
Introduction

Biography

The Chapelle Saint-Piat, attached by dramatic flying buttresses to the rear of the Cathédrale de Notre-Dame in Chartres, is the final resting place of John of Salisbury (late 1110s–1180). He was interred here in 1911 after archaeological investigations in the abbey of St Marie de Josaphat at Leves uncovered his remains in their original ornate Romanesque sarcophagus.¹ John now rests under a medieval fresco of the miracles of another famous scholar who made his home at Chartres, Fulbert (d. 1028), in a conjunction that links the eleventh- and twelfth-century intellectual life of the cathedral city. A plaque outside the chapel commemorates John's career as Bishop of Chartres from 1176 to 1180, the twilight of his life and a period from which little evidence remains.² John's early years are similarly shadowy. We know he was born in Old Sarum some time between 1115 and 1120 during the bishopric of Roger (d. 1139); he may have been the son of a married canon.³ Letters from John to his brother Richard and half-brother Robert survive.⁴ References to John as canon of Salisbury, and to revenues held by him within the diocese, demonstrate his continued connection to that area.⁵

It was in Salisbury that John's early education occurred, as memorably recorded in the *Policraticus*. John describes being entrusted to a priest to be taught the psalms – that is, how to read – but the unscrupulous priest attempted instead to teach John and another student the art of crystal gazing.⁶ It is to John's *Metalogicon* (II. 10), where he describes his studies in France from 1136 to 1147, that we must turn to receive a detailed account of his later, and more intellectually challenging, education.⁷ John names his teachers on the Mont Sainte-Geneviève, in the heart of Paris: Peter Abelard (1079–1142/43) for dialectic, Alberic, 'the best of the

other dialecticians', and Robert of Melun (c.1100–1167) also for dialectic.⁸ John then became a pupil of William of Conches (c.1090–after 1154) for grammar from 1138 to 1141, while simultaneously studying rhetoric with Thierry of Chartres (c.1100–c.1155) and the German Hardewin, who taught John the *quadrivium*. In 1141, John began to study theology with Gilbert of Poitiers, and from 1142 to 1144 he studied with Robert Pullen (d. c.1146).⁹ His final years of education were spent under the tutelage of Simon of Poissy, a theologian, whom John describes as 'a faithful but dull teacher'.¹⁰ Other figures mentioned by John in connection with this period of learning include Peter Helias (c.1100–after 1166), Richard l'Évêque (d. 1181) and Adam du Petit Pont (1100×02?–1157×69?).¹¹

The location of John's education has provoked substantial debate. In the 1890s, Alexander Clerval, at one point superior of the choir school at Chartres, reinforced the narrative that John's studies with William of Conches and Thierry took place at the cathedral school at Chartres.¹² This view was refuted by Richard W. Southern in a paper delivered in 1965, in which he argued that the association of these scholars with Chartres had contributed to an inflated sense of the importance of the school in the development of medieval education, questioning not only whether John ever actually studied at Chartres, but also the existence of a specific genre of teaching unique to that cathedral school.¹³ Southern pointed out that John could equally have heard William's teachings in Paris, though Peter Dronke has pointed out that there is insubstantial evidence to link Thierry, often called '*Carnotensis*' but never '*Parisiensis*', with that city.¹⁴ The definitive resolution of whether or not John ever studied at Chartres seems intractable on the basis of the current state of evidence.¹⁵ Bearing that in mind, more recent studies that seek to look beyond the chronological and locative issues raised by the account in *Metalogicon*, Book II. 10, and to reconstruct, instead, what John actually learned during his period in France seem to be pursuing a more productive line of enquiry.¹⁶ Katharine Keats-Rohan, noting that John's account of his education in the *Metalogicon* is at times highly critical, has pointed out that this passage can be read not simply as a biography, but also as a polemical 'cautionary tale' demonstrating the dangers of over-absorption in dialectic, which instead must be balanced with studies of all parts of the *trivium* (grammar, logic and dialectic, rhetoric) and *quadrivium* (arithmetic, astronomy, geometry, music).¹⁷ John's account also emphasises the diversity of the teaching available in the schools of northern France, and highlights the fluid nature of education in this period; he spent time not only as a pupil,

but also as a teacher.¹⁸ There is little doubt from John's narrative that he was exposed to the foremost educative trends in the twelfth century, from the neo-Platonic theories forwarded by Thierry of Chartres to the nominalism of Peter Abelard.

Under the recommendation of Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153), who described him as 'a friend and a friend of my friends', John joined the episcopal court of Theobald of Canterbury (d. 1161) in late 1147.¹⁹ Between 1148 and 1162 he had a broad range of administrative duties in the episcopal court of Canterbury, which permitted him to travel repeatedly to Italy and France, as well as throughout England, as attested to in the prologue to Book III of the *Metalogicon*.²⁰ Notable among these trips are his journey to Rheims in the spring of 1148 to attend the papal council, and a period at the papal court of Pope Adrian IV (1100–1159) in 1155–56 to obtain the grant of Ireland as a hereditary fee for Henry II (1133–89). During his time in Canterbury, John composed some 135 letters, which he wrote either under his own auspices or for his master, Archbishop Theobald.²¹ It was in this milieu that John's major works – the *Metalogicon* and the *Policraticus* – were completed by the late 1150s.

On 3 June 1162, Thomas Becket (1118–1170) succeeded Theobald as Archbishop of Canterbury. Tension with Henry II heightened throughout the early years of Thomas's episcopate, and in November 1164 Thomas fled into exile.²² John was already in exile, having left in either late 1163 or early 1164.²³ John first went to Paris, and then to Rheims, where he lodged with his friend Peter, abbot of Celle (1115–1183).²⁴ Although John did not join the Becket contingent he remained in constant contact with its members, and wrote many letters on their behalf.²⁵ John's period of exile seems to have been one of soul-searching, as evidence of increased reference to biblical and patristic texts in his letters suggests.²⁶ During this period, under the encouragement of Peter of Celle, John wrote a continuation of the *Chronica* of Siegbert of Gembloux (c.1030–1112), the *Historia pontificalis*.²⁷ Unfortunately incomplete, covering only the period from the Council of Rheims in 1148 to around 1152, it provides not only valuable material about this period, but also an insight into John's methods as a historian.²⁸ In November 1170, John returned to Canterbury in advance of Becket's arrival. He was present at the moment of Becket's murder, although it seems that he fled from the scene, as evinced by the derivative account of it preserved in his *Vita Thomae*.²⁹ After the murder John probably remained in Canterbury, where he assembled the collection of his letters and promoted the cult of Becket. In 1176, John was elevated to the see of Chartres, where, as noted, little evidence of his episcopal career has

been preserved. He died on 25 October 1180, bequeathing his books and belongings to the Cathédrale de Notre-Dame.³⁰

The scholarly tradition

John of Salisbury has been extensively studied. The subject of three biographies, he has also come under consideration in analyses of political theory of the Middle Ages, in histories of educational development and for his role as a witness to many events in the 1150s and 1160s.³¹ Often, these studies have sought to situate John's work within larger narratives, such as the history of twelfth-century scholasticism, the development of medieval Aristotelianism and the rise of medieval humanism. The present study seeks to establish an alternative context within which to view John's intellectual contributions, namely what I will term the 'Roman Renaissance' of the twelfth century. It offers a thorough contextualisation of John's political thought, while, by extension, demonstrating the way in which Roman classical philosophy, particularly the works of Cicero and Seneca, shaped philosophical theorising in the Middle Ages. In so doing, it aims to demonstrate how John's work epitomised many of the trends now seen as characteristic of the transformation of the twelfth-century educational environment. As an Englishman who travelled abroad to the schools of Paris, he was part of a cosmopolitan educational elite that participated in cutting-edge theoretical debates led by some of the foremost teachers of the day. John was described by Charles Homer Haskins in his study *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* as 'the best classical scholar of the age'.³² Of course, such a presentation is somewhat circular; we regard John as characteristic in part because so much of our received narrative about education in the twelfth century depends on what can be learned from his extensive surviving works. This has led, in the past, to an over-emphasis on John's significance (and on the twelfth century more generally) in the context of the medieval classical revival. This study aims, instead, to show how John accessed, read and used his sources, with the goal of demonstrating ways in which he was exceptional, as well as ways in which he incorporated ideas familiar to his contemporaries. Even if John was – to paraphrase the words he ascribed to the teacher Bernard of Chartres – a dwarf standing on the shoulder of giants, the interesting question is how he reached that position.³³

This approach aims to redress the dismissal by Charles Howard McIlwain in the 1930s of John as a 'systematiser rather than an innovator', given to 'rapid skimming' of classical works without real engagement,

a historiographical position that has remained persistent in studies of John's use of sources.³⁴ In many respects, Hans Liebeschütz's *Mediaeval Humanism in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury*, an authoritative work published in 1950, exemplifies this stance.³⁵ While Liebeschütz correctly identified the Roman origins of many of John's theories, he based his conclusions on an image of John as a vapid scholar given to excerption and devious invention, while overestimating the range of texts at John's disposal. Janet Martin, on the other hand, presented a more conservative impression of the breadth of John's knowledge. Her unpublished thesis, 'John of Salisbury and the Classics' (1968), assessed John's access to classical sources, concluding that much of his material was obtained through compilations and extracts.³⁶ One, no doubt unforeseen, contribution of her findings, however, was a lasting impression of John's views as derivative or unoriginal in some fashion. In thinking about what is 'original' about John's works, it is necessary to tread a middle ground between the implication that only 'radical originality' counts as a marker of value for a text and the relativist position that values 'synthetic originality', but in doing so, risks making all texts 'original'.³⁷ Nevertheless, it is undeniable that synthesis and borrowing can be regarded as cornerstones of John's compositional methodology, and are at the root of how he treated classical and Christian sources. Hans Berman noted how John achieved such synthesis in his writings 'through the use of concepts which combined contradictory norms by abstracting their common qualities'.³⁸ By this reading paradox, not plagiarism, characterises John's work, while such methods of synthesis and extraction can still be seen as innovative, if not 'radically original', in the context of the historical moment of production of his texts.

Scholarship on John since the early twentieth century has been marked by several phases of analysis. As noted, John's career was first examined extensively as an exemplar of twelfth-century scholasticism. The great contribution of Clement C. J. Webb, editor of the *Policraticus* and the *Metalogicon*, was an impetus to this tradition, which is exemplified in the later work of Reginald L. Poole.³⁹ Arguably, Liebeschütz's study established John at the forefront of medieval humanism, while in the second half of the twentieth century, studies of John received a new catalyst with the publication of the first volume of his letters (1955) and of the *Historia pontificalis* (1956), both of which prompted revisions of the chronology of John's career. Martin's contributions revised impressions of John's sources, while the structure of the *Policraticus* was analysed in 1977 by Max Kerner.⁴⁰ In 1979, the second volume of letters by John was published, heralding the culmination of a new phase of Johnian scholarship.

Coinciding with the 800th anniversary of the death of John, a colloquium was held in 1980, which resulted in a volume (1984) containing a provocative and wide-ranging series of articles covering the scope of his learning and career.⁴¹ The outline of John's later years was established in more detail through the work of Anne Duggan on the Becket correspondence.⁴² Meanwhile new editions of John's works were prepared: the *Entheticus* was edited by Jan van Laarhoven in 1987; the *Metalogicon* by J. Barrie Hall and Katharine Keats-Rohan in 1991; and the first half of the *Policraticus* by Keats-Rohan in 1993.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s these studies have provided the basis for further analyses of John's life and works. A significant figure in this 'new wave' of research on John is Cary Nederman, who has produced substantial work on John's Aristotelian debt, although his appraisal of John's political contributions is, on occasion, at the expense of acknowledging their strong ecclesiastical dimensions.⁴³ In contrast to this are the unpublished PhD thesis and articles of John McLoughlin, which focus on John's role in ecclesiastical circles, and a number of articles by Julie Barrau which illustrate the extent of John's dependence on biblical and patristic sources.⁴⁴ These studies can now be supplemented with the account given by Christophe Grellard of John's scepticism, which focuses largely on theological aspects of his writings.⁴⁵ The range of essays in *A Companion to John of Salisbury* (2015) shows the breadth of themes John's works offer for scholarly analysis.⁴⁶ However, it remains the case that accounts of his political thought have tended, by and large, to concentrate on the supposed highlights of John's works: the theory of tyrannicide and the metaphor of the polity as a human body.⁴⁷ A tradition of over-emphasising Books IV–VI of the *Policraticus* would seem to stem from John Dickinson's selection of these 'political chapters' of the *Policraticus* for his translated part-edition (1927), a limitation in scope also suffered by the latest part-translation of the *Policraticus* by Nederman (1990).⁴⁸ John Hosler's recent study of John's military knowledge has, by contrast, brought the less-studied books of the *Policraticus* to the fore, while David Bloch has given renewed attention to the *Metalogicon*.⁴⁹ Following this momentum, this study seeks not only to examine the *Policraticus* as a whole, but also to look at it in the context of John's other works, notably the *Metalogicon* and *Entheticus*, texts alongside which it circulated in the earliest manuscripts. Such an approach will lead to a more nuanced account of John's political theory and use of classical sources.

The case for a ‘Roman Renaissance’

The application of the term ‘Renaissance’ to the twelfth century is a contested one. However, like other so-called renaissances of the medieval and early modern period, it has as one of its dominant features a resurgence of interest in classical texts. Much attention has focused on the influence of Plato and Aristotle, despite the limited availability of their texts at this juncture. Plato’s *Timaeus*, which circulated in partial form with the commentary by Calcidius (fl. 321), was a very popular text in the twelfth century, with thirty-three extant manuscripts dating from the second half of the 1100s.⁵⁰ In all, there are over 150 extant medieval manuscripts of *Timaeus*, either in the Calcidian translation or in the translation by Cicero.⁵¹ Twelfth-century interest in the text is also clear from the number of commentaries on it, notably those of Bernard of Chartres and William of Conches.⁵² While the continuity of the Platonic tradition is assured through its absorption into other classical and patristic sources, particularly through its neo-Platonic manifestations, the paucity of texts available rendered Plato’s views opaque, at times, to the medieval scholar. Meanwhile, the logical works of Aristotle were slowly becoming part of the medieval curriculum in the twelfth century, with John one of the principal witnesses to their reception. At the start of the twelfth century only *Categoriae* and *De interpretatione* were known in Latin, through the translations of Boethius (forming, along with Porphyry’s *Isagoge*, the so-called *logica vetus*). From about 1120 onwards, the rest of Aristotle’s logical works became known, although full translations of his ethical and political works (most notably of the *Eudemian Ethics*, *Nichomachean Ethics* and *Politics*) would not be made until the thirteenth century. John’s access to the *logica vetus* and to the *logica nova* – the *Analytica Priora*, *Topica* and *Sophistici Elenchi* in rediscovered translations by Boethius, and the translation from Greek of the *Analytica posteriora* by James of Venice – has been much studied.⁵³ The *Metalogicon* can be read, thus, as an exposé of Aristotelian logic, with the second book introducing the value of Aristotle’s logic, the third book summarising the *Topics* and the fourth containing a summary of the *Prior* and *Posterior Analytics*.⁵⁴ John refers to Aristotle as ‘the philosopher’, although Bloch has recently questioned the degree of John’s familiarity with the available Aristotelian corpus.⁵⁵ While John was indisputably an ‘early adopter’ of Aristotelian ideas, their influence on John’s work has frequently been overstated, and this has led to the under-appreciation of other, more accessible, streams of influence.⁵⁶

To turn to the Roman inheritance, one of the philosophical streams

most easily accessed in the twelfth century was Stoicism, an inherently varied political discourse frequently mingled with other philosophies. Roman philosophers of the late Empire and early Republic reworked Greek sources and ideas, as demonstrated by Cicero's *De officiis*, a revision of the treatise *On Duty* by the Greek Stoic Panaetius.⁵⁷ Cicero, an eclectic thinker, identified himself as a sceptic – denying the plausibility of absolute knowledge in favour of what was most probable – but despite this difference of opinion, he remained an important conduit for Stoic ideas for later readers. A purer Stoicism was found in the writings of Seneca, also popular in the medieval period.⁵⁸ While John's use of Roman sources has long been recognised as one of the dominant features of his works, the specifics of how they served to shape his philosophical and political position has not yet been determined. No complete synthesis of his utilisation of Roman Stoic texts has yet been undertaken, and many of the studies have thus far focused mainly on John's use of Cicero.⁵⁹ The specifics of John's access to the writings of Cicero and Seneca, and other classical works, will be discussed in Chapter 1. In part, one purpose of this investigation is to probe the answer given by Sten Ebbesen to the question: 'Where were the Stoics in the Middle Ages?' – to which Ebbesen answered, 'everywhere and nowhere'.⁶⁰

This theme was elaborated in Alisdair MacIntyre's *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, where Stoicism is regarded as 'one of the permanent moral possibilities within the cultures of the West'. In that text, MacIntyre characterised the confrontation between Becket and Henry II as a conflict of authoritative roles, secular and divine, but he also recognised that the protagonists shared a common 'narrative structure', a 'shared framework of detailed agreement on human and divine justice', that is, an understanding of what constitutes the common good.⁶¹ Thus, an intellectual consensus existed between these political actors on the need for common interests to take precedence over those of the individual; by this reading, society is an arena for maximising the good of the community, not for achieving individual ambitions. This agreement on the common good was partially shaped by a set of shared Christian values, which emphasised one's obligations towards others within the community of the Church. It was also, however, shaped by an antique tradition of discourse on the appropriate content of the law for social groupings, found in the writings of Plato, Aristotle and other classical thinkers, as well as in the biblical book of Deuteronomy. In this present study, it is argued that a normative ideal of community similarly underpins John of Salisbury's writings. In this respect, the *Policraticus* marks an important milestone in the develop-

ment of medieval communitarian thought. Cary Nederman has also identified communitarian traits in John's writings, deriving his argument from the mutuality of relationships within the organic model of the body politic, memorably presented by John in Book V of the *Policraticus*.⁶²

This study, however, will show how the organic model went above and beyond Nederman's claims on its part, with particular reference to how John developed a sophisticated theory of political duties, emphasising solidarity and moral obligation within the community. Chapter 2 discusses two philosophical aspects of John's political theory: his understanding of nature and of reason. It will demonstrate how 'following nature' was linked with correct exercise of reason and regarded as the foundation of political sociability. Chapter 3 illustrates how following nature necessarily involves exercising political duties that are limited and extended by a rational understanding of personal and social bonds, a view that is intellectually shaped by both the Christian and Roman traditions, notably by the simultaneous presence of Christian ideas of *caritas* and the Stoic theory of *oikeiôsis* (the extension of a sense of duty from the self to those who are akin to the self) in John's writings. Chapter 4 takes a deeper look at the application of this perspective to the organic model of the body politic, demonstrating how the body model does not simply serve to show how the parts of the organic whole work together, but also provides an entirely original way of representing political responsibilities, distinct from the works of John's contemporaries and with important implications for his understanding of rulership.

In the final two chapters, the focus turns to the implications that John's ethical perspective had for political behaviour. Chapter 5 examines what moderation consists of according to John, and how it influences virtuous behaviour. John adopts a Ciceronian interpretation of what constitutes the 'mean', and his insistence on an internal mental orientation towards virtuous behaviour is influenced by Stoic ethics. John applies his recommendations to the ruler, but also to other members of the polity, as demonstrated through a series of case studies on the practice of the individual virtues. Chapter 6 turns to the head of the body politic, the prince. A number of case studies (King Stephen, Frederick Barbarossa and Thomas Becket) show how John's perspective on contemporary society was influenced by his theoretical position regarding right rulership. A good ruler cannot rule without the support of a well-ordered polity, but a well-ordered polity can come about only through the actions of a good ruler.

Methodology

At the heart of this study is an interpretation of what is ‘political’ about John’s works. As Quentin Skinner memorably noted, the historian must avoid construing the ‘political’ as the projection of whatever we now regard as to be the proper level of rational discourse on politics.⁶³ John Pocock, in turn, recognised that the historian faces a challenge in identifying the presence of political language; anachronism endangers the capacity of the reader to determine reliably the political content of a text.⁶⁴ One solution is to adopt a contextualist approach, as advised by Skinner, who advocates examining what the subject ‘was doing’ when the text was composed. By this reading, political language, in addition to being circumscribed terminologically through its reference to unambiguously political entities (such as the *res publica*, *senatus*, *princeps* and *rex*), also defines itself in terms of context: political language discusses ‘the political’, whatever that is determined to be at the point of composition.⁶⁵ Furthermore, if we consider the text to be an ‘authoritative artefact’, whose authority determines the manner in which it is read, then the language in which it is written carries certain implications that determine the modes of its usage.⁶⁶ This approach to the history of political thought, which requires the investigation of political ideas as situated in the historical context that produced them, has come to be known as the ‘Cambridge School’ method, and has dominated the field since the 1960s. It marks a departure from the idealist approach that looked at political ideas abstracted from their context – thus neutralised of their historical content – and the normative approach that sought to find in the history of political thought lessons which could usefully be applied to a contemporary present. Adopting the ‘Cambridge School’ method requires, instead, that three categories of information are to be investigated when searching for the political content of a text. First, we need to isolate the normative propositions it delineates for political conduct. Secondly, we must examine the description it gives of the political world contemporary to its composition. Finally, we must look at the immediate context in which the text was written, including the sources used.

Informed by this method, the present study seeks, in part, to determine what constitutes ‘the political’ in the twelfth century, using the oeuvre of John of Salisbury as a case study. As an extension, it seeks to demonstrate the way in which works of Roman philosophy had a profound effect on shaping the way in which social and political life was viewed in this period. However, such a task also provokes a variety of theoretical questions

concerning how transmission and influence are valued and determined. Explicit approval of sources alone cannot suffice; this denies the influence of explicit disapproval, as well as the significance of allusion, quotation and veiled reference.⁶⁷ Skinner suggests three conditions which serve to confirm direct influence of one thinker on another: that genuine similarity between the doctrines of A and B can be determined, that B could not have found the relevant doctrine in any other writer apart from A and that the probability of the similarity being random is low.⁶⁸ These criteria may also be used as a standard against which indirect transmission can be judged. However, it can also be suggested that much transmission of classical ideas in the medieval period occurred through unconscious channels. Stoic thought, for example, was gradually absorbed and assimilated into early Christian texts. By this process the ‘authoritative’ influence of classical texts is compromised and counter-balanced by the ‘authority’ of the patristic corpus in the Middle Ages. The question of what constitutes ‘influence’ in this period will be investigated in more depth in Chapter 1.

Finding ‘the political’ in John’s work

From the mid-1150s on, John wrote a series of works with significant applications for the understanding of medieval society.⁶⁹ Emanating from the context of the episcopal court at Canterbury, they deal with the full spectrum of political life, clerical and secular. First among these is a long poem, *Entheticus de dogmate philosophorum*.⁷⁰ Finished during Thomas Becket’s chancellorship (1154–62), it may date in earlier drafts from John’s time as a student.⁷¹ A shorter version of this poem, *Entheticus in Policraticum*, was appended to John’s principal works, the *Policraticus* and the *Metalogicon*, which were completed in 1159. The former, dedicated to Thomas Becket, is subtitled ‘*De nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum libri*’ – ‘On the Trifles of Courtiers and the Footsteps of Philosophers’ – and is a polemical work on the nature of rulership and society. The latter, primarily an educational treatise, is a descriptive work exploring the arts of the *trivium* in the light of the Aristotelian logical revival. It was originally intended to be read alongside the *Policraticus*, as is clear from the earliest manuscripts where the two texts (and *Entheticus in Policraticum*) appear together. This suggests that John regarded the two texts as companions, each informing the reader on a different aspect of life.⁷² Meanwhile, John’s extensive letter collection covers a period from his time at the episcopal court in Canterbury, stretching into his exile in France during the Becket conflict and concluding with a brief series of

letters pertaining to his later life. These letters offer a valuable counterpart to the formal works, demonstrating John's views on significant political and social events.⁷³

The *Policraticus* has often been situated within the 'mirror for princes' genre, although, as Julie Barrau noted, this intention was secondary in John's mind; the book is formally addressed to Thomas Becket, and a theory of monarchy was not at its core. Barrau referred to a set of marginal annotations in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 46 (hereafter CCC 46), the manuscript traditionally regarded (on the basis of its *ex libris*) as Thomas Becket's own copy of the *Policraticus*, to illustrate her point. These annotations, which Barrau terms '*un guide de lecture*', seem to have been added at the time of the redaction of the text but do not, by and large, provide a commentary on the main sections where rulership was discussed in the *Policraticus*. Instead, as Barrau notes, they are scattered throughout the manuscript, dealing with public affairs, the nature of making just decisions and the practice of moderation, and highlighting various classical and biblical *exempla*.⁷⁴ While the thrust of Barrau's assertion – that Becket, not Henry, is the intended principal (and first) audience of the *Policraticus* – is persuasive, these marginal additions to the text deserve re-examination, as they illustrate how the *Policraticus* was intended to be read by its earliest audiences, and, by extension, what the vocabulary of the 'political' was in this period.

CCC 46, the base-text of Webb's 1909 edition, has held traditional primacy among manuscripts of the *Policraticus*, by reason of its association with Becket and its Canterbury provenance. This primacy was questioned by Keats-Rohan, who rejected CCC 46 as the base-text of her part-edition, on the grounds that, when compared with other key manuscripts, it never presented a unique reading of the text in any instance. However, as Guglielmetti has demonstrated, CCC 46 is the source of two other early copies of the text: London, British Library (hereafter BL), Royal MS 13 D IV and Oxford, Bodleian Library (Bodl.), MS Lat. misc. c. 16, thereby explaining such textual similitude.⁷⁵ Guglielmetti has further determined that corrections in BL Royal MS 13 D IV indicate likely collation with what she terms the 'French family' of manuscripts, notably Soissons, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 24. The latter manuscript has recently been re-dated by Patricia Stürnemann to England, c.1160.⁷⁶ On palaeographical and decorative grounds, Stürnemann's analysis seems sound.⁷⁷ Furthermore, Stürnemann has proposed that this manuscript may be identified with John's own copy of the *Policraticus*, left upon his death to Chartres Cathedral, even suggesting that John's hand can be

identified with that of the *ex libris* on fo. 1r, a hand that provides some careful corrections throughout the manuscript.

Regardless of the weight of evidence attributing ownership to Becket in the case of CCC 46, or to John in the case of Soissons MS 24, these manuscripts, along with BL Royal MS 13 D IV and Oxford, Bodl. Library, MS Lat. misc. c. 16, represent the earliest surviving exemplars of the English copying tradition of the *Policraticus*. The production context of BL Royal MS 13 D IV can also be closely linked to John's circle. Copied at St Albans, it is, according to Rodney Thomson, one of the earliest surviving books made during the abbacy of Simon (1167–83).⁷⁸ Thomson suggests that Simon and John were actually acquainted, noting that at a point between 1171 and 1173 Abbot Simon is listed as a witness to a settlement between Oseney and Eynsham along with 'Master John of Salisbury' and Nicholas, prior of Wallingford. Furthermore, in 1174, John would act as a papal judge-delegate in a dispute between the abbey of St Albans and the monks of Durham over the status of Tynemouth priory. Thomson goes so far as to suggest that the addition of *Entheticus maior* to BL Royal MS 13 D IV (the earliest witness to that text) and some textual revisions throughout the manuscript may demonstrate continued contact between John and Simon, and perhaps personal intervention by John in the make-up of the manuscript. Thomson observes that the aforementioned Nicholas, prior of Wallingford, who was prior of Malmesbury (1183–87) and a monk of St Albans, was an acquaintance of Peter of Celle.⁷⁹ Although Thomson points out that this relationship is indicative of contact between St Albans and 'the world of continental reformed monasticism', he does not make explicit the fact that Peter may have been a potential conduit between Nicholas and John. Malmesbury's own copy of the *Policraticus*, now Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Barlow 6, was copied during the abbacy of Robert (1187–1205) and was the source for a further copy made at Cirencester in the 1180s, now Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Barlow 48. Bodl. MS Lat. misc. c. 16 also comes from a monastic context, and is recorded as having been donated to Battle Abbey by Abbot Richard (1215–35). As it dates from the last quarter of the twelfth century, however, Guglielmetti posits that this was actually the copy given to Odo, a monk of Canterbury, who was prior of Battle from 1175 to 1200, a speculation given strength by the fact that Odo is named in *Entheticus in Policraticum* as one of the recipients of the 'best wishes' of his 'little book', that is, the *Policraticus*.⁸⁰

While Barrau's analysis was confined to CCC 46, the copy associated with Thomas Becket, it is intriguing to note that the other early

manuscripts mentioned here also contain a comparable set of marginal annotations. In Book 1, for example, the annotations which refer to classical figures and authors, like Ulysses, Virgil, Horace and Ovid, among others, are found alongside identical passages of text in the four manuscripts. Barrau drew specific attention to a series of annotations in the margins of CCC 46, fo. 92r-v (alongside the account of the successive kings of England, Book VI. 18), suggesting that these may have been added to the manuscript to draw Henry II's attention to this part of the text, pleasing him by highlighting his rightful dynastic succession.⁸¹ An alternative interpretation of this set of annotations can now be posited following comparison of the four manuscripts in question, where this section is one of the most consistently glossed. The annotations, in fact, follow a broader narrative arc, commencing in Book VI. 14, following John's detailed discussion of the responsibilities and duties of soldiers. A notation symbol in the form of a *chi-rho* marks the textual bridge, where John points out that a ruler is useless if he does not maintain discipline and train his soldiers, with the chapter concerned with how Roman leaders led their armies.⁸² The annotations then draw attention to the reference to Nero in this chapter, adding in the margin '*De nerone*', to stress how he corrupted Rome through his indulgence, while Julius Caesar is similarly emphasised in Book VI. 15 ('*De Iulio cesare*') as a contrasting example of powerful leadership.⁸³ The annotations then proceed to refer to leadership in the contemporary period and to Britain, through the addition of a marginal note alongside Book VI. 16 reading '*De coaetaneis nostris*', before the addition of '*De Brenno*' (in two manuscripts) alongside the account of Brennus, leader of the Senones, who John believed to have originated from England (Book VI. 17).⁸⁴ Book VI. 18 is a comparative study of discipline and rulership in England; the annotations to Book VI. 18 refer in succession to Cnut, William Rufus, Henry I, Henry II, Stephen and Stephen's son Eustace.⁸⁵ Reading the annotations in Book VI. 18 in conjunction with those that precede them broadens the scope of their applicability beyond seeking favour with the king. Instead, the annotations bring together a number of examples of good and bad rulership, setting the contemporary history of England within a wider frame of reference stretching back to ancient Rome, while reinforcing a general message regarding discipline in leadership.

Furthermore, the presence of these annotations in multiple manuscripts elevates their status beyond a *guide de lecture*, confined to one manuscript and intended for one reader, to that of a paratextual apparatus that circulated alongside the text, was copied from manuscript to manuscript

and was seemingly regarded as integral to its understanding. Analysis of the precise relationships of the annotations in the manuscripts, and what they can tell us about the transmission and collation of copies of the *Policraticus*, lies beyond the scope of this book.⁸⁶ However, it is clear that they were conscientiously replicated in manuscripts of the text, as most clearly demonstrated by one of the later manuscripts, Bodl., MS Barlow 48, which rubricates the annotations and encloses them in penwork borders, according them a visual status akin to that of its chapter headings.⁸⁷ As noted earlier, to understand what is ‘political’ about a text we must look at the context within which it was written and read. Annotations of this type provide an insight into the contemporary reception of the text. For example, the annotations alongside Book VI. 14–18, which highlight the necessity of discipline in leadership, point to a subject that was of interest to Becket and Henry II alike, but was also relevant to all. Georges Duby suggested that the *Policraticus* can be read as a ‘*speculum curiae*’ intended for study by the whole court.⁸⁸ This approaches the truth; the *Policraticus* was not intended as simply a ‘mirror for princes’, but rather is a mirror for the whole polity. The following chapters will investigate the political lessons which John hoped to impart.

Notes

- 1 R. Joly, ‘Josaphat: Lieu de sépulture de Jean de Salisbury’, *Notre-Dame de Chartres*, 11 (1980), 10–14; J. Villette, ‘Le tombeau sculpté de Jean de Salisbury, un chef d’oeuvre trop peu connu’, *Notre-Dame de Chartres*, 11 (1980), 15–17.
- 2 For contrasting opinions of John’s legacy as a bishop in Chartres see E. Türk, *Nugae Curialium: Le règne d’Henri II Plantegenêt (1145–1189) et l’éthique politique* (Geneva: Droz, 1977), pp. 92–4; J. van Laarhoven, ‘*Non iam decreta, sed Evangelium!* Jean de Salisbury au Latran III’, in M. Fois, V. Monachino and F. Litva (eds), *Dalla Chiesa antica alla Chiesa moderna: Miscellanea per il Cinquantesimo della Facoltà di Storia Ecclesiastica della Pontificia Università Gregoriana* (Rome: Università Gregoriana, 1983), pp. 107–19; K. Bollermann and C. J. Nederman, ‘The “Sunset Years”: John of Salisbury as Bishop of Chartres and the Emergent Cult of St. Thomas Becket in France’, *Viator*, 45 (2014), 55–76; J. Barrau, ‘John of Salisbury as Ecclesiastical Administrator’, in C. Grellard and F. Lachaud (eds), *A Companion to John of Salisbury* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 105–44 (pp. 118–43). See list of episcopal *acta* from John’s period in Chartres in *Letters* II, pp. 809–10. See also A. Piper, ‘New Evidence for the Becket Correspondence and John of Salisbury’s Letters’, in M. Wilks (ed.), *The World of John of Salisbury* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1984), pp. 439–44, which points to evidence of some untraced correspondence of John, possibly dating from his episcopate.

- 3 C. N. L. Brooke, 'John of Salisbury and his World', in Wilks (ed.), *World*, pp. 1–20 (p. 3); D. Luscombe, 'Salisbury, John of (late 1110s–1180)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2011), www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14849 (accessed 24 January 2017).
- 4 To Richard: Letters 164, 169, 172 in *Letters II*; to Robert: Letters 145–8 in *Letters II*. John's visit to his mother, Egidia, upon his return from exile in December 1170 is detailed in Letter 304 to Peter of Celle, *Letters II*, pp. 716–17. F. Barlow, 'John of Salisbury and his Brothers', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 46 (1995), 95–109.
- 5 See Letter 152 to Thomas Becket (late summer 1165), *Letters II*, pp. 52–3. John is referred to as a canon of Salisbury in William Fitzstephen's *Life of Thomas Becket*, *MHTB III*, p. 46.
- 6 *Pol. II.* 28; 1, p. 164. For analysis of the practice see N. Orme, *Medieval Children* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), pp. 102–3.
- 7 *Met. II.* 10, pp. 70–3. C. Giraud and C. Mews, 'John of Salisbury and the Schools of the 12th Century', in Grellard and Lachaud (eds), *Companion*, pp. 31–62 (pp. 32–47, 60–1). The account given in *Met. II.* 10 should be read alongside the additional details on these teachers provided in *Met. I.* 5, pp. 20–2.
- 8 On the tradition of teaching on the Mont-Saint-Geneviève see W. Courtney, 'Schools and Schools of Thought in the Twelfth Century', in C. J. Nederman, N. Van Deusen and E. A. Matter (eds), *Mind Matters: Studies of Medieval and Early Modern Intellectual History in Honour of Marcia Colish* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), pp. 13–45 (p. 20). Courtney notes (p. 25) that the scholars who taught here were probably granted some sort of teaching licence by the abbey of Saint-Geneviève, although they were not directly associated with teaching at the abbey, living, instead, in rented quarters, a situation that would have allowed several masters to teach within the same area at the same time.
- 9 John provides further information on Gilbert in *Historia pontificalis*, recounting his summons before the Council of Rheims in 1148: *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 15–41; see C. Monagle, 'John of Salisbury and the Writing of History', in Grellard and Lachaud (eds), *Companion*, pp. 215–32 (pp. 221–8).
- 10 *Met. II.* 10, p. 72: 'fidus lector, sed obtusior disputator'.
- 11 See Letter 201 to Richard l'Évêque, which John composed during exile, *Letters II*, pp. 292–5.
- 12 J. A. Clerval, *Les Écoles de Chartres au Moyen-Âge (du V^e au XVI^e siècle)* (Chartres: Selleret, 1895). The suggestion was originally made in C. Schaarschmidt, *Johannes Saresberiensis nach Leben und Studien, Schriften und Philosophie* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1862), pp. 21–5. A notable supporter of this perspective was R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought and Learning* (London: SPCK, 1932), pp. 177–89. The literature on the school of Chartres is extensive; a summary can be found in E. Jeuneau, *L'Âge d'or des écoles de Chartres* (Chartres: Éditions Houvet, 2000), pp. 19–24.
- 13 R. W. Southern, 'Humanism and the School of Chartres', in his *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970), pp. 61–85. Southern's

- later responses to the developing debate can be found in his ‘The Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres’, in R. L. Benson, G. Constable and C. D. Lanham (eds), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), pp. 113–37, and his *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe*, vol. 1: *Foundations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), pp. 61–101. See also I. O’Daly, ‘Revisiting the Evidence for the Study of Rhetoric and Dialectic at the School of Chartres in the Time of Fulbert (d. 1028)’, *Viator*, 47 (2016), 23–43, which reassesses the state of teaching in the eleventh-century school.
- 14 P. Dronke, ‘Thierry of Chartres’, in P. Dronke (ed.), *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 358–85 (p. 358).
 - 15 It is likely that John had some links with the diocese, as his later elevation to the episcopate suggests, as well as the informed references he made to Gilbert of Poitiers’s chancellorship (see *Met.* I, 5, p. 20).
 - 16 For example, K. M. Fredborg in ‘The Grammar and Rhetoric Offered to John of Salisbury’, in J. Feros Ruys, J. O. Ward and M. Heyworth (eds), *The Classics in the Medieval and Renaissance Classroom: The Role of Ancient Texts in the Arts Curriculum as Revealed by Surviving Manuscripts and Early Printed Books* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 103–30.
 - 17 K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, ‘John of Salisbury and Education in Twelfth-Century Paris from the Account of his *Metalogicon*’, *History of Universities*, 6 (1987), 1–45 (6). See also K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, ‘The Chronology of John of Salisbury’s Studies in Paris: A Reading of *Metalogicon* II. 10’, *Studi medievali*, 3rd series, 28 (1987), 193–203.
 - 18 This fluidity is captured by S. Ferruolo’s analysis in *The Origins of the University: The Schools of Paris and their Critics, 1100–1215* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985), pp. 22–3. John refers to a period as a teacher, provoked by penury, in *Met.* II. 10. See D. Bloch, *John of Salisbury on Aristotelian Science* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), pp. 12–19.
 - 19 Bernard of Clairvaux, Letter 361, in *Sancti Bernardi Opera Omnia*, vol. 8: *Epistolae*, ed. J. LeClercq and H. Rochais (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1977), pp. 307–8. Bernard describes John as ‘amicum meum et amicum amicorum meorum’.
 - 20 A. Saltman, *Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London: Athlone Press, 1956) gives details of the early charters to which John was a signatory (p. 170). Barrau, ‘John of Salisbury as Ecclesiastical Administrator’ (p. 110) notes that he held no specific title, but suggests (p. 114) that he effectively held the position of *secretarius* by Theobald’s later years.
 - 21 A notable example of John’s administrative writing is Letter 131, *Letters* I, pp. 227–37, written in 1160 on behalf of Archbishop Theobald to Pope Alexander III, regarding the dispute between Richard of Anstey and Mabel de Francheville.
 - 22 C. Duggan, ‘The Becket Dispute and the Crimonious Clerks’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 35 (1962), 1–28.
 - 23 L. Robertson, ‘Exile in the Life and Correspondence of John of Salisbury’, in

- L. Napran and E. Van Houts (eds), *Exile in the Middle Ages: Selected Proceedings from the International Medieval Congress, University of Leeds 8–11 July 2002* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), pp. 181–97.
- 24 J. McLoughlin, 'Amicitia in Practice: John of Salisbury (c.1120–1180) and his Circle', in D. Williams (ed.), *England in the Twelfth Century: Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1990), pp. 165–81. On this friendship see also J. Haseldine, 'Introduction', in John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon*, trans. J. B. Hall (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 23–4.
- 25 A. Duggan, 'John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket', in Wilks (ed.), *World*, pp. 427–38.
- 26 J. Barrau, 'La *conversio* de Jean de Salisbury: La Bible au service de Thomas Becket?', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale X^e–XII^e siècles*, 50 (2007), 229–44.
- 27 See C. N. L. Brooke, 'Aspects of John of Salisbury's *Historia Pontificalis*', in L. Smith and B. Ward (eds), *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Margaret Gibson* (London: Hambledon Press, 1992), pp. 185–95. See the case for John's authorship of the *Historia pontificalis* in J. McLoughlin, 'John of Salisbury (c. 1120–80): The Career and Attitudes of a Schoolman in Church Politics' (PhD dissertation, Trinity College, Dublin, 1988), pp. 129–47.
- 28 J. Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories: Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 285–94, 305–16; M. Chibnall, 'John of Salisbury as Historian', in Wilks (ed.), *World*, pp. 169–77; Monagle, 'John of Salisbury and the Writing of History'.
- 29 M. Staunton, *Thomas Becket and his Biographers* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2006), pp. 19–27. John's *Vita Thomae* can be found in *MHTB* II, pp. 299–352, and in translation in R. E. Pepin, *Anselm and Becket: Two Canterbury Saints' Lives by John of Salisbury* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2009), pp. 78–95.
- 30 *Cartulaire de Notre-Dame de Chartres*, ed. E. de Lépinos and L. Merlet, vol. 3 (Chartres: Garnier, 1865), pp. 201–2.
- 31 The three biographies are Schaarschmidt, *Johannes Saresberiensis*; C. C. J. Webb, *John of Salisbury* (London: Methuen, 1932); and C. J. Nederman, *John of Salisbury* (Tempe: Arizona Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005).
- 32 C. Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927), p. 225.
- 33 *Met.* III. 4, p. 116.
- 34 C. H. McIlwain, *The Growth of Political Theory in the West from the Greeks to the End of the Middle Ages* (New York: Macmillan, 1932), p. 320.
- 35 H. Liebeschütz, *Mediaeval Humanism in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury* (London: Warburg Institute, 1950).
- 36 J. Martin, 'John of Salisbury and the Classics' (PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1968). See also J. Martin, 'John of Salisbury's Manuscripts of Frontinus and of Gellius', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 40 (1977), 1–26; J. Martin, 'Uses of Tradition: Gellius, Petronius and John of Salisbury', *Viator*, 10 (1979), 57–76; J. Martin, 'John of Salisbury as Classical Scholar', in Wilks (ed.), *World*, pp. 179–201.

- 37 On these terms see C. Condren, *The Status and Appraisal of Classical Texts: An Essay on Political Theory, its Inheritance, and the History of Ideas* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), pp. 106–7, 117.
- 38 H. J. Berman, *Law and Revolution: The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), p. 280.
- 39 Poole, *Medieval Thought and Learning*, and R. L. Poole, *Studies in Chronology and History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), pp. 248–86.
- 40 M. Kerner, *Johannes von Salisbury und die logische Struktur seines Policraticus* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1977).
- 41 Wilks (ed.), *World*.
- 42 A. Duggan, *Thomas Becket: Friends, Networks, Text and Cult* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007); *Thomas Becket* (London: Bloomsbury, 2004); *The Correspondence of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury 1162–70*, ed. and trans. A. Duggan (2 vols; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); *Thomas Becket: A Textual History of his Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980).
- 43 Many notable articles by Nederman are collected in C. J. Nederman, *Medieval Aristotelianism and its Limits: Classical Traditions in Moral and Political Philosophy, 12th to 15th Centuries* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997). Individual articles will be referred to throughout this volume, when relevant. See also C. J. Nederman, ‘John of Salisbury’s Political Theory’, in Grellard and Lachaud (eds), *Companion*, pp. 258–88.
- 44 McLoughlin, ‘John of Salisbury’; McLoughlin, ‘Amicitia in Practice’; J. McLoughlin, ‘The Language of Persecution: John of Salisbury and the early phase of the Becket dispute (1163–66)’, in W. J. Sheils (ed.), *Persecution and Toleration: Papers Read at the Twenty-Second Summer Meeting and Twenty-Third Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1984), pp. 73–87; J. Barrau, ‘Jean de Salisbury, intermédiaire entre Thomas Becket et la cour capétienne?’, in M. Aurell and N.-Y. Tonnerre (eds), *Plantagenêts et Capétiens: Confrontations et héritages* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), pp. 505–16; J. Barrau, ‘Ceci n’est pas un miroir, ou le *Policraticus* de Jean de Salisbury’, in F. Lachaud and L. Scordia (eds), *Le Prince au miroir de la littérature politique de l’Antiquité aux Lumières* (Rouen: Publications des Universités de Rouen et du Havre, 2007), pp. 87–111; Barrau, ‘La *conversio* de Jean de Salisbury’.
- 45 C. Grellard, *Jean de Salisbury et la renaissance médiévale du scepticisme* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2013).
- 46 Grellard and Lachaud (eds), *Companion*.
- 47 J. van Laarhoven, “‘Thou shalt NOT slay a tyrant!’ The So-Called Theory of John of Salisbury”, in Wilks (ed.), *World*, pp. 319–41; K. L. Forhan, ‘Salisburyian Stakes: The Use of “Tyranny” in John of Salisbury’s *Policraticus*’, *History of Political Thought*, 11 (1990), 397–407; R. H. Rouse and M. A. Rouse, ‘John of Salisbury and the Doctrine of Tyrannicide’, *Speculum*, 42 (1967), 693–709. John’s views on tyranny will be discussed in detail in Chapter 6, while the model of the body politic comes under investigation in Chapters 3 and 4.
- 48 *The Statesman’s Book of John of Salisbury: Being the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books and Selections from the Seventh and Eighth Books of the Policraticus*, trans.

- J. Dickinson (New York: Knopf, 1927); John of Salisbury, *Policraticus: Of the Frivolities of Courtiers and the Footprints of Philosophers*, trans. C. J. Nederman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- 49 J. Hosler, *John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Bloch, *John of Salisbury on Aristotelian Science*.
- 50 A. Somfai, 'The Eleventh-Century Shift in the Reception of Plato's *Timaeus* and Calcidius's *Commentary*', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 65 (2002), 1–21; M. Gibson, 'The Study of the *Timaeus* in the Eleventh and Twelfth Century', *Pensamiento*, 25 (1969), 183–94. For the Calcidian commentary see Calcidius, *Timaeus a Calcidio translatus commentarioque instructus*, ed. J. H. Waszink (London: Warburg Institute, 1975).
- 51 Somfai, 'The Eleventh-Century Shift', p. 1; on the differences between the preservation of the text in the two translations see pp. 4–5. On the fragmented Ciceronian translation of the *Timaeus* see L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), pp. 124–8.
- 52 Bernard of Chartres, *The Glosae super Platonem of Bernard of Chartres*, ed. P. E. Dutton (Toronto: PIMS, 1991); William of Conches, *Glosae super Platonem*, ed. E. Jeuneau (CCCM 203; Turnhout: Brepols, 2006); P. E. Dutton, 'The Uncovering of the *Glosae super Platonem* of Bernard of Chartres', *Mediaeval Studies*, 46 (1984), 192–221.
- 53 See B. G. Dod, 'Aristoteles Latinus', in N. Kretzmann, A. Kenny and J. Pinborg (eds), *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 45–79. E. Jeuneau, 'Jean de Salisbury et la lecture des philosophes', in Wilks (ed.), *World*, pp. 77–108, notably pp. 103–8, where Jeuneau suggests that John the Saracen could have been the translator of the edition of the *Posterior Analytics* used by John. C. Burnett, 'John of Salisbury and Aristotle', *Didascalica*, 2 (1996), 19–32 (24–5), notes the intimacy of Robert of Torigni and Richard l'Évêque. Robert may have served as an intermediary between Richard and James of Venice and, thus, as a source for John's access to James's translations. John requested Aristotelian glosses from Richard to be made 'at my expense (and no cost spared here on my account, I beg)'; see Letter 201, *Letters II*, pp. 294–5. See *Met. IV. 6*, p. 145, on the *Posterior Analytics*.
- 54 A useful summary of the *Metalogicon* can be found in Haseldine, 'Introduction', pp. 54–76.
- 55 *Met. IV. 7*, pp. 145–6. Bloch, *John of Salisbury on Aristotelian Science*, especially pp. 83–186.
- 56 For examples of such overstatement see the following articles by C. J. Nederman: 'The Aristotelian Doctrine of the Mean and John of Salisbury's Concept of Liberty', *Vivarium*, 24 (1986), 128–42; 'Aristotelian Ethics before the *Nicomachean Ethics*: Alternate Sources of Aristotle's Concept of Virtue in the Twelfth Century', *Parergon*, 7 (1989), 55–75; 'Aristotelianism and the Origins of "Political Science" in the Twelfth Century', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 52 (1991), 179–94. The case for regarding Nederman's views as an overstatement will be conveyed in Chapter 5. His implication that John's writing took place in a

- near-vacuum, in which classical models of political writing were almost absent, as found in Nederman, 'John of Salisbury's Political Theory' (pp. 260, 288), must be rejected, as this belies the significance of intermediary witnesses, as well as ignoring the value of texts such as Cicero's *De officiis* and Seneca's *De clementia*, which can, *contra* Nederman, clearly be regarded as 'major political works'.
- 57 A. R. Dyck, *A Commentary on Cicero, De officiis* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996).
- 58 K. Nothdurft, *Studien zum Einfluss Senecas auf die Philosophie und Theologie des zwölften Jahrhunderts* (Leiden: Brill, 1963).
- 59 Selected studies include: J. Martin, 'Cicero's Jokes at the Court of Henry II of England: Roman Humour and the Princely Ideal', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 51 (1990), 144–66; B. Munk Olsen, 'L'humanisme de Jean de Salisbury, un Ciceronien au 12^e siècle', in M. de Gandillac and E. Jeaneau (eds), *Entretiens sur la renaissance du 12^e siècle* (Paris: Mouton, 1968), pp. 53–69; C. J. Nederman, 'Nature, Sin, and the Origins of Society: The Ciceronian Tradition in Medieval Political Thought', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 49 (1988), 3–26; C. J. Nederman, 'Beyond Aristotelianism and Stoicism: John of Salisbury's Skepticism and Moral Reasoning in the Twelfth Century', in I. Bejczy and R. Newhauser (eds), *Virtue and Ethics in the Twelfth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 175–95; K. Guilfoy, 'Stoic Themes in Peter Abelard and John of Salisbury', in J. Sellars (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of the Stoic Tradition* (London: Routledge, 2016), pp. 85–98 (pp. 93–6), acknowledges the influence of Seneca on John, but does not dwell in sufficient depth upon John's Stoic debt.
- 60 S. Ebbesen, 'Where were the Stoics in the Late Middle Ages?', in S. K. Strange and J. Zupko (eds), *Stoicism: Traditions and Transformations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 108–31 (p. 108). On the Stoic tradition in the Middle Ages see also M. Colish, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages* (2 vols; Leiden: Brill, 1990); G. Verbeke, *The Presence of Stoicism in Medieval Thought* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1983). See also M. Lapidge, 'The Stoic Inheritance', in Dronke (ed.), *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*, pp. 81–112; M. Spanneut, *Permanence du Stoïcisme: De Zénon à Malraux* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1973).
- 61 A. MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (3rd edition; London: Duckworth, 2007), pp. 170–3.
- 62 C. J. Nederman, 'Freedom, Community and Function: Communitarian Lessons of Medieval Political Theory', *American Political Science Review*, 86 (1992), 977–86.
- 63 Q. Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', *History and Theory: Studies in the Philosophy of History*, 8 (1969), 3–53 reprinted with some additions/changes in Q. Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, vol. 1: *Regarding Method* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 57–89; J. G. A. Pocock, 'A History of Political Thought: A Methodological Enquiry', in P. Laslett and W. G. Runciman (eds), *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, 2nd series (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), pp. 183–202.
- 64 J. G. A. Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce and History: Essays of Political Thought and*

- History Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 9.
- 65 See also J. Dunn, 'The Identity of the History of Ideas', in P. Laslett, W. G. Runciman and Q. Skinner (eds), *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, 4th series (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972), pp. 158–73 (p. 165), where the history of political thought is defined as 'the set of argued propositions in the past which discuss how the political world is and ought to be and what should constitute the criteria for proper action within it, and the set of activities in which men were engaging when they enunciated these propositions'.
- 66 Pocock illustrates the levels at which a text can be considered 'authoritative'; the contextual specificity of the environment in which a text is read is actually influenced by the 'authority' of the text itself. See *Virtue, Commerce and History*, p. 29. Cf. S. Fish, *Is There a Text in this Class? The Authority of Interpretative communities* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), pp. 15–17.
- 67 Cf. Ross, who suggests in his study of Seneca's influence on the medieval period that the 'best evidence' for 'influence' consists of 'any instance in which Seneca's views are explicitly approved', although he acknowledges that 'more is really needed to establish that knowledge of them had any formative effect'. G. M. Ross, 'Seneca's Philosophical Influence', in C. D. N. Costa (ed.), *Seneca* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974), pp. 116–65 (p. 116).
- 68 Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', p. 26; see also propositions to this effect in P. Weiner, 'Some Problems and Methods in the History of Ideas', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 22 (1961), 531–48.
- 69 On the style of John's writings see R. Pepin, 'John of Salisbury as a Writer', in Grellard and Lachaud (eds), *Companion*, pp. 147–79.
- 70 *Entheticus de dogmate philosophorum*, or *Entheticus maior*, will be referred to simply as the *Entheticus* throughout; reference to *Entheticus in Policraticum*, or *Entheticus minor*, will be cited specifically as such. The edition used is *John of Salisbury's Entheticus Maior and Minor*, ed. and trans. J. van Laarhoven (3 vols; Leiden: Brill, 1987).
- 71 J. van Laarhoven, in *Entheticus*, ed. Van Laarhoven, pp. 15–16.
- 72 *Ioannis Saresberiensis Policraticus I–IV*, ed. K. S. B. Keats-Rohan (Turnhout: Brepols, 1993), p. xi, notes that the texts were separated in the late twelfth century and from then on had a separate history of transmission. For the later transmission of the text see R. E. Guglielmetti, *La tradizione manoscritta del Policraticus di Giovanni di Salisbury: Primo secolo di diffusione* (Florence: Sismel-Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2005); A. Linder, 'John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* in Thirteenth-Century England. The Evidence of MS Corpus Christi College 469', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 40 (1977), 276–82; A. Linder, 'The Knowledge of John of Salisbury in the Late Middle Ages', *Studi medievali*, 3rd series, 18 (1977), 315–66; F. Lachaud, 'Filiation and Context: The Medieval Afterlife of the *Policraticus*', in Lachaud and Grellard (eds), *Companion*, pp. 375–438.
- 73 *Letters I; Letters II*.
- 74 Barrau, 'Ceci n'est pas un miroir', pp. 101–6.

- 75 Guglielmetti, *La tradizione manoscritta*, p. 16. M. Winterbottom, 'Review of *La tradizione manoscritta del Policraticus di Giovanni di Salisbury: Primo secolo di diffusione* by Rossana E. Guglielmetti', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 58 (2007), 740–2.
- 76 'Soissons, BM, MS 24 – Notice par Patricia Stirnemann (IRHT), décembre 2013', www.manuscripts-de-chartres.fr/sites/default/files/fileviewer/documents/notices-detaillees/soissons-bm-ms-24_policraticus_pstirnemann_2013-12.pdf (accessed 15 August 2014). See also the summary of Stirnemann's research provided in John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon*, trans. Hall, pp. 105–6.
- 77 I have examined a digital facsimile of the manuscript and agree that it can be dated to the third quarter of the twelfth century on palaeographical grounds.
- 78 Note the *ex libris*: fo. 7: '*Hunc librum fecit dominus Symon abbas sancto Albano quem qui ei abitulerit aut titulum deleuerit uel mutanerit. Anathema sit amen amen amen.*'
- 79 R. Thomson, *Manuscripts from St Albans Abbey 1066–1235* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1982), pp. 66–7.
- 80 John describes the *Policraticus* as a 'libellus' in *Entheticus in Policraticum*, 4, p. 231. Odo is referred to at line 191, p. 242.
- 81 Barrau, 'Ceci n'est pas un miroir', p. 106.
- 82 The sign appears in three out of the four manuscripts alongside: '*Est autem dux usquequaque inutilis apud quem disciplina non uiget.*' Pol. VI. 14; 2, p. 38. CCC 46, fo. 90v; Soissons MS 24, fo. 163r; BL Royal MS 13 D IV, fo. 82v.
- 83 CCC 46, fo. 91r; BL Royal MS 13 D IV, fo. 83r; Soissons MS 24, fo. 164r–v; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Lat. misc. c. 16, p. 147.
- 84 There is some variation among the manuscripts. These annotations are absent in Bodl. MS Lat. misc. c. 16. CCC 46, fo. 90v contains reference to '*De coetaneis nostris*'; BL Royal MS 13 D IV, fo. 83r ('*De coetaneis nostris*'), fo. 83v ('*De Brehno*'); Soissons MS 24, fo. 164v ('*De coetaneis nostris*'), fo. 165v ('*De Brenno*').
- 85 CCC 46, fo. 92r: '*De Cnudo; De rege ruffo; de rege henrico primo*', fo. 92v: '*De rege henrico ij; de rege Stephano; Item de rege henrico secundo*', fo. 93r: '*De Eustachio*'; BL Royal MS 13 D IV, fo. 84r: '*De Cnudo; De Rege Ruffo; De Rege Henrico primo*' (a further annotation, in a distinct and smaller hand, refers to '*De duce Roberto*'), fo. 84v: '*De rege henrico ij; De rege stephano; Item de henrico secundo rege; De eustachio*'; Soissons MS 24, fo. 166r: '*De Cnudo*', fo. 166v: '*De rege ruffo; de rege henrico primo; de rege henrico secundo*', fo. 167r: '*De rege stephano*', fo. 167v: '*Item de henrico secundo; De eustachio*'; Bodl. MS Lat. misc. c. 16, p. 149: '*De rege ruffo; De rege henrico i; De rege henrico ij; De rege stephano*', p. 150: '*Item de henrici rege ij*'.
- 86 It is worth noting, however, that there are there are distinctive commonalities between BL Royal MS 13 D IV and Soissons MS 24 – for example, both manuscripts contain the annotation '*Contra sodomitos*' to III. 13 (BL Royal MS 13 D IV, fo. 46r; Soissons MS 24, fo. 89r) – and that Bodl. MS Lat. misc. c. 16 does not contain as many annotations as the other manuscripts. A late twelfth-century English manuscript, BL Royal MS 12 F VIII, contains a number of thirteenth-century annotations, including some that respond to the text. On fo. 84r of this

manuscript, for example, the annotator has added a schematic diagram itemising the list of vices provided in *Pol.* VIII. 1. At that point of the text John refers to Gregory the Great's depiction of '*hanc pestiferam arborem*'; the shape of the divisional diagram provided echoes the reference to the tree in the text, indicative of close reading.

- 87 E. g. fo. 41v: '*Quid princeps*'. This textual annotation in IV. 1 appears in all four early manuscripts (CCC 46, fo. 52v; BL Royal MS 13 D IV, fo. 48v; Soissons MS 24, fo. 94v; Bodl. MS Lat. misc. c. 16, p. 87).
- 88 G. Duby, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*, trans. A. Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), pp. 263–8.