

7

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

YOKO HIRATA

VOL III

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

July 1991

CHAPTER THREE - Correspondents whom John came to know in the service of Thomas Becket

I Introduction--John of Salisbury in the service of Becket

While John served Archbishop Theobald, he enjoyed power and prosperity, he experienced a turn of fortune under Archbishop Thomas. As an important clerk of Becket, he was involved in the quarrel between the king and the archbishop, and spent seven years in France as an exile and outlaw. John was first sent to France perhaps because he was out of favour with the king but also for diplomatic purposes. After Becket himself was exiled, John did not join his household which settled down at Pontigny and then at Sens, but stayed with Peter of Celle in Rheims. While maintaining ties with his English friends through letters, he tried to build up human relations in France. John also visited the Papal Curia which was then at Sens and tried to refresh his relationships with the members of the Papal Curia. Since he lived away from the archbishop's household, he did not make close friends with Becket's clerks. With Master Ernulf gone to Rouen, John's closest friend was Becket himself.

In this chapter, we shall discuss John's correspondents whom he came to know during this period. We also deal with Thomas Becket for whom most of John's later letters were written.

## II Archbishop Thomas's clerks

### 1. John of Salisbury in Becket's household

Becket was at first expected to carry out the same kind of duties as his predecessor Archbishop Theobald, only in closer contact with the king. Becket was to take part in royal administration. He was to take administrative and pastoral charge in his province as well as in Christ Church, Canterbury. He was to hear cases, issue acta, refer some cases to the Pope, transmit judgements from the Pope to members of his province. If Becket had done as expected, his household might have produced eminent churchmen of the realm, future bishops and archdeacons. Able clerks must have gathered at Becket's household seeking for opportunities. In fact, out of 22 eruditi of Becket listed by Herbert of Bosham, 17 joined the household between 1162 and 64.<sup>1</sup>

Becket's clerks initially came from various quarters.<sup>2</sup> Of the 17 eruditi, Herbert of Bosham and Gervase of Chichester came from the royal chancery.<sup>3</sup> Master Ernulf and probably William FitzStephen were also former clerks of the royal chancery.<sup>4</sup> John of Salisbury, Ralph of Sarre and John

---

1. MTB iii, p 523, Barlow, TB, pp 77-8.

2. For the constitution of Becket's household, Barlow, TB, pp 77-9. Also Barlow, F. Thomas Becket and his clerks, Canterbury, (1987) pp 12-20.

3. Barlow, TB, p 78. For Gervase of Chichester, Sheerin, D., 'Gervase of Chichester and Thomas Becket' in Medieval Studies vol 38, (1976) pp 468-82. For Herbert of Bosham, Loewe, R., 'The Mediaeval Christian Hebraists of England--Herbert of Bosham and earlier scholars' Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England, vol 17, (1953) pp 225-49. Smalley, Becket Conflict and the Schools, pp 59-86.

4. Barlow, TB, p 42.

of Tilbury were members of Archbishop Theobald's household. Becket may have recruited such clerk as Gerard Pucelle from masters of schools.<sup>5</sup> He also called on some bishops to provide him with suitable clerks.<sup>6</sup> He probably wished to recruit ecclesiastical administrators rather than scholars or monks.

When John joined the household of Becket, he already knew some of its members. He probably knew Reginald Lombard who was the son of the bishop of Salisbury and to whom he wrote one letter on behalf of his father.<sup>7</sup> John may have met Gerard Pucelle while he was a student in Paris.<sup>8</sup> He continued to associate with Gerard after he defected to Germany.<sup>9</sup> He already knew Master Ernulf from the time Becket was royal chancellor. John asked Master Ernulf in December or January 1156-7 to promote his case to Becket.<sup>10</sup> He had worked with John of Tilbury and Ralph of Sarre in Archbishop Theobald's household.<sup>11</sup> He had probably come to know Jordan of Melbourne with whom he went to the Pope to collect Becket's pallium.<sup>12</sup> John associated with

---

5. For Gerard Pucelle, see the section 4-III-2-C.

6. Barlow, TB, p 78.

7. JS Letters ii, no. 217. See the section 2-II-2-b.

8. See the section 2-III-1.

9. JS Letters ii, nos. 158, 184-6, 226, 277, 297.

10. JS Letters i, no. 27. See the section 3-III-1.

11. See the sections 3-IV-2-b(v) and 3-IV-2-a(i).

12. Barlow, TB, p 73.

Becket's clerks who attested his charters such as Robert Foliot, witness on three occasions in Becket's six surviving charters with witness-lists. John was later to write to the Pope in the name of Bartholomew of Exeter in support of his election to Hereford.<sup>13</sup> John probably came to know Master Lombardus, Silvester, treasurer of Lisieux, and Becket's friend and supporter Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques after he started serving Becket. With Baldwin of Boulogne, whom he had known from before,<sup>14</sup> he probably came to associate more closely.

At the initial stage of Becket's pontificate, John of Salisbury, Jordan of Melbourne and Master Ernulf were closely attached to Becket, and therefore important members of his household. They were sent to collect the pallium along with John of Canterbury and Adam of Evesham.<sup>15</sup> William fitzStephen may also have held an important place.<sup>16</sup> At this time, Herbert of Bosham does not appear to have held a place of special importance. He was a qualified master and diplomat, and served Henry II as a member of his embassy to Germany.<sup>17</sup> He was essentially a theologian and a pupil of Peter Lombard and perhaps of Andrew of Saint-Victor.<sup>18</sup>

---

13. JS Letters ii, no. 321.

14. JS Letters ii, nos. 46, 240.

15. Barlow, TB, p 73.

16. Cheney, M., 'William fitzStephen and his Life of Archbishop Thomas,' EHR vol 54, (1939) p 141.

17. Smalley, Becket Conflict and the Schools, pp 59-62.

18. Loewe, 'The Mediaeval Christian hebraists of England' p 240. Smalley, Becket Conflict and the Schools, p 61.

Nevertheless, as long as the relationship between Becket and the king remained normal, Herbert of Bosham served the archbishop with no greater distinction than other clerks. But Herbert of Bosham's approach to Becket may have prompted his 'breach with the king. Herbert's extreme view on the relations between regnum and sacerdotium influenced that of Becket.<sup>19</sup>

When Becket's quarrel with the king became apparent, some eruditi took their leave<sup>20</sup>, and some clerks were employed as envoys, since much diplomatic activity was directed to France and the Curia which was then at Sens. Master Henry was one of those sent to Sens in September 1163.<sup>21</sup> He was an envoy to the Curia from 1163 to 64,<sup>22</sup> a 'close and confidential clerk whom the Pope and cardinals knew well'.<sup>23</sup> Master Gilbert de Glanville, a canon of Lisieux was also Becket's messenger to the Curia in January 1164.<sup>24</sup> Gunter of Winchester was sent to the Curia early

---

19. Smalley, Becket Conflict and the Schools, p 62.
20. After the Council of Clarendon in January 1164, Jordan of Melbourne and Robert Foliot left Becket. (Barlow, TB, p 100) Reginald, archdeacon of Salisbury had also gone to live in France by June. (Barlow, TB, p 107).
21. Barlow, TB p 131.
22. JS Letters ii, no. 136.
23. Barlow, TB p 131.
24. Barlow, TB, p 131. Master Gilbert, possibly Glanville (JS Letters ii, no. 216, n 3 is later found interceding between Jocelin of Salisbury and Becket with the help of John of Salisbury. (JS Letters ii, nos. 215-7).

in 1164.<sup>25</sup> Master Hervey probably took part in Becket's active diplomatic campaign in summer 1164.<sup>26</sup> John of Salisbury who left England between October 1163 and January 1164 to settle down in Paris served Becket in that capacity sometime in 1164, perhaps in the latter part of that year.<sup>27</sup> John probably associated with other clerks who were sent to France such as Master Henry, Master Hervey, Gunter of Winchester and Gilbert de Glanville.<sup>28</sup>

After Becket's flight from Northampton, his servants were expected to gather at Saint-Bertin. Among those who actually gathered at Saint-Omer were; Becket's chaplains Robert, canon of Merton, Richard of Salisbury<sup>29</sup>, Becket's cross-bearer Alexander Llewelyn, the keeper of his seal Master Ernulf, his clerks Baldwin of Boulogne, archdeacon of Norwich, Gunter of Winchester, Theold, canon of St. Martin's, Canterbury, Master Lombardus of Piacenza and Silvester, treasurer of Lisieux.<sup>30</sup> Out of the 17 eruditi, quite a few names are missing. There were clerks like John of Salisbury who remained faithful to Becket but did not gather at Saint-Omer. John of Tilbury remained in England due to old age.<sup>31</sup> In addition to Robert Foliot and Jordan

---

25. Barlow, TB, p 132.

26. Barlow, TB, p 108.

27. JS Letters ii, no. 144.

28. For John's diplomatic activity in 1164-5, see also the sections 3-VII-3 and 4-III-1.

29. Barlow has cautioned against confusing different Richard of Salisbury, Barlow, TB, pp 120 & 302.

30. Barlow, TB, p 120.

31. JS Letters ii, no. 256, n 1'.

of Melbourne, Matthew and Gervase of Chichester also disappeared from this time. William fitzStephen made his peace with the king.<sup>32</sup> They probably saw no future under Becket and had no hope of reversing his conduct in the direction of cooperation with the king. The decline of Becket's fortune coincided with the conflict as to who would be the most influential adviser of Becket. Those who lost in the power struggle within the household yielded and retired from his service.

There were some clerks who did not follow Becket to Saint-Omer but were forced out of England after their proscription by the king. These clerks had diverse fates in France. Most of the exiles had to be dispersed among well-wishers.<sup>33</sup> Philip of Calne and Ralph of Sarre found their place in the chapter of Rheims and Richard of Salisbury was recommended to the dean and chapter of Thérouanne. Richard the chaplain was sent to Orleans and Master Ernulf to Rouen. Some exiles were maintained by the king of France, by the Empress Matilda and by the count of Flanders. Becket kept at his side only those whose services were indispensable.

From the time he was drawn into quarrel with the king, he required different types of clerks. He needed advisers in theological and canonical matters. He needed skilled

---

32. Barlow, TB, p 120.

33. See the sections 3-VII-3-b and 4-III-3.



propagandists, diplomats, and messengers who could bear hardship and danger. He also needed clerks who were able in addition to ordinary routine work, to write special types of letters such as appeal letters to the Papal Curia and propaganda messages to whoever may support him. If one clerk can carry out several types of works, it would be all the better. While many clerks left Becket out of disappointment, some were discharged or estranged because they did not have the ability that was called for by the exiled archbishop.

While many exiles depended on Becket to be placed to friendly religious or ecclesiastical institutions, some were able to find their own place to stay. Becket perhaps welcomed such clerks because it meant less burden for him. Gerard Pucelle resumed teaching in Paris.<sup>34</sup> John of Salisbury decided to stay in Rheims. He was also trying to make peace with the king.<sup>35</sup>

Between 1165 and the conference of Gisors and Trie in November 1167, further changes occurred to Becket's clerks. Gerard Pucelle defected to Germany in late 1165.<sup>36</sup> Philip of Calne made peace with the king on 1 May 1166 at Angers. Reginald, archdeacon of Salisbury, who was in Paris by June 1164, and who tried to intervene with Herbert of Bosham when

---

34. Barlow, TB , p 127.

35. John appears to have made a decision not to be a member of Becket's household around summer 1165, when he made an extensive campaign to obtain his own peace. (JS Letters ii, no 150)

36. Barlow, TB, p 127.

he was sent to the Curia to prepare for Becket's visit and to check on the activity of the royal embassy, was now serving the king.<sup>37</sup> Silvester of Lisieux also made peace with the king by early 1167.<sup>38</sup> At the conference of Gisors and Trie, Becket was accompanied by his clerks John of Salisbury, Herbert of Bosham, Lombardus, Alexander, John the Canter, Henry (of Houghton), his chaplains Robert (of Merton) and Gilbert (of Chicksands) and some others.<sup>39</sup> Becket's able diplomat Master Hervey of London had died on a mission to the Papal Curia during or after the summer of 1166.<sup>40</sup> Baldwin of Boulogne had possibly been sent to England on a secret mission before the conference of Gisors and Trie.<sup>41</sup> By the time of the conference of Gisors and Trie, the nucleus of Becket's household in exile was more or less fixed. There were more loss of clerks to Becket after the conference of Gisors and Trie. Sometime in 1168, John's relative Richard died on his mission to Benevento.<sup>42</sup> According to Herbert of Bosham, there were more deaths about that time.<sup>43</sup> Master Lombardus of Piacenza transferred to

---

37. Barlow, TB, p 121. La vie de Saint Thomas le martyr par Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence, ed. Walberg, E., Lund, (1922) 11 2291-2320.

38. JS Letters ii, no. 215.

39. Barlow, TB, p 171. JS Letters ii, no. 231.

40. Barlow, TB, p 131.

41. JS Letters ii, no. 240.

42. JS Letters ii, no. 277. See the section 3-IV-7-a(iv).

43. MTB iii, pp 415-6.

the Curia from Becket's household about May 1168.<sup>44</sup>

When Becket went back to England, Herbert of Bosham, John of Salisbury, John the Canter, Alexander of Wales and Günter of Winchester continued to be the most important members of his household. There were a few additional members. The chaplain Richard of Salisbury rejoined the archbishop by Christmas 1170.<sup>45</sup> Master Gilbert of Glanville also came back.<sup>46</sup> William fitzStephen may also have returned. There may have been some newcomers. Among them, William of Canterbury and Edward Grim are known mainly because they were with Becket on the day of his martyrdom.<sup>47</sup> On the 26th., Becket assigned various missions to old members of his household except for John of Salisbury. A new form of administration was planned and together with it, a new power structure within the household was to be generated. Becket's sudden death deprives us of the opportunity to see how it might have worked.

## 2. John's correspondents

### a. Master Ernulf

Master Ernulf was a clerk to Becket as royal chancellor and chancellor to Becket as archbishop.<sup>48</sup> One letter

---

44. Barlow, TB, p 176.

45. Barlow, TB, p 302.

46. Barlow, TB, p 131.

47. Barlow, TB, pp 243-4.

48. JS Letters i, no. 27, n 1. Barlow, TB, pp 81-2.

survives which John wrote to Ernulf as secretary to Becket asking for his assistance. As secretary to royal chancellor, he was able to select among cases brought to him the ones to be promoted to the chancellor.<sup>49</sup> When Becket was promoted archbishop, Ernulf was recruited from the royal chancery.<sup>50</sup> He remained important in Becket's service mainly in the capacity of writing letters.<sup>51</sup> Along with John of Salisbury, he was one of the envoys sent to solicit the pallium in 1162.<sup>52</sup> Master Ernulf was among those who gathered at Saint-Bertin after Becket's flight from Northampton. By late 1165, he was among the exiles whom Becket dispersed among well-wishers.<sup>53</sup> Two letters survive which he wrote from Rouen<sup>54</sup> expressing his sorrow at Becket's abandonment of him.

John's letter no. 27 was written in about December 1156 or January 1157 when he incurred the anger of the king after his return from the Papal Curia. This letter was probably sent with some other letters to Becket who was on the continent with the king. John probably sent Archbishop Theobald's letter<sup>56</sup> to the royal chancellor with 'a letter

---

49. JS Letters i, no. 27.

50. Barlow, TB, p 42.

51. Barlow, TB, p 133. Mats no. 233.

52. Barlow, TB, p 73.

53. Barlow, TB, p 127.

54. Mats nos. 163, 233.

55. For activities of the king and his chancellor on the continent at that time. Eyton, pp 19-21.

56. JS Letters i, no. 22.

from the Pope on my behalf,<sup>57</sup> a letter from Archbishop Theobald supporting the Pope's request,<sup>58</sup> John's letters to the royal chancellor,<sup>59</sup> and to Master Ernulf.<sup>60</sup>

In letter no. 27, John asked Master Ernulf to urge the royal chancellor to help him recover the king's favour and to give him Ernulf's own advice. Since the chancellor was a busy person, John wrote, he would not advance his petitions unless incited by somebody else. John asked Ernulf to let him know how the king received the petitions of the Pope, the archbishop of Canterbury and the royal chancellor.

Apparently Ernulf wrote him back. Early in 1157, John reported to Adrian IV that on account of the bishop of Lisieux, 'the king himself denounced me both to the archbishop of Canterbury and to his chancellor for abasing the royal dignity' and that even the Pope's letter was of no avail.<sup>61</sup> Ernulf was probably John's source of information at the royal court and adviser to John on certain matters. It may have been Ernulf who first informed John of the anger of the king. He may also have advised John to write to the Pope. Although Becket was once his colleague, he was a distant figure as royal chancellor. John felt more at ease with Master Ernulf who probably held the same kind of position to the chancellor as he did to Archbishop Theobald.

---

57. JS Letters i, nos. 21 & 28.

58. JS Letters i, no. 28.

59. JS Letters i, no. 28.

60. JS Letters i, no. 27.

61. JS Letters i, no. 30.

In those years, they probably helped each other by exchanging information and promoting cases to be heard by their masters.

At the time of Becket's accession, both John and Master Ernulf were important clerks in his household. They were both faithful to the archbishop after his flight from Northampton. What divided the fate of the two clerks afterwards was probably that whereas John chose to separate himself from Becket's household, Master Ernulf probably stayed with them until about the end of 1165. By keeping the distance, John was not involved in any power conflict within the household of the exiled archbishop. What is more important, the service John could provide for the archbishop in diplomacy and in advice remained useful to him. On the contrary, Master Ernulf, who was probably skilled in drafting letters and other routine chancery works was not of much use to the archbishop who now needed different types of services. As Herbert of Bosham gained the most influential place among Becket's clerks in exile, Master Ernulf was discarded and sent to Rouen on the occasion when a mass of new exiles arrived in 1165. No evidence exists of communication between John and Master Ernulf after the archbishop's exile. Their positions as secretaries to Becket and Theobald had made cooperation between them useful at one time, but probably they did not develop a personal friendship.

b. Baldwin of Boulogne

John wrote one letter to Baldwin in pseudonyms in 1168 to encourage and instruct him in his mission to contact John's old friends. Baldwin was archdeacon of Sudbury in

the diocese of Norwich.<sup>62</sup> According to fitzStephen, Baldwin and his brother Master Eustace of Boulogne introduced Becket into Archbishop Theobald's household.<sup>63</sup> While John was in the service of Theobald, he wrote one letter to Pope Adrian IV probably in 1157 denouncing Baldwin.<sup>64</sup> In this letter, John asked the Pope not to listen to the possible plea of Baldwin concerning the renewal of the suit over the church of Yelverton.<sup>65</sup> John's reason was that Baldwin, 'a man conspicuous for his malice, guile and skilled mendacity' was spreading rumours that the Pope had sent him to England to receive seven hundred marks from the earl of Warenne in return for hearing his petitions against the king and that the archdeacon used this mission as an excuse for not appearing at the court of the bishop of Norwich. John wrote this letter on behalf of the bishop of Norwich who was friendly to him. Since the aim of the letter was to help the bishop in his struggle with the disobedient archdeacon, John's description of the archdeacon was bound to be unfavourable.<sup>66</sup>

---

62. Le Neve ii, p 69.

63. Barlow, TB, p 29.

64. JS Letters i, no 46.

65. Professor Brooke has suggested other possibilities for the identity of the subject of no. 46. For reasons discussed here, we assume that the initial of B(aldewinus) Norwic(ensis) archidiaconus is correct.

66. See the sections 3-VI-7-a(ii), 3-VI-7-b(i).

Baldwin was among Becket's followers who gathered at Saint-Omer after Becket's flight from Northampton.<sup>67</sup> His name is not found in the list of Becket's clerks in the report of the conference of Gisors and Trie on 18 November, 1167.<sup>68</sup> By this time, he may have already left on his mission to England, where John's no. 240 was probably sent.

Letter no. 240 to Baldwin was written between about December 1167 and March 1168. This letter was written in an intimate tone using pseudonyms, Baldwin being addressed as Godwin, son of Edwin the priest, while John took the name of Godric, his knight. 'Godric' reminded 'Godwin' of their encounter at Siena, when he himself was on his way to the Papal Curia and 'Godwin' was on his way back.<sup>69</sup> In Siena, 'Godric' wrote, 'Godwin' girt him with sword of knighthood. What took place is not clear. The metaphors or expressions are deliberately made vague and indirect. 'Godric' in his fifth year of exile, also referred to his continued fight. Wondering whether he still had any friends in England, he

---

67. Barlow, TB, p 120.

68. Barlow, TB, pp 121 & 130.

69. Baldwin visited the Curia in the 1150's, perhaps c. 1157. (JS Letters ii, no. 240, JS Letters i, no. 46) However, John probably stayed at Canterbury for most of the year of 1157. For his letters nos. 28--43 were written in 1157 and their dates spread evenly throughout the year. Therefore it is not likely that John took a trip to the Curia in 1157. They may have met at Siena on an earlier occasion. According to John, Adrian IV had commissioned Baldwin to receive a sum of money from the earl of Warenne. (JS Letters i, no. 46) Since the date of commission must be earlier than no. 46, (dated c. 1157). Baldwin must have visited the Curia at least once before 1157.



asked 'Godwin' carefully to inquire after them and persuade them to be on 'Godric's' side. He encouraged 'Godwin' and gave permission to show the letter to those whom he was to visit.

Baldwin had been sent to England to rally support for Becket prior to no. 240 which was probably delivered by some other messengers while he was on his mission in England. Baldwin may originally have been sent to England with nos. 205 and 220.<sup>70</sup> No. 240 may have been delivered to him along with nos. 250, 251 and maybe 253 which are to be delivered to John's friends.<sup>71</sup> If he had been sent to Kent where the royal persecution was harshest, he would have been in danger if recognized. Hence, no doubt, the pseudonyms, which also have an intimate play element which could only be understood by John and Baldwin.

Directly or indirectly, John and Baldwin knew each other for a long time. John once denounced Baldwin for taking advantage of his relationship with the Pope in order to get away from the episcopal court. So John also emphasised his relationship with the Pope to try to improve his own position. Whatever their relation may have been in connection with the bishop of Norwich, they knew they were both the same kind of people. Among the clerks of Archbishop Thomas's household, many of whom were recruited

---

70. No. 205 addressed to Wibert and Odo, dated 1164-7. No. 220 addressed to Richard of Dover dated ? summer-autumn 1167, but perhaps closer to autumn. See 3-V-3-a(i).

71. Nos. 250, 251 & 253 probably belong to the turn of 1167-8 (JS Letters ii, p xl.) Along with these three letters, no. 240 also refers to the Emperor's catastrophe. Since this letter and no. 250 to Peter the Scribe are the only letters that contain allusions to Exodus 16:7 and 4 Kings(2 Kings) 7: especially 18-20, it is not unlikely that they were written at the same time. See the section 3-IV-2-b.

on Thomas's accession, John and Baldwin were old timers who shared common experiences. During Becket's exile, they were friends and comrades fighting for common cause.

c. Lombardus of Piacenza

One letter survives in which John made a detailed report of the meeting of La Ferté-Bernard to Lombardus who was then in Rome.

Master Lombardus of Piacenza was one of Herbert of Bosham's eruditi.<sup>72</sup> He was probably recruited into Becket's household sometime before November 1164 possibly from the Papal Curia.<sup>73</sup> He was at Saint-Bertin after the flight of the archbishop from Northampton in November 1164.<sup>74</sup> He was Becket's adviser in canon law at Pontigny<sup>75</sup> and he also wrote some letters for the archbishop.<sup>76</sup> He was among Becket's clerks who were present at the conference of Gisor and Trie in November 1167,<sup>77</sup> but probably in about May 1168, he transferred from Becket's to the Pope's household.<sup>78</sup> On this occasion, he may have served as Becket's envoy to the Curia.<sup>79</sup> He probably carried the

---

72. Barlow, TB, p 78.

73. In February 1167, he wrote to the Pope as papal subdeacon. (Mats no. 292).

74. Barlow, TB, p 120.

75. Barlow, TB, p 133f.

76. Barlow, TB, pp 133, 152. One of the four letters drafted in reply to the bishops' appeal was at the hands of Lombardus. (Mats no. 222).

77. JS Letters ii, no. 231. Barlow, TB, p 171.

78. Barlow, TB, p 176.

79. Mats no. 642.

80. Mats nos. 642, 441-4.

archbishop's letters to the Pope and some cardinals,<sup>80</sup> along with other letters protesting against the archbishop's suspension.<sup>81</sup>

Lombardus continued to act in support of Becket. In July or August, 1168, Becket counted on him to promote his case at the Curia.<sup>82</sup> At the meeting of the two kings at Saint-Léger-en-Yvelines in February 1169, it was arranged that Master Lombardus, who was in the household of William of Sens, was to represent Becket at the conference of the bishops which the king was planning to hold at the Grandimontines.<sup>83</sup> Master Lombardus became a cardinal by 1170 and was archbishop of Benevento from 1171 to 1179.<sup>84</sup> Alan of Tewkesbury, who made the 'definitive edition' of the Becket correspondence, was a canon of Benevento sometime during Lombardus's pontificate and John handed over his 'Life and Letters' of Thomas Becket to Alan before departure to Chartres.<sup>85</sup>

John probably came to know Master Lombardus after Lombardus joined Becket's household and they began to develop closer relationships after Becket's exile. Among Becket's clerks, John appears to have liked and respected Lombardus and Alexander most.<sup>86</sup> When Becket sent letters

---

81. Mats nos. 435-440, 448.

82. Mats no. 406.

83. JS Letters ii, no. 286. Barlow, TB, p 183.

84. JS Letters ii, no. 228, n 3. Barlow, TB, p 78.

85. JS Letters ii, p lxi. Barlow, TB, p 7.

86. When John sent his suggested version of a letter to Cardinal William of Pavia to Becket, he asked him to show it only to them. John looked up to them as they were 'compassionate towards my incompetence'. (JS Letters ii, no. 228)

protesting against the Pope's treatment of John of Oxford and the legateship of William of Pavia,<sup>87</sup> John wrote to the Pope on behalf of the exiles,<sup>88</sup> and as papal subdeacon, Lombardus also wrote to the Pope to inform him of the opinions of the French.<sup>89</sup> Since both letters were probably written in late February 1167,<sup>90</sup> the messenger whom Lombardus knew well and to whom he entrusted oral messages may have also carried John's letter.<sup>91</sup>

John's letter to Master Lombardus was written in July after the papal letter suspending Becket was published by Henry II. His letter was probably delivered to Lombardus along with a letter from Becket.<sup>92</sup> According to John, he had promised Master Lombardus before Lombardus left for the Papal Curia that he would write to him and let him know the news. Letter no. 279 is a detailed and vivid account of the meeting of the two kings at La Ferté-Bernard on July 1-2, 1168 and of the incidents that took place afterwards. John described how the king had boasted of his triumph over the Pope and the Roman Church, and how he remarked on the corruption of the Curia. He further reported that the

---

87. Mats nos. 285-8, 290.

88. JS Letters ii, no. 213.

89. Mats no. 292.

90. Concerning the dating of the letters see the section 4-IV-2-C.

91. Mats no. 292.

92. Mats no. 406.

king had had the papal letter of Becket's suspension copied and published.<sup>93</sup> He also made criticism of the behaviour of the royal envoys to the Curia and of the cardinals. After adding more news, John requested Lombardus to act so that the Pope might support the archbishop and condemn those who persecuted the Church. Along with Becket's, this letter was designed to incite anti-Angevin feeling in the Curia by disclosing the king's atrocious behaviour.<sup>94</sup>

One of the reasons why Lombardus transferred from Becket's household to the Pope's was probably that he lost importance in Becket's household. During Becket's stay at Pontigny, Lombardus had held an important place in his 'study group' together with Herbert of Bosham,<sup>95</sup> and composed Becket's letters at the peak of the epistolary campaign in 1166.<sup>96</sup> But as the conflict of Becket and Henry II merged into the broader war between the Angevins and Capetians and the solution was sought not within the framework of what was essentially a personal strife developed into a war of principles but within a broader and more practical framework of political and diplomatic scope, Lombardus's skill was perhaps not as much called for as before. Besides, he might have preferred to pursue his career at the Curia as he had originally started to. After the retreat of the Germans, when the situation around the

---

93. See Mats no. 395.

94. JS Letters ii, no. 275 to Poitiers was written with a similar aim.

95. Barlow, TB, p 129.

96. See note 76 above.

Curia was stable and improving, the Pope could afford to support Becket. The view of those cardinals who were against the war with the Germans and who believed more in importance of reform and spirituality may possibly have got the upper hand. At such time, the fact that he had been in France with Becket in close association with William aux Blanchesmains may have helped improve Lombardus's position in the Curia. At least it was to his advantage to generate a pro-Becket atmosphere there. His promotion to cardinalate and subsequently to an archbishopric may have owed something to his involvement in the Becket affair.

Master Lombardus would have appreciated John's letter which probably came with Becket's request.<sup>97</sup> Accurate information about the Angevins and Capetians and about how the Pope's decision affected Becket would have helped at the Curia. When the papal clerk Vivian, probably together with Lombardus, wished to ask for Becket's cooperation in negotiations at St. Denis and Montmartre, they turned to John of Salisbury for assistance.<sup>98</sup>

d. Silvester of Lisieux

John wrote one letter to Silvester when the Becket party tried to make contact with the king's court after they came back from Brittany.

---

97. Mats no. 406.

98. Barlow, TB, p 192.

Silvester of Lisieux was a nephew of Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux, who was a friend of Becket, but enemy of John.<sup>99</sup> He became treasurer of Lisieux at Arnulf's accession to the see in 1141,<sup>100</sup> but he acted mainly to the detriment of the bishop in his see.<sup>101</sup> Silvester was the brother of Hugh of Nonant, archdeacon of Lisieux, later bishop of Coventry (1185/8-98). Both brothers were at one time in the service of Archbishop Thomas.<sup>102</sup> Unlike his brother Hugh of Nonant, Silvester is omitted from Herbert of Bosham's list of eruditi. Silvester joined Becket at Saint-Bertin after the archbishop's flight from Northampton in November 1164.<sup>103</sup> He left the service of the archbishop by early 1167<sup>104</sup> and is not in the list of Becket's clerks at the conference of Gisors and Trie in November 1167.<sup>105</sup> He appears to have remained sympathetic to Becket's party at least until about January 1167.<sup>106</sup>

---

99. The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux ed. Barlow, F., Camden Society 61 (1939) p xi, n 1, p xiii & note. Barlow, TB, pp 49, 84. See the section 3-III-1.

100. The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, pp lvi & xi.

101. The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, p lvi, nos. 33, 89, 132.

102. Barlow, TB, p 78.

103. Barlow, TB, p 120.

104. JS Letters ii, no. 215.

105. Barlow, TB, p 131.

106. JS Letters ii, no. 215. Mats no. 269.

There is one letter of Becket addressed to Silvester of Lisieux written c. January 1167.<sup>107</sup> It is written in a friendly and hopeful tone as if Becket were confident of his support. It advised him against believing whatever rumours he might hear about John of Oxford's achievement at the Curia. Concerning the excommunicate, the letter made it clear that those who had been excommunicated at Vézelay remained so. Therefore communication with them would result in contamination. Becket asked Silvester to spread a certain news at the royal court and in his region without revealing its true authorship. With words of comfort, Becket sent greetings to 'our Nicholas,' presumably of Mont-Saint-Jacques.

John's letter to Master Silvester of Lisieux<sup>108</sup> was probably sent with that of Becket. In this letter, John asked for Silvester's continued cooperation in the cause of the archbishop after Silvester's peace with the king and expressed his approval that it was not made rashly for temporal gain but in honourable terms. John described the hope it engendered in others and asked for his help for those who were still in exile. After praising the French

---

107. Mats no. 269. It seems to have been difficult to decide the addressee of no. 269. It has 'the short cryptic, protocol which Becket (and also John of Salisbury) used in secret or sensitive correspondence with friends who might be open to reprisals from the king'. (Duggan, Thomas Becket, pp 32-3, n 3. The letter was believed at one time to have been addressed to Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques. But both Robertson (MTB vi, p 113, n 4) and Duggan (Duggan, Thomas Becket, p 229) agree that it was addressed to Silvester of Lisieux.

108. JS Letters ii, no. 215.



king for his support and protection of Becket and the kindness he had shown to the English church, John expressed his hope for imminent peace, a hope based on information he was not allowed to reveal. John asked Silvester to write back' if he could and advise him on policy for the Church and for themselves.

Both Becket's and John's letters were written to influence the royal court. Since Walter de Insula, a sympathizer of Becket at the royal court, was found out and punished by the loss of his office sometime before the end of 1166,<sup>109</sup> Becket's party would have wished to recruit somebody else to gather information and campaign for Becket at the royal court. Becket and John kept in touch with Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques at least till the end of 1166, and the king's physician Ralph de Beaumont might have acted for the same purpose. The two letters of Becket and John were written to ask Silvester to do the same. As treasurer of Lisieux, Silvester could probably approach the royal court or gather news, at least while the king was in Normandy. But when Becket and John wrote to Silvester in about January 1167, we do not know whether he received their letters in time to do so. For the king's court which probably remained in Rouen in December 1166, moved down to Poitiers for Christmas,<sup>110</sup> and we do not know whether Silvester followed the king there or on to Aquitaine in January 1167.<sup>111</sup>

---

109. JS Letters ii, nos. 180, 189. Barlow, TB, pp 160-1.

110. Eyton, pp 102-3.

111. Eyton, pp 104-5.

Whatever agreement Silvester may have had with Becket on making peace with the king, John seemed to have sufficient reason to assume Silvester's continued support of Becket since the peace was made 'honourably'. What Silvester thought about Becket's and John's request for assistance and cooperation, we do not know. There is, however, an 'amicus' of Becket or more than one of them, who were peculiarly familiar with the king's behaviour in Normandy and sent Becket a number of letters with valuable and detailed information.<sup>112</sup> Silvester might have been among the senders of these letters.

e. Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques, Rouen

Nicholas was a friend of Becket's and John wrote to him on a number of occasions both in his own name and in Becket's. He was a canon of Augustinian leper hospital of Saint-Jacques on the Mont-aux-Malades in Rouen.<sup>113</sup> Becket probably met him first in 1161 when he fell ill and stayed in the suburb of Rouen.<sup>114</sup> Nicholas had close contact with the Empress, the mother of Henry II, who lived in retirement near Rouen, but retained a strong influence on her son.<sup>115</sup> Becket found in him an informant and a well-wisher. At one time, he served as intermediary between Becket and the Empress and Norman bishops. Nicholas was one of Becket's

---

112. Mss nos. 235, 339, 560, 598, 673, 676.

113. JS Letters ii, no. 157, n 1.

114. Barlow, TB, p 62.

115. Warren, Henry II, p 81.

few sympathizers in Normandy and his role was particularly important while there was hope for peace through the mediation of the Empress. Nicholas wrote a number of letters to Becket and received at least one.

Nicholas started playing the role of intermediary between Becket and the Empress shortly after Becket's exile. Apparently Becket asked Nicholas to deliver letters to the Empress and to Arnulf of Lisieux.<sup>116</sup> Nicholas wrote to Becket around Christmas 1164 mainly to report to the archbishop how the Empress behaved to Nicholas on his two visits on Becket's behalf and how Arnulf of Lisieux reacted to Becket's letter.<sup>117</sup> Nicholas asked Becket not to reveal the source of information when he wrote to the Empress and to be careful with letters to him.

Becket had been virtually suspended by the Pope until Easter 1166, but as Easter was approaching, he was getting ready to be on the attack. Probably in early 1166, John wrote to Nicholas in the archbishop's name.<sup>118</sup> The letter was addressed to Nicholas, but it had the nature of an open letter announcing to the Empress and the king what was to come. Becket requested Nicholas to inform the Empress that ecclesiastical censures might fall on her son and his

---

116. Becket's letter to the Empress might have been Mats no. 75 dated Dec. 1164. The one to Arnulf of Lisieux appears to have been lost but Arnulf's reply was probably AL letter no. 47.

117. Mats no. 76.

118. JS Letters ii, no. 157. Mats no. 184. On this letter, see the section 4-VI-3-b.

lands unless he showed repentance. Nicholas was then to tell the Empress that if her son accepted her counsel, Becket would be ready to come to terms with him.

Apparently Becket reported to Nicholas on the Vézelay censures. Nicholas wrote back to him before 24 July 1166<sup>119</sup> in approval of his action and reported the reaction and news at Rouen particularly how the archbishop of Rouen felt and acted on the matter. Nicholas advised Becket to write to the Norman bishops expressing his willingness to return to the see of Canterbury and to accept what is just according to canon law. If necessary Becket was also to write to the archbishop of Rouen and the Empress. Nicholas reported that the Empress did not greet the excommunicate and that at Rouen, the excommunication of the king was expected. He also heard by this time about the appeal of the bishops and the coming council of Northampton on 6 July.<sup>120</sup> Becket sent this letter to John along with those of the bishop of Salisbury, John of Oxford and Master Hervey, and asked for his opinions.<sup>121</sup> As to Nicholas's letter, John agreed with his proposal and reckoned 'nothing wiser....than to follow the advice of Nicholas,' and reported that his friends in Rheims, Master Philip, Masters Fulk and Ralph and the abbot of Saint-Rémi were of the same opinion.<sup>122</sup>

---

119. Mats no. 206.

120. On the effect of Mats no. 206, see the section 3-VI-2-C.

121. JS Letters ii, no. 176 written to Becket probably late July 1166.

122. JS Letters ii, no. 179.

Nicholas appears to have been silent until about 18 November 1166, when the king was back to Normandy from Brittany<sup>123</sup> because, Nicholas wrote, there was no news worth writing about.<sup>124</sup> In this letter, Nicholas sent news collected in his area. The courier who handed letters to the king was tortured and confessed that he received letters from Master Herbert. The king had negotiations with Count Theobald and the Count of Flanders. The king was very angry and Master Walter who did not arrest the courier was punished by loss of his office.<sup>125</sup> The archbishop of Rouen had not published the papal mandate which Becket had sent to the king. Nicholas also transmitted news from Canterbury; the bishop of London had handed over Becket's revenue to the king's treasury; the prior of Canterbury held a certain monk in custody, who spoke in support of Becket; one of Becket's men caught hid in the monastery of Christ Church and fled from there.

One more letter from Nicholas to Becket survives which cannot be dated with precision.<sup>126</sup> It is essentially a letter of apology to Becket that Nicholas could not call on him for various reasons. Since Nicholas wrote the letter while the king was in Rouen, the probable date may be around April 15, 1165, around November or December of 1166 and

---

123. Eyton pp 99-103.

124. Mats no. 254.

125. The same information is contained in Mats no. 253 which might have been written by Walter de Insula. (Barlow, TB, p 161.) See also 3-VIII-2-d.

126. Mats no. 284 dated 1165-9. (Duggan, Thomas Becket, p 254.)

September and October of 1169.<sup>127</sup> Could Becket's call be related to his summonses to English bishops, who were expected by John 'to hear' 'before witnesses' the papal mandate and to discuss other things as John proposed?<sup>128</sup>

Meanwhile, Nicholas may have sent material help to Becket's party. It may have accompanied either Mats no. 253 or 284 and possibly sent care of John of Salisbury. We find John writing in his own name to Nicholas probably about the end of 1166, thanking him for his generosity.<sup>129</sup> John stated that he suffered from poverty and exile, but willingly for justice's sake. He added his opinion on the prospect of peace and his wish that 'the king will act not so that he should darken the glory of his kingship,' asking Nicholas to greet in the court those who were not excommunicate.

John appears here as Nicholas's correspondent in his own name. He certainly knew about Nicholas as he had written to him in the archbishop's name. So far as we could trace in the correspondence between Becket and Nicholas, there was no indication that Nicholas knew John personally. But the nature of the transaction, i.e. sending material help and writing in thanks for it made John a more suitable party for Nicholas to deal with. Letter no. 188 is indeed a well-composed letter of thanks sent from a distant friend

---

127. Eyton, pp 78, 101-2, 128-30.

128. JS Letters ii, no. 173.

129. JS Letters ii, no. 188. On other letters sent at the same time, see 3-VIII-2-d.

who may not have known the recipient very well personally but knew that he belonged to the same camp. Along with his letter no. 189 to Walter de Insula perhaps John also wished to direct what campaigning he could to the king's court.

John wrote to Nicholas again between about December 1167 and March 1168.<sup>130</sup> In this letter John criticised the king's behaviour and warned of the prospect of God's punishment falling on him and his posterity, taking as an example the fall of the ex-emperor Frederick. Giving examples of the recall of the archbishop of Santiago de Compostella, Lyon, and other places, John accused the king of not calling back his archbishop and of retaining evil counsellors. This letter does not contain any personal message. It is a propaganda letter probably intended for the ear of those around the king and in Normandy in general. It was possibly written after the conference of the king, the papal legates and the bishops at Argentan. Although he stated little concretely, John's reproach was probably directed against the king's continued persecution of the archbishop as shown in the renewed appeal of the bishops. This letter may be related to John and Becket's letter to Silvester of Lisieux which were written about the same time. Becket and John may have schemed some kind of campaign directed to the Norman clergy through Nicholas of Mont-

---

130. JS Letters ii, no. 239.

Saint-Jacques and Silvester of Lisieux.<sup>131</sup> In any case, Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques was essentially a friend and supporter of Becket. His relationship to John was auxiliary and supplementary to that.

### 3. Conclusions

One of the characteristics of John's correspondence is that there is little trace of John's association with the core of Becket's household. For various reasons, John decided to live in Rheims away from Becket's household in Pontigny and Sens. Besides the reasons discussed above, it has generally been emphasised that John did not have a good relationship with Herbert of Bosham mainly on the ground that John practically ignored Herbert in his literary works.<sup>132</sup> It is quite likely that John did not care to be involved in the power struggle in the household of Becket in exile. Judging from the difference of personality and viewpoints, it is also likely that John did not care about the predominance of Herbert in Becket's household and wished to avoid direct contact with him. But except perhaps for the initial stage of Becket's exile, John's feeling against Herbert may not have been so strong as to hinder

---

131. On John's letter to Silvester, see above 4-II-2-d.

132. Smalley, Becket conflict and the Schools, p 86. Barlow, TB, p 130.



cooperation.<sup>133</sup> Moreover, John did not discuss much about any of the important clerks of Becket. He occasionally made passing remarks of them in his letters to Becket<sup>134</sup> and from such remarks, we know that John definitely loved and respected Master Lombardus and Alexander of Wales.<sup>135</sup>

One feature of John's relationship with Becket's clerks is that in Becket's household also, John preferred scholars and old timers. John stayed in Rheims where Ralph of Sarre and Philip of Calne also lived. Master Ernulf who was secretary to Becket as archbishop did not remain in correspondence with John during the exile, but John wrote to Baldwin of Boulogne, who was around probably as long as John in the world of English churchmen. Whatever their past relationship may have been, they felt familiar with each other in the household of Becket. Except perhaps for Herbert of Bosham, John felt sympathetic with scholars and learned men in Becket's household. He liked and looked up to Master Lombardus and Alexander and thought that they could understand and accept John's point of view. John may have seen a good chance of developing a circle of literary friends at Canterbury with clerks like Gerard Pucelle.<sup>136</sup>

---

133. John and Herbert were sent together as envoys to Henry II after the peace at Fréteval. (Barlow, TB, p 213.)

134. JS Letters ii, nos. 173, 175, 176, 228.

135. JS Letters ii, nos. 173, 228.

136. For John's friendship with Gerard Pucelle, see the section 4-III-C.

### III Paris ii

#### I. Introduction--John of Salisbury and Paris(1163-65)

It is well established that John left England between October 1163 and January 1165<sup>1</sup> and wrote his first extant letter after exile in Paris.<sup>2</sup> But how long did John stay in Paris and what did he do there? John's stay in Paris has been considered quite short<sup>3</sup> and therefore not worthwhile to give much thought to. However, some of his early activities took place in Paris and some of his human relations John most likely established there. Trying to trace the activities he was involved and people he may have encountered in and around Paris may help clarify the nature and length of his stay in Paris.

For one thing, John acted as Becket's agent and participated in his diplomacy.<sup>4</sup> He visited the French King and magnates on the way to Paris when he left England.<sup>5</sup> On the instruction of Becket, he approached the archbishop of Rheims through Peter of Celle.<sup>6</sup> After Becket's flight from

---

1. JS Letters ii, pp xx-xxiii, n 1.

2. JS Letters ii, p xxiii, n 1.

3. His removal to Rheims is believed to have taken place in 1164. (JS Letters ii, p xxiii. HP, p xxvii.)

4. For John's diplomatic activities, see the sections 3-VII-3-b and 4-II-1.

5. JS Letters ii, no. 136 & pp xxii-iii.

6. JS Letters ii, no. 136. Peter of Celle presumably reported the result either orally or by letters to John by January 1165, for John transmitted the information on to Becket in letter no. 144.

Northampton, John was probably at Sens around the time the royal envoys reached there,<sup>7</sup> and he may have met Becket who was there shortly before. John visited the Papal Curia at the end of 1164, and afterwards he met Louis VII near Paris.<sup>8</sup> He may have met Henry II's envoy Richard of Ilchester in Paris around this time.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, along with Sens, Paris was an important centre of John's diplomatic activities in 1164-5.

Paris appears to have also been important in connection with John's academic activities. When John left Becket, he was advised 'to stay at Paris as a scholar merely' and 'to be in every way a scholar among scholars.'<sup>10</sup> In 1164-5, between missions to the Curia and French magnates, John probably spent some time in the academic world of Paris among students and masters. Among John's students,<sup>11</sup> Ralph Niger may have belonged to this period.<sup>12</sup> Ralph was also a student of Gerard Pucelle, who in turn taught John's relative, Master Richard.<sup>13</sup> John appears to have been in touch with Gerard Pucelle until just before his defection to Germany.<sup>14</sup>

---

7. See the section 3-VI-3-a.

8. JS Letters ii, no. 144.

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

10. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

11. See the section 2-III-1.

12. For Ralph, see below under respective section.

13. For Master Richard, see the section 3-VI-7-a(iv).

14. In letter no. 158, John wrote as if he had been close enough to claim a letter. See below, the section of Gerard Pucelle.

John probably also met or came to know the friends of his students more closely. Ralph Niger was an intimate friend of Richard of Ilchester. When John met Richard of Ilchester in Paris<sup>15</sup> or when John sought his help in 1165, Ralph Niger may have played some part.<sup>16</sup>

Another possible association of John in Paris was with Peter of Blois and Reginald of Salisbury. Peter of Blois, a pupil of John of Salisbury between 1145-7,<sup>17</sup> was probably engaged in writing a treatise of letters in the mid-1160s,<sup>18</sup> after his return to Paris from his visit to the Papal Curia.<sup>19</sup> John may also have associated with Reginald of Salisbury, who had left Becket to live in France by June 1164,<sup>20</sup> and who gave financial assistance to Peter of Blois before he went to Sicily in 1167.<sup>21</sup> John and Reginald, the son of Bishop Jocelin of Salisbury remained friendly after and in spite of Becket's censure of the bishop.<sup>22</sup> Gerard Pucelle may also have associated with John's or his pupils' friends such as Richard of Ilchester and Reginald of Salisbury. They may have been counted among the 'many

---

15. JS Letters ii, no. 149.

16. We find John reminding Ralph of the fact that Richard had not responded to John's plea for help. (JS Letters ii, no. 149.)

17. Southern, Medieval Humanism, p 109, n 1.

18. Southern, Medieval Humanism, p 111.

19. Robinson, J.A., Somerset Historical Essays, p 102.

20. Barlow, TB, p 107.

21. Robinson, J.A., Somerset Historical Essays, pp 102-3.

22. JS Letters ii, no. 217. See the section 2-II-2-b.

supporters among the English' who perhaps arranged for Gerard's return from Cologne to the English king's court.<sup>23</sup>

John must also have refreshed his old friendships with Parisian religious and academics and made some new friends. He may have met again his old friend and master Adam du Petit Pont, who continued to teach in Paris until well after 1170.<sup>24</sup> When John wrote the Historica Pontificalis after exile, his revived friendship with Adam may have prevented him from criticising his attitude to Gilbert de la Porree at the Council of Rheims.<sup>25</sup> During this time, John appears to have been close to abbot Ernisius and prior Richard of Saint-Victor who was a Scotsman.<sup>26</sup> He may have refreshed his former friendship with them. He asked the abbot's help in obtaining the king's peace of Master Geoffrey's son Richard.<sup>27</sup> The Victorines may have provided information on the bishop of Hereford and told John how he was avid of

---

23. JS Letters ii, no. 277.

24. For Adam, see the section on Paris i.

25. In HP, John related that Robert of Melun and Peter Lombard attacked Gilbert de la Porree out of jealousy. (HP, viii) Otto of Freising made a similar comment but included Adam into his list of Gilbert's opponents. (Nielsen, L.O., Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century, Leiden, (1982) p 32. Ottonis et Rhewini Gesta Frederici I. Imperatoris, Scriptorum Regum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, MGH, Hannover, etc. (1912) (3rd ed) p 75.

26. Gabriel, A.L., 'English Masters and Students in Paris during the XIIth Century' Analecta Praemonstratensia, vol 25 (1949) pp 51-59.

27. JS Letters ii, no. 161.

praise and despised money while teaching in Paris,<sup>28</sup> After the bishops' appeals, John transmitted this information to Becket and advised him to ask the prior of Saint-Victor and the like to admonish the bishop of Hereford.<sup>29</sup> While John was in Paris, he probably came to know Gerard, archdeacon of Paris, who visited Rheims in summer 1166,<sup>30</sup> and on whose behalf, John wrote to the bishop of Poitiers.<sup>31</sup>

Among John's correspondents, there are others whom John may have come to know in Paris, although there is no certain evidence. Master Odo may have been a master whom John heard while he was in Paris as an exile.<sup>32</sup> Master Laurence, whom John appears to have recommended to the archdeaconry of Poitiers,<sup>33</sup> and Master Nigel, whom John thought of advancing to an office in the event of peace, might have also been masters in Paris.<sup>34</sup> This is merely a conjecture and there is no evidence to connect these masters with Paris, but the possibility exists that they were among John's friends who notified him of the bishop of Poitiers's illness before early June, 1166.<sup>35</sup>

---

28. JS Letters ii, no. 175. On the relationship between Robert and the Victorines, see 3-VI-2-C and n 66.

29. JS Letters ii, no. 175.

30. JS Letters ii, no. 179.

31. JS Letters ii, no. 211.

32. For further discussion, see the section of Master Odo below.

33. See the section 3-VII-2-a(ii).

34. JS Letters ii, no. 284.

35. JS Letters ii, no. 166.

In this section, we shall deal with John's academic friends who appear to have some relationship with John in this period, namely Master Odo, Ralph Niger and Gerard Pucelle.

## 2. John's Correspondents

### a. Master Odo

Master Odo is not certainly identified, although various suggestions have been made.<sup>36</sup> He was an accomplished Biblical scholar<sup>37</sup> and probably lived in France at the time John wrote his letter no. 271.<sup>38</sup> We are tempted to assume that he was a master in Paris and that John sat at his feet before he left for Rheims,<sup>39</sup> but there is no certain evidence.

---

36. According to Professor Luscombe, Master Odo was probably a pupil of Abelard and author of the Ysaogoe in theologiam. ('The authorship of the Ysaogoe in theologiam,' in Archives d'histoire doctrinale et litteraire du moyen age, vol 35 (1968) pp 7-16.) Professor Brooke has pointed out the possibility that he was Odo, prior of Canterbury, later abbot of Battle, because the Battle chronicler says that he was 'doctus lege divina. (JS Letters ii, no. 271, n 1). Some scholars have suggested an identification of him with Odo of Dover (Kuttner & Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman canonists' p 293.) or with Odo of Soissons. (Ferruolo, pp 156, 190, 341.)

37. JS Letters ii, no 271, n 1.

38. McLoughlin, pp 475-6.

39. In no. 271, John wrote, 'Dum his operam dare licuit sub alis uestris, et rotam in medio rotae cum propheta, immo cum filiis prophetarum doctrinae uestrae beneficio contemplari et audire per os uestrum quid Spiritus loquatur ecclesiis, michi regis Anglorum indignatio licet multa gratis abstulerit, tamen magnum visa est attulisse compendium, adeo ut fructuosa uideretur esse iactura, iocunda laesio et grata iniuria. Sed cum auulsus sum a pedibus uestris, tunc primum dispendii et laesionis aculeos expertus sensi, et quidem non solus, eo quod omnium fere scholarium iactura communis est;..'

The letter is undatable and deals with some academic questions. John described the pleasure that letters brought him and deplored his loss of the 'consolation of letters' through exile and outlawry. Even exile had been fruitful while John could hear Odo's teaching. But when he 'was torn away from your feet' he started feeling loss and damage. He praised Master Odo's scholarship and asked him 'in what book may be found the gloss which goes under Augustine's name, and passed on the tradition that the Jews celebrated the seventh day, the seventh week, the seventh month and so forth;' John also asked Master Odo to send a copy of a commentary of Jerome's on St. Mark, if he had one; if he did not, to make one himself. This letter and no. 194 to Master John the Saracen are the only letters of academic inquiry in John's letter collections. John held both of them in great esteem and wrote to them in the hope that they might clarify the point which he did not understand.<sup>40</sup>

John probably asked the Saracen some questions in the course of writing the Historia Pontificalis and requested him to translate the works of pseudo-Denis with a view to the general interest in negative theology in Champagne.<sup>41</sup> We wonder whether John posed the question to Master Odo for any such purposes.

---

40. To both of them John cited Lamentations 4:4 'the tongue of the nursing has cleaved to his palate for thirst: the poor children have asked for bread and there was none to break it for them. (See JS Letters ii, no. 194.) See 3-VII-4-a, n. 110.

41. See the section 3-VII-4-a.



b. Ralph Niger

John probably taught Ralph Niger before he moved to Rheims between the end of 1163 and summer 1165, unless he taught him as a small child.<sup>42</sup>

Ralph Niger is known as a historian, but he has also left works on theology and law.<sup>43</sup> He was probably born around 1140,<sup>44</sup> and was a student in the schools of Paris in 1160s and possibly at Poitiers in 1166.<sup>45</sup> As a student he enjoyed the acquaintance of important persons of the time. He introduced Becket to Conrad of Wittelsbach, the archbishop of Mainz probably in 1165 at Sens.<sup>46</sup> He was intimate with Richard of Ilchester.<sup>47</sup> One of Ralph's masters in Paris was Gerard Pucelle, who left for Cologne at the end of 1165.<sup>48</sup> Ralph Niger appears to have led a somewhat itinerant life as a student being in Paris, Poitiers and possibly in Sens.<sup>49</sup> He was called master in 1168.<sup>50</sup> He

---

42. John was already in the service of Archbishop Theobald in 1147, when Ralph was about seven years old.

43. JS Letters ii, p 199 n 1.

44. Flahiff, G.B., 'Ralph Niger - an introduction to his life and works' in Medieval Studies, vol 2 (1940) pp 104-26, esp. p 104. For biographical details, see Flahiff.

45. Flahiff, 'Ralph Niger' p 107. JS Letters ii, p 199 n 1.

46. Flahiff, 'Ralph Niger' p 105. Barlow, TB, p 137.

47. Flahiff, 'Ralph Niger' p 107. JS Letters ii, nos. 181-2.

48. Flahiff, 'Ralph Niger' p 107. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman canonists' p 297 & n 7.

49. John sent at least one letter to Ralph in Poitiers. (JS Letters ii, no. 182). He was with Becket sometime in 1168. See 4-III-2-C(iii).

50. JS Letters ii, no. 181, n 1. & no. 277.

suffered disgrace by King Henry II some time afterwards,<sup>51</sup> and then was in turn in the service of Young Henry, stayed in Northern France, dedicating his works to William aux Blanchesmains, and was back in England during the reign of Richard, where he probably died in 1199.<sup>52</sup>

John wrote two letters to Ralph in summer 1166 at close intervals. No. 181 was written after the bishops' appeal on 24 June 1166, possibly in July. Apparently, John had previously requested Ralph to examine the possibilities of reconciliation with the king. Ralph Niger took some time on the project and after careful studies, he compiled a list of all the points which were for or against John. John accepted Ralph's apology for delay with understanding and affection and appreciated his laborious and thorough work. After alluding to the failure to obtain his peace at Angers, he commented on the bishops' appeal and promised Ralph that he would speak for Richard of Ilchester.<sup>53</sup> Ralph had been much concerned about Richard who was excommunicated at Vézelay and asked John to intercede with Becket. With regard to Ralph's request as to whether he should go to the royal court, John answered somewhat ambiguously to seek the advice of someone who was wise and religious. In case he was persuaded to go, Ralph should do so with the purpose of bringing back the archdeacon to the right path.

---

51. Flahiff, G.B., 'Ralph Niger--an introduction to his life and works' Mediaeval Studies, vol 2, (1940) pp 104-26, esp. 107.

52. Flahiff, 'Ralph Niger', pp 107-114.

53. For Richard of Ilchester, see the section 3-VIII-2-e.

Ralph apparently wrote back to John saying that he had so far declined to go to the king's court, but that he was being persistently invited. In letter no. 182, John praised his attitude in the matter and congratulated Ralph on the progress of his studies at Poitiers. John had developed clearer ideas on communicating with the excommunicate. From a general point of view, he commended Ralph for refusing to associate with the archdeacon of Poitiers, while he is excommunicate. However he distinguished between different kinds of excommunicate and concluded that there were instances in which one was permitted to communicate with them with a view to bringing them back from their impieties. However, Ralph may not have visited the king's court, for after the Vézelay censures, the king left for Brittany and was found at Fougères in July with Richard of Ilchester<sup>54</sup> and was not back in Normandy until October 1166.

We meet Ralph Niger once again in John's letters in about May 1168.<sup>55</sup> Ralph was back in Northern France by this time. When the Becket party was trying to obtain the recall of Gerard Pucelle from the Pope, Ralph took part in their effort. John himself drafted the letter to the Pope in the presence of Ralph and asked him to write a consecutive account of their efforts to his former master Gerard Pucelle. We do not know whether Ralph did as expected. If he did, the letter did not survive.<sup>56</sup>

---

54. Eyton, pp 95-6.

55. JS Letters ii, no. 277.

56. Flahiff, 'Ralph Niger' p 107.

Master Ralph Niger was a young man in the years 1166-8 and a pupil of John of Salisbury and his friend Gerard Pucelle. Ralph held John in respect and John treated him with affection and a certain regard for his achievement. Ralph was involved in politics probably through his friends and acquaintances. His friendship circle in Paris and from England included people of various opinions. In the course of the Becket dispute, he continued to like and be sympathetic to them regardless of their obedience at least until the summer of 1166. Perhaps he was closest to John and the Becket party. His sympathy for the archbishop has been suggested to be the possible reason for his disgrace by the king.

c. Gerard Pucelle

i. Gerard Pucelle and John of Salisbury

An Englishman, student in Paris, episcopal clerk, then bishop, Gerard's course of life was similar to John's. They had associations from time to time, but they do not seem to have enjoyed a good relationship.

Gerard Pucelle was born in England probably in 1115--20.<sup>57</sup> He spent several years studying philosophy in the schools in France, where he may have met John of Salisbury. Whereas John started working for Archbishop Theobald since 1147 and became an important clerk by 1156, Gerard appears to have remained in Paris to study and before 1156, he started teaching there. He lectured in theology as well as canon and civil law, and among his pupils were Lucas of Hungary, Walter Map, Ralph Niger and Master Richard, probably a relative of John of Salisbury.<sup>58</sup> Gerard was a

person of political importance and enjoyed the favour of Louis VII.

Gerard Pucelle received ordination and his first préferment from Archbishop Thomas of Canterbury.<sup>59</sup> We do not know exactly when he joined Becket's household, but there he met John of Salisbury presumably for the second time. Gerard's name does not seem to appear in documents recording Becket's activities before the exile. Nor does his name appear in the list of clerks who gathered at Saint-Bertin after Becket's flight from Northampton in November 1164. He may have been among those who were exiled after the king's proscription on Boxing Day 1164. He resumed teaching in Paris,<sup>60</sup> and appears to have been in contact with John whose activities centred around Paris before he moved to Rheims. Gerard left for Germany at the end of 1165 on a mission to the Emperor apparently with the approval of the Pope, but without informing his friends and patrons.<sup>61</sup> He was in touch with John and Becket and his other friends during his stay in Cologne.

---

57. For his biography, see Kuttner, S. and Rathbone, E., 'Anglo-Norman canonists of the twelfth century' Traditio, vol 7, (1949-50) pp 279-358, esp. p 297.

58. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman canonists' p 297. Flahiff, G.B., 'Ralph Niger--an introduction to his life and works' in Mediaeval Studies, vol 2, (1940) pp 104-26.

59. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman canonists' p 297. JS Letters ii, nos. 277, 297.

60. Barlow, TB, p 127.

61. Barlow, TB, p 127. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman canonists' pp 297-8. JS Letters ii, no. 184.

In Germany he was given a high position probably as master of Cathedral School and he received benefices for his position.<sup>62</sup> His teaching was accepted as authoritative<sup>63</sup> and gave a great stimulus to the study of canon law in Cologne.<sup>64</sup> But presumably on account of difficulties of the situation in Germany, Gerard was forced to return. Both John and Becket took part in obtaining Gerard's recall from the Pope.<sup>65</sup> However, without visiting his former master Becket, he went over to Henry II in 1168 and took the oath to accept the Constitutions.<sup>66</sup> Later in the year Gerard Pucelle was reconciled with Becket on condition that he would renounce his benefice in Germany and take an oath declaring ordinations made by the schismatics to be invalid.<sup>67</sup>

After his return from Cologne, Gerard was found to be in the service of the English king and tried to seek John's help in mediating between Becket and Geoffrey Ridel, the archdeacon of Canterbury.<sup>68</sup> He probably taught in Paris

- 
62. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman canonists' p 298. Fried, J. 'Gerard Pucelle und Köln' ZSSRG Kan Abt vol 99, (1982) pp 125-135, esp. p 125.
63. JS Letters ii, no. 158. Fried, 'Gerard Pucelle und Köln' p 128. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman canonists' p 298.
64. Fried, 'Gerard Pucelle und Köln', pp 134-5. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo Norman canonists' pp 298-301.
65. JS Letters ii, no. 277. Mats nos. 419-422.
66. JS Letters ii, nos. 275, 297.
67. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman canonists' p 298.
68. Barlow, TB, p 199. JS Letters ii, no. 297. See below Section (iii).

again in the early part of 1170s,<sup>69</sup> but returned to administrative service in about 1174 or 75 and served Becket's successor Richard of Canterbury. He appeared as witness to 47 out of 186 surviving acta, usually at the top of the list.<sup>70</sup> While he was serving Archbishop Richard, he spoke on behalf of Abbot Odo of Battle in a suit against Godfrey de Luci, a task which both John of Salisbury and Bartholomew of Exeter declined.<sup>71</sup> In spring 1178, he was sent on a mission to the Curia by Archbishop Richard<sup>72</sup> and about the same time in June 1178, he was recommended to the Pope by cardinal Peter of Saint Chrysogonus as one of the candidates for cardinalate.<sup>73</sup> He was sent to the Curia again in 1179 to take part in the third Lateran Council.<sup>74</sup> He was elected bishop of Chester-Coventry in 1183 and died in January in his see from a cause which led his contemporaries to believe that he was poisoned.<sup>75</sup>

---

69. Fried, 'Gerard Pucelle und Koln' p 129.

70. English Episcopal Acta II: Canterbury 1162-1190, ed. Cheney, C.R., & Jones, B.E.A., London, (1986) nos. 55, 85, 91, 113, 144, 160, 175, 196, 206, 221 etc.

71. Morey, Bartholomew, p 39. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman canonists' p 302. The chronicle of Battle Abbey, ed. & trans. Searle, E., Oxford, (1980) pp 322-23. See the section 3-V-3-d.

72. Fried, 'Gerard Pucelle und Köln' p 129. According to English Episcopal Acta II: Canterbury, (p 37) Gerard left in autumn 1177.

73. Glorieux, 'Candidats a la pourpre en 1178' pp 1-26.

74. Fried, 'Gerard Pucelle und Köln' p 129.

75. Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman canonists' pp 302-3.

As with some other correspondents, John's relationship with Gerard Pucelle went through a change between 1166 and 1170. It was essentially brought about by the shifting of international politics, especially through the failure of the Emperor's Italian expedition. The major change occurred between October or November 1167 and about May 1168. Until about October or November 1167, John wrote to Gerard Pucelle as a friend and fellow scholar often starting his letters with elaborate expression of affection and importance of literary exchanges. After c. May 1168, John wrote simply to deliver Becket's messages.

ii. 1166-1167

John appears to have contacted Gerard Pucelle shortly after Gerard defected to Germany in late 1165. The surviving correspondence between John and Gerard Pucelle started in early 1166, but John wrote one letter shortly before, which Gerard had not answered.<sup>76</sup> There was a good reason for John to write to his friend in Germany. 1165 had been an unsettled year and the political situation was fluid. Leaving Sens in April, the Pope returned to Rome in November 1165.<sup>77</sup> In spring 1165, approaches were made between Frederick Barbarossa and Henry II by mutual exchange of ambassadors, with the result of widening the schism and altering the balance of power to the disadvantage of Louis

---

76. JS Letters ii, no. 158.

77. JS Letters ii, p xxvii. Pacaut, M., Frederick Barbarossa, London, (1790) p 120.



VII.<sup>78</sup> The approach of Henry II and Frederick Barbarossa was by no means welcome to Becket.

The first surviving letter was written in early 1166 and was sent to Gerard either with or shortly after Becket's letters.<sup>79</sup> These two letters, one from John, the other from Becket, probably had a single aim--to ask for Gerard's help to improve Becket's position.

What exactly Becket wrote to Gerard Pucelle in this situation cannot be known, but he must have made some kind of request, possibly to gather news or to make efforts to gear the dissident churchmen in Germany to the support of Alexander with a view also to loosen the tie between Barbarossa and Henry II. John's letter was written partly for personal reasons but partly to support Becket's requests. John left the news of the English church and possibly concrete requests to Becket's pen and concentrated on the moral point of view and urged Gerard to try to bring the schismatics back to the Church. John stated that although Gerard Pucelle did not answer John's previous letter, he would write because he had an opportunity and that he could not 'curb my heart's ardour...(especially in dealing with my friends and in defending justice), so I would not keep my pen from writing'.

Touching briefly on his own life as an exile, John expressed how he valued 'the life of letters, the pursuit of virtue and the trial of the purpose of true philosophers'.

---

78. For the German situation, Pacaut, Frederick Barbrossa, pp 116-120.

79. JS Letters ii, no. 158. ; (

John congratulated Gerard on the news of his success in Cologne and added that he valued even more the fact that, as he had heard, Gerard Pucelle did not mix with the schismatics and spoke against them. John discussed at some length the ways of philosophy and requested Gerard to try to call back the schismatics to the Church and strive so that they might not behave out of fear of the Emperor and the archbishop of Cologne.

The direct and straightforward expression of negative feelings was not essentially in John's nature. In this letter, much of his natural feeling was concealed behind superficially agreeable statements. In a way it was necessary, for John was writing essentially in order to help Becket, who was asking for Gerard's cooperation.

But John's true feeling was complex. It was quite unbelievable that a man like Gerard Pucelle, who could understand 'true philosophy' could choose to go over to the barbarous German schismatics and that for temporal goods and honour. It is an abominable act in itself. Moreover, John could not help feeling that by so doing Gerard betrayed and deserted the exiles who were poor and who had no escape from poverty and misery. John upheld the life of a true philosopher to persevere in his fate. The least John could do to Gerard was to stress that it was in exchange for the idea of a philosopher's life that he took an 'abundance of temporal goods' and became the 'supreme authority in scholarship and conduct' among 'those barbarous people' who

were 'the Church's enemies'. John was probably all the more offended because he was not consulted beforehand.

For all the feelings of accusation, indignation, and contempt, John could not help feeling a tinge of jealousy for this extremely capable and learned scholar. At this point, John had not renounced the idea that an urge to be a true philosopher in his sense of the word had a strong appeal to Gerard Pucelle. It is undeniable though, that John began to doubt Gerard's integrity from this time onwards.

From early 1166 to about 1 October 1166, Gerard Pucelle wrote two letters to John. John kept silent until about 1 October 1166, but then their communication became intense. Gerard's first letter reached John before early June 1166 and in this letter he probably wrote about his success and prosperity without becoming a schismatic and invited John to join him.<sup>80</sup> John did not reply to this letter. The second letter was brought by Gerard's own messenger who had to depart from Rheims c. 1 October 1166.<sup>81</sup> This letter was probably sent with letters to Master Ralph and possibly to Becket.<sup>82</sup> Gerard probably sent a report or information to Becket, which would be beneficial to the archbishop such as news from Germany and Henry II's diplomacy there.<sup>83</sup> In the letter to John, Gerard laid out his problems possibly giving excuse to his departure. Gerard asked for John's advice through Ralph.

---

80. JS Letters ii, no. 167.

81. JS Letters ii, no. 184.

The intense communication between Gerard Pucelle and John centred around Gerard's request for assistance. The nature of Gerard's request is not quite clear from John's letter, but Gerard probably wanted John to intercede with his friends to prepare his return. Perhaps about this time, he started to find it difficult to stay in Cologne. Political unrest such as the princes' revolt against the Duke of Saxony which he was to report to Becket a little later<sup>84</sup> may have already been manifest. The widening of the schism and the Emperor's expedition to Italy which was to start in October<sup>85</sup> may have made it difficult for Gerard to continue teaching the way he had done.

Letter no. 184 written c. 1 October 1166 dealt with several tasks, but the main purpose was to answer Gerard's request for advice and to urge him to use his influence on Rainald for Becket's cause. As in no. 158, John first

---

82. JS Letters ii, no. 184. Master Ralph may have been Ralph of Sarre (JS Letters ii, no. 184, n 1) but there appears to be a possibility that he was Ralph Niger, provided that he was called Master already in 1166, hence his involvement in the attempt for Gerard's recall on the part of the Becket party. (JS Letters ii, no. 277).

83. The English king's wish to have the Pope captured by the Emperor, which John referred to in no. 181 to Ralph Niger, may have been the subject of the letter from Henry II to Rainald Dassel which John reported he had obtained. (Mats no. 213. mentioned in JS Letters no. 174 to Bartholomew of Exeter.) In letter no. 177 to John of Canterbury written in c. July 1166, John refers to a letter from Cologne in which the king seeks a safe conduct for his envoys going to Rome to act against Becket.

84. Mats no. 234, Feb. 1167.

85. Munz, P., Frederick Barbarossa, London, (1969) p 249.

referred to the ardour of writing to friends in separation. He refused politely but firmly to comply with Gerard's request, saying that 'God may deign to pay out on your behalf. ..what may conduce to your honour, be expedient for your advantage and profit your salvation'. Against Gerard's excuses, John reminded the fact that people had not been told Gerard's ideas, the compulsion he was under, the permission he had had from the Pope, the advantage the Church might receive from his conduct. John informed Gerard how he had appeared to the public as a defector to the schismatics. He went on to advise Gerard to preach true faith and peace among the schismatics, reporting the weakening of the Emperor by the splitting of his Empire. John informed Gerard that he had forwarded Gerard's letters to Becket, but that he had not received his answer yet. He reported briefly that Becket had been granted the legateship for England, and his primacy was confirmed, stating that Henry II was asking for William of Pavia to be sent as legate a latere so that the case may be settled according to his will. John urged Gerard to induce the archbishop of Cologne to influence the English king against such an action. He added his own advice to soothe the king of France who used to be his friend.

Beneath the sugar-coated expressions of friendship was John's criticism that Gerard, who was willing to live among the schismatics when there were promises of temporal goods and honour, now wanted to make peace with those whom he had left without a word. John was probably all the more indignant because Gerard made plausible excuses of his departure, as if they would justify his ignominious deed.

Therefore, John stubbornly repeated that Gerard ought to try to bring the schismatics back to the Church and insisted from the moral point of view that he should not be deterred from doing what he should do by the change of situations. John did not hesitate to stress to Gerard the weakening of the power of the Emperor and the archbishop of Cologne, which was detrimental to him.

Shortly after he had dispatched no. 184, John wrote another letter in about mid-October 1166.<sup>86</sup> The news of the Emperor's expedition to Italy, which took place in October 1166,<sup>87</sup> must have reached John by this time. This letter was written partly to inquire after the Emperor's expedition and partly to supplement John's message in no. 184. After reminding the necessity of communication between close friends, John asked Gerard to let him know about the Emperor's expedition and Rainald Dassel's activities. He reminded Gerard of the life of a true philosopher again, this time stressing the importance of action--of 'real things, not words', and being not 'hearers nor preachers of it... but doers'. Urging Gerard to 'philosophize in patience', John inquired about the books Gerard may have found in Cologne, especially those of St. Hildegard. John also asked him to 'protect the property of St. Remi in your

---

86. JS Letters ii, no. 185.

87. Munz, Frederick Barbarossa, p 121.

88. Concerning this sentence, Prof. Brooke has suggested that this possibly means a book or books John had borrowed for Gerard from the Library of St. Remi. (JS Letters ii, p 225, n 9. Reuter has interpreted res beati Remigii to mean 'the property of Saint Remigius within the Empire.' Reuter, T. 'John of Salisbury and the Germans' in The World JS, p 425 & n 44. See also the section 2-IV-b.

keeping'.<sup>88</sup> Since this letter was not written in reply to Gerard's letter John's account was fairly straightforward.

Not long after, John received a letter from Gerard Pucelle 'in reply to which he wrote his letter no. 186. Gerard's letter was probably written impeccably both in style and in contents. This letter was 'full of devotion and learning' and was valuable to John 'because of its eloquence and of my affection and respect for your name'. John wrote that he was particularly pleased that after having studied his message, Gerard Pucelle had 'said, done and written whatever had to be said, written and done', so that he stopped seeking honour and riches among the schismatics. John emphasised again the wrongs of schism and the danger of siding with the schismatics for temporal gain. Admitting part of Gerard's refutation presumably on the Church and the place of the church of Cologne, as it was in line with the accepted dogma of the Catholic Church, John did not withdraw his opinion that 'an anathema lies' 'in the midst of... the church of Cologne'. He accused the archbishop of Cologne and the Emperor who had set out for Italy to place the anti-pope in Rome and asked Gerard Pucelle to carry out intently by 'speaking, writing, doing what you know helps towards the end of the schism'.

This letter, which seemingly approved of Gerard's conduct and praised what appeared to be expressions of acceptance and submission to John's advice, betrays John's feelings against Gerard. It was probably a common knowledge that though Gerard worked to promote the study of canon law in and around Cologne, he received benefices from the schismatics for his service. What John really wanted to say

was that Gerard Pucelle, 'receiving a sordid exchange of ephemeral riches for your soul' and 'throwing in your lot with schismatics for a temporal gain', would endanger 'salvation', 'lose the name of a philosopher' and 'reject the conscience of a Christian'. John was especially infuriated by Gerard's bold-faced lies. Gerard had a nerve to lie to him thinking that John could be deceived so easily

For his part, what Gerard Pucelle wanted in October and November 1166 was a sympathetic friend who could assess international situations objectively and to advise him the best course of action in a difficult situation. What he got from John was an elaborate preaching on schism and the philosopher's life. After he received John's letter no. 184, Gerard probably renounced the idea of trying to find in John a sympathetic adviser. Therefore he wrote a letter, well-written and eloquent, hiding his disagreement and disapproval and perhaps disappointment behind outward submission. As John detected, Gerard 'indicated, wisely and (I hope!) truthfully that you have studied the message of my letter...' and acted according to his own judgement and not John's advice.

One piece of John's advice which Gerard probably took at once was to try to curry favour with Louis VII.<sup>89</sup> Since the attempt failed, Gerard doubted if Becket and his followers acted against his benefit. Against such charges, John wrote that the French king was angry more because Gerard left without telling the king and that he had gone to

---

89. JS Letters ii, no. 184.



his enemy who had called him a kinglet.<sup>90</sup>

Meanwhile, Gerard Pucelle wrote also to Becket in about February 1167<sup>91</sup> mainly to report the news gathered at Cologne; the king of England had written to the archbishop of Cologne that William of Pavia and Henry of Pisa would be coming to France; the princes had revolted against the Duke of Saxony, and the Emperor tried to pacify them; the archbishop of Cologne fell ill and he was unable to leave for Italy with the army; during his illness, his clergy put pressure on him to make peace with Alexander III. Gerard Pucelle revealed this last information to Becket on the understanding that he would keep it secret. Apparently they had agreed that Gerard should not write to Becket, but they were on good terms with each other. Gerard assured the archbishop that he would always be ready to return to him in case of need. It was probably this letter that was to become one of the causes of Gerard's later grievances to the Becket party.<sup>92</sup> We do not know whether the content of this letter was passed on to John. Among his extant letters, we do not find the ones which contain the information.

After nearly one year of silence, John wrote again to Gerard Pucelle in about October or November 1167, apparently because he found a courier who was about to leave.<sup>93</sup> Letter no. 226 is a short letter in which John hopefully

---

90. JS Letters ii, nos. 186 & 277.

91. Mats no. 234.

92. JS Letters ii, no. 277.

93. JS Letters ii, no. 226.

reported news. Referring to his affection to Gerard and the importance of communication through writing, John sent the news that Becket and the exiles had 'proved acceptable' to the French king and magnates and that the cardinal legates were at work for peace. He asked Gerard Pucelle to write to him and continue to work for the Church, expressing delight at the news of the failure of the Emperor's expedition and Rainald Dassel's death. In spite of the three consecutive letters of 1166 in which John expressed abomination of Gerard Pucelle being with the schismatics and receiving benefices from them, and in spite of the fact that John distrusted Gerard Pucelle's statement that he had done as advised, John felt friendly enough to Gerard to write him a letter when there was an opportunity.

iii. 1168-70

While John was delighted at the defeat of the Emperor and the death of Rainald Dassel, Gerard Pucelle was probably in great difficulty. As Gerard Pucelle himself wrote to Becket in February 1167, the situation in Germany even in the presence of the Emperor was not entirely stable. The absence of the Emperor, and his defeat and return to Germany in spring 1168<sup>94</sup> without Rainald, cannot have made Gerard's life easier. Gerard may already have felt the need to return when he wrote to Master Ralph before 1 October 1166.<sup>95</sup> His wish or need to return was prompted. He must

---

94. Pacaut, Frederick Barbarossa, p. 129.

95. JS Letters ii, no. 184. See above note 82.

have made every effort to return whether to Louis VII or to Henry II. Gerard Pucelle probably wrote to John asking for assistance on his recall shortly after John wrote letter no. 266 in October or November 1167.

Upon the request of Gerard, the Becket party made a series of attempts. Becket wrote to the Pope petitioning for Gerard's recall. His messengers approached the Pope, who consented to his return, but refused to recall him.<sup>96</sup> Becket consulted the legates on the matter and was told that he should only recall Gerard 'with the advice and goodwill of the Pope.'<sup>97</sup> Becket wrote to the Curia again, and this time John drafted the letter in the presence of Ralph Niger who was to write a consecutive account of the affair to Gerard.<sup>98</sup> John's relative Master Richard probably took Becket's letter concerning Gerard,<sup>99</sup> and some other letters.<sup>100</sup> Between John's letter no. 226 written in October or November and no. 277 written in c. May 1168, John seems to have made no direct contact with Gerard Pucelle, but he was working on Gerard's recall. John appears to have written to Thomas again from Paris on Gerard's behalf shortly after 17 April.<sup>101</sup>

---

96. JS Letters ii, no. 277.

97. JS Letters ii, no. 277.

98. JS Letters ii, no. 277. See the section on Ralph Niger above.

99. For Master Richard, see the sections 3-VI-7-a(iv) and 4-II-1.

100. John's letters nos. 234 and 235 addressed to Cardinal Walter and Cardinal Albert and Mats no. 359 might have gone with the letter. See the section 4-IV-2-b.

101. JS Letters ii, no. 277.

In the eyes of Gerard Pucelle, who possibly had other sources of information, what Becket and his followers were doing did not appear to facilitate his recall. Gerard wrote either to John or Becket criticising the archbishop and revealing his intention of going over to Henry II. John wrote a letter after 12 May 1168<sup>102</sup> in which he defended the archbishop and advised Gerard against the unjust course of action he might be going to take. Gerard Pucelle's main charge against Becket was that he acted against Gerard's interest in the French king's court. Admitting that some of Becket's fellow exiles may have spoken against Gerard, John denied further charges made against them and emphasized that Becket himself defended Gerard and spoke on his behalf on many occasions. As in no. 184, John repeated three reasons for the French king's anger against Gerard Pucelle. He reported that Becket had petitioned for permission for Gerard's recall and finally obtained it from the French king in John's presence. John further stated in detail various measures Becket took for Gerard's recall and reported that

---

102. JS Letters ii, no. 277. No. 277 was probably written just after 12 May 1168 and preceded no. 275 which was presumably written in about June. (JS Letters ii, p. xxxix.) In no. 275, John reported to John of Canterbury that Gerard Pucelle had crossed over to the English king on his return from Cologne without seeing Becket. Whether Gerard Pucelle received John's no. 277 advising him against making a rash decision or not, he probably left Cologne so that he might be with the king before no. 275 was written. Becket's messenger eventually returned with the Pope's letters concerning Gerard Pucelle (Mats nos. 420-22) which were dated c 20 May 1168. These letters probably arrived too late to stop Gerard Pucelle.

there was a loss of information due to the death of Gerard's student and John's relative, Master Richard and the interception of letters. Another messenger or group of messengers had reached the Curia but they had not returned by 12 May 1163. Referring to the fact that he saw Gerard's messenger in the conference of the kings, he stressed the efforts to realize Gerard's recall and asked him to be patient and refrain from making rash decisions concerning the date of departure. As to Gerard's intention of going over to Henry II, John wrote that he did not wish to dissuade him from making peace with the king but pointed out that Becket's followers found it impossible to comply with the king's conditions, reminding him also that he received ordination from Becket.

Becket tried to let Gerard know in June or July that he had received the letters of the Pope on behalf of Gerard and that he would receive him back again,<sup>103</sup> but Gerard had already started to serve Henry II and we see him trying to mediate between Becket and Geoffrey Ridel.

In 1166-7, John forcefully and stubbornly told Gerard the wrongs of the schismatics and the duty of the 'true philosopher' to strive to bring the schismatics back to the Church, refusing Gerard's request for assistance. When the dramatic change in the situation in Germany forced Gerard to return, John and Becket tried to help Gerard the best they could, probably because they wished to prevent Gerard from going over to Henry II. John patiently defended Becket and explained what had been done on Gerard's behalf. He

---

103. Mats no. 419.

suspected nevertheless, that Gerard had already turned to the king and therefore in order to justify his action, he put the blame on Becket and his followers for the failure of his recall to France. John tried to delay Gerard's departure and discourage him from joining the king, possibly knowing that his words would be of no avail to Gerard who had decided to launch on another career.

John wrote to Gerard Pucelle in February 1170<sup>104</sup> shortly after Becket had proceeded to meet the king but was made to stop at Pontoise.<sup>105</sup> This letter was written on the instruction of Becket refusing Gerard's proposal to have another meeting with the bishop of Séez and the archdeacon of Canterbury. John argued the incompatibility of the proposal involving a meeting with a man whom the archbishop had excommunicated, expressing Becket's surprise and displeasure that Gerard had communicated with the excommunicated archdeacon of Canterbury against his public teaching. He also sent a copy of a letter of refusal to previous request made by the bishop of Séez. John stated Becket's conditions of the absolution of Gilbert Foliot and Geoffrey Ridel and of peace with the king. He warned Gerard Pucelle under pain of anathema to negotiate more cautiously and avoid intercourse with the excommunicate and not to make mistakes again. Unlike other letters to Gerard this letter carried little of John's own message.

---

104. JS Letters ii, no. 297.

105. JS Letters ii, p. xlii. Barlow, TB, p 200.

106. Mats no. 637.

It was written on the instruction of Becket and John acted strictly as his deputy. He no longer needed to cajole Gerard.

#### iv. Conclusions

The relationship between John and Gerard Pucelle was essentially that of two scholar-clerks who sought the same line of career, but held an entirely different philosophy of life.

Through the years 1166 and 67, Gerard Pucelle was not one of John's fondest correspondents. He had very mixed emotions about Gerard. At first John wrote to him because he wanted news. John also wrote to him partly on behalf of Becket for the possible service Gerard could perform in Cologne. John wrote to Gerard possibly because they were in fairly close touch just before his defection to Germany. They probably belonged to the same circle of friends in Paris. They were both scholars who believed in the value of eloquence and friendship expressed through letters. John felt that what they valued in common was 'philosophy to whose profession we have long been dedicated.'<sup>107</sup>

However, John felt uncomfortable to write to Gerard, because he came to feel very suspicious of his integrity for several reasons. For John, to choose to live among the schismatics and moreover to seek honour and prosperity among them is almost insanity. Moreover, in the course of doing so, Gerard fled from the situation in which John had to part

---

107. JS Letters ii, no. 185.

108. See the sections 2-V-2-C & 2-V-3-b(i).

109. See the section 3-VIII-2-b. (

with his brother<sup>108</sup> and old servant.<sup>109</sup> Gerard deserted the exiles in straits whom he was probably capable of helping. It was a betrayal not only of John and other exiles but also of the kind of life which John had believed they both upheld as 'the true life of a true philosopher'.<sup>110</sup> It is fitting for a philosopher to profess the truth, reverence justice, despise the world and, when necessary, to love poverty.<sup>111</sup> While the idea of a 'true philosopher' helped John to bear his misfortune, it seems to have been abandoned or changed shape in Gerard when he refused to perevere in the life of an exile and to 'suffer in innocence and for the defence of

---

110. John used this word roughly in three different but inter-related meanings. All three meanings originally appeared in the Policraticus and the Metalogicon. As a writer of letters, John adopted them to suit the real situation and in some cases further developed on the impetus he received from real life.

(1) philosophy considered in connection with literary studies; philosophy as the goal of learning, as wisdom that is attained through eloquence

Metalogicon i-21--24

no. 194 Master John the Saracen

no. 256 John of Tilbury

no. 158 Gerard Pucelle, Master

no. 159 Master Nicholas?

(2) philosophia vs. curia

life of literary pursuit as opposed to life at court (Moos. P. van. Geschichte a/s Topik; Das rhetorische Exemplum von der Antike zur Neuzeit und die historiae im "Policraticus" Johannis von Salisbury, Hildesheim, etc. (1988) p 292.)

Policraticus v 10

no. 210 Master Ralph de Beaumont

no. 194 Master John the Saracen

(3) philosophy and its goal 'wisdom'; philosophy pursued not as knowledge but as the practice of virtue-philosophy as art of living, hence perseverance, pursuit of virtue in adversity

Metalogicon iv-40

nos. 158, 185-6 Gerard Pucelle

no. 204 Master Ralph of Lisieux

no. 267 Master Osbert of Faversham

111. JS Letters ii, no. 158. ; /

112. JS Letters ii, no. 158.



faith and justice',<sup>112</sup>

Now that he had gone, he should at least remain a Christian philosopher who 'upholds the truth, serves justice, and is a proclaimer of God's judgement' among the schismatics.<sup>113</sup> Such was the only way, that was fitting to Gerard as philosopher. In concrete terms, as John held it, it meant to work as an agent of Becket's interest in Germany by trying to influence the Emperor and the archbishop of Cologne's policy for the benefit of Becket, by stirring up the dissidents in Germany against the Emperor and by supplying information.

However, in reply to John's urge to be a philosopher, Gerard wrote back to John perfectly plausible excuses for what appeared to John to be an ignominious behaviour. John felt more infuriated because Gerard made a fool of him thinking that John could be deceived and outwitted so easily. When he read Gerard's letters, he could not help feeling disgusted, so he wrote all the more nicely and artificially to conceal his real emotion. John's stubborn insistence that Gerard should stay in Cologne and try to bring the schismatics back to Church regardless of the situation may be made out of disgust and total lack of sympathy for Gerard. Until the end of 1167, John nevertheless felt Gerard to be among his friends.

After Gerard had turned over to Henry II, John wrote to him only to represent Becket. Even though Gerard was a

---

113. JS Letters ii, no. 184.

learned man, he was a self-centred careerist who would do anything to improve his position and who had concern of neither his fellow exiles nor his master nor the cause he was fighting for. For all his deeds, Gerard was the most unworthy of the name of philosopher.

Since Gerard's letters to John are lost, we do not know what his excuses were. Having long been an excellent scholar in Paris, he may have had different experiences, different outlook of life and different opinions on the Germans and schismatics. Moreover, people such as members of Henry II's court, who had closer diplomatic contact with the Emperor, may have had less feelings against the Germans. Gerard's reputation as a scholar or clerk does not seem to have suffered from his stay in Cologne. Maybe Gerard was the type of scholar who, by excellence of his work, succeeds climbing up the ladder in spite of dubious character and meaner moral stature. At least that was how Gerard appeared to John. But his opinion does not appear to have been supported universally. Gerard was described as a candidate of cardinalate in 1178 as 'Homme discret, fin lettré.'<sup>114</sup>

In one way, John and Gerard Pucelle were the most homogenous of John's correspondents. They had similar education and careers and similar outlook and goals in life. The difference was whereas John had more practical experience, Gerard was more established as a scholar. When

---

114. Glorieux, 'Candidate à la pourpre en 1178', p 22. 'Praeterea magister Girardus Puella discretus et litteratus existit et de omnimoda ejus honestate ab omnibus qui eum noverunt testimonium perhibetur, sicut apostolica circumspectio videre potuit et audire.' PL 200 col 1371.

Gerard joined the circle of Becket's household, their similarity in other respects made John assume that their philosophy of life should also be the same. As John was beginning to find out that it was different, he felt all the more indignant because of their similarity. Or perhaps, the root of his indignation may be deeper, going back to his student days in Paris. Like the case of Robert of Melun, he may have already formed an unfavourable opinion of Gerard long before his action appeared to prove it. But this remains a conjecture, for we know nothing of their association in Paris in 1140s.

### 3. Conclusions

It appears that John was beginning to build a friendship circle in Paris which consisted of masters, students and religious. It's members were mainly British, but there were some French clergy and religious. It included both Becket's clerks and royal servants. In 1164-5, when the situation was still fluid, there was probably little friction between them.

Neither knew whether or how long the quarrel between the king and the archbishop would last and there were still possibilities that they would shortly work once again in cooperation. The harmony of the 'English colony' rapidly deteriorated in 1165. We do not know exactly what caused it, but one possibility was the king's order of exile and proscription of Becket's supporters and their subsequent exodus. They started to cross the Channel in the spring of 1165. Sudden influx of refugees became a problem to the Becket party.<sup>115</sup> Except for a few like Gerard Pucelle and John of Salisbury, most of them had no

means of supporting themselves. Taking the advice of the bishop of Poitiers,<sup>116</sup> Becket tried to place them in religious institutions and other well-wishers. They probably also sent back those who were in France but were not proscribed to make room for the exiles. John and his brother Richard's old servant was sent back, to be in the service of Nicholas de Sigillo.<sup>117</sup> John probably sent back his brother Richard to Exeter on this occasion, for he had the king's peace although he had not secured his full favour.<sup>118</sup> We do not know whether or what other repercussions the king's orders had. Among the residents of the Capetian city, they may have clearly distinguished supporters of Becket from those of the king. The life in Paris appears to have become difficult for John of Salisbury as well as Gerard Pucelle perhaps from about summer or autumn 1165. While John's solution to improve the situation was to live in Rheims under the patronage of his old friend Peter of Celle at the same time as to try his best to place the exiles to well-wishers,<sup>119</sup> Gerard's was to defect to Germany.

---

115. For the exile and proscription of Becket's followers, see the section 4-II-1.

116. Mats no. 103.

117. JS Letters ii, no. 140. See the section 3-VII-3-b.

118. JS Letters ii, nos. 159, 160. See 3-VIII-2-b.

119. JS Letters ii, nos. 141, 142. See 2-V-3-b(i).

#### IV Papal Curia ii

##### 1 John of Salisbury and the papal Curia (1164--75)

John's personal correspondence to the Papal Curia ended with the death of Adrian IV in September 1159. Since John had not cultivated as strong a friendship with any other members of the Curia, the weakening of the tie between John and the Pope and the subsequent death of Adrian IV deprived him of the reason to write personal letters to the Curia. In fact, with the death of Archbishop Theobald, for whom John wrote official letters, the memory of his clerk may have faded away among the cardinals.

Nevertheless, John was to write to the Curia, again, as he served a new master, Archbishop Thomas. His letters were written mostly to different persons, for different purposes and on different occasions. Among the recipients of a series of Archbishop Theobald's letters written by John in 1156 (nos. 8-11), the former papal chancellor Roland, now Alexander III continued to appear as John's correspondent, whereas John of Sutri, another recipient of the series of letters does not seem to have heard from John after 1164. Instead, some new recipients appeared: they are Albert, cardinal priest of St. Lorenzo in Lucina, Humbald, cardinal bishop of Ostia, Walter cardinal bishop of Albano, William of Pavia, cardinal priest of St. Peter ad Vincula, Theodwin, cardinal priest of San Vitale and Gratian, papal notary. William of Pavia and Gratian were among those who were sent by the Pope to settle the Becket dispute. Albert and Theodwin were papal legates whose assignment was the restoration of order after the murder of Becket. Most of them were among Becket's correspondents.

John's letters to the Curia between 1164-75 were essentially written on behalf of his friends. They may be divided into two groups according to the time when they were written: (1) letters written while John was in exile on behalf of Becket's cause (1164-70); (2) those written after he came back to Canterbury' (1171-75). The second group includes those which were written after Becket's death on behalf of John's old friends in England. Five letters belong to the first group and twelve to the second group. Letters in both groups were written in John's own name as well as in others. Recipients of the second group were not always the same as those of the first group. Since Dr. McLoughlin has fully discussed John's letters to the Curia in connection with the Becket dispute<sup>1</sup>, their aim and tactics as well as other aspects of the relationships of John, Becket and the Papal Curia, here we concentrate on how they shifted from time to time following the course of the conflict.

## 2. During the Becket dispute (1164-70)

Roughly speaking, the relationship between John and the Papal Curia went through two phases during the Becket conflict. The first phase coincided with the period in which both John and the Pope were in France--from the beginning of John's exile to the end of the Pope's stay in France. (early 1164--spring/summer 1165) The second phase (1166-70) is further divided into two periods--1166-7 and 1168-70. During the first phase, John collected information

---

1. McLoughlin, pp 380-439.

of the Curia and passed it on to Becket. At the same time, he acted as a diplomat of Becket either by writing or by visiting in person the Papal Curia at Sens. After the Pope went back to Italy, John lost direct touch with the Curia. He no longer acted as an envoy to the Curia. Unlike Archbishop Theobald, Becket did not use John as his secretary and letter writer.

In 1166 and 67, John nevertheless kept some contact with the Curia. The five letters of John's which were written to members of the papal Curia during the Becket conflict belong to this period. There were four recipients. John wrote letters to members of the Curia at least in 1167. They were all related to the Becket dispute and were written for the most part in coordination with Becket's correspondence. One characteristic of John's communication in 1167 was that it all related to the papal legates, William and Otto. In these years as before, John collected news of the Papal Curia and sent it to his friends in England and other places.

In the years 1168-70, transmitting news became John's main business with regards to the Curia. He collected news concerning the Pope and other members of the Curia and passed it on to his friends for their benefit. He used it effectively for the purpose of propaganda.<sup>2</sup> Except for the early stage when John consulted his own peace to the Pope, John's contact with the Papal Curia was made on behalf of Becket.

---

2. McLoughlin, pp 436.

a. 1164-65<sup>3</sup>

The characteristic of this period was John's direct contact with the Curia. In late 1163 or early 1164 when John went into exile, he was expected by Becket to act as his 'ambassador to the Curia at Sens, but he was reluctant to do so at first. John reported to Becket that he had not gone to the Papal Curia. The reason was, according to John, to avoid 'plausible suspicions being raised against me'. He further reported that this is known to the Pope and the Curia, as John of Canterbury informed John.<sup>4</sup> From John's letter we learn that John of Canterbury had been unsuccessfully working to combat Clarembald of St. Augustine who had refused to make his profession of obedience to Canterbury.<sup>5</sup> John was probably expected to take over what John of Canterbury had been doing.

Perhaps another reason why John had put off going to the Papal Curia was that there was no certain news about the coming of the abbot of St. Augustine's or the bishop of Lisieux, whose arrival John expected to be informed by Becket's clerk Master Henry.<sup>6</sup> John's old grudge against Arnulf of Lisieux may have been another reason of John's reluctance to go to the Curia. Arnulf and his friend Richard of Ilchester were employed by Henry II as

---

3. For John's activities in this period, see also 3-VII-3-b, 3-VIII-2-e and 4-II-1.

4. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

5. Barlow, TB, pp 96, 138. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

6. JS Letters ii, no. 136.



envoys to the Papal Curia at that time.<sup>7</sup> Their purpose was to obtain for the archbishop of York either a papally confirmed primacy or a papal legation, neither of which Becket held in the years 1163-4.<sup>8</sup> Obviously there would be a clash of interest if John met them at the Papal Court. He was probably afraid of the repetition of the circumstances of 1155-6. John also reported to Becket at this time that upon receiving his letter, he wrote to William of Pavia and Henry of Pisa explaining that it would be a calamity for the Roman Church if the measures against Becket were to be taken.<sup>9</sup> Since William of Pavia and Henry of Pisa worked in close contact with the king in 1161<sup>10</sup> and participated in promoting Becket to archbishop of Canterbury,<sup>11</sup> Becket had a good reason to count on their help and understanding.

During the year of 1165, even after November when Becket was exiled in France, John's activity as his diplomat continued. Although John hesitated to go to the Curia in early 1164,<sup>12</sup> he visited the Pope at Sens probably around the end of 1164 and sent a report of their meeting to Becket.<sup>13</sup> On that occasion, John proposed a plan to restore

---

7. Barlow, TB, p 96. See the section 3-VIII-2-e.

8. Barlow, TB, p 106.

9. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

10. Barlow, TB, p 66. Eyton, p 54.

11. Eyton, p 56.

12. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

13. JS Letters ii, no. 144.

peace to Alexander III and to Becket. His proposal was probably on the one hand to ask the Empress to mediate between the king and the archbishop and on the other to advise the Pope to mediate between the kings of France and England, so that they might be bound together in support of the Pope's fight against the schismatics. After the meeting with the Pope, John advised Becket to accept the mediation of the Empress.<sup>14</sup> There was also an attempt by the Pope to mediate between the kings of France and England. The Pope, John reported 'seemed sure of a conference between himself and the kings'.<sup>15</sup> After leaving the Curia, John talked with the French king and he found out his attitude towards Becket. Becket in turn decided his policy upon estimation of John's information. He appears to have made requests to the Pope concerning papal policy towards the king, according to which, the Pope, John reported to Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques in the name of Becket, 'first offered devout prayers, then tried exhortations, then added chiding, and failing in all of them, he threatened the English king'.<sup>16</sup> In the same meeting with the Pope, John seems to have discussed conditions for his own peace with the king.<sup>17</sup>

While Alexander III was in France, John collected information on the Pope and visited him on Becket's behalf.

---

14. JS Letters ii, no. 144.

15. JS Letters ii, no. 144.

16. JS Letters ii, no. 157.

17. JS Letters ii, no. 139.

Together with Master Henry of Houghton, Hervey of London and John of Canterbury, John served as Becket's envoy to the Curia. John also discussed personal problems with the pope.

b. 1166-67

After his departure from Sens in April, the Pope arrived in Rome in November,<sup>18</sup> stopping at Bourges on the way, where he met Becket.<sup>19</sup> From this time onwards, John had lost direct communication with the Papal Curia. With the Pope's departure, he no longer served Becket in the capacity of diplomat.<sup>20</sup> In 1166, the Pope appeared mainly as topics of John's letters. How the Pope acted or reacted or thought about current events was of great concern for Becket's party and John's correspondents. The Pope's approval or disapproval, or pleasure or displeasure influenced Becket's policy and John's campaigning.

In writing to his English friends at the time of the Vezelay censures and the subsequent appeals of the bishops, John tried to stress the papal authority behind Becket's actions: Becket's title of primate of all England and legate of the apostolic see has been confirmed and notified;<sup>21</sup> papal displeasure of John of Oxford for swearing the oath at Wurzburg as well as accepting the deanery of Salisbury was the cause of his excommunication;<sup>22</sup> the Pope confirmed the

---

18. JS Letters ii, no. 152, n 9 & p xxiv.

19. JS Letters ii, no. 323.

20. JS Letters ii, no. 152.

21. JS Letters ii, no. 152, n 9.

22. See the section 4-II-1.

Vézelay sentences and the deposition of John of Oxford from his deanery.<sup>23</sup> In trying to impress the papal support of Becket's sanctions, John proposed Becket to invite his suffragans to hear among other things the papal mandate announcing Becket's legateship.<sup>24</sup>

What the Becket party was faced with shortly after was the diplomatic failure of their mission to the Papal Curia. Becket's envoy, the brother of the imprisoned chaplain of Becket, William of Salisbury was probably no match for the king's mission led by John of Oxford.<sup>25</sup> In the beginning of 1167, the Pope's show of exceptional favour to John of Oxford was used for campaigning in John's letters directed both to England and the Papal Curia.<sup>26</sup>

One of the king's petitions granted to John of Oxford was sending of William of Pavia, cardinal priest of St. Peter ad Vincula and Otto, cardinal deacon of St. Nicholas in Carcere Tulliano as papal legates a latere. The news that the king had requested William of Pavia as legate was a topic in John's letters already in October 1166.<sup>27</sup> One papal document published by the clerks on royal authority announcing the sending of legate a latere was dated

---

23. JS Letters ii, no. 174 & n 30. Mats nos. 193, 197.

24. JS Letters ii, no. 173. Mats nos. 172, 173.

25. Barlow, TB, pp 149, 162.

26. JS Letters ii, nos. 213-16, 219, 234, 235, 241. For John's use of the incident for propaganda, see McLoughlin, pp 427-8. On the incident as appeared in John's letters to the Papal Curia, see below for further discussion.

27. JS Letters ii, no. 184.

1 December 1166.<sup>28</sup> In about January 1167, John wrote to the bishop of Poitiers asking him for his advice on how to deal with the legates.<sup>29</sup> After February, the bishop of Poitiers wrote to inform Becket what he had learned of the legation from the royal envoys at Tours.<sup>30</sup> A group of letters was sent to the Papal Curia presumably after Becket had heard from John of Canterbury. John's letter no. 213 to the Pope was among them.<sup>31</sup> The letter was designed to create a certain atmosphere in the Curia in the hope of turning its policy in favour of the Becket party. Their contents are similar. With difference of degrees and concreteness, they deal with the return of John of Oxford and the papal legate, William of Pavia.

The main purpose of Becket's letter to his clerk John<sup>32</sup> was to inform him of the situation in England and Becket's attitude towards the papal legates and their possible

28. Barlow, TB, p 162. Mats no. 257.

29. JS Letters ii, no. 212.

30. JS Letters ii, p xxxiii, Mats no. 283.

31. JS Letters ii, p xxxiii.

<u>Mats</u> 285	TB--John, clerk	post 2 Feb. 1167
<u>Mats</u> 286	TB--Pope	post 2 Feb. 1167
<u>Mats</u> 287	TB--all cardinals	post 2 Feb. 1167
<u>Mats</u> 288	TB--Conrad of Mainz	post 2 Feb. 1167
<u>Mats</u> 290	TB--Cardinal John of SS John and Paul,	post 2 Feb. 1167
<u>Mats</u> 293	Louis VII--Pope	mid-late Feb. 1167
<u>Mats</u> 292	Lombardus, subdeacon--Pope	late Feb. 1167
<u>Mats</u> 295	JS--Pope	late Feb. 1167

Mats 295, John of Salisbury--Alexander III is the same as JS letter no. 213 and is dated by Brooke, c. Jan. 1167 and by Duggan late Feb. 1167. Duggan's is perhaps a more precise date.

32. Mats no. 285.

decision. Becket's letter to the Pope<sup>33</sup> was to serve mainly as a testimonial of his envoy, clerk John, who probably conveyed orally the message delivered in the letter from Becket. Becket's letter to all cardinals<sup>34</sup> mainly centred upon the king's evil deeds. He urged the cardinals to resist the king's wealth and support the cause of the Church. In the letter addressed to Conrad of Mainz,<sup>35</sup> Becket stated his difficulties as archbishop. In a letter to John of Sutri,<sup>36</sup> cardinal priest of St. John and St. Paul, Becket remonstrated the loss of his favour and requested him to support his cause. John's letter to the Pope was designed to impress the Curia the hardship and suffering of the exiles at the same time as to criticise the papal policy in a way that was difficult for Becket.<sup>37</sup> Two other letters, one from Master Lombardus and the other from Louis VII<sup>38</sup> to the Pope were to inform him of the unfavourable reaction of the French on the result of John of Oxford's mission.

John's letter to the Pope<sup>39</sup> was written on the same subject along with the general mass of Becket's campaigning

---

33. Mats no. 286.

34. Mats no. 287.

35. Mats no. 288.

36. Mats no. 290.

37. McLoughlin, pp 397-404.

38. Mats nos. 292, 293.

39. JS Letters ii, no. 213.

to the Curia. In this letter, John represented Becket's clerks in exile.<sup>40</sup> Starting with an expression of grief and a description of the hardships of the exiles, John complained about the Pope's policy especially his treatment of John of Oxford, whose petitions had been granted in spite of the fact that he was excommunicate and schismatic. The exiles were disappointed and now suspected the legates. From the point of view of the exiles, William of Pavia was the worst choice the Pope could have made for a legate. John further complained that the Pope had prolonged their exile for a year to maintain the alliance of the English king and remonstrated that the Pope had not been firmer in his support of Becket.

We do not know whether these eight letters written between post 2 February and late February were carried by the same messenger from the same place or by two or more messengers from different places. Mats no. 292 and 293 were possibly carried together by a messenger whom Master Lombardus knew well enough to entrust some oral messages to the Pope.<sup>41</sup> Oral messages from the messengers of Lombardus and Becket probably played an important part in making the Pope realize what repercussions had been generated by his decisions: how his favour to John of Oxford was taken by Becket and the French court and with what anxiety his choice of legates a latere was received among the exiles. Among

---

40. JS Letters ii, no. 219, n 1. McLoughlin p 397.

41. Mats no. 292.

the written messages, John's appears to have been the clearest and harshest on these points. The eight letters written by various authors to various recipients in the Curia may possibly have resulted in the restriction of the power of papal legates, William of Pavia and Otto of St. Nicholas in Carcere Tulliano.<sup>42</sup>

The arrival of the legates and how to deal with them was a matter of great discussion between John and Becket in about September 1167.<sup>43</sup> While Becket did not conceal his hostility and rejected the intervention of William of Pavia,<sup>44</sup> John was of the opinion that at least until their arrival in Normandy, they should be treated with due respect as they were sent by the Pope.<sup>45</sup>

In the meanwhile John wrote directly to the pope and William of Pavia. John's letter no. 219 to the Pope was written in about September or October 1167. Like no. 213 earlier, it was written on behalf of Becket's clerks in exile. It was probably sent to the Curia with Mats no. 322 written by Becket in about September 1167. The main purpose of these letters was to complain about William of Pavia, but their content and style are different reflecting the standpoints of Becket and John. In Mats no. 322, Becket congratulated the Pope's victory over Frederick, which was

---

42. Mats no. 307, ? May 1167.

43. JS Letters ii, no. 227.

44. JS Letters ii, p xxxvi.

45. JS Letters ii, no. 227 to TB (September-October 1167) No. 229 to William of Pavia (c. October, 1167) See McLoughlin, pp 406-409.



taken as a manifestation of God's power and justice. Having stressed William's closeness to the English king, Becket expressed his belief that it was not necessary for him to obey their justice nor examination. Becket asked the Pope to diminish the power of the legates, urging him to take action against the king.

In his letter no. 219, touching on the defeat of the Germans and briefly congratulating the Pope on his victory, John made a direct but somewhat emotional complaint about the papal policy from the point of view of the exiles. He continued to complain about the Pope's treatment of John of Oxford, this time particularly in connection with absolving impenitent excommunicate. John insisted that the absolution by the bishop of St. Asaph was not legal and the excommunicate were still under the ban. A more recent cause of John's grievances was the papal legates William of Pavia whose personal integrity John doubted, judging from his behaviour at the council of Pavia.<sup>46</sup> Becket's and John's letters would have conveyed together a collective message from the Becket party. The effect of these letters may possibly have been Mats no. 355 from the Pope to William and Otto written in October 1167 ordering that those who were released from excommunication must restore the church's property.

While the legates were approaching Aquitaine, John tried his best to obtain information on William of Pavia from his Poitevin friends.<sup>47</sup> When John visited the Curia

---

46. See below on William of Pavia, esp. n 49.

47. JS Letters ii, nos. 222-4. See the section 3-VII-4-b.

as a messenger of Archbishop Theobald, John does not appear to have had much relationship with William of Pavia. But already from the pontificate of Adrian IV, William was one of the cardinals who was involved in the papal diplomacy directed towards the north of the Alps<sup>48</sup> and he played an important role at the Council of Pavia.<sup>49</sup> Therefore, John knew about William and had already formed an unfavourable opinion of him. William was in Normandy on a mission shortly after, which was carried out with a view to seeking support for Alexander III and to improve Anglo-French relations.<sup>50</sup> William of Pavia and Henry of Pisa, cardinal priest of St. Nereus and St. Achilles were in close contact with Henry II and helped him carry out his plans.<sup>51</sup> They gave Henry dispensation to enable the king's son Henry to be married to Louis VII's daughter Margaret<sup>52</sup> and they participated in promoting Becket to archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>53</sup> Although John was in the same opinion as Becket regarding William's character, he wrote to William to mitigate his feelings towards Becket who had sent him a

---

48. Concerning William's activities as papal legate to the north of Italy, see Ohnsorge, W., Die Legaten Alexanders III in ersten Jahrzehnt seines Pontificat (1159-1169), Berlin, (1928) pp 7--15.

49. Concerning William at the Council of Pavia, see JS Letters i, no. 124. Zenker, B., Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums von 1130 bis 1159 (Dissertation) Würzburg, (1964) p 119.

50. Barlow, TB, p 66. See also Ohnsorge, Die Legaten Alexanders III, p 15.

51. Barlow, TB, p 66.

52. Barlow, TB, p 60. Warren, Henry II, p 90. Eyton, p 52.

53. See above n 11.

hostile letter.<sup>54</sup>

In his letter no. 229, John wrote expressly that the legates came 'on the request of his majesty the king and on the orders of our lord the Pope' to restore its proper freedom to the English church and to bring about peace and co-operation between the king and Becket.<sup>55</sup> Expressing his trust that William of Pavia would not receive personal gifts, John suggested that his friendship with the king may be profitable to the Church at the same time as to bring salvation to the king and glory to himself. Recognizing his adherence to the king, John repeated his opposition to absolution without penitence, which he previously expressed to the Pope. Speaking on behalf of all his fellow exiles, he asked the cardinals to end the misery of the church of Canterbury.

By the time this letter was written however, the relationship between the legates and Becket had probably improved, reflecting the change of diplomatic relations between France and England.<sup>56</sup> Moreover, in October, Becket heard from the archdeacon of Bourges from whom he had formerly requested information on the legates. On meeting with the legates at Chateauroux, the archdeacon found out

---

54. On Becket's diplomacy towards the legates and the relationship between JS's letter to TB and JS's letter to William of Pavia, see the section 4-VI-3-c.

55. The tactical significance of this letter has been fully discussed in McLoughlin, pp 408-12.

56. Barlow, TB, p 170.

from them that the papal mandates were more in favour of Becket than not.<sup>57</sup> About the same time, Becket wrote to William and Otto offering to use his influence on the French king to assist their mission of reconciling the English and French kings and proposing a meeting.<sup>58</sup> At Sens, the cardinals came to Becket and the meeting appears to have been friendly.<sup>59</sup> If the relationship between Becket and the legates had improved before, or rather if John had known of the improvement, it may not have been necessary for John to write no 229. We do not know whether it reached its destination or was 'burned in your household or his'<sup>60</sup> as John suggested.

After the conference of Gisors and Trie, John had two main tasks. One was to participate in Becket's campaigning at the Curia. The other was to inform his friends of the conference and what happened afterwards, giving them advice when necessary. John wrote detailed reports of the conference of Gisors and Trie and sent additional news to his friends.<sup>61</sup> He also wrote about the cardinals' behaviour and their opinions at and after the conference at Argentan when they met the king and his entourage.<sup>62</sup> John

---

57. Mats no. 308. Mats no. 355 from Pope to William and Otto dated Oct. 1167 was written by the Pope when he heard the Becket's messenger who probably took Mats no. 322 and possibly John's no. 219 to the Pope.

58. Mats nos. 329-30.

59. Barlow, TB, p 170.

60. JS Letters ii, no. 228.

61. JS Letters ii, nos. 230-2.

62. JS Letters ii, nos. 236, 241, 245, 246, 271, 274.

especially criticised William of Pavia and attributed the failure of peace partly to him,<sup>63</sup> for though he was eloquent, he was light in faith and accepted bribes.<sup>64</sup>

While John was busy sending news to his friends, diplomacy continued between the king and Becket and from both parties to the Curia. Becket's clerks John and Alexander were sent to the Pope with Becket's letter and letters of the French king and magnates.<sup>65</sup> They were dispatched three days prior to the arrival of the legates' and the bishops' messengers on 14 December. They probably left with Becket's long letter addressed to the Pope, in which the archbishop stated his various grievances.<sup>66</sup> This letter was different from his previous letters in 1167 in that Becket now talked about himself as exile and stressed the misery of the situation, just as John of Salisbury used to do. The letter Becket wrote after the arrival of the legates and the bishops' messengers was a very bitter letter of complaint against the legates and the Pope's treatment of his person and it was dispatched with two bearers.<sup>67</sup> Becket deemed himself as a miserable exile in this letter as well.

---

63. JS Letters ii, nos. 233, 234, 236.

64. JS Letters ii, no. 236.

65. John and Alexander appear to have been dispatched three days prior to the arrival of the legates' and the bishops' messengers. (Barlow, TB, p 175.) Messengers were sent to the Pope with letters of the French king and magnates. (JS Letters ii, no. 233.) Since the reference is made to the letters of the French king and magnates was made in Becket's letter written about or after 14 Dec., (Mats no. 348.) the messengers of Becket's letter and the letters of the French must have been John and Alexander.

66. Mats no. 331.

67. Mats no. 348.

John's letters to Cardinal Albert and Cardinal Walter<sup>68</sup> were written in late 1167, but it is not clear when they were sent to the Curia. They may have gone with either of the two missions of Becket. Of the two missions, it is more likely that they went with the latter.<sup>69</sup> There is a possibility also that John's letters had some connection with the chapter of Rheims who were going to the Curia.<sup>70</sup> At least Peter of Celle's letter of protest to the Pope may have found its way with the chapter of Rheims.<sup>71</sup>

The two letters were different from either of Becket's letters. They also differ from each other and from John's previous letters to the Curia.<sup>72</sup> Whereas both Becket's letters around this time<sup>73</sup> dwelled on what had happened to him and stated his grievances, John's letters to the cardinals at least partly stated principles as reflected in the present situation and seem to have attempted a rational persuasion.

Albert, cardinal priest of St. Lawrence in Lucina, future Gregory VIII (1187), the recipient of John's letter

---

67. Mats no. 348.

68. JS Letters ii, nos. 234, 235.

69. Professor Brooke has pointed out that there is a link between nos. 233 and 234 in the contemptuous description of William of Pavia. (JS Letters ii, p xxxvi.) Since no. 233 reported the sending of a courier to the Pope with the French king's letter, no. 234 might have been written after the dispatch of Becket's first mission.

70. JS Letters ii, no. 235. See JL 11380(Feb. 11, 1168).

71. Mats no. 352(c. Dec. 1167), PC Letters ii, no. 135.

72. JS Letters ii, nos. 213, 219.

73. Mats nos. 331, 348.

no. 234 was a friend of Becket's.<sup>74</sup> Cardinal Albert was among the 'peace' party of cardinals which became influential in the later part of the pontificate of Alexander III.<sup>75</sup> He was critical of Alexander's policy of striving for direct political power. He was much interested in the urgent tasks of reform.<sup>76</sup> Becket wrote one letter in 1163<sup>77</sup> and two letters in mid-April 1170.<sup>78</sup> After reconciliation at Fréteval, Albert wrote to Becket expressing some hesitation to congratulate him, doubting whether peace would last.<sup>79</sup> In spite of little direct contact, Cardinal Albert was considered a supporter of Becket, and Simon of Mont-Dieu wrote to him on behalf of Becket after the conference of St. Léger-en-Yvelines.<sup>80</sup>

Since cardinal Albert was said to model himself on the Pope,<sup>81</sup> John praised in his letter the Pope's zeal and justice which had earned him success.<sup>82</sup> John contrasted

---

74. For Albert's life and his activities as legate, Zenker, Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums, pp 125-9. Ohnsorge, Die Legaten Alexanders III, pp 59ff, 118ff, 163. Tillman, Die päpstlichen Legaten in England, pp 68-72. For Albert's friendship with Becket and letter no. 234, McLoughlin, pp 412-19.

75. Barraclough, G., The Medieval Papacy, London (1968) p 110.

76. Barraclough, G., The Medieval Papacy, pp 109-10. Zenker, Die Mitglieder der Kardinalkollegiums, p 128. Brixius, J.M., Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums von 1130-1181, (Inaugural Dissertation) Berlin, (1912) pp 57-8.

77. Mats no. 32.

78. Mats nos. 662, 664.

79. Mats no. 703.

80. Mats no. 465.

81. JS Letters ii, no. 175.

82. JS Letters ii, no. 234.

the increase of the king's power against the weakened authority of Becket and misery of the exiles. He complained about William of Pavia, who supported the king's customs which were contrary to God's law and destructive of the right of the Holy See, and who 'handed over to the prince's will all right and authority over the church's affairs'; From the point of view of principles, John argued that if episcopal office is undermined by the king, it will be dangerous to the Church itself. Touching on the defeat of Frederick, which, John believed, was God's will brought about by the prayers of the exiles, John urged the cardinal to trust in God and advise the Pope and other cardinals to check the English king. John suggested the need of the legates to withdraw, reminding him of the Pope's treatment of John of Oxford.

Cardinal Albert was considered a supporter of Becket, but Cardinal Walter<sup>83</sup> was probably neutral in his attitude. John's letter no. 235<sup>84</sup> was probably an attempt to sway him into Becket's support both by appealing to his personal connections and by rational persuasion. Cardinal Walter was a successor of Nicholas Breakspear when he became Pope Adrian IV.<sup>85</sup> Adrian IV was interested in his appointment. It has been suggested that one Walter, canon of St. Ruf on

---

83. Nothing much seems to be known concerning Walter's biography. He was cardinal bishop of Albano from before 1159(1154-5) to 1177-9. (JS Letters ii, no. 235, n 1) He was vicar of Rome from May 1167 to September 1172. (Ohnsorge, Die Legaten Alexanders III, p 92, n 9 & p 166. JS Letters ii, no. 272)

84. For the letter no. 235, see McLoughlin, pp 419-422.

85. JS Letters ii, no. 235, n 1.



whom Archbishop Theobald sent a favourable report was the same person as Cardinal Walter.<sup>86</sup> John hesitated to approach him, but nevertheless did so 'on account of our common father, the most holy Adrian', John felt that there was 'a common bond between them, for John was much loved by Adrian and Walter was his successor as cardinal bishop of Albano. Stating that accepting gifts was against his honour and the honour of the Roman church, John argued that it was dangerous to be silent and indifferent 'if God's Church is handed over to tyrants to be despoiled and trampled under, if wickedness triumph over justice.' John stressed that Becket and his followers were exiled and outlawed in their fight for the Church's liberty and for the sake of the Holy See. The Roman Curia should not give benefit to the rich and powerful but do justice to all. John wrote to the cardinal 'as my father and lord' informally as a friend so that he should not give consent to iniquity. Finally, John asked the cardinal to work so that the Pope might confer deanery of Rheims on his friend Ralph.<sup>87</sup>

On this occasion as before, John's letters appear to have been written in such a way as to supplement what was lacking in Becket's letters. On two previous occasions, however, John wrote as a representative of the exiles and conveyed to the Pope their criticisms towards his policy. On this occasion, John and Becket used the same arguments but Becket's letters were more emotional and emphatic and were written as an exiled archbishop. John's letters were

---

86. JS Letters i, no. 49. JS Letters ii, p xv.

87. JS Letters ii, no. 235.

more rational and calculating in a way that they tried to persuade the cardinals from the point of view of moral significance as well as of ultimate benefit of policy based on principles.

The disadvantage was that whereas John knew Alexander III and could express his emotions, he hardly knew the cardinals he wrote to at the end of 1167. While Becket's own expression of his bitterness may have impressed the Pope, John's arguments would have been less impressive, not on account of the lack of skill in his letters but of the fact that he was not well-known by these cardinals. In spite of all the support Becket got from the French king and magnates, the result of Becket's mission to the Curia appears to have been a diplomatic failure. Although the situation at Benevento was improving due to the defeat of the Germans, placing the Pope in a better position to help Becket, the king's envoys Clarembald, abbot-elect of St. Augustine's and Reginald fitzJocelin, archdeacon of Salisbury and others gained the upper hand and won for the king the suspension of Becket.<sup>88</sup>

c. 1168-70

During these years, John does not appear to have taken part in Becket's epistolary campaign to the Curia. His relationship with the Curia seems to have become more passive: for the most part, he simply gathered information on the Pope, the Papal Curia and papal messengers, and

---

88. Barlow, TB, p 175. JS Letters ii, nos. 275, 276, 279, 280.

89. JS Letters ii, nos. 242, 236, 272.

transmitted it to his friends often for the purpose of campaigning. John's references centre around several incidents: the defeat of the Emperor;<sup>89</sup> Becket's suspension;<sup>90</sup> excommunication of the bishops of London and Salisbury;<sup>91</sup> coronation of young Henry.<sup>92</sup>

Since communication with the Curia in Benevento was particularly difficult in 1168 due to the retreat of the Germans, only 8 letters of Becket to the Curia survive from that year, 5 of them from the summer months.<sup>93</sup> They were written in protest against the suspension of Becket. John does not appear to have taken part in the campaign directed to the Curia, although he asked John of Canterbury to write to the Pope.<sup>94</sup> After the failure of peace at Montmirail on 6 January 1169, John at least made some attempt to improve the situation for Becket. He probably asked the archbishop of Rheims to write to the Pope on behalf of Becket.<sup>95</sup>

In 1169-70, perhaps there was less need for John to write to the Papal Curia. Papal policy was generally in favour of Becket. Therefore Becket did not need to rally support for his cause in the Curia, making use of every tactic he could think of. Becket wrote many letters to the Curia, but they were mostly announcements.

---

90. JS Letters ii, nos. 275, 278, 279, 280.

91. JS Letters ii, nos. 295, 296, 298.

92. JS Letters ii, p xliii, no. 300.

93. Mats nos. 441-4, 406.

94. JS Letters ii, no. 275.

95. JS Letters ii, no. 296.

3. 1171-75

John's relationship with the Curia did not end with the murder of Becket. Being either in Canterbury or Exeter working for his old friends, John kept his interest in papal affair, especially in connection with the canonization of the murdered archbishop and the consecration of bishops-elect.<sup>96</sup> John wrote a number of letters in his own name as well as in the names of Bartholomew of Exeter and Prior Odo of Christ Church.

a. Letters for Richard of Dover

In about June 1173, John wrote four letters to the Papal Curia in support of the archbishop-elect of Canterbury, Richard of Dover. He wrote three letters to the Pope, one in the name of Prior Odo, another in the name of Bartholomew of Exeter, and a third in his own name.<sup>97</sup> He also wrote a letter to cardinal Boso in his own name.<sup>98</sup> These letters all requested assistance to bring about the consecration of Richard of Dover.

The letter in the name of Prior Odo was the longest and most elaborate. It gave a detailed account of the election of the archbishop and other bishops and the young king's appeal against it and asked the Pope to support the archbishop-elect, Richard. The letters of Bartholomew of Exeter repeated the course of events more briefly.

---

96. For John's activities after the murder of Becket, see the sections 3-V-3-d and 4-VI-3-e.

97. JS Letters ii, no. 311 in the name of Prior Odo, 312 in the name of Bartholomew of Exeter and no. 313 in his own name.

98. JS Letters ii, no. 315.

Bartholomew commended Alexander for canonizing Becket and the legates' activities. He also asked the Pope 'to set in St. Thomas's place' a man who was faithful to him in his suffering.

'The letter from John was written with a simple heading 'Domino Papae Johannes'. It omitted most of the details which 'my mother the church of Canterbury has lucidly explained in its letter'. It merely mentioned briefly the merits of the elect and the fact that the election was canonical. John expressed his humble wish that the archbishop-elect would be consecrated. This letter was the shortest of all the letters with the least account of the events. It was almost a personal letter.

The letter to Cardinal Boso<sup>99</sup> was also written by John about the same time. It is a letter requesting the cardinal to act for the benefit of the church of Canterbury and support the archbishop-elect, as he had done to earlier archbishops. As Becket had done once before,<sup>100</sup> stressing Boso's friendship to the church of Canterbury from the days of Pope Lucius, John reminded the cardinal of the fidelity and devotion of the church of Canterbury to the Holy See and of Archbishop Theobald's efforts to 'preserve the Church's law and the canons of the Holy See'. Boso was not one of the sympathizers of Becket in the Papal Curia. His main concern was directed to the fight with the Germans. Cardinal Boso, who mentioned Becket just once in his biography of Alexander III may not have been very pleased to

---

99. JS Letters ii, no. 315. For Boso, see the section 3-III-2-a.

100. Mats no. 250.

hear St. Thomas mentioned much, although he might be persuaded to help the church of Canterbury through the history of his association with it.

b. Letters for Richard of Ilchester

John also wrote a number of testimonials for the bishop-elect of Winchester, Richard of Ilchester.<sup>101</sup> John wrote to cardinals Albert and Theodwin, Cardinal Humbald and papal notary Gratian in his own name and to the Pope in the name of Bartholomew of Exeter and Prior Odo. The letters were all written in 1173 or 74. John wrote to cardinals Albert and Theodwin while they were legates to England and France.<sup>102</sup> John stated that by the work of the legates, it finally became possible to consecrate bishops to the vacant sees. Reporting that the church of Winchester elected Richard of Ilchester, John described his merits. Adding that his election 'was first solemnized in his episcopal see, then solemnly approved in a gathering of bishops' and that royal assent was given, John requested the legates to 'complete what was laudably begun by you'. John further stated that the elect will be a very strong pillar in the Church and will support the needs of his and other churches.

Cardinal Humbald,<sup>103</sup> who was spiritually close to

---

101. JS Letters ii, 316-20. For Richard of Ilchester, see the section 3-VIII-2-e.

102. JS Letters ii, no. 316.

103. For Humbald, see Zenker, Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums, pp 23-5. Ohnsorge, Die Legaten Alexanders III, pp 164-5, 93, 82ff, 146ff.

Cistercian order and who succeeded Alexander III as Lucius III(1181-5) was one of Becket's most important correspondents in the Papal Curia. Becket wrote to him at least on 5 occasions<sup>104</sup> and he was among those who wrote back to Becket in late September 1170 after the peace of Fréteval.<sup>105</sup> However, John and the cardinal do not seem to have known each other very well. John stated that he felt bold enough to write to him because of his affection for Becket, referring to the fact that he was the archbishop's fellow exile.<sup>106</sup> With much description of his merit, John commended Richard, bishop-elect of Winchester so that 'you may forward his business with your favour'. John mentioned again Richard's attachment to the martyr, 'whom he has chosen as his patron'.

Gratian was one of the papal envoys sent in 1169 to mediate between Henry II and Becket. Nephew of Eugenius III,<sup>107</sup> he had Baldwin of Totnes as his tutor at Ferentino<sup>108</sup> and he met John of Salisbury there.<sup>109</sup> He was also a friend of Becket's.<sup>110</sup> John met Gratian at Vézelay

---

104. Mats no. 30, (post 1 Oct. 1163): Mats no. 444, (post 6 July 1168): Mats no. 538, (June 1169): Mats no. 584, (post 29, Sept. 1169) and Mats no. 684, (post 22 July 1170).

105. Mats no. 707.

106. JS Letters ii, no. 317.

107. JS Letters ii, no. 289.

108. JS Letters ii, no. 289.

109. JS Letters ii, no. 289. JS Letters i, pp 253-6.

110. JS Letters ii, p xxxiv.

on 22 July<sup>111</sup> and got an impression that the Pope was favourable to Becket.<sup>112</sup> During the conference with the king, he became indignant at Henry II's treatment of their messenger Peter of Pavia and he left the conference for Benevento accompanied by William, archbishop of Sens.<sup>113</sup> Becket wrote at least five letters to Gratian, and all the extant ones belong to 1169 or after.<sup>114</sup> John does not appear to have written to him during the life time of Becket. The only surviving letter was written after Becket's death.<sup>115</sup> John wrote to Gratian because 'you were on embassy for St. Thomas's affairs.'<sup>116</sup> John commended to Gratian, Richard, bishop-elect of Winchester as one of those who were devoted to the martyr. Describing and praising the merit of his person, John asked Gratian to accept his case and promote his affair.

John's letter to the Pope in the name of Bartholomew of Exeter was a little more formal in tone. John wrote that the Roman Church would summon 'those fitted to the care of pastoral office and to grant them the favour and defence of papal protection'. From that point of view, the church of Winchester benefitted by the election of Richard of Ilchester. Commending his person, John in the name of Bartholomew stated that the election was free, canonical and

---

111. JS Letters ii, no. 289.

112. JS Letters ii, no. 290. Barlow, TB, p 187.

113. Barlow, TB, p 191. Mats no. 560.

114. Mats nos. 533, 604, 663, 665, 695.

115. JS Letters ii, no. 318.

116. JS Letters ii, no. 318. ; (



was given royal assent. John added that, judging from their letters, the papal legates were glad of it, for Richard could contribute much to restore the ruins of the church and to strengthen the influence of the Holy See.

John's letters nos. 311-15 and nos. 316-21 were probably part of the larger scale epistolary campaigning against the appeal of the young king.<sup>117</sup> But we do not know how they reached their destination. No. 316 was possibly sent to France with John's letter to William aux Blanchesmains<sup>118</sup> while the cardinals retained their legateship.<sup>119</sup> Were other letters sent directly to the Pope or were they also sent to the legates and through their agency forwarded to the Curia? Was the explanation of the situation entrusted to the bearer or did the letters for Richard of Dover and Richard of Ilchester form a group with the letter from Prior Odo describing the situations fully? How about no. 322 written in the name of Bartholomew of Exeter for the sake of Robert Foliot? Such questions have not found definite answers.

#### 4. Conclusions

John's closest friend at the Papal Curia was probably Pope Alexander III. When John wrote to the Pope in the name of Prior Odo or Bartholomew of Exeter, John chose the style suitable to the dignitaries concerned, just as he did when he wrote on behalf of Archbishop Theobald. When John wrote

---

117. See the section 3-VIII-2-e.

118. JS Letters ii, no. 314. See below 4-IV-2.

119. Tillmann, Die papstlichen Legaten in England, p 72.

to the pope in the name of simple Johannes without title, somehow he was confident that the Pope would pay attention to what 'Johannes' had to say. After all, they had known each other for a long time. The memory Cardinal Roland had of a capable clerk of Archbishop Theobald survived and was revived as he, as Alexander III, met John again in 1164 in France. The memory refreshed was strengthened as they discussed various problems. The time when they were both in France was doubly important, because they shared a common fate as exiles and common acquaintances. Proximity made their ties closer so that John, now working for Archbishop Thomas of Canterbury had left a deep enough impression on the Pope. Alexander III was not Adrian IV who specially favoured his countryman John of Salisbury. But Alexander III certainly knew him and probably held for him a certain affection.

Judging from his letters, although he used phrases and expressions befitting to each recipient, John does not seem to have been particularly close to the cardinals. During the Becket conflict, he wrote to three cardinals on behalf of Becket. To William of Pavia, John wrote purely for tactical reasons. The cardinals Albert and Walter were those who appeared to John most likely to give support to Becket. He wrote to Cardinal Albert because he was a friend to Becket and also because he had a reputation of being a just and righteous man, who would support the cause of the Church's liberty. John wrote to Cardinal Walter, for, like John, Walter was favoured by Pope Adrian IV, and therefore might be sympathetic to John. When he wrote to cardinals in 1173 or 74, his choice of cardinals was made the same way.

The martyrdom of St. Thomas, John thought, would not appeal to Cardinal Boso, but since he had a close tie with the church of Canterbury, he might feel affectionate to Richard, the archbishop elect of Canterbury. Besides, while John was serving Archbishop Theobald, they had a fairly good working relationship, although it did not develop into personal friendship.<sup>120</sup> John wrote to cardinals Albert and Theodwin on behalf of Richard, bishop-elect of Winchester, because they were the legates who ordered free elections to vacant sees.<sup>121</sup>

The reason why John felt Cardinal Humbald would be sympathetic to him was that he had a true affection for Becket and that he felt that it would appeal to him to mention that John was Becket's fellow exile. The common tie that bound them was St. Thomas. To Gratian, John wrote mainly because he was an embassy for Becket and favourable to his cause. John also met him during the conflict and exchanged conversation. John's letter to Gratian was, therefore fairly informal.

---

120. See the section 3-III-2-a.

121. Mats no. 784.

## VI Champagne ii

### 1. Introduction -- William aux Blanchesmains

An important person John of Salisbury came to know while exiled was William aux Blanchesmains, the fourth son of Count Theobald and a brother to Henry the Liberal. John got acquainted with William possibly through Thomas during the Becket conflict. William's involvement had a decisive effect on the course of the Becket dispute.

William aux Blanchesmains was brought up with an ecclesiastical career in view. ~~He was a monk at Clairvaux and a protégé of Saint Bernard.~~<sup>1</sup> In his youth, he appears to have been in touch with his uncle, the bishop of Winchester.<sup>2</sup> He was bishop-elect of Chartres in 1165--7 and was consecrated in December 1167.<sup>3</sup> From 1168, he was archbishop of Sens in plurality, and was also papal legate since 1169.<sup>4</sup> Upon the death of Louis VII's brother, Henry, archbishop of Rheims, he was translated to Rheims in 1176. He was made cardinal priest of St. Sabina in 1179.<sup>5</sup> He was a powerful political figure not only at the French court but also at the Papal Curia.

The first time William appeared in the ecclesiastical-political scene in connection with Thomas was as bishop-elect of Chartres in 1165. In that year, we find the Pope

---

~~1. Hallam, p 123.~~

2. JS Letters ii, no. 272.

3. JS Letters ii, no. 274.

4. Barlow, TB, p 158. William, J.R., 'William of the White Hands and men of letters' in Anniversary Essays in Mediaeval History by Students of Charles Homer Haskins, New York, 1929 (reprinted in 1967) pp. 365-87.

5. Barlow, TB, p 158.

asking the bishop of Troyes to transfer the provostship of his church from the bishop-elect of Chartres to Herbert of Bosham.<sup>6</sup> The direct contact between Becket and the bishop-elect of Chartres started already in late July 1166.<sup>7</sup> In the latter half of 1166, we find William aux Blanchesmains writing to the Pope in support of Thomas Becket.<sup>8</sup> From about spring 1168 when William was elected archbishop of Sens, where Becket had resided since the end of 1167, Becket appears to have gained the full support of William aux Blanchesmains.

The year 1167 appears to have been a turning point both in Becket's fight against Henry II and William's position at the French court. Becket spent almost the whole year of 1167 in expectation of the papal legates and it ended in bitter disappointment. Apparently it was difficult to put up a lone fight against the king who could even have the legates appointed of his choice. At the French court, there appears to have been a shift of balance of power to the benefit of William aux Blanchesmains. There had been influential relatives of the king: Henri de France, a brother of Louis VII and the archbishop of Rheims was one:<sup>9</sup> Robert of Dreux, another brother of the king may also have been another.<sup>10</sup> However, Henry the Liberal's change to pro-

---

6. Barlow, TB, p 138.

7. JS Letters ii, no. 176.

8. Mats no. 192.

9. In the initial phase of the conflict, Becket tried to contact Henri de France. (JS Letters ii, no. 136.)

10. JS Letters ii, no. 144.

Capetian policy<sup>11</sup> was beginning to bear fruit and the influence of the members of the house of Blois appears to have increased possibly after the birth of Philip Augustus by Adela of Champagne in 1165.

In these circumstances, in 1168, we find William aux Blanchesmains as archbishop of Sens acting as adviser to the king of France and chief spokesman of the French court and the French church.<sup>12</sup> His influence was already recognized by Henry II, who approached William in trying to lobby the French court before the conference of La-Ferté-Bernard.<sup>13</sup> William decided on firm support for Thomas Becket. In some ways he may have taken over at least part of the nuisance of negotiation from Becket who, according to John, was increasingly occupied with spiritual exercises.<sup>14</sup>

From about the time of the conference of La Ferté-Bernard, close ties between archbishop William and Becket in their policies were easily recognized. William also often used his family ties at the French court in the diplomacy towards the Papal Curia. After the conference of the two kings at La Ferté-Bernard, William of Sens wrote to the Pope in protest at the suspension of Becket.<sup>15</sup> We also find Queen Adela of France, King Louis and others writing to the

---

11. See the section 2-IV-4-d.

12. Mats nos. 192, 446, 470, 498.

13. JS Letters ii, no. 272. Mats nos. 469, 570, 571, 572.

14. JS Letters ii, no. 274.

15. Mats no. 446.

Curia.<sup>16</sup> John left no record of William at Montmirail, but he reported his activities at the conference of the two kings at Saint-Léger-en-Yvelines on 7 February 1169.<sup>17</sup> At this conference, it was proposed that the English king was to submit himself to the judgement of the master of the Grandimontines and also to have the conference with the bishops.<sup>18</sup> William of Sens may have arranged for Becket to be represented by Master Lombardus, a former clerk of Becket who was staying in the household of Archbishop William at that time.<sup>19</sup> William also wrote about the conference to the Pope.<sup>20</sup>

In 1169, after Becket passed the sentence of excommunication on the bishops of London and Salisbury and others on 13 April at Clairvaux and on 29 May, he succeeded with the help of William of Sens in getting the support of French bishops. Along with Becket himself, they also wrote to the Curia.<sup>21</sup> When Gilbert Foliot made a claim for the independence of the see of London from the jurisdiction of Canterbury, William joined Becket again in writing to the

---

16. Mats no. 440, Queen Adela of France to the Pope.  
Mats no. 435, Louis VII to the Pope.  
Mats no. 439, Louis VII to the Cardinals.  
Mats no. 437, Bishop of Meaux to the Pope.  
Mats no. 438, Matthew, treasurer of Sens to the Pope.

17. Barlow, TB, pp 182-3.

18. Barlow, TB, p 183.

19. JS Letters ii, no. 186.

20. Mats no. 470.

21. Mats no. 497, Becket to the Curia. Bishops of Auxerre, Therouanne, Noyon and Paris also wrote to the Curia. (Mats nos. 498, 538, 540-6.)

Curia.<sup>22</sup> After Gilbert of London was absolved at Rouen on 5 April, 1170, William of Sens wrote along with Becket and his clerks in protest to Alexander III.<sup>23</sup>

When the new papal commissioners Rotrou of Rouen and Bernard of Nevers proposed that Becket have a conference at Freteval, it was William of Sens who persuaded Becket who felt reluctant about the matter.<sup>24</sup> When Becket met the king at Freteval on 22 July, he was accompanied among others by William aux Blanchesmains and Theobald of Blois.<sup>25</sup> Even after peace was made and Becket returned to England, it was still to William of Sens that Becket turned by sending messengers to report to him that conditions promised at Freteval and after were not fulfilled.<sup>26</sup>

Becket found himself in William aux Blanchesmains the most influential and the staunchest supporter of his cause. But through William's involvement, the Becket dispute was reduced to being a bargaining tool and a propaganda matter of the French king and church. William aux Blanchesmains was chief instigator of this policy and through this he probably gained a stronger influence in the French court as well as in the Papal Curia.

William was probably sincere in his support of Becket and remained the most reliable help for former Becket's

---

22. Mats no. 538, Becket to Cardinals.  
Mats no. 547, William of Sens to the Pope.

23. Mats no. 674, William of Sens to the Pope. See also Mats 656, 658-67.

24. Barlow, TB, pp 205-10.

25. Barlow, TB, pp 205-10.

26. Barlow, TB, pp 233-4.



clerks after Becket's death. From William's point of view, Becket remained a useful diplomatic tool even after his death. When Becket was murdered, William of Sens was swiftly notified. It was from the household of William of Sens that Becket's own messengers Alexander and Gunther were sent to the Curia to report the murder.<sup>27</sup> Already in January 1171, William of Sens, Theobald of Blois as well as Louis VII were writing to the Pope calling for vengeance.<sup>28</sup> William of Sens also sent a Carthusian monk to King Henry to investigate the cause.<sup>29</sup> Since William of Sens and Rotrou of Rouen had received the papal mandate dated 9 October 1170 authorizing the imposition of an interdict if the terms of the peace of Fréteval should fail, William summoned a provincial council on 25 January 1171 to enforce the measure.<sup>30</sup> In spite of King Henry's attempt to prevent the laying of the interdict by sending a legation of prominent members first to Sens, then to the Curia, William of Sens obtained the unanimous support of the French bishops and abbots and ordered an interdict on Henry II's French lands.<sup>31</sup> He also sent letters to Rome asking to confirm his sentences.<sup>32</sup> In this situation, former clerks of Becket continued to look to William of Sens for vengeance of the

---

27. Mat no. 735.

28. Mats nos. 740, 736, 734.

29. Barlow, TB, p 252.

30. Barlow, TB, p 253.

31. Barlow, TB, p 253.

32. Mats no. 740.

wicked deed and for the canonization of Thomas Becket.<sup>33</sup> For William, the murder in the Cathedral provided a good opportunity to harm Henry II and he probably also took advantage of the plea of former Becket's clerks.

## 2. John of Salisbury and William aux Blanchesmains

William began to appear as a topic in John's letters from July 1166.<sup>34</sup> Reference to William increases from 1168 as he became more involved in the Becket affair.<sup>35</sup> No letter is extant from John to William during exile. Perhaps there was no need for John to write, for they had chances to see each other. But John must have known William, for his later correspondence presupposes his earlier relationship with William which was cultivated during this time.

Three extant letters from John to William aux Blanchesmains were written in the period following the murder of Becket. One was written in the name of the clerks of Archbishop Thomas, accusing Roger, Archbishop of York by disclosing his scandalous deeds.<sup>36</sup> Its content and John's authorship have been discussed by Professor Brooke, who has concluded in favour of the authenticity of the letter as John's.<sup>37</sup> The sentiment contained in the letter probably reflects that of the group of former Becket's clerks. The

---

33. JS Letters ii, nos. 307, 308.

34. JS Letters ii, no. 176.

35. JS Letters ii, nos. 272, 274, 277, 286, 298.

36. JS Letters ii, no. 307. The letter has been dated by Prof. Brooke, early 1172 (JS Letters ii, p 742). Duggan has dated Mats no. 777, which is the same as JS no. 307 early 1171. (Duggan, Thomas Becket, p 250).

37. JS Letters ii, p xliv.

other letter was written in John's own name in 1171-3.<sup>38</sup> In this letter, John referred to miracles, praised the martyr and complained of the delay of Becket's canonization. Both letters somehow reveal John's confidence that William aux Blanchesmains would make efforts to meet his requests.

John also asked for William's assistance when he took part in the campaign on behalf of the archbishop-elect, Richard of Dover. Probably about the same time as John wrote four letters to the Papal Curia on behalf of Richard of Dover, he also wrote to William aux Blanchesmains.<sup>39</sup> In this letter, John stated that 'since I am agreed to be a member of the church of Canterbury', he would like to cooperate with more potent members of the church. Referring to the aid Richard had given to the martyr, John described the merit of the elect at some length. John asked William to help Richard and 'bring comfort to the church which you have guided to harbour after shipwreck.'. One of the reasons John wrote to William was apparently because he was suspected to have campaigned to William to hinder Richard's consecration. Since this was not true, John asked the archbishop to clear the charge 'when the time is ripe'. This letter which may have been sent to William with other letters going to the Curia<sup>40</sup> concentrated mainly on the merit of Richard of Dover, with little explanation of the situation in general. Although the French supported the young king in the rebellion against Henry II and the

---

38. JS Letters ii, no. 308.

39. JS Letters ii, no. 314.

40. See the section 4-IV-3-b. ; (

young king was at Louis VII's court from about March, 1173,<sup>41</sup> John appears to have taken it as a matter of course that the archbishop would help him on this matter as in the case of Becket's canonization.

Perhaps from about 1168, John was found to be of service not only to Becket but also to William aux Blanchesmains. As John passed information to Exeter and Poitiers, he must have received as much information from these and other areas. Information he collected and advice based on accurate information must have been valuable to William aux Blanchesmains as they were to Becket. During the conflict, as John acted as a propagandist for Thomas, he consequently served as a propagandist for the French king. In his letters, John made the French king appear as a protector not only of the exiled archbishop but also of the Church and Holy See. Every time John spoke of 'the most Christian king', which incidentally was the title John never used for him before 1164, the French king's image was impressed accordingly.

John of Salisbury was promoted bishop of Chartres in 1176. Perhaps it was not surprising that William aux Blanchesmains was instrumental in John's election. Perhaps it was extraordinary as Peter of Celle expressed surprise at the perfect regularity of the election.<sup>42</sup> It was not common

---

41. Eyton, p 171.

42. PC Letters ii, no. 117.

for a secular clerk with no connections to be elected bishop.<sup>43</sup>

Announcing the election of John, Louis VII wrote to the bishop-elect of Chartres, 'tum beati Thomae martyris consideratione, cujus familiaritatem meritis vestris meruistis adipisci, tum morum et scientiae vestrae contemplatione'. Besides his habits and learning, the reason of his election was his service to Saint Thomas the martyr. But there were other eruditi in Thomas's household, among whom Herbert of Bosham himself must have been a flamboyant figure at the French court. There appear to have been several factors that distinguished John from other members of Becket's household. John was already renowned in Champagne for his learning. Henry the Liberal had accepted him as such and so had the clergy and religious of the area. John was probably well received by Count Theobald who worked in cooperation with William aux Blanchesmains at that time. Since Count Theobald resided in Chartres most of the time, his opinion may possibly have been reflected in William's recommendation. The see of Chartres was probably given to John partly for his service to William aux Blanchesmains during the Becket dispute. William was a young and ambitious churchman who sought every opportunity to extend his influence both within and outside of the Capetian domain. He found John by the side of Becket who could

---

43. Pacaut has given one example of the importance of connection in ecclesiastical election -- Guy de Noyers, who succeeded William aux Blanchesmains in the province of Sens, was provost of Auxerre, then archdeacon of Sens: his mother was Marie de Châtillon and his nephew Hugh was bishop of Auxerre from 1183. (Pacaut, M., Louis VII et les Elections Episcopales dans le Royaume de France, Paris, (1957) p:140.

provide him with accurate information and advice. It probably also gave satisfaction to William and the Capetians to reward one of Becket's former clerks with a bishopric. William was much angered by the murder in the cathedral and he took drastic measures against Henry II on that account. It went along with the anti-Angevin policy of the Capetians.

## VI Thomas Becket

### 1. Introduction

Thomas Becket was one of John's correspondents with whom he maintained a long-lasting relationship. It started from the time John joined Archbishop Theobald's household and lasted till after Becket's death. If the collection of John's early letters had Archbishop Theobald at its core, Thomas Becket occupies the same place in the collection of later letters.<sup>1</sup> Almost every one of later letters had something to do with Thomas. Moreover, except for the Historia Pontificalis, Thomas played some part in all of John's works.

Various studies have been made recently both on the life of Becket and on the relationship between Becket and John of Salisbury.<sup>2</sup> The two recent scholars of Becket, David Knowles and Frank Barlow, dealt with the subject from two different angles. Knowles looked back at Becket's life from the point of time when he was canonized in an attempt to find signs of sanctity at every phase of life which was destined to be that of a saint. Barlow on the other hand traced the life of Becket as a man no different from any other man until the time when he was murdered in the

---

1. JS Letters ii, p xix.

2. Knowles, TB: Knowles, D., The Historian and Character and other essays, Cambridge, (1963) pp 98-128: Knowles, EC: Barlow, TB: Smalley, B., The Becket conflict and the schools: A study of intellectuals in politics, Oxford, (1973): Duggan, A., 'John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket', The World JS, pp 427-438: McLoughlin: McLoughlin, J.P., 'The language of persecution: John of Salisbury and the early phase of the Becket dispute 1163-66', Persecution and Toleration, ed. Sheils, W.J., Oxford, (1984), pp 73-87.

cathedral and as a result became canonized. Different aspects of the relationship between John and Becket have also been treated by various scholars. Smalley pointed out that while John was not 'moderate' but close to extreme in his view of the supremacy of sacerdotal power, his relationship with Becket was strained.<sup>3</sup> Duggan argued that John's loyalty to Becket and opposition to the Constitutions of Clarendon deprived him of the peace with the king.<sup>4</sup> McLoughlin has suggested that John was not committed to Becket's policy in the early phase of the conflict but that he was driven to do so by circumstances.<sup>5</sup> Their views are all relevant, but particularly so at certain phases of the relationship between Becket and John of Salisbury. At other phases, different or even contradictory facts appear to be manifest. In this section, we hope to trace the changing relationship between Becket and John of Salisbury chronologically and by so doing try to show that certain features manifest themselves at certain times while other features apply better to other times. We also hope that by considering the year-long relationship between John and Becket, we are able to compare and contrast clearly the ideals, personalities, and outlooks of life of the two men.

---

3. Smalley, B. The Becket conflict and the schools, pp 87-108.
4. Duggan, A. 'John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket' The World JS, pp 427-38.
5. McLoughlin, 'The language of persecution': McLoughlin, pp 360-79.



## 2. Before 1162

John of Salisbury first met Thomas Becket when he joined the household of Archbishop Theobald. Thomas was several years senior in the service of the archbishop. Their relationship appears to have been fairly good. There were occasions in which John and Thomas were present in the same place or worked together. They appeared together as witness to several charters of the archbishop.<sup>6</sup> Both were present at the Council of Rheims in March 1148.<sup>7</sup> They may also have worked together at the Papal Curia to obtain the legateship for Archbishop Theobald.<sup>8</sup> They seem to have kept their good relationship after Thomas Becket became royal chancellor and John started serving the archbishop mainly as his secretary.

While the king and his chancellor were in England, John probably had opportunities to deal with Becket. Sometime before autumn of 1156, John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury entrusted a man to Becket upon the request of Thomas, provost of Celle.<sup>9</sup> While the king and his chancellor were abroad, John kept in touch with Becket through letters which were personal as well as official. One such instance occurred in late 1156 or early 1157 in connection with levying the archdeacon's aid. Nos. 22 and 28 addressed to Becket and written in the name of the

---

6. Saltman, Theobald, nos. 57, 147, 182, 255.

7. Barlow, TB, p 34.

8. Saltman, Theobald, p 32. MTB, iii, p 16. Barlow, TB, pp 35-6. JS Letters i, p 253. See the section 3-III-1.

9. JS Letters i, no. 20.

archbishop and John respectively were probably written upon the return of the archbishop's messengers.<sup>10</sup> Letter no. 27 and the letters written by the Pope and Archbishop Theobald on behalf of John probably accompanied them.<sup>11</sup> In no. 22, written in the name of Archbishop Theobald, John informed Becket of the archbishop's decision to forbid the custom of 'second aids' imposed upon the churches and to refuse the request of Becket concerning the exaction of this aid. John implied that there were other matters pending and that the archbishop was waiting for the advice of the king and his chancellor. Concerning the decision against the custom of 'second aids', John made it clear that the decision was made on religious grounds.

No. 28 is essentially John's personal letter to Thomas written both in reply to Thomas's request and to ask his help to recover the king's favour. He stated that the king had become indignant to him without cause but that if he had done anything to deserve the king's disfavour, he should be permitted to make due satisfaction. John sent letters from the Pope and the archbishop written on his behalf, asking Becket to return the letter from the Pope. No. 28 was also a reply to Becket's request to watch over his interests at Canterbury. John reported that he was of little avail because in spite of his objection, the archbishop had ordered that the aid which had been paid by his own churches should be withdrawn from Becket. John advised Thomas that he should write to the archbishop himself. Expressing fear

---

10. JS Letters ii, no. 28.

11. JS Letters i, no. 27. See also sections 3-III-1 & 3-VIII-1.

that his letters might get lost or stolen, John asked Becket to let him know what he should do. On hearing from John, Becket seems to have acted upon his request. When Becket returned to England before 1 April, 1157, John learned from him that the king's anger had receded.<sup>12</sup>

The need of communication arose once again about two years after the king had left for Normandy in connection with the Papal schism and the Exeter election.<sup>13</sup> The archbishop's age and infirmity further heightened the sense of urgency. In May-June 1160, John wrote to the king on behalf of the archbishop asking for his return and for conference, if not with the king, at least with the archdeacon. Both Becket and the king replied to the archbishop.<sup>14</sup> John wrote back to them in September both in his own and in the name of the archbishop.<sup>15</sup> In no. 120, the archbishop implored the king again to come back to England and strongly pressed for the release of his chancellor.<sup>16</sup> He also reminded him of the business of the church of Exeter. No. 129 written in the name of Theobald is a letter of mild admonition to the royal chancellor. The archbishop urged his return, but acknowledged that the king's wish to retain him must be respected. The archbishop requested that the chancellor carefully promote the business of the Exeter election.

---

12. JS Letters i, no. 31.

13. JS Letters i, pp 263-7.

14. JS Letters i, no. 128.

15. JS Letters ii, nos. 120, 128-9.

16. For the dating of no. 120, JS Letters i, p 264, n 2.

No. 128 was John's personal letter to Becket written in reply to his, in which John explained the intricate background in which nos. 120 and 129 were written, adding his own opinions on some of the points. He reported that in accordance with Becket's request, he had drafted the letters to him and the king in austere terms so that necessity of the chancellor's return might be firmly impressed. However, on the instruction of the archbishop, John had to re-write the letters to soften the tone as the king's request presumably to retain the royal chancellor was unexpectedly delivered. John expressed that the archbishop had suspicion of collusion and that he had some hesitation to dispatch the letters in such circumstances. John solicited Becket's help in the Exeter election, earnestly recommending Master Bartholomew of Exeter. He also stressed that it was important that Becket return before the imminent death of the archbishop.

Through the two instances in which the correspondence between John and Becket took place, we may observe that they were friends and colleagues. They helped each other in their respective activities, representing each other's interests, acting on each other's behalf and furnishing information. As Theobald's secretary, John first of all transmitted to Becket the archbishop's wishes. He often supplied in addition informal information and private opinions. John did what he could to protect Becket's interest and meet his requests. John was better placed than anyone else to ask for help for Becket in matters pertaining to the archbishop of Canterbury.

To John, Becket was more than a friend and colleague.<sup>17</sup> He was archdeacon of Canterbury and royal chancellor, who was expected by the archbishop to mediate between himself and the king. In the case of the Exeter election, since Master Bartholomew was not only the archbishop's candidate but his own friend, John was all the more eager to obtain Becket's help to win the king's consent. When John fell into disgrace with the king, he solicited Becket to use his influence to help him recover the king's favour. As he made the petition to the royal chancellor, John felt it necessary to obtain the help of his secretary.<sup>18</sup> It was Becket, however, who told John in person that the king's anger had receded.<sup>19</sup> Besides helping John at the royal court, Becket probably introduced John to other clerks of the royal chancery such as Walter de Insula and Richard of Ilchester, who appear as John's correspondents after 1164.

Since Becket was the only courtier of the king whom John knew as a friend, he seems to have expected much from him and shown much concern for him. In 1159, John dedicated the Policraticus, Metalogicon and Entheticus to him. Since Becket encouraged John to write them,<sup>20</sup> he may have been interested in what John had to say. John may have

---

17. Dr. McLoughlin has pointed out that in nos. 28 & 128, expressions of friendship appear and they are the only two letters such expressions appear in John's letters to Becket. (McLoughlin, p 322). Whatever their relationship may have been, when the two letters were written, they were surely friends.

18. JS Letters i, no. 27.

19. JS Letters i, no. 31.

20. Entheticus, 1. 1291. Pol. vii-prologue. Entheticus, vol i, pp 48-9.

expected to find an audience at King Henry's court through Becket. He asked Peter of Celle to read and correct the Policraticus before it was sent to Becket. 'For it is a garrulous piece of work, and such as will scarce find a single friend at court. But I should not like it to make me an enemy to the courtiers'.<sup>21</sup>

Although the three books were written mainly for John's friends at Canterbury and other places who shared his literary interest,<sup>22</sup> the books at times express what appears to have been John's personal message to Becket. The Entheticus, one of whose addressees is considered to be Becket,<sup>23</sup> appears to contain a warning to the royal chancellor.<sup>24</sup> After describing the evils of the royal court, it warns the addressee to be careful and go home.<sup>25</sup> In 1159, about the time when the Entheticus was possibly written, Archbishop Theobald became gravely ill and John felt too much responsibility.<sup>26</sup> From early 1160, both John of Salisbury and Theobald began to write about the archbishop's illness to the king and the royal chancellor requesting the return of Becket.<sup>27</sup> John was perhaps worried about Becket being exposed to envy and jealousy at the royal

---

21. JS Letters i, no. 111.

22. Entheticus, vol i, p 50.

23. Entheticus, vol i, pp 47-52.

24. Entheticus, 11, 1495-1532 & vol ii, pp 391-2.

25. Entheticus, 11 1753-1834. On the suggested destination of the addressee, see Entheticus vol ii, p 414.

26. Met iv-42.

27. JS Letters i, nos. 116, 121, 122, 128, 129, 135.

court.<sup>28</sup> He was perhaps also concerned that Becket might be so completely carried away by his service to the king that he would desert the way of true philosopher.

### 3. After exile

#### a. 1163-65

John was present at the election of Becket as archbishop of Canterbury<sup>29</sup> and he was an important member of Becket's household from the beginning of his pontificate. He was the only principal clerk remaining from Archbishop Theobald's circle.<sup>30</sup> He was one of Becket's embassy sent to collect the pallium in July 1162.<sup>31</sup> Before the Council of Tours in May 1163, John wrote the life of Anselm in preparation for the canonization of Anselm which Becket intended to promote at the council.<sup>32</sup> In the 6 surviving acta of Archbishop Thomas which have witness-lists, John appeared once.<sup>33</sup> When the relationship between the king and the archbishop turned bad, John reproved the archbishop for his hostility to the king<sup>34</sup> until he left for France. He was probably not present at the councils of Clarendon and

---

28. Türk, E. NUGAE CURIALIUM, Le règne d'Henri II Plantagenêt (1145-1189) et l'éthique politique, Genève, (1177) pp 18-20.

29. JS Letters ii, no. 175.

30. JS Letters ii, p xxii.

31. JS Letters ii, p xxii. Barlow, TB, p 73.

32. JS Letters ii, p xxii, Barlow, TB, pp 86-7. Southern, R.W., Saint Anselm and his Biographer, Cambridge, (1963), p 338.

33. Barlow, TB, p 81.

34. JS Letters ii, no. 150.

Northampton, but John later attempted an apology of Becket's behaviour there.<sup>35</sup>

John left England for Paris between October 1163 and January 1164 and either stayed there or had much business to do there until summer or autumn of 1165.<sup>36</sup> During this time, John wrote three letters to Becket. No. 136 was written in Paris in early 1164, as the first report of his mission shortly after John settled there. Before he left, Becket had instructed him to meet the French king and magnates with the purpose of winning their support. Apparently Becket added an instruction by letter, which, contrary to his initial instruction, ordered John to visit the Papal Curia at Sens. By this time, John had already received a letter from John of Canterbury, bishop of Poitiers. In letter no. 136, John reported how he was warmly received by the servants of Count of Guines at Saint-Bertin, and how the counts of Flanders and Soissons and the French king were sympathetic to Becket and ready to help him. As to the archbishop of Rheims whom he was also instructed to see, John reported that he was unable to do so and that he entrusted the task to his friend the abbot of Saint-Rémi.

The archbishop's exile to France which John's mission seems to have anticipated did not take place after the council of Clarendon.<sup>37</sup> John appears to have been engaged at least partly in the archbishop's diplomacy with John of

---

35. JS Letters ii, no. 187.

36. For John's activities in this period, see 3-VII-3-b, 4-III-1, 4-IV-2-a.

37. JS Letters ii, p xxiii.



Canterbury and Master Hervey in the summer of 1164.<sup>38</sup> After Becket's flight from Northampton in October 1164, John was not among his clerks who gathered at Saint-Bertin<sup>39</sup> John may have been at Sens during or before Becket's visit there.<sup>40</sup> John continued to serve as Becket's diplomat. In January 1165, he sent his messenger to Becket with no. 144. This letter is also a letter of report and advice to Becket. It was written after his meeting with the Pope, the French king and possibly Richard of Ilchester.<sup>41</sup> John probably met Peter of Celle and the bishop of Châlons about the same time.<sup>42</sup> On the whole, John felt quite pessimistic about the prospects of peace.

John reported that he had proposed ways towards peace to the Pope and that the Pope was a little hopeful after he had received a messenger from the Empress.<sup>43</sup> After meeting the French king, however, John felt less hopeful, because of the king's personality, his fear of the English king and of his superior tactics in negotiation. Due to the pro-English sentiment of the royal butler and Robert of Dreux, John reasoned, it would be difficult to gain the support of the archbishop of Rheims who was close to Count Robert. In this

---

38. Barlow, TB, pp 107-8.

39. Barlow, TB, p 120.

40. John met the bishop of Worcester at Sens (JS Letters ii, no. 196) and the only instance that they could have met was when the bishop went there as a member of the royal mission in November 1164. Therefore, John may possible have been in Sens around November 1164.

41. See the sections 3-VIII-2-e, 4-III-3, 4-IV-2.

42. JS Letters ii, no. 144.

43. On John's proposition, see 4-IV-2-a & note 3.

grim situation, judging that Becket's cause is hopeless, John wrote his famous advice that Thomas should renounce the study of laws and turn to prayer.<sup>44</sup> He made another more practical advice that since the bishops in whose dioceses his 'churches lay now exercised jurisdiction over them, Becket should obtain a letter patent from the Pope against this. John may have learned about the Count of Dreux and the archbishop of Rheims from Peter of Celle, and of the English dioceses from Richard of Ilchester.

Important events that took place after John's letter no. 144 such as the king's proscription of Becket's followers<sup>45</sup> and Becket's visit of the Pope at Bourges<sup>46</sup> and subsequent restriction of his power probably<sup>47</sup> influenced John's attitude towards Becket. Shortly before he wrote letter no. 152 to Becket, John sent a messenger to England and made a campaign to obtain the king's peace for himself and his brother.<sup>48</sup> In some letters to his English friends, he made his standpoint clear. John consistently stated that he had kept faith with the church and the archbishop, but saving the king's honour.<sup>49</sup> But if he was accused of having acted against the king and if he failed to clear himself, he would perform due satisfaction.<sup>50</sup> Though he did not

---

44. JS Letters ii, p xxiv.

45. Barlow, TB, pp 125-6. See the section of 4-III-3.

46. JS Letters ii, no. 323.

47. Barlow, TB, p 138, p 305, n 41. Mats no. 95.

48. On John's campaign to obtain the king's peace, see the section 2-V-3-b.

49. JS Letters ii, nos. 139, 150.

50. JS Letters ii, nos. 139, 150.

hesitate to reprove Thomas for arousing the resentment of the king,<sup>51</sup> John felt, it was dishonourable to deny his master and renounce obedience. That would be against his conscience and harmful to his reputation.<sup>52</sup> John emphasized that even though he kept faith and affection towards the archbishop, he had decided to leave his household.<sup>53</sup> As to the archbishop's state of exile, John felt that it was good 'both for his learning and his character'.<sup>54</sup>

John sent the same messenger that came back from England with his letter no. 152 written in late summer 1165. He also sent him the letter from the bishop of Bayeux assuring him of the position of his brother.<sup>55</sup> John recounted to Becket of the situation in England as he had found out about it. He also reported that he had written to the bishops of London, Hereford, Worcester, Chichester and to the archdeacon of Poitiers and to Kent and that he heard from nobody except the bishop of Chichester. Meanwhile, John had heard news and rumours of things relating to Thomas and wished to know more about them such as the contact by the king of the Scots, the efforts for peace by the count of Flanders on the commission of the Empress, the return of some of Becket's household from Wales and the Pope's journey back to Rome. John recounted a

---

51. JS Letters ii, no. 150.

52. JS Letters ii, no. 150.

53. JS Letters ii, nos. 139, 150.

54. JS Letters ii, no. 150.

55. The letter may have been the reply to no. 137 in which John asked his help for the king's peace for himself and his brother.

detailed story of the state of the Germans in Italy, stating that 'most of those among whom I am living foretell disasters' for Frederick. Apparently, trying to make peace with the king separately was not a morally dubious act.

'When John had arrived in France in 1163-4, he was 'a man holding office in the church and enjoying a certain celebrity'.<sup>56</sup> John carried out his mission as best he could except that he was reluctant to visit the Papal Curia. He met the French king and magnates, sent information and advice to Thomas. Being away from Thomas and England, however, John perhaps could not make an accurate judgement of the situation. He could not perceive how deep the king's resentment was nor in what direction Thomas's household was moving. While he hoped and believed that his stay in France would be temporary and that he would soon return to England, the worsening of the situation around him was being felt. His property in England was confiscated and from spring 1165 onwards, he was preoccupied in placing the incoming exiles with well-wishers and probably he himself had to move to Rheims.<sup>57</sup> During these years John probably felt more like a friend and colleague of the archbishop than a clerk. John was able to express his opinions freely and reprove him when the need arose. No doubt John was suited for the mission Thomas prescribed for him in France. But his removal probably prompted worsening of the relationship between the king and the archbishop.

---

56. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

b. 1166

After John moved to Rheims, he seems to have either met or contacted Becket occasionally. One such instance of contact took place in February or March 1166 when John wrote no. 157 to Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques in Becket's name.<sup>58</sup> It was presumably on this occasion that both John and Becket wrote to Gerard Pucelle who was already in Cologne.<sup>59</sup> In letter no. 157, Becket wished to warn the king through the Empress that ecclesiastical sanctions might fall on his person and his land unless the persecution of the Church ended. The archbishop had first warned the king repeatedly, then asked the Pope, sent messengers and finally asked the Empress to persuade him but to no avail. Becket wished Nicholas to inform the Empress that he would 'unsheathe against his person and his land in a little while...the sword of the Holy Spirit'. Although it was written in the archbishop's name, the spirit was John's as we learn from his advice to Becket in summer 1166.<sup>60</sup> Instead of being provocative and inviting further resentment, he wanted to emphasize the archbishop's patience and efforts to maintain peace.

---

57. JS Letters ii, nos. 141 & 142. See the sections 2-IV-4-b, 3-II-2, 3-VII-3-b, 4-III-1, 4-III-3.

58. John's letter no. 157 is Mats no. 184 which has been dated Feb-March 1166 by Duggan (Duggan, Thomas Becket, p 250). Barlow has stated, 'In May Thomas began to warn the king. He informed the Empress Matilda, through Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques that he was about to take ecclesiastical sanctions against her son and his land....' (Barlow, TB, p. 144, & p 305 n 4.) In stating 'In May...', he perhaps meant 3 consecutive letters by Becket, Mats nos. 152-4.

59. JS Letters ii, no. 158.

shortly after, at Easter 1166, John accompanied Becket with other principal clerks to Angers. An abortive meeting between Henry II and Louis VII was arranged there. On this occasion John met the king, but his peace was not advanced. Becket's meeting with the king did not take place.<sup>61</sup> The failure to obtain peace at Angers made John reflect on his relationship with Becket and to reaffirm his support of the archbishop. In contrast to somewhat negative comments on the archbishop which appeared in his letters in summer 1165, his reflections had turned wholly in favour of the archbishop. The reason why John chose to follow the archbishop was partly because he was compelled to do so by circumstances,<sup>62</sup> but partly because of his strong moral sense. He wrote repeatedly to his friends that he would only make peace with the king on conditions which would not harm his honour and reputation. Even though the same conditions were satisfactory for most of Becket's former clerks, they constituted no excuse for John to renounce his service to Becket. It would be like a betrayal and therefore against his conscience. Moreover, John essentially agreed with Becket that the Church's liberty was to be fought for and maintained, and therefore one should not swear oaths to observe the Constitutions. John, however, did not renounce his hope of making peace with the king. He hoped that the king's conditions would be

---

60. JS Letters ii, no. 175.

61. JS Letters ii, p xxviii.

62. McLoughlin, pp 360-79, esp. p 379.

mitigated by efforts of his friends on the continent when they had chances to see the king.<sup>63</sup>

Before the Vézelay sentences, Becket sent his last warning letter to the king at Chinon,<sup>64</sup> where he was found from 1 June.<sup>65</sup> If we believe in John's words, he did not know the details of the Vézelay censures beforehand.<sup>66</sup> However, John met Becket shortly before on Becket's outward or return journey to Soissons at Château-Thierry and they probably discussed laying of the ban of excommunication on the king and interdict on his land.<sup>67</sup> After the censures, John immediately began to work in public relations for Thomas. John's letter no. 168 appears to have already reached the bishops by the time they prepared the bishops' appeals on 24 June. The letter explains how the Vézelay censures were brought about. By the time he wrote no. 168, John must have received a letter from Master Raymond of Poitiers, who probably furnished information on the conference of Chinon,<sup>68</sup> for he reported how the king complained against the archbishop and how the bishops of Lisieux and Séez were dispatched in a hurry to catch the archbishop before he passed any sentences. John recounted the archbishop's conduct before and at Vézelay and stated the reasons for the excommunication, publicly condemning the

---

63. JS Letters ii, nos. 167, 177, 190, 191, 201.

64. Mats no. 154.

65. MTB v, p 266, n. a. Eyton p 93.

66. JS Letters ii, no. 181.

67. JS Letters ii, no. 176. Barlow, TB, p 146.

Constitutions.

In the month following Vézelay censures and the subsequent appeals of the English bishops, John's attention was centred mainly on three activities: (1) diplomacy at the French Court: (2) campaigning activities directed to various areas.<sup>69</sup> (3) advice to Becket. John wrote at least 4 letters to Becket,<sup>70</sup> and three letters to Exeter,<sup>71</sup> and other letters to his friends.

John appears to have visited the court of Louis VII at Laon.<sup>72</sup> He probably went there to report on the Vézelay censures and subsequent events and to gain support for the archbishop's conduct. Being at Pontigny where communication with the French court was not easy, Becket probably still relied on John for the diplomacy directed to the French court.

After the Vézelay censures, John wrote to several letters to his friends on behalf of the archbishop. To Nicholas of Norwich, John denounced the bishops' behaviour and referred to perseverance of the exiles;<sup>73</sup> to Ralph Niger, who was probably in Paris, he also denounced the bishops' behaviour and the king's connection with the Germans and mentioned the Pope's prosperity in Italy;<sup>74</sup> to

---

68. JS Letters ii, no. 166.

69. For John's campaigning made through Exeter, see the sections 2-V-3-b(ii) and 3-VI-2-a.

70. JS Letters ii, nos. 173, 175, 176, 179.

71. JS Letters ii, nos. 171, 172, 174.

72. JS Letters ii, nos. 171, 173.

73. JS Letters ii, no. 178.

74. JS Letters ii, no. 181.



John of Poitiers, he tried to discredit the king by sending the copies of his communication with the Germans;<sup>75</sup> to Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques and Walter de Insula who was probably in Normandy, John cautioned against communicating with the excommunicate.<sup>76</sup>

The letters John wrote to Becket in summer 1166 are filled with advice and opinions mainly concerning the policy towards the English bishops and the Empress's mediation for peace. John wrote no. 173 presumably in reply to the archbishop's letter asking advice. His letter probably contained the rumour of the bishops' appeals without details of the contents. It is a short letter in which he advised Thomas to summon his suffragans, expressing hope for peace by the Empress's intervention. John added the latest news of the siege of Fougères which he had learned at the French court. We know from letter no. 174 written to Bartholomew of Exeter that John's advice to summon the bishops was immediately taken.

No. 175 to Becket was written after John read the bishops' appeal. The appeal may have been sent by Becket with request for advice. In this letter John attacked the bishops and gave advice to Becket as to how to deal with them. He immediately identified the chief author of the letter as the bishop of London. Unlike no. 168 in which the king was the main target of John's accusation, no. 175 concentrated on the bishops. John reproached Gilbert Foliot for his thwarted ambition to be archbishop of Canterbury and

---

75. JS Letters ii, no. 177.

76. JS Letters ii, nos. 180, 188, 189.

Robert of Hereford's breach from what he had taught. John accused them of praising the king who had unjustly outlawed the archbishop and his followers, promoted his ancestor's depravities and strengthened schism. John felt that the bishops should instead counsel the king so that he might not go astray.

Although the archbishop appears to have already answered the appeal before John wrote his letter no. 175, John wished nevertheless that the archbishop might emphasise his patience and the efforts he had made to restore peace through various agents including the Pope and the Empress. John repeated his advice to summon some English bishops such as Salisbury and Worcester. For he believed that not all the bishops consented to the bishops' appeals and that by frequent letters the archbishop could urge them for support. With regard to the bishops of Hereford and Worcester, he suggested, it was best to ask masters of the schools or religious in Paris to write to them.

Thomas took John's advice about the bishop of Hereford. We know that Ernisius and Richard of St. Victor wrote to Robert of Hereford in August, criticising his action.<sup>77</sup> Becket did not consult John before he sent the reply to the bishops' appeal probably because he knew what John would advise, which would be different from what he had in mind. In his reports of the Vézelay censures to the Papal Curia,<sup>78</sup> Thomas stated how patiently he had waited for the king's

---

77. Mats no. 220.

78. Mats no.s 195, 196, c. June 12, 1166.

correction and how he had contacted him by letters and by messengers. Therefore, even if John could not influence Becket's attitude and diplomacy towards English churchmen, his opinion was essentially in agreement with Becket's in dealing with the Papal Curia.

In late July 1166, Becket sent a batch of letters to John and asked his advice on the following points; (1) on the mediation of the Empress; (2) on affairs at Salisbury; (3) on further sanctions against the English king; and (4) the approach to the archbishop of Rheims. Becket sent the letters of the bishop of Salisbury, John of Oxford, Master Hervey and Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques. But the servant brought neither John of Oxford's nor Hervey's. John remarked that it was difficult for him to make a correct assessment particularly without the letter from Hervey, for much depended on what aid the Holy See would make. John advised Becket to follow the counsel of Nicholas and write to the Empress, archbishop and bishops of Normandy and tell them that he was ready to receive their mediation provided that peace be made on certain conditions.

John's answer to those who might point out the danger of Becket's going to Normandy without completing penance was that there was no one who was not ready to suffer for the faith and that whoever 'suffers for justice is a martyr'. With regard to the two letters concerning Salisbury, of which John of Oxford's was missing, John recalled the instance on which he heard from Becket himself about the two clerks from Salisbury who had visited the archbishop at

Pontigny.<sup>79</sup> Becket sent back John of Oxford's messenger saying that since John was excommunicate, he had no right to appeal. John stated that the sentence was now confirmed by the Pope.<sup>80</sup>

'As to ecclesiastical sanction against the king's person, John appears to have been reluctant. The bishops were more to blame. Pointing out the bishops' general tendency of not wishing to be 'free', but rather be held in their 'ancient slavery', John accused the bishops especially of London and Hereford for not guarding the king against doing evil deeds. He heard that they would use the appeal as an excuse for disobedience and continued intercourse with the excommunicate. John found it difficult to advise whether the archbishop should excommunicate the king and lay the sentence of interdict on his kingdom. He stated that his opinion had not been changed since he gave it to the archbishop at Château-Thierry. He advised further that the archbishop should consult the bishop of Poitiers<sup>81</sup> and Master Hervey.

Concerning the last counsel the archbishop had sought, namely whether he should approach the archbishop of Rheims, John's answer was in the negative. Finally, John proposed to go to Pontigny after 1 August.

Becket wrote back to John and sent him some copies of letters. By this time John had presumably heard the rumour

---

79. See JS Letters ii, no. 171 to Bartholomew of Exeter.

80. See JS Letters ii, no. 174. Mats no. 197.

81. Concerning John of Canterbury's role as advisor, see the section 3-VII-3-b.

of the prospect of the meeting in Normandy.<sup>82</sup> Before John wrote back to Becket, he had already written to the bishop of Poitiers to advise the archbishop. John reported to Becket how he had consulted on the matter with the abbot of Saint-Rémi and his other friends in Rheims and how they all agreed to follow the Pope's advice and approved the counsel of Nicholas. Becket presumably wrote about the danger of going to Normandy and John answered that certain risks must be taken for the soul's salvation and the liberation of the church of Canterbury and that there was a rumour that some of Becket's persecutors had already lost favour with the king. John's conclusion was that Becket should go to Rouen and if the negotiation failed, he could come back to Pontigny escorted by the archbishop of Rouen. John further advised Thomas to be moderate and to take a few prudent and wise clerks. He would not volunteer; but he would be ready to go in case Thomas so wished.

The proposed meeting did not take place but after the king's return from Brittany to Normandy in October, Becket's diplomacy or espionage seems to have been active there.<sup>83</sup> John may have prompted Becket to summon the bishops, especially of Hereford and Worcester. In late 1166, John wrote no. 187 to Baldwin of Totnes. This appears to be the last of the series of propaganda letters to Exeter written in relation to the Vézelay censures. In this letter, John attempted to answer at least partially the charges made

---

82. JS Letters ii, no. 179.

83. See the section 3-VIII-2-d.

84. Barlow, TB, p 160.

by Gilbert Foliot in Multiplicem.<sup>85</sup>

In 1166, John helped Thomas in various capacities. John wrote letters on Becket's behalf, he was Becket's envoy to the French court and he gave advice to Becket. After the Vézelay censures, besides giving counsel, collect information and discuss matters with his other important friends like Peter of Celle and John of Canterbury, John's role was more specifically to be in charge of public relations. In addition to engaging in the epistolary campaign against Gilbert Foliot, John's service was particularly appreciated with regard to handling English bishops.

John tried to break the apparent unity of the bishops by the following measures: (1) pointing out in his letters to Exeter that only three seals were placed on the appeal and therefore the rest of the bishops were ambivalent; (2) trying to single out Gilbert Foliot and Robert of Hereford and attack them; (3) advising Becket to summon his suffragans; (4) making an attempt to detach the bishops of Worcester and Hereford from the group by asking Parisian masters to write to them. Becket totally agreed with John on this strategy and took his advice willingly.

However, Becket could not think of adopting John's advice of 'moderation' regarding ways of addressing the bishops. John was not entirely in accord with Becket concerning the policy towards the English king. After his

---

85. Comparison and discussion of Multiplicem and JS's no. 187 have been made by Barlow, TB, pp 155-7. G. Foliot pp 166-187. See the section 3-VI-2-a.

experiences at Clarendon and Northampton, Becket would have liked first and foremost to maintain the dignity suitable to his office. To John, Thomas and his immediate entourage seem to have acted against the king and his advisers too much out of emotion. During the course of events in 1164 when Becket's relationship with the king went irretrievably wrong, John was already away in France. He neither participated in Becket's decision nor shared his experience nor was he in touch with the generally hostile atmosphere surrounding the archbishop. While John was more objective and his advice more sensible from the point of view of making peace, he could not understand nor approve of actions based on mutual enmity and hatred which were generated during his absence and which made some of his advice unacceptable to Becket and his hope for reconciliation with the king on honourable terms impossible. Except in connection with his attitude to the king and his suffragans, Becket appeared to take John's advice wholeheartedly.

Even though John was in disfavour with the king, he left England as ambassador of the archbishop of Canterbury around the end of 1163. In a way, he was thrown into the lot of exile and outlawry by coincidence. John tried to obtain peace with the king several times without success. Although he was forced into the support of Becket by circumstance, he acted as the most reliable supporter and adviser to the archbishop in the turbulent year of 1166. From the end of 1163 onwards, it became a fixed pattern for John to live away from Thomas and his household. While this

hindered John from building up a close relationship with Becket's household, it allowed him to maintain a more objective and practical point of view. John's attitude towards Becket went through a change reflecting the general situation. The tone of his letters to Becket became much more grave and serious. From about this time, John began to conceive Becket not in an extension of their former relationship as friend and colleague, but as archbishop suffering persecution by the king and exile for the sake of the Church. At least that was one aspect of Becket which John wished to present to the English clergy.

c. 1167

The chief event of the year 1167 was the coming of the papal legates culminating with the meeting at Gisors and Trie. While much of Becket's and John's attention were centred around their arrival, less conspicuous events also took place in which they were involved. In the early part of the year, John received an envoy of the suspended bishop of Salisbury, on behalf of whom John pleaded with Becket in vain.<sup>86</sup> After the death of Prior Wibert on 27 September 1167, which caused an increase of royal intervention to the monastic matters, Becket entrusted John to write to the monks of Christ Church Canterbury in order to maintain their control.<sup>87</sup> After the conference between the legates and the archbishop at Gisors and Trie, John joined Becket in his protest of the Papal Curia.<sup>88</sup> As before, John sent news of

---

86. JS Letters ii, nos. 216-8. See the section 2-II-2.

87. JS Letters ii, nos. 242-8, etc. See the section 3-V-3.

88. JS Letters ii, nos. 234, 235. See the section 4-IV-2-b.



important events such as the conference at Gisors and Trie and its aftermath<sup>89</sup> as well as of Becket's well-being and his relationship with the French.<sup>90</sup> His correspondence with the archbishop centred around the arrival of the papal legates and what attitude to take towards them.<sup>91</sup>

The correspondence between Becket and the papal legate William of Pavia had started at least by the summer of 1167 while the communication between John and Becket was cut off due to the rebellion in Rheims.<sup>92</sup> William wrote to Becket<sup>93</sup> and Becket wrote a reply without consulting John. Becket later wrote to John and sent copies of his own and the legate's letter.<sup>94</sup> Becket seems to have reported his correspondence with William of Pavia to John and asked him for his opinion of the excommunication of the bishop of London and the archdeacon of Canterbury. John wrote letter no. 227 to Becket in which he remonstrated with Becket the style and content of his letter. John thought that the letter did not reveal a spirit of humility nor moderation, but betrayed bitter feelings of the writer.

---

89. JS Letters ii, nos. 230-1, 233, 236.

90. JS Letters ii, nos. 215, 226, 233.

91. JS Letters ii, nos. 227-8. On the coming of the legates see the section 3-VII-4-b. On John's relationship with William of Pavia, see the section 4-IV-2-b.

92. JS Letters ii, no. 223, & n 1.

93. Mats no. 311.

94. Becket's letter was either Mats no. 312 or 313 dated July 1167. (JS Letters ii, p xxxvi) For John's letter to William of Pavia, see the section 4-IV-2-b.

He thought that the archbishop should not insult the legates but hide his true feelings and assume a more friendly attitude. Otherwise, compared with the legates' letter, Becket's letter might work against his interest in the eyes of the Pope. In John's opinion, Becket should have asked William to work for the restitution of Becket's and his followers' property and liberty of the Church. John was not against the excommunication of the bishop of London and the archdeacon of Canterbury, but he pointed out the necessity of citation beforehand.

Apparently Becket wrote back to John asking for his opinion of the drafting of two letters.<sup>95</sup> John disapproved of both of them.<sup>96</sup> But Becket had already written to William of Pavia against John's advice and rejected the cardinal's intervention.<sup>97</sup> Since either Mats no. 312 or 313 seems to have been sent,<sup>98</sup> John wrote his own letter no. 229 to William to counteract Becket's previous letters.<sup>99</sup> He was sending a bearer to Poitiers and he had instructed him to visit Becket. John thought that the archbishop could also send a message to Bishop John. Besides, John wished Becket to see his letter addressed to William of Pavia, which was written in conciliatory tone.

---

95. JS Letters ii, no. 228. The two letters were presumably Mats nos. 312 & 313. (JS Letters ii, pp xxxvi-vii).

96. Mats nos. 312, 313 dated c. July 1167. (JS Letters ii, p xxxvi, no. 228 dated Sept-Oct. 1167 to Becket.)

97. JS Letters ii, p xxxvi, no. 223, Oct. 1167.

98. JS Letters ii, p xxxvi.

99. About the tactics of John's letter and its relations to Becket's, see McLoughlin, pp 404-412.

John thought that his letter might not have 'suited to your eminence, yet closer...to what is suitable'. John asked the archbishop that if he approved of the letter, it should go to Bishop John at Poitiers, where the legates would shortly reach, otherwise it should be destroyed.<sup>100</sup> We do not know whether William of Pavia received John's letter no. 229 which was written in September or October. About this time, Becket wrote to William proposing a meeting near Paris.<sup>101</sup> Becket's attitude towards William was probably softened by this time.<sup>102</sup>

While the legates were in Poitiers, possibly with the knowledge of Becket, John also tried to obtain direct information about the legates. John asked Master Laurence of Poitiers, whom he had possibly recommended to an archdeaconry, to provide him with information since Laurence was appointed to be in attendance on the legates.<sup>103</sup>

John was present at the conference of Gisors and Trie. In the report of the conference,<sup>104</sup> he appeared at the top of the list of exiles who were present at the conference and was considered at least as one of the authors of the report of the conference.<sup>105</sup> The legates conveyed the king's charges against Becket that he had stirred up the French king to war and asked the archbishop for his advice on what

---

100. See the sections 3-VII-4-b and 4-IV-2-b.

101. Mats no. 329.

102. See the section 4-IV-2-b.

103. JS Letters ii, no. 221.

104. JS Letters ii, no. 231.

105. JS Letters ii, no. 230, no. 231 & n 1.

could be done, suggesting that peace could be made if he acted with humility and moderation. According to the 'Report of the Conference between Gisor and Trie', (no. 231) the 'archbishop of Canterbury, 'in all humbleness and calmness of spirit, with a clear countenance, sparkling eyes and rosey face, spoke out with eloquent skill in the Latin tongue', and 'the whole throng which was gathered there wondered at his wisdom and answer'.<sup>106</sup>

In the aftermath of the conference at Gisors and Trie, John was concerned about its repercussions which affected both the archbishop and his friends in England. One of them was Roger of Worcester's proposition of renouncing his bishopric on behalf of the archbishop.<sup>107</sup> Bishop Roger's action, though well meant, was an insult to the archbishop. But Becket, according to John, was against believing such rumours and, although roused a little he acted 'like a wise man and deferred to the occasion'.<sup>108</sup>

During this year, John's role remained unchanged -- i.e. to be Becket's adviser and to be engaged in propaganda for him. John's advice was made from the point of view of making peace and returning to England, so that the archbishop and his clerks could live in their former condition. With this in mind John advised Becket not to provoke the legates and to mind the importance of practical matters such as restitution of their property. Becket's

---

106. JS Letters ii, no. 231. Also no. 230.

107. JS Letters ii, no. 238. William of Pavia's scheme was to translate Becket to another see and Roger's proposal was made to enable this. (JS Letters ii, no. 238, n 4). For Roger, see the section 3-VI-3-a.

108. JS Letters ii, no. 241.

mind on the other hand was set, not on making any compromise for the sake of peace and returning to England, but on continuing his fight until his cause would win. There was a basic difference between what John and Becket wished.

However, from this period onwards, we begin to notice in John's letters comments favourable to the person of the archbishop. Perhaps it was due to John's more total commitment to Becket's cause. Perhaps it was at this time that Becket came to cultivate ways of behaving with dignity as an exiled archbishop. John in turn began to accept Becket as such. The exiled archbishop began to be a more distant figure whose mind was not working for practical and ad hoc solutions of problems, but basing his decisions on certain ideas or ideals, which probably made him appear to John at times unrealistic and incapable of practical judgement. Becket consulted John on some matters, but his action does not appear to have been influenced much by John's advice.

d. 1168-70

During the years between 1168 and 1170, Becket's energy was directed to two activities; negotiations with the Pope and conferences between the kings. Becket's issues were now discussed as part of the problems between the kings of France and England.<sup>109</sup> There seem to have been at least four major conferences between the kings<sup>110</sup> and several

---

109. See the section 4-V-1.

110. La Ferté-Bernard on 1-2 July, 1168 (JS Letters ii, no. 279); Montmirail on 6 January 1169 (JS Letters ii, nos. 285-8); Montmartre on 18 November 1169 (Barlow, TB, p 194); Fréteval on 22 July (JS Letters ii, no. 303).

abortive meetings. Becket's life changed a little according to the changes of situation. In order to be ready to attend the conferences, Becket spent more time travelling. According to the outcome of the conferences, the archbishop as well as the king wrote to the Pope. Becket could no longer take the sole initiative in deciding his policy.

John's life and his role with Becket also changed. He probably spent more time with Becket, or at least in his service, and did much travelling. He appears to have attended some of the conferences between the kings. Besides this, he went on a pilgrimage to Saint-Gilles.<sup>111</sup> and to Vézelay.<sup>112</sup> He was at Mantes in about May 1168.<sup>112</sup> After the peace of Fréteval, he also served the archbishop as his envoy to Henry II in Normandy,<sup>114</sup> and after that he went to England to prepare for the archbishop's return.<sup>115</sup> Only two letters to Becket survive from this period. Probably there was less need of letters. Two major enterprises John was in charge of through correspondence were; (1) rallying support, mainly financial for the archbishop among his English friends;<sup>116</sup> and (2) dealing with Christ Church Canterbury.<sup>117</sup> He kept on sending his friends information and advice after each important event.

---

111. JS Letters ii, nos. 272, 274.

112. JS Letters ii, no. 289.

113. JS Letters ii, no. 277.

114. Barlow, TB, p 213.

115. JS Letters ii, no. 304.

116. See the section 3-IV-2-b(i).

117. See the section 3-V-3-a and b.

Except for John's letters rallying support for the archbishop, which were written mainly in 1168, John's letters tended to cluster around the important events he and the archbishop were involved in.

The first cluster of John's letters in these years belonged to the spring of 1168 and some of them were written just after John's pilgrimage to Saint-Gilles mainly in connection with Becket's suspension. The aim of the pilgrimage was probably to collect information of the German expedition in Italy. Becket had sent John the Cantor and Alexander and another group to the Papal Curia about the end of 1167 after the failure of the papal legates. John stopped to see the archbishop on the way back. According to John, the archbishop was 'a man of holy life who strives to do only what will conduct to God's glory and his own salvation', and he was 'busy in spiritual exercises' waiting for the return of his messengers from the Curia.<sup>120</sup>

While John was still with Becket, he took care of one business; to draft a letter on the commission of the archbishop to his messenger at the Curia, instructing them to work for the recall of Gerard Pucelle. John also asked Ralph Niger who was present at the scene to report the affair to Gerard Pucelle.<sup>121</sup> On this occasion occurs the only reference to John of Salisbury in all the surviving

---

118. See the section 4-IV-2-c.

119. JS Letters ii, no. 274.

120. JS Letters ii, no. 274.

121. JS Letters ii, no. 277.

letters of Becket.<sup>122</sup> It may also be while John was with the archbishop that the messengers of the legates came to the archbishop requesting the relaxation of the archbishop's sentence against the bishop of Salisbury.<sup>123</sup>

John probably wrote his no. 278 to Becket shortly after he visited him on the way back from Saint-Gilles and before he heard the news of Becket's suspension. It was written on behalf of the bishop of Salisbury when Reginald of Salisbury was at Rome. The letter was probably connected with the petitions which went to the Pope from the king and the legates and the fact that the Pope agreed to relax the sentence of suspension of the bishop of Salisbury.<sup>124</sup> Referring to the unreliability of the Romans and his hope in the righteousness of the Pope and accepting that the archbishop would wait for his messengers' return, John asked him to be lenient on the bishop of Salisbury to whom John was indebted.

Shortly afterwards, John probably heard (presumably from Becket) of the suspension of the archbishop<sup>125</sup> and of further attempt on the part of the count of Flanders to arrange the meeting between the king and the archbishop. John asked the bishop of Poitiers to attend the meeting between the kings and to let him know what went on.<sup>126</sup> John

---

122. Magister Johannes in Mats no. 409 in which the recall of Gerard Pucelle was dealt with is considered to be John of Salisbury. (MTB vi, p 434 & n.)

123. JS Letters ii, no. 272.

124. JS Letters ii, no. 272. Barlow, TB, p 178.

125. JS Letters ii, nos. 275-6.

126. JS Letters ii, no. 276. ; (



may also have accompanied the archbishop when the conference of the kings was held at La Ferté-Bernard on 1-2 July. He sent detailed reports of the conference to two directions. Lombardus of Piacenza at the Papal Curia<sup>127</sup> and Baldwin of Totnes in England.<sup>128</sup> Both letters concentrated chiefly on the proceedings of the conference and the English king's reaction on receiving the news of the archbishop's suspension, but each was written in a way that was most effective for campaigning purposes. To Lombardus at the Curia, John probably wished to impress the atrocity of the king's behaviour and to Baldwin of Totnes, John preferred to lay the blame on cardinals and to mitigate the shock by stressing that the Pope's condition of this action was for the king to make peace with the archbishop swiftly.

John was again involved in Becket's diplomacy about the time of the conference at Montmirail in January 1169. After the conference at Montmirail, John wrote a letter to John of Canterbury<sup>129</sup> explaining why the archbishop did not wish to attend the meeting proposed by the bishop. The letter probably accompanied Becket's letter to the bishop.<sup>130</sup> Along with the archbishop, John wrote to the papal commissioners Simon and Engelbert in the aftermath of the conference at Montmirail.<sup>131</sup> After what seemed like an

---

127. JS Letters ii, no. 279.

128. JS Letters ii, no. 280.

129. JS Letters ii, no. 285. See also 3-VII-4-c.

130. Mats no. 454.

131. JS Letters ii, no. 286. Mats no. 452.

apology for the failure of peace at Montmirail, John related to the monks Becket's wish to have nobody else but Master Lombardus at the envisaged conference at the Grandimontines. Reporting the result of the contact he had had on their advice with the archbishop of Rheims, John requested their further support. About the same time, John also wrote to John of Canterbury again asking him to see to it that when the conference took place, the holy men would work for peace of the Church.<sup>132</sup> Several months later, when the new papal commissioners Gratian and Vivian arrived, John met them at Vezelay.<sup>133</sup> He asked the bishop of Poitiers to strengthen their support.<sup>134</sup>

John was curiously silent about the conference of Montmartre on 18 November 1169, which was particularly well reported by Herbert of Bosham.<sup>135</sup> About that time John appears to have been engaged in writing to Christ Church on various issues as they came up. In no. 292, he denounced the claim of the bishop of London that he owed no obedience to the see of Canterbury and that he would have the metropolitan throne transferred to London.<sup>136</sup> In October or November 1169, he reported that the archdeacon of Canterbury and others who had been absolved fell back into the same ban as a result of the failure of the king to obtain peace by

---

132. JS Letters ii, no. 287.

133. JS Letters ii, no. 289.

134. JS Letters ii, no. 291.

135. Barlow, TB, p 192.

136. G. Foliot pp 149-151. JS Letters ii, no. 294. See the section 3-V-3-b(ii).

the stipulated time and told them not to fear royal officials.<sup>137</sup>

In 1170, John continued to take part in Becket's diplomacy. While sending news of the archbishop to Exeter<sup>138</sup> and being approached by Gerard Pucelle who was now serving the king,<sup>139</sup> much attention was paid on the coronation of the young king. John wrote to Christ Church urging the monks to publish a papal letter prohibiting the coronation of the young king, which John believed had reached Canterbury.<sup>140</sup>

Almost immediately after the coronation, John wrote to Becket.<sup>141</sup> He urged the archbishop to issue at once to the archbishops of Rouen and Tours the papal letters ordering action if peace was not made. John added that the archbishop of Sens was of the same opinion. He blamed Becket for his delay in sending the form of agreement to the archbishop of Rouen and the bishop of Nevers and also the letter to the archbishop of York and other bishops prohibiting the coronation. John reminded Becket of his previous advice and blamed him for having resorted to auguries and prophecies. Just at the time when Becket asked John's opinion on the letters of William of Pavia, John probably felt Becket's judgement inadequate from the point of view of practical politics.

---

137. JS Letters ii, no. 295.

138. JS Letters ii, no. 298.

139. JS Letters ii, no. 297.

140. JS Letters ii, no. 300.

141. JS Letters ii, no. 301. ; (

After the conference at Fréteval, from about mid-August to about mid-September, John was busy on a mission to Henry II with Herbert of Hosham trying to see to the recovery of the archbishop's revenues in England and to discern his friends and enemies at court.<sup>142</sup> After the archbishop met the king for the second time between Blois and Amboise on 12-13 October,<sup>143</sup> John announced the arrangement made at that time and informed the monks at Christ Church of the proposed date of the archbishop's departure.<sup>144</sup> John was sent to Canterbury on 15 November to attend a synod to prepare for the archbishop's return.<sup>145</sup> Upon the archbishop's landing, John accompanied him to Canterbury and sent a report to his friend Peter of Celle of how they were received.<sup>146</sup>

During the years 1168-70, John's role went through a change. Whereas in previous years, Becket consulted John on important matters, during these years Becket did not think much of John as an adviser. Becket was probably more inclined to French magnates, especially the archbishop of Sens. John volunteered to write a letter of advice just once and with the approval of the archbishop of Sens. John may also have frequented the French king's court. In this period, John continued to send news to his friends in Exeter and Poitiers. He tried to maintain the friendship of Bartholomew of Exeter by providing him with news and advice,

---

142. Barlow, TB p 213.

143. JS Letters ii, p xliii. Barlow, TB pp 214-5.

144. JS Letters ii, no. 303.

145. JS Letters ii, no. 304. Barlow, TB, p 220.

146. JS Letters ii, no. 304.

not only on behalf of the archbishop but of his friends in Exeter. John sometimes asked the bishop of Poitiers to work on behalf of the archbishop in the king's camp. He wanted him to provide information from the king's side and to encourage the papal commissioners to work for the archbishop.

Although John advised the archbishop less, his service did not diminish. He was commissioned by Becket with two important tasks -- to maintain the allegiance of Christ Church and to rally support from whatever quarter he could. When the conferences between the kings were held, John seems to have accompanied Becket, if not to all, at least to some. He was sent on important missions to the English king with Herbert of Bosham and to England after peace was made. In some ways John appeared less detached from the archbishop's household. John served Becket in various capacities as a capable clerk who was totally committed to his cause.

John continued to serve as a mediator between the archbishop and his own friends who were unable to approach the archbishop directly. He interceded with Becket for their sake. He asked Becket once again to relax the sentence on the bishop of Salisbury, but John's friendship with the bishop was not enough for Becket to change his mind. John and Becket worked for the recall of Gerard Pucelle. Although they succeeded in obtaining papal letters to that effect, they could not prevent Gerard from going over to the king. For Gerard, John served as a channel of contact with the archbishop when he proposed a meeting between the archbishop and the archdeacon of Canterbury.

During this period, in his appeal letters to England, John presented Becket as the archbishop in exile fighting for the Church's liberty and legal justice alone with the help of foreigners. To John of Canterbury, who was probably together with the king at least part of the time, John described him as 'a man of holy life' engaged in spiritual exercises'. John continued to think that Becket as archbishop was somewhat unskilled in grasping reality and manoeuvring in practical politics.

e. December 29 1170 and thereafter

After the archbishop's return to Canterbury, John wrote no letter to Becket. The murder in the cathedral occurred less than a month after Becket's return. Unlike his other correspondents, John's relationship with Becket outlasted Becket's death. For John was one of the chief advocates of Becket's martyrdom<sup>147</sup> and his canonization, and an author of one of the lives of Thomas.

Letter no. 304,<sup>148</sup> which is the only surviving letter after John's return before the murder of Becket contains news of events which occurred in mid-December or later.<sup>149</sup> In the circumstances in which persecution continued and Becket could not rally support of the rich and great, John

---

147. Duggan, A. 'John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket', The World JS, pp 427-438, esp. p 427.

148. The letter is addressed to Peter of Celle. See the section 2-IV-3-b(iii) and 3-VII-4-d.

149. The young king's prohibition of Becket's further progress occurred in about mid-December and Becket's return to Canterbury which is related in letter no. 304 took place on about 17 or 18 December. (Barlow, TB, pp 228-30).

described how the crowd welcomed the archbishop and how the archbishop dispensed justice to all who came to him, without distinction of persons and without accepting gifts.

John was the only one of the principal clerks who was present at Canterbury at the time of the murder. Thomas had sent others on various missions, Becket probably chose to leave John at his side because as a former clerk of Archbishop Theobald, he was most familiar with matters pertaining to the province of Canterbury and Christ Church. Becket had many problems to solve around Canterbury, including that of the illegal prior Odo. Therefore John could best serve him at Canterbury. As a result he was an eye-witness of the event of 29 December.

The murder in the cathedral did not immediately make its victim a martyr. There were opposing forces at work and without the efforts of an advocate such as John of Salisbury, Becket's canonization might not have been realized. Just after the murder took place, the shock was so great that nobody knew what to do nor how to take the event. The veneration of the murdered archbishop as a martyr does not seem to have started among his clerks. Becket was not popular with the monks.<sup>150</sup> Moreover, he was about to depose the prior of their choice, Odo. By the enemies of Becket such as Roger of York, he was called Pharaoh even a year after his death.<sup>151</sup> From the royalist point of view, the archbishop was 'a traitor to the king and

---

150. For the relationship between Becket and the monks of Christ Church, Southern, R.W., The Monks of Canterbury and the Murder of Archbishop Becket, Canterbury, (1985), pp 11-13. See also the section 3-V-3-a.

151. JS Letters ii, no. 306.

kingdom'.<sup>152</sup> On the night of the murder, the royal official Broc justified the killing of a traitor and threatened the monks so that they might bury the archbishop immediately in some 'obscure place'.<sup>153</sup> The threats of royal officials may well have succeeded in burying the name of the traitor archbishop Thomas in obscurity.

The factor that turned the monks in favour of the archbishop was that they discovered that Thomas was wearing 'a hair-shirt crawling with lice and worms and furthermore...his underclothes right down to his knees were made of hair cloth'.<sup>154</sup> Another important factor for Becket's martyrdom was the occurrence of miracles. In spite of an attempt to suppress it, the rumour of miracles spread and by Easter 1171 at least twenty miracles had occurred.<sup>155</sup>

Whether John of Salisbury was the first advocate of Thomas's martyrdom or not, there was no reason for him to deny that Becket was a martyr. Unlike his master Robert of Melun, in whose opinion, to be a martyr is to die for faith, as distinct from dying for the cause of ecclesiastical freedom,<sup>156</sup> John thought that 'whoever suffers for justice, is a martyr'.<sup>157</sup> John certainly took on the role of propagandist for Thomas's canonization.

---

152. Barlow, TB, p 245.

153. Barlow, TB, p 249. Finucane, C., Miracles and Pilgrims -- Popular Beliefs in Medieval England, London (1977) p 122.

154. JS Letters ii, no. 305. Barlow, TB, p 250.

155. Finucane, Miracles and Pilgrims, p 122.

156. MTB iii, pp 60-1.

157. JS Letters ii, no. 176.     ; (



John's letter no. 305, the first extant letter in his collection which was written after the murder, appears to have had the clear intention of promoting Becket's canonization. This letter no. 305 was also the earliest extant account of the murder. It was written to John of Canterbury sometime after the first news of the murder had spread widely.<sup>159</sup> A similar letter was also sent to Peter of Celle.<sup>160</sup> The account of the murder in no. 305 was later used in John's Life of Thomas without revision.<sup>160</sup> Whenever no. 305 may have been written, it was surely written after some kind of consensus had been reached in Canterbury that Thomas was indeed a martyr.

In no. 305, John described the murdered archbishop as a 'most incorrupt judge -- who neither accepts persons nor gifts -- protagonist of the Church's liberty, a tower built in Jerusalem against the face of Damascus, the hammer of the wicked, but a comfort to those in poverty and sorrow'. Asserting that the case makes the martyr, John put forth

---

158. Prof. Brooke thought that no. 305 was written a few days after the murder but 'long enough for the event and the first whisper of miracles to have spread'. (JS Letters ii, p xliv). But Dr. McLoughlin is of the same opinion as Abbot who placed the letter three or four months after the event. (Abbott, E., St. Thomas of Canterbury, vol. 1, London, (1898) p 194 & n 3). McLoughlin asserts the existence of a previous letter, now lost, which was sent to Sens and used by William of Sens to write a letter to the Curia. (McLoughlin, pp 509-513). Indeed, William of Sens merely described the murder and called for vengeance in the form of an interdict on King Henry's land, but he made no mention of miracles, martyrdom or canonization. (Mats no. 740). However, judging from extant letters alone, Thomas's canonization does not seem to have been the French concern at the outset.

159. PC Letters ii, no. 121.

160. MTB ii, pp 301-322, esp. 316-322. JS Letters ii, pp lix-lx.

Becket's case and stated how he scorned riches and all the world's glory, set Christ's love before the love of friends and family submitted to exile, laid himself and his followers open to peril and poverty and fought to preserve God's law. John emphasized Becket's constant fight without compromise which resulted in the extension of exile and outlawry into a seventh year. And John described how in the meanwhile Thomas led the life of austerity; 'He had shown himself long since a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing to God; he had crucified his flesh, its vices and desires in prayers, in vigils and fasting, in constant wearing of the harsh hair-shirt; he had laid bare his back to the whip...' and finally offered his own blood for sacrifice. Comparing his murder with Christ's passion, John movingly described the scene of the murder -- in the cathedral and how the murderers pillaged the archbishop's belongings and stole letters and valuables. John related tales of miracles that occurred after the murder and urged that Thomas be addressed as martyr in public prayers without papal authority.

Sometime between 1171 and March 1173, John wrote again to William of Sens complaining the delay of Becket's canonization.<sup>161</sup> In this letter, much emphasis was given to miracles. Taking the example that worshipping the divinity of Christ needed no approval by the Senate, John demanded that with God's approval, the glory of the martyr be exalted 'neither by papal decree nor princely edict'. Since the martyr strove to spread the honour of Christ, He repaid him

---

161. JS Letters ii, no. 308.

in turn and since 'God is at work, a higher authority is looked for in vain', John warned against those who wished to nullify the glory of this martyr. John used the expression 'glorious martyr' in his letter written before the papal announcement of Thomas's canonization in March 1173<sup>162</sup> and afterwards.<sup>163</sup> After the 'announcement of the canonization, John used the appellation of St. Thomas<sup>164</sup> and gave accounts of more miracles.<sup>165</sup>

Even with the approval of the monks and support of the populace, Thomas's canonization would have been impossible without powerful campaigning by his former clerks. Lives of Becket were written after the murder, but few were ready before March 1173.<sup>166</sup> John wrote to John of Canterbury, Peter of Celle and William of Sens. Herbert of Bosham wrote to the Pope.<sup>167</sup> They both helped Thomas's martyrdom to penetrate into the schools.<sup>168</sup> At the time the papal legates arrived in December 1172,<sup>169</sup> French religious and clerics were probably well informed of the matter. The letters announcing the canonization of Becket were written in March 10-12 and sent to the papal legates Albert and

---

162. JS Letters ii, no. 307.

163. JS Letters ii, nos. 311, 312, 314, 317.

164. JS Letters ii, nos. 311, 317, 322, 323, 325.

165. JS Letters ii, nos. 323, 325.

166. Barlow, TB, pp 4-9.

167. Mats no. 769.

168. Smalley, Becket conflict and the schools, pp 196-221, esp. p 196.

169. Warren, Henry II, p 530. Foreville, L'Eglise et la Royaute, pp 333-5.

Theodwin, the Canterbury chapter and others.<sup>170</sup> After the canonization, John continued to refer to St. Thomas in his letters<sup>171</sup> and sent accounts of miracles even after his elevation to the see of Chartres.<sup>172</sup> He continued to venerate St. Thomas and when as bishop of Chartres he wrote to Richard, archbishop of Canterbury, he called himself 'once clerk of St. Thomas the martyr, now by God's grace and the merits of the blessed martyr Thomas, humble servant of the church of Chartres'.<sup>173</sup>

#### 4. Conclusions

Initially John and Thomas were friends and colleagues. While Thomas was a few years senior in the service of Archbishop Theobald, John was the better educated of the two. After Thomas became royal chancellor, they cooperated and helped each other in their own respective spheres of influence. John relied much on Thomas on matters pertaining to the king, but he also did what he could for Thomas as secretary to Archbishop Theobald. Though Becket was powerful as royal chancellor much trusted and favoured by the king, there was not much difference between John and Thomas in a sense that both had Archbishop Theobald as their master and that they were both servants to their masters.

From 1147, John worked first mainly as a messenger, then as secretary to an archbishop, then after a brief

---

170. Mats nos. 783-6.

171. JS Letters ii, nos. 311, 312, 318, 323, 325.

172. JS Letters ii, nos. 323, 325.

173. JS Letters ii, no. 325. On this letter see section 3-V-3-d(iii).

interval, he was a clerk to another archbishop who used to be one of his colleagues. His status as an episcopal clerk remained unchanged. During the same period of time, Becket went through a vast range of experience through a variety of jobs' -- a clerk to an archbishop, royal chancellor, then archbishop. At each step' of the ladder, Becket held a position of more importance and responsibility.

As far as their attitude towards life is concerned, John established his own philosophy of life towards the end of his archiepiscopal service, which he set down in the Policraticus, Metalogicon and Entheticus. It was the summing up of his knowledge and learning cultivated through literary education and observation gained through his service to Archbishop Theobald. It was such that would guide him to live a good life as a Christian, giving him courage to fight against injustice and persevere in hardship. John's philosophy of life remained basically unchanged for the next decade when he went through all the hardship in his service to the new master, Archbishop Thomas.

Becket on the other hand had to make a great deal of adjustment as he served different masters and performed various tasks.<sup>174</sup> While Becket served Archbishop Theobald and King Henry II, the best service he could render was to do his utmost to carry out their wishes. As he strove to satisfy both masters of vastly different expectations, he

---

174. For Becket as clerk to Archbishop Theobald, see Knowles, TB, pp 21-29, Barlow, TB, pp 24-40, Saltman, Theobald, pp 20, 32, 42-5, 48-9. For Becket as royal chancellor, see Knowles, TB, pp 30-49, Barlow, TB, pp 41-63.

had to make considerable adjustment. Since his former colleague Becket turned so completely to be a courtier that John felt impelled to warn him of the danger of courtly life in his writings and dedicate them to him. John also wrote letters urging him to return to Canterbury both in his own and in Theobald's name.

Becket did not return to Canterbury as John's colleague, but as archbishop. It is commonly accepted that Becket was at one time reluctant to be promoted archbishop foreseeing the problems that might emerge out of his acceptance of this office.<sup>175</sup> But when he became archbishop, Becket wanted to do his best in this capacity and that was not to continue to carry out the king's orders. There were signs of Becket trying to establish a pontificate at least matching that of his immediate predecessor.<sup>176</sup> Among other things such as collecting able clerks, changing his appearance and conduct, he seems to have been in search of his own ideas of what an archbishop should be. His interest in and veneration of St. Anselm may have been born in the course of his quest of his own ideal of archbishop. Although Archbishop Theobald used to mention the name of Anselm in special veneration, Anselm's reputation had not grown rapidly.<sup>177</sup> Whenever Becket started taking special notice of Anselm, he commissioned John of Salisbury to write

---

175. Knowles, TB, p 51. Barlow, TB, pp 69-70.

176. For Becket's first years of pontificate, Barlow, TB, pp 74-87.

177. Southern, R.W., Saint Anselm and his Biographer, Cambridge, (1963) pp 219 & 337.

a life of Anselm<sup>178</sup> before the Council of Tours in May 1163. John's version was to be used at the Council of Tours to promote Anselm's canonization. The attempt was not successful at that time, but Anselm was eventually canonized.<sup>179</sup>

Whether consciously or not, Becket modelled himself on Anselm.<sup>180</sup> Anselm had gone into exile. He had fought for the freedom of the Church.<sup>181</sup> In minor events also, Anselm's life may have influenced Thomas's behaviour. At the time of the conference of Montmirail, when the papal commissioners tried to persuade the archbishop to observe the customs, Becket replied that 'none of his predecessors had been compelled or driven to make profession to customs, save only St. Anselm who went into exile for seven years for the same cause'.<sup>182</sup> And Becket also decided to go back to Canterbury after seven years of exile.

If Becket admired Anselm and modelled his behaviour on him, John, through writing his life, gained knowledge and understanding of not only Anselm but also of Becket. Indeed the Life of Anselm may have provided common ground for understanding for the two persons. As he re-wrote Eadmer's Life of Anselm, John became thoroughly familiar with the saint so that allusions to Anselm occurred occasionally as

---

178. For John's Life of Anselm, see McLoughlin, pp 324-360.

179. Southern, St. Anselm, p 339.

180. Southern, St. Anselm, p 337.

181. Eadmer, The Life of St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, ed. Southern, R.W., NMT, London, (1962) p 140. JS's Vita S. Anselmi Cantuariensis, PL, vol 199, col. 1031.

182. JS Letters ii, no. 288.

he wrote letters. In accusing the monks of Christ Church for their 'hereditary right to hate their archbishop', John named as an example their lack of support for Anselm 'when he twice went into exile for righteousness' sake.<sup>183</sup> When John urged the monks of Christ Church to prepare for Thomas's return, John stated that the monks of Christ Church were the first to meet their father Anselm when he returned from exile.<sup>184</sup> John's idea of martyrdom may also have been influenced by Anselm.<sup>185</sup>

---

183. JS Letters ii, no. 244.

184. JS Letters ii, no. 303 p 713, n 4. It has been noted by Prof. Brooke that Eadmer did not specify that monks from Christ Church were the first to welcome Anselm but that this was recorded in John's own Life of Anselm.

185. Eadmer Vita Sancti Anselmi, pp 52-3, i-42-4. On the question of whether to worship Saint Elphege, Eadmer wrote, 'Palam est quod is qui ne leve quidem contra Deum peccatum admittat mori non dubitat multo maxime mori non dubitaret, priusquam aliquo gravi peccato Deum exacerbaret. ... Nec immerito ut reor inter martires computatur, qui pro tanta justitia mortem sponte sustinuisse veraciter praedicatur ... Qui autem pro Christo moritur ecclesia teste martyr habetur. Beatus vero Aelfegus aequae pro justitia, ut beatus Johannes passus est pro veritate. Cur ergo magis de unius quam de alterius vero sanctoque maertyrio quisquam ambigat, cum par causa in mortis perpeffione utrumque detineat?...' In John of Salisbury's Vita S. Anselmi PL vol.199 col. 1020;

Cum itaque martyrem non faciat poena sed causa... 'Martyr, inquit, videtur egregius: qui mori maluit, quam injuriam praesertim his quos tueri debebat irrogare. Et plane qui hoc quod parvum videtur tantum exhorruit, conventus in confessione Christi fidelissime staret ..... Sic ergo Joannes pro veritate, sic et Elphegus pro justitia passus mihi martyr habetur insignis. Nam uterque pro Christo, qui, sicut veritas, ita quidem et justitia est.'

In JS Letters ii, no. 176

....ex conscientia peccatorum nondum apti estis martirio. Ad quod ego: nemo non aptus est, nisi qui non vult pati pro fide et operibus fidei...nam quicumque pro iusticia patitur, martir est, id est, testis iusticiae, assertor causae Christi.

In JS Letters ii, no. 305 and Vita S. Thomae, MTB ii, p 317. (footnote continued on following page)



John probably understood Becket and accepted the fact that from the point of view of making peace the archbishop behaved foolishly and tactlessly. John showed much veneration for the late Archbishop Theobald whose ways of handling problems left a strong impression on him. By observing and participating in the archbishop's fight against the monks of Christ Church and against the bishop of Winchester, John was probably led to believe that an archbishop should act patiently and try to attain his goal little by little through negotiation and compromise. Becket believed in straight-forward assertion of his case. Truth and justice will win and compromise is not necessary. In the course of fighting for his cause, in spite of the sacrifice and suffering of his followers, peace with the king and return to England were of secondary importance.

Another factor that made John accept Becket's impractical stubbornness was because he was not only fighting against the king but also trying to transform his inner self possibly after the model of the monk-archbishop Anselm. Taking it into consideration that John was in the habit of adjusting his manners and contents of speech according to the recipients of his letters, still Becket's transformation is clearly visible in the way he is represented in John's letters. In early 1164, when John wrote to Becket, he addressed him like a former colleague. In summer 1165, when John made up his mind not to be a

---

(footnote continued from previous page)

185. Et si causa martirem facit, quod nulli rectum sapienti uenit in dubium, quid iustius, quid sanctius causa eius?

member of his household his feeling towards Becket was not exactly one of respect, as he wrote 'the exile has undoubtedly been profitable to the archbishop of Canterbury both for his learning and character.'<sup>186</sup> In 1167, however, when the archbishop met the papal legates at Gisors and Trie, John reports, he answered their questions gently but clearly in eloquent Latin.<sup>187</sup> In 1168 onwards, Thomas was depicted as a man of holy life, engaged in spiritual exercises.<sup>188</sup> From mid-1165 onwards, Thomas was always represented as an exiled archbishop who was fighting for the liberty of the Church. When back in Canterbury, in circumstances of extreme uncertainty, Thomas was described as dispensing justice without distinction of persons and without accepting gifts.<sup>189</sup> John previously described Becket in Christ's image in his letters of campaign directed to his English friends.<sup>190</sup> When the murder took place in the cathedral, it probably appeared to John to be a martyr's comparable to passion of Christ, which was granted by God with miracles as the sign of His approval.

During his lifetime, unlike Anselm, little sanctity was felt to attach to the person of Thomas. Unlike Anselm, who had devoted much of his life to spiritual activities, Thomas

---

186. JS Letters ii, no. 150.

187. JS Letters ii, nos. 230-31.

188. JS Letters ii, no. 274.

189. JS Letters ii, no. 304. On the significance of this passage, see Noonan, J. T. Jr., 'Bribery in John of Salisbury'. Proceedings of the VIIth International Congress of Medieval Canon Law, Cambridge, 23-27 July 1984, ed. Linehan, P. (Monumenta iuris canonici. Ser. C: Subsidia, vol. 8, Vatican, (1988), pp 197-203.

190. McLoughlin pp 270-79.

made his career in the service of a secular king whose policy was sometimes against the Church. Moreover, Becket was a fighting archbishop and he did everything to win. In order to give stronger ground to his claim against the king, he studied canon law. He used what spiritual power he could. While he suffered exile and outlawry, he did not hesitate to let the people around him to suffer the same misfortune. However, while fighting, he did not forget to discipline his life and convert his inner self from royal chancellor to monk-archbishop. When the exiles returned to Canterbury, Becket's behaviour carried dignity suitable for an archbishop. When he was murdered in the cathedral, monks also felt veneration for him when they found that Becket had lived an austere life. Miracles occurred as if to approve of Becket's life and his death. And John, who promoted Anselm's canonization and who was in charge of campaigning for Becket's cause during his lifetime, now advocated the canonization of Thomas. In a way, Becket's canonization was made easier by the fact that level-headed John of Salisbury was the eye-witness and not fanatical Herbert of Bosham. John was by no means credulous and he would not have been convinced of Becket's martyrdom without enough ground, even though the honour of having served a martyr would not have deterred him from believing it when there was enough ground. He probably became familiar with the conditions for canonization when he wrote the Life of Anselm. He stated Becket's cause clearly and included posthumous miracles which were an important condition for canonization.

In short, the relationship between John and Becket was that of a philosopher and a saint. John's philosophy of

life was for the most part formed by 1159 when he finished writing the Policraticus, Metalogicon and Entheticus and dedicated them to Becket. For John, a philosopher was a person who has cultivated, through a broad literary education, the ability to make correct and moral judgements. He is courageous enough, when faced with difficulty, to carry out what he believed to be right and he can bear hardship and persecution. His thoughts are moderate and temperate and must inevitably be pleasing to God. John enjoyed thinking about such matters and expressing them in various literary forms. Becket on the other hand was not a philosopher nor a literary figure. He did not find his pleasure in thinking how man should live nor in expressing his thoughts in written forms. He was more a man of action. While he served Archbishop Theobald and Henry II, Becket intuitively strove to do his best in life, which was at that time to please his masters by carrying out their wishes. When Becket became archbishop, primate of England, at times legate of the Holy See, the king's servant as holder of his fief, yet his spiritual father, the abbot of the monastery of Christ Church, there was no single person he could please or displease. His ultimate goal would be to please God, but how? The early years of his pontificate was the time when he was trying to adjust himself to the new office at the same time as to formulate his own ideas of how the office should be. We do not know when Becket came to be interested in Anselm, but already by May 1163, his mind was set to work on his canonization. Probably from about this time, consciously or unconsciously he sought his model in the life of Anselm. Becket could not match the clarity of mind and

intensity of intellect of the author of the Proslogion and Cur Deus Homo nor the spirituality of the abbot of Bec who devoted his life to prayers and meditation of God. But Anselm's behaviour as archbishop nevertheless could serve Becket as a model of how to serve God in that capacity. In the eight years of Becket's pontificate, John witnessed the transformation of his former colleague into a saint. He became distant, his ideas and ideals at times became incomprehensible and his attitude, stubborn and even fanatical. But God rewarded Thomas's single-minded efforts directed both within and without with a martyr's death while John hid himself behind one of the altars. As an afterthought, Becket's commission to John to write a life of Anselm appears to have been Becket's answer to what John had to propose in his books as an ideal way of life. As archbishop, Thomas did not choose a philosopher's path, but a path to sainthood.

The conversation that took place between Becket and John just after the first assault of the murderers was recorded by some of Becket's biographers:

'You have always been like that. You always act and speak entirely on your own, without taking advice. The archbishop took him up good-humouredly. 'What would you then, master John?' 'You should have summoned your council. You must realize that those knights simply want an excuse for killing you.' 'We must all die, master John', replied Thomas, 'and we must not let the fear of death make us swerve from justice. I am ready to accept death for the sake of God and of justice and the Church's freedom -- far

more ready to accept death than they are to kill me.' 'It is all very well for you to say that', was John's reply, 'but the rest of us are sinners and not so ready for death. Not a soul here except yourself is asking to die'. 'God's will be done', said the archbishop quietly.<sup>191</sup>

So Thomas ascended into the sphere of saints which was inaccessible to the philosopher, for whom, however, the task remained to propagate the significance of the event. The philosopher in turn was elevated to a bishopric 'by God's grace and the merits of the blessed martyr...'

---

191. Knowles, D., The Historian and Character and other essays, Cambridge, (1963), p 125.

## VII Conclusions to Chapter Three

While John's correspondence in chapter two unfolds us John's range of association almost in full, the one in chapter three reveals only part of it. John probably wished to establish a comfortable friendship circle of academics in Paris, but the situation did not allow it. He appears to have maintained only some contact with them after he moved to Rheims. Since John lived away from Becket's household, he does not appear to have had close ties with Becket's clerks. John's pragmatic approach to peace with the king, was different from that of the other members of Becket's household in 1166. However, in some other matters John's opinion was well accepted and his advice carried out in full. John seems to have accompanied Becket to conferences along with Becket's other clerks. Nevertheless, John seems to have associated with old timers or those who were less influential in Becket's household. John had no close friends at the Papal Curia, but his contact was made as part of epistolary campaigns on behalf of Becket, and after his death, on behalf of Richard of Dover and Richard of Ilchester. John's name was probably known well enough to leave some impression on the Pope and cardinals.

Except for some correspondents with whom John discussed academic matters, Becket played an important part in all of John's letters. Becket was also instrumental in John's fate after he joined the archbishop's household. John knew Becket for a long time. He was a witness of Becket's metamorphosis from royal chancellor to monk-archbishop. After the murder of Becket, John was one of the chief advocates of Becket's canonization.

There appear to have been few friends whom John made after he went into exile, for many recipients of John's letters in this chapter came to know John somewhat earlier. However, John appears to have enjoyed equally fruitful human relations in exile. During the seven years of exile, John made new friends among the clergy and religious in Champagne. He may also have come to know members of the French royal court. With their support, John succeeded in his campaign for Thomas's canonization. With their recommendation, John was elected bishop of Chartres.



## 5. CONCLUSIONS

Having surveyed John's relationships with 16 groups of correspondents mainly at the time of the Becket conflict, one cannot but notice that (1) there are groups with which John succeeded in establishing or maintaining good relationships throughout; (2) there are others with which John initially had good relationships but, through the course of the conflict, could not maintain them; (3) there are also groups with which John did not succeed in establishing solid relationships: (4) some groups also included a variety of people within them so that with some, John maintained good relationships but with others he failed to do so. To the first group belong John's friends in Champagne, Exeter, Christ Church, Archbishop Theobald's clerks including John of Canterbury and Thomas Becket. In Champagne, John had his life-long friend Peter of Celle. To the solid friendship with Peter, John joined the friendship circle of spiritual leaders in Champagne. Through Peter, John succeeded in gaining the favour of magnates of the realm such as the counts of Champagne. The centre of the friendship group in Exeter may be said to have been Bishop Bartholomew of Exeter, to whose promotion John contributed. The presence of John's blood relationship there helped to generate a stronger bond between John and the bishop. Moreover, John's links at Exeter were assisted much by the archdeacon Baldwin of Totnes who had the necessary knowledge of law in discussing matters in question but whose position is not as conspicuous as the bishop.

John also kept good relationship with the two former clerks of Archbishop Theobald who were promoted to bishop of

Poitiers and archbishop of Canterbury, John of Canterbury and Thomas Becket. As colleagues they used to cooperate in business and perhaps were together on missions. During the Becket dispute, the friendship between Becket and John of Canterbury was allowed to continue because unlike the English bishops, the bishop of Poitiers was not in a position to be compelled to oppose the archbishop of Canterbury. Therefore, as a clerk of Becket John maintained a smooth working relationship with John of Canterbury.

John's relationship with the monks of Christ Church appears to have been somewhat ambivalent because he played a dual role there from the outset. He was a friend of Canterbury monks sharing spiritual and literary interests at the same time as he was an agent of Archbishop Theobald who sometimes fought against them. During the Becket dispute, John worked as Becket's agent trying to control them and maintain their obedience, but after the murder of Becket, he became their friend again and supported the archbishop-elect of Canterbury and advocated the canonization of Becket.

John cultivated good relationships with some of Archbishop Theobald's clerks. After the death of Theobald, they were dispersed, serving different masters. In some cases, they appear to have helped John in his campaigning or in some secret ways, but as an individual episcopal clerk, their power and ability may have been too limited to help John effectively even if they wanted to.

The second group includes Salisbury, royal servant and the scholars whom John met during his stay in Paris in 1164-5. The bishop of Salisbury was John's friend and patron before the Becket conflict. For various reasons the bishop

of Salisbury was singled out as the archbishop's worst enemy. John interceded with Becket on the bishop's behalf without success. At the end of the conflict, the enmity between Becket and Jocelin of Salisbury was so great that there was no way for Becket's clerk to maintain a friendly relationship with the bishop of Salisbury and his family. The same applies to John's relationship with royal servants. The antagonism between the archbishop and the king prevented the royal servants from remaining friends with John of Salisbury. Their friendship was only allowed to revive after the death of Becket. In some cases the relationship was broken by deaths. Milo of Théroutanne died in 1169 and Pope Adrian IV died in 1159. John's tie with the Papal Curia was much weakened by the death of his only personal friend.

John's relationship with Parisian masters cannot be traced very well through his letters. John left a precious record of his masters in the Metalogicon, but how much contact he had after he had left the schools cannot be known for certain. During the Becket dispute, only a few letters of a purely academic nature have survived. Only one letter to a former master of John is extant; this was written to Richard l'Evêque, archdeacon of Coutances. It was probably sent to Coutances together with the letters concerning John's attempt to intercede with Becket on behalf of the bishop of Salisbury. Letters to scholars could only be sent accompanying other letters of political nature and therefore academic relationships were hard to maintain.

Another unusual relationship, which appears to have ended abruptly is between John of Salisbury and the

academics of Paris, a relationship which was probably in the making just after John's exile in 1163/4. Probably some external force made it difficult for scholar-clerks of Becket to stay in Paris.

John did not succeed in establishing solid human relationships with members of Becket's exiled household and members of the Papal Curia during the pontificate of Alexander III. After John left England, a small group of very close followers was constituted in Becket's household. After his exile, they lived with him at Pontigny while John stayed away from them in Rheims. John was fairly close to Becket, but he was not very close to other members of his household. He probably felt more at ease with the clerks who left their master at the initial stage of the conflict than with the small group of faithful and fanatical members. As regards members of the Papal Curia, the brief period of their stay in France gave John chances to be in touch with them personally. However, their stay in France was not long enough for him to make close ties with them. The members of the Curia, especially Pope Alexander III, knew him well enough to lend an ear to what he had to say.

John had friends among English clergy and religious, but his degree and manner of association were vastly different depending on individuals. With some of them John cultivated and maintained good relationships, but with others, he could not. The Becket dispute made him enemy to some of them.

Going through the list of John's friends, one may notice that there were types of people John found difficult to associate with. Unlike Becket, the royal chancellor who

successfully mixed with the king and his entourage and even participated in battle, John found the king and some members of the royal court repellent and their ways of life loathsome. Among the clergy, John found it difficult to make friends with some high-ranking churchmen -- those of noble birth and good connections such as Henry of Winchester, Roger of Worcester and Gilbert Foliot. They were too distant from John and for them, John never appeared to be somebody of similar rank or position.

There were certain factors which worked to help John make friends and maintain them such as nationality, length of acquaintance, shared interest and rank and class. When John was out of England, except in Champagne, he appears to have found it more pleasing to be in the company of the English when he was in foreign countries. When he was in Paris between 1136 and 47, he was in contact with at least three English masters, Adam du Petit Pont, Robert of Melun and Robert Pullen. He may also have known some Victorines who were English. At the Papal Curia, John made friends with the English Pope Adrian IV. Bishop Milo of Th rouanne was also English. John stayed in Paris for a brief period after his exile in 1163/4, he appears to have associated with the Victorine prior Richard who was British, and he made friends with English students who were staying in Paris at that time.

With a few exceptions, the longer John knew his friends, the easier it was to retain good relationships with them. John had good friends in Exeter. Having known each other for a long time helped generate mutual trust, apart from John's efforts for the promotion of Bartholomew. John

and Peter of Celle also enjoyed a long-lasting relationship. The fact that they came to know each other already as students probably helped maintain feelings of love and friendship.

John's relationship with Peter of Celle provided him with friendships with other religious. John adored the spiritual world of Peter of Celle. Through his contact with Peter, John learned to enjoy and adjust himself to the world of religious life. He came to associate with the monks of Christ Church Canterbury and other religious institutions. Besides monks, John also cultivated practical friendships with his colleagues while serving Archbishop Theobald. John of Canterbury, Thomas Becket and some other clerks of Archbishop Theobald appreciated John's ability to handle practical matters and they cooperated and assisted each other in case of need.

In fact, clerks in the episcopal administrative service were those with whom John could associate quite frankly. They belonged to the same rank and class. They were the people with whom John felt at ease. They shared problems in common. When John was in exile, his communication with the English bishops appears to have often been made through their clerks. Successful communication with them depended on whether John had good friends among the clerks of their household.

Another feature of John's relationships, as can be observed through his letters, is its evolution. While John's communication with his friends continued, their feelings towards each other were not the same. For instance, while maintaining a good relationship, John's

feelings towards Becket went through a series of changes. John's first extant letter to Becket<sup>1</sup> was written when he was royal chancellor. Although the all-powerful royal chancellor was a distant figure for him, John nevertheless made some expression of friendship, since he was also archdeacon of Canterbury.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps John and Thomas were fairly friendly before Thomas became royal chancellor. But expression of friendship disappears from his later letters to Becket.<sup>2</sup> The difference of rank and position, the business in which they were involved and about which they communicated, and the change of Becket's personality may have discouraged John from treating Becket as friend. The change that occurred in the recipient sometimes deterred John from feeling or expressing friendship. The same thing applied to Peter of Celle at the time when John was promoted bishop of Chartres.

Another instance at which John's feelings towards his correspondents altered significantly was when he was influenced by his masters' view points. John's attitude to Henry of Winchester differed much from the time when he served Archbishop Theobald and when he served Becket. In the case of Jocelin of Salisbury the enmity between the bishop and John's master Becket was too strong for John to maintain a good relationship, so that finally their affection towards each other seems to have been totally lost. John's relationship with Richard of Ilchester was only allowed to revive after the death of Becket.

---

1. JS Letters i, nos. 28, 128.

2. McLoughlin, Table 1.

To turn to the contents of his letters, in spite of the variety of people John wrote to, there is no serious contradiction or inconsistency in his statements. However, John made much effort to find best possible ways to appeal to each recipient usually by stressing different aspects of the matter. In summer 1165, when he wrote to Bartholomew of Exeter, Henry of Bayeux, Richard of Ilchester and Robert of Merton with the aim of obtaining peace with the king, John wrote to Robert in a deeply religious tone asking for his prayer, to Richard, requesting practical help, to Bartholomew and Henry, stating his standpoint and attitude both to the king and the archbishop. After the Vézelay censures, apart from the major campaigning through Exeter, John made attempts of public relations to other places such as Norwich, Paris, Poitiers and Normandy. To Nicholas of Norwich, John mainly denounced the bishops, to John of Poitiers, he tried to discredit the king, to Ralph Niger, presumably in Paris, he tried a little of both and to Walter de Insula and Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques, John reminded them that some members of the royal court had been excommunicated. Therefore, in order to gain their sympathy and support, John carefully adjusted himself in what to say according to the rank, position, location of the recipients and the situation in which they were placed.

Likewise, in dealing with concepts, John made adjustment in what aspects to emphasize when, and to whom, while maintaining his basic ideas. In no. 168 to Bartholomew of Exeter, which was probably sent in order to supplement Becket's formal announcement of the Vézelay censures, John made somewhat emotional attacks on the king's



behaviour, touching on the theory of two swords and ecclesiastical sanctions which might fall on the king.

In no. 174 to Bartholomew which was the commentary on the bishop's appeals and in no. 187 which was an indirect reply to Multiplicem, the latter of which seems to have no counterpart written by Becket, the centre of John's attack shifted to the bishops whose role it was to deter the king from wrong actions. John justified Becket's fight for the liberty of the Church by attacking the customs for the reason that they were against the Law, but little direct reference was made to the supremacy of spiritual power nor its relation to the Roman Church.

In no. 234 to Cardinal Albert which was sent together with other letters of protest after the conference of Gisors and Trie, appeal was made to the interest of the Roman Church. The customs were described as 'contrary to God's law and destructive of the rights of the Holy See', with reference to the theory of two swords. John's attack on the king is made in such a way as to remind the Roman cardinal of the danger of the Germans. Although the Curia had little to worry about the direct harm from Henry II, John wanted to hint that Henry II and Frederick were inherently the same type of ruler. Henry II almost always appears as the enemy of the Church in John's letters except for one notable exception. John praised the king to John of Canterbury who was in close touch with the king at that time.

Becket's fight for the liberty of the Church was widely used as a slogan in John's letters to the Papal Curia and English clergy, but the concept seldom appears in John's letters to Christ Church, Canterbury. In his letters to

Christ Church, much emphasis was laid on obedience, love and charity of the monks to their father. The attempt at explanation or justification of their father's behaviour was not made at all in the initial stage of their communication in the end of 1167 and the beginning of 1168. The monks were accused of asking the king for permission to elect a new prior and they were told to refrain from communicating with the excommunicate. While John was quite lenient with Ralph Niger on the problem of communication with the excommunicate, he strictly forbade the monks to communicate with Ranulf and Robert de Broc. In his earlier letters to Canterbury addressed to Wibert and Odo and Richard of Dover as well as in his later letter written in 1169, the reason for the archbishop's exile and outlawry was given as his fight for God's justice and the Church's liberty. When the relationship between Becket and Christ Church was relatively good, restoration of the ancient privilege of Canterbury was also touched on.<sup>3</sup>

News of the Germans, especially of their calamities, was fully exploited in John's letters to England, while it was a matter of less importance to John's correspondents elsewhere. In his letters to Exeter, Christ Church and to his other English friends including Gerard Pucelle, John presented the defeat of the Germans as an example of God's punishment for offences against the Church, which would also befall Henry II. As the instance of the news of the Germans indicates, news that John obtained was not sent forth to his other friends indiscriminately. The news from Flanders was

---

3. JS Letters ii, nos. 205 & 293.

sent on to Poitiers when it appeared useful to the bishop. Instead of hearing about the Germans, the bishop of Poitiers received precise information on Becket -- his suspension, negotiations with the cardinals and the conferences of the kings.

John appears to have usually been accurate in his news and does not seem to have knowingly given false information for the purpose of campaigning, but there were instances on which he sent information which could be misleading. For instance, admitting the diplomatic victory of John of Oxford at the Papal Curia in 1167, John made it sound as if there were details in favour of Becket, which could not be publicised at that moment.<sup>4</sup> The report of the excommunication of Gilbert Foliot in late 1167 or early 1168 is another such instance.<sup>5</sup> Fighting against rumours was the problem John faced in dealing with his English correspondents.<sup>6</sup>

During the years covered by John's two letter collections, John's wishes, intentions and emotions were complex and their expressions were liable to change according to time, occasion and recipients. When compelled to choose between wealth and position and a life of honour and reputation, he chose the latter without renouncing hope for the former. While serving his master faithfully, he did not hesitate to express his wishes for peace with the king when he felt there was a chance. At times, he could not

---

4. JS Letters ii, nos. 197, 199, 200, 215.

5. JS Letters ii, nos. 237, 238, 241, 244.

6. JS Letters ii, nos. 202, 289/ 292.

help feeling the loss resulting from this decision: he felt apologetic to his family and relatives for not being able to do what was best for them: he sometimes felt jealousy and resentment towards people who chose wealth and position without hesitation. In his letters, while emphasizing his material prosperity to his English friends, he did not hide his poverty to Becket and Master Raymond of Poitiers. To his academic friends, he philosophized and accepted his misfortune with peace of mind. In serving his master, he exploited his friendship ties to the utmost, but he tried hard to maintain his most important friendship groups by protecting their benefits and reminding them of his personal feelings. Whatever variety his outward expressions may exhibit, his philosophy of life was basically unchanged and stable and he held on to some basic ideas and principles throughout his life. In this sense, he may be said to have been a man of integrity.

Unlike letter collections of Arnulf of Lisieux or Peter of Blois, John's letter collections went through little later revisions. They are a valuable record of a man acting and reacting to the changing circumstances. They remind us of the fact that in spite of typical, twelfth-century ideas and ideals he expressed in his letters, his attitudes towards the people around him have curious affinity with those of our own. He also suffered from conflicting emotions and contradictory wishes. At the moments of decision, he also let his likes and dislikes play a fundamental part.

APPENDIX i: Dating of Peter of Celle's correspondence  
with John in PC Letters i

Dating of Peter of Celle's letters to John of Salisbury written before Peter moved to Rheims.

PC no. 67 was probably written shortly before JS no. 19 as a warning of the great disgrace.<sup>1</sup> Since JS no. 19 is dated autumn 1156, PC no. 67 was probably written shortly before that date.

PC no. 68 reports the fire at the priory of Saint-Aigulf of Provins. Therefore it must be dated prior to JS no. 32 which is a letter of consolation for the burning of the priory written in July-August 1157.

PC no. 74 was written in reply to JS no. 32 and therefore should be dated no earlier than July-August, 1157.

These three letters are the only ones that can be fairly safely dated. Even among these, no. 67, may have belonged to different occasion. The dating of other letters can only be a conjecture. But perhaps it is still worthwhile to make some attempt to date them from their contents.

PC no. 71 is a letter of consolation over John's misfortune. It may have been written after JS no. 19, dated Autumn 1156, which reported the great disgrace.

PC no. 72 is a letter of reproach that John had not written for a long time. This may possibly have been written before JS no. 31 dated 1-8 April 1157, in which John apologized to Peter.

---

1. JS was out of the King's favour from about autumn 1156 to spring 1157. On this incident, see the sections 3-III-I, 3-I, 3-IV-1.

PC no. 69 expressed Peter's joy on receiving John's letter. Apparently the letter was humorous. Perhaps no. 69 was a reply to JS no. 33, but there is also a possibility that it was the answer to JS no. 112.

PC no. 70 also expressed Peter's pleasure in hearing from John. Peter's letter praised the content and style of John's letter. The reference to Saint-Aigulf makes it close after no. 68.

PC no. 73 is puzzling. Peter seems to be against John's exile in Paris. The only time we knew that John thought the prospect of exile was early 1164 when John tried to settle down in Paris as a scholar. (JS Letters i, no. 136). But at that time Peter was already abbot of Saint-Remi.

PC no. 75 was written in praise of monastic life and again this letter gives no hint for dating.

APPENDIX ii: Lists of Letters

- I.
  1. Letters to Exeter
    - (a) Letters and their recipients
    - (b) Groups of letters and their accompaniments  
(i, ii, iii)
- II.
  1. Letters to Archbishop Theobald's clerks
    - (a) Themes
    - (b) Themes in appeal letters of 1168 (i, ii)
  2. Letters to Christ Church
    - (a) John's letters to Christ Church & Kent
    - (b) Becket's Pope's letters to C.C. & Kent
    - (c) Letters on behalf of Richard of Dover & Richard of Ilchester
  3. Letters to English Clergy & Religious
    - (a) Propaganda war in 1166
    - (b) Correspondence with Worcester & Winchester
    - (c) Correspondence in the Norwich area
  4. Letters to Poitiers
    - (a) Letters of JC. TB & JS between 1163-65
    - (b) JS's Letters to Poitiers after 1166
    - (c) Becket's correspondence with the Pope and papal legates
    - (d) Letters related to the correspondence of JS and JC exchanged between April-July 1168
- III.
  1. Letters to Becket's Clerks
    - (a) Correspondence of Becket's party with Rouen
  2. Letters to the Papal Curia between 1163-70
  3. Letters of William aux Blanchesmains  
(MTB v-vii)



I.	1.	<u>Letters to Exeter</u>		
		(a) <u>Letters and their recipients</u>		
(i)		<u>Bartholomew of Exeter</u>	118	1160-1
		<u>as archdeacon</u>	133	1161
		<u>Bartholomew of Exeter</u>	150	summer 1165
		<u>as bishop</u>	168	June 1166
			171	July 1166
			174	July 1166
			288	c.Feb. 1167
(ii)		<u>Baldwin of Totnes</u>	170	late June 1166
			187	late 1166
			238	c.Dec.1167-Jan1168
			241	c.Jan. 1168
			249	probably 1167-68
			272	c.April-May 1168
			273	c.May 1168
			280	c.July 1168
			281	1168-70
			289	probably late Aug. 1169
			298	Feb.-March 1170
(iii)		<u>Richard</u>	164	? May-June 1166
		<u>his</u>	169	c.June 1166
		<u>brother</u>	172	June-July 1166
(iv)		<u>Robert, son of</u>	145	probably 1165
		<u>Egidia</u>	146	? 1165-6
			147	undatable
			148	undatable
(v)		<u>Roger of Sidbury</u>	153	? 1165-6
(vi)		<u>Alfred of Chard</u>	154	? 1165-6

b(i) Groups of letters and their accompaniments to Exeter

No.	Recipient	Date	Note
145	Robert, son of Egidia	probably 1165	carrier-JS's brother?
?	Bartholomew of Exeter	lost	
150	Bartholomew of Exeter	summer 1165	
149	Richard of Ilchester	summer 1165	possibly received
?137	Henry de Beaumont	1164-5	at Woodstock or
151	Robert of Merton	summer 1165	nearby in September
	G.F. & Richard de Luci	lost	
146	Robert, son of Egidia	?1165-6	
153	Roger of Sidbury	(Probably autumn	
154	Alfred Chard	1165)	
164	Richard, his brother	?May-June 1166	
	'another letter'	lost	
168	Bartholomew of Exeter	June 1166	bearer
169	Richard, his brother	c. June 1166	Fulk?
170	Baldwin of Totnes	late June 1166	
171	Bartholomew of Exeter	July 1166	bearer
172	Richard, his brother	June-July 1166	man from Devon

b(ii)

no.	Recipient	Date	Note
174	Bartholomew of Exeter	July 1166	bearer - JS's servant
	summons of Thomas Becket	lost	Mats no. 213
	copy of a letter of Henry to Cologne		
2147	Robert, son of Egidia		
238	Baldwin of Totnes	c. Dec. 69-Jan. 1168	
	copy of a papal letter	lost	GF's eccom.
241	Baldwin (Benedict)	Jan. 1168	pseudonym
	copy of renewed appeal of the bishops		GFL nos. 181-2
	copy of the Pope's letter to legates		Mats no. 355
249	Baldwin of Totnes	probably 1167-8	
272	Baldwin of Totnes	April-May 1168	
273	Baldwin of Totnes	c. May 1168	
280	Baldwin (Benedict)	c. July 1168	pseudonym
			messenger well known

b(iii)

no.	Recipient	Date	Note
288	Bartholomew of Exeter	c. Feb. 1169	cf. Mats nos. 464, 471
289	Baldwin of Totnes	probably late Aug. 69	
281	Baldwin of Totnes	1168-70	
	copy of Pope's letter to Roger of Worcester Peter of Celle's letter no.127		Mats no. 401?
298	Baldwin of Totnes	Feb.-March 1170	Mats no. 626
	copy of Pope's letter to the King		Mats no. 626

- II. 1. Letters to Archbishop Theobald's clerks
- (a) Themes
- a. schism's head was battered - the Emperor's defeat
  - b. TB soldier on his own resources (I Corinthian 9:7)
  - b' TB's fight for the Church, esp. for the English Church
  - c. peace at the gates
  - d. light from the east has dawned
  - e. fourth year of exile
  - f. fifth year of exile
  - f' sixth year of exile about to start
  - g. Peter's oarsmen at the ship (Mark 6:48)
  - h. the fear of the recipients
  - i. benefit of doing the work of charity
  - j. JS's love
  - k. charity
  - l. JS's prosperity
  - m. sending money secretly
  - n. messenger
  - o. need to redeem the time
  - p. J not asking for his own sake

b(i) Themes in JS's appeal letters of 1168 (some letters are not 'appeal letters' but are included here for comparison)

	a	b	b'	c	d	e	f	f'	g	h	i	j	k	l	m	n	o	p
220 Richard of Dover: summer 1167	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓													
221 Master Laurence: autumn 1167	✓																	
237 Robert of Inglesham: c. Dec. 67- Jan. 68				✓			✓											
240 Baldwin of Bounlogne: c. Dec. 67- Jan. 68	✓				✓													
242 William Brito: probably late 67					✓													
243 William Brito: late 1167	✓																	
247 William Brito: 1168																		
249 Baldwin of Totnes: probably 67-68	✓			✓														
250 Peter the Scribe: 1167-68	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓							✓			
251 Gerard, cellarer Norwich: 1167-68	✓	✓	✓	✓														
252 John, prior of Norwich: "		✓	✓				✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓			
253 Walkelin of Suffolk: c. 1168	✓	✓		✓			✓		✓					✓				
254 William de Deceia: probably 68						✓							✓	✓	✓			
255 William of Northolt: c. 1168		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓					✓	✓			
256 John of Tilbury: c. 1168				✓														

	a	b	b'	c	d	e	f	f'	g	h	i	j	k	l	m	n	o	p
257 Walter, bishop Rochester: c. 1168		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓			✓	✓			✓
258 Ralph of Wingham ? : c. 1168			✓	✓					✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓
259 Robert de Limesia: c. 1168		✓	✓				✓		✓					✓				✓
260 Henry of Blois: c. 1168		✓	✓				✓		✓					✓				✓
261 Robert of Inglesham: c. 1168		✓	✓						✓	✓				✓	✓			✓
262 William bishop Norwich: c. 1168		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓			✓	✓		✓		✓
263 Monk Azo - ? : c. 1168		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓			✓				✓
264 Thustan of Acolt: c. 1168(o)		✓	✓						✓	✓	✓							✓
265 William, prior Merton: 1167-68																✓		✓
266 " : c. 1168		✓	✓											✓				
268 Geoffrey											✓					✓		
269 Nicholas Decanus: 1164-69																✓		
270 Baldwin of Vale Darii																✓		
282 Nicholas of Norwich: prob. late 1168		✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓					✓		✓
283 Hugh of St. Edmunds: "		✓	✓						✓	✓				✓		✓		
284 Master Nigel : "							✓							✓				

2. Letters to Christ Church

(a) JS's letters to Christ Church and Kent

No. 205	Wibert and Odo, priors of C.C.	1164-1167
220	Richard, prior of Dover	? summer- autumn 1167
242	William Brito, sub-prior of C.C.	probably late 1167
243	William Brito, sub-prior of C.C.	late 1167
244	The community of C.C.	late 1167 or early 1168
245	William Brito, sub-prior of C.C.	end 1167 or early 1168
246	Ralph of Arundel, monk of C.C.	late 1167 or early 1168
247	William Brito, sub-prior of C.C.	1168
248	Robert, vice-archdeacon, Canterbury	?1167-1168
263	Azo, monk of C.C.	? c.1168
292	The community of C.C.	late 1169
293	William Brito, sub-prior of C.C.	late 1169
294	William Brito, sub-prior of C.C.	1167-1170, ?1169-1170
295	The community of C.C.	Oct.Nov.1169
296	Robert, the sacrist of C.C.	spring 1970
300	The community of C.C.	May-June 1170
303	William Brito, sub-prior of C.C.	mid-Oct. 1170

JS's other letters to Kent

No. 195	Master Osbert of Faversham
267	Master Osbert of Faversham



264 Thurston of Acolt

c. 1168

270 Baldwin of Vale Darii

(b) TB's and Pope's letters to Christ Church and Kent

TB's letters to C.C. and Kent

<u>Mats</u>	237	Geoffrey Ridel	August-September 1166
	238	Geoffrey Ridel	August-September 1166
	499	clergy of Kent	c. 13 April 1169 *
	500	Geoffrey Ridel	c. 13 April 1169 *
	502	Christ Church	c. 13 April 1169 **
	573	Christ Church	post 18 November 1169
	574	clergy of Kent	post 18 November 1169
	680	Christ Church	late June 1170 ***
	681	all Canterbury deans	late June 1170 ***
	682	St. Augustine's	late June 1170 ***

\* Opinion differs between Barlow and Duggan on the dating of these letters. (Barlow p.309, Duggan p.238)

\*\* Geoffrey Ridel, who was excommunicated on 29 May 1169 according to Barlow, appears in this letter as excommunicate.

\*\*\* They were produced, but perhaps not sent. (Barlow p.207).

The Pope's letters to C.C. and Kent

<u>Mats</u>	131	Christ Church	? late 1165
	165	Canterbury prelates	7 April/3 May 1166.
	173	clergy of Canterbury province	24 April 1166
	412	Holy Trinity	16 May 1168

(c) Letters on behalf of Richard of Dover and Richard of Ilchester

JS's letters on behalf of Richard of Dover

<u>Nó.</u>	<u>in the name of</u>	<u>addressed to</u>	<u>date</u>
311'	Prior Odo of C.C.	Alexander III	June 1173
312	Bartholomew of Ex.	Alexander III	prob. c.June 1173
313	John of Salisbury	Alexander III	prob. c.June 1173
314	John of Salisbury	William of Sens	prob. c.June 1173
315	John of Salisbury	Cardinal Boso	prob. c.June 1173

JS's letters on behalf of Richard of Ilchester, etc.

316	John of Salisbury	Albert & Theodwin	1173-1174
317	John of Salisbury	Humbald of Ostia	1173-1174
318	John of Salisbury	Gratian	1173-1174
319	Bartholomew of Ex.	Alexander III	1173-1174
320	Christ Church	Alexander III	1173-1174
321	Bartholomew of Ex.	Alexander III	1173-1174

JS's other letters written after 1171

307	clerks of T.B.	William of Sens	early 1172
308	John of Salisbury	William of Sens	1171-1173
310	John of Salisbury	Peter of Celle	? c. 1173
321*	Bartholomew Ex.	Alexander III	1173-1174

\* on behalf of Robert Foliot

3. Letters to English Clergy and Religious

(a) Propaganda war in 1166

Mats. no. 172 Pope - TB 24 April 1166

Mats. no. 173 Pope to clergy, Canterbury 24 April 1166

(the Vezelay censures) 12 June 1166

Mats. no. 198 TB - Canterbury suffragans c.12 June 1166

Mats. no. 239 TB - GF June 1166

Mats. no. 179 TB -R.Hereford,R.Worcester c.June 1166

JS no. 168 JS - Bartholomew of Exeter June 1166

(King's order to English bishops) 16,17 June 1166

Mats. no. 204 bishop to Pope

Mats. no. 205 bishop to TB (GF 167) c.24 June 1166

(delivery of TB's legation to GF) June 30 1166

Mats. no. 208 GF to Henry II (GF 168)

JS no. 174 JS - Bartholomew of Exeter July 1166

Mats. no. 223 TB - English suffragans July 1166

Mats. no. 224 TB - GF July 1166

Mats. no. 225 GF - TB (GF 170) July 1166

JS no. 187 JS - Bartholomew of Exeter late 1166

(b) Correspondence with Worcester & Winchester

Correspondence with Roger of Worcester and others

JS ?	JS-Roger of Worcester	1165
*JS no. 196	JS-Roger of Worcester	1166-67
*JS' no. 197	JS-Ralph, prior of W.	1166-67
*JS no. 198	JS-M. Simon' Lovel	1166-67
*JS no. 199	JS-Adam of Evesham	1166-67
*JS no. 200	JS-Reginald of Pershore	1166-67
<u>Mats.</u> 303	TB-Roger of W.	1166-67(Duggan) <sup>1</sup> late 1167(Cheney)
<u>Mats.</u> 496	TB-Roger of W.	c.April 1169
<u>Mats.</u> 551	TB-Roger of W.	June 1169
<u>Mats.</u> 649	TB-Roger of W.	March-April 1170

Correspondence with Winchester & Merton

JS no. 151	Robert, prior of Merton	prob. summer 1165
JS no. 156	Robert of Merton	probably 1165-7
JS no. 237	Robert of Inglesham	Dec.1167-Jan.1168
*JS no. 259	Robert de Limesia	c. 1168
*JS no. 260	Henry of Blois	c. 1168
*JS no. 261	Robert of Inglesham	c. 1168
*JS no. 265	William of Merton	1167-68
*JS no. 266	William of Merton	c. 1168
JS no. 296	Master Herbert	prob. c.Nov.1169

\* carried together

---

1. Dating differs between the two scholars.

(c) JS's correspondence in the Norwich area

no. 159	Master Nicholas	probably spring summer 1166
'no. 160	William de Turba	probably spring summer 1166
no. 161	M. Geoffrey of St. Edmunds	May 1166
no. 162	M. Geoffrey of St. Edmunds	summer 1166
no. 163	Abbot Hugh of St. Edmunds	? summer 1166
(no. 178	Master Nicholas	c. July 1166
(no. 192	Abbot Hugh of St. Edmunds	1166-7(c.July 1166)
(no.193	Master Geoffrey	1166-7(c.July 1166)
?	Master Nicholas	?
no. 251	Gerard, cellarer, Norwich	1167-8
*no. 252	John, prior, Norwich	probably 1163 (maybe late 1168)
no. 253	Walkelin, archd. Suffolk	c. 1168
no. 262	William de Turba	c. 1168
no. 268	Geoffrey	?
*no. 282	Master Nicholas	probably late 1168
*no. 283	Abbot Hugh of St. Edmunds	probably late 1168

\* probably sent together

(  
(

4. Letters to Poitiers

(a) Letters of John of Canterbury, Thomas Becket and  
John of Salisbury between 1163-65

?	TB to J Canterbury	?
post 29 June 1163	J. Canterbury to TB	<u>Mats</u> 25
?	TB to J. Canterbury	?
Nov.-Dec. 1163	J. Canterbury to TB	<u>Mats</u> 35
?	J. Canterbury to JS	?
early 1164	J. Salisbury to TB	JS no. 136
22 June 1164	J. Canterbury to TB	<u>Mats</u> 60
Jan. 1165	J. Salisbury to TB	JS no. 144
late Aug. 1165	J. Canterbury to TB	<u>Mats</u> 103
late summer 1165	J. Salisbury to TB	JS no. 152
probably late summer 1165	J. Canterbury to TB	<u>Mats</u> 116
(Feb. 1167	J. Canterbury to TB	<u>Mats</u> 283)

(b) JS's letters to Poitiers after 1166

no. (165	John of Canterbury	early June 1166
(		
(166	Master Raymond	early June 1166
(167	Master Raymond	June 1166
(		
(194	Master John the Saracen	1166-67
177	John of Canterbury	c. July 1166
211	John of Canterbury	undatable(?1166)
212	John of Canterbury	c. January 1167
221	Master Laurence	summer-autumn 1167
(222	Master Laurence	c. Oct. 1167
(		
(223	John of Canterbury	c. Oct. 1167
(		
(224	Master Raymond	c. Oct. 1167
230	John of Canterbury?	late Nov. 1167
232	Master Raymond	c. Nov.-Dec. 1167
233	John of Canterbury	c. Nov.-Dec. 1167
236	John of Canterbury	mid-late Dec. 1167
274	John of Canterbury	c. April-May 1168
275	John of Canterbury	c. May 1168
276	John of Canterbury	c. June 1168
285	John of Canterbury	Jan.-Feb. 1169
287	John of Canterbury	c. Feb. 1169
291	John of Canterbury	c. end of Aug. 1169
305	John of Canterbury	early 1171

( probably sent together



(c) TB's correspondence with the Pope and papal legates

<u>Mats</u> 307	Pope - William & Otto	7 May 1167
<u>Mats</u> 311	<u>William of Pavia - TB</u>	July, Aug. 1167
<u>Mats</u> 312	<u>TB - William of Pavia</u>	c. July 1167
<u>Mats</u> 313	<u>TB - William of Pavia</u>	July 1167
<u>Mats</u> 324	Pope - William & Otto	22 Aug. 1167
<u>Mats</u> 329	<u>TB - William of Pavia</u>	Sept, Oct. 1167
<u>Mats</u> 355	William & Otto - Pope	Oct. 1167
<u>Mats</u> 342	William & Otto - Pope	c. 9 Dec. 1167
<u>Mats</u> 343	William & Otto - TB	c. 9 Dec. 1167

(d) Letters related to the correspondence of JS and John of Canterbury between April-July 1168

<u>Mats</u>	400	24 April	Pope to English bishops		
<u>Mats</u>	404	26 April	Pope to Henry II	Restricting TB's power	
JS	272	c. April-May	JS to Baldwin of Totnes		
JS'	274	c. April-May	JS to John of Canterbury		
JS	273	c. May	JS to Baldwin of Totnes		
JS	277	c. May	JS to Gerard Pucelle		
}	<u>Mats</u>	420	20 May	Pope to TB	Probably brought back by TB's
	<u>Mats</u>	421	20 May	juramentum of Gerard Pucelle	Messengers
	<u>Mats</u>	422	20 May	Pope to Louis VII	"
	<u>Mats</u>	413	19 May	Pope to all English bishops	"
	<u>Mats</u>	414	19 May	Pope to TB	suspension of TB
	<u>Mats</u>	415	May	Pope to John Cumin	"
	<u>Mats</u>	395	19 May	Pope to Henry II	"
	<u>Mats</u>	396	19 May	John of Naples to Henry II	"
	<u>Mats</u>	423	22 May	Pope to Henry II	announcing new papal envoys
	<u>Mats</u>	424	25 May	Pope to Simon & Bernard	
JS	275	c. May	JS to John of Canterbury	suspension of TB	
JS	276	c. June	JS to J. Canterbury & M. Raymond	"	
<u>Mats</u>	419	June-July	TB to Richard & William de Valasse,	concerning G. Pucelle	
JS	279	July	JS to Lombardus		
<u>Mats</u>	406	July-August	TB to Lombardus		
}	<u>Mats</u>	435	July	Louis VII to Pope	in protest of suspension
	<u>Mats</u>	437	June-July	Stephen of Meaux to Pope	
	<u>Mats</u>	438	"	Mathew, treasurer of Sens to Pope	
	<u>Mats</u>	439	"	Louis VII to Humbald of Ostia	
	<u>Mats</u>	440	"	A. Queen of France to Pope	
	<u>Mats</u>	441	"	TB to Cardinal Manfred	
	<u>Mats</u>	442	"	TB to Conrad of Mainz	
	<u>Mats</u>	443	"	TB to Bernard of Porto	
	<u>Mats</u>	444	"	TB to Humbald of Ostia & Cardinal Hyacinth	
	<u>Mats</u>	446	July	William, elect of Chartres to Pope	
JS	280	July	JS to Baldwin of Totnes		

III. 1. Letters to Becket's clerks

(a) Letters to Rouen

<u>Mats</u> no. 75	TB - Empress	December 1164
lost	TB - Arnulf of Lisieux	December 1164
<u>Mats</u> no. 76	Nicholas - TB	post Christmas 1164
AL no. 42	Arnulf of Lisieux - TB	March 1165
<u>Mats</u> no. 152	TB - Henry II	early 1166
<u>Mats</u> no. 153	TB - Henry II	early 1166
<u>Mats</u> no. 184	TB - Nicholas	Feb., Mar. 1166
=JS no. 157	TB - Nicholas	"
<u>Mats</u> no. 154	TB - Henry II	April, May 1166
lost	TB - Nicholas	post 12 June 1166
<u>Mats</u> no. 201	TB - Rotrou of Rouen	post 12 June 1166
<u>Mats</u> no. 209	Nicholas - TB	ante 24 July 1166.
JS no. 188	JS - Nicholas	probably about end 1166
JS no. 239	JS - Nicholas	c.Dec. 1167 - March 1168
<u>Mats</u> no. 234	Nicholas - TB	uncertain 1165-69

2. Letters of TB to the Papal Curia between 1163-70  
 (MTB v-vii)

1163

29	Pope Alexander	post 1, Oct. 63
30	Humbald, Cardinal Bishop	"
31	Bernard of Porto	"
32	Albert, c-priest of San Lorenzo in Lucina	"
33	Hyacinth, Cardinal Deacon of Cosmedin	"
27	Pope Alexander	ante 18, Oct. 63

1164

48	Conrad, archbishop of Mainz	early Jan. 64
74	Causa TB ante pope Alexander	mid. Nov. 64

1166

250	Cardinal Boso	? early.
195	Pope Alexander III	c. 12 June
196	to the cardinals	"
246	Pope Alexander III	November
247	Conrad, archbishop of Mainz	"
248	Henry of Pisa, cardinal priest of ss Neveus & Achilles	"
249	Hyacinth, cardinal	"
160	Pope Alexander III	? 1166

1167

285	(John, Becket's clerk)	post 2 Feb.
286	Pope Alexander III	"
287	all cardinals	"
288	Conrad, archbishop Mainz	"
290	Cardinal John (ss. John & Paul)	"
466	Pope Alexander III	post 7 Feb.
313	William of Pavia	July
314	Conrad, archbishop Mainz	July
312	William of Pavia	c. July
315	Hyacinth	c. July
309	Otto, Cardinal Deacon St. Nicholas in Carcere Tulliano	July - Aug.
407	Pope Alexander III	"
322	Pope Alexander III	c. Sept.
329	William of Pavia	Sept. Oct.
330	Otto, cardinal	"
331	Pope Alexander III	post 19 Nov.
348	Pope Alexander III	post 14 Dec.
349	William of Pavia	Dec.
394	Pope Alexander III	1164-67

1168

359	(Alexander and John)	? early 68
642	Pope Alexander III	Feb. - March
441	Cardinal Manfred	"
442	Conrad of Mainz	"
443	Bernard of Porto	"
444	Cardinals Humbold & Hyacinth	"
406	(Lombardus of Piacenza)	July - Aug.
450	Pope Alexander III	c. 28 Dec.

463	Pope Alexander III	post 6 Jan.
467	William of Pavia	"
468	Cardinal Otto	"
466	Pope Alexander III	post 7 Feb. 67
497	Pope Alexander III	c. 13 April
538	Humbald of Ostia	June
551	Roger of Worcester	June
541	Cardinal John	June-July
542	Cardinal Hugh of Bologna	June-July
643	Pope Alexander III	June-July
559	Pope Alexander III	ante 15 Aug.
533	Master Gratian	c. August
554	Pope Alexander III	Sept.
612	(Alexander and John)	c. Sept.
583	Pope Alexander III	post 29 Sept.
584	Humbald of Ostia	"
585	Cardinal Hyacinth	"
586	William of Pavia	"
587	Cardinal John	"
588	Bernard, bishop of Porto	"
589	John of Naples	"
602	Vivian Master	ante 11 Nov.
604	Vivian & Gratian	c. 16 Nov.
617	John of Naples	Nov.
609	Gratian	Post 18 Nov.
610	(Alexander & John)	"
611	Pope Alexander III	"
617	John of Naples	c. Nov. 69
501	Albert & Theodwin	1166-70

1170

646	Pope Alexander III	late Feb.
662	Cardinal Albert	mid April
663	Master Gratian	"
664	Cardinal Albert	"
665	Exiles to Master Gratian	"
666	Pope Alexander III	c. May
590	Pope Alexander III	mid. 1170
684	Pope Alexander III	post 22 July
691	Walter of Albano	"
692	Humbald of Ostio	"
693	William of Pavia	"
694	Cardinal Hyacinth	"
695	Master Gratian	"
716	Pope Alexander III	Oct.-Nov.
723	Pope Alexander III	early Dec.

3.	<u>Letters of William aux Blanchemains</u>		(MTB v-vii)
192	June-Dec.	1166	William elect of Chartres to Pope
446	July	1168	William elect of Chartres to Pope
469'	c. Jan.	1169	Henry II to William of Sens
498	c. 13 April	1169	William of Sens to the Pope
470	post 7 July	1169	William of Sens to the Pope
547	August	1169	William of Sens to the Pope
570	24Aug.-2Sept.	1169	Henry II to William of Sens
571	24Aug.-2Sept.	1169	William of Sens to Henry II
572	24Aug.-2Sept.	1169	William of Sens to Grantian, Vivian
606	post 18 Nov.	1169	Becket to William of Sens
674	post 14 June	1170	William of Sens to the Pope
668	c. June	1170	Pope to William of Sens
710	9 Oct.	1170	Pope to William of Sens, Rotrou, Rouen
777	early	1171	John of Salisbury to William of Sens (= JS <u>Letters</u> ii, No. 308)
735	January	1171	William of Sens to the Pope
740	c. 25 Jan.	1171	William of Sens to the Pope
774	21 May	1172	Albert, Theodwin to William of Sens



B I B L I O G R A P H Y

I. EDITIONS OF JOHN OF SALISBURY'S WRITINGS

Letters

The Letters of John of Salisbury 1: The Early Letters (1153-1161), ed. Millor, W.J., Butler, H.E., Brooke, C.N.L., NMT, London (1955) reprinted OMT (1986)

The Letters of John of Salisbury 2: The Later Letters (1163-1180) ed. Millor, W.J. & Brooke, C.N.L., OMT, Oxford (1979)

Policraticus sive de nugis curialium

- (1) Ioannis Saresberiensis Episcopi Carnotensis Policratici sive de Nugis Curialium et Vestigiis Philosophorum Libri viii, ed. Webb, C.C.J., 2 vols. Oxford (1909).
- (2) trans: The Stateman's Book of John of Salisbury being the fourth, fifth and sixth books of 'Policraticus' trans Dickinson, J., New York (1927)
- (3) trans: Frivolities of courtiers and footprints of philosophers, being a translation of the first, second and third books and selections of the seventh and eighth books of the 'Policraticus' of John of Salisbury trans. Pike, J.B., Minneapolis (1938) reprinted New York (1972).

## Metalogicon

- (1) Ioannis Saresberiensis Episcopi Carnotensis Metalogicon ed. Webb, C.C.J., Oxford (1929).
- (2) trans: McGarry, D.D., as The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury: A twelfth-century defence of the verbal and logical arts of the Trivium, University of California (1955); reprinted in Gloucester, Mass. (1971)

## Entheticus

- (1) John of Salisbury's Entheticus major and minor, ed. Laarhoven, J. van, Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 17, 3 vols. Leiden-New York etc. (1987)
- (2) 'The Entheticus of John of Salisbury: A critical edition', ed. Pepin, R., Traditio 31 (1975) pp. 127-93.

## Historia Pontificalis

John of Salisbury's Memoir of the Papal Court  
trans. Chibnall, M. NMT, London (1956)

## Vita Sancti Anselmi

ed. Wharton, H., PL 199, cols. 1009-1040.

## Vita Sancti Thomae

ed. Robertson, J.G., Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, RS, vol. 2, pp. 301-22.

II. PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES

Abelard: Historia calamitatum, ed. Monfrin J.  
Paris (1962)

Arnulf of Lisieux: The Letters of Arnulf of  
Lisieux ed. Barlow, F., Camden Society 61 (1939)

Alexander III, Epistolae et privilegia, PL 200

Antiquus Cartularius Ecclesiae Baiocensis,  
ed. Bourrienne, V.  
Rouen-Paris (1902)

Baldwin of Ford

Le Sacrement de l'Autel (vol. 1)

ed. Morson, J., and Solms, E. de, Sources  
Chrétiennes, Paris (1963)

Bernard of Clairvaux: Sancti Bernardi Opera  
Omnia ed. Leclercq, J., Talbot, C.H.,  
Rochais, H.M., 8 vols. Rome (1957-77)  
trans: B. Scott James, St Bernard's  
Letters (1953)

Boso's Life of Alexander III

trans. Ellis, G.M., Oxford (1973)

The Chronicle of Battle Abbey, ed. Searle, E.,  
OMT, Oxford (1980)

Chronicles of the reign of Stephen, Henry II and  
Richard I, ed. Howlett, R., 4 vols. RS (1984-90)

Cicero: De Amicitia (Loeb edn & trans 1964)

Cicero: De inventione (Loeb edn & trans 1976)

Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers,  
ed. Häring, N.M., Toronto (1966)

English Episcopal Acta I: Lincoln 1067-1185, ed.  
Smith, D.M., The British Academy, London (1980)

English Episcopal Acta II: Canterbury 1162-1190,  
ed. Cheney, C.R. & Jones, B.E.A., The British  
Academy, London, (1986)

English Episcopal Acta VI: Norwich 1070-1214, ed.  
Harper-Bill, C., The British Academy, Oxford (1990)

Eugenius III: Epistolae et Privilegia, PL 180 cols  
1013-1614

Gallia Christiana---Opera et Studio monachorum  
Congregationis S. Mauri, 16 vols (1715-65)

Gerald of Wales: Vita Sancti Remigii, ed. Dimock,  
J.F., RS (1877)

Gerald of Wales Expugnatio Hibernica ed. Dimock,  
J.F., RS (1867)

Gervase of Canterbury: Opera historica ed. Stubbs,  
W., 2 vols, RS (1979-88)

Gesta Stephani ed. Potter, K.R., Oxford (1976)

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

Glanvill: The treatise on the laws and customs of the realm of England commonly called Glanvill (Tractatus de legibus et consuetudinibus regni Anglie qui Glanvilla vocatur) ed. Hall, G.D.G., NMT, London (1965)

Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence: La vie de Saint Thomas le martyr, ed Walberg, E.F.G., (Lund 1922)

Héfele, C.J. and Leclercq, H. et al., Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux, 10 vols. Paris (1907-38)

Henry of Huntingdon: Historia Anglorum ed Arnold T, RS (1879)

Henry of Rheims: Epistolae et diplomata, PL 196 cols 1565-84

Herbert of Bosham: Epistolae, PL 190 cols 1415-1474

JL: Regesta pontificum Romanorum...ad annum 1198, ed. Jaffé, P., 2nd ed. Loewenfeld, S. et al, 2 vols (Leipzig 1885-88)

John bishop of Poitiers: Epistolae, PL 209 cols 877-82

Lanfranc: Decreta Lanfranci: The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc ed. Knowles, D., NMT London (1951)

Le Neve, J., Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1066-1300 i, ii, iii, ed. Greenway, D.E., London (1971-1977)

Lucius II: Epistolae et privilegia, PL 179 cols  
823-936

Mansi, J.P., Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et  
Amplissima Collectio vol. 21 (1759)

Materials for the History of Thomas Becket ed.  
Robertson, J.C., (and for vol. 7 Robertson, J.C.  
and Sheppard, J.B.) 7 vols, RS (1875-85)

Matthew Paris: Chronica Majora ed. Luard, H.R.,  
vol. 2, AD 1067 to AD 1216 RS (1874)

Matthew Paris: Historia Anglorum sive, ut vulgo  
dicitur Historia Minor item ejusdem Abbreviatio  
Chronicorum Angliae 3 vols. ed. Madden, F.,  
RS (1866-9)

Ottonis et Rahewini Gesta Friderici I. Imperatoris  
Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum.  
MGH, Hanover & Leipzig (1912) (3rd edn.)

Papsturkunden in England, ed Holtzmann, W.,  
Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften  
zu Göttingen Phil-Hist Klasse Neue Folge, BD xxv  
1-2; Dritte Folge, xiv-xv, xxxiii Berlin-Göttingen  
(1930-52)

Ralph de Diceto: Radulfi de Diceto Decan  
Lundoniensis Opera Historica: The Historical Works  
of Master Ralph de Diceto Dean of London vol. 1,  
ed. Stubbs, W., RS (1876)

Ralph Niger: Radulfi Nigri Chronica: The Chronicles of Ralph Niger, London (1851)

Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France  
vol. 16, Brial, M-J-J., new edition dir.

Delisle, L., Paris (1877)

Recueil des actes de Henri II...concernant les provinces francaises et les affaires de France,

4 vols, ed. Delisle, L., Paris (1909)

Richard of Devizes: The Chronicle of Richard Devizes of the Time of King Richard the First: Cronicon Richardi Divisensis De Tempore Régis Richardi Primi ed. Appleby, J.T., NMT, London (1963)

Richard, FitzNigel: Dialogus de Scaccario: The Course of the Exchequer, ed. Johnson, C., OMT, Oxford (1983)

Robert de Melun: Oeuvres de Robert de Melun: tome I Questiones de Divina Pagina, Louvain, (1932)

Rogeri de Wendover libri qui dicitur flores historiatarum ab anno domini MCLIV annoque Henrici Anglorum regis secundi primo: The flowers of history by Roger de Wendover, ed. Howlett, H.G., vol. 1, RS (1886)

Rymer, T., Foedera, Conventiones, litterae et cujuscunque generis acta publica, inter reges Angliae et alios ab ingressu Gulielmi I in Anglican A.D. 1066 and nostra usque tempora habita aut tractata, 1066-1383 London (1816-69)

Thomas of Walsingham: Gesta abbatum monasterii  
Sancti Albani, ed. Riley, H.T., RS 3 vols. (1867)

Usserius: Veterum Epistolarum Hibernicarum sylloge  
Paris, (1665)

Virgil: Eclogues (Loeb edn. & trans. 1967)

Walter Daniel: The Life of Ailred of Rievaulx  
ed. Powicke M., NMT, London (1950)

William Malmesbury: The Historia Novella  
ed. Potter K.R., NMT, London, etc. (1955)

William of Tyre: Willelmi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi  
Chronicon: ed. Huygens, R.B.C., Corpus  
Christianorum LXIII, LXIII A, Brepols  
(1986)

Wilkins, D: Concilia Magnae Britanniae et  
Hiberniae, 4 vols. (1737)



III. SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abbott, E.A. St. Thomas of Canterbury His death and Miracles vol 1, London (1898)
- Baldwin, J.W. 'Masters at Paris from 1179 to 1215. A social Perspective'  
Renaissance and renewal in the twelfth century  
ed. Benson R.L & Constable G.  
Oxford (1982)
- Barlow, F. Thomas Becket and His Clerks  
Canterbury (1987)
- \_\_\_\_\_, Thomas Becket London (1986)
- \_\_\_\_\_, The English Church 1066-1154  
London (1979)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The English, Norman and the French Councils called to deal with the Papal Schism of 1159'  
English Historical Review vol 51  
(1936) pp 264-268
- Barracclough, G. The Medieval Papacy London (1968)
- Bartlett, R. Gerald of Wales (1146-1223)  
Oxford (1982)
- Becquet, J. 'Les évêques de Limoges aux X<sup>e</sup>, XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles'  
Bulletin de la Société  
archéologique et histoire du

Limousin vol 6 pp 85-114 (1979)

Beech, G.T.

A rural society in medieval  
France: The gâtine of Poitou in  
the eleventh and twelfth centuries  
Baltimore (1964)

Bell, D.N.

'The Preface to De Commendazione  
Fidei of Baldwin of Ford'  
Commentarii Cistercienses vol 36  
(1985) pp 152-157

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Corpus of the Work of Baldwin  
of Ford'

Commentarii Cistercienses vol 35  
(1984) pp 215-234

Benjamin, R.

'A Forty years war: Toulouse and  
the Plantagenets, 1156-96' The  
Bulletin of the Institute of  
Historical Research vol 61 (1988)  
pp 270-285

Benson, R.L.

The bishop-elect Princeton (1968)

Benson, R.L. &  
Constable, G.(ed)

Renaissance and renewal in the  
twelfth century Oxford (1982)

Benton, J.F.

'Nicholas of Clairvaux and the  
twelfth century sequence with  
special reference to Adam of St.  
Victor'  
Traditio vol 43 (1962) pp 149-215

- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'Philology's Search for Abelard in  
the Metamorphosis Goliae'  
Speculum vol 50 (1975) pp 199-217
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Court of Champagne as a  
Literary Center'  
Speculum vol 36 (1961) pp 551-91
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Revenue of Louis VII'  
Speculum vol 42 (1967) pp 84-91
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'Suger's Life and Personality'  
Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis: A  
Symposium, ed Gerson, P.L.,  
New York (1986) pp 3-15
- Bethell, D. 'William of Corbeil and the  
Canterbury York Dispute'  
Journal of Ecclesiastical History  
vol 19 (1968) pp 145-159
- Bienvenu, J.-M. 'L'ordre de Fontevraud et la  
Normandie au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle'  
Annales de Normandie  
vol 35 (1985) pp 3-15
- Bishop, T.A.M. Scriptores regis Oxford (1961)
- Blake, D.W. 'The Church of Exeter in the  
Norman Period' Exeter M.A. Thesis  
(1970)

- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Development of the chapter of  
the diocese of Exeter 1050-1161'  
Journal of Medieval History vol 8  
(1982) pp 1-11
- Bligny, B.  
'Les premiers Chartreux et la  
pauvreté' Le Moyen Age vol 57  
(1951) pp 27-60
- Biossonade, P.  
'Administrateurs laïque et  
ecclésiastique Anglo-Normands en  
Poitou a l'époque d'Henri II'  
Bulletin de la société des  
antiquaire de ouest (1919)  
pp 156-190
- Bolgar, R.P. ed.  
Classical influences on European  
culture 500-1500 Cambridge (1971)
- Bonnard, F.  
Histoire de l'Abbaye royale et de  
l'ordre des chanoines réguliers de  
St-Victor de Paris 2 vols  
(1904-8)
- Bourrienne, V.  
Un grand bâtisseur Philippe de  
Harcourt Paris (1956)
- Boussard, J.  
Le gouvernement d'Henri II  
Plategenêt Paris (1956)
- Boyancé, P.  
'Cicéron et la vie contemplative'  
Latomus vol 26 (1967) pp 3-26

- Bredero, A.H. 'Thomas Becket et la canonisation de saint Bernard'  
Thomas Becket: Actes du colloque international de Sédicière, 19-24 août 1973 ed. Foreville, R., Paris (1975) pp 55-62
- Brixius, J.M. Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums von 1130-1181  
Berlin (1912)
- Brooke, C.N.L. 'Gregorian Reform in Action: Clerical Marriage in England, 1050-1200'  
The Cambridge Historical Journal vol 12 (1956) pp 1-21
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'John of Salisbury and his World',  
The World of John of Salisbury  
Oxford (1984) pp 1-20.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Twelfth-century renaissance  
London (1969)
- Brooke, C.N.L. Church and government in the middle ages - Essays presented to C.R. Cheney on his 70th birthday Cambridge (1976)
- Luscombe, D.E.
- Martin, G.H.
- Owen, D. ed.
- Brooke, Z.N. 'The Effect of Becket's Murder on Papal Authority in England'  
The Cambridge Historical Journal vol 2 (1928) pp 212-218

\_\_\_\_\_ ,  
'The Register of Master David of  
London, and the part he played in  
the Becket Crisis'

Essays in History presented to  
Reginald Lane Poole ed.

Davis, H.W., Oxford (1927)

pp 227-45

Brown, P.

The Cult of the Saints

Chicago (1981)

Brown, M.A.

'John of Salisbury'

Franciscan Studies vol 19 (1959)

pp 241-97

Bur, M.

La formation du comté de Champagne

v 950 - v 1150 Nancy (1177)

Bynum, C.W.

'Did the Twelfth Century Discover  
the Individual?'

Journal of Ecclesiastical History

vol 31 (1980) pp 1-17

Camargo, M.

'The Libellus de arte dictandi

rhetorice Attributed to Peter

of Blois' Speculum vol 59 (1984)

pp 16-41

Chadwick, H.

The Early Church London (1967)

Chalandon, F.

Histoire de la domination Normande  
en Italie et en Sicile

New York (1960), (originally  
published in Paris 1907)

- Chaplais, P. Essays in Medieval Diplomacy and Administration London (1981)
- Châtillon, J. 'Théologie, spiritualité et métaphysique dans l'oeuvre oratoire d'Achard de St. Victor' Études de Philosophie médiévale vol 58 (1969) pp 53-85
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'L' influence de S. Bernard sur la pensée scolastique au XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle' Saint Bernard theologien, Analecta sacri ordinis Cisterciensis 9 (1952) pp 268-88
- Chédeville, A. et al Histoire de Chartres et du pays Chartrain Toulouse (1983)
- Cheney, C.R. 'The Punishment of Felonous Clerks' The English Historical Review vol 51 pp 215-236 (1936)
- \_\_\_\_\_, From Becket to Langton - English Church Government 1170-1213 Manchester (1956)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The deaths of popes and the expiry of legations in twelfth century England' Revue de droit canonique vol 28 (1978) pp 84-96

- \_\_\_\_\_,  
English bishop's chanceries  
1100-1250 Manchester (1950)
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
The English Church and its Laws  
12th-14th centuries  
Variorum Reprints London (1982)
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'The office and title of the papal  
chancellor 1187-1216'  
Archivum historiae pontificiae  
vol 22 (1984) pp 369-376
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
The Papacy and England 12th-14th  
Variorum reprints, London (1982)
- Cheney, M.  
Roger, Bishop of Worcester  
1164-1179, Oxford (1980)
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'William FitzStephen and his Life  
of Archbishop Thomas'  
Church and government in the  
middle ages: Essays presented to  
C.R. Cheney on his 70th Birthday  
ed. Brooke, C.N.L. et al  
Cambridge (1976) pp 139-56
- Chibnall, M.  
'John of Salisbury as historian'  
The World of John of Salisbury  
ed. Wilks, M. Oxford (1984)  
pp 169-178



- Chodorow, S. 'Dishonest Litigation in the Church Courts, 1140-98'  
Law church and society  
ed. Pennington, K. and Somerville, R. pp 187-206
- Clanchy, M.T. 'Moderni in Education and Government in England'  
Speculum (1975) pp 671-688
- Classen, P. 'Das Decretum Gratiani wurde nicht in Ferentino approbiert'  
Bulletin of Medieval canon law  
vol 8 (1978) pp 38-40
- Clay, C.T. 'The Early Treasurers of York'  
Yorkshire Archaeological Journal  
vol 35 (1940-3) pp 11-19
- Colish, M.L. 'Teaching & learning theology in medieval Paris'  
Schools of thought in the Christian tradition dedicated to Jaroslav Pelikan  
Philadelphia (1984) pp 106-124
- Colker, L. 'The Trial of Gilbert of Poitiers, 1148: A previously Unknown Record' Medieval Studies  
vol 27 (1965) pp 152-183

Colvin, H.M.

The White Canons in England

Oxford (1951)

Constable, G.

Medieval Monasticism - a select

bibliography Toronto (1976)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'The abbots and anti-abbot of  
Cluny during the Papal Schism of  
1159' Revue Bénédictine, vol 90  
(1984) pp 487-502

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Structure of Medieval Society  
According to the Dictatores of The  
Twelfth Century'

Law, church and society ed.

Pennington, K. & Somerville, R.

pp 253-67

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Second Crusade as seen by  
Contemporaries'

Traditio vol 9 (1953) pp 213-279

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Alleged Disgrace of John of  
Salisbury in 1159'

English Historical Review

vol 69 (1954) pp 67-76

\_\_\_\_\_,  
Letters and letter-collections

Typologie des Sources du Moyen Age

Occidental fasc 17 Brepols, 1976

\_\_\_\_\_,  
The letters of Peter the Venerable

vols 1 and 2, Cambridge, Mass.

(1967)

- Constable, G. & Kritzeck, J. ed Petrus Venerabilis 1156-1956-  
Studies and texts commemorating  
the eight centenary of his death  
Rome (1956)
- Cosgrove, A. ed. A New History of Ireland II:  
Medieval Ireland 1169-1534  
Oxford (1987)
- Cowdrey, H.E.J. 'The Anglo-Norman Laudes Regiae'  
Viator vol 12 (1981) pp 37-78
- Cronne, H.A. The Reign of Stephen 1135-54  
Anarchy in England London (1970)
- Crosby, E.U. 'The Organization of the English  
Episcopate under Henry I'  
Studies in Medieval and  
Renaissance History Univ. of  
Nebraska Press, Lincoln (1967)  
pp 3-64
- Crouch, D. The Beaumont Twins  
Cambridge (1986)
- Crubellier, M. dir ed. Histoire de la Champagne  
Univers de la France et des pays  
francophones, Toulouse (1975)
- d'Alverny, M-T. 'Translations and Translators'  
Renaissance and renewal in the  
Twelfth Century  
ed. Benson, R.L. & Constable, G.  
pp 421-62

- David, C.W. Robert Curthose, Cambridge, Mass.  
(1920)
- Davis, R.H.C. King Stephen 1135-1154  
London (1967)
- Davison, E.S. Forerunners of Saint Francis  
Cambridge (1927)
- de Gryse, L.M. 'Some observations on the origin  
of the Flemish Bailiff: The reign  
of Philip of Alsace' Viator  
vol 7 (1976) pp 243-95
- Delhaye, P. 'L'Enseignement de la philosophie  
morale au VII<sup>e</sup> siècle'  
Medieval Studies vol 11 (1949)  
pp 77-99
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'Quelque points de la morale  
d'Abélard' Sapientiae Doctrina:  
Mélanges de Théologie et de  
Littérature Médiévales offerts à  
Dom Hildebrand O.S.B.  
Louvain (1980) pp 39-60
- D'Haenens 'Aller à Rome au moyen âge'  
Bulletin de l'institut historique  
Belge de Rome vol 50, pp 93-129  
(1980)

- Denholm-Young, N. 'The Cursus in England'  
Oxford Essays in Medieval History  
presented to Herbert Edward Salter  
Oxford (1934) pp 68-103
- Desportes, P. dir ed. Histoire de Reims  
Univers de la France et des pays  
francophones, Toulouse (1983)
- Devailly, G. Le Berry du X<sup>e</sup>, siècle au milieu  
du XIII<sup>e</sup>, Paris (1973)
- Dickinson, J. 'The Medieval Conception of  
Kingship and some of its  
Limitations, Developed in the  
Policraticus of John of Salisbury'  
Speculum 1, (1926) pp 308-337
- Dickinson, J.C. The origins of the Austin canons  
and their introduction into  
England, London (1950)
- Dronke, P. Women Writers of Middle Ages  
Cambridge (1984)
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'New Approaches to the School of  
Chartres' Anuario de estudios  
medievales  
vol 6 (1969) pp 117-140
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
The Medieval Poet and his World  
Rome (1984)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'Peter of Blois and Poetry at the  
Court of Henry II'

Medieval Studies vol 38

Toronto (1976) pp 185-235

Duggan, A.

Thomas Becket: A textual history  
of his letters, Oxford (1980)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'John of Salisbury and Thomas  
Becket' The World of John of

Salisbury, ed. Wilks, M.,

pp 427-438

Duggan, A.

'The Coronation of the Young King'

as Heslin, A.

Studies in Church History 2

Papers read at the second winter  
and summer meetings of the

Ecclesiastical History Society

ed. Cuming, G.J., London (1968)

pp 165-78

Duggan, C.

'Bishop John and Archdeacon

Richard of Poitiers: their roles  
in the Becket dispute and its  
aftermath'

ed. Foreville, R.

Thomas Becket - Actes du Colloque  
International du Sédicières 19-24

Août 1973 Paris (1975) pp 71-83

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'Richard of Ilchester, Royal  
Servant and Bishop'

Transactions of the Royal  
Historical Society ser 5 vol 16  
(1966) pp 1-21

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Becket Dispute and the  
Criminous Clerks'  
Bulletin of the Institute of  
Historical Research, vol 35 (1962)  
pp 1-28

\_\_\_\_\_,  
Twelfth-century Decretal  
Collections and their importance  
in English History London (1963)

Duggan, C. and  
Duggan A.

'Ralph de Diceto, Henry II and  
Becket with an Appendix on  
Decretal Letters' Authority and  
Power - Studies on Medieval Law  
and Government presented to Walter  
Ullman on his seventieth birthday  
ed. Tierney, B. and Linehan, P.  
Cambridge (1980) pp 59-81

Dunbabin, J.

France in the Making 843-1180  
Oxford (1985)

Dunken, G.

Die politische Wirksamkeit der  
"päpstlichen Legaten in der Zeit  
des Kampfes zwischen Kaisertum  
und Papsttum in Oberitalien unter  
Friedrich I Berlin (1931)

- Dupuy, A. 'La representation du Saint-Siège  
appres des organizations  
gouvernementales'  
Le Saint-Siège dans la diplomatie  
Multilatérale, Paris (1980)
- Edwards, K. The English secular cathedrals in  
the middle ages, Manchester (1949)
- Engen, J. Van 'The "Crisis of Cenobitism"  
Reconsidered: Benedictine  
Monasticism in the years  
1050-1150' Speculum vol 61 (1986)
- Evans, J. Monastic life at Cluny  
Oxford (1968)  
(first published 1931)
- Evergates, T. Feudal society in the bailliage  
of Troyes under the counts of  
Champagne, 1152-1282, Baltimore -  
London (1975)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Chancery Archives of the  
Counts of Champagne: Codicology  
and History of the Cartulary-  
Registers' Viator vol 16 (1985)
- Eyton, R.W. Court, household and itinery of  
King Henry II, London (1878)



- Falkenstein, L. 'Pontificalis Maturitas vel Modestia Sacerdotalis? Alexander III und Heinrich von Frankreich in den Jahren 1170-1172'  
Archivum Historiae Pontificiae  
vol. 22, Rome (1984) pp 31-88
- 
- 'Appelationen and den Papst und Delegations-gerichtsbarkeit an Beispiel Alexander III und Heinrichs von Frankreich'  
Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte  
vol 97 (1936) pp 36-65
- Favreau, P. Le diocèse de Poitiers, Histoire des diocèses de France, vol 22, Paris (1988)
- Fawtier, R. The Capetian kings of France  
trans. Butler L. & Adam, R.J.  
London (1960)
- Feiss, H. Peter of Celle, Selected works  
Cistercian studies Vol 100  
Kalamazoo, Mich. (1987)
- Ferruolo, C. The Origins of the University-  
The Schools of Paris and their Critics, Stanford (1985)
- Finucane, C. Miracles and pilgrims - Popular beliefs in medieval England  
London (1977)

- Flahiff, G.B. 'Ralph Niger - an introduction to his life and works'  
Mediaeval Studies, vol 2, (1940)  
pp 104-26
- Flanagan, M.T. Irish society, Anglo-Norman settlers, Angevin Kingship- Interactions in Ireland in the Late Twelfth Century  
Oxford (1989)
- Flori, J. 'La Chevalerie selon Jean de Salisbury: (Nature, Fonction, Ideologie)'  
Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique,  
vol 72 (1982) pp 35-77
- Foreville, R. 'La diffusion du culte de Thomas Becket dans la France de l'Ouest avant la fin du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle'  
Cahiers des Civilisation Médiévale  
vol 19 (1976) pp 347-369
- \_\_\_\_\_, Thomas Becket dans la tradition historique et hagiographique  
Variorum reprint, London (1981)
- \_\_\_\_\_, L'Eglise et la royauté en Angleterre sous Henri II Plantegenêt (1154-1189)  
Paris (1942)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'Une Lettre Inédite de Jean de  
Salisbury, Evêque de Chartres'  
Revue d'Histoire de l'Eglise de  
France, vol 22 (1936) pp 179-85

\_\_\_\_\_, ed.  
Thomas Becket: Actes du colloque  
international de Sédicière, 19-24  
août 1973, Paris (1975)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'La place de Latran III dans  
l'histoire conciliaire du XII<sup>e</sup>  
siècle' Le Troisième Concile de  
Latran (1179), ed. Longère, J.  
Etudes Augustinienne (1982)  
pp 11-18

\_\_\_\_\_,  
Latran, I, II, III et Latran IV,  
Paris (1965)

Fraher, R.M.

'The Becket dispute and two  
decretist traditions: the  
Bolognese masters revisited and  
some new Anglo-Norman texts'  
Journal of Medieval History  
vol 4 (1978) p 347-368

France, J.

'St. Bernard, archbishop Eskil,  
and the danish Cistercians'  
Cîteaux vol 89 (1988) pp 232-248

- Fried, J. 'Gerard Pucelle und Köln'  
Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung  
für Rechtsgeschichte Kanonistische  
Abteilung  
vol 99 (1982) pp 125-135
- Gabriel, A.L. 'English Masters and Students in  
Paris during the XIIth Century'  
Analecta Praemonstratensia  
vol 25 (1949) pp 51-95
- Garfagnini, G.C. 'Da Seneca a Giovanni di  
Salisbury: "Auctoritates" Morali  
e "vitae Philosophorum" in un Ms.  
Trecentesco' Rinascimento  
Firenze (1980) pp 201-247
- Gasparri, F. 'Godefroid de Saint-Victor: une  
personnalité peu connue du monde  
intellectuel et artistique  
Parisien au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle'  
Scriptorium vol 39 (1985)  
pp 57-67
- \_\_\_\_\_ /  
'Le Dossier Paléographique de  
Godefroid de Saint-Victor'  
Scriptorium  
vol 36 (1982) pp 29-50
- Gaudemet, J. Eglise et société en Occident au  
moyen âge  
Variorum reprints London (1984)

- Gaussin, P-R. 'Y a-t-il en une politique monastique des Plantegenêt?  
Cahiers des Civilization Médiévale  
X<sup>e</sup> - XII<sup>e</sup> siècles vol 29 (1986)  
pp 83-94
- Geisthardt, F. 'Der Kämmerer Boso'  
Historische Studien Heft 293  
Berlin (1936) pp 26-40
- Giacono, R. 'Masters books and library at Chartres According to the cartularies of Notre-Dame and Saint-Père'  
Vivarium vol 12 (1974) pp 30-51
- Gibson, M. Lanfranc of Bec  
Oxford (1978)
- Gillingham, J. Richard the Lionheart  
London (1978)
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Life and times of Richard I  
London (1973)
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Angevin Empire London (1984)
- Glorieux, P. 'Candidates à la Pourpre en 1178'  
Mélanges de science religieuse  
vol 11 (1954) pp 5-30

- Gray, J.W. 'The Ius Praesentandi in England  
from the Constitutions of  
Clarendon to Bracton'  
English Historical Review vol 67  
(1952) pp 481-508
- Greenaway, G. Arnold of Brescia  
Cambridge (1931)
- Guillemain, B. 'L'épiscopat français à Latran  
III' Le Troisième Concile de  
Latran (1179)  
ed. Longère, J.  
Etudes Augustinienne (1982)  
pp 23-32
- Guth, K. Johannes von Salisbury  
(1115/20 - 1180): Studien zur  
Kirchen-Kultur und  
Sozialgeschichte West Europas im  
12 Jahrhundert,  
Münchener Theologische Studien,  
Historische Abteilung 20  
Sankt Ottilien (1978)

Guth, K.

'Standesethos als Ausdruck  
hochmittelalterlicher Lebensform  
zur Gestalt des ethischen  
Humanismus in der Briefwelt des  
Johannes von Salisbury  
(1115/20 - 1180)'

Freiburger Zeitschrift f.

Philosophie u. Theologie vol 28

(1981) pp 111-132

Hall, J.B.

'Note on the 'Entheticus' of John  
of Salisbury, Traditio  
vol 39 (1983) pp 444-7

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'Towards a Text of John of  
Salisbury's "Metalogicon"

Studi Medievali vol 25 (1984)

pp 791-816

Hallam, E.M.

Capetian France 987-1328

London (1980)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'Henry II, Richard I and the order  
of Grandmont'

Journal of Medieval History

vol 1 (1975) pp 165-86

Halphen, L.

Etudes sur L'administration de

Rome au Moyen Age (751-1252)

Paris (1907) reprinted in N.Y.

1974

Haring, N.M.

'The Case of Gilbert de la Porrée  
Bishop of Poitiers'

Medieval Studies vol 8 (1951)

pp 1-40

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'Notes on the Council and the  
Consistory of Rheims (1148)'

Medieval Studies vol 28 (1966),

pp 39-59

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'Zur Geschichte der Schulen von  
Poitiers im 12. Jahrhundert'

Archiv für Kulturgeschichte vol 47

(1965) pp 23-47

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'Chartres and Paris revisited'

Essays in honour of Anton Charles

Pegis ed. O'Donnell, J.R.,

Toronto (1974) pp 268-329

Harper-Bill, C.

'Bishop William Turbe and the  
Diocese of Norwich 1146-1174'

Anglo-Norman Studies vol 7 (1975)

pp 142-60

Harris, M.A.

'Influence on the Thought of Alan  
of Tewkesbury'

The Journal of Ecclesiastical

History vol 33 (1982) pp 10-15

Haskins, C.H.

The renaissance of the twelfth

century, Cambridge, Mass. (1928)



Norman Institutions

New York (1918)

Higonnet, E.C.

'Spiritual Ideas in the Letters of  
Peter of Blois'

Speculum vol 50 (1975)

pp 218-344

Hingeston-Randolph, F.C. The Register of Walter de  
Stapledon Bishop of Exeter  
(A.D. 1307-1326) London,  
Exeter (1892)

Hohenleutner, H.

Studien zur Briefsammlung und zur  
Kitchenpolitik des Johannes von  
Salisbury

Inaugural Dissertation,  
Universität Ludwig-Maximilians  
München (1953)

Holdsworth, C.J.

'Another Stage...A Different  
World': Ideas and People around  
Exeter in the Twelfth Century  
Exeter (1979)

Hunt, N. ed.

Cluniac Monasticism in the Central  
Middle Ages London (1971)

Hunt, R.W.

'Studies on Priscian in the  
Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries'  
Medieval and Renaissance Studies  
vol 1 (1941) pp 194-231

- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'Studies on Priscian, in the  
Twelfth Century' Mediaeval and  
Renaissance Studies vol 2 (1950)  
pp 1-56
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'English Learning in the Late  
Twelfth Century'  
English Historical Review  
vol 52 (1937) pp 19-42
- Huygens, R.B.C. 'Guillaume de Tyr étudiant: Un  
chapitre (XIX, 12) de son  
"Histoire" retrouvé'  
Latomus vol 21 (1962)  
pp 811-29
- Huizinga, J. Men and Ideas: History, the Middle  
Ages, the Renaissance  
trans. London (1960)
- Hyde, J.K. Society and Politics in Medieval  
Italy London (1973)
- James, M.R. The Ancient Libraries of  
Canterbury and Dover  
Cambridge (1903)
- Jeauneau, E. "Lectio Philosophorum"  
Recherches sur l'Ecole de Chartres  
Amsterdam (1973)

- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'Jean de Salisbury et la lecture  
des philosophes'  
The World of John of Salisbury  
ed. Wilks M. pp 77-108
- Jewell, H. English Local Administration in  
the Middle Ages New York (1972)
- Jolliffe, J.E.A. Angevin Kingship London (1963)
- Janson, T. Mechanisms of Language Change in  
Latin Stockholm (1979)
- Jordon, K. Henry the Lion, A biography  
trans. from the German  
Oxford (1986)
- Kealey, E.J. Roger of Salisbury, Viceroy of  
England London (1972)
- Keats-Rohan, K. 'John of Salisbury and education  
in twelfth-century Paris from the  
account in his Metalogicon',  
History of Universities 6  
(1985-6) pp 1-45
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Chronology of John of  
Salisbury's Studies in France:  
A Reading of [Metalogicon] II.  
10' Studi Medievali vol 28  
(1987) pp 193-203
- Ker, N.R. Medieval Libraries in Great  
Britain London (1964) (2nd edn.)

- Klibansky, R. 'Peter Abailard and Bernard of Clairvaux'  
Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies  
vol 5 (1961) pp 1-26
- Knowles, D. Thomas Becket London (1970)
- \_\_\_\_\_, The episcopal colleagues of archbishop Thomas Becket  
Cambridge (1951)
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Historian and Character and other essays Cambridge (1963)
- Knowles, D. & Hadcock, R.N. Medieval Religious Houses in England and Wales London (1953)
- Knowles, D., Duggan, A. & Brooke, C.N.L. 'Henry II's Supplement to the Constitutions of Clarendon'  
English Historical Review vol 87  
(1972) pp 757-71
- Knowles, D., Brooke, C.N.L. & London, V.C. The Heads of Religious Houses in England and Wales 940-1216  
Cambridge (1972)
- Kobler, A. 'Die Martyrer Englands im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert'  
Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie vol 8 (1884)  
pp 444-447

Kupper, J-L.

'La chancellerie impériale dans  
le seconde moitié du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle  
Le Moyen Age vol 90 (1984)  
pp 487-502

Kuttner, S.

Gratian and the Schools of Law  
1140-1234

Variorum Reprints London (1983)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
Medieval Councils, Decretals, and  
Collections of Canon Law

Variorum Reprints London (1980)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'Cardinalis; the History of a  
Canonical Concept'

Traditio vol 2 (1944)

pp 129-215

Kuttner, S. &

Rathbone, E.

'Anglo-Norman canonists of the  
twelfth century: An Introductory  
study'

Traditio vol 7 (1949-51)

pp 279-358

Laarhoven, J. van

'Non Iam Decreta, sed Evangelium!

Jean de Salisbury au Latran III'

ed. Mario F. et al

Dalla chiesa antica alla chiesa

moderna, Miscellanea per il

cinquantesimo della facolta di

storia ecclesiastica della

pontificia Universita Gregoriana

Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae

50 Roma (1983) pp 107-119

Labande, E-R.

'Les filles d'Alienor d'Aquitaine:  
étude comparative'

Cahiers des Civilization Médiévale

vol. 29 (1986) pp 101-112

Lally, J.

The Court and Household of King

Henry II, 1154-1187

University of Liverpool,

Ph.D. thesis (1969)

'Secular patronage at the court of  
King Henry II' pp 159-184

Bulletin of the Institute of

Historical Research

vol 49 (1976) pp 159-184

Landon, L.

'The early archdeacons of Norwich diocese'

Proceedings of the Suffolk

Institute of Archaeology and

Natural History vol 20 (1930)

pp 11-35

Landgraf, A.

'Studien zur Theologie des Zwölften Jahrhunderts'

Traditio vol 1 (1943) pp 183-222

Leclercq, J.

'Autour de la correspondance de S. Bernard'

Sapientiae Doctrina: Mélanges de Théologie et Litterature

Médiévales offerts à Dom

Hildebrand Bascour O.S.B.

Louvain (1980) pp 185-198

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'Textes sur Saint Bernard et Gilbert de la Porrée'

Mediaeval Studies

vol 14 (1952) pp 107-128

\_\_\_\_\_,  
Recueil d'Etudes sur Saint

Bernard et ses Ecrits 3 vols

Rome (1962-9)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
Monks & Love in Twelfth-Century

France: phycho-historical essays

Oxford (1979)

Leclercq, J.

'Nouvelles Lettres de Pierre de Celle' Studia Anselmiana vol 43 (1958) pp 160-179

\_\_\_\_\_,  
The Love of Learning and the Desire for God (A translation of L'Amour des lettres et le desir de Dieu:

Initiation aux auteurs monastiques du moyen âge) New York (1982)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
La Spiritualité de Pierre de Celle (1115-1183) Paris (1946)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'L'Amitié dans les lettres au Moyen Age autour d'un Manuscrit de la Bibliotheque de Petrarque'  
Revue de Moyen Age Latin vol 1 (1945) pp 391-410

Le Goff, J.

Les intellectuels au moyen âge  
Paris (1957)

Lemarignier J-F. &  
Poirier-Coutainsais F.  
ed.

Gallia Monastica vol I: Les Abbeyes Bénédictines du Diocèse de Reims Paris (1974)

Lerer, S.

'John of Salisbury's Virgil'  
Vivarium vol 20 (1982) pp 24-39



- Lesne, E. Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France (tome V)  
Les écoles de la fin du viii<sup>e</sup> siècle à la fin du xii<sup>e</sup>  
Lille (1940)
- Lewis, A.W. Royal Succession in Capetian France; Studies on Familial Order and the State  
Cambridge, Mass & London (1981)
- Leyser, K. 'The Crisis of Medieval Germany'  
Proceedings of the British Academy  
vol 69 (1983) pp 409-443
- Liebeschütz, H. Medieval Humanism in the Life and writings of John of Salisbury  
London (1950)
- Linder, A. 'The Knowledge of John of Salisbury' in the late Middle Ages  
Studi medievali vol 18 (1977)  
pp 315-66
- Lloyd, J.E. A History of Wales 2 vols  
London (1911)
- Loewe, R. 'The Mediaeval Christian Hebraists of England - Herbert of Bosham and Earlier Scholars'  
Jewish Historical Society of England Transactions vol 17 (1953)  
pp 225-249

- Logan, R.D. 'A Conception of the self in the later middle ages'  
Journal of Medieval History  
vol 11 (1985) pp 253-269
- Longère, J. ed Le Troisième Concile de Latran (1179), sa place dans l'histoire communications présentées à la table ronde du C.N.R.S. Le 26 Avril 80 Paris Etudes Augustiniennes (1982)
- Lot, F. & Fawtier, R. Histoire des Institutions Françaises au Moyen Age 3 vols Paris (1957-62)
- Luchoire, A. Social France at the Time of Philip Augustus trans. by Krehbiel, E.B. New York (1912)
- Luscombe, D.E. 'The reception of the writing of Denis the pseudo-Areopagite into England' Tradition and Change ed. Greenway, D. et al  
Cambridge (1984) pp 115-143
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Authorship of the Ysagoge in Theologiam'  
Archives d'histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Age vol 35  
(1969) pp 7-16

---

'Trivium, quadrivium and the  
organization of schools'

L'europa de secoli XI e XII fra  
novità e tradizione: sviluppi di  
una cultura: Atti della decima  
Settima internazionale di studio  
Mendola, 25-29 agosto 1986 Milano  
(1989)

---

Peter Abelard's Ethics  
Oxford (1971)

---

"Peter Comestor"  
The Bible in the Medieval World  
ed. Walsh, K. & Wood, D., Oxford  
(1985)

---

The School of Peter Abelard: the  
influence of Abelard's thought in  
the early scholastic period  
Cambridge (1969)

Mack Smith, D.

A History of Sicily: Medieval  
Sicily 800-1713 London (1968)

Malone, S.

'Adrian IV and Ireland'  
Dublin Review vol 10 (1883)  
pp 83-102

---

'Adrian IV and Ireland'  
Dublin Review vol 11 (1883)  
pp 316-343

- Manitius, M. Geschichte der lateinischen  
Literatur des Mittelalters,  
vol 3 Munich (1931)
- Martel, G. de 'Pierre de Celle à Rheims'  
Mémoires de la Société  
d'Agriculture Commerce, Sciences  
et Arts du Département de la Marne  
vol 89 (1974) pp 71-104
- Martin, J. 'Uses of Tradition: Gellius,  
Petronius, and John of Salisbury'  
Viator vol 10 (1979) pp 57-76
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'John of Salisbury as classical  
scholar' The World of John of  
Salisbury ed. Wilks, M.  
pp 179-201
- Massey, H. J. 'John of Salisbury: some aspects  
of his political philosophy'  
Classica et Mediaevalia  
vol 28 (1967) pp 357-372
- Mayr-Harting, H. 'Henry II and the papacy  
1170-1189' Journal of  
Ecclesiastical History vol 16  
(1965) pp 39-53
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Hilary, bishop of Chichester  
(1147-1169) and Henry II'  
English Historical Review  
vol 78 (1963) pp 209-24

\_\_\_\_\_,  
The Acta of the Bishops of  
Chichester 1075-1207,  
Torquay (1964)

McGarry, D.D.

'Educational theory in the  
Metalogicon of John of Salisbury'  
Speculum vol 23 (1948) pp 659-75

McGuire, B.P.

'Why Scandinavia? Bernard, Eskil  
and Cistercian Expansion in the  
North 1140-80' Goad and Nail  
ed. Elder, E.R., Cistercian  
Studies series vol 84, Studies in  
medieval Cistercian history  
vol 10 Kalamazoo, Mich.  
(1985) pp 251-281

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'The collapse of monastic  
friendship: the case of Jocelin  
and Samson of Bury'  
Journal of Medieval History vol 4  
(1978) pp 369-397

McKeon, R.

'Rhetoric in the Middle Age'  
Speculum vol 17 (1942) pp 1-32

McLoughlin, J.P.

'The language of persecution:  
John of Salisbury and the early  
phase of the Becket dispute  
1163-66' Persecution and  
Toleration ed. Sheils, W.J.,  
Studies in Church History 21  
Oxford (1984) pp 73-87

---

John of Salisbury (c. 1120-1180):  
The Career and Attitudes of a  
Schoolman in Church Politics,  
Ph.D. thesis, Trinity College  
Dublin (1988)

Miczka, G.

Das Bild der Kirche bei Johannes  
von Salisbury  
Bonner historische Forschungen 34  
Bonn (1970)

Millett, B.

'Les Diocèses d'Irlande jusqu'au  
xv<sup>e</sup> siècle'  
Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique  
vol 80 (1985) pp 5-50

Milson, S.F.C.

The Legal Framework of English  
Feudalism Cambridge (1976)

Minio-Paluello, L.

Adam Balsamiensis Parvipontani ars  
disserendi (Dialectica Alexandri)  
Roma (1956)

---

Opuscula: the Latin Aristotle  
Amsterdam (1972)

- Moore, R.I. The Birth of Popular Heresy  
London (1975)
- , The Origins of European Dissent  
London (1977)
- Moorhead, J. 'Papa as bishop of Rome'  
Journal of Ecclesiastical History  
vol 36 (1985) pp 337-350
- Moos, P. von Geschichte als Topik: Das  
rhetorische Exemplum von der  
Antike zur Neuzeit und die  
historiae im "Policraticus"  
Johanns von Salisbury  
Hildesheim, Zurich, New York  
(1988)
- , 'The use of exempla in the  
Policraticus of John of  
Salisbury' The World of John  
of Salisbury, Oxford (1984)  
pp 207-262
- Moreau, E. de Histoire de l'Eglise en Belgique  
L'église féodale 1122-1378  
vol 3 Brussels (1945)
- Morey, A. Bartholomew of Exeter, Bishop and  
Canonist Cambridge (1937)
- Morey, A. & Gilbert Foliot & his letters  
Brooke C.N.L. Cambridge (1965)

Morizot, M.P.

'Jean de Salisbury et la  
Champagne' Mémoires de la Société  
d'Agriculture Science et Arts du  
Département de l'Aube vol 99 (1939)  
pp 257-291

Morris, J.

Life and Martyrdom of Saint Thomas  
Becket London (1885 2nd ed)

Morris, W.A.

The Medieval English Sheriff  
Manchester (1927)

Murphy, J.J.

Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A  
history of rhetorical theory from  
St. Augustine to the Renaissance  
Berkeley, Los Angeles,  
London (1974)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Arts of Discourse 1050-1400'  
Mediaeval Studies vol. 22 (1960)  
pp. 194-205

Munz, P.

Frederick Barbarossa  
London (1969)

Nederman, J.

'Aristotelian Ethics and John of  
Salisbury's Letters'  
Viator vol 18 (1987) pp 16-73

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Aristotelian Doctrine of the  
mean and John of Salisbury's  
concept of liberty' Vivarium  
vol 24 (1986) pp 128-42



- Nederman, C.J. &  
Brückmann, J. 'Aristotelianism in John of  
Salisbury's Policraticus'  
Journal of the History of  
Philosophy vol 21 (1983) pp 203-29
- Nielsen, L.O. Theology and Philosophy in the  
Twelfth Century  
- A Study of Gilbert Porreta's  
Thinking and the Theological  
Expositions of the Doctrine of the  
Incarnation during the Period  
1130-1180 Leiden (1982)
- Noonan, J.T. 'Who was Rolandus?'  
Law, Church and Society, Essays in  
Honor of Stephen Kuttner  
ed. Pennington K. & Somerville R.,  
pp 21-48
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Bribery in John of Salisbury'..  
Proceedings of the VIIth  
International Congress of Medieval  
Canon Law, Cambridge 23-27 July  
1984, ed. Linehan, P., (Monumenta  
iuris canonici, ser. C: Subsidia,  
vol 8) Vatican, 1988 pp 197-203
- Norgate, K. 'The Bull Laudabiliter'  
English Historical Review vol 8  
(1893) pp 18-52

- Norgate, K. Richard the Lion Heart  
London (1924)
- Norwich, J.J. The Kingdom in the Sun 1130-1194  
London (1970)
- Ohnsorge, W. Die Legaten Alexanders III im  
ersten Jahrzehnt seines  
Pontifikat (1159-1169)  
Berlin (1928)
- Orme, M. 'A Reconstruction of Robert of  
Cricklande's VITA ET MIRACULA S.  
THOMAS CANTUARIENSIS' Annalecta  
Bollandiana vol 84 (1966)  
pp 379-398
- O'Reilly, J. "'Candidus et Rubicandus" An image  
of Martyrdom in the Lives of  
Thomas Becket' Annalecta  
Bollandiana vol 99 (1981)  
pp 303-314
- Orpen, G.H. Ireland under the Normans  
Oxford (1968)
- Otway-Ruthven, A.J. A History of Medieval Ireland  
London (1968)
- Pacaut, M. Doctrines politiques et structures  
ecclésiastiques dans l'Occident  
médiéval Variorum reprint  
London (1985)

---

Alexandre III

Etude sur la conception du  
pouvoir pontifical dans sa pensée  
et dans son oeuvre Paris (1956)

---

Louis VII et les Elections  
Episcopales dans le Royaume de  
France Paris (1957)

---

'Les Legats d'Alexandre III  
(1159-81)' Revue d'Histoire  
Ecclesiastique vol 50 (1955)  
pp 821-38

---

'Alexandre III et le concile  
oecumenique de 1179' in  
Le Troisième Concile de Latran  
(1179)... ed. Longère, J. Etudes  
Augustinienne (1980) pp 19-22

---

Frederick Barborossa  
London (1970)

Painter, S.

'Castellans of the plain of Poitou  
in the Eleventh and Twelfth  
Centuries' Speculum vol 31 (1956)  
pp 243-257

---

'The lords of Lusignan in the  
eleventh and twelfth centuries'  
Speculum vol 32 (1957) pp 27-47

William Marshal

Knight-Errant, Baron, and Regent  
of England

Toronto, Buffalo, London (1933)  
reprinted in 1971

'The houses of Lusignan and  
Chantellerault 1150-1250'

Speculum vol 30 (1955) pp 374-384

Parkers, M.B. &  
Walson, A.G. ed.

Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts &  
Libraries: Essays presented to  
N.R. Ker London (1978)

Patt, W.D.

'The Early "Ars dictaminis" as  
response to a changing society'  
Viator vol 9 (1978) pp 133-155

Pennington, K. &  
Somerville, R. ed.

Law, Church and Society  
Essays in Honor of Stephan Kuttner  
Pennsylvania (1977)

Pepin, R.E.

'Amicitia Jocosa: Peter of Celle  
and John of Salisbury'  
Florilegium 5 (1983) pp 140-56

Peters, E.M.

'The Archbishop and the Hedgehog'  
in Law, Church and Society, ed.  
Pennington & Somerville,  
pp 167-84

- Pfaff, V. 'Sieben Jahre päpstlicher Politik:  
Die Wirksamkeit der Päpste Lucius  
III, Urban III, Gregor VIII'  
ZSSRG Kan Abt vol 67 (1981)  
pp 148-212
- Pontal, O. 'Les évêques dans le monde  
Plantegenêt' Cahiers des  
Civilization Médiévale X<sup>e</sup>-XIII<sup>e</sup>  
Siècle vol 29 (1986) pp 129-137
- Poole, A.L. ed. Studies in Chronology and History  
Oxford (1934)
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
From Domesday Book to Magna Carta  
1087-1216 Oxford (1955 2nd edn.)
- Poole, R.L. 'The Early Lives of Robert Pullen  
and Nicholas Breakspear'  
Essays in medieval history  
presented to T.F. Tout ed. Little  
A.G. and Powicke F.M. Manchester  
(1925) pp 61-70
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
Illustrations of the history of  
Medieval thought London (1920  
2nd edn.)
- Pouzet, P. L'anglais Jean dit Bellesmains  
(1122-1204) Lyon (1927)
- Quain, E.A. 'The Medieval Accessus ad  
Auctores' Traditio vol 2 (1944)  
pp 215-264

Raby, F.J.E.

'Some notes on Virgil, mainly in English authors, in the middle ages' Studi Medievali (1932)  
pp 359-71

Ray, R.

'Medieval historiography through the twelfth century: problems and progress of research'  
Viator vol 5 (1974) pp 33-59

---

'Rhetorical scepticism and verisimilar narrative in John of Salisbury's Historia Pontificalis'  
Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography, ed. Breisach, E.  
Kalamazoo, Mich. (1985)  
pp 61-102

Reuter, T.

'John of Salisbury and the Germans' The World of John of Salisbury, ed. Wilks, M.  
pp 415-25

---

'A list of bishops attending the Council of Tours (1163)' Annuario  
historiae concilliorum  
vol 8 (1976) pp 116-25

Richardson, H.G.

'The Early Correspondence of John of Salisbury'  
English Historical Review vol 54  
(1939) pp 471-473

Ross, B.

'Audi Thoma... Henriciani Nota:  
A French scholar appeals to Thomas  
Becket?' English Historical  
Review vol 89 (1974) pp 333-338

Round, J.H.

Geoffrey de Mandeville  
London (1882)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
Studies in Peerage and Family  
History Westminster (1901)

Rowe, J.G.

'Hadrian IV, the Byzantine Empire  
and the Latin Orient' Essays in  
medieval history presented to  
Bertie Wilkinson, ed. Sandquist,  
T.A., and Powicke, M.R., Toronto  
(1969) pp 3-16

Ryan, J.J.

'Saint Peter Damiani and the  
Sermons of Nicholas of Clairvaux:  
a Clarification' Mediaeval Studies  
vol 9 (1947) pp 151-161

Saltman, A.

Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury  
London (1956)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'John of Salisbury and the world  
of The Old Testament' The World of  
John of Salisbury ed. Wilks, M.  
pp 343-63

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'Two Early Collections of the  
Becket Correspondence and of other  
Contemporary Document'

Bulletin of the Institute of  
Historical Research vol 22 (1949)  
pp 152-157

Scammell, G.V.

Hugh du Puiset Bishop of Durham  
Cambridge (1956)

Shaw, I.P.

'Giraldus Cambrensis and the  
primacy of Canterbury'  
The Church Quarterly Review  
vol 148 (1949) pp 82-100

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'The ecclesiastical Policy of  
Henry II on the continent, 1154-  
1189' The Church Quarterly Review  
vol 149 (1950) pp 137-155

Schmugge, L.

'Thomas Becket and König Heinrich  
II in der Sicht des Radulfus  
Niger' Deutsches Archiv für  
Erforschung des Mittelalters  
vol 32 Köln (1976) pp 592-9

Sheerin, D.

'Gervase of Chichester and Thomas  
Becket' Mediaeval Studies vol 38  
(1976) pp 463-482



- Schnith, K. von 'Studien zu den Konzilien Anselms von Canterbury' Annuario Historiae Concilliorum vol 18 (1986) pp 75-90
- Smalley, B. 'An English Theologian's View of Roman Law: Pepo, Irnenius, Ralph Niger' Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies vol 1 no. 1 pp 237-252
- Smalley, B. The study of the Bible in the middle ages Oxford (1952 2nd edn.)
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Becket Conflict and the Schools Oxford (1973)
- Somerville, R. Pope Alexander III and the council of Tours (1163): A study of ecclesiastical politics and institutions in the twelfth century Berkeley, Los Angeles, London (1977)
- Southern, R.W. 'The Schools of Paris and the Schools of Chartres' Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century ed. Benson, R. & Constable, G. pp 113-137
- \_\_\_\_\_, Platonism, Scholastic method and the Schools of Chartres Reading (1979)

- \_\_\_\_\_,  
Medieval Humanism and other studies Oxford (1970)
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'Peter of Blois and the Third Crusade' Studies in Medieval History presented to R.H.C. Davis ed. Mayr-Harting, H. & Moore, R.I. London (1985) pp 207-218
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'Some New Letters of Peter of Blois' English Historical Review vol 53 (1938) pp 412-424
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'St. Anselm and his English Pupils' Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies vol 1 pp 1-91
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
The Monks of Canterbury and the Murder of Archbishop Becket Canterbury (1985)
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
Saint Anselm and his Biographer Cambridge (1963)
- Spörl, J.  
'Rainald von Dassel auf dem Konzil von Reims 1148 und sein Verhältnis zu Johannes von Salisbury' Historische Jahrbuch, 60 (1940) pp 250-7
- Stenton, D.M.  
English Justice between the Norman Conquest and the Great Charter 1066-1215 London (1965)

- Tacchella, E. Giovanni di Salisbury e i  
Cornficianti Sandalion vol 3 (1980)  
pp 273-313
- Théry, P.G. 'Documents concernant Jean  
Sarrazin' Archives d'histoire  
doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen  
Age vol 17 (1950-51) pp 45-87
- Thompson, K. 'Family and influence to the south  
of Normandy in the eleventh  
century; the lordship of Bellême'  
Journal of Mediaeval History  
vol 10 (1985)
- Thouzellier, C. Hérésie et Hérétiques: Waudois,  
Cathares, Patarins, Albigeois  
Roma (1969)
- Tierney, B. 'The Continuity of Papal Political  
theory in the Thirteenth Century'  
Mediaeval Studies vol 27 (1965)  
pp 227-245
- Tillmann, H. Die päpstlichen Legaten in England  
bis zur Beendigung der Legation  
Gualas (1218) Bonn (1925)
- Tobin, R.B. 'The Cornifician Motif in John of  
Salisbury's Metalogicon' History  
of Education vol 13 (1984) pp 1-6

Trenard, L. dir. ed.

Histoire des Pays Bas Francais  
Univers de la France et des pays  
francophones Toulouse (1972)

Turk, E.

NUGAE CURIARIUM  
Le règne d'Henri II Plantegenêt  
(1145-1189) et l'éthique politique  
Genève (1977)

Ullmann, W.

'Cardinal Roland and Besançon'  
The Papacy and Political Ideas  
in the Middle Ages Variorum  
reprints, item 4 London (1976)

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Influence of John of  
Salisbury on Medieval Italian  
Jurists' English Historical Review  
vol 59 (1944) pp 384-392

\_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Pontificate of Adrian IV'  
The Papacy and Political Ideas in  
the Middle Ages Variorum reprints  
item 3 London (1976)

Urry, W.

Canterbury under the Angevin  
Kings London (1967)

- Vauchez, A. La sainteté en occident aux derniers siècles du moyen âge d'après les procès de canonisation et les documents hagiographiques Rome (1981)
- Vodola, E. Excommunication in the Middle Ages Berkeley & Los Angeles (1986)
- Voss, L. Heinrich von Blois, Bischof von Winchester (1129-71) Berlin (1932)
- Walker, D. 'Crown and episcopacy under the Normans and Angevins' Anglo-Norman Studies vol 5 (1983) pp 220-33
- Ward, J.O. 'The Date of the Commentary on Cicero's "De Inventione" by Thierry of Chartres (ca. 1095-1160?) and The Cornifician Attack on the Liberal Arts' Viator vol 3 (1972) pp 219-73
- Warren, W.L. Henry II London (1973)
- Watt, J.A. The Church and the two nations in mediaeval Ireland Cambridge (1970)

- Webb, C.C.J. 'Joannis Saresberiensis  
Metalogicon: Addenda et  
Corrigenda' Mediaeval and  
Renaissance Studies vol 1 no 1  
pp 232-236
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'Notes on John of Salisbury'  
English Historical Review  
vol 46 (1931) pp 261-62
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
John of Salisbury London (1932)
- Weigand, R. 'Magister Rolandus und Papst  
Alexander III' Archiv für  
Katholisches Kirchenrecht, vol 149  
(1980) pp 3-44
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'Quaestiones aus der Schule des  
Rolandus und Metellus' Traditio  
vol 25 (1969)
- Weijers, O. 'The chronology of John of  
Salisbury's studies in France  
(Metalogicon, ii. 10)  
The World of John of Salisbury  
ed. Wilks, M., pp 109-116
- Weinstein, D. &  
Bell, R.M. Saints and Society Chicago (1982)

- Wenck, K. 'Die römischen Päpste zwischen Alexander III und Innocenz III und der Designationsversuch Weihnachten 1197' ed Brackmann, A. Papsttum und Kaisertum (1926)
- Werner, K. 'L'acquisition par la maison de Blois des Comtés de Chartres et de Chateaudum' Mélanges de numismatique, d'archéologie et d'histoire offerts à Jean Lafaurie Paris (1980) pp 265-74
- West, F. The Justiciarship in England 1066-1232 Cambridge (1966)
- Wilks, M., ed. The World of John of Salisbury Oxford (1984)
- Williams, G. The Welsh Church from conquest to reformation Cardiff (1962)
- Williams, J.R. 'William of the Whitehands and Men of Letters' Anniversary essays in mediaeval history by students of Charles Homer Haskins New York (1929) reprinted in 1967
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Quest for the Author of the Moralium Dogma Philosophorum 1931-1959' Speculum vol 32 (1957) pp 736-747

- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Cathedral School of Rheims in  
the Eleventh Century' Speculum  
vol 29 (1954) pp 661-677
- \_\_\_\_\_,  
'The Cathedral School of Reims in  
the time of Master Alberic,  
1118-1136' Traditio vol 20 (1964)  
pp 93-114
- Wilson, C.L.      'La vie de Saint Thomas le Martyr  
par Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence  
Poeme historique du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle,  
publié par E. Walberg'  
The Modern Language Review vol 18  
(1923) pp 491-499
- Witt, R.      'Medieval "Ars Dictaminis" and the  
Beginnings of Humanism: a New  
Construction of the Problem'  
Renaissance Quarterly vol 35  
(1982) pp 1-35
- Wynne, E.H.      'The Tradition: Sacerdotium  
versus Regnum and the two Becket's'  
Cîteaux vol 23 (1972) pp 289-315
- Zenker, B.      Die Mitglieder der Kardinal  
kollegiums von 1130 bis 1159  
Würzburg (1964)



Zinn, G.A. Jr.

'Suger, Theology, and the Pseudo-  
Dionysian Tradition'

Abbot Suger and Saint-Denis.

A Symposium, ed. Gerson, P.L.

New York (1986) pp 33-40