

JOHN OF SALISBURY AND HIS CORRESPONDENTS:
A STUDY OF THE EPISTOLARY RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN
JOHN OF SALISBURY AND HIS CORRESPONDENTS

YOKO HIRATA

VOL I

A thesis submitted to the Department of History
in the University of Sheffield for the degree of
Doctor in Philosophy

July 1991

DECLARATIONS

This thesis was written under the supervision of Professor D.E. Luscombe, MA, PhD., Litt.D (Cambridge), FBA. FSA, Professor of Medieval History, University of Sheffield during the years 1986 to 1991. It is entirely my own work and has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other university.

Yoko Hirata

July 1991

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I should like to thank Takachiho University for granting me one year's leave to begin work on this thesis. I should also like to thank the Nippon Shigaku Kyokai for a one year research grant and Sheffield University for a Crewe Exhibition.

While preparing this thesis I have been immensely helped and encouraged by my supervisor Professor D.E. Luscombe. During this time I must have often tried his patience as I have needed far more than academic advice. Professor Luscombe has helped me in such varied fields as English language, daily life and immigration formalities. I am also very grateful to Mrs. Luscombe who always helped me and my daughter feel relaxed in an unfamiliar environment.

In the course of my research I have been helped and stimulated by Professor E.J. King, Mr. R.I. Moore and Dr. K. Keats-Rohan. I am also grateful to Dr. G. Daniels who helped make my written English more natural. While working in Japan I have been indebted to Professor Y. Noguchi and Professor T. Torigoe for their advice and encouragement. I should also like to thank the staff of the University of Sheffield Library, the British Library and the Library of Sophia University. I am particularly grateful to Miss Lois Burt and Miss Denise Harrison of Sheffield University Library who were kind enough to send photocopies of important documents to me in Japan. Living in a country in which it is difficult to obtain medieval western materials I would have been unable to complete my dissertation without their kind help.

I am also grateful to Mrs. P. Holland, secretary of the Department of History in Sheffield University who had the task of communicating with a student who was distant from England for very long periods. I should like to thank Mrs. Julie Fletcher and Mrs. Hazel Hunt who typed my thesis.

Finally, I owe very much to my husband and daughter who have tolerated the inconveniences of a home without a wife and mother, or with one who was preoccupied with academic work.

John of Salisbury and his Correspondents:
A study of the Epistolary Relationships between
John of Salisbury and his Correspondents

Yoko Hirata

SUMMARY

This dissertation deals with the relationships between John of Salisbury and his correspondents as observed through his letters. As a rule, the letters discussed are those written in John's own name, not those which were written on behalf of others. Most such letters fall into the period between 1164-1170 while he was an exile serving Becket. John's correspondents are divided into sixteen groups according to location and activities. The groupings have been made according to biographical order so that the correspondents whom John encountered in the early part of his life are treated earlier and those whom he encountered later are examined later in the thesis. The dissertation attempts to establish and evaluate the relationships between John and these groups and also between John and each individual correspondent. It aims to show what John meant to his correspondents and what they meant to him, how John adjusted himself to his correspondents, what effects he expected to produce through his letters and how successful he was in this.

On account of the period to which most of this correspondence belongs, the dissertation is also much concerned with the Becket dispute and with John's role in it. However, while emphasis is placed on those years, attempts have also been made to trace John's relationships

with his correspondents as far back and as far forward as possible. Consequently special attention is paid to chronology in order to depict in full the evolution of the relationships between John and particular groups or individuals over a long period of time whenever possible.

The dissertation aims to shed clearer light not only on the activities of John of Salisbury but also on the numerous persons with whom he corresponded.

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
Summary	iv
ABBREVIATIONS	xv-xix
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. CHAPTER ONE: JOHN'S CORRESPONDENTS WHOM HE CAME TO KNOW BEFORE 1147	8
I. Introduction	8
II. Salisbury	9
1. Introduction - John of Salisbury and Salisbury	9
2. Jocelin de Bohun, bishop of Salisbury	11
a. Jocelin de Bohun, bishop of Salisbury	11
b. Reginald, archdeacon in the diocese of Salisbury	16
c. Richard de Bohun, bishop of Coutances	18
d. John's letters	19
3. Henry de Beaumont, bishop of Bayeux	23
a. Henry de Beaumont, bishop of Bayeux	23
b. Humphrey Bos, Master	26
c. John's letters	26
4. Conclusions	31
III. Paris i	33
1. Introduction - John of Salisbury in Paris (1136-1147)	33
2. Richard l'Eveque	39
3. Conclusions	43

IV.	Champagne i	46
1.	Introduction - John of Salisbury and Champagne	46
2.	Isolated figures	47
a.	a member of the chapter of Sens	47
b.	the treasurer of Rheims	48
3.	Peter of Celle	49
a.	Biography	50
b.	Peter and John	52
i.	1140s-62	52
ii.	1162-70	66
iii.	1171-76	69
iv.	1176-80	73
c.	Conclusions	76
4.	Peter of Celle's friends	78
a.	the abbot of Saint-Amand	79
b.	Guy, bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne	80
c.	Engelbert, prior of Val-Saint-Pierre	81
	Simon, prior of Mont-Dieu	
	the abbot of Saint-Medard	
d.	Henry, count of Champagne	89
5.	Conclusions	94
V.	Exeter	95
1.	Introduction - John of Salisbury and Exeter	95
2.	Principal Correspondents	96
a.	Bartholomew of Exeter	96
b.	Baldwin of Totnes	99
c.	John's brother, Richard, Magister Peccator	100
d.	Robert, son of Egidia	102

3.	John's correspondence	103
	a. - 1161	103
	b. i. 1164-65	106
	ii. 1166	111
	iii. 1167-70	123
	4. Conclusions	136
VI.	Conclusions to Chapter One	142
3.	CHAPTER TWO: JOHN'S CORRESPONDENTS WHOM HE CAME TO KNOW WHILE SERVING ARCHBISHOP THEOBALD	
	THEOBALD	144
I.	Introduction - John of Salisbury in the service of Archbishop Theobald (1138-1161)	144
II.	Flanders	148
	1. Introduction - Philip of Flanders during the Becket conflict	148
	2. Milo, bishop of Thérouanne	150
III.	Papal Curia i	155
	1. Introduction - John of Salisbury and the Papal Curia (1147-61)	155
	2. John's correspondence (1154-61)	159
	a. John's letters in the name of Archbishop Theobald	160
	b. John's own letters to Adrian IV	167
	3. Conclusions	173
IV.	Archbishop Theobald's clerks	177
	1. Introduction - John of Salisbury and Archbishop Theobald's clerks	177
	2. John's correspondents	178
	a. (i) Ralph of Sarre	178
	(ii) Master William (?)	183
	(iii) Ralph of Lisieux	184
	b. (i) John's appeal letters of 1168	190

(ii)	Peter the Scribe	198
(iii)	William of Northolt	201
(iv)	Ralph of Wingham	203
(v)	Master John of Tilbury	204
c.	Hugh de Gant	206
3.	Conclusions	209
V.	Christ Church, Canterbury	211
1.	Introduction - John of Salisbury and Christ Church Canterbury	211
2.	John's correspondents	213
a.	The Community of Christ Church	213
b.	Prior Wibert	214
c.	Prior Odo	214
d.	William Brito	217
e.	Richard of Dover	218
f.	Robert de Broc, vice- archdeacon of Canterbury	220
g.	Other correspondents in the area	221
3.	John's correspondence	222
a.	Before the election of Prior Odo	223
(i)	While Wibert was in office	223
(ii)	The death of Wibert and the beginning of problems	226
(iii)	Towards the election of the new prior	228
b.	After the election of the new prior	235
(i)	The claim of the bishop of London for metropolitan status	235
(ii)	After the conference of Monmartre	238
(iii)	The coronation of the young king	240

c.	John's campaigning tactics to Christ Church	241
d.	John and the monks of Christ Church after the murder of Becket	249
(i)	Prior Odo of Christ Church	249
(ii)	John of Salisbury	251
(iii)	Richard of Dover	253
4.	Conclusions	254
VI.	English Clergy and Religious	258
1.	Introduction - John and English Church	258
2.	Recipients of lost letters	259
a.	Propaganda War in 1166	259
b.	Gilbert Foliot	267
c.	Robert of Melun	273
3.	The Worcester area	283
a.	Roger of Worcester	284
b.	Religious in the Worcester area	291
4.	The Winchester area	294
a.	Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester	295
b.	John's Correspondence with Winchester	299
c.	Merton Priory	306
5.	Walter of Rochester	311
6.	Hilary of Chichester	314
7.	The Norwich area	320
a.	Correspondents	321
(i)	William de Turba, bishop of Norwich	321

(ii)	Other correspondents in Norwich	323
(iii)	Hugh, abbot of Bury St. Edmunds	324
(iv)	Master Geoffrey	325
b.	Correspondence	326
(i)	While John was in Archbishop Theobald's service	326
(ii)	1166	330
(iii)	1168	337
c.	Conclusions	342
8.	Conclusions	346
a.	Bishops	346
b.	Clerks	349
c.	Religious	349
VII.	Poitiers	352
1.	Introduction - John of Salisbury and Poitiers	352
2.	John's correspondents	353
a.	Poitevin Masters	353
(i)	Master Raymond	354
(ii)	Master Laurence	356
(iii)	Master John the Saracen	357
b.	John of Canterbury	358
3.	John's correspondence i	362
a.	John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury under Archbishop Theobald	362
b.	Becket, John of Canterbury and John of Salisbury in 1164-5	364
4.	John's correspondence ii	373
a.	1166	381
b.	1167	383

c.	1168-9	383
d.	1170-1	404
5.	Conclusions	405
VIII.	Royal Servants	409
1.	Introduction - John of Salisbury & King's court	409
2.	Royal servants	416
a.	Nicholas Decanus	416
b.	Nicholas de Sigillo	417
c.	Master Ralph de Beaumont	419
d.	Master Walter de Insula	420
e.	Richard of Ilchester	424
3.	Conclusions	437
IX.	Conclusions to Chapter Two	440
4.	CHAPTER THREE: JOHN'S CORRESPONDENTS WHOM HE CAME TO KNOW IN THE SERVICE OF THOMAS BECKET	443
I.	Introduction - John of Salisbury in the service of Becket	443
II.	Archbishop Thomas's clerks	444
1.	John of Salisbury and Becket's household	444
2.	John's correspondents	452
a.	Master Ernulf	452
b.	Baldwin of Boulogne	455
c.	Lombardus of Piacenza	459
d.	Silvester of Lisieux	463
e.	Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques	467
3.	Conclusions	473
III.	Paris ii	475
1.	John of Salisbury and Paris 1163-65	475
2.	John's Correspondents	480

a.	Master Odo	480
b.	Ralph Niger	482
c.	Gerard Pucelle	485
(i)	Gerard Pucelle and John of Salisbury	485
(ii)	1166-67	489
(iii)	1168-70	499
(iv)	Conclusions	504
3.	Conclusions	508
IV.	Papal Curia ii	510
1.	John of Salisbury and the Papal Curia (1164-75)	510
2.	During the Becket dispute (1164-70)	511
a.	1164-65	513
b.	1166-67	516
c.	1168-70	531
3.	1171-75	533
a.	Letters for Richard of Dover	533
b.	Letters for Richard of Ilchester	535
4.	Conclusions	538
V.	Champagne ii	541
1.	Introduction - William aux Blanchesmaines	541
2.	John of Salisbury and William aux Blanchesmains	547
VI.	Thomas Becket	552
1.	Introduction	552
2.	Before 1162	554
3.	After Exile	560

a.	1163-65	560
b.	1166	566
c.	1167	577
d.	1168-70	582
e.	December 29 1170 and thereafter	591
4.	Conclusions	597
VII.	Conclusions to Chapter Three	608
5.	CONCLUSIONS	610
	APPENDIX	622
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	650

ABBREVIATIONS

- AL Arnulf of Lisieux
- Barlow, TB Barlow, F., Thomas Becket London
(1986)
- Bur Bur, M., La Formation du comté de
Champagne, Nancy (1977)
- Councils and Synods I, II Councils and Synods with other
documents relating to the English
church I: AD 871-1204 Part II:
1066-1204, ed Whitelock, D.
Brett, M. & Brooke, C.N.L.
Oxford (1981)
- Delisle Recueil des actes de Henri II...
concernant les provinces françaises
et les affaires de France 4 vol
Paris (1909)
- DNB Dictionary of National Biography,
ed. Stephen L. and Lee, S., 66 vols
London (1885-1901)
- Dunbabin Dunbabin, J., France in the Making
Oxford (1985)
- Entheticus Entheticus major et minor
ed. Laarhoven, J. van, Studien und
texte zur Geistesgeschichte des
Mittelalters 17, 3 vols, Leiden,
New York etc. (1987)

^R
EH

English Historical Review

Eyton

Eyton, R.W., Court household and
itinerary of King Henry II

London (1878)

Ferruolo

Ferruolo, S.C., The origins of the
University, Stanford (1985)

GC

Gallia Christiana, 16 vols, Paris
(1715-1865)

GF

Gilbert Foliot

G. Foliot

Morey, A., Brook, C.N.L., Gilbert
Foliot and his letters Cambridge
(1965)

GFL

The Letters and charters of Gilbert
Foliot..., ed. Morey, A.,
Brooke, C.N.L., Cambridge (1967)

Hallam

Hallam, E., Capetian France,
987-1328 London (1980)

Heads

The Heads of Religious Houses,
England and Wales, 940-1216, ed.
Knowles, D., Brooke, C.N.L. and
London, V.C.M., Cambridge (1972)

HP

Historia Pontificalis: John of
Salisbury's Memoir of the Papal
Court, ed. and trans. Chibnall, M.
NMT Edinburgh etc (1956)

- JEH Journal of Ecclesiastical History
- JC John of Canterbury
- JL Regesta pontificum Romanorum...ad
annum 1198 ed. Jaffé, P.
 Loewenfeld, S. et al. 2 vols,
 Leipzig (1885-8)
- JS Letters i The Letters of John of Salisbury
Volume 1: The Early Letters
 (1153-1161) ed. Miller, W.J.,
 Butler, H.E., and Brooke, C.N.L.,
 NMT (1959) (reissued in OMT, 1979)
- JS Letters ii The Letters of John of Salisbury
Volume 2: The Later Letters, ed.
 Millor, W.J. and Brooke, C.N.L.,
 OMT Oxford (1979)
- Kealey, Kealey, E.J., Roger of Salisbury
Viceroy of England, Berkeley, etc.
 (1972)
- Knowles, EC Knowles, D., The episcopal
colleagues of archbishop Thomas
Becket Cambridge (1951)
- Knowles, TB Knowles, D., Thomas Becket
 London (1970)

- Le Neve Le Neve, J., Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1066-1300, i, ii, iii, ed. Greenway, D.E., London (1968, 1971, 1977)
- Mats Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury... ed. Robertson, J.C. and Sheppard, J.B., vols. v-vii, (Letters cited by number)
- McLoughlin McLoughlin, J.P., John of Salisbury (c. 1120-1180): The Career and Attitudes of a Schoolman in Church Politics, Ph.D. thesis, Trinity college, Dublin (1988)
- Mediaeval Humanism Southern, R.W., Mediaeval Humanism and other studies Oxford (1970)
- Met John of Salisbury, Metalogicon ed. Webb, C.C.J., Oxford (1929)
- MGH Monumenta Germaniae Historica, ed. Pertz, G.H., et al Berlin, Hanover, Weimar (1826-)
- Morey, Bartholomew Morey, A., Bartholomew of Exeter, Bishop and Canonist, Cambridge (1937)

<u>MTB</u>	<u>Materials for the History of Thomas Becket</u> ed. Robertson, J.C. (and for volume 7 Sheppard, J.B.), 7 vols, RS (1875-85)
NMT	Nelson's Mediaeval Texts
OMT	Oxford Mediaeval Texts
PC	Peter of Celle
<u>PL</u>	<u>Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina</u> , 221 vols, ed. Migne, J.P. Paris (1844-64)
<u>Pol</u>	John of Salisbury, <u>Policraticus...</u> ed. Webb, C.C.J., 2 vols, Oxford (1909)
<u>Renaissance and Renewal</u>	Benson, R.L. and Constable, G., ed., <u>Renaissance and renewal in the twelfth century</u> Oxford (1982)
TB	Thomas Becket
<u>The World of JS</u>	Wilks, M., ed. <u>The World of John of Salisbury</u> , Oxford (1984)
<u>ZSSRG Kan Abt</u>	<u>Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte</u> , Kanonistische Abteilung

1. INTRODUCTION

The importance of John of Salisbury lies mainly in the historical value of his writings. He left two letter collections which are believed to have been originally compiled by himself;¹ the Metalogicon, a defence of 'logic';² the Policraticus, which includes important discussions of government, kingship and society;³ the Entheticus, an account in verse of the schools, the royal court and his contemporaries;⁴ the Historia Pontificalis, an account of the Papal Curia between the years 1148 and 1153;⁵ The Vita Sancti Anselmi⁶ and the Vita Sancti Thomae.⁷ They are varied in purpose and genre and provide rich materials as historical sources.

John's career also serves particularly well as an example of an emerging class of clerks serving lay or ecclesiastical magnates and he left valuable accounts of his life and thoughts and of the people he had encountered. In the 1130s and 40s, he was a pupil of famous masters in Paris such as Abelard and Gilbert de la Porrée. He was a member of the friendship circle of spiritual leaders in

1. JS Letters i and ii.

2. Met.

3. Pol.

4. Entheticus.

5. HP.

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

7. Vita Sancti Thomae, MTB, ii, pp 301-22.

Champagne which included Peter of Celle and Bernard of Clairvaux, and which was an influence on counts Theobald and Henry of Champagne. In the late 1140s and 1150s, he was a clerk of Archbishop Theobald and a friend of Pope Adrian IV. He was a supporter and propagandist for Becket during the Becket dispute. At each stage of his life, he associated with important people of his time. He was influenced by the thoughts of some and assisted by the friendship and patronage of others. He in turn gave service and advice. The interactions between John and the people around him is made more interesting, because John's writings offer many chances for us to observe them.

With a view to enquiring how John associated with people, attention will be focused on his letter collections. Medieval letter collections have been our major source of information on twelfth century diplomacy, business, administration and personal relationships⁸ and important letter-collections such as those of Bernard of Clairvaux, Gilbert Foliot and Peter the Venerable have recently been edited.⁹

John's letter collections have already been much used as sources from which to extract examples of his views

8. On medieval letters, see Constable, G., Letters and letter-collections, Brepol, 1976.

9. Sancti Bernardi Opera Omnia, ed. Leclercq, J., Talbot, C.H., Rochais, H.M., vols 7 & 8, Rome (1955-77). The Letters and Charters of Gilbert Foliot..., ed. Brooke, Z.N., Morey, A., Brooke, C.N.L., Cambridge (1967). The letters of Peter the Venerable, ed. Constable, G., 2 vols, Cambridge, Mass., (1967).

on particular subjects.¹⁰ However, until the publication of Professor Brooke's edition of John's letter collections in which the letters are carefully arranged chronologically, use of the letters as historical sources was limited and studies of the letters themselves were much more difficult to write.¹¹ Even with Professor Brooke's edition of John's letters, reading the letters through one by one, it is difficult to understand the meaning and background of all of the letters -- why they were written and with what aim. Recently, studies have been made to clarify the nature of John's letter collections. It has been noted that some of the recipients of John's letters fall into friendship groups and that some letters were sent to the same destinations.¹² Attempts have also been made by Dr. McLoughlin to analyse John's activities in relation to groups of people particularly with a view to finding his epistolary tactics during the Becket conflict.

This dissertation was started in 1986 before Dr. McLoughlin's thesis became available. I obtained a copy of

10. Some works that fall into this category are Miczka, G., Das Bild der Kirche bei Johannes von Salisbury, Bonn, 1970. Liebeschütz, H., Mediaeval humanism in the life and writings of John of Salisbury, London, (1950) Smalley, B., The Becket conflict and the schools: A study of intellectuals in politics, Oxford, 1973) pp 87-108. Reuter, T., 'John of Salisbury and the Germans', The World JS, pp 415-25.
11. One of the studies of John's letters made before Prof. Brooke's edition is that by Hohenleutner, H., Studien zur Briefsammlung und zur Kirchenpolitik des Johannes von Salisbury, Inaugural Dissertation, München, (1953).
12. Guth, K., Johannes von Salisbury (1115/20-1180). Studien zur Kirchen-Kultur und Sozialgeschichte West Europas im 12 Jahrhundert, Sankt Ottilien, (1978) pp 257-268.

it in 1989 when the framework of my own study had already been made. There are certain areas where our studies overlap and where both Dr. McLoughlin and myself make similar use of John's correspondence. The major difference between our theses is that, as his title indicates, Dr. McLoughlin has used John's letters in the course of defining John's activities as a schoolman engaged in Church politics by means of careful philological study. Although Dr. McLoughlin also grouped John's letters, he chiefly used those which were sent to Exeter, Christ Church and the Papal Curia. On the other hand, my thesis concentrates on all John's letters and its aim is to bring to light the relationships between John and all his correspondents.

I had been little concerned with the genre of letters, nor with John's style or vocabulary. At times certain key words and expressions are examined to help to characterize particular types of correspondents and particular occasions of correspondence, but no attempt has been made to analyze John's terminology systematically. I have not attempted to write a work of a philological or literary criticism but rather to study the changing course of personal relationships through reading and classifying the letters with the aid of my own judgement and sometimes conjectures.

I have attempted to group all the letters and recipients systematically and thoroughly. However, the letters John wrote in the names of other people are generally excluded from the present study except in a few unusual instances. The groupings are made according to locations and the activities of the recipients. In establishing a grouping, I have paid special attention to

where John first made contact with his correspondents. For instance, Henry de Beaumont, bishop of Bayeux is included in the section on Salisbury, where he first met John of Salisbury. Except for a few unidentified correspondents, every one is included in some section so that small figures hitherto neglected may also find their significance as members of particular groups of correspondents.

While previous studies of John's letters have been made essentially to find out about John of Salisbury, attempts are made here to discuss mutual relationships, thereby trying to obtain a clearer picture of the personalities not only of John of Salisbury but also of his friends. More specifically, we hope to clarify in this study three things. First, I shall try to show what John of Salisbury meant to particular individuals or groups of people and what they meant to John; and what effects he expected to produce through his letters and how successful he was in this. Secondly, I wish to explain how John adjusted himself to the rank and position of his correspondents and what differences there were in the contents of his letters according to where they went. Thirdly, I shall enquire how John of Salisbury's relationships with his correspondents changed as time went by and in what matters John was and was not consistent.

Since this study aims at tracing the evolution of the relationships between John of Salisbury and his correspondents, an emphasis is put on chronology. The dating of John's letter-collections in the editions of Professor Brooke partly follows the order of letters in the manuscripts and is accepted as a basis of this study, but a few suggestions are made from time to time for closer

dating. John's relationships with his correspondents are traced as far back as possible. However, except for a few cases where sources are available, they cannot be traced further forward than the termination of John's Later Letters. Naturally, John's relationships with his correspondents can best be studied for the period during which efforts were made to preserve and compile letters -- between 1152 and about 1179,¹³ and especially between 1164 and 1170, while John was an exile in the cause of Becket. Since the study of John's letters in this period is impossible without knowledge of the Becket dispute, this study owes as much to recent scholarship on Becket as to the editions of John of Salisbury's works and to the secondary literature on him.¹⁴

I hope to shed clearer light on John of Salisbury's activities and his correspondents so that the crowds of people who lived in his bustling, contentious world may be brought to life. I hope also to show his ninety-two correspondents, who lived as far apart as Rome, Poitiers, Cologne, Canterbury and Exeter, interacted with each other with John at the centre. In the course of this interaction, as I shall try to show, some correspondents, torn between conflicting loyalties, strove to reconcile duty and

13. The first letter of JS Letters i, is dated 1152 (JS Letters i, p.302.) and the last letter, 1177-9. (JS Letters ii, p.802.)

14. Among the most important recent studies on Becket are; Barlow, TB, which gives precise accounts of the chronology of the Becket dispute and Duggan, Thomas Becket, which dated Becket's correspondence. In this study, I have followed Dr. Duggan's dating for Becket's letters.

obedience with conscience and honour on the one hand and love of kinship on the other. Others were compelled to abandon one or the other and still others pursued desire for wealth and worldly comfort without doubt or hesitation. At the heart of this study is a kaleidoscope of medieval lives as they were woven in the schools of Paris, in the archiepiscopal household of Canterbury, in the Papal Curia and among the exiles of France.

Finally, I would like to bring it to the readers' attention that I am writing this thesis in a second language. I would like to apologise for any difficulty in understanding caused by this fact.

2. CHAPTER ONE - John's correspondents whom he came to know before 1147.

I Introduction

In this chapter, we shall deal with John's correspondents in four areas -- Salisbury, Paris, Champagne and Exeter. Since John was born in Salisbury, his correspondents probably knew him when he was very young. If they did not know him, they must have known his family who stayed in Salisbury until about 1155. Since John spent much of his twelve years of studies in Paris, his correspondents in the city knew him as a student. Champagne was the place where he possibly spent a short period at the end of his student days. He had a life-long friend Peter of Celle in Champagne and through him, he came to know other people. Exeter was the city in which John's family lived probably from 1155. He had good friends there -- Bartholomew of Exeter whom he may possibly have known in Paris and Baldwin of Totnes, whom he probably met in Ferentino in about 1150 or 51. Although actual correspondence took place mainly during the period of John's exile between 1163 and 70, John's correspondents who are treated in this chapter are, with a few exceptions, his longstanding friends. Therefore, to some degree, this chapter will consider how relationships made a long time before were affected by the great political conflict surrounding Becket. However, it will not neglect the features that remained unchanged throughout the years. It will further discuss what features were different and what were common to the four areas.

II Salisbury

I. Introduction -- John of Salisbury and Salisbury

Salisbury was a place of importance for John of Salisbury for a number of reasons. First of all, Old Sarum was the place where John was born and raised. Neither the precise year of his birth nor his origins are known, but the year of his birth is estimated to be 1115--1120, his origins, perhaps not too humble. It is almost certain that he spent his younger days there before he went to Paris. He had his family in Salisbury, who remained there at least until 1155.¹ He had friends in Salisbury whom he grew up with -- one of them we know to be Henry de Beaumont.²

Salisbury was a wealthy diocese comprising Wiltshire, Berkshire and Dorset.³ While John was young, Roger, bishop of Salisbury was so powerful that he was called 'viceroy of England'.⁴ Roger was also interested in education. He recruited good scholars from France,⁵ but we do not know whether John experienced direct contact with them.⁶ John left just one account of his younger days at Old Sarum. As a young boy he was sent to a priest to learn The Psalter, but he was subjected to an experience of

1. JS Letters i, p xiii.

2. JS Letters ii, nos. 137, 138 & 191.

3. Kealey, pp 86, 96.

4. Concerning Roger of Salisbury's power under Henry I, see Kealey, pp 26-79.

5. Kealey, pp 91-4.

6. A school master named Alwinus was in Salisbury in 1122. In 1113, a group of nine canons visited from Laon and about ten years later, some monks visited from Savigny. See Kealey, pp 91-2.

necromancy, which he considered sacrilegious. The teacher, according to John, later repented and went into a monastery.⁷ Although this is not a favourable account of the education in Salisbury, but his initial education there provided him with enough learning to cope with studies in Paris. It is quite possible that Bishop Roger was John's patron.⁸ It was also in the wealthy and prosperous Salisbury under Bishop Roger that John began to form an idea of his style of life in the network of patronage.⁹

Things changed much in the twelve years which John spent in France. Bishop Roger was arrested by the new king Stephen and died a few years after John left England. The diocese of Salisbury was now administered by Jocelin de Bohun and no longer belonged to the man 'second only to the king'. After his studies in Paris, John did not go back to Salisbury, but joined the household of Archbishop Theobald.¹⁰ While John's importance in Theobald household increased, his relationship with Salisbury continued. He came to know the new bishop and he also kept friends of his younger days.

-
7. Kealey, pp 92-3. Webb, C.C.J. John of Salisbury, London, (1932) pp 2-3. Pol, ii-28.
 8. Kealey, p 93.
 9. Brooke, C.N.L., The Twelfth Century Renaissance, London, (1969), pp.53-8.
 10. For John in Theobald's household, see the sections 3-I and 3-I-1. (The sections will be indicated according to the numbers in the table of contents.)

2. Jocelin de Bohun, bishop of Salisbury

a. Jocelin de Bohun, bishop of Salisbury

Jocelin was related to the Earl of Gloucester¹¹ and his brother Richard became bishop of Coutance.¹² Jocelin was a protégé of Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester and occurs as archdeacon of Winchester between 1139 and 1142.¹³ He became bishop of Salisbury in 1142, after both the first candidate of Henry of Blois, Henry of Sully, and King Stephen's candidate Philippe de Harcourt were turned down.¹⁴ His activities as bishop of Salisbury seem to be relatively obscure except in relation to the Becket dispute.

Bishop Jocelin probably did not know John of Salisbury before he left for Paris, but he certainly knew him as secretary of Archbishop Theobald. John's old tie with the see and his family who remained in Salisbury until at least 1155¹⁵ may have helped establish good relationship between Bishop Jocelin and John. John was certainly a canon of Salisbury by 1163.¹⁶ He felt much obliged to the bishop and he later called himself a 'debtor' to Bishop Jocelin.¹⁷

-
11. Concerning Jocelin's origin and genealogy, much has been presented in Knowles, EC, pp 17-20, 158-9.
 12. Knowles, EC, pp 18-9.
 13. JS Letters ii, no. 216, n 1. GFL, p 538. Le Neve, ii p 92.
 14. Knowles, EC, p 20. Bourrienne, V., Un Grand Bâtitseur, Philippe de Harcourt, Evêque de Bayeux (1142-1163), Paris, (1956) p 6.
 15. JS Letters i, pp xii-xiii. See the section 2-V-1 and 2-V-2.
 16. JS Letters i, p xiii, n 1. JS Letters ii, no. 152
 17. JS Letters ii, no. 278.

Jocelin de Bohun appears in a number of John's letters written in the name of Archbishop Theobald.¹⁸ John probably wrote at least one letter to Bishop Jocelin, attacking the behaviour of the Knights Hospitallers and advising him not to permit their malice against the bearer of the letter.¹⁹ The circumstances of the letter are not known but John probably acted on the petition of the bearer of the letter who was the bishop's clerk and priest.

After John started serving Thomas Becket, his relationship with Bishop Jocelin was much affected by the relationship between the bishop and Becket. Bishop Jocelin was at first among the bishops who were more sympathetic to the archbishop, but after his exile, the bishop of Salisbury became one of the worst enemies of the archbishop.²⁰ In 1165, Jocelin gave the deanery of Salisbury, upon request of the king, to John of Oxford, who swore an oath of fidelity to the anti-pope at the Council of Würzburg. His election was also carried out in the absence of some of the canons who were exiles.²¹

From then on, while the relationship between Jocelin of Salisbury and Thomas Becket became worse, John had two parties to think about. He had to think and act for the benefit of Becket's policy. He was also concerned about

18. JS Letters i, nos. 16, 83, 84, 102.

19. JS Letters 1, no. 91.

20. See above, note 14.

21. Knowles, EC, pp 111-4. JS Letters ii, p xxx.

happiness and welfare of the bishop of Salisbury. Since the archbishop's attitude towards the bishop of Salisbury constituted an important aspect of the conflict, he also informed of it to his other English friends for the purpose of campaigning. After Becket suspended Jocelin from his episcopal and priestly office at Vézelay²² and the English bishops in turn made an appeal to Rome, John's repeated advice to Becket was to summon some of his suffragans including the bishop of Salisbury, who complained that he had been suspended unjustly.²³ In July 1166, John wrote to Bartholomew of Exeter reporting the arrival of two clerks of Salisbury to the archbishop.²⁴ One was from the bishop and the other, from the dean of Salisbury. John recounted how the archbishop treated the messenger from the dean. Since John was concerned about the bishop and wished to know the archbishop's intention towards him, he sent his own messenger to Becket to make more inquiries.²⁵ On the part of Becket, he probably sent, along with other letters, the letters from Salisbury for John's inspection and asked his opinion of them.²⁶ John was sympathetic to Bishop Jocelin and wrote to Becket about 'the intrusion of the dean and the intrigues of the bishops who by their counsel induced the bishop and the cathedral to break the

22. Mats nos. 199 & 200. Barlow, TB, p 149.

23. JS Letters ii, nos. 173 & 175.

24. JS Letters ii, no. 171.

25. JS Letters ii, no. 171.

26. JS Letters ii, no. 176.

papal mandate...²⁷ John felt at the same time that Becket's conduct was right therefore the Pope confirmed his sentence. In spite of John's feelings and wishes, the relationship between the archbishop and Bishop Jocelin did not improve. Becket placed the diocese of Salisbury under an interdict in October or November 1166, because of Jocelin's failure to secure the release of the archbishop's chaplain, William of Salisbury.²⁸ It was probably after the announcement of this sentence that Master Gilbert, possibly Gilbert Glanville²⁹ came to plead with the archbishop.³⁰

Almost a year after, in the aftermath of the conference of Gisors and Trie, John appeared less sympathetic to Bishop Jocelin. The bishop was at the meeting of the king and the legates at Argentan. John reported to Baldwin of Totnes that the bishops of Salisbury, London, Chichester and Worcester laid the burden on Exeter's shoulders on the matter of absolving the excommunicate.³¹ It was probably shortly afterwards that Master Gilbert came to Becket as a messenger from the bishop of Salisbury. He was probably also a carrier of letters from the bishop and his relatives to John of Salisbury requesting him to intercede with the

27. JS Letters ii, no. 176.

28. Barlow, TB, p 149. Mats no. 235.

29. JS Letters ii, nos. 216 & n 3.

30. JS Letters ii, nos. 216 & 218. See below 2-II-2-d.

31. JS Letters ii, no. 241.

archbishop to relax the sentence on the bishop.³² About the same time, the bishop of Salisbury also worked on the Papal Curia possibly through Reginald of Salisbury who was a member of the royal mission.³³ In spring 1168, as a result of successful diplomacy of Reginald fitzJocelin, the Pope requested the archbishop to relax the sentence of Salisbury and designated the terms.³⁴ While Reginald was still in Rome, John interceded once again with the archbishop on behalf of Jocelin of Salisbury, but in vain.³⁵ In the years 1169 and 1170, Bishop Jocelin merely appeared in news in John's letters. He was excommunicated in April 1169 at Clairvaux together with Gilbert Foliot.³⁶ Then once absolved, he was under the ban again in October 1169 just before Thomas' return to England.³⁷ After the archbishop returned to England, John reported the excommunication of the bishops of London and Salisbury.³⁸ The bishop of Salisbury was with the king in Normandy when the king uttered words that led the four knights to commit the murder of the archbishop.³⁹

32. JS Letters ii, nos. 216-8 & p 316, n 3.

33. JS Letters ii, no. 272.

34. JS Letters ii, no. 272. See below, 2-II-2-b

35. JS Letters ii, no. 278.

36. Mats nos. 488, 489, 490, 495 & 497. Barlow, TB, p 184.

37. Barlow, TB, p 216.

38. JS Letters ii, no. 304.

39. Barlow, TB, p 234.

b. Reginald, archdeacon in the diocese of Salisbury

Reginald, known as the Lombard, archdeacon in the diocese of Salisbury, was Jocelin de Bohun's son. He is said to have been born in Italy while his father was studying at Bologna, just before he was ordained priest, but different opinions were expressed by his contemporaries with regard to legitimacy of his birth.⁴⁰ He was at one time in the service of Archbishop Thomas and was included in the group of eruditi listed by Herbert of Bosham.⁴¹ He was in Paris by 1164, where he may have had some English friends in Paris including John of Salisbury.⁴² When Becket went into exile, Reginald went to Corbeil to meet the royal mission which was sent to the Pope at Sens.⁴³ He may have decided to part with Thomas on this occasion. He does not appear in the list of Becket's clerks who were present at Gisors and Trie in 1167.⁴⁴ In fact he was among the royal mission to the Pope at the end of 1167, on which occasion, he obtained a papal letter requesting Archbishop Thomas to relax the sentence on his father, the bishop of Salisbury.⁴⁵ While Reginald was in Rome, John interceded with Becket for the bishop of Salisbury referring to the fact that Reginald had obtained a papal

40. Knowles, EC, p 19.

41. Barlow, TB, p 131. MTB iii, pp 524-5.

42. See the section 4-III-1.

43. Barlow, TB, p 121. Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence, La vie de Saint Thomas le Martyr, Lund, (1922), 11 2292-2311.

44. Barlow, TB, p 131. JS Letters ii, no. 231.

45. Barlow, TB, p 178.

letter to relax Becket's sentence on Jocelin.⁴⁶

After the conference of Montmirail on 6-7 January 1169, Reginald was sent to the Curia again.⁴⁷ While he was at the Curia, both Becket's and the king's parties were spreading rumours regarding the achievement of Reginald. In February or March, John reported that the king's envoys to the Curia including Reginald of Salisbury did not achieve their goal.⁴⁸ In June or July, Reginald is reported to have claimed that he had obtained everything that the king had asked for.⁴⁹ In late August 1169, John denied the rumours -- that the papal envoys would undo all the efforts and achievements of the archbishop by papal authority.⁵⁰

About this time, Reginald's importance as a royal servant increased. In about August, he attended the council of Norman bishops and abbots as one of the most active royal clerks.⁵¹ He was one of the royal clerks who were entrusted to negotiate with the papal envoys Gratian and Vivian after Henry II's departure from the scene.⁵² He was sent to the Curia again in 1169 - 70.⁵³

46. JS Letters ii, no. 278.

47. Barlow, TB, p 182.

48. JS Letters ii, no. 298.

49. Barlow, TB, p. 187.

50. JS Letters ii, no. 289.

51. Barlow, TB, p 189.

52. Barlow, TB, p 190.

53. JS Letters ii, no. 298. Barlow TB, p 201.

After the murder of Thomas Becket, he was among the royal mission sent first to Sens and then to Rome.⁵⁴ For his active service to the king during the conflict, he was promoted bishop of Bath in 1173/4 and remained in office until 1191, when he was elected archbishop of Canterbury. He died as archbishop-elect in 1191.⁵⁵

c. Richard de Bohun, bishop of Coutances

Among the three relatives of the bishop of Salisbury, Richard de Bohun was probably the least known to John. Richard was a brother of Jocelin, the bishop of Salisbury and had been dean of Bayeux from before 1133.⁵⁶ He was chancellor to Geoffrey of Anjou as duke of Normandy.⁵⁷ After Geoffrey's death,⁵⁸ Richard continued to be chancellor to his son Henry until December 1151, when he was promoted bishop of Coutances, because Henry did not want him to continue to act as chancellor.⁵⁹ Bishop Richard died

54. Barlow, TB, pp 252-3, 255-6.

55. Barlow, TB, pp 78, 107, 189-92. JS Letters ii, no. 216, n 1. GFL, p 530. Robinson, J. A., Somerset Historical Essays, London, (1921), pp 106ff.

56. JS Letters ii, no. 216, n 1.

57. JS Letters ii, no. 216, n 1.

58. On Geoffrey's death and Henry's succession, see Hallam, E., Capetian France 987-1328, London, (1980), p 123.

59. JS Letters ii, no. 216, n 1. Robert of Torigny, p 163. Antiquus Cartularius Ecclesiae Baiocensis, ed. Bourrienne V., vol. 1, pp 230-1, vol. ii, pp 12, 125, 129, 218-9.

in 1179/80.⁶⁰ During the Becket conflict, some Norman Churchmen such as archbishop Rotrou of Rouen, bishops Arnulf of Lisieux and Henry of Bayeux were often found in the entourage of Henry II, but Richard of Courtances, along with Achard of Avranches, was among those who did not appear to be actively serving the king in his politics.⁶¹ However, he may have written to the Pope on behalf of his brother Jocelin possibly after the archbishop had pronounced a sentence of interdict on the diocese of Salisbury.⁶² At Coutances, instead, we find John of Salisbury's old Parisian master Richard l'Evêque as archdeacon, who, together with the abbot of Mont-Saint-Michel, quietly pursued learning particularly the learning of Aristotle.⁶³

d. John's letters

John wrote one letter each to the three members of the Bohun family.⁶⁴ The three letters were written in early 1167 in reply to their request to intercede with the arch-

60. JS Letters ii, no. 216, n 1.

61. Concerning Achard's attitude to the Becket conflict, see Foreville, R. 'L'Eglise anglo-normande au temps du Bienheureux Achard de Saint-Victor, évêque d'Avranches (1161-1171)' Thomas Becket dans la tradition historique et hagiographique, Variorum reprints, London, (1981), item 1.

62. The Pope is reported to have replied to him by early 1167. JS Letters ii, nos. 217-8.

63. For Richard l'Evêque, see the sections 2-III-1, 2-III-2.

64. JS Letters ii, nos. 216-8.

bishop on behalf of the bishop of Salisbury.⁶⁵ Whether John received their letters all at one time or not is not clear. John's replies were sent to Coutances perhaps accompanied by no. 201 to Richard l'Eve[^]que, the archdeacon of Coutances. At least John entrusted the bishop of Coutances to see to it that his letter to the archdeacon or Salisbury would reach its destination.⁶⁶ Master Gilbert, Jocelin of Salisbury's envoy to Becket appears to have reached him before John received their letters.⁶⁷ John was present with Thomas when Master Gilbert came and solicited with Thomas on the bishop's behalf. According to his letter, John took trouble to speak to Thomas about the matter again after he received a letter from Reginald.⁶⁸

In these letters John expressed his sympathy towards the suffering of the bishop. Emphasizing his attempt at mediation and expressing his hope for Becket's reconciliation, he stated that since the bishop of Salisbury had set an example of disobedience, it is necessary for him to show repentance and withdraw from his appeal, publicly confess his fault, and obey the archbishop in future. John also referred to the papal letter to the bishop of Coutances on the matter and to papal mandates to the archbishop.

65. Brooke has dated the letters c. March 1167 (JS Letters ii, pp xxxiii, nos. 216-18.) Barlow has pointed out the possibility of dating them a little earlier. (Barlow, TB, p 307).

66. JS Letters ii, no. 216.

67. JS Letters ii, p xxxiii.

68. JS Letters ii, no. 218.

Among the three letters, the one to the bishop of Coutances is the most succinct and impersonal.⁶⁹ The letter to Reginald is more personal and familiar in tone.⁷⁰ It contains a clearer expression of sympathy and a more detailed account of John's own attempt on behalf of the bishop of Salisbury and of Thomas's viewpoint. John also gave advice with regard to the bishop's behaviour from the moral point of view, stressing the virtue of obedience. The letter to Jocelin of Salisbury reveals more than others John's discomfort and embarrassment to have to bring unwelcome news to someone to whom he felt indebted.⁷¹ In spite of his affection and obligation to Bishop Jocelin, John basically accepted Becket's justice. John stated Becket's standpoint and the support he received from the Curia and in France. He explained in detail how Becket felt about the bishops' appeal and Jocelin's own and emphasized that the bishop had to withdraw from the appeal to be forgiven by the archbishop. John regretted that there was not much he could do to relax the archbishop's sentence on Salisbury, but sincerely expressed his devotion and willingness to help the bishop whenever possible.⁷² Since each letter compensates the deficiency of the other, conveying together both the necessary message and John's personal feelings, the three letters would best be read together.

69. JS Letters ii, no. 216.

70. JS Letters ii, no. 217.

71. JS Letters ii, no. 218.

72. JS Letters ii, no. 218.

Jocelin was the first English churchman on whom Becket's ecclesiastical sanction was inflicted. Since Jocelin had no personal enmity against the archbishop, and what he did about the deanery was done out of necessity, he probably felt no reason to be singled out and punished so severely. As part of his efforts to try to have the archbishop's sentences relaxed, he appealed to Rome and sent envoys to Becket. It was natural for Jocelin of Salisbury to ask John to speak for him to the archbishop. For John was his former protégé and friend, whose family lived in Salisbury under him, who had friends there, and who was friendly to his son, Reginald. Whatever the relation between Jocelin of Salisbury and Thomas Becket may be, John's feelings towards the bishop was one of affection and obligation. More than with other English bishops, John had a personal relationship with the bishop of Salisbury. John's attempt to help the bishop of Salisbury did not end with these three letters. We find him writing to the archbishop asking him to have mercy on the bishop when Reginald was at Rome.⁷³

Unfortunately John's efforts did not bear fruit. From mid-1168, John's personal friendship with Salisbury was overwhelmed by the Becket dispute. In John's letters, the bishop and his son continued to appear, but only in news, and with little personal feelings. Perhaps their relationship cooled, because of John's failure to intercede with Thomas on the bishop's behalf.

73. JS Letters ii, no. 278.

In 1173-4, when the English Church had trouble in the election of six vacant sees, John wrote five letters in various names to the Curia on behalf of the bishop-elect of Winchester and one for the elect of Hereford.⁷⁴ While Reginald fitzJocelin succeeded in gaining the support of Gilbert Foliot and Arnulf of Lisieux, he does not seem to have got John of Salisbury to write to the Curia.

3. Henry de Beaumont, bishop of Bayeux

a. Henry de Beaumont, bishop of Bayeux

Henry de Beaumont may have been related to the famous Beaumont family, but it is not clear in what way. Henry's later promotion suggests a good family relationship as well as political situation pertaining to Salisbury. After the death of Roger of Salisbury, the office of bishop went to Jocelin de Bohun as a result of power struggle involving the Beaumont twins and members of the house of Blois.⁷⁵ Jocelin's rival Philippe de Harcourt was given the diocese of Bayeux sometime after 1142 by Geoffrey of Anjou.⁷⁶

We do not know how Henry de Beaumont was involved in the network of the Beaumont relationships with regard to Salisbury, but Henry must have been brought up in Salisbury

74. JS Letters ii, nos. 316-21. For Richard of Ilchester, see the section 3-III-2-e.

75. On the arrest of Roger of Salisbury and the role of the Beaumont twins, see Cronne, H.A., The Reign of Stephen 1135-54, Anarchy in England, London, (1970), p.50.

76. Crouch, D., The Beaumont Twins, Cambridge, 1986, pp 47-8, 54. William of Malmesbury's Historia Novella, ed. Potter, K.R., NMT, London, etc. (1955), p 39. Walker, D., 'Crown and Episcopacy under the Normans and Angevins', Anglo-Norman Studies, vol 5, (1983), pp 220-33.

and came to know John of Salisbury before he left for Paris in 1136.⁷⁷ He succeeded Robert, dean of Salisbury in 1155, when Robert was promoted to the bishopric of Exeter.⁷⁸ It is not clear on whose instigation or through whose agency the deanery was given to Henry.⁷⁹ Henry was elected bishop of Bayeux by late summer 1165, and he remained in office until 1205.⁸⁰

Whenever the election took place is not clear. As ducal control over episcopal elections was strong in Normandy, Henry de Beaumont was probably appointed bishop by Henry II out of consideration of intricate family relationships.⁸¹ Perhaps the king's visit to Normandy in April 1165 may have constituted a decisive factor in Henry's

77. JS Letters ii, nos. 137-8.

78. GFL, pp 530, 533.

79. Henry's successor John of Oxford was appointed to the office in 1165 by request of the king. (Barlow, TB, p 139.)

80. GFL, p 530. Robert of Torigny, p 225. JS Letters ii, pp xxv & nos. 137 & 152. The year of Henry's election has been discussed by Prof. Brooke. (JS Letters ii, p xxv, n 1). He has concluded that it was either 1164 or 1165, but for reasons discussed below, 1165 appears to be more likely.

81. Torigny entered the succession to the sees of Rouen and Bayeux at the same time. (Robert of Torigny, p 225). Routrou, who was transferred from Evreux to the archbishopric of Rouen was the son of Henry, early of Warwick, grandson of Roger de Beaumont, cousin of Waleran of Meulan. Henry de Beaumont, dean of Salisbury was promoted to Bayeux, where his predecessor was a protégé and kinsman of Waleran of Meulan, Philippe de Harcourt. (Crouch, The Beaumont Twins, pp 79, 97, 239. Barlow, TB, p 105.)

election.⁸² The king probably expected Henry of Bayeux and Rotrou of Rouen, both of the house of Beaumont, to work in cooperation and in active service to the king just as the cousins of the Beaumont family, Philippe, bishop of Bayeux and Rotrou, then bishop of Evreux had done in their mission to Pope Alexander in 1162.⁸³ Henry of Bayeux acted as expected. Together with the archbishop of Rouen and bishop of Lisieux, he was the king's most trusted bishop in Normandy.⁸⁴ After the murder of Becket, he was the king's candidate for the archbishopric of Canterbury.⁸⁵

82. On this visit, the king met Louis VII on about 11 April and received Philip of Flanders and the embassy from Germany before he went back to England on about 15 May. (Eyton, pp 77-79). Robert of Torigny entered the succession to the sees of Rouen and Bayeux right after these references. (Robert of Torigny, p 225).

83. Crouch, The Beaumont Twins, p 97. Barlow, TB, p 69.

84. Henry de Beaumont was a member of the committee consisting of the archbishops of York and Rouen, and the bishops of London, Hereford and Worcester which was set up by the king in order to examine the obnoxious 'customs'. (Cheney, M. Roger of Worcester, 1164-1179, Oxford, (1980) p 28. MTB, v. p 287) Henry of Bayeux seems to have been in the entourage of the king after the conference of Gisors and Trie on 18 November 1167 and attended the meeting at Argentan. (JS Letters ii, no. 236). Around July 1168, Henry of Bayeux appears to have been in the service of the king as he and the archbishop of Rouen and the bishop of Le Mans were counted among the three bishops of Normandy whose decision concerning the peace the king was said to be prepared to stand by. (JS Letters ii, no. 280). In August-September 1169, when the papal envoys Gratian and Vivian were in Normandy, Henry of Bayeux, together with the bishops of Lisieux, Seez, Redon, Worcester and royal officials, was entrusted with the negotiations with them after the king had departed. (Barlow, TB, p 190). In 1170, the bishop of Bayeux seems to have attended the coronation of young Henry. (Barlow, TB, p 171.)

85. Foreville, R., L'Eglise et la Royauté en Angleterre sous Henri II Plantagenêt (1154-1189), Lille, (1943), p 375.

b. Humphrey Bos, Master

John wrote three letters to Henry de Beaumont⁸⁶, and two of them were accompanied by the letters to Master Humphrey Bos. Humphrey Bos seems to have held various titles in the church of Bayeux and appeared alternatively as archchaplain and chancellor of Bayeux until 1169.⁸⁷ Therefore it was before Henry de Beaumont became bishop that Humphrey held some kind of office at Bayeux. How John came to know Humphrey Bos cannot be known. It does not appear that John had much contact with the see of Bayeux while he was in the service of Archbishop Theobald.

c. John's letters

John's letters nos. 137 and 138 to Henry, bishop-elect of Bayeux were probably written in 1165 within a short interval of time.⁸⁸ No. 137 was written after Henry was elected bishop of Bayeux but before he left England, which must be after September 1165.⁸⁹ It was probably delivered by John's own messenger who came back to France before late summer 1165. In a letter to Becket, John referred to the letter and news from Salisbury which was sent from the

86. JS Letters ii, nos. 137-8, 191.

87. JS Letters ii, no. 139 & pp 20-1, n 1. Antiquus Cartularius Ecclesiae Baiocensis, ed. Bourienne, V., vol 1, nos. 64, 102, 106, 117, 139, etc.

88. Brooke has dated this letter 1164-5, but summer-autumn, 1165 seems to be a more precise date, if Henry de Beaumont's election was made under the circumstances discussed above under the section of Henry de Beaumont. Also see below n 89.

89. Henry appeared as elect of Bayeux in September 1165 at Woodstock. (Eyton, p 84).

bishop of Bayeux.⁹⁰ No. 138 was probably written after Henry de Beaumont had crossed to Normandy and was sent there with no. 139 to Master Humphrey Bos by John's own messenger.

Both nos. 137 and 138 were written essentially to congratulate Henry for his promotion and to ask him for help in making peace with the king. In both letters, John reminded the bishop of their younger days, mourned the loss of Henry for Salisbury. John gave thoughts to his successor, perhaps not without hope for his own promotion. No. 137 is the shorter of the two, asking the bishop to intercede with the king for himself and his brother before the bishop's departure which was expected shortly. Perhaps John wanted to catch Henry while he still had an easy access to the king in England. John's messenger probably conveyed orally his wish to know about his revenues in Salisbury. Henry de Beaumont wrote a reply on this matter.⁹¹

No. 138 is a little longer and more elaborate. John asked Henry to advise him on making honourable peace with the king and to ask the Empress to arrange for his peace. The Empress was active in trying to mediate between the king and the archbishop in 1165 until about summer 1166.⁹² From about the time of his exile, Thomas started approaching the Empress through Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques of Rouen, who served as a go-between for Thomas and the Empress.⁹³ While

90. JS Letters ii, no. 152.

91. JS Letters ii, no. 152.

92. The Empress was described in John's letters to Thomas as the most eager and reliable mediator. (JS Letters ii, nos. 144, 157, 173, 176, 179.)

93. JS Letters ii, no. 157.

John was involved in Thomas's contact with the Empress through Nicholas,⁹⁴ he asked his personal friend Henry de Beaumont to solicit the Empress to mediate between him and the king.

The letter to Humphrey Bos⁹⁵ which probably accompanied no. 138 was written in order to ask advice of Humphrey about John's peace. He also hoped that Humphrey would explain the bishop subtle matters such as his situation and his condition of peace. John asked him to reply by the messenger whom he had sent to the bishop of Bayeux. He described his situation more in detail than in his letter to the bishop. He recounted an abortive attempt for his peace made earlier in the year and its conditions, which were objected by the Pope.⁹⁶ John himself felt it dishonourable to deny his master and renounce obedience even though he had left his household. He reported that he had consulted with the archbishop of Rouen, probably Rotrou, whose support he gained.⁹⁷ John's letter to Humphrey was full of details of his problems and altogether more candid in tone.

John wrote to Henry de Beaumont and Master Humphrey Bos probably in late 1166.⁹⁸ After the expedition to Brittany, the king spent much of his time around Rouen between late

94. JS Letters ii, no. 157.

95. JS Letters ii, no. 139.

96. John visited the Pope before January 1165 (JS Letters ii, no. 144). He may have had a chance to see the Pope who was on his way back to Rome when he stayed in Paris around 12-20, April, 1165. (Barlow, TB, pp 136-8).

97. JS Letters ii, no. 139, n 4.

98. JS Letters ii, nos. 190-1.

October and late December and John wrote a number of letters which were probably sent to Normandy.⁹⁹ Apparently, upon the king's return to Normandy from Brittany, John attempted to communicate with those who were now in direct touch with the king and his court. John still referred to Henry's promotion and praised his qualities as bishop, but he no longer wrote about the deanery of Salisbury, which had already been given to John of Oxford. Obliquely criticising the king's church policy John took examples from Scripture and referred to priests who behaved upright with the rulers who held the priesthood in contempt.¹⁰⁰ John expressed his wish that Henry would put his efforts towards helping the Church, but he did not press the point much further, nor expounded the cause of Becket. Since Henry of Bayeux was much favoured and trusted by the king, John probably thought it unwise to do so. Instead, he asked the bishop's advice on making peace with the king, hoping vaguely that the bishop might volunteer to intercede with the king for his peace.

With this letter went John's letter no. 190 to Humphrey Bos. Describing his recent state of affairs, both financial and mental, he asked for Humphrey's advice on how to reconcile with the king. John consoled himself that persecution would bring him salvation and that he was suffering for righteousness, but he nevertheless wished to

99. Eyton, pp 99-103. JS Letters ii, nos. 188-91. See also the sections 3-VIII-2-d and 4-II-2-e.

100. The same theme appears in John's letters written in summer to autumn in 1166. (JS Letters ii, nos. 174, 175, 181, 184, 187). The argument was put forward most forcefully in his letters to England.

be reconciled with the king without loss of good name. John asked Humphrey for the bishop's advice hoping that Humphrey might promote his case to the bishop. He asked Humphrey to reply 'so far as it is safe'. With the discovery of Thomas's messenger and punishment of Walter de Insula, perhaps communication between John and the bishop became more difficult.¹⁰¹ It does not appear that correspondence between John and Henry continued after this date.

Henry de Beaumont was friendly enough to answer John's letters at the initial stage of the Becket conflict. The bishop probably sent information. We do not know whether the bishop worked for John's peace, but at least until late 1166, John hoped that he would. It was mainly the reminiscence of their early friendship that bound the two men together. Besides, John felt freer to express his own feeling and desire for peace with the king to a Norman bishop Henry of Bayeux.

Perhaps the correspondence between John and the bishop of Bayeux was bound to continue only 'so far as it is safe'. John could not possibly sway the bishop for the support of Thomas and their friendship did not turn into political cooperation in which friendship in opposite party worked for the benefit of both parties concerned. For one thing, as the king's nominee to the see of Bayeux, Henry de Beaumont was too close to the king. He was one of the king's most

101. JS Letters ii, no. 180. Mats nos. 253-4. See the section 3-VIII-2-d.

trusted servants in Normandy. The king's expectation on the bishop was not so much to control over local situation as was the case with the bishop of Poitiers. Henry worked mainly as agent of the king's policy and was sent on important missions. As such, he must be in accord with the king as well as firm supporter of his policy. Moreover, Henry de Beaumont had practically no connection with Becket. Unlike the bishop of Poitiers who was a friend of Becket, he had no reason to be particularly concerned about Becket, let alone be sympathetic to his cause. His mind was already set for faithful support of the king. Since John knew the situation of Henry of Bayeux, he made just one slight expression of his wish that Henry would stand for the cause of the Church among the supporters of the king. The bishop of Bayeux's friendship to John was not so strong as to survive through the danger of the king's disfavour which their continued correspondence might incur.

4. Conclusions

John and his Salisbury friends tried to take advantage of mutual friendship when they fell into difficulty. When John wished to obtain the king's peace he turned to Henry de Beaumont for help. Henry probably did what he could without incurring the wrath of the king. John's communication with Henry seems to have stopped in late 1166 probably because it became unsafe for the bishop to communicate with John. There was not much for a Norman bishop to gain from association with a clerk of the exiled archbishop of Canterbury. Much of the information John obtained and sent to England was of less value to those in Normandy, for it

was to reach there sooner or later unhindered by blockades. Since communication with John had little benefit and was potentially hazardous, it was probably discontinued.

As to Jocelin of Salisbury, it was the bishop who asked John to intercede with Becket so that he might relax his sentences. John repeatedly spoke to Becket on behalf of Jocelin. While his efforts met with no success, the hostility between Jocelin of Salisbury and Archbishop Thomas became even stronger. Bishop Jocelin and his son Reginald became active supporters and servants of the king and the son was very successful in his service. We do not know what John felt about Jocelin and Reginald of Salisbury in the aftermath of Becket's murder. Perhaps their friendship cooled off. The hostility between Bishop Jocelin and Archbishop Thomas was so strong that it probably quashed personal friendship and affection between John and the Bohun family. There seem to have been no efforts to re-build their former relationship.

III Paris i

I. Introduction -- John of Salisbury in Paris (1136-1147)

John left Salisbury in 1136 and spent twelve years in France studying various subjects.¹ During these years John acquired literary knowledge and learning which were to be useful for his later profession. They also provided the basis of his thought and action as well as of his literary works. The human relationships he cultivated during this period was to help him on many occasions. John met roughly three kinds of people; masters, fellow students and his own students. We find his correspondents in all three groups.

As to his fellow students in France, John mentioned the existence of some in the Metalogicon without referring to their names.² Gerard Pucelle, an Englishman, who started teaching law sometime before 1156, was John's fellow student of philosophy.³ Bartholomew of Exeter may also have been a student and master in Paris.⁴ Peter of Celle was in Paris about that time but he was back at Montier-la-Celle in 1140-45.⁵ Adam of St. Liz, later abbot of Evesham was possibly John's fellow student in France.⁶

1. Met ii - 10.

2. Met ii - 10.

3. Kuttner, S. and Rathbone, E., 'Anglo-Norman Canonists of the Twelfth Century', Traditio, vii (1149-51) p 297.

4. Morey, Bartholomew, p 4.

5. Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloître, trans. Martel, G. de, Sources Chretiennes, Paris, (1977) p 13.

6. JS Letters ii, no. 199.

John also took some students out of financial need, most of them, children of nobles.⁷ John named but one such student in the Metalogicon -- William of Soissons.⁸ We know from other sources that Peter of Blois and Ralph Niger were also John's students,⁹ and Engelbert of Val-Saint-Pierre and Peter of Celle may also have been one.¹⁰ Some of them are almost a generation younger than John. They may have been John's students during his brief stay in Paris in the initial phase of his exile in 1164.

The most important contacts John had in Paris were with his masters who made not only academic impact but also personal impression on him. John had varied feelings towards the different masters whom he described in the famous passage of the Metalogicon ii - 10. There were such masters as Peter Helias and Hardewin the German on whom John left almost no account. There were some masters who, John felt, left something to be desired. John made few favourable comments on Masters Alberic and Robert of Melun

7. Met ii - 10.

8. Met ii - 10.

9. For Peter of Blois, see Southern, R.W., 'Peter of Blois, a Twelfth Century Humanist?' Medieval Humanism, p 109: Barlow, TB, p 135: Mats nos. 622 & 675. For Ralph Niger, see JS Letters ii, nos. 181-2 & 277. Also Barlow, TB, p 135.

10. Englebert appears in John's letter no. 207 as 'alumpnum nostrum'. He is also the receiver of John's letters nos. 183 & 206. He is mentioned in nos. 208 & 304. Also see Barlow, TB, p 179. However, for reasons discussed under the section 2-IV-3, 2-IV-4, Englebert may not have been John's student. For Peter of Celle, see JS Letters i, p xxvii. HP, p xii.

under whom he studied dialectic after Abelard left Paris.¹¹ Among the masters of theology, John was least impressed by Simon de Poissy, who came last in his list of masters, following Gilbert de la Porrée and Robert Pullen.¹²

There are also some masters like Peter Abelard, William of Conches, Gilbert de la Porree, Master Thierry and Robert Pullen whom John held in great esteem and who were probably most influential in John's knowledge and learning and his thought. John left various comments and a long description of the teaching of Bernard of Chartres,¹³ who was already dead by the time John started his studies. Since the students who associated themselves with the solution of their masters were often grouped with their master's name,¹⁴ the name Bernard of Chartres may have represented the whole school of Bernard. John was much

11. Met, ii-10. In the Entheticus, lines 55-6 read, Iste loquax minimumque dicax redolet Melidunum, creditur Alberico doctior iste suo, (Entheticus, vol 1, pp 108-9). Laarhoven identifies 'Melidunum' with Robert of Melun, but he is of the opinion that these lines should not be immediately related to Robert of Melun. He considers that description on lines 49-66 resembles that of the teaching of 'Cornificius' in Met i-3. (Entheticus, vol ii, pp 263-4). On Robert, see 3-VI-2-c.

12. Met ii-10.

13. Met i-11, i-24, ii-17, iii-2, iii-4, iv-35, Pol vii-13.

14. Southern, R.W., Platonism, Scholastic Method and the School of Chartres, Reading, 1979, p. 29.

influenced by this group of scholars,¹⁵ including Master Thierry¹⁶ and William of Conches. Judging from John's description of Bernard of Chartre's teaching,¹⁷ it may be safely assumed that William of Conches, 'the most accomplished grammarian since Bernard of Chartres'¹⁸ had especially contributed to the development of John's ability in letters and broad literary learning. The famous comparison of the moderns with dwarfs perched on the shoulders of giants, which appeared as the words of Bernard of Chartres in the Metalogicon¹⁹ were used by William of Conches in his own work much the same way.²⁰

The masters of theology, Gilbert de la Porree and

15. Numerous studies have been made regarding whether part of John's education took place in Chartres. Scholars have not reached a decisive conclusion. To list a few such studies; Poole, R.L., 'The Masters of the Schools at Paris and Chartres in John of Salisbury's Time' Studies in Chronology and History, ed. Poole, A.L. Oxford (1934), pp 223-247: Southern, R.W., 'Humanism and the School of Chartres' Medieval Humanism, pp 61-85: Southern, R.W., 'The Schools of Paris and the Schools of Chartres' Renaissance and Renewal, pp 113-137: Dronke, P., 'New Approaches to the School of Chartres', Anuario de Estudios Medievales, vol 6, (1969) pp 117-140: Haring, N., 'Chartres and Paris Revisited' Essays in Honour of A. Ch. Pegis, Toronto, (1974) pp 268-329: Weijers, O., 'The Chronology of John of Salisbury's Studies in France' The World JS, pp 109-116: Keats-Roham, K.S.B., 'John of Salisbury and Education in Twelfth Century Paris from the Account of his Metalogicon' History of Universities, 6 (1985-6) pp 1-45.
16. Met i-5, ii-10, ii-17. See also Jeauneau, E., "Lectio Philosophorum" -- Recherches sur l'Ecole de Chartres, Amsterdam, (1973) pp 89-90.
17. Met i-24.
18. Met i-5.
19. Met iii-4.
20. Jeauneau, "Lectio Philosophorum", p 58.

Robert Pullen, also gave much help to John in the formation of his thought. Their brilliant careers were examples of the possibilities available to masters. Gilbert may have influenced John in moulding his criticism against the 'Cornificians'.²¹ John's statements of a negative theology,²² whose relation with pseudo-Denis's writings has been discussed by Jeauneau,²³ was probably also an influence of Gilbert de la Porrée. Gilbert was elected bishop of Poitier in 1142 and left teaching. John was to meet him in 1148 at the Council of Rheims, of which he left a precious account in the Historia Pontificalis.²⁴ Robert of Pullen, on the other hand, influenced John in the application of theology to church politics. Robert discussed the relationship between the Church and State and the two swords, which may have helped John in writing the Policraticus in 1159 and letters during the Becket dispute.²⁵ Robert was summoned to Rome in 1143 to be

21. Met i-4, i-5. According to McGarry, "the Quadrivium according to Cornificians", is 'service of the Church as monks or clerics, the medical profession, official position at court, and ordinary money-making business.' (McGarry, D.D., The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury, University of California, (1955) p 20 n 57.)

22. Met iv-40.

23. Jeauneau, E., 'Jean de Salisbury et la lecture des philosophes' The World JS, pp 77-108. On John of Salisbury and Denis, see Luscombe, D.E., 'Denis the pseudo-Areopagite' Tradition and Change, eds. Greenway, D., Holdsworth, C. and Sayers, J., Cambridge, (1985) pp 137-8. See also the section 3-VII-2-iii.

24. HP, p viii-xii.

25. Smalley, B., The Becket Conflict and the Schools, pp 42-3, 48 & 88. Liebeschütz, H., Medieval humanism in the life and writings of John of Salisbury, Nendeln, (1968), pp 23-30.

cardinal and shortly after, papal chancellor, and died in 1146.²⁶

There were masters to whom John felt friendly or like a colleague. Such were Richard l'Evêque and Adam du Petit Pont. Adam du Petit Pont was not John's correspondent, but he appears to have been much more in touch with John than other masters.

Adam of Balsham or of the Petit Pont, was another English master. His school opened probably in the early 1130s and was still open in the 1170s when Alexander Neckam is believed to have attended Adam's school to study the liberal arts.²⁷ Adam's ars disserendi was written in 1132.²⁸ John made a critical comment of it in the Metalogicon,²⁹ but he had a very high opinion of Adam as a Peripatetic and placed him with Abelard and Gilbert de la Porree as representing contemporary scholars.³⁰

John was not Adam's student, but he became intimate with him.³¹ He entrusted to Adam one of his own students, William of Soissons, after instructing him in the first

26. Met i-5, Poole, R.L., 'John of Salisbury at the Papal Court,' EHR 38, (1923), pp 321-30. Ferruolo, p 134.

27. Ferruolo, p 312.

28. Minio-Pluella, L., Twelfth Century Logic -- Adam Balsamiensis Parvipontani Ars Disserendi, Rome, (1956) p xxi.

29. Met iv-3. In the Entheticus line 49, John also referred to 'incola' of 'Modici Pontis', but Laarhoven considers that it meant a disciple of Adam. (Entheticus, ii, p 236.)

30. Met ii-10, iii-Prologue.

31. Met iii-3.

principles of logic.³² Through Adam, John gained information about other masters and had a glimpse of the academic world as a hard world of competition filled with envy.³³ John also gained knowledge of academic matters from Adam. He appears to have benefitted especially from Adam's explanations of the Categories.³⁴ One may wonder how much influence Adam had on John's writing of the Metalogicon, a good part of which is a commented resume of the Organon.³⁵

2. Richard l'Evêque

Master Richard l'Evêque was another teacher of John who may have some connection with his knowledge of Aristotle. He later became archdeacon of Coutances, then bishop of Avranches in 1170 and died in 1182/3.³⁶ Along with William of Conches, Richard was John's instructor in grammar.³⁷ They both used Bernard of Chartre's method of teaching, but they were overwhelmed by popular demands to give their whole instruction in a short time and they retired.³⁸ With Richard, John also reviewed what he had studied under other

32. Met ii-10, iii-3.

33. Met ii-10, iii-3.

34. Met iii-3, iv-3.

35. Jeauneau, E., 'Jean de Salisbury et la lecture des philosophes' in The World JS, p 103.

36. JS Letters ii, no. 201, n 1. He also appears in Recueil des actes de Henri II...concernant les provinces françaises et les affaires de France, ed. Delisle, L., Paris, (1916) vol 1, p 424. Richard as bishop of Avranches appears in Robert of Torigny pp 247, 304 and in note pp 359-60. GC, xi, pp 481-2.

37. Met i-24.

38. Met i-24.

masters.³⁹ John was impressed not only by Richard's broad learning but also by his good personality as he described him as 'a good man both in life and conversation',⁴⁰ who was 'honest rather than vain, virtuous rather than ostentatious'.⁴¹

From when he held his office is not clear, but at the time the Metalogicon was written, Richard was archdeacon of Coutances.⁴² He was possibly in communication with John⁴³ and he may have helped him in writing the Metalogicon. John is known to be one of the first scholars in France to use James of Venice's translation of Aristotle's Posterior Analytics,⁴⁴ which he discussed in the Metalogicon. He used two sets of translations and one of them was made by James of Venice. The fact that James had translated and commented on the Prior and Posterior Analytics, the Topics and Sophistici Elenchi was mentioned by the abbot of Mont-Saint-Michel, Robert of Torigny,⁴⁵

39. Met ii-10.

40. Met i-24.

41. Met ii-10.

42. Met i-24.

43. In JS Letters ii, no. 201, John writes, '..iam a multo tempore...itero...quatinus libros Aristotilis, quos habetis, michi faciatis exscribi...' 'Precor...iterata supplicatione...'

44. Minio-Paluello, L., Opuscula -- The Latin Aristotle, Amsterdam, 1927, p 215.

45. Minio-Paluello, Opuscula, pp 193-5,

who was himself in touch with Richard l'Evêque.⁴⁶ So, it may have been Richard who supplied a copy of James's translation to John.

During John's exile between 1164 and 70, there is one extant letter written to Richard,⁴⁷ who is the only master of John's to whom he is known to have written. The letter cannot be dated precisely, but was probably written in 1167.⁴⁸

It may possibly have been sent to Coutances together with John's letters to Bishop Richard of Coutances and his relatives in early 1167.⁴⁹ Since a messenger was going to Coutances on more substantial business, John probably thought that it was a good chance to send a letter to his friend. John described his situation and his current state of mind. Referring to his temporal prosperity which he thought was given because God thought him unworthy for greater suffering for His sake, he expressed his wish to reconcile with the king, should the right formula of peace be found. He asked Richard to write back and earnestly repeated his request (made over a long period of time) to have a copy made at his own expense of the books of Aristotle which Richard had and of the glosses on Mark. He also asked Richard to provide glosses on more difficult points in Aristotle's works as the translator is not well instructed in grammar.

46. Minio-Paluello, Opuscula, pp 215-217.

47. JS Letters ii, no. 201.

48. JS Letters ii, p 201, n 1. Minio-Paluello, Opuscula, p 216.

49. JS Letters ii, nos. 216-18. See the section 2-II-2-c.

This letter is almost unique in that it was addressed to a friendly scholar with little or no political interest. Referring to his feelings about his temporal prosperity, John comfortably related a similar sentiment expressed by Anselm of Laon. His feeling about his own prosperity is itself expressed differently in this letter.⁵⁰ John's attitude toward Richard was also different from that towards other scholars to whom he also made academic enquiries.⁵¹ He usually maintained a humble attitude, expressing his respect for the masters. In no. 201, John appeared as one of Richard's fellow scholars united in the pursuit of knowledge and learning.

Richard l'Evêque seems to have been favourably placed to pursue his studies. His bishop, Richard de Bohun, was not in the front-line of Henry II's politics, and the Becket conflict did not affect him much except in relation to his brother, the bishop of Salisbury. Richard l'Evêque was in touch with the abbot of Mont-Saint-Michel, Robert of Torigny,⁵² The bishop of Avranches, whom Richard was to succeed in 1170, was Achard, the former abbot of Saint-Victor.⁵³ He could not have been much help to John in making peace with the king, nor in gaining support for Becket by means of public relations in Coutances. John

50. For John's references to his own prosperity, see below, the section 3-IV-2-b.

51. JS Letters ii, nos. 194 & 271.

52. Minio-Paluello, Opuscula, pp 215-217, 292-4.

53. Foreville, R., '...Achard de Saint-Victor, évêque d'Avranches (1161-1171) item 1, Thomas Becket dans la tradition historique et hagiographique, Variorum reprints, London, (1981).

would not have expected it. Instead, John found in Richard a friend outside the tumult of political strife, with whom he could reflect on the meaning of life and share the common topics of scholars. Richard evidently remained a learned scholar with good personality. Robert of Torigny paid a special tribute to him in his announcement of Richard's death; '...vir magnae litterae tam secularis quam divinae, morum honestate virgo ab utero laudandus.'⁵⁴

3. Conclusions

The striking feature of John's relationship with his masters is that he kept up with the latest news of the academic world of Paris and that he remained in touch, directly or indirectly, with quite a few masters after he left France. One such master was Gilbert de la Porrée, whom John probably last met at the Council of Rheims in 1148. Though there is no evidence that John kept contact with the bishop from 1148 to his death in 1154.⁵⁵ He was certainly informed of what happened between the abbot of Clairvaux and the bishop of Poitiers.⁵⁶ John devoted considerable space to Gilbert of Poitiers in the Historia Pontificalis.⁵⁷

Apparently John held Gilbert in continued respect and kept himself informed of Gilbert's latest work. Finally, one may wonder if Bishop Gilbert played any part in Master

54. Robert of Torigny, p. 304.

55. On the life of Gilbert de la Porrée, Nielsen, L.O., Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century, Leiden, 1982, pp 25-40.

56. HP xiii.

57. HP xiii-iv.

Peter Helias becoming dean of Poitiers in 1152, two years before his death in 1154.⁵⁸

John also seems to have been familiar with news of William of Conches and Richard l'Evêque. As their names were almost coupled in the Metalogicon,⁵⁹ the two masters may have been close to each other. They were both victims of Cornifician attacks on the arts and retired from teaching.⁶⁰ William served Geoffrey of Anjou from between 1144 and 49 until 1154 and taught the future Henry II.⁶¹ Since probably both William and Richard and certainly Richard retired after John left Paris, there must have been someone, possibly Richard himself, who informed John of the news. As John mentioned the fact in 1167 that he had asked for copies of books 'before over a long period',⁶² John and Richard were probably in touch with each other continuously.

John was not ignorant of the changing academic scene of Paris. When he wrote the Metalogicon twelve years after he had left Paris, he knew that his master in dialectic, Robert of Melun had become proficient in theology and acquired

58. JS Letters ii, pp 94-5, n 1. Ferruolo, p 134. According to Lesne, however, Peter Helias became dean of Poitiers in 1147. (Lesne, E., Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France (tome v). Les écoles de la fin du viii^e siècle à la fin du xii^e, Lille (1940) pp 74-5.

59. Met i-24. ii-10.

60. Met i-24.

61. McGarry, the Metalogicon of John of Salisbury, p 21, n 65.

62. JS Letters ii, no. 201.

greater renown.⁶³ There are several possible sources of such information. John or his friends from Canterbury could have passed through Paris. John may have had contact with the Victorines whom he asked for assistance during his exile.⁶⁴ Adam of the Petit Pont may have been one since he had been a good friend of John and remained a master in Paris till the 1170s.

63. Met ii-10.

64. JS Letters ii, nos. 161,175.

IV Champagne i

1. Introduction -- John of Salisbury and Champagne

While John was a student in Paris, he probably met Peter of Celle who was also a student at that time. Their encounter is one of the most important events in John's life. John gained a life-long friend. John appears to have stayed at Provins with Peter of Celle for a short time after the end of his studies in Paris.¹ Peter played an important part in John's obtaining a testimonial from Bernard of Clairvaux to Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury,² whom John started to serve in 1147. John may also have been introduced by Peter to the count of Champagne, Theobald the Great, who was known as a patron of literary persons.³ During this time or shortly after when he started serving Archbishop Theobald, John may have made his own friends in the area. John's contact with Champagne continued and expanded while he was serving Archbishop Theobald, further involving his brother and other friends in Canterbury.⁴

After John was exiled he came to live in Rheims under the patronage of Peter of Celle, who was now abbot of Saint-Remi. During this time, John came to know Peter's other friends among clergy and religious in Champagne. Peter of Celle also appears to have been instrumental in Henry the Liberal's commission to John to answer some theological

1. JS Letters i, pp xvi-xvii.

2. McLoughlin, pp 113-122. See the section 2-IV-3-b(i) & notes 24 & 25 for further details.

3. For Theobald's patronage, JS Letters ii, no. 209.

4. For John's contact with Champagne while servant of Archbishop Theobald, see the sections 2-IV-3, 2-V-2, 2-VII-2, 2-VII-3.

questions.⁵ Peter of Celle stood at all times at the core of John's relationship with people in Champagne.

In this section, we shall consider John's friendship with Peter of Celle. We shall also discuss how Peter and his friends were involved in and reacted to the Becket conflict.

2. Isolated figures

Among John's correspondents in Champagne, there are two persons who cannot be identified precisely. Their relationship with John and Peter, and when John could have met them cannot be clearly known.

a. a member of the chapter of Sens

In autumn 1156, John wrote a letter of advice to a member of the chapter of Sens who was an old friend.⁶ It was written in reply to his friend's letter in which he reported a case involving himself and the precentor of Sens stating that the Pope had overruled his previous decision and ordered them to undergo the judgement of men whom they did not approve of. Expressing concern that his advice might not be adequate, being far away from the scene, he nevertheless gave a few pieces of practical advice regarding procedures of the case. John also wrote a letter to Pope Adrian IV⁷ in case his friend had to visit the Curia. John sent the letter to the member of the chapter of Sens so that this might serve as a testimonial. Whoever John's old

5. JS Letters ii, no. 209.

6. JS Letters i, no. 17.

7. JS Letters i, no. 18.

friend at Sens was cannot be known nor where John first met him. John may have met him during his student days or shortly after, perahps through Peter of Celle. The letter contains humorous and playful elements which often appeared in John's letters to his intimate friends at this time and the allusion to the onslaught of the Senones was used again in a later letter written in similar sentiment.⁸ The archbishop of Sens, whom John denounced in his letter to the Pope was not in good relationship with Peter of Celle around July-August 1157.⁹ He condemned the marriage of Peter's niece, whose case was represented at Rome by John's friends from Canterbury.¹⁰

b. The treasurer of Rheims

John's letter to the treasurer of Rheims cannot be dated precisely nor can the recipient be identified by name.¹¹ It was written after the death of Archbishop Samson, while Henry of France was archbishop of Rheims.¹² On account of pressing business and slight illness, John was compelled to put in writing to the treasurer what he preferred to convey orally. Apparently, the treasurer had

8. On John's use of the story of the sack of Rome by the Gauls, see JS Letters i, p 28, n 3. Of the campaign of the Gallic leader Brennus, see also Pol vi-17. Brennus and the Senones appear in JS Letters ii, no. 240 to Baldwin of Boulogne.

9. PC Letters i, no. 74.

10. PC Letters i, nos. 9 & 10.

11. JS Letters ii, no. 208, n 1.

12. JS Letters ii, no. 208, ns. 4 & 5.

made two mistakes and on that account his place had been taken by canon Laurence. John asked him whether he would want to be translated from being treasurer to sub-treasurer or prefer to choose some other course. He promised to support the treasurer as long as his action is not shameful, stressing that this is due to his memory of Samson. John had attended the Council of Rheims which was held during the time of Archbishop Samson, but we do not know how well he knew the archbishop, nor do we know when or how John came to know the treasurer. John knew that the name of Samson would make its mark.

Along with the member of the chapter of Sens, the treasurer of Rheims appears to be an isolated figure whose relationship with John's other friends in the area cannot be traced.

3. Peter of Celle

The role Peter of Celle played in John's life was almost as important as that of Thomas Becket. John's relationship with Peter lasted longer than with any one else. It lasted in fact until the death of John, when Peter succeeded John as bishop of Chartres. Their relationship is remarkable in the sense that it continued without break and that it is well documented by the preservation of their

correspondence.¹³ Peter of Celle stood at the core of John's relationship to the clergy and religious and the lay magnates of Champagne, because he originally introduced John to these circles.

a. Biography

Peter of Celle was born into a noble family in Champagne about 1118.¹⁴ He received his primary education at Montier-la-Celle¹⁵ and then entered the Cluniac priory of Saint-Martin-des-Champs in Paris.¹⁶ He probably met John of Salisbury and possibly Bartholomew of Exeter in Paris.¹⁷ On finishing his studies, he went back to Montier-la-Celle. Shortly after, between 1140 and 1145, when he was hardly thirty years old, he became abbot of

-
13. For edition of John's letters, see Introduction. Peter of Celle's letters are included in PL 202. In 1613, Jacques Sirmond edited 169 letters of Peter and divided them according to chronological order and recipients. This division was followed by Janvier but criticised by Dom Brial, who preferred to divide them into two groups - those written during his abbacy at Montier-la-Celle and the others written during his Rheims period. (In the present thesis, they are designated as PC Letters i, and PC Letters ii, respectively.) Migne accepted this division in the Patrologia, adding a few other letters addressed to, or related to him. Seven other letters were published by Leclercq in 1948. Therefore, there are 177 letters in the letter collection of Peter of Celle. (Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloître, ed. Martel, G. de, Paris, (1946) p 19. Leclercq, J. 'Nouvelles lettres de Pierre de Celle' in Studia Anselmiana, vol. 43, (1958) pp 160-179.)
14. Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloître, p 11. Benton, J. 'The Court of Champagne as a Literary Centre' in Speculum, vol 36, (1961), pp 551-591. Leclercq, J., La Spiritualité de Pierre de Celle (1115-1183), Paris, 1946, p 9.
15. Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloître, p 11.
16. Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloître, p 13.
- 17.. Brooke, C.N.L., The Twelfth Century Renaissance, p 66.

Saint-Pierre de Celle,¹⁸ which enjoyed a reputation as an intellectual centre .¹⁹ In 1162, he was called to become abbot of the monastery of Saint-Rémi of Rheims, where Henri de France, the brother of Louis VII, was also transferred to be archbishop.²⁰ When Thomas Becket and John of Salisbury were exiled in France in the course of the conflict with Henry II, Peter of Celle received and protected John of Salisbury and his brother Richard. Peter remained sympathetic to the cause of Becket throughout the conflict.

Peter of Celle became bishop of Chartres after the death of John of Salisbury in October 1180. He remained in office only for a short time and died in February 1182.²¹

Besides letters and sermons, Peter of Celle composed some treatises. They include, among others, De panibus, De conscientia and De disciplina claustrali.²²

The friendship between John of Salisbury and Peter of Celle lasted for nearly 40 years, and it went through changes as time passed. Since the correspondence of both parties survives, we can trace the vicissitudes of their relationship.

18. Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloître, p. 13.

19. Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloître, p. 13.

20. Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloître, p. 15.

21. Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloître, pp 16-8.

22. Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloître, pp 19-24.

Roughly speaking, they went through four phases.

1. 1140s--62

After Paris and the obscure period that followed, John of Salisbury started serving Archbishop Theobald, Peter of Celle became abbot of Montier-la-Celle in 1140--45.

2. 1162--70

Peter of Celle became abbot of Saint-Rémi in Rheims and John of Salisbury was exiled from 1164.

3. 1171--76

John of Salisbury was back in England. Peter of Celle continued to be abbot of Saint-Rémi.

4. 1176--80

John of Salisbury became bishop of Chartres and Peter of Celle succeeded John upon his death.

b. Peter and John

i. 1140s-1162

During this time, the communication between John and Peter was diverse and frequent.

One of Peter's most important circles of association from which John had also benefited was the court of Champagne. Since Peter himself was from a noble family of Champagne, he seems to have kept close relationships with the court for two generations, Count Theobald the Great and Henry the Liberal. Theobald is known for his interest in the religious and their institutions.²³ There appears to have been a group of religious around Count Theobald the

23. Williams, W. Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, Manchester, 1952 (first edition, 1935) pp 190-1.

Great with Bernard of Clairvaux at its centre,²⁴ and Peter of Celle was its member. Peter was directly or indirectly instrumental both in Count Theobald's and Archbishop Theobald's patronage of John of Salisbury.²⁵

Peter's friendship with Count Henry of Champagne and his religious entourage was also helpful to John. The only extant letter of Peter to the count is a short letter pertaining to payment of money,²⁶ but he was to dedicate one of his treatises De Disciplina Claustrali to the count.²⁷ Peter of Celle's letters also reflect the count's various transactions with the religious in the area²⁸ including Simon of Mont-Dieu and Engelbert of Val-Saint-Pierre who were to be John's correspondents.²⁹

As abbot of a renowned monastery of the area, Peter of Celle sometimes wrote to the Papal Curia on local law suits. John played a part in at least one of them. Peter's letter no. 4 deals with the lawsuit between the monastery of

24. Peter of Celle was one of Bernard of Clairvaux's correspondents. (S. Bernardi Opera, vol 8, Epistolae, eds. Leclercq, J. & Rochais, H., Rome, (1977), nos. 293 & 419.) Peter was in close association with Nicholas of Clairvaux, one time secretary of Bernard of Clairvaux. (PC Letters i, nos. 50, 52, 60-66.) Peter also became friendly with a much venerated Cistercian monk John, later bishop of Saint-Malo, who appeared as St. Bernard's and Nicholas of Clairvaux's correspondent. (PC Letters i, nos. 13-18, PL, 202, col 415, n 22.)

25. JS Letters ii, no. 209. Peter of Celle's friend, Bernard of Clairvaux wrote a testimonial for John to Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury. (S. Bernardi Opera, vol 8, Epistolae, no. 316.)

26. PC Letters i, no. 30.

27. Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloître, p 32.

28. PC Letters i, nos. 47 & 48.

29. For Simon and Englebert, see below 2-IV-4-c.

Augustinian canons and Peter of Celle concerning the cemetery of Chantemerle. John had once participated in obtaining the privilege of the priory of Saint-Serenus in Chantemerle and Peter entrusted the case to John again.³⁰

Peter sometimes got into conflict with local clergy and there is one occasion in which John and his friends in Canterbury helped him. It happened in connection with the marriage of Peter's niece, Heloise. Archbishop Hugh of Sens condemned the marriage of Heloise and Peter of Tournelle because of consanguinity and Peter took the matter to the Curia.³¹ He commissioned Canterbury clerks to act as his agents at the Curia. In his letter no. 74, which was written after July-August, 1157,³² in reply to John's letter no. 32, Peter reported that Master W. and Master R. proved the friendship which they had for John in the business of his niece Heloise. The two clerks stood at the Curia and opposed to a breaking of her marriage. Master W. may have been Master William who appeared in JS Letters, i, nos. 31 and 39 and Master R., Master Ralph of Sarre who appeared in no. 42 addressed to Master William(?).

As can be observed through the case of masters W. and R. staying at Celle, communication and epistolary exchanges were frequent between Celle and Canterbury particularly around the years 1156-7. We know that sometime in 1156,

30. PC Letters i, no. 4 & n 8 & no. 72. JS Letters i, p 255, n 1. Apparently the suit went on intermittently for some time, for we find Bulla pro monasterio S. Sereni Cantumerla written in 1165. (PL 200, cols. 331-2).

31. PC Letters i, nos. 8-11.

32. This letter was written in reply to JS Letters i, no. 32 which is dated July-August, 1157.

John's brother, presumably Richard,³³ visited Peter of Celle. In letter no. 19 written in autumn 1156, and again in no. 31 written on 18 April 1157, John thanked him for his generosity to his brother.

In John's letter no. 31 written in April 1157, John also apologized to Peter for not having visited him.³⁴ John mentioned that he had meant to entrust his defence to John, treasurer of York and Master William who were probably scheduled to pass through the area presumably on Archbishop Theobald's mission. Apparently, the treasurer and William failed to deliver John's message to Peter, who reproached John for not coming. Even though the two Canterbury clerks changed either their plans or their route, it was John's original understanding that they would stop at Celle.

Like Peter of Celle with visitors from England, John also helped visitors from Peter of Celle and his friends. We find John sending information to Thomas, provost of Celle concerning his relatives in England. John inquired after his 'auunculus P' and reported back to the provost on his safety and prosperity.³⁵ As for the person whom John and the treasurer of York had committed to the charge of the royal chancellor upon the provost's request, John reported his recent state.³⁶ Sometime later, John sent his regards to Thomas the provost in his letter to Peter of Celle.³⁷

33. JS Letters i, no. 19, n 1.

34. Content of the letter will be discussed below.

35. JS Letters i, no. 20.

36. JS Letters i, no. 20.

37. JS Letters i, no. 31.

Whether he was Thomas's 'auunculus' or not, we find Peter writing to one 'P. monacho Norwicensi' because 'T, vester, imo noster impetravit et rogavit'.³⁸

When John had visitors from Celle, he did his best to take care of them. One such occasion arose when Peter sent two monks to Canterbury to raise funds for the priory of St. Aigulf, a dependency of Celle, which was burned down by a fire.³⁹ Peter reported the event, referring to his decision to appeal to the English Church.⁴⁰ John wrote back to him with advice on the mission to Archbishop Theobald.⁴¹ Peter's letter to Archbishop Theobald, which commended two monks may possibly have been written on this occasion.⁴² John's letters nos. 32-5 testify how John promoted Peter's business in connection with his appeal for Provins and how he took care of the monks from Celle⁴³

38. PC Letters i, no. 76.

39. PC Letters i, no. 68.

40. PC Letters i, no. 68 and JS Letters i, no. 32.

41. JS Letters i, no. 32

42. PC Letters i, no. 12. However, the possibility exists that this letter has no relation to Peter's appeal. If this letter was written on this occasion, it probably went to Canterbury with PC Letters i, no. 74. See below for no. 74.

43. The background to the letters nos. 33-5 and the activities of the monks are explained in JS Letters i, headnote to no. 33. However, the situation cannot be made clear. One mission of Peter, brothers Thomas and Ralph went to Earl Hugh of Norwich. (See no. 50 below). But Peter also seems to have sent 'brother Thomas of Norwich, brother William and others' (no. 35 & headnote to no. 33). Did Peter send several missions in connection with his appeal for the priory of Provins?

going to Norwich.⁴⁴

Finally, in connection with Peter of Celle's relationship to John and other Canterbury people, it should be noted that as royal chancellor Thomas Becket also appears among Peter's correspondents. Peter wrote to him in answer to his letter.⁴⁵ He referred to the power of the chancellor as 'next to the king in four kingdoms', and stressing the unworthiness of a mere abbot, gently declined his friendship. He promised nevertheless, in reply to Becket's request, to search out a copy of the sermons of Master G. and to have them copied for him. Becket appears to have repeated his request for friendship. Peter refused again but with a promise to send the sermons of G.⁴⁶ John of Salisbury was also interested in the precentor of Troyes, i.e. Master Gebuin, a pupil of St. Bernard and a celebrated preacher.⁴⁷ If Becket made this request in order to prepare himself for his new office as archbishop,⁴⁸ Peter's letters should also belong to 1160-1.

To sum up Peter's relationship with John, John was involved in three spheres: (1) the Papal Curia; (2) Canterbury; (3) Champagne. John helped Peter of Celle in appeal cases at the Curia. On one occasion, he probably drafted Peter's appeal. On another, Peter was represented

44. John was present when brother Thomas delivered letters to Earl Hugh, who, according to Prof. Brooke, was either Hugh Bigod, earl of Norfolk or Hugh II, earl of Chester. (JS Letters i, no. 33, n 17). Hugh Bigod may be a more likely candidate because in his letter to John of Canterbury written in about November 1157, John referred to his visit to Norwich. (JS Letters i, no. 39.)

45. PC Letters i, no. 14.

at the Papal Curia by Canterbury clerks who were John's friends. At Canterbury, John promoted Peter's appeals to the archbishop of Canterbury and magnates of the realm. He also took care of Peter's missions to England. John was like Peter's outpost in England. In Champagne, Peter, instead, entertained John's friends. John's brother visited Peter and his fellow Canterbury clerks also stopped at Montier-la-Celle on the way to Rome. In Champagne, John was introduced to Peter's circle of friends. John received patronage from Count Theobald. He obtained a testimonial from Bernard of Clairvaux to Archbishop Theobald. The friendship of other local clergy and religious with whom John got acquainted presumably during this period, was to be exploited later during his exile at the time of the Becket dispute. The friendship between John and Peter was not limited to themselves. It invited the participation of their friends. It extended over wide distances. It was a friendship between two highly influential persons and they did not hesitate to use their influence and position to help their friends.

But what opinions and feelings did they express through their letters? How did they express them? In what way does their friendship differ from those between John and his other friends? In short, what are the special features of their friendship? Since the correspondence between John and

46. Leclercq, J., 'Nouvelles Lettres de Pierre de Celle' in Studia Anselmiana vol 43, (1958), pp 160-179.

47. JS Letters i, no. 31 & n 7.

48. Barlow, TB, p 63.

Peter survives, we have here a rare occasion to trace their communication. However, since Peter referred less to concrete events, his letters are usually difficult to date and can often be dated only through their relationships with John's letters. This causes difficulty in constructing the circumstances in which the letters were written.⁴⁹ Keeping this in mind, we can still compare and contrast the ideas and feelings of the two men and consider their common interests and topics of conversation. We can also think about the differences between their letters from the view point of subject matter as well as of style.

There are a number of occasions on which the two men expressed their feelings on a similar topic. One such topic was human misfortune. John encountered misfortune at the time of the great disgrace⁵⁰ and Peter encountered misfortune at the time of the fire of St. Aigulf. On hearing about the fire of the church of St. Aigulf, John selected words of consolation from I Corinthians, 10:13, 'and turn to Him who does not suffer His faithful servants to be tempted beyond their powers'.⁵¹ For John felt that 'whatsoever departs from iniquity...nonetheless furthers our salvation and wins the crown of glory,'⁵² so that one should bear misfortune with good cheer. John's words of

49. For the dating of Peter of Celle's letters during this period, see Appendix i.

50. John was in the king's disfavour after he came back from his mission to Rome in 1156. On this incident, see the section 3-III-2 and notes 33 & 34.

51. During his exile John often used the same citation to describe his misfortune. (JS Letters ii, nos. 151, 161, 170, 181, 188, 199, 206, 250, 289, 300).

52. JS Letters i, no. 32.

consolation are basically an expression of human wisdom teaching what mental attitude one should adopt to survive misfortune with good spirits.

There is one occasion on which John asked Peter 'for consolation because he felt lonely, demanded help, because he endured exile, implored remedy, because he lamented discord'.⁵³

We cannot be sure about its date nor about the exact occasion of this letter.⁵⁴

The possible occasion was when John suffered from the king's disgrace between the autumn of 1156 to spring 1157. Peter declared that he was no one to give consolation to John. Instead he immediately turned to prayers. Through numerous metaphors and biblical images, Peter led John to pray as follows:

'Misericordissime Domine, et Pater misericordiarum, posito in labore hominum da requiem angelorum, ejecto a facie terrae da ingressum supernae patriae, consolatione destituito humana, adsit divina.'⁵⁵

Peter compared human suffering with that of Jesus Christ. Asserting that John's suffering was meant to purify him, he wrote, 'Haec, inquam, tibi sit consolatio, ut affligens te manus Dei non pareat.'⁵⁶

Peter's concern was not essentially to live content in this world. He thought that through suffering one's soul is purified for the world to come.

Another instance that permits comparison of ideas between the two men lies in their attitude to friendship.

53. PC Letters i, no. 71.

54. See appendix i.

55. PC Letters i, no. 71.

56. PC Letters i, no. 71.

In the letter in which John announced the sending of the Policraticus, he wrote, 'Virtue lays it down that all the property of friends should be shared between them, and the judgement of wisdom excludes from the shrine of friendship all those who claim even their feelings as their own rather than their friends. Who doubts that he ought to share his goods with those who are of one single mind with him, if the truth of professed friendship is preserved by the loyalty of love?'⁵⁷ He also wrote, 'Thus too let us, if it displease you not, make use of each other and the things that are ours.'⁵⁸ For John, friendship meant sharing: sharing of feelings, and of goods, and making use of each other.⁵⁹ It was a pleasure for him to have friends, to talk to them, to write to them and to do things for them.⁶⁰ It was also a pleasure to reciprocate friendship.

Peter did not define friendship as John did, but he expressed his love towards John in his letters amply and frequently. Peter described John as a source of joy and delight, happiness and hope, a seat for relaxation and a shelter where he could rest protected from the heat and thunder of the world.⁶¹ He defined his feeling towards John as '...laticor in corde, rarior in ore amor, ardet in fumo, currit sine spuma; movet alas, sed silenter: petit

57. JS Letters i, no. 111.

58. JS Letters i, no. 111.

59. For John's ideas of friendship, see McLoughlin pp 7-9 and List A.

60. Concerning John's ideas of friendship, see also JS Letters i, no. 97. JS Letters ii, no. 159.

61. PC Letters i, nos. 68 & 69.

ima, sed tam sublimiter pro animi generositate, quam fortiter pro integritate. Accedit, sed non incendit. Nam calorem facit, sed non cinerem. Finem quidem novit, sed cum termino consummationis, non consumptionis.⁶² It was a quiet flow of feelings that led directly to the worship of God. Peter expressed his love and gratitude to God who gave John to him; 'Qualem loquor scribendo amorem, talem in amicum cogito, imo recognosco. Felix anima mea quae talem peperit, vel saltem reperit amicum. Domine Deus cordis mei, tuus erat Johannes, et mihi eum dedisti...'⁶³ John felt that friendship was something to enjoy in this world. Although Peter of Celle took advantage of the pragmatic aspects of friendship, the love of friends was precious for him because it originated from God, and should be returned to Him in gratitude.

The features of their friendship has been termed Amicitia Jocososa and it is particularly applicable to their friendship in this period.⁶⁴ Although Peter almost always enjoyed hearing from his friends, John's letters seem to have given him special pleasure, particularly when filled with laughter and harmless jokes. Peter wrote, 'Ut vidi litteras os meum impletum est risu. Miscuisti siquidem jocos seriis, sed temperatos et sine detrimento dignationis et verecundiae. Sales tui sine dente sunt, joci sine

62. PC Letters i, no. 70.

63. PC Letters i, no. 70. The same element is also observed in nos. 68 & 69.

64. Pepin, R.E., 'Amicitia Jocososa: Peter of Celle and John of Salisbury, 'Florilegium, vol 5, (1983), pp 140-56.

vilitate.⁶⁵ We do not know exactly which of John's letters was described with these words. It could have been no. 112 or no. 33 or the respective letter has been lost. Although Peter was not the sole recipient of letters of this kind,⁶⁶ joking, laughing and playing with words constituted a major characteristic of John's letters to Peter in this period. Peter, on his part also enjoyed writing letters to John with a touch of humour, even about a serious matter like the fire at the priory of St. Aigulf, which he reported rather dryly to the bishop of St. Malo with a request for assistance.⁶⁷

Another feature that was present in their friendship in this period was a sharing of intellectual interests and of gifts. They exchanged books by various writers and compositions of their own. In his letter no. 31, John asked Peter to send the letters of St. Bernard, and to have the anthology made out of his works, Peter's own and those of Gebuin. In no. 32, John thanked Peter for sending the letters of St. Bernard and repeated his previous requests. In no. 34, John asked for a Commentary by Hugh of St. Victor and, on his brother's behalf for the return of Boethius's Concerning the Trinity, which he had left behind. As for their own compositions, Peter sent his De Panibus in 1157⁶⁸ and John sent the Policraticus in the autumn of

65. PC Letters i, no. 69.

66. e.g. JS Letters i, no. 110.

67. PC Letters i, nos. 68 & 16.

68. JS Letters i, no. 33.

69. JS Letters i, no. 111.

1159.⁶⁹ He may also have sent the Entheticus.⁷⁰ During this period of friendship, John also sent Peter a gift as a token of his affection.⁷¹ He explained the meaning of his gift by use of symbolism.⁷²

Finally, we may ask about their influence on each other and whether their communication mutually affected their ideas or ways of thinking. John's knowledge of Scripture owed much to Peter and Peter's fondness for classical allusions owed much to John.⁷³ John's esteem for literary learning and his idea of philosophy was reflected in Peter's letter.⁷⁴ We see Peter's idea of human suffering partially reflected later in some of John's letters.⁷⁵

Another influence that Peter may have exerted to John was his attitude towards the practice of law and dialectical argumentation. Reminding John of his former love of the life they spent together, Peter criticised John who 'armed by the horn of laws of dialectical argumentations' preferred the courtly life to the monastic.⁷⁶ It is interesting to hear Peter's opposition to the practice of law and

70. Pepin, 'Amicitia Jocososa' p 149.

71. JS Letters i, no. 34.

72. JS Letters i, no. 34. Similar use of symbolism can also be observed in JS Letters ii, no. 145.

73. Pepin, 'Amicitia Jocososa' p 149.

74. In PC Letters i, no. 70, Peter wrote, '...Sensibus philosophicis quae scribis condiuntur, rhetoricis coloribus vestiuntur, decentissimis legum ornamentis decoratur,....' The idea of 'philosopher' seldom appears in Peter's letters. Another occasion is in PC Letters ii, no. 160 addressed to Master G., presumably Gerard Pucelle. For Gerard, see the section 4-III-2-c.

75. JS Letters ii, no. 201, 151.

76. PC Letters ii, no. 72.

dialectical argumentation. Since the letter can only be dated loosely 1159 x 1162, we cannot say that Peter's opinion as expressed in this letter had an influence on the Metalogicon and Policraticus, in which, possibly in 1159, John expressed his criticism of courtly life and opposition to preoccupation with dialectical studies at the expense of a broader literary education and also to a utilitarian way of life promoted among others by the study of law.⁷⁷

This much may be certain: that John had an intimate friend at that time who felt critical about the same things as he did. The difference between them was that the criticism led Peter to praise the monastic life⁷⁸ while it made John an advocate of practical moral philosophy and of the Ciceronian ideal of a life of the philosopher-statesman. It is ironical that Peter thought John to be like one of those whom John termed Cornificians. Peter accused John of preoccupation with the practice of law and dialectical argumentations and with preference for the courtly life.

John of Salisbury and Peter of Celle lived in different milieux. John was a secular clerk and Peter was a monk. John's life was devoted to administrative service and Peter's to prayers and spiritual exercises. John's mind enjoyed reporting actual events and describing concrete matters, but Peter's was so filled with spiritual topics and biblical images that worldly matters were apt to be left in notes at the end of letters or to oral report by his

77. McLoughlin has pointed out that the Metalogicon was directed to the monastic audience. (McLoughlin p. 64)

78. PC Letters i, nos. 72 & 75.

messengers. But their differences enhanced affection and mutual respect. John had respect for Peter's spirituality and Peter relied on John's knowledge and ability in certain practical matters. They also had something in common. They were men of learning and they both loved knowledge. They enjoyed laughing and making harmless jokes about people they knew. In case of need, they helped each other by giving warning, advice and consolation. At the root of their friendship was shared experience and affection already firmly established in the past, if not at Paris, at Provins, and fostered and nourished not only through letters and visits but also through the exchange of people around them.

ii. 1162-1170

The relationship between John of Salisbury and Peter of Celle was probably very close especially after John's exile, but since they lived near each other and we have no letters belonging to this period.

Having learned Canterbury clerks such as John and his brother Richard of Salisbury⁷⁹ and Ralph of Sarre⁸⁰ in Rheims must have been a delightful and intellectually stimulating experience for Peter and his friends, although John and Richard were under his care and he had to support and help them. Peter commissioned John to write the Historia Pontificalis and he encouraged him to answer the theological questions posed by Henry, Count of Champagne.⁸¹ These writings, especially the Historia

79. See below the section 2-V-1-c.

80. See below the section 3-IV-2-a(i).

81. JS Letters ii, no. 209. See below 2-IV-4.

Pontificalis must have been highly entertaining⁸² as well as edifying. Through them, Peter and his friends came to learn some of Gilbert de la Porrée's teachings and they may have learned still more had John had more time and had he been equipped with more books.⁸³

As John's friend, Peter was closely informed of the Becket dispute⁸⁴ and both he and his friends in Champagne tried to help John in many ways.⁸⁵ Although Peter declined Becket's request for friendship again,⁸⁶ he helped promote his cause. In December 1167, after the failure of the papal legates William and Otto became apparent, the Becket party wrote letters of complaint to the Papal Curia. Peter's letter no. 135 was one of them.⁸⁷

Sometimes, Peter wrote to John's friends with the intention of supplementing and strengthening John's messages. Of the two letters addressed to Bartholomew of Exeter, one belongs to this period, in which Peter offered

82. Ray, R.D., 'Rhetorical scepticism and verisimilar narrative in John of Salisbury's Historia Pontificalis' Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography, ed. Breisach, E., Karamazoo, Michigan, (1985) pp 61-102.

83. See the sections 2-IV-4-d, 3-VII-2 & 3-VII-4.

84. JS Letters ii, nos. 141, 143, 136, 144, 179.

85. PC Letters ii, no. 147 to Hugh, abbot of Saint-Amand was actually written by John and appears in John's letter collection. On the abbot and this letter, see below 2-IV-4-a.

86. PC Letters ii, no. 114 was addressed to Becket and probably written in reply to his letter. It was written after Becket went into exile.

87. Peter's letter is the same as Mats no. 348. Concerning the epistolary campaign to the Curia at that time, see the section 4-IV-2-b.

him asylum at his monastery in case the bishop might fall into difficulty in England. This letter may have gone with John's no. 281 to Baldwin of Totnes, as both letters stressed the ultimate importance of obedience.⁸⁸ Peter also wrote to Master Gerard Pucelle, who was among the schismatics. The letter advised him on the right behaviour and urged him to be a 'disciple of the good philosopher' just as John did in his letters.⁸⁹

John and Peter had friends in common and John's correspondence probably found its way to the destination along with Peter's. Such were the cases with abbot Hugh of Bury St. Edmunds,⁹⁰ and with Ralph of Worcester, with whom Peter discussed matters pertaining to a dependency of Saint-Remi, the priory of Lapley.⁹¹ John may have been the bearer of Peter's letter to Saint-Gilles.⁹²

Peter of Celle's network of communication may also have helped John's letters to reach Gerard Pucelle in Cologne and

88. PC Letters no. 127, JS Letters ii, no. 281 to Baldwin of Totnes. Dating discussed in the section 3-V-3-b-(iii)

89. PC Letters ii, no. 160. JS Letters ii, no. 158. See the section 4-III-c.

90. PC Letters ii, nos. 133 & 134. They may have gone with two of John's three letters to Bury. - nos 163, 192, 283.

91. PC Letters ii, nos. 152 & 153 are addressed to the prior of Worcester. Ralph of Bedford was prior of Worcester from 1146 to 1189. (Heads, pp 83-4, Le Neve ii, p 103). Concerning Lapley, PC Letters, nos. 152, 153, 154, 130 and JS Letters ii, no. 310. The prior of Lapley was P. who was deposed by Peter of Celle, followed by Absalom and Inganus. (Heads p 105). On Lapley, also see Gallia Monastica, i, Les Abbayes Benedictines du Diocese de Reims, ed. Lemarignier, J-F., Poirier-Coutansais, F., Paris, (1974) pp 58,112,126,136 & Chart 6.

92. PC Letters ii, no. 144.

gather information from there.⁹³

iii. 1170--1176

During this period, there was less communication and little exchange of visits between John's friends and Peter's. It was partly on account of the political and social unrest in England in the aftermath of the Becket conflict and the revolt of the young king as well as John's own personal situations.

John wrote two letters to Peter.⁹⁴ Peter wrote two to John alone⁹⁵ and three jointly to John and his brother Richard.⁹⁶ The letters in this period cannot be dated with any precision and except for those which are treated presently, it is difficult to establish the interrelations of the events described in the letters.

One letter was written in December 1170, reporting the situation in England from the time John went back in November 1170 until Becket's unsuccessful attempt to meet the young king.⁹⁷ Apparently, Peter sent a messenger shortly after John went back. John kept him for some time. He was expected to supply with the letter an oral message.

93. The monastery of Saint-Rémi is known to have had prebends in Meerssen, and Peter wrote a number of letters in and around Liège. (PC Letters ii, nos. 113 & 132. On Meerssen, see Gallia Monastica, esp. pp 78-9.)

94. JS Letters ii, nos. 304 & 310.

95. PC Letters ii, nos. 124-5.

96. PC Letters ii, nos. 112-13.

97. JS Letters ii, no. 304.

Describing the desolate state of England and how the archbishop's party was treated, John recalled with 'groans, sighs, and tears' the days he had spent at Saint-Rémi, asking for the prayers of the religious he knew in the area.

Shortly after this letter, the archbishop was murdered. John described the event in his no. 305 to John of Canterbury.⁹⁸ A similar letter seems to have been sent to Peter of Celle: it contained the question of whether Becket's death should be considered to be martyrdom. In his no. 121, Peter of Celle approved of calling Thomas martyr without papal authority⁹⁹ and expressed his interest in visiting the shrine of Thomas.¹⁰⁰ In this letter which was probably written after the initial shock of the murder had somewhat receded, Peter referred to the event with a light touch of humour. Peter's no. 122 was probably written in 1171--3 since it reported the arrival of the papal legates Albert and Theodwin.¹⁰¹ Peter passed whatever information he could to John.¹⁰²

98. Prof. Brooke has dated the letter early 1171. (JS Letters ii, p 724). Dr. McLoughlin has suggested that no. 305 was written around April but that another letter reporting the murder was sent earlier to William of Sens and others. (McLoughlin pp 509-513). Peter's no. 121, which was written in reply to the same question as in no. 305 carries little sense of urgency. On JS Letters ii no. 305, see 3-VII-4-d and 4-V-3-e.

99. JS Letters ii, no.305, n. PC Letters ii, no. 121.

100. The wish was expressed to John and Richard of Salisbury and Bartholomew of Exeter. PC Letters ii, nos. 121, 124, 128.

101. Tillman, H. Die päpstlichen Legaten in England bis zur Beendigung der Legation Gualas (1218) Bonn, (1926), pp 68-72. Perhaps the letter was written around October 1171 when the legates were in France.

102. PC Letters ii, no. 122.

John's no. 310 referred to the unrest of the time, presumably the revolt of the young king.¹⁰³ He described the general desolation of the realm and then reported the result of his investigation of the priory of Lapley, a dependency of Saint-Rémi. John advised Peter to send some more monks.

The uniqueness of their friendship with each other can still be detected in this period, although less conspicuously, perhaps partly on account of the paucity of letters. John was still, characteristically, a clerk in administrative service and Peter, a religious. John's quality as an efficient administrative servant is manifest in his detailed report of the situation in England at the time of the return of Becket and also in his investigation of the situation of Lapley.¹⁰⁴ Peter, on the other hand, continued to help John with spiritual matters. One letter of consolation is extant.¹⁰⁵

Peter's exuberant expressions of his friendship with John more or less died down or changed into something quieter. In Peter's letter to John, we observe less elaborate metaphors or biblical images piled up one upon another. In John's letters, a proud display of his knowledge of classics is absent. A touch of humour and an element of joking and laughing remain especially in Peter's letters.¹⁰⁶ In addition to the general tone of

103. JS Letters ii, no.310 & p xlv.

104. JS Letters ii, no. 310.

105. PC Letters ii, no. 125.

106. PC Letters ii, nos. 121, 123, 124.

humorous familiarity, Peter reminisces explicitly the old days when they used to joke together.¹⁰⁷ He jokes too about their drinking.¹⁰⁸ But we see less sharing of their intellectual interests, such as borrowing books and exchanging compositions.

A new feature that emerges is the development of friendship between Peter and John's brother Richard. Peter was beginning to feel affectionate to Richard. As he wrote, 'Fratrem vestrum Richardum, quem tenerrime diligo et dulcissimo amplector a Jesu Christo et a Spiritu sancto, imo a Deo Patre, ubertate gratiarum impleri exopto.'¹⁰⁹ We find Peter engaging in spiritual discussion with Richard and later writing to him individually.¹¹⁰ Peter's treatise, De Disciplina Claustrali was written for Richard.¹¹¹

The vicissitudes of time and the change of John's role at Canterbury brought about certain external changes to their friendship but the relationship between John and Peter remained essentially the same. Stressing the importance of continued communication, Peter promised John and Richard of Salisbury that messengers could not go out of Saint-Rémi empty handed.¹¹² They helped each other in whatever

107. PC Letters ii, no. 124.

108. PC Letters ii, nos. 123-5. Similar references to drinking also appear in JS Letters ii, no. 270 addressed to Baldwin of Vale Darii. See also JS Letters i, no. 33.

109. PC Letters ii, no. 124.

110. PC Letters ii, nos. 122, 124.

111. Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloître, pp 24-7.

112. PC Letters ii, no. 123.

capacity they could, and their feelings with mutual friends did not die out -- John asked for the prayers of the religious in Champagne through Peter of Celle, and Peter sent regards to the bishop of Exeter through John.¹¹³ There were less intellectual exchanges. They still enjoyed joking with each other. But their emotions matured in such a way that their expression became more reserved and moderate, devoid of excess.

iv. 1176--1180

In 1176, John was promoted to the bishopric of Chartres. We have part of John's episcopal acta, but no personal letter survives from this period.¹¹⁴ John took part in the third Lateran Council in 1179 where he probably met his old friends.¹¹⁵ Peter of Celle remained at Saint-Rémi but was nominated candidate of cardinalate in 1178,¹¹⁶ He was engaged in the enlargement of his church presumably during this period.¹¹⁷ In 1179, Peter composed De Disciplina Claustrali at the request of Richard, brother of John of Salisbury, then canon at Merton Priory.¹¹⁸ About

113. JS Letters ii, no. 304. PC Letters ii, no. 124.

114. JS Letters ii, Appendix, pp 809-10.

115. Foreville, R., Latran I, II, III et Latran IV, Paris, (1965), pp 153, 209. Guillemain, B., 'L'Episcopat Français a Latran III' Le Troisieme Concile de Lateran (1179), ed. Longère, J., Etudes Augustinienne (1982), pp 23-32.

116. Glorieux, 'Candidats à la Pourpre,' esp. pp 15-16. Leclercq, J., 'Nouvelles Lettres de Pierre de Celle,' Studia Anselmiana, vol 43, (1958) esp. p 160.

117. PC Letters ii, nos. 154, 158, 166. L'Ecole du Cloître p 16.

118. Pierre de Celle L'Ecole du Cloître, p 27.

this time, to Peter as bishop-elect of Chartres, engaged in a discussion over the Immaculate Conception with Nicholas of St. Albans.¹¹⁹

In this period, we have three letters of Peter and no letter of John. When Peter of Celle learned of John's promotion to the see of Chartres, Peter wrote to William, archbishop of Rheims, 'Hoc opus de raritate admirabile, de singularitate incomparabile, de puritate commendabile, de bonitate speciali omnibus imitabile'.¹²⁰ Since the letter was written in praise of William's part in the election, it may be understandable that no emphasis was placed on John's qualities. Peter wrote to his friends and acquaintances that his 'former clerk' or 'alumnus' Master John was promoted bishop of Chartres.¹²¹ In his letter to the newly elected archbishop Richard of Canterbury, he wrote, 'Sanctissimae memoriae praedecessor vester, archiepiscopus Theobaldus, de gremio et sinu nostro magistrum Joannem Carnotensem episcopum inopem et pauperem suscepit'.¹²²

Perhaps John's promotion came as a surprise to Peter. John was no doubt a renowned scholar and certainly enjoyed an influence on dignitaries in both France and England, but his official rank had never risen above that of treasurer of

119. PC Letters ii, nos. 169, 171, 172, 173. Feiss, H. Peter of Celle, Selected works. The school of the cloister, On affliction and reading, On Conscience Kalamazoo (Mich.), Cistercian Publications (1987) p. 35.

120. PC Letters ii, no. 117.

121. PC Letters ii, nos. 105, 115, 151.

122. PC Letters ii, no. 115.

Exeter. The office of bishop of Chartres was one that Peter respected. When the abbot of Saint-Crépin was promoted to the cardinalate, Peter's love for him did not change. They continued to exchange affectionate letters.¹²³ But about John's promotion, Peter may have had a complex feeling.

The first extant letter to John after his elevation was a letter of reproach. Peter wrote that piles of letters testify the special friendship they had enjoyed, but that there had been no communication for over a year. Peter asked whether it was on account of his preoccupations as a bishop or whether John had no time to write nor to love. Peter also reported John's bad reputation and that people who knew that Peter was his friend had come to him to criticise John's behaviour. He wrote, '...sic mutabilis est in promissis, sic instabilis in verbis et consiliis suis, sic ingratus beneficiis, sic ad iram facilis, sic improvidus in disponendis judiciis, sic totus pendet de voluntate ei consilio unius hominis, minus prudentis et multum cupidi.'¹²⁴ Peter asked whether John's personality had changed and blamed him for not having lived up to the expectation of the archbishop who received him.¹²⁵ He demanded John's answer through the abbot of Saint-Crépin. Peter also had some business to do with John. He described his petition briefly 'ne autem sim oneri occupatissimis auribus Carnotensis episcopi,'¹²⁶ demanding a hearing as

123. PC Letters ii, nos. 93-5.

124. PC Letters ii, nos. 118-120.

125. PC Letters ii, no. 118.

126. PC Letters ii, no. 119.

soon as possible.

Peter's letters of this period were not filled with the light humour and harmless laughter that had been characteristic of his previous letters. Perhaps John reminded Peter of another John, bishop of Saint Malo,¹²⁷ who was not a diligent correspondent after his promotion. Upon receiving Peter's letter, John probably apologized to Peter just as he did in 1157 when a similar charge was made against him.¹²⁸ We know that John and Peter came to terms again as Peter wrote him a letter of forgiveness. Peter was apparently satisfied by the way John treated the abbot of Saint Crépin, and by John's words of apology.¹²⁹

c. Conclusions

In the three letters written to the bishop of Chartres, many of the features of their former relationship disappear. The youthful delight in friendship, the affection turning into prayers and gratitude to God, the joy in laughter and jesting, the love of intellectual exchange, the words of consolation filled with deep spirituality -- these are gone. Even moderate expressions of humour and affection hardly seem to be present. John probably helped Peter by taking action on his petition and did what he could for Peter just as he had always done. Basic trust in John was not lost and John's sincere apology was accepted. At this last stage Peter's friendship with John was perhaps not the most

127. PC Letters ii, nos. 13-18.

128. JS Letters i, no. 31.

129. PC Letters ii, no. 120.

affectionate, nor the most delightful and spiritually satisfying for him. Peter probably felt more affectionate to Richard, John's brother, with whom he discussed old age and for whom he composed De Disciplina Claustrali. It was possibly more delightful for him to exchange letters with Bernard of Saint-Crépin and more stimulating and satisfying to discuss spiritual subjects with Nicholas of St. Albans. Nevertheless the friendship with John continued.

The lives of John of Salisbury and Peter of Celle went through vicissitudes and so did their friendship. Different features appeared more strongly at one time or the other. Much of what formerly made their friendship pleasant and delightful was gone at this last stage. The core of their friendship was probably basic affection and the sense that they could rely on each other. The importance of time-tested trustworthiness held the two men together at the close of their lives. Perhaps the greatest characteristic of the relationship between John and Peter was its continuity as Peter concluded his last extant letter to John, 'Radix...longaeva pruina subita non arescit, neque marcescit',¹³⁰ Peter of Celle, who succeeded John of Salisbury as bishop of Chartres, found a suitable resting place next to John at the abbey of St. Josephat, where he followed John a little more than a year after his death.¹³¹

130. PC Letters ii, no. 120.

131. Pierre de Celle, L'École du Cloître, p 18.

4. Peter of Celle's friends

One of the greatest benefits John enjoyed from Peter of Celle was that he was introduced to Peter's friendship circle in Champagne. Besides the counts of Champagne and Bernard of Clairvaux, John came to know the clergy and religious of the area and made friends with them. Other than the monks at Celle, he seems to have known in 1156-7 the abbot of Boulancourt,¹³² the prior of Chantemerle,¹³³ Simon, prior of Provins,¹³⁴ and a member of the chapter of Sens. During his exile in 1164-70, John associated with the priors of Mont-Dieu and Val-Saint-Pierre, the abbots of Saint Nicaise and Saint-Crépin,¹³⁵ and the treasurer of Rheims.¹³⁶ Some of them appear as his correspondents. In most cases, they were also Peter of Celle's friends, but there may be cases in which John made his own friends. Among John's correspondents, the two Carthusian priors, Simon and Engelbert were important because they were also papal commissioners to mediate between Becket and the English king. John's relationship with Count Henry of Champagne is interesting in that it testifies how John was accepted as a scholar in that area.

132. JS Letters i, no. 19.

133. JS Letters i, no. 19.

134. JS Letters i, no. 34.

135. JS Letters ii, no. 304.

136. JS Letters ii, no. 208.

a. the abbot of Saint-Amand

John's letter no. 143 was written by P(etrus) abbas Sancti Remigii to the abbot of Saint-Amand. It was written by Peter on John's behalf, but the actual author was John of Salisbury.¹³⁷ This is the only surviving letter addressed to him. The abbot of Saint-Amand between 1150-1168 was Hugh,¹³⁸ and this letter was addressed to him, as it was written in the early stages of John's exile.¹³⁹ Peter asked the abbot to help John become reconciled with the English king through the mediation of himself and the count of Flanders. This letter was probably written in connection with the count of Flanders's approach to Henry II, possibly around the time of his visit to Normandy in April 1165.¹⁴⁰

After stressing his friendship with John of Salisbury, Peter wrote that his 'fame for scholarly learning and honourable character is better appreciated by everyone the better they knew him'. And the reason for his exile was that he had served his master the archbishop of Canterbury as he should. Peter asked the abbot to make an effort to obtain royal letters patent allowing John a safe return. Probably John felt that his fame for learning and sincere personality and exile for the service of Archbishop Thomas would best

137. JS Letters ii, xxiii-iv.

138. JS Letters ii, p 29 n 1. GC, iii, 262. Martène, E., and Durand U., Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum, iii, Paris, (1717) cols. 1398-9.

139. JS Letters ii, p xxiii-vi

140. Eyton, p 78. JS Letters ii, no. 143 is dated 1164-70, probably early. On the Count's visit to Normandy and his and the Empress's attempt for peace, see below 2-IV-4-a and the section 3-II-1 for the Count of Flanders.

appeal to the abbot of Saint-Amand. Since this letter was written after the completion of his major works, John's scholarship may have been known in the area.

b. Guy, the bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne

Guy was bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne from 1162/4-1190.¹⁴¹ He was a friend of Peter of Celle. There is no letter to him in Peter's letter collection, but probably there was much communication between Rheims and Chalons as they were neighbouring episcopal cities. John wrote one letter to the bishop thanking him for taking an exile into his care.¹⁴² This letter was probably written after January 1165. About that time, John of Salisbury reported to Becket that he had spoken to the bishop of Châlons and that the bishop had consented to take one of Becket's clerks.¹⁴³ The clerk was possibly one of those who were exiled and proscribed by the king's order on Boxing Day of 1164. In his letter John also promised to visit the bishop as Guy had requested. John seems to have come to know the bishop during the early part of his exile or even before. Not much else can be established about their relationship.

141. JS Letters ii, p 27. n 1. MGH Scriptorum, xvi, pp 489-90. GC ix, pp 882-3. In GAMS, he appears between 1164-90 as Guido III de Joinville. (GAMS p 534).

142. JS Letters ii, no. 141.

143. JS Letters ii, no. 144.

- c. Engelbert, prior of Val-Saint-Pierre
- Simon, prior of Mont-Dieu
- the abbot of Saint-Médard

Since these monks appear to have known each other and John's letters to the three correspondents are closely related to one another, they are discussed here as a group. John wrote to Engelbert probably before and both to Simon and Engelbert after the conference of Montmirail.¹⁴⁴ He also wrote to Engelbert on some unidentified occasion.¹⁴⁵ John's letter to the abbot of Saint-Médard was written on behalf of Engelbert.¹⁴⁶

Engelbert was a Carthusian monk and the first prior of Val-Saint-Pierre which was founded in 1149 in the diocese of Laon.¹⁴⁷ Engelbert became bishop of Chalon-sur-Saône between 1173 and 1179.¹⁴⁸ He later resigned the see to become prior of Mont-Dieu sometime in the 1180s.¹⁴⁹ He may have spent his younger days at Montier-la-Celle and perhaps may also have been John's pupil at one time.¹⁵⁰

144. JS Letters ii, nos. 183, 286.

145. JS Letters ii, no. 206.

146. JS Letters ii, no. 207.

147. JS Letters ii, no. 184, n 1.

148. JS Letters ii, no. 184, n 1.

149. JS Letters ii, no. 184, n 1.

150. Dr. McLoughlin has put John's letter no. 207 among his letters written in Peter of Celle's name. (McLoughlin, List B, Recipients of Letters written in other persons' names). In that case, 'E(nglebertum) Karissimum alumpnum nostrum' would mean that Engelbert was a religious at Montier-la-Celle before he moved to Val-Saint-Pierre. Professor Barlow has taken the letter to have been written by John in his own name and considered the phrase to mean that Engelbert was one of John's pupils. (Barlow, TB p 179, p 309 n. 24).

Simon of Mont-Dieu is almost sure to have started his religious life at Montier-la-Celle, under the supervision of Peter of Celle.¹⁵¹ Peter loved him dearly and also had great regard for him. After his removal to the Carthusian community of Mont-Dieu, Peter and Simon exchanged letters frequently.¹⁵² Along with Peter himself, Simon was one of the candidates for the cardinalate recommended by Cardinal Peter of Saint Chrisogonus.¹⁵³ Simon died at Mont-Dieu in 1184.¹⁵⁴ Simon and Engelbert were both papal commissioners in 1168 working for peace between the kings.¹⁵⁵ Their mission regarding the English king and Becket proved unsuccessful. During his exile John of Salisbury closely associated with Simon and Engelbert.¹⁵⁶

John's letter to the abbot of Saint-Médard was written in an attempt to diminish the troubles of Engelbert, prior of Saint-Pierre.¹⁵⁷ The letter asked the abbot 'to help and advise Engelbert and his brothers in such matters as they need his protection.' It also asked the abbot on behalf of Engelbert to 'spare their shame by anticipating when suitable the petitions of their poverty.' Request was also made that the abbot stop his monks disturbing the prior and their monks and also to restore peace to them. We know that

151. Glorieux, 'Candidats à la Pourpre', esp. p 15.

152. PC Letters i, nos.40-47. Leclercq, J., La spiritualité de Pierre de Celle (1115-1183) Paris (1946) pp 20-21.

153. Glorieux, 'Candidats à la Pourpre', esp. pp 15-17.

154. Glorieux, 'Candidats à la Pourpre', esp. p.17.

155. Barlow, TB, pp 167, 179.

156. JS Letters ii, no. 304.

157. JS Letters ii, no. 207.

an abbot of Saint-Médard was a correspondent of Peter of Celle, although he was not a close friend.¹⁵⁸ The main purpose of this letter was to help Prior Engelbert of Val-Saint-Pierre. Since the situation is obscure and dating uncertain, it is difficult to establish what kind of relationship there was between the abbot of Saint-Médard and John of Salisbury.¹⁵⁹

John's letter no. 206 was written when Engelbert was going through difficulties. John wrote that he could believe that Engelbert had troubles pertaining to his preferment but that he did not believe that he sought for it out of ambition. John referred to Engelbert's preference for poverty, one of the characteristics of the order of the Carthusians,¹⁶⁰ over transitory honours of no account. He advised him, 'If the office of prior which has been forced on you, and the care of souls and bodies....brings a rush of troubles, bear it patiently.'¹⁶¹ John's expression of

158. PC Letters ii, no. 148. The letter was addressed to the abbots of Saint-Médard and Saint-Crépin. In this letter Peter deplors the discords between the abbots and urged them to return to the harmonious relationship of their predecessors. The abbot of Saint-Crépin may or may not have been Bernard, a good friend of Peter who became abbot of Saint-Crépin in 1163 and was promoted to cardinal in 1179.

159. Professor Brooke has dated this letter ? 1164-8. (JS Letters ii, p 311, n 1). His ground appears to be that the abbot of Saint-Médard was the same as the abbot of Saint-Amand. In the references provided, I do not find evidence for this. If the abbot of Saint-Médard was not the same as the abbot of Saint-Amand, there seems to be little ground for dating the letter 1164-8.

160. Bligny, B. 'Les premiers Chartreux et la pauvreté' Le Moyen Age, vol 6 (1951) pp 27-60.

161. JS Letters ii, no. 206.

consolation is the usual one that 'He is faithful and will not suffer you to be tempted beyond your power' but will turn temptation itself to your profit'.¹⁶² The letter was made fit for a monastic audience. For instance, like Peter John' invoked the wood of the Cross when he wrote 'Whatever seems unbearable you may lay with pious confidence on His shoulders, on which He brought back the lost sheep and carried the burdens of all humanity on the tree,...'.¹⁶³ The situation described in the letter is obscure.

John's letter no. 183 was written to Engelbert. In this letter John explained to Engelbert the king's injustice to John and his brother Richard and asked for the prior's prayers. He mentioned a similar appeal which had been made to Simon of Mont-Dieu. In the letter to Engelbert, John explained the reason why he and his brother were exiled. According to John, he stood by the archbishop and the Church of Canterbury and gave no offence to the king. But John and his brother were unjustly exiled and outlawed. John turned to Engelbert and his 'fellow saints' for help and protection so that God may lift the 'scourge from his church' and from the exiles including John and Richard.

162. From I Corinthians 10:13. Other allusions to this verse appear in John's letters nos. 32, 151, 161, 170, 181, 188, 199, 250, 289, 300.

163. In no. 206, John writes, 'Et quod tibi visum fuerit importabile pia confidentia reicias in humeros eius, quibus ouem reuexit perditam et totius humani generis in ligno portavit onera, quando principatus ipsius factus est super humerum eius.' The elaborate development of images of the tree and the wood of the Cross appears in PC Letters i, no. 71 and also in no. 75.

This letter appears similar in tone and content to the letter written to another religious, Robert of Merton¹⁶⁴ written probably between 1165 and 1167.¹⁶⁵ Therefore, it may also be dated summer or autumn 1166¹⁶⁶ but there seems to be another possible date. It may have been written on the occasion on which Engelbert joined Simon of Mont-Dieu and Bernard de Corilo, the papal commissioners, to work for peace between the kings.¹⁶⁷ When Simon was appointed as a commissioner in May, 1168, John briefed him of his misfortune and the king's offence against the church.¹⁶⁸ When Engelbert joined the other two, it was important to impress on him the king's injustice. Since they were friends of John and possibly of his brother,¹⁶⁹ the king's personal injustice to the brothers as well as his offence against the church would certainly make a bad impression on Engelbert. Therefore the real message of this letter appears to have been the wrong-doing of the king and it was probably written with a stronger political intention than it appears to be.

164. JS Letters ii, no. 156.

165. JS Letters ii, no. 156, n 1.

166. Professor Brooke has suggested with some hesitation that this letter was written in summer or autumn of 1166 on the ground that both John and Richard have been outlawed and their current situation seems of recent date. (JS Letters ii, p xxxi).

167. Barlow, TB, p 179.

168. JS Letters ii, no. 183.

169. Barlow, TB, p 179. In no. 304, John sent regards to both Simon and Engelbert. Richard, John's brother, appears later as Peter of Celle's individual correspondent. See above, the section 2-IV-3-b.

John's no. 286 addressed to Simon and Engelbert was written in January-February 1169, shortly after the Conference of Montmirail.¹⁷⁰ At the Conference, the attitude of the religious was arbitrary at best and was much swayed by the whim of the king. They were overwhelmed by the king's shrewd action and failed to deliver the threatening letter from the Pope.¹⁷¹ John's letter was written as part of Becket's diplomacy in the aftermath of Montmirail. Becket himself wrote a justification of his standpoint to Simon and Engelbert.¹⁷²

Reflecting on the behaviour of the religious at the Conference of Montmirail, John probably wished that the religious might stand firm for the cause of Becket in the anticipated conference. His letter intended to ask for their understanding and cooperation by justifying Becket's behaviour and further denouncing the king. Disclosing the fact that John of Canterbury's attempt to hold a meeting was a trap, John expressed doubt over the sincerity of the king's intentions. He described how the king won the sympathy of those who were present while Thomas was laughed at. John went on to report the result of his approach to the archbishop of Rheims; he made a request to Archbishop Henry as advised by Simon and Engelbert, to write to Bernard de Corilo, but was refused; the archbishop of Rheims, however, was writing to the Pope according to John's

170. JS Letters ii, p xli.

171. JS Letters ii, no. 288.

172. Mats no. 454.

wishes.¹⁷³ John reported that Thomas was to be represented by Master Lombardus at the prospective meeting with the Grandimontines. He asked the Carthusians to act in support of Becket. Although the Carthusians were not successful with regard to peace between the king and Becket at Montmirail, and they were frustrated by the king's behaviour, they remained well-wishers of Becket's cause. John could hope for their continued cooperation because of their friendship from before.

The friendship between John and Engelbert of Val-Saint-Pierre and Simon of Mont-Dieu was part of the whole network of friendship among the religious in Champagne. It was essentially a circle of monastic friendship, in which exchanges of letters and visits were main features, but assistance in practical matters was by no means absent. Peter of Celle was its important member. With the removal to Rheims, Peter probably became closer to Mont-Dieu, which was less distant from Rheims and had been founded by Peter's predecessor Odo of Saint-Rémi.¹⁷⁴ Not only Peter but the abbot of Saint Crépin and Engelbert may also have visited Mont-Dieu.¹⁷⁵ To Engelbert, Peter also gave assistance in practical matters by writing to papal legates cardinals Albert and Theodwin and William aux

173. Mats nos. 458 & 459.

174 Martel, G. de, 'Pierre de Celle à Rheims' Mémoires de la Société d'Agriculture, Commerce, Science et Arts du Département de la Marne, vol 89 (1974) pp 71-104, esp. p 76.

175. PC Letters ii, no. 155.

Blanchesmains.¹⁷⁶ The friendship circle also included the abbot of Saint-Nicaise and of Montier-la-Celle who succeeded Peter.¹⁷⁷ Friends in the circle knew each other and assisted each other in dealing with a third party. John and probably Richard, of Salisbury joined the circle during exile. The Carthusians were not only sympathetic to them and the cause they were fighting for but also helped gather news.¹⁷⁸ John in turn helped the religious of Champagne in whatever way he could. He wrote a letter of consolation and advice to Engelbert of Val-Saint-Pierre. He may also have written to the abbot of Saint-Médard on his behalf.

John was probably a well-accepted but heterogeneous member of this friendship group. He was English and he was a secular clerk. He was bound to this group mainly by the influence of Peter of Celle. However, John was sympathetic to monastic ideas and ways of living. He had a great regard for them. Similar sentiments and modes of speech were used by him when communicating with English religious as we shall discuss below.¹⁷⁹ John's friendships with monks in Champagne were an extended part of his association with religious in general.

176. PC Letters ii, nos. 86 & 116 were written sometime in 1171-3 while cardinals Albert and Theodwin were papal legates. No. 86 was written while cardinal Albert was not far from Soissons. Engelbert of Val-Saint-Pierre was sent to install a priory of Val-Dieu, a Carthusian priory in the diocese of Chartres (PL 202, col 533, n 95). The consecration of the priory was delayed and so Peter wrote to Cardinal Albert to hasten the matter. He also wrote to the Archbishop of Sens, William aux Blanchesmains, about it. (no. 116).

177. PC Letters ii, no. 121. JS Letters ii, no. 304.

178. JS Letters ii, no. 272.

179. See the sections 3-VI-3-b, 3-VI-8-c.

d. Henry, count of Champagne

Among the ruling families of the time, John probably had the closest relationship with those of the house of Blois. Henry was of the house of Blois and John was in contact with various members of the house of Blois¹⁸⁰ both in England and in Champagne on various occasions. John received patronage from Theobald the Great and the relation of patronage continued on to the next generation, two of the sons of Theobald, Count Henry the Liberal and William aux Blanchesmains.¹⁸¹

Henry the Liberal took after his father's interest in learning and John was to write a letter to him on that account. Henry was born in 1127 as the eldest son of Theobald the Great.¹⁸² Endowed with the eastern part of his father's territory, he continued his father's policy of economic and commercial development. He cultivated good relationships with Henry II who was married to his mother-in-law, but he made it a rule not to be involved in the conflict between Henry II and Louis VII. He only served as a mediator between the kings. Contrary to his father, he sought peace with the Capetians. He married Marie, the daughter of Louis VII, sometime before 1159.¹⁸³ As suzerain

180. On the history of the house of Blois in the 12th Century, see especially, Bur, M., La formation du Comté de Champagne, Nancy, (1977), pp 281-307; Hallam, pp 43-50, 170; Dunbabin, pp 190-6, 310-18; Davis, R.H.C., King Stephen, London, (1967), pp 1-23.

181. For William aux Blanchesmains, see the section 4-V.

182. Benton, 'The Court of Champagne,' p 553.

183. Benton, 'The Court of Champagne,' pp 553-4.

of the family, he enforced the same policy with other members of the family. His brother Theobald was married to another daughter of Louis VII. He succeeded in arranging the marriage of his sister Adela with Louis VII. Henry did not take sides with Frederick Barbarossa in his ecclesiastical policies except for a brief period in which he took part in Frederick's plan in support of the anti-pope Victor who happened to be Henry's kinsman.¹⁸⁴ The routes to Champagne thus secured, the fairs further flourished during the time of Henry of Champagne.

The wealth acquired in this way was not unrelated to Henry's reputation as the Liberal and to his interest in learning. His court flourished as a literary centre and he maintained good relationships with the clergy and religious of his land.¹⁸⁵ John's friend Peter of Celle was at times found at Henry's court. His name appears as witness to six of Henry's charters between 1152 and 1178.¹⁸⁶

One of John's extant letters was addressed to Count Henry of Champagne.¹⁸⁷ The letter is more like a short treatise and was written in 1166¹⁸⁸ primarily to answer the count's questions on spiritual subjects. John first expressed his obligation to the count's father Theobald the

184. Munz. P., Frederick Barbarossa, London (1969) pp 28-32. Hallam, p 125.

185. Benton, 'The Court of Champagne,' esp. pp 567-8.

186. Benton, 'The Court of Champagne,' esp. p 558. On Henry the Liberal and Peter of Celle, see 2-IV-3-b(i).

187. JS Letters ii, no. 209.

188. Chibnall, M., 'John of Salisbury as Historian' The World JS, pp 169-77, esp. p 171.

Great's patronage. Then he wrote how he was astounded when Alberic of Rheims, 'de porta Veneris' posed some scriptural questions in the count's name and how he could only believe his request after Peter of Celle's assurance of the sincerity of the mission. The questions are as follows:

1. What do you believe to be the number of books in the Old and New Testaments?
2. Who were their authors?
3. What is the Table of the Sun seen in the sand by the philosopher Apollonius, mentioned by Jerome in his letter on Holy Scripture to the priest Paulinus?
4. What are the centos of Virgil and Homer mentioned in the same letter?
5. What is the source and meaning of the oft-quoted statement "Those things which do not exist are more God-like than those things which exist"?

The first two questions were requests for information. The third and fourth were from a well-known letter in Scripture by Jerome. The fifth question may have been derived from the writings of John the Scot.¹⁸⁹ In this letter John only answered the first three questions. He gave as an excuse for not answering the last two the lack of time and leisure. Most of John's statements in the letter derive from books of St. Jerome, Cassiodorus and Isidore.¹⁹⁰ Although John had used St. Jerome's epistle 53 to compose answers for the count, we find him expressing an interest in St. Jerome's letters and other works a little later. He

189. Benton, 'The Court of Champagne,' p 547.

190. JS Letters ii, no. 209, n 1.

asked William Brito both directly and through Baldwin of Vale Darii to send the letters of St. Jerome.¹⁹¹ In his letter to Master Odo, posing some scriptural questions, John also asked him to send the commentary on St. Mark.¹⁹² The relation between the count's fifth question and John's interest in the works of pseudo-Denis has been fully discussed by Professor Luscombe.¹⁹³ Had he received the translation of Denis's work from John the Saracen and had he received other works of St. Jerome, would he have answered the fourth and fifth questions of Count Henry? At the time this letter was written John did not know the count very well. He only knew him as the son of his former patron Theobald the Great. It was through the recommendation of Peter of Celle that John came to write this letter. We do not know whether John came to know the count personally after this letter was written.

As Henry was an important political figure of the time, John was nevertheless interested in the count's activities and he collected information of the count's policy whether directly or through Peter of Celle. John reported in July 1166 that the Emperor Frederick wrote to Count Henry a letter in which the English king's intentions were discussed.¹⁹⁴ John obtained the letter from the count and

191. JS Letters ii, nos. 245, 270.

192. JS Letters ii, no. 271.

193. Luscombe, D.E., 'The Reception of the Writings of Denis the pseudo-Areopagite into England' in Tradition and Change, pp 115-143.

194. JS Letters ii, no. 177.

sent it to Becket. John did not leave any account of how he obtained the letter, but merely spoke of the people from Rheims who witnessed the council of the Emperor. In October 1167, the Count appeared in John's letters as a mediator in the rebellion that occurred in Rheims.¹⁹⁵ In spring 1168, Count Henry and the count of Flanders appeared in John's letters as mediators in the conflict between the kings.¹⁹⁶ On this occasion, the count supported the cause of Henry II, and so the English king's messengers frequented the court of Champagne.¹⁹⁷ In July 1168, John reported that the count promoted the business of arranging marriages for Louis VII's children at the Emperor's behest.¹⁹⁸ Since Henry of Champagne retained his policy of neutrality, he was not involved in the conflict between the English king and the archbishop of Canterbury. We do not know whether Thomas's party made any attempt to approach the count for support. Even if they did, they were not successful in turning the count in their favour. The count was interested in John not as a clerk of Becket but as a learned scholar. What little activity John could have done with the count on behalf of Becket was probably to gather information.

195. JS Letters ii, no. 223.

196. JS Letters ii, no. 272.

197. JS Letters ii, no. 274.

198. JS Letters ii, no. 279.

5. Conclusions

John had three substantial groups of correspondents in Champagne: Peter of Celle and his monks; clerics and religious in the area, and Count Henry of Champagne. Peter of Celle was the core of almost all John's relationships in Champagne. Other groups accepted John first of all as a friend of Peter of Celle. Through the course of the Becket affair, they wanted to help John and his master for whose cause he was fighting. Some took Becket's clerks into their care. Some may have tried to reconcile John with the king. Around the time of the Conference of Montmirail, there appear to have been close contacts between John and the Carthusian commissioners of the Pope. John briefed them on the situation and they gave advice to John. But involvement in political matters was probably a secondary matter to both John and his friends. If the monks did not act as John wished at the conference, that would not have affected their relations very much. The essence of their friendship was probably non-political and it lay in literary and spiritual exchanges. As regards Henry of Champagne, he probably considered John to be one of the friends of the monks. He knew John mainly as a learned man and a master in theology. John sought no position or office while he was an exile in France.¹⁹⁹ He remained a guest. In that capacity, he was respected as a learned person with good habits and a faithful servant of the exiled archbishop.

199. There were members of Becket's household who held a position in the French episcopal household such as Ralph of Sarre in the chapter of Rheims.

V Exeter

1. Introduction -- John of Salisbury and Exeter

While he was serving Archbishop Theobald, John cultivated a specially strong tie with the church of Exeter. There are at least two links between John and Exeter. One is John's friendship with people in Exeter. Among his friends there were Bartholomew, archdeacon, later bishop, of Exeter; Baldwin, canon, later archdeacon, of Totnes; canons Richard fitzReinfred,¹ Roger de Limesheia,² Simon Lovel,³ and also Roger of Sidbury and Alfred of Chard. Some of them appeared as John's correspondents. John also had family ties with Exeter. John's family lived in Salisbury at the time of his departure for Paris,⁴ but his family probably moved to Exeter under the aegis of Robert, dean of Salisbury who was elected bishop of Exeter in 1155.⁵ John's mother lived in Exeter,⁶ and so did John's younger brother Richard, Magister 'Peccator',⁷ and his half brother Robert, son of Egidia.

During the Becket conflict, Exeter received more letters from John than almost anywhere else. Except during

1. JS Letters i, no. 133 & n 27.
2. JS Letters i, no. 133 & n 18. JS Letters ii, no. 178, n 1.
3. Morey, Bartholomew, pp 92 & 133.
4. Met ii-10.
5. JS Letters i, pp xii-xiii. Webb, C.C.J., John of Salisbury, London (1932) pp lff.
6. JS Letters ii, nos. 172, 304.
7. Blake, D.W., 'The Church of Exeter in the Norman Period' (Exeter M.A. Thesis, 1970) p 181 n 5. JS Letters ii, pp xxv-vi, n 3.

the initial phase, the bishop of Exeter remained one of the few episcopal supporters of Thomas Becket's cause.

2. Principal correspondents

a. Bartholomew of Exeter

Bartholomew of Exeter was John's chief correspondent in Exeter and remained one of the few episcopal supporters of Becket.

Bartholomew was born in Brittany or Normandy between 1115 and 1117.⁸ He probably studied in Paris or some other centre of learning to obtain the degree of Magister and skill in canon law.⁹ He probably came to know Peter of Celle in Paris.¹⁰ If 'Bartholomeus' in the list of masters in Metamorphosis Goliae is the same person as Bartholomew of Exeter, he was a famous master in Paris in the 1140s, but this link is uncertain.¹¹ Bartholomew is referred to as an 'alumnus' of the Church of Canterbury, but the meaning of the word 'alumnus' is obscure,¹² He appears as archdeacon of Exeter in a witness list to a charter of Archbishop Theobald sometime between 1157 and 1161¹³ and he served as

8. Morey, Bartholomew, p 3.

9. Morey, Bartholomew, p 4.

10. Morey, Bartholomew, p 5.

11. Morey, Bartholomew, p 4.

12. Morey, Bartholomew, pp 3-4. 'pater noster Bartholomeus, Cantuariensis ecclesiae alumnus.' (MTB i, p 407). In JS Letters ii, no. 241, John wrote about Bartholomew, '...hoc certum est universis Cantuariensibus complacere. Amici tui sunt plurimi, et te iure societatis antiquae velut fratre confident'.

13. Saltman, Theobald, pp 306-8.

one of the messengers of Archbishop Theobald to King Henry in June or July 1160.¹⁴ He was elected bishop of Exeter in 1161¹⁵ and attended the Council of Tours in 1163.¹⁶

After the quarrel between the king and Becket had started, Bartholomew was at first among those who felt that the quarrel was personal and that the whole Church should not be sacrificed on account of Becket.¹⁷ Bartholomew was one of the royal ambassadors to the Papal Curia at Sens after the archbishop's flight from Northampton.¹⁸ During Becket's exile, Bartholomew was generally sympathetic to his cause and retained outward neutrality between the two parties. In 1170, he was among those who attended the young king's coronation in spite of Becket's and the Pope's prohibition.¹⁹ When the Pope's sentence of suspension was made against the English bishops, however, Becket wrote to the Pope on Bartholomew's behalf, praising his support.²⁰

After the murder of Becket, the task fell on Bartholomew to absolve the murderers.²¹ On 21 May, 1172, Bartholomew took part in the election of the archbishop of

14. JS Letters i, no. 125.

15. Morey, Bartholomew, pp 13-4.

16. Morey, Bartholomew, p 16.

17. Knowles, EC, pp 73, 81.

18. Barlow, TB, p 121.

19. Barlow, TB, p 207.

20. Morey, Bartholomew, p 30.

21. Morey, Bartholomew, p 32. Barlow, TB, p 258.

Canterbury and in the filling of six episcopal vacancies.²² In the subsequent trouble pertaining to the consecration of the elects, Bartholomew sent letters of appeal to the Pope which were drafted by John.²³

Starting in about 1174, Bartholomew of Exeter became increasingly occupied in acting as papal judge-delegate.²⁴ In 1177, Bartholomew stood high in royal favour and was consulted frequently on important matters of policy.²⁵ Bartholomew did not attend the Lateran Council of 1179,²⁶ and died on 15 December 1184.²⁷ According to Walter Map, he was still engaged in literary work in his old age.²⁸

Three theological works are attributed to Bartholomew of Exeter; the Penitential, De libero arbitrio and Dialogus contra Judaeos.²⁹ Dialogus contra Judaeos, which he wrote in his old age was dedicated to Baldwin, his former archdeacon, archbishop of Canterbury from 1184, who in turn dedicated one of his works to Bartholomew.³⁰

22. Morey, Bartholomew, pp 33-5.

23. JS Letters ii, nos. 312, 319, 321-2.

24. Morey, Bartholomew, pp 35-7. Also JS Letters ii, p xlvi, n 2, & no. 322.

25. Morey, Bartholomew, p 40.

26. Morey, Bartholomew, p 42.

27. Morey, Bartholomew, p 43.

28. Morey, Bartholomew, p 43.

29. Morey, Bartholomew, pp 5, 163.

30. Morey, Bartholomew, pp 106-7.

b. Baldwin of Totnes

Baldwin was probably from the Exeter region³¹ and he was an important correspondent of John during the Becket dispute. He had studied and taught in France³² and was appointed tutor of Gratian, a nephew of Pope Eugenius III at Ferentino in 1150 or 51.³³ Since John was also at Ferentino in 1150-51³⁴ he probably met Baldwin there. Baldwin came back to Exeter in the mid 1150s.³⁵ He was a canon of Exeter in early 1161³⁶ and was promoted archdeacon of Totnes by Bartholomew of Exeter later in 1161.³⁷ About this time, both John and Baldwin supported Bartholomew's preferment to the see of Exeter.³⁸ Baldwin retired into the Cistercian monastery of Ford in 1170 probably before John's return to England in 1170 and became abbot at least by 1175.³⁹ Baldwin worked as papal judge-delegate in the 1170s with Bartholomew of Exeter and Roger of Worcester.⁴⁰

-
31. Blake, D.W., 'The Church of Exeter in the Norman Period' (Exeter M.A. Thesis, 1970), p 180, n 5.
32. Blake, 'The Church of Exeter' p 180, n 5.
33. JS Letters ii, no. 289. On Gratian's role during the Becket dispute, see 4-IV-2-c.
34. JS Letters ii, no. 289, & n 3. HP, xxii-xxiii.
35. Holdsworth, C.J., 'Another Stage...A Different World': Ideas and People around Exeter in the Twelfth Century, Exeter, (1979) p 12.
36. JS Letters i, no. 133, n 27.
37. Morey, Bartholomew, p 105.
38. JS Letters i, no. 133.
39. Holdsworth, 'Another Stage...A different World', p 17.
40. Morey, Bartholomew, pp 36, 69, 70.

In 1178, he was recommended to the Pope for a cardinalate on account of the fame of his learning and religion which had spread through the Cistercian Order.⁴¹ Although he did not become a cardinal, he was elected bishop of Worcester in 1180.⁴² In 1184, he became archbishop of Canterbury⁴³ and later involved in a feud with monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, and died in 1190 at Acre during the Third Crusade.⁴⁴ Baldwin was described by Gerald of Wales as a gloomy and nervous man, learned and religious.⁴⁵ Baldwin dedicated his De Sacramento Altaris, which was written while he was abbot of Ford, to Bartholomew, bishop of Exeter, who also dedicated one of his works to Baldwin.⁴⁶

c. John's brother Richard, Magister Peccator

Richard was a younger brother of John and John wrote several letters to him in Exeter before he joined John in exile at Rheims in 1166. He may have served in the court of King Stephen before 1154.⁴⁷ Apart from this, his career and friendship groups had much in common with John's who probably helped him follow his own footsteps. Along with

41. Holdsworth, 'Another Stage... A Different World', p 17. Glorieux, P. 'Candidats à la pourpre en 1178' Mélanges de science religieuse, vol 11, (1954) pp 5-26 esp. pp 13-4.

42. Le Neve ii, p 100.

43. Le Neve ii, pp 5, 100.

44. Morey, Bartholomew, p 107. Holdsworth 'Another Stage...A Different World', p 17.

45. Morey, Bartholomew, p 106. Giraldi Cambrensis Vita S. Remigii, ed. Dimock, J.F., RS, London (1877) p 68.

46. Morey, Bartholomew, pp 106-7.

47. JS Letters ii, no. 270, n 2.

John, Richard 'Peccator', was a canon of Exeter and was one of the few who, at least to some extent, served both Archbishop Theobald and Archbishop Thomas.⁴⁸ He also appears to have received some revenues from Salisbury.⁴⁹ Richard stayed at Montier-la-Celle from autumn 1156 until about spring.⁵⁰

John appears to have brought Richard with him when he went into exile between October 1163 and January 1164,⁵¹ but Richard probably returned to Exeter in summer 1165.⁵² For although Richard was not in the king's full favour, he had the king's peace⁵³ and he could go back to England. While they lived apart John was much concerned about him because of his uncertain status, at this time.⁵⁴ Richard was also concerned about John and warned him of what might be disadvantageous to him.⁵⁵

48. JS Letters ii, p xxii, p xxvi & n. JS Letters i, no 19 & n. Saltman, Theobald, pp 222, 306-8. Blake, 'The Church of Exeter' pp 176, 179, 181.

49. JS Letters i, p xiii & n 1.

50. JS Letters i, nos. 19, 31 & 34. On Richard's visit to Celle, see the section 2-IV-3-b(i).

51. JS Letters ii, p xxiii, no. 136.

52. JS Letters ii, pp xxiv-v. See the section 4-III-3.

53. JS Letters ii, nos. 159 & 160.

54. In summer 1165, John asked Henry de Beaumont, bishop elect of Bayeux, to make peace for himself and his brother with the king. (JS Letters ii, no. 137.) He entrusted Richard's care to his half brother, Robert, son of Egidia. (no. 145) Richard is also mentioned in John's letter to his friend in Exeter, Roger of Sidbury. (no. 153) In the spring and summer of 1166, John commended him to the bishop of Norwich and Master Nicholas, so that his revenue could be transferred to Richard. (nos. 159, 160).

55. Richard warned John of a detractor called Benedict of Bedingham who had written to the bishop of Norwich against him. (JS Letters ii, no. 162).

John's failure to obtain the king's peace at Angers in May 1166 made it difficult for Richard to stay in Exeter. By July 1166, we find him in Rheims with John.⁵⁶ During his stay in Rheims, Richard seems to have been incorporated into the friendship circle of Rheims.⁵⁷ He was also acquainted with John's correspondents Walter de Insula and John of Canterbury.⁵⁸

In 1170, Richard returned to England with John. He travelled back to Exeter while John stayed at Canterbury and witnessed the murder of Thomas Becket⁵⁹ Sometime afterwards, Richard became a regular canon of Merton Priory.⁶⁰ As such Richard maintained friendship with Peter of Celle, who wrote his De disciplina claustrali on Richard's request in 1178 or 79.⁶¹

d. Robert, son of Egidia

Robert was a half brother of John of Salisbury.⁶² He was married, had a son⁶³ and was canon of Exeter. His name is found in Exeter witness-lists in the mid 12th Century

56. JS Letters ii, p xxv, nos. 174, 177.

57. JS Letters ii, no. 183.

58. JS Letters ii, nos. 180, 189; nos. 177, 274.

59. JS Letters ii, no. 304.

60. Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloitre, p 25. Smalley, Becket conflict, p 121.

61. Pierre de Celle, L'Ecole du Cloitre, p 25. On Richard's relationship with Peter of Celle, see the section 2-IV-3-b(iii).

62. JS Letters ii, p xxv.

63. JS Letters ii, no. 147.

before c. 1161.⁶⁴ He appears to have been a physician⁶⁵ and he had friends in common with John and was much trusted by John and the Becket party.⁶⁶ Robert succeeded Baldwin of Totnes as archdeacon of Totnes in 1170 and remained in office until 1185/6.⁶⁷

3. John's correspondence

John's correspondence to Exeter may be divided roughly into two periods, according to the nature, purpose and recipients of letters. The first period is till April 1161, while John was secretary to Archbishop Theobald. The second period is when he was in exile in France. The second period may be further subdivided into three periods, reflecting the transition of the Becket Conflict. The first is from 1164 to the end of 1165, the second, the year 1166 and the third from 1167 to February or March 1170, when the last extant letter to Exeter was written.

a. - 1161

During this period Bartholomew, who was archdeacon of Exeter was John's sole correspondent. Bartholomew knew John's brother Richard and they had friends in common such as Baldwin and Richard fitzReinfred. Their communication was close, especially during the vacancy of the see of

64. JS Letters ii, p xxvi, n 3.

65. JS Letters ii, nos. 145, 147, 289 & n 20.

66. He was designated a possible recipient of an archiepiscopal mandate which John did not wish to have delivered directly to the bishop. (JS Letters ii, no. 174.)

67. JS Letters ii, pp xxv-vi n. 3.

Exeter in 1160-1, partly because John was involved in the election. There are six extant letters written in connection with Exeter election.⁶⁸ Three letters were written to Exeter, two of them were in John's name.⁶⁹ and three letters were written to the king and his chancellor.⁷⁰

No. 118 was written in 1160-1 to the archdeacon of Exeter in John's name. This letter was written during the vacancy, but before the election of Bartholomew came to the fore. John entrusted Bartholomew the case of a man who had suffered wrong done by one of the Exeter rural deans, which was committed to him by order of the king partly because of the illness of the archbishop. The tone of the letter quickly changed from business to private conversation. John added personal information and gossip in a joking and familiar manner because 'it is pleasant to speak in a friend's ear and because there was no news to convey to you'. He asked Bartholomew to give his wishes to Magister Peccator and Richard, son of Reinfred and others. This letter is humorous and we can detect the same element of jest and laughter as we encounter in John's letters to Peter of Celle and Ralph of Lisieux.⁷¹

Letter no. 133 was written in early 1161 when Bartholomew's election to the see of Exeter faced

68. JS Letters i, pp 263-7.

69. JS Letters i, no. 117 from Theobald to the chapter of Exeter. Nos. 118 & 133, from John to Bartholomew.

70. JS Letters i, nos. 116 & 125, from Theobald to Henry II. No. 128, from John to Thomas Becket.

71. JS Letters i, e.g. nos. 33 & 112 to Peter of Celle. No. 110 to Ralph of Lisieux, Master (?).

difficulty. In this letter, we see many traits that were present in John's letters to Exeter during the Becket conflict -- insider's information, accurate assessment of the circumstances and adequate advice. It started with John's exhortation to Bartholomew that he should commit his cause to God, because it was not Bartholomew that originated and promoted his own candidature to the see of Exeter. John wrote about the rival candidate Henry fitzHarding, who, according to his own judgement, was not likely to obtain the king's consent. He advised Bartholomew not to enter into any compact with him in relation to his promotion. He informed that Master William the archdeacon and others as well as Roger de Limesay, (who possibly constituted a faction in the chapter), were ready to acquiesce in Bartholomew's election, and advised him to talk to the archbishop for counsel and to come with Master Baldwin, the son of Reinfred, Peccator and the rest. It was probably John who saw to it that Bartholomew would have a chance to appeal to the king directly by sending him and William de Ver as messengers to deliver the archbishop's report of the Council of London.⁷² John also wrote a letter to the royal chancellor Thomas, in which he mentioned the Archbishop's wish to commend Bartholomew to the king.⁷³

It was John's whole-hearted wish to see Bartholomew elected bishop of Exeter and John did everything he could to help him. It would also have been a benefit for him and his family to have a close friend as bishop. Bartholomew must

72. JS Letters i, no. 125.

73. JS Letters i, no. 128.

have found in John a reliable friend and associate in ecclesiastical business.

b. i. 1164-65

John was already in France in early 1164. While he was engaged in diplomatic activities for Archbishop Thomas, he hoped to make peace with the king. We know little about Bartholomew's activities except that he was involved in a dispute with Gilbert, bishop of London, about the payment of Peter's Pence.⁷⁴ In September 1165, we find Bartholomew at Woodstock witnessing a royal charter with other bishops and royal officials.⁷⁵

No. 150, John's first extant letter written to Bartholomew after his exile belongs to the summer of 1165, but it was by no means the first time John wrote to him from France.⁷⁶ John had probably sent news of the Pope and of the German court before. No. 150 was probably a reply to a letter from Bartholomew which informed of his plans to join the king, offering to help him obtain peace.

Therefore, no. 150 may have been delivered to Bartholomew when he was in the company of the king at or around Woodstock in August or September, 1165. On this occasion, a charter was witnessed not only by Bartholomew of Exeter but also by the archdeacon of Poitiers and the

74. Morey, Bartholomew, p 20. Mats no. 110.

75. Eyton, p 84.

76. JS Letters ii, no. 150. John also refers to the promise of the archdeacon of Poitiers of which he had written before. For order and accompaniment of John's correspondence, see Appendix ii, I-1-b.

bishop-elect of Bayeux.⁷⁷ Having found that the king and the major churchmen of the realm would meet at Woodstock, John appears to have made an extensive campaign to obtain the king's peace. John wrote to the bishop-elect of Bayeux to intercede with the king;⁷⁸ he wrote to the archdeacon of Poitiers reminding him of his promise of help at Paris and asking him to arrange a safe passage through Kent in the event of his return;⁷⁹ he also wrote to the prior of Merton about the same time asking him to work for his peace.⁸⁰ In the same letter, John referred to the attempts of the archdeacon of Poitiers, bishop of London and Richard de Luci.

In the letter addressed to Bartholomew, John reported his previous requests to the archdeacon of Poitiers and the bishop of London to help his reconciliation with the king and added that the archdeacon had not replied. John asked Bartholomew to work out an honourable formula for peace, for John would not wish to betray the archbishop. He stated that he had been faithful to the archbishop saving the king's honour and that if he had done wrong to the king, he was prepared to amend it. John expressed his criticism of the archbishop's behaviour and stated that although he would continue to serve the archbishop, he would cease to be a member of his household. Finally, he asked Bartholomew whether, if he is permitted to come back, he should come

77. Eyton, p 84.

78. JS Letters ii, no. 137. See the section 2-II-3.

79. JS Letters ii, no. 149. See the section 3-VIII-2-e.

80. JS Letters ii, no. 151. See the section 3-VI-4-c.

with his books and all his baggage.

Among the letters that were probably sent together, this is the only one that contained criticism against the archbishop and John's decision not to join the household of the archbishop. Perhaps Bartholomew was the only person to whom such delicate information could be entrusted for the right use. By revealing the names of others whom he had asked for assistance, John may have given Bartholomew to lobby the king effectively.

At about the same time or a little earlier, John probably wrote to his half brother, Robert, son of Egidia.⁸¹ By this time, Robert seems to have frequently sent 'a seal of good faith and a symbol of affection'. On this occasion, Robert sent John a special gift which John would treasure -- a gold ring set with a sapphire with the inscription 'Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat'. John wrote an elaborate letter of thanks describing in detail the symbolic meaning of the shape, material and inscription.⁸² In relation to the symbolic interpretation of the inscription, John referred to the position of the Emperor. Reference was also made to archdeacon Baldwin, Roger of Sidbury and John's little brother, evidently Richard. This letter could have gone to Exeter with the letter, now lost, which John wrote to the bishop of Exeter before no. 150 and in which John had

81. JS Letters ii, no. 145.

82. The letter has been discussed in detail in Brooke, C.N.L. Twelfth-Century Renaissance, London, (1969) pp 66-8.

probably told him some news about 'the Emperor's court'. The bearer of the letter may have been Richard, John's brother, as he wrote, '...rogans attentius ut fraterculum nostrum commendatum habeatis'. Since John was fairly hopeful of his own return, he thought that he would soon join his brother.

John probably heard from his brother and other friends and he wrote back to thank them after autumn 1165.⁸³ Nos. 153 to Roger of Sidbury and 154 to Alfred of Chard were such letters. Roger of Sidbury was a friend of John's who also knew Robert, son of Egidia and possibly archdeacon Baldwin and John's brother Richard. The meaning of the letter is mostly lost,⁸⁴ but John expressed his gratitude for Roger's love for himself and his brother. He specially thanked him for what he had done for his brother. Another correspondent, Alfred of Chard was probably custos of Exeter.⁸⁵ John's letter was written in reply to Alfred's. John gave thanks for his sympathy and affection.

The two letters probably formed part of the group of letters to Exeter while Richard was there in 1165-66.⁸⁶ Another letter that may have belonged to the same group is no. 146 to Robert, son of Egidia. In this letter, as in the one to Alfred of Chard, John excused himself for not being able to do anything but to thank him because he was an

83. From about autumn 1165, perhaps on account of the failure of the attempt for peace, John started to call himself 'an exile'. Nos. 140 & 141 also seem to belong to this period.

84. JS Letters ii, no. 153, n 1.

85. Morey, Bartholomew, pp 150-3.

86. JS Letters ii, p xxvii.

exile.⁸⁷ This letter was written mainly to thank him for taking care of John's brother, Richard. John knew that Richard was in difficulties, but drew a little comfort from the knowledge that his brother is suffering as a Christian and not as a murderer or a blasphemer or a seeker after other men's goods.⁸⁸ John had no chance to thank Robert except by means of words but hoped to put his feelings into effect in future. Apparently Robert did much to support John's brother and to inspire others to help him. He also protected Richard from possible charges made against him at Exeter.

Nos. 147 and 148, which were addressed to Robert, son of Egidia have been classified undatable by Professor Brooke. Indeed few hints can be found in these letters. No. 147 refers to the sapphire set in gold and was therefore written after no. 145. It was probably written after the departure of his brother to Exeter since the tone of the letter suggests that John was alone. The theme of the letter is love. The theme of no. 148 is grace. In this letter, John described grace as the greatest gift and commended brotherly love. These letters are seemingly unrelated to the political conflict and probably accompanied other letters to be part of a wider message to his Exeter correspondents.

87. From this reference, one is tempted to group this letter with nos. 153 & 154, but the possibility is not without that no. 146 went with no. 164 to Richard, his brother, in which John reported the failure of peace at Angers on 1 May 1166. The biblical allusion from I Peter, 4:5 appears in two other letters written in 1166, nos. 161 & 180.

88. I Peter 4:15.

In the years 1164-5, John wished for two things from his friends in Exeter -- assistance of the bishop to obtain the king's peace and care of his younger brother, Richard. John thought that it was possible to make an honourable reconciliation with the king which did not involve rejection of the archbishop. Among his well-wishers, John expected Bartholomew to play an important part in the petition. He laid out his conditions and revealed what could be used in his favour. In spite of all his efforts, John could not obtain peace. As for his brother Richard, who was sent back to Exeter in a somewhat precarious situation, Robert, son of Egidia and other friends received kindly. In spite of the king's order of exile and proscription of Thomas's clerks and in spite of the failure of peace, John's friends in Exeter appear to have sent affection and assistance.

b. ii. 1166

In spring and summer 1166, the main concern of John's correspondence to Exeter was his report of the failure to obtain peace at Angers and its possible repercussion on Exeter and the campaign for Becket after the Vézelay censures.

No. 164 to his brother Richard is probably the earliest letter of this period. It was written after John's meeting with the king at Angers on 1 May, reporting the failure to obtain reconciliation with the king. John explained to his brother how the terms of the peace were unacceptable to him. John comforted his brother and advised him to take the bishop's counsel to decide whether to join him in exile in France. Evidently 'another letter' went either with this or

shortly after, in which Richard was expected to find news. The letter may have been lost, for no. 164 stands somewhat isolated and other letters that contain news belong to later months.

In June, three letters, namely nos. 168, 169 and 170 were carried to Exeter perhaps by Fulk, who may possibly be identified with the later dean of Rheims.⁸⁹ No. 168 is the first of the long letters to Exeter in which John tried to expound the archbishop's case.⁹⁰ Giving the examples of the ill fortune that fell on the German schismatics, John predicted God's punishment on the king's party for their recent offence against the Church. He defended Becket's behaviour as royal chancellor, stressing his present repentance. In connection with the theory of two swords, which was one of the themes of Becket's letters to the king,⁹¹ John told of the punishment that fell upon a king who attempted to crush the Church. He turned to more recent events and recounted the conference at Chinon, the archbishop's pilgrimage to Vézelay, the news of the king's illness, the Vézelay censures and the king's counter-measures against the archbishop's attack, adding some news from Italy. This letter is something like an official account of the Becket party and John intended that the contents of this letter be known to the English clergy so

89. JS Letters ii, no. 171. On Fulk, JS Letters ii, p xxxvi. For relation of the letters, JS Letters ii, p xxiv & n 4.

90. For dating and background of this letter, see the section 3-VI-2-a.

91. Mats. nos. 153 & 154.

that they might understand, and be persuaded to support the archbishop's standpoint. In a way, this letter set the tone of later propaganda letters to England; some of its themes were to recur and develop in his later letters.

With no. 168, John sent no. 169 to Richard, his brother, in which John told him to seek advice of the bishop and Master Baldwin and others in deciding whether to leave England or not. John described his recent state of mind: he accepted that the scourge cleanses a person, making his spirit more ready to practice virtue; he was assured that the righteous will finally triumph, for there is no peace for the wicked.

Another letter that went with no. 168 is no. 170 to Baldwin, archdeacon of Totnes, which is essentially a letter of thanks for the care of his friends. John had known Baldwin well from early 1161, but this was the first extant letter to him. John expressed his gratitude towards 'the frequent, indeed, unceasing, examples of your unselfish care'. John thanked Baldwin for his charity and friendship both to himself and his brother, referring to his letter to the bishop from whom Baldwin can learn news.

Nos. 168-170 were essentially written for the addressee personally, but yet they were designed to be read together by John's friends in Exeter. The letter to Bartholomew was formal and was meant to be used by him for the publication to other English clergy.⁹¹ More informal news may have been passed by Fulk to all three recipients and others. The letter to Baldwin is a personal letter of thanks. The

91. On the occasion when the content of this letter may have been used by Bartholomew, see 3-VI-2-a.

letter to Richard was meant to be read by the bishop and the archdeacon as they were expected to advise him. So these three letters together with the messenger served collectively to transmit to Exeter news and propaganda as well as personal feelings. And the two personal letters expressing affection and gratitude to his friends and kin added credibility to his formal message.

Shortly after these three letters and in the same month, another set of letters, probably including nos. 171 and 172 was delivered to Exeter by a native of Devon.⁹² They were written before Fulk's return. John stated that he was writing because there was someone who was travelling to Exeter. John or rather Thomas's party, had an urgent message to deliver to Exeter as they heard the rumour of the bishops' appeal. They had not got hold of the text, but they had heard of the role the bishop of Hereford had played.⁹³ In no. 171 to Bishop Bartholomew, John commended the bearer of the letter who claimed to have come from Devon, and asked the bishop to listen to his requests. John wrote that since he had given all the news through Fulk, he had little more to add but that if anything was missing from the more substantial letter, the bearer would convey it. John recounted some more recent news: the rumour of the bishops' appeal: the arrival of the two clerks before the archbishop, one from the bishop of, the other from the dean of Salisbury: their denial that the dean had sworn any oath

92. JS Letters ii, no. 171.

93. Mats no. 106. See the section 4-II-2-e.

to the Emperor: the archbishop's refusal to see the dean's clerk on the ground that his master had been excommunicated: the French reaction against the bishops' appeal and their amazement over the role of the bishop of Hereford.

No. 172 is addressed to Richard and speaks of the bishops' appeal in the same breath as nos. 171 and 173.⁹⁴ It was meant to be read together with no. 171. John first expressed his love to his brother and advised him to listen to the counsel of the bishop. Then the letter turned into advice to the bishop as John wrote, 'I had something to tell him, only the sheet of vellum was so small I had no space',⁹⁵

John felt that it was crucially important to advise the bishop as to how to conduct himself on the occasion of the bishops' council and with regard to their appeal. John urged moderation and advised him to keep the golden mean, knowing full well the difficulty of doing so in practice. He turned his attention more concretely to the bishops' appeals and expressed his opinion on how the bishops should act towards the king. In the company of the bishops, John advised, Bartholomew should imitate Hushai who strove to overthrow the wicked counsel of Achitophel by moderation. John referred to the rumour of the attempt by the bishops of London and Chichester to bar the return of the archbishop of Canterbury, although he did not give full credit to the rumour. He turned his attention back to Richard and told him to salute their mother with special affection.

94. JS Letters ii, p xxx.

95. For this letter, see Brooke, Twelfth Century Renaissance, pp 69 - 70.

The link that connects these two letters is the rumours of the bishops' appeal. No. 171 reported the news and the French reaction to it more or less objectively, whereas no. 172 is a more personal counsel as to how the bishop should act 'on the occasion of such an attempt on the part of the bishops. Both nos. 171 and 172 were meant to be read together by the bishop, so that he might be informed by the news and be equipped to face the bishops' council. John hoped that in the event of the council, Bartholomew would persuade the bishops against evil deed. John probably tried to supply him with various weapons he could use in arguments. We do not know exactly what happened at the councils,⁹⁶ but Bartholomew of Exeter may have taken some kind of action, which caused him, along with the bishop of Worcester, 'to be held and treated in every way as mortal enemies of the realm and a menace to public safety'.⁹⁷

Later in July 1166, John sent his own servant to Exeter who carried at least no. 174, summons of the archbishop to the bishop of Exeter and other documents. By this time, the content of the bishops' appeal was fully known to Becket's party, and the archbishop himself wrote to the English clergy and the bishop of London against the appeal.⁹⁸ No. 174 mainly criticised the bishops' appeal, reproached the king and advised Bartholomew on the papal mandate to

96. On the councils of London and Northampton, and the bishops' appeal, see 3-VI-2-a.

97. JS Letters ii, no. 174.

98. Mats nos. 223 & 224. For no. 174, see also the section 3-VI-2-a. No. 174 has been discussed as a propaganda letter in McLoughlin, pp 451-3.

restore the revenues and goods of the archbishop's clerks and the prospected summons of the archbishop. John expressed indignation against the bishops' defence of the king and, expressed doubt as to whether the bishops were united in drafting the appeal. He particularly accused the bishop of London of aiming to be archbishop of Canterbury.⁹⁹ In order to discredit the king, he disclosed the secret negotiation between Henry II and the Emperor and other diplomatic activities.¹⁰⁰ John denied the validity of the bishops' appeal¹⁰¹ and related the archbishop's attitude against it, referring to Becket's reply to the bishops, the papal announcement of his legation,¹⁰² and the papal approval of Becket's sanctions.¹⁰³ John informed Bartholomew that he may ignore the papal mandate concerning the property of the archiepiscopal clerks without fear of incurring the archbishop's displeasure. He also warned Bartholomew of the summons that the archbishop had dispatched which was carried by the same servant. Whether Bartholomew should receive it or not, what he decided to do with it, was left to him with the permission of its author. John saw to it that the summons should be handed either to Robert, son of Egidia or archdeacon Baldwin and not to the bishop himself. John closed his letter hinting at the possibility of excommunication of the king.

99. This charge was also made by Becket against Gilbert Foliot. Mats no. 224.

100. Mats no. 213.

101. Mats nos. 223 & 224.

102. Mats no. 223, Mats nos. 172-3, GFL no. 168.

103. Mats no. 182.

No. 174 was a mixture of propaganda intended for all English bishops and John's message to the bishop. Bartholomew was expected to understand, accept and further transmit the archbishop's point of view to other clergy. However, at the same time he was assured that the archbishop would not be angry if he might do with the papal mandate ordering the return of the property of Becket's clerks or archdeacons.

It was not until late 1171 John wrote to Exeter again. No. 187 addressed to the bishop of Totnes appears to have been sent singly unless one of the undatable letters to Robert of Egidia.¹⁰⁴ The letter was written to defend the archbishop and confront Foliot.¹⁰⁵ The letter denounces the bishops' actions and was meant to be an indirect reply to Multiplicem.¹⁰⁶ Some of the themes that appeared in nos. 168 and 174 were developed, and new themes were introduced. Some such as the example of the German schismatics disappeared temporarily. In this letter, we do not find any statement of the theory of two swords. The theme continued to appear throughout the propaganda war with attack on the king and his customs and the bishops' counsel for the king. John continued to call Gilbert the ruler of the synagogue and in no. 187, the Achitophel is also associated with him. Against Gilbert's comment that

104. No. 147 or 148.

105. On no. 187, see also the section I-2-a.

106. JS Letters ii, p xxxi. Barlow pp 155-6.

there was no need to fight for the Church's liberty,¹⁰⁷ John argued that one should fight to preserve the law of God and the Church's liberty, on the ground that they are the two most important causes. The defence of Thomas's standpoint and the justification of his behaviour at Clarendon and Northampton were further elaborated¹⁰⁸ to create a Christ-like image of Becket. In this letter, we find the argument on the validity of the bishops' appeal from the point of view of canon law¹⁰⁹ on the one hand and on the other a more practical protest against the sequestration of the goods of his followers and injustice done to the church's property.

The whole message in no. 187 was intended to reach wider circles of the English clergy. John appears to have been cultivating a campaigning system to Exeter--making Baldwin of Totnes a recipient of letters against the English bishops.¹¹⁰ Since June, Bishop Bartholomew may have been labeled as pro-Becket by the English bishops led by Gilbert Foliot and was probably unable to support Becket openly without danger. Besides it was awkward to make comments denouncing the English bishops to Bishop Bartholomew who was himself an English bishop. Therefore John had to invent a

107. GFL no. 166.

108. See Mats nos. 223 & 224.

109. See Mats nos. 223 & 224. On appeal Ad cautelam, Gilbert Foliot and his letters, Morey, A. and Brooke, C.N.L., Cambridge, 1967, pp. 162-6.

110. Dr. McLoughlin has discussed the reasons for having Baldwin as addressee of many letters to Exeter. (McLoughlin pp 447-448).

way of conveying his message without hurting his friend just as he did later with messages to Christ Church, Canterbury.

But this letter turned out to be the last of the series of propaganda letters exchanged between Becket and Gilbert Foliot. After John of Oxford's success in arranging the papal legation of William and Otto, the attention of the Becket party shifted from propaganda to the English bishops to diplomacy in connection with the arrival of the papal legates.

1166 saw dramatic changes in John's correspondence to Exeter. In 1164 & 1165, John's concern was mainly personal matters. Topics such as the failure of John's peace with the king, Richard's plight and his exile, and gratitude for the continued support and friendship of the people in Exeter still occupied a great part of John's letters till June 1166. But then they began to be overwhelmed by larger political issues as Becket began to launch his attack on the king and declare his principles. By the end of 1166, John's personal problems were scarcely discussed in his letters to Exeter. Since Richard was with John in Rheims by July, John had no more worries about his persecution. Since the king had crossed to Normandy in April 1166, there was not much that the bishop of Exeter could do to promote John's peace with the king. Although John continued to appreciate the favours of his friends in Exeter, their importance became less as far as John's personal life was concerned.

One feature that appeared in John's letters of 1166 was his attempt to publicize and promote Becket's standpoint. Some messages were directed only to his friends in Exeter,

but others were meant to be conveyed to other English clergy by the efforts of his friends in Exeter. Bartholomew of Exeter was probably the first English bishop who was given a clear explanation of Becket's behaviour and his intentions at the time of the Vézelay censures. Through no. 168, he learned for the first time how the conflict was viewed by Becket party and how it was interpreted outside England. After the Vézelay censures, the people at Exeter were not exposed merely to the royal propaganda or Becket's harsh words of antagonism. They were introduced to Becket's point of view through John's explanation and persuasion: Becket and his followers thought the conflict to be the matter of principles: from the point of view of principles, spiritual power is superior to temporal power: the Constitutions of Clarendon contain 'ancient customs' that are harmful to the freedom of the Church: the king's church policy was comparable to that of the German schismatics. John's letters also supplied the background knowledge to interpret the verbal exchanges of the two parties -- the archbishop's sentences, the bishops' appeal and the archbishop's reply to their appeal. It was not only on behalf of the people in Exeter that John's message should be propagated. It was to the advantage of the archbishop to increase his supporters in England. It was to the advantage of Bartholomew of Exeter to have among the English clergy others who shared his opinions with regards to the action that English bishops should take. Consequently, along with clarification and persuasion, John began to advise Bartholomew on what course of action he should take on certain anticipated situations.

This feature appears more prominently in the following years.

Consequently, John's correspondents changed. Richard disappeared and Robert, son of Egidia's importance diminished as John's correspondence became more and more political. Bishop Bartholomew was considered at least until July 1166 as someone who could propagate the archbishop's standpoint and perhaps speak for the archbishop publicly. John later realized that the bishop himself was not immune to danger and that his open support of the archbishop might endanger his position. Master Baldwin, archdeacon of Totnes came to the fore at this point. He was a master trained in law and theology who was able to understand the principles involved and their canonical interpretations. Archdeacon Baldwin was a less prominent, therefore, perhaps less conspicuous figure, but he was capable of comprehending the situation and taking appropriate actions. And he was close both to the bishop and John.

During his campaign directed to the English clergy in the summer of 1166, Becket consulted with John quite often.¹¹¹ In due course, Bartholomew of Exeter, who was probably never close to Becket at any stage of his life, was coming to enjoy a special relationship with the archbishop through John. The first such instance already appeared in this period when Bartholomew was permitted to disregard the archiepiscopal summons.

111. See the section 4-VI-3-b.

b. iii 1167 - 70

Exeter was somewhat neglected in 1167, while the diplomacy of the Becket party was directed at the papal legates and there is no extant letter until about December 1167. About this time, the issue of the absolution of those who were excommunicated at Vézelay was brought up at the meeting at Argentan. John sent a letter of warning to the effect that the bishop of Exeter would receive the legates' letter ordering him to absolve those who were excommunicated by the archbishop.¹¹² From this time onwards, various attempts were made to draw Bartholomew into the support of the king. How to come out of the difficulty without incurring the wrath of either the king or the archbishop was the problem Bartholomew faced from this time. While John helped Bishop Bartholomew with information and advice, his friends in Exeter probably continued to support him in various ways.

About a year after he received no. 187, Baldwin received two letters from John. They were no. 238 written in c. December 1167--January, 1168 and no. 241 written in January 1168. No. 241 was written in pseudonyms -- John as Gratian and Baldwin as Benedict. No. 238 was accompanied by a copy of the Pope's letter concerning the excommunication of Gilbert Foliot.¹¹³ No. 241 was accompanied by a copy of the renewed appeal of the bishops¹¹⁴ and a copy of the

112. JS Letters ii, no. 241.

113. The excommunication of Gilbert Foliot did not actually take place. JS Letters ii, p xxvii.

Pope's letter to the legates.¹¹⁵ The two letters were written about the same time, but convey different messages. They may have been sent together by the same messenger, one letter to Baldwin and another to his friend Benedict.

In no. 238, John commented on the letter addressed to their mutual friend Benedict, from which Baldwin was to learn the news. Then John reported the rumour of the bishop of Worcester.¹¹⁶ His speech and conduct 'in the presence of the bishops and other men' possibly around the time of the meeting of the king and the legates at Argentan, invited misunderstanding. Apparently, Roger of Worcester proposed out of good will to renounce his bishopric in order to make possible William of Pavia's proposal to move Becket to another see. Such a proposal was an insult to the archbishop who was fighting not for material comfort but for justice and for the liberty of the Church. On the assumption that Roger of Worcester went back to England,¹¹⁷ John asked Baldwin to persuade the bishop to clear himself of Becket's charge if there was a chance. John also mentioned the fact that the absolution of those who were excommunicated by Becket at Vézelay by the bishop of St. Asaph was not valid. This letter was apparently written so that Roger might have a chance to take some action to soothe Becket. It could also have served as a further clarification of Becket's standpoint and a warning to

114. GFL nos. 181-2.

115. Mats no. 355.

116. On Roger of Worcester and this letter, see 3-VI-3-a.

117. As to Roger's whereabouts, see the section 3-VI-3.

Bartholomew of Exeter from taking wrong actions unintentionally. The letter introduced Baldwin to the issue of absolution of the excommunicate, which was the main theme of Gratian's letter to Benedict.

In no. 241, Gratian informed Benedict what happened in the conferences of Becket and the cardinals and the cardinals and Henry II. He sent a copy of the renewed bishops' appeal. Gratian referred to the strong tie he had with the Becket party and conveyed their willingness to help and trust they had in Benedict. Gratian warned that Bishop Bartholomew would soon receive the legates' letter ordering him to absolve those who had been excommunicated by Becket,¹¹⁸ and gave advice that Bartholomew should look closely at the terms of the mandate and find excuse not to give absolution. If Bartholomew should be induced to absolve them, Gratian says, it would displease Becket considerably, but that he would mitigate his anger. Gratian urged Benedict to send the legates' mandate without delay as he would be able to give better advice if he knew the exact nature of the mandate. Thus, the Becket party gave all possible reassurance, encouragement and advice to prevent the bishop of Exeter from absolving the excommunicate.

Becket's party also feared that Bartholomew might be induced to join the bishops' appeal and even to take part in it in person. Since Bartholomew had already taken part in the bishops' appeals twice before, a third time might offend Becket irrevocably. But it was best for Bartholomew not to provoke the king, so that if he was asked to join in an

118. A similar letter was addressed to the bishops of Norwich and Chester. (Mats no. 353.)

appeal, he should employ delaying tactics by giving various excuses. In spite of these discussions on sophisticated legal issues, John did not forget to put in a sound and basic advice to prefer God and to preserve integrity of conscience. Between nos. 238 and 241, no 241 carried a more substantial message and that was probably why pseudonyms were being used. The two letters together carried out a most delicate business to Exeter -- reaffirmation of Becket's cause, encouragement and advice from Becket's party, and threat mitigated by John's promise of support. Besides nos. 238 and 241, one cannot detect letters that may have been delivered to Exeter together. Exchanges of letters and sending of gifts and news seem to have been frequent, but in the years 1167 to 1170, letters appear to have been delivered singly, usually to Archdeacon Baldwin. No. 249 appears to be a reply to Baldwin's letter. It expressed gratitude to Baldwin's favours, which possibly included material help. Baldwin apparently reported rumours that circulated in England and John wrote to him not to be disturbed by them.

No. 272 addressed to Baldwin of Totnes written in April-May 1168 is a long letter containing news which John had collected on his pilgrimage to St. Gilles. It is mainly about the situation in Italy: the escape of Frederick Barbarossa; the fate of anti-Pope Paschall III at Rome; the negotiation of Henry II and the king and queen of Sicily and Louis VII's counter-diplomacy; petition on behalf of the bishop of Salisbury and the Pope's letter asking Thomas to relax his sentence. John also reported the situation in France: the conference of the two kings at Soissons; the

violation of the agreement by Henry; the attempt to arrange another meeting through the mediation of the counts of Champagne and Flanders; Henry's lobbying of the French and his approach to William aux Blanchesmains; talk of the Crusade; Henry's attack of the Poitevins and the French complaint of Henry's attitude. John promised Baldwin to let him know of the treaty between the kings and the situation of the Pope and the cause of the English Church. John asked Baldwin to write back.

While this letter was on the way, John probably received favours from Baldwin, possibly including material help. John wrote his letter no. 273 in about May 1168, expressing his gratitude. His report on the fate of the schismatics continued from his letter no. 272 and he expressed his hope for peace in the near future.

No. 280 was written in about July 1168, shortly after the conference of La Ferté-Bernard. John used pseudonyms in this letter also. It was addressed to Benedict, and Gratian repeatedly emphasized the oral message to be delivered by a messenger who was well-known to Benedict. What we read in the letter, therefore, is probably not the most important message delivered on the occasion. John reported the news of the anti-Pope, the archbishop's suspension, the legates' departure and Cardinal Otto's urge for Henry II to make peace with the archbishop. What the most important message delivered orally by the messengers was, we have no way of knowing. But in a letter addressed to Master Lombardus written about the same time, John gave a full account of the conference of La Ferté-Bernard including Henry's boast of having obtained from the Pope a letter announcing the

archbishop's suspension, granting the king 'permission to sin'. Was this related to 'the other news, better spoken than written, so that when you know all you too can choose the path on which you can walk most safely'? This question remains unanswered.

The next letter to Exeter, no. 288 addressed to Bartholomew of Exeter was written in about February 1169. It contains a vivid and detailed description of the conference of the two kings at Montmirail and of how Henry and Becket failed to reach an agreement. The letter also reports what happened after Montmirail: how John of Canterbury tried to arrange an abortive meeting of the king and Becket: the king's secret dealings with the Curia while still pretending to be interested in the meeting with the archbishop: the second conference of the king's at St. Léger-en-Yvelines the proposed conference of the king with the Grandimontines and the English bishops. The rest of the news was entrusted to the messenger, whom Bartholomew was asked to send back as soon as possible. John also sent him a copy of the Pope's warning letter to the king on behalf of Becket.¹¹⁹ Just like his letter no. 168 to Bartholomew, this letter contains very little personal feelings. It is like a bulletin of news to be made public.

John wrote letter no. 289 probably in late August, 1169. John referred to his meeting with the papal commissioners Gratian and Vivian and the fact that Baldwin was tutor to Gratian. This letter was written basically to advise Bartholomew and it was clearly written in reply to

119. cf. Mats nos. 464, 471.

Baldwin's letter in which he asked questions and expressed his concern on diverse matters. Some of Baldwin's questions may have been shared by the English clergy in general. John answered Baldwin's question on the legal ground of the excommunication of the bishops of London and Salisbury on 13 April, 1169 at Clairvaux. Baldwin must have mentioned the rumours that the royal envoy to the Curia, Archdeacon Reginald, was supposed to be spreading to the effect that the archbishop's efforts would be made useless. John inquired into the matter and reported that the papal envoys denied the rumour. Upon analysis of the situation, John drew his conclusion that peace would be made in the near future.

John also gave counsel to Baldwin who probably expressed his concern on behalf of the bishop of Exeter. There was an attempt to draw Bartholomew into a joint appeal of the bishops in support of the excommunicated bishops and to let him take part in it in person.¹²⁰ John gave his approval of the bishop's withdrawal from intercourse with the excommunicate, but as to making an appeal for the king, his opinion was that whether Bartholomew crossed the sea or stayed at home, it would be very difficult for him to ward off the pressure. He advised Bartholomew to avoid the issue prudently as long as possible. John gave a brief account of the news that Frederick was about to make peace with the Church. He referred to the carrier of the letter and to the care which his brother, presumably Robert, son of Egidia, could take for his recovery.

120. Morey, Bartholomew, p 28.

There seem to have been several meetings, either just planned or actually carried out, of the English bishops around the time of the excommunication of Gilbert of London and Jocelin of Salisbury. The first meeting took place at London at the beginning of Lent.¹²¹ The second was the conference of Northampton on 15 May, 1169, which may have been a general conference assembled by Richard of Ilchester and other royal servants in an attempt to get the whole bench of bishops to join in an appeal against the excommunication of the bishops of London and Salisbury.¹²² Another council was planned in London for 7 June.¹²³ Since no. 189 was written in probably late August 1169,¹²⁴ John's advice cannot have been directed to any of the above mentioned episcopal conferences. However, the situation described in the letter has some semblance to what happened at the conference of Northampton. Bishop Bartholomew's behaviour presumably at Northampton is described by Dom Morey as follows:

The bishop of Exeter pointed out that by supporting the appeal he would be keeping company with excommunicates, but, if the king would give him leave, he was willing to leave England and make a fresh appeal of his own. This, however, would be against the possibility of a further censure,

121. Barlow, TB, p 186. GFL nos. 198-202

122. Barlow, TB, p 186. Mats nos. 508, 518-20, 552.

123. Barlow, TB, p 310. GFL no. 204.

124. JS Letters ii, pp xlii & 650.

presumably an interdict, rather than against that already inflicted. Another version of the bishop's speech makes his opposition even more downright. The bishop of London held his scruples up to ridicule, and henceforth, we are told, Exoniensis extra synagogam fuit.¹²⁵

On this occasion, John seems to have succeeded in preventing the bishop of Exeter from joining the appeal by giving advice and information of the situation favourable to the archbishop brought about by the papal envoys and the defeat of the Germans.

John's letter no. 281 might have been written after no. 289.¹²⁶ Most probably Peter of Celle's no. 127 went with it. The letter described the Church's straits with dangers pressing it on every side and with the king trying to destroy her liberty. Nothing concrete about the crisis was described in the letter, but Bartholomew was urged to be obedient both by John and by Peter as 'Obedience is the greatest command of all.' The Pope's letter to Roger of Worcester¹²⁷ which was added below John's was the one in which he advised Roger to stay on the continent in support of the archbishop rather than return to his bishopric and obey the king's wishes. Bartholomew was probably faced

125. Morey, Bartholomew, p 28. MTB i, p 56. Mats no. 553. Duggan has dated this letter April-May 1168 (Duggan, Thomas Becket p 239). Barlow has asserted that the letter was written in 1169. (Barlow TB, pp 186 & 310).

126. Letter no. 281 is placed after no. 280 in Professor Brooke's edition and it has been dated 1168-70. (JS Letters ii, p 614). For reasons being discussed, this letter might have been written after no. 289 in the latter part of 1169.

127. Perhaps Mats no. 401 dated by Duggan, April-May, 1168, (Duggan, Thomas Becket, p 243).

with a crisis in which, in order to be obedient to the archbishop, he might have to seek asylum in the monastery as offered by Peter of Celle. In fact, Bartholomew eventually went into a monastery after holding a diocesan synod at Exeter on 29 September 1169.¹²⁸ 29 September was the deadline for a settlement of peace, and as the date drew near, the king took measures to protect his kingdom against ecclesiastical sanctions. He ordered Geoffrey Ridel and Richard^{of} Ilchester to obtain the adherence of the English Church for the measures. Every free man over the age of 14 was to take an oath to observe supplements to the Constitutions of Clarendon.¹²⁹ The bishop of Norwich retired into his cathedral monastery and the bishop of Chester went into Wales to escape molestation.¹³⁰ Bartholomew also retired into a religious house but not at Rheims.¹³¹

John sent a news letter no. 298 to Baldwin in February-March, 1170. It was written partly in order to soothe Baldwin who was perturbed by rumours. To prove the authenticity of his account, John sent the letter which the archbishop's envoy lately sent him from the Curia.¹³² He also sent news which he received from Rome: the German

128. Morey, Bartholomew, p 29.

129. Knowles, M.D., Duggan, A.J. & Brooke, C.N.L., 'Henry II's Supplement to the Constitutions of Clarendon' in EHR, vol 87, (1972), pp 757-771.

130. Knowles, Duggan, Brooks, 'Henry II's Supplement to the Constitutions of Clarendon', p 760. Knowles, EC, p 134. Barlow, TB, p 196.

131. Morey, Bartholomew, p 29.

132. Mats no. 626.

attempt to make peace with the Church; the mission of the royal envoys led by Reginald of Salisbury ended in failure, hampered by the oath-taking in England the year before; the new royal envoys withdrew the king's previous request and committed the case and the terms of peace wholly to the judgement of the Pope. Other news from the continent was also delivered: the two kings were discussing the Crusade; Henry's peace with the Church was discussed, agreement reached and the archbishop was summoned to Normandy. When he reached Pontoise, he was told to go no further because the king had returned to England; there was a rumour that the king's return was to punish those who would not swear the oath; the king was told that unless he made peace before May 1, the Church's sanctions against his person and his lands would be made. John entrusted the rest of the message to the bearer of the letter. Like no. 272, this letter was intended to let Exeter people and possibly other clergy know of current events on the continent.

John's correspondence to Exeter ends in February or March, 1170. Although John's relationship with his friends in Exeter was by no means over, there is no extant letter written after this date. One of the reasons was perhaps that the chief correspondent, Baldwin of Totnes went into the Cistercian monastery of Ford.

In this period, John's correspondence remained highly involved with politics and carried few personal messages. John continued to rely heavily on Baldwin -- nine out of ten letters were addressed to him. John's friends in Exeter must have continued to support John and Becket as we find John thanking Baldwin for his favours. John continued to

send accurate and detailed news of the continent and the Papal Curia. In spite of his information, rumours current in England sometimes perturbed the people in Exeter, as we find Baldwin commenting on and asking for assurance in such matters.

One feature prominent in 1166 that disappeared in this period is exposition of Becket's principles. The phase of direct verbal campaign ended at the end of 1166. In the period between 1167 and 1170, in which papal decisions and negotiations between the kings became ever more important, epistolary campaigning was carried out in a subtler manner,¹³³ such as through John's choice of information to be dispatched to England. For instance, in April-May, 1168, John sent Baldwin news of the defeat of the Germans which he had collected on his pilgrimage to St. Gilles. He described it in detail in two letters.¹³⁴ The fate of the German schismatics should serve as an admonition to the king's advisers who appear to follow a similar policy in opposition to the Church.¹³⁵

The most outstanding characteristic of John's letters in the years 1167 to 1170 is advice to the bishop of Exeter. Out of ten letters that belong to this period, three are letters of advice. They are written on three occasions:

133. Concerning campaigning to Exeter, McLoughlin, pp 441-470, esp. 449-469.

134. JS Letters ii, nos. 272-3.

135. Reuter, T., 'John of Salisbury and the Germans' in The World JS, pp 415-425. In this letter no. 274 written to John of Canterbury about the same time, John merely mentioned the fact that he went on a pilgrimage to Saint-Gilles, because the news of the Germans had little propaganda value to him.

when the absolution of those who were excommunicated at Vézelay was going to be commissioned to Bartholomew by the papal legates;¹³⁶ when there was pressure on Bartholomew to join 'the bishops' appeal:¹³⁷ when the English clergy as well as laymen were ordered to take oaths to observe the king's decree, supplementing the Constitutions of Clarendon.¹³⁸ John's guideline for Bartholomew's conduct was to try neither to offend the archbishop and suffer in conscience, nor to offend the king and antagonize the English bishops. On the first occasion, John gave Bartholomew some concrete instructions to carry out the policy of moderation, advising him to adopt delaying tactics. On the second occasion, John advised Bartholomew to evade the issue prudently. We can recapture Bartholomew's behaviour, presumably at Northampton, but we do not know whether there had been a further attempt to put pressure on the bishop of Exeter.¹³⁹ On the third occasion, John advised Bartholomew to be obedient. Since oath-taking was mandatory, no delaying tactic would work nor would evasion as long as he stayed in office. Upon consultation with Peter of Celle, John advised him to join him in exile at Rheims. Bartholomew eventually sought asylum in a monastery at home.

In all three instances we can clearly see that John wanted Bartholomew to be first and foremost a supporter of

136. JS Letters ii, no. 214.

137. JS Letters ii, no. 289.

138. JS Letters ii, no. 280.

139. Councils and Synods II, pp 914-920.

Thomas's cause. It was equally important both for John and the archbishop that he remain the archbishop's supporter in England. Becket would not have liked to have another bishop taking the same course of action as the bishop of Worcester. It was very important for him to have a stronghold in England. Some material support could also be expected. To have another band of exiles in France would increase Becket's financial burden. From John's point of view, he would not have liked his mother and brother left in a diocese without the bishop who was their friend, nor to see them among the wretched exiles. In the years 1167 to 1170, we see that much of John's efforts lay in trying to find for the bishop the way to maintain the precarious balance of being Becket's supporter without provoking the king.

4. Conclusions

Just like the rest of the English clergy, the clergy of Exeter were affected by the Becket conflict to some degree or other. John's letters played an important part in shaping their lives in the aftermath of the conflict.

Among John's correspondents, Robert, son of Egidia was relatively unaffected by the conflict. He probably stayed in Exeter during the conflict and helped John by sending gifts and taking care of his brother, but his help was confined to personal matters. His capacity as physician somewhat limited his role, especially as John's correspondence began to involve much legal and canonical discussion later in the conflict. He seems to have been a man of some importance, for he was promoted archdeacon of Totnes after Baldwin retired to the abbey of Ford in 1170.

As to John's brother Richard, he appears to have led a life almost parallel to John's. In July 1166, he joined his brother in exile at Rheims. He returned to England with John, but appears to have gone straight back to Exeter. Richard joined Merton Priory sometime after 1170 and presumably before 1176, when John was elected bishop of Chartres. Richard's visit and stay at Merton may be related to John's stay there with Guy of Southwick, when they were engaged in assembling Becket's letters.¹⁴⁰

One feature that appeared later in his life was his friendship with Peter of Celle. Peter wrote three letters addressed both to John and Richard of Salisbury¹⁴¹ and six letters to Richard alone.¹⁴² They were probably written after Richard became a regular canon of Merton. Whereas Peter of Celle's letters to John as bishop of Chartres sound cool and formal, those to Richard increase in friendliness. Richard often renewed his request to Peter to write something about monastic discipline. Finally Peter set down to writing De Disciplina Claustrali for him after he had suffered a great illness.¹⁴³ Richard did not become a monk, but he may have found at Merton Priory, a life more to his taste than what he had seen of his brother.

Baldwin of Totnes, who was close both to John and Bartholomew, fulfilled a most onerous role during the Becket conflict. He was probably in charge of sending

140. Duggan, Thomas Becket, p 74.

141. PC Letters ii, nos. 121-3.

142. PC Letters ii, nos. 162-6. On Peter's friendship with Richard, see 2-IV-3-b(iii) & (iv).

143. PC Letters ii, no. 164.

material aid to John and that rather frequently. He was one of the advisers to John's brother Richard. He provided John with news and informed him of rumours in England. He received news and information from John. He passed them to the bishop and possibly transmitted them to other clergy. He asked John for advice on Bishop Bartholomew's course of action. He obtained John's advice and probably gave counsel to the bishop. His role in the conflict was therefore a dual one, to help John and also Bartholomew.

His service to Bartholomew required special skill and knowledge. Both John and Bartholomew believed that in principle, justice lies in the cause of Becket. Nevertheless, they wished, if possible to support his cause without provoking the king. In two out of three instances which the bishop was faced with such a danger, John advised him to avert it through accurate analysis of the case and through his skill and knowledge of law. We observe legal discussions taking place in John's letters to Baldwin. When John's letters reached Exeter, similar discussions must have taken place between the bishop and Baldwin. In order to understand John's argument and to help the bishop decide his action, Baldwin must have been equally skilled in law.

We do not know what prompted Baldwin to retire into the Cistercian abbey of Ford in 1170. Maybe the dual role he played proved too taxing for a 'gloomy and nervous man, learned and religious', if the description of his later years by Gerald of Wales was applicable to Baldwin in 1170. If he had wished to be relieved of his role, his knowledge and interest in law were by no means abandoned. In fact,

his innate love of legal argument as reflected in John's letters was to find an appropriate occasion for expression when he acted as papal judge-delegate as abbot of Ford. After he succeeded Roger as bishop of Worcester, we find him collecting papal letters.¹⁴⁴

Bartholomew's course of action was even more affected by John's letters than Baldwin. Although he was sympathetic to John and tried to help him make peace with the king, he was by no means a supporter of the archbishop at the beginning of the conflict. However, throughout the period following the Vezelay censures, the bishop of Exeter appears to have been steadfast in his support of the archbishop. Perhaps Bartholomew was not in a good relationship with Gilbert Foliot since their dispute over the Peter's Pence, which made him lean towards Becket. But he decided to support Becket not only because he agreed with his formal declaration of principles, but also because of the result of John's persuasion, the news and information he sent to authenticate his viewpoints, his well-founded advice, especially on legal issues, and moreover his effective lobbying with the archbishop on behalf of Bartholomew. The presence of his family at Exeter was no doubt a significant factor. John wanted Bartholomew to support Thomas for the justice of his cause. It was his wish that the bishop should not risk his soul's salvation by not supporting the Church. But John did not wish him to provoke the king's anger lest he and his people including John's own family become wretched exiles.

144. Duggan, C., Twelfth Century Decretal Collections and their importance in English History, London (1963) pp 110-117.

During the latter part of the conflict, much of John's attention was devoted to help the bishop maintain neutrality.

When the conflict was over with the murder of Becket, Bartholomew was out of it unscathed. His stance, which at times nearly incurred the king's anger, turned out to be an advantage in the aftermath of the conflict. He enjoyed the Pope's favour then and could be employed in delicate issues such as the absolution and punishment of the murderers of Becket and the celebration of the Mass at the reopening of the Cathedral Church of Canterbury. He enjoyed high favour from the king later on and was consulted on important issues. It must have been out of a feeling of gratitude that he offered John of Salisbury the office of treasurer at Exeter sometime after the murder of Becket.

With all four major correspondents in Exeter, John's relationship was essentially personal in the sense that it did not start from official or business communication. Richard was his brother and Robert, son of Egidia, his half brother. With Baldwin of Totnes, whenever John met him, he was a good friend and both of them were members of the chapter of Exeter. Bartholomew was a longstanding friend and possibly from his student days. The tie of friendship was strengthened through John's contribution to Bartholomew's election to the bishopric of Exeter. It was not as secretary to Archbishop Theobald nor as a follower of the exiled archbishop that they knew John. All his friends in Exeter knew each other and they accepted John as kinsman, and as a friend. Their acceptance of John as a sincere and trustworthy person, learned among other things, in law, with

a genuine concern for their happiness and welfare proved a decisive element in their attitude towards John in exile as well as towards the Becket conflict in general.

VI Conclusions to Chapter One

After having treated John's correspondence in four different areas in which John had longstanding friends, we realize that the relationships between John and his correspondents during the Becket dispute and afterwards differed considerably from area to area. John's ties with his friends in Salisbury were probably broken in the course of the Becket dispute. His correspondents in the area or who originated from the area were supporters of the king. The bishop of Salisbury was more or less forced into strong antagonism against Becket. The bishop of Bayeux who was much involved in the network of patronage in Normandy had little reason to support Becket. The feeble tie of childhood memory or antiquated patronage and family tie could not serve to hold their friendship during the stormy political conflict. Although John did his best to represent the bishop of Salisbury's standpoint to Becket, his efforts did not succeed and in the aftermath of the murder, the bishop of Salisbury and his family had little reason to patch up their friendship with a former clerk of their formidable opponent.

With regards to masters whom he first met in Paris, only one appears as his correspondent. John retained academic friendship with him like some other scholars among his correspondents. The relationship between John and his correspondent Richard l'Eveque was essentially unperturbed by the storm of the Becket conflict. It was partly because of the non-political and academic environment in which Richard L'Eveque found himself.

John's lifelong friend, Peter of Celle stood at the core of John's correspondents in Champagne. Peter who probably met John as a student in Paris introduced him to his circle of friends -- the count of Champagne, whose patronage John enjoyed, and the religious of the area with whom he cultivated monastic friendship. The Champagne area generally accepted John first and foremost as a learned man with an honourable character. During the Becket conflict he was a faithful servant of the exiled archbishop who was fighting for the cause of the Church against their enemy, the Angevin king. John was in a way an honourable guest. In addition to his service to William aux Blanchesmains it was probably on account of the reputation of his personal qualities that he was rewarded with the bishopric of Chartres.

The people in Exeter, on the other hand, knew him first of all as a most trustworthy friend and kinsman, who served them during the Becket conflict like a pilot on a stormy sea, leading them to a safe shore. John's correspondents in Exeter did their best to help him, but were helped by him just as much. That was why the bishop of Exeter rewarded him with the office of treasurer.

What was common to all four areas was that their relationships with John were essentially personal to start with. In other words, John did not initially appear to them as someone who was executing mandates of his master. When John came into a situation in which he had to carry out some official business, he tried his best to maintain good personal relationships.