fidelium omnium iudex est a Domino constitutus" - and from *sacerdotal judgement* neither cause nor person is exempted.

If we leave out the claim that the pope was 'ruler of the whole Christian body' this is probably an accurate assessment of John's view. However we must remember that in using the phrase 'fidelium

---

45 LL p 242.  
47 Miczka, Bild pp 103-114.  
48 Papal Government p 421.
omnium iudex' John was not suggesting that the papacy should interfere actively or as a matter of course in cases other than purely ecclesiastical ones. When he used the phrase in ep 187 John was suggesting that the pope is iudex in a passive sense: any of the faithful and especially the clergy could bring their cases to the audientia of the pope.\(^4\) In the letter John was justifying Becket's decision to flee England in November 1164 and to appeal to the pope against judgements made at the Council of Northampton. The emphasis of the passage is on the pope as guarantor of priestly liberty and not on the authority of the pope over laymen.

The main thrust then of Ullmann's argument - that John had the concept of an 'all-embracing comprehensive Christian republic' under the direction of the pope - is, therefore, not sustained by the evidence from John's writing.

In The Becket conflict and the schools, Beryl Smalley concludes her essay on John of Salisbury by stating that he and Herbert of Bosham were 'papalist, anti-imperialist, high churchmen'.\(^5\) By 'high church' she means what we term 'sacerdotalist', that is asserting the independence of the church from, and its supremacy over, all lay authority. Smalley points out that John's views cannot be rigidly classified: 'John packed his ideas into an untidy parcel, but the string seemed firm'.\(^6\) So she makes no sharp distinctions between John's papalism, anti-imperialism or sacerdotalism. In the space of three pages she sets out fourteen examples of John's attitudes. Of these, one is evidence of John's anti-imperialism;\(^7\) nine provide

---

\(^4\) LL p 242.

\(^5\) Op cit p 108.

\(^6\) Ibid p 101.

\(^7\) Ibid p 101 (John's annoyance at the German claim to the Empire).
evidence for his 'sacerdotalism'\textsuperscript{53} and four, for his 'papalism'.

The four examples which provide evidence of John's 'papalism' are worth considering.

1) At \emph{Policraticus} 6:24 John says that dissenters from papal doctrine (\emph{doctrina}) are either schismatics or heretics.\textsuperscript{54} This quotation comes from John's report of a conversation which he had with Adrian IV at Benevento. Adrian had asked John for his views on the state of the church of Rome. During his caustic reply, an attack on the avarice of the cardinals, John remarks:

\begin{quote}
Quia ergo instas, urges, precipis, cum certum sit quod Spirituo sancto mentiri non licet, fater quia quod praecipis faciendum est, egri non sitis omnes operitus imitandi. Nam qui a doctrina vestra dissentii aut hereticus aut scismaticus est.\textsuperscript{55}
\end{quote}

As Georg Miczka observes, the view that to differ from the doctrina of the pope was heretical or schismatic is not remarkable for the mid-twelfth century, and was widely held by leading churchmen.\textsuperscript{56}

2) John was reproached for upholding the rights of Rome, in England.\textsuperscript{57} This is a particularly strong argument in favour of John's

\textsuperscript{53} These are 1) John’s doctrine that the lay ruler holds his 'sword' from the church as her minister (p 99); 2) John adopts and adds detail to Robert of Melun’s theory of resistance (pp 90-100; cf p 53); 3) the assertion that if the king offends against God and the church, he endangers the soul of the commonwealth (p 100); 4) the assertion that royal officials hound anyone who stands up in defence of clerks or clerical privilege (p 100); 5) the view that ecclesiastics should not hold office as courtiers or royal servants (p 100); 6) the statement that tyrants cite bad precedents for their evil deeds, as when they thrust royal servants into churches without due election (p 101); 7) John’s defence of benefit of clergy, citing the principle that there should be no double punishment (p 101); 8) the comment that church property should be protected by sanctions (p 101); 9) the assertion that the English church has suffered from royal tyranny in the past (p 101).

\textsuperscript{54} Smalley \emph{Becket Conflict} p 99; Webb 2 p 70/10-11.

\textsuperscript{55} Webb 2 p 70/7-11.

\textsuperscript{56} Miczka, \emph{Bild} p 145. See discussion sect 5 pp 315-6 below.
'papalism'. It suggests that about 1156 John was probably perceived by Henry's advisers as being too sympathetic to appeals from England to the papal curia. But, as we have argued in the previous chapter, John was probably also keenly aware of the shortcomings within the appeals system. In any case John did not fall into disgrace simply because of his attitudes to the papacy. He himself states that three allegations were made against him: the encouragement of papal rights in England, the assertion of ecclesiastical freedom in elections and in the judgement of ecclesiastical cases.

3) John supported Adrian's claim to dominion over Ireland as part of the inheritance of the Donation of Constantine. Again this is a particularly strong item of evidence in favour of John's 'papalism'. However, while this and the previous example point to some degree of 'papalism' on John's part, neither indicates what importance John placed on the advancement of papal authority; they do not necessarily show that John was trenchant or energetic in his defence of papal rights.

4) In the schism of 1159 John backed Alexander III as the true pope. This, however, is no indication of strongly 'papalist' attitudes, as the same view was held by the overwhelming majority of

57 Becket Conflict p 101.
58 See chap 5 above.
59 EL ep 19 p 32: 'Quod quis nomen Romanum apud nos invocat, mihi inponunt. Quod in electionibus celebrandis, in causis ecclesiasticis examinandis vel umbram libertatis audet sibi Anglorum ecclesia vendicare, michi inputatur, ac si dominum Cantuariensem et alios episcopos quid facere oporteat solus instruam'.
60 Becket Conflict p 101. See p 302 below.
churchmen in England and France.

Of the four items of evidence which Smalley uses, the second and third - John’s disgrace and his backing for papal possession of Ireland and England - are the most persuasive. But while these point to a degree of loyalty to the papacy on John’s part, they do not tell us what importance John attached to the defence or the extension of papal rights.

The most cautious assessment of John’s attitudes to the papacy is to be found in Georg Miczka Das Bild der Kirche bei Johannes von Salisbury (1970). Miczka points out the importance which John placed on obedientia and reverentia towards the apostolic see, but does not go as far as to assert that John was ‘papalist’ in outlook.

3: THE POPE AND SECULAR RULERS

The fact that John says little about the relationship between the pope and secular rulers, suggests that this was a topic to which he gave little thought. Nevertheless it is essential in any assessment of John’s ‘papalism’ that we scrutinise what he says about this relationship.

a: The ‘two swords’

A useful way of testing John’s views on the relationship between pope and secular rulers, is to look at the way in which he handles the allegory of ‘two swords’ based on Luke 22:38 (‘At illi dixerunt; Domini, ecce duo gladii hic. At ille dixit eis; Satis est.’) and John 18:11 (‘Dixit ergo Iesu Petro: Mitte gladium tuum in vaginam.

62 See n 30 above.
63 op cit p 152 ff.
Calicem, quem dedit mihi Pater, non bibam illum?). During the twelfth century this allegory received several standard interpretations. The interpretation which is most familiar to historians is that the two swords signified spiritual and secular jurisdiction. Until the 1950s, accounts of medieval political theory tended to assume that when medieval writers used the allegory they were referring to the two jurisdictions, spiritual and secular. But more recent research, especially by Alfons Stickler, has shown that the interpretation of the 'two swords' allegory was more varied than this. Medieval interpretations of the 'two swords' were shaped by the fact that the sword is a recurrent image in scripture. In the Old Testament, and particularly in the Psalms, it was used as a symbol of violence. Sometimes it symbolized the impious violence of God's enemies and sometimes, the just and vengeful violence of God. But in the New Testament the image was occasionally used to convey a different meaning. Thus at Ephesians 6:17, Paul writes 'And take unto you the helmet of salvation; and the sword of the spirit (which is the

64 See for instance J. Leclerc 'L'argument des deux glaives dans les controverses politiques du moyen-âge', Recherches de science religieuse 21 (1931) 299-339.


66 See for instance the sword imagery in Psalm 36:14-17 where both themes occur, the violence of God's enemies and the vengeance which God will direct against them. For gladius as a symbol of persecution see Romans 8:35.
From these scriptural references, patristic and medieval commentators created several interpretations. The standard interpretations included 1) the 'two swords' - or at least one of the swords - represented the powers of punishment available to the church; 2) the two swords represented the Old and New Testaments; 3) at least one of the swords represented the faith which Christians should have in Christ. The Glossa ordinaria - the best guide to the interpretations of scripture known and accepted by twelfth-century churchmen - alludes to each of these interpretations of Luke 22:38. 67 First it suggests that the two swords are: 'unus novi, alter veteris Testamenti, quibus adversus diaboli munimur insidias'. 68 Then it suggests an alternative interpretation: that one sword gave courage to the apostles to stand by Christ and taught that even when He was about to die, Christ had the sanctity and power ('pietatem virtutemque') to heal; and that the other sword - which was not drawn from the sheath - taught the apostles that they were forbidden to do everything in their power to defend Christ. 69 As the apostles were a standard 'figure' for the episcopate and the priesthood, this interpretation indicates that the priesthood must place their faith in Christ and must not use all the powers at their disposal. 70 The powers available to the

67 Glossa ordinaria, vol 5 col 967. For similar interpretations to the sword imagery of Ephesians 6:17 see ibid vol 6. For refs to the Glossa as a source see chap 2 n 133 above.

68 This was a well established interpretation. Cf Ambrose Expositio Evangelii secundam Lucam CC 14 p 361 lines 540-41. Also: Bruno of Segni Commentaria in Lucam PL 165 col 445c.

69 loc cit: 'Satis est: Duo gladii sufficiunt ad testimonium sponte passi Salvatoris. Unus qui et apostolis audaciam certandi pro Domino et evulsa ictu ensis auricula Domino etiam morituro pietatem virtutemque medicandi inesse doceret. Alter qui nequaquam exemptus vagina, ostenderet eos non totum quod potuere, pro eius defensione facere permissos.'
apostles or priesthood were those of excommunication and physical coercion. It is not clear whether the Glossa is recommending restraint in the use of both excommunication and physical coercion, or whether the recommendation applied simply to the use of physical coercion.

As political allegory the 'two swords' could be interpreted either as the coercive powers available to the church, or as the two jurisdictions, secular and spiritual. Stickler has demonstrated that the first interpretation was more widespread and was certainly held by Master Gratian and by Bernard of Clairvaux. Before the Investiture Contest sword imagery was used to indicate the powers of punishment, both physical and spiritual, available to the Church. But a sharp distinction was rarely drawn between the swords. Churchmen did not find it necessary to distinguish sharply between physical and spiritual sanctions.

In the period after the Investiture Contest a sharper distinction was made between the two swords: one represented the spiritual sanction of excommunication, the other the material sanction of physical coercion (corporal punishment, physical punishment, and the waging of war). Thus when Bernard of Clairvaux wrote that both swords belonged to the church but that the material sword should be wielded 'by the hand of the knight ... and at the order of the emperor', he meant that the church could call upon secular rulers to defend the church against heretics, schismatics and oppressors of the

---

70 See Isidore, Allegoriae quaedam sacrae scripturae, PL 83 cols 97-130 at col 117A: 'Apostoli quoque omnes totius Ecclesiae portant typum ...'.

71 See n 65 above.

church, but that the church itself should never become directly involved in the use of force.\textsuperscript{73}

John’s use of the political allegory ‘two swords’ does not fit neatly into Stickler’s thesis for he used it in both senses, as the coercive powers available to the church and as the two jurisdictions. There are five references in John’s writings to the material sword: \textit{Policraticus} 3:15, 4:2 to 4:3, and 6:9, and epp 174 and 269; though only one of these passages explicitly uses the word ‘\textit{materialis}'.\textsuperscript{74}

There are three references to the \textit{Petri gladius}: \textit{Policraticus} 8:23 and epp 219 and 295.\textsuperscript{75}

In the \textit{Policraticus} the fullest reference to the material sword occurs in the opening lines of book 4, chapter 3. Here John is clearly speaking about the authority of the prince to use force:

Thus the prince receives this sword from the hand of the church, although the church has no sword of blood at all. Yet it possesses this sword which it uses through the hand of the prince. It confers on the prince the power of bodily coercion, (\textit{cohercendorum corporum potestas}), keeping for itself authority over spiritual matters in the person of the bishops (\textit{in pontificibus}).\textsuperscript{76}


\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Pol} 3:15 (Webb 1 p 232 esp lines 19-22); \textit{Pol} 4:2 - 4:3 (Webb 1 pp 237-9, see p 238/26 onwards, and the opening lines of 4:3 p 239); \textit{Pol} 6:9 (Webb 2 p 22/7-19); \textit{LL} ep 174 p 140, \textit{LL} ep 269 pp 542-44, which alone of these references speaks explicitly of the ‘spiritual’ and ‘material swords: ‘\textit{Nam sicut alii praesules in partem sollicitudinis a summo pontifice evocantur ut spiritualem exerceant gladium, sic a principe in ensis materialis communionem comites quasi quidam mundani iuris praesules asciscuntur}.’

\textsuperscript{75} See pp 299-301 below.
The gladius which is given to the prince represents more than the coercive power which the church can call on for its own defence. It represents the power of bodily coercion which the prince is entitled to use for the public good. This is evident from the context of John's remarks. The preceding chapter is entitled: 'What the Law is; and that the prince, although free from the bonds of the law, is the servant of law and equity; he acts as a public person ('publicam personam') and innocently sheds blood'. The whole thrust of this preceding chapter is that the prince has a public persona and must act in the interests of the community ('rei publicae procurat utilitatem'), placing the needs of others above his own personal wishes. Acting as the agent of the public good ('publicae utilitas minister') the prince punishes all damages, losses and crimes by means of equity. In this public role he:

... is entitled to carry the sword with which he innocently sheds blood. He is not a 'man of blood', nor does he incur the charge of homicide, even if he frequently slays men.

Here the sword clearly does not represent the coercive sanction which

76 Webb 1 p 239.
77 Webb 1 p 237: 'Quid lex; et quod princeps, licet sit legis nexibus absolutus, legis tamen servus est et aequitatis, geritque personam publicam, et innocenter sanguinem fundit.'
78 Webb 1 p 238/16-7.
79 '... rei publicae procurat utilitatem, et in omnibus aliorum commoda privatae praerat voluntati.' Ibid lines 4-6.
80 Ibid lines 15-8. For John's views on aequitas see Hohenleutner Briefsammlung pp 96-100. Hohenleutner shows the importance of aequitas in John's thought. See also Brooke's comments (EL pp xxi-xxii) on John's use of aequitas and for the conclusion that John learnt his Roman Law from Martinus Gosianus or from one of his disciples and that he was in touch with the Gosian circle at Bologna.
81 Webb 1 p 238/26-9.
can be invoked by the church, but represents the prince’s right to use force.

In *Policraticus* 4:3 John then shifts focus and proceeds to show that the prince’s coercive power is conferred by the church. As the title of the chapter indicates ‘the prince is the agent of priests and is inferior to them’ (‘Quod princeps minister est sacerdotum et minor eis; et quid sit ministerium fideliter gerere’). It is his duty to carry out those ‘sacred offices’ which are unworthy of the priesthood. John admits that the prince’s duties are ‘sacred’, for every aspect of enacting the ‘sacred laws’ is religious and pious. But, says John, the prince’s office is nevertheless inferior to that of the priest. The prince is little more than ‘executioner’ who, like the emperor Constantine, ought to be respectful and obedient to the priesthood. John’s comments amount to a trenchant ‘sacerdotalism’ - the prince derives his coercive power, in effect all his legitimate authority, from the church.

John’s references to the ‘material sword’ at *Policraticus* 3:15 and 6:9, support the impression that for John the ‘material sword’; represented the prince’s power of physical coercion, his right to exercise legitimate authority. In chapter 3:15, headed ‘Quod ei dumtaxat licet adulari, quem licet occidere; et quod tirannus publicus hostis est’, John refers to Matthew 26:52: ‘... omnes enim, qui acceperint gladium, gladio peribunt.’ He states that this passage is not to be interpreted as applying to the *gladius* received from God:

\[
\text{Sed accipere, intelligitur qui eum propria temeritate usurpat, non qui utendi eo accipit a Domino potestatem.}
\]

---

83 ibid p 239/30 - p 240/12.
The rightful ruler then receives his jurisdiction, his right to use force (gladius, potestas) from God.

At Polycraticus 6:9 John comments that

Duos gladios sufficere imperio Christiano Evangelii Sacra testatur historia ...

This clearly refers to two forms of authority: spiritual and secular; all other forms of coercion are illegitimate:

omnes alii eorum sunt qui cum gladiis et fustibus accedunt ut captiam capiant Christum, nomen eius delere cupientes.

But there is an echo of the other meaning given to the sword - that it represents the power of physical coercion which the church can use in its defence but which it delegates to laymen. For a few lines later John writes that the tasks of a knight are:

To defend the church, fight perfidy, venerate the priesthood, protect the poor from injury, maintain peace in the country (pacere provinciam), shed blood for his brothers as required by his oath, and if necessary to give up his life.

This set of duties which linked to the material sword, indicates that here John was using the sword as a symbol of the right to use physical force and this right was vested in the knightly class. The list of duties contains echoes of the idea that the sword symbolises the sanction of physical coercion which the church delegates to laymen, for the militia must 'defend the church' and 'venerate the

84  Webb 1 p 232/20-22.
85  Webb 2 p 22/16-7.
87  Webb 2 p 23/3-7.
priesthood'.

In ep 174 which John wrote to Bartholomew bishop of Exeter in July 1166, the material sword appears not as a symbol of jurisdiction, but as power of physical coercion which the church delegates to the king. Rebutting the claim of the English bishops that Henry wished only to do good, John states that Henry should not dishonour the priesthood (sacerdotium) and imperil souls by taking away the freedom of the church:

\[
de \text{cuius manus suscepit gladium ad ipsam cuendam et injurias propulsandas, non subruunt libertatem.} \quad 88
\]

In ep 269 written to Nicholas Decanus sheriff of Essex during the Becket dispute John uses the terms 'spiritualis gladius' and 'ensis materialis' to denote two distinct jurisdictions.

Other lords, lords spiritual (praesules), are called by the Pope to exercise pastoral care and wield the spiritual sword; in a similar way comites are summoned by the prince (princeps) into the fellowship of the temporal sword to be, as it were, bishops of the law of the world ......

If Stickler's thesis is correct - that for most twelfth century writers the sword which was conferred on secular rulers signified the church's power of physical coercion - then John's views were unusual. For John uses the symbol of the 'material sword' to represent both this coercive power and the jurisdiction of the secular ruler.

For John there was no sharp distinction between the concepts. Secular jurisdiction consisted mainly of physical coercion carried out on behalf of the church or in defence of it. The chief tasks of the lay rulers were to wield the 'material sword' by protecting the church

\[88 \quad \text{LL p 140.}\]
\[89 \quad \text{LL pp 543-5 (Brooke trans adapted).}\]
and by punishing evildoers.

John uses the image of the 'material sword' to emphasise that the authority of the prince was dependent on and inferior to the church. However nowhere does John argue or imply that the 'material sword' belongs to the papacy. He simply says that it belongs to the ecclesia.

b: The Petri gladius

John speaks on three occasions of the Petri gladius: in Policraticus 8:23, ep 219 and ep 295. In the passage in the Policraticus John says that when the church is threatened by schismatics, it should be patient:

> Interim contineat Ecclesia manus suas, quoniam gladius Petri, qui sanguinem carnali sitienc aut affectu, mandato Domini ad praesens tegitur in vagina, et discipuli eradicare zizanias properantes praecipiuntur messores angelos expectare.

The meaning of gladius Petri is unclear. It could conceivably refer to the physical sanction which the church should exercise through secular rulers. But since there is no definitive evidence for one or other interpretation, we shall have to assume that John was using the phrase in its standard sense: the power of excommunication available to the church.

In ep 219 addressed to Alexander III and written in September-October 1167, John uses the phrase Petri gladius to indicate the sanction of excommunication available to the pope. Referring to Frederick Barbarossa’s recent military reverses, John urges the pope to join in God’s work so that ‘just as you see the sword of God drawn against the heads of tyrants, so you may draw the sword of Peter

---

90 Webb 2 p 404/24-8.
against them'. John urges the pope to assist the extermination of those 'qui, ut stabilant iniquias hominum traditiones, verbum Dei moliuntur extinguer'.

In ep 295 to the monks of Christ Church Canterbury in October-November 1169, John asserted that 'Petri gladius potenter exertus est' and that Peter will cut off the ear of Malchus. As John indicates, the standard exegetical interpretation of 'Malcus' was 'rex'. The implication, therefore, was that the king now stood in danger of being excommunicated. It had not been thought that the bishop of London 'and other fomenters of schism would be struck by the sword of anathema (anathematis gladio)'. However the sentence of excommunication was to be imposed by Becket with the approval of the pope. The phrase Petri gladius is being used not to indicate powers that are exclusive to the papacy, but to indicate excommunications which have been confirmed by the pope.

Writing long after the Becket dispute, Herbert of Bosham in his Vita uses the term Petri gladius several times in his version of the speech which Becket made to the pope at Sens in November 1164. Herbert uses the term in the sense of ecclesiastical censure but links it - appropriately - with other phrases exalting the papacy: vicarius Christi, successor Petri.

In his presentation of the 'two swords' allegory, John made no particular claims for papal authority over secular rulers, nor in his

91 LL p 376.
92 LL p 678.
93 LL p 678 n 3.
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95 MB 3 pp 345, 346, 347 (where it is linked with 'vicarius Christi, successor Petri').
concept of the Petri gladius did he claim for the papacy particular powers of censure which were exclusive to the papacy.

c: The pope and secular rulers: Conclusions

John's references to the relationship between Rome and secular rulers are sparse, suggesting that the relationship was not one to which he gave much thought. There are only a few references in his writings to the allegory of the two swords. The references to the gladius materialis are not used to assert claims for papal authority over secular rulers. It is particularly significant that when John speaks of the gladius being delegated to the princeps, he states that this is done by the ecclesia which is led by bishops (pontifices). There is no reference here to papal authority. Nor in his concept of the Petri gladius did he claim for the papacy particular powers of censure which were exclusive to the papacy. Aside from the allegory of the two swords, there are three passages in John's works which give us glimpses of his views on the relationship.

In a letter to William Brito (ep 242), written probably in late 1167, John stated the principle that the pope has the right to depose an evil emperor and to release his followers from their bonds of fealty. John's comments occur in a passage in which he claims incorrectly that Alexander III had deposed Frederick Barbarossa. As noted earlier, the text implies that deposition of the emperor should take place only as a last resort and under extraordinary conditions when the unity of the church is under threat. This accords with John's comment in Policraticus 8:23 that the church should be slow to use 'gladius Petri, qui sanguinem carnali sitiebat affectu'.

96 See pp 284-5 above.
97 Webb 2 p 404/24-8; see pp 299-300 above.
As we noted in a previous chapter, John was not greatly perturbed at Geoffrey of Anjou’s refusal to allow papal legates to enter his territories. John was not so committed to the pope’s rights over secular rulers that he would condemn out of hand rulers who restricted the activities or blocked the entry of legates a latere. At Metalogicon 4:42 and in the Historia pontificalis we get significant views on the relationship between the church of Rome and secular rulers. In the final chapter of the Metalogicon John tells of the crucial role which he played in obtaining from Adrian IV the grant of Ireland for Henry II. He says that it was at his request ‘ad precas meas’ that Adrian made the grant and ‘per me’ that Adrian sent to Henry, the ‘anulum ... aureum, smaragdo optimo decoratum, quo fierent investitura iuris in gerenda Hibernia’.

The basis for the grant was:

\[
\text{Nam omnes insule de iure antiquo ex donatione, qui eam fundavit et dotavit, dicuntur Romanam Ecclesiam pertinere.}
\]

The language used here is not that of impersonal rights which the pope has over all secular rulers. Rather it is the language of particular rights which one ecclesia, the ‘Romana ecclesia’, had over certain territories. Constable suggests the claim that all islands pertain to the Roman church, carried the implication that England also belonged to the Roman church and that the king of England was a vassal of the pope’s.

In the Historia pontificalis we see John once again displaying
an awareness of the territorial rights of the Roman church. John tells of how Roger II of Sicily consecrated his own son William without consulting the pope:

a proceeding certainly not lawful, since it is common knowledge that Sicily belongs to the patrimony of the Roman church. 102

It is striking that apart from the passage asserting the pope’s right to depose evil rulers in extraordinary situations, the only passages in which John writes about papal supremacy over secular rulers deal not with universal bonds which unite all princes to the pope, but with particular bonds based on territory. Here John reveals the attitude of a churchman, actively involved in an episcopal household, placing great emphasis on the particular rights - territorial, feudal and ceremonial - which belong to his ecclesia.

The main conclusions to be drawn about John's views on the relationship of pope and secular ruler are:

1) he did not claim that secular authority derives from the pope; but he did claim that secular authority is bestowed by the church and if abused can be removed by the church;

2) he did not give the pope's superiority over secular rulers any prominence in his writings;

3) he never wrote of the pope's right to intervene in secular jurisdiction;

4) he accepted the pope's right to depose the Emperor, and by implication other secular rulers in extraordinary circumstances.

These are negative conclusions which accord well with the climate of opinion among conscientious churchmen, who were loyal to the papacy and committed to reform of the church. Research during the last
35 years suggests that from the 1120s the papal curia deliberately sought to avoid conflict with secular rulers, choosing to concentrate its reforming efforts on the internal structures of the church. Leading churchmen such as Bernard of Clairvaux were committed to the clear-cut separation of spiritual and secular powers. This is reflected in the view emphasised in Bernard's De consideratione that the papacy should not become directly involved in warfare, and that it should be slow to call in the aid of the secular arm. Such churchmen would have been dismayed at the suggestion that the pope should interfere frequently or as a matter of course in the activities of secular rulers. There would have been opposition to any notion that the pope should intervene as a matter of course in the judicial activities of secular rulers. Even half a century later, Innocent III, usually depicted as a strong exponent of papal authority, stated in the bull Per venerabilem, that apart from the patrimony of the church, the church had occasional jurisdiction (causaliter) over 'certis causis inspectis'. This 'occasional' jurisdiction came into operation when there were particular difficulties or uncertainties either in lay or ecclesiastical jurisdictions.

4: THE POPE AND BISHOPS

a: Introduction

103 See refs in chap 5 n 4 above.


By the twelfth century, the Romana ecclesia had behind it an eight hundred year old tradition of primacy over other churches. This tradition had never been static. The notion of 'primacy' took on different meanings as the objectives and policies of popes changed. But underlying these changes was the unchanging assertion that the apostolic see had juridical authority over other churches.

During the Investiture Contest papal primacy had become a more prominent feature of papal claims. In the Decretum the primatum of the Romana ecclesia was given an explicit and detailed treatment at 1 Dist XXI c.2 which is headed 'Romana ecclesia a Christo primatum accepit' and 1 Dist XXII. c.1, which is headed 'Romana ecclesia ceterarum primatum obtinuit' and 1 Dist. XXII. c.2, headed 'Non ab apostolis, sed ab ipso Domino Romana ecclesia primatum obtinuit'.

The primacy of the papacy was, then, a common presupposition shared by churchmen of the twelfth century. To test the assertion that John was a trenchant exponent of papal authority over other churches, we shall examine how John handles themes of papal primacy - in particular the theme of the 'Petrine commission' which was the chief source for Rome's claims to primacy.

b: The 'Petrine commission'

i: Introduction

In three scriptural passages - Matthew 16:18-19; Luke 22:32 and John 21:15-17, it is clear that Christ chose Peter as his successor and as the leader of the apostles and that he committed the church to


107 See Ullmann, Papal government pp 262-309 on how canon-law collections shaped ideas of papal primacy.

108 CIC 1 cols 69,73, 74.
Peter's care. This action - the 'Petrine commission' - was commented on by numerous patristic writers, but its meaning was ambiguous. It could be interpreted either as applying to the whole episcopate (or even to the entire priesthood) or as applying exclusively to the pope. Augustine commented that Peter was primus among the apostles. The passage from Jerome quoted in the Glossa ordinaria at Matthew 16:18-19 stated that the powers given to the entire church - the keys to the kingdom of heaven and the powers of binding and loosing - had been given specialiter to Peter. Such statements were vague and conveyed no indication of what juridical powers had been conferred on Peter or on his successors, the bishops of Rome. In fact it was a commonplace of patristic exegesis that Peter prefigured the church. Thus in the historical sense, Christ gave powers to Peter; in the allegorical sense He gave these powers to the whole church. This view was strengthened by other New Testament passages which seemed to indicate that sacramental powers had been conferred on all the apostles and that the Holy Spirit had come directly to all the apostles.

Commenting on Matthew 16:19, Augustine wrote:

Did Peter but not Paul receive those keys? Did Peter receive them, but not James and John and the other apostles? Are those keys not vested in the church which


110 Sermo 76 (PL 38 col 479, referring not to Petrine commission but to Matthew 14:24-33).

111 Glossa ordinaria vol 5, col 281.

112 e.g. Augustine, Retractionum libri duo, PL 32 col 618A; idem PL 32 col 196 (on Matthew 16:18); Isidore, Allegoriae quaedam sacrae scripturae, PL 83 cols 97-130 at 117A: 'Petrus personam Ecclesiae gestat ...'.
This interpretation lasted beyond the twelfth century. The canonist Huguccio writing c.1190 interpreted Luke 22:32 as applying both to Peter himself and in a wider sense to the universal church.  

An alternative 'papalist' interpretation of the 'Petrine commission' had emerged from time to time. Several Carolingian writers - including Paschasius Radbertus - thought it necessary to counteract this interpretation and to emphasise that the commission applied to the whole church and not exclusively to the papacy. But only during the Investiture Dispute was the strongly 'papalist' interpretation given prominence. In the hands of Gregory VII and his polemicists the Scriptural passages describing the commission were used to support claims of papal primacy.

For a person generally credited with trenchant 'papalism', John makes remarkably few references to the 'Petrine commission'. If we include three general references to John 21 the total is fourteen; of these only seven refer to papal authority.

113 Sermo 149, PL 38 col 302.

114 Brian Tierney, Origins of papal infallibility... (Leiden 1972) p 34 n 4. For Huguccio's comments on Matthew 16:18, see ibid p 35 n 3.


116 See I. S. Robinson, Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest... (Manchester 1978) p 26, also ibid pp 171-2 for the use of Cyprian, De ecclesiae catholicae unitate, chap 4, in the eleventh-century debate on the significance of Matthew 16:18.

117 The seven references alluding to the papacy are:
   a) Matthew 16:18-19 at Pol 7:21 (Webb 2 p 195/16-8); Pol 8:23 (Webb 2 p 404/29); EL ep 91 p 140;
   b) Luke 22:32 at Pol 8:23 (Webb 2 p 405/3);
   c) John 21 at LL ep 250 (p 504), ep 260 (p 526), ep 282 (p (Footnote continued)
Non-papal allusions

It is worth considering the seven references which do not allude to papal authority. In the concluding lines of Pollicraticus 2:27 attacking diviners and palmists, John alludes to Matthew 16:18:

Se siquidem ad huiusmodi flagitia prohibunt invitari publica voce Ecclesiae, adversus quam nec portae inferi praevalebunt.

Consider for example how John uses Luke 22:32, the passage in which Christ says to Peter 'But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren'. On three occasions in the Later Letters John alludes to Luke 22:32, in which Christ says to Peter: 'But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren'. In each of the three allusions John uses only the first part of the sentence to emphasise faith in times of adversity: 'ut non deficiat fides tua'. In doing this John was following the precedent of the Glossa ordinaria which emphasised the themes of faith and tribulation in Luke 22:32. Thus in late 1166 John wrote to Baldwin archdeacon of Totnes:

one thing only we should ask of our friends, that they assuage the sorrows of our exile by their prayers that our faith fail not ......

The seven references containing no allusion to the papacy are:

a) Matthew 16:18019 at Pol 2:27 (Webb 1 p 161/4-5); EL ep 100 (p 160), ep 127 (pp 219-20 - two refs);


In addition there is an allusion to John 21:17 at LL ep 256 (p 518) but without reference to the 'Petrine commission'; for an explanation of this allusion see A. Saltman, 'John of Salisbury and the world of the Old Testament', World JS pp 343-63 at pp 350-1.
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In an undated letter to Master Ralph of Lisleux, John declared: 'obsecrans et obtestans ut non deficiat fides tua'.

In ep 230, written in late November 1167 and probably addressed to John of Canterbury, bishop of Poitiers, the addressee is told the ecclesia, evidently, the church of Canterbury, was praying for him:

Illa rogavit pro te et rogare non cessat, ut non deficiat fides tua; et tu, quandocumque opportunitas fuerit, conversus ad illos, confirma fratres tuos.

In one of the Early Letters, ep 100 from Theobald, possibly to Robert archdeacon of Lincoln, the locus Matthew 16:19 is used, but only in the sense of the powers of confession and penance vested in all priests.

In ep 127 written to Henry II in Theobald’s name in the summer of 1160, but probably drafted in part by John, the 'Petrine

---

120 LL ep 187 p 251.
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122 This letter and related accounts (ep 231 and MS Oxford Bodleian Rawl. Q f.8 (2r)) of the meeting between Becket and the cardinal legates in November 1167, were drafted, as Brooke suggests, by 'one or more of Becket’s companions' (LL ep 230 p 407n). Brooke argues that there is a strong possibility that John of Salisbury had a role in drafting the letter. Brooke’s argument that John of Canterbury, bishop of Poitiers, may have been the recipient, is strengthened by John’s remarks towards the end of the letter (p 414): 'Haec illis ostendes ad quos missus es. Lapsos erige, stantes robora, ut firmi sint; plures enim sunt patroni et defensores quam umpugnatores'. The exhortation to 'raise up the fallen and to strengthen the upright' must have been addressed to a bishop. The phrase 'ad quos missus es' would be particularly appropriate for John of Canterbury, who left his native England to become bishop of Poitiers.
123 LL p 414.
124 EL p 160: 'Et quidem eius est mortuum solvere vel ligare qui solus potest mortuos suscitare'.
commission' is twice referred to, but without reference to papal authority. Having reminded Henry of the debt which he owes Theobald and the church, he comments:

I have commended you to the Church, and I desire that she should be commended to you. She is your mother, the Bride of Christ; she is more glorious and mightier (potentior) than any prince and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against her.  

A little later, Theobald urged Henry to fill the vacant see of Exeter. The Petrine language which Theobald uses is a reference not to papal authority but to the fact that Exeter cathedral is dedicated to St Peter:

The Spouse of the Church calls on you by my mouth; Peter the shepherd of the sheep and first of the Apostles calls on you: they urge you that if you desire to have them as your patrons and your helpers, you should agree to the ordination, under God, of a shepherd for the church of Exeter, and should be zealous to save the church from overwhelming shipwreck. It is the first of all the churches for whose welfare you made provision in your realm.

The use of the Petrine commission twice in one letter, may reflect the fact that at this period, there was considerable unease about the papal schism. The letter was drafted about the same time as the synod of Beauvais (July 1160) when the English and French churches agreed to recognise Alexander III as pope.

iii: Papal allusions

In Policraticus 8:23 - the chapter dealing with the papacy and schism - John included two references to the Petrine commission. The

125 EL p 220.
126 EL p 220.
references occur within a few lines of each other:


It refers to the papacy in times of schism but is not used to underline the primacy of Rome.

On two occasions when criticising the Hospitalles for evading episcopal authority, John uses Matthew 16:19. In the Early Letters he alleged that the Hospitallers were withdrawing churches from the control of bishops, refusing to be summoned to episcopal courts and yet at the same time relying on episcopal authority whenever 'they desire to summon anyone within their provinces'. John alleged that:

... in contempt of the Apostles [the Hospitallers] usurp the office of binding and loosing (ligandi et solvendi ... officium) and usurp the keys of the church (claves ecclesiae).

In the Policraticus John described the Hospitallers in almost identical words: 'usurping the keys of the church' and 'undermining Peter'. In these passages John clearly did not actually mean that the Hospitallers had usurped specific powers which belonged to the pope. He was suggesting that the Hospitallers had been undermining episcopal authority and that any threat to episcopal authority was also a threat to the pope's authority.

129 EL p 140.
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In three letters all apparently written in 1168 - John refers to John 21, the passage where the risen Christ appears to the apostles for the third time. The scene is the lake of Tiberias where the apostles are fishing. Peter is the first to recognise Christ and hastens towards the shore. The other apostles follow and find 'hot coals lying and a fish thereon and bread'. Christ bids the apostles to eat: ‘Venite, prandete’, and then He commands Peter 'Feed my lambs ... Feed my sheep ...'. In one of the letters John wrote:

Peter's fellow-disciples have long wearied in manning the ship, but now they reckon themselves near harbour: bidden to Christ's feast they rejoice to be making the longed-for landfall.

In the other two letters John uses similar language. The immediate purpose of these references was to convey a feeling of confidence, to suggest that a settlement satisfactory to Becket was imminent. But they were also part of a broader campaign to prove that Becket's conflict with Henry II was - like the conflict between Alexander III and Frederick Barbarossa - part of a universal struggle for church liberties, a struggle against tyrants and schismatics. Within the English church and in the papal curia there was a strong impression - encouraged by Henry II's advisers - that Becket's dispute with the king was a personal one and that Becket was motivated by vindictiveness and ill-will rather than by a genuine concern for the welfare of the church. From 1166 Becket propagandists - including John - made efforts to counteract this impression. They tried to identify Henry II and Frederick Barbarossa as fellow tyrants hostile to God and to the church. In these passages echoing John 21, the

131 LL epp 250 (p 504), 260 (p 526), 282 (p 620).
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focus is not the commission given to Peter, but the common purpose, the fellowship of the apostles who have been called to Christ's feast. In these letters, then, John was not seeking to make any statement about the nature or extent of papal authority.

c: The pope and bishops: Conclusions

The paucity of references in John's writings to the 'Petrine commission' suggest that the assertion of papal authority over the episcopate was not a major concern of his. The references themselves give no hint that he favoured the strengthening of the pope's authority over bishops. Indeed his critical attitude to appeals, and his attacks on exemptions from episcopal authority, indicate that he was conscious of the dangers which papal authority posed to episcopal authority.

5: THE POPE AS LEGISLATOR

John's views on the legislative powers of the pope, were those shared by other twelfth-century churchmen concerned with church reform and with the freedom of the church from lay interference. In ep 213 John accepted that the pope may create new laws ('nova iura condere') and abrogate old ones ('vetera abrogare'), but that he cannot change those things 'quae a Dei verbo in evangelio vel lege perpetuam causam habent'. Here lex appears to mean 'divine law', the will of God

133 For these themes see chap 7:3 esp pp 360-63 below.
134 See chap 5 above.
135 e.g. his attacks on the exemptions enjoyed by the Hospitallers (Pol 7:21 Webb 2 p 195/16-17; EL ep 91 p 140) discussed p 311 above. The comments in the Policraticus occur in a passage attacking exemptions in general.
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which is the foundation of law, both ecclesiastical and secular.

John used these statements on the pope's legislative powers to suggest that the pope ought to abrogate the privilegium which, according to rumour, has been granted to John of Oxford:

Was it right to exempt him from the jurisdiction of all bishops in such a way as to allow him (as his accomplices boast) by papal authority to rage against those subject to him, allowing them no right of appeal?  

According to John the privilegium allowed John of Oxford to 'summon bishops and clergy of England and instruct them not to obey the archbishop of Canterbury, nor go to him when summoned' and to absolve men lawfully excommunicate, without making satisfaction or giving any security at all, still persisting in their sacrilege ....

The thrust of John's argument had nothing to do with the nature of papal authority. John's complaint was that John of Oxford was arranging for the English bishops to absolve persons whom Becket had excommunicated. The question is referred to in ep 219, a letter to Alexander III, which was probably drafted by John. These absolutions given to persons who had been disputing the possessions of Canterbury and seizing the possessions of Canterbury clerks, were, according to ep 219, not true absolutions for:

in the eyes of God, who never absolves criminals without repentance, they are surely bound. There is no doubt of their impenitence, since they neither make satisfaction when they can nor restore anything of what they have taken.
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John's views on the pope's right to create new laws and abrogate old ones, are consistent with those in Gratian's *Decretum*. The reasons that John offers for this are, firstly, that Eugenius deserved it 'by so readily revoking the sentences of his predecessors, not to mention his fellow-bishops'; and secondly, that he tended to rely on his personal opinion in imposing sentences ('in ferendis sentenciis'). Later in the *Historia* he speaks of the odd *privilegium* that Eugenius granted to Simon the nephew of the late abbot Suger:

> Welcomed by the pope, he was granted letters of protection containing, as well as the common form, an astonishing *privilegium* without precedent (*sine exemplo sed non sine admiratione*), exempting him from answering any charge except in the presence of the pope himself.

The 'astonishing privilege without precedent' perturbed the French bishops, for it seemed to confirm sinners in their misdeeds and to encourage men guilty of crimes to seek similar privileges. Even if papal rulings were ill-conceived they had to be obeyed. In *Policraticus* 6:24 John makes the statement that any who oppose the *doctrina* of the Roman church are schismatics or heretics. No matter how he behaved the pope cannot be judged by any human
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authority:

Quis enim praesumet summum iudicare pontificem, cuius causa Dei solius reservatur examini? 145

This was a well-established doctrine to be found in Ivo of Chartres' Decretum Panormia 146 and in Gratian's Decretum (II. ix. 3. c.14). 147

John's presentation of the pope as legislator was not radical, but was based on doctrines that were well-established and uncontroversial. 148

6: CONCLUSIONS

The evidence marshalled in this chapter indicates that the advancement of papal authority over secular rulers or over bishops was not a major concern in John's writings or career. 149 The view, deeply engrained in the secondary literature, that John was a 'papalist' must therefore be rejected. In the wider debate on the political theories of medieval popes, canonists and publicists, John of Salisbury cannot be used as an instance of 'papalist' or 'papal-hierocratic' attitudes. 150

The standard interpretations of John's views on papal authority

145 Webb 2 p 405/23-5.
146 PL 161 cols 325D, 1184D.
147 2 c.9.3.cc 13-14 (= CIC I col 610). cf c.9.q.3 dict. post c.9 (= CIC I col 609): 'Sola enim Romana ecclesia sua auctoritate ..., de ea vero nulli iudicare permittitur'.
148 It has been argued by J. van Laarhoven that the speech decrying the church's drift towards increased legislative and judicial activity at the expense of its ministry, and usually attributed to John of Salisbury at the Third Lateran Council in 1179 is authentic (I have not seen his article on the subject; 'Non iam decreta, sed Evangelium! Jean de Salisbury à Lateran III', Dalla chiesa antica alla chiesa moderna ..., Miscellanea historiae pontificiae 50, Rome 1983, pp 107-119). J. W. Baldwin, Masters, princes and merchants: The social views of Peter Chanter and his circle, 2 vols (Princeton 1970) vol 1 p 315 and vol 2 p 212 rejects the authenticity of the attribution.
149 See pp 301-4, 313 above.
150 For the wider debate see pp 275-77 above.
have been founded on the assumption that 'sacerdotalism' - a strong insistence that secular authority derived from and was inferior to the church - necessarily implied 'papalism'. However that assumption is unwarranted, for although John was no 'papalist', his 'sacerdotalism' is unmistakeable. In the Policraticus he was consistent and emphatic that royal power was inferior to ecclesiastical power, and that the secular ruler was minister sacerdotum. It was, therefore, possible for a twelfth-century schoolman to be strongly 'sacerdotalist' without being committed to advancing the authority of the papacy.

John had more contact with the papal curia than most of his English contemporaries. He made at least ten visits to the curia in the period 1148-1159; in the household of archbishop Theobald during the 1150s he had special responsibility for dealing with appeals being made from the court of Canterbury to the papal curia; he was a close friend of pope Adrian IV. During the period 1171-76 John appeared frequently as a witness to judge-delegate decisions and occasionally as a judge-delegate himself. It is highly significant that in spite of this relatively high degree of contact with the curia, he was not papalist. It suggests how tenuous was the papacy's hold on the loyalties of churchmen, even in an age when appeals were being made increasingly to the papal curia and when more people - both lay and ecclesiastical - were being brought into contact with the pope's jurisdiction.

151 See Pol 3:4 Webb 1 p 238.
152 See chap 4 pp 188-90 above.
153 See chap 5 p 230 above.
154 See chap 4 pp 185-6 above.
155 See LL p xlvi n 2.
156 For episcopal resistance to papal assertions of authority, see (Footnote continued)
Despite John’s wide travelling and his many years spent outside his native land, his loyalties and his values were essentially local ones. Despite his numerous visits he seems not to have built up a network of contacts at the papal curia. The few persons with whom he established contact while at the curia or in southern Italy, were mainly fellow Englishmen. His experience of the curia in fact made him hostile to its workings and, in particular, hostile to the negotiatores, the cardinal-politicians, whose assistance was necessary for the successful prosecution of cases.

The strength of local loyalties - can also be seen in the way in which his loyalty to the ecclesia of Canterbury shaped his attitudes to the papal curia. During the 1150s John like Theobald of Canterbury, was uneasy about the danger which the appeals system posed to the effectiveness of Canterbury’s jurisdiction. Such local loyalty also shaped the way in which John conceived the rights of the papacy. While he never advanced claims for the universal authority of the pope over secular rulers, he was clearly sympathetic to specific territorial and feudal rights of the papacy. Thus he was not greatly upset by the resistance of individual rulers to the activities of papal legates, but he supported the papacy’s territorial claims over Sicily and, on the basis of the Constitutum Constantini - over islands such as Ireland.

(continued)


See chap 4 p 197 above.

See chap 4 pp 214-5 above.

See chap 5 above.
Although a cosmopolitan person, in an age when the intellectual elite of Christendom was increasingly characterised by contacts that ranged across political boundaries, John’s loyalties and views on ecclesiastical authority were very much shaped by the local perspective and interests of his ecclesia, Canterbury.

See pp 302-3 above.
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CHAPTER 7: JOHN OF SALISBURY AND THOMAS BECKET

1: INTRODUCTION

During the years of the Becket dispute John of Salisbury acted as an agent and adviser to Thomas Becket. In early 1164, about nine months before Becket went into exile, John was acting on his behalf, sounding out support at the court of Louis VII, among French ecclesiastics and at the papal curia which was then based in northern France.¹ Throughout the dispute John remained apart from Becket’s household, staying instead with his closest friend, Peter of Celle abbot of St Rémi in Rheims. From there he advised Becket by letter and had special responsibility for winning and maintaining support for him within the English church.² On a few occasions John met Becket and could have advised him in person.³ After the settlement reached between king and archbishop at Fréteval on 22 July 1170, it was John who in October returned to Canterbury in advance of Becket to make preparations for his return.⁴ Although John remained outside Becket’s familia and was at times critical of the approach adopted by Becket and his immediate advisers, he was identified by his contemporaries as one of the leading members of the Becket circle. Thus William FitzStephen says that John and John of Canterbury were removed from England by Henry II, to prevent them from giving counsel and aid to Becket.⁵ John of Canterbury was removed, so William states, by being

¹ See LL ep 136.
² See chap 9 below.
³ See LL p 416 (at the conference of Gisors-Trie, November 1167), p 576 (1168 on return from St Gilles visited Becket).
⁴ See LL ep 304.
appointed bishop of Poitiers, while John of Salisbury was sent into exile. As there is no other evidence in the Becket correspondence or in John's own letters that he was forced into exile ahead of Becket, we cannot assume that FitzStephen's account is accurate. However, it does suggest at least that when writing his *Vita* of Becket in 1173-74, William FitzStephen had a recollection that the two Johns were seen in the early days of the dispute as closely identified with Becket.

Despite being active on Becket's behalf, there appears to have been a certain degree of detachment and even tension between John and the Becket circle. John's thirteen extant letters to Becket contain remarkably few expressions of friendship. Only in two letters does John use any of the language of friendship. In ep 28, written about December 1156 - January 1157, when seeking the assistance of Becket, then royal chancellor, in regaining the king's favour, John speaks of his 'devotio anticae familiaritas' and 'spectatae amicitiae fidem'. In that letter and in ep 128, written c. September 1160, John describes Becket as *dilectio vestra*. Given the elaborate and extended allusions to the sentiments and obligations of friendship which occur in John's letters to *amici*, the sparsity of such allusions implies that John did not include Becket as one of their number.

---

5 MB 3 p 46; see LL p xxii.

6 For the dates of composition of the *Vitae* of Becket see E F G Walberg, *La tradition hagiographique de Saint Thomas Becket avant la fin du XIIe siecle* (Paris 1929) pp 133-34. But note that T. Reuter, in a paper as yet unpublished argues that John of Salisbury's *Vita* was composed in early 1173 at the very latest, rather than between 1173 and 1176 as suggested by Walberg pp 173-85. I wish to thank Dr. Reuter for his advice on this point. Barlow TB pp 4, 279 also refers.

7 EL p 45.

8 EL pp 46, 221.
John no longer played the role of leading confidant to the archbishop of Canterbury, which he had done during the last years of Theobald's pontificate. On becoming archbishop Becket brought in new advisers, the leading ones being William FitzStephen and Master Herbert of Bosham. During the years of exile there are occasional hints, in John's letters, of friction between him and Becket's advisers. Thus in 1167, when submitting a conciliatory draft of a letter to William of Pavia for Becket's approval, John asked Becket not to show it to the rest of the familia, in case it was attacked by them. John's severe criticism of the draft letter which Becket intended sending to William of Pavia, also implies that in late 1167 John's approach to dealing with the papal legates was utterly at variance with that of Becket's advisers. For Becket's letter must have been seen and approved by Becket's immediate advisers.

The questions posed by John's attitude to Becket and to Becket's cause have most recently been analysed by Beryl Smalley and Anne Duggan. Smalley convincingly rejects the view that in church affairs John was a 'moderate', who was alienated by Becket's extremism. She shows that John's 'sacerdotalism', his commitment to the supremacy of church over state, was uncompromising and far from

9 See Table 1 above.
11 For Herbert see B Smalley, The Becket conflict, pp 59-86.
12 LL ep 228 p 400.
13 LL ep 227; discussed chap 8 pp 406-8 below.
'moderate'. Smalley however suggests that John's relationship with Becket was strained. Commenting on Herbert of Bosham, she says, 'Herbert linked together the two halves of Becket's experience. He sympathised with the proud chancellor and the converted archbishop. Becket felt more at home with him then he ever could with John of Salisbury.' In contrast, Duggan while accepting that there was a coolness between John and Becket's immediate advisers, argues that it was John's 'unswerving loyalty to the archbishop and opposition to the Constitutions of Clarendon which cost him the peace he so earnestly desired'. The object of this chapter is to explore (a) how closely John identified with Becket's cause in the early phase of the dispute, 1162-1166; and (b) how he presented Becket's cause. To do this for the period before John went into exile, his Vita Sancti Anselmi, written in 1163, is analysed as a source and its political implications are assessed. For the period 1164-1166 the use of 'persecution' themes in John's letters is explored to argue that at first he was not committed to Becket's policy, but that in 1166 he found himself obliged by circumstances to do so.

2: THE VITA SANCTI ANSELMI

a) Introduction

John's Vita Sancti Anselmi survives in a single sixteenth century transcript, Lambeth 159. This is a composite manuscript volume

16 Smalley p 86.
17 World JS p 438.
18 PL 199 cols 1009-1040
19 ff 160v-176r. See M. R. James, A descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts in Lambeth Palace (Cambridge 1930-2).
consisting of five distinct books, each in a different hand, and it contains materials relating to Canterbury. The second book, which contains John's *Vita*, also contains other material relating to Anselm: a verse epitome of John's *Vita*; Eadmer's *Vita* and *Miracula* and Alexander III's bull of 1163 authorising Becket to investigate and decide on the canonisation of Anselm. The book also contains the lives of other archbishops of Canterbury - Elphege, Dunstan, and Odo - and a life of 'St Ethelbert king and confessor as well as founder of Christ Church Canterbury'. The contents of this second book were compiled in 1507 by Richard Stone, a monk of Christ Church. The colophon to John's *Vita Sancti Anselmi* states that it was transcribed (scriptum) by Richard Stone and completed on 12 December 1507 'ad laudem et honorem dei et sancto patrono nostro Anselmo'.

The transcript attributes the *Vita* to John of Salisbury. This attribution can be accepted as reliable, for the text is almost

---

20 ff 48-220.


22 ff 117r-160r. The *Vita* (i.e. *Vita et conversatio Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi*) and the *Miracula* (i.e. *Quaedam parva descripitione miraculorum gloriosi patris Anselmi Cantuariensis*) are both contained in Eadmer, *The life of Saint Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury*, ed and trans R. W. Southern, OMT, (repr with corrections: 1972) [Henceforth: Eadmer, ed Southern].

23 f 76v. See MB5 ep 23 pp 35-6.

24 ff 80r-97v; also *Translatio* ff 99v-101r.

25 ff 1-63r (Vita and other materials). This material thus occurs in the first and second books of the manuscript.

26 ff 68r-74.

27 ff 215v-220r.

28 Stone was professed monk of Christ Church in 1483 (W. G. Searle, *Christ Church Canterbury ... II: Lists of deans, priors and monks of Christ Church monastery*, Cambridge Antiquarian Society octavo ser 34 (1902) 153-96 at p191). He died c.1508-9 (C. E. Woodruff, 'The (Footnote continued)
certainly based on a manuscript which was available at Canterbury in 1507. This and the other texts transcribed in the second book of Lambeth 159, being of Canterbury interest, would have been available at Christ Church. The transcript of Eadmer's *Vita Sancti Anselmi* for instance is a very accurate copy of a Christ Church manuscript composed c.1125.\(^{31}\) Even if the transcript of John's *Vita* is not based on the original twelfth century manuscript, it was based on a Christ Church manuscript which was likely to have contained an accurate attribution. A second ground for accepting the attribution is that Richard Stone was a careful editor interested in the materials which he was transcribing. The colophon to John's *Vita* reveals the pious zeal which motivated Stone's antiquarian activities. His piety and extreme accuracy are shown in the transcript of Eadmer's *Vita* and *Miracula*, which Southern has described as 'a very careful copy' of British Museum Harleian 315.\(^{32}\) A third ground for accepting the attribution is that in the *Vita* attributed to John there is an

\(^{28}\) (continued)

sacrist's rolls of Christ Church Canterbury', *Archaeologia Cantiana* 48 (1936) 38-80 at p 68).

\(^{29}\) f 176r: 'Scriptum per fratrem Ricardum Stone eiusdem ecclesie commonachum. Anno domini m v vll perfecit hoc opus xii die decembris ad laudem et honorem Dei et sancto patrono nostro Anselmo.' This colophon is scored through in red, indicating that an editor, probably Stone himself, wished to remove the colophon. This suggests the possibility that the transcripts in the second book of Lambeth 159 were intended as preparatory copy for a more attractive manuscript.

\(^{30}\) f 176r: 'Explicit Vita Sancti Anselmi Cantuariensis ecclesie archiepiscopi secundum Johannem Carnotensem episcopum.' See also f 160v: 'Incipit prologus Johannis Saresberiae ...' and 'Explicit prologus ... secundum Johannem Saresberiensem'; f 161: 'Incipit Vita ... edita a Johanne Carnotense episcope.' It is unclear whether the two versions of John's name reflect two twelfth-century manuscript traditions. It is possible that Stone himself may have given the 'Salisbury' version of John's name in the incipit and explicit to the prologue.

\(^{31}\) MS London British Library: Harleian 315.

\(^{32}\) Eadmer, ed Southern p xxiv.
incident which is found nowhere else except in one of John's Later Letters. This is the incident of the monks of Christ Church Canterbury hurrying to be the first people to greet Anselm on his return from exile in 1100. In the *Vita* we read:

Primi quidem omnium ad Patrem sub omni celeritate monachi Cantuarienses occurrunt ......

In *ep* 303, written to William Brito the subprior and others at Christ Church in mid-October 1170, we read:

In Historia Novorum repperi decessores vestros, primos occurrisses revertenti ab exilio patri Anselmo ......

No extant version of Eadmer's *Historia Novorum* contains this incident. So John either drew the incident from a version of the *Historia* now lost, or he drew it from some other source and attributed it incorrectly to the *Historia*, or he simply invented the incident. The last alternative would certainly fit in with what we know about John's readiness to invent and distort sources. However, it is unlikely that in *ep* 303 John was trying to deceive his audience, for they had access to Eadmer's *Historia Novorum*, and would probably have been familiar with the traditions surrounding Anselm and his relationship with the monks of Christ Church. In itself the occurrence of this incident in the *Vita* would not prove that John was the author of the *Vita*. But, combined with the evidence that Stone's transcripts were based on Canterbury sources and that Stone was a

---

33 col 1031 C.  
34 LL p 712-3.  
35 ed M. Rule RS 81 (1884) [= HN].  
36 For instance the text contained in MS Cambridge Corpus Christi College 452 (see Ker, *Medieval Libraries* p 31 and Rule introduction to HN pp ix-xiv).
careful and painstaking scholar, it indicates quite clearly that the Vita was written by John.

John’s Vita was almost certainly written as the dossier for Anselm’s canonisation which was presented at the Council of Tours in May 1163. During 1163 Becket fostered the cult of Anselm, a cult which naturally suggested that there were parallels between Anselm’s struggle for church liberties and Becket’s early clashes with Henry II. At Canterbury a local cult of Anselm appears to have been growing, even before Becket came to office. There is evidence for a confraternity of St Anselm at Canterbury during the 1150s and 1160s, and it has been suggested by Raymonde Foreville that archbishop Theobald was instrumental in fostering the cult at Canterbury. Becket’s decision to encourage the cult of Anselm was probably in part a response to the canonisation of Edward the Confessor two years previously. The process for that canonisation had been initiated by the monks of Westminster, but had received the powerful backing of Henry who saw the political advantages of numbering a saint among his

37 For the Council of Tours see R. Somerville, Pope Alexander III and the Council of Tours 1163 ..., (Berkeley-London 1977); also: Councils and Synods 1:2 pp 845-50.
38 For a discussion of the campaign see Southern, Anselm pp 337-8; note also Councils and Synods 1:2 pp 847, 850.
40 See R. W. Scholz, ‘The canonisation of Edward the Confessor’, Speculum 36 (1961) 38-60. See also R. W. Kemp, Canonisation and authority in the western church (Oxford 1948) pp 82-3. The correspondence concerning the canonisation has been edited in F. Barlow, Edward the Confessor (London 1970) Appendix D.
and royal predecessors. It suggested that Henry like Edward stood for the close cooperation of church and royal government, and it also strengthened Henry's claims to be the legitimate ruler of England by inheritance.

At the Council of Tours Becket submitted a dossier for Anselm's canonisation, but due to the pressure of business at the council the matter was deferred. According to Alexander III, writing to Becket a month after the Council of Tours, the case for Anselm's canonisation had to be deferred because of the large number of similar applications. In the same letter Alexander authorised Becket to convene a council to investigate and decide on the case for Anselm's canonisation. There is no evidence that such a council was called. It has been suggested by Southern that Becket did convene such a council. He cites as evidence a Christ Church calendar which can probably be dated to 1171, and which indicates that there was liturgical observance of Anselm's translation (7 April) and feast-day (21 April). Southern considered that these liturgical observances must have been preceded by a formal canonisation. Raymonde Foreville has however pointed out that for a purely local cult such observances could be introduced by the local bishop without recourse to Rome. She has suggested that these observances were probably instituted by archbishop Theobald, and that the translation of Anselm's body could have been carried out by Theobald rather than Becket.

41 In his letter to Alexander III requesting the canonisation of Edward, Henry drew attention to the tie of kinship: 'De cuius sanguine propagatum me ...', Barlow Edward the Confessor p 310.
42 See MB 5 ep 23 pp 35-6. cf n 23 above.
43 Anselm pp 339-40. The calendar references are to be found in MS Oxford Bodleian: Add C. 260 at 2v.
44 Foreville 'Culte de Saint Anselme' pp 301-4.
The *Vita* has features which we would expect in a dossier for canonisation: it is written in a compressed style and it places particular stress on the posthumous miracles. John’s *Vita* is therefore very different from most of his other works. It compares poorly with the elegance of the *Metalogicon* and the *Policraticus*, or with the vivacity of the *Historia pontificalis* and the Letters. It contains few traces of John’s attitudes and no trace at all of his personality, his sense of humour or his interest in the way people behave. The only occasion when John is likely to have been asked to compose a life of Anselm was in 1162-3 when Becket began to encourage the cult of Anselm.

Because it is dull and derivative, and compares poorly with John’s other writings, the *Vita Sancti Anselmi* has generally been dismissed as little more than a resumé of Eadmer and of little historical value. Schaarschmidt simply pointed out that John’s *Vita* was closely based on Eadmer’s writings. Later historians, such as Manitius, Guth and Miczka, have been far more dismissive. But the *Vita* is in fact a skilful reworking of Eadmer’s *Vita* and *Miracula*, and into it John has placed several insertions, two of which throw light on his relationship with the Becket circle in 1162-3 and on the

---

45 The central argument of ‘Culte de Saint Anselme’, see esp 306-10.

46 For these features in John’s writings, see chap 3 pp 174-80 above.

47 Johannes Saresberiensis p 242.

political priorities of the Becket circle at this stage. To assess the significance of these insertions we need first to examine how John set about composing his dossier for canonisation.

b: The reworking of Eadmer's *Vita* and *Miracula*

i: Miracles

In undertaking to write a dossier for canonisation, John was faced with the problem that only 19 posthumous miracles could be attributed to Anselm. This was a particularly serious problem as one of the criteria which were emerging for canonisation in the twelfth century was the occurrence of posthumous miracles, rather than miracles effected in the lifetime of the saint. Although the evidence for this distinction comes later than John's *Vita*, it is likely that the distinction was formulated long before it entered papal rulings on canonisation. As greater emphasis came to be placed on posthumous miracles, the two proofs which were becoming essential for canonisation were evidence of a good and pious life, and evidence of miracles after death. In 1188 Clement III wrote to Absalon archbishop of Lund about Ketillus a *vir religiosus* 'who while he lived shone with many virtues ... After his death and on account of his

49 See Table 4 p 335 below. Schaarschmidt, Johannes Saresberiensis pp 243-44 was under the mistaken impression that the miracles contained in John's *Vita* chaps 17-18 were not derived from Eadmer.


51 For some post-1199 references to these two types of evidence see S. Kuttner, 'La réserve papale du droit de canonisation', Essay VI in *idem The history of ideas and doctrines of canon law in the middle ages*, Variorum, (London 1980) (= repr from Revue historique de droit français et étranger 4e ser 17 (1938) 172-228) at p 207 and at Appendix no 6 (pp 224-8).
merits, God enacts numerous and constant miracles ... Later in the same letter Clement authorised archbishop Absalon to convene his suffragans and religious men to inquire into the sanctity of Ketillus: 'de operibus eius et miraculis, quibus post mortem proponitur coruscare'. Almost eleven years later, in January 1199, Innocent III emphasised the importance of posthumous miracles rather than those carried out in life. The reason that posthumous miracles were regarded as so convincing is that the person regarded as a saint was indeed in Heaven and interceding with God. Miracles effected by someone in his own lifetime might in reality be sorcery inspired by Satan and designed to mislead the faithful.

Eadmer's *Vita* and *Miracula* contain only 19 miracles which occurred at Anselm's death or after. To these John could only add one recent miracle - the cure of Elphege, a monk of Christ Church, who from birth had been blind, deaf, dumb and crippled. With such an astonishing cure, remarkable even as miracles go, we might feel that John had little need for other recent miracles. However if there had been other recent miracles, John would certainly have included them as they would have strengthened the case for canonisation. John avoided the problem of a shortage of posthumous miracles with characteristic aplomb. He speaks of vaguely the *grandia volumina* which contain more instances of Anselm's sanctity. In the opening lines of the final chapter he writes:

> It would take a long time to recount all the happenings of this kind. But as I have promised brevity and succintness,

---

53 *ibid* 1361 B.
54 See Kemp p 104.
55 col 1040 B.
I shall close the book with only a few instances. Anyone who wishes to know more should return to the sources; I speak of the enormous volumes (grandia volumina) from which I have drawn these instances as if to console and refresh with so little.56

The grandia volumina cannot be the works of Eadmer for with one understandable exception,57 John retells all the miracles which are to be found in Eadmer's Vita and Miracula. Nor can the volumina be collections of more recent miracles for John would have included whatever miracles he could. We must therefore accept Southern's suggestion58 that the grandia volumina existed only in John's imagination. They formed yet another of John's persuasive fictions.59

ii: Omissions

Besides having an abundant supply of posthumous miracles, the successful dossier for canonisation needed to be succinct. In the Prologue to the Vita John indicates that he has deliberately chosen to write in a compressed, unadorned style. After admitting that Eadmer had written luculento stylo about Anselm, he says:

I have undertaken to write something about the life and conversation of this great Father, briefly, succinctly and in a plain enough style; so that whoever cannot manage to read the vast stream of works which have been written by or about Anselm, can at least taste a little from the great river, and discover how good, how sweet is the Lord; how blessed, how needful is He whom Anselm served.60

A dossier for canonisation needed to concentrate on those incidents or

56 col 1038 C.
57 See p 336 below.
58 Southern, Anselm p 338.
59 For other fictions see chap 1 nn 33-34.
60 col 1009 C.
miracles which demonstrated sanctity. There was no value in padding a dossier with anecdotal or colourful information or with shrewd psychological insights. These could only distract the readers or listeners from the central argument of the dossier, the case for canonisation. In preparing the dossier, John had also to bear in mind that there would be a large amount of business to be carried out at the Council of Tours and very little time in which to do it. So the more succinct the dossier was, the more successful it was likely to be. The result was a very short Vita. In the Patrologia Latina Eadmer's Vita alone takes up almost 70 columns; John's Vita, which summarises the contents of Eadmer's Vita and Miracula, takes up a mere 30.

John effected his reduction of Eadmer's text in two ways: by the deletion of entire passages and by the severe reduction of other passages. The omissions, tabulated below point to the difference in purpose between John and Eadmer. Writing mainly for the monks of Christ Church Canterbury and for a monastic audience, Eadmer was interested in recording the conversations of Anselm, his views on the monastic life (as in the letter to Lanzo), his practice of monastic values (as in his desire for monastic tranquillity, his aversion to secular business, his humility when praised), and the close, friendly relationship which he supposedly had with the monks of Christ Church. John on the other hand was only interested in anecdotes which revealed Anselm's sanctity.

61 For an earlier instance of the advantages of writing a short dossier, see Vita Sancti Arnulfi Suessionensis 3:15 (PL 174 cols 1367-1440) at cols 1433-4.
62 PL 158 cols 49-118.
63 PL 199 cols 1009-40.
64 Eadmer, Vita 1:20 pp 32-4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pages in Southern ed</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>Anselm's thoughts on where to become a monk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-6</td>
<td>1:9</td>
<td>How Anselm converted hatred into genuine love.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1:19 (end)</td>
<td>The attack by Gaunilo on Anselm's Proslogion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-4</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Letter to Lanzo on the monastic life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 48, 50              | 1:29    | a) Anselm honorably received by the monks of Christ Church and made a member of their fraternity;  
b) Anselm's speech on caritas. |
| 59-60               | 1:33    | Anselm tempered the severity of his lifestyle for the sake of others. He taught that one should not have a will of one's own but should fit in with God's harmony. |
| 72                  | 2:9     | The spiritual and physical aid which Anselm gave to all comers. |
| 74-80               | 2:11-12 | Various, including:  
a) Anselm's conversation at mealtimes;  
b) his response to critics. |
| 93-7                | 2:21 (most of) | Anselm's speech to the monks of Canterbury, before he went into exile. |
| 100-2               | 2:25    | Anselm's visit to St Bertin. |
| 103-4               | 2:28    | A personal reminiscence by Eadmer about an incident on Anselm's journey between Lyons and Rome: the abbot of Susa praises Anselm, who displaying humility, does not reveal his identity. |
| 132-3               | 2:55    | Eadmer's reminiscence of a conversation with Anselm; the relic of St Prisca martyr. |
| 148-9               | 2:71    | Authorities for the Vita. |
| 150-1               | 2:72    | How the Vita was written despite the prohibition by Anselm. |
| 168 (Miracula)      |         | Fragrance at Anselm's tomb. |
One of these omissions, at first glance seems surprising. In his final chapter John omits one of the posthumous miracula recorded by Eadmer, the account of how a certain brother was passing before Anselm's tomb when he became aware of 'an odour emanating from it, so fragrant and so incomparable that it could not be likened to any kind of earthly scent or sweetness'. The brother had already had a vision confirming Anselm's sanctity. Smelling the fragrance from Anselm's tomb the monk realised at once that he could place confidence in his vision. It is understandable that John should have included the story of the monk's vision, but not the story of the sweet fragrance. The real miraculum was the vision, the sweet fragrance merely a confirmation of the miraculum. In any case the occurrence of a sweet fragrance emanating from Anselm's tomb compared rather feebly with the other miracles recorded by Eadmer: cures of dropsy, fever, tumour of the stomach, and detailed visions confirming Anselm's sanctity.

The alternative method for reducing the length of the text was severe compression. The severity of John's compression can be demonstrated with several examples:

---

65 Eadmer p 168.
66 ibid pp 167-8.
67 col 1038 C-D.
68 See Table 5 p 343 below.
In these and other passages John cut the anecdotal details to the minimum. In the account of Anselm’s childhood vision for instance, John leaves out such details as:

The Lord asked him in a pleasant and friendly way who he was, where he came from, what he wanted. He replied to the questions as best he could.

The result of such omissions is that John’s Vita lacks the immediacy and warmth of Eadmer’s text.

It would be a mistake, however, to think that John merely reduced or deleted passages. To create fluent passages he seems to have grasped the gist of each passage, and then if he decided to

---

69 Eadmer 1:2 pp 4-5 (‘Et audito unum Deum ... publice asserebat.’); John col 1010 B-C.
70 Eadmer 1:3 pp 5-6 (‘At ille in suo ... facturum mente proponit.’); John col 1010 C.
71 Eadmer 1:28 pp 46-8 (entire chapter); John col 1020 A.
72 Eadmer 1:32 pp 57-8 (‘Quidam igitur vir nobilis ... sciscitantibus responderet.’); John col 1021 A.
73 Eadmer 2:6 pp 67-8 (entire chapter); John col 1022 C-D.
74 Eadmer 2:51 pp 129-30 (‘Lectio igitur in quo’ to end of chapter); John col 1032 C.
75 Eadmer p 5.
include it, he rewrote it in his own way. Sometimes John used the same key words as Eadmer but in grammatically different forms. Thus in describing the hatred with which a young monk Osbern regarded Anselm, John says

\[ \text{Excercebant hic dente caninum et odio insatiabili} \]

\[ \text{prosequebatur Anselmum} \]

an echo of Eadmer's:

\[ \text{et insuper, odium quod omnino more canino contra Anselmum} \]

\[ \text{exercebat.} \]

But frequently the key verbs and nouns are replaced by new ones. Thus in the account of Anselm's childhood vision we find the following alterations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eadmer</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>incumbere</td>
<td>inhaerere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suspicatus</td>
<td>opinabatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aulam</td>
<td>palatium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cacumen</td>
<td>devexitate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mulieres quae regis erant ancillae</td>
<td>famulos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>segetes</td>
<td>triticum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposuit</td>
<td>disponeret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dapifero</td>
<td>dispensatore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nitidissimum</td>
<td>candidissimum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even when compressing a passage John sometimes added his own comments or phrases. Thus in the account of Anselm's childhood vision the word 'Deum' in Eadmer's text is enlarged to 'Deum omnium conditorem ... largitoremque remuneratoremque bonorum ... et iam in tenera aetate ad illius notitiam aspirabat.'

By using Eadmer's keywords in a different way, by changing

76 col 1014 D.
77 Eadmer p 16.
78 col 1010 B.
keywords and by adding his own phrases and comments, John created a
text which flows and which is quite distinct from Eadmer's text.

iii: Restructuring

For the most part John followed the order of Eadmer's text. In only
five places did John rearrange the order of Eadmer's chapters. On
two occasions there seems to be no aim in the rearrangement. But on
the other three occasions the rearrangement was deliberate and
created a cogency which was absent from Eadmer's text. In Book 3 of
his Vita John rearranged the contents of Eadmer's chapters 2:7-8 and
2:17-8 to create a clear-cut structure. The result can be tabulated
thus:

Structure of John's Vita Sancti Anselmi, Book 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eadmer Vita</th>
<th>Eadmer page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Anselm becomes prior of Bec 7 12
2. Anselm devotes himself to Scripture, the best guide to living well (insertion)
3. Anselm's prayers and fasts 8 14
4. Anselm committed to justice, like St Martin 8 14
5. Anselm's anxiety about damnation 2:15 84
6. Study and correction of texts 8 15
7. Miracle of seeing through walls 7 12-13
8. Miracle of unusually large trout being caught 17 26-27
9. Miracle of sturgeon being caught 18 27-28

Here the structure is far clearer than in Eadmer's account, for John
gives a thematic and chronological unity to incidents which are
scattered throughout Eadmer's text. First there is an introductory

79 cols 1012 B - 1013 D.
section on Anselm's appointment as prior of Bec; then several sections showing Anselm's commitment to the monastic life, to justice and to the study of scripture; and finally three of the miracles which occurred while Anselm was at Bec.

Within Book 4 of John's Vita we find a more striking rearrangement of Eadmer's chapters. Here John rearranged chapters 2:10-14 in order to impose a linking theme for three miracles which are unconnected in Eadmer's text. The theme which John imposed is that Anselm took particular care of both young and old.

Structure of John's Vita Book 4 (part)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme drawn from Eadmer, Vita:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Anselm's care for young and old</td>
<td>2:11 and 2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Anselm's care for the elderly Herewald</td>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anselm cures a young novice who felt as if his genitals were made of lead</td>
<td>2:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anselm wins the goodwill of a young monk Osbern who was at first very hostile to him</td>
<td>2:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third occasion on which John deliberately re-ordered Eadmer's text is in the account of miracles that occurred at the time of Anselm's death and after. Southern has pointed out that John's reason for reordering these miracles was to make a clear distinction between miracles which occurred before and after burial. After recounting the death of Anselm, John introduces the wonders which accompanied his death, with a passage which is not to be found in

80 cols 1013 D - 1015 D.

81 Southern, Anselm p 338.
Eadmer:

His happy crossing and glorious journey were proclaimed by the occurrence of wonders; and the most holy merits of the confessor were made known to all by conspicuous signs. 

Then after listing these miracles, John closes the section with another statement not to be found in Eadmer's text: he compares the passing of Anselm to the passing of St Martin of Tours:

In the same way the passing of Martin was revealed in vision to saints, thus God, whom both men served in a similar fashion, glorified Martin and Anselm in the same way.

Here John was drawing on Gregory of Tours' De Virtutibus Sancti Martini chapters 3-5 which describe Martin's 'gloriosum transitum'. According to Gregory, Martin's death and his arrival in Heaven were revealed in visions to saint Severus in Cologne and to saint Ambrose in Milan. In the two chapters which follow (17-18) John deals with the miracles which occurred after Anselm's burial. Here there are some deviations from the order in Eadmer's text, but there seems to be no pattern or purpose behind these.

In his Vita Eadmer had skilfully used a series of brilliant vignettes to convey Anselm's personality, his teachings, his views on monastic life and his skills as an abbot. The stories which Eadmer told were ones which monastic readers and listeners could meditate on, and from which they could learn. John in contrast, in order to produce a dossier of canonisation, needed a briefer and more tightly

82 col 1036 B 'Felix transitus' etc.
83 col 1037B.
84 For the visions of St Severus and St Ambrose see MGH Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum 1 pp 584-661 at pp 589-91.
85 ibid pp 589 line 28 - 590 line 1.
structured work. In their content and in their order all the stories which John told of Anselm had to assist in the argument that Anselm was a saint.
TABLE 5: John's Vita Sancti Anselmi: Miracles at the time of Anselm’s death and after

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location in Eadmer (Southern ed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eadmer (Southern ed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 16 (cols 1035C - 1037B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Unending supply of balsam</td>
<td>143-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A layman's vision at time of Anselm's death</td>
<td>156-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Dreams of Elias, monk of Christ Church, and of a monk of St Augustine's at</td>
<td>154-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the time of Anselm's death</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison of deaths of Anselm and St Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 17 (cols 1037C - 1038B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Enlargement of Anselm's coffin (1037B-C)</td>
<td>144-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Robert, a monk, recovers possessions unharmed from the Thames</td>
<td>147-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Arnulf son of Roger Montgomery saved in storm</td>
<td>146-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Vision of monk, revealing Anselm's beatification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 18 (cols 1038C - 1040C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The grandia volumina of miracles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Revelation of Anselm's sanctity to another monk</td>
<td>167-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>A monk is cured at Anselm's tomb</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>A knight, Humphrey, cured of dropsy by the touch of Anselm's belt</td>
<td>158-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Vision of recluse at St Irenaeus</td>
<td>161-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Anselm reveals his beatitude to a former servant</td>
<td>162-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Cure of a noble Englishwoman in Scotland</td>
<td>163-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Anselm's belt cures a monk of Christ Church</td>
<td>164-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Anselm's belt helps women in labour</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Anselm's belt cures monk of swollen stomach</td>
<td>165-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The cure of Elphege</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Fire stopped at Bury St Edmund's</td>
<td>168-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Cure of Elias abbot of La Trinite-du-Mont at Rouen</td>
<td>166-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iv: Hagiographic additions

In order to rework Eadmer’s text as a dossier for canonisation, John did more than delete, shorten and rearrange passages from Eadmer. He made a number of short insertions which depict Anselm as following in the footsteps of the apostles and the saints.\[^{86}\] The theme of Anselm following the footsteps of apostles and saints is first indicated in the Prologue:

> The saints are indeed the sons of the apostles and prophets; just as they succeed them in faith, so also they gain the inheritance of virtue and of wondrous works, and the reward of eternal glory. Among these blessed, Anselm archbishop of Canterbury shines forth like the brightest star ....

In four passages John links Anselm to the apostles. In a lengthy addition he describes Anselm as ‘*verus Christi discipulus*’, who, although he was the greatest among his companions, behaved as if he were the least.\[^{88}\] Earlier in the passage John says that Anselm rejoiced to be in exile:

> he had recognised it as a pledge of future blessing, since the Lord considered him worthy to suffer for justice (*pro iustitia pati)*.

This reference to the Sermon on the Mount (‘*Beati qui persecutionem patiuntur pro iustitia*’) is a striking insertion, for later in the Becket dispute it was to become one of the key themes in John’s

\[^{86}\] For examples of the hagiographical technique of analogy with the apostles, St Paul and Christ see K. F. Morrison, ‘The structure of holiness in Othloh’s *Vita Bonifatii* and Ebo’s *Vita Ottonis*’, in K. Pennington and R. Somerville ed *Law, church and society* pp 131-56 at p 149.

\[^{87}\] col 1009 A-B; this addition was noted by Schaarschmidt, *Johannes Saresberiensis* p 243.

\[^{88}\] col 1026 B.

\[^{89}\] col 1026 A.
letters on behalf of Becket. In the account of Anselm’s zeal as a young monk at Bec, John suggests a comparison between Anselm and St Paul. Referring to Paul’s epistle to the Philippians 3:13, he states:

'forgetting the things that are behind’, and in the manner of the Apostle (ad Apostoli formam) ‘stretching forth to those that are before’, he strove to live up to his commitments as a monk (studuit implere monachum).

In a later passage John picks up this theme again. He begins by an allusion to 2 Corinthians 11:29:

He fulfilled his tasks as an apostolic man, that if his humility did not hinder him, he could have declared with the Apostle, with pure heart, good conscience and true faith: ‘Who is weak and I am not weak? Who is scandalised and I am not on fire?’

After his comparison with St Paul, John instantly moves on to compare Anselm with John the Evangelist ‘whom Jesus loved’:

And what we know about the disciple whom Jesus loved - that whatever he said was warmed by the fire of love - was also true of Anselm. Although Anselm would not claim comparison with so great an apostle, nevertheless with diligent care he imitated his example so well that his every word, his whole life and even all his writings seemed to shine with the fire of divine love (divinae dilectionis igne) which shone in them. You would believe that he lived not for himself but for others; and yet the truer he was to himself, the more useful he was to others and the more faithfully he lived for God.

The final insertion on the theme of Anselm as the ‘apostolic man’ occurs in the account of how Riculf, one of the monks of Bec, saw

---

90 See n 227 below.
91 See n 227 below.
92 col 1012 A.
93 col 1014 A.
Anselm surrounded by a fiery globe when praying late one night. In Eadmer this is recounted simply as yet another wonder. John in contrast considers the significance of the globus igneus and draws comparisons with St Martin and with the apostles:

A fiery globe marked out Martin when he celebrated mass, and surrounded Anselm as he prayed. The apostles received the Holy Spirit in tongues of fire, and the tongue of Anselm brandished it with fire. For he commanded demons, banished illness, foretold the future, obeyed and taught the law of God. He was considered by many to be an 'apostolic man'.

The comparison with Martin is based on Sulpicius Severus' second and third Dialogues. The comments on commanding demons, banishing illness and foretelling the future do not refer to particular passages in scripture, but they are reminiscent of Christ's ministry as recorded in the gospels and the ministry of the apostles as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles.

The reference to St Martin in this passage belongs to another series of insertions: those comparing Anselm with other saints. John may have got the idea for the comparison with St Martin from Eadmer's comment:

we can unhesitatingly affirm of him, what was said of St Martin, that 'in the name of Christ, or of justice of whatever else belongs to the way of the true life was always on his lips.'

---


96 See Sulpicius Severus Dialogus 2:2 (CSEL 1 at pp 181 line 27 - 182 line 2) and Dialogus 3:10 (ibid) at p 208.

97 Eadmer Vita 1:8 p 14. The allusion is to Sulpicius Severus Vita (Footnote continued)
Into his *Vita* John makes several insertions comparing Anselm with the great saints. His power of prophecy is compared with that of Benedict, his deference to the wishes of his host is compared to Clement’s; his patient endurance of William Rufus’ persecution is compared with the sufferings of St Basil the Great in the time of Julian the Apostate; his generosity is compared with that of Nicholas, the *gemma sacerdotum*. On two occasions John adds comparisons with Martin of Tours; one is the account of the fiery globe; the other is when John compares the visions and signs which marked Anselm’s death with those which marked the death of Martin.

These insertions indicate that John was familiar with hagiographic traditions. His sources — whether used directly or indirectly — included the Latin version of the *Vita Sancti Basilii Magni*, Sulpicius Severus’ *Vita Sancti Martini* and Dialogues, Gregory the Great’s second Dialogue (dealing with Benedict), Gregory of Tours’

97 (continued)
Sancti Martini 27 (CSEL 1 p 137).


99 col 1027 B. See Gregory of Tours *Liber in gloria martyrum* 36 (MGH Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum I pp 484-581 at p 511.

100 col 1031 B. Cf Eadmer pp 126-7.

101 col 1020 A. Cf Eadmer pp 46-8. John’s insertion reads: ‘Et sicut alter Nicolaus, gemma sacerdotum, adeo circa pauperes misericordiae visceraibus affluerebat, ut hoc, solum quodammodo nosse videretur; s\_ *Omni perentiae te tribue.*’ The phrase ‘misericordiae visceraibus affluerebat’ is a hagiographic commonplace (e.g. Sulpicius Severus, referring to St Martin, Ep 3 CSEL 1 at p 148 lines 13-14). However John was definitely alluding to a *Vita* of St Nicholas which was textually close to that contained in MS Namur 15 (a thirteenth MS from St Hubert near Liège). According to this *Vita* (ed in *Analecta Bollandiana* 2 (1883) 143-51 at p 143 lines 35-7): ‘Quod audiens vir Deo devotus, graviter tulit tam miserabile factum, et condolens nimium misero homini ex multitudine viscera suorum quibus affluerebat circa miseriam inopum ...’ A similar phrase (‘compiatisens et superafflictos (Footnote continued)
De virtutibus Sancti Martini, as well as Vitae of Saint Nicholas of Myra and Saint Clement. ¹⁰³

With the scattered insertions depicting Anselm as a latterday apostle or as the equal of the great saints, John strengthened his argument that Anselm ought to be entered into the catalogue of venerated saints.

c: Insertions into the text

The analysis of how John composed the Vita Sancti Anselmi shows the work to be a skilful exercise in hagiography. By reducing the length of Eadmer's text, reorganising it and making a number of additions, John created a cogent dossier for Anselm's canonisation. Because John's Vita was so clearly designed as a short, tightly-written argument for Anselm's canonisation, we must give special attention to four insertions which have no connection with Anselm's sanctity.

i: William Rufus

The first addition to Eadmer's text consists of two passages dealing with Anselm's relations with William Rufus and one short passage dealing with his relations with Henry I. ¹⁰⁴ The two passages dealing with William Rufus are particularly significant, one discussing his...

---

¹⁰¹ (continued)

pia gestians viscera') is found in the liturgy for the octave of St Nicholas contained in an eleventh century Canterbury MS (British Library MS Cotton Nero E.1; liturgy ed in Charles W. Jones, The Saint Nicholas Liturgy and its literary relationships (ninth to twelfth centuries)... (Berkeley - Los Angeles 1963) pp 14-41 at p 21). See also Thiofrid of Echternach, Flores Epitaphii Sanctorum 3:5 (PL 157 at col 380 C).

¹⁰² See n 95 above; PL 199 col 1037C.

¹⁰³ See nn 96-101 above; for the Vita Sancti Basilii see n 115 below.

¹⁰⁴ col 1031 C.
accession and lifestyle, the other discussing his death while hunting in New Forest. Both passages are written with a vehemence not found in Eadmer's Vita. In Eadmer's account of the accession of William Rufus, we are merely told that he was an oppressive ruler:

When the renowned William king of the English died, his son William inherited his kingdom. Then the venerable father Lanfranc departed this life and William oppressed the churches and monasteries throughout England most harshly. In the fourth year of his oppression Anselm was invited ... to come to England by Hugh earl of Chester ...

In contrast John delivers a long and scathing diatribe:

On his death the glorious king William was succeeded by his son William, named Rufus, a man who was indeed strong in arms, but hardly just or pious. He wasted his own wealth and strove to seize the property of others. He loved wild animals greatly but neglected the souls of his people. Favouring might and malice he oppressed the church and the innocent, and eagerly indulged in voluptuous vice. In him there thrived with equal strength a love of the world (amor mundi) and a contempt for God (contemptus dei), which were without limit or measure. And what is so unseemly in a prince, he had no respect for the body and defiled himself in every perversion. Not only his nobles, but even the wretched populace followed the ways of the prince - so far as they could. This is hardly surprising for it is well known that 'as the ruler of a city, so the inhabitants'. Indeed:

The world composes itself to the pattern of its ruler; The life of a ruler sways men more effectively than any law.

After the venerable father Lanfranc had been taken from this world, the church now exposed on all sides, was threatened by even greater danger. For there was no-one to stand as a wall before the house of God. In the fourth year of this oppression, Anselm invited by the nobles and urged by the church, came to England.

The length and vehemence of the passage is startling. The attack is hammered home in a series of superlatives - ferarum amantissimus sed
negligentissimus animarum, vehementissimus oppugnator, voluptatis sectator acerrimus - which rise in a crescendo in the contemptuous remark:

utpote in quo sine modo et mensura vigebat pariter amor mundi et contemptus Dei.

By twisting amor Dei and contemptus mundi, phrases from the vocabulary of religion and monastic life, John aimed to show that William Rufus was the antithesis of all that is good and godly, that his values were perverted, and that he was the very antithesis of Anselm, the perfect monk and 'apostolic man'.

This passage on the accession of William Rufus is, however, more than just a vituperative attack on a dead king. The quotation from Claudianus De quarto consulatu Honorii ('Componitur orbis' etc) reiterates John's view that the prince must obey as well as enforce divine law. John used the same quotation in Policraticus 4:4108 which carries the chapter heading: 'Quod divinae legis auctoritate principem legi iustitiae esse subiectum.' There John used the quotation from Claudianus to introduce a theme which dominates the succeeding chapters: that in his private life the prince ought to be virtuous. This was part of John's general contention in the Policraticus that the secular ruler was not a private individual free of all restrictions. John's attack on William Rufus should then be read as a statement on the duties of a king to the community.

In the second passage dealing with Rufus - that describing his death - John again takes the opportunity to make a comment on kingship. The equivalent passage in Eadmer's Vita is bland and

107 col 1021 C.
uncontentious. The idea of divine vengeance being a force at work in the death of William Rufus is found in Eadmer's Historia Novorum, a work which John knew, in Florence of Worcester and in Orderic Vitalis. However John's account has no verbal links with these works. Like the first passage dealing with William Rufus, this too has an echo of the Policraticus:

Likewise, while Basil was suffering patiently, Julian - to the consolation of the church - was killed by a fatal arrow. When the latterday Julian was slain in England, Anselm was recalled to the consolation of the church. Who shot the arrow is still uncertain... Certainly whoever did the act, obeyed the will of God Who showed compassion on His church in its troubles.

The final sentence is the sting in the tail, for it reiterates John's assertion in the Policraticus that in some circumstances the killing of a tyrant is justifiable. The reference to the death of Julian also occurs in the Policraticus where it is used as one of the chief examples of the divine vengeance meted out to tyrants. In Book 8 chapter 21 John recounts the killing of Julian the Apostate while on expedition against the Parthians in the year 363. He begins with the version from the Vita Sancti Basilii, according to which St

109 Eadmer p 126.
110 HN p 116.
112 col 1031 A-B.
113 For the question of whether John had a doctrine of tyrannicide see the argument and refs in J. van Laarhoven, 'Thou shalt not slay a tyrant! The so-called theory of John of Salisbury', World JS pp 319-41.
115 ibid p 381/14 - p 382/14. The source is the Vita Sancti Basilii chaps 36-7 (Acta SS June vol 2 p 944).
Basil saw in a vision that God, responding to the laments of Basil and other holy men, dispatched the martyr Mercury from Heaven to slay Julian. As an alternative, John offers the more prosaic account of Orosius who stated that Julian was slain by the arrow of a passing knight. But whichever version is preferred, John regarded the killing of Julian as an act of divine punishment.

The two passages on William Rufus show that John's views on kingship and tyranny were as trenchant and as provocative as ever. But the inclusion of the passages in a dossier for canonisation also suggests that in 1163 the issues of kingship and the relationship between king and church were at the forefront of John's mind. How then should we interpret the passages? As veiled statements about Henry II or as warnings to Henry and his advisers?

In 1163 a precise identification of Henry II with William Rufus would have seemed absurd. Henry still retained the goodwill of the English church and of the papacy, both of which had backed his accession. He had declared himself for Alexander III rather than the anti-pope 'Victor IV', had successfully persuaded Alexander to canonise his royal ancestor Edward the Confessor, and had the one quality that recommended itself to most churchmen - he was a strong and effective ruler, capable of keeping his magnates and other subjects in order. It is unlikely that John was trying to suggest an

---

116 Historia adversus paganos 7:30 (CSEL 5 pp 509-11); Pol Webb 2 p 382 lines 14-16.


119 See nn 40-1 above.
exact comparison between Henry and William Rufus.

From another of John's insertions it is clear that John was comparing Henry II in a more general way with the two rulers who had persecuted Anselm. Speaking of the good relationship which existed at first between Anselm and Henry I, Johns says that Henry:

promised that he would follow Anselm's advice in all affairs of the kingdom. He made sure to maintain the appearance of being pious and mild. For it is the custom of rulers to be mild until their power is secure. Indeed the lot of kingdoms is most favourable (mitissima) under a new king.\textsuperscript{120}

This would certainly have been read by John's contemporaries within the English church and at the royal curia as a comment on Henry II. This passage and the passages about William Rufus point to a cynicism about royal power and a hostility towards the court of Henry II. Since the Vita was commissioned by Becket, John's insertions about the king's obligations to the community, the fate of tyrants, the right in some circumstances to slay a tyrant, must all be taken as an indication that by mid-1163 the Becket circle was viewing church-state relations in terms that were hostile and provocative.

\textbf{ii: Anselm's return 1100}

The second addition\textsuperscript{121} which John makes to Eadmer's text is that when Anselm returned from exile in 1100 the monks of Canterbury were the first to greet him. We have already discussed this incident in the context of John's authorship of the Vita.\textsuperscript{122} In October 1170 John again mentioned the incident\textsuperscript{123} in a warning to the monks of Christ
Church that a settlement had been reached between Henry and Becket and that the monks ought to show some sign of their goodwill to Becket before he returned. He suggested that the monks should live up to the tradition of their predecessors ('decessores vestros') who were the first to greet Anselm on his return from exile. The letter stressed the close relationship and mutual interests which supposedly characterised the relationship between the archbishop and the monastic community. Was John trying to do the same in the Vita? Relations between Becket and the monks had been strained from the time of his election. It would make sense for one of Becket's apologists to emphasise the loyalty which Christ Church ought to show to the archbishop. However John's insertion is extremely brief and is not supported elsewhere in the text by similar insertions. John was not therefore trying to convey a message on the relationship that should exist between Becket and the monks of Christ Church. The explanation of the insertion is probably that John knew of the tradition that the monks of Canterbury had been the first to greet Anselm in 1100, and that in writing about Anselm's return he recalled the incident and wrote it into the text.

iii: Canterbury's primacy

More significant is the third addition consisting of two passages dealing with Canterbury's primacy over York. The first passage occurs at the end of chapter 12 and discusses in detail Paschal II's grant of primacy to Anselm. This does not occur in Eadmer's Vita but the

123 LL ep 303 pp 712-3.
124 See MB 2 p 16 (Lambeth Anonymous) and MB 4 p 368 (Edward Grim).
125 col 1032 A-B. Schaarschmidt, Johannes Saresberiensis p 243 refers briefly to this insertion.
text of Paschal's letters was available at Canterbury in copies of the Historia Novorum and in the letter collection of Anselm. The second passage consists of the end of chapter 14 and the whole of chapter 15. This deals with the clash between Anselm and Thomas II of York and contains a letter from Anselm to Thomas. Like the letter of Paschal II in the first passage, this letter is not to be found in Eadmer's Vita but does occur in the Historia Novorum.

The inclusion of the primacy theme at all indicates the importance which John attached to it. But the first passage reveals even more, for in it John distorted the contents of Paschal's letters on the primacy. Writing to Gerard archbishop of York in December 1102, Paschal II ordered Gerard archbishop of York to make a profession of obedience to Anselm just as his predecessor Thomas I had professed obedience to Lanfranc and his successors. In November of the following year Paschal wrote to Anselm restating in more emphatic terms Canterbury's ancient right to the primacy. This marked the highpoint in Canterbury's attempts to gain recognition of its claims to primacy. Later popes consistently denied these claims. In

---

126 See n 36 above.
127 To Anselm: Anselm Epp no 303 (= vol 4 of Anselm, Opera omnia ..., ed. F. S. Schmidt, 6 vols, Edinburgh 1938-1961); to Gerard, ibid no 283. Both occur in an early twelfth-century MS from Christ Church: Lambeth 59 (see 'Index Siglorum' at Anselm, Opera omnia 3 p 94).
128 cols 1034 C - 1035 B. Schaarschmidt (p 243) draws attention to the significance of chap 15 of the Vita.
129 HN p 206.
131 Anselm Epp no 303; HN pp 154-55.
March 1120, Calixtus II forbade Thurstan archbishop of York from making any profession of obedience to Canterbury and ordered that the archbishop with prior consecration would have precedence. This arrangement was confirmed by Honorius II in December 1128, Innocent II in November 1131, Eugenius III in June 1151 and Alexander III in January 1161. The single exception to this series of rulings was the grant of primacy made by Eugenius III in May 1145, renewing Paschal II’s grants of 1102 and 1103. Eugenius’ grant was however vague and was open to different interpretations:

Quicquid etiam dignitatis seu potestatis eidem sancte Cantuariensi seu Doroberensi ecclesie pertinere cognoscitur, presentis scripti pagina confirmamus, sicut a temporibus beati Augustini predecessores tuos habuisse apostolice sedis auctoritate constat, salva eiusdem sedis apostolice auctoritate.

In succeeding years it became clear that the papacy did not intend this grant to give Canterbury jurisdiction over York, for at the Council of Rheims in March 1148 Theobald’s efforts to assert his primacy over York was politely but firmly rebuffed by Eugenius III, and in January 1151 in a letter to Henry Murdac archbishop of York, Eugenius reaffirmed that Henry should not make profession of obedience to Theobald.

132 JL 6831.
133 PUE 2 no 12 p 147; PL 166 col 1242 no 29. The dating of this document as given in PUE is supported by D. Bethell, ‘William of Corbeil and the Canterbury-York dispute’, JEH 19 (1968) 145-59 at p 157 n 2, which corrects D. Nicholl, Thurstan archbishop of York (1114-1140) (York 1964) p 109 n 102. For the primacy dispute during the 1120s and 1130s see Nicholl chaps 3 and 4, and Duball chap 5.
134 PUE 2 no 13 pp 148-50.
135 PUE 2 no 66 pp 231-33.
136 PUE 2 no 105 p 291.
137 PUE 2 no 43.
In 1163 any attempt to resurrect Canterbury's claims to primacy or jurisdiction over York, had to ignore the tenor of papal rulings made between 1120 and 1161 and had to concentrate on the ruling of Paschal II. It is striking that John 'improved' Paschal's ruling. He says of Paschal:

he follows the decision in the dispute which in the time of Lanfranc had been solemnly made by Alexander the Roman pontiff and which had been confirmed in writing. This is confirmed by his Paschal's bulls which still survive in the church of Canterbury.

There is a double distortion here, for Alexander never confirmed the claim to primacy which Lanfranc established in 1072. Nor did Paschal's letter to Anselm suggest that Alexander had done so. As all the information relating to the primacy was available to John at Canterbury, we must conclude that John was deliberately trying to mislead his readers and listeners. But why?

In 1162-3 the primacy had become a contentious issue once again. Roger of York could claim precedence over Thomas on the grounds of seniority. In January 1161, while Theobald was still alive, Roger had obtained from Eugenius III a grant confirming earlier papal rulings that the archbishop with seniority should have precedence. During the vacancy at Canterbury Roger had managed to obtain papal permission to

138 HP p 5; see n 135 above. C. N. L. Brooke and A. Morey have suggested that Theobald abandoned the use of the primatial title when it became clear that it did not involve jurisdiction over York (CGF p 91 n 2, GFL pp 505-6). Note however that of the 21 surviving professions of obedience made by bishops to archbishop Theobald, 18 contain the title 'totius Britanniae primas' (Canterbury Professions ed M. Richter, Canterbury and York Society 67 (1973) p lxix). 139 col 1032 A-B.

140 For the settlement of 1072 see Councils and Synods 1:2 pp 591-605; and M. Gibson, Lanfranc of Bec (Oxford 1978) p 119 and for the issue of the primacy throughout Lanfranc's pontificate, Gibson pp 116-31.
crown the young king Henry, a concession which was not exercised until 1170. 141

The issue came to a head at the Council of Tours when Thomas and Roger clashed over the seating arrangements which were normally taken as an indication of precedence. 142 In the Draco Normannicus Stephen of Rouen presents this as one of the major issues of the Council. 143 This is certainly an exaggeration and Stephen evidently got great enjoyment from depicting the antics of squabbling prelates. He opens his account with the cynical mock-heroic:

Hoc post sermones causarum turba subintrat:
Hic Digesta sonant, Codicis atque vigor. 144

However exaggerated Stephen’s account, it suggests that the dispute over precedence made an impact on some contemporaries. Similarly the Summa causae inter regem et Thomam, 145 an early anonymous account sympathetic to Becket suggested with almost equal exaggeration that the Council of Westminster in October 1163 was convened to settle the primacy issue.

The clash at Tours would certainly have been foreseen by Becket and his advisers and by John. For as John points out in the Historia pontificalis 146 the claims of precedence and jurisdiction (the

---

141 Quanto per carissimum (MB 6 ep 310 pp 206-7); see A. Heslin, 'The coronation of the young king in 1170', Studies in Church History 2 ed G. J. Cuming (1968) pp 165-78.
144 ibid p 744 lines 1005-6.
145 MB 4 pp 201-12 at p 201; cf chap 9 pp 484-6 below. For the Council of Westminster see Councils and Synods 1:2 no 158 pp 848-52.
146 HP 1 pp 4-6.
Proclamationes synodales) should be the first item of business at a general council. As we have seen, among the claims which John records as having been put forward at the Council of Rheims in 1148 was Theobald’s claim to primacy over Henry of York.147

Being prepared for a clash on the issue of primacy, the Becket circle would seek to circulate their claim as widely as possible immediately before and during the Council. One way of doing this was to insert Canterbury’s claims into the Vita Sancti Anselmi. We do not know how the Vita was circulated at the Council. Copies may have been circulated, and extracts read to small groups. Becket did not succeed in getting a full discussion of Anselm’s canonisation. If he had done so, the Vita or extracts from it would presumably have been read to the Council.

John distorted previous papal rulings on primacy with the same casualness and aplomb with which he ‘improved’ sources or conjured up ones like the Institutio Traiani. In the Vita Sancti Anselmi as in most of his other works John showed an enthusiasm for distorting texts and facts.148

d: Conclusions

The additions about William Rufus and about the primacy reveal the preoccupations of the Becket circle in 1163. The additions about William Rufus suggest that even if John was not trying to represent Henry II as a latterday William Rufus, he and the Becket circle were already viewing the clashes with Henry II in terms of church liberty versus secular tyranny. The additions about the primacy show that this issue may have been equally important to Becket as the clash with

147 ibid p 5.
148 See chap 1 nn 33-34 above.
Henry. Becket was determined to defend the rights of the church and particularly the rights of Canterbury, whoever the opponents might be. The fact that John was willing to draft the Vita with its topical and provocative references, indicates that at this stage John and the Becket circle shared broadly similar views on the early clashes between Henry and Becket.

3: THE LANGUAGE OF PERSECUTION: JOHN OF SALISBURY AND BECKET 1163-66

a: The argument

Medieval churchmen who became involved in ecclesiastical disputes or in disputes with secular authority, had access to a rich 'language' of phrase and imagery with which to strengthen their case. This 'language', drawing on Scriptural sources and on standard interpretations of Scripture, could be used to depict almost any dispute as a struggle between good and evil, as the persecution of pious men by the impious, as the renewed persecution of the church universal, as a latterday trial and passion of Christ, or as an assault on church liberties. By 'standard interpretations' is meant those interpretations which most highly educated churchmen would have known and accepted. The interpretations which would have been familiar to John of Salisbury and his readers are those contained in the Glossa ordinaria.149

To polemicists the advantages of this 'language' - a 'language of persecution' - were that it was highly emotive and that it touched on deeply ingrained religious values. It could be used to simplify issues which were in reality highly complex or very unclear. It could transform personal and political disputes into disputes over

149 See refs chap 2 n 133 above.
themes of Christ's passion, the comparison of Becket with Christ and exploited the images of shipwreck and storm, which were to become recurrent motifs in pro-Becket polemic.\textsuperscript{154} Writing to the pope in November 1164, Becket emphasised the theme of assault on the libertas ecclesiae,\textsuperscript{155} identified his own predicament with that of the pope (who was then in conflict with the emperor Frederick Barbarossa),\textsuperscript{156} and then drew a stark contrast between himself and his fellow-bishops, who were, he says, conspiring with the prince and placing more value on their worldly obligations rather than on their spiritual ones.\textsuperscript{157} About the same time Becket received a letter from one of his advisers.\textsuperscript{158} In this the themes of tribulation and persecution are fully developed and we can see some of the loci\textsuperscript{159} which were later to recur throughout the dispute: the Lord will punish those who desire evil; He will bring to naught the 'counsel of Achitophel'; Becket is identified with the 'innocent David', a Scriptural figure for Christ;

\textsuperscript{154} The Christ themes: 'multiplicantur iniuriae, non nostrae sed Christi - immo quia Christi, eo magis nostrae', MB 5 p 48; 'Eripitur Jesu Christo quod sanguine suo comparavit; in ipsam Eius sortem potestas saecularis manum extendit' ibid. For an image which combines storm and shipwreck: 'succedentibus sibi invicem more fluctuum procellis, solum nobis videmus imminere naufragium, nec ... "Domine salva nos, perimus".' ibid.  

\textsuperscript{155} MB 5 ep 74 (Ad audientiam tuam) p 138.  

\textsuperscript{156} MB 5 p 138 where Becket hopes 'eam vel solam vel maximam meae persecutionis causam attendas, quod exemplo tuo usus sum'.  

\textsuperscript{157} MB 5 pp 140-1: 'Quid etiam si in universam ecclesiam cum offenso nobis principe conspirationem fecerunt? Et te, pater sanctissime, suspectio ista poterat attingere. "At", inquient, "regi tenebantur ex debito domini." Sed illi corporaliter, mihi spiritualiter.'  

\textsuperscript{158} MB 5 ep 59 (Legitur Constantii principis), November - December 1164.  

\textsuperscript{159} Divine vengeance: MB 5 pp 107-8: 'Et ecce inimici Filii hominis gladiis accincti et ad nocendum dum preparati ...' For the 'counsel of Achitophel' and the 'innocent David', ibid p 107: 'consilia Achitophel consociorumque eius adversus David innocentem infatuet.' For the attack on the Maccabees, ibid p 107.
the king’s persecution of the church is likened to the attack by Antiochus against the Maccabees.

The object of this section is, the ‘language of persecution’, to show how John of Salisbury was drawn reluctantly into becoming a leading exponent of Becket’s cause. As seen above John had worked as an adviser and agent to Becket in 1163, playing an important part in the campaign to obtain the canonisation of Anselm. He acted later as Becket’s agent in France at the turn of 1163/64. There is also some evidence that by early 1164 John was regarded as an influential and very formidable adviser to Becket. However, at some point in 1164 or 1165 John withdrew from Becket’s household and made vigorous efforts to gain a personal settlement with Henry II. Why should John have distanced himself thus from Becket? One explanation which has not usually been considered is that John, like the English bishops, regarded the dispute as ‘personal’: it was a breakdown in relations between archbishop and king and, although fundamental issues were involved, other churchmen should not be dragged in. John expresses the idea in the Historia pontificalis which in its present form was written after 1163. In a thinly

---

160 Note LL ep 136 written in early 1164.

161 William FitzStephen says that John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury were removed from England by Henry to prevent them from giving counsel and aid to Becket (MB 3 p 46). Placed in the context of the Council of Clarendon this passage must be incorrect; see LL p xx. However it may be that FitzStephen is recording the vague recollection that very early in the dispute the two Johns were seen as closely identified with Becket.

162 For the withdrawal from Becket’s household see LL ep 139 (Master Humphrey Bos probably 1164-65) p 22: ‘... sciatisque pro certo quia michi propositum est ut non sim de cetero curialis; et hoc ipsum bene novit dominus Cantuariensis, a cuius me subtraxi consortio, sed nec fidem subtraho nec caritatem.’ See also LL ep 150 (to Bartholomew of Exeter summer 1165): ‘Nollem quidem expromittere quod Cantuariensi de cetero non servirem, et tamen michi Deus testis quod ex proposito non ero de cetero curialis.’ John’s search for a personal reconciliation can be seen in LL epp 137-9, 150-1.
veiled attack on Henry II, John suggests a contrast between Archbishop Theobald's two periods of exile and Becket's exile:

... On neither occasion, though he [Theobald] numbered the king and his counsellors among his bitterest enemies, was one of the archbishop's friends or supporters proscribed or driven into exile rather than remain in their own country. The archbishop alone suffered the miseries of exile and the pains of proscription; his friends were free to come and go as they wished and even, if they chose, to bring him material assistance for his needs.

In his attack on Henry, John reveals his view that the dispute ought to be a 'personal' one and that the archbishop alone ought to bear the brunt of the struggle.

It will be argued here that as the dispute escalated in 1166 John was compelled to abandon this view and to commit himself fully to the Becket cause. At the conference of Angers (Easter 1166) John's attempts to gain a personal reconciliation with Henry were sharply rebuffed and it became clear to John that there was no realistic chance of a settlement for himself. In the summer of 1166 Becket polarised the dispute by threatening to excommunicate Henry and by actually excommunicating several of his officials. Becket's actions forced English churchmen to opt for one side or the other. The bishops, under some royal pressure, opted for the king, while John, re-affirming his basic loyalties and his commitment to the liberties of the church, opted for Becket.

163 For discussion of the dating see chap 3:3 above.
164 HP p 42. cf Herbert of Bosham's account of the mass expulsions: MB 3 p 359.
165 For John's comments on the failure of the conference at Angers see LL ep 164 (?May-June 1166) pp 84-6, and ep 167 (early June 1166) p 98 ('In profectione versus Andegavim ... simile subire dispendium'). cf LL p xxvii.
166 For John's account of excommunications at Vézelay and the appeal by the bishops see LL ep 168 pp 108-114.
This interpretation would account for John's efforts to gain a personal settlement as well as accounting for the scraps of evidence which suggest that John was offering advice which differed sharply from that of Becket's closest advisers. In the early phase of the dispute John seems to have been more concerned with safeguarding the privileges and possessions of Canterbury than with fighting the Constitutions of Clarendon. In a well-known letter written to Becket in January 1165 (ep 144), John urged Becket to stop vexing himself with the legal aspects of the dispute and, instead, to pray, meditate and to read the Psalms and Gregory's *Moralia*.\(^{167}\) As Beryl Smalley\(^{168}\) has pointed out, John goes further: towards the end of the letter he entreats Becket to pay more attention to protecting the possessions of Canterbury from encroachment by other bishops and he suggests that Becket obtain from the pope 'letters patent that no encroachment upon the church of Canterbury at this crisis can harm it in time to come'.\(^{169}\) Six months later (in the late summer of 1165) John was once again touching on the Canterbury theme.\(^{170}\) After discussing the crisis facing the universal church and identifying Becket's situation with the pope's, John suddenly switches direction:

> If the protectors (patroni) of the holy church of Canterbury are with you - and it is well to keep them always in our minds - under God this storm will be duly stayed ...

If we look at the *Historia pontificalis*, an essential source for John's attitudes at this period, we find evidence of the same concern

---

167 LL pp 32-4.
168 Smalley, *Becket conflict* p 103.
169 LL p 35.
170 LL ep 152 pp 56-7.
with Canterbury's interests. In describing the conflict between Theobald and Stephen in 1148-49, the focus of John's attention is not on the rights of the papacy or on the general libertas ecclesiae but on the failure of the English bishops to make the king restore confiscated goods to Theobald and provide compensation for the injuries suffered by him.

In order to argue the interpretation that John initially regarded the Becket dispute as a 'personal one' between Henry II and Becket, we shall compare the letters written in 1164 and 1165 with those written in 1166. The sample used consists of all John's letters which can be dated to between early 1164 and c.1 October 1166. The initial date is that of the earliest dateable letter (ep 136) which John wrote during the Becket dispute. The final date is that of a letter (ep 184) to Gerard Pucelle. This cut-off point is somewhat arbitrary and has been chosen simply because John's shift in view had already occurred by that stage. There is an imbalance in the surviving evidence: only nine letters can be assigned to the period 1164-65, while twenty-seven belong to the year 1166. The imbalance means that particular care has to be taken in assessing shifts in John's attitudes. It also means that detailed attention will have to be paid to the earlier set of letters. In addition to these we have also to consider twenty-six letters to which no certain date can be assigned.

171 HP pp 45-6. For the importance of the 'Theobald theme' in the Historia see chap 3 pp 163-9 above.
172 LL epp 136-9, 144-5, 150-2.
173 LL epp 158-84.
174 See nn 191-3 below.
b: The letters 1164-65

Of the nine letters which can be assigned with reasonable assurance to the years 1164-65, five are concerned mainly with John's efforts to obtain a personal reconciliation,\(^\text{175}\) three are addressed to Becket\(^\text{176}\) and one is to John's half-brother Robert son of Egidia.\(^\text{177}\)

In the 'reconciliation letters' John naturally avoids the 'language of persecution'. The one allusion he does make to persecution is entirely neutral. In a letter to Robert prior of Merton he expresses the hope that the Lord 'may soften the anger of the king who has persecuted me and still persecutes me without occasion'.\(^\text{178}\) There is no reference here to general persecution of the church.

As we might expect, John's letters to Becket are rather different in viewpoint. Though distancing himself from Becket, John accepted that Becket was struggling for *libertas ecclesiae*. At the beginning of 1164 John wrote to Becket saying that in looking for support in the papal *curia*, 'It is in your favour that you are afflicted (tribulamini) for the liberty of the church'.\(^\text{179}\) But within the letter this remark is isolated and is unsupported by any of the themes from the 'language of persecution', such as divine vengeance, the persecution of the Church, or the passion of Christ.

In the next extant letter from John to Becket the 'language of persecution' is also absent but there is an emphasis on personal tribulation. This is the well-known ep 144 mentioned already. Here

\(^{175}\) LL epp 137-9, 150-1.

\(^{176}\) LL epp 136, 144, 152.

\(^{177}\) LL ep 145.

\(^{178}\) LL ep 151 p 51.

\(^{179}\) LL p 11.
John depicts the period of adversity as a spiritual test, a means of self-improvement. A few months later (summer 1165) John makes the same point when writing to Bartholomew bishop of Exeter: 'the exile has undoubtedly been profitable to the archbishop of Canterbury both for his learning (ad litteraturam) and his character'.

It is in ep 152, written to Becket in the late summer of 1165 that we catch a glimpse of the persecution theme. But even this is very circumscribed. After outlining the successes of the emperor Frederick Barbarossa against the papacy, John suddenly makes comments that could apply with equal force to the papacy and to Becket:

In such a storm I consider nothing more salutary for us than to fly to Christ's mercy, who, even if he is a second time crucified, is not killed, but will have his executioners more fearfully crucified in vengeance for his dove.

This is the earliest extant reference to the themes of crucifixion and divine vengeance and is linked to the notion that Becket is fighting for fundamental principles. For a few lines later John remarks that 'we' have stood for the practice of divine law (lex divina). It is conceivable that John was already elaborating these themes in letters now lost. But it seems unlikely. In the first place, John introduces the themes of crucifixion and divine vengeance in the context of the crisis facing the entire church: the schism and the struggle between emperor and pope. John had not yet reached the stage of applying

---

180 LL pp 32-4. The idea of persecution as a spiritual and beneficial test was a commonplace; thus Jerome: 'Persecutio non ad negationem credentium, sed ad probationem pertinet et coronam.' (PL 24 col 187).

181 LL ep 150 pp 48-9.

182 LL p 55.

183 LL p 57.
persecution themes directly to Becket. Secondly, about the same time John was writing to Bartholomew of Exeter, depicting the exile entirely in terms of adversity and personal tribulation and not in terms of persecution.

There is however a letter which may have been written in 1165 and which contains an elaborate treatment of persecution themes. This letter (ep 145) to John’s half-brother Robert is dated by Brooke as ‘probably 1165’ though it may well have been written as late as the summer of 1166. The uncertainty about the date is tantalising but cannot be resolved. In the letter John thanks Robert for sending him a gold ring set with a sapphire and carrying the inscription: ‘Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat’. The words are drawn from the Laudes regiae used in the coronation of emperors and kings and they immediately arouse the suspicion that the ‘gift’ with its topical inscription might be a fictional device to criticise the enemies of the church: Henry II and Frederick Barbarossa. John’s criticism of the emperor is explicit and trenchant: Frederick is not truly emperor but a schismatic ‘striving by force and fraud’ to overthrow God’s designs and to take the imperial dignity from Christ. ‘He is eager to abolish the name of Christ from the empire; but as the inscription of your gift tells us, Christ’s name alone endureth for ever.’ In contrast the criticism of Henry is much vaguer. John draws on the ‘language of persecution’ to make

---

184 See n 181 above.
185 The letter mentions ‘fraterculus’, evidently John’s brother Richard who was probably in England until May or June 1166; see LL p xxv.
186 LL ep 145 n 1.
187 LL p 41.
188 LL p 41.
comments that apply with equal force to the pope's predicament and to Becket's. Commenting on the phrase *Christus regnat* he says:

... it has ... attributed to Christ his kingdom, so as to teach those who have been through the hazards of strife and hardship with Christ that they will reign with him; and that his adversaries, when justice is turned to judgement, are to be destroyed with double disorder and destruction.\textsuperscript{189}

There then follows what could possibly be interpreted as a critical contrast between Christ the King and Henry:

The king's [Christ's] honour loveth judgement and his eyes (since they love it) look upon equity; for where our love is, there is our eye.\textsuperscript{190}

If this is indeed an attack on Henry II its vagueness would have been dictated by John's sense of caution. The interception of a letter explicitly attacking Henry would have placed Robert in great danger, especially if it were sent in 1165 a year of massive expulsions and widespread intimidation of Becket supporters, their friends and families. It is arguable that in more favourable circumstances John might have expressed his views more forcefully. But this argument cannot be taken for granted for even in ep 152 written to Becket in late summer 1165 (and discussed above) John avoids making a direct attack on Henry, preferring to suggest parallels between Becket's situation and the pope's.

John's ep 152 and perhaps his letter to Robert - if it was written in 1165 - indicate that John thought of the dispute at this stage in terms of Christ offering succour to the exiles and bringing vengeance on Becket's enemies and on the enemies of the church

\textsuperscript{189} LL p 39.

\textsuperscript{190} LL p 39.
universal. But these are themes of consolation and tribulation, very
different to the Christ themes which John was to use during 1166. For
then John compared Becket’s adversity with the trial and passion of
Christ and identified Becket’s cause as Christ’s cause.

c: The letters without an exact date

The twenty-six letters\textsuperscript{191} to which no exact date can be assigned do
nothing to challenge the impressions which we have gained from the
letters discussed above. Of the undateable letters, seventeen make no
reference to the ‘language of persecution’;\textsuperscript{192} two contain Christ
imagery but not in relation to the Becket dispute;\textsuperscript{193} one gives a
glimpse of the ‘language of persecution’ when John refers to himself
as ‘an exile for God and the freedom of the Church’.\textsuperscript{194} The remaining
six contain more significant allusions to persecution.

In ep 146 to Robert son of Egidia, John alludes to
1 Peter 4:15-16, which he was to use twice again in the spring and
autumn of 1166:

You know St Peter’s saying: ‘if any man suffer as a
Christian, let him be not ashamed, but let him glorify God
...’ You are assured, I take it, that our little brother
is not ‘suffering as a murderer or a blasphemer or a seeker
after other men’s goods’...\textsuperscript{195}

Likewise in a letter to Master Ralph de Beaumont (ep 210) John
makes a passing allusion to Christ imagery. After several oblique

\textsuperscript{191} LL epp 141, 146, 156, 202-4, 210 and the letters listed in the
two succeeding nn below.

\textsuperscript{192} LL epp 140, 142, 147-9, 153-5, 195, 201, 208-9, 211, 267, 268,
270-1.

\textsuperscript{193} LL pp 206-7.

\textsuperscript{194} LL ep 141 p 27.

\textsuperscript{195} LL p 41-3.
references to the Becket dispute, John expresses his hope that Ralph will not lose faith (non diffidis) in the kingdom of Christ (de regno Christi). 196

In ep 156 to Robert prior of Merton, John uses a string of allusions to tribulation and persecution: 197

I am beaten with these scourges, and sharper scourges still - and I know not the cause of the beating.

If it means that God of His mercy would have me suffer for justice's sake, I esteem myself most happy ... I profess I have kept faith with God's Church, have faithfully obeyed my archbishop ...

Three letters to Master Ralph of Lisieux (epp 202-4) contain sharper and more polemical references to persecution. In ep 202 John depicts the exiles as fighting for church liberties, justice and the law of God. 198 Later in the letter the Christ imagery is brought out: 199

Let them say what they will: let them boast that they have prevailed over the Lord's anointed in their vanity ... The ears of those who hissed and laughed at Christ's poor shall ring with the hisses and outcry of the faithful ...

In the passage which contains these two excerpts, John deploys two other themes from the 'language of persecution': vengeance against the enemies of God and the vision of the world as transitory and vain: 200

196 John contrasts (LL p 338-9) those 'whom the world, showing no gratitude to God, persecutes without cause' and 'those who seemed to be the pillars of the church ...' The reference to the kingdom of Christ: p 340.
197 LL p 63.
198 LL p 297: 'But he who sought out the mean and sick and permitted us to make public profession of the church's liberty, to be defenders of justice and witnesses of the law ... he gives us boldness to hope'.
199 LL p 299.
Destruction is waiting at the gate for those whose joy is for a moment, whose glory is fire, dung and a worm.

In ep 203 to Master Ralph John depicts the exiles as 'the household of faith (\textit{domesticiis fidei}) ... the scattered children of Israel'.\textsuperscript{201}

In the third letter to Master Ralph (ep 204) John draws a sharp contrast between those who suffer for the word of Christ ('\textit{pro verbo Christi}') and the evil men who, fawning on the world ('\textit{adulantium mundo}') prefer to 'rule in the counsels of the wicked with earthly princes'.\textsuperscript{202}

Of the twenty-six undateable letters, only those addressed to Master Ralph of Lisieux show a trenchant and polemical use of the 'language of persecution'. There seems to be no way of dating these three letters, but in tone they differ greatly from the letters which we can assign with certainty to 1164-65; they have more in common with those written in 1166.

\textbf{d: The letters of 1166}

The sudden increase in extant letters which occurs in 1166 is an indicator of John's growing commitment as an adviser to Becket. It seems likely that, with the upsurge of political activity in the summer of 1166, John was actually writing more letters than before. But even if this were not so, he was at least taking greater care to preserve them. The detailed and sometimes very lengthy letters sent to Bartholomew of Exeter and Becket\textsuperscript{203} show that he was now fulfilling

\textsuperscript{200} LL p 299.

\textsuperscript{201} LL pp 300-01.

\textsuperscript{202} LL pp 304-5.

\textsuperscript{203} To Bartholomew: LL ep 171 and the lengthy epp 168 and 174. To Becket: epp 173, 179 and the lengthy 175-6.
the role of active adviser and apologist for the Becket circle.

Of the twenty-seven letters written at this stage, all but six contain some reference to persecution. Sometimes the reference is very slight. Thus in ep 170 (late June 1166) John writes to Baldwin archdeacon of Totnes and speaks of the misfortunes of exile and the abandonment by people whom John had regarded as old friends. At the end of all this, John asks Baldwin to pray

that our faith fail not, that we do nothing under this storm to offend the Lord, but, as he alone can, make profit even out of temptation. Indeed, he has made a beginning; he has granted us a zeal in suffering for justice ...

More often the themes of persecution receive greater elaboration, and in some letters (for instance ep 168 to Bartholomew of Exeter) the whole text is keenly polemical and infused with the 'language of persecution'.

The bulk of letters from 1166 were written during the summer, after Becket had passed sentence of excommunication against several of Henry's officials and after the English bishops had lodged their appeal against Becket. The polemic in these letters is directed mainly against the bishops and to a lesser extent against the king.

What then were the main features of John's polemic? The most dramatic and most often quoted aspect of his polemic is the series of attacks against Gilbert Foliot bishop of London. By identifying Gilbert as Doeg the Edomite who instigated the attack on Nob, the village of the priests (I Kings (I Samuel) 22), John casts Gilbert into the role of persecutor of the priesthood. There is also the

---

204 The exceptions are LL epp 158, 160, 162, 166, 170, 182.
205 LL p 123.
206 For instance Knowles, TB p 114.
implication that Gilbert is the enemy of Christ, for the standard
interpretation of Doeth Idumaeus was that as an adversary of King
David he prefigured the enemies of Christ: Judas and Antichrist.\textsuperscript{208}
And by describing Gilbert’s political activities as the ‘counsel of
Achitophel’ John seeks to portray Gilbert as a false friend and
adviser.\textsuperscript{209}

However the core of John’s polemic lies not in the colourful and
occasional attacks on Foliot, but in the more sustained presentation
of Becket’s cause as Christ’s cause, the equation of Becket’s
adversity with Christ’s passion and by extension the presentation of
Becket’s opponents as the perfidious Jews who crucified Christ.

Medieval writers had two main ways of defining and describing
persecution: first in terms of the ten great persecutions waged by the
Roman emperors against the early church;\textsuperscript{210} and secondly, in terms of
the passion of Christ. John used only the second, the Christ-centred,
method,\textsuperscript{211} which, as we have seen, was already being exploited by

\textsuperscript{207} LL ep 175 pp 152, 156; ep 181 p 202.
\textsuperscript{208} Note for instance Cassiodorus: Quapropter per nomen Doecl Idumaei iure Antichristus intelligitur ... (PL 70 col 373 A).
\textsuperscript{209} LL ep 175 pp 152, 156.
\textsuperscript{211} During the entire Becket dispute John makes only one reference
to persecution by a Roman emperor: ‘Peter and Paul would have escaped
Nero’s sword, and not even made him their enemy, if they had not
preached against men’s pleasures and wrongdoings.’ (LL ep 187 pp 246-7). There is one indirect reference to Henry II as being like
the emperors Titus and Vespasian, who were not among the persecutors
of the early church but who had repressed the Jewish people with great
cruelty. See ep 173 pp 136-7; the allusion to Psalm 79: 14-15
(80: 13-14) and the Glossa ordinaria on this.
Becket in 1163 and 1164.

The Christ theme is most highly developed in the letters to Becket. In advising and consoling him, John speaks of 'our enemies ... or rather the enemies of Christ and the Church.' In ep 176 John draws a graphic picture of the followers of Christ standing up to the threats of tyrants ... the cowardice of a judge ... the avarice and inconstancy of those who seek at every turn what is their own - that is the things of the flesh, not the things of Christ Jesus.

In the same letter John alludes to Psalm 2:2, saying:

Has the king ever abandoned intercourse with any excommunicate? Have not the bishops, and almost all the clergy, stood by him against the Lord and his anointed (adversus Dominum et adversus christum eius).

Psalm 2 was traditionally given a Christological interpretation. The Glossa ordinaria, quoting the Pseudo-Bede, notes that in the early part of the Psalm the prophet speaks 'de Iudaeis propter Christi passionem'. In the glosses on Psalm 2, the reges terrae et principes who stand against the Lord, are variously interpreted as the persecutors of Christ (Herod, Annas and Caiphas, Pilate) and as 'those kings who stand up against the Lord'.

In ep 179 there is a passage linking Becket with Christ:

He [Christ] is still prepared to die for the humble and carry the shame of the Cross. This seems to be the right course because those who persecuted you, and Christ in you, are said to have lost some of the king's favour ... Christ will triumph ...

212 LL ep 175 p 165.
213 LL p 167.
214 LL p 175.
215 PL 93 col 489. For the identification of the Pseudo-Bede as Manegold of Lautenbach see the general remarks and references in Smalley, Study of the Bible pp 48-9.
The image of the church as the bride (sponsa) of Christ is found also. In ep 180 to Walter de Insula it is linked to a cluster of Christ-references. John notes that if the 'king returns to himself, he will appease his Lord, the church's bridegroom'. Then there follows a warning: if the king despises the 'exules et proscriptos Dei' because they are poor, he should remember that Christ protects such men ('talium patronus est Christus'). After listing several persons who were destroyed by God, John asserts in an echo of I Peter 4:15-16, that the Becket exiles suffer not as criminals but as Christiani.

The image of Henry waging war on Christ is brought out in a letter to Bartholomew: 'cares chafe him on every side, but he presses on with the war which he wages on Christ and the Church'.

The counterpart of the Christ theme was to depict Becket's opponents as the persecutors of Christ. For this, however, the references are fewer and less explicit. The English bishops are occasionally described as 'high priests' (principes sacerdotum). There is a curious reference in which Becket is likened to the 'penitent thief' who was crucified alongside Christ and who was mocked by the perfidi Iudaei. The 'penitent thief' must be an allusion to Becket's role in making exactions from the church for the Toulouse campaign in 1159. For during 1166 this was one of the topics raised

216 LL p 191.
217 LL pp 194-5.
219 LL ep 178 p 186.
220 LL ep 163 p 84: 'Ridet ad haec prudentia carnis, et perfidorum vocibus Iudaeorum insultat et maledicit ei qui cum Christo pendet in ligno.'
by Becket’s opponents to discredit Becket’s stance as a defender of church liberties. The perfidi Iudaei are, John indicates, Becket’s enemies within the English church.

In ep 173 to Becket, John speaks of the English bishops as cheering every wrong done to the churches, dicentes ’Euge, euge’ - an echo of Psalm 34(35):21 which reads:

Et dilataverunt super me os suum; Dixerunt Euge, Euge! viderunt oculi mei.

In the Glossa ordinaria, the word dilataverunt is defined as ‘openly crying "Crucify, crucify"’. The Glossa also contains a cross-reference to Matthew 27:42 where the priests, scribes and elders jeered Christ, challenging Him to descend from the cross if He were truly the King of Israel.

The identification of Becket with Christ and of Becket’s opponents with the Jews, is complemented by the array of other themes drawn from the ‘language of persecution’: divine vengeance; the identification of Henry with Frederick Barbarossa (and the accompanying implication that Henry and the English bishops were attacking the church universal just like the German schismatics);

221 John counteracts these accusations: ‘Someone will say that the imposition of the tax and harrying of churches is to be laid wholly at the door of the king’s chancellor ...’ LL ep 167 pp 105-7.
222 ‘Nunquid enim clericus institutus est ut comedens’ etc, LL p 84.
223 LL p 134.
224 For instance, ibid ep 169 pp 118-9: ‘But wait awhile, and in time they will be held in regard (in tempore erit respectus eorum).’ This reference to Wisdom 3:6 is explained in Glossa ordinaria as in diei iudicii. The next sentence in John’s letter is more direct: ‘In the meantime there is no peace for the wicked’ etc.
225 For instance ep 181 p 201: ‘The king puts his trust in the Emperor and in the hope that he will capture the pope as is foretold to him by the prophets of Baal, who see false things and foolish, because they speak not from the Lord.’
setting the Becket dispute against an historical scale - the whole
history of God's people; the blessedness of suffering for
justice.\textsuperscript{226}

\textbf{e: Conclusions}

In the summer of 1166 John crossed a boundary in his relations with
Becket. From the start he had always been sympathetic to Becket's
struggle for \textit{libertas ecclesiae}; but he had taken the view that the
struggle should be fought and settled by Henry and Becket; he withdrew
from Becket's \textit{familia} and proffered advice that appears to have been
very different from that which Becket was receiving from his own
aides. It was during the intense months of 1166, when churchmen were
being forced to declare their loyalties, that John opted for Becket
and began to exploit the 'language of persecution' to console and
counsel the Becket circle, to reprove the English bishops and to
courage sympathisers, like those in Exeter, to stand firm.

\textsuperscript{226} For instance, LL ep 174 pp 144-6 are combined the themes of
divine vengeance and historical scale. After listing Cain, Pharaoh,
Adoni-bezek and Ham as examples of the dictum 'Wherewithal a man
sinneth, by the same also shall he be punished.' John remarks: 'in
every age and in every race, if one considers the history of divine
providence, one will clearly recognise that there has always been some
similarity between crime and punishment.'

\textsuperscript{227} The blessedness of suffering for justice, a \textit{locus} drawn from
Matthew 5: 10 and I Peter 3: 14 is to be found in LL ep 161 p 78:
\textit{patimini propter iusticiam beati eritis} and occurs at a later stage in
ep 273 p 572 and ep 298 p 696. The theme of \textit{pro iusticia pati} (with
no mention of beatitude) is found at pp 250, 258, 296, 302-4.
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INTRODUCTION

While the Becket dispute has generated a large secondary literature, there has been no detailed analysis of how Becket and his advisers pursued their political objectives. Such analysis would entail looking at the individuals whom the Becket circle lobbied and the relationships between the Becket circle and these individuals; as well as looking at the sources and types of arguments used. This chapter attempts such an analysis for one aspect of the problem: how John of Salisbury assisted Becket in lobbying the papal curia. It will consider whom John wrote to, the types of argument he used when writing to curiales; the kind of advice he gave to Becket; the extent to which he differed from Becket on tactics and policies; and his role in collecting and disseminating information about the papal curia.

The task of lobbying members of the curia was a major concern for the Becket circle. From the years of exile there are 26 extant letters from Becket to Alexander III,\(^1\) and 44 to other members of the curia,\(^2\) as well as one letter from a member of his household to the pope\(^3\) and two to cardinals.\(^4\) The number of extant letters from Becket.

---

\(^1\) MB epp: 27, 29, 160, 195, 246, 286, 322, 331, 348, 394, 407, 450, 463, 466, 497, 554, 559, 583, 590, 611, 643, 646, 666, 684, 716, 723. In addition there are four letters written by Herbert of Bosham 'in persona Thomae' which do not occur in the MSS of the Becket collection, but only in the collection of Herbert's letters MS Cambridge, Corpus Christi 123. These are MB epp 156, 530, 537 and PL 190 ep 20 cols 1451-56. Anne Duggan (TB:TH p 201 n 7) doubts whether these were despatched (See Table 7 n 2). (Two extant pre-exile letters from Becket to Alexander III are MB epp 27, 29).

\(^2\) See Table 6 below, where 47 letters are listed; for doubts as to whether three of these were despatched see Table 7 n 2 below.

\(^3\) MB ep 292 (Lombardus).
and his household to the curia, therefore, amounts to 73. In comparison there are 61 extant letters to English churchmen and 15 to French churchmen - a clear indication that lobbying the papacy was a dominant concern for Becket and his advisers. In addition to direct lobbying they also succeeded in getting a number of ecclesiastics and laymen from the kingdom of France to write to the curia on their behalf: there are 27 such letters extant from 13 ecclesiastics, and 3 lay persons. (See Table 8).  

As the pope in consultation with the cardinals would have the decisive say in the final shape of the settlement, Becket had to maintain a constant flow of propaganda aimed at persuading the pope and curiales that his cause was Christ's cause and that his interests, those of the universal church. He had to urge the curia to take a stronger line in his support, as well as countering the propaganda activities of Henry II's agents at the curia.

The struggle to win and maintain support at the curia was an uphill one for both sides in the dispute, but particularly for the Becket circle whose financial resources were no match for those of Henry II. Although most of the cardinals with whom Becket was in correspondence were sympathetic to Becket's struggle, they could not all be relied on to give unwavering support. Letters have survived from Becket to 18 cardinals, of these 8 were strong supporters.  

4 MB ep 664 (coexsules of Becket to Albert), ep 665 (coexsules of Becket to Gratian).  
5 See Table 7 below.  
6 See Table 8 below.  
7 See Table 8 which lists 30 letters from 13 ecclesiastics; included are three letters written 'in persona' by Herbert of Bosham and which may not have been despatched. See Table 7 n 2.  
8 See Table 6 below.
were generally sympathetic but at times critical, and 3 were generally hostile; for 3 we have no indication of where sympathies lay.

Considering the scale and importance of the task of influencing curiales, and given John's long experience of dealing with the curia, we might expect him to have been actively involved in three key activities: directly lobbying members of the curia, giving advice to Becket, and collecting information about the curia. It is therefore startling to find that John's Later Letters contain only fleeting glimpses of business relating to the papacy.

The evidence for John's direct lobbying of the curia on Becket's behalf is restricted to three periods: late 1163 to early 1164, early 1167 and late 1167. The first period is represented by ep 136, John's report written in early 1164 to Becket recounting how he had been sounding out support in the French church, at the court of Louis VII.

I intend to carry out further research into Becket's relationship with cardinals and his lobbying of the curia. The references in this and succeeding footnotes are not intended to be comprehensive. The eight strong supporters were: (1) Albert: MB 5 ep 60 p 113; MB 7 ep 703 p 369 (where comments on the settlement of 22 July 1170 show great empathy with Becket's views); (2) Boso: MB 6 ep 250 p 57; (3) Conrad of Mainz: MB 5 ep 83; MB 6 epp 247 (p 51), 314 (p 211), 462 (p 471); (4) Gratian: MB 7 epp 535 (p 8), 610 (p 175), 609 (pp 171-2), 695 (pp 352-3); (5) Henry of Pisa: MB 1 p 43 (William of Canterbury Vita); MB 2 p 306 (John of Salisbury, Vita); MB 3 p 18 (Anonymous I, Vita); MB 5 epp 60 (p 113), 186 (p 363); MB 6 epp 248 p 53; (6) Hugh of Bologna: MB 7 ep 542 pp 34-5; (7) Humbald of Ostia: MB 6 ep 439 p 497; (8) Manfred: MB 5 ep 96 p 180.

For these see Gemma Lunghi, 'I rapporti tra Tommaso Becket ed i legati pontifici Bernardo di Porto, Giovanni di Sutri e Guglielmo di (Footnote continued)
and at the papal curia which was then based in Sens. On this occasion John did not attend the curia in person ‘lest any plausible suspicion (suspicio probabilis) be conceived against me’. He did however write letters, now lost, to Henry of Pisa cardinal-priest of SS Nereus and Achilles and to William of Pavia cardinal-priest of St Peter ad Vincula, setting out Becket’s case. The second period for which we have evidence of John’s direct lobbying – the beginning of 1167 – is represented by a single letter written by John on behalf of the Becket exiles. The third period – late 1167 – is represented by six letters from John, two to Becket, one to Alexander III and three to cardinals. These will be examined in detail later.

Aside from direct lobbying there is evidence in three letters of John offering advice to Becket on how to deal with matters relating to the curia, suggesting that John may have been an adviser if not a lobbyist of Becket’s. The evidence that John collected information

11 (continued)


(1) Bernard of Porto: MB 5 ep 54 p 95.

(2) John of Naples: MB 5 ep 54 p 95; MB 6 ep 396 pp 381-2; MB 7 ep 589 pp 132-33 (Becket reminds John of promises to help but, unusually for such a letter, does not express thanks for past services); for the post-1170 hostility of Becket apologists towards John see the rubric to this letter (p 132); the MSS containing these rubrics are according to Duggan, TB:TH (pp 12, 82), derived from archetypes probably composed c. 1174-6; MB 7 ep 617 p 188.

(3) William of Pavia: MB 5 epp 47 (p 81), 54 (p 95); MB 6 epp 245 (p 46), 247 (p 52), 248 (p 54), 248 (pp 56-7). See discussion of the Becket circle’s campaign against William of Pavia in 1167, pp 404-9 below.

12 Reimundus, Vivian, and Walter of Albano. MB ep 251, the single extant letter to Reimundus, may not have been despatched (Table 7 n 2 below).

13 LL pp 5-15.

14 LL p 8.

15 ibid.

16 ep 213. See pp 397-8 below.
about the *curia* is patchy and suggests that John did not have unusually well-placed contacts there.\(^{19}\)

The meagreness of evidence for John's involvement in the propaganda campaign which Becket directed at the papal *curia* is so striking that it requires some initial explanation. Is it possible that the lack of evidence may be entirely deceptive and that John did in fact write a substantial number of letters, now lost, to members of the *curia*? After all, we have seen that in ep 136 John referred to two letters which have not survived and which were addressed to cardinals. Such an explanation could conceivably be true but is very unlikely, first of all, because the disparity between three extant letters to cardinals and 168 letters\(^{20}\) to other correspondents is overwhelming, and secondly, on several *a priori* grounds. Had John written extensively to cardinals, a large proportion of this correspondence would almost certainly have survived. For John, like other twelfth-century letter writers would certainly have taken particular care to preserve copies or drafts of his letters to persons of high rank: popes, cardinals, bishops and kings.\(^{21}\) Such letters

---

17 The letter to Alexander (LL ep 219) is discussed in sect 2 below. The other letters are discussed in sect 3 below.

18 See pp 423-6 below.

19 See pp 426-36 below.

20 The total of 169 consists of LL epp 135-304 less ep 231 (for which see Table 1 p 12). For further breakdowns of this total see pp 386 and 441 below.

21 of Peter of Celle's two collections of letters (PL 202 cols 397-636). The first collection (consisting of 77 letters written while Peter was still abbot of Celle, c.1143-1162) contains only one letter addressed to a cardinal (ep 7 to Roland as chancellor of the Roman church) and six addressed to the pope (epp 1-6). In the second collection (letters written after Peter became abbot of St Rémi in 1162) 12 of the 102 letters written by Peter are addressed to cardinals (epp 86-96 including 88a) and 8 to Alexander III (epp 77-78, 80-85).
provided an opportunity to display rhetorical skills and ingenuity, as any letter to a person of high rank had to clothe the business of the letter, normally a petition of some kind, with the right mix of tact, respect and flattery. Such letters were also of special interest to readers as rhetorical models suitable for imitation and because readers have always had an almost insatiable interest in the activities of the great and famous. Letters to popes, cardinals and other prominent persons, while rarely providing any information about the recipients, nevertheless provided readers and listeners with a link to the highest ranks of society.

In contrast to three extant letters to members of the curia, there are, from the years of John's exile (1164-70), 86 extant letters from John to English churchmen, 22 34 to churchmen in Henry's continental lands, 23 12 to the Becket circle, 24 5 to churchmen in the kingdom of France, 25 and 5 to members of Henry II's court. 26 The inference to be drawn from these figures is that the lobbying of the papacy occupied very little of John's attention. But why was John not

22 See chap 9 p 441 below.

23 For other details see Table 1: Henry de Beaumont, bishop of Bayeux (3), Master Humphrey Bos (2), John of Canterbury, bp Poitiers (13), joint letter of John of Canterbury and Master Raymond chanc Poitiers (1), Master Laurence of Poitiers (2), Nicholas of Mont Saint-Jacques (2), Master Ralph of Lisieux (4), Master Raymond chanc Poitiers (4), Richard de Bohun bp Coutances (1), Richard L'Evêque acdn Coutances (1), Master Silvester treasr Lisieux (1).

24 Eleven to Becket (see Table 1) and one to Master Lombardus (ep 279).

25 Englebert prior of Val-Saint Pierre and Simon prior of Mont Dieu (1), Guy bp of Châtons-sur-Marne (1), Milo bp Thérouanne (2), Treasurer of Rheims (1). In addition there is one extant letter to a layman in France: Henry Count of Champagne (ep 209) and three letters to schoolmen there: Master John Saracen (1), Master Odo (1) (see pp 475-6 below) and Master Ralph Niger (2).

26 Master Ernulf (1), Master Ralph de Beaumont (1), Richard of Ilchester (1), Walter de Insula (2).
deployed in a more active role by Becket in the campaign to win and maintain support at the curia? One reason which needs to be emphasised is that - as argued in chapter four above - John, for all his knowledge of the workings of the papal curia and his shrewd assessments of its members and politics, does not seem to have established a network of close friends at the curia. In the Becket dispute therefore letters from John to the pope or to cardinals were not in themselves likely to carry great weight. The most effective letters were those written by Becket or in his name by his immediate advisers, because these at least carried the authority of Becket's archiepiscopal office. But in dealings with the English church, on the other hand, John's name carried considerable influence. As Theobald's adviser he had been actively involved not only in judicial business at Canterbury but also in the diocesan synods of Canterbury and probably in provincial councils.\textsuperscript{27} He had plenty of opportunity to be in contact with a wide range of churchmen within the province of Canterbury and was on close terms with three bishops: Hilary of Chichester, William of Norwich and Bartholomew of Exeter.\textsuperscript{28}

In the late 1150s John had been immersed in church politics and administration, whereas Becket had become detached from this, the office of chancellor keeping him out of England from August 1158 to May 1162.\textsuperscript{29} After his election as archbishop Becket had only two

\textsuperscript{27} For John's responsibility for appeals from Canterbury to the papal curia see chap 5 above. For his presence in a diocesan synod see EL ep 92 p 141. The two councils for which have evidence in this period are the Council of London in 1156 (EL nos 14, 15; Councils \& Synods 1:2 pp 829-35) and the Council of Canterbury in 1161 (Councils and Synods 1:2 pp 841-2).

\textsuperscript{28} See EL epp 13,29; for John's friendship with Bartholomew see chap 9 p 444.

\textsuperscript{29} See Eyton, Itinerary pp 40, 56. Previously Becket had been in England until January 1156, on the continent between January 1156 and April 1157 (Eyton Itinerary pp 16-25) and in England again from April (Footnote continued)
years to win the confidence of fellow churchmen. Given the turbulent contretemps into which he was drawn during this period, he can have had little opportunity to establish any kind of intimacy or trust. His energies were concentrated on conflict with the king rather than on consolidating his own support within the church. The suspicions which fellow bishops had about his motives for clashing with Henry II and their profound doubts about the advisability of his policy, further undermined Becket's chances of winning trust and support among the English bishops. The advisers whom Becket drew into his household as archbishop had no links with Canterbury and, it seems, little administrative experience. In this situation Becket needed the assistance of John of Salisbury to work on cultivating and maintaining support within the English church.

Although John's involvement in direct lobbying of the curia was minimal, his experience and knowledge of the curia were highly valued by Becket who turned to him for advice on at least several occasions. An exploration of his role as an adviser and agent to Becket on papal matters should therefore throw light on his relationship with Becket and the Becket circle, on his outlook, and on his methods and skills as a political operator.

[Text continues p 397]

29 (continued)
1157 to August 1158 (ibid pp 25-40).
30 e.g. their criticism of Becket at the council of Northampton. (Alan of Tewkesbury, MB 2 pp 326-9 esp p 328).
31 For the catalogus eruditorum in Becket's household listed by Herbert of Bosham (Vita Sancti Thomae 3:12 MB 3 pp 206-8), see Barlow, TB pp 77-9.
**TABLE 6: Becket's letters to members of the papal curia, November 1164 - December 1170.**

References are to letter numbers in MB Epp (= vols 5-7)

To the following recipients:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bernard of Porto</td>
<td>443, 558.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Boso</td>
<td>250.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conrad of Mainz</td>
<td>196, 247, 288, 314, 442.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Master Gratian</td>
<td>533, 609, 663, 695.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Henry of Pisa</td>
<td>248.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hugh of Bologna</td>
<td>542.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Humbald of Ostia</td>
<td>538, 584, 692.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humbald and Hyacinth</td>
<td>441.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hyacinth</td>
<td>249, 315, 585, 694.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>John (of Naples) of St Anastasia</td>
<td>589, 617.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>John of SS John and Paul</td>
<td>290, 541, 587.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Manfred</td>
<td>441.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Otto</td>
<td>309, 330, 468.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Reimundus</td>
<td>251 (Herbert of Bosham 'in persona Thomae'). 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Theodwin</td>
<td>(see ep 585 fin MB7 p 128 for reference to a letter). Theodwin:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(see ep 585 fin MB7 p 128 for reference to a letter). Theodwin:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>602.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Master Vivian</td>
<td>602.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Walter of Albano</td>
<td>691.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>William of Pavia</td>
<td>312 and 313 (probably not despatched), 33 329, 349, 467, 540, 586, 693.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To all cardinals: 287

---

32 For A. Duggans' doubts (TB:TH p 201 n 7) as to whether this and most other letters composed by Herbert 'in persona Thomae' were actually despatched, see note 2 introducing Table 7 below.

33 Duggan TB:TH p 30.
### TABLE 7: Letters from Becket and his household to English churchmen, November 1164 - December 1170

**Note:**

1. All letters are from Becket except for those marked with an asterisk.
2. Letters from Herbert of Bosham: Anne Duggan (TB:TH p 201 n 7) doubts whether the majority of the ten letters written by Herbert 'in persona Thomae' were actually despatched. She points out that only two (MB epp 536, 636) occur in the MSS of Becket correspondence. The other ten occur only in the collection of Herbert’s letters, Cambridge MS Corpus Christi 123. Her doubts apply to MB ep 670 (to Roger of Worcester) and ep 221 (to bishops and ecclesiastics in the province of Canterbury) included below. Her doubts should be extended to include MB ep 222 written by Master Lombard 'in persona Thomae', which likewise occurs only in the MS of Herbert's letters (fo. 24v).

The same doubts cannot be directed against four of Herbert's letters listed below: to Baldwin archdeacon of Totnes, Bartholomew of Exeter, Wibert prior of Christ Church Canterbury, and Gregory abbot of Malmesbury, even though these likewise occur only in Cambridge MS Corpus Christi 123. For the letters written 'in persona' must either have been drafts, which were submitted to Becket, or rhetorical exercises - in the case of letters to distinguished recipients such as cardinals or other leading churchmen. Neither of these considerations apply to the four letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To:</th>
<th>MB Epp no (or details of source if not in MB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, archdeacon of Totnes</td>
<td>*(Herbert of Bosham ep 31, Cambridge MS Corpus Christi 123 fo. 50; PL 190 cols 1464-5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew, bishop of Exeter</td>
<td>*(Herbert of Bosham ep 30, ibid MS fo. 49v; PL 190 col 1464).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester, clergy and people of</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, diocese:</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all faithful in</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clergy</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, Christ Church:</td>
<td>573, 680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wibert prior of</td>
<td>*177 (from Herbert of Bosham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William subprior and chapter</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>MB Epp no (or details of source if not in MB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarembald, abbot-elect and canons of St Augustine's, Canterbury</td>
<td>575, 682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Ridel, archdeacon of Canterbury</td>
<td>237, 238, 581 (and to others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Foliot</td>
<td>81, 155, 166, 198, 224, 239, 297, 479, 480, 678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert of Sempringham</td>
<td>148, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory abbot of Malmesbury</td>
<td>*176 (from Herbert of Bosham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry of Winchester</td>
<td>144, 550, 549, 576, 650, 679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary bishop of Chichester</td>
<td>203, 577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh bishop of Durham</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelin bishop of Salisbury</td>
<td>199, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, clergy of</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel of Ely and Richard archdeacon</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentney, canons of</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard bishop of Coventry</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert bishop of Hereford</td>
<td>202, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger, bishop of Worcester</td>
<td>179, 303, 496, 551, 670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger bishop of York</td>
<td>651, 683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury, chapter</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William bishop of Norwich</td>
<td>489, 688, 726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>MB Epp no (or details of source if not in MB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffragans</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishops and other ecclesiastics in province of Canterbury</td>
<td>221 (Herbert of Bosham 'in persona')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>222 (Lombardus 'in persona')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All clergy of England</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All bishops of England</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffragan bishops and bishop of Durham</td>
<td>536 (Herbert of Bosham 'in persona')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Christians in England</td>
<td>636 (Herbert of Bosham 'in persona')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All bishops of England</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All deans in archiepiscopate</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8: Letters from Becket and his household to French churchmen, November 1164 - December 1170.

All letters are from Becket, except the 6 asterisked, which are from Herbert. The reservations about whether letters found only in Herbert's letter collection (Cambridge MS Corpus Christi 123) were in fact despatched, does not apply to the two letters below which fall into this category - i.e. those to Bernard abbot of St Crispin and William of Vézelay. For here we are not dealing with letters written in persona of someone else and which might therefore have been drafts which were rejected. (See Duggan TB:TH p 201 n 7 and the introduction to Table 7 above.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To:</th>
<th>MB Ep:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernard 35 abbot of St Crispin, Soissons</td>
<td>*(Herbert of Bosham ep 23, Cambridge MS Corpus Christi 123 fo 44v; PL 190 cols 1457-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard of Nevers</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulk dean and chapter of Rheims</td>
<td>86, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey of Auxerre 36</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 Marcel Pacaut, Louis VII et les elections episcopales dans le royaume de France (Paris 1957) provides the best overview of the French church in this period; for an indication of who controlled dioceses see ibid map facing p 72.

35 See GC 9 cols 398-9.

36 The rubric to this (MB7 p 225) - ' ... Gaufredo Autisiodorensi episcope' cannot be correct as William de Toucy was bishop of Auxerre 1167-82 and there was no Gaufredus holding the see earlier. (Pius Bonifacius Gams, Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae, 1873-66, repr Graz 1957, p 502; GC 12 cols 295-7). In fact it is clearly to Geoffrey of Auxerre (formerly secretary to Bernard of Clairvaux, abbot of Clairvaux 1162-65) since it refers to the abbot of Citeaux: 'precor ut qualiter mecum actum sit et agatur per vos innotescat domino Cistertiensi ...' For aspects of Geoffrey's writings see: J. Leclercq 'Les écrits de Geoffroy d'Auxerre', Revue Bénédictine 62 (1952) 274-91; idem 'Le témoignage de Geoffroy d'Auxerre sur la vie Cistercienne', Studia Anselmiana 31, Analecta Monastica ser 2 (1953) 174-201; N. M. Haring, 'The writings against Gilbert of Poitiers by Geoffrey of Auxerre' Analecta Cisterciensia 22 (1966) 3-83 at pp 14-16. For Geoffrey's role as a biographer of Bernard of Clairvaux see passim A. H. Bredero, 'Etudes sur la Vita Prima de Saint Bernard', Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciens 17 (1961) 3-72, 215-261; and ibid 18 (1962) 3-59.
### TABLE 8 (contd.)

**To:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>MB Ep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard abbot and William prior of Le Valasse</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon prior of Mont Dieu</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen bishop of Meaux</td>
<td>613, 582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William archbishop of Sens</td>
<td>606, *175 (from Herbert of Bosham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* *652 (&quot;&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* *653 (&quot;&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* *654 (&quot;&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William abbot of Vézelay</td>
<td><em>(Herbert of Bosham ep 29, Cambridge MS Corpus Christi 123 fo 48v; PL 190 cols 1462-3)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9: Letters from French churchmen and lay persons, on Becket’s behalf, to the papal curia

The table is restricted to persons from the kingdom of France.

The four letters written by Herbert of Bosham 'in persona':

A reservation must be noted about letters written 'in persona' by Herbert of Bosham for Almaric of Senlis, Baldwin of Noyon, Matthew precentor/treasurer of Sens and Stephen of Meaux. These occur only in one MS - in Herbert's collection of letters in Cambridge MS Corpus Christi 123 - and do not occur in any of the MSS of the Becket Collection. Therefore, as Anne Duggan has pointed out (TB:TH p 201 n 7), there is no assurance that they were even issued to their recipients.

All the letters are to Alexander III except those asterisked.

From:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lay persons</th>
<th>MB Ep:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alicia queen of France</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry count of Troyes</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis VII</td>
<td>293, 294, 435, *439 Humbald of Ostia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecclesiastics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almaric bishop of Senlis</td>
<td>241 (Herbert of Bosham 'in persona')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin bishop of Noyon</td>
<td>543, 639 (with Maurice bishop of Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry archbishop of Rheims</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew precentor/treasurer of Sens</td>
<td>281 (Herbert of Bosham 'in persona')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew bishop of Troyes</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice bishop of Paris</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milo bishop of Thérouanne</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>MB Ep:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter of Celle</td>
<td>352 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheims, canons of</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon, prior Mont-Dieu</td>
<td>*465 Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen bishop of Meaux</td>
<td>240 (Herbert of Bosham 'in persona')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William bishop of Auxerre</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of Sens</td>
<td>192, 446, 470, 498, 547, *572 (to Gratian and Vivian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 Peter of Celle's other letters to Alexander III and cardinals, contained in PL 202 cols 397-638, do not deal with the Becket dispute.
Among John’s later letters are two addressed to Alexander III: epp 213 and 219. These provide evidence for a degree of close co-operation between John and the Becket household. They also provide good examples of the types of argument which John and the Becket advisers thought would carry weight at the papal curia.

Epp 213 and 219 were written c. January 1167 and c. September-October 1167 respectively and deal with similar themes: firstly, disappointment at the pope’s decision to absolve John of Oxford from the sentence of excommunication and to confirm his appointment as dean of Salisbury, and secondly, unease about the appointment of cardinal-legates William and Otto. C. N. L. Brooke has pointed out that ep 213 opens as if it were a general plea from the exiles. This impression is created by the use of first person plural form in the opening sentence

Si de exilio clamamus ad patrem pro quo clamamus ad Dominum, pro cuius fide et honore contra persecutores ecclesiae clamavimus semper et clamabimus ...

As Brooke notes, the letter rapidly lapses into the singular form. Had the occurrence of the singular in this letter been only occasional, one could have argued that the letter was composed in the name of Becket’s clerks and that John had lapsed unwittingly into the singular. However because the singular is used throughout the bulk of the letter, it is quite clear that this was intended as a letter from John himself. By using the plural in the arenga John identified himself with Becket’s household and implied that he was writing on

38 LL p 347 n 1.
39 LL p 346.
40 LL p 347 n 1.
their behalf. Before composing a letter in which he presented himself as spokesman for Becket's clerks, John must certainly have conferred with Becket. In fact it is highly probable that Becket invited him to write the letter, since it is one of a group of letters which Becket and his advisers despatched to the papal curia in early 1167 decrying the lenient treatment of John of Oxford.  

The second letter from John to Alexander III, ep 219, was written at the height of the Becket circle's campaign against the cardinal-legate William of Pavia. Once again this is clearly a letter written in John's name but on behalf of all the Becket exiles. This kind of double role is made absolutely clear in the opening sentence of the letter where John mixes the singular and plural forms of the first person.

Anima nostra, pater, in amaritudine est, ut (quod in conspectu vestro timeo plurimum) verbo modestiam subtrahat vis doloris et patientia prae miseriarum cumulo querelas omnino nequeat cohibe~. Alii enim pro defensione iusticiae morientes ...

After 2 February: MB epp 286 (Becket to Alexander III), 290 (Becket to John cardinal of SS John and Paul). Late February: MB ep 292 (Master Lombard to Alexander). Probably also despatched as part of this campaign were epp 287 (Becket to all cardinals) and 288 which, though complaining about the way Becket's case was being handled at the curia, contain no explicit reference to John of Oxford. Brooke considers that they were probably in the 'posse of letters of complaint' despatched at this stage (LL p xxxiii) and Anne Duggan dates them as 'post 2 February 1167' (TB:TH pp 229, 281 for ep 287; pp 230, 280 for ep 288). In addition, also dealing with John of Oxford's reception at the curia, are MB epp 280 and 281, addressed to Alexander and written by Herbert of Bosham in persona of Henry count of Champagne and Matthew precentor/treasurer of Sens. But, as Anne Duggan observes, (TB:TH p 201 n 7), it is unlikely that these were despatched.

See pp 404-9 below.

LL p 370. This obvious mixing of the first persons singular and plural does not support Brooke's suggestion (LL p 347 n 1) that this letter, like ep 213, starts 'as if a general appeal from the exiles'. Duggan's suggestion (TH p 155) that this letter was written in Becket's name cannot be correct, for the letter speaks about Becket in the third person: 'potestate domini Cantuariensis' (p 372), 'excommunicati domini Cantuariensis' (p 374), 'eorum qui Cantuariensi (Footnote continued)
Here and throughout the letter the singular represents John's own observations and comments and the plural represents the views and experiences shared by all of Becket's supporters in exile. A little later John makes it unequivocally clear that the letter is being written on behalf of the Becket supporters in exile:

Et miseris Cantuariensibus ad quos inter Deum et se mediatores confugiendum est nisi ad Romanam ecclesiam...

As this was one of several letters which John wrote during the campaign against William of Pavia in late 1167, it is possible that John wrote it without consulting Becket in advance. But as is the case of his letter drafted to William of Pavia, he would certainly have sought Becket's approval before despatching it.45

Both letters, then, point to close co-operation between John and Becket in early 1167 as well as during the campaign against William of Pavia. It is significant that John was writing not as an individual but on behalf of the Becket exiles. He was evidently acceptable to them as a spokesman. This point needs to be stressed, as it shows that John's differences with Becket and the Becket household were ones of tactics and not of policy.

John's letters 213 and 219 provide us with examples of the types of argument which he thought would be most effective with Alexander III: using the 'language of persecution', identifying the Becket dispute with Alexander's struggle against Frederick Barbarossa,

43 (continued)
archiepiscopo ... minabantur' (p 374).
44 LL p 372.
45 LL p 400.
exalting the powers of the papacy while criticising its present policies, using scriptural exempla. These were the same techniques used by Becket and his advisers.

In the arenga of ep 213 there are two occurrences of the persecution theme. The first is explicit and occurs in the opening sentence: 'clamamus ad Dominum, pro cuius fide et honore contra persecutores ecclesiae clamavimus et clamabimus ...' The second instance is a verbal echo of I Corinthians 4:11:

et nos quid patienter querimus inter tot mortes, carceres, vincula, flagra, contumelias, terrores, esuriem, sitis, nuditatis et multimodae calamitatis angustias?

This echo, like many instances of the 'language of persecution' would have been associated in the minds of John and of his readers and listeners with the figure of Christ. For the verse in I Corinthians occurs in a passage dealing with the imitation of Christ.

In ep 219 it is likewise in the arenga that John resorts to the theme of persecution:

Alii enim nostrum pro defensione iusticiae morientes a Deo et ecclesia expetunt innocentis sanguinis ultionem ...

The use of the phrase 'innocentis sanguinis' - alluding to Psalms 78(79):10, 93(94):21, 105(106):38 and Jeremiah 22:3 - was an

46 LL p 346.
47 LL p 348. Cf 1 Cor 4:11 'Usque in hanc horam et esurimus, et sitimus, et nudi sumus, et colaphis caedimur, et instabiles sumus ...'
48 1 Cor 4:10: 'Nos stulti propter Christum, vos autem prudentes in Christo ...' 1 Cor 4:15-6: 'Nam si decem millia paedagogorum habeatis in Christo, sed non multis patres. Nam in Christo Iesu per Evangelium ego vos genui. Rogo ergo vos, imitatores mei estote, sicut et ego Christi.'
49 LL pp 370-2.
unmistakeable reference to Christ.  

It has been argued previously that one of the reasons for using themes of persecution and Christ allusions was to present the Becket dispute as being a struggle over fundamental issues and to counteract any suggestion that it was primarily a personal conflict which might be resolved by compromise. A similar motivation would seem to underlie attempts to identify Becket's cause with Alexander III's. Thus in the arenga of ep 213 John declares:

tamen Deo teste acerbius dolemus et ingemiscimus magis de imminutione gloriae vestrae et fama Romanae ecclesiae denigrat\textsuperscript{52} quam de dampnis, iniuriis et oppressionibus nostris.\textsuperscript{52}

Likewise towards the end of the letter there is a linking of the Becket dispute and the schism when John urges Alexander not to delay in seeking a settlement of the dispute:

An nescitis quoniam quicumque oderunt ecclesiae libertatem sive scismatico imperatoris confoederati sunt, vitae vestrae (quam Deus in multa protendat tempora!) terminum optant? Patet ergo quam periculosa sit ista dilatio ...\textsuperscript{53}

The third type of argument used by John in these letters is to exalt the papacy. In ep 213 he does so by using the phrases successor Petri and vicarius Christi.\textsuperscript{54} In ep 219 he depicts the Romana
ecclesia as the protector of divine law and the head of the entire priesthood: 'ubi viget divinae legis custodia et totius sacerdotii principatus'. There were obvious reasons for exalting the papacy when writing to the pope: to indicate - and gain - goodwill, especially if the letter was, like epp 213 and 219, highly critical of the pope's actions; to suggest that by its exalted position, the papacy had duties which it should be living up to. In ep 219, John's words exalting the papacy are immediately followed by the assertion that if the Roman church was really determined it could immediately free the church of Canterbury.

The fourth type of argument deployed by John in epp 213 and 219 was by Old Testament exempla. In both letters the exempla were used to remind Alexander III of his duty to aid the Becket exiles. Referring to rumours that the pope was delaying a settlement in order to have time to forge an alliance with Henry, John warns:

Sed memineritis foederis Benadab, quod regi Israel fuit in scandalum et populo in ruinam, quia ultionem divinitus procuratam in publicae religionis hostem noluit exercere.

In ep 219 he uses three exempla:

1) In times of danger the children of Israel were rescued when they returned to the tabernacle of the covenant for assistance - an exemplum which John links to the assertion that the only remedy open to the Becket exiles is to petition the pope.

---

55 LL p 372.
56 LL p 372: 'Nam si illa post Deum decreverit salvare nos, continuo liberabimur ...'
57 For John’s use of the Old Testament see A. Saltman, 'John of Salisbury and the World of the Old Testament' World JS pp 343-63.
2) In times of difficulty the sons of Israel also sought help from Moses and Aaron the sancti Domini: again this exemplum is linked to the insistence that the pope and Roman church should comfort the exiles in their tribulation.  

3) In the third scriptural exemplum the pope is likened to Moses, raising his hands so that Amalech might be laid low. This is intended as an exhortatory exemplum: Alexander should imitate Moses by taking action to save the Canterbury exiles.

An aspect of John's attitude to the papacy is revealed in ep 213. He was quite prepared to express frank and explicit criticism of Alexander's actions. Though attributing accounts of these actions to rumour, John nevertheless delivers a very sharp rebuke to Alexander:

And if what is being said at the cross-roads is true, I do not see how your majesty can establish your own innocence. I pass over the fact that that oath-swearer [John of Oxford] has received the deanery from your hands ... Was it right to exempt him from the jurisdiction of all bishops ... (as his accomplices boast)? Was he to be exalted by such mighty privileges that on his return to England he could by your authority summon the bishops and clergy of England and instruct them not to obey the archbishop of Canterbury, nor go to him when summoned; and that men lawfully excommunicate, without making satisfaction or giving any security at all, still persisting in their sacrilege, should be absolved?

John's frank expression of criticism was typical; it fits in well with

59 LL p 372, cf Exodus 26:1, 34 etc.
60 LL p 372.
61 LL p 372: 'Nam si illa post Deum decreverit salvare nos, continuo liberabimur; si manus erexeritis, sternetur Amalech, et quos Pharaoni dedit in Deum deiciet omnes adversarios ecclesiae a facie vestra.' The comparison of Alexander with Moses is strengthened by the reference to Pharaoh, the standard exegetical figure for Satan. As Brooke suggests (LL p 372 n 4) this is probably an allusion to Frederick Barbarossa.
his claim in the *Policraticus* to have spoken frankly to Adrian IV about the widespread criticisms of the Roman church. On that occasion too John purported to be echoing other people's criticisms. One of John's political strengths was his ability to express very incisive criticism without appearing aggressive. The same skill shows itself in John's masterly letter to William of Pavia.

In conclusion John's letters 213 and 219 show that John's relationship with Becket and the Becket household was close enough for him to be allowed to send letters to the pope on behalf of Becket's co-exiles. They are also indicators that in contrast with his position from 1164 to 1166, John was prepared to throw himself actively, when required, into Becket's propaganda activities.

3: LOBBYING IN 1167

a: The campaign against William of Pavia

In late 1166 there were persistent rumours that William of Pavia might be appointed as one of the papal legates commissioned to settle the dispute between Henry II and Becket. In three letters composed in November 1166 Becket referred to a rumour that William had been declaring openly at the papal curia that he was certain to be appointed legate and that he would make a judgement favourable to Henry. The circumstantial detail which Becket provides - that William's remarks were being repeated by his 'clericus' - suggests

---

64 ibid p 67/13-14: ' ... mala, quae in diversis provinciis audieram, patenter exposui, sicut enim dicebatur a multis ... '
65 LL ep 229 (discussed pp 409-12 below).
66 MB6 ep 247 (to Conrad of Mainz) p 52; ep 248 (to Henry of Pisa, cardinal priest of SS Nereus and Achilleus) p 54; ep 249 (to Hyacinth, cardinal-deacon of St Mary in Cosmedin) pp 56-7.
that there was some basis to these rumours and that Becket was not simply inventing a slander. There was no doubt about William's strong predisposition towards Henry. About a month before Becket wrote about these rumours, William had declared, in a letter to Gilbert Foliot, his ties of friendship with Henry II and his determination to aid Henry's interests. Early in 1167 it became known in northern France that the pope had appointed William of Pavia and Otto, cardinal-deacon of St Nicholas in Carcere Tulliano. About January John in a letter to the pope, voiced his misgivings about William: '... we have heard from many sources that one of them has made a pact with the King to our harm ...'. The Becket circle had other reasons for being uneasy about the role which William might play in shaping a settlement. It was conceivable that if William conducted the negotiations skilfully, Becket might come under considerable pressure from French churchmen and from the court of Louis VII to accept a settlement favourable to Henry II. In a letter to John of Poitiers c. January 1167, John set out the Becket circle's dilemma very clearly:

If we refuse their judgement (examen), it is to be feared that our cause will suffer in the eyes of the French king and the French church; if we accept it, even though with suspicion, it is to be feared that they will overturn our just cause.

67 MB6 ep 245 (c. October 1166) p 46: 'Amicitiae ratio, qua vobis adstringimur et illustrissimo regi Angliae, diligendi servientique propositum nullatenus commutandum plurimum persuadet, ut his quae honori suo ac vestro consona videantur facilem praebeamus assensum.'

68 For the appointment and terms of reference of the commission see MB epp 257 (pope to English bishops 1 December 1166); 258 (idem to Henry II, 20 December 1166); 259 (idem to Becket, c. 20 December 1166); 272-74 (idem to Becket, Henry II and the cardinal-legates, c. 1 January 1167); 307 (idem to William and Otto, 7 May 1167). Cf Barlow TB pp 162-66; Winston TB pp 265-66.

69 LL ep 213 p 351 Brooke trans.

70 LL ep 212 p 347 Brooke trans.
As the legates made their way northwards the Becket circle began openly to declare their distrust of William of Pavia. The strategy was effected in letters from Becket to William of Pavia and other cardinals and to Alexander III.  

We have already noted that as part of this strategy John composed ep 219 to Alexander III, probably at Becket's request. Becket also asked John for his advice on drafts of letters to William of Pavia. John's response is to be found in epp 227 and 228, which urge greater tact and subtlety on Becket's part. These letters of advice give us a clear insight into John's method of lobbying, and while highlighting the differences in approach between John and the Becket circle, they also point to broadly similar views on how to present the issues.

John opens ep 227 by rebuking Becket for intending to address William in a tone so offensive that it would be intolerable if directed against a messenger of the pope, let alone a cardinal-priest and legate of the apostolic see.

John's rebuke ends with the comment:

Si suas et vestras domino papae remiserit literas, regis causam iustificasse videbitur at~statio scripti vestri et propriam contumaciam convicisse.

The comment points to one of John's strengths as a political operator. Unlike Becket, he was well able to see how actions would appear to outside observers. The ability to view a situation from the outside

71 MB6 ep 309 to Otto ('Et licet multis suspectis ut collega vester, dicentibus quod acceptor est personarum et munerum, et domini regis intimus fautor, ut et velit in omnibus patrocinari' etc pp 203-4); ep 315 to Hyacinth (p 214); ep 322 to Alexander III (p 229); LL ep 219.
72 LL pp 396-8
73 LL p 398.
was not simply the result of living at a distance from the Becket household and of being on the periphery of the Becket circle, but was part of John's pragmatic approach to politics which was revealed throughout his writings. This outlook can be seen in the rest of the letter. Immediately after reproving Becket, John urges Becket to 'dissimulate' by appearing to accept William of Pavia in good faith and allowing William's actions to reveal his true position. As John notes, the pope himself had urged Becket to practi\textit{c}e dissimulation.\textsuperscript{74}

The crux of John's advice is that Becket ought to cultivate the cardinals as far as conscience and reputation would allow.\textsuperscript{75} This approach is far more subtle and craftier than Becket's, which tended to concentrate almost exclusively on the issues of principle rather than on political tactics.

The advice which John proceeds to give to Becket concentrates on tactics. If William of Pavia has written to Becket saying that he ought to avoid actions which might generate further discord, then Becket should ask him to explain what things he thinks should be avoided.\textsuperscript{76}

Becket should ask William to pursue the matters of restitution and church liberties with the king and to report on the success of his discussions. This request should be justified on the grounds that Becket and his followers did not have the resources to travel to a meeting and that in any case none of his supporters would be safe if

\textsuperscript{74} LL p 398: 'Esto quod fuerit et sit adhuc Willelmus inimicus; dissimulandum puto donec mala opera eius in lucem prodeant, quoniam et dominum papam ita consuluississe ex relatione nuntiorum vestrorum certum est.' Cf MB 6 ep 273 (Alexander to Becket c. 1 January 1167) p 124.

\textsuperscript{75} ibid: 'Hic interim haerendum credidi, et ipsos cardinales alliciendos, quatenus salva conscientia et fama fieri poterit ...'

\textsuperscript{76} ibid: 'Rogandus ergo fuerat, ut opinor, quatinus ea quae vitanda dicit praescribat ...'
they crossed into Henry II’s territories. This unobtrusively, without any show of aggression or indignation, was designed to put pressure on William, and to counteract the pressure which William was putting on Becket. John’s letter ends with tactical advice that Becket ought to ensure that before sentence of excommunication was passed Gilbert Foliot should be cited, so that the excommunication would have full effect in law as well as in fact.

Somewhat later John sent Becket a brief covering letter (ep 228) which accompanied his own draft of a letter to the cardinal legates. This was a response to the second draft of a letter which Becket had addressed to William, for John opens by stating baldly that he disapproves of both versions. From this second and very brief letter of John’s on how to deal with William of Pavia we get two very significant insights into John’s method of lobbying. First, the advice to dissimulate goodwill towards William is given an added twist. John says that he has drafted a letter to the cardinal-legates which uses a form of words (‘conveniendi formam’) needed by the circumstances but which would be inappropriate if it came from Becket himself:

Ego michi aliam cardinales imprimis conveniendi formam praecelegi, quae quidem vestrae personae eminential decet; sed tam similiorem arbitror condecenti.

77 ibid: ‘Rogandus ... ut de restitutione vestra et vestrorum et ecclesiae libertate agat cum domino rege, vobisque rescribat quatenus profecerit, quia et vobis et vestris sumptus desunt ne colloquium eius possitis accedere nec tutum est aliqui vestrorum ingredi terminos regis Anglorum.’

78 LL pp 398-400

79 LL p 400: ‘Ego michi aliam cardinales imprimis conveniendi formam praecelegi ...’

80 LL p 400: ‘Nec priorum nec posteriorum michi placet conceptio literarum quas ad dominum Willemum mittere decrevistis ...’

81 LL p 400.
The clear implication is that John agreed with the policy of publicising the Becket circle's distrust of William of Pavia but considered that the attacks on William should not emanate from Becket himself. Instead while Becket created the impression of welcoming William with goodwill, his associates could attack William's trustworthiness. John's support for the campaign directed against William is evidenced by his letters to Albert cardinal-priest of St Laurence in Lucina and Walter cardinal-bishop of Albano.  

The second insight into John's lobbying, provided by ep 228 is that his approach to dealing with cardinal-legates, based on practical tactics and dissimulation rather than on denunciation and the assertion of principle, found little favour among Becket's advisers. For when mentioning his own draft of a letter to the cardinal-legates he asks that the draft of his own letter to the cardinal-legate should be shown only to Master Lombardus and to Master Alexander and not to any other members of Becket's household (in vestrae clientelae) lest his draft be subject to their ridicule.

b: John's letter to William of Pavia

John's one extant letter to William of Pavia (ep 229) is a masterpiece of innuendo, which succeeds in making clear John's and the Becket circle's doubts about William and which also delivers an unmistakeable warning to William that he should not let his friendship with Henry II affect his handling of negotiations for a settlement.

Although very subtly composed, the letter is so sharp in tone that it cannot be regarded as an exercise in the kind of dissimulatio which John was urging on Thomas. As John had suggested to Becket (ep

82 See pp 412-22.
83 LL p 400.
228), John himself could adopt a tone quite different from that which Becket could use. But, though willing to adopt a sharp tone in writing to William, John nevertheless displayed far greater subtlety than Becket had employed in his drafts to William. In John’s letter there are no open accusations comparable with Becket’s intention of telling William that in the midst of his letters the cardinal had proferred poison.

In his letter to William, John leaves no room for doubt that he distrusted William, but the letter is written skilfully enough to fall short of open accusation. Disingenuously John asserts his faith in William while repeating that there are some who fear that William, like Lucifer, will have his light extinguished and that there are many who are suspicious of William’s friendship (familiaritas) with Henry II. John has the advantage of reporting these accusations and conveying a warning to William, while at the same time protesting his detachment from the accusations.

What is very striking about the letter is John’s avoidance of direct, indignant attacks which might easily rebound or which might be too clumsy to be effective. In his political manoeuvrings, John was not interested in writing or acting simply to relieve feelings of frustration or anger. He normally concentrated on achieving feasible objectives. The objective of this letter, it would seem, was to put

84 See pp 407, 408-9.
85 LL p 396: ‘Quid autem scripsit ... ut eum recte dicatis, in medio literarum vobis propinare venenum.’ cf MB6 ep 312 p 209.
86 LL p 402: ‘Unde vehementes consilium vestrum et auxilium michi censui implorandum ...’
87 LL p 402: ‘... timentque plurimi ne Lucifer denuo temptatus extinguatur et corruat, veriti ne familiaritas quam cum rege, ut dicitur, ulterius contraxistis, vobis sit occasio delinquendi.’ Ibid: ‘... haec vestri et domini regis familiaritas, quae multis adeo suspecta est ...’
pressure on William of Pavia not to fall in too easily with the plans of Henry II. This was done by warning William that he was distrusted by the Becket circle and people in France, the plurimi and multi to whom John refers.

Rather than directly attacking the familiaritas binding William and Henry, which alarmed and annoyed Becket, John turned the fact of William’s friendship with the king to advantage, to put pressure on the cardinal. John states that he feels all the more confident in asking for William’s consilium and auxilium since William was reputed to be on such good terms with Henry. He hopes that the familiaritas will be fruitful for the church, useful to the Becket circle and will bring salvation to the king and glory to William.  

The letter contains features which occur in John’s letters to the cardinals Albert and Walter of Albano, written about the same time. He uses the locus ‘acceptio personarum’ when insisting that he, for one, trusted William’s integrity. He also refers to his opposition to the Customs of Clarendon, reminding William that Alexander III had condemned them at Sens on the advice of the cardinals. The insistence on making no compromise on the Customs is also to be found in John’s letters to Albert and Walter.

Opposition to the Customs was of course a recurrent feature of the Becket circle’s correspondence, but, at this stage, there was some

---

88 LL p 402: ‘A magnis etiam ... auditum est quod praefatus dominus noster rex de amore vestro confidit, ut obtemperare decreverit’ etc. Ibid: ‘Ceterum ego interim spero quod haec vestri familiaritas ... fructosa erit ecclesiae necessaria nobis, salubris illi et vobis gloria.’

89 LL p 402. See also LL pp 432, 434. Cf 2 Chronicles 19:7, Romans 2:11, etc.

90 LL p 404 end.

91 LL pp 428, 434.
anxiety that William would work for a compromise that would either give recognition to the Customs or which would simply make no reference to the Customs. An indication of this anxiety is that in September or October 1167, John thought it necessary to say in his letter to the pope:

If the king by your authority won the confirmation or tolerance of the customs which he seeks, what would any prince from now on fear to demand against the Church? One thing I know, that with safety to his profession and without injury to God’s law, no bishop, nor any Christian man, can keep these customs.  

Later evidence for this is post factum: at the conference at Gisors-Trie, William tried unsuccessfully to get Becket to recognise the Customs or at least to accept a settlement which contained no reference to them.  

c: John and cardinal Albert

John’s letter to Albert cardinal-priest of St Laurence in Lucina, composed in late 1167, had the objective of making known and explaining the Becket party’s dissatisfaction at the pope’s handling of the dispute between Thomas and Henry II. There were two sources of dissatisfaction referred to by John. The first was the appointment of William of Pavia, as one of the papal legates commissioned to resolve the dispute between Thomas and the king. The distrust with which the

92 LL pp 375-77, Brooke trans.
93 LL ep 230 pp 408-10; ep 231 pp 420-22.
94 Certainly later than the first week in September for it refers to the disease which destroyed the army of Frederick Barbarossa in Rome at the very beginning of August (LL p 430: ‘Nonne dominus papa ... zelo iusticiae ... meruisse credendus est, ut hostis fidei Fredericus contritus sit a facie eius, et ira Dei castra eius exterminaret qui iam videbatur de urbe et orbe et universalis ecclesia triumphasse?’)
Becket circle regarded William is dealt with at length and occupies two thirds of the letter. The second source of dissatisfaction referred to in the opening and closing parts of the letter was that in December 1166 Alexander III had absolved John of Oxford from the sentence of excommunication imposed by Becket and had confirmed his appointment as dean of Salisbury by bishop Jocelin.

It is evident from the letter that John had a very high regard for Albert but that he had no previous ties of obligation or friendship with him. In the arenge John states his respect for Albert's integrity:

Truth's friend hears the truth with gladness, and a man who prefers the allurements of deceitful flattery to harsh but saving truth is damned. So I am all the bolder to write to you, since I have no doubt that you are truth's friend and I do not think that anything which you know is for the good of God's church will displease you. I know that you would wish, if God should grant it to follow in the steps of Christ, who laid down his life to free the church.

It is a theme which John returns to at the very end of the letter, using one of the recurrent phrases in the Becket correspondence (acceptio personarum):

Dignetur ergo sanctitas vestra, apud quam non est acceptio personarum, dominum illum, qui Anglicam conculcat ecclesiam, domino papae et fratribus vestris verba veritatis et virtutis ingerendo reprimere ...

95 From 'De altero tamen legatorum merito confidit ecclesia ... et utinam alter potentatui et gratiae regis, quam appetit hactenus, praeferet veritatem ... ' (LL p 428) to 'Non enim creditur nunc aut fide sincerior aut caritate ferventior aut virtute constantior, novam ex alto fortitudinem induisse, ut non possit muneribus aut metu flecti aut gratia hominis, qui eo patrono semper usus est in causa ista.' (LL p 430)

96 LL p 428: 'Collegerunt item pontifices et nostri temporis Pharissaei in adventu Iohannis illius insignis iuratoris concilium ...'; p 430: 'Iam vero vicisset ecclesia, nisi auxilio et consilio eius iurator ille decanus praevaluisse' etc.

97 LL p 426-8.
While these references to Albert's integrity have the ring of rhetorical flattery, there were good grounds for supposing that Albert would act with an integrity unusual among curiales. Throughout his career cardinal Albert (the future pope Gregory VIII, 1187), appears to have been regarded as a person of outstanding piety and learning.99 An Augustinian canon educated in northern France, he retained a life-long interest in his mother-house St Martin of Laon, and both as cardinal and pope took an active interest in the reform of the house of St Victor.

The emphasis which is given in twelfth-century letter-writing and in John's own letters to bonds of personal obligation (obsequium) and to previous contacts (such as the bestowal of benignitas, honores or beneficia)100 is noticeably absent from this letter to Albert suggesting that there was no earlier connection between the two men. In contrast it can be seen from other correspondence that Becket and Albert were on terms of friendship, well before 1164. In a letter from Becket to Albert written sometime between October 1163 and November 1164, Becket deploys the language of friendship. In the salutatio he calls the cardinal, 'Domino et amico carissimo'.101 He then declares his desire to be in the presence of Albert, to chat to him about his present situation. This would give Becket great

98 LL pp 430-2.
100 See Table 1.
101 MB5 ep 32 p 51.
Nil nobis hac tempestate jucundius dari posset quam
vestrae copia praesentiae, ut de statu nostro conferre
possemus ad invicem, et vestrae discretionis consilium
reportare, quod in omnibus vivax et efficax sumus experti.
Jocunda, inquam, nobis esset huicmodi, quia
pernecessaria.

The desire to be in the presence of one's friend is a commonplace in
medieval letters, but one which Becket could hardly have used unless
there was indeed a real basis of affection between the two men. It is
a topos which does not occur in Becket's letters to other cardinals.
Becket develops the theme of their friendship, describing Albert as
his specialis patronus et amicus fidelissimus with whom he can talk
privately and in confidence:

Loquimur vobis tamquam speciali patrono et amico
fidelissimo, non verentes animum nostrum vobis aperire
medullitus, ut tamen quod dicimus ad aliam non transeat
audientiam in fide et dilectione suppliciter
obsecranter.

This letter to Albert was one of several which Becket wrote in late
1163 accrediting Master Henry who was working on his behalf at the
papal curia in northern France. In the other three extant letters of
accreditation - to Humbald cardinal-bishop of Ostia, Bernard
cardinal-bishop of Porto and Hyacinth cardinal-deacon of St Mary in
Cosmedin - there is no sign of the affectionate sentiments and
phraseology found in the letter to Albert. Other letters between
Becket and Albert do not mention friendship but in ep 501, written

102 ibid pp 51-2.
103 ibid p 52.
104 MB epp 30, 31, 33.
105 MB epp 501, 662, 703.
to Albert and Theodwin sometime between 1166 and 1170, Becket alludes to the ties of obsequium which bind him to the two cardinals.

In a letter which Albert wrote to Becket in late September 1170 we get an interesting glimpse of Albert's sympathy for Becket and his cause. Like other cardinals writing to the archbishop after the settlement of La Ferté-Bernard on 22 July 1170, he rejoiced that a reconciliation had been effected. But - in contrast to the other cardinals - he declared himself very suspicious of Henry's intentions, for just as the Ethiopian cannot change his skin nor the leopard his spots, so Henry could not be relied on:

\[ \text{et ego ipse, unus expectantium et gaudientium, nisi gaudium meum haesitatio quaedam, de adversariorum tergiversatione proveniens, suspendebat ... et intelleximus quod non facile mutat ethiops pellem suam, aut pardus varietates suas.} \]

In comparison cardinals Hyacinth and Theodwin also writing to Becket in late September 1170 did not represent Henry's motives as likely to upturn the settlement, but instead urged Becket to act with restraint in his dealings with the king. While Hyacinth and Theodwin were supporters of Becket and clearly accepted that Becket's cause was the church's cause, they seem to have thought that Becket's personality posed a possible threat to the settlement and they did not identify so closely with Becket as to regard Henry as the chief danger. Albert's

---

106 MB6 ep 501 p 587.
107 MB7 epp 704-708.
108 MB7 ep 703 p 369.
109 MB7 ep 706 p 372 (Hyacinth): 'Verum si corpus quod corrumpitur non sinit eum ad hunc rectitudinis locum mentem revocare, consuluius modis omnibus et monemus ut eum in spiritu lenitatis studeatis instruere...'; ibid ep 708 p 378 (Theodwin).
110 See refs in n 10 above.
strong indictment of Henry's intentions reveals a real sympathy and support for Becket's difficult situation, an attitude not found in letters from other members of the papal curia.

As John does not appear to have had the same personal links with Albert which Becket had, we are faced with the puzzle of why John addressed to Albert one of the few letters which he wrote to cardinals. Clearly John was not going to carry more weight with Albert than Becket did. The explanation is probably that, having been drawn into discussions with Becket on how best to deal with the cardinal-legates William and Otto, John became involved in lobbying, either on his own initiative or at Becket's request. It is very likely that John himself took the initiative and seized the opportunity to become involved in lobbying. For in ep 228 to Becket, when he speaks about his own alternative draft letter to William of Pavia, he gives no indication here (or in ep 227 written a little earlier) that Becket had requested such a draft. His detailed advice to Becket on tactics, his admiration of political skills, and his general readiness to become involved in political plotting, suggest that lobbying was an activity in which John would have been eager to become involved - even though in the early stages of dispute he had proclaimed his desire to give up all such activity and cease being a curialis.

There are parallels in theme and treatment between John's letter to Albert and Becket's letter to cardinals Albert and Theodwin, Ecclesie molestias, which was written sometime between 1166 and

---

111 eg his comments on Alexander III matching his opponents' machinations with his own skill (ars) LL ep 278 p 600, discussed p 426 below.

112 See for instance LL ep 208.

113 See chap 7 n 162 above.
Although the language is entirely different, the contents suggest that John and Becket thought in broadly similar ways about how to present the issues to the papal curia. In these letters both men argue that there is a threat to the freedom of bishops to exercise their office without the interference of secular rulers. John says that if the pastoral office (‘pastorale officium’) is only exercised at the will of the prince then crimes will go unpunished, the savagery of tyrants will pass uncondemned and the church itself will not last long.

Becket handled the same theme declaring near the beginning of his letter to Albert and Theodwin:

If pastors (pastores), through love or hate, greed or neglect, through hope or fear of worldly things (temporalium) desert their post (locum suum), it will come to pass that their light will be removed and they will ensnare and ruin their people.

By arguing that the pastorale officium was at stake John and Becket were doing two things: first, they were asserting that the issues at the heart of the dispute were fundamental and had far-reaching consequences for the entire church; secondly, they were implying that the pope should fulfill his own pastoral office by giving Becket effective support and by ceasing to aid the opponents of Becket. John closes his letter to Albert by suggesting that the pope, in allowing John of Oxford to hold the deanship of Salisbury, has been involved in undermining the pastoral office:

If only the lord pope had not made another man’s sin.

---

114 MB6 ep 501.

115 LL p 428: ‘Si pastorale officium non nisi ad nutum principis liceat exercere, proculdubio nec crimina punientur nec tirannorum arguetur immanitas nec re ipsa diu stabit ecclesia.’

116 MB6 ep 501 p 587.
(peccatum alienum) his own ... and had not appointed as
guardian of souls (custodem animarum) a person who was a
persecutor of the church ... 117

A second feature found both in John’s letter to Albert and in
Becket’s letter Ecclesie molestias is the contention that Henry should
be brought to heel as he sets a pernicious example to other princes.

John comments:

Sperabatur in adventu cardinalium aliqua consolatio; sed
ece eo magis crudescunt cornua tirannorum, quod vident
alpa et non remorderi illum qui fecit et facit omnia
haec. 118

Becket depicts Henry as likely to be an evil example to present rulers
and to his descendants:

Quis alios principes, aequo nobili et potentes, prohibent
similia vendicare? Malorum enim exempla citius rapiuntur,
et posteri relictit maiorum vitii rarius ad exercitia
virtutis assurgunt. 119

In conclusion, the themes found in John’s letter to Albert and
in Becket’s to Albert and Theodwin, indicate that although John was
excluded from the Becket circle’s campaign of lobbying the papal curia
and although he was extremely critical of Becket’s proposals for
dealing with William of Pavía, he nevertheless had similar views to
Becket about which arguments should be propagated at the curia.

d: John and cardinal Walter

In late 1167 John also wrote to Walter cardinal-bishop of Albano.
John’s letter shows that he and Walter had probably met previously and

117 LL p 432.
118 LL p 428.
119 MB6 p 588.
they had certainly belonged to Adrian IV's circle of close friends. John says that Adrian's special affection (affectio) for John was known to Walter and a few others and would have become more widely known had Adrian lived longer, a comment which suggests that John had had some expectation of being appointed a cardinal.\textsuperscript{120} John describes Adrian as 'utriusque nostrum pater', since he appointed Walter as his successor to the title of Albano and had loved John above all other Englishmen ('praeceteris conterraneis').\textsuperscript{121} John appeals to this previous fellowship, saying that it has given him confidence (fiducia) to put his case before Walter, a point he makes at the beginning and the close of the arenga:\textsuperscript{122}

Magnam michi praestat apud vos audendi fiduciam ... 

Ea ergo fiducia qua ipsum consueveram alloquor et vos quia ... 

This early connection did not however form the basis of further ties of friendship or obligation between the two men. It is true that towards the end of the letter John says that he is speaking 'familiarius', that is informally and as a fellow or associate.\textsuperscript{123} This need not point to any intimacy between the two men. 'Familiarius' carries not necessarily the connotation of friendship and love but of association, being in the same familia. The familiaritas between the two men could then have been based on the times they had met through

\textsuperscript{120} LL p 434: 'Haec ipsius ad me affectio nobis adinvicem et alii interim partis innuit; sed nisi eum fata praepropere (quod nunc luget orbis Christianus) e medio rapuissent, iam innotuisset et mundo.' See Brooke, World JS p 12; cf Pol 6:24 (Webb 2 p 67).
\textsuperscript{121} LL pp 432-34.
\textsuperscript{122} LL p 432.
\textsuperscript{123} LL p 436: 'Haec iccirco vobis tanquam patri et domino credidi familiarius intimanda ne consensum detis iniquitati, sed animam vestram liberetis apud Deum et homines.'
Adrian rather than to any later contact. This appears to be confirmed by the language which John uses in the *arenge*. This shows that he did not consider himself bound to Walter by ties of obligation (*obsequium*); instead he offers to Walter the loyalty (*obsequium*) which he used to devote to Adrian:

> Ea ergo fiducia qua ipsum consueveram alloquor et vos, quia, sicut illi obsequium meum plena et sincera affectione devoveram, ita et, quod in me prætūm est, honorì vestro et gloriae paratus sum inservire.\(^{124}\)

It appears then that John wrote to Walter not because he was a friend of John's but because he was someone with whom John had contact at one time, and to whom an appeal to past fellowship could be directed.

The main line of argument pursued in John's letter to Walter was, unsurprisingly, the same as in the letter to Albert - that the members of the papal *curia* were failing in their responsibilities to the universal church: they were allowing the church to be despoiled and crushed by tyrants, letting clerks be sacrificed like lambs for slaughter, and through silence and torpor letting the depraved customs of Clarendon win the force of law.\(^{125}\) Just as in the letter to Albert John used Christ imagery, so in this letter he draws comparisons between the contemporary situation and the example set by the prophets, Christ and the saints of the church. Attacking the cowardice of the *curia* he exclaims: 'Nunquid haec est via Domini? Ubi lex? ubi prophetæ? ubi evangelium Christi? ubi decreta et exempla sanctorum?'.\(^{126}\) As in the letter to Albert, John uses the Scriptural

\(^{124}\) LL p 434.

\(^{125}\) LL p 434: '*... si ecclesia Dei spolianda et conculcanda tiranis ... vestro silentio et torpore servandorum vobur optinent legum.*'

\(^{126}\) LL p 436.
phrase 'takers of persons and gifts' ('personarum accepores et munerum') to denote persons who act corruptly. In his attack on the curia he asks how the honour of the Roman church can survive and the unity of the body of Christ be preserved if the cardinals are 'personarum ... accepores et munerum'.

While the letter to Walter is, like that to Albert, focussed on the failure of the cardinals, it does not mention William of Pavia by name. The reason for this is probably that John felt reluctant to launch a scathing attack on William - however gracefully worded - when writing to a cardinal with whom neither he nor Becket were on close terms. When writing to Walter he would have felt inhibited from being as candid as he had been with Albert, who was known to be a close friend and supporter of Becket's.

e: Conclusions

From looking at John's involvement in the campaign against William of Pavia in late 1167 several conclusions emerge. John was in agreement with the policy of attacking William in letters to members of the curia and of warning William not to defer to the will of Henry II. But he differed sharply from Becket and his advisers on tactics. He was more inclined to follow a pragmatic approach which concentrated on practical and effective strategems rather than on the assertion of principles and which involved dissimulation if necessary. John's views on tactics appear to have little favour among Becket's advisers but it is interesting that Becket himself was willing to seek out John's advice on the drafts of letters he intended to send to William of Pavia. This suggests that Becket at least appreciated the value of John's advice.

127 LL p 434.
John's involvement in the campaign against William of Pavia confirms the argument that in general he played a negligible role in direct lobbying of the curia. For at first his involvement was simply to advise Becket on the drafting of letters to William, but once drawn into this it seems that John seized the opportunity to become involved, briefly, in the direct lobbying of the curia.

4: ADVISER TO BECKET

While John was not actively involved in lobbying the papal curia, he gave Becket advice on several occasions about how to handle business that involved the curia. Among the eleven extant letters from John to Becket, there are, apart from the two dealing with William of Pavia, three letters which include an assessment of papal policy and tactics: ep 136 written in early 1164 when John had gone into exile ahead of Becket and was sounding out support in France and at the papal curia; ep 179, written in the summer of 1166, in which John, after consulting his closest friends at Rheims, proferred Becket advice on how to negotiate a settlement; ep 278, written in the spring or summer of 1168, in which John comments on Alexander III's handling of the suspension of Jocelin, bishop of Salisbury. The first of these letters, ep 136, was composed as a report on what John had achieved in his first few months of exile. The other two letters were responses to requests from Becket for John's views. Thus John opens ep 179, written in summer 1166, by referring to a letter from Becket which had evidently arrived not long before:

\[\text{Ea fere omnia quae michi vestra significant dignatio fama divulgante audieram, sed auctoritate nominis vestri facta sunt certiora.}\]

128 LL epp 136, 144, 152, 173, 175, 176, 179, 227, 228, 278, 301.
129 epp 227, 228.
A few lines later John mentions that he had been asked by Becket to get the views of Becket's friends at Rheims: Peter of Celle, Master Fulk and Master Ralph.

In ep 278 written in 1168, there is no direct reference to a letter from Becket, but without such a letter, John's text would have been baffling and absurd. The letter opens with the statement that no-one should be surprised that the Romans indulge in cheating. It then proceeds to suggest that in the circumstances Alexander III has done well from the church, and, although for the moment, he reserves judgement on Alexander's policy, he is willing to interpret it favourably. Such an opening, without arenga or narratio, suggests that John and Becket had previously been in correspondence on the matter. It looks as if John was responding to a letter in which Becket had denounced the corruption which was hindering the success of his nuntii at the curia, and complained about Alexander III's failure to give forthright support to the Becket cause.

In these three letters, two aspects of John's attitudes to negotiating with the curia are prominent: the first is a pragmatic recognition that bribery is rife at the curia, and that there is little point decrying it; the second is his favourable attitude to the
tactics being adopted by the pope. In his report written in early 1164 John advised Becket against bribing cardinals since his resources would certainly be outmatched by those of Henry II. In ep 278 his admonition to Becket not to be surprised at curial corruption, reflects John’s general impatience with complaint or denunciation unless these had some practical goal.

The same practical approach to politics, which was focussed sharply on getting results, is shown in John’s sympathy for Alexander III. In the summer of 1166 when the dispute was becoming polarised but before Becket delivered the sentences of excommunication against royal officials at Vézelay, John was urging Becket to treat with his opponents, and to display humility.

John says that he and his closest friends at Rheims - Peter of Celle, Master Fulk, Master Ralph and Master Philip - supported the advice given to Becket by the pope. He goes on to urge Becket to recognise that he must compromise with the needs of the time and that he must subsume his interests in those of the entire church:

'Attendenda enim est instantia temporis, condicio ecclesiae Romanae, necessitas regni Angliae, periculum non modo sedis vestrae commissarum vobis et ecclesiarum et animarum ...'

John’s acceptance that Alexander III was adopting the correct

---

136 LL p 10 ‘Sed scribitis, ut tandem, si alia via non patuerit, promittamus ducentas marcas. At certe pars adversa, antequam frustretur, trecentas dabit aut quadringentas ...’

137 See pp 422-3 above.

138 LL p 190: ‘... quibus si vel occurrere id subvenire potueritis, vix tanti debetis facere animam vestram ut non pro salute ipsius animae et liberatione ecclesiae naufragantis accedatis ad colloquia persecutorum et experiamini quid per humilitatem vestram dignetur efficere pius Iesus ...’

139 LL p 190.
tactics for the needs of the time is also displayed in his lively
defence of Alexander in ep 278. As we have seen, this was a response
to a letter from Becket complaining about Alexander and the curia.
John emphasises the difficulties of Alexander’s situation by
portraying him as attacked on all sides by evil opponents:

... quod ad tot et tanta tonitra comminationum, ad tot et
tantarum promissionum blanditias, ad machinas
Balaamitarum, quas subornatis et exquisitis mendacii
oriente usque in Syciliam dolo multiplici erexerunt ...

Despite these onslaughts the pope has done well until now (‘adhuc bene
nobiscum agi censeo’) and his actions should be judged favourably. 141
What is particularly interesting is that John presents Alexander as
operating skilfully to outmanoeuvre the skills and tactics of his
opponents: ‘ut arbitror, artem eorum arte conatur eludere’. 142
Instead of indecision or lack of principle, John attributed to
Alexander political acuity. 143

In his advice on dealings with the papacy, as in his advice
generally to Becket, John urged action that was based on realistic
assessments of the political situation rather than on wishful
thinking. He was concerned not with asserting principles but with
adopting the tactics that would lead to success.

5: COLLECTING AND DISSEMINATING INFORMATION

John’s letters written during the Becket dispute contain a number of
passages providing information about negotiations at the papal curia

140 LL p 600.
141 ibid.
142 ibid.
143 On the various interpretation of Alexander’s behaviour during
the dispute see: Barlow TB pp 134-7, 143-4.
as well as information about political activities in Italy. These are listed in Table 10 below. John's reasons for providing such information were primarily propagandist. His main motives in recounting details of negotiations at the curia were to create as favourable an impression as possible about how Becket's case was viewed at the curia and to rebut claims being made by Henry II and his advisers about successes there. In the struggle to win and maintain support among English churchmen both sides in the Becket dispute had to create the impression that their case had the support of pope and curia. In a gibe aimed at Henry II's supporters, John points out the importance of disseminating favourable interpretations of papal negotiations:

The supporters of both sides say a great deal each against the other, and try to bring those they can, by whatever means they can, to assent to them. Both sides seek the favour of the Holy See, and I reckon that those who earned or obtained it less, boast the more that they have realised their wishes; they claim to have won this or that concession, but I know that no wise man will believe them, especially points said to have been won contrary to justice, unless they produce original, authentic letters as evidence.

Though he derides Henry II's agents in this passage, John himself was skilful and energetic in propagating a favourable version of negotiation at the curia. We can observe this in letters written in spring 1167 to Reginald archdeacon of Salisbury, Richard de Bohun bishop of Coutances, and to Master Silvester treasurer of Lisieux. These referred to the fact that John of Oxford had received the pope's absolution and been confirmed to the deanery of Salisbury, a move which had been vigorously opposed by Becket. John of Salisbury

144 LL ep 298 p 691 Brooke trans.
145 ep 216 (to Richard) p 362: '... cuius tamen si promissa processerint, et eorum quae iuramento firmata sunt fides fuerit' (Footnote continued)
presents this setback in a positive light, saying that John of Oxford
had to give undertakings on oath to the pope which cannot be revealed
for the present, but which if fulfilled will lead to the archbishop
and his followers being reconciled shortly and to the re-establishment
of peace, to the Church’s honour, between regnum and sacerdotium.

A similar propagandist motivation lies behind John’s comment in
a letter to Baldwin c. July 1168 (ep 280) that on their return to the
curia, the cardinal-legates William and Otto were ‘non sine confusione
poenitentes’ for having lowered the cause of the church and complied
with the royal will. Whether this is true or not, the purpose in
recounting it was to show that Becket had been justified in refusing
to agree to the cardinals’ peace proposals or to accept their
judgement.

John’s reporting of the difficulties encountered by Frederick
Barbarossa and the anti-pope Paschal III in Italy also had a
propagandist intent. The clash between Alexander III and Frederick
and the concomitant problem of schism had practical implications for
the Becket party. So long as Alexander’s military and political
position was weak he could not give them the backing they were looking
for. Any sign of improvement in Alexander’s fortunes was encouraging
to Becket and his supporters. The linking of Becket’s fortunes with
those of Alexander was of course turned to good propaganda advantage.

145 (continued)

146

147

LL p 610.

LL ep 230 pp 408-12; ep 236 p 441.
It carried the implication that Becket was fighting the same struggle as Alexander - a struggle for God and the church. The catastrophic reversal of Frederick’s fortunes in August 1167, when at the pinnacle of success, his army was ravaged by plague, was used by John as an exemplary warning to Henry II. Writing to Peter Scriptor about October John commented:

Deus autem, qui iam incepit ecclesiam suam consolari in capite, per misericordiam suam consolidabit et membra; et qui Teutonicum tyrannum scismaticorum principem coegit ab urbe recedere confusum, ipse domum regem Anglorum gratia sua reducit et deducet in viam rectam, ut de cetero consiliariis malis non acquiescat.\[48\]

Later, sometime between c. December 1167 and March 1168, in a letter to Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques at Rouen, John again used Frederick’s misfortunes as an exemplum which Henry II should take note of:

Et si historiarum non movetur exemplis, eum vel Fredericus ex-Augustus potest instruere, qui de fastigio Romani imperii ob ecclesiae persecutionem in paupertatem et ignominiam miser, sed nulli miserabilis, corruit, ad gloriam eius qui solus pro arbitrio regna et imperia transfert, erigit quas vult et deicit potestates.\[49\]

John’s reasons for recounting or referring to news from Italy were not always propagandist. In a letter to Gerard Pucelle about the same time, who was then in Cologne, John also refers with delight to the collapse of Frederick’s Italian campaign and to the death of Rainald of Dassel, the fomentor of schism (scismatis caput); as the church is now growing strong rather than sinking, Gerard should invest the talent entrusted to him.\[50\] Here John is clearly not driving home

---

148 LL ep 225 p 392.
149 LL ep 239 p 454.
150 LL ep 226 p 396.
a propaganda message, but is urging Gerard to keep faith with the
catholic church although he continues to live in the midst of
schism.  

Likewise it is evident that John was making no propagandist
point when he mentioned to John of Poitiers, in a letter written in
mid-to late December 1167, that Frederick had been defeated in a
skirmish with the Milanese and that the pope, now in Benevento, was
continuing negotiations with emperor Manuel Comnenus and with
William II of Sicily. Here John is simply informing an influential
friend who is sympathetic to Becket about matters which will greatly
interest him.

How did John gather his information and what were his sources?
The first point to be stressed here is that John was not simply a
passive recipient of news from the curia. On at least two occasions
he undertook journeys to obtain information. Early in 1168 he
travelled some 500 miles from Rheims to Saint-Gilles in southern
France. On one of the main routes to northern Italy and close to
another major routeway to there from imperial Burgundy, the town of
Saint-Gilles was the ideal place to pick up news and gossip about the
curia and about Frederick Barbarossa. During his stay there he
gathered information from a wide range of people. He mentions that

151 The theme is dealt with more explicitly in other letters to
Gerard: LL ep 158 (early 1166) p 70: '... rogo, moneo et modis omnibus
consulo ut errantes studeatis a scismatis revocare' etc; ibid use of
Zerubbabel (1 Esd 'Ezra) 4:1-3) as exemplar of Gerard; LL ep 186
p 228 (soon after November 1166): 'Inde est quod affectuosius peto
quatinus instantius agatis quod agitis, dicendo, scribendo, faciendo
quod ad evacuationem scismatis per collatam vobis sapiemtiam a Domino
cognoveritis pertinere ...'; LL ep 277 (c. May 1168).

152 LL ep 236 p 446.

153 By modern roads the journey is about 470 miles (AA Big Road
Atlas to Europe, Basingstoke 1984).

154 LL ep 272 p 558.
one of his informants was a conversus from the Chartreuse who had been with the embassy of viri religiosi - the prior of the Chartreuse, Geoffrey former abbot of Auxerre and the bishop of Pavia - who had been summoned to Lombardy to give advice to Frederick in his dealings with the pope. Other informants appear to have been the canons of Noyon, the envoys (nuntii) of Count Henry of Champagne and Henry II's envoys, all of whom, says John, had been in Lombardy and seen the emperor's miserable situation ('Hanc miseriam tiranni, aut potius gloriam Dei ... viderunt ...').

It is not clear exactly what inspired John to travel so far in search of news. In a letter (ep 272) to Baldwin archdeacon of Totnes, written c. April-May 1168 after his return from the south, John relayed a lot of detailed news about military activities and political intrigues in northern Italy: the desperate retreat of Frederick across the territories of the marquis of Montferrat and the count of Biandrate; his attempts to save his situation by pretending that he was willing to make peace with Alexander III and by summoning an embassy of viri religiosi to advise him; his subsequent cold-shouldering of the embassy when it became clear that through obtaining a truce with his north Italian opponents, he would be able to escape; his hurried flight through the Val di Susa with only a few followers.

The information is detailed, and in places is confirmed by other contemporary sources. The letter also deals with negotiations.

155 LL p 556.
156 LL p 554.
157 LL p 554.
158 LL p 554.
159 LL p 558.
otherwise unknown between Henry II and the marquis of Montferrat for a marriage between the marquis' son and a sister of William I of Scotland; and with the anti-pope Paschal III's isolation and increasing difficulties in Rome. He also speaks briefly about the failure of Henry II's envoys to trick the pope and their subsequent threats that Henry would prefer to become an infidel rather than let Thomas hold office at Canterbury; and their attempts to enlist the aid of William II and the queen of Sicily. Unfortunately no details of the substance of the negotiations are supplied.

The second occasion on which John travelled in search of curial news was in 1169 when he went from Rheims to Vézelay for the feastday of St Mary Magdalene (22 July) to meet the papal nuntii Gratian and Vivian 'causa (sicut videbatur) addiscendi quid Cantuarienses timere oporteat vel sperare'. The words 'sicut videbatur' may give the impression that this was not John's real purpose in coming to Vézelay and Professor Brooke has translated it as 'as I pretended'. However it can be argued that the words should not be given so strong a meaning: in this phrase John is preparing the way for the next sentence in which he says that the real purpose of his visit was to visit his friend Gratian: 'Desiderabam autem revera meum videre ... Gratianum ...'. The sharp contrast between the apparent reason for coming to Vézelay - a political one - and his real reason - a personal one - should not be accepted too literally, for John in fact states

---
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165 LL ep 289 (to Baldwin, prob late August 1169) p 650.
that he discussed curial matters with the nuntii:

familarius didici quod dominus papa et ecclesia Romana
Cantuariensibus plurimum faveut ...

Had John made many other journeys in search of curial news, some trace would almost certainly be found in the letters as John passed on the news he had discovered. It looks, therefore, as though he made only a few such journeys. What then were the other ways in which he gained information and who were his sources? The range of possible sources is papal curiales, the Becket household, people returning from the curia and other people in northern France.

On only one occasion is there clearcut evidence of John obtaining information directly from curiales: his meeting with Gratian and Vivian at Vézelay in 1169. There is also one reference to John obtaining information from a person at the curia in 1166, though whether his contact was a member or simply someone doing business there is not clear. In a letter written to Becket, probably in late July 1166, John says that as he had already learned from the curia, the pope has confirmed Becket’s ruling on the appointment of John of Oxford as dean of Salisbury:

Et sicut michi ab urbe significatum est et ego vobis scripsisse me memini, dominus papa iam vestram sententiam confirmavit, immo suam vindicavit iniuriam.

All the other information which John gives to his readers about the curia or activities in Italy could have been picked up from sources outside the curia. Some of the information certainly came from Becket’s household. Thus in February or March 1170 John stated

166 LL p 650.
167 LL ep 176 p 170.
in a letter to Baldwin archdeacon of Totnes that he was enclosing the letter which Becket's nuntii at the curia had recently sent to Becket.\textsuperscript{168} The information which he supplied to Reginald archdeacon of Salisbury and Richard of Coutance\textsuperscript{169} that John of Oxford had been compelled to make certain undertakings on oath to the pope must certainly have been known to the Becket household and John probably derived his information from there. These instances indicate that, whatever the differences in political tactics between John and the Becket circle, he was in close contact with the household and was kept informed of developments at the curia.

Persons returning from the curia must have been a major source of information for John. On two occasions John refers to these as carriers of news. In a letter written to Gerard Pucelle c. May 1168, John says that Becket's representatives and those of the king are engaged in disputation at the curia, and that while the outcome is still unknown, it has been learned from people returning from the curia ('\textit{a redeuntibus ab apostolica sede}') that Becket's envoys have the upper hand.\textsuperscript{170} In late August of the following year John wrote to Baldwin at Exeter and spoke briefly about negotiations at the curia to settle the dispute between Frederick and the papacy, but concluded that they would know more fully about this when Frederick's representatives, the abbots of Clairvaux and Citeaux 'return from the Roman church'.\textsuperscript{171}

Some of John's reports of business involving the curia were almost certainly based on information he picked up from people in

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{168} LL ep 298 p 690.
  \item \textsuperscript{169} See n 145 above.
  \item \textsuperscript{170} LL ep 227 pp 594-6.
  \item \textsuperscript{171} LL ep 289 p 658.
\end{itemize}
northern France. Thus ep 275 written about May 1169 to John of Poitiers reports that the abbot of St Augustine’s told Geoffrey of Auxerre, formerly abbot of Clairvaux, that he and his companions had been acting in the curia on the advice of the cardinals (‘nichil dixerunt aut fecerunt in curia nisi de instructione cardinalium’). Clearly this item of information could easily have been supplied secondhand from one of Peter of Celle’s Cistercian friends at Clairvaux.

In ep 281 (written between 1168 and 1170) to Baldwin, John reveals his knowledge of a letter which Alexander had sent to Roger of Worcester, replying to his query as to whether he should return to his bishopric and obey the king or remain in exile with Becket. This snippet is very likely to have come from Roger or someone who knew him.

In the case of John’s letter ep 288 to Bartholomew written c. February 1169, it is certain that it was from sources in northern France or in Henry’s territories that John heard the rumour that after the conference at Montmirail on 6 January 1169 Henry II had secretly sent nuntii to the curia to forestall the use of papal litterae comminitoriae by Bernard of Grandmont. In view of the date of the letter John could not have heard this from curial contacts and it was in any case the kind of information which would have become well-known or suspected amongst people who were in contact with Henry’s court.

This survey suggests that John gathered little if any information from well-placed sources within the curia. The evidence

172 LL p 578.
173 See chap 2:3 pp 113-122 above.
174 LL p 618.
175 LL p 644.
which we have from his sources indicates that he gleaned it indirectly from the Becket household and from reports by people returning from the curia. But given John's delight in collecting news and commenting on it, we can be reasonably certain that he made the fullest use of the sources available to him.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ep no</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Bartholomew of Exeter</td>
<td>June 1166</td>
<td>Italian cities rebel against the Emperor; deaths of cardinals Hugh bishop of Tusculum and Hubald; death of William I of Sicily and his deathbed gift of 60,000 Sicilian terrini for the pope’s use (p 117).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Becket</td>
<td>prob late July 1166</td>
<td>Pope has confirmed Becket’s ruling on the deanery of Salisbury (p 171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Milo bishop of Thérouanne</td>
<td>early 1167</td>
<td>John of Oxford, deanery of Salisbury; delay in departure in legates (p 354)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Master Silvester, treasurer of Lisieux</td>
<td>early 1167</td>
<td>John of Oxford; letter from the pope to Becket confirming John of Oxford’s undertakings; delay in departure of legates (p 358)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Richard bishop of Coutances</td>
<td>c. March 1167</td>
<td>John of Oxford’s undertakings at the curia (p 362)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Reginald archdeacon of Salisbury</td>
<td>c. March 1167</td>
<td>&quot; (p 364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Peter Scriptor</td>
<td>c. October 1167</td>
<td>Frederick Barbarossa’s withdrawal from Rome (p 392)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Gerard Pucelle</td>
<td>c. October-November 1167</td>
<td>&quot; (p 396)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>John of Poitiers</td>
<td>mid-late December 1167</td>
<td>Frederick Barbarossa’s skirmish with Milanese; the pope’s negotiations with Manuel Comnenus and William II of Sicily (p 446)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep no</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques</td>
<td>c. December 1167</td>
<td>Catholic bishops return to Italian cities (p 456)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- March 1168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Baldwin of Boulogne</td>
<td>c. December 1167</td>
<td>Frederick Barbarossa's military difficulties in northern Italy (p 458)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- March 1168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>William Brito</td>
<td>prob late 1167</td>
<td>The 'deposition' of Frederick Barbarossa (pp 472-6); on the accuracy of this see LL n 4 p 474; and T. Reuter in World JS pp 416-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Baldwin arch-deacon of Totnes</td>
<td>c. April-May 1168</td>
<td>Information gathered at Saint-Gilles about Frederick Barbarossa's retreat through northern Italy (pp 552-60); his ostensible willingness to make peace with Alexander III (pp 558-60); the difficulties of antipope Paschal III (p 560); Henry II's envoys try to negotiate a marriage with the marquis of Montferrat (p 554). Information received in Northern France: pope's mandate to Becket to relax his sentence on Jocelin of Salisbury (p 562)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Gerard Pucelle</td>
<td>c. May 1168</td>
<td>Becket's messengers and king's at curia (pp 594-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>John of Canterbury</td>
<td>c. May 1168</td>
<td>Clarembald abbot of St Augustine's said that he and companions (on Henry II's embassy to Rome) were working with advice of the cardinals (p 578)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ep no</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Baldwin arch-deacon of Totnes</td>
<td>c. July 1168</td>
<td>Paschal III’s difficulties in Rome (p 610), the return of cardinals William and Otto to the curia in disgrace (p 610)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Baldwin arch-deacon of Totnes</td>
<td>1168-70</td>
<td>Letter from Alexander III to Roger of Worcester (p 618)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Bartholomew of Exeter</td>
<td>c. Feb 1169</td>
<td>Henry II’s secret despatch of a mission to the curia (p 644)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Baldwin arch-deacon of Totnes</td>
<td>prob late Aug 1169</td>
<td>Frederick Barbarossa’s negotiations with the papacy; the consecration of his son (pp 656-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Hugh de Gant</td>
<td>c. end Aug 1169</td>
<td>Henry II’s intrigues to win support in Italy (p 660)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Baldwin arch-deacon of Totnes</td>
<td>Feb-Mar 1170</td>
<td>Encloses letter which Becket recently received from his envoys at the papal curia (p 690); the prospect of peace being established between emperor and pope (p 690-2); Henry II’s delegations at the curia, Henry’s agreement to submit his case to pope’s judgement (p 692)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 9: JOHN, BECKET AND THE ENGLISH CHURCH

1: INTRODUCTION

During his years in exile (1164-1170), John addressed most of his letters to friends and contacts in England: Eighty-six of his 168 extant letters from this period were to recipients in England. It was argued in the previous chapter that because John had built up such an extensive network of contacts in the English church during his years in the household of archbishop Theobald, he was deployed by Becket to lobby English churchmen.

The extant letters to English recipients were to several main centres:

- Exeter 24
- Christ Church Canterbury 17
- Norwich diocese 16
- Winchester diocese 9
- Canterbury and Kent (apart from Christ Church) 7

1 For the letters to England see below. For letters to other destinations see pp 385-6 above. The total of 168 consists of LL epp 135-305, less ep 231, a report of the conference at Gisors-Trie 1167 see Table 1 p 12 above.

2 Three letters to John's brother Richard, who was temporarily based in Exeter, plus the 21 discussed pp 442 onwards.

3 See sect 3 pp 470-490 below.

4 Baldwin of Boulogne (1), Master Geoffrey of St Edmunds (4), Gerard cellarer of Norwich (1), Hugh abb Bury St Edmunds (3), John pr Norwich (1), Master Nicholas (3), Walkelin acdn Suffolk (1), William Turbe bp (2).

5 Henry of Blois bp (1), Master Herbert (1), Robert pr Merton (2), Robert de Limesia (1), Robert of Inglesham acdn Surrey (2), William pr Merton (2).

6 Hugh de Gant (1), John of Tilbury (1), Osbert of Faversham (2), Ralph of Wingham (1), Richard pr Dover (1), Robert Canterbury (1), Thurstan of Acolt (prob Kent, 1).
Can it be accepted that this pattern of survivals reflect the ratios of letters which were actually despatched? One possible distortion was that after Becket's death, John was based in Exeter and perhaps in Canterbury. Brooke has shown that the texts of some of John's letters must have been drawn from the Exeter archives. It is possible that a similar distortion could exaggerate the proportion of letters sent to Canterbury. However in broad terms the ratios of extant letters to different centres is probably similar to ratios of letters actually despatched. For given that John was the leading writer, employed to lobby and produce propaganda, because of his outstanding literary skill, he would have been aware of the literary and historical value of the letters he composed, and would almost certainly have retained the bulk of them in drafts or copies.

There were also various reasons - both political and personal - why John would have written extensively to both Christ Church Canterbury and Exeter. He had spent the years c.1152 to 1161 in the midst of Theobald's household and therefore had friends and contacts in the chapter community of Christ Church Canterbury - contacts of the type which Becket, with his relatively brief stay in Canterbury (1162-64) would not have had the opportunity to cultivate. At Exeter, John had family connections, was a canon of the cathedral chapter and

7 Adam of Evesham (1), Ralph pr Worcester (1), Reginald abb Pershore (1), Roger bp (1), Master Simon Lovel (1).
8 Alfred of Chard (1), but possibly in Exeter, Jocelin of Salisbury (1), Nicholas Decanus sheriff of Essex (1), Nicholas de Sigillo acdn Huntingdon (1), Reginald acdn Salisbury (1), Walter bp Rochester (1), William de Diceia (1), William of Northolt (1).
9 LL p lxiii, discussed pp 446-8 below.
had been closely involved in the political manoeuvres to appoint bishop Bartholomew.

We would expect that in the propaganda campaign to justify the Becket dispute to English churchmen, John would concentrate on working through those centres where he had the largest concentrations of influential friends. The aim of this chapter is to look at John's contacts in Exeter and Canterbury and to assess the tactics and objectives of his correspondence with these centres.

2: EXETER

a: Exeter: Friendship and politics

During the years of exile (1164-1170) John's most intimate contacts in England were his friends in Exeter: bishop Bartholomew; Baldwin archdeacon of Totnes; Roger of Sidbury and John's half brother Robert son of Egidia. There are 21 extant letters to the Exeter circle for these years: 5 addressed to Bartholomew, 11 to Baldwin, 1 to Roger of Sidbury and 4 to Robert son of Egidia. As we have previously noted, the relatively high number of extant letters to persons in Exeter may reflect the fact that after 1170 John was easily able to obtain the recipients' copies for his letter collection. However the detailed nature of John's letters to Bartholomew and Baldwin make it clear that he used Exeter as his chief centre in England for disseminating and collecting information about the Becket dispute. The following section deals with the letters which John sent to

10 LL epp 150, 168, 171, 174, 288.
12 LL ep 153.
14 See pp 446-8 below.
Bartholomew and Baldwin, as they are in the main propaganda letters designed to influence the actions and views of people within the English church.

John had family ties with Exeter - his half brother, Robert and, Richard 'Peccator' his younger brother (fraterculus meus) were canons of Exeter and occur in witness lists before 1161. John had especially close ties with Bartholomew of Exeter from before 1160. In 1160-7, he wrote Bartholomew a letter full of word-play and jokes - an indication that their relationship was friendly and easy-going:

Paginam verborum impleri foliis, et quia dulce erat loqui in aure amici ...

Around the same time John was actively involved in Theobald's campaign to have Bartholomew elected bishop of Exeter and to undermine the candidature of Henry fitz Harding. Theobald's household evidently supported Bartholomew because he was the highly educated candidate. His opponent was castigated as 'illiterate', an accusation which was evidently untrue as fitz Harding appears to have succeeded Bartholomew as archdeacon of Exeter.

John's friendship with Baldwin archdeacon of Totnes goes back as

---

15 EL p 244 n 27.

16 See EL p 32 n 1, p 195 n 8, p 244 n 27. For Richard's occurrence in witness lists 1155-59, and for Robert's, from before c. 1161 see LL. p xxvi and references cited there. For John as canon and Treasurer of Exeter in the 1170s see LL p xlvi n 2.

17 EL 118 p 195.

18 EL ep 128 p 222 (John to Becket c. Sept 1160); ep 129 p 225 (Theobald to Becket). For the evidence that the candidate was Henry fitz Harding see EL p 222 n 3, p 243 n 22.

19 EL p 222: '... de persona illitterata et inutili ...'; see John's comments EL p 243 on a proposed deal according to which Bartholomew's opponent would be appointed archdeacon on Bartholomew's election as bishop; for Brooke's comments ibid n 22.
far as 1150-51, when they appear to have met at the papal court in Ferentino. Occasional references in John’s letters make the strength of his friendship with Baldwin very clear.

On one occasion John declares his affection for Baldwin:

*Siquidem mihi pridem multis argumentis innotuit benignitas tua, suo merito bonis omnibus graciosa, sed (quod de conscientia dixerum) nulli mortalium quam mihi dulcior.*

In medieval letter-writing such declarations of affection could not always be taken at face value. John’s other references to friendship are more pragmatic, referring to the obligations and duties of friendship, using the key words of *devotio, officia, beneficia.* Twice John refers to the obligations recreated by Baldwin’s favours and his own inability to repay at present:

*Liberalitatis tua diligentia, dilectissime Baldewin, meritum sedulitate procurat ut eadem mihi semper occurrat materia scriptandi quae consistit in actione gratiarum. Beneficiis enim continuis grates oportet agi perpetuas, et devotionis munus, quod usus retineri non potest, debet acceptantis memoriae inseparabiliter contiri.*

On one occasion he mentions the *officia amicitiae,* saying that he should not, because of his recent silence, be thought of as

---

20 See chap 4 p 192 above.

21 In addition to the references discussed note LL ep 238 p 450: ‘Ubi de seriis agitur, nugas multiplicare non expedit; et indecens est, medicorum more fallacium, cum necessitas aliud exegit, amicis indigentibus verba dare pro rebus.’

22 LL ep 241 pp 460-2.

23 LL ep 170 p 120.

24 LL ep 249 pp 500-02.
unwilling to reciprocate the duties of friendship:

Etsi parvitas mea ad dignas gratiarum non sufficiat actiones, opinioni tamen praieudicium faciam si de taciturnitatis merito praesumatur me beneficiorum esse immemorem, et vicem referendi in officiis amicitiae deesse voluntatem. 25

Elsewhere John speaks of the officiorum gerendorum norma and ius societatis antiquae, when referring to ties of companionship which linked Baldwin to the Cantuarienses now in exile:

Hoc enim officiorum gerendorum norma praescribit, hoc certum est universis Cantuariensibus complacere. Amici tui sunt eorum plurimi, et de te iure societatis antiquae velut de fratre confidunt. 26

There is no evidence indicating what these ties were. As Becket’s eruditi, aside from John, were not drawn from Theobald’s household, the societas antiqua may refer to some period which Baldwin spent in Canterbury between 1162 and 1164.

It was on this basis of earlier intimacy and a similarity of education that John built his political letters to Baldwin and Bartholomew. During the Becket dispute John wrote to Baldwin rather than Bartholomew. The reasons for this can be surmised. Bartholomew was clearly committed to the defence of church liberties and to discharging diligently his duties as pastor. In late 1169 he refused unequivocally to mix with persons excommunicated by Becket 27 and would not join Gilbert Foliot and Jocelin of Salisbury in their appeal against Becket. In 1170 he seems to have avoided taking part in the coronation of the young king Henry. 28 However, Bartholomew was also

25 LL ep 273 p 570.
26 LL ep 241 p 462.
27 LL ep 289 p 654.
critical of Becket and had been prominent in urging Becket's resignation at the Council of Northampton in November 1164. The Becket circle could not therefore be entirely confident of Bartholomew's support. They had to work carefully on maintaining his goodwill and ensuring that he was not manoeuvred into giving ostensible support to Becket's opponents. Thus c. December 1167 - January 1168 John warned Baldwin that Bartholomew was likely to come under pressure to participate in a new appeal by the English bishops. In late summer 1169 he gave a similar warning. As Becket's agent, John had the delicate task of exerting influence on Bartholomew without antagonising him. At first - in the summer of 1166 - John wrote two letters directly to Bartholomew strongly denouncing the English bishops' failure to stand by Becket. But thereafter he sent such criticism via Baldwin. It is quite likely that John thought it more effective to work through a sympathiser at Exeter who could judge how best to argue Becket's case with Bartholomew.

b: The despatch of letters

C. N. L. Brooke has conjectured that the letters to Exeter came in packages which carried the bishop's name or title. He puts forward the suggestion in order to explain a discrepancy between the rubrics in MS Q which designate Bartholomew as the recipient of epp 187, 241,

28 See Knowles' comments, EC p 104.
29 MB 2 p 328; for the reliability of this account see Knowles, EC p 72.
30 LL ep 241 p 468.
31 LL ep 289 pp 654-6.
32 LL p liv.
272, 281, 289 and 298, and the rubrics in the X MSS which designate Baldwin rather than Bartholomew as the recipient. In epp 187, 241 and 289 references to Bartholomew or to the bishops in general, confirm that the recipient must have been Baldwin. Brooke notes that there can be little doubt that MS Q, which is based on the collection made by John himself and which is usually accurate in its rubrics, is in these six instances wrong. This seems to imply that when John was compiling his letter collection - i.e. the basis of MS Q - in the early 1170s, he obtained the texts of these letters from Exeter, rather than from drafts or copies retained at the time of composition. 33 If this conjecture is correct, then the texts which were obtained from the Exeter archives must have contained no indication of recipient. For had there been such indications, they would have been noted and copied out when John was compiling his collection.

John does in fact state in ep 168 to Bartholomew, written in June 1166, that he has omitted the salutis votum from the beginning of the letter since it is rumoured that everywhere snares were being set 'so that it is not safe for good men to have speech with one another or exchange letters'. 34 The only surviving protocol of a letter from John to Exeter contains pseudonyms for Baldwin and John - 'Suo Benedicto suus Gratianus salutem et benedictionem a Domino.' 35

The absence of a recipient's name in the letters despatched suggests that John was taking considerable care to protect the identity of his contacts in Exeter, lest the letters should fall into the hands of royal officials.

33 See LL p lxiii.
34 LL pp 100-02.
35 LL ep 280 p 608.
The letters dealing with such controversial topics had, necessarily, to be carried by persons who could be relied on. As several letters required their bearers to supply information of a confidential and detailed kind, it is evident that the messengers had to be articulate persons, whose discretion and loyalty were entirely trustworthy.

c: Propaganda: John’s tactics and objectives

John’s letters to Bartholomew and Baldwin are political and propagandist with three exceptions: ep 150 (summer 1165) in which John sought Bartholomew’s support for a personal reconciliation with Henry II; and epp 249 (probably 1167-8) and 273 (c. May 1168) to Baldwin, which are primarily ‘friendship’ letters reasserting old ties of affection.

The letters to Bartholomew and Baldwin show John engaged in four main activities as Becket’s agent:

a) advising on how Bartholomew should act;

b) disseminating information;

c) presenting the dispute as involving fundamental principles.

John offered Bartholomew two types of advice on how he should

36 John uses the terms portitor (ep 171 p 124; ep 280 p 608), nuncius (ep 187 p 230; ep 280 p 612) and lator praesentium (ep 289 p 658; ep 298 p 696) indifferently. Note in ep 280 he uses portitor, nuncius and baiulus to describe the same person. In ep 174 p 152 John to his puerus (servant) delivering letters.

37 LL ep 280 p 612: ‘Nuntius supplebit cetera dicenda potius quam scribenda, ut et tu, cum omnia noveris, provideas quomodo possis cautissime ambulare.’ ibid p 614 of the cardinal legates: ‘Facientes autem transitum per Christianissimum regem Franciae redierunt in gratiam eius, intervenientibus pactis, quae vobis harum baiulus intimabit.’

38 See sect a pp 443-7 above.
act: encouragement to follow the Becket line by not getting involved in bishops' appeals and, in 1168 suggesting about how to evade being forced by the cardinal-legates William and Otto to absolve persons excommunicated by Becket.\(^{39}\) Given the need to retain Bartholomew's goodwill, John was prepared to give practical and detailed advice on how Bartholomew might handle the conflicting pressures coming from king and archbishop. When advising him in 1168 to avoid, if possible, acting on any mandate from the legates to absolve excommunicates, John proffered detailed advice: the mandati tenor should be scrutinised\(^{40}\) and evasive tactics taken, but if the excommunicates agree to make repentance and promise amendment, then Bartholomew must absolve them to assuage the fury of the king and cardinals.\(^{41}\)

Likewise about eighteen months later, when advising Baldwin on how Bartholomew should respond to royal pressure to join an appeal from the English bishops against Becket, John advised a course of evasion for as long as possible; but if this failed, Bartholomew would have to take a stance on principle.\(^{42}\)

One of John's major tasks in corresponding with Baldwin was to disseminate the Becket circle's version of political developments. This comprised supplying the Becket circle's version of negotiations, meetings and councils. Some of the information conveyed seems to have no overt political intention but was intended simply to keep the Exeter circle informed of current developments. Such information was political only in the sense that John may have thought it advisable to keep his allies in Exeter as well-informed as possible about a broad

\(^{39}\) LL ep 241 pp 462-4.

\(^{40}\) LL p 464.

\(^{41}\) LL pp 464-466.

\(^{42}\) LL pp 654-56.
range of political activities. As one might expect, information of this type was frequently wedged in between points which were sharply propagandist. Thus in ep 168, written to Bartholomew in June 1166, John provided a long account of the recent actions of Henry II and Becket: Henry's meeting of magnates and household at Chinon on 1 June; Becket's preparations for excommunicating Henry and his advisers; his decision not to excommunicate the king on hearing of his illness; the excommunications uttered by Becket at Vézelay on Whit Sunday, and his detailed condemnation of the customs of Clarendon. John's report is primarily informative and appears to be accurate.  

Similarly in ep 174 to Bartholomew in July 1166 John recounts in the midst of other information which is unmistakably propagandist, some details of marriage negotiations between Henry II and the marquis of Montferrat. John's account alleges that the negotiations were entangled with the marquis' promise to Henry to obtain the deposition of Becket. While this carries the implication that Henry was resorting to every tactic at his command to defeat Becket, it does not make a clear cut propagandist point and must be seen chiefly as 'information'.

Some of the information conveyed however was unmistakably propagandist in purpose. Speaking of Henry II's consultations with bishops and magnates at Chinon at the beginning of June, he presented the king's situation as precarious:

Urunt eum undique sollicitudines, sed bellum, quod adversus Christum et ecclesiam exercet, ulterior praegravat et ei videtur inextricribilis laberinthus.  

44 LL pp 146-8.  
45 LL p 108.
John observes that it is justly (et merito) said that the sentence of interdict will be passed on Henry's territories and that Henry himself will be excommunicated. 46

A little later in this passage there is information which is equally loaded with political purpose. John tells Baldwin that before delivering sentences of excommunication and denouncing the customs of Clarendon at Vézelay on Whit Sunday 1166, Becket travelled to Soissons and prayed there to the Blessed Virgin, St Drausius and Gregory, the Anglicanae ecclesiae fundator. 47 In choosing to commend his case to these saints, Becket would have been well aware of the political significance of his action. The commendation to St Gregory emphasised Becket's insistence that he was waging not a personal or misguided struggle, but a struggle on behalf of the entire English church. The selection of St Gregory as a patron was a message aimed at fellow English churchmen. St Drausius on the other hand was certainly intended to convey a message to the lay magnates of Henry. John observes that St Drausius was prayed to by those about to go into battle. 48

At one level this was certainly a scriptural allusion which would probably have been recognisable only to churchmen. By using the word agon 49 when saying that Becket commended his cause to these saints, John was echoing the Pauline metaphors of fighting and competitive running to depict the Christian's path to Christ, which occur in 1 Corinthians 9: 24-6 and 2 Timothy 2: 3-5. Bartholomew, and indeed any churchman reading the letter, would have picked up the

46 LL p 110.
47 LL p 110.
48 LL p 110: 'et beato Drausio ad quem confugiunt pugnaturi ...'
49 LL p 110: 'agonem suum precibus commendaret.'
implication that Becket was serving Christ in manner set out by St Paul. The echo of 2 Timothy 2 reinforced the identification of Becket's cause with Christ's, for in that passage St Paul speaks of the 'miles Christi Iesu', as someone struggling against the concerns and dealings of this world:

Labora sicut bonus miles Christi Iesu. Nemo militans Deo implicat se in negotiis saecularibus: ut ei placeat, cui se probavit. Nam et qui certat in agone, non coronatur nisi legitime certaverit.

But in addition to the scriptural allusion John makes it clear that selecting St Drausius as patron had a significance which lay magnates would have understood. He notes that Robert of Montfort prayed at the tomb of St Drausius before his duel with Henry of Essex. The duel which took place only three years previously and which centred on the allegation that Henry of Essex had committed treason by dropping the royal standard in the Welsh campaign of 1157, would have been well known to the laymen and ecclesiastics of Henry's territories. 50 By explicitly identifying Becket with Robert, who had been successful in his duel, John was driving home the argument that Becket had the backing of a powerful saint in his fight. The implication was that he, like Robert, would be successful.

In the lengthy passage of information in ep 168 there are two sharply propagandist points - that Henry II's situation is precarious and that Becket has the backing of powerful saints - interwoven into other information which was largely factual and presumably intended to ensure that Bartholomew would know whom Becket had excommunicated at Vezelay, that the excommunications had been in correct legal form and that Becket had absolved the bishops from their

50 LL p 111 n 26, and references there.
promise to abide by the customs of Clarendon. 51

Some of the items of information reported by John were clearly intended to refute or forestall rumours emanating from Becket's opponents. Thus in ep 272 to Baldwin c. April-May 1168, John provided details of how the pope agreed to pardon Jocelin of Salisbury whom Becket had suspended from office. 52 The papal reversal of Becket's decision could easily be portrayed as a setback for Becket. It seems likely that John's reason for setting out the conditions of the pardon was to demonstrate that the pope accepted Becket's contention that Jocelin was guilty and should have to make the fullest undertakings to give satisfaction.

John's account of the final meeting between Henry II and the cardinal-legate Otto in early 1168, has the appearance of an item intended to contradict royal versions of what had happened. According to John, Henry declared his willingness to submit the dispute between him and Becket to the judgement of 100 of his men from England, 100 from Normandy and 100 from Anjou and his other lands; or, if this were not acceptable, he would submit his case to three English bishops and three of his continental bishops; failing that, he would accept the judgment of the pope. 53 In the hands of royal propagandists this could be used to demonstrate Henry's magnanimity and his willingness to reach a settlement. John's account however knocks this on the head by saying that when Otto asked what restitution Henry planned for Becket and his supporters, the king angrily retorted, 'Nothing'. According to John, Otto then remarked that unless Henry altered the way in which he dealt with the church he would be punished more

51 LL pp 112-4.
52 LL p 562: see Barlow, TB pp 149-51, 165, 178.
53 LL p 614.
severely and sooner than he might think. The account which John sent to Bartholomew of the fruitless meeting between Henry and Becket at Montmirail in January 1169, is weighted towards Becket in that it plays down French disaffection with Becket's behaviour. Nevertheless it is relatively neutral and is free from any major distortion of events. The intention behind composing the account must certainly have been to counter any hostile versions which might be circulated by Henry’s advisers and which would presumably have stressed how much Becket had by his actions lost the sympathy of Louis VII and the French magnates and ecclesiastics.

In a letter to Baldwin in late August 1169, John stated explicitly that he was rebutting rumours being spread by Reginald archdeacon of Salisbury. According to these, Gratian and Vivian, the new nuntii appointed by the pope, would undo with papal authority all that Becket had accomplished. John who had recently met the envoys asserted that this could not be so, for the envoys had openly denied it on oath and in any case the terms of their instructions were very restricted.

To provide irrefutable evidence which would support the Becket interpretation of current events John occasionally supplied copies of documents. In his letters to Baldwin, he refers to six letters of which he was sending rescripta or exempla; one letter of which he

54 LL p 614.

55 For this meeting see Barlow, TB pp 179-82.

56 LL p 652.

57 LL p 652: ‘omnes conatus et facta archiepiscopi apostolica auctoritate, evacuabunt . . .’

58 LL ep 168 (p 110) refers MB ep 154 (Becket to Henry II; see ibid epp 152-3, 184); LL ep 174 (p 147) refers to MB ep 213 (Henry II to Rainald of Dassel); LL ep 238 (p 452) and ep 241 (p 464) refer to MB ep 355 (pope to legates William of Pavia and Otto); LL ep 281 (n 618) (Footnote continued)
promised to send rescripta; and on one occasion he says that exempla of letters are being sent to Baldwin.

Five of the eight copied letters were clearly intended as convincing proofs of pro-Becket assertions and which would rebut any opposing claims being circulated by Becket’s opponents:

(1) In June 1166 John sent to Bartholomew a copy of Becket’s letter to Henry II threatening excommunication and interdict. John’s purpose in sending this was to show that the threat was real and Henry’s situation precarious. It is preceded by a passage emphasising the difficulties which Henry was now experiencing:

Let anyone turn his mind’s eye to view the number and the quality of the enemies which the Lord has raised against the King since he lifted his heel against God to crush the Church. He will surely be astonished and, if he is wise, filled with reverence for God’s judgement: for He has chosen not emperors, nor kings, nor the princes of the nations to quell him, but chose first the remotest of men, the Welsh of Snowdon ...

Henry is presented as burdened with troubles and struggling as if trapped within a labyrinth.

John’s purpose in sending documentary proof of Becket’s threat

---

58 (continued)
refer to MB ep 401 or a related letter (pope to Roger of Worcester); LL ep 298 (p 690), refers to a lost letter to Becket from his representatives at the curia; LL ep 298 (p 692) refers to MB ep 626 (pope to Henry II).

59 LL ep 280 (pp 610-2) refers to MB ep 414 (pope to cardinals William of Pavia and Otto).

60 LL ep 241 p 462: ‘... ex litteris quarum tibi mittuntur exempla ...’. This appears to refer to GFL no 181 or 182, letters from the English bishops to the pope in November 1167 appealing on the king’s behalf against Becket.

61 LL p 110.


63 LL p 108.
must have been intended to convince the Exeter circle that Henry's situation was indeed very dangerous; and it may also have been intended to counter any possible attempts by the king's advisers to stifle news of the threat to Henry.

(2) When writing to Bartholomew a month later in July 1166, John's decision to include a copy of a letter from Henry II to Rainald of Dassel was, as John explicitly stated, intended to discredit Henry:

A copy of the letter he recently sent to the schismatic of Cologne is being passed on to you, so that everyone may know the truth of what is proclaimed with such confidence about the piety and righteousness (de pietate et iusticia) of your king: you can judge now how glorious, how catholic, how pious the letter is.

By supplying the letter John was ensuring that Henry's dealings with the court of Frederick Barbarossa could not be played down by royal officials.

(3) In two letters to Baldwin written c. January 1168 John refers to the pope's letter Suggestum est nobis, sent in October 1167 to the papal-legates William and Otto. This states that persons whom the legates absolved, were to be excommunicated once more without delay, omni appellatione cessante, unless they made satisfaction. In one letter John mentions this in order to justify Becket's decision to proceed with the excommunication of Gilbert Foliot and to explain why Becket regarded as still excommunicate, those persons whom the bishop of St Asaph had absolved. In the second letter, the papal mandate is mentioned in the context of John's advice on how Bartholomew should respond to the legates' request to absolve persons excommunicated by

---

64 p 147 Brooke trans adapted.
65 LL ep 238 (p 452) and ep 241 (p 464) which summarises the tenor of the letter.
66 LL ep 238 p 452.
Becket. Supplying a copy of the pope’s letter was intended to show that despite appearances to the contrary - such as the legates’ authority given in an earlier mandate - Becket had a papal mandate which allowed him to regard as void the absolutions authorised by William and Otto.

(4) Writing in July 1168 to Baldwin, John promised to send a copy of a papal mandate to Becket. The mandate restrained Becket from passing sentence of excommunication against the king or against persons in his kingdom, or passing sentence of interdict on suspension. As John notes, the king had been boasting about these restrictions on Becket’s powers.

John’s statement that he will send a copy of this apostolica constitutio when it is permitted, should be taken at face value. It is possible but extremely unlikely that John was trying to find reasons to avoid sending a copy of the papal letter. For the papal mandate, though it angered the Becket circle, supported John’s assertion that the suspension of Becket’s power was only temporary, and it presented Henry II in an unfavourable light: Alexander describes how Henry through his messengers threatened the pope:

et quam dura et aspera, et quae nostrum animum plurimum affligebant, per eos a nobis petierit, terribiles minas praetendens, nisi voluntati eius condescenderemus.

---

67 LL pp 610-2.
68 MB 6 ep 414 pp 421-22.
69 LL p 610: 'Unde litteras illas de quibus rex gloriatur ...'
70 LL p 612.
71 LL p 612: 'Et quidem iam revocata est, nisi infra certum satisfecerit diem, exinde enim liberum est archiepiscopo procedere de vigore litterarum ...'
72 MB 6 p 421.
(5) In ep 298 to Bartholomew in January 1170 John says that he is sending a copy of a letter which Becket had received from his representatives at the papal curia; and he states explicitly that his purpose is to rebut royal claims that an agreement favourable to the king had been reached.73 John goes on to deride royal officials for their inability to support their boasts with documentary proof of the sort he was providing: 'scripta autentica et originalia'.

(6) In the same letter to Baldwin, John mentions that he is enclosing Alexander III's letter to Henry which welcomed the king's decision to submit his dispute with Becket entirely to the judgement of the pope.74 John's purpose in supplying a copy of the pope's letter was probably to ensure that the Exeter circle would know the terms being set by Alexander: that Henry must give Becket the kiss of peace75 and restore all the possessions of Becket and his followers.76 It was the sort of information which would be useful to Becket's supporters in England if Henry tried to wriggle out of his undertaking and if his officials tried to obscure the conditions which had been outlined by the pope.

In six out of eight instances therefore John's motive for supplying copies of documents was to provide persuasive proof of the Becket circle's claims which might otherwise be challenged or undermined. The copying of the remaining two letters had differing purposes: the copy of Alexander III's letter to Roger of Worcester on whether he should remain in exile or stay in his see, was offered 'ut ad obediendi virtutem fortius animeris'.77 The copy of a letter, or

73 LL p 690.
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perhaps letters, setting out the English bishops’ appeal against Becket in late 1167 seems to have been intended simply to keep the Exeter circle accurately briefed on current political affairs.

John’s involvement in sending copies of documents is an indication of how closely he worked with the Becket circle. For he must have obtained from Becket’s household copies of the five letters from the pope,\(^78\) the one letter from Becket to Henry,\(^79\) and the letter from Becket’s envoys.\(^80\) The copying of letters also demonstrates the importance of John’s propaganda activities. As we have seen, all but two of the documents were copied to refute or forestall hostile rumours. Throughout his career John sought to wield influence indirectly, through his personal contacts. It seems likely therefore that John expected that the copied documents would have a wider influence. For even if they were not actually circulated further within England, they would have been referred to by the Exeter circle in their dealings with English churchmen.

The information which John transmitted to Exeter was in the main reasonably accurate. His method of persuasion was generally to combine fact with forceful moral arguments based on scriptural exempla. This degree of honesty may at first glance seem to sit oddly with the findings of Janet Martin who has shown that in the Policraticus John amended and at times distorted the classical sources he was using. She has also argued convincingly that the Institutio Traiani, the source on which John claimed to base his political

---
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theory, was in fact an invention of John's. The difference between John's literary distortions and the high degree of accuracy in the information he sent to Exeter is, however, understandable. Manipulating and distorting sources was almost certainly not seen as matter of honesty in John's view - it was simply an exercise in literary creation. In describing current political events John was honest, perhaps because he considered he ought to be honest, or more probably because he thought it politically more effective to feed Baldwin and Bartholomew with accurate information and thus retain their trust.

There is only one occasion in which John deliberately indulged in deceiving his Exeter friends, and here we can see why he felt forced to do so. In a letter to Baldwin, written probably in late August 1169, he gave what purported to a summary of a letter from the pope to Becket. John was responding to a report from Baldwin that many people were wondering what legal basis there was for Becket's excommunication of Gilbert Foliot, Jocelin of Salisbury and others on Palm Sunday 1169. It was alleged, Baldwin said, that those condemned had not been convicted of any crime or contumacy, nor had they been cited and astonishingly ("mirandum quidem esset") they were excommunicated after they had lodged appeals. Becket had no strong grounds for refuting the allegations which were extremely serious since they challenged the legality of his actions. John sought to justify the excommunications in two ways. First he side-stepped the issue entirely, declaring:

not only did their deeds go before to judgement, but they
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called upon themselves, as it were, a tardy, slow-moving condemnation; not only in due time will men convict them, but heaven and earth cry out against them.

Second, John argued that the pope had removed the right of appeal from those condemned and had granted Becket 'plenae potestatis auctoritas' to act against the King's kingdom and persons in the kingdom.

C. N. L. Brooke's comment on John's précis is mild: 'If the pope's letter survives it must be MB Epp 531, and John's account of it a trifle disingenuous.' If John was referring to MB ep 531 then he was not just being somewhat disingenuous, but completely misleading. As Brooke notes, while the pope did not revoke the sentences against 'quaslibet personas regni', he expressed his displeasure at the sentences:

mirabile gerimus quod, non exspectato reeditu nuntiorum tuorum, non cognito consilio nostri, quaslibet personas regni aliqua sententia gravasti.

It is possible, as Brooke suggests, that John may have been referring to a private letter, now lost, from the pope to Becket which, written in the midst of diplomatic manoeuvres of the legation of Gratian and Vivian, might have contained more encouraging remarks than the pope was willing to make in public. However, for several reasons, this is very implausible. It is inconceivable that Alexander III would have granted the waiving of so important a right as that of appeal in a purely private letter. In any case the advice given by Alexander III in MB ep 531 accords well with the advice of moderation which he urged on Becket at other points in the dispute.

---
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John's exercise in deception is understandable, for by failing to follow fully the legal procedures of excommunication, Becket had weakened his own credibility considerably and ran the risk of losing the goodwill of churchmen who were sympathetic to him. John had warned Becket in late 1167 of the dangers of bypassing these procedures.

Presenting the Becket dispute as being a clash over fundamental issues was one of John's objectives in his Later Letters. But it was not a major theme in his letters to Baldwin and Bartholomew except for two letters written in 1166, epp 168 and 187. Most of his letters to them were primarily concerned with providing information and giving advice.

The two letters concentrating on fundamental issues were written in 1166, ep 168 in June and ep 187 later in the year. Ep 168 recounts Becket's excommunication of royal officials at Vézelay in June and his determination to punish Henry. With the collapse of negotiations after the meeting in Angers at Easter and the subsequent hardening of Becket's policy, John evidently felt it necessary to present the issues in the starkest terms: a struggle of good against evil; a struggle in which Christ would shortly avenge his followers. His account of Becket's recent actions is prefaced by comments drawn from the language of persecution: *iniquitas* was plotting tricks against *innocentia*, but vengeance was at hand:
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Ad momentum turbinis adversus ecclesiam malitia debachatur et adversus Dominum, videntur praevalere impii quibus in brevi Christus, quem persequuntur, sic respondebit ad merita ut praeponderare videatur libra vindictae et quos potenter puniet non tam examinar lanceae aequitatis quam mole magnitudinis praegravare ....

John then goes on to identify the fortunes of Henry II with those of Frederick Barbarossa, a parallel which casts Henry on the side of evil and of schismatics. John suggests that Frederick’s setbacks will soon be crowned by complete collapse, and observes that Henry is likewise having difficulties in Wales and other places.

Ep 187 was written later in 1166, after the details of the English bishops’ appeal of 24 June had become known to the Becket circle, and was primarily an attack on the bishops and particularly on Gilbert Foliot, who, John alleged, was the real author of the appeal. The appeal issued in the bishops’ name, was a public declaration that leading English churchmen did not support Becket and implied therefore that Becket’s struggle was a personal one which had nothing to do with church liberties. John’s letter was also a response to the accusations that Becket had acted improperly by fleeing from the judgement of the king in November 1164. With this
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background the letter is argumentative in tone. Thus at one point John creates the impression of arguing his case before a group:

But perhaps someone will say: 'What has this to do with the case of your archbishop of Canterbury, who yielded in the Church's cause at Clarendon, and who, when summoned legally for a financial offence ... lost confidence in his pretexts, and by a secret flight ... professed his own guilt ... and justified his opponents?' To be sure he yielded ...

The letter is strongly polemical and deploys the 'language of persecution'. It is constructed largely of references to scripture depicting Becket as Christ-like and in a long historical tradition of prophets, apostles and martyrs. The English bishops are presented as being the enemies of God and being like the Jews who brought about the death of Christ.

The letter opens with a long chain of scriptural allusions. Becket's opponents, though now having the upper hand, will like the Amorite, be swiftly broken. There has been no warning from the watchmen (speculatores) - i.e. the bishops - against the actions of evildoers. The blood of the evildoers who are condemned to Hell will be on the heads of the watchmen who should have sounded the alarm. Gilbert Foliot is denounced as archisinagogus, underlining the identity of Gilbert with the Jewish leaders who brought about the death of Christ. John then forces the issue into simple terms of God against saeculum, saying that the columns of the church - the bishops - have embraced dung. They have chosen to fear man and
serve Mammon rather than serve God; to be the friend of the world (amicus saeculi) and the enemy of God ('Dei se constituit inimicam'). The theme is then backed up by the explicit appeal to service to Christ when John quotes from St Paul's letter to the Galatians: 'si hominibus placere vellem, Christi servus non essem'.

John goes on to indicate that the cause of church liberty which the bishops say there is no need to defend, is an issue which had to be fought for in Biblical times. John thus indicates a link between the Biblical past and the present. God's people, says John, were called to liberty ('ad libertatem vocatus est') and Egypt punished with plagues because it kept the church in slavery by 'ancestral' custom ('avita consuetudine'). John thus set the customs of Clarendon in the context of Biblical history.

The exempla on which the bishops ought to model their behaviour are then set out: the Maccabaeans who gave up their lives for the liberty of their brothers ('pro libertate fratrum suorum'), and David who killed the Philistine. Having set out exempla of the courage demanded of bishops, John then adduces the exempla of Ahab and Eli to support the assertion that the law of God 'prohibits every wickedness (iniquitas) and commands the church's pastors to punish every disobedience, - something which the bishops in their letter of appeal are trying to evade. From this collection of Scriptural references John then concludes that the bishops should be actively...
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defending the 'divine law':

Therefore for every point in the divine law one must fight, stand up against the powers and with all one's strength strive to overthrow whatever attacks charity, which is the fulfilment of the Law.\(^\text{108}\)

These exempla are argumentative in the sense that they are marshalled in order to drive home an assertion. Argumentative in a different way are the exempla which John uses to show that the Bible contains historical justifications for Becket's policies. He asserts that clerical exemption from public duties ("a publicis functionibus") - a clear reference to clerical exemption from secular jurisdiction - has an historical basis in Scripture: the case of the high priest Abiathar who escaped sentence of death because he had carried the Ark and the privileges enjoyed by the priestly tribe of Levi.\(^\text{109}\) Becket's decision to avoid judgement at the hands of the king at Northampton and to appeal to the pope is defended by a quotation from Deuteronomy 17: 8-12, which sets out the right of the priestly tribe of Levi to settle all disputes. By implication John intended the allusion as a justification of the system of appeal to Rome.\(^\text{110}\) But the exempla are not all argumentative; some are affective, designed to sway the audience by casting one side as evil, the other as good. While the bishops are likened to Jannes and Mambres who resisted the Holy Spirit (2 Timothy 3:8),\(^\text{111}\) Becket, we are told, is condemned because he denounces the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah.\(^\text{112}\) Within a single sentence
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John fuses two themes: that the Becket dispute has long historical precedents and that Becket is a Christlike figure:

ut et hi impleant mensuram patrum suorum qui ex causa similis prophetas et apostolos persecuti sunt, et quidam eorum adhuc martires Christi, id est, testes veritatis et iusticiae persequuntur. 113

The mensura patrum refers to Christ’s denunciation of the Pharisees in Matthew 23:32 and reiterates one of the central loci in Becket propaganda: casting Becket as Christ, and the bishops as Pharisees who persecuted Christ. 114

The central purpose of John’s letter was to raise the dispute from a political level to a higher one. It was an attempt to force Bartholomew - and any other readers of the letter - to see that the issues reflected on their integrity. John’s aim of putting the dispute on a higher plane is summarised in his assertion towards the end of the letter:

Those who persecute the archbishop of Canterbury in this case do not persecute him because he is Thomas, because he is a Londoner by birth, by profession a clerk, a priest in rank, a bishop in dignity but because he announces to God’s people their sins ... 115

In two letters written later to Baldwin - ep 281 in 1168-70, and ep 298 in February or March 1170 - John touches briefly on the theme that the Becket dispute is a struggle of good against evil. 116 But it is striking that John does not resort to such sustained use of these
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themes in the letters he later wrote to Exeter. What were the reasons for this? With the lines of the dispute hardening, it looks as if John saw little value in concentrating on the theme of fundamental issues when writing to friends who were sympathetic to Becket, and instead made it his task to supply Baldwin with the information and advice which would help both Baldwin and Bartholomew to advance Becket's cause in England. This reflects John's practicality as a political operator. As we noted when looking at the advice he gave to Becket about dealing with the papal curia, he had no interest in complaining unless it was going to produce practical results. In the same way he used arguments of principles only when he judged these to be necessary.

d: Conclusions

Were John's political letters to Exeter mainly reactive responses to changing political circumstances, or were they pro-active attempts to build up support for Becket in England? Of the fourteen surviving political letters to Exeter, eleven are responses to current political developments: ep 168 was a report of recent stages in the hardening of the Becket dispute in 1166 - Henry II's council at Chinon at the beginning of June and Becket's sentences excommunication issued at Vezelay on Whit Sunday; epp 171, 174 and 187 written in 1166 were responses to the English bishops' appeal of c.24 June; ep 238 was a rapidly written response to news that Roger of Worcester was involved in a scheme to have Becket transferred to another see; ep
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241 was John’s response to news that the cardinal-legates Otto and William were shortly to send mandates to Bartholomew ordering him to absolve persons whom Becket had excommunicated; ep 249 was written in 1167 or 1168 to ward off claims by Becket’s opponents to have gained papal support; in ep 280 the political development on which John was commenting - the papal letter of 19 May 1168 temporarily restricting Becket’s power - is lodged between encouraging news that the antipope was facing increased difficulties and the report of Henry II’s final meeting with William of Pavia, which John uses as an exemplum of Henry’s bad faith; ep 288 was mainly a record of the proceedings at the conference of Montmirail in January 1169; ep 289 was a report on how the arrival of the papal envoys Gratian and Vivian in France in summer 1169 affected the Becket dispute; ep 298 reported the new situation in negotiations between Becket and the King which had been brought about by recent discussions at the curia.

The four letters which were not written in reaction to political developments - epp 272-3 and 280-1 - were mixtures of information and encouragement. Ep 272, consisting mainly of John’s report of news gathered during his stay in St Gilles, provided information about political developments in northern Italy, business at the papal curia and the latest negotiations between Henry II and Louis. Ep 273 is a brief letter of encouragement, noting Frederick Barbarossa’s setbacks and expressing the hope that the present storm will soon end. Ep 281 is an exhortatory letter, proclaiming that the church is pressed on all
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sides by difficulties and urging the importance of obedientia.  

Although the majority of John's letters were reactive - they were direct responses to current political developments - he used the letters, as we have seen, to brief Bartholomew and Baldwin very fully, to anticipate and supply advice on developments which might occur shortly and to promote Becket's cause as being one involving fundamental issues. The impression is therefore that John had no instructions to encourage the Exeter circle to develop an active campaign in favour of Becket. His tasks were, as we have observed, to retain Bartholomew's support and ensure that he was not manipulated by Becket's opponents; and therefore to keep the Exeter circle fully briefed with information and persuasive propaganda.

Even though it is evident that John was not trying to use Baldwin to build up a campaign within the English church, he may well have envisaged that Baldwin in his meetings with fellow churchmen would pass on some of the information contained in John's letters or in the copies of documents enclosed with them.

3: CHRIST CHURCH CANTERBURY

a: Introduction: Becket's correspondence with Christ Church

The actions of the community of Christ Church Canterbury were inevitably a major concern for the Becket circle, since the community owed obedientia to the archbishop as their abbot, their spiritual pater. Any failure on their part to support him was bound to be seen by Becket and his advisers as a serious attack on archiepiscopal authority. The political stakes were very high: opposition to Becket


125 This is one of the main themes in John's letters to Christ Church. See n 191 below.
by his own chapter would weaken his authority over other English churchmen who were not bound to him by such close ties of obedientia. In view of the special relationship between archbishop and chapter, it is striking that only four letters survive from Becket and his immediate advisors to the monks of Christ Church Canterbury - three from Becket and one from Herbert of Bosham. One of these was never despatched: MB ep 680, written in Becket's name in late June 1170 and addressed to William Brito and the community of Christ Church. This was a mandate to impose interdict on the kingdom of England. But the interdict was never decreed, for after the mandate was issued Becket entered into negotiations with Henry II which resulted in the settlement of Fréteval on 22 July. It appears therefore that this mandate-letter had been drawn up as a precaution in case the negotiations collapsed.

In contrast to the mandate-letter the other two letters from Becket to Christ Church - Quot et quanta written c. 13 April 1169 and Lamentati sumus written after 18 November 1169 - could not have been written in readiness for possible use. They were lengthy, detailed letters referring to the current political situation.

More difficult to judge is whether Herbert of Bosham's letter, ep 177, was ever despatched to Wibert and the community of Christ Church. A. Duggan has argued cogently that the majority of Herbert's letters written 'in persona Thomae' were never sent. While her arguments do not apply to the letters which Herbert wrote in his own name, ep 177 gives the impression of being a rhetorical exercise,

---

126 MB ep 177 from Herbert of Bosham and epp 502, 573 and 680 from Becket.
127 See Barlow, TB p 207.
128 Duggan TB:TH p 201 n 7.
for it contains no allusions whatsoever to an immediate political context. The letter compares Becket with the iusti of all generations, such as 'Abel in the field, Noah in the flood, Job on the dungheap and Daniel in the lions' den' and builds up a comparison of Becket with Joseph. These exempla lead to the conclusion that the community of Christ Church should give Becket temporal and spiritual support, in other words they should aid the archbishop with their prayers and with material support:

Decet vero famam sanctitatis vestrae ipsius per omnia et super omnes sollicitudinem gerere, ipse in iugi die et nocte in spiritualibus, in temporalibus vero frequenter et supra etiam possibilitatis vestrae modum, cum omni hilaritate providentes.

Such a letter could have been written at virtually any stage of the Becket dispute. The only indication of date is the heading in Cambridge MS Corpus Christi 123 which states that the letter was to Wibert prior of Canterbury and the community. Wibert’s death on 27 September 1167 therefore provides a terminus ad quem - although we have to bear in mind that manuscript rubrics are not absolutely reliable. There are therefore only two extant letters which were certainly sent from Becket to the community at Christ Church; and one from Herbert which may perhaps have been despatched. None of these letters refers to previous correspondence. It is remarkable that so few letters have survived from Becket to his own chapter. In
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comparison 10 letters have survived to his opponent Gilbert Foliot; 6 have survived to Henry of Winchester; 5 to Roger of Worcester. The inescapable conclusion is that Becket addressed very few letters to Christ Church, for the Becket letter collections compiled in the early 1170s drew on the surviving copies or drafts from archives of Becket's household. The inclusion in the collections of ep 680, which was never despatched, demonstrates clearly that these archives were used. Had Becket written a large number of letters to the community, far more than three letters would have been retained in the archives and would have been transcribed by the early letter collectors.

Why did Becket write so few letters to Christ Church? One possibility to be considered is that he considered that correspondence with the community was too risky: given the special relationship between Becket and Christ Church, he may have felt that a close watch would have been kept for any communications from him. Within a community as small as Christ Church there was high risk that monks hostile to Becket - and there were at least some - would have learned quite rapidly of any letters received by individuals. That line of argument, however, cannot be sustained. During the dispute, John of Salisbury wrote at least six letters to the community as a whole and a further ten to individuals within it. Letters from John would have encountered the very same risks as ones from Becket.

A more plausible explanation for the lack of letters to Canterbury is that Becket could only write to the community as a whole, and not to individuals. There is no evidence that between 1162 and 1164 Becket managed to win friends within Christ Church. Instead

---
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the very slight surviving evidence suggests that initially he was not popular with the community. But even if he did have some friends, he could not, as archbishop, have lowered his own dignity by writing to them as individuals, cajoling and urging them to support him. Instead he had to write letters which would be delivered publicly to the community. In practice of course such letters could not be delivered without putting the bearer at great risk.

To influence the community at Christ Church, Becket may well have sent oral messages. The other option, which he did take up, was to use John of Salisbury who, having been at Canterbury over about a decade (from c. 1148 until Theobald’s death in 1161), had a group of friends in Christ Church.

b: John’s letters to Christ Church

For the period of the Becket dispute there are 16 extant letters from John to the community of Christ Church: of these, six were to the community as a whole or to several leading officials; the remaining ten letters were to individuals with whom John was on friendly terms: six to William Brito and one each to Azo, Baldwin de Valle Darii, Ralph of Arundel, Robert the Sacrist. It has been suggested by C. N. L. Brooke that ep 271 to Master Odo may have been to Odo who was prior of Christ Church from 1168-69 onwards. However, there is
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no reference in the letter to indicate that the recipient was in Canterbury. There is in fact a clue showing the recipient lived in the kingdom of France: in the letter John described Henry II as rex Anglorum. Throughout his correspondence John uses this phrase only when writing to correspondents outside England or when for clarity he was distinguishing between the English and French kings. Otherwise when writing to recipients within England John simply used the phrases rex or dominus rex. The single exception to this is ep 164, written in 1166 to John's brother Richard, who was then in England. But here John was indulging in mock deference to Henry, describing him very formally as serenissimus rex Angl(orum):

Miraris fortasse cum populo et cum amicis doles quod pacem, quae michi a serenissimo rege Angl(orum) oblata dicitur esse, non recepi ....

In the passage referring to rex Anglorum in the letter to Master Odo there is no mock deference; nor is a distinction being drawn between the English and French kings. It follows therefore that the Odo who received this letter was living outside the territories of Henry II and presumably in the kingdom of France.

c: Friends and correspondents

Throughout his years in Theobald's household, John built up a group of friends at Canterbury. To Ralph of Arundel, one of his correspondents there, John observed:

... I was sure of your personal affection, as of that of others whose love I have earned, since I have always loved the church of Canterbury and in many ways brought it clear
benefit, as many know. 146

The five individuals in Christ Church to whom John wrote were all close friends of his. The letter to Baldwin de Valle Darii is entirely apolitical and is a teasing, joking letter in which John ridicules the English as drunkards and makes fun of Baldwin because ‘letters make you mad’. 147 The letters to the others, however, all have a political element and show John working at harnessing affection for political purposes.

The texts of the letters provide unmistakeable evidence for John’s ties of friendship with the five individuals. In the case of William Brito the evidence is also confirmed by reference in one of John’s Early Letters written in 1159 to Peter of Celle, when John speaks affectionately of ‘that thief William Brito’ who would not give back a manuscript of the Policraticus until he had it completely copied. 148 In the six letters which John wrote to William during the Becket dispute we find friendship indicated in two of the salutatio formulae in which he uses the form ‘Suo Britoni’, which is used only between friends: in one he uses the standard ‘Suo X suus Y salutem ...’ form; in the other he explicitly describes William and himself as friends: ‘Suo Britoni amicorum suorum minimus salutem ...’ 149 In ep 247 written to William, John speaks of the caritas and amicitia which bind the two men, when he says that he is offering criticism as a friend but fears that the criticism may endanger their friendship:
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Tu vero, prout ex caritate prodeuntia ... limites voles, aut fidel et amicitiae stimulis affectum diligentis etiam non amantes in verba cогes erumpere .... Sed vereor ne de praesenti scripto michi proveniat quod cavebam, scilicet ne vera dicens amicis aurium teneritudine laborantibus eorumdem iactura pericliter ... 150

John’s letters to William Brito have in addition features which occur in his letters to close friends: 151 the use of the tu form is found in all his letters to William; there is one example of personal allusion whose meanings are not easily understandable to outsiders, 152 and one discussion about obtaining manuscripts. 153

The friendship between John and William Brito survived some political strains: the failure of Christ Church and William its sub-prior to give financial support to Becket: 154 the allegation that William had been involved in preventing the escape of Ralph of Arundel from England. 155 The strain between the two became very pronounced in 1168. In a letter which contains several indications of friendship, John opened by declaring that, because he had heard that William found the frequency of his letters a burden, he had refrained from writing but now understood this to be false gossip (falsa suggestio). 156 In
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what follows, John accepts William Brito's goodwill, but nevertheless holds William responsible for failing to persuade the community at Christ Church to back the archbishop:

Saepe quidem monui, nec a memoria tua debuerat excidisse, ut operam dares et diligentiam quatinus ecclesia Cantuariensis ..... aliquam consolationem impenderet patri ..... Me ventis verba dedisse res indicat, et in contrarium eventum ..... vota cesserunt. 157

Although John is on occasions sharply critical of William, he obviously accepted that William was not actually hostile to Becket and might be persuaded to win other members of the community over to Becket's side. Thus in the letter discussed above, written in 1168, John urges William:

Ergo quaeso, dilecte mi, dum tempus est, moram redime, et persuade fratribus ..... ut communicent paternis angustiis ..... 158

Writing in late 1169 John was urging William to canvass his fellow monks to give financial support to Becket. 159 There are two curt letters to William Brito in which the main body of the letter gives no traces of affection: they simply deal with the political business in hand. 160 However the abruptness of these is not evidence of tension, for in one of them, ep 293, the salutatio 'Suo Britoni suus Iohannes ...', survives, indicating and re-affirming friendship. The business-like manner of these letters suggests, rather, that there was a frank relationship, stable enough for John to send some letters
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160 LL epp 293; 294 (the allusions to caritas, p 674, refer to loyalty which William owes the archbishop).
which were not dressed up in rhetoric.

John's letter (ep 263) to Azo is dominated by indications of friendship. The arenga dwells on the theme of affectus, John's regret that he and Azo are not free to write as much as they would like and the assertion that John's love is as strong as ever.\textsuperscript{161} The letter ends with a reminder that he wants a copy of Quintilian 'scriptum et emendatum'. Between these features typical of a missive between friends, is the political element of the letter: an assertion that Becket is struggling for the cause of God, the liberty of the church, and the public good.\textsuperscript{162}

In his letter (ep 246) to Ralph of Arundel John refers to their strong friendship. He says that previously he had not written because, even though he was confident of Ralph's love, he was not sure whether he supported Becket.\textsuperscript{163} Ralph in fact committed himself to Becket's cause by insisting on presenting certain papal letters to the English church, for which he was banished from the chapter.\textsuperscript{164}

John's letter (ep 299) to Robert Sacrist in spring 1170 was, according to John, written at the request of Robert's messenger (nuntius) who had conveyed Robert's devotion to John. After speaking about his abandonment by veteres amici, John urges Robert to persevere in his present path. The letter ends with John affirming his willingness to 'serve' Robert: 'ad obsequium vestrum ... sum paratus'.

\textsuperscript{161} LL p 532: 'Affectus ab effectu convincitur' etc; ibid 'His ergo difficultatibus rarius et minus scribo, sed certe non minus amo ...'
\textsuperscript{162} LL p 534: 'Interim michi propositum est ... pro causa Dei et libertate ecclesiae domino Cantuariensi commilitare, qui cum publicae serviat utilitati ...'
\textsuperscript{163} LL p 492: 'Deinde nesciebam (etsi personam meam ... a te, sicut ab aliis quos promerueram, amari confiderem), quid de causa sentires suspecta .....'
\textsuperscript{164} LL ep 247 pp 496-8.
John numbers Robert among his *veteres amici*; he is one of those who
has sent good wishes ('bona vestra') to the exiles. There is no trace
in the letter of whether they were close friends, or shared the same
interests. The evidence of their friendship may simply have been that
they knew each other at Canterbury during John's period in the
household of archbishop Theobald (c.1147-1161). The letter is a
good example of how John used links of past companionship for
political purposes, for after acknowledging Robert's *devotio*, he urges
Robert to make public the *devotio* he owed Becket.

John seems to have taken particular care to write only to
friends whom he knew would be willing to receive his letters with a
political purpose. He evidently refrained from writing when he felt
his letters might cause embarrassment to the recipient. We have seen
two instances of John judging it best not to correspond: when he was
unsure how Ralph of Arundel viewed Becket's cause and when he heard
that William Brito was troubled by receiving his letters. However
he was quite willing to keep up correspondence with William and
reaffirm their friendship, even though William never gave any
ostensible support to Becket.

d: The objectives of John's letters to Christ Church

The letters which John wrote to Christ Church Canterbury had several
major objectives:

a) to try to obtain funds for Becket;

165 Robert became sacrist in the late 1140s; see LL ep 299 n 1
(p 699).

166 LL p 698: 'Perseverate ergo in eo quod fideliter incepistis, et
devotionem quam patri vestro debetis et ecclesiae laboranti continua
caritate exhibitione ...'

167 See nn 156, 163 above.
b) to persuade the community to take other specific action on behalf of Becket, e.g. to resist the primatial claims being asserted by Gilbert Foliot;

c) to display obedience to Becket as the pater of the community;

d) to persuade the community to see the struggle as a fundamental one between good and evil.

One of John’s major roles as Becket’s agent was to raise funds. In his correspondence with Christ Church, John broached the topic with the senior members of the community: sometime between 1164 and 1167 in a letter to Wibert prior and his successor Odo;\(^{168}\) and in three letters to William Brito.\(^{169}\) The letters to William Brito show how the urgent financial needs of the Becket household could cause friction even with persons who were sympathetic to Becket. In ep 243, written in late 1167, John refers to a letter from William Brito in which William had evidently rebuffed John’s request that William should try to make community funds available to Becket.\(^{170}\) William had argued that his funds, or the church’s, had recently been made ‘public’ (‘opes ... de novo publicatas’) and that John’s requests risked them being ‘transferred to Babylon’, i.e. put in the hands of royal officials. The letter was probably written in late 1167\(^{171}\) and the statement that the community’s revenues were publicata evidently refers to the revenues of the community coming into the hands of royal officials because of the vacancy in the office of prior.\(^{172}\)

\(^{168}\) LL ep 205 p 306: ‘Ergo quia ob hanc causam Romanae ecclesiae tenetur in aliquantula pecunia, supplicat ipse ... quatinus ei in hac necessitate subveniatis .’.  

\(^{169}\) LL epp 243 and 294 discussed below; ep 293 (late 1169) p 675.  

\(^{170}\) LL p 478.  

\(^{171}\) See LL p xxxvii.
Another of the letters in which John broached the same theme is ep 294, written between 1167 and 1169, in which John strongly urged William to send some Christ Church funds secretly to Becket. In ep 300, addressed to the community of Christ Church in May-June 1170, John referred briefly to the failure of the community to supply funds. John's request that William should secretly divert funds, an action which would have placed William in great personal danger, shows how desperate the financial difficulties of the Becket circle had become.

The specific actions to which John urged the community of Christ Church show that his correspondence with the monks was very different in purpose from the letters which he wrote to Bartholomew and Baldwin in Exeter. The Exeter letters were pro-active and were designed to win and maintain the support of sympathisers at Exeter and to provide propaganda which would be more widely disseminated. In contrast the

172 Wibert died on 27 September 1167 and Odo was elected his successor between 16 May 1168 and November 1169 (Heads p 34). The wardship of a vacant cathedral priory fell to the king only if the see was also vacant (Susan Wood, English monasteries and their patrons in the thirteenth century (Oxford 1955) p 9). During Becket's absence the see was treated as vacant, and proffers were made to the Exchequer from ii Henry II (1164-65) (Publications of the Pipe Roll Society 8: The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Eleventh Year of the Reign of King Henry the Second AD 1164-1165 (London 1887) and succeeding volumes).

173 Brooke has dated this letter to 1167-70, with a tentative suggestion that it may have been written in 1169-70 (LL p xxxviii). It must however have been written in the period before the election of Odo (ie certainly not later than November 1169; (Heads p 34)) as prior, when William Brito as sub-prior might have been in a position to divert surreptitiously some of the community's funds to Becket as John requested.

174 LL p 676: 'Nec differas benefacere cum possis, sed, si alter salus eorum expediri non potest, fratribus utcumque subtrahe aliquid ignaris aut invitis, unde incolumitas et indemnis eorum in die obductionis valeat procurari.'

175 LL pp 702-4: 'Sed praetenditis publicae potestatis vires .... Plane magnae sunt, et utinam magnae sint semper in Domino vires regiae potestatis, sed non tantae ut omnes vestras cohiberet impensas ....'
letters to the community at Canterbury were strikingly reactive. Ep 244 was written in late 1167 or early 1168 in response to news that following the death of prior Wibert, the monks had sought the King's permission to elect a new prior. John attacked the move as an infringement of the archbishop's rights and an attempt to preempt any future archbishop from having a role in choosing the prior:

He went on to represent it as contravening the *Regula Sancti Benedicti*, which indicated that the abbot should select the prior, and as the ceding of sacerdotal rights to the king.  

Ep 292 written to Christ Church in late 1169 was likewise reactive. Here John was trying to stir the community into actively opposing the metropolitan claims which Gilbert Foliot had allegedly been making for the see of London. John states that Gilbert had made two claims in public: first that he owed no obedience to Canterbury and, secondly, that the metropolitan authority should be transferred from Canterbury to London. The basis for the claims, according to John was the previous existence of the pagan archflamen at London and a prophecy of Merlin which implied that the metropolitan dignity had originally pertained to London rather than Canterbury. These

---

176 LL p 484.
177 See LL p 484 n 8.
178 LL p 486, John comments ironically: 'Prudenter utique, ut absolveret defuncti fratris animam rex, ad quem iura sacerdocii credunt qui desipiunt pertinere.'
179 LL p 666.
arguments, drawn from Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*, are mocked by John.\footnote{181}

The real purpose of John's ep 292 is not as clear-cut as it may seem. If John was accurately representing Gilbert Foliot's claims then we could see the letter as an attempt to enlist support to defend the interests of the see of the Canterbury. If, however, John was misrepresenting Gilbert then another purpose must be sought.

The background to the letter was that since March 1169, when he lodged preventative appeals ad cautelam, Gilbert had been actively campaigning against the threat of excommunication by Becket.\footnote{182} At the beginning of Lent and again on 15 May he had tried unsuccessfully to persuade the English bishops to join his appeal. Becket's letter of excommunication issued on Palm Sunday (13 April) was delivered to Foliot on Ascension Day (29 May). As part of the campaign against the sentence, Gilbert's advisers apparently drew up the 'Causa inter Cantuariensem archiepiscopum et episcopum Londoniensem'.\footnote{183} The Causa is the only work emanating from Gilbert's circle referring to the question of the obedience owed by the see of the London to Canterbury. The other references come from the Becket circle. Thus the letter from Maurice bishop of Paris to Alexander, written in June 1169, repeats almost word for word, John's statement that Gilbert had been using the former existence of archiflamines in London as the basis for claiming that the metropolitan see should be transferred there.\footnote{184}

\footnote{180}{LL pp 666-8.}
\footnote{181}{LL pp 666-8. For the references to Geoffrey of Monmouth see LL p 667 n 4, p 668 n 6; EC Appendix III pp 160-62 summarises the sources and some secondary interpretations.}
\footnote{182}{MB Epp 518-29; cf GFL nos 198-200; for the chronology see GFL no 198 headnote pp 270-1.}
\footnote{183}{MB 4 pp 213-43; for the manuscript context see Duggan TB:TH pp 152-3.}
Embedded in the *Causa* is a short passage which asserts that Gilbert owes no obedience to Canterbury. The argument is that as bishop of Hereford he had made a profession of obedience to archbishop Theobald, which lapsed when Gilbert left that see; when translated to London he had made a minimal *professio* insisting that he owed nothing to the archbishop, on the grounds that the see of London was the *mater* not the *filia* of the see at Canterbury.185 This was indeed a far-reaching claim, which if enacted, would have turned the ecclesiastical dominance of Canterbury which had existed for over 500 years. However, it fell far short of the assertion that archiepiscopal authority should be transferred from Canterbury to London. Gilbert would hardly have pushed so ambitious and self-interested a claim at a time when he was trying to win episcopal support in his fight against the sentence of excommunication. The occurrence in the *Causa* of a claim to be free of obedience, is no proof that this was a major policy of Gilbert’s circle. For the *Causa* was essentially a legal brief for Gilbert and his advisers setting out objectively and in detail the arguments drawn mainly from canon law and civil law for and against the validity of Gilbert’s excommunication. It gives the impression that it was designed firstly to provide a wide range of arguments which could if necessary be deployed, and secondly to anticipate and forestall arguments which Becket’s advisers might devise. The passage on freedom from obedience is outweighed by the overwhelming attention given to Becket’s failure to cite Gilbert Foliot before passing sentence,186 whether the grounds

---

184 MB 7 no 546 p 41: *'Ausus est etiam gloriari quod archiepiscopalem cathedram Londoniam transferri faciet, ut civitas quam ante tempus beati Gregorii Anglorum apostoli, archiflaminem dicit habuisse, eadem nunc archiepiscopum habeat temporibus Christianis.'*

185 MB 4 p 225.
for excommunication were valid\textsuperscript{187} and whether Becket had the authority to exercise\textsuperscript{188} legatine powers while outside his province. The passage on obedience has the appearance of a fall-back argument or an aside, to show that although Gilbert was throughout the work accepting Becket’s authority over him, he was nonetheless insisting on the principle that the see of London ought to be independent of Canterbury, and could even use this claim if all other arguments failed.

The conclusion therefore is that John and the Becket circle seized on a claim which Gilbert was not actively pursuing, but which could be used to represent Gilbert in a very bad light as it showed him attacking the jurisdiction of Canterbury. John and the Becket circle may well have had a garbled version of what Foliot was claiming and may have been genuinely anxious about the attack on Canterbury’s jurisdiction. However John and the Becket circle clearly saw their opportunity to use the allegations as a means of discrediting Gilbert and his weakening appeal against the sentence of excommunication.

Ep 300 written to the monks of Christ Church, like epp 244 and 292, responds to immediate political needs. Its purpose was to persuade the monks to deliver the pope’s mandate prohibiting the coronation of the young king Henry, or if the mandate had been stopped, the community should on their own authority issue an appeal and prohibition and order the suffragans of Canterbury not to take part in the ceremony.\textsuperscript{189}

One of the four extant letters from John to Christ Church -

\begin{verysmall}
\begin{itemize}
    \item \textsuperscript{186} MB 4 pp 213-20, 231-33.
    \item \textsuperscript{187} MB 4 pp 220-24, 230-31.
    \item \textsuperscript{188} MB 4 p 226.
    \item \textsuperscript{189} LL p 704-6.
\end{itemize}
\end{verysmall}
ep 295 written in October-November 1169 - does not seem to be a response to immediate political circumstances. But like the other three letters it urges specific action - that the monks should openly declare themselves loyal to Becket:

... set your hearts upon your ways; and do you who have been in great measure stepsons hitherto ... serve your father's needs, pursuing the fruit of penitence and obedience, driving slander and infamy from the Church...

John's letters to the community of Christ Church were in the main reactive and all were concerned to persuade the monks to take specific action. Although the letters also contain the themes of the obedience owed to Becket as abbot and spiritual pater, and of the Becket dispute being a fundamental clash between good and evil, there is no extensive exposition of Becket's cause of the kind found in the letters to Exeter. The conclusion to be drawn is that John saw that little was to be gained by directing extensive propaganda to

190 LL p 681.

191 LL ep 244 salutatio formula p 482; ep 247 p 496 (failure of Christ Church to give consolatio to their pater Becket); ep 292 p 666 ('Inter haec rarus admodum etc; lack of obedience joined with reference to monastic professio'); ep 292 p 668 (depicts opposition to Becket as parricidialis impietas: 'Nunquid adeo praenominatos patronos etc).

192 LL ep 242 p 472 ('... et regnum proprio sanguine acquisitum optineat triumphator Jesus ...'), p 476 (themes of punishment drawn from scripture, see ibid nn 11 and 12); ep 244 pp 482-84 (Christ Jesus exemplum, 'Sic Iudaei, ne locum perderent etc'); ibid pp 486-88 (same theme, 'Alioquin videbimini mandasse etc'); ep 246 p 492 (Christ theme: '... et an votis et favore velles assistere cum turbis et principibus sacerdotum eis qui christum Domini persequuntur ...'); ep 292 p 672 (identification of actions of Christ Church with the Biblical magi Jannes, Mambres and Achitophel); ep 292 pp 668-70 (apocalyptic language alluding to the day of judgement: 'Venit enim temporis plenitudo ut Sathanae non liceat ulterius tanto furore in ecclesiam debachari'); ep 295 p 680 ('... in quo conflictu patenter agnoscet Dominus qui sunt eius, et qui pluris faciunt ollas Aegyptias pane caelesti, verbo scilicet Dei quod dat vitam mundo'; the threat of sors damnationis, (Ps.57:10 (58:9)); the choice between following verbum Dei or one's neighbours).
Canterbury, perhaps because there was no strongly pro-Becket sympathisers such as Baldwin of Exeter.

The letters to the community as a whole must have been composed at least with Becket’s approval. However John was also something of an independent operator, acting as an intermediary between Becket and persons whose goodwill John considered important to retain. Thus he advised William Brito that if he received a summons from Becket he could ignore it - rather like advice which he had offered to Bartholomew of Exeter via his archdeacon Baldwin. \(^{193}\)

John was also prepared to defend his friends and patrons before Becket, or at least he said so. He thus informed William Brito that he would defend him against malicious rumours which were reaching Becket’s circle. \(^{194}\)

John’s letters to individuals show that despite the strong disapproval he expresses about the cautious - in John’s view, sometimes cowardly - behaviour of the community and of individuals, he maintained friendly relations with several persons there. One senses that John had no personal hostility to the community as a whole, though he was dismayed at their policy. He was severely critical of some individuals, such as the otherwise unknown Mainerius, who had allied themselves with Becket’s opponents. \(^{195}\) John’s friendly correspondence with persons like William Brito reveals a determination to keep in contact with anyone who was not actively opposed to Becket.

\(^{193}\) LL ep 242 p 478.

\(^{194}\) LL ep 245 p 490: ‘Dicunt etiam qui detrahunt tibi’ to ‘Partes tuas et ecclesiae quantum, Deus donaverit, tuebor ut proprias ...’

\(^{195}\) See LL ep 246 (to Ralph of Arundel) pp 492-94.
### Table II: Titles used in the Later Letters to describe Henry II

When writing to persons in England John always used the phrases *rex* or *dominus rex* to describe Henry II, unless he was distinguishing between Henry and other kings or rulers. The one exception is an ironic use of the phrase *serenissimus rex Anglorum* (LL ep 164) discussed pp 475-6 above.

When writing to correspondents in the continental Angevin lands, John usually - though not always - used the phrases *rex* and *dominus rex*. The few exceptions occur in letters to John of Canterbury, bishop of Poitiers: LL pp 344, 574, 578. In the following list of the phrases John used to describe Henry II, there may be some omissions.

1. **To correspondents in Angevin lands: rex**

2. **To correspondents in Angevin lands: dominus rex**

3. **To correspondents outside Angevin lands: rex**

4. **To correspondents outside Angevin lands: dominus rex**

5. **To correspondents outside Angevin lands: rex Angliae or rex Anglorum**

6. **Rex Angliae or rex Anglorum** used to indicate contrast with other kings and rulers:
   - LL pp 30, 102, 112, 146 (contrast with Achab and *similes reges*), 426, 444, 454 (contrasts with kings of past, e.g. of Babylon and contemporary rulers like the king of Danes), 555, 562, 564, 566, 568, 576, 580, 586, 612, 624, 636, 638, 648.

(There are in addition a few instances of the use of *rex* and *dominus rex*, when it is unclear whether or not the correspondent was in Angevin lands: LL ep 181 p 198 (to Ralph Niger who at the time was either in Paris (1165-66) or Poitiers (1166); see p 199 n 1); LL ep 230 pp 408, 410, 412 with rubric 'amicus amico'.

---

*Note:* The table continues with additional notes and exceptions not fully transcribed here.
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CHAPTER 10: THE DEATH AND CULT OF THOMAS BECKET

1: INTRODUCTION

The early Lives of Becket and the collections of miracles attributed to him constitute the largest and most detailed dossier we have on the cult and death of any medieval saint. Within a decade of the murder ten accounts had been written of his life and death. All but one - the Vita by Robert of Cricklade - have survived. Seven of the lives contain at least some independent details, and three are highly detailed and reliable. During the same decade William of Canterbury and Benedict of Peterborough recorded over seven hundred miracles attributed to Becket. The Lives have been used extensively as historical sources and their interrelationships have been fully established. The Miracula have attracted less attention, but they have been analysed by Foreville and their potential as a source of


2 This Vita was used by the author of Thomas Saga Eribyskyups (RS 65, see intro vol 2 pp xcii-xciii). Note M. Orme, 'A reconstruction of Robert of Cricklade's Vita et Miracula S. Thomae Cantuariensis', Analecta Bollandiana 84 (1966) 379-98.

3 That is all but John of Salisbury and the Lambeth Anonymous.


6 E. F. G. Walberg, La tradition hagiographique de Saint Thomas Becket avant la fin du XIIe siècle (Paris 1929).

information on how a cult developed, what people expected of it and how it was orchestrated has been indicated by R. C. Finucane and by Benedicta Ward.

This chapter uses as its main sources the early Lives and John's letter *Ex insperato* to examine two topics which are of historical importance but which have not been analysed in detail before. First, John's presentation of the death and miracles of Becket will be examined; particular attention will be paid to the reliability of his account and to its probable influence on Becket's other biographers. Secondly, an attempt will be made to assess whether or to what extent Becket's behaviour in December 1170 was influenced by the themes of persecution and sacrifice which had been used by his propagandists throughout the 1160s. It has often been suggested that at the very end of his life Becket may have cast himself in the role of martyr, and that he may have looked forward to or even provoked his own death. The question however has not been discussed in any detail before.

Historians have generally regarded John's *Vita Sancti Thomae* as a derivative work. E. F. G. Walberg's view that the *Vita* was based largely on the Lives by William of Canterbury and the Lambeth Anonymous has held sway for over half a century. However T. Reuter argues that Walberg's interpretation does not stand up to close scrutiny, and that William of Canterbury and the Anonymous of Lambeth drew their material from John's *Vita*. This gives a date of early 1173

---

8 See n 5 above.
10 *LL* ep 305.
11 See pp 539-40 below.
12 *MB* 2 pp 301-22.
at the very latest for John’s life.¹³ We are therefore deprived of what might have been a major source for the Becket dispute revealing much about Becket’s personality and behaviour, his motives, and the activities of his circle. In 1176 or 1177 Alan of Tewkesbury used John’s Vita as a preface to his definitive collection of letters relating to the Becket dispute.¹⁴ It has been plausibly suggested by C. N. L. Brooke that John may have intended his perfunctory Vita as a preface to a letter collection.¹⁵

2: JOHN AND THE ORCHESTRATION OF THE BECKET CULT

To explain the rapid diffusion¹⁶ of the Becket cult most historians have emphasised the ‘passive’ factors, that is factors which imply that given the circumstances of Becket’s murder, the contemporary views on sanctity and martyrdom, and the attitudes of contemporary churchmen, it was natural, almost inevitable that Becket should have been widely recognised as a martyr. An ‘active’ factor which has been largely ignored is that initially the cult was promoted by a group of highly able and experienced propagandists, John of Salisbury, Herbert of Bosham and William archbishop of Sens. All three had supported Becket in his lifetime and were now determined to secure recognition of his sanctity. Their energetic activities between December 1170 when Becket was murdered and March 1173 when he was canonised, must be

¹³ See Walberg, La tradition hagiographique pp 173-85. I wish to thank Dr. Reuter for writing to me about this. He intends to publish his findings in due course. Barlow, TB pp 4, 279 also referred.

¹⁴ See Duggan TB:TH pp 85, 89.

¹⁵ LL pp 1x.

¹⁶ On the diffusion see R. Foreville, ‘La diffusion du culte de Thomas Becket dans la France de l’Ouest avant la fin du XIIe siècle’ article IX in Thomas Becket dans la tradition (see n 7 above), and idem ‘La culte de Saint Thomas Becket in France: Bilan provisoire des recherches’, article XI in ibid.
given weight in any assessment of why the Becket cult spread so rapidly and so far. Within England the campaign to publicise Becket's sanctity was promoted by the monks of Christ Church who appointed William of Canterbury and Benedict to record miracles¹⁷ and by two outsiders, Edward Grim¹⁸ and William FitzStephen.¹⁹ The earliest results of the campaign in England were the Vitae written by Grim (1172)²⁰ and by the Lambeth Anonymous (late 1172 or early 1173). After his canonisation in March 1173, Becket's reputation was promoted in the Vitae written by William of Canterbury (1173 or spring 1174), Benedict (1173-74) and William FitzStephen (1173-74). Alongside this intense hagiographical activity there was the careful recording of miracles by William of Canterbury and Benedict.

The importance of the 'active' factor - the energetic promotion of the cult by a small group of propagandists - was fully recognised by Lord Lyttelton writing about 1770. Imbued with the rationalist and sceptical values of the Enlightenment he charged John and his companions with deliberately inventing the miracles attributed to Becket:²¹

... John of Salisbury ... and many monks of the convent in confederacy with him, had recourse to a method of raising the character of their late friend and patron, which the ignorance of those times and the propensity to believe the

---

¹⁷ For the appointments of William and Benedict, and for their activities see MB 1 pp xxvii-xxviii; MB 2 pp xxii-xxiii.

¹⁸ On Grim see MB 2 pp xlv-xlvi.


²⁰ The dates for this and following Lives are taken from Walberg's summary in La tradition hagiographique pp 134-5; the summary is also to be found in Walberg's introduction to Guernes p iv.

most incredible fictions rendered very successful. They gave out that such miracles were wrought by the intercession of this martyr and saint, as equalled or even exceeded the greatest contained in the legends of the church.

The implication that John and his companions may have deliberately invented the miracles attributed to Becket, is unconvincing. For as Benedicta Ward has very effectively demonstrated\(^\text{22}\) the literate elite of medieval society accepted that miracles could and did occur, and they were disposed to accept miraculous explanations for events. It is more plausible that John and his companions shared these assumptions and that they sincerely accepted the stories of visions and miraculous cures as proof that Becket was a martyr and saint. However Lyttelton’s recognition that the cult was in some way orchestrated by a small group of propagandists was justified. More recently the importance of Becket’s eruditi, in particular John of Salisbury and Herbert of Bosham, in promoting the Becket cult has been pointed out - though not developed - by Beryl Smalley.\(^\text{23}\)

The 'passive' factors underlying the spread of the cult deserve to be restated. First of all, in the twelfth century the murder of a prelate was an extraordinary event. Relations between lay rulers and leading churchmen were sometimes strained, but in general rulers and churchmen co-operated closely and had the common objective of maintaining a stable society and strong government. The murder of a prelate was an outrage, a breach of the rules which was almost unthinkable. The sense of outrage felt by churchmen at Becket's murder was channelled into a conventional form: the belief and the assertion that Becket had suffered martyrdom and that he was a saint.

Related to this was a second 'passive' factor: the papacy and

\(^{22}\) Ward, Miracles esp pp 21-33.

\(^{23}\) Smalley, Becket conflict p 196.
churchmen who were committed to the assertion of libertas ecclesiae had a vested interest in recognising and fostering the cult of Becket. Becket it seemed had died fighting for justice and for the freedom of the church. He was therefore used as a symbol for the cause of church liberties. This is not to suggest that these churchmen acted without sincerity; it simply illustrates that sincere beliefs can be convenient ones.

A third factor was the need felt by laymen and churchmen alike to have the aid of powerful saints who would act as intercessors before God and who would even provide physical and material support in this world. The point is well summarised by Smalley:

St Thomas combined secret asceticism with public persecution and murder. At last the people had a real martyr to intercede for them. There had been nothing so authentic since the apostles and martyrs of the early church.

The fourth 'passive' factor was that in his lifetime Becket was an international figure. He ruled an ancient and distinguished metropolitan, which in practice, By his very office the archbishop of Canterbury was one of the leading churchmen of Christendom; his activities and his fate were bound to arouse an international interest which was accorded to few other ecclesiastics. But more importantly in the course of his dispute Becket had become involved in dealings not only with Henry II and the papacy but also with the court of Louis VII and the French episcopate. In a sense Becket had also become involved in the broader struggle between Alexander III and the emperor Frederick I, firstly because he had sought to identify his struggle with that of the empire and papacy, and secondly because the

---

24 ibid pp 195-6.
26 See chap 8 Tables 8-9 pp 393-6 above.
shifting circumstances of this broader struggle had affected the amount of practical support which Alexander could offer to Becket.  

Becket’s international stature within his own lifetime had the effect of transforming what might otherwise have been a local cult or regional cult into an international one.

'Passive' factors are not entirely adequate for explaining how the cult of a saint grew and was diffused. All saints' cults involved some degree of orchestration. Throughout the Middle Ages bishops and religious houses promoted their own prestige and gained real material and financial advantages from encouraging the cults of saints whose relics they possessed. The possessors of relics had to publicise the efficacy of the relics and had to attract interest in them; they sometimes had to create rituals which involved the public display and veneration of the relics, they had to commission Vitae which recorded the powers and the sanctity of the saint. In the case of new cults the possessors had often to overcome a certain

---

27 See chap 7 pp 362, 378, chap 8 above.

28 For a shrewd assessment of Alexander’s situation, see Smalley, Becket conflict pp 138-59.


30 See C. E. Woodruff, 'The financial aspect of the cult of St Thomas of Canterbury as revealed by a study of the monastic records', Archaeologia Cantiana 44 (1932) 13-32.


degree of incredulity. Thus in the 1170s Thomas of Monmouth, who was promoting the cult of St William of Norwich, found it necessary to devote sections of his *Vita* to refuting detractors of the saint and to recording how the saint had punished those who disbelieved in his powers. 33

From very shortly after Becket's murder, John, Herbert of Bosham and William of Sens were promoting the view that Becket was a saint and martyr. At first they were probably more concerned to obtain vengeance for Becket's murder than to prove his sanctity. Thus in his letter *Ex insperato* written in early 1171 to John of Poitiers, John of Salisbury called for the punishment of Becket's murderers. 34 In the letter *Inter scribendum*, which Herbert of Bosham drafted for William of Sens in January 1171, there was a demand that Alexander should punish the 'tyrant' Henry II. 35 Letters sent by Louis VII, 36 Theobald count of Blois 37 and Stephen bishop of Meaux 38 reiterated the demand that Becket's murder should be avenged. However it is also clear that from an early stage claims that Becket was a saint and martyr were being circulated in northern France. In the letter *Ex insperato* John speaks of numerous miracles occurring at Becket's tomb, 39 a claim also

---

34 LL p 730: 'Nam quod de signifero proditorum Iuda sermone celebri vulgatum est, pari iure trahendum est et ad complices' etc.
35 MB 7 ep 735 p 432: 'Hinc miseratio, inde te moveat indignatio. Unam debes filio, alteram tyranno ... Illi vero praest a ignominiam, qui in terra sua tam horribiliter persecutus est Deum.'
36 MB 7 ep 734 p 428: 'Excitetur itaque exquistae genus iustitiae denudetur gladius Petri in ultionem Cantuariensis martyr is ......
37 MB 7 ep 736 p 435: 'Ad vos itaque clamat sanguinis iusti et martyris Dei et flagitat ultionem.'
38 MB 7 ep 734 pp 446-7
made in Louis VII's letter Ab humanae pietatis written to Alexander III in early 1171. As early as January 1171 it was being claimed, by William of Sens and Herbert in the letter Inter scribendum, that Becket had appeared to numbers of people and revealed 'that he was not dead, but lived'.

The promoters of the Becket cult had to overcome several problems: the incredulity that greeted any new cult, the fact that Becket's life and character had displayed few traces of sanctity, and the active royal opposition to the cult. While it is true that there was in the Middle Ages a strong demand for the aid and intercession of powerful saints, it would be an error to think that medieval people were entirely credulous. Before a cult could be successful a consensus had to be reached that the claims made for the saint were indeed true. There were many cults which failed to do this. Thus William of Malmesbury writing about the failure of the cult of Wulfstan lamented the incredulity of contemporaries. The frequent occurrence in hagiographical works of accounts of how saints punished those who disbelieved in their powers strongly suggests that most saints' cults encountered some degree of resistance.

39 LL p734
40 MB 7 p 428. See p 512 below.
41 MB 7 p 431: 'Dicitur namque et constanter asseritur post passionem suam multis apparuisse in visu, ouibus perhibet se non mortuum esse, sed vivere ......'
42 For example the cults of Anselm at Canterbury and of archbishops Thurstan and William at York. For the failure of the Anselm cult to expand before the 1160s see R. W. Southern, Saint Anselm and his biographer ...... (Cambridge 1963) pp 336-41. The cases for the sanctity of William and Thurstan are to be found in Vita Sancti Willelmi, Historians of the Church of York (RS 71) 2 pp 270-91, and Vita Thurstini archiepiscopi in ibid pp 259-69.
In the case of the Becket cult the normal resistance to new cults was strengthened by the fact that there was little in Becket's life to suggest that he had been a person of outstanding sanctity. His aggressive energy, love of display and his love of hunting and his active involvement in the Toulouse campaign were well known to contemporaries and were not the qualities which one would associate with a saint. According to Edward Grim, immediately after Becket's murder one of the monks of Christ Church openly denied that Becket was a martyr and suggested that he had been rightly killed for his stubbornness. William of Canterbury tells of the punishments which St Thomas the martyr meted out to two people who denied his sanctity and of how he appeared in a vision to monk of Canterbury, William, who had denied the martyr's sanctity.

In his letter Sicut plurimi (1177-79) addressed to Richard archbishop of Canterbury and to the chapter and clergy of Canterbury, John described another example of scepticism about the powers of Becket. In the letter written while John was bishop of Chartres, we are told that the bearer - a stone-cutter from Chartres - had been struck dumb and senseless when he declared that St Thomas had no power

---

44 e.g. Becket's attack on Hamelin at the Council of Northampton (William of Canterbury MB 1 p 39; cited by Knowles, Historian and Character p 113).
45 See Knowles, Historian and Character p 114.
46 See William FitzStephen MB 3 p 20; Edward Grim MB 2 p 360.
47 FitzStephen MB 3 pp 33-5.
48 MB 2 p 440: '... nobis enim audientibus calumniatus est quidam habitus nostri ac tonsurae, quod nequaquam loco martyris habendus esset, qui merito pertinacieae suae occisus est ...'
49 MB 1 pp 151-3.
50 ibid p 148.
51 LL ep 325.
to perform miracles and that he had been cured only when John treated him with Becket's relics.

People who had been very strongly opposed to Becket in his lifetime must have found it difficult to accept the proposition that Becket was a saint. Writing almost a year after Becket's murder, Roger of York denounced Becket as 'idem Pharao' and as the spiritual leader of the people who had been wrongly accusing Roger of instigating Becket's murder. Such language was very strong for 'Pharaoh' was a well-known Biblical 'type' for the devil.

It appears that in the early 1170s there was a disputation between a Master Roger and Master Peter the Chanter on the question of whether Becket had died as a martyr for church liberties, as the Chanter asserted, or whether he had been rightly killed for his obstinacy. We cannot be certain whether this was an isolated disputation or whether the question was discussed more widely in the schools. In any case the disputation reinforces the impression that immediately after Becket's death it was by no means clear that Becket would receive universal recognition as a saint.

The final problem facing the early promoters of Becket's cult was active royal opposition. Royal officials attempted to prevent people from visiting Canterbury and from spreading rumours of miracles. In addition to suppressing the cult in England, Henry was

52 LL ep 306, 13 December 1171.
53 ibid p 740.
54 See ibid p 740 n 3.
56 MB 4 p 160 (BL Lansdowne 398): 'Audiens etiam rex magnalia Die et mirabilia quae per sanctum martyrem suum Thomam fecit, non credit, sed votivos homines sanctum martyrem poscentes regia maiestate
during 1171 projecting an image of Becket which was far from saintly.

In his letter Ob reverentiam to Alexander III, Henry admitted that his words spoken in anger had contributed to Becket’s murder. But after begging the pope’s forgiveness, Henry then let loose a scathing attack on Becket’s aggressive behaviour in December 1170:

Ipse vero in ingessu suo, non pacis laetitiam sed ignem portavit et gladium, dum contra me de regno et corona proposuit quaestionem. Insuper meos servientes passim sine causa excommunicare aggressus est.

John of Salisbury and his companions who were active in the initial phase of promoting the Becket cult, had to struggle hard against disbelief in Becket’s sanctity and against the active royal campaign. The Becket apologists were fighting a propaganda campaign to persuade the doubtful - particularly those in the papal curia - and to counteract the propaganda coming from the court of Henry II.

Just how uncertain the outcome of the pro-Becket campaign seemed to be is shown in the anxiety with which John and his companions tried to have Becket’s name entered as a saint and intercessor in the liturgy as soon as possible. In a circular-letter distributed to friends on the continent John sought reactions to the idea that Becket should be prayed to as an intercessor even before papal permission was obtained. John’s justification for this suggestion was that Becket was manifestly a martyr and that because of royal restrictions it was

56 (continued)
prohibuit, suos qui ierant, corripuit quicunque Cantuariam ierent, observavit et fecit.' Also John’s comments (LL p 736): ‘... viri impii, qui eum insatiabiliter oderant, intuente... inhibuerunt nomine publicae potestatis ne miracula quae fiebant quisquam publicare praesumeret.’

57 MB 7 ep 739 p 440.
58 ibid p 440.
59 The extant form of this letter is Ex insperato (LL ep 305); see pp 507-8 below.
60 LL p 736.
not possible to get in contact with the pope. However if persons could travel from Canterbury to John's friends in northern France and Poitou they could also have travelled to the curia, and have obtained at least an informal indication of whether the pope approved of Becket being prayed to as an intercessor. John must surely have known from his experience of the campaign for the canonisation of Anselm and from his experience of papal politics, that the pope would not permit Becket's name to be used as an intercessor, until there had been some investigation of the case and until a settlement had been reached between the papacy and Henry II. In posing his question to his friends John revealed his real reasons for wishing to preempt the papal decision: if Becket were not included in the catalogue of martyrs then his soul must be prayed for, an action which might cast doubt on his sanctity. John and his associates saw clearly that incorporating Becket into the liturgy at Canterbury would strengthen the cult of Thomas the martyr and that any delay would weaken it. From one of the early visions described by William of Canterbury, it is also clear the question of praying to Becket was being debated in England.

Almost immediately after Becket's murder John was at the centre of the campaign to publicise his sanctity. When Becket was murdered on 29 December 1170 the leading members of his household were widely dispersed. Only three days earlier Herbert of Bosham and Alexander Llewellyn had been despatched on a mission to Louis VII of France.

61 ibid p 736: 'Iam super hoc consultus esset Romanus pontifex, nisi quia facultas transseundi adeo omnibus praeusa est, ut nullus ad navigium admittatur nisi litteras regis ante porrexerit.'

62 ibid p 736: 'Timetur enim ne sic orandi instantia beati martiris iniuria videatur' etc.

63 MB I pp 150-51.
The most important member of Becket's circle remaining at Canterbury was John of Salisbury. Early in 1171 John sent a circular-letter to his friends within the French church; copies were sent to John bishop of Poitiers, Peter of Celle and probably to William archbishop of Sens. That this letter was widely circulated is indicated by the fact that readings from it are to be found in martyrologies or lectionaries from Citeaux, Hanson, Marchiennes, Moissac, Saint-Martial de Limoges, Saint-Rémi of Reims and in a Clermont-Ferrand lectionary of uncertain provenance. The letter may have been circulated in a number of versions, but it now survives as a full text in only one version - the letter Ex insperato.

Throughout 1171 and 1172 John played a part in lobbying for the canonisation of Becket. In the letter Licet Anglicanae (1171-3) addressed to William archbishop of Sens, John attacked the papacy for its slowness in recognising Becket as a gloriosus martir. The campaign to prove Becket's sanctity achieved its objective in March 1173 when Alexander III issued the bulls of canonisation, Quamvis nonnulla, Gaudendum est and Redollet Anglia. Before his appointment as bishop of Chartres in 1176 John, with the assistance of Guy canon of Merton (later prior of Southwick), compiled a collection of Becket's correspondence. This contained at least 112 letters and

64 Herbert MB 3 p 486.
65 See p 507 onwards below.
67 LL ep 308 p 750.
68 MB 7 epp 783-5.
70 ibid p 96.
appears to have been used as the basis of Alan of Tewkesbury's definitive collection. Before setting out for Chartres John had also completed his *Vita et Passio Sancti Thomae*.

As bishop of Chartres John continued to have an active interest in the cult of Becket. We have already noted his letter *Sicut plurimi* which describes the sufferings and cure experienced by a stonemason of Chartres who had denied Becket's sanctity. This letter reveals not only that John was interested in keeping the community of Canterbury informed about the most recent miracles, but also that John was actively fostering the new cult of St Thomas at Chartres in the face of some incredulity. John had gone to Chartres prepared to foster the cult, bringing with him a phial (*philaterium*) of Becket's blood and a knife (*cultellus*) which had belonged to Becket.

John's commitment to the cult of Becket had an element of self-interest in it. Less than an hour before Becket's death the differences of attitude and personality between the two men were starkly revealed when John accused Becket of never taking advice and of having needlessly provoked the knights. The brutality and the sacrilege of Becket's death and the miracles soon being attributed to him, necessarily altered John's entire view of Becket.

---

71 LL p 804: '... *philaterium in quo reposueram sanguinem beati Thomae, quem mecum Carnotum detuli ...'*

72 LL p 806: 'cultellum boni martyris'.

73 See pp 534-55 below.

74 John and the other biographers insist that Becket's murderers were more cruel (*immaniores*) than Christ's executioners: John (LL p 732), FitzStephen (MB 3 pp 144-5), Herbert (MB 3 p 510).

75 John indicates that the timing and the location of Becket's murder were sacrilegious: 'At iste non modo in urbe, sed intra ecclesiam, non tempore prophano, sed die quem nativitatis dominicae solemnitas consecravit' (LL p 728). Those involved in the murder were 'auctores et perpetratores tanti sacrilegii' (ibid p 730).
saw himself as one of those

In John's mind having been a familiaris of St Thomas would have had practical advantages: it meant having a friend and patron in Heaven who could intercede in spiritual and material matters. If the cult were fostered successfully it was also certain to boost John's reputation as bishop and to assist him in his relations with his chapter, with the clergy and religious of the diocese and with the laity. In a similar though less dramatic way John had on one occasion during the Becket dispute exploited the suggestion that the late archbishop Theobald was his patronus before the court of God. During his brief pontificate John identified himself more closely with Becket than he had ever done during Becket's lifetime. The close relationship between bishop and martyr is asserted in the protocol to Sicut plurimi where John describes himself as 'divina dignatione et meritis beati martiris Thomae, Carnotensis ecclesiae minister humilis'.

3: THE LETTER EX INSPERATO AS SOURCE

a: Introduction

The earliest account of Becket's murder and of the miracles being attributed to him is to be found in John's letter Ex insperato.
which was written very soon after Becket's murder. Though far less
detailed than most of the Vitae which were subsequently written, it
conveys the mood of Becket's last hours with an immediacy and emotive
force which can still impress the modern reader. It also conveys
the feelings of sorrow and outrage which gripped the Becket circle
after the murder, as well as the strong conviction that Becket had
died as a martyr and that miraculous occurrences at Canterbury were
already attesting to his sanctity.

In the Q MS derived from John's own collection of letters, the
letter is addressed to 'Iohanni Pictavensi episcopo'. However setting
aside the introductory part of the letter directed to John of
Poitiers, the bulk of the text probably belongs to a circular-letter
which John sent to his friends and contacts in the French church, for
it is evident that Peter of Celle received a version of it. In the
X MSS (Alan of Tewkesbury's collection of Becket correspondence) the
letter is addressed 'cuidam amico suo' and at the end is attached
John's inquiry as to whether it was permissible to address Becket as
an intercessor in the mass and other public prayers without awaiting
papal approval. We know that John also addressed a letter to Peter
of Celle giving an account of Becket's death and ending with the same
inquiry. For Peter answers the question in his letter Stylum
scribendi addressed to John of Salisbury and his brother Richard, by
saying:

Concerning the question which you have placed at the end of
the Passion of the blessed martyr Thomas ..... I certainly
consider that for no reason can the lamp which has been lit
by the hand of God be suppressed or extinguished. Nor
should the judgement of men be waited for, when God has

80 ep 305.
81 See Brooke's comments, LL p xlv; Duggan, TB:TH p 89.
82 For what follows see LL p 724 n 1.
Peter of Celle was clearly one of the people to whom John sent a Passio Thomae and question on addressing prayers to Becket. As we shall see, an earlier version was probably sent to William archbishop of Sens within weeks, possibly within days of Becket’s murder.

b: Date

When was the circular-letter composed? The letter must have been composed quite soon after the murder, for although John suggests that John of Poitiers must already have heard of the murder and that indeed it is widely known throughout the orbis Latinus, the letter is detailed enough to indicate that John intended it to be the first accurate and detailed report which John of Poitiers would have received. But how soon after the murder was the circular-letter composed? Professor Brooke dates the letter to early 1171 but has also suggested that the letter may have been composed within days of the murder. Anne Duggan has suggested dates of early January 1171, January 1171 and early 1171. In contrast, E. A. Abbott argued for a date of after Easter 1171. It is very unlikely that the letter was completed within days of Becket’s murder for John states that the recipient is likely to have already heard 'de passione gloriosi

83 PL 202 ep 121 col 571 C-D.
84 LL p 726: 'ut opinor, iam fere per orbem Latinum ex relatione plurimorum sit nota et vulgata materia.'
85 LL headnote to ep 305
86 ibid p xlv.
87 Duggan, TB:TH p 46 (for date early January 1171), pp 235, 252, 270 (for date of January 1171), p 89 (for date of early 1171).
88 St Thomas of Canterbury: his death and miracles, 2 vols (London 1898) 1 p 194.
martiris Thomae Cantuariensi archipiscopi', and because he refers to
the large crowds coming to visit the cathedral and to the large number
of miracles occurring there. It is true that the cult of Becket
grew with astonishing speed. However it is implausible that the
cult had already gained momentum within days of the murder; a
time-span of several weeks is more likely. The cult must have already
had some momentum for John to write of 'multa et magna miracula' and
of 'catervatim confluentibus populis'.

Should a date of early January 1171 then be given to the
circular-letter? There are slight textual similarities between Ex
insperato and William of Sens' letter Inter scribendum written to
the pope in early January 1171. According to the Cambridge MS Corpus
Christi 123 (Herbert of Bosham's letter collection) the letter Inter
scribendum was drafted by Herbert on William's behalf. The
attribution is confirmed by the fact at the end of the letter we are
told that the 'praesentium portitores' are Master Alexander and Master
Gunter 'viros probos et industriosos, qui sancto Dei martyri in vita
sociati sunt et in morte separari non possunt'. Master Alexander is
obviously Becket's cross-bearer, Alexander Llewellyn, who only days
before Becket's murder had set out with Herbert for the court of Louis
VII. While Alexander travelled on to the curia with William's

89 LL pp 724-6.
90 ibid p 736.
91 See Ward, Miracles p 98.
92 LL p 736.
93 MB 7 ep 735
94 f. 57r.
95 MB 7 p 433.
96 See n 64 above.
report on Becket's death, Herbert appears to have remained with William.

The letter drafted by Herbert makes use of the most striking image to be found in John's letter *Ex insperato*: that Becket offered himself as a sacrifice before the altar, just as he had been accustomed to offer the sacrifice of Christ at the altar. Although the similarity of wording is slight, the coincidence of the image is striking:

Ex insperato

Sed et ubi sit immolatus advertisite ... Qui ergo se ipsum a multo tempore exhibuerat hostiam vivam sanctam. Deo placentem ... qui Christi corpus et sanguinem solitus erat offerre in altari, coram altari prostratus, effusum manibus i~iorum obtulit proprium.

Inter scribendum

... ibidem christus Domini pro nomine Christi meruit immolari, ubi quotidie immolatur et Christus. Et sacerdos ille Altissimi, stans ante altare, et crucem, quam ante se gestare consueverat, brachiis suis complectens, et orans, voluntarie se ipsum inter crucis et altaris cornua pacificam Deo hostiam obtulit.

It is unlikely that as he wrote the letter *Inter scribendum* Herbert had before him a copy of the circular-letter now represented by *Ex insperato*. For while Herbert writes of Becket having appeared in visions and revealed that he is now in heaven, he makes no mention of the numerous miracle-cures of which John speaks in the letter *Ex insperato*. It is inconceivable that if Herbert and William of Sens had known of the miracle-cures happening at Canterbury that they would have omitted to mention them in the report to Alexander III. It follows therefore that Herbert was using an earlier version

97 LL p 728
98 MB 7 p 431.
99 MB 7 p 431.
of the circular-letter. We cannot be certain what form this earlier version took. It may have been very similar to Ex insperato but with no reference to miracles and no question posed about the suitability of praying to Becket in the mass and in public prayer. On the other hand it may have been a rapidly written and briefer letter.

There is evidence to suggest that news of miraculous cures had reached France by the end of January 1171. For Louis VII wrote to Alexander III in the letter Ab humanae pietatis:

Et ecce ad tumulum agonistae, ut relatum est nobis, divina in miraculis revelatur gratia, et divinitus demonstratus, ubi humanitus requiescit, pro cuius nomine decertavit.

Although the nature of the miracula is not stated, the fact that they were occurring at Becket’s tomb indicates that they were cures rather than visions. Louis VII’s letter was probably written in January 1171; if written much later the news in it would have been out of date. However we cannot give the letter a more precise date. Is it possible that the drafters of Louis’ letter had seen a version of the letter Ex insperato with its reference to ‘magna et multa miracula’?

There are two reasons for thinking not. First, the reference in Louis’ letter to ‘divina in miraculis revelatur gratia’ is too feeble to be an echo of the strong assertion in John’s letter that

paralitici curantur, caeci vident, surdi audiant, loquuntur muti, claudi ambulant, evadunt fabricantes, leprosi mundantur, arrepticii a daemonio liberantur, et a variis morbis sanantur aegroti, blasphemi a daemonio arrepti confunduntur.

The second reason for doubting that the drafters of Louis’ letter made use of Ex insperato, is the argument which we have already put forward, that in the week or so after Becket’s death, even John would not have written about miracles occurring on this scale.

100 MB 7 p 428.
101 LL p 736.
In assessing the date of *Ex insperato* we need to bear in mind that Becket's tomb was closed to the public almost immediately after his burial, and was not re-opened until Easter week 1171. So if John is correct in saying that miracles were occurring 'ubi tandem sepultus est', a date of after Easter 1171 (March 28) seems probable. On the dating of the circular-letter now represented by *Ex insperato* we may conclude: 1) that it was not written within days of Becket's death; 2) that we have no evidence that in its present form it was written in early January; 3) that it was written in early 1171, but probably after 28 March; but 4) there may have been an earlier version drafted within a few weeks of Becket's murder.

c: Structure

The circular-letter must have been altered according to who the recipient was. From the text of *Ex insperato* we can see which parts would have been altered and which parts represent the unchanging core of the circular-letter. The letter can be divided into five distinct sections. A consideration of these shows how John operated his part of the campaign to publicise Becket's sanctity.

(1) The opening paragraph is directed to one particular recipient. John says that he will take advantage of the bearer of the letter who is on his way to visit the recipient. The direct, informal tone of this paragraph, the absence of an extended arenga or even an introductory proverbium, confirms the attribution in MS Q that this version of the circular-letter was sent to John of Poitiers. For over half the letters which John sent to John of Poitiers begin in

---

103 LL p 724.
this informal way.  

(2) The first part of the second paragraph: 'Sed unde sumetur exordium? ..... iam fere per orbem latinum ex relatione plurimorum sit nota et vulgata materia.' In its extant form this section was intended for John of Poitiers alone. For John of Salisbury says that he will not write at length 'praesertim cum et tempus scribendi breve sit'. This suggestion that Ex insperato was put together in haste fits in with the statement in the opening paragraph that John has decided to take advantage of someone who was setting out to visit the recipient. However this section could obviously have been retained in other copies of the circular letter provided that the reference to writing in haste was deleted. Apart from its final clause this section does not occur in John's Vita Sancti Thomae.

(3) A lengthy section in which John firstly deals with the circumstanqua of the murder - the persons, time and place - and then attacks the 'auctores et perpetratores tanti sacrilegii', urging their punishment and predicting that God will destroy them. This entire section occurs in the Vita Sancti Thomae.

104 See Table 1 p 25 above.
105 LL p 724-6.
106 LL p 726.
107 cf MB 2 p 316.
108 LL p 726 ('Hoc tamen in tanto divinae ...') to p 730 ('... tanti sacrilegi aut convetet aut conteret?').
109 See n 123 below.
110 LL pp 728-30; quote p 730.
111 MB 2 pp 316-9.
(4) The passion and miracles of Becket.\textsuperscript{112} Apart from minor changes of wording and from the omission of how the murderers ransacked the archiepiscopal palace,\textsuperscript{113} this section is also to be found in the \textit{Vita Sancti Thomae}.\textsuperscript{114}

(5) The question on whether Becket should be prayed to as an intercessor even before papal approval was obtained.\textsuperscript{115}

The bulk of the letter - sections 2 to 4 - was probably conceived as a single unit. This is suggested by the fact that sections 2 and 3 are likely to have been written as a unit, while sections 3 and 4 were certainly written as a unit.

In sections 2 and 3 John gives prominence to the question of what rhetorical form he should give his material. He opens section 2 with the theme:

\textit{Sed unde sumetur exordium? Haec dicendi parit inopiam materia copiosa et exuberans . . . .\textsuperscript{116}}

To John and his recipients the term \textit{exordium} meant the opening section of a letter as defined in the rhetorical works of Cicero,\textsuperscript{117} in Isidore of Seville\textsuperscript{118} and in the eleventh and twelfth-century authors of \textit{artes dictaminis}.\textsuperscript{119} John was indicating that because of the scale

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{112} LL p 730 ('Passurus autem in ecclesia ...') to p 736 ('... nisi me super his fides certissimum reddisset.').
\item \textsuperscript{113} LL pp 733-6 ('Carnifices autem ... fuerat inauditum, reperta sunt').
\item \textsuperscript{114} MB 2 pp 319-22.
\item \textsuperscript{115} LL pp 736-8.
\item \textsuperscript{116} LL p 724.
\item \textsuperscript{117} \textit{De inventione} I.xv.20 - xviii.26 (Loeb edn 1976 pp 40-52). See Pseudo-Cicero \textit{Rhetorica ad Herennium} I.iii.5 - vii.12 (Loeb edn 1954 pp 10-22).
\item \textsuperscript{118} \textit{Etymologiae} 2:7
e.g. by Alberic of Monte Cassino in the \textit{Dictaminum Radii} (see J. J. Murphy, \textit{Rhetoric in the Middle Ages ...}, Berkeley-London 1974 p)
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
of the theme (quae ... fidem excedit)\textsuperscript{120} and because of his personal grief he was uncertain of what rhetorical forms he should use. At the end of the section John again refers to the materia and how he will deal with it. He will write briefly partly because he does not have much time and partly because the materia is widely known (nota et vulgata) throughout the Latin world.\textsuperscript{121} In the next sentence - the opening sentence of section 3 - John indicates that he will structure his letter around the rhetorical circumstantiae:\textsuperscript{122}

\ldots omnes circumstantiae concurrerunt in agone pontificis, ut patientis titulum perpetuo illustrarent et persequentium revelarent impletatem et nomen sempiterno macularent obprobio.\textsuperscript{123}

In the sentences which follow this statement John alludes to the circumstantia quis (‘Si enim personas hinc inde intueri et metere placuerit.’)\textsuperscript{124} Later in the letter John alludes to the circumstantiae ubi and quando in a paragraph which opens ‘Sed et ubi sit immolatus advertite.’\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{119}(continued)

205); Hugh of Bologna in the Rationes dictanda prosaica (Murphy, Rhetoric pp 216, 220). Note the Libellus de arte dictandi usually attributed to Peter of Blois (see M. Camargo in Speculum 59 (1984) 16-41 at p 29).

\textsuperscript{120} LL p 724.

\textsuperscript{121} LL p 726.


\textsuperscript{123} LL p 726.

\textsuperscript{124} LL p 726.

\textsuperscript{125} LL p 728.
Sections 3 and 4 were without any doubt written as a unit. Section 3 is a rhetorical exordium; it introduces the main features (circumstantiae) of the case and it tries to win the sympathy of readers by making a stirring attack on the 'authors and perpetrators' of Becket's murder. Section 4 provides the narratio, the detailed account of events. The two sections, exordium and narratio, complement each other. That the two sections were written as one unit is brought out clearly in the opening sentence of section 4; beginning abruptly, this refers to one of the topics dealt with in the preceding section:

Passurus in ecclesia, ut dictum est, coram altari Christi martir ... occurrit eis e gradu quem ex magna parte ascenderat 

d: Mobilising support for Becket

The conclusion that sections 2 to 4 were written as a unit takes on a particular significance when we consider the strikingly informal tone of section 2. Had John been writing to persons with whom he had no personal ties of friendship or loyalty, it is improbable that he would have asked 'Sed unde sumetur exordium?' Instead of speaking about the problem of giving rhetorical shape to his material, he would simply have made effective and elegant use of the rhetorical conventions with which he and his readers were familiar. To speak explicitly of the rhetoric which he was using or might use was an informality which John reserved for his intimates. That section 2 was written for intimates is further supported by the reference to private sorrows, which is more appropriate in a letter to friends than in a letter to

126 LL pp 728-30 ('Et quidem, ut creditur ...').
127 LL p 730.
128 See Table 1 above p 12 onwards.
persons whom one does not know:

Publicas angustias an domesticas deplorabo? Sed gener\textsuperscript{129}e
mundus agnovit, sua quemque miseria perurit acrius .....

It follows that the main part of the circular-letter (sections 2 to 4) was composed as a unit and was to be distributed among people with whom John already had some ties. Thus in publicising Becket's sanctity John wrote to his intimates who might have influence in the French church or at the papal curia. There was no question of John writing directly to powerful persons with whom he had no personal ties. John did not hold the kind of high ecclesiastical office which would have given his views weight in the French church or at the curia. As a clerk and administrator his success in influencing people depended on his ability to mobilise the support of those of his intimates who held ecclesiastical office and who carried influence at the highest levels of the church. The effectiveness of the campaign being run by John is seen in the letters which Alexander III received from leading Frenchmen in early 1171 demanding vengeance for Becket's murder. The senders included Louis VII, Theobald count of Blois, William archbishop of Sens and Stephen bishop of Meaux.\textsuperscript{130} By making use of his closest contacts on the continent - John of Poitiers, Peter of Celle and William of Sens - John succeeded in mobilising French pressure on the papal curia.

4: JOHN'S PRESENTATION OF BECKET AS MARTYR

In the letter Ex insperato Becket is portrayed as a martyr ('\textit{pontificiam per martirium coronato}')\textsuperscript{131} who fought to the death ('\textit{certavit

\textsuperscript{129} LL p 724.

\textsuperscript{130} MB 7734, 740, 743.

\textsuperscript{131} LL p 734.
usque ad mortem')\textsuperscript{132} for the lex Dei, honor Dei and honestas ecclesiae\textsuperscript{133} and against the abusiones veterum tirannorum.\textsuperscript{134} He was courageous in the face of threats, exile, proscription\textsuperscript{135} and even death.\textsuperscript{136} He carefully avoided the traps, ploys and blandishments which were used by his opponents to tempt him, and withstood the onslaughts of cruel fortune.\textsuperscript{137} He was the athleta fortissimus whose glory could not be hidden by his opponents.\textsuperscript{138}

Two of the most important aspects of John’s presentation of Becket as martyr are Becket’s asceticism and the parallels between the deaths of Becket and Christ. When Becket’s body was being prepared for burial, it was found to be wrapped in a hair-shirt full of lice and worms. A few of Becket’s familiares had known that he wore a hair-shirt, but all were astonished to see that even his underclothing (femoralia interiora)\textsuperscript{139} were also of hair cloth. According to John the discovery made had a powerful emotive impact on all who were present:

\begin{quote}
Quis referat quos gemitus, quanto lacrimarum imbres sanctorum certus quid derat in revelatione sic adumbratae religionis emiserit.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{132} LL p 736.
\textsuperscript{133} LL p 736.
\textsuperscript{134} LL p 736.
\textsuperscript{135} LL p 726: ‘Nec ad modicum et quasi ad horam credens et in articulo temptationis recedens, adversus perpessus est, sed exilium et acerbam proscriptionem ... proteavit.’
\textsuperscript{136} LL p 732: ‘Sed in his omnibus cruciatibus invicti animi et admirandae constantiae martir nec verbum protulit nec clamorem emisit.’
\textsuperscript{137} LL pp 726-8: ‘... tanta quidem virtute constantiae regia via incedens et Christi et apostolicorum virorum sequens vestigia, ut invictus eius animus nec fortunae saevientes impetu frangit nec blanditiis emolliri.’
\textsuperscript{138} LL p 734.
\textsuperscript{139} LL p 734.
The news of Becket's extraordinary asceticism would also have made a deep impression on John's readers. It was the kind of evidence needed by Becket's early biographers who had the problem of trying to create a saint out of the real-life Becket, the Becket who was aggressive, ostentatious, and who had once indulged enthusiastically in the aristocratic activities of hunting and warfare. They tended to place great emphasis on Becket's reputed chastity and on his piety. His severe asceticism was the convincing kind of proof they needed; it demonstrated that Becket had spent years in a 'living martyrdom'.

The occurrence of Christ parallels in the early accounts of Becket's death has been noted by numbers of historians but has not been explored in any detail. Abbott concluded his study of the death and miracles of Thomas Becket with a chapter entitled 'The martyr and the saviour'. However Abbott was not greatly interested in how the early biographers presented Becket as Christlike; he was more interested in the actual parallels between the death and sequels to the deaths of Becket and of Christ, and in the similarities between the sources for Christ's death and those for Becket's death. He hoped to show that a consideration of these parallels would be useful for the student of New Testament criticism. P. A. Brown refers fleetingly to the Christ parallels used by the early biographers, in The development of the legend of Thomas Becket. In his comparative study of John's Vita Sancti Thomae and the other Vitae, A. D. McLay points out some of the Christ parallels used by the early

140 LL p 734.
141 St Thomas of Canterbury 2 pp 305-15.
142 (Philadelphia 1930) pp 121, 136.
143 A comparative study of the life of St Thomas of Canterbury by John of Salisbury and other contemporary Latin lives (PhD Thesis, (Footnote continued)
The prominence which John gives to the parallels between the deaths of Christ and Becket is not surprising, for as we have seen during the years of exile John and the other Becket proponents tried to present Becket as a Christlike figure.

John introduces the Christ theme early in the letter Ex insperato. At the end of the passage dealing with Becket’s causa we are told that Becket, setting out on the regia via, followed the footsteps of Christ and of apostolic men. In the Glossa ordinaria to Numbers 21:22, the via regia is linked to Christ who is the ‘via veritas et vita’. In the next sentence - which opens the passage dealing with the locus of Becket’s death - John points to a comparison between Becket’s death and the sacrifice of Christ: ‘Sed et ubi sit immolatus advertite.’ The word immolatus would instantly remind John’s readers of St Paul’s comment on the sacrifice of Christ: ‘Etenim Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus’ (1 Cor 5:7). Further on John provides a sentence so rich in allusions to Christ that it needs to be quoted before being analysed:

Qui ergo se ipsum a multo tempore exhibuerat hostiam vivam, sanctam, Deo placentem, qui carnem suam in orationibus, vigiliis, ieiuniis et asperioris cilicii usu continuo cum vitiis et concupiscentiis crucifixerat, qui dorsum (quod sancti familiares eius noverant) tanquam Christi puerulus exponere consuuerat ad flagella, qui Christi corpus et sanguinem solitus erat offerre in altari prostratus, effusum manibus impiorum obtulit proprium.

In this sentence there are two types of Christ allusion: first, the

144 See chap 7:3 pp 360-79 above.
145 LL pp 726-8.
146 col 1330.
words which simply indicate a parallel between Becket and Christ; secondly, the explicit comparison of Christ’s sacrifice and Becket’s sacrifice. The first sort of allusion occurs twice: when John says that ‘crucified’ his flesh in prayers, vigils, fasts and the discomforts of the hair-shirt; and secondly when Becket is described as ‘Christus puerulus’, having his back whipped in imitation of Christ. The second type of allusion is more daring for it compares Becket’s murder with the sacrifice of Christ in the Mass. John echoes the canon of consecration when he says that for years Becket had showed himself to be ‘hostiam vivam, sanctam, Deo placentem, (Romans 12 : 1). The final part of the sentence makes an effective and impressive contrast between the Becket who in life was accustomed to offer the body and blood of Christ at the altar (in altari) and offered up his own blood. The idea of a Christlike victim allowing himself to be sacrificed so that others may be saved, is restated later in the letter when Becket declares to the knights in the cathedral:

‘Mortem libenter amplector, dummodo ecclesia in effusione sanguinis mei pacem consequatur et libertatem’.

Although some of Becket’s biographers used the Christ themes mentioned by John in Ex insperato and all developed other parallels between Becket and Christ, only Herbert of Bosham used the vivid image of Becket as ‘a living sacrifice, holy and pleasing to God’, like the sacrifice of Christ in the Mass. As we have noted, the first occasion on which Herbert made use of John’s image was in the letter Inter scribendum. He later incorporated parts of his letter, including

---

147 LL p 728.
148 LL p 730.
149 See Table 12 below.
the image of Becket as living sacrifice, into his Vita.  

Elsewhere in Ex insperato John draws parallels between the passion of Becket and Christ’s passion. As Becket spoke to the knights before the ‘altar of Christ’ he told them that he was willing to die but he forbade them on pain of anathema to harm any of the monks, clerks or laymen who were present. Commenting on this, John compares Becket’s words with those of Christ when arrested in the Garden of Gethsemane:

Verba eius nonne Christum videntur exprimere in passione dicentem, ‘Si me quaeritis, sinite hos abire.’

Just as Becket is compared with Christ, so those involved in planning or provoking the murder are compared with Judas and with the sacerdotum principes who arranged Christ’s death:

Et quidem, ut creditur, necem ipsius traditores procurare discipuli, sacerdotum principes formaverunt.

During the Becket dispute John had used the term sacerdotum principes to indicate those English bishops who were opposed to Becket. Here John evidently had in mind Roger of York, Gilbert Foliot and possibly

150 See pp 510-11 above.
151 For Becket as ‘living sacrifice’ in Herbert, Vita MB 3 p 498. The main links between Inter scribendum (MB 7 ep 735) and Herbert’s Vita (MB 3) are: 1) the lengthy passages: Inter scribendum p 431 (...) ibidem christus Domini ... spiculatoribus decalvatus est ...) and Vita pp 498-99 ('Sentiens itaque sacerdos ... isto sicut et illo decalvato.'); 2) Some phrases in the passages describing the first meeting between Becket and the knights (Inter scribendum p 430, Vita p 488): a) Inter scribendum: ‘a sancto viro salutati non resalutaverint’; Vita: 'nec suo vel regis nomine ipsum salutantes’; b) Inter scribendum: 'sciscitantes si episcopos suspensos sive excommunicatos ad regis esset illico absoluturus mandatum'; Vita: 'sciscantes si episcopos regis suspensos et excommunicatos absolveret'; c) Inter scribendum: 'et continuo exierunt ad cohortem'. Vita: 'Et statim prope hortum collegerunt cohortem.'
152 LL p 732; of John 18:8.
153 LL p 728.
154 See chap 7 p 377 above.
Jocelin of Salisbury who had travelled to the court of Henry II at Bures in December to complain of the sentences of excommunication which Becket delivered against them. According to the several biographers it was the complaints of these bishops which provoked Henry’s furious outburst against Becket and thus precipitated the murder. Guernes of Pont-Sainte Mâncie accused Roger in particular of having incited Henry to encourage the murder of Becket. In 1171 the Becket circle were so successful in accusing Roger of complicity in the murder that he was forced to prove his innocence by compurgation.

At the time that he composed the letter Ex insperato John may not have known about Henry’s outburst nor that it was provoked by the complaints of the bishops. However he knew that the bishops had travelled to Normandy with the intention of enlisting the king’s support against Becket. The knights who killed Becket had come from the king’s court and had declared that their main objective was to get Becket to rescind the excommunications. Thus in the eyes of John and his companions at Canterbury the bishops were unmistakably implicated in the murder. Already in early January of 1171 William of Sens was spreading the accusation that the three bishops were guilty of murder. In the letter Inter scribendum he, or rather Herbert of Bosham in his name, describes the three bishops:

155 Herbert (MB 3 p 481).
156 See Warren, Henry II (pb edn London 1977 p 508) who does not think that news of the suspensions and excommunications of the bishops was the cause of Henry’s rage.
157 Guernes (ed Walberg) lines 5126-33.
158 MB 7 p 502. See also LL ep 306 (Roger of York to suffragans etc).
159 See William of Canterbury (MB 1 p 129), FitzStephen (MB 2 pp 132-3).
et ab omni ecclesiarum orbe perpetuo detestandos fratres, Rogerium videlicet Eborasensi archidiabulum, et Londinensi et Sarisberiensi, non episcopos sed apostaticos, qui filium tuum, fratrem tuum Joseph, non mystice sed in veritate occiderunt ....

The identification of Becket's murderers with those who procured Christ's death is also underlined when John suggests that Judas' manner of death, hanging, should also be the punishment for Becket's murderers 'eo quod de similibus idem constet esse iudicium'. Later John identifies Becket's murderers with the soldiers at Calvary when he likens the ransacking of the archiepiscopal palace to the division of Christ's garment among the soldiers at the Crucifixion.

The Christ themes in John's letter Ex insperato also contain contrasts between the death of Becket and Christ, the point being that Becket's murder was even fouler than Christ's. John reminds us that Christ was at least given some opportunity to defend himself ('qualemqualem allegandi pro se acceperat facultatem'); he had been executed by authority of the government ('auctoritate publicae potestatis') and had been killed by people who did not know God.

Christ's killers had also ensured that the city would not be contaminated nor the Sabbath polluted, by having him executed outside the city gate. In contrast Becket had been killed:

... non modo in urbe, sed intra ecclesiam, non tempore prophano, sed die quem nativitatis dominicae solemnitas consecravit ...

160 MB 7 p 433.
161 LL p 730.
162 LL pp 732-4 ('Carnifices autem ...')
163 LL p 728.
164 LL p 728.
165 LL p 728.
166 LL p 728: 'Christus enim, ne civitas foederetur, ne polluetur ...'
The knights who slew Becket were even more brutal (immaniores) than Christ’s executioners, for, according to John, when Becket was already dead the knights cut off the top of his skull, spilling brain, blood and bones across the floor. In contrast Christ’s crucifiers, on seeing that Christ was dead, refrained from breaking his legs.\textsuperscript{168}

For John and the other Becket propagandists who had portrayed Becket’s cause as Christ’s cause during the years of exile, it was natural to identify Becket the martyr with the crucified Christ. The first person to make this identification and to propagate it was John of Salisbury. Several of Becket’s biographers echoed in content, though not in words used, some of the Christ parallels which John had used: Becket’s asceticism,\textsuperscript{169} his command to the knights not to harm the people accompanying him,\textsuperscript{170} the ransacking of the archiepiscopal palace\textsuperscript{171} and the suggestion that Becket’s murderers were more evil than Christ’s executioners.\textsuperscript{172} Becket’s earliest biographers were remarkably individualistic in their use of parallels between Becket’s and Christ’s death (see Table 12 below). Aside from the parallels which derive ultimately from John’s letter \textit{Ex insperato}, and from play on the words \textit{agonia}, \textit{agonotheta} and \textit{christus Domini}, no two accounts make use of the same parallels.

\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
167 & LL p 728. \\
168 & LL p 732. \\
169 & Lambeth Anonymous (MB 4 p 135). \\
171 & Benedict (MB 2 pp 14-5), FitzStephen (MB 3 p 144), Herbert (MB 3 p 513). \\
172 & FitzStephen (MB 3 pp 144-5), Herbert (MB 3 p 510).
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
**TABLE 12:** Explicit parallels between Becket and Christ in the twelfth-century accounts of Becket’s death.

Excluded are parallels drawn from *Ex insperato* (LL ep 305).

1. **William of Canterbury**

Becket did not trust the knights at his first interview with them:

Recolens autem illius evangelici quodam presagio futurorum pontifex, ‘Jesus non credebat semetipsum eis, eo quod Ipse nosset omnes’, revocavit iam divertentes familiares.

MB 1 p 129; cf John 2:24.

2. **Benedict of Peterborough**

Tunc sanctus, Dominicum illud praeeptum etiam ad iteram non immemor observare, ‘Qui vult venire post me, abneget tollat crucem suam et sequatur me’, crucem suam praeferrī sibi praeeptī.

cf Matthew 16:24, Mark 8:34; (MB 2 pp 10-11).

3. **Becket’s declaration ‘Ecce ego non proditor sed archiepiscopus’ etc.**

cf John 18:5-6; (MB 2 p 12).

4. ‘Quid est Reginalde? Multa contulī beneficia; et ad me in ecclesiam armatis accedis?’ Nonne his verbis videbatur imitator Christi, Christum exprimere, Judaeis dicentem, ‘Tanquam ad latronem existis cum gladiis et fustibus comprehendere me?’

cf Matthew 26:55, Mark 14:48; (MB 2 p 13).

5. **The knights who killed Becket were like those who mocked Christ on the cross:**

Alii autem insultabant dicentes, ‘Voluit esse rex, voluit esse plus quam rex; modo sit rex, modo sit rex.’ Et in hoc illis similès, qui Domino in cruce pendentī insultabant, praetereuntes et capita sua moventes, et inter caetera dicentes, ‘Dixit enim “Filius Dei sum.”’

cf Matthew 27:43 (MB 2 p 4).
6. Becket saved the church from the servitude of the world just as Christ redeemed it from the devil:

... manifesta rerum similitudine cunctis innotescerent fidelibus, ita eripiendam esse ecclesiam per sanguinem martyris a servitute mundi, sicut per mortem Christi redempta est a potestate diaboli.

(MB 2 p 15).

Edward Grim

Becket like Christ received five blows. Hugh Mauclerc spattered Becket's brains across the floor 'ne martyri quinta plaga deesset, qui in aliis Christum fuerat imitatus'.

(MB 2 p 438)

8. The sun darkened after Becket's death as it did after the death of Christ.

(MB 3 pp 142-3).

9. A vision showing that whenever a martyr dies, Christ is once more crucified:

Cuidam viro religioso in nocturna revelatione ostensus fuit Jesus Christus crucifixus in ea parte cryptae ubi beati Thomae repositus erat mundanus homo. Vere quidem, quia Ipse in singulis martyribus suis patitur qui beato Petro Romam ad martyrium eunti occurrit et quaerenti, 'Domine, quo vadis?' respondit, 'Venio Romam iterum crucifiigi.'

See Ambrose De basilicis tradendis 13 (PL 16 col 1011); (MB 3 pp 150-1).

10. Herbert of Bosham

Becket courageously hurled William Traci (actually Reginald FitzUrse) just as Christ cast out all those who sold and bought in the temple:

... tam audens, tam fidens, tam pronus, tam promptus, tam intrepidus et tam paratus occurrerit! quos et de templo Salvatoris, Salvatorem suum imitans, non formidavit eiicere.

cf Matthew 21:12 etc; (MB 3 p 3).
11. Contrast between Robert de Broc, whom Herbert thought had spattered Becket’s brains on the floor, and Longinus:

Ecce Robertus hic, Longinus alter, non quia certe ille ab isto justificatus est ...

(MB 3 p 506)

12. The four knights and their cohort who were involved in Becket’s murder, like those involved in Christ’s execution:

Et milites quidem haec fecerunt quattuor cum cohorte in hac passione christi Domini, sicut et in passione ipsius Christi, qui cum profana cohorte sua ecclesiam vix egressi, mirabantur si iam obisset.

(MB 3 p 506)

13. Anonymous II

Becket forbade Edward Grim to defend him, just as Christ commanded Peter to put away his sword.

(MB 4 p 130)
How reliable, how distorted is John’s account of Becket’s murder? 173

John was well placed to write an accurate account of the murder. In the late afternoon of Tuesday 29 December 1170 he was one of Becket’s companions in an inner room of the archbishop’s palace, when Reginald FitzUrse and his companions forced their first interview with Becket. After the knights had left, John remained with the archbishop. Later when the knights were heard returning, John was one of the group of monks and clerks who hurried the reluctant Becket through the cloister and into the cathedral. Once inside the cathedral Becket refused to have the doors barred, declaring that the church of Christ should not become a fortress. According to William FitzStephen it was at this point that John and most of Becket’s companions decided to flee. 174

They must either have hidden in dark corners or have mingled with the crowds 175 who were present in the cathedral. For the precise details of what happened after this point, John must have relied on information supplied by the three persons present at the murder: William FitzStephen, Edward Grim and Robert of Merton. 176

In his painstaking comparison of the different accounts of Becket’s death, Abbott suggested that there were only two factual errors in John’s account: according to John, Becket had been slain before (coram) 177 the altar, whereas he had in fact been slain in the

173 The best modern account of the murder is provided by Knowles, Historian and character pp 123-8. The accounts in the different Vitae are laid out and analysed in Abbott, St Thomas.

174 MB 3 p 139. A few of Becket’s companions appear to have fled later when Becket confronted the knights in the cathedral; see William of Canterbury (MB I pp 133-4).

175 Grim MB 2 p 435: ‘Turbaisque qui adherant ac tumulabantibus (iam enim qui vespertinis intenderant laudibus ad lethale spectaculum accurrerant) in spiritu furoris milites exclamaverunt ....’

176 MB 3 p 139.
vicinity of an altar; and, John's suggestion that Becket died inter consacerdotes is misleading, for all but a few of Becket's companions fled before the murder. But these are hardly serious errors of fact for 'coram altari' does not convey a very different impression from 'iusta altare', and when John spoke of Becket dying 'inter consacerdotes' he probably had in mind the entire incident and not just the moment when Becket died. These slight distortions remind us that John was not trying to write a pedantically accurate account of the murder, he was trying to convey in a vivid way the mood and the salient facts of the incident. The real distortion in John's account is more subtle; it lies in the suppression of any hint that Becket had been aggressive in his final hour.

The most striking feature of John's accounts of Becket's death in the letter Ex insperato and in the Vita Sancti Thomae is that they make no mention of the events which he had witnessed most closely. Both accounts begin on the steps of the altar where Becket and the knights came face to face for the second time.

John's reluctance to discuss the earlier events is understandable in view of the sharp clash of opinion which he had with Becket during and immediately after Becket's confrontation with the knights in the inner room of the palace. The clash is mentioned by Benedict, FitzStephen and Guernes of Pont-Sainte-Maxence.

177 LL p 728.
178 LL p 728.
179 LL p 730 ('Passurus autem in ecclesia .....'); Vita MB 2 pp 319-20.
180 MB 2 p 8.
181 MB 3 p 134.
182 ed Walberg lines 5361-80. Derived from Guernes' account is that in Anonymous I (MB 4 p 74). For the relationship between these two (Footnote continued)
Although the versions differ somewhat, a clear picture of the disagreement can be put together. According to FitzStephen, John and Becket came into conflict when the knights were still present in the room. John urged Becket to talk to the knights privately (secretius). What John probably had in mind was that Becket and several of his advisers, including John himself, should speak to the knights. Becket rejected the advice, saying, 'Non expedit, talia proponunt et postulanti, quae omnino facere non possum nec debeo'.

This difference is alluded to in the Vitae which say that at first Becket dismissed his domestici, and then thinking better of it he recalled them. Becket's rejection of John's advice led to a stormy exchange of views. Playing to the audience of Becket's advisers and domestici, Becket and the knights argued aggressively. From the words attributed to the knights it seems that they had the object simply of compelling Becket to withdraw the sentences of excommunication against Roger of York, Gilbert Foliot and Jocelin of Salisbury. However they seem not to have had any clear idea of what to do if Becket refused. According to Edward Grim, FitzUrse at first demanded that Becket accompany the knights to the king's court. But as they were leaving, the knights ordered Becket's servant not to permit Becket to flee the realm. The early biographers

182 (continued)
works see Walberg La tradition hagiographique pp 107-121, which is a reprint of Guerino (ed Walberg) pp xxxvi-xxxix.
183 William of Canterbury (MB 1 p 129), Benedict MB 2 p 21.
185 William of Canterbury (MB 1 p 129), FitzStephen (MB 3 pp 132-33).
186 See Warren, Henry II pp 509-10.
187 MB 2 p 430.
insist that Becket behaved calmly in the face of provocation. According to Benedict the knights were shouting threats and swearing that they had had to put up with too much from Becket, so that the 'weak in spirit' (insipientes corde) grew afraid. In comparison to the knights Becket may well have been calm and self-controlled. It is clear however that he did not restrict himself to stating his principles or to rebutting the knights' demands. His arguments ranged from his insistence that only the pope could absolve Roger of York and that he himself would not absolve Gilbert or Jocelin at present, his assertion that he would not flee from his church, and his complaints of the harassment which he and his household had suffered since returning to England. Becket's works ranged from statements of principle to individual points - such as his complaint that a mule belonging to his household had its tail cut off 'tanquam in diminutione bestiae dehonestari possim'.

At the end of the meeting, Becket spoke in fighting words:

Frustra mihi miniamini; si omnes gladii Angliae capiti meo immineant, ab observatione iustitiae Dei et obedientia domini papae terrores vestri non me dimovere poterunt. Pede ad pedem me reperietis in Domini proelio.

188 Benedict (MB 2 p 5): 'Sanctus autem, non immemor sententiae, qua dicitur, 'Cór iracundus suscitat rixas, sapiens autem mitigat suscitas', amaritudo satellitis animo mitis responsi apposuit medicinam, dicens ...'

189 ibid p 6: 'Exclamaverunt autem tunc et alii milites, în minas easdem prorumpentes per plagas Dei iterum et iterum iurantes quod eum supra modum sustinuissent. Turbati sunt igitur insipientes corde ...'

190 FitzStephen (MB 3 p 133).

191 ibid pp 134-5: '... rediens in consilio et obedientia domini ad ecclesiam meam: amplius in sempiternum non eam deseram.'


194 FitzStephen (MB 3 pp 134-5).
The final incident in the interview shows Becket not as passively calm but as characteristically aggressive. As the knights left, Becket followed them and heard them telling his servants that they were no longer bound by their obligation to him. Becket raising his hand above his head shouted after the departing knights: 'Quaerite, qui vos fugiat .... Hic, hic reperietis'.

John's misgivings about a public confrontation had been confirmed. When Becket returned to his companions, John severely criticised him. The most detailed account of this criticism is to be found in Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence. John first accused Becket of never taking advice:

'You have always ignored our advice, always doing what you have already made up your mind to do.'

The clash between John and Becket was sharp enough to have made an impression on Guernes' informant. But the precise details of the conversation may be coloured by the author's knowledge that Becket was murdered less than an hour later. According to Guernes, John remarked that the knights were looking for any excuse to kill Becket. Becket then replied that he was willing to die for justice and the liberties of the church, to which John said 'We are sinners and not ready for death. I see no-one here who wishes to die, except you.'

195 Grim (MB 2 p 433).


197 For the times of the events late afternoon of 29 December 1170, see Knowles, Historian and character p 123 n 2.

198 lines 5368-9: "Quant li chevalier vindrent chaienz a vus parler. Fors a chaisun ne quierent de vus a mort livrer".
Becket then replied 'Domini voluntas fiat'. This exchange has a suspiciously hagiographical tone. It indicates that Becket was willing to die, and it emphasises the difference between the vir sanctus and his companions who were sinners. The same distinction is made by William of Canterbury who admits that being a poor sinner he fled before Becket was murdered. However, even though the report of this conversation between John and Becket is obviously hagiographical in purpose, it is possible that John and Becket may have spoken about the risk of violence or even death. The knights had been aggressive and angry; to the people in the room with Becket it may have been clear that there was considerable potential for an outburst of violence. John had little patience for people who sought their own death. In Polericus while writing about the veteres philosophi, John commented:

No-one who provokes death can be excused; more excusable are those who flee from imminent death. For who knows what the will of the Lord or whether he can by some means escape impending death?

If John had thought that Becket was being needlessly provocative and that he was endangering his own life, he would certainly have rebuked him.

By concentrating on the final part of Becket’s passion - his
confrontation at the altar - John not only suppressed the embarrassing
details of his disagreement with Becket, but he also concentrated on a
scene which could be presented in a very stylised way, with Becket
being represented as a martyr and Christlike sacrifice. Becket is
depicted as going calmly and with resignation to face martyrdom.

The view that Becket went calmly and with resignation to his
death is echoed by the other biographers. Benedict\textsuperscript{203} speaks of
Becket willingly exposing his head to the swords of the knights in
order to protect the liberty of the church. Edward Grim\textsuperscript{204} says that
Becket yearned for martyrdom. William FitzStephen\textsuperscript{205} says that Becket
seemed to rejoice in dying for 'justice, liberty and the cause of his
church'. But there are enough clues throughout the \textit{Vitae} to indicate
that this is an incomplete picture of Becket's behaviour in his final
hour. At the first meeting with the knights his manner had been
combative and aggressive. Later, when the knights were returning,
Becket accused his companions of cowardice. According to
FitzStephen\textsuperscript{206} this happened when the monks urged Becket to hurry into
the cathedral. Becket's retort was 'Absit; ne timeatis; plerique
monachi plus iusto timidi sunt et pusillanimes'. According to William
of Canterbury Becket's remark was made inside the cathedral when his
companions wished to lock the door after them:\textsuperscript{207}

\textit{'Abite', inquit, 'pusillanimes, sinite miserors et caecos
delirare. Praecipimus in virtute obedientiae ne ostium
accludatis.'}

\textsuperscript{\textit{203 MB 1 p 6.}}
\textsuperscript{\textit{204 MB 2 p 434: 'qui abolim martyrii flagrabat amore'.}}
\textsuperscript{\textit{205 MB 3 pp 137-8: 'Insuper et securum se sanctus homo gerebat qua(n) gaudens se nactum causam moriendi pro iustitia et libertate et causa ecclesiae suae; et quasi cupiens et esse cum Christo'.}}
\textsuperscript{\textit{206 MB 3 p 138.}}
\textsuperscript{\textit{207 MB 1 p 132.}}
William of Canterbury and FitzStephen were present with Becket. The fact that they both record Becket's retort, but nevertheless differ as to when it was said, strongly suggests that Becket did speak such words and that both authors were relying on their memory of the incident. Had one been drawing his account from the other, we would expect the incident to be in the same chronological sequence.

In his final moments Becket showed the same aggressive energy, manfully resisting the efforts of the knights to hoist him on to William Traci's back, and hurling Reginald FitzUrse away from him.208

Alone of the early biographers, Herbert of Bosham emphasised Becket's forcefulness in dealing with the knights. Saying that Becket was not afraid but eager for death (non pavidus sed avidus), Herbert depicts Becket as a David fighting Goliath:

not with the sword of iron, but with the sword of the word, not with the stone from a sling but with the stone of the tongue.209

Becket is depicted as energetically and boldly arguing with the knights: 'not degrading himself, but (as we have said) arguing and chastising masterfully (cum omni imperio)' 210 He is likened to Samson 'courageous in resistance' ('intrepidus ad occurrendum') and to Saint Paul 'prompt in argument'.211

Herbert draws attention to Becket's act of hurling Reginald FitzUrse - or as Herbert thought, William Traci - to the floor. He compares it with Christ driving the moneylenders from the temple:212

208 Anonymous I (MB 4 p 74): 'Excutiens se vir Dei impegit eum a se, ita quod fere corruit super pavimentum'.

209 MB 3 p 496.

210 MB 3 p 493.

211 MB 3 p 493.
tam audens, tam fidens, tam pronus, tam promptus, tam intrepidus et tam paratus occurrent! quos et de templo Salvatoris, Salvatorem suum imitans, non formidavit elicere.

Herbert had a liking for the vigorous imagery of struggle. He was energetically aggressive in personality and uncompromising in principle.\textsuperscript{213} We would certainly expect him to portray Becket as a fighter to the last. But this does not invalidate Herbert's version of Becket's last hour. In fact Herbert's version is plausible because we know Becket to have been aggressive and forthright in facing opposition throughout his pontificate\textsuperscript{214} and because we have seen that the other Vitae show that Becket was not entirely passive or resigned on the day of his death.

The most striking distortion of John's \textit{Ex insperato} is that it entirely omits the aggressive, combative side to Becket's behaviour and presents instead an image of Becket which John must have known to be false. The object of John's distortion was to present Becket as a martyr whose death ought to be avenged and whose sanctity ought to be recognised.

6: \textsc{Becket and the Language of Martyrdom}

The Christlike image with which the hagiographers endowed Becket was similar to the language which had been used by Becket's propagandists during the years of exile. Did this polemical language have any impact on Becket's behaviour? Is it possible that at some stage in his exile Becket began to take the Christ imagery and the language to

\textsuperscript{212} MB 3 p 493; cf Matthew 21:12, Mark 11:15.

\textsuperscript{213} Herbert's personality is brilliantly described in Smalley, Becket conflict chap 3.

\textsuperscript{214} See pp 550-1 below.
heart, and that he entertained the possibility, even the desirability of dying for his cause? When he returned to England in December 1170 did he see his death as imminent and was he making preparations for his death?

The generally accepted view is that Becket foresaw his murder and even welcomed it. Focussing on Becket's final days Z. N. Brooke remarks:

That in the last days he expected his death seems certain, and he played his final role superbly, and left an imperishable memory behind him. 215

D. Knowles suggests 216 that in the last months of 1170, and perhaps even earlier, Becket 'had become convinced that only by his death would a solution be found'. But Knowles also points 217 out that although Becket may have foreseen his imminent death, there is no convincing evidence that desire for martyrdom made Becket fatalistic or reckless. On the contrary he 'delighted in his homecoming, and would as he said, willingly live in peace at Canterbury'. More strongly stated is W. L. Warren's suggestion that Becket chose to die:

Thomas Becket did not have to die on 29 December 1170. That he did is partly, to say the least, because he chose to do so.

That is not to say necessarily that he craved the martyr's crown or thought it would bring him the victory that had eluded him in life. He may have also, but it is just as possible that he realised that only his death could resolve the dilemmas which his return posed, and rather than put off the evil hour, he embraced death at the hands of the four knights, with resignation but with courage. 218

215 The English church and the papacy from the Conquest to the reign of John (Cambridge 1931) p 211.
216 The historian and character p 122.
217 ibid 122.
The evidence that Becket cast himself in the role of martyr can be viewed under four headings: i) evidence that he was becoming more extreme, more otherworldly in his years of exile; ii) claims in the Vitae that Becket had foreseen and predicted his martyrdom; iii) Becket's behaviour in December 1170; iv) his behaviour on the day of his death.

i) There can be little doubt that the years of exile, lobbying and fundraising hardened the outlook of Becket and his inner circle. Their conception of the issues had in Knowles' words 'deepened and become more spiritualised'. It is probable that by the end of the dispute they viewed the conflict very much in terms of fundamental principles: a struggle of good versus evil, an attack on the Church Universal by impious men, a struggle between the forces of Christ and Antichrist. Becket's extreme asceticism in exile suggests that as the conflict deepened and hopes of settlement receded, the language of persecution may have taken on a personal, emotive and deeply religious meaning for him. If this is so, then the language of persecution was no longer for Becket simply a rhetorical device nor something to be believed in on a purely intellectual level.

In 1166 John had written to Becket urging him to abandon the study of canon law and to read instead the Psalms and the Moralia of Gregory the Great. Given John's ironic outlook and the absence in his works of emotive religion, we may assume that he was

---

218 Henry II p 511-2.
219 Historian and character p 121.
220 LL ep 144 pp 32-4.
221 See chap 3 pp 174-80, esp for humour and irony in the Historia pontificalis.
recommending prayer and quiet contemplation which would console Becket in his darkest hours. Becket however was an enthusiast in everything he did, and he soon committed himself with energy and zeal to the task of becoming a saintly man. William of Canterbury\textsuperscript{222} catches the atmosphere of Becket's religiosity in exile: he was a monk living among monks; as a wealthy man he abandoned God, but now as a poor man (privatus) in exile he rediscovered God; by the mortification of the flesh, by the proscription of himself and his followers, by his care for the clergy, whom he protected, he advanced towards martyrdom.

Given the type of piety practised by Becket, it is conceivable that he saw martyrdom as a possible or even desirable outcome of his struggle. However we have no certain evidence from the period of exile that Becket did view martyrdom in this way. What we can be certain of is that this period strengthened his resolve to take a principled stance whatever the consequences might be. The language of persecution with its emphases on the salvation of the pious man, the destruction of the wicked, and the value of suffering even to death, must have given Becket the strength to face continued exile, poverty and - if he ever considered it - the possibility of having to die for his cause.

ii) All the early lives of Becket assert that he foresaw his own death and made preparations for dying. Edward Grim,\textsuperscript{223} Benedict,\textsuperscript{224} William of Canterbury\textsuperscript{225} and Herbert of Bosham\textsuperscript{226} claim that during

\begin{itemize}
  \item\textsuperscript{222} MB 1 p 131.
  \item\textsuperscript{223} MB 2 pp 413, 419.
  \item\textsuperscript{224} MB 2 p 12.
  \item\textsuperscript{225} MB 1 p 51.
  \item\textsuperscript{226} MB 3 pp 405-6.
\end{itemize}
his period in Pontigny (1164-66) Becket had a vision in which God revealed to him his future martyrdom. In the earliest of these Vitae, Edward Grim (1172), two visions are recounted. In one vision Christ appears and tells him of his future martyrdom; a similar vision is described by Benedict (1173-4). In the second vision recorded by Grim, Becket's vision was being heard 'in praesentia domini papae et cardinalium'. The cardinals became enraged that Becket was standing up courageously against the king and attacked him, trying to rip out his eyes. The pope cried out in protest but his voice was drowned by the cries and noise of the cardinals. Then when the cardinals and pope had departed, Becket saw coming towards him some men 'terrible in aspect and full of fury'; with their swords they struck him on the crown of the head. It is this second vision which is described by William of Canterbury (1173-4) and Herbert of Bosham (1186).

The two versions of Becket's vision - the straightforward prediction of martyrdom and the vision of being attacked at the papal curia - provoke numbers of questions: Do the versions go back to a single dream? Did Edward Grim, William of Canterbury and Herbert fuse two dreams which Becket had, one reflecting anxieties about, or a desire for, martyrdom? Are the accounts of Becket's vision perhaps entirely fictitious? If they do have some basis in reality are they seriously distorted?

It was commonplace of saints' Lives and episcopal Lives that God revealed to the good or holy man the imminence or the manner of his death. This gave the saint or bishop the opportunity to make

---

227 MB 2 p 419.
228 MB 2 p 413.
229 e.g. Wulfstan (William of Malmesbury, De gestis pontificum, RS (Footnote continued)
preparations for his death. The two visions which Becket is supposed to have had at Pontigny, however, are unusual in that they occurred years before his death. This combined with the circumstantial statement\textsuperscript{230} that Becket had spoken about the visions to the abbots of Pontigny and Valluisant suggest that the accounts of Becket’s dream had some basis in reality. Given the problems which Becket was having in the period 1164-66 in getting effective support from the papal curia,\textsuperscript{231} it is quite plausible that he may have had a dream in which he was savaged by the cardinals, while the pope looked on helplessly. The appearance of armed assailants at the end of the vision is however far too neatly prophetic and ought to be rejected as an embellishment made by Becket’s earliest biographers.

FitzStephen records,\textsuperscript{232} without giving any indication of date, that Becket used to tell his companions that his dispute with Henry II ‘sine sanguinis effusione non posse terminari’. The possibilities for distortion in this type of report are considerable. This report could derive from a recollection that Becket had stated that the dispute could not be settled so long as both Henry and Becket lived. In the same passage FitzStephen makes an observation intended to emphasise that Becket foresaw his imminent death:\textsuperscript{233}

\[ ... omnia haec recolens praecurrentia martyrii sibi imminentis signa, animum firmans ad exitum suum de Aegypto, \]

\textsuperscript{229}(continued)
52, p 287); William of York (Vita Sancti Willelmi RS 71 vol 2 at p 277); Hubert Walter (Gervase of Canterbury, Actus pontificum ed W. Stubbs, RS 73 pp 325-414 at p 413).

\textsuperscript{230} William of Canterbury (MB 1 p 51) says Becket recounted the vision to the abbot of Pontigny; according to Benedict (MB 2 p 12) and Herbert (MB 3 pp 405-6) the abbot of Valluisant was also told.

\textsuperscript{231} See Barlow, TB chap 7 passim.

\textsuperscript{232} MB 3 pp 126-7.

\textsuperscript{233} MB 3 p 126.
de die in diem se praeparat, in eleemosynis profusior, in oratione devotior, omni cura animae suae sollicitior.

In December 1170 Becket's distribution of alms would certainly have been more liberal than previously; for when in exile he and his household had been short of funds and had depended on the generosity of others. Back in England Becket had access to the revenues of the see, even if he was encountering difficulties in recovering all its rights and properties. The claim that Becket was 'in oratione devotior, omni cura animae suae sollicitior' is so vague that it may not reflect any change in Becket's behaviour. In any case it is clear from the eleventh and twelfth century accounts of how English bishops died, that the death of a good bishop should ideally be a lengthy process, in which the bishop settled his affairs and prepared his soul. Giving alms and praying are two prominent features in the descriptions of deaths of bishops. Arguably, what FitzStephen is doing in this passage is showing that although Becket was murdered, he, like the conventional good bishop, had made preparations for his death.

Both FitzStephen and Grim state that Becket predicted publicly that there would soon be a new Elphege, archbishop-martyr. Grim

---

234 For John's fund-raising activities see chap 9 pp 482-3.


236 For instances of almsgiving see the accounts of the deaths of Ralph of Chichester and Henry of Winchester (see n 236 above). Examples of bishops dying in prayer are: Lanfranc (William of Malmesbury De gestis pontificum p 73); William of York (Vita Sancti Willelmi, RS 71 vol 2 at p 277).

237 Grim (MB 2 p 427) describes Becket as making similar preparations for death.
indicates that this prediction was made sometime in December: 'postquam ab exsilio reversus est'. FitzStephen\textsuperscript{239} gives a more precise date: in a sermon to the people before High Mass on Christmas Day. FitzStephen's date is supported by Benedict's \textit{Passio}:

\textit{quum die Nativitatis Domini verbi Dei panem populo ministrasset, ait inter caetera, 'Non alia de causa redisse se ab exsilio, nisi ut vel eos a juge inflictae sibi servitutis exueret, vel inter eos et pro eis mortis pateretur supplicium.}

Are these statements attributed to Becket after his return to England entirely conventional or do they point to what Becket was saying in the final weeks of his life? Three interpretations of these statements can be offered: 1) Becket made these statements because he sought martyrdom; 2) they distort what Becket may have said and are therefore no guide to his state of mind; 3) Becket made these statements or ones like them, not from any enthusiasm for martyrdom but simply because his situation was in fact precarious and because there were threats of violence. The last option is the most probable for it fits best into what we know of the atmosphere and events of December 1170 and of Becket's behaviour in this period. The agreement reached between Henry and Becket at La Ferte-Fréteval in July 1170 had been unsatisfactory for it had dealt with none of the central issues of the Becket dispute. It had contained no reference to the \textit{Constitutions of Clarendon}.\textsuperscript{241} Becket had difficulty in getting Henry to order the restitution of church properties,\textsuperscript{242} and even when Henry

\begin{footnotes}
\item[238] MB 2 p 434; cf ibid p 437.
\item[239] MB 3 p 130.
\item[240] MB 2 pp 17-8.
\item[241] See MB 7 epp 684-86, 690.
\item[242] For the unsuccessful mission of John of Salisbury and Herbert to (Footnote continued)
did issue mandates for the restitution of properties,\textsuperscript{243} Becket and his household found that royal officials were not enforcing them.\textsuperscript{244} When John of Salisbury returned to England in mid-November he found that there was a widespread reluctance to believe that peace had been achieved or that Becket would return.\textsuperscript{245} Royal officials and the people who had benefited from Becket’s exile, in particular the Kentish family of de Broc, were hostile to Becket’s return, and the \textit{Vitae} indicate that even before he had returned they were making plans to harass the archbishop and his household.\textsuperscript{246} 

The text which best conveys the atmosphere of this period is John’s letter \textit{Mea mora} (ep 304) written to Peter of Celle shortly before Becket’s death. John speaks of the hostility with which Becket and his followers were met by the officials of Henry II and the young king. Becket’s isolation is well summed up by John’s comments on Becket’s situation after the young king had prohibited him from entering cities or towns and commanded him to return to Canterbury:

\begin{quote}
... the archbishop and his attendants returned to Canterbury, and there we await God’s salvation in great danger (cum multo discrimine). No other path of comfort or safety is open to us, save by the prayers of yourself and the saints to escape the snares of those who thirst for the Church’s blood and seek to uproot us utterly from the earth or else to perish swiftly in the Church’s ruin. The persecution is fearful, and hardly a single visitor comes to the archbishop from the circles of the rich and great.\textsuperscript{247}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{242}(continued) find out ‘\textit{si forte rex promissam restitutionem compleret}’ see Herbert MB 3 p 468.

\textsuperscript{243} MB 7 epp 686-7.

\textsuperscript{244} FitzStephen MB 3 p 113.

\textsuperscript{245} LL p 716.

\textsuperscript{246} William of Canterbury MB 1 p 88.

\textsuperscript{247} LL p 723 (Brooke’s trans).
These lines cannot be rejected as mere hyperbole, for there was a threat of violence in December 1170. According to John, when Becket arrived at Sandwich, he was intercepted by royal officials (regii satellites) and armed guards who were making a lot of noise and appeared to be there for a harmful purpose (ad nocendum). It is also clear that Ranulf de Broc, who had administered archiepiscopal properties on behalf of the king, was unwilling to forego gracefully the benefits which he and his family had gained from Becket's exile, and was determined to harass Becket as much as possible. In his Vita FitzStephen inveighed against 'familia illa infamis de Broch'. Among the list of grievances which Becket sent to the young king's court were allegations that the de Broc family were still holding the archiepiscopal castle of Saltwood, that they had seized wine intended for Becket's household, and that a relative of the de Brocs had docked the tail of a horse carrying provisions to Becket. In the behaviour of royal officials and of the de Broc family, there was clear threat of violence, though not necessarily of murder.

In his Passio Benedict of Peterborough reported that during December 1170 there had been rumours of a plan to murder Becket. A knight of Canterbury called Reginald had told Becket of a conspiracy to kill him. Another knight had informed Richard the cellarer of Canterbury that Becket would not live to see vespers on the third day

248 LL p 718.
249 LL p 720.
250 See Grim MB 2 p 404.
251 MB 3 p 126.
253 MB 2 p 18.
hence. The circumstantial detail of the second report - that Richard the cellarer had obtained the information - suggests that we should not reject it out of hand. Given that Becket and his household were being bullied and isolated it is quite possible that there were rumours of a plot to murder Becket. If there were such rumours they must have originated from the de Broc family who were so obviously hostile to Becket. There is no way of proving just how seriously Becket would have taken such talk. But even if he were alarmed there are no grounds for thinking that he would have seen his death as inevitable or probable. It is more plausible that he would have seen such threats as dangerous bravado which could probably be overcome.

iii) As Knowles pointed out, Becket's activities in December 1170 are not those of a person seeking martyrdom. Instead they give the impression that Becket was fully occupied with practical problems: he intended to demonstrate his authority in public, to gain goodwill or at least acceptance at the young king's court and among the magnates (the divites and honorati) and to defend the material interests of the see of Canterbury.

Becket's determination to demonstrate his authority in public showed itself even before he set sail for England. On the eve of crossing the channel he sent ahead the papal letters excommunicating the bishops who had participated in the coronation of the young king, in particular Roger of York, Gilbert Foliot and Jocelin of Salisbury. This has sometimes been interpreted simply as a provocative action; it was provocative but it was a provocation

254 Historian and character p 122.
255 LL p 722.
256 LL p 718, MB 7 ep 723 (Quam iustis, Becket to the pope).
which almost paid off for Becket. For his suffragans Gilbert and Jocelin appear to have been willing to submit to Becket.258 Had they done so, Becket’s authority would have been greatly strengthened; he would have demonstrated his authority over his suffragans and at the same time would have isolated and humiliated Roger of York.

Becket wished to demonstrate publicly that he was once again archbishop in fact and not just in name. On his way to visit the young king at Winchester he travelled via Rochester and London. In both cities he was greeted by large crowds. As a sign of his liberality and goodwill he brought with him his presents for the young king, three warhorses with full caparison. At London he distributed largesse.259

The way in which Becket issued the excommunication of the bishops, his efforts to meet the young king, his demonstrations of largesse, his lists of complaints made when he was forbidden entry to the court, are the actions of a politically astute prelate who was seeking to strengthen his authority, win favour and defend the interests of his see. They cannot be used as evidence that Becket sought or even foresaw his martyrdom.

iv) On the afternoon of his death Becket first confronted the four knights - Reginald FitzUrse, William Traci, Hugh of Moreville and Richard Brito - in the stormy argument that took place in an inner

257 e.g. Richard Winston, Thomas Becket (London 1967) p 315.
258 LL p 722: ‘Ad huiusmodi et similes allegationes episcopi moti sunt et, sicut pro certo relatum est, ad clementiam archiepiscopi confugissent, nisi eos saepe nominatus Eboracensis seduxisset, dissuadens ne quid rege facerent inconsulto, quem patronum habuerant in omnibus operibus suis.’ cf William of Canterbury MB 1 p 105.
259 FitzStephen (MB 3 p 122): ‘et iniecta in locum eleemosynarum suarum palma eis monetam extractam plena compassione et manu fecit distribui.’
room of the archiepiscopal palace. Later when the knights, now armed, returned and tried to break into the palace, Becket had to be forced by his companions to hurry towards the cathedral. When they reached the north door of the cathedral Becket stopped and refused to enter until his crossbearer had arrived. Once inside the cathedral he refused to let the door be shut, to the alarm of his companions. He refused to hide but confronted the knights near the high altar of St Benedict, and boldly proclaimed where he was. As FitzStephen comments, Becket could have escaped into the dark recesses and passageways of the cathedral but he chose not to do so. However these actions are no proof that in his final hour Becket was seeking martyrdom. By personality and training Becket tended to deal with opposition head on and where there was a conflict he tended to force the issue. On becoming archbishop he had energetically entered into conflict in order to define the rights of the archbishopric and to demonstrate his independence of the king. Twice during the years of exile he had demonstrated dramatically his willingness to force issues. At Vézelay in June 1166 Becket’s excommunication of named officials of Henry II had startled even the aggressive Herbert of Bosham, and had forced English churchmen to declare their support either for Becket or for Henry. On the eve of returning to England in December 1170, Becket excommunicated Roger of York, and the bishops of London and Salisbury. His objective seems to have been to force

260 MB 3 p 140: ‘crypta erat prope, in qua multa, et pleraque tenēbrosa diverticula. Item erat ibi aliud ostium prope, quo per cochleam ascenderet ad cameras et testudines ecclesiae superioris; forte non inveniretur, vel interim aliud fieret. Sed nihil horum voluit’.

261 Herbert (MB 3 p 417). For the Vézelay censures see MB 5 epp 195-6; cf LL pp 112-4.

262 See MB 7 ep 723.
submissions and declarations of obedience from Gilbert and from Jocelin, and to humiliate Roger for his part in the coronation of the young king. Becket's tendency to confront opposition and to force issues may in part reflect his own personality, but it probably also reflects his experience as close adviser to Henry II. For throughout his reign Henry sought energetically to define his rights and to force his opponents to fight or give way.

Becket's characteristic aggression must also reflect in part his baronial training. During his twenties Becket was in close contact with the baron Richer de l'Aigle and may have spent a period in his household. According to Guernes of Pont-Sainte-Maxence, it was from Richer that Becket learned his love of hawks and hounds. During his period as chancellor Becket moved with ease among the barons. He displayed the values of a baron by his largesse, his love of display, his skill at hunting, and his active role in the Toulouse campaign of 1159. He shared the values of an elite trained for war, an elite in which value was placed on physical courage and aggression. Among such an elite to run away from an enemy would be degrading and humiliating.

Becket's personality and his training disposed him to deal with opponents in a forthright, aggressive way. In December 1170 his resolve to deal uncompromisingly with opponents had certainly been hardened by his feeling that he had failed in courage in 1164. Thus in his first meeting with the four knights Becket asserted that under no circumstances would he abandon his church a second time.
When it became clear that there was a real threat of violence, Becket was not prepared to hurry away in a humiliating way. William sums up Becket's frame of mind as he stood on the steps of the altar:

Ecce palam stat, latebras degeneres non quaerit. 267

In assessing Becket's behaviour in his final hour, we have to consider how he judged the danger. Even as the knights stormed into the cathedral there was still the slight possibility that there might be no violence. Becket might yet call the knights' bluff. This made facing the knights openly a reasonable if very risky option. Becket had the option of trying to escape, but this would have been unacceptable to him, for even if he ran away and lived, his reputation and authority would have been badly shaken. No longer would he have been able to present himself as the man of God courageously fighting Christ's battle. Instead the image of a cowing cleric would have been put into circulation. If Becket were to be killed it would be far better that he should die courageously rather than miserably. It would aid his cause and the cause of the church more if he were to die in an exemplary fashion.

Knowing that there was a strong possibility that he would be killed, Becket chose the place for his confrontation with the knights. As William of Canterbury says, Becket died before the icon of the Virgin Mary and surrounded by the memories and relics of saints. 268 Becket was familiar with the language of martyrdom and sacrifice. In his final moments as he commended 269 his soul and cause to God, the

267 MB 1 p 132.

268 MB 1 pp 132-33: 'prae se beatae Mariae virginis iconiam, circumquaque memorias et reliquias sanctorum'.

269 For the different versions of Becket's commendation see William of Canterbury (MB 1 p 133); Grim (MB 2 p 437); Herbert (MB 3 pp 498-9); Anonymous I (MB 4 p 77).
Virgin Mary, St Denis and St Alphege, Becket may well have seen himself as a 'holy sacrifice', a puerulus Christi, a martyr in the mould of St Alphege or St Denis. But such thoughts cannot be retrieved by the historian. What the historian can say is that Becket's behaviour up to and including 29 December 1170 does not indicate that he was seeking martyrdom or that he was preparing for his death. His period in exile may have hardened his attitudes, made him more prepared to face death if necessary, and in his final hour, given him the strength to face the knights with 'resignation and courage'.

Throughout the years of exile Becket's advisers, including John of Salisbury, had portrayed Becket as a Christ-like figure. This highly developed imagery probably explains why in 1171 Becket's apologists could so rapidly create the image of Becket the Christ-like martyr. During the Becket dispute Christ-like imagery was skilfully used as one of the tactics to win support for Becket. There is no convincing evidence that this propaganda had the effect of making Becket see martyrdom as inevitable or desirable. The balance of evidence suggests instead that Becket, like his advisers, could distinguish between the conventions of polemic and the practicalities of action.
CHAPTER II: CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this dissertation has been to examine John of Salisbury as a case-study of a schoolman who was actively involved in church politics. The intention has been not only to throw light on John and his milieu, but also to reach conclusions and raise questions which could be tested against the careers of other twelfth-century schoolmen involved in church politics and administration.

The revisions and discoveries made about John and his milieu have been extensive and have implications for research into several aspects of twelfth-century history, including the schools of northern France and the Becket dispute. These findings have mainly been the result of the three-pronged approach which has been used: (1) emphasising John's activities as a church politician, rather than building up a complex structure of consistent views supposedly held by him; (2) analysing his activities and attitudes in the context of the main groups within which he operated; (3) giving special attention to the status of John's writings as sources.

In three instances - the Metalogicon, the Historia pontificalis and the Vita Sancti Anselmi - the analysis of John's writings as sources has generated major reassessments of his career and attitudes. It has been argued here that one of the main aims of the Metalogicon was to justify specialised studies to a critical monastic audience including Peter of Celle. Interpretations which present the work as essentially a plea for the study of literature rather than logic, are misleading. The central figure of 'Cornificius' whom John derides throughout the Metalogicon represents neither an individual nor a grouping within the schools, but is simply a rhetorical device - a thoroughly disreputable opponent, a man of straw, whose attacks on specialist studies can be easily rebutted. There is therefore now a
need to revise the 'Cornifician' interpretation of trends in the mid-twelfth century schools of northern France.

The re-examination of the *Historia pontificalis* as a source in toto, scrutinising its authorship, date, value as an historical source and intention, was the first detailed analysis of the work. One of the main conclusions to emerge was that the *Historia* was not intended as a defence of the papacy but can be better understood as an apologia for Theobald archbishop of Canterbury.

The critical assessment of John's *Vita Sancti Anselmi* - the first time this source has been analysed in detail - shows that the work cannot be dismissed as a derivative work of no historical worth. It was in fact a skilful reworking of Eadmer's *Vita* and *Miracula* and can be used to uncover information about the political outlook at Canterbury in 1163. It reveals that John, like the members of Becket's household, viewed the earliest clashes between Henry II and Becket in terms of church liberty versus tyranny.

The assessment of John's dealings with Becket and his activities during the 1160s as an agent and adviser to the archbishop, have occupied a major part of the thesis. The main conclusions which emerge are: John did not regard Becket as one of his amici; but because he was strongly committed to the supremacy of sacerdotium over regnum and because of his commitment to the interests of Canterbury, he shared the Becket circle's perceptions of the growing tensions in 1163 in terms of church liberty versus tyranny. However during the early phase of the dispute (1164-1166) he regarded the break between Becket and Henry II as essentially a personal one which might be ended by political compromise. From the evidence of how John used the 'language of persecution' in 1164-66, it is argued that at first John was not committed to Becket's policy but that in 1166 he found himself obliged by circumstances to do so.
The detailed surveys of John's activities as an adviser and agent of Becket, show that John concentrated on winning and maintaining the support of English churchmen, rather than lobbying the papal curia. While there was considerable strain between John and Becket's advisers, John was keen to volunteer advice. That he operated closely with Becket's household is evident from the letters which John wrote to Alexander III on behalf of Becket's clerks and from the information and copies of documents he received from them.\(^1\)

The examination of the methods used by John when lobbying English churchmen is the only study of lobbying and propaganda techniques used in the Becket dispute. John's main types of technique were: (1) appeals to the obligations imposed by amicitia; (2) disseminating information, at times by sending copies of key documents; (3) collecting information; (4) presenting the Becket dispute as involving fundamental issues, as a struggle between good and evil rather than as a personal conflict between king and archbishop which might be settled by negotiation and compromise. This was one of the major techniques adopted by Becket's supporters and it took two main forms: the use of the 'language of persecution' which presented Becket as a Christlike figure being attacked by the forces of evil; and the identification of Becket's struggle against Henry with Alexander III's struggle against successive anti-popes and the Emperor Frederick I.

John of Salisbury emerges from this study as a skilled political operator. One gets the feeling that he enjoyed the plotting and manoeuvring of ecclesiastical politics. Shortly after going into exile in Rheims he was active in chapter politics there, advising the

---

\(^1\) For information about curia which John obtained from the Becket circle see chap 8 pp 433-6 above; and for copies of letters see chap 9 pp 455-60 above.
treasurer of Rheims to resist the Archbishop Henry's plans for the appointment of a sub-treasurer. It looks as if John himself took the initiative in participating in lobbying the papal curia and cardinal legates in late 1167. During the Becket dispute some of the aspects of his political skills which were evident were his ability to express very incisive criticism without appearing aggressive; his ability to view a political situation from the outside; his emphasis on tactics rather than simply restating principles; his readiness to indulge in dissimulation. He enjoyed and admired the art of politics. In a letter to Becket in early 1168, John countered Becket's disenchantment with pope Alexander III, asserting that in the circumstances the pope had done well for the church and shown outstanding skill (ars) in his struggle against powerful opponents.

But what of the wider issue - the effect which the schools had on politics and administration in the twelfth century? There are several main conclusions which could be tested against the careers of other schoolmen. Firstly, throughout his career John deliberately built up personal alliances, or ties of amicitia. The earliest occasion on which we see him using such contacts to exercise 'indirect influence' was in 1147 when he used a chain of contacts through Peter of Celle, Nicholas of Clairvaux and Bernard of Clairvaux, to obtain

---

2 LL ep 208.
3 See chap 8 p 417 above.
4 LL epp 229, 213 discussed pp 403-4 above.
5 See chap 8 pp 406-7 above.
6 See chap 8 p 409 above.
7 See chap 8 p 407-8 above.
8 LL ep 278; see p 426 above. For John's definition of ars as an efficient plan or design ratio, see Met 1:11 p 28/9-17.
employment in the household of archbishop Theobald. During the Becket dispute he energetically exploited such contacts for political purposes. The question to be tested against the careers of other schoolmen is whether schoolmen who had no strong family resources but whose training opened up the prospect of career advancement, tended to rely very much on building up ties of amicitia.

One of the most remarkable and unexpected conclusions to emerge from the thesis was that John was not 'papalist' - that is, he was not strongly committed to advancing papal authority over lay rulers or bishops. It has been shown that John had no significant circle of contacts at the papal curia, that during the 1150s he - like archbishop Theobald - was uneasy about the detrimental effect which the appeals system was having on Canterbury's interests, and that his writings do not make radical claims for papal authority. It has been shown instead that John was profoundly loyal to his own ecclesia, Canterbury, where he spent most of his working career. That John's loyalties were centred on the local ecclesia rather than on the papacy is significant. For if this was so of a churchman who had a relatively high degree of contact with the curia, then how tenuous must the papacy's hold have been on the loyalties of other churchmen - even in an age when an increasing number of people - both lay and ecclesiastical - were turning to the papacy for judicial remedies.

John's lack of 'papalism' in spite of a trenchant 'sacerdotalism' - an insistence on the supremacy of sacerdotium over regnum - suggests that the schools of the mid-twelfth century were in no sense factories producing agents and supporters for the papacy. They may however have been shaping the 'sacerdotalism' and the interest in social ethics which characterise John's writings.

9 See chap 2:3 pp 113-22 above.
The effect of the schools on twelfth-century society is territory which still awaits exploration. Research might proceed by a number of routes: (1) study of the teachings of twelfth-century schoolmen and linking these with the stated attitudes and the actual activities of the schoolmen in politics and administration; (2) quantitative studies of the presence of schoolmen in ecclesiastical, loyal and baronial employ; (3) case-studies of individuals. This case study is intended as one part of that wider exploration.
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