

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

YOKO HIRATA

VOL II

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

July 1991

CHAPTER TWO - John's correspondents whom he came to know while serving Archbishop Theobald

I Introduction - John of Salisbury in the service of Archbishop Theobald (1138-1161)¹

John joined the household of Archbishop Theobald in 1147 and served him till the latter's death in 1161. John held no official title there. John's service to Archbishop Theobald seems to be roughly divided into two distinct periods. From 1157 to about 1154, he was mainly employed as a messenger to the Papal Curia. Along with Becket and John of Canterbury, John appears to have been involved in the archbishop's important diplomatic activities in Rome. It is difficult to discern the nature of John's missions as a messenger to the Curia. Archbishop Theobald had been trying to obtain the legateship and he succeeded in doing so in about 1150. Both Thomas Becket and John of Salisbury may have been involved in the archbishop's negotiations at the Curia.² There had also been a chronic dispute between Archbishop Theobald and the abbot of St. Augustine's at Canterbury.³ John's visits to the Curia in 1150--53 and also in 1155-6⁴ may have been made at least partly in connection with the dispute between Archbishop Theobald and St. Augustine's Canterbury. One of John's missions at

-
1. For the activities of Archbishop Theobald and the main issues of his pontificate, see Saltman, Theobald, pp 3-177.
 2. John was at the Curia in summer 1150 and between November 1150 and the summer of 1151. (JS Letters i, pp 254-5.) Becket was engaged in the above negotiation. (Saltman, Theobald, pp 30-2.)
 3. Saltman, Theobald, pp 64-75. McLoughlin, pp 236-41. HP- xliii.
 4. Concerning John's visit to the Curia, JS Letters i, pp 253-6 and see the section 3-III-1.

Ferentino between November 1150 and summer 1151 might have been concerned with the prohibition of coronation of King Stephen's son, Eustace.⁵ Although John spent much time abroad during this time he may also have been involved in Theobald's conflict with Christ Church, Canterbury.⁶

John's place in Archbishop Theobald's household began to change in about 1154, possibly because of the departure of some important senior clerks. Archbishop Theobald's household is famous for its brilliant clerks.⁷ Becket became royal chancellor, then archbishop of Canterbury. Roger of Pont l'Évêque, archbishop of York and John of Canterbury, treasurer of York, bishop of Poitiers, then of Lyon, all belonged to Theobald's household. The three left the household of the archbishop by 1154 or 55.⁸ John's importance as a clerk was increasing. Still utilized as a messenger to Rome, he began to be employed in the capacity of writing letters as well.⁹ However, John was probably not the only important clerk. With the development of archiepiscopal chancery, Philip the chancellor and Peter the Scribe also seem to have held important positions. Peter

5. Saltman, Theobald, pp 36-37, HP - xlii.

6. JS Letters i, no. 1.

7. JS Letters i, pp xxvii-xxviii. Barlow, TB, pp 30-1. Saltman, Theobald, pp 165-77.

8. Saltman, Theobald, p 168. Barlow, TB, p 30.

9. There is only one letter in the collection of John's early letters which can certainly be dated before 1154. (JS Letters i, pp 1 & 302.) Many letters were written after 1156. Dr. McLoughlin made further attempt of dating John's letters written in the name of Theobald. (McLoughlin, pp 240-60).

and Philip witnessed 15 and 17 extant charters respectively.¹⁰ Philip also acted as an executor of Archbishop Theobald's will.¹¹

Starting in about 1156, John served Archbishop Theobald as secretary and personal adviser.¹² He appears to have had varied duties. As the archbishop's chief adviser of papal affairs, he drafted letters, particularly those of complicated appeal cases.¹³ John often mediated between the English religious and clerics and their institutions and the Papal Curia. Both Theobald and John had to take into account the intentions of the new Angevin king, Henry II.¹⁴ Henry sometimes interfered in the proceedings of ecclesiastical courts as well as in appeals¹⁵ and episcopal elections. When the king left England in 1156¹⁶ the repercussions of his activities on the continent were felt in Canterbury in matters like levying of scutage.¹⁷ Besides, the distance between the king and the archbishop caused difficulty particularly at the time of the papal schism and the Exeter election.¹⁸ The archbishop's illness

10. Saltman, Theobald, p 229.

11. JS Letters i, no. 134.

12. See the section 3-III-3 for the reasons why his duties were changed.

13. McLoughlin, pp 231-2.

14. On Henry II, see also the section 3-VIII-1 & n 7.

15. Saltman, Theobald, p 160.

16. Eyton, p 16.

17. JS Letters i, no 13 & n 1.

18. JS Letters i, pp 263-7.

at the end of his pontificate appears to have put much burden on John's shoulders, since he was undoubtedly one of the most trusted and influential clerks.

John made contacts with many people through his duties. Some of them appeared as his correspondents during and after his service to Theobald. In the first part of his service, he built up his relationships in the Papal Curia and the people he met on his journey. He also became close to his fellow clerks who were sent to the Curia with him. After 1154, as he started to lead a more sedentary life, he probably came to know his fellow clerks better. He also made friends with the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, with whom he shared literary interest. They appear to have played some part in John's composition of his major works, the Policraticus, the Metalogicon and the Entheticus.

John's duty as secretary to Archbishop Theobald brought him in touch, mostly through various law suits, with English religious and clerics. He made friends with some of them and maintained not close but good relationships with others. Since 1154, Archbishop Theobald had to deal with Henry II. John also had to take heed of the king and the types of clerks who surrounded him.

II Flanders

1. Introduction -- Philip of Flanders during the Becket conflict

Milo, bishop of Thérouanne was John's only correspondent in this area. He may have been one of the first churchmen John made contact with after he joined the household of Archbishop Theobald. John appears to have kept in touch with him during his service to Archbishop Theobald and after he went into exile. Throughout the Becket conflict, Milo appeared as a well-wisher of Becket, who was willing to receive the exiles. He was closely associated with the count of Flanders, who played an important though not decisive role in the Becket conflict.

Philip of Flanders appears fairly often in John's letters and he met John at least once before 1164. In letter no. 136, John reported to Becket that the count was sympathetic to Becket and that he promised help. The count pledged to provide ships for the archbishop and to send an agent to finalize such an arrangement. None of this materialized, since Becket did not leave England after the council of Clarendon. Philip, however, did not translate his initial enthusiasm into action, when Becket fled Northampton. The royal embassy to Philip requested that he not give assistance to Becket, or even to forcibly send him back to England. Therefore, the count was hesitant to meet Becket's request for safe conduct.¹

1. Barlow, TB, p 120.

Count Philip visited King Henry at Rouen in April 1165.² According to John, the Empress and the queen had requested that Philip work to reconcile the king and the archbishop, and the count had sent a distinguished party of men to the king. John reported their return to Becket in late summer 1165, stating that he had not found out their results yet.³ John wrote probably around this time to Hugh, abbot of Saint-Amand, in the name of Peter of Celle, asking him and the count of Flanders to work for his reconciliation.⁴

John's letters reveal the count's role as a mediator between the kings of France and England. At the meeting of the two kings at Soissons, Philip of Flanders and Henry of Champagne supported the English king's cause before the French.⁵ The meeting was a failure. Both counts mediated again. Another unsuccessful conference was held near Pacy and Mante on 7 April 1168.⁶ Before June 1168, with the consent of the English king, he tried to invite Becket to a conference at the abbey of Tiron.⁷ The conference does not seem to have taken place there. Instead, a conference was held at La Ferté-Bernard on 1-2, July 1168.⁸ Whereas the

2. Eyton, p 78.

3. JS Letters ii, no. 152.

4. JS Letters ii, no. 143. See the section 3-IV-4-a.

5. JS Letters ii, no. 272.

6. JS Letters ii, no. 272. Eyton, p 113.

7. JS Letters ii, no. 276.

8. JS Letters ii, no. 279.

count of Champagne pulled out of the task of mediation, Philip worked as a mediator, and both the English and the French kings counted on his support. The meeting of the kings did not take place, nor did that of Henry II and Becket.⁹ Count Philip continued to take interest in the matter and he attended the conference at Montmartre on 18 November 1169.

The count of Flanders was initially an ally of Henry II.¹⁰ Henry II and Philip met at Dover in 1163 to confirm their alliance.¹¹ However, later on he seems to have grown closer to the French king, as John reported the English king's efforts to hinder the conference and the agreement between the French king and the count of Flanders in February--March 1170.¹² Being situated in the midst of great powers, the count of Flanders had to manoeuvre carefully keeping balance of power in mind in order to maintain and increase his own prosperity.¹³

2. Milo, bishop of Therouanne

Milo II of Therouanne was an Englishman and a Premonstratensian like his predecessor.¹⁴ From 1139 on, he

9. Barlow, TB, p 177.

10. In 1159, Henry arranged the marriage of the abbess of Romsey, the heiress of Boulogne, to Philip of Flanders' brother Matthew. (Barlow, TB, p 58.)

11. Barlow, TB, p 84.

12. JS Letters ii, no. 298.

13. de Gryse, L.M., 'Some observations on the origin of the Flemish Bailiff: the reign of Philip of Alsace' Viator, vol 7, (1976), pp 243-296. For the assessment of Philip's achievement esp. pp 243-45.

14. JS Letters i, no. 108, n 1.

appears as archdeacon.¹⁵ John as well as Thomas Becket may have met Milo as archdeacon of Thérouanne on a number of occasions if he had accompanied bishop Milo I: at the Council of Rheims in 1148;¹⁶ at the consecration of Gilbert Foliôt, bishop-elect of Hereford at St. Omer in 1148;¹⁷ in England on Milo I's mission by Geoffrey, count of Anjou in 1148.¹⁸ John probably had opportunities to cultivate his friendship with Milo II in the course of his trips to Rome or other parts of Gallia¹⁹ since Thérouanne is situated almost en route for travellers from south-eastern England to France and going further.

Milo II succeeded Milo I and was bishop of Thérouanne from 1159-69.²⁰ John wrote one letter in Archbishop Theobald's name in connection with Milo II's election in 1159.²¹ It was addressed to Pope Adrian IV and asked him to

-
15. Moreau, E. de, Histoire de l'Eglise en Belgique, Brussels, (1945), p 20.
16. Moreau, Histoire de l'Eglise en Belgique, p 20.
17. Concerning the attendance of Milo I at the Council of Rheims, Nielsen, L.O., Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century -- A study of Gilbert Poretta's Thinking and Theological Expositions of the Doctrine of the Incarnation during the Period 1130-1180, Leiden, (1982), p 33.
18. HP - xvi. Scholars agree that John was not an eye-witness to all the accounts made in the HP. The account of Archbishop Theobald's exile is classified by McLoughlin among those which were possible first hand reports. (McLoughlin, p 158).
19. HP - xvii. Also Tillman, H., Die päpstlichen Legaten in England bis zur Beendigung der Legation Gualas (1218), p 51.
20. JS Letters i, no. 108, n 1.
21. JS Letters i, no. 108. Concerning the dispute over the election of Milo II, Robert Torigny, p 204. Also Moreau, Histoire de l'Eglise en Belgique, p 21.

end the dispute between the rival chapters of Thér/ouanne and Boulogne in favour of Milo II. John's whereabouts in 1163 are not clearly known, but both Becket and Milo II attended the Council of Tours.²² When John left England in the latter part of 1163, he visited Saint-Omer which is near Thér/ouanne.²³ Becket was advised by John to take the same route after his flight from Northampton in November 1164, and stopped at Saint-Bertin.²⁴ Milo II came to greet him on this occasion and presented to him a white horse.²⁵ Together with Abbot Godescal of St. Bertin, he personally conducted Becket out of Flanders as the count of Flanders gave an equivocal answer to Becket's request for safe conduct.²⁶ Milo was among the French bishops who wrote to the Papal Curia in support of Becket's action in 1169,²⁷ but he was closer to the count of Flanders than to the French king.²⁸ He subscribed a good number of charters of the count, and the count for his part intervened at times in the affairs of the church of Thér/ouanne.²⁹

John wrote two letters to Milo.³⁰ One letter was

22. Moreau, Histoire de l'Eglise en Belgique, p 21.

23. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

24. Barlow, TB, p 119. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

25. Barlow, TB, p 119.

26. Barlow, TB, p 120.

27. Barlow, TB, p 185. Mats no. 544, was sent from Milo to the Pope in 1169.

28. Moreau, Histoire de l'Eglise en Belgique, p 23.

29. Moreau, Histoire de l'Eglise en Belgique, p 23.

30. JS Letters ii, nos. 142 & 214.

probably written in summer-autumn 1165.³¹ John expressed his gratitude to the bishop for having been the first to help the exiled archbishop when he was in Flanders.³² John also thanked him for helping the exiles and especially for receiving his kinsman Master R.³³

Communication between John and Milo resumed in late 1166 or early 1167 possibly through the instigation of the count of Flanders. The count perhaps wished to know about Becket's recent state, his relationship with the French king and other things pertaining to Becket. The count was probably seeking an opportunity to mediate between the English king and Becket as he had tried to do in 1165. Milo apparently sent a messenger, who returned to the bishop with John's letter no. 214. Having heard from the messenger the bishop's continued sympathy and support for Becket's cause, John commended his integrity in the changing world. He gave news of Becket: the French king gave support to Becket now at Saint-Colombe at Sens: former members of his household were scattered in France. John indignantly wrote a detailed account of John of Oxford's activities at the Papal Curia.

John's letters to Milo are somewhat formal and ornate as was suitable to the dignity of a bishop and they reveal little intimacy, but John probably knew Milo II well. Milo was probably also aware of the fact that Archbishop Theobald

31. JS Letters ii, no. 142.

32. JS Letters ii, no. 142.

33. JS Letters ii, no. 142.

appealed to the Papal Curia for his sake and that John personally transacted the business. He may have felt obliged to John and therefore he bestowed a special favour on John's kinsman who was an exile. Milo was also friendly to Becket. That could be why he went to meet him at Saint-Bertin and took care of the exiles.

We do not know whether there was any more communication between John and the bishop of Thérouanne than the surviving letters testify. However, around June 1168, secret news pertaining to the count of Flanders, concerning a meeting of the king and Becket proposed to be held at the abbey of Tiron, was passed to John presumably by someone close to the count.³⁴ John was certainly grateful for information related to the archbishop coming from a reliable source in Flanders. John's information would have been appreciated by the bishop of Thérouanne, a close associate of the count of Flanders, whose involvement in cross-channel diplomacy was considerable.

34. See JS Letters ii, no. 276.

III Papal Curia i

1. Introduction -- John of Salisbury and the Papal Curia i (1147-61)

In the household of Archbishop Theobald, John was employed mainly as a messenger to the Papal Curia from 1147 until about 1154. Six of John's seven visits to the Papal Curia, which Professor Brooke demonstrated with positive proof took place before 1154.¹ This period is less well-documented but important in that it prepared him for his later career as a letter writer and the archbishop's adviser to papal matters. It also helped him formulate some ideas which he was to express later in his works and letters.

John certainly learned ways of promoting his cases at the Papal Curia. He came to know the presence of negotiatores whose support was needed to promote his case but costly to obtain.² John probably gained experience in drafting appeal letters to the Curia, as he was able to help Peter of Celle in his case regarding Saint-Serenus.³

John's contact with the Papal Curia also broadened his experience. He was much better placed at the Papal Curia to be in touch with events in Sicily, the Byzantine Empire

-
1. Prof. Brooke has discussed seven positive and one hypothetical occasions of John's presence at the Curia down to 1161. (JS Letters i, pp 253-56). Dr. McLoughlin further clarified the time and length of John's visits. (McLoughlin, pp 189-91).
 2. McLoughlin, pp 215-6. JS Letters ii, nos. 136, 234-5, 275, 279.
 3. JS Letters i, p 255. JL 977. According to Southern, John's letters, more than $\frac{1}{2}$ of which were sent to the Curia, with his personal letters removed, may have been collected as a kind of formulary, (JS Letters ii, p ix-x. Southern, R.W., Review of The early letters of John of Salisbury EHR 72, (1957) p 495. See the section 3-IV-3-b(i)

or the Holy Land.⁴ On his visits to Apulia, John was particularly attracted by the sumptuous wealth of the Sicilian kingdom and advanced Greek studies in southern Italy.⁵

However, while he was at the Papal Curia, John appears to have been influenced more than anything else by the person of Adrian IV (1154-59),⁶ who was John's sole correspondent in the Curia. Adrian IV probably met John for the first time between November 1150 and summer 1151 at Ferentino while he was still cardinal bishop of Albano.⁷ In 1152, he was sent on a mission to Scandinavia and returned late in 1154. Shortly after in December, 1154, he was elected pope. John's relationship with Adrian IV became much closer when he spent three months at Benevento with

-
4. He left the description of events on the Second Crusade in HP xxiii-xxx. Reference to Sicilian affairs also occur in HP xxxii-iv and in Fol, vii-9, viii-7. JS Letters i, no. 33 and pp 254-5.
 5. See the section 3-VII-2-a(iii).
 6. For Adrian IV's pontificate, see Mann, H.K., The lives of the popes in the middle ages, vol 9, London, (1925), pp 231--340. Ullman, W., 'The Pontificate of Adrian IV' in The Papacy and Political Ideas in the Middle Ages, Variorum reprints, London, (1976) item iv. Southern, R.W., 'Pope Adrian IV' in Medieval Humanism, Oxford, (1970) pp 234-52. Rowe, J.G., 'Hadrian IV, the Byzantine Empire and the Latin Orient', in Essays in medieval history presented to Bertie Wilkinson, ed. Sandquist, T.A., and Powicke, M.R., Toronto, (1969), pp 3-16.
 7. Adrian IV first appeared as cardinal Nicholas of Albano on the 30 January, 1150. ^{Pococke, R.L.} 'The Early Lives of Robert Pullen and Nicholas Breakspear' in Essays presented to T.F. Tout, ed. Little A.G., and Powicke, F.M., Manchester, (1925) pp 61-70.) For John's association with Nicholas at Ferentino, JS Letters i, no. 52 & JS Letters ii, no. 289. Also Met iv-42. Nicholas must have left for his Swedish mission early 1152, for his last appearance at the Curia before 1154 is February 1152. (JL ii, p 20).

him.⁸ He was much influenced by his ideas as well as the way he dealt with events that shook the Curia at that time.

Under the pontificate of Adrian IV, some fundamental changes in the papal policy took place. One was the stern measures taken against the Roman commune and Arnold of Brescia.⁹ Curial reactions against popular movements and Adrian IV may have partly been the cause of John's antipathy against the citizens' revolt at Rheims.¹⁰ Another was that he changed the pro-German policy of Eugenius III and made an alliance with the kingdom of Sicily. Adrian may have had unfavourable attitudes towards the Germans from the beginning.¹¹ At the beginning of his pontificate, Adrian feared a possible cooperation between Frederick and the Roman commune.¹² The turmoil of Rome caused by the commune which prevented Adrian's residence there and the retreat of Frederick after coronation without giving requested help to the Papacy were among the reasons for the diplomatic volte-face embodied in the Treaty of Benevento in June 1156. John was at the Curia just before the time when Adrian made an alliance with Sicily¹³ and he appears to have been much

8. Met iv-42. Pol vi-24. JS Letters i, nos. 15, 18, 41, 50, 51, 52.

9. 'Pope Adrian IV' in Medieval Humanism, pp 239-40.

10. JS Letters ii, no. 223.

11. Adrian attached the Swedish church in the see of Bremen-Hamburg to the see of Lund and this was disadvantageous to the Germans and displeasing to Frederick. (Pacaut, M., Frederick Barbarossa, London, (1970), p 66).

12. Greenaway, G.W., Arnold of Brescia, Cambridge, (1931), p 152.

13. JS Letters i, p 256.

influenced by the anti-German and pro-Sicilian attitude of Adrian. John's visits to the Curia and his association with Adrian IV probably defined his later opinions on the Germans and Sicilians.¹⁴

Pope Adrian's influence on John regarding ideas and papal policy is more difficult to assess. John's strong belief of the supremacy of spiritual authority over secular may have been influenced by Adrian IV. John had already been introduced to the problem of the relationship between temporal and spiritual powers while he was a student at Paris.¹⁵ But Adrian IV was the Pope who 'revived the high-Gregorian programme for the reform of Church government'¹⁶ and who 'applied the traditional programme of the medieval papacy to situations for which it appeared to have been prepared'.¹⁷ Therefore what John observed under Adrian IV was the ideas which were already familiar to him converted into action. One of such ideas may have been regarding the way appeals should be made to Rome.¹⁸ Practically speaking the friendship with the

14. In HP xxxii-iii, John recounted Sicilian affairs and wrote somewhat unfavourably about King Roger's church policy. However, he was quite impressed by Robert of Salesby, the Sicilian chancellor of English origin. (Pol ii-23, vii-9, viii-7. JS Letters i, pp 254-55 & no. 33). John denounced the Germans for supporting the anti-pope Victor IV (JS Letters i, no. 124). For John's use of the Germans as exempla, Reuter, T., 'John of Salisbury and the Germans' in The World JS pp 415-25.

15. Smalley has pointed out that John applied Robert Pullen's teaching in politics. Smalley, The Becket Conflict, pp 39, 42-3.

16. Warren, Henry II, p 192.

17. Ullman, 'The Pontificate of Adrian IV' p 236.

18. McLoughlin pp 236-41. See below 3-III-2-a.

Pope was immeasurably valuable to John. It facilitated his missions to the Curia. Through Adrian's favour, John obtained for Henry II the privilege over Ireland, on which John prided himself as his greatest achievement while writing the Metalogicon in 1159.¹⁹ The friendship with Adrian IV also strengthened his position at Canterbury in a sense that he could help his friends by referring their cases directly to the Pope.²⁰ Until the death of Adrian IV, John could perhaps hope for promotion from the Pope, since at Ferentino, he had given John his 'own ring and belt as a pledge of things to come.'²¹

2. John's correspondence (1154-61)

John's role as Archbishop Theobald's private secretary and adviser on papal affairs probably began in about 1154²² and conscious efforts to preserve the letters appear to have been made by John himself after 1156,²³ from about the time when he served less as a messenger of Theobald. Many of his letters from this period were written in the name of Archbishop Theobald and therefore excluded from consideration. However a number of letters written in the name of Archbishop Theobald appear to disclose John's own

19. Met iv-43.

20. McLoughlin, p 231.

21. JS Letters i, no. 52 and p 256.

22. See the section 3-IV-1.

23. Southern, 'Pope Adrian IV' p 246. Southern, R.W., 'Review of the early letters of John of Salisbury' EHR, vol 72, (1957) pp 493-97. Further attempt has been made by Dr. McLoughlin to date hitherto undated letters. (McLoughlin, pp 240-60, esp, 252-3.)

relationships with curial officials. Those which accompanied John's own letters will be treated along with them. There is also a group of letters written on behalf of the archbishop which reveals John's epistolary strategy as well as his relationship with the Papal Curia. They will be given a separate section.

a. John's letters in the name of Archbishop Theobald

Letters nos. 7-12 were written in the name of Archbishop Theobald, but they seem to reveal John's own relationships with the people in the Papal Curia²⁴ as well as the sequence of events that were taking place both at the Curia and in England. As Professor Brooke has pointed out,²⁵ these letters are interrelated and ought to be considered in context. The letters were addressed to Pope Adrian IV (nos. 7 & 8), Cardinal Roland, the papal chancellor (no. 9), Cardinal John of Sutri (no. 10) and Boso, the papal chamberlain (no. 11). Dr. McLoughlin has discussed these letters in detail²⁶ and pointed out that tension existed between Rome and Canterbury over the issue of appeals from Canterbury to Rome and over the success of St. Augustine's Canterbury in their dispute against Theobald. The series of letters were written with the intention of mitigating the Pope's anger. In this section,

24. Dr. McLoughlin has expressed doubt as to John's authorship of these letters. (McLoughlin, p 217). Prof. Brooke is in the opinion that with a possibility of few exceptions, there is little reason to doubt that letters in JS Letters i were composed by John. (JS Letters i, p xii). The letters nos 7-12 are treated here with the assumption that they were written by John.

25. JS Letters i, pp 258-62.

26. McLoughlin, pp 236-241.

we shall deal with the letters from the point of view of John's relationships with the recipients of letters.

Letter no. 7 from Archbishop Theobald to Pope Adrian IV was probably written in late 1155.²⁷ Archbishop Theobald was 'not under the Pope's displeasure at this time, but somehow anticipated it.'²⁸ In no. 7, Archbishop Theobald stressed his loyalty to the Roman Church and reported that he had satisfied 'the claim of your creditors'. He briefly described the case of Hugh, the bearer of the letter, entrusting other messages to be delivered orally.

John appears to have been sent to the Curia shortly after he wrote no. 7.²⁹ John may have reached Benevento by December, where he may have represented Peter of Celle.³⁰ This mission of John was particularly important in that it was carried out in a fluid situation³¹ and that it had a

27. JS Letters i, headnote to no. 7.

28. JS Letters i, no. 7, n 1.

29. His visit to the Papal Curia at Benevento took place between November 1, 1155 and July 1156 and he stayed there for three months. Since we find John as a letter writer from spring 1156 onwards, as the sequence of his letters reveals, he must have been back to Canterbury by that time.

30. Adrian IV issued a bull and confirmations concerning the monastery of Saint-Aigulf and a cell of Saint-Serenus to Peter, abbot of Celle on 19 December 1155 (JL 10098-10100). John may have taken some part in this as he had done under the pontificate of Anastasius IV. (PC Letters i, no. 72).

31. From about the time of the coronation of Henry II on 19 December, 1154, many changes took place in England. Theobald spent much time in attendance of the king in 1155. One of his clerks, Thomas Becket began to serve the king as royal chancellor. John of Canterbury and Roger of Pont l'Evêque also left the archbishop's service. In September 1155, the king held a council at Winchester, where his plan to conquer Ireland was thwarted by the objection of the Empress.

special significance to John's later life. John was most probably sent by Archbishop Theobald, but exact nature of his mission is not clear. Since Archbishop Theobald had anticipated the Pope's displeasure possibly on the issue of St. Augustine's or that of appeals going to Rome, he may have been sent to counteract the situation.³² Or his mission may have been also to obtain the papal grant of Ireland for Henry II.³³

During John's stay at Benevento, the Papal Curia had other envoys from Henry II's domains,³⁴ and the papal attitude against Archbishop Theobald hardened. Direct cause of this change is not clear, but Arnulf of Lisieux, who was to be John's worst enemy, was a member of the royal

-
32. Dr. McLoughlin appears to lay more stress on the issue of appeals going from Canterbury to Rome and its connection with John's mission. (McLoughlin, pp 236-41).
33. See Constable, G., 'The alleged disgrace of John of Salisbury in 1159'. EHR, vol 69, (1954) pp 67-76. JS Letters i, p 257. Southern, R.W., 'Pope Adrian IV' in Medieval Humanism, p 244. However, with regard to the reception of and reaction to the bull in England, Norgate, K., 'The Bull Laudabiliter' EHR, vol 8 (1893) pp 18-52, esp. p 48. Concerning Canterbury's interest in Ireland and its relation to John's mission, Flanagan, M.T., Irish society, Anglo-Norman settlers, Angevin Kingship -- Interactions in Ireland in the Late Twelfth Century, Oxford, (1989) pp 7-55.
34. Nov./Dec./1155: Adrian IV issued privileges and related letters to Robert, abbot of St. Albans. (JL 10113-7).
Jan 13/1156: the Pope ordered Sylvester, abbot of St. Augustine's Canterbury "ut professionem faciat" to Archbishop Theobald. (JL 10124).
Jan 23/1156: the Pope reproached Archbishop Theobald for his offenses against the Church and instructed him to order Sylvester, abbot of St. Augustine's "ut professionem ei exhibeat". The Pope also gave privileges to St. Augustine's (JL 10128-9, see also McLoughlin, pp 236-9).
Jan 27/1156: the Pope also confirmed privileges and made favourable decisions regarding the case of the monastery of St. Bertin. (JL 10132-4).

mission to the Curia about the same time³⁵ and another member of the royal mission Robert, abbot of St. Albans, successfully obtained privileges for his abbey.³⁶ John devoted nearly a whole chapter in the Policraticus on the conversation he had had with Adrian IV at Benevento, whose topic appears to have been mainly the corruption of the Papal Curia.³⁷ John returned to Canterbury by spring, by July 1156 at the latest, and he probably brought back among other things 'the only letter in our favour which was brought to us by our messengers'³⁸ and at least one letter of consolation from Cardinal Roland.³⁹ Upon return, John wrote letters nos. 8-11, which were all essentially concerned with the displeasure of certain cardinals on Archbishop Theobald. John could not prevent the Pope from taking actions unfavourable to Archbishop Theobald on account of 'certain cardinals', possibly negotiatores, who were politician-cardinals, Roman aristocrats in origin, and who had family interests in the politics both of the Curia and of the city of Rome.⁴⁰ The recipients of nos. 8-11, Pope Adrian IV, Cardinal Roland, Cardinal John of Sutri and Boso

35. Eyton, p 13.

36. There is an account in the Chronicle of St. Albans of how the abbot had obtained the privileges and how well his gifts were received at the Papal Court. (Matthaei Parisiensis Monachi sancti Albani, Chronica Majora, vol 2, AD 1067-AD 1216, ed. Luard, H.R., RS, London, 1874, p 71). Also Councils and Synods i, pp 934-5.

37. Pol vi-24.

38. JS Letters ii, no. 8.

39. JS Letters ii, no. 9.

40. For neogiatores see McLoughlin, pp 215-16.

were new men brought into the Curia about 1148 by Eugenius III⁴¹ who acted under the influence of the spiritual leadership of St. Bernard.

The most formal letter of petition was sent to Cardinal John of Sutri. It is somewhat similar to John's own letters of petition which he was to write at the time of his disgrace and in exile.⁴² It emphasised the former loyalty and services of Theobald to the Papacy, expressed his surprise and grief over the displeasure of certain cardinals and asked to be restored to their favour. The letter also asked for the petition to be furthered by the cardinals since the archbishop's messengers had not been well received at the Curia. It also referred to the Pope's prospective visit to France.

The letter to Cardinal Roland (no. 9) is also essentially a letter of petition. However, it is less impersonal and more detailed. Roland's letter which was presumably brought back by John must have given some consolation and instruction to Theobald, for which the archbishop expressed his gratitude. Archbishop Theobald reported how he had done as the cardinal had advised, emphasising his devotion and obedience to the Papacy. Stating that some cardinals were against him, he petitioned that their favour be restored, since he had done nothing to deserve their hostility. Since his own messengers were not received favourably at the Papal Curia, he asked Roland to present the petition to the cardinals and send him the

41. McLoughlin, p 217.

42. Especially nos. 28, 137-39, 149-51.

reply. The letter reveals certain familiarity and betrays the personal relationship which existed between the cardinal and Theobald's messenger. Perhaps he influenced the cardinal to send Archbishop Theobald a more personal message of consolation and advice along with the formal mandates from the Curia.

Letter no. 8 to the Pope is a formal one reflecting the rank and dignity of both the writer and recipient, but in some ways the content sounds familiar. First of all, Archbishop Theobald reported that he had paid Peter's Pence, stressing his great devotion and service to the Curia. He also touched on the rumour of the Pope's visit to France, and expressed his wish to know the date in advance. Briefly commenting on the situation in Rome and his own illness, the archbishop asked the Pope to restore St. Augustine's profession to Canterbury. In this letter as in no. 11 to Boso, John wrote about the monks of St. Augustine's securing many letters. Referring to 'the only letter in our favour which was brought to us by our messengers', the archbishop stated that for the sake of the Pope's honour, 'I have not thought fit to show to anyone'. Letter no. 8 was written by someone who was familiar with the current situation in the Curia. One also gets the impression that a certain amount of John's own feeling and messages are conveyed through the archbishop's manner of speech.

No. 11 to Boso, the papal chamberlain is more familiar in tone. The letter referred to Boso's kindness 'for the benefits he had bestowed on Canterbury and confided in him as a friend the problem that the archbishop was faced with, i.e. the displeasure of certain cardinals -- and asked him

to help remove it. The reason of their persecution, John wrote, was because 'they favour my detractors and support my adversaries'. In this letter, as in no. 8, John wrote about the Pope's rejection of the archbishop's petitions and his granting those to his adversaries, especially the monks of St. Augustine's. John further complained on behalf of the archbishop that 'I who have so many and such important friends in the Roman Church, am not granted even the least of my requests...' This letter is the most informal and personal of the four letters. Since Boso had previously acted on behalf of Canterbury,⁴³ and Theobald knew him personally,⁴⁴ the archbishop felt able to describe his problems in a more personal manner. However, the letter also discloses the nature of the problem which John as his messenger confronted at the Curia. The four letters allege that Archbishop Theobald had been misrepresented by his 'enemies' and had been treated unjustly by the Pope.⁴⁵ Theobald's assertion was at least partly based on the experience of his messengers who were not received well. When the letter refers to 'my detractors' and 'my adversaries', one is bound to feel that John suffered from their harm as much as the archbishop.

The series of letters nos. 8-11 and part of the matters described seem to relate to another series of letters, namely those written in connection with the great disgrace.

43. JS Letters ii, no. 315.

44. Geisthardt, F., Der Kämmerer Boso, Berlin, (1936), p 15.

45. McLoughlin, p 239.

One of the 'detractors' whom John complained about in no. 11 might have been Arnulf of Lisieux. Along with the abbot of St. Albans and two other Norman bishops, he was probably a member of the king's embassy at the Curia while John was there. Upon return, he may have spread rumours of John's behaviour at the Curia at the king's court in Normandy, which brought about the king's disgrace.⁴⁶

b. John's own letters to Adrian IV

Pope Adrian IV was the only person in the Curia to whom John wrote in his own name. Nine letters to the Pope are extant: an equal number to those addressed to Peter of Celle. In John's mind, Pope Adrian IV occupied as important a place as Peter of Celle, though for different reasons.

Except for one letter which was written in reply to the Pope's, most of John's letters were letters of petition. When letters were written in connection with some law suit, they usually accompanied other letters.⁴⁷ Sometimes John's letters served as testimonials of the bearers going to the Curia.⁴⁸ Apparently the Pope had encouraged John to turn

46. JS Letters i, nos. 18 & 30. There may have been a rivalry between members of the royal and archiepiscopal missions at the Curia, but the direct cause of disgrace may not have been the bull Laudabiliter. (See notes 33 & 34 above). At least in 1159, John wrote in Met vi-42 about the charter and the ring which had been granted to him by Adrian and which were being kept in a muniment chest at Winchester at the time the book was written.

47. JS Letters i, nos. 15, 18, 30, 41.

48. JS Letters i, nos. 18, 50, 51, 52.

to him for help.⁴⁹ John's letters often included a little personal touch such as recent news⁵⁰ or reminiscences of their days together.⁵¹

No. 15 was written in the summer of 1156 on behalf of William, bishop of Norwich. This accompanied no. 14. In this letter the archbishop asked the Pope to issue orders so that archdeacon Walkelin might end his offences against the bishop of Norwich, stating the sequence of events which were causing problems for the bishop. No. 15 is more personal in tone and concentrated on describing Walkelin's offences against the Church and the bishop. John asked the Pope to prevent Walkelin from going unpunished and for this purpose to appoint a man of justice in place of the bishop of Worcester who was 'slothful in the execution of your mandate and is about to leave England'.

No. 18 was written in autumn 1156 and was probably sent to Sens with no. 17 addressed to a member of the chapter of Sens.⁵² It was to serve as a testimonial for a bearer who went to the Curia from Sens. John solicited the Pope to give a favourable hearing to the precentor of Sens and stop 'the violence of the archbishop of Sens'. John added news on the abbot of Reading and of Osbert, archdeacon of York.⁵³

49. JS Letters i, nos. 18, 50, 51.

50. JS Letters i, nos. 18, 30.

51. JS Letters i, nos. 21, 41, 52.

52. Letter no. 17 has been discussed in the section 3-IV-2-a.

53. See also JS Letters i, no. 16.

He turned to his own problem and appealed to the Pope to 'repay the bishop of Lisieux' for arousing the king's indignation which had made it difficult for John to leave England.⁵⁴

The Pope took immediate action and wrote both to the king and to John.⁵⁵ John probably wrote no. 21 in autumn 1156 in reply to the Pope's letter.⁵⁶ He thanked the Pope for the consolation that his letter had brought him. He referred to 'Fortune's rage, which she was venting on both of us' and congratulated the Pope on the peace which had been brought about by his good work. He remarked that his situation remained unchanged and described how he bore his present misfortune.

Letter no. 30 was written in early 1157 and accompanied no. 29 written in Archbishop Theobald's name.⁵⁷ No. 29 succinctly stated the case of William Cumin to whom the church of Chard was restored by Bishop Robert of Bath according to a papal mandate. The letter requested the Pope not to give a kindly hearing to clerk A. who was going to Rome to object to the decision. In no. 30, John presented the same case in a more personal tone. The latter half of the letter is devoted to John's own problem. He stated that the bishop of Lisieux had denounced him to Archbishop Theobald and his chancellor 'for abasing the royal dignity' and that he had even tried to discredit the Pope's letter

54. See notes 33, 34 & 46 in the present section.

55. In no. 28 to Thomas Becket and no. 30 to the Pope, mention is made of the Pope's letter to the king.

56. JS Letters i, no. 21, n 1.

57. See Saltman, Theobald, pp 145-6.

written in his defence. He further asked the Pope to help him retain the king's favour. Perhaps John wrote no. 30 more for his own sake than for William Cumin.⁵⁸

No. 41 was written in mid-December, 1157 and accompanied letter no. 40 written in Archbishop Theobald's name. No. 41 is also related to nos. 39, 42 and 43.⁵⁹ Both nos. 40 and 41 asked for the relaxation of the sentence of suspension imposed on Nigel of Ely who failed to carry out the papal mandate concerning the restoration of alienated property of his see. No. 40 is written in a tone which is well-suited to the rank and dignity of both the sender and recipient. The letter emphasises both the former and prospected service of the bishop of Ely and requests the Pope to 'turn your censure' to those who 'keep the possessions of the Church in their grip'. No. 41, written in John's own name stated that he was writing to the Pope at the request of the bishop of Ely. For the bishop had been faithful to the Pope and had been helpful to John in carrying out the papal mandate. John reported that he had deposited with the archbishop the sum of money transferred to him by the bishop for the execution of the papal mandate. John wrote at the same time to Master William, who was presumably at the Curia, instructing him to negotiate the matter with the papal chamberlain Boso.⁶⁰

58. On 12 May 1157, the Pope gave a privilege to Robert, bishop of Bath, but we do not know whether this is related to the present case. (JL 10272).

59. Their contents and background have been discussed in headnote to no. 39.

60. JS Letters i, no. 42.

Four more letters of John have survived which are considered to have been addressed to Pope Adrian IV. These do not seem to have accompanied letters written in the name of Archbishop Theobald. They can only be dated roughly between 1154 and 1159. Perhaps they belong to the later part of these years, as they do not reveal any close relationship between John and the Papal Curia. No. 46 may have been written in 1157.⁶¹ John solicited the Pope not to allow Baldwin, archdeacon of Norwich to renew his suit over the church of Yelverton. John recounted his disobedience against the bishop of Norwich and related his boast and the unbelievable rumours he was spreading regarding his relationship with the Papal Curia. Professor Brooke has identified the archdeacon as Baldwin of Boulogne with some reserve for Baldwin later appears as John's close friend and comrade.⁶² When John's letter was written, however, this archdeacon was a menace to the bishop of Norwich, for whom John wrote to the Pope.

Nos. 50 - 52 were meant to serve as testimonials. No. 50 was written for the monks of Merton Priory who were sent to the Papal Curia because of their problems over the church of Effingham and the church of Upton. Referring to the Pope's encouragement to write and to the request of his friends he briefly described the problems and commended the bearers, mentioning the Augustinian abbey of St. Ruf where

61. JS Letters i, headnote to no. 46.

62. JS Letters i, no. 46, n 1.

was abbot before he joined the Papal Curia.⁶³ No. 51⁶⁴ was made for one William, who was going to the Holy See for the second time because of 'the malice of his adversary'. This letter also refers to the Pope's encouragement to write and the request John received from his friend. No. 52 was written on behalf of a religious who was going to Rome to seek a dispensation to transfer to a stricter order.⁶⁵ John stated that his friendship with the religious dated back to John's meeting with the Pope at Ferentino and asked the Pope to grant his request. John expressed his confidence in the Pope's kindness reminiscing about the time 'when at Ferentino you gave me your own ring and belt as a pledge of things to come'.

We do not know what effects John's testimonials had on the bearers' reception at the Papal Curia. What we see in them is a sure sign of John's settling down in Canterbury. His ties with the English clergy and religious were strengthened as he started to live a more settled life. John's friendship with the Pope impressed his friends in Canterbury and John took advantage of it in helping them. As John's new service to Archbishop Theobald started, however, his ties with the Papal Curia weakened. After nos. 40-42, which were written in December 1157, somehow there are no letters to the Papal Curia which reveal the strengthening of John's relationship with his friends there.

63. JS Lettres i, no. 50, n 2.

64. Dr. McLoughlin has suggested that no. 51 was written probably 1156-7. (McLoughlin, p 252).

65. JS Letters i, no. 52, n 6.

Judging from letters alone, it is unlikely that John ever visited the Papal Curia after his three months stay at Benevento in 1155-56. While his importance as Theobald's secretary increased, John perhaps never forgot Adrian's 'pledge of things to come'.⁶⁶ John's testimonials for his friends may have had dual purposes -- to help his friends in England at the same time as to remind the Pope of his far off presence in Canterbury.

3. Conclusions

As discussed above, it is hard to detect in John's letters signs of his further visits to the Curia after Benevento in 1155-56. One is bound to wonder why, after this date, John served as Archbishop Theobald more as a secretary and letter-writer than as an envoy to the Papal Curia. It is true that around 1154, Archbishop Theobald needed to make changes in his household and his own political alignment. A secretary and adviser who could handle papal affairs with confidence would certainly have been useful for the archbishop. But he also had to send messengers to the Papal Curia. He does not seem to have employed John in that capacity in spite of his experience and connections. Ironically, he was considered unfit to be a messenger to the Curia because of his too close association with the Pope.

John was a capable and reliable servant of the archbishop at the Papal Curia. The relations that John had established and contacts which he had developed had served

66. JS Letters i, no. 52.

him well. But whatever John's mission was in 1155-56, it was not a success. Archbishop Theobald's 'messengers' were not received well at the Curia and they could not regain papal favour for the archbishop on account of the detractors and 'adversaries'. Moreover when John came back to Canterbury, he found a detractor at the king's court. Arnulf of Lisieux, who appears to have been at the Papal Curia at the same time as John, spread evil rumours so that John's name might be closely associated with Rome. John was accused of encouraging appeals to Rome, defending the freedom of election and the Church's right to jurisdiction in ecclesiastical causes. John was even considered to be an instigator of the archbishop's pro-papal policy.⁶⁷ In the situation in which the new Angevin king started to develop his own diplomacy towards the Curia, and when a difference of ideas between Canterbury and royal court was reflected at the Papal Curia, it was easy to pin the blame on the archbishop's messenger. Even though wrath of the king did not actually fall on John in 1156-7, it was difficult for Archbishop Theobald to send him as an archiepiscopal envoy to the Curia again for fear of provoking the king. Therefore Theobald employed John's other talent -- his skill of writing letters, particularly to the Holy See.

John's experience at the Curia served him much less as a letter-writer. His friendship with the Pope could no longer serve him on his missions, but he wrote testimonials for his friends instead, hoping that the Pope might help

67. JS Letters i, no. 19.

them. He also wished to remind the Pope of his own presence at Canterbury. With a hope that promotion might come from that direction, as the Pope once hinted, John waited in vain until he heard the news of Adrian's death in 1159. Metalogicon iv-42, which John wrote as he heard the news of Adrian's death must have been an expression of John's grief over the loss of his friend the Pope as well as that of his shattered hope for a career in the Curia.

While John served the archbishop as secretary, John's arch-enemy Arnulf of Lisieux visited the Curia in 1158,⁶⁸ and had personal contact with the Pope and Chancellor Roland.⁶⁹ He also maintained friendship with cardinals like Walter, cardinal bishop of Albano,⁷⁰ and Henry of Pisa.⁷¹ Arnulf of Lisieux wrote emphatically in support of Alexander III at the outset of the schism.⁷² It appears that Pope Adrian IV and his sympathizers at the Curia favoured more than one person from Henry II's realm. Walkelin of Suffolk felt himself favoured by the Pope.⁷³ Baldwin, archdeacon of Norwich claimed that he had been entrusted by the Pope

68. The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, ed. Barlow, F. London, (1939), pp 18-21.

69. The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, nos. 14-17.

70. The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, no. 25.

71. The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, nos. 27, 30. Arnulf also wrote a letter addressed collectively to John of Naples, William of Pavia, Henry of Pisa and Hyacinth Orsini. (no. 23).

72. One of John's sources for his letter no. 124 was Arnulf's letters to Pope Alexander III and to the English bishops. (JS Letters i, no. 124, n 1.)

73. JS Letters i, no. 15.

to collect a sum of money from the earl of Warenne.⁷⁴ Among the visitors to the Curia, it was not John but Arnulf of Lisieux who succeeded in maintaining his tie with the Curia until after the death of Adrian IV.

74. JS Letters i, no. 46.

IV Archbishop Theobald's clerks

1. John of Salisbury and Archbishop Theobald's clerks

How did John associate with his fellow clerks in the household of Archbishop Theobald? How did he keep his ties with them after the death of Theobald and the subsequent disintegration of his household? Episcopal clerks are relatively small figures in history. Unless they came to hold important ecclesiastical offices later on, as some of them indeed did, or they had other causes for renown such as the composition of books, the lives of episcopal clerks have little chance of surviving in the record of history. However, through John's letters, we can get a glimpse of their friendships. John wrote only one or two letters to each clerk, but with all the letters to John's fellow clerks collected together, they may present before us the careers, activities, and interests of the clerks in the household of Archbishop Theobald. They also testify how John associated with them while in the service of Theobald, and later on, how he tried to cultivate his former friendships in order to gain support for Becket. Sometimes John's former colleagues became members of other episcopal households, in which capacity they helped him facilitate his communication with their masters.

John made many friends in the household of Archbishop Theobald. He appears to have been on missions to Rome together with John of Canterbury and Thomas Becket¹ and he also wrote to them.² Perhaps John was not close to Roger

1. See the sections on 3-III-1, 3-VII-2-b, 4-VI-2.

2. JS Letters i, no. 28 to Becket, nos. 39 & 43 to John of Canterbury.

of Pont l'Évêque. He wrote to Roger in the name of Archbishop Theobald and later in the name of the clerks of Becket.³ While he was serving Archbishop Theobald, John wrote to Master Ralph of Sarre, and probably Master William and Master Ralph of Lisieux.⁴ After he went in exile, he wrote to former colleagues of Archbishop Theobald's household: Master Ralph of Lisieux, Peter the Scribe, John of Tilbury, William of Northolt, Hugh de Gant and Ralph of Wingham.⁵ A number of letters whose recipients have not been identified may have gone to people who had some connections with Theobald's household.

2. John's correspondents

a. (i) Ralph of Sarre

Ralph of Sarre is a recipient of one letter which is unique in the collection of John's early letters -- a commentary of the council of Pavia. John wished to gain the support of Ralph and the archbishop of Rheims on behalf of Pope Alexander III.

Ralph of Sarre was an Englishman⁶ and was probably a native of Sarre in Kent.⁷ He was a member of Archbishop

3. JS Letters i, nos. 203 & 307.
4. JS Letters i, no. 124 to Ralph of Sarre, no. 42 to Master William and no. 110 to Master Ralph of Lisieux.
5. JS Letters ii, nos. 155, 202-4 to Master Ralph of Lisieux, nos. 225 & 250 to Peter the Scribe, no. 256 to John of Tilbury, no. 255 to William of Northolt, no. 290 to Hugh de Gant, No. 258 to Ralph Wingham.
6. MTB iii, p 526.
7. JS Letters i, no. 42, n 1 & no. 124, n 1.

Theobald's household, but since we do not find his name among the witness lists of extant charters of Archbishop Theobald, he may have been in Theobald's service for a short period or spent much of his time on missions abroad. He also served Archbishop Thomas but he did not belong to his household.⁸ He is nevertheless included in Herbert of Bosham's list of eruditi.⁹ He appears to have made some connection with Rheims by June 1160¹⁰ and he was living in the chapter there by 1165.¹¹ In 1176-7, he succeeded Fulk as dean of Rheims and died about 1196.¹² After his removal to Rheims, he continued to have connections with Canterbury and he was probably the Ralph of Rheims who left some books to Christ Church including those by St. Denis.¹³

John probably made friends with Ralph in Archbishop Theobald's household and they had friends in common such as John of Canterbury and Bartholomew of Exeter.¹⁴ He was probably sent on a mission to the Papal Curia together with Master William in December 1157.¹⁵ It may have been on that

8. JS Letters ii, pp xxi-xxii. See also p xvi & no. 235.

9. MTB iii, p 526.

10. JS Letters i, no. 124.

11. Mats no. 146.

12. JS Letters ii, p xvi.

13. JS Letters ii, p xxxvi, n 3. Also James, M.R., Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover, Cambridge, (1903) pp 86-88.

14. JS Letters i, nos. 124, 118 & n 4.

15. JS Letters i, nos. 39 & 42.

occasion that Ralph of Sarre became friendly with Peter of Celle.¹⁶

John's letter no. 124 was written to Ralph of Sarre in June or July 1160 in reply to Ralph who probably lived in Rheims. At that time, diplomatic, political situation regarding the schism was fluid and whether to support Alexander III or Victor IV was the greatest concern among the churchmen. Ralph wished to know the English reactions and John wanted to influence Ralph and the archbishop of Rheims for the support of Alexander. The letter is mostly a commentary on the imperial council of Pavia held in February 1160 and the official rescript which contained the announcement of its decision in favour of the anti-pope Victor IV. John appears to have gathered information mainly through the letters and encyclicals issued by rival groups of cardinals, and popes and their supporters.¹⁷

Analysing the documents he had read, he denounced Frederick's policy and Victor's election and declared his support of Alexander. He criticised the behaviour of William of Pavia, at the time of the council of Pavia. John also informed Ralph who were the supporters of Alexander, who were not and who remained ambivalent: he described how the archbishop of Canterbury was carried in the litter to the synod of London to ensure the English bishops' support of Alexander: he informed Ralph that the bishops of Winchester and Durham might join the party of Victor IV and that the archbishop and treasurer of York were supporters of

16. PC Letters i, no. 74.

17. JS Letters i, no. 124, n 1.

Alexander. Praising the French king's firm support of Alexander, John expressed his fear that Henry II might be influenced by the German Emperor to support the anti-pope.¹⁸

No. 124 appears essentially to be a testimony of a discussion between two intellectuals who were concerned about the most important event of the day, the papal election. Ralph of Sarre was personally close to John and their interest and ways of thinking were similar, so he wrote to find out the situation in England. John, who was already firmly in favour of Alexander, tried to secure the support of Ralph and the archbishop of Rheims. John's support of Alexander may be partly owing to Theobald's, but he had his own reasons to prefer Alexander to Victor.¹⁹ John felt hostile to negotiatores and the Germans. Since Count Henry of Champagne was initially pro-Octavian, John would have wished to ensure that at least the archbishop of Rheims be on Alexander's side.²⁰ In June or July 1160, Peter of Celle was not in Rheims yet, so John had little tie with Rheims except through Ralph of Sarre.

The relationship between John and Ralph continued, although we do not possess any other letter between them. Since John spent most of his exile in Rheims, they saw each other there. Along with Peter of Celle and Master Fulk,

18. See also JS Letters i, nos. 121-3.

19. John felt hostile to negotiatores and the Germans. See the section 3-III-1.

20. Munz, P., Frederick Barbarossa, London, (1969) pp 228-32.

Ralph was John's and Becket's trusted friends.²¹ Ralph and John also had friends in common. Gerard Pucelle asked for John's advice through the agency of Ralph.²² And William Brito denounced John in his letter to Ralph.²³

John and Ralph of Sarre were tied to each other both in ecclesiastical business and academic interests while in the household of Theobald and afterwards. They cooperated with each other in work. They were personal friends. They belonged to the same circle of friends including Archbishop Theobald's clerks and monks of Christ Church such as William Brito. After Ralph found his way into the chapter of Rheims, he appears to have found his place in the circle of friends who had spiritual and academic interests. Ralph's interest in St. Denis and negative theology was shared by Count Henry of Champagne as well as John who joined Ralph in exile.²⁴ Ralph probably shared John's opinions of the relationship of the church and state and ecclesiastical politics in general. While secretary to Archbishop Theobald, John counted on him to support Alexander. After John's exile, Ralph was a supporter of Becket's cause. As a friend John wished to do

21. John consulted him on the question as to whether Becket should follow the advice of the Pope and allow the mediation of the Empress. (JS Letters ii, no. 179).

22. JS Letters ii, no. 184. However, Gerard's friend may have been Ralph Niger and not Ralph of Sarre. (See the section 4-III-2-b, 4-III-2-c).

23. JS Letters ii, no. 245.

24. For Ralph's interest in St. Denis, see Luscombe, D.E., 'The reception of the writings of Denis the pseudo-Areopagite into England' in Tradition and Change -- Essays in honour of Marjorie Chibnall presented by her friends on the occasion of her seventieth birthday, ed. Greenway, D., et al, Cambridge, (1985) pp 115-43, esp. 140-41.

what he could for the interests of his former colleague and friend -- he tried unsuccessfully to use his influence at the Papal Curia for Ralph's promotion to dean of Rheims.²⁵

a. (ii) Master William(?)²⁶

John wrote letter no. 42 in mid-December 1157 to someone who was on a mission to the Papal Curia, giving further instruction on the business to be carried out there. The letter has no heading but since the recipient was a companion of Master Ralph, he was probably Master William who appeared in no. 39 together with Ralph.²⁷ This same William may be the one who had been expected to go on a mission passing through Champagne before April 1157 with John of Canterbury.²⁸

Letter no. 42 was written to Master William to instruct him on business concerning the bishop of Ely. In letter no. 39 written to John of Canterbury in about November 1157,

25. JS Letters ii, no. 235.

26. Evidently there were several Williams in Archbishop Theobald's household. Prof. Brooke has named three: William of Pagham, William Northall and William de Ver. (JS Letters i, no. 39, n 9 & no. 46, n 3). From the analysis of Archbishop Theobald's charters and witness lists, Saltman listed in Theobald five clerks or chaplains whose names were William; William (charter no. 281), William of Clare, monk (nos. 77 & 78), William Cumin (nos. 147 & B), William of Northall, master (nos. 77, 78, 83, 84, 125 & 263) and William de Ver (nos. 46, 100 & pp 215-6). William of Northall appeared as 'master' in charter no. 77. William de Ver was chaplain of Henry II. (JS Letters i, no. 125, n 7). Since the recipient of John's letter no. 42 was Master William, he may perhaps have slightly more chance of having been Master William of Northall, who was also a recipient of no. 255.

27. JS Letters i, no. 39, n 1 & no. 42, n 9.

28. JS Letters i, no. 31.

John inquired after the way of collecting money from the bishop of Ely.²⁹ Since the bishop had paid the sum of money demanded by the Curia, William should negotiate with Boso so that the bishop might obtain the letters of absolution as had been promised. John gave news of events in England and mentioned the rise of food price in London, in whose connection he mentioned Master Ralph. Two letters to Adrian IV, no. 40 from Archbishop Theobald and no. 41 from John probably accompanied this letter.

Master William and Master Ralph probably stopped at Celle on the way to the Curia. On the commission of Abbot Peter, they stood for him at the Papal Curia to save the marriage of his niece.³⁰ Master William was a good friend and comrade of John. They cooperated in business and they shared friends both in and out of the household of Archbishop Theobald.

a. (iii) Ralph of Lisieux, Master³¹

In Master Ralph of Lisieux, we have an interesting correspondence between John and a clerk of the archbishop of Canterbury which continued from the pontificate of Theobald to that of Thomas. In their communication, we can observe how a dramatic change of social and political circumstances

29. Concerning the case, a detailed explanation has been made by Prof. Brooke in the headnote of no. 39. See also letters nos. 40 & 43.

30. PC Letters i, no. 74. See also the section 3-IV-3-b(i).

31. Prof. Brooke identified the recipient of John's letter no. 110 with Ralph of Lisieux with some hesitation. (JS Letters i, p 175, n 1). The following discussion will be made on the assumption that the recipient of letter no. 110 is Ralph of Lisieux, who is the same as the recipient of John's letters nos. 155 & 202-4.

affected their sentiments and topics of conversation while their friendship remained intact.

While in the household of Archbishop Theobald, Ralph appeared as witness to three extant charters which are dated between 1139 and 48.³² By 1159, he appears to have stayed at Lisieux for some time³³ and have been in close contact with the bishop and other Lexovians.³⁴ Ralph was one of the most trusted servants of Archbishop Theobald in the last years of his pontificate. Together with the bishop of Rochester, chancellor Philip and John of Salisbury, he was designated as executor^{or} of Archbishop Theobald's will in 1161.³⁵ One letter survives from the period of John's service to Theobald and four from the period of exile. Ralph was learned in 'philosophy' and well-versed in canon law.³⁶

Letter no. 110, which was written in July-August 1159, may be classified as an example of 'the humanist's letter'.³⁷ John and Ralph had not been together for long but apparently they had been in correspondence for some time. John heard from Ralph 'last autumn', and more recently William the physician, who was presumably in the company of Henry II's troops on the way back from Toulouse, brought him Ralph's greetings.

32. Saltman, Theobald, pp 215, 284, 310, 369.

33. JS Letters i, no. 110.

34. JS Letters i, no. 110.

35. JS Letters i, no. 134.

36. JS Letters i, no. 110 & JS Letters ii, no. 204.

37. JS Letters i, pp xxxviii-lii.

The theme of the letter no. 110 is John's praise of Ralph's eloquence made through the metaphor of spiced wine and his refutation of Ralph's criticism of his silence. It is made through rhetorical embellishment to be understood only by someone of equal literary knowledge and learning. The letter was primarily written for the sake of enjoyment of literary exchanges. Even though the correspondents appear to be bickering, there is an underlying love for each other.

Ralph must have been at Canterbury at the time of Theobald's death in April 1161, but what happened to him afterwards is not known. He does not appear to have served Archbishop Thomas, but he was possibly in Kent where the king's persecution of Becket's followers was severe. Evidently John had tried to communicate with him after exile before his first surviving letter was written. Before the summer of 1155, when John tried to contact bishops of London, Hereford, Worcester, Chichester and other English friends, he probably tried to communicate with Ralph without success.³⁸

The four surviving letters to Ralph after John's exile are totally different both in tone and in topics. They were written by an exile who was fighting for the cause of the exiled archbishop to his former colleague who lived in the area where the supporters of the archbishop were most severely persecuted. John wrote no. 155 most probably in 1165 or 66, expressing his concern for Ralph who had been

38. In letter no. 152, in which he reported the result of his attempted communications with his English friends, John reported to Becket that he had heard nothing from Kent.

silent and would not reply John's frequent letters.³⁹ Since John had heard of Ralph from travellers but not from Ralph, he presumed that Ralph refrained from writing out of precaution. But his anxiety for Ralph and his other friends made him send a personal courier, from whom Ralph could hear the news of John 'if you are at leisure and are permitted to and cared to'.

John heard from Ralph and wrote back no. 202. No. 202 is not datable but Prof. Brooke has suggested an early date from the references to the oath and John's peace.⁴⁰ Whether John wrote any letters between nos. 155 and 202 is not clear. No. 202 clearly stated John's standpoint and appears to have had a fairly distinct political intention. Ralph had obtained the information on John's peace and he appears to have stated an optimistic opinion on the oath proposed to and refused by John. The main difference of John's and Ralph's opinions regarding the oaths was that whereas Ralph was of the opinion that one should seek for peace for the sake of his relatives and friends, John believed that he should obey God's counsel rather than act on behalf of friends and relatives. John advised Ralph to ignore the rumours that Ralph had mentioned, expressing faith in God and the victory of 'Christ's poor'. At this point, John appears to believe that peace was near and knowing the possible difficulty, he urged Ralph 'to be a defender of God's law' as much as he could without danger. John

39. Professor Brooke has dated this letter between 1164 and 70, but he had pointed out the probability that it was written around 1165 or 66. (JS Letters ii, p xxvii).

40. JS Letters ii, no. 202, n 1.

referred to the bearer for some personal news and asked Ralph to give regards to his friends whose names he had entrusted to the courier.

This letter was written with full consideration of the situation in which Ralph was placed. John carefully avoided mentioning the king and explained deliberately in vague manner the reason why he was against taking the oath. Just as he was to do with the monks of Christ Church, John explained his opinion that it was more important to adhere to certain basic principles than to act on behalf of friends and relatives who were persecuted. John also tried to stop Ralph and his friends from taking the king's propaganda at face value. John informed him that Thomas's cause also had a chance and that 'those who have been wretched and given up for lost will come to his assistance'.

Ralph's view point on the conflict between the king and the archbishop may have been altered by John's letter. For he showed 'kindness' to John, for which John wrote no. 203, a short letter of thanks. John also asked Ralph to 'persevere in the course you have begun'. The expected role of Ralph was to 'comfort the scattered children of Israel, show mercy for the poor, serve the needs of the outlawed and discharge all the duties of your ministry as you have learned from the Apostle'. Letter no. 204 is also undatable. Ralph had presumably indicated through Adam⁴¹ his willingness to give further assistance to John. John

41. Adam here is not identified, but the nephew of Osbert of Faversham called Adam was sent presumably to Kent with a mission. For Osbert of Faversham and Adam, see below notes nos. 80 & 81.

praised Ralph for his good works and encouraged Ralph to continue his work to help the followers of the archbishop asking him to send urgently 'a kind, swift and fruitful answer to those to whom you are bound by old and just affection...'. Ralph who was 'educated in philosophy and proficient in Christ's law', was expected to act according to the instruction of the bearer of the letter. Ralph was probably perhaps a secret supporter of Becket at a place where royal control was strongest. Perhaps he gave financial help to John at first. Then he probably consented to take on a more important mission. He may have served as part of the link of communication between John and places in Kent.

In the three correspondents who have been discussed above, we can observe how John communicated with his fellow clerks while he was serving Archbishop Theobald. He enjoyed literary exchanges, discussed current topics and cooperated in works. Among these three correspondents, John maintained contact with at least two of them. Ralph of Sarre, who lived in Rheims was a supporter of Becket's cause and belonged to the academic and religious circle of friends around Rheims. Ralph of Lisieux seems to have stayed in Kent and remained there as a secret supporter of Becket. We do not know whether William of Northolt, who appears as John's later correspondent was in fact Master William to whom he wrote in 1157. If he was, that would mean that John kept in touch with all three of his early correspondents. While John was in exile, two of them appear as recipients of John's appeal letters.

b. (i) John's appeal letters in 1168⁴²

What with the removal of the Curia to Benevento, with the cessation of French financial aid and with the suspension of Becket, 1168 was a difficult year for the Becket party.⁴³ John wrote a series of letters to his English friends with the purpose of gaining their support and financial assistance, partly because watch over English ports was not in the tightest at that time.⁴⁴ Apart from letters sent to Christ Church and Exeter, about 25 such letters are extant. This number cannot be precise, because some letters cannot be dated and some recipients cannot be identified. Some letters are not appeal letters, but were written in connection with them, regarding messengers or other related matters. They mostly belong to the year 1168, but some letters containing similar references belong to earlier dates. Since Professor Brooke has already picked out some themes found in common in these letters,⁴⁵ the attempt here is further clarification and association with other letters and with political situations at the time.⁴⁶

42. The phrase 'appeal letters' is rather ambiguous and may be used in various meanings. Here it may be understood to mean the letters which were written to John's friends in England around 1168 asking for their support, mainly financial.

43. For the political situation of 1168, see Barlow, TB, pp 175-78.

44. English ports were watched particularly carefully after the council of Chinon in spring 1166, around Easter 1169 when Becket's repeated excommunication of the bishops was feared and just before the coronation of the young king. There is not much reason to suspect that the royal officials made a tight watch over English ports in 1168.

45. JS Letters ii, pp xl-xli.

46. See Appendix ii, tables II-1-a, II-1-b.

The central theme of this group of letters is that the archbishop was fighting exile and outlaw on his own resources⁴⁷ for the Church's liberty, particularly for the benefit of the English church.⁴⁸ Some letters included references to the Emperor's defeat in Italy.⁴⁹ In most of the appeal letters, John expressed his feeling that peace was near.⁵⁰ Some of them⁵¹ contained a reference to Peter's oarsmen toiling and coming into port.⁵² Another popular theme was John's material prosperity and strong denial that he was 'begging' on his own behalf.⁵³ They sometimes appear with expression on the misery of exile.⁵⁴ In some letters, John expressed his love to the recipients⁵⁵ and in others, he asked for charity.⁵⁶ John often asked for

47. From I Corinthian 9:7.

48. JS Letters ii, nos. 220, 250, 252, 255, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 266. No. 253 only refers to Becket's lone fight.

49. JS Letters ii, nos. 250, 251, 253. Nos. 220 to Prior Richard of Dover and no. 221 to Master Laurence of Poitiers, and no. 262 to William Brito contain similar reference, but the first two are dated summer-autumn 1167. (JS Letters ii, p xxxvii.)

50. JS Letters ii, nos. 220, 237, 250, 251, 253, 255, 256, 257, 258, 262, 263, 282.

51. JS Letters ii, nos. 250, 253, 257, 258, 260, 262, 282, 283.

52. Mark 6:48.

53. JS Letters ii, nos. 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 263, 266, 283, 284.

54. JS Letters ii, nos. 252, 256, 261, 282.

55. JS Letters ii, nos. 251, 252, 254, 255, 258, 268.

56. JS Letters ii, nos. 250, 252, 255, 257, 258, 262.

material help, sometimes suggesting ways of sending it undetected by royal officials.⁵⁷ References to his messengers are also frequent.⁵⁸ Some letters were written in John's fifth year of exile⁵⁹ and in two letters, John stated that his sixth year of exile was about to start.⁶⁰ To some correspondents, John expressed possible fear on the part of the recipients.⁶¹ With others, John felt that it was for their own good to show charity to the archbishop.⁶² Professor Brooke has pointed out that the letters were not of one date but written over a period of time.⁶³

In some cases further clarification is possible, occasionally leading to a possibility of closer dating. In JS Letters ii, there are a number of letters referring to the defeat of the Emperor in the summer of 1167. The reference appears in the summer or autumn of 1167⁶⁴ and the Emperor's fate continued to be John's favourite topic until about May 1168⁶⁵ and even later.⁶⁶ In some letters written

57. JS Letters ii, nos. 257, 258, 261.

58. JS Letters ii, nos. 255, 259, 265, 268, 269, 270, 282, 283.

59. JS Letters ii, nos. 237, 240, 252, 253, 254, 260, 284.

60. JS Letters ii, nos. 282, 283.

61. JS Letters ii, nos. 251, 252, 257, 258, 261, 262, 282.

62. JS Letters ii, nos. 257, 258, 262, 263, 264 and some letters to Christ Church Canterbury which will be treated under the respective section.

63. JS Letters ii, p xl.

64. JS Letters ii, nos. 220, 221.

65. JS Letters ii, no. 273 to Baldwin of Totnes.

66. JS Letters ii, no. 290.

in 1167-8, John used expressions such as 'the schism's head was broken.'⁶⁷ Among them, nos. 250, 251 and 253 are considered to belong to the turn of 1167 and 68.⁶⁸ John probably wrote them because he anticipated financial difficulties for Thomas when he heard of John Cumin's boast of having succeeded in desuading the French king and nobles from helping Becket.⁶⁹ We may presume that the carrier of at least one of them, no. 250, to Peter the Scribe, was Baldwin of Boulogne.⁷⁰ John wrote to Baldwin between about December 1167 and March 68.⁷¹ This letter was written in the fifth year of John's exile and it also mentioned the catastrophe of the Emperor. Since this letter and no. 250 to Peter the Scribe are the only letters in John's later letter collection that contain allusions to Exodus 16:7 and 4 Kings 4: especially 18-20, it is not unlikely that they were written at the same time.

Another feature of John's letters that needs closer attention is John's hope for 'imminent peace'. In general, Becket's party had no reason to hope for it except during a brief period at the end of 1166⁷² and possibly shortly before the conference of Montmirail in January 1169. There

67. JS Letters ii, nos. 220, 221, 243, 250, 251, 253.

68. JS Letters ii, p xl.

69. Barlow, TB, p 176.

70. JS Letters ii, no. 240. For Baldwin see the section 4-II-2-b.

71. JS Letters ii, pp xxxv, xxxvii and no. 240.

72. JS Letters ii, p xxxii.

are a number of letters that do not include this comment.⁷³ Among them, five letters concentrate on the diocese of Winchester.⁷⁴ No. 259 to Robert Limeseia⁷⁵ asked him to help the bearer and see to it that he get some financial help from Henry of Winchester. No. 260 to the bishop of Winchester asked for financial help. In no. 261 to Robert of Inglesham, archdeacon of Surrey, John asked him to present his wishes to the bishop and suggest to him that one can send money secretly. Nos. 265 and 266 were written to Prior William of Merton. No. 266 is a typical appeal letter. No. 265 is a more personal letter and congratulating the prior for his promotion, it asked him to go with the bearer of the letter to the bishop of Winchester and help him if possible. The letter was written later than 4 August 1167⁷⁶ and probably in the latter part of 1168, judging from the content of the letter to the bishop.⁷⁷ Perhaps John could rely on the support of Henry of Winchester and the prior of Merton without expressing his hope for 'imminent peace', which would have helped urge half-hearted supporters to turn to Becket.

73. JS Letters ii, nos. 252, 254, 256, 269, 270, 284.

74. For the five letters, see 3-VI-4.

75. For Robert of Limeseia, see the section 3-VI-4-b.

76. JS Letters ii, no. 265, n 1. Heads, p 175.

77. The reference to sending money secretly seems to appear in later appeal letters when the Becket party was in greater difficulties.

Apart from the lack of mention of 'imminent peace', one may also note that John hardly referred to fear of the king in his letters to Winchester and Merton. He merely made a passing remark in no. 261. On account of Henry of Blois's specially strong position and the distance from the centre of the king's persecution, the recipients of John's letters did not need to fear the king as much.

John's reference to the recipients' fear was expressed most strongly in his letters to Kent and Norwich. It appears particularly in no. 257 to Walter, bishop of Rochester and in no. 258 to Ralph of Wingham. In both letters, John mentioned the archbishop's fight for the Church's liberty, his hope for imminent peace, Peter and other disciples coming into harbour, John's own prosperity and the way to send money secretly. In both letters, John expressed his understanding of difficulties and probable fear on the part of the recipients, but he emphasised their own benefit in doing the work of charity. Judging from the similarity of tone, the letters may have been written about the same time. Becket's party was perhaps particularly in straits when John wrote these letters. Fully aware of the recipients' difficulties, John still had to write to them. Ralph of Wingham, John's former colleague in the household of Archbishop Theobald,⁷⁸ probably lived in Kent where fear of the king was greatest.

John appears to have written to his correspondents in the Norwich area more than once. No. 251 to Gerard,

78. Saltman, Theobald, p 453. McLoughlin, List A -- Recipients of letters written in John's name.

cellarer of Norwich and no. 253 to Walkelin, archdeacon of Suffolk, which include references to the defeat of the Emperor, were probably written at the turn of 1167 and carried by Baldwin of Boulogne together with no. 250. No. 262 to William de Turba asked for the bishop's charity. This is a typical appeal letter and contains usual features such as Peter and his fellow disciples having 'toiled at the oars' and the archbishop still soldiering on his own resources and those of a foreign people for the benefit of the whole English church. The letter has some semblance to nos. 257 and 258 which probably went to Kent in that it reveals an urgent state of need. They all urge the recipients to send money secretly, trying to convince them of the benefit of doing so with the prospect of 'imminent peace'. No. 262 along with nos. 257 and 258 may have been written when the prospects of Becket's party were at their worst and when they were much in need.

Among John's appeal letters, there are two letters which have little in common with others, namely no. 254 to William de Diceia and no. 256 to John of Tilbury.⁷⁹ No. 254 refers to John's five years of exile and his own prosperity. The letter mainly concentrates on the discussion of charity and John's complaint that his friends did not pay him back for his former favours. William de Diceia is not identified and we know about him only through John's letter. John probably did some favour to William while he was in office and hoped that William would pay him back.

79. See below 3-IV-2-b-(v) for John of Tilbury.

Finally, a number of letters have references to couriers. As discussed above, Baldwin of Boulogne was probably a bearer of no. 250 and some other letters. Osbert of Faversham's nephew Adam, who had some missions probably in Kent⁸⁰ may have been a bearer of some letters to that area.⁸¹ John also mentioned his messenger in his letters to Winchester,⁸² to William of Northolt who was probably in London,⁸³ and to Norwich and Bury which were sent probably about the end of 1168.⁸⁴ John asked Baldwin of Vale Darii,⁸⁵ Nicholas Decanus,⁸⁶ and Prior William of Merton⁸⁷ to assist the bearer. Since these letters have not been dated precisely, it is not certain whether they were written to assist carriers of John's appeal letters. Apart from Exeter⁸⁸ to which John maintained constant and reliable route of communication, John had to rely on ad hoc measures to deliver letters to their destination.

Among his former colleagues of Archbishop Theobald, John sent appeal letters to William of Northolt, Master John

80. JS Letters ii, no. 267. See also the section 3-V-2-h.
81. JS Letters ii, no. 204.
82. JS Letters ii, no. 259.
83. JS Letters ii, no. 255.
84. JS Letters ii, nos. 268, 282, 283.
85. JS Letters ii, no. 270.
86. JS Letters ii, no. 269.
87. JS Letters ii, no. 265.
88. Although Exeter is one of the farthest places from Rheims, John did not complain of difficulty of communication or scarcity of travellers.

of Tilbury, Ralph of Wingham and Peter the Scribe. For whatever reason, they are the ones whose support of the archbishop John felt he could hope for.

b. (ii) Peter the Scribe

We do not know where Peter was and whom he was serving during the Becket conflict, but he appears as a recipient of at least two of John's letters. One is a rare propaganda letter addressed to a non-Exeter cleric and that in 1167. The other is an appeal letter of 1168.

Peter the Scribe was probably a chancery scribe under Henry I, Stephen, the Empress, and Henry II from about 1130 to 1160.⁸⁹ He also worked for Archbishop Theobald and Canterbury Cathedral priory.⁹⁰ In the household of Archbishop Theobald, Peter was clearly a man of some importance. Archbishop Theobald requested the monks of Canterbury to grant him an income, which they did.⁹¹ He witnessed fifteen charters between 1149 and 1161 and appeared as co-witness to John in six of them.⁹² In the household of Archbishop Theobald, his function appears to have been to draft charters.⁹³

In 1167, much of John's and Thomas's attention was centred on the coming of the papal legates. Becket's party

89. JS Letters ii, no. 225, n 1.

90. JS Letters ii, no. 225, n 1.

91. Saltman, Theobald, pp 267-8, charter no. 40.

92. Saltman, Theobald, pp 214-5, 230-1, charters nos. 34-5, 46, 57, 125, 175 and A, pp 535-6.

93. Cheney, C.R., English bishop's chanceries, 1100-1250, Manchester (1950) pp 30-31.

was not sure what kind of power they were delegated with and since William of Pavia was known to be partial to the king, it was feared that matters such as the absolution of the excommunicate would be settled in his favour. John's campaigning which had been directed heavily to Exeter in 1166 was singularly lacking this year. Instead, John wrote one letter to Peter the Scribe. Wherever he may have been situated at the time, John probably believed that Peter should be informed of the archbishop's standpoint and his intentions as well as the news.

In about October 1167, John wrote a letter to Peter the Scribe in which he attempted an apology of Becket's behaviour and announced the archbishop's intention not to submit to the legates' decision.⁹⁴ After referring to the difficulty of communication, John wrote, taking Peter's situation into consideration, that 'it is not permissible to preserve or to defend the Church's freedom', but that he felt himself permitted to state the principles to which he devoted himself. John expressed his hopes for peace to be brought about by the cardinals but suspected the possibility that the archbishop might refuse their conditions unless the freedom of the English church was obtained. John defended the archbishop's behaviour since the Council of Clarendon in January 1164 attributing the cause of his action to his decision to defend the Church's liberty. As a sure sign of God helping the Church, John gave the news of the Emperor's flight from Italy and deaths of Rainald of Cologne and other

94. JS Letters ii, no. 225.

German prelates, expressing his faith that God would direct Henry II to the right path.

In October 1167, nobody knew exactly with what authority the cardinals were to perform their missions. Since John knew that the archbishop was reluctant to obey the judgement of the pro-Henrician William of Pavia, he could expect a postponement of reconciliation. To the English clerics, John wished to appeal that it was on account of Becket's persistence to the freedom of the English church. John probably wanted Peter the Scribe to spread the news and publicise Becket's standpoint as he had wished Bishop Bartholomew and Archdeacon Baldwin of Exeter to do when the bishops' appeals were made. John must have been fairly confident of Peter's support. Perhaps Peter's position was such that he could comply with John's request without much difficulty.

Whether John had heard from Peter the Scribe or not, John's expectation of his sympathy continued and he wrote another letter to Peter at the turn of 1167 and 68.⁹⁵ This was one of the earlier appeal letters. It referred to the defeat of the Emperor, which was considered to be a good sign for peace in the English Church. John expressed his hope for peace in the near future explaining at some length the reason for his confidence in this 'prophecy'. Referring to his own prosperity, John hinted at the need for help for the archbishop.

Peter the Scribe was probably considered to be one of the best available help for the archbishop's campaign.

95. JS Letters ii, no. 250.

While in the service of Archbishop Theobald, John probably worked in close touch with Peter the Scribe as both of them played an important role in the household. Being a scribe who possibly dealt with papal bulls and charters, he would have been more exposed to the upsurge of papal supremacy, which made it easier for him to accept some of Becket's contentions. From the two letters, we may gather that Peter was situated at a place where the king's power was felt but that he was still able to be a supporter of Becket without grave danger. John counted on his support when there was need, in spite of the difficulty of communication.

b. (iii) William of Northolt

Master William of Northolt, a colleague of John in the household of Archbishop Theobald, was a recipient of John's appeal letter.⁹⁶ He appeared in six extant charters issued between 1150 and 61,⁹⁷ and John was a co-witness to three of them.⁹⁸ He was a canon of St. Paul's under Gilbert Foliot⁹⁹ and was present at Mass when the letters of excommunication were delivered to the bishop of London on 20 May 1169 at St. Paul's.¹⁰⁰ William of Northolt served Archbishops Richard and Baldwin of Canterbury from 1175 to 86.¹⁰¹ He was archdeacon of Gloucester from 1177 to 86 and

96. Saltman, Theobald, pp 214-6.

97. Saltman, Theobald, pp 276, 301-2, 307-8, 347, 496.

98. Saltman, Theobald, pp 307-8, 347.

99. Le Neve i, p 64. G. Foliot, p 208.

100. DNB, vol 41, p 184. Barlow, TB, p 185. Mats, no. 508.

101. JS Letters ii, no. 255, n 1.

bishop of Worcester from 1186 until his death in 1190.¹⁰² If the recipient of John's letter no. 42 and 'Master William, a clerk of the archbishop of Canterbury' in no. 46 was William of Northolt, his relationship with John in Archbishop Theobald's household was that of an associate in the archbishop's business.¹⁰³

Letter no. 255 appears to be the first letter John wrote to William after exile and contains features of appeal letters. John had refrained from writing to William, but since he felt anxious about William and his other friends and since he felt that 'the storm is easing', he decided to enquire by the carrier of the letter how they were. He entrusted the carrier for the exchange of personal news. Stating that the archbishop toils for the general good at his own cost, John reminded him in a detour manner that it was for his own benefit to give on behalf of the archbishop. No. 255 was probably an early appeal letter. For John appears to be fairly confident of William's support and financial need seems to be less pressing at this stage.

Although a canon of St. Paul's under Gilbert Foliot, and in a good relationship with the king as his later career proves, William seems to have been sympathetic to Becket's cause. Whether William of Northolt was the Master William of no. 42 or not, he must have been a good friend and reliable comrade. Except for his friends in Exeter, William was probably one of the first English clergy to whom John wrote for support, for he was fairly certain of receiving

102. G. Foliot, pp 208, 284. Le Neve ii, pp 100, 107.

103. See the section 3-IV-2-a(ii).

it. Whatever help William gave or did not give, he was basically obedient to the archbishop, for he refused to be present at Mass after Gilbert Foliot was excommunicated.¹⁰⁴

b. (iv) Ralph of Wingham

Ralph of Wingham came from Wingham in Kent.¹⁰⁵ He was a clerk or chaplain in Archbishop Theobald's household¹⁰⁶ and appeared as a witness to one extant charter between 1151 and 1160.¹⁰⁷ Letter no. 258 to Ralph is an appeal letter which was probably written when Becket was in most pressing need. In this letter, particular emphasis was laid on the good prospects for peace and on the benefits of helping the archbishop. Having heard that Ralph was promoted to be a priest, John wished him well in his new office. He discussed the importance of charity and advised him to help the archbishop. He urged Ralph to get others to help the archbishop in case he could not do it himself. He also hinted that fear could not be Ralph's excuse for he was not under suspicion and therefore he could send money unnoticed if he wished to. This letter is more forceful and compelling than some of the others written for the purpose. From his letter, it is difficult to conceive John's relationship with Ralph of Wingham while they served Archbishop Theobald. Perhaps the archbishop's situation was so strained that John had to try to persuade or even compel someone whose support he was not sure of.

104. DNB vol 41, p 184. Mats no. 508.

105. JS Letters ii, no. 258, n 1.

106. Saltman, Theobald, p 215.

107. Saltman, Theobald, p 453.

b. (v) John of Tilbury

John wrote letter no. 256 to John of Tilbury sometime in 1168, but the letter has little in common with John's appeal letters. John of Tilbury served Archbishop Theobald as a scribe and notary.¹⁰⁸ He was one of the senior clerks of Theobald and witnessed eight extant charters between 1150 and 61 and he was co-witness with John in six of them.¹⁰⁹ He and John were the only principal clerks of Archbishop Theobald who served Archbishop Thomas as well. John of Tilbury appears as witness in two out of six extant charters of Archbishop Thomas issued between 1162 and 64 which have witness-lists¹¹⁰ and his name is included in Herbert of Bosham's list of eruditi.¹¹¹ He was probably the author of Ars Notaria Aristotelis dedicated to Henry II¹¹² and he appears to have composed three works on stenography by 1174-5.¹¹³ He did not accompany Archbishop Thomas in exile partly because of old age.¹¹⁴ We do not know where and how he lived afterwards.

From this letter, however, we may get a flavour of the thoughts exchanged between John and John of Tilbury and

108. Barlow, TB, p 31.

109. Saltman, Theobald, pp 215, 242, 246, 273, 317, 347, 363, 453, 382. Barlow, TB, p 31.

110. Barlow, TB, pp 81 & 84.

111. MTB iii, p 527.

112. JS Letters ii, no. 256, n 1.

113. Martius, M. Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters iii, Munich, (1931) pp 311-12.

114. JS Letters ii, no. 256, n 1.

possibly others, especially concerning philosophy and ways of life.¹¹⁵ In no. 256, John seems to feel that he should not praise his former days of prosperity during his present hardship. For it is against the 'philosophy' of life he had acquired to 'be distressed by the loss of temporal goods'. In the Metalogicon John discussed pagan philosophers such as the Stoics and the Epicureans.¹¹⁶ and described the person who was 'most truly philosophizing'.¹¹⁷ Perhaps in their 'philosophical musing' in the household of Archbishop Theobald, John of Salisbury and John of Tilbury discussed such matters as were incorporated into the Metalogicon. There are other letters in which John refers to philosophy and the philosopher's way of life.¹¹⁸ But no. 256 is the only one in which philosophy and philosopher's way of life is associated with John's intellectual life in Archbishop Theobald's household. In about 1168, John probably regarded John of Tilbury as a friend and former colleague who used to enjoy intellectual exchanges. He may have hoped that John of Tilbury could do something for him, but perhaps expected little by way of political support.

Of the four recipients of John's letters in 1168 who were his former colleagues under Theobald, John was more

115. For John's use of the word philosophy in his letters, see the section 4-III-2-c.

116. Met ii-2, iv-31, iv-35, iv-40.

117. Met iv-40.

118. JS Letters ii, nos. 158, 159, 194, 204, 256 -- to Gerard Pucelle, Master Nicholas, John the Saracen, Ralph of Lisieux and Osbert Faversham, and perhaps some others.

hopeful of support from Peter the Scribe and William of Northolt. John associated with them in business matters while he was in the household of Archbishop Theobald. They were probably in some ecclesiastical service and were not out of the favour of the king. Their previous relationship and present situation made John feel more certain of their support. John was not as close to Ralph of Wingham. They do not seem to have cooperated much in business nor to have had deep spiritual relationship. Perhaps sometime in 1168, when Becket's party was in straits, they had to seek out anyone who might possibly help. The only way of persuasion was to appeal to their charity and possible benefit they might have in case of the archbishop's early return. John's relationship with John of Tilbury was essentially different from the other three. They were friends who shared academic, philosophical, and perhaps spiritual interests. John of Tilbury may have been able to help John not out of political or ecclesiastical concern or calculation, but out of their old friendship. Their relationship probably remained basically personal.

c. Hugh de Gant

Hugh is a recipient of one extant letter of John written in 1169 in reply to or in connection with Hugh's greeting sent to Becket.¹¹⁹ The letter is essentially a news letter and was written after John's encounter with papal commissioners Gratian and Vivian, which made him hopeful of imminent peace.

Hugh was a clerk in Archbishop Theobald's household. He appeared as witness to four extant charters of Archbishop

Theobald between 1154 and 1161. In two of them, he was co-witness with John, his brother Richard, canon of Exeter, and Bartholomew, then archdeacon of Exeter.¹²⁰ His later career is unknown.

Letter no. 290 was written about the end of August 1169. The letter is packed with news. John expressed his delight in the better prospect of peace as a result of the defeat of the Germans. He related news from Italy and the Papal Curia and reported that the conditions of the mission of papal messengers, Gratian and Vivian and the terms of peace which had been revealed and proved satisfactory to Becket. Hugh was advised not to be disturbed by information from other sources. John wrote that he had not heard what reception the Pope's messengers got from the king, but that the king had bound himself to follow the Pope's advice. Hugh was told that Becket answered his greeting 'very fully and affectionately'.

No evidence has been found of Hugh de Gant in the service of Becket either at Canterbury or in exile.¹²¹ Although only one extant letter was written to Hugh, he appears to have been someone John could trust. Almost all the other news letters of this kind went to Bartholomew, or Baldwin of Exeter, whom John fully trusted and relied on.

Except for some letters which cannot be dated or can only be dated loosely between 1164 and 1169, there are only eleven extant letters written in 1169. Three letters were

119. JS Letters ii, no. 290.

120. Saltman, Theobald, pp 214, 273, 307, 308, 347.

121. Barlow, TB, p 310.

written in the aftermath of the conference of Montmirail,¹²² five about the end of the year.¹²³ The three remaining letters were written about late August.¹²⁴ Unlike 1168, John's correspondence was limited in 1169 and in 1170. He only wrote to persons and areas he knew well and where he was sure of support. Letters also went to places where John had less difficulty of sending them. Since the oaths to observe the supplement to the Constitutions of Clarendon was about to be extracted, communication with England was getting difficult. The letter to Baldwin of Totnes concentrated on the legal ground of the archbishop's excommunication of the bishops of London and Salisbury and the problem of taking the oath to obey the supplements to the Constitutions of Clarendon which the bishop of Exeter was about to face. The letter to Hugh de Gant was the only extant news letter that John sent to England at that time. John was fairly certain that Hugh would benefit by the news, if not propagate it. It may even be possible, considering the limited areas John's letters were sent to in that year, that the letter went to Exeter together with no. 289. There is no evidence, however, that Hugh had any relations with Exeter except that he appeared once as co-witness to Theobald's charter with John, his brother Richard and Bartholomew of Exeter.

122. Nos. 285 & 287 to John of Canterbury. No. 286 to Simon and Engelbert. No. 288 to Bartholomew of Exeter.

123. Nos. 292-295 to Christ Church. No. 296 to Master Herbert.

124. No. 291 to John of Canterbury. No. 289 to Baldwin of Totnes. No. 290 to Hugh de Gant.

3. Conclusions

Roughly speaking, John appears to have had two types of friends in the household of Archbishop Theobald -- 1) those with whom John shared spiritual and academic interests and 2) those with whom he cooperated in business. The former group probably included some monks of Christ Church. Ralph of Lisieux, John of Tilbury and perhaps Ralph of Sarre belong to the former group. Peter the Scribe, William of Northolt, Master William as well as John of Canterbury and Thomas Becket belonged to the latter. The two types are not clear-cut, and appeared to merge when the situation required. John of Tilbury, with whom John must have discussed philosophy, probably sent him a friendly greeting and John replied with a letter reminiscing about their old friendship. John expected little from him by way of political or financial support. Ralph of Lisieux, who was a 'humanist' like John and enjoyed literary exchanges, became a secret supporter of Becket in an area where the king's persecution was harsh. Ralph of Sarre who was probably a good comrade as well as a friend who shared intellectual interests with John probably remained as such while John stayed in exile in Rheims. Ralph was a supporter of Becket's cause and belonged to a spiritual and intellectual circle around Rheims. It is difficult to detect to which group Ralph of Wingham and Hugh de Gant belonged. We know too little about them. Ralph may have belonged to those who were interested in spiritual matters, whereas from John's letters we find that Hugh was not disinterested in news and political events. Peter the Scribe, William of Northolt and Master William were probably less interested in

spiritual or intellectual pursuits. They were more concerned about ecclesiastical politics and international relations. Peter the Scribe and Master William were more susceptible to ideas of papal supremacy. Peter's position in Archbishop Theobald's household, which probably gave him the chance to deal with papal bulls and mandates, must have made him more conscious of growing papal authority. Master William and Ralph of Sarre, as well as John of Canterbury and Thomas Becket had opportunities to feel this growing authority in the Papal Curia and perhaps they also saw that royal control of the Church was not strong in some places outside England. Among Theobald's clerks with whom John had business dealings, he probably had better relationships with those who were familiar with or interested in papal and foreign situations such as the clerks who were educated abroad or sent on missions abroad or had dealings with papal or foreign matters. Himself a cosmopolitan, John would have more easily communicated with them and shared opinions on ecclesiastical principles. Learned in letters and interested in cultivating a philosopher's way of life, John was inclined to choose friends with whom he could share such thoughts.

V Christ Church, Canterbury

1. Introduction -- John of Salisbury and Christ Church, Canterbury

As Archbishop Theobald's clerk, John could not be totally unaffected by the events at Christ Church especially when there were struggles between the archbishop and the monks of Christ Church. The archbishop of Canterbury was the abbot of the monastery of the cathedral church, but the prior under the archbishop was virtually regarded as the head of the monks. Therefore, there was a tension inherent in the relationship between the archbishop of Canterbury and the monks of the monastery of Christ Church. The monks wanted a degree of autonomy from the archbishop, who in turn guarded his authority over the monks.¹ Four priors served under Archbishop Theobald. Two of them maintained good relationships with him, but Theobald had fierce struggles with the other two.

Theobald's relationship with Prior Jeremiah (1137 - c. 1143)² was initially amicable, but a conflict started between them which seemed to have its root in Jeremiah's election to the priory sede vacante.³ After a series of bitter actions including the monks' appeal to Rome, the conflict ended with the resignation of Jeremiah.⁴ The next prior, Walter Durdent (c. 1143-49),⁵ maintained good

1. Concerning the status of the archbishop, Saltman, Theobald, p 56. Le Neve ii, p ix.

2. Le Neve ii, p 9.

3. Saltman, Theobald, p 57.

4. Saltman, Theobald, pp 57-9.

5. Saltman, Theobald, p 59. Le Neve ii, p 9.

relationships with the archbishop. During the exile of Theobald after the Council of Rheims in 1148, he was probably responsible for retaining the obedience of Canterbury to the archbishop while the archbishop failed the bishops.⁶ Walter was consecrated bishop of Coventry in 1149.⁷ Then, the archbishop appointed his chaplain Walter de Meri, alias Walter Parvus (1149-52/3).⁸ Since the estates of the monastery suffered and the monks ran into debt under his administration, the monks advised the prior to ask the archbishop to manage their estates. There was a conflict between the monks and the archbishop over their management. After an unsuccessful effort by the monks to appeal to Rome, Archbishop Theobald placed an interdict on the cathedral and deposed the prior.⁹ Wibert (1152/3-67), the sub-prior, was chosen to be the new prior.¹⁰ No conflict was apparent during the time of Theobald¹¹ nor possibly during that of his successor Thomas Becket until Wibert's death on 27 September 1167.

While John sometimes had to deal with the community of Christ Church on behalf of the archbishop, he also had friendly contacts with the monks. The archiepiscopal palace

6. HP - xviii.

7. Saltman, Theobald, p 59.

8. Le Neve ii, p 9, n 5. Saltman, Theobald, pp 59-62. JS Letters ii, p 302.

9. Concerning the conflict between Walter and Archbishop Theobald, see Saltman, Theobald, pp 59-62. For the date of deposition of Walter, Le Neve ii, p 9 n 5. JS Letters ii, p xvii. JS Letters i, p 302. Heads p 34.

10. Saltman, Theobald, p 62.

11. Saltman, Theobald, p 62.

was situated in the precincts of the Cathedral Church of Canterbury,¹² so they had an easy access. John and some other clerks had friends among them with whom they shared interest and exchanged books.¹³

John knew Prior Wibert and sub-priors William Brito and Odo. He knew such monks as Richard of Dover, Ralph of Arundel, Azo, and Robert, the sacrist. John also met some people who did not belong to Christ Church, but lived in the vicinity or had some relationships to the monastery such as Baldwin of Vale Darii, Thurstan of Acolt and Osbert of Faversham. During the Becket conflict, John was also to write to a royal official Robert de Broc on behalf of the monks of Christ Church.

2. John's correspondents

a. The community of Christ Church

John came into the service of Archbishop Theobald when the prior was Walter Durdent. After the period of happy cooperation between the archbishop and the prior was over, John observed a bitter struggle between them. He spent much time at the Papal Curia in the years 1150 and 51, but he was back at Canterbury for the concluding phase of the struggle. In 1152/3, after the deposition of Walter de Meri, John wrote to the community of Christ Church in the name of Archbishop Theobald announcing his sentences on the deposed prior and his accomplices.¹⁴ The archbishop commanded

12. Urry, W., Canterbury under the Angevin Kings, London, (1967) map 1.

13. JS Letters i, no. 111, JS Letters ii, nos. 245, 270.

14. JS Letters i, no. 1.

obedience to the monks and reminded them not to err but to keep the peace. Since the letter was written on behalf of Archbishop Theobald, John's personality is not revealed much. Whether the monks are conscious of John as the author of this letter or not they probably regarded him as the archbishop's agent.

b. Prior Wibert

Prior Wibert (1152/3-67) was the fourth prior of Christ Church under Theobald. He maintained good relationships both with Theobald and Becket and with the monks until his death in September 1167. Prior Wibert is known for his extensive acquisitions of holdings in Canterbury.¹⁵ He must have been interested in books and studies.¹⁶ He probably knew John of Salisbury and other clerks, but not much is known about the nature of his relationships with them. During the Becket conflict, one extant letter was addressed possibly to Wibert and Odo.

c. Prior Odo

Odo was a nephew of Prior Wibert.¹⁷ He was a monk of Christ Church and clerk to Prior Wibert.¹⁸ He was sub-prior in 1163 and was sent by Becket to the Curia as his

15. Concerning Wibert's acquisitions, Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin kings, pp 407, 28-34, 204-7.

16. Prior Wibert left a book to the library of Christ Church. James, M.R., The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover, Cambridge, (1903) p 96.

17. Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin kings, p 69.

18. Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin kings, p 69.

envoy in the dispute with the archbishop of York.¹⁹ He was elected prior after 16 May 1168 and probably before October or November 1169,²⁰ but without recognition by Becket. At the beginning of Lent 1169, when Gilbert Foliot tried to get the English religious and clergy to support him and to join in his appeal to Rome Odo complained to Richard of Ilchester that the monks of Canterbury had been forced to join in the appeal of the bishops against their father and archbishop.²¹ After his return to Canterbury, Thomas attempted to depose Prior Odo who was firmly supported by the monks.²² In fact after the murder of Becket, they wanted to elect him as archbishop in September 1172 and again after the death of Archbishop Richard in 1184.²³ In 1172-3, Odo played an important part in the election of Richard of Dover as successor of Becket.²⁴ In 1175, Odo was elected abbot of Battle after much persuasion and received the blessing not from the bishop of Chichester as would have been usual, but from Archbishop Richard.²⁵ According to the Battle chronicle, he was 'a man of exceptional holiness'. Besides his other virtues, he was renowned for his eloquence

19. DNB vol. 41, p 427. MTB v, p 45.

20. Le Neve ii, p 10. Heads, p 34.

21. Foreville, L'Eglise et la Royauté, p 192. Mats no. 552.

22. Barlow, TB, p 249. MTB i, p 542, MTB iii, p 89.

23. Barlow, TB, p 271.

24. Foreville, L'Eglise et la Royauté, pp 375-8.

25. Heads, p 29. DNB, vol 41, p 427.

with which, as one learned in divine studies, he knew how to bring forth at the right moment new teachings as well as old.²⁶ As abbot of Battle, he was involved in a law suit against Godfrey de Luci. He asked for assistance first from Bartholomew of Exeter and then from John of Salisbury. Both of them refused on the ground that Godfrey was a member of the chapter of Exeter.²⁷ Gerard Pucelle, a clerk of Archbishop Richard, succeeded in turning the tide in Odo's favour.²⁸ Abbot Odo died in 1200.²⁹

Odo was certainly a good friend of John and he held Odo in high regard. In the Entheticus, he described Odo as follows:

Odo bows himself totally over books, but still there is more grace in those which smell of Christ.³⁰

Odo probably had official and business as well as personal relationships with John. Except for one letter addressed jointly to him and Wibert, we have no letter to him during John's exile. John sent regards to him through William Brito.³¹ After Becket's murder, he wrote one letter

26. The Chronicle of Battle Abbey, ed. & trans. by Searle, E., Oxford, (1980) pp 282-5.

27. Morey, Bartholomew, pp 38-39. The Chronicle of Battle Abbey, pp 322-3.

28. The Chronicle of Battle Abbey, pp 330-1. Kuttner, S. and Rathbone, E., 'Anglo-Norman canonists of the twelfth century: An introductory study' in Traditio vol 7 (1949-51) p 302.

29. Heads, p 29.

30. Odo libris totus incumbit, sed tamen illis, qui Christum redolent, gratia maior inest. (Entheticus, vol i, 11 1675-6).

31. JS Letters ii, no. 245.

to the Pope in Odo's name commending Richard of Dover for archbishop.³²

d. William Brito

William Brito succeeded Wibert as sub-prior when Wibert became prior in 1152/3. John and William shared literary interests and William was probably the first person to read the draft of the Policraticus.³³ William Brito copied it without John's permission. John was a little annoyed but flattered when he wrote to Peter of Celle about 'that thief at Canterbury named Brito', from whose hands 'it could scarcely be torn' 'until it was copied in full'. William Brito is also described in the Entheticus as follows:

You will find Brito happy if cheese is present: more

however, he sometimes rejoices that books are present:

for as much as Brito's nature or rank allows,

he indulges himself in studies and takes his leisure in poetry.

A house which has been commissioned to him for its

management rises again, and the appearance of evil flees at his coming:³⁴

Apparently William Brito was a very amicable person.

He was also friendly with Theobald's clerk, Ralph of

32. JS Letters ii, no. 311.

33. JS Letters i, no. 111.

34. Invenies laetum Britonem, si caseus adsit:
plus tamen interdum gaudet adesse libros:
nam quantum patitur Britonis natura vel ordo,
indulget studiis, carminibusque vacat.
Dispensanda domus illi commissa resurgit,
atque mali species hoc veniente fugit:
(Entheticus vol i, 11 1667-72)

Sarre.³⁵ Five extant letters were addressed to William during the Becket conflict.

William Brito and Odo seem to have been good friends interested in studies. They both left books in Canterbury library.³⁶ John often associated Odo and William together.

In the Entheticus, John compared them as follows:

Brito's hand is careful, and Odo's tongue is golden

when it speaks of Christ: both are full of faith.

Let these be your companions, to them reveal all your affairs:

for Brito approves your amusement, Odo your wisdom.³⁷

After Becket's murder, John wrote one letter addressed jointly to Odo, the prior, William Brito, the sub-prior, and the monks of Christ Church recounting a miracle reported in France.³⁸

e. Richard of Dover

Richard of Dover received the monastic habit at a tender age at Christ Church, Canterbury.³⁹ He was made chaplain to archbishop Theobald and was close to Becket at

35. JS Letters ii, no. 245.

36. James, M.R., The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover, Cambridge, (1903) pp 42, 72, 96.

37. Cauta manus Britonis, Odonis et aurea lingua,
dum Christum loquitu plenus uterque fide.
Hi tibi sint comites, illis tua cuncta revela;
nam Brito, quod ludis, quod sapis, Odo probat.
(Entheticus, vol i, ll 1679-82).

38. JS Letters ii, no. 323.

39. DNB vol 49, p 191.

that time.⁴⁰ He was prior of Dover from 1157 to 1174.⁴¹ During the Becket conflict he was sympathetic to Becket and John wrote one letter to him.⁴² Upon return to England in December 1170, Becket sent him on a mission to the young king at Winchester,⁴³ and summoned him in connection with the deposition of Prior Odo.⁴⁴ Richard was elected archbishop of Canterbury in 1173, but his consecration was prevented by an appeal from the young king.⁴⁵ John wrote to the Curia and William of Sens in support of Richard both in his own name and in those of others.⁴⁶ As archbishop, he approved of the king's ecclesiastical policy,⁴⁷ and was considered by his contemporary to have lost for the Church every point for which Becket had fought.⁴⁸ He was also rumoured to have removed Prior Odo from Christ Church in the guise of promotion.⁴⁹ However, he gathered learned people around him and is counted among those who contributed in the

40. Barlow, TB, p 32. DNB vol 49, p 191.

41. Heads, p 88.

42. JS Letters ii, no. 220.

43. Barlow, TB, p 228.

44. Barlow, TB, p 249.

45. JS Letters ii, p xlv. Foreville, L'Eglise et la Royauté, pp 373 ff. Mayr-Harting, H., 'Henry II and the Papacy, 1170-1189', JEH vol 41, pp 39-53.

46. JS Letters ii, nos. 311-15. See also the section 4-IV-3-a.

47. DNB vol 49, p 192.

48. Giraldi Cambresis Opera (Vita S. Remigii) ed. Dimock, J.F., RS (1877), pp 69-70. Mayr-Harting, H., 'Henry II and the Papacy, 1170-1189'. JEH vol 41 (1965), pp 39-53. See also the section 3-VIII-2-e.

49. The Chronicle of Battle Abbey, p 289.

application of decretal law and in the development of English decretal collections.⁵⁰ During his pontificate John wrote one letter as bishop of Chartres.⁵¹

f. Robert, vice-archdeacon of Canterbury

Robert was Geoffrey Ridel's kinsman and his vicar.⁵² As such, he was probably situated in England and worked against the interests of Becket. He appears to have usurped some churches of Canterbury.⁵³ He is known to have taken possession of Charlwood in the deanery of Croydon.⁵⁴ On 13 April 1169 Becket threatened to excommunicate Geoffrey Ridel and Robert at Clairvaux.⁵⁵ He actually excommunicated them on 29 May and suspended them from their offices.⁵⁶ After the coronation of the young king, Becket was to take punitive measures against Geoffrey and was given authority to punish Robert as well.⁵⁷

60. DNB vol 49, p 193. Duggan, C., Twelfth century decretal collections and their importance in English history, London (1963), p 149.

61. JS Letters ii, no. 325.

62. Barlow, TB, p 184.

63. JS Letters ii, no. 248.

64. Barlow, TB, p 230.

65. Barlow, TB, p 184.

66. Barlow, TB, p 184.

67. Barlow, TB, p 216.

We do not know whether John was personally acquainted with him or not, but it is not very likely.

~~on 13 April at Clairvaux.⁵⁸ On the day of Becket's murder, Robert de Broc assisted the four knights by leading their way.⁵⁹~~

g. Other correspondents

John had about three individual monks as his correspondents. Ralph of Arundel is considered to have become prior of Hurley⁶⁰ and abbot of Westminster from 1200 to 1214.⁶¹ The incident described in letter no. 247 may have caused his transfer to the Westminster community of which he was probably a member.⁶² Nothing much is known about monk Azo except that he was possibly Azo or Athso, monk and priest of Canterbury and that his death is recorded in Christ Church obituaries.⁶³ Robert, the sacrist of Christ Church, Canterbury was a supporter of Becket. Upon Becket's return to England, Robert came down to join him at Wissant. He was later involved in a conflict between the monks and Archbishop Baldwin, in which he is reported to have acted stupidly.⁶⁴

John also had some friends in the vicinity of Canterbury. Baldwin of Valle Darii was one of them. He is

~~58. Barlow, TB, p 184.~~

~~59. Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin kings, p 184.
Barlow, TB, pp 242-4.~~

60. Heads, p 92.

61. Heads, p 77.

62. JS Letters ii, no. 246, n 1.

63. JS Letters ii, no. 263, n 1.

64. JS Letters ii, no. 299, n 1.

not identified, but he served under King Stephen possibly with John's brother Richard when he was still a boy. Baldwin then changed course and studied grammar. He may have had some relation to Christ Church, as he seems to have known William Brito.⁶⁵ Thurstan of Acolt was John's and John of Canterbury's friend in Kent.⁶⁶ Osbert of Faversham was also one of John's Kentish friends. He was probably a doctor.⁶⁷

3. John's correspondence⁶⁸

Most of the letters to Christ Church were campaign letters relating to the Becket conflict. The Becket party had no effective means to fight against the royal usurpation of archiepiscopal possessions. It was very important for them to secure the support of the monks of Christ Church. If the king succeeded in controlling the monks, the Becket party would have no place to return safely. And if the archbishop should fail to retain obedience of them, it would have had bad effects on his control over other religious or ecclesiastical institutions in England.

Most of John's letters were written on the instruction of the archbishop. There are a few letters which appear to

65. JS Letters ii, no. 270, n 1 & 2.

66. JS Letters ii, no. 264, n 1. See also 3-IV-2-b(i) & 3-VII-3-b..

67. JS Letters ii, no. 267, n 1. On Osbert see 3-IV-2-b(i).

68. The aim and nature of John's communication with Christ Church has already been discussed by Dr. McLoughlin. (McLoughlin, pp 471-489). Here we shall rather concentrate on the relationships between John and his correspondents, especially how they went through transitions according to the change of time.

have been written on John's own instigation. John also sent purely personal messages to Christ Church, but most of the time, these formed parts of letters written for other purposes. Business relating to Christ Church appears to have also been conducted through letters to his other friends in Kent.

The campaign towards Christ Church went through roughly two stages -- before and after the election of the new prior of Christ Church in May 1168. Each stage may be subdivided into several phases as the letters have been written in reaction to important issues of the time.

a. Before the election of Prior Odo

(i) While Wibert was in office

Wibert had been in office almost ten years when Becket became archbishop. The monks had regarded Becket as a gallant royal chancellor and archdeacon of Canterbury who did not return in spite of the repeated summons of his father, Archbishop Theobald. In fact, Canterbury chapter opposed the election of Becket as archbishop,⁶⁹ and the monks were offended by him particularly by the way he dressed.⁷⁰ When the archbishop fled from Northampton, the community had no prospect of how long the exile was going to be, nor what they would be expected to do. The exile of an archbishop was not an unprecedented event. Less than twenty years before, Archbishop Theobald had been an exile after

69. Warren, Henry II, p 455.

70. Barlow, TB, p 75.

71. Saltman, Theobald, p 29.

the Council of Rheims. At that time, Christ Church was probably the only community that kept obedience to him.⁷¹ This time the monks felt unexpected rigour on the part of the king. After Boxing Day 1164 began the persecution of the 'archbishop's familia, the exile of his followers and confiscation of their property. The ravaging by the royal officials Ranulf de Broc, and his nephew Robert de Broc, must have taken place before their eyes.⁷² Backed by royal authority, Robert also took extensive lands.⁷³

There are two extant letters which belong to this period. One letter was addressed to Wibert and Odo⁷⁴ which was written between 1164 and 1167.⁷⁵ In this letter John requested financial aid. In this letter, John emphasized that the archbishop was acting to restore the church of Canterbury and to fully recover 'the dignities and privileges which it enjoyed under the blessed Lanfranc'. John did not consider Becket to be 'on a par with his predecessors who are glittering with miracles in our church', but he felt that his cause was just as important as theirs. John requested financial help referring to the monks' duty to help their father.

72. Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin kings, pp 183, 308.

73. Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin kings, p 183. JS Letters ii, no. 236.

74. JS Letters ii, no. 205.

75. Prof. Brooke has pointed out the possibility that the letter belongs to the period after Wibert's death and before Odo's election. (JS Letters ii no. 205, n 1). Judging from the tone and content of the letter, it is unlikely that this was written after the prior's death. The letter does not betray any anxiety for problems which might be caused by his death.

This letter contains themes which appear in his appeal letters of 1168,⁷⁶ but it cannot be classified as an appeal letter nor a letter of campaign to Christ Church. It was probably written later than the latter half of 1165 when John started defining the conflict as Becket's fight for the freedom of the Church. This letter is also different from other letters to Canterbury in that almost equal stress is laid on the duty of the monks and on the interest of the Church of Canterbury, and also that in this letter Becket is described objectively, even coolly. This letter may be an early request of financial aid for the archbishop from his personal friends. At this stage, John was not concerned about the loss of obedience on the part of the community and he appears to be reasonably sure of the monks' support.

No. 220 to Richard, prior of Dover is another letter of financial request and is believed to have been written in summer or autumn of 1167. It refers triumphantly to the defeat of the Germans and expresses hope for imminent peace. John promised his service to the prior to whom he owed favours. He wrote hopefully about the time in the future when he would reminisce the present troubles as past, and referred to the archbishop's fight without the support of the English. The letter was possibly written more towards autumn than summer.⁷⁷

76. For appeal letters, see 3-IV-b(i).

77. Throughout the summer that year, communication from Rheims was difficult on account of a rebellion in the city against its archbishop. (JS Letters ii, no. 223.) No. 220 has a similar vein of thought as no. 242 regarding the defeat of the Emperor and no. 242 is dated late 1167. (JS Letters ii, p xxxvii.)

In the summer and autumn, before the arrival of the legates William and Otto, John felt optimistic about his return. He looked forward to returning favours to Prior Richard. He probably felt fairly certain that Richard's support would be secured through expressing his hopes of return and hinting at the lack of support from the English church.

We do not know how the monks felt about the major events of the time pertaining to Canterbury such as the excommunication of Ranulf de Broc and the repeated summonses of the archbishop directed to archdeacon Geoffrey Ridel,⁷⁸ which he ignored. The community of Christ Church at least remained united under Prior Wibert, who was probably ready to obey the archbishop just as Walter Durdent was in 1148.

(ii) The death of Wibert and the beginning of problems

The monk's peace and unity was broken by the death of Prior Wibert on 27 September 1167. Ranulf de Broc tried to take further possession of monastic estates.⁷⁹ Conflicts arose between different factions of monks, some in favour of taking sides with the king, others with the archbishop. The news of their unrest reached the archbishop and he commissioned John with the task of disciplining them.⁸⁰

No. 242 written probably in late 1167 was addressed to sub-prior William Brito, an old friend of John's. This letter appears to have been the first of the series of letters John wrote to Canterbury with the purpose of

78. Mats nos. 237, 238. Geoffrey Ridel may have been on the continent in the company of the king. (Eyton, p 101).

79. JS Letters ii, no. 236 & p xxxvii.

80. Barlow, TB, p 176.

controlling the monks' behaviour. Reporting triumphantly the fate of the schismatics in the same tone as in no. 220, John tried to admonish William Brito and the community of Christ Church. The archbishop's main grievances were the monks' continued communication with the excommunicate Ranulf de Broc and their handing over to the king of the Pope's letter on behalf of the archbishop. John admitted that his admonition might sound harsh to William but stressed that it was made as a friend. He added that it was not necessary to listen to the archbishop's summons possibly because he had interceded with Becket so that his anger would not fall on Brito if he did not obey.

In reply to John's admonition, William probably reported the news about Canterbury and expressed the fear of persecution by royal officials and asked him not to offend the king. Otherwise, they might be put into the hands of royal officials.

John rebuked Brito in letter no. 243 written in late 1167 for making excuses for not helping the archbishop. John reproached the monks for not supporting the archbishop with the excuse that 'the church's resources were once again made public'.⁸¹ John also accused William Brito of trying to prevent 'the escape of a man who had slipped out of the hands of murderers and had fled to the help of our

81. The statement refers to the revenues of the community moved into the hands of royal officials due to the vacancy of the office of prior. (McLoughlin, p 482).

supporters'.⁸² At the end of the letter, John referred to the books whose names 'are buried in his mind' and the seal he received in William's name, which 'your little Breton took' from him. The meaning of the reference is not clear, but obviously personal.

The difference between the standpoint of the two men was becoming clear. William Brito sought John's understanding of the situation at Canterbury and the monks' fear of royal officials. John appears to have ignored William's plea for sympathy and understanding and repeated his one-sided demands for firm support of the archbishop. Refuting this letter, William appears to have written not to John but to Master Ralph of Sarre, former clerk of Archbishop Theobald.

(iii) Towards the election of the new prior

What annoyed the Becket party at the end of 1167 to early 1168 was the monks' turning to the king for a licence to elect their new prior and their continuing association with the excommunicate Ranulf de Broc. Three letters no. 244 to Christ Church, no. 245 to William Brito and no. 246 to Ralph of Arundel were written in late 1167 or early 1168. They may have been sent together. They convey different messages in different tones, but read together, they are meant to appeal more totally to the monks to support the

82. Prof. Brooke has identified this man as Ralph of Arundel (JS Letters ii, no. 243, n 6) but Ralph appears to have still been in Canterbury when no. 246 was addressed to him in late 1167 or early 1168. He was banished because he showed a letter from the Pope to the chapter. The banishment appears to have taken place after no. 246 and before no. 247. Or else, as no. 243 and no. 246 are close in dates, Ralph may not have received John's letter, being already banished.

archbishop.

No. 244 is a letter of reproach and admonition addressed to the community of Christ Church, Canterbury from 'their fellow slave, the least of their brothers'. The main criticism by the Becket party was that the monks had turned to the king to obtain a licence for the election of their prior. From Becket's point of view, they should have turned to him. For the monks should not turn to secular authority in a matter of election to a monastic office. John reported of a brother who made an appeal against the archbishop in the name of the whole community.⁸³ He deliberately concealed his name in this letter, but revealed it to be Mainer in his letter to Ralph of Arundel.⁸⁴ Reminding them of the peril of associating with the excommunicate, John informed them of the papal decision conveyed to the legates to reimpose the previous sentence on those excommunicates who had been absolved without effect. This letter is designed to threaten and harrass the monks and John was deliberately adopting a high-handed attitude for that purpose, like a spiritual father admonishing his disobedient flock. What was hitherto expressed in his letters addressed to the person of William Brito is now stated in a harsher tone in an open letter to the whole community of Christ

83. This monk may be the same as the one described in no. 236 to John of Canterbury. In no. 236, John wrote, 'When the bishops had appealed in their own name and that of the kingdom, a clerk of Geoffrey, archdeacon of Canterbury, appealed on his master's behalf; and also one of the monks of Canterbury cathedral, who had not been sent for this purpose by his community, but to beg for the king's mercy to restrain that villain Ranulf de Broc from laying hands on the monk's possessions now that the prior was dead.'

84. JS Letters ii, no. 246.

Church. This letter sets the tone of John's later open letters.

No. 245 was addressed to William Brito. It was written in reply to William's letter to Master Ralph. William Brito probably wrote to Ralph refuting John and criticising his misunderstanding of the situation. William had probably also expressed his concern over the archbishop's reaction and his intentions. As in no. 244, John referred to the fact that the legates had not been given any instruction on the absolution of any of the excommunicates. Besides this, the letter concentrates mainly on the explanation of Becket's intentions. John wrote that Becket would hold William Brito and the community of Christ Church blameless unless he was provoked by their evil conduct. Becket had not made up his mind against William, but it was held against him that he had granted by charter a church to Robert de Broc, nephew of Ranulf, vice-archdeacon of Canterbury. John informed William of the presence of detractors and advised him to be careful not to invite misunderstanding. He reported, possibly in reply to William's question or request, that he could not persuade the archbishop to let the bishop of Rochester or some others to exercise part of his functions. In addition to his advise and regards to Odo, the letter contained personal messages such as a request, possibly repeated, for the letters of St. Jerome. The letters of St. Jerome were apparently very important to John, for he asked his friend Baldwin of Valle Darii to press Brito to send them to him.⁸⁵

85. JS Letters ii, no. 270.

No. 245 is a personal and even friendly letter. But it might have caused distress to William Brito. For the fact that he received a friendly letter from a supporter of the archbishop may have invited an adverse reaction from supporters of the king.

Letter no. 246 to Ralph of Arundel is a letter of commendation to a supporter of the archbishop at Christ Church. Apparently Ralph knew John of Salisbury and had contacted him before, but John did not write back to him, because he was not sure whether Ralph wanted to receive his letters nor was he certain of Ralph's support of the archbishop's cause. But Ralph proved his integrity.⁸⁶ As in no. 244, John referred to the fact that there were monks who turned to the king and had dealings with the excommunicate. One of them is Mainer, who made an appeal against the archbishop in France.⁸⁷ As was described in no. 244, apparently Mainer was considered to be an 'accomplice to the excommunicate' in France. John commended Ralph, the supporter of the archbishop and criticised Mainer, the follower of the king.

The three letters would have had different effects on the monks. They contained formal admonition as coming from the archbishop, information concerning the archbishop's intentions, commendation of the good behaviour and criticism of the bad. They may have helped turn the monks to support Becket but they may also have endangered the receivers,

86. JS Letters ii, no. 247. See also note 82 above.

87. JS Letters ii, nos. 236 & 244.

especially Ralph of Arundel. In a small closed society of a monastery, it was difficult to keep secret and the contents of those letters probably came to the knowledge of the whole community including the royal officials. Ralph of Arundel's banishment may have been caused not only by the event described in no. 247 but also by the fact that he received commendation from the Becket party.

After the three letters that went to Canterbury in late 1167 or early 1168, John was silent for a while. Perhaps the personal letter to William and commendation to Ralph worked against them. Or probably nos. 244 and 245 were not received well by William Brito, for the letters showed no understanding of or sympathy for the situation in Canterbury. William appears to have written to John slandering him for what John wrote out of kindness. John believed that William did not like to hear from him too often. But he learned from the bearer of the letter no. 247 and Osbert, presumably of Faversham,⁸⁸ that he had been misrepresented by false gossip. Therefore he wrote no. 247 sometime in 1168 because he felt that he should write when necessary. Other than personal reasons, John was obliged to contact the monks on this occasion. For one thing, the archbishop had to retain control of Christ Church. For another, financial and diplomatic difficulties facing Becket in 1168⁸⁹ compelled John to rally whatever support he could get. No. 247 to William Brito and no. 263 to Monk

88. JS Letters ii, nos. 195 & 267. For Osbert, see below and also above under the section 3-IV-2-b(i).

89. Barlow, TB, pp 175-6.

Azo, and no. 264 to Thurstan of Acolt which presumably went to Kent, contain features common with John's appeal letters of 1168.⁹⁰

In no. 247, John was conscious of the fact that he might be writing harsh words. This letter urged William Brito and the monks again to give help and to support the archbishop. John reminded William of his previous warnings and complained that when a papal mandate was directed to Christ Church or when there were discussions among the monks on the archbishop's interests, at once they were reported to the king through the royal official and that as a result, the Pope was accused and the monks were forced to act against the interests of the archbishop. For that reason, according to John, Ralph of Arundel was banished because he presented the Pope's letter to the English Church. John urged William again to persuade the monks to help the archbishop before it is too late. Copies of letters were sent and William Brito was told that something might be revealed to him and Odo alone under strict oath. At this point, John probably realized their lack of information due to royal intervention. The monks were blinded by fear and probably unable to comprehend the overall situation and therefore unable to form a judgement from a wider and more fundamental point of view. The copies of the letters were probably meant to supply the necessary information or verify what John had written. We do not know what copies of letters John sent. Mats no. 412 was issued by the Pope on 15 May 1168 to the chapter ordering it to accept the prior

90. For appeal letters, see the section 3-IV-2-b(i).

of the archbishop's choice. Could this be among them?

John wrote letter no. 263 to monk Azo sometime in 1168. This letter may have accompanied other letters with the aim of cumulative effect, but which ones it accompanied is not clear. In this letter, John accused Azo of lack of support for the archbishop and asked him at least to send the 'Quintilian which I asked for, written and corrected'. John probably singled out monk Azo to show up the monks' failure to support the archbishop. Letter no. 264 to Thurstan of Acolt was another appeal letter that went to Kent. John wrote to Thurstan for three reasons: intimate friendship; 'law and obligations of partnership' cultivated through serving the same masters; common friendship with the bishop of Poitiers. John urged Thurstan to make up for lost time and give the archbishop financial support.

Sometime in 1167 or 1168, John wrote to Robert, vice-archdeacon of Canterbury. No. 248 to Robert is considered to be connected with the threat to excommunicate Geoffrey Ridel.⁹¹ Expressing his hesitation to write to Robert de Broc, John informed him that the archbishop had raised many charges against him and that there was no absolution for those who are impenitent, reminding Robert of archiepiscopal sanctions. This letter was probably written to threaten Robert or the archdeacon of Canterbury, Geoffrey Ridel not to do harm to the monks. It was possibly also designed to be part of the campaigning to the monks who would certainly hear of the threat to Robert. Ranulf and Robert de Broc were excommunicated on 13 April 1169 at Clairvaux and

91. JS Letters ii, p xxxviii.

Geoffrey Ridel, on 29 May 1169.⁹²

Meantime, the new prior was elected to Christ Church, Canterbury sometime between 16 May 1168 and November 1169, possibly during the summer of 1168,⁹³ by the licence of the king. Since the new prior Odo was a personal friend of John and renowned for his learning and spirituality, the Becket party no longer had to worry about the monks' lack of unity. The next step was to lead them towards firm support of the archbishop.

(i) The claim of the bishop of London for metropolitan status⁹⁴

The important event that took place in 1169 was the excommunication of the bishops of London and Salisbury on 13 April 1169. The king's and the bishop of London's policy to counteract this was to hold councils of clergy and religious in London at the beginning of Lent and on 15 May at Northampton.⁹⁵ As a part of his campaign, Gilbert Foliot put forward a claim that he had made a profession of obedience to Archbishop Theobald as bishop of Hereford; when translated to the see of London he did not renew his profession to Becket on the ground that the see of London was the Mater not the filia of the see at Canterbury.⁹⁶

92. Barlow, TB, p 184. Concerning Ranulf and Robert's excommunication, see Mats nos. 488 & 494. Concerning Geoffrey's, Mats nos. 499, 500, 507. For the dating of Mats nos. 499 & 500, see Barlow, TB, p 309.

93. Barlow, TB, p 176. Heads p 34.

94. G. Foliot, p 151ff. McLoughlin, pp 484-7.

95. Barlow, TB, p 186.

96. McLoughlin, p 486. Barlow, TB, pp 86, 186.

With slight distortion, this can be interpreted to mean that the bishop of London was immune from Archbishop Thomas's excommunication because he owed no obedience to Canterbury and because the metropolitan see should be in London.⁹⁷ One of the tactics of the Becket party was to stir up the feelings of the monks of Christ Church against the bishop of London, for his claim was certainly unacceptable to them. Therefore, another set of letters were dispatched to Canterbury: John's no. 292 to Christ Church, no. 293 to William Brito and possibly Mats no. 502 from Becket to the community of Christ Church.

The central theme of letter no. 292 to Christ Church written in late 1169 was the claim of the bishop of London. John exaggerated and misrepresented his claim saying that the bishop of London had made a public assertion that he owed no obedience to Canterbury and that he would have the metropolitan throne transferred to London. Moulded around this theme were John's denunciations of Christ Church. In no. 293 to William Brito, John asked him to send two monks to the Pope so that they might be ready to defend the cause of Canterbury when the bishop of London set out for the Curia.⁹⁸ John asked William to help the archbishop and solicit the brothers.

Mats no. 502 from Becket to the community of Christ Church seems to be related to John's letters nos. 292 and 293. The dating of the three letters is somewhat different,⁹⁹ but their contents are closely related. The main topic of Mats no. 502 is Gilbert's contention that the

97. JS Letters ii, p xxxviii.

metropolitan throne belonged to the church of London and that Gilbert owed no obedience to the see of Canterbury. The archbishop recounted the bishop of London's offences and ordered the monks to send two brothers to refute the bishop of London in the presence of the Pope. In this letter, stress is laid on the recent excommunication of the royal servants including the archdeacon of Canterbury, Geoffrey Ridel and his vicar Robert. About the same time two other letters were written by Becket. Mats no. 499 is a letter to the clergy of Kent announcing the excommunication of Gilbert of London and Ranulf de Broc, and ordering them not to obey Geoffrey, archdeacon of Canterbury and his vicar Robert. Mats no. 500 is an announcement of Robert de Broc's excommunication.¹⁰⁰

John's letter to the community of Christ Church probably served to unite the archbishop and the monks of Canterbury in sharing opposition to the bishop of London. His letter to William Brito laid down what should be done. Becket's letters must have helped validate John's information as well as impress the monks with his own authority. At this time, the archbishop's authority was strong enough, with the papal backing, to excommunicate some

98. After his excommunication, the bishop of London made up his mind eventually to go to the Curia. (Barlow, TB, p 186). The Becket party had probably heard the news.
99. John's letters nos. 292 and 293 are dated late 1169, but Mats no. 502 is dated c. 13 April 1169. (Duggan, Thomas Becket, p 239.) In this letter Geoffrey the archdeacon of Canterbury appears as one of the excommunicate. According to Barlow, Geoffrey was excommunicated on 29 May, 1169. (Barlow, TB, p 184.)
100. Concerning the dating of Mats nos. 499 & 500, see note 92 above.

important royal officials. At this stage, both Becket and John were reasonably confident of their support. They could hope that the community would send two monks to Rome, who were to speak against the bishop of London.

(ii) After the conference at Montmartre

After the failure of the conference of Montmartre on 18 November 1169, the archbishop wrote a series of letters to English clergy. Mats no. 573 to Christ Church and no. 574 to clergy of Kent were among them. Becket announced that unless peace was made by 2 February, 1170, a general interdict would be laid over England. He also announced among other things that Geoffrey, archdeacon of Canterbury and his vicar Robert and others who had been excommunicated in April and May were to incur the same ban. He threatened to excommunicate the king.

John's letter no. 295 to the community of Christ Church was written in October or November 1169 and was possibly sent with the archbishop's letters. It is a strong admonition to the monks to support the archbishop. John reviewed recent events. The excommunication of the bishop of London had not been expected to take place, but it did. And it was confirmed by the Pope. The papal messengers, Gratian and Vivian, had been sent to absolve the excommunicate on condition that the king make peace with the Church according to the Pope's prescription. Geoffrey Ridel and others who were also excommunicated in the spring had been absolved on the continent. But peace, which was the condition of their absolution, did not come within the time limit set by the Pope, so they fell under the ban. John

urged the monks to support the archbishop through his often repeated arguemnt, but the tone was harsher.

John's letter no. 295 was accompanied by Becket's announcements and they may have worked together to change the 'attitude of the monks. For in no. 294 written to William Brito between 1167 and 70, possibly in 1169 or 1170,¹⁰¹ John expressed his delight in finally receiving financial help from Christ Church. He commended William Brito to continue his work and advised him 'if the brother's salvation cannot be served any other way', to divert funds without their knowledge. John referred to the bearer of the letter who had oral messages. From this letter it seems that William Brito was cooperating with John, although he had difficulty in persuading other monks. Sometime in 1169, the tide appears to have turned in favour of the archbishop at Christ Church, Canterbury.

In the spring of 1170, John received a messenger from Robert the sacrist of Christ Church, Cantrbury. The messenger conveyed to John the devotion and friendship of Robert. John wrote no. 299 to thank him for his care, and urged him to serve the archbishop and the Church. John referred to peace being imminent and told him not to be dismayed if the papal envoys, the archbishop of Rouen and the bishop of Nevers, come to England, because they come with good intentions. John wrote hopefully of his return in

101. JS Letters ii, no. 294 is dated by Prof. Brooke 1167-70. He pointed out the stronger possibility that the letter belonged to 1169-70. Dr. McLoughlin has argued that the letter was written before November 1169. (McLoughlin, p 483, n 173).

the near future. Robert's expression of devotion and friendship may be related to no. 294 written possibly in 1169-70 in which John expressed his delight to William Brito in receiving material help from him.

(iii) The coronation of the young king

When the Becket party was beginning to feel hopeful in early 1170 that peace was imminent, the king's intention of crowning young Henry before Becket's return became apparent. Letter no. 300 was written in May or June, 1170, addressed to the community of Christ Church from 'John of Salisbury, least of the outlaws'. John's main purpose in writing was to let the monks disseminate the Pope's letter prohibiting the young king's coronation if the letter had reached them, as John believed it had. He further urged them not to be threatened away from issuing their prohibition and appeal or from ordering suffragans to the Church by the authority of the Holy See to be absent from the ceremony. John expressed a rather optimistic view of the king that as the Lord's anointed, he would 'do no injury to those who come to him seeking justice'. In spite of John's campaign, the coronation took place on 14 June, 1170. At this point, John no longer stressed obedience nor lack of unity, but redemption of their former misdemeanour.

No. 303, the last extant letter to Christ Church during John's exile, was written in mid-October 1170. It was addressed to William Brito, sub-prior, Robert, the sacrist and obedientiaries of Christ Church. John announced the restoration of peace to the English Church and the return of the archbishop after the feast of All Saints. He asked them

to prepare to meet their father and to send across the sea 'a token of faith and friendship, devotion or counsel'. They should redeem their delay and welcome the archbishop just as their predecessors who were the first to welcome St. Anselm when he returned from exile. We know that the monks did as advised and Robert, the sacrist, met the archbishop at Wissant.¹⁰²

At about this time, the Becket party was reasonably sure of the monks' support. The archbishop could at least hope that they would promulgate the papal letter prohibiting the coronation if it fell into their hands. They were also sure that at last Christ Church was ready to receive the archbishop back again, if not whole-heartedly, at least with obedience.

c. John's campaigning tactics to Christ Church

When we compare John's task to Christ Church with that to Exeter, we realize that the one to Christ Church was much more difficult. Mutual love and friendship between John and his family and friends in Exeter exempted him from the efforts of trying to win their faith and support. Besides, the Exeter area did not go through territorial upheaval following the confiscation of Becket's and his followers' property. It probably saw much less persecution on the followers of the archbishop. Instead, John had to help and advise the bishop of Exeter because he was almost under constant pressure to support the king.

102. Barlow, TB, p 223.

In Canterbury, John was faced with a different situation. Kent saw territorial changes and persecution of Becket's followers. The care of the archbishopric was deliberately entrusted to men who were the archbishop's personal enemies. Under their supervision, the monks must have been under constant threat of persecution. In addition, compared with the twenty-two years of Theobald's pontificate, Becket's two years were too short to form an effective impression of him as abbot and archbishop. Many monks remembered him mainly as royal chancellor, the disobedient archdeacon, and the archbishop who fled, after two years in office, leaving his sons persecuted. According to the more recent royal propaganda, Becket was an archbishop who was ungrateful to the king and refused to obey the ancient customs that his predecessors, even a saint among them, accepted and obeyed, and was therefore a traitor of the realm. In this situation, John's task was to make the monks see the Becket dispute not as his personal strife against the king but as a struggle involving some fundamental issues pertaining to their spiritual life, and to make them accept Becket as their abbot and archbishop.

During the first phase of his campaign after the death of Prior Wibert, John tried to unite and control the monks through his friend, sub-prior William Brito so that the monks might give spiritual and financial support to the archbishop and that they might not approach the excommunicated royal servant Ranulf de Broc and through him, the king. The attempt was not successful. John and William Brito were talking on two different planes. John tried to persuade William Brito to see the problem from a more basic

and fundamental point of view.¹⁰³ Various themes were used recurrently for this purpose. The strongest undercurrent appears to have been the appeal to charity and the monks' duty of obedience to their father. But William Brito tried to get John to understand the actual situation at Canterbury with a hope of relief from the ordeal through actions of the archbishop. As sub-prior after the death of the prior, he was responsible for the welfare of the monks. William Brito's appeal to John on account of his fear of the king was probably understood by John. He would have replied as he so often did when he talked about hardships that God will not suffer the faithful to be tried beyond their strength.¹⁰⁴ However, John's sense of duty to the archbishop probably made him suppress some of his personal feelings. As a member of the Becket party, John also came to see the conflict as a matter of principles. For those principles the Becket party were suffering as exiles and outlaws and that it was on behalf of the clergy and religious of England. John could not forgive the monks for being so complacent about the exiles' suffering and complaining about their fear of persecution. The only attempt he could make to revive their old friendship was through personal comments at the end of the letters. At this stage, the more John pressed his points, the more angry William Brito seems to have been over John's lack of understanding and compassion.

103. For John's aims to Canterbury, see McLoughlin, pp 481-2.

104. I Corinthians 10:13. JS Letters ii, nos. 32, 151, 161, 170, 181, 188, 199, 206, 250, 289, 300.

John had to devise a new method of persuasion. He stopped trying to achieve the expected result through William Brito alone. For as long as John tried to do that, his letters would sound like personal criticism and would only anger Brito. Therefore, John tried to incorporate all the criticism in an open letter addressed to Christ Church, deliberately adopting the manner of an abbot admonishing his flock. As a result, critical comments hitherto made sporadically in personal letters were allocated in the subsequent letters addressed to the community. Therefore we see criticisms like the division among the monks, their lack of obedience and failure to give support to the archbishop and their communicating with the excommunicate, and references such as the authority of Catholic church as against the king's power, the faint-heartedness of the English clergy and religious, God's justice, the Church's liberty, exile and outlawry for justice's sake, mercy, charity and help to the suffering brothers and to their father in his plight repeated as if John were trying to impress the ideas by repetition on the minds of the stubborn monks. John searched for an effective way of handling disobedient flock and possibly found an idea in the way employed by Archbishop Theobald. John's more personal messages were put in separate letters addressed to the party concerned. This method allowed him to express harsh admonitions of the abbot-archbishop as well as John's own sentiments. The method was an improvement, but it found some difficulties at the initial stage. John's letters continued to appear to be imposing and unreasonably one-sided demand on the monks whose conflict with the king

brought so much suffering to them. It may also have helped royal officials to spot and persecute the archbishop's supporters among the monks.

In 1168, the hitherto strong tie of friendship between John and William Brito was in danger. According to what John understood, William did not wish to hear from him. However, judging from the comments of those who had visited Brito, and compelled by the circumstances which required contact with Christ Church, John tried once more to change Brito's mind and to turn the monks to support the archbishop. This time John wrote a sincere but harsh letter of accusation to William. He supplied copies of letters that were probably hard for them to obtain on account of the king's interference. John also sent a threatening letter to Robert de Broc.

Meanwhile, a new prior was elected. He was John's and Brito's friend Odo, whom Becket had once employed as an envoy to the Curia. He seems to have been elected of his personal qualities and as a person, acceptable to the Becket party, although the election was carried out without the archbishop's recognition. Under the circumstances, the result must have been satisfactory for the Becket party, for it was not entirely unlikely that a royalist like Mainer could have been elected. Throughout John's correspondence after the election of Odo, we hear not a single reproach of the new prior. John's efforts in informing the monks of the archbishop's intentions, his dispatch of letters containing information that was hard for the monks to obtain and his threat on Robert de Broc may have helped achieve this

result. The nature of John's achievement was probably that he succeeded in making Brito and Odo think and act not according to everyday concern but on more fundamental grounds. The election of Odo may be considered largely a success of John's campaign. For during the year 1168, little could be done by the archbishop to impress his own authority to the community of Christ Church.

With Odo elected as the new prior, John and Becket were no longer concerned about lack of unity of the monks. They could take it for granted that the new prior had basic understanding of the archbishop's standpoint. If the ties between the community and the archbishop were strengthened, the Becket party could hope for their support and cooperation. By this time, John's campaigning method was more or less established. His chief message went in open letters to Christ Church written in the form of spiritual admonition; more informal messages and instructions went to William Brito and others in separate letters.

One opportunity which the Becket party could exploit to strengthen the ties between the archbishop and Christ Church came with the bishop of London's claim for metropolitan status. Between March and June 1169, when Gilbert Foliot tried to rally support of the English clergy and religious against the archbishop, he failed with the clergy, but succeeded in gaining support from the English monastic circles. Some ten English abbots and priors wrote

testimonials to the Pope.¹⁰⁵ We do not find the prior of Canterbury among them. On the contrary, sometime in June 1169, we find him complaining to Richard of Ilchester about being forced by the bishop of London to take part in an appeal against his father.¹⁰⁶ John's letters accompanied by Becket's must have helped generate the monks' enmity towards the bishop of London. At least, the monks and the archbishop were united in their opposition to Gilbert's claim.

What ultimately turned the monks to support the archbishop was the display of his authority from the spring of 1169 onwards: his excommunication of the bishops of London and Salisbury and of the royal officials; his announcements addressed to the clergy of Canterbury; his threat of interdict and of excommunication of the king. The monks would have felt by this time that not only 'kings have long arms, bishops can stretch further'.¹⁰⁷ The archbishop's return now appeared imminent. Through the combination of threats and harrassment, repeated admonition and explanation of the archbishop's conduct with up-to-date information of the situation on the continent that was favourable to the archbishop the monks were made to accept

105. Barlow p. 186. Mats, 518--27
Mats no. 518 London Chapter post 18 March 69
Mats no. 519 L. of Westminster
(MS Abbot Ramsey) 18 March 69
Mats no. 520 William of Ramsey c. 18 March 69
Mats no. 521 W. of Ramsey post 18 March 69
Mats no. 522 A. of Chertsey June 69
Mats no. 524 William of Reading.
Mats no. 525 A. of St. Osyth's June 69
Mats no. 527 William of Holy Trinity London June 69

106. Mats 552 Odo to Richard of Ilchester, June 1169.

107. JS Letters ii, no. 248.

the archbishop as their spiritual father. This could have been best achieved by John who was 'the only substantial figure from Theobald's circle in the list of Becket's eruditi'.¹⁰⁸ For he knew from his experience in the service of Archbishop Theobald how to deal with the monks. He also understood from Theobald's exile after the Council of Rheims the utmost importance of retaining control of Christ Church.

In order to perform his task, John had two assets: one was his friendship with the monks and the other, the impression of authority he had left as secretary to their former abbot and archbishop Theobald. Monks found in John a friend who shared their interest in books and scholarly pursuits. But they remembered him acting with authority on behalf of the archbishop. They sometimes felt that he was less amicable, for some of the archbishop's orders were not to the liking of the monks. The dual role John played made the monks conscious of the fact that he was not 'one of them' and therefore not the best representative of their interests. John's personal qualities and his scholarly interest were not enough to remove the feeling of doubt and alienation from their mind. For they thought that if there was a clash of interests between the archbishop and the monks, John would stand by the archbishop. Although John's efforts played an important part, alone they were not enough to bring the monks the support of the archbishop. Furthermore, John's campaigning was far from sufficient to turn the monks' minds to the acceptance of Thomas as their spiritual father. It is recorded that the first time the

108. JS Letters ii, p xxii.

monks felt that the archbishop was a true monk was when they discovered after his murder that he was wearing a hair shirt and breeches.¹⁰⁹ It was perhaps after his murder that Thomas was accepted as a monk and abbot. It probably required his canonization for Thomas to win the monk's love and veneration.

d. John and the monks of Christ Church after the murder of Becket

Since the murder of their abbot and archbishop took place in their cathedral, the monks of Christ Church were most seriously affected by the event. We have little record of what happened to individual monks who appeared as John's correspondents, but we are able to trace fairly well the later lives of Prior Odo, Richard of Dover, and John of Salisbury and examine how they interacted with each other in the aftermath of the murder.

(i) Prior Odo

Odo appears to have played a crucial part in controlling the monks throughout the conflict. When he was elected prior, he would have known the danger inherent in this election which took place after the papal mandate was issued ordering the chapter to accept the prior of the archbishop's choosing.¹¹⁰ He would also have known of the fate of Prior Jeremia who was elected sede vacante about 30 years before. The Battle Chronicle records Odo's words as he was persuaded to be abbot of Battle: 'For me, being prior has always been more a burden than an honour. I certainly

109. Barlow, TB, p 250. MTB iii, pp 147-8.

undertook it unwillingly and have held it to this moment unwillingly and under compulsion'.¹¹¹ Probably that was how he was elected prior of Christ Church between May 1168 and November 1169.

Prior Odo and the monks had sent Robert the sacrist to Wissant to welcome the archbishop as advised by John. Nevertheless the monks must have been bewildered and even hostile when the archbishop actually returned to Canterbury. As was expected, the archbishop was harsh on his own convent and was contemplating Odo's deposition and was seeking a replacement outside Christ Church.¹¹² The respect which John and the monks had for Odo did not change the fact that he was an illegally elected prior and therefore deserved some kind of archiepiscopal sanctions. Only the murder of the archbishop saved Odo from deposition.¹¹³

After the murder of Becket, Prior Odo made great efforts to secure a 'free election' and to nominate a candidate that would satisfy different parties concerned.¹¹⁴ In the course of trouble caused by the young king's appeal which prevented the consecration of Richard, John of Salisbury wrote in Odo's name to the Curia and to William of

110. Mats no. 416.

111. The Chronicle of Battle Abbey, pp 288-9.

112. Barlow, TB, pp. 232, 249.

113. Barlow, TB, p. 249

114. MTB i, pp 239-44. Concerning the election, Mayr-Harting, Henry II and the Papacy, 1170-1189', JEH, vol 16, (1965) pp 39-53. Foreville, L'Eglise et la Royauté, pp 373ff. JS Letters ii, p xiv.

Sens on behalf of the archbishop elect and other bishops-elect.¹¹⁵

A curious story has been handed down to us concerning the relationship between Prior Odo and Archbishop Richard: the 'archbishop feared 'the firmness and perfection of his (Odo's) behaviour, as one who could not easily, saved by reason, be got to consent to his will' and for that reason, Richard wished to remove Odo from the office of prior and transfer him elsewhere 'under the guise of greater honour'.¹¹⁶ In spite of this, Odo seems to have belonged to a confederation of alliance and mutual aid formed around Archbishop Richard. Odo relied on it in the 1170s and it did not fail him as was shown in the law suit against Godfrey de Luci.¹¹⁷

(ii) John of Salisbury

John was the only principal clerk of Archbishop Thomas who was at Canterbury at the time of the murder. We hear little of what happened to Thomas's former clerks afterward.¹¹⁸ After the death of their master, they had lost their political significance and were merely clerks without a patron.

In John's correspondence, we find a letter written to William of Sens in the name of miseri Cantuarienses in early 1172.¹¹⁹ The letter disclosed Roger of York's scandal in

115. JS Letters ii, nos. 311-15.

116. The Chronicle of Battle Abbey, pp 288-9.

117. The Chronicle of Battle Abbey, pp 14, 330-31.

118. Barlow, TB, p 263.

119. JS Letters ii, no. 307. See the section 4-V-3.

his personal life and accused him. It was probably written in indignation after Roger of York's suspension was lifted on 13 December 1171.¹²⁰ Whoever the rest of the miseri may be, John is considered almost certainly to be the author of no. 307.¹²¹

John appears to have been engaged in various activities around Canterbury after the murder of Becket. He was probably in the service of Bartholomew of Exeter and Prior Odo at Canterbury and was once more regarded an authority in appeal cases.¹²² Odo and Bartholomew were in contact towards the end of 1171, as the bishop of Exeter took an important part in the reopening of the cathedral of Canterbury.¹²³ In 1173, John wrote letters to the Curia and to William of Sens commending the archbishop-elect, the bishops-elect of Winchester and Hereford both in his own and in the names of Bartholomew and Odo.¹²⁴ John worked as a

120. JS Letters ii, no. 306, n 1.

121. JS Letters ii, p xliv.

122. JS Letters ii, p xivi. The closeness of John with Odo and Bartholomew can be observed through the way Peter of Celle's letters were sent to Canterbury. John wrote to Peter a letter similar to no. 305 to which Peter replied with PC Letters ii, no. 121. (JS Letters ii, no. 305, n. On no. 305 see the sections on 3-VII-4-d and 4-IV-3-e.) Peter's no. 121 may have accompanied no. 149 to Prior Odo of Canterbury. They both express his relief to learn John's safety. Peter also inquired details of Thomas's miracles to Prior Odo in his letter no. 150. In both nos. 149 & 150, Peter sent regards to John. Peter also wrote to Bartholomew expressing his regret not to be able to visit the tomb of St. Thomas. (PC Letters ii, no. 128.)

123. Morey, Bartholomew, p 33.

124. JS Letters ii, nos. 311-21. On the campaign of English clergy to support the bishops-elect against the young king's appeal, see GFL nos. 221-6. Also the section 3-VIII-2-e and 4-IV-3.

witness of papal judge-delegate decisions or as judge himself.¹²⁵ He worked mainly with Bartholomew of Exeter, Roger of Worcester and Richard of Ilchester.

John was engaged in working for Becket's canonization, writing the vita of Thomas and collecting Thomas's letters,¹²⁶ which later formed part of a larger and more comprehensive collection of Thomas's letters by Alan of Tewkesbury. In 1174-5, John wrote to the Pope in support of Herbert, archdeacon of Northampton.¹²⁷ He also sent tales of miracles reported at the council of Bourges to Christ Church.¹²⁸ He may have been in France in 1174-5, but we do not know who sent him and for what purpose. Nor whether he was there in connection with his election to the bishopric of Chartres.

(iii) Richard of Dover

Richard was probably one of the few supporters of Thomas in England at the time of his return and the archbishop relied on his service and advice. He was at Canterbury at the time of or just after the murder of Becket. Eventually it was Richard who got hold of the situation and arranged for the burial of the archbishop.¹²⁹ He was apparently good at handling practical situations.

125. JS Letters ii, p xlvi & n 2 & no. 322.

126. Duggan, Thomas Becket, pp 85-98. JS Letters ii, no. 305. See the section 4-IV-3-e.

127. JS Letters ii, no. 324.

128. JS Letters ii, no. 323.

129. Barlow, TB, p 249.

Richard of Dover's election to Canterbury was made with a view to choosing someone who was the least harmful to all parties concerned and the least provocative to the dignitaries abroad. On that account he had to be careful and make great efforts to cooperate with various parties concerned and not to provoke any of them, especially the king. This was why he appeared even to his contemporaries to have given in too much to the king. The removal of Odo from Canterbury may also have been made to secure the peace in his pontificate. For a prior much venerated and fully supported by his monks might one day become a threat to the archbishop. Richard recognized the importance of canon law and gathered able clerks around him. But he refrained from employing former Becket's clerks possibly for fear that they might form a dissident group.

4. Conclusions

In his twelve years of service in the household of Theobald, John made his own circle of friends, which included monks of Christ Church. With some of them, John shared his interests in books and literary studies. John liked some monks very much and held others in great esteem. At Canterbury probably John enjoyed the same kind of monastic friendship as he did in Champagne. The friendship did not take the form of epistolary exchanges as they lived so close to each other. We can get a glimpse of such a friendship mainly through the Entheticus and through John's requests for books and other personal messages in his letters. One difference is that at Canterbury, John sometimes acted as clerk to Archbishop Theobald.

We do not know how Prior Odo and the monks received John who was sent to Canterbury to represent the archbishop at a synod on 18 November 1170.¹³⁰ Nor do we know how John mediated between the hostile monks and angry archbishop. The murder of the archbishop removed one obstacle for the restoration of their former friendship -- John was no longer serving a master who was in conflict with the monks. In the course of John's murdered master turning into a martyr, it would not have been difficult for John and the monks of Christ Church to revive their old friendship. Along with Prior Odo and Bartholomew of Exeter, John took part in the campaign against the young king's appeal which prevented the consecration of Richard of Dover. John's name as a former clerk of the martyr would have been well received in the Curia and by William of Sens. What John could not do (nor could Bartholomew) was to stand up to Godfrey de Luci in support of Abbot Odo of Battle. Friendship alone was insufficient to let them overcome fear of the powerful justiciar Richard de Luci, Godfrey's father, just as it had been for the monks to overcome the fear of royal officials during the conflict. It took the clerk of Archbishop Richard, a man of greater importance and higher status, to save Odo from these difficulties. After Odo had left for Battle, John appears to have remained at Canterbury until he received the announcement of his election to the see of Chartres on 22 July 1176.¹³¹

130. Mayr-Harting, H., 'Henry II and the Papacy 1170-1189'
JEH vol 41 (1965) p 39.

131. JS Letters ii, p lxi.

Archbishop Richard, for whose support John wrote letters to the Curia and William of Sens does not appear to have given John the opportunity to do him service which John had offered back in 1167. Richard may have been eager to maintain his monastic friends and sphere of influence, but once elected and consecrated, he probably wished to have little to do with the murdered archbishop's clerks. They might express dangerous ideas in or out of the household of Archbishop Richard, when he was working towards peaceful cooperation with the king at the time of readjustment and reconciliation between Church and State. Archbishop Richard preferred to have new men like Peter of Blois, Gerald of Wales and Gerard Pucelle in his service. Perhaps he represented those who enjoyed the benefit of the newly-canonized martyr, but who did not wish to be reminded of the process through which he became one.

Sometime between 1177 and 1179, Archbishop Richard received a letter from a '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.'¹³² The letter reminded Richard of the presence of people who tried 'at the devil's prompting' to hide 'the virtues and good works of the most blessed Thomas', while he was fighting for God's law and the Church's liberty. John recounted a miracle that had happened to such folk in his presence at Chartres. He closed his letter saying '...may you remember ourself and our church in God's presence and the glorious martyr's through whom your church and city have

132. JS Letters ii, no. 325.

grown famous throughout the whole world.'

Through the story of a miracle, the letter appears subtly to criticise men who slighted Archbishop Thomas while he was alive and were forgetful of God's grace and Thomas's merits that were revealed in his martyrdom. John probably could not help feeling bitter about such trends in England as represented by Archbishop Richard. He felt a little vindicated that a reward for his devotion finally came to him from the people who understood and appreciated the cause that the martyr had fought for.

V1 English Clergy and Religious

1. John and English Churchmen

The main category of people John associated with outside the precincts of Canterbury were English churchmen. John had known some for a long time, but most were acquaintances made while he was serving Archbishop Theobald. John met them on many occasions. He probably had contacts with them regarding law suits and appeals. He sometimes met them at synods. He may have come to know some of them through friends and relatives. He may have known some merely through letters which he wrote in the name of Theobald. In this section, we shall consider what relationships John developed with them and how they were affected by the Becket conflict. The monks of Christ Church, the bishops of Salisbury and Exeter and the former clerks of Archbishop Theobald are excluded as they have been dealt with above. For the sake of better understanding of John's relationship with English churchmen, two bishops are included in this section even though they were not recipients of John's extant letters.

2. Recipients of lost letters

i. Propaganda War in 1166

Some letters written by John to English churchmen were either lost or destroyed. We know that the letters were written from references John made in his other letters. Among the recipients of such letters were Gilbert Foliot, the bishop of London and Robert of Melun, the bishop of Hereford.

Unlike John's other correspondents, they belonged to the opposition. Both bishops were deeply involved in the propaganda war of 1166. The central incidents are concentrated in the months of June and July, 1166, with a few scattered letters in the earlier or later part of 1166.

Becket pronounced the Vézelay sentences on 12 June. The news reached the king possibly at Chinon on 16 or 17 June. The king dispatched orders that English bishop should appeal to Rome against Becket's action.¹ About the same time or earlier, the Becket's party made at least three attempts for the news to reach English clergy --(i) Becket wrote to the Canterbury suffragans;² and to the bishop of London;³ and sent the papal letter announcing his legation.⁴ (ii) As a protective measure he also sent another set of letters to Hereford and Worcester, requesting them to show the papal letters to the bishops of London, who would in turn show them to the bishop of Durham. The bishops of

1. Eyton, p 95.

2. Mats no. 198.

3. Mats no. 239.

4. Mats nos. 172 & 173.

Hereford and Worcester were also requested to notify the grant of legateship to the bishops of Bath, Salisbury, Exeter, Chester, St. David's and Winchester.⁵ (iii) John of Salisbury wrote to Bartholomew of Exeter.⁶ Owing to the general difficulty of communication, which was made worse by the blockade of the English coast, three sets of letters went through different courses. John's letter to Exeter probably reached its destination without much trouble and its content was duly known. The letters to the bishops of Hereford and Worcester were supposed to be delivered to the senior of them according to the papal practice of the time. However, Bishop Robert was not at Hereford, but was probably taking part in the council of London drafting the appeals of the bishops. The carrier of Becket's letters turned to Roger of Worcester, who acted as instructed.⁷ The letters to London did not reach their destination until St. Paul's day (30 June) and was served on the bishop by a stranger.⁸

While three sets of letters from the continent were following different courses, Gilbert Foliot acted on the king's command. The bishops met on 24 June in London and 6 July at Northampton.⁹ They drafted appeals to the Pope and

5. Mats no. 179.

6. JS Letters ii, no. 168.

7. Cheney, M., Roger, Bishop of Worcester 1164-1179, Oxford (1980) pp 30-1.

8. GFL no. 168.

9. Barlow, TB, p 146.

to the archbishop.¹⁰ It is not known how many bishops attended the meeting, but according to Councils and synods, '...presumably a fair gathering must have been needed to account for the confident presumption of GFL nos. 166-7...'¹¹ It is possible on the contrary, that only a few bishops gathered at London, namely those of London, Hereford and perhaps Winchester and drafted the appeals.¹² Since only a short notice could have been given after the arrival of the king's order until the council of London, the two or three bishops drafted the appeals to the Pope and a letter to the archbishop with the assumption that other bishops would agree to the measure.¹³ Gilbert Foliot had probably obtained and yet hoped to obtain the consent of other bishops possibly at the conference of Northampton on 6 July.

The bishops who gathered at London had to act on the information available at that time. The king's instruction to the English bishops certainly contained news of the Vézelay censures, but it could not have included a copy of the papal announcement of Becket's legation. The bishops may possibly have obtained a copy of John's letter no. 168, which was probably written with the intention of supplementing Thomas's Mats no. 198, a formal announcement

10. Barlow, TB, p 146. Councils and Synods, pp 918-9. Mats no. 209, from Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques to Becket, ante 24 July 1166. GFL nos. 166 & 167.

11. Councils and Synods, p 919.

12. Mats no. 209.

13. GFL no. 165 to Nigel of Ely may have been one of Gilbert Foliot's attempts to gain the English bishops' support for the appeals. A similar request appears to have also been made to the bishop of Norwich.

of the Vézelay censures. It included a threat to excommunicate the king. Since the letters dispatched by the archbishop to the bishop of London had trouble reaching their destination, the king's command and John's letter to Exeter were probably the only reliable information the bishops had at the time of the draft of the appeals. John's letter, which was at least an authentic representation of the standpoint of the opposite party, may have provided a guideline for the bishops' appeal.

John's letter no. 168 explained the process that led to the Vézelay censures.¹⁵ According to John, Henry II used to be a good king, but he started to oppress the Church from the time of his attack on Toulouse. The present archbishop who had participated in it as royal chancellor now repented and confessed his fault. On the other hand, the king was punished for his offences against the Church by the trouble in Wales. John described the measures that the king had taken at the conference of Chinon and the archbishop's journey to Soissons and Vézelay, where he excommunicated some royal officials and condemned Henry's customs.

The bishops' appeals¹⁴ centred on two themes:

(i) protest against the archbishop's excommunication of the royal officials and suspension of the bishop of Salisbury without due canonical process; (ii) defense of the king's person and behaviour. The English bishops' appeal to Pope

14. GFL nos. 166 & 167.

15. On JS Letters ii no. 168, see also 2-V-3-b(ii).

Alexander III¹⁶ tried at first to impress upon the Pope how good a king Henry II was. The king reacted quite reasonably when the bishops of London and Hereford visited the king on the borders of Wales in 1165 to exhort him.¹⁷ Henry II was a most Christian king, because when there were licentious clerks, he referred their crimes to ecclesiastical judges. The customs were recorded not to oppress the Church's liberty but to secure peace in the land. The letter went on to reproach the archbishop for contumacious and inordinate behaviour; he had excommunicated royal servants who had not been cited nor defended, thereby subverting the order of justice. The suspension of the bishop of Salisbury was also an inordinate and unjust sentence on the part of the archbishop. Therefore they appealed to the Pope. The letter of the English bishops to the archbishop¹⁸ was shorter but similar in content, but it started with a sarcastic congratulation of the archbishop for repenting for his past deeds and turning to the life of devotion and prayers. It criticised the archbishop for his ingratitude to the king who made him what he was. The letter also stressed how good and reasonable the king was and how he was ready to make correction in case he had behaved unjustly. Commenting on the suspension of the bishop of Salisbury, the letter announced the appeal of the bishops. Not having received the archbishop's own announcement and the papal letter of his legation, the bishops must have felt that they

16. GFL no. 166.

17. See Mats no. 108. GFL no. 155.

18. GFL no. 167

were justifiably reproaching the archbishop.

However, that was not how it appeared in the eyes of Becket and his followers. They thought that since they had sent letters notifying Thomas's legateship and his announcement of the excommunication of royal officials and suspension of the bishop of Salisbury, the English bishops dared to act against the archbishop with full knowledge of what was happening on the continent, deliberately ignoring Becket's legateship and papal authority, preferring to follow the Constitutions of Clarendon. Therefore the bishops' appeal appeared to John to be a challenge to papal and archiepiscopal authority as John wrote to Thomas 'that they plan henceforth to guard against all your orders and even papal decrees, so far as they dislike them, on the excuse that they have made an appeal'.¹⁹

As the bishops' appeals reached the continent, John recognized their authorship and discussed the contents with the archbishop.²⁰ John heard that the archbishop's answer to the English bishops and to Gilbert Foliot²¹ had already been sent before he wrote his no. 175. He wished that Becket had laid more stress on his patience. John's own reaction to the bishops' appeals which he related to Bartholomew of Exeter²² does not seem to coordinated

19. JS Letters ii, no. 173.

20. JS Letters ii, nos. [173] 175 & 176, especially no. 175. Their contents will be discussed under the section 4-VI-3-b.

21. Probably Mats nos. 223 & 224.

22. JS Letters ii, no. 174.

well with the archbishop's answers to the English suffragans. Had he tried to cover up the shortcomings of Becket's letters to the bishops, he would have put more emphasis on the patience of the archbishop for keeping silent so long just as he had done when he wrote to Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques in the name of the archbishop a letter of warning intended for the king.²³

Whereas Becket's letters to the English bishops and the bishop of London were formal announcements in tone and content, John's no. 174 dealt with matters in a tone that would have been difficult for the archbishop to adopt.²⁴ John wrote against the bishops' defence of the king and expressed doubt that the bishops' appeal had been made with the approval and support of all the bishops. John attacked Gilbert Foliot for having an ambition to become the archbishop of Canterbury and accused him and other bishops for not admonishing the king against making wicked decisions. John reported, on the assumption that Gilbert Foliot had received the papal letters announcing Becket's legateship and his primacy over England except York, the archbishop's further measures including his decision to regard the king as excommunicate due to his seizure of the church's possessions and the arrest of William, the chaplain of Becket.

23. JS Letters ii, no. 157.

24. On JS Letters ii no. 174, see also 2-V-3-b(ii).

Gilbert Foliot replied to Becket's and John's charges²⁵ in the famous Multiplicem²⁶ which neither Thomas nor members of his household attempted to reply directly. John's no. 187' written to Baldwin of Totnes was the only reply, indirectly made, on the part of the Becket's party.²⁷ This letter was much more comprehensive than no. 174 and dealt with matters which the archbishop himself formerly handled. Deploring the lack of support from the English clergy, John stressed the importance of fighting for the cause of the Church's liberty and of a creed of religious life. John attempted to counter Gilbert Foliot's Multiplicem and accused the bishops because they persecuted the archbishop of Canterbury not 'because he is Thomas, because he is a Londoner by birth, by profession a clerk, a priest in rank, a bishop in dignity -- but because he announces to God's people their sins', and exhorts the king and the bishops to 'obey the law of God'. John also accused the king for proscribing Thomas and his followers cruelly and unjustly, stating his faith in God's comfort in his tribulation. Since the letter was not a formal reply by the archbishop but by one of his clerks who was not in a position to give a command to the English bishops, John appears to have attempted more to appease their emotions.

25. Mats nos. 203 & 204. JS Letters ii, no. 174

26. GFL no. 170.

27. On JS Letters ii, no. 187, see also the section 2-V-3-b(ii).

John wrote no. 187 to Baldwin of Totnes with the assumption that the propaganda war was to continue. However, shortly after it was written, the interests of both parties shifted to the coming of the legates a latere, whom Henry II had requested. For the time being, John stopped writing letters to Exeter.

ii Gilbert Foliot

The relationship between John of Salisbury is an example of years of acquaintance without developing into a deeper or friendlier relationship. It was almost totally decided by the relationship between Gilbert and John's masters.

One need not repeat the biography of this famous opponent of Becket, a Cluniac, a friend of the Empress Matilda and Archbishop Theobald, who became successively abbot of Gloucester (1139-48), bishop of Hereford (1148-63) and bishop of London (1163-87) and who had many relatives among men of importance of the day.²⁸ While abbot of Gloucester, he was already in close association with Archbishop Theobald.²⁹

When John first met Gilbert Foliot cannot be known for certain, but in the Historia pontificalis, he left an account of Gilbert Foliot's election to the see of Hereford in 1148.³⁰

28. EC pp 37-49, G. Foliot pp 1, 73-104, 122-3.

29. G. Foliot, pp 93, 122-3, JS Letters i, p xxvii, Saltman, Theobald, p 23.

30. HP - xix.

We can also get a glimpse of Gilbert's continued association with Archbishop Theobald and his possible contact with John of Salisbury through one passage in the Policracticus³¹ and through Gilbert Foliot's and John of Salisbury's letters. Besides appearing as assessor and witness and as vicar of a vacant see, Gilbert Foliot sometimes acted in cooperation with Archbishop Theobald in appeals to the Papal Curia.³² The instance in which both John and Gilbert Foliot were interested was the election of Alexander III and the papal schism. They both agreed in their support of Alexander III.³³

These instances reveal little of John's personal relationship with Gilbert Foliot while he was serving Archbishop Theobald. It is unlikely that John was close to the bishop. Gilbert Foliot was an important friend and collaborator of his master, the archbishop. On account of the bishop's prominent position by birth and in career and capacity, he was too remote from John. Gilbert on his part probably regarded John as a clerk. He had dealings with the archbishop through but not with his clerk. If the royal chancellor Thomas Becket was looked down upon by

31. Pol - vii - 24, In discussing envy John recounted Gilbert's story of his change from the time he became a monk to his promotion to bishop.

32. JS Letters i, nos. 5, 45, 56, 73-5, 84, 86 & 107.
GFL nos. 112, 127, G. Foliot pp 47 & 202.

33. GFL no. 133 to Alexander III, Nov., Dec. 1160. JS Letters i, no. 124 to Ralph of Sarre.

Gilbert Foliot on account of his lowly birth, John probably had to accept the same fate. In 1165, John wrote to Gilbert Foliot, now bishop of London, soliciting to help him with his reconciliation with the king.³⁴ By late summer of 1165, the bishop of London had not written back to him.

There is no evidence that John made any further attempt to communicate with the bishop of London after 1165. However, John had an indirect relationship with him after the Vézelay sentences. In the series of letters between the Becket's party and 'the English bishops' as represented by Gilbert Foliot, some of John's messages were directed against the person of the bishop of London.

When the Becket party received the bishops' appeals, John immediately detected who the author was.³⁵ The style of the letter was Gilbert Foliot's.³⁶ John felt especially hurt and offended that the bishops' letter to the archbishop contained reference which appeared to be malicious distortion and exaggeration of John's comments.³⁷ Hence John felt that the letter was written in a spirit of Achitophel and Doeg.³⁸ For 'It perverts everything so much.'³⁹ John retaliated with an attack on the person of the bishop and on his ambition to be archbishop of Canterbury; his ambition had been thwarted, but he had been made ruler of the synagogue.⁴⁰

34. JS Letters ii, nos. 150-2.

35. JS Letters ii, no. 175.

36. JS Letters ii, no. 175.

37. Barlow TB, p 150. JS Letters ii, no. 168, John wrote concerning the state of the archbishop, '...nunc (continues to p270)

He further attacked the bishops' defence of the king's conduct. What John found especially provocative was their comment that the king was willing 'when he is admonished to set right any offence against the Lord.' John cited the passage that contained the reference⁴¹ in six of his letters written in 1166.⁴²

Gilbert Foliot did not reply to John's letters, but answered his accusation about his ambition to be archbishop of Canterbury in his famous Multiplicem, which slanders Becket, but ignores the clerk who had made the charges against him.

37. (Continued from p 269)
poenitentiam agit, agnoscit et confitetur culpam et, si cum Saulo quandoque ecclesiam impugnavit, nunc pro ea cum Paulo ponere paratus est et animam suam.' In GFL no. 167, 'Erat quidem nobis solacio, quod post discessum uestrum ad omnes ilico fama diuulgante peruenit, uos scilicet in transmarinis agentem nil altum sapere, uos in domnum nostrum regem aut regnum eius nulla machinatione insurgere sed sponte susceptum paupertatis onus cum modestia sustinere: lectioni et orationi insistere, preteritorumque iacturam temporum ieiuniis, uigiliis, lacrimisque redimere, et spiritualibus occupatum studiis ad perfectum beatis uirtutem incrementis ascendere.'

38. JS Letters ii, no. 175.

39. JS Letters ii, no. 175.

40. JS Letters ii, nos. 174 & 175.

41. GFL no. 167.

42. JS Letters ii, nos. 174, 175, 178, 187, 192 & 198.

However, news of Gilbert Foliot continued to appear in John of Salisbury's letters in connection with important events of the consecutive years. After the conference of Gisors and Trie, Gilbert's presence and behaviour at the meeting of Argentan⁴³ and the problem of his excommunication were recurring topics in John's letters to various places in 1167. John informed the bishop of Poitiers that the English bishops' messengers who came to the archbishop were refused to meet him on the ground that they were acting on behalf of bishops including the bishop of London who he reckoned to be excommunicate.⁴⁴ John also wrote to his English correspondents that Gilbert Foliot had been excommunicated.⁴⁵ But this excommunication seems to have been quashed by the Pope and cardinals.⁴⁶ Perhaps John might have wished nevertheless to create a rumour that Foliot was excommunicated. Foliot's excommunication actually took place in 1169 when the archbishop announced it on Palm Sunday, 13 April.⁴⁷ His behaviour after his excommunication continued to be a matter of concern for the Becket party. As one of the measures to counteract his excommunication, Gilbert Foliot was considered to be planning to transfer the primacy from Canterbury to London, and John made full use of this in his letter to Christ

43. JS Letters ii, nos. 236 & 241.

44. JS Letters ii, no. 236.

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

46. JS Letters ii, p xxxvii.

47. JS Letters ii, nos. 289 & 295.

Church.⁴⁸ When John heard that the bishop of London was going to the Curia, John wrote to Christ Church and urged them to send two monks to the Curia who were ready to meet Gilbert when summoned. However John later warned Baldwin of Totnes of the falsehood of rumours that the king's envoys to the Pope had obtained Gilbert's absolution.⁴⁹ Even after John went back to England, he reported to Peter of Celle that the bishops of London and Salisbury had been placed under the ban of excommunication once again prior to his return to England.⁵⁰

The enmity of Becket and Gilbert Foliot appears to have been deep and complicated.⁵¹ John's feeling against Gilbert was fostered for the main part by the hostility of the bishop of London against his master, Archbishop of Canterbury. The bishops' appeal made him search out the reason for Gilbert's unbelievably strong hostility against his master and made him conclude that its root lay in the bishop's thwarted ambition to be archbishop of Canterbury. Its root was much deeper and more complex. It was not just that Becket and not he became archbishop of Canterbury. It was that the one who thought himself to be more worthy of the office was turned down and the least worthy obtained it. When John and Thomas tried to impress the English bishops with the archbishop's authority, his religious behaviour

48. JS Letters ii, no. 292. G. Foliot pp 151-62. Barlow, TB, p 186. See the section 3-V-3-b(i).

49. JS Letters ii, no. 298.

50. JS Letters ii, no. 304.

51. Barlow, TB, pp 152-7, G. Foliot, pp 30-1, 147-187.

and spiritual life, the strongest denial came from Gilbert Foliot.

He believed and continued to believe that the former royal chancellor was the most unsuitable person for the office of archbishop. He refused to accept that Becket, a Londoner of lowly birth could ever be made as fit for an ecclesiastical office and the religious life as Gilbert was. A mixture of disappointment, envy, hatred and contempt was the driving force of the heavy rhetoric of Multiplicem, and Becket could not have countered it, let alone John, for in the eyes of Gilbert Foliot, the former clerk of Archbishop Theobald remained a clerk.

iii Robert of Melun, bishop of Hereford

During the Becket conflict, Robert of Hereford was the only bishop who was formerly a master of the schools in Paris. He was moreover a former master of John of Salisbury.

The relationship between John and Robert was unique in the sense that John's experience as Robert's student was carried over into his impression of Robert as bishop. During the Becket conflict, John wrote at least one letter to the bishop,⁵² but the letter is not extant.

52. See JS Letters ii, no. 152.

Robert of Melun was born in England probably before 1100.⁵³ Early in the twelfth century, he went to France and studied under Hugh of St. Victor and Abelard.⁵⁴ He was teaching on Mont-Sainte-Geneviève after Abelard's departure.⁵⁵ John studied dialectic under him and Master Alberic for two years and left an account on the two masters in the Metalogicon.⁵⁶ He was good at providing various possible answers and in his replies, he was penetrating, concise, and to-the-point. In describing both Robert of Melun and Master Alberic, John wrote, 'Both had keen minds and were diligent scholars. I am confident that each of them would have been outstanding as great and illustrious students of nature, had they but possessed a broad foundation of literary learning, and kept to the footsteps of their predecessors as much as they took delight in their own inventions.'⁵⁷

Robert of Melun came to teach theology about 1142 at Melun.⁵⁸ But he was back in Paris in 1147, where he placed an attack on Gilbert de la Porrée with Peter Lombard. He may have attended the Council of Rheims.⁵⁹ Robert probably

53. Knowles, EC, p 29.

54. Knowles, EC, p 29.

55. Met ii-10.

56. Met ii-10.

57. Met ii-10.

58. Les Oeuvres de Robert de Melun, tome 1, Questiones de Divina Pagina ed. Martin, R.M., Louvain (1932), p.viii.

59. HP-viii. Haring, N. 'Notes on the Council and the Consistory of Rheims (1148)', Medieval Studies, vol 28, (1966) pp 39-59.

spent the years from 1148-63 teaching in Paris and Roger, future bishop of Worcester was one of his students.⁶⁰ He seems to have had close contact with the canons of St. Victor, but whether he taught there or not is not certain.⁶¹ Three theological works of Robert are extant; Quaestiones de Divina Pagina, Quaestiones de Epistolis Sancti Pauli and Sententiae. Robert of Melun was promoted bishop of Hereford in 1163. According to FitzStephen, this was due to a suggestion of Chancellor Becket to Henry II that the king should recall to England poor Englishmen of good repute living in France as monks and masters in schools.⁶² Pope Alexander III may also have been instrumental in Robert's promotion.⁶³ The Pope, being in France at that time was more closely in touch with English affairs than usual and he may also have met Robert between February and April, 1163, when he was in Paris.⁶⁴

The date of Robert's election to Hereford is not known, but he was consecrated on 22 December 1163 by Archbishop Thomas.⁶⁵ During his short episcopacy, too much attention was paid to the Becket conflict to allow him to have time

60. Cheney, M., Roger, Bishop of Worcester p 9.

61. Luscombe, D.E., The School of Peter Abelard, Cambridge (1969) p 282, n 3. Cheney, M., Roger, Bishop of Worcester 1164-1179, Oxford (1980) p 10.

62. MTB iii, p 24. Smalley, The Becket Conflict, p 51.

63. Mats no. 141. MTB v. p 252.

64. Cheney, M., Roger, Bishop of Worcester, p 14.

65. Barlow, TB, p 98.

for diocesan administration.⁶⁶ He received commissions to act as papal judge-delegate a number of times, usually with Roger of Worcester.⁶⁷ He died on 27 February, 1167.⁶⁸

Robert of Melun's role and its significance in the Becket dispute has been discussed fully elsewhere.⁶⁹ It should be noted that, following the complex situation over his election to the see, the Pope, the archbishop and the king looked to Robert of Hereford with different expectations from the beginning. The Pope, having been instrumental in Robert's promotion, expected that he would serve him in the pursuit of papal policy. Becket considered him to be one of the closest to him as he had consecrated Bishop Robert. The king's natural expectation was for him to be obedient to the king as a bishop in his realm. In 1163, when Alexander III sent his envoy Philip, abbot of l'Aumone to Archbishop Thomas upon the king's request in order to ask him for moderation, Robert of Melun, who was to be bishop of Hereford, accompanied Philip.⁷⁰ As a result of their persuasion, the archbishop gave assent to the Constitutions of Clarendon in January 1164.⁷¹

66. Barrow, J.S., 'The bishops of Hereford and their acta 1163-1219' (D. Phil thesis) Oxford (1981), p 14.

67. Cheney, M., Roger, Bishop of Worcester, Appendix II, nos. 31, 100, 101 & 124.

68. Barlow, TB, p 168.

69. Knowles, EC, pp 9, 28-9, 77-8, 87-8, 97, 104-5. Smalley, The Becket Conflict, pp 39-58.

70. Knowles, EC, pp 59-60, Barlow, TB, p 97.

71. Barlow, TB, pp 98-9, Knowles, EC, pp 60-3.

At the meeting of Northampton, Becket counted on the support of Robert of Hereford. He was one of the three bishops who were most closely connected to him and were asked to request the king for a safe conduct to the coast.⁷² After the archbishop's flight, however, Robert of Hereford was one of the king's ambassadors to the Pope at Sens. Robert did not take an active part.⁷³ In 1165, the Pope's expectations of Robert continued to be complex. Whereas in 1163, he was expected to remonstrate with the archbishop, this time his mission was to do the opposite. When Alexander III wrote to Gilbert Foliot on 8 June from Clermont, he ordered him and Robert of Hereford to remonstrate with the king to recall the archbishop.⁷⁴ Both the bishops of London and of Hereford pursued the king on his Welsh campaign to the border, but their mission met with little success.⁷⁵ The Pope thanked the bishop of London for his effort⁷⁶ but expressed his disappointment to the bishop of Hereford.⁷⁷

72. Knowles, EC, p 88. MTB iii, p 69.

73. Barlow, TB, p 121.

74. Mats no. 93.

75. Mats no. 108.

76. Mats no. 106.

77. Mats no. 141. Duggan has dated this letter ? mid-1165 (Thomas Becket p 254) Mats no. 106 from the Pope to Foliot is dated 22 Aug. 1165. The two letters may have been written about the same time.

In 1165, John considered Robert of Hereford to be friendly. He was among those to whom John wrote to inquire after his properties in England. But Robert was among those who did not reply.⁷⁸

When Becket launched his offensive in spring, 1166, Robert of Hereford was counted among his supporters. He and the bishop of Worcester were requested to publish the papal letters announcing his legateship in case communication with London failed.⁷⁹ In the letter of instruction, emphasis was put on their obedience to the Roman Church which procured their election and to the archbishop who consecrated them as well as on their knowledge and teaching of law.⁸⁰ Therefore, when the bishops' appeals reached the continent and the rumour of Robert of Hereford's behaviour against Becket was brought about by Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques,⁸¹ the Becket party was especially indignant to find that Robert was one of the three bishops who put his seal on the appeals. John's reaction to Robert's conduct was expressed in two sets of letters; one addressed to Becket written for the purpose of advice, the other addressed to Exeter for campaigning.⁸²

78. JS Letters ii, no. 152.

79. Cheney, M., Roger, Bishop of Worcester, pp 29-30. Mats nos. 172 & 173.

80. Mats no. 179.

81. Mats no. 206.

82. JS Letters ii, nos. 171, 173, 174, 175, 176, 187.

Although John felt dismayed at Robert of Hereford's participation in the bishops' appeals, nevertheless he thought it important to win the English bishops over to the archbishop's support, especially Robert of Hereford who was Becket's son in consecration. John advised Becket to write to him and also to ask masters of schools and religious in Paris such as the prior of St. Victor to admonish him, because he was 'avid for praise and devoted to glory' while he was a master in Paris.⁸³ We find Thomas writing a letter of admonition to Bishop Robert in which he complained of lack of support in his fight for God's law and the liberty of the Church.⁸⁴ Abbot Ernisius and Prior Richard of St. Victor also wrote to Robert of Hereford late in the summer of 1166, expressing their disappointment in the bishop's behaviour.⁸⁵ Another measure John advised the archbishop to take to win the support of the English bishops was to summon some of his suffragans, particularly those who put their seals on the appeals.⁸⁶

Robert of Hereford could not have heard John's words of reproach which were sent to Thomas, but he would certainly have heard of or read John's criticisms expressed in his letters to Exeter. John's first reaction to Robert's activities was expressed to those in England in July.⁸⁷ He

83. JS Letters ii, no. 175.

84. Mats no. 219.

85. Mats no. 220.

86. JS Letters ii, nos. 173, 175.

87. JS Letters ii, no. 171.

wrote to Bartholomew of Exeter that he was astonished to hear that Robert, a man of learning had attacked and criticised Becket who was his father in consecration. Later, as John found out further details -- about the bishops' appeals, his reapproach was directed to the fact that Robert was one of the bishops who sealed the appeal.⁸⁸

As the situation in France became clearer, Robert of Hereford must have been astounded by the reaction to the bishops' appeal which he had a part in drafting. He would have found out eventually about the archbishop's papal legation. He would also have learned that the archbishop had sent him and the bishop of Worcester an instruction to show the papal letters to the bishop of London and to notify the grant of legateship to some other bishops. The archbishop's summons to Pontigny must have come to him in the meanwhile. He probably heard about John's criticisms in his letters. What Robert had done almost as a matter of course was taken to be an act of treachery. It never occurred to him at that time that what he had done was inconsistent with what he had taught. His conduct was caused by misunderstanding resulting from the failure of communication. Ignorance was essentially the cause of his action, but it did not seem like a reason or an excuse to Becket's friends and supporters at that time.

Meanwhile, Thomas's letter of admonition came and then the criticism of the Victorines. The archbishop's summons was repeated a few times. After the third summons, Robert

88. JS Letters ii, no. 174.

of Hereford wished to go to the archbishop and he sent his clerk to the king at Caen. In spite of the king's prohibition to return once the bishop left,⁸⁹ Robert went to Southampton late in January 1167, but was turned back by the papal envoy, John of Oxford and died, it is said, of a broken heart on 27 February.⁹⁰

During the Becket conflict, it was as if Robert of Hereford was singled out to pursue his ill fate. Some of the criticism heaped upon him could also apply to other bishops, but a great deal was laid upon him because he was formerly a scholar whose business it was to teach the ideal. With so many expectations made of him, Robert's position in England was probably the most difficult of all the bishops. And he was probably the weakest and the most easily pressurized. He had no royal or aristocratic connections in England. He was a new face among the bishops and practically unknown in his diocese. Except perhaps for the archbishop, Robert had no friend among the Becket's party who would send him information and advice. Even if he had grasped the situation in France, he probably would not have had much choice but to act in accordance with the bishop of London. Robert of Melun's was the unfortunate case of a scholar promoted to an important ecclesiastical office. Being 'an old teacher, but prentice bishop' as John put it, it was especially difficult for him to find ways of reconciling the ideals that he had taught with the actual

89. Mats no. 253.

90. MTB iii, p 87.

duty put upon him as bishop of the realm. It was Robert's further tragedy that probably before he realized his dilemma, before he even grasped the situation, he had become decisively committed to the king's cause, thus inviting accusations from the Becket party. At the time when he put his seal on the bishops' appeals, the thought of incompatibility between his former teaching and his action would not have occurred to him. When he later came to understand the situation more fully, he tried to reverse his course of action but it was too late.

If Robert did not grasp the situation, neither did the Becket party. They did not know that Robert of Hereford's behaviour was largely caused by the failure of communication, not by his conscious betrayal of his father. What came to John's mind when he learned of his behaviour was the impression he had of his former teacher. John commented most scathingly to the archbishop: 'before it was known who he was, he long stood as the shadow of a name; not a great name, but a name. ...he is believed to be a man of letters by those who know nothing of letters or of him.'⁹¹ John remembered Robert of Melun as a master who was possessed of a keen mind and of diligence, but deficient in a broad foundation of literary learning. He was too interested in his own inventions and lacked due respect for tradition. A broad foundation of literary learning and a respect for tradition were qualities John valued highly, for

91. JS Letters ii, no. 175.

out of literary learning, one should draw moral lessons and derive courage to live up to principles. They open the ways to a good life, a life of wisdom, a 'philosopher's life'.⁹²

According to John, 'Philosophical truth concerns itself with' deeds, not words'.⁹³ John never liked 'an opinion which relates to words alone'.⁹⁴ He thought that 'a priest must show courage and constancy. To feel fear is permissible; to give way in time of need is not'.⁹⁵ But because of lack of courage, Robert of Melun seemed as if he had succumbed to fear of the king and betrayed the principles he had taught in the schools. When John found that Robert of Melun was not living up to the ideals he had taught and had thus betrayed the archbishop, his criticism of his former master was revived as criticism of the new bishop.

3. The Worcester area

In John's Collection of Later Letters, we find five letters which went to the Worcester area. They were addressed to two clergy and three religious. The letters that went to the Cathedral Church were written for political purposes. The religious in the area were John's personal friends. The letters were dispatched mainly because there was a courier going to the area. Roger, bishop of Worcester was the central figure among the correspondents.

92. For John's idea of philosopher's life, see the section 4-III-2-C, note 115.

93. JS Letters ii, no. 185.

94. JS Letters ii, no. 185.

95. Smalley, The Becket conflict, p 100. Pol viii-23.

a. Roger of Worcester

Roger of Worcester was a cousin of Henry II.⁹⁶ For a time he was educated at Bristol with Henry II and later studied at Paris. He was about thirty years old when he was elected bishop of Worcester in March, 1163. He was present at the Council of Tours as bishop-elect. He was consecrated in August 1164 by Archbishop Thomas. During later years of the Becket conflict, he went into voluntary exile and thereby appeared as a staunch supporter of Archbishop Thomas. After the conflict, he was active as a papal judge-delegate.⁹⁷ He died at the abbey of Marmoutier in August 1179 on his way to Rome to attend the Third Lateran Council.⁹⁸

During the first phase of the Becket conflict, Bishop Roger's behaviour was somewhat arbitrary. At Northampton, Thomas counted on his assistance together with the bishops of Hereford and Rochester,⁹⁹ but he was among the king's envoys to Sens.¹⁰⁰ It was presumably on this occasion that

96. On Roger's life, see Cheney, M., Roger, Bishop of Worcester, pp 1-16.

97. JS Letters ii, p xlvi, nos. 322 & 324.

98. On Roger's death, see Cheney, M., Roger, Bishop of Worcester, p 223.

99. Cheney, Roger, Bishop of Worcester, p 25. Knowles, EC, p 73.

100. Cheney, Roger, Bishop of Worcester, p. 25.

John had a word with Bishop Roger.¹⁰¹ John asked for assistance and Roger promised it. Roger was one of those to whom John wrote, in late summer 1165, probably inquiring after his revenues.¹⁰² John reported to Archbishop Thomas that he had not received an answer yet, but he expressed his hope that the answer might come with his messenger.

In the year 1166, when the archbishop decided to go on to the offensive, Roger of Worcester was expected first and foremost to obey and support the archbishop, because he was his 'son in consecration.' After the Vézelay sentences, Becket wrote to Robert of Hereford and Roger of Worcester at the same time as to Gilbert Foliot to publish the papal announcement of his appointment as legate of the apostolic see. Roger and Robert of Hereford were also instructed to transmit the papal announcement to some bishops. Roger seems to have obeyed the mandate while Gilbert Foliot refused to publish it and Robert of Hereford did not receive it.¹⁰³ Perhaps on this account, as John wrote to Bartholomew of Exeter, Bishop Roger was 'to be held and treated in every way as mortal enemies of the realm and a menace to public safety.'¹⁰⁴

101. JS Letters ii, no. 196 & n 2.

102. JS Letters ii, no. 152.

103. Cheney, Roger, Bishop of Worcester, pp 29-30. Mats no 172 (Pope to Becket dated 24 April 1166) Mats no 173 (Pope to Canterbury diocese, dated 24 April 1166) Mats no 179 (Becket to Roger of Worcester and Robert of Hereford, dated c. June 1166)

104. JS Letters ii, no. 174.

After the English bishops responded to the Vézelay censures with their appeals, John advised the archbishop to summon some bishops who were particularly related to the appeals.¹⁰⁵ Roger was also to be summoned because he was consecrated by Thomas. John further advised the archbishop to ask the Parisian masters to write to the two bishops who were consecrated by him, Roger and Robert of Hereford.¹⁰⁶ Obviously John thought that they were the most obliged to the archbishop and therefore the easiest to bring over to his side.

The five letters that went to the Worcester area¹⁰⁷ were probably written before John of Oxford's return from the Curia in February 1167.¹⁰⁸ It may be a coincidence that John found a bearer going to Worcester at this time. But perhaps the archbishop devised the situation. It is not impossible that the bearer also carried one of the archbishop's summonses to the bishop of Worcester. Among the five letters, one was addressed to Roger, bishop of Worcester¹⁰⁹ and another to Master Simon Lovel, his clerk.¹¹⁰

105. JS Letters ii, no. 175.

106. JS Letters ii, no. 175.

107. JS Letters ii, nos. 196-200.

108. JS Letters ii, p x1.

109. JS Letters ii, no 196.

110. JS Letters ii, no. 198.

Master Simon Lovel was archdeacon of Worcester between 1167/8 and 1189/90.¹¹¹ He started his service to Roger before that date.¹¹² Since he was a canon of Exeter,¹¹³ John may also have known him in that capacity. In the letter to Master Simon Lovel, John first asked him to commend the bearer of the letter to the bishop of Worcester. The bearer would also give some news of John. John mentioned in this letter the prospect of early peace which would result from the papal decision. He added that he was not permitted to go into details about the matter. He criticized the bishops' appeal and the fact that none had attempted to admonish the king. John asserted the need for such admonition by the bishops, hinting to Simon that he should so advise the bishop.

John's appeal to the bishop of Worcester appears to be part of Becket's campaigning after the Vézelay censures. In spite of Becket's attempts¹¹⁴ and John's heavy propaganda campaigning¹¹⁵ directed to Exeter, it was difficult for Becket to win the actual support of the English clergy.

111. Le Neve, ii, p 105 f.

112. Cheney, Roger, Bishop of Worcester, p 32.

113. Morey, Bartholomew, p 92.

114. The archbishop's announcement of the Vézelay censures (Mats no. 198) went to London, but since the bishop of London refused to publish it, (Cheney, Roger, Bishop of Worcester pp 29-30) Roger may not have had a full knowledge of it.

115. JS Letters ii, nos. 174 & 187.

Becket tried to summon some bishops as advised by John. John tried to supplement his open messages to Exeter with similar references in his personal letters whenever he could.¹¹⁶ He may have hoped that some bishops would raise their voice against the bishops' appeal or would show their disapproval in some form of action. John's letters to the bishop of Worcester and Master Simon Lovel were apparently written for such a purpose. With these letters, John tried to bring to Roger's attention to the evil done by the king, hoping that the bishop might admonish the king. We do not know whether he did so. We do know nevertheless that sometime before February 1167, Roger of Worcester and Robert of Hereford attempted to obey the archbishop's summonses.¹¹⁷

Roger of Worcester appears in John's letters when, after the conference of Gisors and Trie on 18 November 1167, the bishops of London, Chichester, Salisbury and Worcester and the archbishop of York discussed with the king and the legates the measures to be taken in the future.¹¹⁸ Probably on this occasion, Roger stood up in front of the bishops to make his proposal for peace. He pronounced that he was prepared to renounce his bishopric for the sake of Becket¹¹⁹. The proposal was meant well both for the king and the archbishop, but it was hardly practicable and invited contempt and criticism from both parties. The

116. JS Letters ii, no. 178 to Nicholas of Norwich, no. 192 to Hugh of St. Edmunds.

117. Mats nos. 253 & 285.

118. Cheney, Roger, Bishop of Worcester, p. 35.

119. JS Letters ii, no. 238.

bishop's behaviour at Argentan was received badly by the exiles for two other reasons. One of the measures agreed at the discussion between the king, the legates and the bishops was the renewal of the bishops' appeals. The bishop of London led the criticism against the archbishop, but Roger does not appear to have objected to it.¹²⁰ Moreover, Bishop Roger was considered to be an accomplice in putting the task of absolving the excommunicate on Exeter's shoulders.¹²¹

John was very disappointed with the bishop's behaviour. However, neither Thomas nor John thought that Roger was one of the archbishop's enemies.¹²² After the meeting at Argentan, both Thomas and John tried to send messages to Roger. Thomas sent a summons to Roger to visit him while the bishop was in Normandy.¹²³ While Thomas tried to catch Bishop Roger during his stay in Normandy, John ^{tried to} contact him ^{thinking that he had returned} after his return to Worcester. Since the communication with

120. JS Letters ii, nos. 236 & 241.

121. JS Letters ii, no. 241.

122. JS Letters ii, no. 236. Mats no. 331, TB-Pope 'Rex autem solos illos evocavit, qui, nobis ab initio hujus turbinis adversantes, incentores tantae malitiae esse noscuntur, videlicet Eboracensem archiepiscopum, et episcopos Londoniensem et Cicestrensem, accito cum eis et Wigorniensi, ut velamento ejus aliorum malitia pallietur.'

123. Mats no. 303 is dated by Duggan late 1166-67. Cheney seems to be of the opinion that Mats no. 303 was written after the meeting of Argentan in Dec. 1167. She stated nevertheless, that there is no evidence that the meeting between Roger and Thomas took place. (Cheney, Roger, Bishop of Worcester, p. 37)

the area was apparently difficult,¹²⁴ John tried to send a message to Roger through Baldwin of Totnes warning him against attempting to renounce his see on behalf of the archbishop.¹²⁵ John requested Baldwin if he had a chance to try to persuade Roger to take pains to clear himself of this suspicion.

Roger of Worcester seems to have resided in Tours for most of his exile. Perhaps due to the facility of communication, we find Roger of Worcester in contact with the archbishop.¹²⁶ Bishop Roger's behaviour was unique in that he managed to support Archbishop Thomas without incurring the wrath of the king. Roger's blood relationship with the king allowed him a much greater freedom than other bishops.¹²⁷

In spite of all the attention and interest John showed to Roger of Worcester, John would not have mattered too much to Roger. He was a clerk of Archbishop Thomas. As such he talked to him at Sens and as such he remained throughout the conflict. Roger probably received two letters from him, in

124. JS Letters ii, nos. 197 & 199.

125. JS Letters ii, no. 238.

126. Mats no. 496 c. April 1169 TB--Roger
Mats no. 551 June 1169 TB--Roger
Mats no. 649 March-April 1170 TB--Roger

127. For Roger's conduct after the meeting of Argentan, Cheney, Roger, Bishop of Worcester, pp 37-49, esp. p. 48. MTB iii, pp 104-6.

one of which he was criticised for being a supporter of the king's actions against the Church and he was advised to admonish the king with other bishops. Roger may have read copies of John's letters sent to Exeter which expounded the point of view of the archbishop. They may have helped clarify the matters. But it was his relationship with the archbishop, his consecrator, that mattered to him.

b. Religious in the Worcester area

Among the five letters that went to the Worcester area in late 1166 or 1167, three were addressed to monks in and around Worcester, namely, Ralph, prior of Worcester, Adam, abbot of Evesham, and Reginald, abbot of Pershore.¹²⁸ Since the three letters were written on the same occasion, they have some references in common and they also share some characteristics of John's appeal letters of 1168.¹²⁹ They all refer to the difficulty of communication due to distance and the scarcity of travellers. John also mentioned his own prosperity in his fourth year of exile. All the letters ask for help with the prayers.

John had probably known Ralph of Bedford who was prior of Worcester from 1146 to 1189¹³⁰ from the time he was under Archbishop Theobald. At least through various cases involving Archbishop Theobald John was in touch directly or

128. JS Letters ii, nos. 197, 199, & 200.

129. For appeal letters, see 3-IV-2-b.

130. Le Neve ii, p. 103. Heads pp 83-4.

indirectly with the bishops of Worcester John of Paghham, former clerk of Archbishop Theobald,¹³¹ and Alfred.¹³² Unlike two other letters which went to Worcester Cathedral, it had little political message. Since there was an opportunity, John seized it to write to him. Referring to the archbishop's fight for the Church with the help of foreigners, he stated that there was a prospect of an early peace for reasons which he was not permitted to disclose.

Adam of Evesham to whom John wrote no. 199 was formerly a monk of La Charité-sur Loire. He was prior of Bermondsey from 1157 to 61, abbot of Evesham from 1161 to 1189.¹³³ Adam and John seem to have been students together at some time and kept in touch frequently.¹³⁴ Adam was elected abbot of Evesham in an ecclesiastical council at Canterbury¹³⁵ and was confirmed by the archbishop of Canterbury. The translation took place just before Theobald's death,¹³⁶ when John's role seems to have become very important. Adam was one of the embassy of Becket together with John, who were sent to the Pope to

131. Bishop of Worcester, 1151-57. Le Neve ii, p. 99, JS Letters i, nos. 14 & 15.

132. Bishop of Worcester, 1158-60. Le Neve ii, p. 99, JS Letters i, nos. 98, 99 & 109.

133. Heads pp 47, 115; GFL p 533 & no. 134.

134. JS Letters ii, no. 199.

135. For Council of Canterbury in early 1161, see Councils and synods i, p 841.

136. Bishop Gilbert of Herford, probably acting as vicar of the diocese of Worcester in the vacancy of the see, wrote to the prior and convent of La Charité-sur-Loire to release prior Adam of Bermondsey from his obedience to his mother house, La Charité. (GFL no. 134, p. 533)

collect the pallium after Thomas's election.¹³⁷ He also served as papal judge delegate.¹³⁸ In no. 199, John first described how they became friends-- they studied together; they had likeness of character; and they frequently expressed intimacy. John commended 'my dear friend N., your brother in the Lord and the companion of our exile' to the abbot to take care of. He related his recent state with phrases often found in his appeal letters, entrusting news of the archbishop to the bearer.

Reginald, to whom John wrote no. 200, was abbot of Pershore from before 1155 until his death in 1174/5.¹³⁹ John probably had some contact with Reginald while serving Archbishop Theobald.¹⁴⁰

In no. 200, John stated that a man was lacking in charity if he did not seize a chance to send greetings. Therefore John instructed the bearer of the letter, a native of Worcester, to greet the abbot. He entrusted to the bearer news about himself and the exiles. John reported that agreements had been made with the Pope for peace, though he was not permitted to discuss them in detail, and

137. Barlow, TB, p. 73.

138. Mayr-Harting, H., 'Henry II and the papacy, 1170-1189' JEH, vol 16 (1965) pp 39-53.

139. Heads p. 59.

140. JS Letters i, no. 45 records the instance in which Reginald appeared at the archiepiscopal court to give testimony. He was also among those who were sent to supervise the election of the abbot of Evesham in 1159. (JS Letters no. 109.)

that the king's messengers had fared badly at the Curia.

Of John's three letters to these religious, the ones to Adam of Evesham and Reginald of Pershore were mostly personal messages. John wrote to them for the sake of friendship and, as he wrote, because there was an opportunity to send a letter. John possibly wanted to help the bearer. John's letter to Ralph, prior of Worcester was probably also read and talked about by the bishop and others. The letter served to supplement the message to the bishop and Master Simon Lovel with news of the exiles, of John's own prosperity and the archbishop's fight for the Church with the help of foreigners. It also helped to impress the failure of the king's envoys to the Curia. Just like letter no. 220 to Richard of Dover which was probably written in the autumn of 1167, this letter also hinted the archbishop's need of financial aid. Along with his urge for charity to the bishop of Worcester, John may have hoped for financial support from Worcester. However, to monks, John wrote mainly for the sake of friendship, asking for their prayers, and the monks probably did what they could to help John or the bearer.

4. The Winchester area

John had some friends and acquaintances in Winchester Cathedral and Merton Priory. His relationships date back to the time when he served Archbishop Theobald and was involved directly or indirectly in the strife between Theobald and Henry of Blois. His relationship with Bishop Henry turned better after he started serving Becket who was much favoured by the bishop. While he was an exile, John was to ask for

the bishop's financial help. When John got to know Prior Robert of Merton is not certainly known, but he was already friendly with the prior in 1154-9.¹⁴¹ Since Merton Priory was situated in the bishopric of Winchester,¹⁴² the bishop and the prior appear to have had contact with each other.

During the Becket conflict, John wrote a number of times to the area mostly on behalf of the archbishop, but his communication with Robert, prior of Merton at the early stage of the conflict was personal.

a. Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester

One need not repeat Henry's biography: born in the 1090s, monk of Cluny at an early age, then abbot of Glastonbury, bishop of Winchester and papal legate between 1139 and 1143, he was one of the most powerful and influential men both in secular and ecclesiastical politics at the time.¹⁴³ One reason of his great influence was that he had as his brothers Theobald the Great, count of Blois and Champagne (d. 1152) and Stephen, king of England (d. 1154). Bishop Henry acted in cooperation or against his brothers and was involved in affairs of importance in England and France as well as the Papal Curia. He also had

141. JS Letters i, no. 50.

142. Barlow, TB, p. 17.

143. For his biography, see Voss, L. Heinrich von Blois, Berlin (1932) esp. pp. 1-100. Knowles, The Monastic Order in England, pp. 286-93. Knowles, EC, pp. 34-7.

occasional contact with Count Theobald's sons.¹⁴⁴

During Archbishop Theobald's pontificate, John as well as Thomas Becket acted for the most part against Henry of Blois. Both John and Becket were present at the Council of Rheims, when the bishop's absence offended Bernard of Clairvaux, and Pope Eugenius III suspended him, although the sentence was relaxed by the mediation of the bishop's brother Count Theobald.¹⁴⁵ John visited Rome for the first time between November 1149 and February 1150. Since Archbishop Theobald was granted legateship probably early in 1150, John and possibly Becket were involved in the negotiation for it.¹⁴⁶ John met the bishop of Winchester there¹⁴⁷ and the description of Bishop Henry which John included in the Historia Pontificalis is by no means favourable.¹⁴⁸ It probably reflected the feelings of Pope Eugenius III and Bernard as well as of Archbishop Theobald.

144. Bishop Henry committed the Anesty Case at one time to Theobald V, Count of Blois, presumably on the ground that Richard's uncle and Mabel's father William de Sackville held a fief of the count. (JS Letters i, no. 131 & p. 233 n 18 and Appendix VI.) One of Theobald the Great's sons, William aux Blanchesmains visited him. (JS Letters ii, no. 307).

145. HP-iv. For Becket's presence at the council, Barlow, TB, p. 34.

146. JS Letters i, p. 254. Saltman, Theobald, p. 31-2. The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury, vol II, The Gesta Regum with its continuation, The Actus Pontificum and the Mappa Mundi by Gervase, the monk of Canterbury, ed., Stubbs, W., RS London, (1880) p. 384, MTB iii, p. 16.

147. JS Letters i, pp. 253-6. HP-x1.

148. HP-x1.

After John started to work as Archbishop Theobald's secretary, he worked more against Henry of Winchester than for him. While Becket as royal chancellor must have helped demolish Henry's castles,¹⁴⁹ John wrote three letters to the bishop who was exiled to Cluny between 1155 and 58.¹⁵⁰ They were written in the name of Archbishop Theobald with the intent of summoning back the bishop. John referred to the bishop of Winchester in a number of letters written in the name of Archbishop Theobald.¹⁵¹ When John wrote the letter of appeal in the Anesty case to the Pope in about October or November 1160, John's report on Henry of Winchester was objective making no attempt to mitigate the assertion of one of the parties that Henry had been 'corrupted by filthy lucre.'¹⁵² Since all the letters were written on behalf of Archbishop Theobald, they do not reveal John's feelings. It is evident nevertheless that John was serving a master who, once overshadowed by this bishop, had gained his primacy in the province by patient efforts.

With the death of Archbishop Theobald, the relationships between Henry of Winchester and Becket and John came to change. In spite of Becket's role under Theobald, the bishop of Winchester apparently held no animosity against him. Henry helped Becket to be elected archbishop of Canterbury and consecrated him on 3 June

149. Knowles, EC, p. 36.

150. JS Letters i, nos. 36-8 and headnote to no. 36. Voss, Heinrich von Blois, pp. 40 & 123.

151. JS Letters i, nos. 50 & 56.

152. JS Letters i, no. 131.

1162.¹⁵³ During the beginning of the conflict between Becket and Henry II, the bishop of Winchester represented a body of moderate opinion. His attitude remained balanced and 'least motivated by self-interest or malice.¹⁵⁴ Therefore, it was a surprise for the Becket party, to find Henry of Winchester as one of the three bishops who put his seal on the bishops' appeals in 1166.¹⁵⁵ The Becket party much accused the appeals, but John refrained from criticising the bishop of Winchester, 'my lord and friend of Winchester of whom I will speak no ill'.¹⁵⁶ Perhaps John kept a good relationship with the bishop and his household from the beginning of the conflict. One of his clerks may have helped transmit John's revenue to his brother.¹⁵⁷

After his participation in the bishops' appeals in June 1166, Henry no longer took part in the bishops schemes against the archbishop. He does not seem to have been at Argentan when the bishops renewed their appeal in November 1167.¹⁵⁸ Henry refused to join the excommunicated bishop of London in his appeal¹⁵⁹ or swear an oath to observe the

153. JS Letters ii, no. 261 & p. 530 n 3. Councils and Synods i, pp. 843-4. Barlow, TB, p. 73.

154. Knowles, EC, pp 36-7.

155. Knowles, EC, p. 97.

156. JS Letters ii, no. 174.

157. R. de Limeseia who may have helped transmit John's revenue from Norwich to John's brother Richard may have belonged to the bishop's household. See below, 3-V1-4-b.

158. Knowles, EC, pp. 98, 109.

159. Knowles, EC, p. 110.

renewed constitution in 1169.¹⁶⁰ He did not take part in the coronation of the young king.¹⁶¹ After he came back to England, Archbishop Thomas turned to him for support and help.¹⁶²

We have six surviving letters of the archbishop addressed to Henry of Winchester and except for one letter which was written in 1163, they are all dated later than June 1169. One letter is extant which was written by Henry of Winchester to the exiles.¹⁶³ Three of the archbishop's letters are formal announcements, one a personal letter of thanks and one, a letter of commendation of the bishop's behaviour. John's own communication with Winchester started about December 1167 or January 1168. There are five extant letters and they were all addressed to the Bishop of Winchester and others in his household.

b. John's correspondence with Winchester

The first extant letter to Winchester was written between about December 1167 and January 1168 to Robert of Inglesham, archdeacon of Surrey.¹⁶⁴ He was probably

160. Mats nos. 553, 576. JS Letters ii, no. 296.

161. Barlow, TB, p. 206.

162. Knowles, EC, p. 110.

163. Mats no. 144 TB to Henry of Winchester June 1162
Mats no. 553 H. of Winchester to exiles after May 1169
Mats no. 550 TB to H. of Winchester early June 1169
Mats no. 549 TB to H. of Winchester Sept. 1169
Mats no. 576 TB to H. of Winchester post Nov.18, 1169
Mats no. 650 TB to H. of Winchester March-April, 1170
Mats no. 679 TB to H. of Winchester late June 1170

164. Robert was archdeacon of Surrey from 1158/9 to 1178 or later. He was also a clerk of Archbishop Richard of Canterbury and became archdeacon of Gloucester by 1187, where he last occurs in 1190. (Le Neve ii, p. 94. JS Letters ii, p. 447 n 1.)

in a position to promote cases to the bishop. John and Robert appear to have been comrades who helped each other in business. In his letter to Robert of Inglesham¹⁶⁵ written at the end of 1167 or the beginning of 1168, John expressed his gratitude for the favour bestowed on him and recounted hopeful prospects of peace. He gave news of the cardinals' failure to procure peace and of the problem of absolution for those excommunicated by the archbishop at Vézelay. He asked Robert to convey the news to the bishop. John wrote that he would not write to the bishop for fear that he should appear to be begging, but nevertheless, he sent greetings to the bishop, hinting at the need of help in a detour manner.

Sometime in 1168, John sent three letters to Winchester. These letters may be grouped with John's appeal letters of 1168.¹⁶⁶ One was addressed to the bishop, another to Robert of Inglesham, and a third to Robert de Limeseia,¹⁶⁷ who may have been a chaplain of the bishop of Winchester.

165. JS Letters ii, no. 237.

166. JS Letters ii, nos. 259-61. For appeal letters see Appendix ii, II-1-a & II-1-b.

167. Robert occurs as a canon of St. Martin-le-Grand, London in 1158. He may have been connected with Robert de 'Limesey' bishop of Chester-Coventry, 1085/6-1117. (JS Letters ii, no. 259, n 1) Robert may also have been R. de Limeseia who helped transmission of John's revenue in Norwich to his brother Richard. (JS Letters ii, no. 178, n 1) Professor Brooke has suggested the possibility that R. de Limeseia was R(ogerus) de Limesheia, a canon of Exeter, who appeared in JS Letters i, no. 133 (JS Letters i, no. 133 n 18.)

The three letters were probably carried by the same bearer for whom John had requested help from William, prior of Merton.¹⁶⁸ They were possibly written in the latter part of 1168¹⁶⁹ and were all concerned with asking for financial assistance for the archbishop. In fact, all three were meant to work together to accomplish the desired effect. In all the letters, John mentioned the straits of the archbishop, his cause and how the bishop's alms should be directed making it clear that he was not writing on his own behalf. To Robert of Limeseia, chaplain of Henry of Blois, John wrote to ask him to help the bearer of the letter forward his business. The letter to the bishop was a typical appeal letter of 1168. Praising his generosity, John asked that his alms be given for a worthy cause, that is for the archbishop who was fighting for the Church. To Robert of Inglesham, John wrote that the archdeacon's help might advance the request he had made on Henry of Winchester. He reminded Robert of Henry's part in Becket's promotion and also the fact that Henry was the consecrator of Becket. John mentioned the justifiable fear of royal officials, suggesting a way of forwarding things without the king's knowledge.

168. JS Letters ii, p. xli.

169. See the section 3-1V-2-b.

John's petitions appear to have been responded to generously.¹⁷⁰ After nos. 259-61 were written probably in late 1168, Becket's communications with Henry of Winchester became frequent.¹⁷¹ Henry wrote to the exiles after May 1169 reporting the behaviour of the English bishops and the conference of Northampton on 15 May 1169.¹⁷²

Becket wrote to the bishop of Winchester in early June 1169¹⁷³ denouncing Gilbert of London and announcing the excommunication of Geoffrey, archdeacon of Canterbury. Thomas wrote to the bishop again in September 1169¹⁷⁴ thanking him for his support, with further business and a message entrusted to the messenger. After 18, November 1169, Becket announced the failure of negotiation at Montmartre.¹⁷⁵ Becket wrote to the bishop that those who were excommunicated earlier that year, though temporarily released on account of the papal request, were again under the ban, and that in case no peace was made by 2 February 1170, there was to be a general interdict over England and the king was himself to be excommunicated.

170. Knowles, EC, p. 110. MTB iii, p. 106 contains an account that Bishop of Winchester helped the exiles.

171. See note 163 above.

172. Mats no. 553. According to Robertson neither the writer nor the recipient can be certainly identified. (MTB vii, p. 56) Duggan has dated this letter April-May 1168. (Duggan, Thomas Becket, p. 239.) Barlow is of the opinion that it was written in 1169. (Barlow, TB, pp. 186 & 310.) See also the section, 2-V-3-b(iii).

173. Mats no. 550.

174. Mats no. 549.

175. Mats no. 576.

John's letter to a clerk of Henry of Winchester, Master Herbert,¹⁷⁶ may have been written after the abortive conference at Montmartre about the same time as the Becket's report on the conference was written. John's letter was apparently written in reply to Herbert's. He expressed his gratitude for Herbert's care and regretted that he could not return it for the time being. He further stated that all the exiles were delighted to hear that the bishop had resisted the royal demand to swear an oath to observe the renewed Constitutions.¹⁷⁷ John advised him not to be disturbed by the rumour that those who had been excommunicated would be absolved by the Pope.¹⁷⁸ The message in this letter was certainly meant to be conveyed to the bishop.

Becket was also to write a similar letter of commendation of the bishop's behaviour to resist the royal measures against the Church in March or April, 1170¹⁷⁹. Another aim of Becket was to prohibit the coronation of the young king under threat of anathema. The last surviving

176. On Master Herbert, JS Letters ii, no. 296 & n 1. Voss, Heinrich von Blois, pp. 159 & 165-6.

177. See Mats no. 650.

178. Also see JS Letters ii, no. 289.

179. Mats no. 650.

letter to the bishop announcing the interdict¹⁸⁰ written in late June 1170 does not appear to have been sent.¹⁸¹

John's relationship with the bishop of Winchester was for the most part indirect when he was working under Theobald and it remained so when he was under Thomas. His impression of Henry of Winchester altered partly with the change that occurred to the bishop and partly according to his masters' relationship with the bishop. While John was serving Archbishop Theobald, John did not approve of the bishop's conduct. His absence from the Council of Rheims, his conduct at Rome and in his see were not considered favourably by John. However, being merely a clerk of Archbishop Theobald, he would not have had much chance to convey his feelings to the bishop. John probably maintained a good working relationship with the bishop's clerks.

John's feeling towards the bishop changed considerably as he started working under Archbishop Thomas. By this time, the wealthy, ambitious bishop of noble lineage turned into an elderly statesman, somewhat retired from the world of political intrigues. He had reached the state of mind in which he was more concerned about the time when he would be called to God's judgement.¹⁸² The relationship between Thomas Becket and the bishop was good from the beginning and the bishop remained a supporter of Thomas almost throughout the conflict. John also now regarded the bishop with

180. Mats no. 679.

181. Barlow, TB, p. 206.

182. Mats no. 650.

affection and gratitude. John and the exiles in some ways relied on the bishop and were encouraged by his behaviour in support of the archbishop. Henry on his part responded generously to the plea for help and welcomed their gratitude.

But the relationship between John and Henry of Winchester was essentially indirect and remained subsidiary to that of his master. Indeed the status gap that separated the wealthy and influential bishop of noble birth from a clerk to the archbishop and an exile was great. In the eyes of Henry of Winchester, John was probably seen as one of the clerks of Becket and one of the exiles in need of his help. In fact, John felt more familiar with the bishop's clerks. They were men of the same status. When John wished to pass his request for help to the bishop, he needed the assistance of these men.

There was an occasion, however, when John may have influenced the bishop. The bishop of Winchester remained a constant supporter of Becket except once when his action seemed inconsistent and contradictory to his general principles, that is when he put his seal on the bishops' appeals in June-July 1166. As has been discussed above,¹⁸³ this was probably caused by a failure of communication. The reason why the bishop returned to supporting Becket may owe something to John's letters in 1166 which he sent to Exeter with a hope that his messages would be promulgated to the

183. See the section 3-VI-2-a.

English clergy.¹⁸⁴ At the time when there was little or no communication between the archbishop and English churchmen, John's messages probably helped the bishop grasp the situation and decide the right course of action.

c. Merton Priory

Merton Priory is known as the place where Thomas Becket received his education probably between 1130 and 1141.¹⁸⁵ Becket retained an interest in the priory and helped it when he was chancellor and took one of its canons whose name is Robert, as his chaplain and confessor.¹⁸⁶ According to Knowles, Robert of Merton played an important role at Northampton on the night before that dramatic Tuesday when Becket appeared at the king's court resolved on a struggle.¹⁸⁷ Robert of Merton was to be by the side of the archbishop until his death on 29 December 1170.¹⁸⁸

Robert II was prior of Merton from 1150 to 67.¹⁸⁹ John's relationship with Prior Robert started presumably while John was in the household of Archbishop Theobald.¹⁹⁰

184. JS Letters ii, nos. 168, 174, 187.

185. Barlow, TB, p. 17.

186. Barlow. TB, p. 18.

187. Knowles, EC, pp. 75-6.

188. Barlow, TB, pp. 245-6, 249.

189. Heads, p. 175.

190. JS Letters i, nos. 50 & 103 were written by John, no. 103 in the name of Archbishop Theobald.

Letter no. 50 was written between 1154 and 1159 in John's own name to Pope Adrian IV, who may also have been educated at Merton Priory before 1120.¹⁹¹ In this letter, John asked the Pope to give a hearing to the brothers sent from Merton Priory in the law suit over the church of Effingham. John also reminded the Pope of his relationship with Merton Priory while he was a canon and abbot of another Augustinian Abbey, St. Ruf.¹⁹² John must have been friendly enough to Prior Robert to write to the Pope on behalf of his priory.

After John was exiled, we find the prior reciprocating his favours by working for peace for John. In summer 1165, John replied to a letter from him, thanking him for taking trouble for his peace.¹⁹³ No. 151 may possibly have been sent with nos. 150, 149 and possibly 137 by the messenger who went to Woodstock or nearby in the summer of 1165.¹⁹⁴ John apparently heard from the prior or others that he was making an effort for peace for John. John thanked the prior for this and asked him to continue the effort, referring to other persons who would work for his peace such as the bishop of London, Richard of Ilchester and Richard de Luci. Other letters which were presumably sent with this one also asked the recipients to intercede with the king for John's sake. But the tone of each letter is different. Whereas the one to Henry de Beaumont was cordial, to Bartholomew

191. Barlow, *TB*, p. 18.

192. *JS Letters* i, p. 88 n 2.

193. *JS Letters* ii, no. 151.

194. See the section 2-V-3-b(i).

of Exeter, personal and familiar, and to Richard of Ilchester, curt and businesslike, the letter to the prior was strongly religious.

John ascribed what success the prior had had to 'your prayers and to the prayers of my friends' and asked him 'to intercede for me with the Lord' that he might come back to England. John wished that He may soften the anger of the king and also that He may spare him. John asked the prior to petition the above-mentioned dignitaries 'so long as you do not think it will injure your church' and that 'If it is not safe to appeal to men,' 'to pray God... that He may order my steps in His paths'.

John wrote another letter to the prior between 1165 and 1167, in which he appeared to be more pessimistic.¹⁹⁵ He felt that human counsel had failed and that he must take refuge in God's, which could be obtained by the prior's prayers. John described his suffering as an exile and an outlaw without just cause, but attributing it to God's will. He professed having kept faith with God's Church and having maintained obedience to the archbishop.

John asked the prior to 'commend our contest to the Lord' adding that 'We need nothing else, save that our cause should be pleasing to God'. There is no obvious internal clue to dating this letter but Professor Brooke discerned for various reasons that it belongs to 1165-6, or

195. JS Letters ii, no. 156.

thereabouts.¹⁹⁶ Some themes of the letter makes one assume that it was probably written after John's failure to obtain peace from the king at Angers.¹⁹⁷ As far as peace from the king is concerned, which was the topic of his previous letter to the prior, this may have been the time when John felt that human counsel had failed. It may also have been the time when he felt the need to profess that he had kept faith with God's Church and faithfully obeyed the archbishop. John asked for the prior's prayers, but he may have been in need for their material help.¹⁹⁸

The prior appears to have been a close friend with whom, like Odo of Canterbury, John shared an interest in spiritual and religious matters.¹⁹⁹ John thought that 'he (Robert) reckoned me among his few dearest friends and that I was higher in his favour than the many who were before me in desert'.²⁰⁰ Prior Robert died in August 1167²⁰¹ and was succeeded by William in 1167/8.²⁰²

196. JS Letters ii, p. xxvii.

197. Similar themes like keeping faith with God's Church and maintaining obedience to the archbishop also appear in no. 167 written in early June 1166.

198. See nos. 163 & 192 to Hugh of St. Edmunds. Also PC Letters i, no. 16 to John of Saint-Malo written after the fire of Saint-Aigulf.

199. Entheticus, vol. 1, 11. 1667-1682. See the section 3-V-2-C.

200. JS Letters ii, no. 265.

201. Heads p. 175.

202. Heads p. 175.

In letter no. 265 written in 1167--8, John congratulated the new prior William on his promotion. He described the friendship and favour he had enjoyed from his predecessor and wished that he would continue to have the affection of his 'successor. Referring to the fact that he had all he needed in spite of being an exile and an outlaw in a foreign land, John asked for the prior's prayers. Then he gave the 'sum of my prayers': he requested William to take the bearer, who was known to the prior, to the bishop of Winchester personally, if possible, or with a representative and help him in his business. It may be that the bearer whom the prior was asked to help was the same as the one who carried the letters to chaplain Robert de Limeseia, Master Robert of Inglesham and the bishop of Winchester.²⁰³ John also asked Robert de Limeseia to help the bearer of the letter in his business.²⁰⁴

No. 266 was possibly sent together with no. 265 as an open message to the prior and the canons of Merton. This was one of John's appeal letters written in 1168.²⁰⁵ John asked for their prayers: 'For this alone we ask, and we assure you in the charity which is God not even to think of giving support from your earthly resources.' John was not personally as close to prior William as he had been to Prior Robert. He appears nevertheless confident that the prior would help the bearer in his business and that he and the

203. JS Letters ii, nos. 259-61.

204. JS Letters ii, no. 259.

205. See Appendix ii, II-1-a & b.

canons would help the archbishop with their prayers. Maybe this confidence was based on the archbishop's patronage of the priory.

5. Walter of Rochester

Bishop Walter of Rochester appeared as a recipient of one extant letter. Walter was Archbishop Theobald's brother. He had been archdeacon of Canterbury, became bishop of Rochester in 1148 and remained in office until 1182.²⁰⁶ While archdeacon, he was friend and patron of Becket in Archbishop Theobald's household.²⁰⁷ Walter was friendly with Thomas, but John would not have known him closely as a colleague. He became bishop of Rochester shortly after John joined Archbishop Theobald's household. But by the nature of the see of Rochester, which was close both in distance and in relationship to Canterbury,²⁰⁸ John and the bishop had occasion to meet with each other.²⁰⁹ Both Walter of Rochester and John were appointed as ^{ors} ~~executors~~ of the will of Archbishop Theobald.²¹⁰

206. Le Neve ii, pp. 13 & 76.

207. Knowles, EC, p. 12. Barlow, TB, p. 33.

208. Knowles, EC, p. 9.

209. Bishop Walter appeared at the archiepiscopal court when the case between Gervase, abbot of Westminster, and the monks of Malvern was heard. (JS Letters i, no. 45.) He may have been in touch with Bartholomew of Exeter on the occasion of his election. (JS Letters i, no. 118, n 4).

210. JS Letters i, no. 134.

211. Barlow, TB, p. 72.

212. Knowles, EC, p. 88.

After Becket was elected archbishop of Canterbury, he was ordained priest by Walter of Rochester on 2 June, 1162.²¹¹ At Northampton, Becket counted Walter among the bishops closest to him.²¹² Nothing much was heard of Walter after the archbishop's exile.

He is not known to have been particularly friendly to the exiles. No letter of Thomas survives that was addressed to Rochester. In 1169, the news of the bishop of London's excommunication crossed the Channel before the official letters. The bishop of Rochester is reported to have been one of those who refrained from performing their usual offices for fear of being handed the announcement of excommunication unexpectedly.²¹³ When the coronation of young Henry took place on 14 June, 1170, Walter assisted in the ceremony with Gilbert of London and Jocelin of Salisbury.²¹⁴ Bishop Walter may have liked Becket as a clerk, but it was difficult for him to give support to an exiled archbishop. For Kent was the area to which the royal persecution was directed and where the king's control was tightest. The position of the bishop of a semi-dependent see must have been made difficult without the archbishop of Canterbury. His greatest possible support was not acting positively against Becket. After his return to England, Becket appears to have visited Rochester.²¹⁵

213. Knowles, EC, pp. 98-9.

214. Knowles, EC, p. 136.

215. Barlow, TB, p. 228.

During the Becket dispute, only one letter is extant from John to Walter²¹⁶ and it is one of the appeal letters John wrote perhaps in the latter part of 1168. There may have been other letters that were sent to Rochester, since not all the recipients of appeal letters have been identified. In this letter, John first reminded Walter of his devoted service to Archbishop Theobald till his death. On that account John was bound to the bishop of Rochester. John asked Bishop Walter to help the archbishop who had to support many exiles in his fight for the Church. John countered the possibility of a negative answer that might contain an excuse based on fear of the king or the poverty and debts of the bishop's own people. John tried to persuade him of the benefit of helping the archbishop: it would free his conscience; it would increase the bishop's reputation; it would save him from disgrace so that in the event of peace, which John predicted to be near, the bishop would have helped Becket in exile. Referring to his own prosperity, John urged the bishop 'to fulfil the office of charity'. Bishop Walter must have well understood that John was desperately in need of help and that he was fully aware of the bishop's own difficulties. He would probably have wished to meet John's request. But whatever he felt about Becket and the exiles, it would have been difficult for him to offend the royal officials.

216. JS Letters ii, no. 257.

6. Hilary of Chichester²¹⁷

Hilary was the Pope's candidate to the see of Chichester, and became bishop at about the same time as John joined Archbishop Theobald's household. John probably got to know him at the council of Rheims where Hilary was one of the three bishops sent by King Stephen to present apologies for Archbishop Theobald's absence.²¹⁸ While still abroad, when asked by the Pope to assist Theobald in the consecration of Gilbert Foliot, newly elected to Hereford, Hilary refused on account of his loyalty to the king.²¹⁹ After John began to serve the archbishop as his secretary, he was probably in touch with Hilary fairly frequently. For Hilary was a renowned canonist and was often employed as Archbishop Theobald's assessor and papal judge-delegate. He often appeared in John's letters in that capacity.²²⁰ When John wrote to the Pope in the name of Archbishop Theobald in reply to his inquiry of canon Walter of St. Ruf, he stressed that the canon was known to Bishop Hilary.²²¹ In a letter written probably in 1156-7, John wrote in the name of Archbishop Theobald thanking Hilary for 'your loving care in giving sound counsel'.²²² Archbishop Theobald complained that he had not heard of what was happening around the king and asked Hilary to keep him informed in all things.²²³

217. For life and relationship with Becket, see Knowles, EC, pp. 24-7, 58-9, 72-88. For his relationship with Henry II, Mayr-Harting, H. 'Hilary, Bishop of Chichester (1147-1169) and Henry II' in EHR, vol 78., (1163) pp 209-224. See also Saltman, Theobald, pp. 100-2, 144-58 et passim.

218. HP-ii.

219. HP-xix.

220. JS Letters i, nos. 5, 16, 56, 72, 74, 80, 84, 99 & 113.

One letter is extant which John wrote to the bishop in his own name while in the service of Archbishop Theobald. It was apparently written in reply to the bishop's letter of protest over the archiepiscopal decision against his claim that certain churches were in his diocese rather than Canterbury.²²⁴ In no. 92 John reported how he tried to handle the matter in favour of the bishop without success. In due course, John reported, he was accused of 'concealing the claim of jurisdiction put forward by the archbishop and the church of Canterbury, in order to curry favour with you' and Hilary was accused of taking advantage of the archbishop's sickness and of invading the boundaries of the church of Canterbury. The facts refuting Hilary's claim were reported to the archbishop 'somewhat against my will'. The archbishop excommunicated Hilary's contumacious parishioners as the dean and the synod urged. John wrote to Hilary apologetically, 'I am quite unable to maintain any opinion which you decide to impugn', hinting, however that those who had ignored the summons of their metropolitan were not without blame. For the outcome of the affair, John preferred to apologise to the bishop rather than 'employ legal arguments or allege the commands of my lord and the necessity of obedience'.

221. JS Letters i, no. 49.

222. JS Letters i, no. 44.

223. The significance of this letter in connection with the dispute between Hilary of Chichester and Battle Abbey has been discussed by Mayr-Harting, 'Hilary of Chichester' p. 223.

224. JS Letters i, no. 92, n 1. JS Letters ii, no. 144, n 9. For the letter no. 92 and the synod, see Councils and Synods i, pp. 815-17.

This letter appears at first sight to represent an instance in which John's concern for his friend overrode the interest of the church of Canterbury and also an instance in which John tried to use his personal influence over the archbishop for his friend's sake without success. Indeed, John could have tried such things. However, this letter was more probably a tactfully and carefully written letter of apology to a friend who could be easily driven into argument. Since Hilary was a capable and quick-witted lawyer, John was careful not to incite him into argument, but to try to stress his sincerity and to appeal to his emotions. John probably valued his friendship and thought highly of him.

During the pontificate of Archbishop Thomas, their friendship became very difficult with the quarrel between the king and the archbishop. John was already in France in the beginning of 1164 as a diplomat of Becket. And at the council of Northampton in October 1164, Hilary's stance as a 'royalist' was quite evident. Hilary maintained friendship with John at least until the summer of 1165. When John wrote about that time to the bishops of London, Chichester, Hereford and Worcester, and to the archdeacon of Poitiers, Hilary was the only one who replied to John.²²⁵

Did their correspondence last beyond this date? There is no further evidence of communication in John's later letters, but he appears to have been familiar with the bishop's behaviour in mid-late 1166. John reported in

225. JS Letters ii, no. 152.

June 1166 that the king had summoned the bishop of Chichester and others for their counsel.²²⁶ In a letter to his brother Richard, written in June-July,²²⁷ John wrote that the bishop of London and 'even my friend the bishop of Chichester' are among the servant of iniquity against the Church'. When he wrote to Gerard Pucelle around 1 October 1166 and asked him to persuade the Emperor through the archbishop of Cologne, to desist from his evil acts and 'from piling up the grounds of exceptions to his charge for his opponents' use', John brought up the example of Hilary's argument. John wrote; 'The bishop of Chichester has lately attacked this very point, indicating to the king that he himself was helping the archbishop of Canterbury more than any other human agency. When the king asked how, he replied: "Because you justify his case by committing many large injustices so often, and have thereby strangled your own right, if you had any. You give him aid and counsel too by compelling the best clerks you had in your land, or some of them at least, to go into exile with him and by not allowing them to return." The king was stirred by this and confessed his anxiety with many a sigh, but the strength of his anger did not allow him to learn wisdom.'²²⁸ This incident probably took place when, summoned by the king, Hilary gave his counsel in June or July, 1166. The incident is reported in John's letter no. 184, but the

226. JS Letters ii, no. 168.

227. JS Letters ii, no. 172.

228. JS Letters ii, no. 184.

original source of information appears lost. The informer may be anybody who may have been present such as John of Canterbury, Walter de Insula or an 'amicus' of Becket. The bishop himself is not a totally unlikely candidate.

'It is not likely that John and Bishop Hilary of Chichester kept in touch, but Hilary appeared in John's letters a number of times as a subject of news. After the conference of Gisors and Trie, when the king, the legates and the English bishops met at Argentan, Hilary of Chichester's presence was reported.²²⁹ Advising Baldwin of Totnes how the bishop of Exeter could cope with the difficulty if Bartholomew was asked to absolve those who had been excommunicated by the archbishop, John expressed his hope that the bishops of Chichester and Worcester might give aid to release Bartholomew from his dilemma.²³⁰ From John's letter, we also know that Master Jocelin, chancellor of Chichester and nephew of Hilary²³¹ was one of the messengers delivering the repeated appeal of the bishops. Hilary continued to act on behalf of the king.²³² His last known act before his death on 19 July 1169 was to publish Thomas's sentence of excommunication of Gilbert of London.²³³ He does not appear again in John's extant letters until after

229. JS Letters ii, nos. 236 & 241.

230. JS Letters ii, no. 241.

231. JS Letters ii, no. 236, n 9.

232. Barlow, TB, p. 186.

233. Knowles, EC, p. 111.

his death when John referred to the bishop in his letter to William aux Blanchesmains in connection with the exiles' accusation of Archbishop Roger of York.²³⁴

While in the service of Archbishop Theobald, in one of the letters to Bartholomew of Exeter, John made a comparison between two able lawyers, Arnulf of Lisieux and Hilary of Chichester.²³⁵

'There were once two advocates (but now, it is said, they are shepherds of souls holding the office of bishop at Lisieux, to wit, and Chichester) who proceeded by different methods: the bishop of Lisieux preferred to spoil his case rather than his speech, while he who is now bishop of Chichester yielded to him an elegance of style, but snatched the glory of victory from him by his careful attention to the matter in hand. I am not capable of imitating either of them, but I prefer to tread in the footsteps of the latter'.

John and Hilary of Chichester were friends who liked and helped each other in their respective capacities. John had a high opinion of him, particularly of his knowledge and ability in law.

234. JS Letters ii, no. 307.

235. JS Letters i, no. 118.

**DAMAGED
TEXT
IN
ORIGINAL**

7. The Norwich (Norwich and Bury St. Edmunds)

John had fairly relationships with clergy and religious in the No area. The main centres of communication were the cathedral of Norwich and the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds. Between the two, John's connection was much stronger at first with Norwich, but when John's kinsman Master Gey became a monk of St. Edmunds, John came to maintain his communication with the abbey, especially after he went to exile. John appears to have had much contact with the bishop of Norwich while he was secretary to Archbishop Theobald. They were in touch mostly through various legal cases in the area. The chancellor of Archbishop Theobald, Peter Colle was archdeacon of Norwich.²³⁶ Besides his own, Peter Colle's connection with Norwich²³⁷ also served to strengthen John's ties with this area. Due to their proximity, Norwich and Bury St. Edmunds appear to have had contacts. They were sometimes involved in the same legal case,²³⁸ and some of their personnel seem to have known each other.²³⁹ During John's exile, communication with Bury may have been made relatively easy by the contacts between Abbot Hugh of St. Edmunds and Peter of Celle.²⁴⁰

236. Saltman, Theobald, pp. 229-30. Le Neve ii, p. 63, Cheney, English bishops chanceries, 1100-1250, pp. 30-1.

237. A monk at Celle called Thomas is known to be from Norwich. (PC Letters i nos. 33 & 34.)

238. JS Letters i, no. 81.

239. JS Letters ii, no. 162.

240. PC Letters ii, nos. 133 & 134.

There were altogether 15 extant letters and they concentrated in two different periods--spring and summer 1166 and 1168, and we do not seem to possess letters written in other years. The messengers usually visited both Norwich and Bury St. Edmunds.

a. Correspondents

i. William de Turba, bishop of Norwich

William de Turba was probably born before 1100.²⁴¹ He was a monk at the cathedral priory of Norwich. He later became sub-prior and prior of the house and was subsequently elected bishop of Norwich in 1146/7 and remained in office till his death in January 1174.²⁴² He was one of the bishops who were sent to the council of Rheims in 1148.²⁴³ In 1156, he was concerned about the scutage levied in order to support the king's campaign against his brother Geoffrey.²⁴⁴ He was papal judge-delegate and assessor of the archbishop.²⁴⁵ William was a man of learning, educated in the monastic literary tradition and was regarded with

241. For William's biography, see Knowles, EC, pp. 31-3. Harper-Bill, C., 'Bishop William Turbe and the diocese of Norwich, 1146-1174' Anglo-Norman Studies vol 7, (1985) pp. 142-60. English Episcopal Acta IV: Norwich 1070-1214, ed. Harper-Bill, C., The British Academy, Oxford, (1990) pp xxxiii-xxxiv.

242. Le Neve, ii, pp. 56, 59.

243. HP-ii. Saltman, Theobald, pp. 25, 141.

244. Knowles, EC, p. 33. Harper-Bill, 'Bishop William de Turbe', p. 144. JS Letters i, no. 13.

245. Knowles, EC, pp. 51-2. Harper-Bill, 'Bishop William de Turbe' pp. 146-8. Saltman, Theobald, p. 146.

respect and affection both by Gilbert Foliot and Thomas Becket.²⁴⁶

During the Becket conflict, he remained neutral throughout. Both at Clarendon and at Northampton, William was among those who pleaded with the archbishop to yield,²⁴⁷ since he and the bishop of Salisbury were already out of favour with the king.²⁴⁸ After that he 'remained out of sight' during most of the conflict.²⁴⁹ In 1167, he was requested by the papal legates William and Otto to absolve those excommunicated by Becket,²⁵⁰ but there is no evidence that he carried out the request.²⁵¹ He stopped associating with Gilbert Foliot as soon as he was excommunicated in 1169.²⁵² In the same year, William retired into his cathedral monastery.²⁵³ The bishop's behaviour during the dispute is characterized as that of 'a conscientious prelate responding cautiously, and perhaps pragmatically'.²⁵⁴

246. Knowles, EC, p. 32, n. GFL no. 233 (Mats no. 347) Mats nos. 688 & 726.

247. Knowles, EC, pp. 108-9. At Clarendon, he acted with Jocelin of Salisbury and at Northampton, with Jocelin of Salisbury and Bartholomew of Exeter.

248. Knowles, EC, p. 61. Harper-Bill, 'Bishop William de Turbe' p. 145.

249. Knowles, EC, pp. 108-9.

250. Mats no. 353.

251. Harper-Bill, 'Bishop William de Turbe' p. 145.

252. Knowles, EC, pp. 108-9.

253. Knowles, EC, pp. 108-9. Harper-Bill, 'Bishop William de Turbe,' pp. 145-6.

254. Harper-Bill, 'Bishop William de Turbe,' pp. 144-5.

John probably met William at the Council of Rheims and their contacts increased through the bishop's role as assessor of Archbishop Theobald²⁵⁵ and through various lawsuits involving his see.²⁵⁶ On some occasions John went to Norwich in person to carry out his business.²⁵⁷ At such times, he met other clerks and monks at Norwich.²⁵⁸ Bishop William had a personal as well as official relationship with John. John had some revenues in Norwich and he commended his brother Richard to receive them in spring 1166.²⁵⁹

ii. Other correspondents in Norwich

John's other correspondents in Norwich were Master Nicholas, Prior John and the cellarer Gerard. Master Nicholas appears as witness to thirty-two of Bishop William's acta,²⁶⁰ from 1146--c. 1150 to c. 1170/74.²⁶¹ He probably assisted the bishop in practical matters such as sending John's revenues to his brother through the agency of

255. JS Letters i, nos. 5 & 113.

256. JS Letters i, nos. 14, 15, 78, 80, 81.

257. JS Letters i, no. 39.

258. JS Letters i, no. 39. Master N. can be Master Nicholas who appears as John's correspondent in JS Letters ii and monk John, future prior John who was promoted in 1157. (English Episcopal Acta VI: Norwich 1070-1214, p xliv, JS's letters, nos. 39, 252).

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

260. English Episcopal Acta VI: Norwich 107-1214, p xlv.

261. JS Letters ii, p xxvi. The recipient of JS Letters ii, nos. 159 & 178 is treated here as the same person as that of no. 282. (JS Letters ii, no. 282, n 1)

R. de Limeseia.²⁶² He was probably learned in letters and enjoyed friendly literary exchanges.²⁶³ John also wrote to two archdeacons of Norwich, Baldwin of Boulogne²⁶⁴ and Wálkelin of Suffolk. Walkelin of Suffolk first occurs as archdeacon before 1143 and last occurs on 13 January 1185/6.²⁶⁵ John made unfavourable comments on the archdeacons of Norwich to the Pope in his letters written for the sake of the bishop of Norwich who was disputing with his archdeacons.²⁶⁶

iii. Hugh, Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds

Hugh was elected abbot of Bury St. Edmunds in 1157, and he remained in this office till his death in 1180.²⁶⁷ Hugh may be the abbot of Bury St. Edmunds who appears in John's letter no. 81 written in the name of Archbishop Theobald to the Pope in relation to a law suit over the church of

262. JS Letters ii, no. 178.

263. JS Letters ii, no. 159.

264. Since Baldwin was in the service of Becket, he will be treated in the respective section.

265. Le Neve ii, p 67. Landon, L., 'The early archdeacons of Norwich diocese' Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and Natural History, vol 20(1930) pp 13-4, 18-25, 30-1. English Episcopal Acta VI: Norwich 1070-1214, pp xxxix-xl.

266. JS Letters i, nos. 14, 15, 46.

267. Heads, p. 32.

Beccles.²⁶⁸ John does not appear to have been close to the abbot while he was in the service of Archbishop Theobald. Probably a closer relationship developed through Master Geoffrey, John's kinsman who became a monk of Bury St. Edmunds. Hugh was in contact with Peter of Celle sometime between 1161-81.²⁶⁹

iv. Master Geoffrey²⁷⁰

Master Geoffrey was John's kinsman. He was at one time married and had a son. He later became a monk at Bury St. Edmunds.²⁷¹ We do not know much else about Master Geoffrey, but we can gather a fair amount of information on his son. If his son 'R(icardus) filius vester'²⁷² was the same person as 'Magister Ricardus, cognatus meus' in John's letter no. 277, Master Geoffrey's son was a student of Gerard Pucelle.²⁷³ Master Richard was in the service of Becket most probably on the recommendation of John²⁷⁴ and on that account exiled probably in summer or autumn of 1165²⁷⁵ and

268. The name of the abbot was not mentioned in the letter; it is either Ording(1148-56) or Hugh(1157-80). (JS Letters i, no. 81, n 1)

269. See the section 2-IV-3.

270. The recipient of JS Letters i. no. 95 and that of JS Letters ii, nos. 161-2, 193 & 268 are treated as the same person.

271. JS Letters i, no. 95, n 1.

272. JS Letters ii, no. 161.

273. JS Letters ii, no. 277. Barlow has cautioned us not to confuse the three Richards who were from Salisbury or related to John. (Barlow, TB, p. 302).

274. JS Letters ii, no. 161.

275. JS Letters ii, no. 167.

was entrusted to Milo, bishop of Thérrouanne.²⁷⁶ 'Magister R. filius vester' successfully made peace with the king as a result of John's effort at Angers in May 1166.²⁷⁷ For reasons we do not know, 'Magister Ricardus cognatus meus' seems to have come back to Becket's service and died on his mission to the Curia sometime before May 1168.²⁷⁸

b. Correspondence

i. While John was in Archbishop Theobald's service

During this period, the bishop of Norwich was very much the centre of John's communication in the area. The only other correspondent was Master Geoffrey, whose whereabouts were uncertain. John wrote to William both in his own and in Theobald's name sometimes in connection with law suits.²⁷⁹ He also wrote to the Pope in support of the bishop's cases. Already by 1156, John appears to have become a personal friend of the bishop of Norwich. In spring or summer 1156, he wrote to the bishop when the messengers to the king returned from the continent.²⁸⁰ Probably the bishop had petitioned the king to remit scutage on ecclesiastical estates. The messengers brought back the answer that the king could not remit scutage because he was still fighting with his brother but 'the desired effect shall be given to our petitions' upon his return. Probably

276. JS Letters ii, no. 142. "you have given me a special welcome in my kinsmen 'magister R. cognatus meus'."

277. JS Letters ii, no. 161.

278. JS Letters ii, no. 277.

279. JS Letters i, nos. 78, 79.

280. JS Letters i, no. 13.

as secretary to Archbishop Theobald, John was in a position in which he was able to select cases to promote to the king or to the Pope. Perhaps John himself was against levying scutage.²⁸¹ On this point John and the bishop were of the same opinion.

On behalf of the bishop of Norwich, John wrote to the Pope on two occasions against archdeacons of Norwich, Walkelin of Suffolk and Baldwin of Boulogne. He wrote to the Pope against Walkelin of Suffolk about the same time as he wrote to the bishop about scutage. One letter was written in his own name, the other, in the name of Archbishop Theobald.²⁸² Nos. 14 and 15 might have been sent with no. 13 to the bishop of Norwich so that he might use them when he appealed to the Curia. John wrote the letters after the Council of London which was held in or after June 1156²⁸³ and at which the bishop of Norwich addressed the bishop of London with charges against Walkelin, archdeacon of Suffolk. John objectively and succinctly stated the case against Walkelin in the archbishop's petition to the Pope in support of the bishop of Norwich. John also wrote to the Pope in his own name and he was much freer in his expression. John stated that although Walkelin had piled up offences against the Apostolic See on his return from Rome, he had not yet received restitution. John related as an

281. In letter no. 168, John tried awkwardly the defence of Becket's role in connection with it.

282. JS Letters i, nos. 14 & 15.

283. JS Letters i, p. 22. Councils and Synods i, pp. 829-835.

example of his evil deeds the fact that he had named his illegitimate son after the Pope, stating that the general opinion was against Walkelin. As usual the pair of letters was meant to convey the full message together. No. 14 was the formal statement of the case, whereas no. 15 was meant to give more frankly the type of information that could not be included in the formal letter. Later in about 1157, John wrote to the Pope again denouncing Baldwin of Boulogne, archdeacon of Sudbury.²⁸⁴ The letter was written in John's own name. He stated that Baldwin had not appeared in the bishop's court giving an excuse that he had been sent to England on a special mission by the Pope, which was too extravagant to be true. He asked the Pope not to accept his suit over the church of Yelverton if he tried to renew it.

During his service with Archbishop Theobald, William of Norwich was about the closest to John of all the English bishops. Only two surviving letters out of 135 were written in John's own name to other English bishops. Two out of the nine letters John wrote to the Pope in his own name were on behalf of William. John did everything he could officially and personally for the sake of the bishop. John probably held the bishop in esteem and affection. They probably agreed on certain principles of the Church. John had some revenues in Norwich. John had friends in Norwich such as Master Nicholas, and the monk John. He may also have made

284. JS Letters i, no. 46.

friends with the two notorious archdeacons of Norwich. John may have denounced them in those years, but later he wrote to both of them as friends.²⁸⁵

Judging from his letters alone, John's relationship with Bury St. Edmunds did not amount to much while John was in Archbishop Theobald's service. One letter is extant which is addressed to his kinsman Master Geoffrey. Master Geoffrey appears as monk of Bury St. Edmunds in John's later letters. Master Geoffrey seems to have written many letters and John's letter no. 95 was the answer to one of them. This letter is a humanist's letter;²⁸⁶ its theme is friendship, it is full of word play and manifestation of knowledge without practical business to attend to. It is similar to John's letters addressed to another relative, Robert, son of Egidia,²⁸⁷ except that kinship is not stressed so much here. John approved of this letter on friendship 'in which with the authority of your own peculiar learning (sub domesticae eruditionis auctoritate) you impressed upon me the necessity of virtue and courage.' John stated that it is 'a great thing to be adorned with the insignia of high office, but it is beyond all doubt still greater to deserve them by our virtue' and asked Geoffrey to write frequently in order to dispel idleness from his mind and kindle it to virtuous actions.

285. JS Letters ii, nos. 240 & 253.

286. JS Letters i, no. 95 n 3 & pp xxxviii-1ii.

287. JS Letters ii, no. 145. See the section 2-V-3-b(i).

In those days Geoffrey seems to have sought John's friendship. Judging from John's answer, Geoffrey was probably the lesser scholar and an inferior letter writer, but nevertheless, he wished to keep on writing letters of friendship to his relative who was already renowned as a scholar and who had rich and powerful friends both at Archbishop Theobald's and Henry II's court. Among John's personal letters written while he was in the household of Archbishop Theobald, there are some in which John demonstrated his erudition perhaps excessively. This letter to his kinsman was one of them. John valued humbleness but in dealing with his relative, perhaps he wished to show off his position and learning.

ii. 1166

After exile, John appears to have refrained from writing to Norwich for some time. The first extant letters to the Norwich area belong to spring or summer 1166. Messengers were probably sent to the area three times in spring and summer 1166. The first one carried nos. 159 & 160 to Norwich and nos. 161 & 163 to Bury. The second messenger probably just took no. 162 to Bury. The third carried no. 178 to Norwich and nos. 192 & 193 to Bury St. Edmunds.

Nos. 159 and 160 to Master Nicholas and the bishop of Norwich were written before 24 June and probably before the Vézelay sentences.²⁸⁸ No. 161 to Master Geoffrey of St.

288. JS Letters ii, pp xxvi, xxix.

Edmunds was written after May 1.²⁸⁹ Therefore the first messenger to the Norwich area probably left between 1 May and 12 June. In no. 159, referring to the fact that he had not-written to Nicholas for a long time, John expressed his love to Nicholas and his grief for not being able to convey his feelings freely. He also deplored the Church's plight, his friends' suffering, the fickleness of mind and loss of charity in his friends. He consoled himself that ill fortune would not last long 'since the fashion of this world passes like a shadow in the eyes of philosophers'. Declaring that his love would not change, he asked Nicholas to commend his brother to the bishop of Norwich so that John's revenues which was due on 24 June may be transferred to him. No. 160 to William de Turba was much shorter. After expressing affection and devotion, John commended his brother whose goods have also been proscribed. He stated his request concerning his revenues because his brother had the king's peace, though 'he has not yet secured full favour'. As we have seen elsewhere, the two letters together were meant to have the desired effect. Perhaps being friendly to Master Nicholas was as important as being friendly to the bishop, for he could promote cases to the bishop and actually carried out the necessary transactions.

The two letters that went to Bury St. Edmunds were entirely different in character. One was a letter to his kinsman reporting how he had worked to secure the king's peace for his son. The other letter to the abbot asked him for prayers for the sake of the exiles. No. 161 to

289. JS Letters ii, pp xxviii, xxix.

Geoffrey was written soon after the conference at Angers. John proudly recounted how carefully he arranged for Geoffrey's son Richard's peace, involving the abbot of Saint-Victor and other religious, Master Walter de Insula and 'through him many others whose good faith seemed particularly sincere'. Without mentioning the failure of his own attempt for peace, John referred to the continued suffering of the exiles and asked Geoffrey for his prayers. John advised him to thank Master Walter if Geoffrey saw him and added apologetically that 'I could not do him(Richard) greater kindness' but 'I did as much for him as circumstances allowed'.

No. 163 to the abbot of Bury St. Edmunds was a short letter accompanying that to Master Geoffrey. After inquiring how the abbot was and expressing his wish to serve him, John asked the abbot to support the Church and the exiles by his prayers. John made comments criticising the ways of the clergy who 'wait the hour of death, eating, drinking and snoring,' while the Church is in its shipwreck and Christ's exiles in toil. John was fairly certain that the abbot would listen to his appeal for the exiles fighting for the Church.

It is interesting to compare John's letters to Geoffrey with the one also written to his brother Richard just after the conference at Angers.²⁹⁰ In this letter, John reported in detail on his failure to secure peace with the king. He

290. JS Letters ii, no. 164. For the letter to Richard, see the section 2-V-3-b(ii).

explained to Richard that he could not accept the peace that was offered him by the king, because it involved taking a wicked and dangerous oath. John regretted to have to convey the news knowing that Richard would be 'astonished with the crowd and sad with his friends,' for peace with the king would have saved Richard and other members of the family much embarrassment and unhappiness. However, John's letter to Master Geoffrey concentrated on his son's peace and did not refer to his own. John probably wished to maintain his attitude as a patron of Geoffrey and his son.

No. 162 to Master Geoffrey was different in tone from no. 161 and was probably written in a hurry. It was probably sent singly or else with Peter of Celle's letter to the abbot of St. Edmunds possibly before the return of John's messenger from Norwich and St. Edmunds and before early June.²⁹¹ John wrote this letter upon receiving a letter from Richard, his brother, shortly after John wrote the series of letters to the Norwich area.²⁹² Having heard from Richard that there was a detractor at Norwich who was spreading a remour that John had written against the honour of William, he was probably much worried that the request made in nos. 159 and 160 might not be carried out. John wanted Master Geoffrey to work so that possible misunderstanding be resolved and their anger mitigated.

291. JS Letters ii, no. 167.

292. JS Letters ii, nos. 159, 160, 161 & 163.

John's messenger probably came back from Norwich and Bury St. Edmunds in early June shortly after no. 162.²⁹³ He probably brought back the abbot's promise to send help through Geoffrey but without any message from Geoffrey himself.²⁹⁴ Therefore John complained to Master Raymond of Poitiers that although John successfully obtained the peace of Master Geoffrey's son who had been his fellow exile for eight months, John's courier to Bury St. Edmunds could 'not get a line out of him for me'.²⁹⁵

Whether Master Geoffrey had acted on John's behalf or not, John wrote to Master Nicholas upon his brother's arrival in about July 1166 thanking him 'for your kindness to him by R. de Limeseia's agency'.²⁹⁶ Master Nicholas probably arranged that Richard could receive the rent due to John. In this letter, John denounced the bishops' appeal as an act of faithlessness, contrasting their lives with those of the exiles 'who bear the seizure of our goods in patience'. He was particularly indignant because the bishops asserted that the king 'reckons it a delightful service whenever he is warned to correct any offence he has committed against God'.²⁹⁷ Although systematic campaigning

293. JS Letters ii, no. 167.

294. JS Letters ii, no. 167.

295. JS Letters ii, no. 167.

296. JS Letters ii, no. 178.

297. GFL no. 167.

was not to take place to the Norwich area, it was part of John's attempt to inform Becket's standpoint to as many quarters as possible.²⁹⁸

No. 192 to Abbot Hugh and no. 193 to Master Geoffrey were probably sent together with no. 178 in about July 1166.²⁹⁹ John wrote no. 192 sometime about July after his messenger came back from the Norwich area with abbot Hugh's letter and his promise of a gift. Discussing friendship and loss of loyalty in adversity with examples taken from Scripture, John deplored that their friends in common turned away from him for 'they want to be provided with benefits, not to provide them'. Thanking for the abbot's kindness he mentioned his concern that Master Geoffrey had not obeyed the abbot's instruction to send his aid. John felt delighted that the abbot had managed to avoid participating in the decision of the bishops to appeal, at the same time as escaping the charge laid against him before the provincial governors. John criticised the bishops because they defended the king instead of admonishing him against evil deeds.

298. Denunciation of the bishops' appeals is included in no. 180 to Walter de Insula (royal court) and no. 181 to Ralph Niger. (Presumably Paris)

299. Nos. 192 and 178 contain the same quotation from the bishops' appeal (GFL no. 167, ll 79-80) No. 192 which contains a remark that he was in his fourth year of exile connects the letter to no. 194 to John the Saracen. (JS Letters ii, p xxxii) No. 194 was probably sent with nos. 165 & 166 to Poitiers in early June. (For dating of the letters to Poitiers, see the section 3-VII-4-a.) All three letters, nos. 192, 193 & 194 refer to Cicero's Ad familiares. (JS Letters ii, p xxxii)

Probably at the same time as he wrote a letter to the abbot of Bury, John wrote to Geoffrey reproaching him that he did not conform with the abbot's instruction.³⁰⁰ John believed that it was due to necessity and not due to loss of loyalty and friendship, but criticised Geoffrey's recent involvement in certain schemes which prevented him from writing letters. John urged him to write back and briefly gave news about himself.

Among the letters written between about 1 May and the end of 1166, seven letters to Exeter and eight letters to the Norwich area are extant. Judging from the number of letters alone, the degree of facility or difficulty of communication to the Norwich area and Exeter appears to be about the same. The contents of the letters to the Exeter and Norwich areas were different. Except perhaps for letters to his brother Richard, the letters to Exeter were laden with news and campaigning on the archbishop's cause written in view of publication. The letters to the Norwich area were essentially personal. John was worried whether he could receive the revenues from the area for his brother. He asked Master Geoffrey to solve the misunderstanding caused by a detractor at Norwich. John made great efforts to secure Geoffrey's son's peace with the king. In turn, he expected Geoffrey to write to him and send him the aid which

300. JS Letters ii, no. 193.

was promised by the abbot of St. Edmunds. When it did not come, John was worried. Abbot Hugh whose friendship with John was almost certainly strengthened by Master Geoffrey, answered John's plea for charity and prayers. There were much less political messages in these letters. John made one attempt to criticise the bishops' appeals, but his messages were not to develop into a whole scale campaigning. Perhaps it was due to the nature of John's correspondents, Bishop William and Master Nicholas.

iii. 1168

During 1168, at least seven letters went to the Norwich area. All except one belong to the group of John's appeal letters.³⁰¹ It appears that the messengers were sent twice to this area: the first time, relatively early, probably between the end of 1167 and the beginning of 1168, while the defeat of the Emperor was valid as a current topic, early peace was expected and the need was not too pressing; the second time, probably in late 1168. Two letters appear to belong to the first group, nos. 251 to Gerard the Cellarer of Norwich and no. 258 to archdeacon Walkelin of Suffolk. The messenger may have delivered the letters to Baldwin of Boulogne, who in turn brought them to their destination.³⁰² John's letters in this period were relatively mild in tone

301. For appeal letters and their relationship to letters to Norwich, see the section 3-IV-2-b(i).

302. For Baldwin of Boulogne, see the sections 3-IV-2-b(i) and 4-II-2-b.

and his requests were expressed mainly by way of news of the archbishop. The messenger who was sent in late 1168 probably took letters to Bishop William of Norwich (no. 262), Prior John of Norwich (no. 252), Master Nicholas (no. 282), Abbot Hugh of Bury St. Edmunds (no. 283) and Geoffrey (no. 268).³⁰³ Except for the letter to Geoffrey, the letters expressed John's requests for help.

Among the first group of letters, the one to Gerard, cellarer of Norwich,³⁰⁴ seems to have been written partly because John had heard (presumably orally) from the courier or from some other sources that Gerard was in favour of the archbishop's cause. Letter no. 253 addressed to Walkelin of Suffolk probably went with no. 251. While John was in the service of Archbishop Theobald, Walkelin was one of the disobedient archdeacons of Norwich, and John had written to the Pope on behalf of the bishop of Norwich denouncing his conduct. In this letter, however, John wrote to Walkelin as a friend with whom he had not had a chance to speak. In this letter John sounded as if he were urging Walkelin to support the archbishop through holding out the prospect of an early peace rather than by emphasizing the

303. No. 252 to Prior John of Norwich is dated by Prof. Brooke c. 1168. This letter may belong to the same period as nos. 282 & 283 if 'exilii mei quintus feliciter expletur' (no. 252) means approximately the same as 'cui exulanti iam sextus imminet annus' (no. 282) and 'exilii mei sextus annus astat pro foribus' (no. 283).

304. JS Letters ii, no. 251.

archbishop's lone fight. John may have thought it more effective to persuade him through the prospect of the benefit he might gain following an early return by the archbishop. At this stage, John was fairly optimistic of obtaining their help, and he merely hinted to the recipients the need of the archbishop.³⁰⁵

Later in 1168, however, John's plea for help became more direct and urgent and some of his letters developed into certain forms. As to his letters to Norwich, nos. 252, 268 and 282 appear to constitute a set conveying the same message in different ways. Nos. 252 to John, prior of Norwich is typical of John's letters requesting help for the archbishop. Describing the misery of the outlaws, John nevertheless stressed his own prosperity. After reminding the recipients of the way of charity, John recounted how the archbishop was fighting for the Church's liberty on his own resources and the charity of foreigners. John considered this a shame for the English and hinted that sometimes the fealty a man had sworn to the king was contrary to charity and would imperil his faith. He suggested further that there should be ways of sending money secretly, but John emphasized quite adequately to a monk that 'All I say springs from charity, and so it is only fair to interpret it by charity.'

Perhaps by this time, John was aware of the bishop's cautious attitude towards the conflict. In no. 262, John

305. See the section 3-IV-2-b(i). See also JS Letters ii, nos. 250 to Peter the Scribe and no. 255 to William of Northolt.

expressed his understanding and approval of the bishop's prudent action. John hinted at the prospect of an early restoration of peace which would soon be brought about by the effort of the archbishop and the exiles. He hinted further that those who had helped the archbishop could rejoice them knowing that they had done what they should. Urging him to overcome fear, John asserted that there should be ways of sending money secretly.

No. 282 was probably addressed to Master Nicholas of Norwich.³⁰⁶ This letter was apparently written in reply to Master Nicholas's letter, for John appeared to quote parts of it. To which of John's letters Master Nicholas had replied cannot be known. For no letter survives in which John asked him to help the archbishop. John stated that he had no complaint against Nicholas in person but that he had to address it to him. Writing about friendship at length, John complained that 'our friends have abandoned the way of friendship and charity'. Describing how the archbishop and the exiles were fighting for the Church's liberty, John accused them of using fear of the king as their excuse. However formidable the king's anger may be, they should fear God more. Hinting that the Church's peace was near, John asked Nicholas and others to help so that they might not repent when it was actually brought about. John commended the messenger who could be trusted.

306. JS Letters ii, no. 282 n 1.

John appealed to the prior of Norwich from the point of view of charity. Showing understanding towards the bishop's attitude, John let him know that he wished for a little more positive support for the archbishop. John's letter to Master Nicholas was the strongest in tone and encouraged him to overcome fear.

In no. 283 to Hugh, abbot of Bury St. Edmunds, John apologized for the change in protocol caused by the dangerous circumstances. Expressing his wish to serve him and the obligation he felt towards him, John emphasized the archbishop's fight for the Church on his own resources and the charity of foreign people. John commended the bearer who would convey the news and to whom the abbot could entrust messages.

No. 268 to Geoffrey cannot be dated, for there is no internal clue. This letter was in fact simply addressed to 'Geoffrey' who was 'perhaps Geoffrey of St. Edmunds'.³⁰⁷ It would be natural to assume that this letter went with other letters to the area when a messenger was available, which would be either in the beginning or in late 1168. But the possibility exists that this went singly. In any case, this letter does not appear to have been written shortly after but probably before the death of Geoffrey's son, Richard, which occurred about May 1168. Apparently John got a reply from the abbot and possibly from Geoffrey himself after he sent his inquiry about the reason why Geoffrey did not sent help to John.³⁰⁸ John accepted his explanation

307. JS Letters ii, no. 268, n 1.

308. JS Letters ii, nos. 192 & 193. See above 3-VI-7-b(ii).

and possibly apology with understanding and sympathy and wrote that he only regretted that Geoffrey had thought that his faith in Geoffrey could be corrupted so easily. Geoffrey became involved in 'this guilt' because 'eagerness gave' it birth, fear fostered it, and anxious care, love's inseparable companion, confirmed it' and perhaps on this account Geoffrey did not set about sending help to John as instructed by the abbot of St. Edmunds. We do not know the nature of his 'guilt' but we are tempted to speculate whether this was related to Geoffrey's son Richard.

In the year of extreme difficulty for the archbishop, John could not but ask for help from his friends in Norwich. John wrote twice to the Norwich area asking for help. It was probably one of the few areas from which John got any reply. It is not surprising that Nicholas of Norwich wrote back to John presumably upon receiving John's first letter, explaining the state of fear and the difficulty of sending money secretly. He was too friendly to ignore John's plea, but John barely succeeded in turning the mind of the bishop towards active support of the archbishop.

c. Conclusions

From the time John was in the service of Archbishop Theobald, he had been very friendly with the bishop of Norwich. John must have felt respect and affection to this elderly bishop just as Gilbert Foliot and Thomas Becket did. John probably liked him all the more because of the bishop's pious moderation and prudence.

During the archbishop's exile, in spite of John's continued affection and respect and in spite of the relative

ease of communication, the tie between John and William de Turba was not of the strongest for several reasons. Like some other bishops, William of Norwich probably did not approve of the role the royal chancellor had played in the levy of scutage and in the siege of Toulouse. Perhaps the bishop's loss of the king's favour may have been the result of his stance against it. No doubt the exiled archbishop was fighting for the Church's liberty as William probably came to learn at some point. William of Norwich, however, was not swayed by the archbishop's enthusiasm for his fight. The bishop would have felt little inclined to support Becket either officially or personally even though he probably agreed with the principles the archbishop was fighting for.

Another reason was that the bishop was not much in need of John's information or his advice to decide his course of action. Unlike the newly elected bishop of Exeter, who tried to cope with the situation by means of his legal knowledge, William had been in office for a long time and had cultivated his own power of judgement and code of conduct both towards the archbishop and towards his fellow bishops. The bishop wished to do what he could personally for the sake of John and so he did when it was possible. John probably understood the bishop's viewpoint and therefore found it hard to find strong enough grounds for urging the bishop to active support of the archbishop.

John was close to Master Nicholas for two reasons. John probably found it easier to deal in practical matters with Master Nicholas. Nicholas could also promote cases to the bishop for him. They were in a sense comrades. John liked Nicholas for another reason. He enjoyed literary

conversation and exchanges of friendship through letters. If John found in Baldwin, archdeacon of Totnes, an interest in discussing matters pertaining to law, he found in Nicholas a man who appreciated his literary erudition and his 'pursuit of philosopher's life. Perhaps both clerks reflected the ways of their masters.

As to Walkelin of Suffolk and Baldwin of Boulogne John wrote to the Pope denouncing their conduct in England. But the letters were written in support of the bishop of Norwich who had trouble with them. Even if John did not hesitate to denounce them on behalf of the bishop of Norwich, John had personally little against them. Among English churchmen, John probably found them easier to associate with because he had something in common with them --experience of being in Rome. Unlike Baldwin of Boulogne, John does not appear to have met Walkelin in Italy. Therefore they had no shared memories together. Professor Brooke assumes that Walkelin must have been 'a plausible and entertaining rogue',³⁰⁹ and such that could better be persuaded with a prospect of benefits more than anything else. Walkelin, nevertheless, would probably have been one who had wider experience than many other English episcopal clerks so that a lengthy account of the Emperor's defeat and escape from Italy would have had more meaning for him.

Abbot Hugh was one of John's religious friends. Since John liked their ways he had many of these in France and at

309. JS Letters i, no. 14, n 1.

Canterbury. They in turn were fond of John and so was Abbot Hugh. When John asked the abbot to support the exiles by his prayers in 1166, he almost immediately responded with a promise of gifts to be forwarded by Geoffrey. His presence may have increased John's contact with Bury, but that was not the reason why the abbot wished to support John and Becket. Since it does not appear that John and Abbot Hugh had much contact through John's office nor did the abbot have much connection with Becket, it was probably purely his friendship with John and the ways of charity that made him wish to help. Maybe the friendship between Abbot Hugh and another abbot of a Benedictine house, Abbot Peter of St. Rémi in Rheims could have contributed to John's friendship with Abbot Hugh.

When John was in the service of Archbishop Theobald, Master Geoffrey sought John's friendship. Just like Robert, son of Egidia, another relative of John's, Master Geoffrey wrote to John letters of friendship. He wanted to pursue the ideal of literary friendship and perhaps join such a circle of friendship. He held John in admiration, for John was a learned scholar, and secretary of Archbishop Theobald, and he had influential friends among religious and clerics including the Pope.

Geoffrey's son was educated in Paris under Gerard Pucelle and John appeared certainly an adequate person to entrust his son's future. Since Archbishop Theobald died in 1161, John probably commended him to his own master Thomas Becket. If Becket had not quarreled with the king, it would have been a promising career for a young man with education. But things did not work out the way he had expected. The

best thing John could do after he went into exile was first to entrust him with the bishop of Thérouanne and then to try to do everything he could to reconcile him with the king so that he could start a new career. John succeeded in obtaining peace for the young man, but he seemed to admit that he was an unsuccessful patron of Richard. Although many of Becket's former clerks found another master at that time, Richard does not seem to have chosen that way. At least in 1168, he was back in Becket's service and died on the way back from his mission to Rome. Why did the young man not seek another master? Was it because John himself remained an exile? Was he devoted to the archbishop's fight for the Church? How did his father's mysterious conduct relate to his son's decision? These questions remain unanswered.

The people in Norwich probably accepted John as a friend and former clerk of Archbishop Theobald who was exiled by misfortune, but they saw in him little of an agent of Archbishop Thomas. Although John wrote appeal letters to in 1168 on behalf of Archbishop Thomas, John's relationship with his friends in the area remained essentially personal and there was no factor that connects personal relations with political interests.

8. Conclusions

a. Bishops

John's relationship with the English bishops was not uniform. John had known bishops like Bartholomew of Exeter and Jocelin of Salisbury for a long time and enjoyed special relationships with them. During his service to Archbishop Theobald, John succeeded in cultivating good friendships

with some bishops, but with others, his relationships remained for the most part official and political.

One of the characteristics of John's relationship with the English bishops was that it was influenced a great deal by the relationship between his masters, Archbishop Theobald at first, then Thomas Becket, and the bishops concerned. John's acquaintance with Walter of Rochester was almost totally dependent on the fact that John was a clerk of Archbishop Theobald who was the brother of Bishop Walter. In the case of the bishops of Winchester, John did not have a favourable opinion of him while he was serving Archbishop Theobald, because the archbishop was then in conflict with the bishop of Winchester over the primacy of England. When John started serving Becket, who had been favoured by the bishop of Winchester, John appears to have changed his opinion of him. On the other hand, while he maintained at least a cordial relationship with Gilbert Foliot as a secretary to Archbishop Theobald, he started calling the bishop 'Achitophel and Doeg' as he became the arch-enemy of his master Thomas.

With the bishop Henry of Winchester and Gilbert Foliot, John did not succeed in establishing a personal relationship. The same applies to John's relationship with Roger of Worcester. One factor that prevented him from establishing personal relationships with them was perhaps class difference. John probably could not find ways to bridge the gap between himself and bishops of noble birth or of renowned family. For such bishops, John remained a mere clerk of his masters who were their real counterparts.

Besides the bishops of Exeter and Salisbury, there were some bishops with whom John succeeded in establishing good friendships. William de Turba of Norwich and Hilary of Chichester were examples of such relationships. John appears at times to have helped them by taking advantage of his position as Archbishop Theobald's secretary. John agreed with William of Norwich on some ecclesiastical matters. He probably enjoyed his spirituality and learning as well as those of other clerics and religious around Norwich. What bound John to the bishop of Chichester on the other hand was probably their common interest in law. Since William of Norwich cautiously remained neutral during the Becket conflict, John was able to maintain contact with him. Since Hilary of Chichester's standpoint was that of a royalist from the outset, John probably could not communicate with him after the Vézelay censures. In spite of the fact that they belonged to opposition, their personal feelings probably remained friendly.

Lastly personal likes and dislikes should not be ignored in considering John's relationship with bishops. One cannot help feeling that John did not care much for Robert of Melun as a master even though he studied under him for two years. At least John did not have as high regard for him as for some other masters. Judging from John's comments on Robert after the bishops' appeals, one can hardly detect a sign of friendship, respect or compassion. This is not merely because of his participation in the bishops' appeal. It was more probably because the opinion which John initially formed of the master later influenced his judgement of Robert of Hereford as bishop.

b. Clerks

John often had a good working relationship with clerks who were serving bishops. They often promoted cases to their masters when asked to do so by their fellow clerks. They also provided information. They assisted bishops in practical matters. Baldwin of Totnes, archdeacon of Exeter, Master Raymond, chancellor of Poitiers, Master Ernulf, secretary of Royal Chancellor Thomas Becket, who are being treated in their respective sections, all belong to this category. They were in many respects John's equals in rank and status. Some of them held a canonry of Exeter just like John. Whether John had close friends in the bishop's household or not influenced a great deal in smooth contact with the bishops.

Bishops' clerks probably best understood their intentions. They probably shared the interests of the bishops.

Such a relationship was found between Bishop William and Master Nicholas of Norwich, Bishop Bartholomew and Master Baldwin of Exeter and possibly between Archbishop Theobald and John himself. John sometimes had not only a business relationship but also personal friendships with the clerks. Just like their bishops, their interests in law or literary learning or spirituality seem to have mediated their friendship.

c. Religious

The greatest difference between John's relationships with the religious and with other churchmen is that while with the latter, John was fully involved in the political and ecclesiastical war between the king and the archbishop,

with the former, John showed very little political interest except with monks of Christ Church. He once congratulated Hugh of St. Edmunds that he had not taken part in the measures against the archbishop and he discussed the bishops' appeal with him. But other than that the storm that shook the English ecclesiastical world appears to have been felt little inside the cloisters partly because up till 1169 the attempts on the part of the royalist bishops to rally the support of the religious was not very great.³¹⁰ John almost always wanted their prayers; at times he wanted their practical assistance; but he expected little by way of their political support.

Apart from the monks at Canterbury, John got acquainted with the English religious through various opportunities. Therefore John's friendship with them had different aspects. He was once a fellow student of the abbot of Evesham. He wrote to Abbot Hugh with the light touch of literary conversation. His relative Master Geoffrey, a monk at Bury St. Edmunds, who used to enjoy literary exchanges with John, may have played some part in his friendship with Abbot Hugh. Abbots and priors in the Worcester area were good friends with whom John wished to converse whenever there was an opportunity. John felt deeply attracted by Prior Robert of Merton's austere spirituality and held him in great esteem. It appears that roughly speaking, John associated with two types of religious, those who preferred literary topics and those who were more inclined to spiritual subjects. We see the two types at Canterbury in William Brito and Odo who are compared in the Entheticus.³¹¹

John almost always wanted prayers from them and nothing else. But on one occasion, he made 'the sum of his prayers' and asked Prior William of Merton to assist his bearer. It also seems to have pleased him all the more if their prayers were 'so efficacious as to bring financial assistance at the same time. But essentially it was monastic friendship that John enjoyed with them. It was probably the same kind of friendship that John cultivated with the religious in Champagne.

310. See the section 3-V-3.

311. Entheticus vol 1, 11 1667-1682. See the section 3-V-2.

VII Poitiers

1. Introduction -- John of Salisbury and Poitiers

John had a very different set of correspondence with his friends in Poitiers compared with that with his English friends. There are several reasons for this difference. One reason lies in the location of the city of Poitiers where John's chief correspondent John of Canterbury was placed as bishop. The diocese of Poitiers included almost the whole of the ancient county of Poitou and was almost the capital of the vast duchy of Aquitaine. Until Poitou came into the possession of Henry of Plantagenet through his marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine in 1152, Angevins and Poitevins fought, sometimes side by side, sometimes against each other. After 1154, when Henry of Plantagenet became the king of England, Poitou became part of 'the Angevin Empire' whose government fell on the shoulders of Henry II. It was the task of Henry II to establish an effective rule over the area extending from the border of Scotland to the Pyrenees. Henry II struggled to rule his 'empire' through the changing situations around him that ranged from international politics to family affairs. The inhabitants of Poitou were affected by his policy and sometimes they reacted in such a way as to make him reconsider it. In his Empire, the city of Poitiers held an utmost strategic and political importance. It was also an intellectual and artistic centre. It had Gilbert de la Porrée as bishop eight years prior to John of Canterbury's occupation of the see.

Another characteristic of John's correspondence to Poitiers was that John of Canterbury was a good friend of not only John of Salisbury but also Thomas Becket. At one

time they almost conspired against the king. Besides, John of Canterbury was not one of the English bishops who were expected to act in a group to oppose their archbishop. Therefore, John of Salisbury did not need to explain basic ecclesiastical principles, the archbishop's standpoint and his intentions to John of Canterbury.

John of Salisbury had four correspondents in this area - John of Canterbury and three Poitevin masters, Raymond, Laurence and John the Saracen. Bishop John of Poitiers was by far the most important. John of Salisbury's correspondence to Poitiers also testifies the facility of communication and academic exchanges between Angevin and Capetian domains in France.

2. John's correspondents

a. Poitevin Masters

There were various ties that bound John to the masters of Poitiers. There appears to have been general exchanges between scholars of Poitiers and Rheims. One of John's former masters Peter Helias became dean of Poitiers in 1152¹ and he knew a clerk of Rheims.² Master John the Saracen who resided in Poitiers at the time of John's exile was acquainted with Odo, abbot of St. Denis, Rheims.³ John's relationship with Poitevin masters appears to have been part of academic exchanges between Poitiers and Rheims and it generated relationships of other masters with Poitiers.

1. See the section 2-III-1.

2. JS Letters ii, no. 167.

3. JS Letters ii, no. 232.

John's student in Paris, Master Ralph Niger also visited Poitiers in the summer of 1166⁴ Master Laurence, archdeacon of Poitiers may have owed John for his promotion.⁵ Three Poitevin masters appear as John's correspondents; Master Raymond, Master Laurence and Master John the Saracen.

(i) Master Raymond

Master Raymond must have been one of the masters of the cathedral school of Poitiers who took the role of chancellor.⁶ He may have been master of the schools in 1161 or earlier.⁷ He appears in charters and other documents between 1166 and 1171 as master and chancellor or as master of Poitevin schools.⁸ We gain knowledge of his activities mainly through John's letters. He had close contact with Bishop John, and as master of the schools of Poitiers, he was probably also familiar with the academic circle and knew among others, masters John the Saracen,⁹ Peter Helias¹⁰ and

4. JS Letters ii, no. 181, & n 1.

5. JS Letters ii, no. 221.

6. Haring, N., 'Zur Geschichte der Schulen von Poitiers im 12. Jahrhundert,' Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, vol 47, (1965). John sometimes addressed him Magistro Raimundo Pictauensis ecclesiae cancellario, (JS Letters ii, nos. 167, 232, 276), sometimes simply Magistro Raimundo, (nos. 166, 224), but in some letters he refers to Master Raymond as 'master of the schools'. (nos. 165, 221, 222).

7. A charter issued by John of Canterbury in April 1161 ends with an inscription 'Datum per manum Raymundi magistri scholarum Pictavensium. (Haring, 'Zur Geschichte der Schulen von Poitiers' p 42).

8. Raimundus magister and cancellarius Raimundus magister scholarum pictav. Haring, 'Zur Geschichte der Schulen von Poitiers' p 47.

9. JS Letters ii, nos. 166, 224, 232.

10. JS Letters ii, no. 167.

and Laurence.¹¹ He appears to have known Gerard Pucelle and Master Geoffrey of St. Edmunds or his son.¹² Apparently Master Raymond was a close friend of John's. Probably they had known each other for some time and even after John's exile, they met at least on one occasion.¹³ Their close relationship and mutual academic friends who had taught at Paris may suggest that they first met at Paris, but there is no evidence.

Five letters to Master Raymond are extant,¹⁴ and they were all written between 1166 and 1168. One of them is addressed jointly to Raymond and Bishop John.¹⁵ While John sent news and discussed political matters with Bishop John he wrote more informal letters to Master Raymond, such as straits of his household, rumours of his friends and complaints against his relatives.¹⁶ He asked for the master's advice on more personal matters¹⁷ and counted on him to send some information.¹⁸ Sometimes, John expressed sympathy to Master Raymond when he was faced with difficulties.¹⁹ Master Raymond was quite often asked to

11. JS Letters ii, nos. 223, 224.

12. JS Letters ii, nos. 161, 167, 277. Master Geoffrey of St. Edmunds's son was probably John's relative Richard, who was also a student of Gerard Pucelle. See the section 3-VI-7-a(iv).

13. JS Letters ii, no. 167.

14. JS Letters ii, nos. 166-7, 224, 232, 276.

15. JS Letters ii, no. 276.

16. JS Letters ii, no. 167.

17. JS Letters ii, no. 167.

18. JS Letters ii, no. 224.

19. JS Letters ii, no. 232.

play the role of a middle man, both towards the bishop and the masters of Poitiers in political as well as academic matters.²⁰ Master Raymond appears to have been a willing coöperator. It may have been partly on account of his efforts that Master John the Saracen completed his translation of St. Denis's On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy and On the Divine Names after John's repeated requests made through Master Raymond.²¹

(ii) Master Laurence

Master Laurence is only known through John's two extant letters.²² John may have had something to do with his obtaining the office of archdeacon of Poitiers.²³ Not much else can be known about him. Reading John's letters, a few questions occur. Did they have a common academic background? Was Laurence English or did he have some connection with or business to carry out, in England when he went there in October 1167?²⁴ What relationship did he have with another archdeacon of Poitiers from England, Richard of Ilchester?

20. JS Letters ii, nos. 166, 224, 232.

21. See below under John the Saracen.

22. JS Letters ii, no. 221 & n 1 and no. 222.

23. In no. 221, John wrote, 'It is better that he grant you the archdeaconry than to some man ignorant of law and an enemy to the Christian life. If you join him, I reckon you will be able to help him to take precautions'. From the same letter we find that Master Laurence sent a valuable gift to John. On different archdeaconries in Poitiers see Favreau, R. ed. Le diocèse de Poitiers Paris (1988) p 50.

24. JS Letters ii, no. 224.

(iii) Master John the Saracen

Little is known for certain concerning the biography of Master John the Saracen. He may have been the Greek interpreter whom John met in Italy and the translator of the nova' translatio of Aristotle's Posterior Analytics.²⁵ John wrote about his Greek interpreter in Italy a number of times in the Metalogicon.²⁶ We are not certain whether John had just one interpreter or different ones nor whether he had one and the same interpreter in mind. John may have invited the Saracen to France.²⁷ Since John of Canterbury accompanied John to Apulia,²⁸ John the Saracen may have met there the future bishop of Poitiers who was to be his patron.

John the Saracen wrote a Commentary on St. Denis's Celestial Hierarchy and in the 1160s he translated Denis's other works.²⁹ John of Salisbury was the instigator of this task and he continued to give encouragement till the work was finished.³⁰ Letters were exchanged between John and

25. Jeauneau, E., 'Jean de Salisbury et la lecture des philosophes' in The World JS, pp 77-108, esp. pp 97-8.

26. Met i-15, ii-5, iv-2.

27. Jeauneau, 'Jean de Salisbury et la lecture des philosophes' p 108.

28. See below under John of Canterbury and also the section 3-III-1.

29. 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 esp. pp 138-9.

30. Luscombe, 'The reception of the writing of Denis' p 139. Théry, G., 'Documents, concernant Jean Sarrazin' in Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Age, vol 17 (1950-51) (pp 45-87.

John the Saracen,³¹ and John also sent messages through Master Raymond of Poitiers.³² The Saracen also wrote to Odo, abbot of St. Denis,³³ at which place John learned of the completion of the translation of On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy and On the Divine Names.³⁴ John the Saracen was the only correspondent in Poitiers with whom John kept a purely academic friendship.

b. John of Canterbury

John of Canterbury is also known as John of Poitiers, and aux Bellesmains and he sometimes appears as John of Belmeis.³⁵ He was probably born between 1115 and 1120 and he is almost certainly from Canterbury.³⁶ John of Canterbury's career started when he joined the household of Archbishop Theobald where he received his education and

31. JS Letters ii, no. 194. Thery, 'Documents concernant Jean Sarrazin' esp. pp 51-7.

32. JS Letters ii, nos. 166, 224, 232.

33. Luscombe, 'The Reception of the writing of Denis', esp. pp 139-140.

34. JS Letters ii, no. 232.

35. On John of Canterbury, see; Duggan, C. 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard of Poitiers: their roles in the Becket Dispute and its aftermath' in Thomas Becket -- Actes du Colloque International de Sédieres 19-24 Août, 1973, ed. Foreville, R., Paris, (1975) pp 71-83. Boissonade, P., 'Administrateurs laïque et ecclésiastique Anglo-Normands en Poitou a l'époque d'Henri II' in Bulletin de la société des antiquaire de ouest, 1919 pp 159-190. Pouzet, P., L'anglais Jean dit Bellesmains (1122-1204), Lyon, 1927.

36. Pouzet, P., L'anglais Jean dit Bellesmains, p 9 & n 6. Duggan, 'Bishop Jean and Archdeacon Richard' p 72. JS Letters i, p xxvii-viii. Urry has given records of the Payne family, one of whom appeared as John's relative and a bearer of his letter. (Mats no. 60. Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin King pp 224, 245, et passim.)

training. John of Salisbury referred to his knowledge of three languages, but they do not appear to have included Greek.³⁷ Robert of Torigny described him as 'vir jocundus, largus et apprime litteratus'.³⁸

John of Canterbury already had a position of some importance when Thomas Becket joined Archbishop Theobald's household in 1143 or 1144,³⁹ and he was especially close to Becket and Roger of Pont-l'Évêque.⁴⁰ He appeared as a witness to 13 extant charters of Archbishop Theobald, often together with Becket, Roger of Pont-l'Évêque and John of Salisbury.⁴¹ He was also employed as a messenger to the Curia and on one occasion, possibly in summer 1150, he was together with John of Salisbury in Apulia.⁴² In 1152, John of Canterbury missed an opportunity to become archdeacon of Middlesex in spite of papal support, for it had already been given to Ralph of Diceto.⁴³ However, he became treasurer of York in 1153 or 1154, shortly before Roger of Pont-l'Évêque

-
37. Pol, viii-7, Met, iii-prologue. Pouzet, L'Anglais Jean dit Bellesmains, p 17.
38. Robert of Torigny, p 214. Pouzet, L'Anglais Jean dit Bellesmains, p 16.
39. Duggan, 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard' p 73.
40. MTB i, p 4. Duggan, 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard' p 73. Pouzet, L'Anglais Jean dit Bellesmains, pp 11-13. Barlow, TB, p 34.
41. Saltman, Theobald, charters nos. 51, 55, 61, 63, 86, 146, 147, 151, 165, 182, 232, 255, 310.
42. Pol viii-7, Met iii-prologue. JS Letters i, p 254-255. Cf. JS Letters i, no. 33 and the section on John the Saracen.
43. Clay, C.T., 'The Early Treasurers of York', Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, vol 35 (1940-43) pp 11-19, esp. p 16. G. Foliot, p 286. Duggan, 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard', p 73.

was promoted archbishop of York.⁴⁴

Whether on account of his mission to Rome or not, Treasurer John was a firm defender of ecclesiastical liberties and an upholder of the papal primacy from early days'.⁴⁵ One such instance was recorded by FitzStephen. In the first half of 1158, when the complaint of a burgess of Scarborough against a rural dean was brought before the king, John of Canterbury maintained that the king had no right to punish the dean, because he was a clerk.⁴⁶

John of Canterbury was elected bishop of Poitiers after the death of Bishop Laurentius.⁴⁷ He was consecrated in September 1162 by Pope Alexander III and made his profession to the archbishop of Bordeaux at the Council of Tours in May 1163.⁴⁸ He faced difficulties in the beginning of his office⁴⁹ and was estranged from the king for some time, but

44. GFL, pp 537, 541. Duggan, 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard', p 73.

45. Duggan, 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard' p 73.

46. Clay, 'The early treasurers of York', p 17, n 4. MTB iii, pp 44-45.

47. John of Canterbury's election was carried out in opposition to the chapter as a result of strong royal intervention 16 months after the death of Bishop Laurentius. John of Canterbury probably took possession of his see in July or August in 1162. (Boissonade, 'Administrateurs laïques et ecclésiastique' pp 156-190, esp. p 172.) According to Häring, however, Bishop Laurentius died in April 1161 and John of Canterbury succeeded him in the same month and issued a charter at Poitiers. (Häring, 'Zur Geschichte der Schulen von Poitiers', p 42.)

48. Boissonade, 'Administrateurs laïques et ecclésiastique' p 172. Robert of Torigny p 214. Pouzet recounts the consecration at Deols. (L'Anglais Jean dit Bellesmains, pp 21-2.)

49. Mats no. 25. JS Letters ii, nos. 165, 166, 167.

was back in his favour by the end of 1166.⁵⁰ Although he came to be favoured by Henry II, he seems to have had difficulty with Henry's son Richard, who was invested with the county of Poitou and the duchy of Aquitaine in 1169.⁵¹ John of Canterbury succeeded in winning the love of his diocese and was much missed at the time he was transferred to Lyon in 1182.⁵²

John of Canterbury was in favour with the Papal Curia as well. He became legate of the apostolic see in 1174 possibly because of the part he played in the work of reconciliation between the church and state after the Becket conflict.⁵³ In 1178, he was a member of the joint mission under the direction of Cardinal Peter of Pavia with the aim of converting the heretics of Languedoc back to Christianity. In 1179, John of Canterbury participated in the third Lateran Council. Shortly afterwards, he was elected archbishop of Lyon. His election to Lyon was partly owing to the difficulty they faced with the rise of the Waldensians and partly owing to the deceased archbishop Guichard of Pontigny who had been friendly to both Thomas Becket and John of Canterbury.⁵⁴ After about ten years of office as archbishop of Lyon, he retired into the abbey of Clairvaux. In the due course he appears to have visited the

50. JS Letters ii, no. 177.

51. Pouzet, L'Anglais Jean dit Bellesmains, p 44. Norgate, K., Richard the Lion Heart, London, (1924) p 9.

52. Pouzet, L'Anglais Jean dit Bellesmains, pp 45-50.

53. Duggan, 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard' p 81.

54. Pouzet, L'Anglais, Jean dit Bellesmains, pp 50-56. Mats nos. 35 & 60.

tomb of St. Thomas. John of Canterbury was a man of great fame and Pope Innocent III is known to have written to him. He seems to have still been living on 24 April 1204,⁵⁵ During his pontificate, he made friends with scholars like John of Salisbury, Isaac of Stella, Stephen of Tournai and Ralph of Diceto. He was not a scholar himself, but he patronized scholars such as John the Saracen. Some of John of Canterbury's letters are still extant.⁵⁶

3. John's correspondence i

a. John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury under Archbishop Theobald.

John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury helped each other and cooperated in carrying out their tasks both before and after John of Canterbury became treasurer of York. When John of Salisbury sent a report of the case between the monks of St. Bertin and the church of Chilham to Pope Adrian IV in the name of Archbishop Theobald sometime in 1156 or 57, John defended John of Canterbury against the monks' charge that he had seized the church through the agency of laymen.⁵⁷ John of Canterbury on the other hand appears to have helped John of Salisbury and his friends in his capacity when he could. Upon the request of Thomas, provost of Celle, John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury committed one of the provost's acquaintances to the charge of the royal

55. Pouzet, L'Anglais, Jean dit Bellesmains, pp 110-118.

56. John, bishop of Poitiers: Epistolae, PL 209, cols 877-882. For Isaac of Stella, PL 194 cols. 1889-96.

57. JS Letters i, no.24

chancellor Thomas Becket.⁵⁸ John of Canterbury may have carried John's letters to Peter of Celle presumably on the way to Rome, as John appears to have requested the task of defending his conduct to Peter before April 1157.⁵⁹

There are two extant letters written by John of Salisbury to the treasurer of York.⁶⁰ They were both written between November to December 1157 and were part of the series of letters written in connection with the fine of 100 marks which Bishop Nigel of Ely had to pay to the papal camera. The bishop was ordered by Alexander III to restore the property of his see which had been alienated since his accession.⁶¹ In no. 39, proudly reporting how he had collected the sum of money which was owing to John of Canterbury from the bishop of Norwich who had not been on friendly terms with the treasurer, John asked in what form the payment of the bishop of Ely should be made. John also stated that the archbishop of York should be advised against crowning the king or other designs against the church of Canterbury. About a month later, John asked John of Canterbury to help him in the affairs in the northern province.⁶² John informed the treasurer for the second time that the bishop of Ely had satisfied the instruction of the papal chamberlain Boso.

After Roger of Pont-L'Évêque and Becket had left

58. JS Letters i, no. 20.

59. JS Letters i, no. 31.

60. JS Letters i, nos. 39 & 43.

61. JS Letters i, no. 39 & headnote.

62. JS Letters i, no. 43.

Archbishop Theobald's household, John of Salisbury was the treasurer's invaluable friend who still remained there. John of Salisbury did whatever he could for the benefit of the treasurer. He was reliable enough to be entrusted difficult and delicate matters and resourceful enough to carry them out successfully 'if somewhat boastful at times. John of Canterbury in turn was ready to help John of Salisbury and his friends in whatever he could. Their relationship at this time was that of good comrades who can cooperate and render mutual assistance for the benefit of both. However, their friendship was not based merely on interest and benefit but love and care for each other.

b. Becket, John of Canterbury and John of Salisbury in
1164-5

We have no extant letter from John of Salisbury to John of Canterbury after the death of Archbishop Theobald in 1161 till mid-1166. But these are the years of change, and during these years important events took place that decided the nature of their future correspondence. Henry II's ecclesiastical policy and the way Becket and John of Canterbury were involved in it determined John of Salisbury's correspondence as a follower of Archbishop Thomas.

John of Canterbury's election to the see of Poitiers in 1162 is considered to have been made as part of Henry II's plan to secure the ecclesiastical appointments in the whole of his realm.⁶³ Henry II had already tried unsuccessfully

63. Foreville, L'Eglise et la Royauté, pp 97-9.

in 1158 to impose his candidate on the vacant archbishopric of Bordeaux. Henry II also appears to have made an attempt of centralization of administration especially in the early years of his reign,⁶⁴ although the attempt was not successful in Aquitaine. In the early 1160s, Henry II was in quest for clarification and definition and was pressing for a definition of his rights with regard to his relationship with the Church.⁶⁵

John of Canterbury's promotion to the see of Poitiers may have been due to Becket's influence on the king. Becket appears to have been in the king's company till May 1162⁶⁶ except for the period when he was ill in spring 1161,⁶⁷ and it has been suggested that he contributed to the promotion of Richard of Ilchester, who was in the office of archdeacon of Poitiers from 1162/3.⁶⁸ The king probably came to know John through several occasions on which he was in the king's

64. Boussard, J., Le Gouvernement d'Henri II Plantagenêt, Paris, (1956) p 434. Boissonade, 'Administrateurs laïques et ecclésiastiques' p 156.

65. The continental church as well as the church of England began in these years to be forced to observe sets of rules. In Normandy, Henry II held a council at Rouen in 1162 and ordered the observance of the Lillebonne decrees of William the Conqueror which decided that bishops should not lay claim to any other jurisdictional rights than those already defined at the council without the approval of the ducal court. (Warren, Henry II, pp 95, 447, 477.)

66. Eyton, p. 56

67. Barlow, TB, p 62. Eyton, p 54.

68. Duggan, 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard' p 74. Duggan, 'Richard of Ilchester, royal servant and bishop Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, vol 16 5th ser (1966) pp 1-23, esp. p 6.

presence.⁶⁹ The instance on which John of Canterbury expressed his opinion in support of clerical immunity apparently did not deter the king from promoting him to Poitiers.⁷⁰ After the consecration of Becket in June 1162, both John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury were members of the embassy who went to the Pope to collect the pallium.⁷¹ Shortly afterwards in August, John himself was consecrated as bishop of Poitiers.

At Poitiers, John of Canterbury was received coldly and even with hostility, for he was imposed on the see against local wishes as one of the first agents to the region to carry out Henry of Plantagenet's plans. Before he was accepted by local clergy, the king's measures were pressed on him. In 1163 and 64, Henry II sent some royal officials who were commissioned to impose edicts restricting the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts.⁷² One of the officials whom John referred to as 'luscus noster' may have been the archdeacon of Poitiers, Richard of Ilchester.⁷³

69. John of Canterbury became treasurer of York before the coronation of Henry II in December 1154. The king went to the York region in January and February 1155 (Eyton pp 5-6) and in January 1158. (Eyton p 33). John of Canterbury appeared as witness to the king's charter at Dover in January 1156. (Clay, 'The early treasurers of York' p 16.) The king was on the continent from January to April 1157 and from August 1158 to January 1163. (Eyton pp 24-5, 40-58).

70. See above under John of Canterbury & note 49.

71. Barlow, TB, p 73.

72. Mats no. 25, John of Canterbury to TB, post 29 June, 1163.
Mats no. 60, John of Canterbury to TB, post 22 June, 1164.

73. On the identification of 'Luscus noster' see the section 3-VIII-2-e.

John of Canterbury's position was difficult: if he helped carry out the king's wishes he would lose the chance of gaining the support of local people: if he opposed Henry II, he would lose the king's favour. John of Canterbury chose to consult his clergy and decided to uphold the Church's liberty. The royal officials nevertheless published the mandate first to an assembly of the barons of Poitou and then to its people.⁷⁴

From about this time, we find John of Canterbury and Thomas Becket writing to each other. The first extant letter from John of Canterbury to Becket which reported the arrival of the royal officials to Poitiers was written shortly after the two met at the Council of Tours in May 1163.⁷⁵ The Council of Woodstock was held in July, 1163, at which Becket opposed Henry II on the issue of criminous clerks.⁷⁶ Becket appears to have written to John of Canterbury reporting the proceedings at Woodstock, asking John for assistance in negotiation at the Papal Curia.

John of Canterbury reported to Becket how he reacted to the requests of the royal officials and described his subsequent actions: he took a journey to Tours and Loches, where he made attempts to obtain advice from Rotrou, bishop of Evreux: his attempts having failed, he wrote to Rotrou and the abbot of Pontigny, requesting the abbot to meet him at Sens to carry out Becket's business together at the

74. Mats no. 25.

75. Mats no. 25 is dated by Duggan post 29 June 1163. Robertson suggested that it had probably been written in August or September 1163. (Duggan, Thomas Becket, p 253. MTB v. p 37.

76. Barlow, TB, p 88.

Curia. Bishop John promised Becket that he would send a messenger to him, asking him to send his friend and Becket's clerk Turstin de Burnis.⁷⁷

From Bishop John's letter, Becket probably learned the king's intention of enforcing in Poitiers rules which would appear later as some articles of the Constitutions of Clarendon, and was probably able to deduce the king's overall ecclesiastical policy in his realm. He also found that he had someone on the continent who was faced with the same problems and was ready to cooperate to tackle them.

John of Canterbury's next letter to Becket⁷⁸ was written from Sens in November or December 1163 in reply to Becket's letter of commission to participate in his diplomacy at the Curia. Becket may also have expressed the idea of going into exile at this period. Becket's commission was probably made as part of his extensive diplomacy after the general assembly of Westminster in October 1163.⁷⁹ John praised the brave behaviour of the archbishop at the Council of Westminster, but was pessimistic about any human help Becket might obtain from the Curia. For the Pope would not do anything that might offend the king. Both Bishop John and the envoys of Becket tried hard for many days, but hardly got any results

77. The description of Turstin has much in common with Thurstan of Acolt of JS Letters ii, no. 264.

78. Mats no. 35.

79. TB wrote Mats 29-33 to the Papal Curia, sending Master Henry of Houghton as messenger. (Barlow, TB, p 96). Mats no. 36 written to TB by a 'nuntius', possibly Master Hervey carries almost identical content to that of Mats no. 35 by John of Canterbury.

concerning the repetition of Gilbert Foliot's profession and Clarembald of St. Augustine's making one.⁸⁰ John of Canterbury was faced with similar or more serious problems. He thought of either preceding Becket in exile or following him. For it would not be inglorious for both of them to renounce vanity and worldly pleasures and to prefer heavenly recompense to worldly. John of Canterbury was about to set out for Pontigny with the intention of commending both himself and Becket.

About the time this letter was written, John of Salisbury left England.⁸¹ One of John of Salisbury's aims was to prepare the way for Becket in case he decided to go into exile.⁸² He sent a report to Becket in early 1164,⁸³ from which we find that John of Canterbury had already learned of John's arrival in Paris and had written to him. In this period, both John of Canterbury and John of Salisbury were working on the commission of Becket in close relations to each other. John of Canterbury appears to have discussed various problems, the repercussions of which may be felt in John of Salisbury's letters to Becket.⁸⁴ John of Canterbury also referred to the difficulty of dealing with the case of the profession of the abbot of St.

80. Barlow, TB, p 96.

81. John left England between October 1163 and January 1164. (JS Letters ii, p xxii.)

82. JS Letters ii, p xxii.

83. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

84. John of Canterbury wrote about the danger of raising suspicion of the king by frequenting the Curia, which was used by JS as an excuse of not wishing to go there. (JS Letters ii, no. 131.)

Augustine's and also to Becket's nephew Geoffrey whom he had supported. The messenger of John of Canterbury may have been William, son of Payne,⁸⁵ from whom, as John of Salisbury wrote to Becket, he took 'seven marks of your bounty'.⁸⁶ William, a porter of Canterbury, was a relative of Bishop John who appeared as a bearer of his letter to Archbishop Thomas.⁸⁷ John of Salisbury also asked Becket to be kinder to the bishop of Poitiers's friends and 'in giving William, son of Payne's daughter in marriage'.⁸⁸

John of Canterbury may have heard from John of Salisbury between early 1164 when John of Salisbury wrote to Becket and 22 June 1164 when John of Canterbury wrote to Becket. In his letter to Becket written in June 1164⁸⁹ Bishop John confirmed his old friendship and affection to Becket and reported news and the outcome of the archbishop's diplomacy at the Curia. He recognized that the archbishop's cause was not only his, but of the Roman Church and of the church universal. John of Canterbury had abstained from visiting the Curia too often because the 'ill-speaking Poitevins' had reported to the king that his attendance there was injurious to the king's interests. He appears

85. 'Willelmus filius Pagani portarius' appears as a witness to Archbishop Theobald's charters A, B, nos. 44 & 255 (co-witnessed by John of Canterbury and John of Salisbury) (Saltman Theobald). Barlow, TB, p 29. William, porter, son of Payne appears in connection with land holding in Canterbury. (Urry, Canterbury under the Angevin kings, pp 157-61, 232, 241).

86. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

87. Mats no. 60.

88. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

89. Mats, no. 60.

instead to have entrusted his task at the Curia such as the case of the profession of Clarembald of St. Augustine's to other people like the abbot of Pontigny and Henry of Pisa. In contemplating the possibility of the archbishop coming to France, John of Canterbury strongly recommended him to make friends with the abbot of Pontigny, for Pontigny was to be his own place of shelter in case of need. Bishop John reported the news of the return of 'Luscus Noster', who went to Aquitaine to gather the army. He also asked to be remembered to John of Salisbury, their friend in common, who was the first to bear the pain of exile on account of his faithful service to the archbishop and the Church.

It is interesting to learn that before Archbishop Thomas and his clerks began to take the conflict as a matter of principles, bishop John had already taken his own and the archbishop's struggle as a fight for the freedom of the Church. He may have helped give a deeper meaning to what appeared at that time to be a personal strife between Thomas Becket and King Henry II. It is also noteworthy that Becket was to take the bishop's advice regarding his sympathizers around Sens.⁹⁰

Perhaps the reluctance of the two Johns to appear at the Curia prompted Becket to try without success to leave England after the consecration of Roger as bishop of Worcester on 23 August, 1164,⁹¹ and after the trial at Northampton in October, 1164, Becket ultimately went into

90. Becket's first choice of residence after exile was Pontigny. He also consulted Henry of Pisa regarding the election of Guichard of Pontigny for the see of Lyon. (JS Letters ii, no. 144, n 12.)

91. Barlow, TB, p 108.

exile and appealed directly to the Pope at Sens.

Now that the archbishop was exiled, John of Salisbury's and John of Canterbury's tasks of preparing for Becket's exile was largely over, although John of Salisbury continued to take part in the archbishop's diplomacy.⁹² John of Canterbury was now expected to provide the archbishop with news and advice. He wrote one letter each of this nature in 1165, 1166 and 1167.⁹³ Mats no. 103, which was written in late August 1165,⁹⁴ was written in reply to Becket's letter, presumably asking for Bishop John's advice on what to do with the mass of exiles coming from England at that time. Bishop John advised the archbishop to retain only those who were indispensable for their service and to entrust the rest to well-wishers. He told the archbishop not to count on the help of Queen Eleanor who depended much on Ralph de Faia, one of Becket's enemies. He was sending a copy of the letter of the king to his mother and he referred to the bearer who was commissioned to hand Becket the writing which a clerk of Richard of Ilchester had directed to him. Becket followed Bishop John's advice to place the exiles in religious houses and other places. John of Salisbury also participated in the matter.⁹⁵

In 1164-5, Bishop John of Poitiers considered that his former friend and colleague, the archbishop of Canterbury

92. In January 1165, he reported to Becket his meeting with the Pope. (JS Letters ii, no. 144.)

93. Mats nos. 103, 116 & 283. Nos. 116 & 283 are discussed under respective sections.

94. Duggan, Thomas Becket, p 254.

95. JS Letters ii, nos. 141-2. Possibly also no. 140.

agreed with him in basic principles of the Church. He also thought that both Becket and himself suffered from the king's new ecclesiastical policy imposed on them and that they could help each other in warding off their problems. After John of Salisbury left England and settled in France, Bishop John also wrote to him and cooperated with him on behalf of Becket. After Becket's exile, John of Canterbury sent him valuable pieces of advice. Although no letter of Bishop John to John of Salisbury is extant, John of Canterbury must have found in John of Salisbury, an efficient reporter, a reliable friend and good comrade. Their mutual interest was well-being of the archbishop of Canterbury, who was master to John of Salisbury and ally for John of Canterbury.

4. John's correspondence ii

a. 1166

John's letters to Bishop John of Poitiers during the Becket conflict survive from 1166. There is one letter that can only be loosely dated 1166 and that has no relation to the Becket dispute.⁹⁶ In this letter, John asked Bishop John to help a servant of the archdeacon Gerard of Paris who was a great friend of his.⁹⁷ This servant, whose name was Jordan, was going to Poitou to regain his debt from the abbot of Saint-Maixent who had treated Jordan in an unfriendly fashion.

John of Salisbury appears to have met at least Master

96. JS Letters ii, no. 211.

97. JS Letters ii, no. 179.

Raymond, chancellor of Poitiers Cathedral, at Angers on the occasion when Henry II held his Easter court on 1 May.⁹⁸ Five letters cluster around June and July 1166, in which important events such as the failure of John's peace with the king and the king's conference at Chinon on 1 June as well as the rumour of John of Canterbury's illness by poisoning appear as topics of discussion.

In early June 1166, John of Salisbury wrote to Bishop John of Poitiers and Master Raymond because he had heard a rumour that the bishop was poisoned and was either dead or seriously ill. In no. 165 addressed to Bishop John of Poitiers, John of Salisbury inquired after the state of health of the bishop because he had heard the rumour from a friend of his who had been staying at Paris recently. John attributed the cause to the local situation in Poitiers and expressed his fear over what appeared to be the king's attempt to enforce such measures as the Constitutions of Clarendon in the bishop's diocese. He was concerned about the possible results such as the confiscation of the bishop's goods and his going into exile. John asked the bishop to let him know immediately how he was.

No. 166 to Master Raymond went with no. 165 and dealt with the same topic. John asked Master Raymond to let him know if the bishop was all right. John was more outspoken about the matter and instructed Raymond to make good preparations for the bishop's death in case he was seriously ill. John wished to know what happened at the conference at Chinon and afterwards and also what Raymond and the bishop

98. JS Letters ii, no. 167.

had thought about John not being there and not having made peace as others have under the prescribed oath. John asked Master Raymond to induce John the Saracen to translate the rest of the Celestial Hierarchies since the first book was received well in France.

John's letter no. 194 to Master John the Saracen probably went with nos. 165 and 166 and it was written in reply to the Saracen's in which he had expressed his intention to translate St. Denis's Ecclesiastical Hierarchy if John had approved of the liber on the Celestial Hierarchy.⁹⁹

John appreciated the Saracen's letter which 'had the savour of the philosopher and the Christian alike', and 'comes from a well-stocked storeroom of virtue and learning'. John further praised the 'orator' in John the Saracen who was skilled in words and 'who put into an eminently persuasive form what philosophical argument and the profession of Christianity put forward'. Complimenting on his virtue and learning and his skill in words and persuasion, John praised the philosopher's life in which one follows the path of virtue undisturbed by courtly trifles and worldly pleasures.

One of the reasons why John wrote to the Saracen was to pose an academic question. He found a Greek word in St. Ambrose's De Incarnatione Verbi, but he could not grasp its concept clearly. Since he would not find anyone conversant in Greek in his area, he wished to seek John the Saracen's help. John requested the Saracen to translate the rest of

99. Luscombe, D.E., 'The Reception of the writing of Denis' Tradition and Change, p 139.

the De Hierarchia, a request that was placed in John's letter to Master Raymond¹⁰⁰ and was to be repeated again.¹⁰¹

In 1166, John was probably writing a letter to Count Henry of Champagne to answer his questions. One of the Count's five questions was: 'Where was it written and to what purpose - a saying read and used by many that "the things which are not are more godlike than those which are"?' The question is considered to be related to St. Denis's theology.¹⁰² John may have wished to use the Saracen's translation, but it was not ready yet.

John may have written no. 194 to John the Saracen also in relation to the Historia Pontificalis, part of which may have been written in 1166. In the Historia Pontificalis, John spent many pages on the preface of Gilbert de la Porrée's commentary on the De Trinitate of Boethius which was revised after the Council of Rheims. He discussed in detail St. Ambrose's view in the De Trinitate¹⁰³ and St. Hilary's in the De Trinitate¹⁰⁴ and De Synodis.¹⁰⁵ In no. 194, John compared St. Hilary's view on 'essence' which appeared in the De Synodis with St. Ambrose's οὐσία in De incarnatione verbi, and asked John

100. JS Letters ii, nos. 166, 224 & 232.

101. JS Letters ii, no. 209. Chibnall, M., 'John of Salisbury as historian' in The World JS, pp 169-77, esp. 171. See also the section 2-IV-4-d.

102. Benton, J.F., 'The Court of Champagne as a literary center', Speculum, vol 36, (1961) pp 573-5.

103. HP-xiii.

104. HP-xiii, xiv.

105. HP-xiii, xiv.

the Saracen to explain the meaning of the Greek word. John may have asked his question in order to write the Historia Pontificalis or in the course of writing it.

Furthermore, one may wonder if John's interest in St. Denis was related to his composing the Historia Pontificalis especially where John described Gilbert de la Porrée's teachings. It has been indicated that there are quotations in the Metalogicon which originally came from St. Denis: 'Ignorance of God is the truest wisdom' and 'It is no small knowledge to know of God what he is not, because what he is is utterly unknowable'.¹⁰⁶ John's interest in negative theology may derive from the teaching of Gilbert de la Porrée. It is interesting that John made a lengthy account on the teaching of Gilbert de la Porrée on the request of Peter of Celle, who instigated John to answer Count Henry's questions including the one related to St. Denis's theology.¹⁰⁷ Apparently, St. Denis and his theology were subjects of general interest around Rheims.¹⁰⁸

Whether no. 194 was written for the purpose of the Historia Pontificalis or to answer Count Henry's questions, it was a letter written by a scholar to another who shared

106. Jeauneau, E., 'Jean de Salisbury et la lecture des philosophes' in The World JS, pp 77-108, esp. pp 98-100.

107. JS Letters ii, no. 209. HP-xiv, xv.

108. Master Ralph of Sarre, John's former colleague in Archbishop Theobald's household, at that time at Rheims possessed a copy of Eriugena's Expositio of St. Denis's Celestial Hierarchy and other works. (Luscombe, 'The reception of the writing of Denis' Tradition and Change p 140.) John the Saracen was in communication with Odo, abbot of St. Denis. (JS Letters ii, no. 232.) See also the section 2-IV-3, 2-IV-4-d.

an outlook on life as well as an interest in scholarly pursuit. John thought the Saracen to be a scholar of first rank, because he knew Greek, which 'none of our masters' knew. Therefore, John the Saracen possessed the wisdom that was out of John's reach. John thought that just like Master Odo,¹⁰⁹ the Saracen was the kind of scholar who was able to help when 'the children sought bread, and there was none to break it for them'.¹¹⁰

Shortly after nos. 165, 166 and 194 reached Poitiers, John of Canterbury and Master Raymond appear to have replied. The news of the conference at Chinon which John had wished to hear¹¹¹ was probably brought through the letter of Master Raymond.¹¹² John also learned from him that the bishop was getting better but his full recovery was yet to come, that the agreement of peace between the bishop and the king had been made and that the problem of John's own reconciliation was touched on.

John's no. 167 and possibly no. 177 were replies to their letters.¹¹³ No. 167 to Master Raymond on the whole deals with more personal and informal matters. Expressing

109. See the section 4-III-2-a.

110. Lamentations, 4:4. The quotation is used only in two of John's letters: no. 194 to John the Saracen and no. 271 to Master Odo.

111. JS Letters ii, no. 166.

112. JS Letters ii, no. 168.

113. No. 167 was written after John's visit to Henry II on 1 May, but before the Vézelay censures. Therefore it may be dated early June 1166. No. 177 was written about a month later, since John's brother was with him. (JS Letters ii, p xxix). However, they both mention the bishop's recovery but treat his full convalescence as something yet to come.

his joy at the news of the bishop's recovery, John referred to the bearer of the letter who was unknown in Poitiers but trustworthy, belonging to the household of the archbishop of Rheims. He had been instructed by one of the archbishop's clerks to retrieve some books from Master Helias -- a task which John had already briefed Master Raymond at Angers. John discussed the condition of his peace in detail and refused to travel to court unless he had a good prospect of making peace, since he was in straits and busy with scholarly pursuit. Giving news of the archbishop, he also referred to personal matters, such as Gerard Pucelle's invitation to Cologne and Master Geoffrey's silence, for whose son's peace John had taken great trouble.¹¹⁴ Perhaps for the information contained, John sent a copy of Gerard's letter to the bishop. It is interesting to note that to Master Raymond, John was quite frank about his straits and fairly outspoken about his friends and relatives.

Somewhat later, in about July 1166, John wrote to the bishop,¹¹⁵ probably in reply to the bishop's letter which had been written prior to John's letter no. 165. Since the news of the bishop's illness reached John, he may have refrained from discussing matters contained in the bishop's letter which were probably about Poitevin local matters and the bishop's peace with the king. Since the peace with the king had already been made by July 1166, John stated mainly his opinions and advice on how to deal with the Poitevin

114. JS Letters ii, no. 161. See also the section 3-VI-7-a(iv) and b(iii).

115. JS Letters ii, no. 177.

situation.

One of John's concerns was what happened to the peace 'looked for and promised' so he asked the bishop to send a letter back with his bearer. John's particular concern was the bishop's 'peace'. He hoped that the bishop was able to improve the situation at his church, which he had already discussed briefly in no. 165.¹¹⁶ John advised the bishop to uphold canon law, for, being a foreigner, the bishop would not be able to expound 'peculiar customs and strange laws of the folk of Aquitaine'. It would be unwise and rash to expect Bishop John to stand against the local interests without the support of 'legal arguments and strength'. John generally approved the formula for peace, but expressed his doubt and concern about the integrity of the Poitevins and in particular the 'fearful, malignant power' of the bishop's adversary.¹¹⁷ For he may have stirred up disfavour against the archdeacon of Poitiers, Richard of Ilchester, 'of whose zeal he was afraid and whose intimacy with you aroused his suspicion'. John congratulated the bishop for the restoration of the king's peace and favour. However, the reconciliation of the bishop and the king was not entirely to the benefit of the Becket party, as he might lose a precious ally. Therefore, John attempted to discredit the

116. Professor Brooke considers that the situation described here may be related to John of Canterbury's complaint against the king's attempt to restrict the church's jurisdiction. (JS Letters ii, p 179, n 2).

117. We do not know who the bishop's adversary may be, but the bishop referred to Ralph de Faia as Becket's opponent. (Mats no. 103) and John also mentioned the spirit of Ralph de Faia being strong at Poitiers. (JS Letters ii, no. 212.)

king by revealing to the bishop information of his secret dealings with the Emperor. He obtained a letter of the Emperor to Count Henry which he would have liked to pass on to Bishop John unless it was already on the way to the archbishop.¹¹⁸ John discussed the content of the oath which, according to the dignitaries of Rheims, John of Oxford swore at the Council of Würzburg. John was sending the bishop a copy of a letter from Cologne so that the double dealing of the king might be disclosed.¹¹⁹ Finally, John discussed, possibly in reply to the bishop's inquiry, the condition of his own peace and concluded that the form should not be such as to be against his conscience and reputation, even though this meant the 'cooling affection of our friends', and the continued pressure on himself, his brother and other exiles.

In 1166, the matters which were discussed between John of Salisbury and his correspondents in Poitiers in the surviving letters are: the bishop's illness; the local situation in Poitou; the king's peace with the bishop and with John. Scattered news were sent both of public and private matters. To the masters of Poitiers, especially to John the Saracen, John mainly discussed matters pertaining to academic pursuit and ways of life. Little of the Vézelay censures and the subsequent appeals of the bishops is

118. John sent a copy perhaps of that letter (probably Mats no. 213) to Bartholomew of Exeter. (JS Letters ii, no. 174.)

119. This may have been a letter from Gerard Pucelle. In no. 167 to Master Raymond, John referred to a letter from Gerard whose copy he had sent to the bishop of Poitiers supressing the author's name.

reflected in John's letters to Poitiers. It goes without saying that Bishop John was aware of these events. In fact, John advised the archbishop to consult the bishop of Poitiers concerning the ban of excommunication on the king and the sentence of interdict on his land.¹²⁰ According to John's letter to Becket John heard certain rumours and received news of England and asked Bishop John to advise Becket.¹²¹ Among the extant letters, we do not have the particular letter addressed to the bishop of Poitiers containing the rumour and what John had heard about conditions in England.

We may notice nevertheless, that in this year as in previous years, the communication between Becket, John of Canterbury and John of Salisbury was close. We have one evidence of their cooperation in relation to the Empress's attempt for mediation. While the communication between the Becket party and the English bishops was clamorous the Vézelay censures and the bishops appeals,¹²² attempt for mediation was in progress in Normandy through the Empress and the archbishop of Rouen with the advice of the Pope. Becket consulted the matter both with John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury. Before John of Salisbury received a letter from Becket, he had heard the rumour and asked Bishop John of Poitiers to advise Becket.¹²³ In no.

120. JS Letters ii, no. 176.

121. JS Letters ii, no. 179.

122. JS Letters ii, nos. 168, 172, 174 to Exeter and nos. 173, 175, 176 to TB.

123. JS Letters ii, no. 179.

179,¹²⁴ John stated his own opinion (which was basically the same as the bishop's) and consented to accompany the archbishop to Normandy if requested. In Mats no. 166 which was written to Becket about the same time as John's no. 179, John of Canterbury stated his opinion on the Pope's letter. He pointed out the Pope's certain lack of enthusiasm to support the archbishop's cause. Bishop John advised that if the archbishop was invited, he should attend the conference of the Empress and Rotrou of Rouen. The archbishop should not take many exiles with him for he should try to gain their compassion by looking as if he were 'pro ecclesiae suae libertate ad extremam deductum paupertatem'. John of Canterbury discussed various questions that should be settled before the archbishop's return to England and he concluded that the best possible solution for both the king and the archbishop would be to submit to a small number of mediators. Finally he advised the archbishop to take John of Salisbury with him in case he decided to go to Normandy, both because of his personal qualities and because the Empress and the archbishop of Rouen thought well of him. The anticipated conference did not take place, but the bishop of Poitiers continued to assist and advise the Becket party although he had already made peace with the king.

b. 1167

The central issue of this year was the coming of the papal legates a latere. The sending of the legates was

124. For JS Letters ii, no. 179, see the section 4-VI-3-b.

announced in a papal document dated 1 Dec. 1166, which was published on royal authority.¹²⁵ From the time the king's

~~of Carcere Tulliano and that they were believed to come with plenitude of power. The royal messengers were also reported to have obtained copies of all Becket's petitions and other~~
Christmas court was held in Poitiers in 1166, throughout the whole year of 1167. John's and Becket's main concern was to find out about the legates so that they know how to deal with them. Among the nine surviving letters to Poitiers written in 1167, most of them reflect the coming of the papal legates.

No. 212 was written to John of Canterbury in about January 1167, shortly after the king held his Christmas court in Poitiers. John wished to know two things -- about his own peace and about the papal legates. Thanking presumably for material help and expressing his anxiety over the bishop who was still in difficulty in Poitiers, John inquired after what had happened at the court and whether there had been any progress in the discussion of peace. John was especially concerned about the result of the king's mission to the Papal Curia and the nature of the power of the legates so that he and Becket might know how to react to them.

John of Canterbury may have received the same kind of request from Becket himself as well. The bishop wrote to him after 2 February 1167 to say what he had found out from the king's messengers whom he had intercepted at Tours:¹²⁶

125. Barlow, *TB*, pp 162-3. *JS Letters* ii, p xxxii.

126. *Mats* no. 283.

one of the legates was to be William of Pavia and the other, Otto, cardinal deacon of Carcere Tulliano; they were to come with plenitude of power. The royal messengers were also reported to have obtained copies of all Becket's petitions and other related letters to the Pope.

There is no evidence that John of Canterbury sent information directly to Becket after this date. John does not seem to have communicated with his correspondents in Poitiers until late summer, 1167, mainly due to political turbulence which made all communication from Rheims difficult.¹²⁷ While John was unable to participate in diplomacy, Becket took measures to counteract the situation.¹²⁸

In summer or autumn of 1167, John wrote to Master Laurence thanking him for his gift which was handed to John by 'our common friend the master of the schools'. John discussed the local situation in Poitiers and consoled Master Laurence not to despair if the situation was unfavourable. He thought that it was better that the bishop should 'grant to you the archdeaconry than to some man ignorant of law and an enemy to the Christian life'. No. 221 does not appear much more than a letter carrying simple messages, but Master Laurence was to have a more important role shortly afterwards.

In October when the legates were approaching, Becket's party took various diplomatic measures in which John was

127. JS Letters ii, no. 223.

128. See the sections 4-IV-2-b, 4-V-3-c.

involved.¹²⁹ One of the measures taken by the archbishop was to write to the legates. The archbishop made two drafts of a letter which was to be sent to William of Pavia. When the archbishop asked John's opinion, he rejected both and proposed his own.¹³⁰ John asked Becket if he approved, to send the letter to the bishop of Poitiers and upon the bishop's approval, it should be forwarded to the cardinals. John wrote to Becket that since he was sending the bearer to Poitiers, he had instructed him to call on Becket on the way. The bearer had been told to explain John's opinions to Becket. Becket could also send a message to the bishop of Poitiers by John's bearer, if there was need. John wrote a letter to William of Pavia in his own name and it was probably sent by the same bearer to Poitiers, since the cardinals 'have come down into Aquitaine'.¹³¹

The reason why John was sending his own bearer to Poitiers must have been due to three other letters written to his friends there.¹³² No. 222 was written to Master Laurence who was presumably in England at the time the letter was written,¹³³ but was to be in attendance on William of Pavia. John asked Master Laurence to read John's letters to the bishop and Master Raymond and send back his opinion immediately with John's carrier. He asked Laurence to help him and Becket's cause possibly by passing

129. For the diplomacy of the Becket's party, see the sections 4-IV-2-b and 4-V-3-c.

130. JS Letters ii, no. 228.

131. JS Letters ii, no. 229.

132. JS Letters ii, nos. 222-4.

133. JS Letters ii, no. 224.

information concerning the legates. John knew that this was ordinarily a morally uncommendable action. He wrote to Master Laurence that in the event that he had to take an oath, he should act 'in such manner that your conscience suffer no loss of innocence'.

No. 233 to the bishop of Poitiers was a longer letter reporting mostly the news of the rebellion in Rheims and Becket's opinion on the legates. John's main concern at this period was the arrival of the legates. John informed the bishop of Becket's intentions of not submitting to the legates' judgement. His decision was not without reason, but it was politically unwise to reveal his suspicion and write hostile letters to the legates. Since the bishop of Poitiers was a good friend of Becket and he was to receive the legates shortly, it was both to his benefit and to Becket's to be informed of Becket's attitude. John felt that Becket would 'accept peace to the Church's honour and his own at the legates' hands', but that almost certainly he would not attend a conference unless his property was restored, nor send any of his followers unless a safe conduct was given. Concerning John's own peace, he made it clear that he would not swear a harmful oath.

In the brief letter to Master Raymond,¹³⁴ John asked him for advice on his course of action and whether he should obtain a safe conduct to approach the legates. John also asked him to send him information concerning the legates' plans, the situation of the king and his court and how things would be for the bishop and the master. John asked

134. JS Letters ii, no. 224.

Raymond to press Master John to comply with his request. He probably wanted Master John the Saracen to make haste with his translation of the work of St. Denis.

Among the three letters which were probably sent to Poitiers by the same messenger, formal news and matters pertaining to the archbishop went chiefly to the bishop who would benefit most from such information. John probably wished the bishop to face the legates with the knowledge of Becket's intentions. The bishop was probably also expected to brief Master Laurence. Master Raymond was probably expected to act as coordinator between the archbishop and Master Laurence and supply John with necessary information. John could relate more familiar matters to him and ask for his advice on his more personal course of action. He had understanding in John's academic interest and had connections with other masters of Poitiers such as John the Saracen.

We do not know whether Becket was aware of John's plan to seek Master Laurence's help. We do not know either if Master Laurence was back from England in time to do as expected by John. At the conference of la Ferté-Bernard in July 1168, however, we find one Master Geoffrey of Poitou as clerk of Cardinal William.¹³⁵

Just as John had wished to know of the legates' plans on behalf of Becket, John of Canterbury would have liked to know what happened between the legates and the archbishop when they met. After the conference ^{of} Gisors and Trie on

135. JS Letters ii, no. 279.

8 November 1167, which John attended,¹³⁶ he probably sent a report to the bishop of Poitiers.¹³⁷ This letter is an objective report of the conference which was probably drafted through a complex process. It reports the exchanges between the archbishop and the legates and the subsequent meeting including Louis VII, describing how Becket and the legates failed to come to agreement.

No. 232 to Master Raymond and no. 233 to the bishop are both dated c. November and December 1167¹³⁸ and they both deal with the aftermath of the legates' activities, but as usual, more familiar and even domestic messages went to Master Raymond while political matters were discussed in the letter to the bishop. In no. 232 to Master Raymond, John apologized for the change in the form of his greeting which might sound presumptuous but he made the excuse that it was on account of persecution.¹³⁹ John expressed his disappointment in the legates and criticised their persons. He stated how the French felt about the cardinals. John intended to send fuller information to Poitiers 'in my

136. JS Letters ii, no. 231.

137. JS Letters ii, no. 230, n 1.

138. In no. 236 which was written in December 1167, John referred to a letter which he had sent to the bishop of Poitiers very recently by 'Master Reginald's servant'. (Master Reginald is a mistake for Master Raymond.-- JS Letters ii, no. 236, n 3). Therefore, no. 233 to the bishop was probably carried by Master Raymond's servant along with no. 232 shortly before no. 236.

139. John may have had special reasons to fear persecution in about December 1167 and January 1168. In no. 236 to John of Canterbury, he reported his change of address. Pseudonyms were used in no. 238 to Baldwin of Totnes and no. 240 to Baldwin of Boulogne, although the reason for their use does not seem to be uniform. Pseudonyms are used again in 1168, (JS Letters ii, nos. 276 & 280) and also the change of his greeting in the protocol. (JS Letters ii, no. 283.)

disappointment in the legates and criticised their persons. He stated how the French felt about the cardinals. John intended to send fuller information to Poitiers 'in my letter' to my John'.¹⁴⁰ He sympathized with Master Raymond for the trouble he must have had upon arrival of the legates in Poitiers. He asked Master Raymond for the third time to ask John the Saracen to send him the books of St. Denis which John learned the Saracen had recently translated.¹⁴¹

In the letter to John of Canterbury which probably went with no. 232,¹⁴² we learn that the bishop had given advice to John. John reported that he had followed the bishop's advice so far as possible and had sent a courier to the Pope with letters from the French king and his magnates who reckoned the legates rather worthless. John repeated what he had written in nos. 230 and 231 in criticism of the legates and of King Louis's words that the archbishop was not responsible for the trouble between the kings. Perhaps in reply to the bishop's question, John denied any probability that Becket was the cause for the split between the English king and the count of Flanders. He entrusted the rest of the news to the bearer and asked the bishop to send him news as often as possible.

The letters of the French king and his magnates to the

140. The letter is considered to be either no. 236 or no. 230 to John of Canterbury. (JS Letters ii, no. 232, n 3.)

141. His previous requests had been made in early June 1166 (no. 166) and c. Oct. 1167 (no. 224) both through Master Raymond. This time John made a more concrete request as he learned at St. Denis that the Saracen had already translated On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy and On the Divine Names.

142. JS Letters ii, no. 233.

Papal Curia do not appear to survive. After the meeting at Gisors and Trie, active diplomacy was directed towards the Papal Curia.¹⁴³ John of Canterbury's advice to John and John of Canterbury's advice to John and the Becket party may have helped them shape their diplomatic strategy.

Letter no. 236 written to John of Canterbury in mid-late December 1167 contains news after the meeting of Gisors and Trie such as that of the meeting of Henry II and the legates at Argentan, the renewal of the bishops' appeal and the arrival of the messengers to Becket from the legates and the bishops on 14 December. John referred to the change of his address and its reason. He reported the king's angry reaction to the outcome of the meeting at Gisors and Trie. Having found out that the legates had no power to pass judgement, the king asked them, and they agreed, to write to the Pope in favour of the king. The bishops renewed their appeal. The cardinals sent two messengers to the archbishop and they presented him with a letter on 14 December.¹⁴⁴ The bishops also sent two messengers to announce the appeal, but the archbishop refused to see them on the ground that they were excommunicated by contamination. Becket declared that the absolution by the Welsh bishop was not valid, entrusting a great deal more to the oral message of his own and the cardinals' messengers. This news letter addressed to John of Canterbury was probably the most comprehensive and detailed report of what happened after the meeting of Gisors and Trie. About the same time, John sent news to his other

143. JS Letters ii, no. 233.

144. Mats no. 343.

correspondents, but only partially.¹⁴⁵

In the year 1167, friendship of John of Canterbury, Becket and John of Salisbury continued with little change in the role the bishop played towards the Becket party. The bishop's greatest help to the archbishop was probably that he sent information concerning the papal legates which he gathered from the king's messengers. John of Canterbury's news of the Christmas court at Poitiers in 1166 may also have been helpful if it was sent as requested by John. John of Canterbury does not appear to have given much advice directly to Becket in this period, but some went through John of Salisbury. We have no evidence of direct communication between Becket and the bishop from February 1167 till after the Conference of Montmirail in January 1169. Sometimes it may have been done through John on the archbishop's approval and instruction.

John's relationship with his correspondents in Poitiers was not always connected with the political interests of Becket. The bishop retained his personal friendship with John. He gave John financial assistance and John still counted on the bishop's help to make peace with the king. John's academic interests had not died out and he sometimes

145. John's letters to Baldwin of Totnes written in about January 1168 (nos. 238 & 241, especially 241) also dealt with the meeting of Henry II, the bishops and the legates at Argentan, but the letters concentrated on the possible trouble Bartholomew of Exeter would fall into and gave advice to avoid it. The news of the flight of the Emperor also appear in other letters to John's major correspondents such as no. 239 to Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques, and no. 242 to William Brito and it remained his favourite topic in 1168 especially in his appeal letters. It appears most heavily in no. 272 to Baldwin of Totnes as information gathered in spring 1168 on John's pilgrimage to St. Gilles.

wished to be in touch with some masters of Poitiers, especially John the Saracen. Master Raymond served as a willing mediator.

John of Canterbury for his part could rely on John to obtain quick and accurate information on the affairs of the archbishop and other matters from the areas where John had good sources of information. Although Bishop John had made peace with the king in mid-1166, and the king held his Christmas court at Poitiers, he soon went away to Gascony and spent the latter half of 1167 in Brittany and Normandy,¹⁴⁶ the bishop was not in close touch with the king and remained a friend and supporter of the archbishop. Communication between Angevin Poitou and Capetian Rheims had much less restriction than between Rheims and England and therefore information appears to have passed between them quite easily. Besides, John of Canterbury's communication with Becket posed little threat to the king.

c. 1168-9

In the years 1168 and 1169, John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury remained good friends, but their role to each other went through a change. The change was brought about mainly by the shift of international politics. The war between the Angevins and Capetians involved John of Canterbury as well as Thomas Becket. If Becket's cause was used as part of Capetian diplomatic tool, the Poitevin rebellion could not be solved merely as Angevin domestic problem. Being in the land of rebellion, where the rebels

146. Eyton, pp 104-112.

defeated the king's army and killed its commander,¹⁴⁷ who was buried in Poitiers,¹⁴⁸ John of Canterbury cannot have remained unaffected. However, being familiar with the local situation, he probably became an important adviser to the king in his domestic and international policy concerning Poitou. The bishop of Poitiers came to play a more important role and he had a closer tie with the king.

By this time, John of Canterbury's pro-Becket stance was accepted by the king. For John of Canterbury, being a supporter of Becket did not necessarily mean a betrayal of the king. Unlike their English counterparts, continental bishops did not have a primate who was in conflict with the king and his ancient customs, upholding the freedom of the Church. The complex political situation of these years affected John of Salisbury as well. John appears to have been more involved in Becket's cause; he had a more diverse role and perhaps worked in closer contact with Becket. Deeper commitment to Becket's cause may have deprived John of the time for scholarly pursuits. He continued to express his interest in scholarly matters, but after the unfinished Historia Pontificalis and the long letter to Count Henry John does not seem to have produced scholarly works.

John's letters written to Poitiers in these years were all of a political nature and almost all were addressed to John of Canterbury. There are three extant letters written

147. JS Letters ii, nos. 272, 277. Robert of Torigny, p 236. Norgate, K. Richard the Lion Heart, London (1924) pp 8-9.

148. Robert of Torigny, p 236.

in 1168 and three written in 1169. The three letters written in 1168 concentrated on spring and summer.

After the bishop of Poitiers received John's comprehensive report of what happened in Normandy after the meeting of Gisors and Trie, John of Canterbury probably wrote back to John as detailed a letter containing the news of Poitou and the king's action. News such as the murder of Earl Patrick of Salisbury and return of King Henry to Poitou, and the worsening of Poitevin situation and the rebels' plans may have been contained in the bishop's letter.¹⁴⁹ It also contained some report of the king possibly a defence of his action, probably touching on the relationship between the king and the religious in the Angevin continental domains.

Letter no. 274 to the bishop of Poitiers was probably written in reply to his letter written after January 1168 when the king spent some time in Poitou.¹⁵⁰ Admitting that both John of Canterbury and he himself were indebted to the king, John expressed his wish that the king should be called back 'from the path of destruction'. Referring to the downfall of 'schismatic Frederick', John feared that King Henry might follow the same path. John asked Bishop John to use his influence on the Grandmontines¹⁵¹ and other religious in Henry's realm so that they might persuade the

149. In no. 272 to Baldwin of Totnes written about the same time as no. 274, John reported news of Poitou to Exeter.

150. Eyton, p 112.

151. On the relationship between Henry II and the Grandmontines, 'Henry II, Richard I and the order of Grandmont' Journal of Medieval History, vol 1 (1975) pp 165-86, esp. p 167.

king to reconcile with Becket. John briefly reported his meeting with Becket on his way from Saint-Gilles, his brother Richard's sending a gift to the bishop, William of Pavia's presence at the consecration of the elect of Chartres, and the king's messengers frequently visiting Count Henry.

Shortly after he had written a letter to the bishop,¹⁵² John wrote another letter in May 1168 because he received additional news:¹⁵³ the result of the royal mission to the Pope¹⁵⁴ and the return of Gerard Pucelle from Germany and his going over to the king. The royal mission succeeded in obtaining the suspension of the archbishop. John recounted the king's comments on his power and influence in the Papal Curia, and the presence of his supporters among the

152. Probably no. 274. (JS Letters ii, no.274, n 1 & p xxxix).

153. JS Letters ii, no. 275. It is difficult to trace the way how John came to know the result of the king's mission in about May 1168. The papal letters announcing the archbishop's suspension were written both to the king and the archbishop and dated 19 May. (Mats nos. 395, 396. Also see no. 414.) They appear to have reached the king on 1 or 2 of July. (JS Letters ii, no. 279 & p xxxix.) Therefore it is unlikely that John obtained a copy as early as May. The Pope's intention may have been known before his letter of the archbishop's suspension, or the news may have preceeded the letter. Mats no. 400 written by the Pope to the English bishops is dated 24 and Mats no. 404 to Henry II is dated 26 April. They do not deal directly with the archbishop's suspension, although they are by no means favourable to him. Possibly the news of the archbishop's suspension was passed through Geoffrey of Auxerre who met the royal mission Clarembald of St. Augustine's on the way to or from his mission when he was summoned by the Emperor in Italy. (JS Letters ii, no. 272).

154. After the conference of Argentan in December 1167, Henry II sent a mission to Benevento consisting of Clarembald of St. Augustine's and Reginald of Salisbury. (Barlow, TB, p 175.)

cardinals. The king is reported to have boasted the bishop of Worcester that he and other bishops were exempt from the power of the archbishop of Canterbury, for he 'now has the Pope and all the cardinals in his pocket'.¹⁵⁵ John expressed his indignation on the ways the Papal Curia had treated the archbishop, asking Bishop John to protest the Pope and cardinals.¹⁵⁶ There is no evidence that John of Canterbury did as was requested, although a number of French prelates wrote on behalf of Becket.¹⁵⁷

Letter no. 276 was written in about June 1168 to Bishop John and Master Raymond in reply to their letters. The letter was written in pseudonyms. John does not appear to have used them merely to avoid danger but rather because of the meanings that they conveyed.¹⁵⁸ The letter from Poitiers probably suggested that Clarembald of St. Augustine's had received blessing from the Pope and they had discussed the grievous news whose nature is not clear. Expressing grief and indignation over the matter and then

155. It is difficult to conceive how John came to know the king's reaction. The bishop of Worcester is reported to have heard the king's boast, but there is no extant letter from Roger to the archbishop at that time, though Roger was on the continent and was in contact with him. With regard to Henry's power and influence at the Papal Curia and the king's boast of obtaining letters of Becket's suspension, no. 275 bears striking resemblance to no. 279 which was written to Master Lombardus after the conference of la Ferte-Bernard on 1-2 July.

156. JS Letters ii, no. 275, n 3.

157. Mats nos. 435, 437, 439, 440, 446. See the section 4-V-2.

158. For the use of pseudonyms in this letter, see JS Letters ii, no. 276, n 1, & 13 and note 139 above.

professing his faith in God and his conviction that the Church would be freed, John concluded that just as Cyril, 'the man with the sick hand was cured by Christ', 'He who strikes and heals' would 'kill to give life'. What concrete matters lay behind John's account delivered through biblical allusion is not altogether clear. John turned to more concrete affairs and the centre of his attention was the prospected meeting of the kings. John reported that the count of Flanders had hoped to bring the two kings to agreement and thought that it was better to have Becket on that occasion.¹⁵⁹ Describing the process of the count's attempt for peace and emphasising the secret nature of the information, John expressed his wish that Bishop John or other sympathizers of the archbishop would be able to attend the conference so that they might be able to relate to John what he needed to know.

When the conference of the two kings was indeed held at La Ferté-Bernard on 1 and 2 July, Becket was invited to be present at the site, but the meeting between him and the king did not take place.¹⁶⁰ We do not know whether John of Canterbury attended the conference, but from John's letter we learn that one Master Geoffrey of Poitou was serving William of Pavia as a clerk.¹⁶¹

159. Letter no. 276 was the only letter to John's major correspondent that is dated about June 1168. For the Becket party, the most important event of this time was the attempt of the count of Flanders for reconciliation of the two kings and that of Henry II and Thomas Becket. The information might have come from Milo of Thérouanne who worked in close service to the count of Flanders. (See the section 3-II-2.)

160. Barlow, TE, p 177.

161. JS Letters ii, no. 279.

The next two surviving letters to John of Canterbury were written after the conference of Montmirail. John of Canterbury was probably with the king on this occasion, for the matters related to Poitou were settled at this conference.¹⁶² After an attempt of reconciliation of Henry II and Becket failed at the conference, John of Canterbury was ordered by the king to pursue Becket and make arrangement to re-open the negotiation. The king and the archbishop were to meet near Tours on 22 February. John of Canterbury appears to have taken the matters too easily and as a result received a letter of rebuke from Becket.¹⁶³ John's letter no. 285 may have gone with Becket's letter. Whereas Becket's letter was brief and to the point without being unfriendly, John's letter explained in more detail the reason why the archbishop refused to attend the meeting with the English king which John of Canterbury had arranged. According to Becket's party, the king had sent an embassy to the Curia while pretending to continue the negotiation with Becket so that he would be unaware of the snares. Becket and John disapproved of the negotiations in which John of Canterbury was involved and considered that Bishop John had been deceived by the king.¹⁶⁴

Since John of Salisbury was concerned about the after effect of the bishop's failure in arranging the meeting, he wrote another letter shortly after no. 285. Letter no. 287 was apparently written after the conference of the two kings

162. JS Letters ii, no. 288. Also no. 279.

163. Mats nos. 453-4. Barlow, TB, p 183.

at St-Léger-en-Yvelines on 2 February. In that conference, it was decided that the king was going to hold a meeting with the Grandimontines.¹⁶⁵ John wanted to ask the bishop to use his influence on the religious so that they would 'look to the Church's peace' in the coming conference. John emphasised that the peace would be most beneficial to the king, for the Crusade would not be profitable to him unless peace was restored to the church. He stated that he was concerned about the king because of John of Canterbury's 'charity towards this great prince', and praised the king's person in such a way as we never see in John's other letters. He asked Bishop John to let him know the news from Rome as soon as they received back their messengers.

John does not seem to have written to anyone from this time until late August 1169. Meanwhile important events may have preoccupied the Becket party. The bishops of London and Salisbury and other royal officials were excommunicated on 13 April and 29 May. Therefore they had to send announcements of excommunication to England,¹⁶⁶ they had to obtain the Pope's confirmation,¹⁶⁷ and for that purpose they

164. JS Letters ii, p xli. Nos. 288 to Bartholomew of Exeter and no. 286 to Simon and Engelbert. Mats nos. 453-54.

165. John of Canterbury appears to have had some contact with the Grandimontines, for John had asked the bishop once before in about April to May 1168 to persuade them to resist the king. (JS Letters ii, no. 274.)

166. Mats nos. 479, 480, 488, 489, 490, 494, 495, 499, 500, 502.

167. Mats nos. 497, 540, 541, 542.

had to persuade some French religious to write to the Curia.¹⁶⁸ They may have had to counteract the English diplomacy on the French court by the bishop of Séés and Geoffrey Ridel.¹⁶⁹ We do not know whether or how much John was involved in the general diplomacy of the Becket party, but he was not idle in July when he met the new papal commissioners Gratian and Vivian on 22nd at Vézelay.¹⁷⁰

John wrote to John of Canterbury at about the end of August 1169, probably because he had heard that the bishop had been called back by Henry II when he was about to take a journey.¹⁷¹ About the end of August, the king summoned major churchmen of his realm to advise him.¹⁷² In a letter of 'a friend to Becket',¹⁷³ John of Canterbury is reported to have excused himself from the event saying that he was going to hold a synod but that he would join after it was over. By this time, the bishop of Poitiers was probably one of the king's trusted servants on the continent. John asked the bishop to give support to Gratian, for he was in favour of the archbishop's cause, but he had 'few on whom he can confidently depend'. John wanted John of Canterbury to persuade Gratian that absolution should not be conferred on the excommunicate unless satisfacton was made and that penitence in the form of restitution of goods taken from the Becket party was necessary. He hoped that the bishop would

168. Mats nos. 498, 543, 544, 545, 546.

169. Barlow, TB, pp 184-6.

170. JS Letters ii, no. 289.

171. JS Letters ii, no. 291.

172. Barlow, TB, p 189.

warn Gratian to be careful not to be deceived by the king.

At the end of August, the negotiation between papal envoys Gratian and Vivian and the king was taking place. The Norman bishops and the bishop of Worcester were present and John of Canterbury was also summoned.¹⁷⁴ The bishops drew up the forma pacis, but it proved unacceptable to the king.¹⁷⁵ Whether or what role John of Canterbury played in this process is not known, but he was in a situation in which he could influence the papal envoys and advise the king so that their form of peace would reflect Becket's wishes and therefore acceptable to his party.

Through John's correspondence in 1168-69, we see the changing situations bringing about changes in the relationship between John of Salisbury and his Poitevin correspondents. In previous years, John expected their help both in personal matters and those relating to the archbishop. His familiar exchanges with them disappeared in these two years. John no longer referred to financial difficulties, expressed his academic interest less, and except in no. 274, he made no mention of his peace with the king. Previously, he wanted his Poitevin friends to send him information and to give him advice. In the years 1168 and 69, his requests to the bishop, made almost always on behalf of Becket, became much more diverse, reflecting the growing importance of the bishop with regard to his local influence as well as his relations with the king. John

173. Mats no. 560.

174. Cheney, Roger, Bishop of Worcester, p 44.

175. Cheney, Roger Bishop of Worcester, p 44.

wanted him to send information, use his influence on the religious in the realm, advise the king, attend a conference, reaffirm the archbishop's intentions to papal envoys, and write a letter of protest to the Pope.

Since we do not possess John of Canterbury's letters, it is difficult to detect how he reacted and what he tried to achieve with his letters. One possible advice he gave to John was to write to Thurstan of Acolt to gain his support and financial help for the archbishop.¹⁷⁶ Apart from complying with John's requests, one of John of Canterbury's efforts was probably directed to clarify the king's standpoint to John. As he became closer in contact with Henry II since 1168, the bishop probably became more acquainted with the problems the king faced in his realm and the way he tried to cope with them and learned that the Becket conflict formed a part of them. Bishop John probably wished John and others to understand the king in a different perspective. John reacted differently to the bishop's defence of the king. In no. 274, he had much to accuse by way of the king's behaviour, for he wanted the bishop to join in the protest to the Pope against the archbishop's suspension. In no. 287, John came to realize that the king's welfare was very important for John of Canterbury. The reason why John started expressing his praise of the king along with criticism and that only in his letters to John of Canterbury was probably because John was conscious of the fact that Bishop John now cared much about the king's

176. JS Letters ii, no. 264. On Thurstan, see above note 77 and section 3-IV-2-b(i) & 3-V-2-h.

honour and welfare. John probably reckoned it more effective to ask for the bishop's cooperation on the ground that it would be for the benefit of the king.

d. 1170-71

There is no extant letter from John of Salisbury to John of Canterbury from about the end of August 1169 until after the death of Thomas Becket. The bishop of Poitiers who had hitherto been a most constant correspondent of John of Salisbury disappeared from the list. In these years, Becket's party was quite busy reacting to changing situations towards peace -- an abortive meeting of the king and the archbishop planned in Normandy in February, the departure of the king to England, the coronation of young Henry, and peace at Fréteval in July.¹⁷⁷ Even after peace was made, many practical matters had to be solved, for which John of Salisbury was sent to Henry II in August and to England in November.¹⁷⁸ John of Canterbury, on the other hand, seems to have been preoccupied with Poitevin local matters. He may have acted as adviser to Queen Eleanor and Richard, especially after the conference of Montmirail.¹⁷⁹ On 31 May, 1170, together with the archbishop of Bordeaux, Bishop John invested Richard who was then 13 years old.¹⁸⁰ Sometime in 1170, Bishop John was one of the bishops who accompanied young Eleanor, daughter of Henry II who was

177. JS Letters ii, pp xlii-iii. Barlow, TB, pp 198-209.

178. Barlow, TB, pp 213, 220.

179. See Boissonade, 'Administrateurs laïques et ecclésiastiques' p 177.

180. Barlow, TB, p 204.

betrothed to Alfonso II of Castile, to the border of Spain.¹⁸¹

In 1170, John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury had less time and less need to write to each other, for they were both occupied but with things that required no cooperation. There is no reason to assume that the bishop was in disagreement either with the king, or with the archbishop and John of Salisbury.

In fact, after the murder of the archbishop, John of Canterbury was one of the persons whom John felt obliged to write. Letter no. 305 is a long and detailed account of the murder of the archbishop and he was already treated as a martyr.¹⁸² As he wrote in his letter, John may have been prompted to write to the bishop because he found a messenger going to Poitiers. But the letter no. 305 whose copies were sent to other friends and later incorporated into John's life of St. Thomas, was originally written to John of Canterbury.¹⁸³ John of Canterbury was undoubtedly considered to be one of the persons who might support the canonization of the murdered archbishop.

5. Conclusions

The friendship between John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury remained essentially unchanged through the course of changing political and personal situations. But what

181. Boissonade, 'Administrateurs laïques et ecclésiastiques' p 178.

182. For further discussion of letter no. 305, see the section 4-VI-3-e.

183. JS Letters ii, no. 305, n° 1.

their friendship meant to one another was different from time to time. They initially came to know each other as colleagues in Archbishop Theobald's household. John of Canterbury and John of Salisbury were sent to Theobald's missions together and they carried out business in cooperation with each other after John of Canterbury became treasurer of York. They had friends in common in the household. Thomas Becket was the closest and the most important of them. John of Canterbury probably knew other clerks of Theobald such as John's correspondents Ralph of Sarre and Master William. He may also have known John's friends Peter of Celle and Gerard of Pucelle. He appears to be fairly close to John of Salisbury's brother Richard. John of Canterbury may have introduced to John his relative Payne and his local friend in Canterbury, Thurstan of Acolt. In short, they were colleagues, personal friends and something like business associates.

After Archbishop Theobald's death and his promotion to the bishopric of Poitiers, John of Canterbury continued to be friend of John of Salisbury who was then serving Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury. John of Canterbury and Thomas Becket faced similar problems in ecclesiastical politics as new bishop and archbishop appointed by Henry II. Before Becket's exile, both John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury helped him by giving information and advice, while maintaining their own personal friendship. During the first half of the Becket conflict, John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury may be termed as former colleagues, personal friends and supporters of a common cause. Till mid 1166 when John of Canterbury reconciled with Henry II, the

bishop of Poitiers was in some ways an ally of the exiled archbishop, while John of Salisbury maintained relationships with masters in Poitiers, which was mainly academic.

During the latter half of the Becket conflict, their relationship went through a change. John's personal friendship and academic relationship with his Poitevin correspondents gave way to his activities as Becket's clerk. He was much more committed to Becket and thoroughly devoted to his cause. John of Canterbury, on the other hand, became an important servant of the king at Poitou from 1168 onwards and his friendship with Becket was accepted by the king and at times taken advantage of. The common goal of John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury was the reconciliation of the king and the archbishop. The archbishop's honourable peace had been John's greatest concern from the beginning of the conflict. As a trusted servant of the king as well as a friend of the archbishop, also from the point of view of principles as well as the Poitevin political situation, John of Canterbury must have been strongly in favour of reconciliation of the king and the archbishop. He tried to arrange an abortive meeting of the king and Becket immediately after the failure of their peace at Montmirail.

The atrocity of the murder of the archbishop was no doubt a shock both to John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury. For John of Canterbury, it meant a loss of a friend whom he cared for and whose cause he supported. For John of Salisbury, it meant the loss of his master and patron. But it left him a new cause to work for -- a belief that Thomas Becket was a martyr and that he should be canonized. John wrote to John of Canterbury because the

bishop of Poitiers was among those who sympathized with the archbishop and therefore most likely to support the movement towards the canonization of Becket.

It was not easy to keep communication during the busy and turbulent years following the archbishop's murder. During these years they do not seem to have written to each other. Perhaps the distance between Canterbury and Poitiers prevented their communication. But more probably, they mutually lacked a strong incentive to overcome the difficulty.

The friendship between John of Salisbury and John of Canterbury was initially that of colleagues who worked in cooperation with each other. Such a friendship is most active when they have a common goal to achieve, for which to cooperate with each other.

VIII Royal servants

1. Introduction -- John of Salisbury and the king's court

On the arrival of Henry II in England in December 1154, John came in touch with the king and his courtiers. Previously, John's circle of association had been limited to spiritual and academic friends in Paris and Champagne, Archbishop Theobald and his clerks, English religious and ecclesiastics and Roman cardinals. Therefore the secular prince and his entourage were the new types of people.

As a principal clerk of Archbishop Theobald, John sometimes had recourse to the king. John may have accompanied Archbishop Theobald while he was in almost constant attendance of the king from his arrival to England until January 1156 when the king left for Normandy.¹ John was sent to the Curia sometime after the king's disclosure of his plan at the council of Westminster to conquer Ireland.² When he left for the Curia, he must have enjoyed the king's favour, but when he came back, he suffered from the king's disgrace.³ The cause as John conceived it was the presence of Arnulf of Lisieux at the king's court, which was then in Normandy.⁴ The reason as John put it was this: 'If any one among us invokes the name of Rome, they say it is my doing. If the English Church ventures to claim even

1. Eyton, pp 1-15.

2. Eyton, p 12. See the section 3-III-1 and note 30.

3. JS Letters i, nos. 18-21, 27-8, 30-1. The cause and chronology are discussed in JS Letters i, pp 257-8. Constable, G., 'The alleged disgrace of John of Salisbury' EHR vol 69 (1954) pp 67-76. See the section 3-III-1 and notes 32-3.

4. JS Letters i, nos. 18, 30. Eyton, pp 16-25.

the shadow of liberty, in making elections or in the trial of ecclesiastical causes, it is imputed to me, as if I were the only person to instruct the lord archbishop of Canterbury and the other bishops what they ought to do'.⁵ In other words, John was branded pro-Roman clerk of Archbishop Theobald who advocated freedom in elections and in the trial of ecclesiastical causes, thereby diminishing the royal dignity.⁶ Although no action was taken against him, it would have been difficult to remove from the king's mind the image thus created of John of Salisbury.

Perhaps on this account, John was used henceforth, not as a messenger to the Curia but mainly as secretary to Archbishop Theobald. As such, John had to handle cases both in cooperation with and in conflict against the king.⁷ He was especially busy with the contact with the royal court from early 1160. In addition to the request of the ailing archbishop for the return of Thomas Becket, the archdeacon of Canterbury, there were pressing matters like Exeter election and the Papal schism. In these matters, John probably appeared to the king as Archbishop Theobald's agent working mainly in the sensitive area of conflict

5. JS Letters i, no. 19.

6. JS Letters i, no. 19.

7. The archbishop's letters were written by John in accordance with the king's wishes in a case like the recall of the bishop of Winchester. (JS Letters i, nos. 37, 38). Letters were written against the king's interests in the following cases: against the king's interference in elections; (JS Letters i, nos. 109, 120-3, 125, 127-9, 133.) opposition led by the bishop of Norwich to the king's attack on the wealth of the Church (JS Letters i, no. 13) king's interference or pressure on ecclesiastical courts. (JS Letters i, nos. 53, 102, 104, 115, 131, 132.)

between Church and State, and representing the ecclesiastical or sacerdotal interest on the part of the archbishop.

Clearly, among Archbishop Theobald's clerks, John was not one of the king's favourites, because his field of learning and basic values were uncompromisingly different from the king's for whom more practical knowledge of administration was far more important than that of letters. John himself knew this. Before the death of the archbishop, John wrote his own testimonial to the king in the name of Theobald.⁸ In this, he hardly stated his own views in full but merely mentioned, 'the sincerity of his faith and performance of his work' in the service of Archbishop Theobald and laid more stress on the deficiency of due reward for his service. He probably found little else that might appeal to the king. The contrast is vivid when this is compared with another testimonial of himself which he wrote to the abbot of Saint-Amand in the name of Peter of Celle.⁹

If the king was once dissatisfied with John's service, John for his part was highly critical of the royal court. John described the characteristics of the royal court in the Entheticus as follows:

8. JS Letters i, no. 126.

9. JS Letters ii, no. 143. See the section 2-IV-4-a.

Drunk with the gift of Fortune the new court under a youthful king believes that all things are lawful for it.

You would think that both young and old men are equally mad, the judge is mad and his office.

The court loves, hears, honours only the triflers;

every courtier holds the arts as detested;

the courtier hates the arts which serve virtue,

but every courtier loves servants of the flesh.

That rope-dancer, who defends by the law of his grandfather whatever he attempts, has introduced these morals to the court.

Those who have a taste for trifles and crimes, are called upon by the law;

those who have the right taste, the law orders to go abroad.¹⁰

To John, who was secretary to the elderly archbishop, the king's youthful confidence and insolence must have been distasteful. John complained about the king's greedy and arbitrary judges.¹¹ John was alarmed at what the restoration of Henry's grandfather's customs might bring about and alarmed by the morality governing the king's court which approved or even encouraged courtiers to be servants of flesh.

In comparison to Archbishop Theobald's household where John enjoyed 'philosophical musing, legal business,literary intercourse, useful and delightful

10. Entheticus, vol i, 11 1463-1472.

11. Entheticus, vol i, 11 1329-1333, 147-150.

disputation',¹² John must have been appalled by the negligence and contempt of studies of arts, especially those pertaining to virtue, and by the flourishing of trifles and of hateful sciences such as hunting, gambling and astrology.¹³ The shock of encounter with the king's court may have been at least one of the reasons why John came to compose his major works the Policraticus, Metalogicon and Entheticus. The books were probably completed in 1159 and dedicated to the royal chancellor Thomas Becket. If Henry II knew about them, the contents would not have been very pleasing to him.

After he started serving Archbishop Thomas, John continued to feel that he was not favoured by the king. In early 1164, he refused Becket's request to go to the Curia because he was 'under the king's disfavour' and feared that he would be grievously out of favour if he countered the king's envoys at the Papal Curia.¹⁴ John was serving as the chief agent of the archbishop in France, whose diplomatic activities were almost rebellious from the king's point of view. He left England about the end of 1163 as the archbishop's diplomat, but after the king's mandate on Boxing Day 1164 against the supporters of Becket, he was an exile and outlaw. He felt that the king's wrath was on him.¹⁵

12. JS Letters ii, no. 256.

13. Pol i & ii. Met i-prologue.

14. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

15. JS Letters ii, nos. 143, 171, 194.

In summer 1165, John tried to make peace with the king through the mediation of Bartholomew of Exeter, Richard of Ilchester and other friends without success.¹⁶ A larger scale attempt for reconciliation between the king and the archbishop's clerks was made in May 1166, but the king's conditions offered to him were probably the severest and were hardly acceptable to John.¹⁷ The king had reasons to impose them on him. As John himself admitted the possibility of having done wrong to the king unknowingly and offered to make amends,¹⁸ his service and fidelity to the archbishop were in themselves harmful to the king.

Perhaps the failure of peace at Angers prompted John to further commitment to the cause of Becket. After the Vézelay censures, John's letters were filled with criticisms against the king's persecution of the church, although John took care to choose what aspect to emphasize according to the recipient.¹⁹ When he wrote to those who were in touch with the king, he was especially careful not to attribute the wrong-doing to the king, but to the evil counsel of the bishops. He yet retained hope for peace through the mediation of the bishop of Poitiers and his friends in Normandy.

16. JS Letters ii, nos. 137-9, 149-51.

17. JS Letters ii, nos. 161, 164, 167, 181.

18. JS Letters ii, nos. 174, 177, 187, 190.

19. John's accusation was centred mainly around three points: (i) the king's persecution of the church and his approach to the schismatic Emperor (JS Letters ii, nos. 174, 177, 187, 190): (ii) the bishops' defence of the king (JS Letters ii, nos. 174, 175, 187.): (iii) their evil and inadequate counsel to the king. (JS Letters ii, nos. 174, 175, 176, 178, 180, 187.)

A feeling of incompatibility between John and the king appears to have persisted from the time of his disgrace in 1156-7. John reported that he felt distaste at the king's behaviour at Angers when he 'twisted my words in a way as thoroughly unsuitable to his majesty'.²⁰ When, after the peace at Fréteval, John and Herbert of Bosham were sent to Normandy to find out the situation at the king's court and to see to the restoration of the archbishop's and his followers' possessions, the king is reported to have said to John: 'I won't give you a single town, my dear John, until I find that you are behaving somewhat better towards me than you have done in the past'.²¹ From the point of view of the king, John served an archbishop who was in conflict with him and John's presence and conduct in France were in many ways detrimental to his policy.

In spite of the king's distasteful behaviour and courtiers' unpleasant attitude, John had to have contacts with the royal court both as a clerk to Archbishop Theobald²² and Archbishop Thomas. He associated with some of its members merely out of obligation and necessity. Robert de Broc, vice-archdeacon of Canterbury was one of them.²³ John may also have associated with justiciar Richard de Luci. He contacted him to solicit his assistance

20. JS Letters ii, no. 181.

21. Barlow, TB p 213.

22. Some cases he dealt with as secretary to Archbishop Theobald involved the king's servants. (JS Letters i, nos. 29, 71, 81)

23. JS Letters ii, no. 248. See the section 3-V-2-f.

in making peace with the king,²⁴ but there is no evidence that Richard wrote back to John or worked for his peace.

There were also some royal servants with whom John made friends and who later became recipients of his letters. Such were Richard of Ilchester, Walter de Insula, Nicholas Decanus, Ralph de Beaumont and Nicholas de Sigillo. Nicholas de Sigillo became archdeacon of Huntingdon and he may have known the king's physician Ralph de Beaumont, a canon of Lincoln.²⁵ The other three had some connection with the king's chapel or chancery.²⁶ John probably met Nicholas Decanus while he was one of the royal chaplains. Walter de Insula was a clerk working under Geoffrey Ridel, Thomas's vice-chancellor. Richard of Ilchester was also a protege of Becket. Maybe royal chancellor Thomas Becket had something to do with John's friendship with these clerks. John appears to have had other friends in the chancery.²⁷

2. Royal Servants

a. Nicholas Decanus

Nicholas was a recipient of one extant letter which can only be dated 1164-9.²⁸ He was one of the four chaplains who were in regular attendance on the king.²⁹ The royal chaplains were learned men who were able to perform administrative tasks and Nicholas probably had some

24. JS Letters ii, no. 151. See the sections 2-V-3-b, 3-VI-4-c.

25. See note 48 below.

26. Concerning the king's chancery, See Barlow TB, p 42.

27. JS Letters ii, nos. 180 & 189.

28. JS Letters ii, no. 269.

training in canon law as he often appeared in a legal capacity.³⁰ He was a sheriff of Essex from Michelmas 1164 to Easter 1169.³¹ Nicholas the chaplain, it has been suggested, is the same person as Nicholas, dean of Tilbury, later treasurer of Lichfield and archdeacon of Coventry.³²

John wrote to Nicholas sometime in 1164-69 to behave rightly in the Becket affair. John reminded him of his duty as a deputy of the provincial comites. Touching on the theory of two swords, John expressed his wish that Nicholas might carry out his duty in such a way that he does not offend God. He thanked Nicholas for his love for John and his people and asked him to give whatever message he had to the bearer of the letter. The occasion or the concrete business for which the letter was written is not clear. The letter may belong to 1168 when John wrote massive letters of appeal to his English correspondents.³³

b. Nicholas de Sigillo, archdeacon of Huntingdon

John's letter to Nicholas was written probably in 1164 or 65³⁴ when the masses of Becket's followers crossed the

29. Lally, J., 'The Court and Household of King Henry II, 1154-1187', The University of Liverpool, Ph.D. Thesis (1969) p 118.

30. Lally, J., 'The Court and Household of King Henry II' pp 118-20.

31. JS Letters ii, no. 269, n 1.

32. Lally, 'The court and Household of King Henry II' pp 119, 328-9. JS Letters ii, no. 269, n 1.

33. For John's appeal letters in 1168, see the section 3-IV-2-b(i).

34. JS Letters ii, p xxv.

Channel after the king's order of their proscription was issued. Nicholas was probably a senior clerk in the royal household in Henry II's reign.³⁵ He may have been a friend of Master Ralph de Beaumont and along with him, he was present at the intimate hearing of the case of Battle Abbey.³⁶ Nicholas appeared as witness to some charters issued in Normandy³⁷ and also as witness to Bishop Robert Chesney's acta.³⁸

John's letter no. 140 to Nicholas is a famous letter congratulating him on becoming archdeacon.³⁹ Listing evil deeds of archdeacons which Nicholas used to lament, John nevertheless congratulated on his promotion and hoped the race of archdeacons might be saved. The letter also served as a testimonial of the bearer who had long been in the service of John and his brother. John referred to his faithful service and knowledge in many skills especially in writing. Since John could not provide for him, he wanted Nicholas to keep him in his employment.⁴⁰

From this letter alone, we cannot discern what relationship John had with Nicholas except that they were

35. Lally, 'The Court and Household of King Henry II' p 206.

36. The Chronicle of Battle Abbey, ed. Searle, E., Oxford (1980) p 85. See the section of Ralph de Beaumont.

37. Delisle, Introduction, pp 406-7.

38. English Episcopal Acta i, Lincoln (1067-1185) ed. Smith, D., London (1980) pp 73, 77.

39. JS Letters ii, p xxv.

40. For the occasion and dating of this letter, see the section 4-III-3.

old friends and that John had enough confidence that Nicholas would take the bearer.

c. Master Ralph de Beaumont

Ralph was physician to Henry II and appears to have been one of the few friends of John's at the royal court. He was one of Waleran of Meulan's clerks⁴¹ and served Henry II from the beginning of his reign till 1170 when he was drowned crossing the Channel.⁴² Ralph was a man of some importance in the king's counsel and was present at the small and intimate hearing of the dispute between the abbot of Battle and Hilary, bishop of Chichester in 1157.⁴³ He was a canon of Lincoln⁴⁴ and appeared frequently as witness to Bishop Robert Chesney's acta.⁴⁵ He probably knew John's friend Nicholas de Sigillo who was archdeacon of Huntingdon from 1164.⁴⁶

41. Crouch, D., The Beaumont Twins, Cambridge, (1986) p 154.

42. JS Letters ii, no. 210, n 1. Lally, 'The Court and Household of King Henry II' pp 336-7. Türk, E., NUGAE CURIALIUM: Le règne d'Henri II Plantagenêt (1145-1189) et l'éthique politique, Genève, (1977) p 28. The Chronicle of Battle Abbey, p 85.

43. Lally, 'The Court and Household of King Henry II' pp 206, 336. Türk, Le règne d'Henri II Plantagenêt (1145-1189) et l'éthique politique, p 28. The Chronicle of Battle Abbey, p 85.

44. Le Neve iii, pp 135-6. Türk, Le règne d'Henri II Plantagenêt (1145-1189) et l'éthique politique, p 28. Lally, 'The Court and Household of King Henry II' pp 206, 336.

45. English Episcopal Acta, Lincoln 1067-1185, p xliv.

46. Nicholas de Sigillo was also present at the hearing. Lally, 'The Court and Household of King Henry II' p 206. The Chronicle of Battle Abbey, p 85.

There is one extant letter to Ralph which cannot be precisely dated.⁴⁷ In this letter, John commended Ralph's works of piety as fitting to a true philosopher. Apparently, Ralph sent a bearer from whom John learned that Ralph 'have dared...to remember the brotherhood which is in the Lord'. John was sending back the bearer with letter no. 210 and some mission. So he asked Ralph to 'carry on as you have begun with the bearer of this letter and assist him when necessary'.⁴⁸ John promised to provide the bearer with his needs if the bearer enjoyed scholarship with John as much as the life at court.

The letter tempts us to make some conjectures but little can be known for certain. We can learn that Ralph offered support to John in a circumstance in which he would find little help and that John regarded Ralph as a true philosopher among those who lived 'with hawks and courtly trifles'.⁴⁹

d. Master Walter de Insula

Walter was Becket's sympathizer in the royal court, who was punished by the king because of it. He was a royal clerk and justice who appears as a canon of St. Paul's from about 1163 to about 1176.⁵⁰ He was a friend of John of

47. JS Letters ii, no. 210.

48. Similar expressions occur in John's other letters in which he requested tasks to recipients who were in difficult situations. (JS Letters nos. 203, 204, 240, 267.)

49. JS Letters ii, no. 210. For John's idea of 'philosopher' see 4-III-2-c(ii) & n. 110.

50. Le Neve i, p 83. JS Letters ii, no. 160, n 3. Barlow, TB, p 144. Mats nos. 253 & 254.

Salisbury, a sympathizer and supporter of Becket at the royal court. His place at the royal court was probably that which Geoffrey Ridel had held under Becket while Becket was royal chancellor,⁵¹ Walter de Insula's position was deputy to the acting-chancellor Geoffrey Ridel and also keeper of the royal seal.⁵² He was also employed as messenger.⁵³ During the Becket conflict, he appears to have served as informant for Becket and he transmitted news and documents.⁵⁴ Although he lost his office as keeper of the royal seal in autumn 1166, he seems to have remained at court and was employed by the king in other capacities. In 1170, he was sent as messenger to summon some English clergy to the royal court in Normandy.⁵⁵ While serving in the royal chancery, Walter probably came to know John as secretary to Archbishop Theobald. Walter was a close friend of John and he also knew John's brother Richard.⁵⁶

In 1166, John turned to Walter when he tried to obtain the king's peace for the son of his kinsman Master Geoffrey. The attempt was successful and we find John reporting the result proudly in his letter to Geoffrey.⁵⁷ We also learn

51. Geoffrey Ridel was Becket's deputy in the chancery and keeper of the king's seal. When Becket ceased to accompany the king in 1161, the ordinary duties of the chancellor were carried out by him. (Barlow, TB, p 82).

52. Lally, 'The Court and Household of King Henry II' p 117.

53. Barlow, TB, pp 144, 149.

54. Barlow, TB, p 163, Mats no. 273 also MTB, vi, p 126, n 5.

55. Barlow, TB, p 215.

56. JS Letters ii, nos. 180 & 189.

57. JS Letters ii, no. 161.

in the same letter that, by May 1166, the king had exacted an oath from Walter and others that they would not receive letters or messengers from the exiles.

After the Vézelay sentences, Walter de Insula was commissioned together with Richard de Luci to require the English bishops to make an appeal to the Pope against Becket. John assumed this task to be distasteful to Walter.⁵⁸ However, in spite of the oath he had taken, he appears to have received a letter from Becket through Herbert of Bosham and it was found that he had not arrested the messenger.⁵⁹ He was punished by the king by loss of his office around November 1166.⁶⁰

John probably learned of Walter's misfortune from Mats no. 253 from 'amicus' and no. 254 from Nicholas of Mont-Saint-Jacques to Becket written before November 1166. This 'amicus' who was acquainted with Nicholas, may have been Walter himself.⁶¹ John wrote letter no. 180 to Walter probably in autumn 1166⁶² to thank him for his kindness and to console him for his misfortune. Criticising the bishops who subvert the king, he hoped for the king's repentance.

58. JS Letters ii, no. 168. Barlow, TB, p 149.

59. Barlow, TB, p 161. Mats nos. 253 & 254.

60. Barlow, TB, p 161. Mats nos. 253 & 254.

61. Barlow, TB, pp 160-161.

62. For the dating of the letter, see the discussion in JS Letters ii, pp xxx-xxxi. Mats nos. 253 & 254 recount events that took place at the king's court in Normandy after his return from Brittany in early October 1166 (Eyton, pp 99-101). It is more likely that John sent no. 180 to Normandy after October.

Emphasizing the uprightness of his action and praising his behaviour which was just in God's eyes, John nevertheless expressed his grief and sympathy that the royal seal had been taken away from him. John gave the news that his brother Richard was now with him and that he was supported by literary pursuit. He sent his greetings to the clerks of the royal household who were not excommunicate.⁶³

This letter carried John's own message, but it also contained an open message from the Becket party to the king's chancery clerks. John may have written this party on the commission of Becket. While John criticised the king's behaviour and his ecclesiastical policy in his letters to Exeter, in this letter, John included little criticism of the king. Instead, he stressed the evil counsel of his advisers and the presence of the excommunicate at the royal court, with an aim to have the members of the royal court observe Becket's order of excommunication.

Walter probably wrote back to John. He appears to have discussed the conditions of peace with John and informed him that Geoffrey Ridel did not work for peace. Letter no. 189 was probably a reply to Walter's letter.⁶⁴ John apologized to Walter for his long silence which he attributed to the barrier of communication between them. Expressing his love and obligation to Walter, he described his recent state of mind, his faith in God, and deplored the transience of human affairs. As regards conditions of peace, John stated

63. JS Letters ii, no. 180.

64. No. 189 may have gone to Normandy along with nos. 188 and perhaps 190-91 which are dated about the end of 1166.

his objection to swearing to uphold the customs. He expressed surprise and reproached Geoffrey Ridel for not working for peace. John sent his and his brother's regards to his household and also to those clerks of the chancery who were not excommunicate.

Walter de Insula was supporter of Becket's cause in the king's court. He was also a personal friend of John. They belonged to the same social rank. They had sympathy for each other, shared common problems, both personal and political and helped each other in case of need. John regarded Walter with respect and felt obliged to him. Walter also served as a channel to John's other friends in the king's chancery to whom he wished to inform Becket's standpoint.

e. Richard of Ilchester

Richard of Ilchester was a royal servant who became bishop of Winchester in 1173 and died in 1188.⁶⁵ His origins are not certain, but he was related to Gilbert Foliot and maybe also to the family of Roger of Salisbury and Nigel of Ely.⁶⁶ He seems to have spent some time at the early stages

65. Le Neve ii, p 85. On Richard's biography see: Duggan, C., 'Richard of Ilchester, Royal servant and Bishop', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, vol 16, (1966), pp 1-21. Duggan, C. 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard of Poitiers. Their Roles in the Becket Dispute and its Aftermath', Thomas Becket, Actes du Colloque International de Sedières, 19-24 Août, 1973, Paris (1975) pp 71-83. Türk, Le règne d'Henri II Plantagenêt (1145-1189) et l'éthique politique, pp 26-7, 40-53. Lally, J. 'The Court and Household of King Henry II (1154-1189)' Ph.D. thesis, Liverpool, 1969.

66. Duggan, 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard of Poitiers', p 74. Duggan, C. 'Richard of Ilchester' p 2.

of his career in the household of the earl of Gloucester, where he may have made the acquaintance of the future Henry II.⁶⁷ He is recorded as 'scriptor curiae' from 1156⁶⁸ and was certainly a royal clerk in 1159.⁶⁹

In the early years of his chancellorship, Becket seems to have known Richard of Ilchester and he took part in the promotion of Richard as archdeacon of Poitiers in about 1162-3.⁷⁰ Richard also became one of the inner circle of the king's agents and administrators.⁷¹ Unlike John of Salisbury, who was educated abroad and served different masters, Richard of Ilchester seems to have started his career as a royal servant and remained essentially as such till the end.

67. Duggan, 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard of Poitiers', p 74.

68. Türk, Le règne d'Henri II Plantagenêt (1145-1189) et l'éthique politique, p 26.

69. Duggan, 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard of Poitiers' p 74. Duggan, 'Richard of Ilchester' p 2. GFL p 537.

70. Duggan, 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard of Poitiers' p 74. Lally, 'The Court and Household of King Henry II' p 245. Türk, Le règne d'Henri II Plantagenêt (1145-1189) et l'éthique politique, p 27.

71. Duggan, 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard of Poitiers' p 74.

72. In John's criticisms of royal servants through pseudonyms in the Entheticus (Entheticus Maior part III, 11 1275-1752), Richard of Ilchester does not seem to have been included. Laarhoven has discussed the identification of pseudonyms and its former attempts in his notes to 11 1275-1752 (Entheticus vol ii, pp 373-413) but Richard of Ilchester was not identified with any of them.

John probably first met Richard of Ilchester after Richard entered the service of King Henry II. No letter of John to Richard survives from this period and Richard does not seem to be mentioned in other works whether in real name or in pseudonym.⁷²

Between 1163 and 65, after Richard became archdeacon of Poitiers, he may have been engaged in at least two different missions -- to help enforce the king's ecclesiastical policy in Poitiers and to take part in the negotiations with the Pope for the legateship of York and for the papal approval of the Constitutions of Clarendon.⁷³ He was at Poitiers before 29 June 1163.⁷⁴ In his letter to Becket, John of Canterbury referred to 'Luscus noster', who has been identified by Duggan as Richard of Ilchester.⁷⁵ However, after the Council of Westminster, about the end of 1163, Richard of Ilchester and Arnulf of Lisieux worked together in the mission at the Curia at Sens. Richard travelled 'six times within three months' between England and France.⁷⁶

73. Mats no. 50.

74. Mats no. 25.

75. Duggan has examined and assessed opinions of scholars regarding the identity of 'Luscus noster', and concluded that it was Richard of Ilchester. (Duggan, 'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard of Poitiers' pp 75-6 & n 45.) It may be noted however that in Mats no. 103, John of Canterbury did not use 'Luscus noster' to designate Richard of Ilchester. From John of Salisbury's letters, it is hard to detect a discord between the bishop and archdeacon of Poitiers, at least after 1166. (JS Letters ii, no. 177 & n 4.) It may be that they were in discord in the earlier years.

76. Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, ed. Barlow, F., p xliii; Duggan, C., 'Richard of Ilchester', p 10; both citing Diceto Capitula Ymaginem Historiarum p 312 & Mats no. 50.

John was expecting Arnulf's visit to the Curia before early 1164 when he wrote his first extant letter to Becket after exile.⁷⁷ One of the last visits of Arnulf and Richard of Ilchester probably took place before 5 March 1164.⁷⁸ Richard of Ilchester was found again in Poitiers before 22 June 1164, summoning the army in Aquitaine against the possible attack of the French.⁷⁹ After the departure of the archbishop from Northampton in November 1164, Richard was among the king's embassy to the Papal Curia at Sens, but he was back in England by c. 25 January 1165.⁸⁰

Richard of Ilchester was busy working as the king's messenger almost exactly when John of Salisbury was engaged in the archbishop's diplomacy in France. When John arrived in France about the end of 1163, he had already been requested by Becket to assist in his diplomacy at the Papal Curia.⁸¹ John visited the Curia at least once, probably at the end of 1164.⁸² He may have met the king's envoys to the Curia after the archbishop's flight from Northampton.⁸³

77. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

78. Mats no. 50. This letter mentions previous envoys as Arnulf of Lisieux and Richard of Ilchester. In late February the king sent Geoffrey Ridel and John of Oxford.

79. Duggan, 'Richard of Ilchester', p 10. Mats no. 60.

80. Eyton, p 77.

81. JS Letters ii, no. 136.

82. JS Letters ii, no. 144.

83. JS Letters ii, no. 196 addressed to Roger of Worcester reported that John met Roger of Worcester at Sens, who was also a member of the king's embassy. This was the only occasion before no. 196 was written when Roger could have been in Sens.

John definitely met Richard of Ilchester in Paris before summer 1165,⁸⁴ but it is difficult to determine when.⁸⁵ At any rate, their meeting took place in Paris when Richard of Ilchester promised help to John of Salisbury.⁸⁶

On that account John wrote to Richard of Ilchester in the summer of 1165.⁸⁷ The letter appears to belong to the group of letters John sent presumably to Woodstock.⁸⁸ The possible recipients of John's letters on this occasion included the bishops of Bayeux and Exeter, the prior of Merton, and others and John seems to have made a campaign to obtain his own peace. The letter to Richard of Ilchester is short and it concentrated on Richard's promise of help. John stated that he had wavered in uncertain hope (presumably fostered by Richard) and that he had wasted time and money on that account. John attributed the so far unsuccessful efforts of Richard to the 'confusion of war' or 'the private enemy with whom...I will never have peace'.⁸⁹ John asked him pathetically to advise what course of action he should take and to let him know if he had any chance of

84. JS Letters ii, no. 149.

85. There are at least two possibilities. Just after John arrived in Paris in January, Richard of Ilchester may have passed through Paris. John was near Paris just before he wrote no. 144 in January 1165. Richard may also have passed Paris on his way back to England from his mission in January 1165.

86. JS Letters ii, no. 149, also nos. 150 & 151.

87. JS Letters ii, no. 149.

88. See the section 2-V-3-b(i).

89. The identity of John's enemy is not clear. (JS Letters ii, no. 149, n 2). But it may be noted that Richard was working with Arnulf of Lisieux on the king's mission at that time.

returning and if he had, to arrange passage through Kent. Since some letters written for the same purpose do not survive, it is difficult to discern John's expectations of Richard's role precisely. Richard of Ilchester was the only royal clerk. At the time of the Constitutions of Clarendon, Richard nominally held a lowly office,⁹⁰ but he was probably in the course of establishing his influence on the king.⁹¹ John may have expected Richard to promote his case more privately and directly to the king. He was probably also in a position to arrange John's passage. Richard of Ilchester probably received another letter from John asking for the restoration of his churches and other revenues,⁹² but he did not write back to John.⁹³

Shortly before letter no. 149 was written, in the spring of 1165, Richard of Ilchester was sent by the king on a diplomatic mission to Germany and attended the council of Würzburg. It was mainly on that account that he was excommunicated by Becket at Vézelay on 12 June 1166.⁹⁴ In the summer of 1166, Richard appears in John's letters in various connections. In about June, he was one of the messengers sent to the French king to excuse King Henry's

90. Duggan, 'Richard of Ilchester' p 10.

91. In 1174, according to Diceto, 'no one could speak to the king more intimately, more urgently or more effectively'. (Duggan, 'Richard of Ilchester' p 9 Radulfi de Diceto Decani Londoniensis Opera Historica. The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto, ed. Stubbs, W., vol 1, London, (1876) Capitula Ymaginum Historiarum, pp 381-2.

92. JS Letters ii, no. 152 & p xxiv.

93. JS Letters ii, no. 181.

94. JS Letters ii, no. 168.

absence from a proposed conference due to illness.⁹⁵ In John's letter to John of Canterbury, who had made peace with the king by July 1166,⁹⁶ his archdeacon⁹⁷ was referred to for one thing as the target of antagonism of the hostile Poitevins and for another as a possible intermediary to obtain John's peace with the king.⁹⁸ The archdeacon accompanied the king in the campaign in Brittany and was at Fougères in July 1166.⁹⁹

In the summer of 1166 also, Richard appeared in John's letters to Ralph Niger.¹⁰⁰ The two letters were written after the Vézelay sentences at short intervals. On hearing the news of Richard's excommunication, Ralph asked John to speak to Becket on behalf of Richard of Ilchester, an intimate friend of his. Stating that the archdeacon was excommunicated without his knowledge, John promised to do his best to 'turn the archbishop in the archdeacon of Poitiers's favour'. Ralph also asked John's advice on visiting the royal court where he would meet the excommunicated archdeacon. He thought about the problem of associating with the excommunicate and gave appropriate

95. JS Letters ii, no. 168.

96. JS Letters ii, no. 177.

97. The 'archdeacon' has been identified as Richard of Ilchester. (JS Letters ii, no. 177 n.)

98. 'Et fortasse cum archidiacono vestro, cuius verebatur industriam et familiaritatem eius ad vos habebat suspectam, exercuit inimicitas ut, ... cum reconciliatus fuerit, de cetero contra eum mutire non audeat...' (JS Letters ii, no. 177).

99. Eyton, p 96.

100. JS Letters ii, nos. 181-2. For letters to Ralph Niger, see the section 4-III-2-b.

advice to Ralph on behalf of Richard 'for whom I feel such whole-hearted respect and friendship as pure charity allows.'¹⁰¹ Richard of Ilchester was himself deeply concerned about his excommunication and consulted on the matter with Ralph de Diceto.¹⁰²

Richard of Ilchester appears to have spent much of his time in the next few years as itinerant justice.¹⁰³ Meanwhile, he was absolved by William of Pavia, but fell under the ban once again on 29 May 1169.¹⁰⁴ It was probably due to his involvement in various schemes against Becket from May 1169. He was one of the royal officials who assembled what seems to have been a general council for the English church on 15 May 1169 at Northampton.¹⁰⁵ It was held in support of the bishops of London and Salisbury and about this time, Prior Odo of Christ Church, Canterbury wrote to Richard asking to be excused from joining in the appeal against the archbishop.¹⁰⁶ Around September 1169, he was a principal agent who was ordered by the king to obtain the adherence of the English church to the king's measures against ecclesiastical censures.¹⁰⁷ Around the time of the coronation, he appears to have been in assistance of the

101. JS Letters ii, no. 181.

102. Barlow, TB, p 159. Mats no. 211.

103. Duggan, 'Richrd of Ilchester' p 7.

104. JS Letters ii, no. 241. Mats no. 550. Barlow, TB, pp 147, 184.

105. Barlow, TB, p 186.

106. Mats no. 552.

107. Barlow, TB, p 191.

young king.¹⁰⁸ Richard of Ilchester was at Bur-le-Roi a few days before Christmas 1170 when the king uttered the fatal words that incited the four knights who were to commit the murder of the archbishop.¹⁰⁹ In spite of his role against Becket, we can gather little information on Richard from John's letters. No mention was made of Richard of Ilchester in John's letters after 1168.

In the aftermath of Becket's murder in 1173-4, we find John of Salisbury writing testimonials to the Pope and cardinals on behalf of the bishop-elect of Winchester, formerly archdeacon of Poitiers.¹¹⁰ On the occasion on which the consecration of the newly elected archbishop and bishops was hampered by the appeal of the young king,¹¹¹ many testimonials were sent to the Pope and cardinals by prominent churchmen including Gilbert Foliot and Arnulf of

108. Barlow, TB, pp 206, 215.

109. Barlow, TB, pp 234-5.

110. JS Letters ii, nos. 312-320.

111. For the young king's protest to the election, JS Letters ii, p xlv: Foreville, R. L'Eglise et la Royauté, pp 373ff: Mayr-Harting 'Henry II and the papacy, 1170-1189' JEH vol 16 (1965) pp 39-53: GFL, nos. 221-6, 288: Councils and Synods, pp 956-63.

Lisieux.¹¹² John wrote to the Pope and other papal officials in his own name as well as in the names of Bartholomew of Exeter and Prior Odo of Christ Church, Canterbury. In some letters, he emphasised Richard's love to the martyr and stated that 'he gives comfort to martyr's many disciples who flock to him in their time of need, and to the best of his ability strives to imitate him'.¹¹³ In 1174-6, we find John witnessing judge-delegate decisions by Bishop Richard of Winchester.¹¹⁴

During the years of the Becket dispute, John and Richard of Ilchester were important members of opposite parties. It would have been difficult for both of them to act openly and successfully on behalf of their friends on opposite sides. In spite of Richard's role against the archbishop, John clearly remained a friend to Richard and expected the same of him. Although Richard did not reply John's letters, in the summer of 1166, John felt it possible to obtain the peace of the king through the mediation of the

112. no.	addressee	on behalf of
AL 92	Albert & Theodwin	elect of Winchester
AL 94	"	elect of Bath
AL 95	"	"
GF 222	Pope	elect of Bath
GF 223	Pope	elect of Winchester
GF 224	Pope	elect of Norwich
GF 225	Pope	elect of Ely
GF 226	William of Pavia	elect of Winchester
GF 228	Pope	elect of Lincoln
JS 316	Albert & Theodwin	elect of Winchester
JS 317	Humbald of Ostia	elect of Winchester
JS 318	Gratian	elect of Winchester
JS 319	Pope (from B. Exeter)	elect of Winchester
JS 320	Pope (from Odo)	elect of Winchester
JS 321	Pope (from B. Exeter)	elect of Hereford
	testimonials for Richard,	elect of Canterbury are excluded.

113. JS Letters ii, nos. 317 & 318.

114. JS Letters ii, p xlvi, n 2.

bishop and the archdeacon of Poitiers, According to John, the excommunication of Richard took place without his knowledge and he promised to speak for him to the archbishop. He also took trouble to find ways so that his student Ralph Niger was permitted with just reason to communicate with him. John's feelings towards the excommunicate Richard is clearly contrasted against his attitude towards the excommunicate in Christ Church.¹¹⁵ John's friendship to Richard of Ilchester may also account for his curious silence on Richard's role at the council of Würzburg. While John clamoured against the oath-swearing of John of Oxford,¹¹⁶ John simply mentioned Richard of Ilchester's name among those excommunicated at Vézelay.¹¹⁷ During the later years of the conflict, John kept silent about Richard of Ilchester's deeds against Becket

John's feeling for Richard of Ilchester remained unchanged till after the murder of the archbishop. The removal of the arch-enemy of the king made their friendship revive. John strongly supported Richard of Ilchester, now bishop-elect of Winchester that he might duly be consecrated and perhaps on account of this, he became witness of judge-delegate decisions by Bishop Richard. But it was not just on account of their old friendship that John supported him, but the expectation that Richard would be the central person to work for true peace and order of Church and State. Richard also gained support from other quarters and appears

115. JS Letters ii, nos. 242, 245, 246, 248, 292, 295.

116. JS Letters ii, nos. 168, 177, 214.

117. JS Letters ii, no. 168.

to have met their expectations. According to Charles Duggan, 'for several years after his elevation to the see of Winchester he was among the most decisive personalities in the English State. It was in those years that a general pattern of harmonious compromise between the rival jurisdictions of Church and State was worked out. Richard was almost uniquely fitted to facilitate this transition, and the situation in England after Becket's martyrdom provided an unusually favourable opportunity'.¹¹⁸

Although Richard never betrayed the king's interest and nobody could have any doubt that he was a faithful servant of the king, he may have had different feeling towards Becket and his cause. He was certainly troubled when ecclesiastical censures fell upon him. Unlike royal servants such as Geoffrey Ridel who wholeheartedly opposed the archbishop and plotted against his return,¹¹⁹ Richard's own ideas about the relationship between Church and State may have been closer to that of Becket, hence his criticism of Archbishop Richard that he lost every point Becket had fought for.¹²⁰ There may have been a just reason for the contemporaries to call Richard a friend of the martyr who 'strives to imitate him'.¹²¹

Finally, judging from the support he received as bishop-elect of Winchester, we are inclined to believe that

118. Duggan, 'Richard of Ilchester' p 21.

119. Barlow, *TB*, pp 200, 211.

120. Mayr-Harting, 'Henry II and the Papacy 1170-1189', pp 39-53. Gerald of Wales: Vita Sancti Remigii, ed. Dimock, J.F., RS (1877) pp 69-70.

121. JS Letters ii, no. 317.

Richard had one quality in common with John: they were both approachable to people whose ideas and interests are different and who belonged to the opposition. John interceded with Archbishop Thomas for his old friend and patron, the bishop of Salisbury. Gerard Pucelle relied on John to defend his conduct and arrange for his meeting with the archbishop. Ralph Niger did not hesitate to ask John to speak to the archbishop on behalf of Richard of Ilchester. On John's part, Richard of Ilchester was the only royal servant whom he solicited repeatedly for help to obtain the king's peace. Maybe Richard 'gave comfort to the martyr's many disciples'. Prior Odo of Canterbury wrote to Richard of Ilchester to be excused from taking part in Gilbert Foliot's appeal. Arnulf of Lisieux, in his last days, wrote to the bishop of Winchester in the hope of recovering the king's favour.¹²²

What characterized both Richard of Ilchester and John of Salisbury during the Becket conflict and its aftermath is first and foremost obedience to orders and faithfulness to their masters. But John was dedicated to the cause of his master without being fanatical. Richard was also devoted to his duties, but he probably did not identify his ideas and feelings with those of his master. Both of them probably allowed their own opinions and sentiments to successfully co-exist with their services to their masters.

Richard of Ilchester's qualities are described as follows: 'Exceptional skill in the detail of administration, unusual energy in the execution of his office, patience and

122. Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, ed. Barlow, F., no. 141. See also nos. 107, 112, 119, 129.

persuasiveness in diplomacy, integrity and constancy according to his concept of his duty: these are the qualities which made him an almost indispensable servant of the king through so long a period'.¹²³

John also shared some of these qualities, at least to some degree. But he was not a royal servant. He even refused to opt for the king when he still had the chance. It was not merely because he could not agree with the king's conditions for peace. Just like royal servants, fidelity and efficiency in his service were part of his values. But he also wanted to live a morally commendable life and spend time in literary pursuit and in exchanges of ideas. John probably did not want to serve the master who valued little of such things. Perhaps he wished to be appreciated not as a function in an administration but as a 'philosopher'.

3. Conclusions

John's association with members of the royal court appears to have been fairly limited. It is not likely that he had much contact with lay magnates of the realm who appeared in the royal court from time to time. John was probably not close to the king's servants who served him in his daily life or met his material needs. They were secular personnel, serving a secular ruler, in pursuit of secular interests. The range of John's association in the king's itinerant court was probably limited to royal clerks, especially chancery clerks and chaplains. They were only a handful and a minority group. The king's clerks often had

123. Duggan, 'Richard of Ilchester,' pp 20-21.

the same kind of training as John and therefore shared ideas and feelings with him. John may have had chances of associating with the members of permanent administrative institutions in England. Since many of the king's clerks were temporary members of his court and had offices and duties elsewhere, John may have known them in some other capacity. During the Becket conflict, there appear to have been clerks, especially in the chancery, who were sympathetic to Becket. At least in the beginning, there may have been a pro-Becket group among the king's servants. They were either Becket's friends or those who agreed with him in matters of principle or both. Amid the hordes of royal servants who wholeheartedly denounced the archbishop in order to please the king and who, though in the service of Becket, renounced him to serve the king, there were conscientious clerks who were against the breach between the king and the archbishop. Walter de Insula may have been one of them. He tried to support Becket by sending information and helping messengers. Perhaps he felt critical about the vice-chancellor Geoffrey Ridel, archdeacon of Canterbury, who was hostile to Becket. Walter was also John's personal friend who knew his brother Richard and helped his relative, the son of Master Geoffrey.

Richard of Ilchester was another conscientious clerk. He was friendly enough to John to promise his assistance to obtain the king's peace. When Richard was excommunicated, he did not take the matter lightly. While he did not stop serving the king, he sought advice from Ralph de Diceto and possibly Ralph Niger on what he should do.

However, John's correspondents at the king's court were king's servants and they were almost totally dependent on the king for their career and promotion. Although they were concerned about the conflict between the king and the archbishop and they had their own ideas on what the relationship of the Church and State should be, they had to obey the will of the king and make the utmost effort to please him. Activities that would deeply displease the king were impossible. Correspondence with Becket's party had to stop as the prospect of peace withered. After the murder of the archbishop, during the period of readjustment, the king had no objection to his clerks associating with former clerks of the archbishop, especially when it might enhance the king's ecclesiastical policy.

IX Conclusions to Chapter Two

People in this chapter came to know John of Salisbury as a clerk in Archbishop Theobald's household. They accepted him in different capacities. Milo of Thérouanne and Pope Adrian IV knew him as a messenger of Archbishop Theobald. English bishops regarded him mainly as a clerk of Archbishop Theobald. For clerks in the services of English bishops, John was a clerk of the archbishop, but he was a man of the same rank and class with the same kind of education and interest. This applies to clerks in the royal chancery. For his fellow clerks in the household of Theobald, John was a colleague with whom they cooperated in business, shared interest and pleasure. Little rivalry within the household can be detected through John's correspondence. Monks of Christ Church and other religious institutions also associated with John as a clerk of the archbishop, but quite often they were friends.

There appear to have been certain types of people with whom John succeeded in making good relationships. John and the religious shared interest in literary or spiritual matters and they engaged in exchanges of friendship on both sides of the Channel. With clerks in the household of Theobald as well as in the royal chancery and chanceries of other bishops, John often worked in cooperation with them and they helped each other in carrying out their business. Some of them shared with John the interest in literary and spiritual matters. They often had friends in common and some of them knew John's family and kinsmen. Some clerks were members of the chapter of the same church.

With some people, John found it difficult to make friends. Among English bishops, John could not develop close relationships with those of noble birth, those from influential families, and those who held important positions among the bishops. Such factors constituted unsurmountable difficulty for him to make friends. Among bishops, John succeeded in making friends with those who shared interest with him. Finally the most important factor in making friends was instinctive likes and dislikes. John and Henry II did not like each other. Of Robert of Melun, John formed an unfavourable opinion probably because he did not like him as his master at Paris. Pope Adrian IV had a special place among John's correspondents. Compared to other English or Norman visitors to the Papal Curia, John was specially favoured by Adrian. John had respect and admiration for the Pope and he was much influenced by him.

During the Becket conflict, relationships John had formed as a clerk of Archbishop Theobald came to play a part. While in exile, John naturally wrote for friendship. When necessary, he also tried to make use of his former friends. John's friendship was a major factor of maintaining the support of Exeter for Becket's cause. John's correspondence played an important part in maintaining the obedience of Christ Church. In 1168, when John sent appeal letters to English clergy and religious, those with whom John had had good relationships tended to respond favourably to John whether or not they could meet his request. It was partly because John knew them well enough to find ways to appeal to them in the best way possible. Needless to say, when the relationship between

John's correspondents and Becket was smooth, John's relationship with them was all the easier. When Archbishop Thomas's cause was in direct clash with the interests of the recipients, there was no way of gaining their support.