John of Salisbury's 'Duel' with the English Military Class

A Twelfth-Century Cleric's Lifelong Obsession with

Critiquing Martial Ethos and Identity

Figure 1 - The passion of St Demetrius of Thessaloniki.

(London, British Library, Arundel 91, f.107, *Detail of historiated initial,* England (Canterbury), *https://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/ILLUMIN.ASP?Size=mid&IllID=12270*)

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Advanced Studies (Honours) in History, University of Sydney

Abstract

This thesis uncovers pervasive critiques of *milites* (soldiers) in the writings of the twelfth-century English cleric, John of Salisbury (c.1110s-1180s). Previous scholarship has proposed John's descriptions of the social function of *milites* were detached from his historical context. This study breaks from that theory by examining the development of these ideas across all John's works, revealing an ideology of social reform which responded to the role of *milites* in the contemporary disputes of the English Church and Crown. This thesis thus broadens understandings of medieval socio-political theories and presents a new legacy for a major figure of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance.

Acknowledgments

My deep gratitude to my supervisor, Dr Hélène Sirantoine. Your encouragement, feedback and wealth of knowledge helped steer me throughout this thesis. I especially appreciate your dedication to accommodating the unusual circumstances of my part-time schedule including reading drafts over the Christmas and New Year period and international Zoom calls. Thank you.

My thanks as well to the History Honours coordinators for 2022 and 2023, Dr Andres Rodriguez and Dr John Gagné respectively. Andres, thank you especially for arranging the change to part-time study when my sudden need for wrist surgery threw a spanner in the works.

To Jake Pollard and my father, who both juggled proofreading amid busy work weeks, I owe you both a beer. To my partner, Brooke, thank you for cheering me on. Most of all, to my family, who make everything possible.

Contents

Introduction

For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places

(Ephesians 6.12 KJV)

Figure 2 – John of Salisbury writing, as depicted at the opening to a 15ᵗʰ century translation of Policraticus.

(Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, John of Salisbury, *Policraticon*, translated by Denis Foulechat, MS 1144, folio 1v, *Miniature,* France, http://initiale.irht.cnrs.fr/en/codex/3283)

In late autumn 1159, couriers heaved eight books, bound together in one tome, into the campaign tent of the chancellor of England, Thomas Becket.[1] The tome bore a strange title, *Policraticus*, a neologism that has escaped translators to this day.[2] Its delivery would have come as some surprise. Becket had not commissioned such a work. He was on campaign in Southern France

---

[1] John Hosler, 'The Brief Military Career of Thomas Becket', *Haskins Society Journal* 15 (2004): 92-93.

[2] Cary Nederman, 'John of Salisbury's Political Theory' in *A Companion to John of Salisbury,* ed. Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 258-259.

4

accompanying the army of King Henry II (1154-1189) in raids after the failed English siege of Toulouse.[3] Yet this lengthy opus, laboriously delivered from England, was addressed to him.[4] Within the pages of its sixth book, Becket read explosive statements about the troops under his command: they were "brigands" not "true" soldiers, "true" soldiers would throw "their nobles in chains" and serve the Church instead.[5] The book even encouraged Becket to overhaul the composition of England's military class.[6] Herein our investigation begins. Why contest the military identity of English troops? Why demand their subordination to the Church?

Scholars recognise the author of these demands, John of Salisbury (1110s-1180s) had a knack for controversiality.[7] An English cleric, administrator and intellectual, whose life spanned over the agitated reigns of Kings Stephen (1135-1154) and Henry II (1154-1189), he prolifically engaged with English, French and Papal politics in letters, poems and critical treatises like *Policraticus*.[8] Amidst composing his monumental corpus, he served as an agent of the Archbishopric of Canterbury while England was riven by civil war (1138-1153) and then underwent political clashes over the respective domains of an expanding royal government and the Church (1156-1170), which culminated in famous assassination of Thomas Becket. I will cover John's life and times in greater detail in each of the below chapters, which follow a chronological order.

Consequent to the troubled politics of his lifetime, John's writings are replete with explosive statements about the moral failings of England's status quo and his political thought has generated a "considerable" modern scholarly production.[9] Yet, hitherto his polemic on the identity and role of England's military class glimpsed above has escaped attention. Instead, the bulk of studies have

---

[3] Hosler, 'The Brief Military Career of Thomas Becket', 92-93.
[4] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus in Policraticum*, 1-2, in John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, trans. Joseph B. Pike (Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press, 1938) 415-417.
[5] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 6.5, 6.8, trans John Dickinson (New York: Knopf, 1927), 190, 198-200.
[6] Ibid., 6.5, 6.7, 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 190-192, 196-197, 198-200.
[7] Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, 'Introduction' in *A Companion to John of Salisbury,* Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 2.
[8] Ibid., 1-19.
[9] Cary Nederman, 'John of Salisbury's Political Theory' in *A Companion to John of Salisbury,* Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 278.

focused on his appraisal of tyrannicide, during a century where Christian Europeans regarded their kings as divinely instituted.[10] How can we fully appreciate this controversial doctrine of tyrannicide when there is a near complete lacuna on John's conceptualisation of the enactors of political violence, the military class?[11] The purpose of this thesis is to investigate, contextualise and explain John's views of *milites* as part of academia's examination of him as a socio-political theorist. How did John rationalise statements like those in *Policraticus* above and how do they relate to his wider work as an ecclesiastical partisan in English politics?

Miles, Milites – A Note on Terminology

When describing the military class that John writes about this thesis will use the Latin word '*miles*' to refer to singular members of that group, with '*milites*' as the plural, without translating.[12] These are the words John employs to define a social group which, by his use, lacks an equivalent term in English. Translating *miles/milites* as "soldier/soldiers", which Oxford's Dictionary defines as "a member of an army" would mislead.[13] In John's writings the word applies more broadly to persons loosely united by a host of martial powers, cultural norms and responsibilities than to the component members of an army. We shall meet *milites* in legal appellants pressing their claim to churches by right of military tenure of the land, in lords neglecting their martial exercises for peacetime frivolities, in an armed pilgrim staving off spiritual dangers and many other individualistic warriors. Associations with uniformity and regulation attached to the modern use of "soldier/soldiers" would detract from

---

[10] Ibid.; Austin Lane Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta 1087-1216* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), 3.

[11] Cary Nederman, 'A Duty to Kill: John of Salisbury's Theory of Tyrannicide', *Review of Politics* 50, (1988): 384; John Hosler, *John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth Century Renaissance* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 3-4.

[12] Though I am using these Latin terms I will not be adapting their cases in my English sentences (e.g. turning *miles* to *militem* when it is the object of the sentence etc.) for risk that such pedantry could alienate non-Latin readers.

[13] Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, '*miles*', accessed 29 January 2023, available from: https://logeion.uchicago.edu/miles; Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, '*soldier*', accessed 29 January 2023, https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/soldier_1?q=soldier.

John's message that the *milites* of his time lacked such standardisation and ought to become more 'soldierly'.

On the other hand, translating *miles/milites* to "knight/knights" might draw readers toward anachronistic associations with a class of military-nobility, which was yet to be clearly established in John's England.[14] He certainly did not attach *miles/milites* to a characterisation that modern readers might consider 'knightly', using the word to describe footslogging urban militias and serfs relying on their campaign leaders to supply their equipment as much as he uses it to describe castle-dwelling cavalrymen.[15] Using *miles/milites* thus sets us upon a blank slate, that we might better see how John's writings on military identity and ethos connect with and distinguish from the twelfth-century trends of military identity, courtly 'knighthood', chivalry, etc.

The State of Historiography

To date, no study has closely examined John's socio-political conception of *milites*. The sole monograph focusing on John's military writings, John Hosler's *John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth Century Renaissance* (2013) is a military history, seeking evidence in John's corpus for twelfth-century strategy and tactics.[16] The study meticulously catalogues instances of military terminology in John's writings but focuses on what he had to say on how *milites* might be armed and supplied, not, as I intend to write, on how John perceived *milites* as a socio-political element in England.[17] John Gillingham's review lamented the monograph would disappoint social historians for though Hosler painstakingly counts how frequently John described things like 'swords' in the corpus,

---

[14] Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, '*miles*', accessed 29 January 2023, https://logeion.uchicago.edu/miles
[15] John D. Hosler, *John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth Century Renaissance* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 20-22.
[16] Hosler, *John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth Century Renaissance.*
[17] Ibid., 11-38, 184-204.

he omits study of words used to describe martial culture.[18] Additionally, Hosler's conclusion that John intended his military writings as tactical advice failed to convince reviewers John Gillingham, Brian Ditcham, and Michael Prestwich, who all hoped a future study might socially contextualise the interesting frequency of military opinions Hosler had highlighted in John's corpus.[19] This study in part hopes to answer those demands.

Besides Hosler's monograph, all other commentaries on John's military opinions have been written as asides within broader studies of medieval political thought and martial culture. Because these authors have limited space for John when they assess his socio-political views of *milites* they tend to consider the statements of only one work, *Policraticus*, which most overtly addresses the topic.[20] Effectively nothing has been written on the socio-political conception of *milites* in John's other works. In turn, because these historians look for continuity between John and other medieval thinkers in their broad surveys, they tend to brush over his unusual descriptions of *milites*. A common refrain is that John's lack of references to military feudalism and compulsive reference to Roman models of soldiering suggest he was out-of-touch.[21] Proponents of this view claim John's writings on

---

[18] John Gillingham, 'Review: John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance', *War in History* 21, no. 2 (April 2014): 252-254.

[19] Ibid.; Brian Ditcham, 'Review: John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth-Century', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 45, no. 1 (Spring 2014): 173-175; Michael Prestwich, 'Review: John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance', *The Journal of Military History* 78, no. 1 (January 2014): 347-348.

[20] Helen Nicholson, *Medieval Warfare: Theory and Practice of War in Europe, 300-1500* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan: 2004) 27, 34, 54; Philippe Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, trans. Michael Jones (London: Blackwell Publishers, 1984), 275; D.E. Luscombe & G.R. Evans, 'The Twelfth-Century Renaissance' in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought 350-1450,* ed. J.H. Burns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 309, 328; Aldo Scaglione, *Knights at Court: Courtliness, Chivalry, & Courtesy from Ottonian Germany to the Italian Renaissance* (Berkeley CAL University of California Press, 1992) 72-73, 202, 249, 349, 350; Richard Kaueper, *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 78-79; Georges Duby, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 263-268, 298-299; C.T. Allmand, *The De Re Militari of Vegetius: the Reception, Transmission and Legacy of a Roman Text in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 84-91.

[21] Cary Nederman, 'John of Salisbury's Political Theory' in *A Companion to John of Salisbury,* Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 259; Cary Nederman, 'Review: John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance', *Mediaevistik* 27 (2014): 368.

milites evidence interesting aspirational feelings for Roman militarism but are largely useless for understanding contemporary military practices.[22] This thesis will try to rehabilitate that reputation.

Those who more narrowly study the development of chivalry have been more forgiving, suggesting John's strange military descriptions are attempts to explain and promote French chivalric practices to an English audience using Classical exemplars.[23] Yet these authors have only paragraphs in their texts on John and as result their explanations are not sufficiently developed to explain why John lionises rustic, even uncouth, *milites* while critiquing courtly ones, who would presumably be most amenable to the adoption of chivalry. What is missing, I propose, is a contextualisation of John's agitative involvement in English politics to fully understand the breadth of his propositions.

Fortunately, two other historians (albeit only across a score of pages) have noted the story changes when John's career motives are considered alongside his military descriptions. Georges Duby's *The Three Orders* (1978) covering the dynamics of interclass relations in the Middle Ages, viewed *Policraticus*' critiques to be an expression of the broader twelfth century contest between clerical and secular governance.[24] He regarded John's relentless Classicism, which has roused others to claims of anachronism, as a political tactic, an "archaising *mise-en-scène*", lending deniability and authority to his original views through a veneer of citing the wisdoms of Romans, that he might more critically address political power in twelfth-century England.[25] Duby saw John as outlining the royal court as the "motor-organ" of the state, in which a "policratic" diffusion of power between royal agents necessitates not only an addressal of the king in promoting reform, but also of all his courtiers.[26] Consequently, Duby argued John appreciated that restoring ecclesiastical political power required winning a "duel" ongoing at the royal court between clerics and *milites*, wherein military

---

[22] Ibid.; Duby, *The Three Orders*, 263; Michael Prestwich, 'Review: John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance', *The Journal of Military History* 78, no. 1 (January 2014): 347-348.
[23] Scaglione, *Knights at Court*, 72-73; Kaueper, *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe*, 78-79.
[24] Duby, *The Three Orders*, 263-268.
[25] Ibid., 263-265.
[26] Ibid., 266.

"new men" increasingly displaced churchmen at the ear of Henry II.[27] Duby thus argues John wrote *Policraticus* to delegitimise such men to their fellow courtiers within the "policratic" power-system, as false knights in their luxury and "braggadocio".[28] Prudently, John couches his critique in praise for the "saintliness" of the military profession when out of politics, slyly suggesting that 'true' *milites* are hardy rustics who keep well-away from halls of power.[29]

Since then, C.T. Allmand's 2011 monograph on the medieval reception of the fourth-century Roman military manual, Vegetius' *De Re Militari*, similarly asserts John's reformative intent in his military depictions.[30] Allmand argues that John, disturbed by the empowered position of military elites under Kings Stephen and Henry II and the encroachment of Welsh raiders, "planned to sow the seed of a big idea", of the role of the *miles* as part of an army of state.[31] Just as Duby wrote of John's "cultural costumery", Allmand argues that John used *De Re Militari* to recall the effectiveness of this concept under the Roman state and put his controversial ideas in the pen of another author.[32] His quotation of it alters the original text's comments on the importance of nobility for recruitment and military leadership, seemingly to reinforce his de-individualisation of *milites* of the court, so they might be institutionalised out of politics and into a national army.[33] It is upon the shoulders of Duby and Allmand that this study finds its footing and hopes to look further and more clearly at John as reformer of the political status of English *milites*.

---

[27] Ibid., 266-267.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 6.2, 6.5, 6.8, trans John Dickinson (New York: Knopf, 1927), 181, 190, 198-200.

[30] C.T. Allmand, *The De Re Militari of Vegetius: the Reception, Transmission and Legacy of a Roman Text in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 85.

[31] Ibid., 88.

[32] Ibid., 87-89, 91; Duby, *The Three Orders*, 264.

[33] Ibid., 87, 89-90.

I argue that examination of John of Salisbury's entire corpus reveals a lifelong obsession with defining the socio-political role of *milites* within English society. All his writings discuss to some extent the social function of the military class and interrelating these writings by analysing them serially allows us to reconstruct a cogent theory of martial identity and ethos which sought to alleviate the erosion of the English Church's influence in political life by subordinating *milites* to ecclesiastical interests. This ideology remains consistent across the variety of audiences for whom and genres in which John wrote. In turn, I find it developed and complexified in response to the ongoing confrontations between *milites* and churchmen which John observed and was a party to during his career.

Chapter One deals with the sources John produced in his early career, *Entheticus Maior* (c.1141-1155), a didactic poem about the pitfalls of political life in the wake of the Anarchy addressed to the newly appointed chancellor, Thomas Becket, and 135 'early' letters written by John from 1153 to 1161 during his employment as Secretary to Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury (d.1161). In these sources, I expose John's early problematisation of an absence of ethics among England's *milites* which sees them harm churchmen, both in politics and in everyday life.

Chapter Two reveals John's attempt at a solution in *Policraticus* (1159), his encyclopaedic treatise to Chancellor Becket on the ideal operation of the state. Here I will rectify *Policraticus'* reputation as an anachronistic text by highlighting how John builds his case that *milites* ought be subordinate to the Church through highly specific but subtle references to contemporary affairs.

Chapter Three then deals with John's later oeuvre, being his hagiographies on Anselm of Canterbury (1162-1163) and Thomas Becket (1171), his memoir of the Roman curia, *Historia Pontificalis* (1164-1169), and his 190 'later' letters dating from 1161 until 1180. In all of these I uncover John's dissemination of his Policratian theory of *milites*, as he attempted to spread his ideas and effect normative change.

Chapter 1: Problematising English *Milites*
(1141-1161)

When swords are drawn the laws fall silent…
(Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Pro Milone*, trans. D.H. Berry, 11)

Figure 3 – The martyrdom of St Foillan at the hands of a miles. Taken from the Passionale (Lives of Saints) produced in the early 12th century at St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury.

(London, British Library, Arundel 91, f.179, *Detail of historiated initial,* England (Canterbury), *https://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/ILLUMIN.ASP?Size=mid&IllID=12277*)

At the core of John of Salisbury's characterisation of *milites* lies polemic regarding the dysfunction between contemporary military behaviour and Christian political ideals. While scholarship has considered the political role assigned to *milites* in John's 1159 book, *Policraticus*, I contend evidence for John problematising contemporary military behaviour as antithetical to the stability of the Christian state may be found earlier, in his poem *Entheticus Maior* (1141-1155) and his early letters (1153-1161). This chapter will reveal how his critiques in these texts responded to England's contemporary military disorders, and engaged with ecclesiastical pressure to impose Christian ethics onto Christendom's *milites*.

Reconciling the soldierly vocation with Christianity had troubled the Church since at least as far back as Bishop Augustine of Hippo (d.430), who examined the narrow justifications for Christian rulers fighting wars.[34] Augustine's focus had been on the ethical responsibility of rulers as the decision-makers of the war-time state and thus he affords greater lenience to Christian *milites* as obedient servants to their ruler's commands, arguing they could generally remain innocent of the sin of murder where their military-service was found necessary for the safety of their state.[35] Though medieval Christian practices of making sacramental penance after battle suggests *milites* regarded this exemption cautiously, by John's period it nonetheless remained the leading theory of the purpose of the military class in Christian polities, with similar 'defensive' justifications for military violence delineated within canon law in the *Decretum Gratiani* (c.1150).[36]

In practice, very few *milites* of the high medieval period so limited their violence to acts in defence of the state. In fact, a chief social campaign of the Catholic Church during the era had been to

---

[34] Ben Lowe, 'just war, just motive' in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Medieval Warfare and Military Technology*, ed. Clifford J Rogers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780195334036.001.0001/acref-9780195334036-e-0498.

[35] John Langan, 'The Elements of St. Augustine's Just War Theory', *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 12, no. 1 (Spring 1984), 23.

[36] Ibid.; Gratian, *Decretum Gratiani*, [Part 2] C. 23, https://go-gale-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/ps/i.do?p=MLFP&u=usyd&id=GALE%7CGN0103750595&v=2.1&it=r.

normatively problematise and restrict the violent feuding of *milites* in Western Christendom from actively destabilising their polities. The sheer frequency of private warfare in France from the 10th to the 11th centuries prompted the Church to promulgate the Peace and Truce of God movements, wherein *milites* were spiritually penalised for violence against churchmen, their properties and unarmed peasants.[37] Yet extant oaths of *milites* to the Peace Movement reveal an attitude concerned with what acts of violence they could get away with rather than with Christian ideals of behaviour. One from Robert II (d.1031), king of France, promised that he and his retinue would not burn peasant homes "unless there is a knight inside" nor attack nuns "unless it is their fault".[38]

More generally across Christendom and into John's lifetime, the Church campaigned against the social disorder caused by *milites* through the declaration of Crusades. In contrast to the defensive limitations of Augustine and canon law, Crusading offered Christian *milites* an outlet for active, offensive use of their profession in conquering the Holy Land. The Church could displace the troublemaking *milites* from Western societies by claiming their violence against unbelievers would win *milites* their salvation.[39] We find this exemplified by ecclesiastical exhortations like those of a letter of Abbot Bernard of Clairvaux (d.1153), a patron of John's, to the still fledgling Knights Templar in 1129, where he contrasts the "error so stupendous" of a *miles* dying in a private feud when he could achieve salvation by fighting the Church's enemies.[40]

John thus inherited an ecclesiastical épistémè which saw *milites* as an incongruous element of Christian polities and offered various solutions to reconcile their murderous vocation with Scripture

---

[37] Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society*, trans. L.A. Manyon (Oxford: Routledge, 1962), 431-435; Scaglione, *Knights at Court*, 26. Kaueper, *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe*, 73; Ben Lowe, 'Peace and Truce of God' in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Medieval Warfare and Military Technology*, ed. Clifford J Rogers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780195334036.001.0001/acref-9780195334036-e-0698.
[38] Robert II of France, 'Peace Oath' in Roland Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War And Peace - A Historical Survey And Critical Re-evaluation* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), 110.
[39] Alfred Andrea, *Encyclopaedia of the Crusades* (Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 2003) 165-166; Andrew Jotischsky, *Crusading and the Crusader States*, 2nd edition (London: Routledge, 2017), 32, 37.
[40] Bernard of Clairvaux, *In Praise of the New Knighthood* 1, 2, in *The Medieval Military Orders*, ed. Nicholas Morton, trans. M. Barbara and K. Bate (London: Routledge, 2013) 145-146.

but also, more practically, to channel their violence to advance Christendom's prosperity. This chapter will reveal the emergence of this military problem in John's earliest writings about English society. I will demonstrate the interrelation of John's gradual ascent into England's chaotic public life with the growing sophistication and specificity of his early critiques of *milites*. In his first work, *Entheticus Maior* (1141-1155), John portrays the negative example set by royal military action in recent English history, suggesting freedoms afforded to high-status *milites* threatened England's rule of law. John's assessment of the military problem broadens further in his early letters (1153-1161) as his entry into administrative work at the Archbishopric of Canterbury made him aware of widespread lawsuits between *milites* and clerics across England's counties, instigating his belief that English military attitudes threatened the safety of the Church. Just like the Peace of God or the Crusades, John's critiques attempted to address a real condition of military disorder in his homeland, as we see below.

English *Milites* in their Twelfth Century Context – Farmer-Knights, Professional Soldiers, and the Anarchy

In twelfth-century England, the identity '*miles*' chiefly applied to a type of landholder whose rent was paid by 'knight-service', an obligation to campaign for approximately forty days annually if called upon to by the lord from whom they held their fief.[41] Most *milites* held tenure on the lands of England's barons.[42] Barons also owed knight-service, and if called upon by their own overlord, the king, would have to provide themselves and a quota of *milites* enfeoffed on their land for the royal army.[43] Jean Scammell, in his seminal survey of military status in the period, notes that the vast majority of these enfeoffed *milites* would have been indistinguishable from the agrarian population.[44] Their prosperity depended on their cultivation of their fief, not through wealth earned fighting.[45] They

---

[41] Austin Lane Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta 1087-1216* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), 12-15.
[42] Ibid., 12-13.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Jean Scammell, 'The Formation of the English Social Structure: Freedom, Knights, and Gentry, 1066-1300', *Speculum* 68, no. 3 (July 1993): 591.
[45] Ibid., 592.

were far from the 'noble-knights' that would emerge in thirteenth-century England.[46] Until 1166, they could be sold "like villeins" by their overlord to another.[47] Many were villein-born and occupied both legal statuses, equally owing knight-service as they did servile obligations to spend a portion of their time working their lord's personal fief.[48] Until the late twelfth-century even freeborn-men enfeoffed through knight-service could owe short terms of labour depending on the specific vagaries of their enfeoffment.[49]

Given the limited campaign duration allowed by the forty day term of knight-service, English war-leaders tended to eschew farmer *milites* in favour of the other major type, professionals.[50] One method was to hire foreign mercenaries using scutage, a tax paid by those owing knight-service in lieu of them campaigning.[51] Henry II's reign, during which John wrote most of his works, saw frequent exaction of scutage.[52] According to chronicler Robert of Torigni (d.1186), the king used scutage in order to not disturb "cultivator-knights" from their work, instead filling the royal army with mercenaries.[53] We shall see John make efforts to reverse this trend.

Additionally, the king and barons customarily maintained retinues on their personal properties to accompany, guard and advise their courts.[54] These 'household-*milites*' tended to also serve as commanders of their lords' armies.[55] Their visibility as the chosen elite and the martial role-model

---

[46] Ibid., 598.
[47] Ibid., 593.
[48] Ibid., 599.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid., 600, 604; Frank Barlow, *The Feudal Kingdom of England 1042-1216* (London: Routledge, 2014), 147,
[51] Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta*, 16; Donald Kagay, '*scutage*' in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780198662624.001.0001/acref-9780198662624-e-5274.
[52] Donald Kagay, '*scutage*' in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780198662624.001.0001/acref-9780198662624-e-5274.
[53] Robert of Torigni, 'Chronicle,' in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. R. Howlett, 4 vols, Rolls Series 82 (London, 1889), 4:202 in Scammell, 'The Formation of the English Social Structure', 601.
[54] Robert Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings 1075-1225* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 266.
[55] Ibid.

status this afforded them made them a frequent target of John's critiques of English military ethos, as we shall see.

England was not immune to the excesses of military disorder that had warranted Church intervention across other parts of Christendom during this period. John had the opportunity to observe the absence of a governing ethos of violence by each of the aforementioned types of *milites* during England's civil war of 1138-1153, known as 'the Anarchy'. As King Stephen fought to retain the throne against the claims of Matilda, daughter of the previous king, and then her son Henry II (the eventual victor) government in the contested counties broke down.[56] Admittedly, recent scholarship has rightfully noted 'anarchy' could not describe all of England during the war as counties more stably held by each faction experienced relative normalcy.[57] But for our purposes in focusing on John's perspective the war certainly must have seemed anarchic; his home county in Wiltshire witnessed significant fighting to the point that by the war's end approximately a third of local fiefs were exempted from royal tax on account of depopulation.[58] Further, as we shall see, John suffered particular danger being a churchman during the period.

Stephen, distrusting the allegiance and skill of English *milites* available through knight-service, composed his army from a mix of Flemish mercenaries and household-*milites*.[59] In his anxiety to ensure their loyalty, he permitted them to enrich themselves by pillaging England's civilian population.[60] William of Malmesbury (d.1143), chronicling the pillaging of Stephen's force, claims

[56] Edmund King, 'Introduction' in *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign,* ed. Edmund King (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), accessed 11 January 2023, https://academic-oup-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/book/11022/chapter/159352123.

[57] C.W. Hollister, 'The Aristocracy' in *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign,* ed. Edmund King (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), accessed 11 January 2023, https://academic-oup-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/book/11022/chapter/159353140.

[58] David Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery: Britain 1066–1284* (London: Penguin, 2003), 177.

[59] C.W. Hollister, 'The Aristocracy' in *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign,* ed. Edmund King (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), accessed 11 January 2023, https://academic-oup-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/book/11022/chapter/159353140; Keith Stringer, *The Reign of Stephen: Kingship, Warfare, and Government in Twelfth-century England* (London: Routledge, 1993), 9.

[60] William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, *Historia Novella* I-II, trans. J.A. Giles (London: Henry Bohn, 1847), 492-493, 509-510.

churches were a favourite target, for they held unguarded treasures and churchmen made good captives for ransoms as the religious houses had money to pay.[61] He describes a normative shift, where *milites* realised under Stephen's license they could ignore taboos.[62] These were not just acts of the errant rank-and-file but behaviours exhibited by the highest status *milites* of Stephen's campaign. For instance, John would have been familiar with William of Ypres (d.1164/5), Stephen's captain of mercenaries, who during the Anarchy occupied the surrounds of Canterbury.[63] He was among the highest ranking *milites* of the war, yet was primarily known for his war-time banditry; looting Abingdon Abbey, extorting the cathedral staff at St Albans and more.[64]

Of the land-holding agrarian *milites*, some took the opportunity to cast off their subordination to their lords and live as outlaws.[65] Contemporaries bemoaned the swathe of castles built and occupied by rogue *milites* who would charge upon the surrounding populace "*tenserie*" ("protection money"), a neologism developing from the war by the commonality of its practice.[66] Again, the Church suffered as its stone abbeys and cathedrals offered good fortifications for these bandits. For example, in 1143-1144, a *miles*, Geoffrey de Mandeville, violently evicted the monks of Ramsey Abbey and used their home as a hold-out to pillage the fen-country of eastern England.[67]

The spectre of Anarchy-era *milites*, wantonly attacking their countrymen and blasphemously disregarding the Church's protections, will loom large in the span of all John's writing, still finding mention in the final letters before his death. The war seems to have propounded the lesson that *milites*,

---

[61] Ibid.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Richard Eales, 'William of Ypres, styled count of Flanders (d. 1164/5), soldier' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023, accessed 21 January 2023, https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-29465.
[64] Emilie Amt, *The Accession of Henry II in England: Royal Government Restored, 1149-1159* (Bury St Edmunds: St Edmundsbury Press, 1993), 88.
[65] David Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery*, 178.
[66] T.N. Bisson, 'The Lure of Stephen's England: Tenserie, Flemings, and a Crisis of Circumstance' in *King Stephen's Reign (1135-1154)*, ed. Paul Dalton, Graeme J. White (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2008), 171.
[67] C.W. Hollister, '*Mandeville, Geoffrey de, first earl of Essex (d. 1144), magnate*' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed 21 January 2023, https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-17927.

unrestricted by a Christian rationale to curb their violence, inevitably would become opponents of the Church. The post-war trends under the Anarchy's victor, Henry II, only further encouraged John to intervene, as the new king elevated the military class John perceived as monstrous abusers into England's magistracies. England's reconstruction saw the counties' bureaucracies replenished by recruiting *milites*. [68] In turn, the king chose many of his household-*milites* to be his ministers to the detriment of clerics who had dominated past Anglo-Norman courts.[69] Some of these appointments may have been personally egregious to John. For example, Richard de Lucy (d.1179), formerly a commander for Stephen, took the office of Justiciar of England when once it had been the purview of the patron of John's education, Bishop Roger of Salisbury (d.1139).[70] Tellingly, his first major work problematises *milites* at the royal court, asserting they destabilised politics with their willingness for violence.

Entheticus Maior - John of Salisbury's formative years amidst England's military chaos (1141-1155)

In 1136, John of Salisbury, aged between fifteen and twenty years, left his home in the hillfort town of Old Sarum in England's South-West and crossed the Channel to study in Paris.[71] He would not return to England until 1148.[72] Hans Liebeschütz has shown that news of the worsening civil war (1138-1153) ravaging his homeland weighed heavily on John's studies.[73] Echoes of that trauma

---

[68] Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings*, 215; Richard Huscroft, *Ruling England: 1042-1217,* 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 2016), 151, 153.

[69] Ibid., 80-82, 153, 157, 151-152; W.L. Warren, *Henry II* (Berkeley CA: University of California Press, 1973), 304-305, 308-310; Jörg Peltzer, 'Henry II and the Norman Bishops' *English Historical Review* 119 (November 2004): 1203.

[70] Emilie Amt, 'Lucy, Richard de (d. 1179), soldier and administrator.' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/17149; John Baker, *An Introduction to English Legal History,* 5th edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 18-20; Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, 'Introduction' in *A Companion to John of Salisbury,* Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 3.

[71] Jan van Laarhoven, *John of Salisbury's Entheticus Maior and Minor* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 3; for clarity this refers to van Laarhoven's critical commentary on *Entheticus*. The references below marked as John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior*, …, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, … refer to van Laarhoven's translation of the text.

[72] Ibid., 5.

[73] Frank Barlow, *The Feudal Kingdom of England 1042-1216* (London: Routledge, 2014), 181; Hans Liebeschütz, *Mediaeval Humanism in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury* (1968), 22 cited in Irene

resound in his first work, *Entheticus Maior* (circa. 1141-1155), which describes King Stephen's "ferals" murdering the common "sheep" in the "slaughter-house" of England and a "pack" taking "impious weapons" against "a needy Church".[74]

Thus, John spent his youth in voluntary exile, undertaking nearly twelve years of scholarship among the progenitor schools to the University of Paris.[75] Initially, and significantly for this study, John disliked the dialectical curriculum at Paris and "transferred" from 1137 to 1140 to the cathedral school of Chartres, a hub of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance where scholars glossed Classical literature to integrate it into contemporary thought.[76] The sheer frequency of John's Classical quotations (van Laarhoven counts 2841 across his entire corpus) evidences Chartres transformed John.[77] According to C.N.L Brooke, the humanist methodologies John encountered encouraged him to use Classical texts in his writings as an almost supplementary Scripture to provide answers where the Bible remained mute.[78] Chapter Two will accordingly argue that *Policraticus'* descriptions of *milites* as Roman legionaries were not the anachronisms scholars have previously held them to be, but were instead precedents John offered from Antiquity for how contemporary *milites* could be improved.

Returning to Paris, from 1142-1144, John came under the tutelage of a fellow Englishman, Robert Pullen (d.1146).[79] Pullen offered unique insight into the application of his studies to politics,

---

O'Daly, *John of Salisbury and the Medieval Roman Renaissance* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), 200.

[74] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior*, 1309-1346, 1370-1378, 1411-1413, trans. Jan van Laarhoven (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 190-196.

[75] John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon* 2.10, trans. Daniel D. McGarry (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955), 99.

[76] Ibid., 97; Cédric Giraud and Constant Mews, 'John of Salisbury and the Schools of the 12th Century', in *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, ed. Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 62.

[77] van Laarhoven, *John of Salisbury's Entheticus Maior and Minor*, 63.

[78] C.N.L Brooke, 'Introduction', in *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1 (1153-1161)*, ed. W.J. Millor SJ and H.E. Butler (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1955), xlii-xliii.

[79] F.L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, 'Pullen, Robert' in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church,* ed. F.L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780192802903.001.0001/acref-9780192802903-e-5653; Hans Liebeschütz, 'John of Salisbury and Pseudo-Plutarch', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 6 (1943), 33-34.

for while tutoring John he also served as a cardinal and then became chancellor to the Papacy.[80]

Pullen's *Sententiarum Logicarum*, a compilation of his lectures, evidence a curriculum particularly interested in the ideal functioning of society's orders. Yet, their influence on John's socio-political conception of *milites* has passed unnoticed by historians. Among Pullen's lectures I note he characterises *milites* as ideally operating as an axis of the social contract between a king and his subjects, where the labour of peasants allows the king to support *milites* to protect them.[81] Consequent to this social purpose to the Christian polity, Pullen reasons 'true' *milites* ought serve cooperatively, be centralised "under the king", and, replicating Augustine's doctrine, fight for the defence of the state.[82] Indeed, a ruler who fails to use his *milites* as part of his obligation to protect his subjects is labelled "unjust".[83] In Chapter Two we will find Pullen's schema reproduced and expanded to form the basis for John's view of the societal role of *milites* in *Policraticus*. Nonetheless, Pullen's concept of a rationalised purposing of military class obligations towards the mutual benefit of society immediately affected John's first work, *Entheticus Maior* (1141-1155).

The *Entheticus* (the title of which, like many of John's titles, is a neologism without known meaning), is a 1852-line poem, partly satirical, partly didactic.[84] It was redrafted several times between John's return from Chartres and the accession of Thomas Becket to the chancellorship of England in 1154 and follows John's career progression in the 1140s with lines 1-1274 examining university life, 1275-1636 on the social circumstances witnessed upon his return to England, and 1637-1852 on Canterbury.[85] In parallel, John matriculated from his Parisian studies in 1147-1148 and entered the employ of Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, as an envoy in 1148-1153 before settling

---

[80] F.L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, 'Pullen, Robert' in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church,* ed. F.L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780192802903.001.0001/acref-9780192802903-e-5653.

[81] Robert Pullen, *Sententiarum Logicarum Libri VIII*, 7.9 in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne, vol. 186 (1854), 921-922.

[82] Ibid. ("under the king" my translation): *sub rege milites sunt.*

[83] Ibid.

[84] van Laarhoven, *John of Salisbury's Entheticus Maior and Minor*, 14-16.

[85] Ibid., 5-6.

into secretarial duties at the Canterbury cloister from 1153 on.[86] John addressed *Entheticus* to Thomas Becket, then a talented colleague at Canterbury who had been selected by the new king Henry II to serve as chancellor, England's most influential advisership.[87] The text is thus replete with John's frank complaints about the state of affairs of England and requests Becket use his chancellorship to address these.

The central theme is the pervasion of *nugae* (courtly "trifles" or "immoralities") in the place of wisdom.[88] *Entheticus* asserts that King Stephen's support for *nugae*, both in the sense of frivolous past-times and in the sense of unethical political endeavours, upended England's social contract, with the king ignoring laws and failing to protect his people.[89] It ties military pillaging during the Anarchy as a consequence of this royal example of arbitrariness, which detached *milites* from their sense of obligation to the state.[90] John implores Becket to set a better example at the new court of Henry II by upholding the rule of law as chancellor, hopefully re-rationalising English *milites* into a social position of cohesion rather than unchecked violence.[91] His argument for addressing the problem begins by moralising on the depths of lawlessness reached during the Anarchy, in heavy metaphor:

> in the time of Hircanus…who believed falsely that kings are bound under no law…we see Mandroger flourish, under whom no evil cause can perish. The [*nugae*] of Mandroger seem the greatest wisdom…[92]

John uses pseudonyms, perhaps as a means of ensuring only Becket could understand his invective against England's recent rulers. Van Laarhoven has convincingly identified Hircanus as King Stephen while Mandroger's identity has been linked with various partisans and officials of the

---

[86] Ibid.

[87] Ibid., 47-52; John Cannon and Robert Crowcroft, '*lord chancellor'* in *Dictionary of British History*, 3rd ed. John Cannon and Robert Crowcroft (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780191758027.001.0001/acref-9780191758027-e-2136.

[88] Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, '*nugae'*, accessed 16 November 2022, https://logeion.uchicago.edu/nugae.

[89] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior*, 147-155, 1301-1354 trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 114-115, 190-193

[90] Ibid., 1315-1354, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 190-193.

[91] Ibid., 1355-1362, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 192-193.

[92] Ibid., 147-155, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 114-115.

former king.[93] The name references a thief-character in the fifth-century Roman comedy *Querolus*.[94] Given what we know of the banditry of Stephen's *milites*, when John writes of Hircanus allowing no law to bind him such that the thief Mandroger flourishes, it appears he is referencing Stephen's wartime decision to fund his campaign through church looting and ransoms, making Mandroger's *nugae* "immoralities" "seem the greatest wisdom".[95] At this early juncture of the poem John thus establishes *nugae* as an alternative military "wisdom", antithetical to a military ethos defined by "law". He returns to this theme when describing to Becket what he saw returning to England during the Anarchy's final years. He depicts Stephen's toleration of the "immoralities" of military pillaging as taken to the extreme in dystopian episodes. We hear of bandits so intermixed with the identity of *milites* that they defend their charges in court "saying: I speak of the king's profit" and flock to Stephen's armies for protection, causing "the just to perish".[96] He jokes that the ransom-taking by *milites* had become so accepted by royal authorities that wolves, a reviled creature in the agricultural milieu of twelfth-century England, were set free if they could provide sheep for ransom.[97] All these signs of socio-political usurpation are traced back to the example set at the royal court, which John refers to as *carnificina*, variously "execution-place", "slaughter-house" or "torture".[98] This was the place Becket had found himself as chancellor and by so describing a churchman attending upon a place of religious impurity John further emphasises the need for Becket to reform his new environment.[99]

He specifically problematises a cadre of pseudonymous, violent individuals at the royal court, the 'executioners' of the *carnificina*, as poor exemplars for *milites*. One individual particularly

---

[93] van Laarhoven, *John of Salisbury's Entheticus Maior and Minor*, 377-378, 382-383.
[94] Ibid., 382.
[95] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior*, 147-155, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 114-115.
[96] Ibid., 1324-1326, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 190-191.
[97] Ibid., 1315-1316, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 190-191; Austin Lane Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta 1087-1216* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), 31.
[98] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior,* 1412-1416, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 196-197; Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, '*carnificina*', accessed 16 November 2022, https://logeion.uchicago.edu/carnificina.
[99] Nathan Ristuccia, 'The Image of an Executioner: Princes and Decapitations in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*' *Humanitas* 29, no. 1-2 (2016), 165-166.

critiqued in the poem's later half is a courtier who serves as the "hand of the king" whom he calls "Antipater", a pun that John spoils by explaining it, "the name…is given to him because he harms the fathers (father in Latin being *pater*) and inflicts injuries and plans murder".[100] Surveying the texts referenced by John's corpus, I have located the name in Josephus' *Antiquitates Iudaicae* where it refers to a general named "Antipater" wreaking havoc under a Judean ruler, notably named "Hircanus".[101] Combined with the correlation between his "injuries" and "murder" against priests and the ecclesiastical persecutions of Stephen's generals as well as his description as a "hand", which would become a metonym in John's later works for *milites*, I argue "Antipater" referred to a military identity at the royal court.[102] This interpretation is supported by the re-appearance of Mandroger, who is described as a lesser commander assisting Antipater's church-lootings for Stephen by leading "the pack of Antipater" with "impious weapons" against "a needy Church".[103] Though we cannot know for certain who these pseudonyms referred to, *Entheticus* roundly blames their sacrilegious example for de-rationalising military behaviour and making politics a matter of 'might-makes-right'. He warns Becket to be wary, again using a slew of Classical pseudonyms, of the *milites* and courtiers at the new court of Henry II for they have precedent to assault or extort a churchman, even if he is chancellor.[104]

Yet *Entheticus* also singles Becket out as capable of changing the political culture.[105] John emphasises his ability to 'fight' the bad example of courtly *milites* by describing Becket's job in military language, as the "defender of law" fighting against "Mandroger and his confederates".[106] He

---

[100] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior*, 1369-1370, 1385-1386, 194-195.
[101] C.C.J. Webb, *Policraticus (Ioannis Saresberiensis episcopi Carnotensis Policratici sive de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum libri VIII)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), 491; Josephus, *Antiquitates Iudaicae* 14.1.3, trans. William Whiston (Salt Lake City UT: Project Gutenberg, 2001), https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/2848/pg2848-images.html#link142HCH0001.
[102] John of Salisbury, *John of Salisbury's Entheticus Maior and Minor*, 1369-1370, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 194-195; van Laarhoven, *Entheticus Maior and Minor*, 384; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 6.1, trans. John Dickinson (New York: Knopf, 1927), 173.
[103] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior*, 1370-1378, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 194-195.
[104] Ibid., 1411-1434, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 196-199.
[105] Ibid,, 1297, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 188-189.
[106] Ibid., 1362, 1435, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 192-193, 198-199.

suggests Becket could be a new military role model in censuring these courtly *milites* and re-asserting military virtue:

> From the example of the commander, the soldier begins to press the enemy more keenly. If the commander flees the soldier turns his back in flight.[107]

Notably, Becket's chancellorship involved him serving as a military commander on several occasions so this was not purely metaphorical.[108] Having exhorted Becket to act, John offers him a simplistic ethos to promulgate at court that might restrict *milites* to their correct socio-political place. Where Augustine had written "peace of all things is the tranquillity of order. Order is the distribution which allots things equal and unequal, each to its own place", accordingly John saw the resolution of England's carnage in an allotting of purposes to classes.[109] He writes:

> a wise man dispenses doctrines according to order, rule and measure; on the other hand for trifle-gushers rule, measure and order perish…he who knows no measure perishes without measure; he whom no rule constrains guilt gives him free reign, untrammelled, it casts him headlong into evil and kills him head over heels. So, let there be order for good men in living.[110]

Pointing Becket away from the reigning ethos of "trifle-gushers" (a translation of John's neologism *nugifluis*, i.e. the courtly *milites* who disseminate *nugae*), John suggests wise action would be an application of "order".[111] That word, "*ordo*", appears ten times in the passage that follows (lines 325-346) and its multiplicity of meanings in twelfth-century England, I argue, present the possibility of this being the first recorded instance of John seeking restructuring of *milites* as a class.[112] *Ordo* could simply follow its primary meaning 'order'.[113] Alternatively, it could follow the use by William of Malmesbury (d.1143) to mean social class, changing the meaning to "a wise man dispenses

---

[107] Ibid., 1451-1452, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 198-199.
[108] John Hosler, 'The Brief Military Career of Thomas Becket' *Haskins Society Journal* 15 (2004): 88-100.
[109] Augustine of Hippo, *De Civitate Dei*, 19.13, trans. Henry Paolucci, *The Political Writings of Saint Augustine* (Washington, D.C: Regnery, 1996), 143-144 quoted in Geoffrey Koziol, *The Peace of God* (York, Arc Humanities Press, 2018) 5-6.
[110] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior*, 325-345, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 126-139.
[111] Ibid.; van Laarhoven, *John of Salisbury's Entheticus Maior and Minor*, 288.
[112] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior*, 325-346, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 126-139.
[113] Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, '*ordo*', accessed 16 November 2022, https://logeion.uchicago.edu/ordo.

objectives for one's class".[114] Even more interestingly, many contemporary English writers use *ordo*

to describe military organisations.[115] John so uses it in *Policraticus* to refer to "the line of battle".[116]

Consequently, the passage can reasonably be argued to suggest that reason prescribes *milites* must be

defined and regulated as a social institution. Failing to restrict *milites*, it implies in turn, created the

'trifle-gushers' and 'executioners' of Stephen's reign and their sacrilegious assaults on the Church.

In this way, *Entheticus* demonstrates problematisation of the limits of state-licensed violence

and the poor example set by England's leading *milites* in John's earliest recorded thoughts. The poem

envisages the violence of King Stephen's reign as a product of the ill-defined social purpose and

inadequate behavioural prohibitions set by the royal court for English *milites*. By so framing the

problem as a political one, emanating from the example of the royal court, the poem shifts

responsibility on to its reader, Becket, amidst establishing his chancellorship, to correct the Crown's

tolerance for military criminality. Thus, as early as 1155, we find John supporting the political

position of the English Church by attempting to normatively restrict *milites* who had harmed

churchmen, an approach that will continue across his career. Yet as John entered the world of political

administration himself in serving as secretary to the Archbishop of Canterbury from 1153, he would

come to see the problem already extended far beyond the limits of the royal courts and permeated the

English populace.

---

[114] Ibid.; William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, 2.150 in *Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores Post Bedam Praecipui, ex vetustissimis codicibus manuscriptis nunc primum in lucem editi* (G. Bishop, R Nuberie & R. Barker Typographi Regii, London 1596), https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=QUlhAAAAcAAJ&hl=en.
[115] Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, '*ordo*', accessed 16 November 2022, https://logeion.uchicago.edu/ordo.
[116] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* vol 2, 6.7, ed. C.C.J. Webb (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), 20.

Early Letters – Perceiving the 'duel' between *milites* and clerics (1153-1161)

Through his early efforts at the Canterbury cloister in the late 1140s and early 1150s, which included embassies to the Papal Curia and *Entheticus*, John likely impressed Archbishop Theobald (d.1161) with his awareness of the English Church's political needs and rhetorical flair.[117] Theobald thus chose to employ John to write his official correspondences as his secretary in 1153, inducting John into the inner workings of one of Christendom's busiest archiepiscopates.[118] This would have brought a dramatic increase in John's awareness of the socio-political state of wider England. Theobald's archepiscopal administration had filled many of the governmental vacuums created during the Anarchy such that the Archbishop's signature appears on more charters than all his predecessors put together as "confirmation from the primate was regarded as of greater value than the king's".[119] As a result, John's work from 1153-1161 involved a high rate of legal correspondences from across England's counties, affording him greater opportunity to observe the interactions and dysfunctions of *milites* within wider English society .

The extant manuscripts of John's letters mix items written on behalf of Theobald with John's personal correspondences.[120] However, the severe illness of Theobald (dated to at latest 1156) presents further ambiguity as to whether we should consider Theobald's letters as the words of the Archbishop or his scribe.[121] This thesis will simply treat those letters as evidence for information John was privy to in the Canterbury administration.

Entheticus had problematised the behavioural example set by a cadre of unnamed high-status *milites* at the royal court which encouraged their peers to ignore prohibitions on violence against churchmen. Now letter-writing for the Archbishop of Canterbury in dealing with legal disputes, John was inundated with evidence suggesting that unrestrained culture had influenced the great mass of

---

[117] C.N.L Brooke, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1 (1153-1161)*, xxix.
[118] Ibid.
[119] Ibid., xxviii.
[120] Ibid., xi.
[121] Ibid.

milites enfeoffed across the English countryside. In legal cases before Canterbury's court which John meticulously recorded, we find frequent accounts of *milites* abusing churchmen from rural monasteries to Canterbury's doorstep, written with the same characterisation as John had used for the 'executioners' of *Entheticus*. In this way, we may expand on Duby's proposal that John perceived a 'duel' between *milites* and clerics at court.[122] His letters reveal he could see this 'duel' playing out in every domain in England, suggesting the source of their conflict was not simply over the ear of the king but related to a general military irreverence for ecclesiastical authority. Exemplifying this, the legal cases John records frequently required the Archbishop of Canterbury to appeal to the pope as *milites* would not otherwise respect ecclesiastical rulings against them. All the letters composed by John for Theobald I have chosen to survey below are papal appeals. Frequently, the defendants are identified as high-status *milites* using the power imbalance inherent to their willingness to kill and the pious non-violence of the clerical plaintiffs, to accomplish their crimes and intimidate witnesses and judges.

Letters 23 and 24 (c.1156-1157) relate a conspiracy conducted by William of Ypres, King Stephen's captain of mercenaries.[123] Having ousted an English lord during the Anarchy, William ceded the church of Chilham on the lord's estate to an order of Flemish monks on the basis they share revenues with his *miles* Odo.[124] John records William even personally threatened Archbishop Theobald during the war-years into agreeing to the Flemish occupation.[125] After the war, Henry II enfeoffed Hugh of Dover, described in turn as both "noble" and a *miles*, as the new lord and he proceeded to break into the church and violently evict the Flemish monks in turn.[126] The pope who had erroneously supported the Flemish ownership based on Theobald's forced consent to it, intervened and demanded Hugh relinquish the property.[127] John tries to lay-out Theobald's

---

[122] Duby, *The Three Orders*, 266-267.
[123] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1, The Early Letters (1153–1161)*, 23-24, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 37-41
[124] Ibid.
[125] Ibid.
[126] Ibid.
[127] Ibid., 23, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 37.

explanation of the correct ownership to the pope and in communicating the Archbishop's argument we find him becoming aware of several of the Archbishop's political concerns that will come to manifest in his own writing. Most acerbically, both letters describe William of Ypres, as "that notorious tyrant and most grievous persecutor of our church".[128] Theobald's descriptor of William as a "tyrant" will be echoed in John's personal letters and is notable given its use in *Policraticus* to refer to individuals who ignore sacred laws and thus corrupt the political order, deserving of death.[129] Its use here in a plea to the pope reveals anxiety at Canterbury at the unchecked power a *miles* could achieve through wanton violence in the Anarchy and the early period of Henry II's rule. The case history in turn would have highlighted to John a general disregard for the Church's authority by *milites* that encouraged their tyrannical actions. At all stages the case is muddled by unrestrained violence, with William of Ypres feeling comfortable to threaten England's leading cleric into signing over Chilham and Hugh of Dover ignoring the pope's initial decree of Flemish ownership and ignoring Theobald's legal processes on the property. Both William the usurper and Hugh the rightful lord are quicker to violently evict the clerical occupiers than rely on legal means of asserting ownership. As such, John may well have considered this as confirming and expanding his view, expressed in *Entheticus*, that in England "the sacred laws yield place to the decrees of executioners".[130]

As if rhyming with that belief, Letter 58 recounts how Andrew, cleric of Lenham, pursued a claim that a priest of Wichling had robbed his tithes through the backing of a *miles* named Richard.[131] When the matter came before Canterbury, Richard had been called away to fight for his liege-lord, William of Anjou, and the Wichling priest, without the threat posed by his violent backer, acceded to

---

[128] Ibid., 23-24, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 37, 39.
[129] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 136, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 2-3; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 7.17, trans. John Dickinson, 281-288; Nederman, 'A Duty to Kill: John of Salisbury's Theory of Tyrannicide', 369.
[130] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior and Minor*, 1416, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 196-197.
[131] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1, The Early Letters (1153–1161)*, 58, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 99.

Andrew's claim. [132] This would have provided to John a further demonstration of the primacy of military violence as a source of social sway in rural England.

By the second half of the twelfth-century, years after the conclusion of the Anarchy, John was still recording cases of evictions by *milites*, such that even clerics on the right side of the law valued the threat of violence more than decrees of the Archbishop. In Letter 102, John reports that a priest attempting to recover his church from occupation by a *miles* of Reginald de Dunstanville, Earl of Cornwall, engaged the military services of Alan III, Earl of Richmond, to evict his evictor. [133] The priest had made appeals to Canterbury but had decided violence would resolve the situation more quickly than legal processes. [134]

Further reinforcing John's conviction from *Entheticus* that the problem emanated from the license afforded to *milites* by the royal court, Letter 53 describes King Henry II intervening in a case before the Bishopric of Coventry to indefinitely adjourn a priest's restitution of his Prestbury church from a military squatter. [135] The destitute priest appealed to Theobald who in turn had to appeal to the pope. [136]

Parallels with the Peace of God movement were there for John to see - *milites* willing to harm defenceless clerics in their pursuit of local suzerainty, cowed only by the threatened penalties of the highest levels of the Church. In that vein, Letter 85 requests the pope make an example out of a *miles* seeking to the evict the monks of Tewkesbury. [137] The letter describes military evictions as not only

---

[132] Ibid.
[133] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1, The Early Letters (1153–1161)*, 102, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 162-163.
[134] Ibid.
[135] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1, The Early Letters (1153–1161)*, 53, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 91-92; Henry II campaigned frequently during the 1150s, perhaps his intervention sought to secure the revenues of the Prestbury church for one of his soldiers so he could keep him fighting his wars; John Hosler, 'Henry II' in *The Encyclopaedia of War* (New York: Wiley, 2011), https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1002/9781444338232.wbeow277.
[136] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1, The Early Letters (1153–1161)*, 53, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 91-92.
[137] Ibid., 85, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 133.

common practice in England but increasingly perceived among the laity as a right of fief-holding *milites*.[138] Thus Theobald requests the pope "crush the temerity of one man that warned by his example others will never dare to aspire to like achievements".[139]

Through exposure to these cases and the fear they invoked as Theobald dictated them to him, I contend John began to problematise the psychology of *milites* in England generally – believing they perceived their interests in society to trump those of the Church. In his personal letters from the same period his ambit expands from *Entheticus*' view of the wantonness of military elites at court and begins conceiving the contemporary condition of the military vocation as inherently destabilising. Exemplifying this, John's personal letter to the Bishop of Salisbury implores him to not grant any assistance to the Knights Hospitaller, for despite the piety of their Crusader cause and their monasticism, they are still *milites* and thus bound to "abuse the generosity" so that "you will deprive yourself and your successors of every church that you grant to them".[140]

Conclusion

My survey of John's early works thus reveals that before he wrote *Policraticus*, which has drawn nearly all study on John's military views, he had given the social condition of England's *milites* much thought. His *Entheticus* and early letters evidence anxieties about the threat posed to churchmen by prevailing soldierly norms, as well as suggestions on how better behaviour might be promulgated by Chancellor Becket and the Papacy. As a result we can contextualise his next work *Policraticus* and its in-depth theorisation of martial ethics, as a solution to problems which were evidently near and pressing in John's mind.

---

[138] Ibid.
[139] Ibid.
[140] Ibid., 91, 140.

Chapter 2: Theorising a Better Military Profession (1159)

"Onward, Christian soldiers,
marching as to war,
With the cross of Jesus,
going on before!
Christ, the royal Master,
leads against the foe;
Forward into battle,
see his banner go!"

(Sabine Baring-Gould, *Onward Christian Soldiers* (1865))

Figure 4 – God sets an example for milites on Earth. Taken from the Great Canterbury Psalter produced at the conclusion of the 12th century at Christchurch, Canterbury.

(Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, *Psalterium Cantuariense*, f12v, England (Canterbury), *https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10551125c/f34.item.zoom*)

Entheticus and John's prolific letter-writing earned him notoriety throughout England in the mid-1150s. Privately corresponding with his friend Peter Cellensis in 1156, John lamented that his reputation as an ecclesiastical agitator had risen amid a wave of bishops resisting Henry II's expansion of government, claiming "if the English Church ventures to claim even the shadow of liberty…it is imputed onto me".[141] The letter explains that the king had charged him earlier that year with *lèse-majesté*, the crime of offending the Crown, for supposedly "instructing" the dissent of England's bishops.[142] The charge forced him into an "internal exile", barring him from participating in English political discourse.[143] He confided with Peter that he bore such fear and anger for his future that he was considering leaving his prestigious employment at Canterbury and fleeing to France.[144] Adding to John's pain, Chancellor Becket, his former Canterbury colleague for whom he had assiduously composed *Entheticus* for, ignored his multiple pleas for assistance in December-January 1156/57.[145] Only the intervention of Pope Adrian IV (d.1159), who John had befriended at Rheims in 1148, restored John to normalcy in April-August 1157.[146] Over that approximate year of isolation and personal grievance with the state of English politics, and especially angered by Becket's inaction on the advice of *Entheticus*, John began writing a vast tome, again addressing the chancellor, called *Policraticus*.[147]

---

[141] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1, The Early Letters (1153-1161)*, 19, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 31-32.

[142] Ibid., 19, 30, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 31-32, 48.

[143] Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, 'Introduction', in *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 10.

[144] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1, The Early Letters (1153-1161)*, 19, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 31-32.

[145] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1, The Early Letters (1153-1161)*, 27, 28, 30, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 44, 45-46, 48; Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, 'Introduction', in *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 10; Karen Bollerman & Cary Nederman, 'John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket', in *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, ed. Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 70.

[146] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1, The Early Letters (1153-1161)*, 30, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 48; Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, "Introduction", in *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, ed. Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 10.

[147] Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, "Introduction", in *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, ed. Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 10.

Policraticus is John's longest work. It is written in eight books, broadly providing John's opinions on how civil servants should act in politics.[148] The first three books provide admonishments against various courtly *nugae* like hunting and gambling, as distractions from public duties and degenerative to Christian social relations.[149] The latter five books set out John's vision of the ideal "Christian Commonwealth", quoting Classical, Patristic and Biblical literature to elucidate 'divinely-ordained duties' for each public office and social class, that Becket ought follow and disseminate as chancellor.[150]

This chapter will mainly examine Book Six which theorises the place of *milites* in this aspirational view of English society. Book Six is largely untrodden ground in modern scholarship. The majority of studies on *Policraticus* have focused on the conceptualisations of royal power in the latter books, or, when studied as a whole, have dealt with the text as evidence for the reception and transmission of the Classics in the twelfth-century.[151] As mentioned in the General Introduction, Duby, Allmand, and Hosler have written about Book Six but none have taken John's social theory of *milites* as their sole focus. In comparison, I will examine Book Six (and some other parts of *Policraticus*) to elucidate John's solution to his personal problematisation of *milites* that had been expressed in *Entheticus* and his early letters. In its critiques of the royal court's tolerance for *milites*

---

[148] Laura Slater, *Art and Political Thought in Medieval England c. 1150-1350* (Martlesham, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2019), 23.

[149] John Dickinson, "Foreword" to *Policraticus*, ed. Joseph B Pike (Minneapolis, University of Press, 1938), v.

[150] John Dickinson, *Policraticus* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927), xviii-xix.

[151] For studies of royal power in *Policraticus'* later books see Nathan J. Ristuccia "The Image of an Executioner: Princes and Decapitations in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*" *Humanitas* 29, no. 1-2 (2016), 157-183; Cary Nederman & Catherine Campbell, 'Priests, Kings, and Tyrants: Spiritual and Temporal Power in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*' *Speculum* 66, no. 3 (July 1991), 572-590; Yves Sassier, 'John of Salisbury and Law' in *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, ed. Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 235-257; Cary Nederman, 'John of Salisbury's Political Theory' in *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, ed. Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 258-287.
For studies of *Policraticus* as evidence for twelfth-century humanism's reception and transformation of Classical literature see Irene O'Daly, *John of Salisbury and the Medieval Roman Renaissance* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018); Laure Hermand-Schebat, 'John of Salisbury and Classical Antiquity' in *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, ed. Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 180-214; Hans Liebeschütz, 'John of Salisbury and Pseudo-Plutarch', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 6 (1943), 33-39; Rodney Thomson, 'John of Salisbury and William of Malmesbury: currents in twelfth century humanism' in *The World of John of Salisbury,* ed. Michael Wilks (London: Blackwell Publishers, 1994), 117-126.

abusing churchmen and the gravitation of military elites toward political power, Book Six reaches

back to the anxieties of John's early works highlighted in Chapter One. In John's constant quotation

of Book Six in later works, described in Chapter Three, we see the crystallisation in *Policraticus* of

how John continued to perceive *milites* and campaign about their normative reform for the remainder

of his life.

In place of the biblio-biographical structure of Chapters One and Three, the 'narrative' of this

chapter will instead follow the structure of John's argument across Book Six. It will demonstrate how

John builds his characterisation of the behaviour of English *milites* into an existential crisis which

renders its intended reader, Becket as the protagonist, able and compelled to solve the problem. Along

the way, John heavily refers to Classical literature and Church doctrine to develop a definition of the

'true' *miles* desired by God and favoured in history. He compares this ideal model to contemporary

military individuals Becket would have personally worked with in his chancellorship and finds they

fail to live up to this definition. Having personalised the stakes, John imputes responsibility on Becket

as chancellor to overthrow the 'false' *milites* around him and resolve England's crisis of military ethos

by uplifting persons John admired to be the new exemplars of martial behaviour.

Milites as the 'Hand' of the English Body-Politic

In 1159, it would have been particularly apparent to John that his problematisation of *milites*

in *Entheticus* had not cut through to Becket. Instead, he observed the cleric he had served with at

Canterbury transform into an accomplice of secular power, duplicating the behaviour of the

pseudonymous 'Mandroger' in ransacking ecclesiastical coffers to fund wars. In 1156, Becket

diligently obeyed Henry II's command to raise money for a campaign in Brittany by demanding

scutage from England's churches, despite their traditional exemption.[152] Later that year, he tried to

---

[152] Karen Bollerman & Cary Nederman, "John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket", in *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 69.

raise a "second aid" from several Canterbury properties which Theobald had awarded him as

benefices while he worked for Canterbury, despite custom requiring churchmen to relinquish these

revenues when they entered secular offices.[153] His former colleagues raged at the betrayal of their

alumnus. John, writing on behalf of Theobald, responded to Becket's further tax by vowing to

"destroy the custom of second aids imposed upon the Church by our brother" and threatened both the

chancellor and his king with "anathema" (a form of excommunication) for attempting to have the

Church fund the king's military adventures in France.[154]

　　　　Matters had not improved when, three years later, John sent *Policraticus* to Becket. The

chancellor had grown far detached from his clerical days of non-violence and not only was

accompanying the king's campaign against the County of Toulouse in Southern France but

commanded the largest division of the royal army, seven-hundred *milites* he had "hand-picked".[155]

John even heard rumours of Becket's involvement in pillaging-raids on the French countryside like

the bandit-armies *Entheticus* about whom vehemently complained to him.[156] The conclusion of

Policraticus reprimands Becket's perpetuation of the unrestrained military culture John had

problematised in *Entheticus* and beseeches him to detach himself from *milites* and reflect on his

"innocence" before God.[157]

　　　　As a result, *Policraticus* begins its discussion of military matters by strenuously asserting the

propriety of a class separation of public officials from *milites*. Recognising Becket had ignored John's

personal opinions in *Entheticus* and his recent letters, *Policraticus* changes tack by expressing its

[153] Ibid.; Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, 'Introduction', in *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, ed. Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 22.

[154] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1, The Early Letters (1153-1161)*, 22, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 35-36; F.L. Cross & E.A. Livingstone, 'anathema' in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F.L. Cross & E.A. Livingstone (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), accessed 15 January 2023, https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library/10.1093/acref/9780192802903.001.0001/acref-9780192802903-e-281.

[155] John Hosler, 'The Brief Military Career of Thomas Becket' *Haskins Society Journal* 15 (2004): 92-93.

[156] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 8.25, trans. Joseph B. Pike (Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press, 1938) 410-411.

[157] Ibid.

theory of military behavioural norms almost entirely through Classical quotations. In doing so, John substitutes his voice which had failed to cut through in those previous appeals to the chancellor with the authoritative voices of ancient philosophers and statesmen.[158] Book Six revives the same imagery of *milites* usurping England's social order from *Entheticus* to premise their requirement of reform but, this time with the hindsight of his 1156/1157 censure, John insists he is merely faithfully repeating a Classical source, the 'Instruction of Trajan', so that if readers are offended they ought "charge it not to me but to Plutarch", the source's supposed author.[159] Yet the 'Instruction' is fictitious.[160] According to John's foremost biographer, the source was "a convenient fiction", which the cleric used to lend credence to his own ideas by masking them as principles foundational to the prosperous reign of the Roman Emperor Trajan, whom twelfth-century writers lauded as a model statesman.[161] With knowledge of the obfuscation involved, we can look behind John's fictitious quotations of Plutarch to observe his genuine opinions on the correct social purpose of *milites* and his efforts, implicit in the lie, to render these amenable to Becket as reforms.

John begins his 'reproduction' of the 'Instruction of Trajan' prior to Book Six, in the opening sections of Book Five, when setting out his general view of society in an anatomical metaphor.[162] The king occupies the "head", the Church the "soul", the royal court forms the "heart", peasants form the "feet" and the "hands" are separately civil servants and *milites*.[163] O'Daly asserts that the separation of *milites* to the "hand", far external to the "decision-making" organs, implies natural law forbids their

---

[158] Hans Liebeschütz, 'John of Salisbury and Pseudo-Plutarch', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 6 (1943), 35.
[159] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 6.Prologue, trans. John Dickinson, 171.
[160] Hans Liebeschütz, 'John of Salisbury and Pseudo-Plutarch', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 6 (1943), 33-39.
[161] Cary Nederman, 'John of Salisbury's Political Theory' in *A Companion to John of Salisbury,* ed. Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 260; John Marenborn, *Pagans and philosophers: the problem of paganism from Augustine to Leibniz* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), 182; Gordon Whatley, 'The Uses of Hagiography: The Legend of Pope Gregory and the Emperor Trajan in the Middle Ages' *Viator* 15 (1 January 1984), 31-36.
[162] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 5.2, trans. John Dickinson, 64-65.
[163] Ibid.

political participation.[164] This responded to the concern expressed in *Entheticus* at the presence of military men like Antipater and Mandroger at the court of King Stephen and the violent examples of political conduct they had created. John certainly seems to have intended Becket to make this conclusion. In an Autumn 1159 letter to Peter Cellensis, attaching a draft of *Policraticus,* John explains the body metaphor as setting out God's intent that *milites* and peasants perform the physical work they are suited to and not inappropriately try to perform the intellectual work of political life:

> the foot which moves in the mire does not aspire to the dignity of the head; but the head on the other hand does not, because it is erect to heaven, despise the foot for plodding in the mud…[165]

We shall see the motif of the "hand" exhaustively utilised in John's later works to similarly exalt examples of *milites* being unthinking enactors of their orders and the law, and to denigrate the impropriety of *milites* who try to act like the 'heart' or 'brain' by involving themselves in the king's counsel. Nevertheless, with the context of *Policraticus* addressing Becket's participation in military affairs around Toulouse, the other function of the separation of 'hand' and 'organs' in the schema may have been to encourage Becket to himself identify with one of the policy-making 'organs' in exclusion of identifying with *milites* 'the hand'. In this way, Becket might retain his "innocence" by not fraternising with *milites* and take responsibility as a policymaker for their actions.[166]

All this justification of *milites* as a class separate from politics pointedly opposed England's reality under Henry II, as covered in Chapter One, where *milites* had flooded into public life from filling rural offices to occupying many of the chief advisory roles at the king's side.[167] John's intent to reverse this trend shines through when, beginning Book Six by again promising to reproduce Plutarch's social schema, he spends the entirety of the book's first chapter separating *milites* "the

---

[164] Irene O'Daly, *John of Salisbury and the Medieval Roman Renaissance* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), 122-123.
[165] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1, The Early Letters (1153–1161)*, 111, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 181-182.
[166] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 8.25, trans. Joseph B. Pike, 411.
[167] Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings*, 215.

armed hand" from civil servants, "the unarmed hand".[168] In a seeming recognition of the status quo he uses military language to describe both, tellingly referring to civil servants as simply *milites* "keeping holiday from arms".[169] Yet he warns one 'hand' cannot do the work of the other, for civil servants should have temperaments conducive to "peace" in their interactions with the state's interior while the brutishness required for repelling enemies of the state renders *milites* useful only for "war".[170] He argues mixing their duties only degrades *milites*' martial dispositions and had, earlier in Book Three, impelled Becket to use his influence as chancellor to reverse the trend:

> display a bit of common sense…the unarmed element of the people prevails over the armed and makes a powerful attack upon manhood by the medium of effeminacy…[171]

Policraticus 6.1 had thus opened with Plutarch's pronouncements on who should not form the "armed hand" of the state, i.e. men involved in politics like himself, leaving Becket with the question: Who should?

The next chapters of Book Six develop a theoretical definition of *milites* that could appropriately serve as this "hand" by reconciling historical exemplars of successful soldiering with the restrictions of ecclesiastical doctrine, familiar to the chancellor from his canon law studies in Bologna and Auxerre.[172] Pointedly, John arrives at a Christian definition of the *miles* which would disqualify effectively all of England's military establishment by their behaviour, especially the *milites* of the royal court.

Leading up to Book Six, John's discussions of royal power in *Policraticus* 4.3 had propounded the Gelasian doctrine to Becket, a theory developed by the early Pope Gelasius I (d.496) that argued secular power existed at the consent of priests as God had given the Church responsibility

---

[168] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 6.1, trans. Joseph B. Pike, 173.
[169] Ibid.
[170] Ibid.
[171] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 3.13, trans. Joseph B. Pike, 198-199.
[172] Frank Barlow, *Thomas Becket* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986),36-37.

for the "eternal condition" of secular rulers and their subjects.[173] The theory had been revived across

Christendom in the twelfth-century as churchmen attempted to argue against ongoing expansions of

government by various kings and had developed popular expression in the motif of a superior

"spiritual sword" and an inferior "secular sword".[174] John appropriates it to argue that a ruler's power

of "bodily coercion" through military violence is a "sword…the prince receives from the hand of the

Church".[175] He explains to Becket that all permissible military violence therefore occurs through the

sanction of churchmen who burden the sinful business of killing onto secular men as it "seems

unworthy of the hands of the priesthood".[176] Early in Book Six, whilst categorising who can be

milites, John reminds Becket of this idea:

> the arms which the law does not itself use, can only be used against the law. The sacred
> Gospel narrative bears witness that two swords are enough for the Christian imperium; all
> others belong to those who with swords and cudgels draw nigh to take Christ captive and seek
> to destroy His name…[177]

John thus cuts through the reality of the entanglement of English *milites* in a web of feudal

obligations with the greater theological 'truth' that the English Crown, and thus by proxy Becket,

owes the Church a responsibility to ensure the *milites* of their polity accord with ecclesiastical

interests. With the Crown's religious legitimacy threatened, John offers Becket guidance on how he

can ensure England's *milites* are divinely-sanctioned. Across the first four chapters of Book Six, he

casts aspersions on the piety of various soldierly types Becket might encounter across England and

especially around him at the royal court, sharing anecdotes of gluttonous household-*milites*, prideful

courtiers who boast about their deeds in battle and more.[178] As a result, Chapter Five begins by

---

[173] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 4.3, trans. John Dickinson, 9; Philip Reynolds, 'Medieval Period' in *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of the Bible and the Law*, ed. Brent A. Strawn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), accessed 19 January 2023, available from: https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref:obso/9780199843305.001.0001/acref-9780199843305-e-90.
[174] Philip Reynolds, 'Medieval Period' in *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of the Bible and the Law*, ed. Brent A. Strawn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), accessed 19 January 2023, available from: https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref:obso/9780199843305.001.0001/acref-9780199843305-e-90.
[175] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 4.3, trans. John Dickinson, 9.
[176] Ibid.
[177] Ibid., 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 199.
[178] Ibid., 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, trans. John Dickinson, 173-179, 180-183, 184-185, 186-189.

conceding that finding contemporary *milites* who are "true" to the Church's needs is a near impossibility.[179] Per the Gelasian doctrine John had outlined, he suggests "true" *milites* should emulate the priesthood.[180] If England's *milites* are to please God they ought similarly follow centralised regulation and command.[181] Here John seems to mirror his demand in *Entheticus* that *milites* should have "order" imposed upon them as a class.[182]

To this end, John again appeals to a Classical authority, quoting the *De Re Militari* of Vegetius (d. circa 383-450) to raise the possibilities demonstrated by Rome's legions for imposing 'order' onto *milites*.[183] This was a shrewd choice of reference. *De Re Militari* enjoyed fame as the preeminent manual on military matters in high medieval Christendom and Becket had probably at least heard of it as a respected text.[184] In Book Six's preceding chapters John had propounded the conquering success of the Roman system, such that by the time we come to this quotation of Vegetius, it reads as if John is unveiling insider secrets to Becket on how he might replicate such military success.[185] Yet John's real intention was to make Rome's success a persuasive argument towards Becket punishing the military criminality that had so harmed the English Church. Luring him in with imagery of conquering legionaries, John suggests Rome's secret lay in limiting the military vocation to those meritocratically selected who swore an oath of obedience to the state.[186] While this might not seem unusual to modern eyes, in England's context where military status was hereditary, where the

---

[179] Ibid., 6.5, trans. John Dickinson, 190.
[180] Ibid.
[181] Ibid.
[182] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior*, 325-345, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 126-139.
[183] Ibid., 6.2, 6.5, trans. John Dickinson, 180, 190-191; Ilkka Syvänne, 'Vegetius' in *The Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity*, ed. Oliver Nicholson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), accessed 13 January 2023, https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780198662778.001.0001/acref-9780198662778-e-4949.
[184] C.T. Allmand, 'Vegetius' in *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Medieval Warfare and Technology*, ed. Clifford J Rogers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), accessed 20 January 2023, https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780195334036.001.0001/acref-9780195334036-e-0949.
[185] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 6.2, 6.4, trans. John Dickinson, 180-183, 186-189.
[186] Ibid., 6.5, trans. John Dickinson, 190.

king had little say in whom his barons established as *milites*, and where *milites* swore oaths of fealty to their lords but not to the kingdom broadly, John had proposed radical change.

Much of John's use of Vegetius in Chapter Five emphasises the onus on Becket, as England's equivalent to a Roman consul, to reform the military class by selecting who should belong to it. In contrast to England's knight-service system, where the king would make do with the men provided by his tenants or otherwise hire mercenaries, John quotes Vegetius describing how "Rome's reputation" was built through an inverse approach where "responsible" statesmen made "careful selection" of who would represent the Empire's interests at its frontiers.[187] John relates this practice as more satisfactorily aligned with Gelasian doctrine than the present system as such a top-down approach by Becket would emulate the pontifical selection processes of the Church, allowing Becket to scrutinise whether *milites* wielded their power in a divinely-sanctioned manner.[188]

To encourage Becket toward taking on this task of discriminating who held military rank in England, John extensively quotes Roman recruitment regulations from *De Re Militari* for the chancellor's ready reference.[189] Allmand points out that among these where the original text claims "birth" as a major criterion for selection, John's quotation replaces this with "strength".[190] Could this be a meritocratic effort in aid of uprooting the hereditary military class which John had so problematised or simply a difference in the manuscript John had read? The former is certainly arguable as John finishes his quote of Vegetius by complaining that the current knight-service system has furnished England with the wrong people for the job:

> recruits sent in by the land-owners to fill the quotas imposed upon them are accepted for service though they are of a quality that any master would scorn to have as slaves…[191]

---

[187] Ibid., 6.5, trans. John Dickinson, 191.
[188] Ibid., 6.5, trans. John Dickinson, 190.
[189] Ibid., 6.5, trans. John Dickinson, 190-192.
[190] Allmand, *The De Re Militari of Vegetius,* 87.
[191] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 6.5, trans. John Dickinson, 191.

By Chapter Five's end, John had presented Becket with historical precedents to rectify a situation crying out for reform. Inaction would be a dereliction of his duty as chancellor to England's best interests. Quoting Vegetius, John informs him, "the safety of the whole commonwealth turns upon the choice of the best recruits".[192]

While this section on selection seems mainly focused on impelling Becket to act, the other portion of Vegetius' definition of a 'true' *miles*, the oath, clearly expresses John's reformatory demand that England's *milites* serve the Church. In Chapter Seven, quoting Vegetius, he states that Rome's "Christian Emperors" made their legionaries "swear by God" that "they will do the best of their ability all things which the prince shall enjoin upon them; that they will never desert from military service nor refuse to die for the commonwealth".[193] John spends the remainder of the chapter and the following two advancing his interpretation that this oath ultimately bound *milites* to the service of the Church.[194] John implies that given Rome's Christian emperors reigned by God's authority, transmission of the oath to the present day would see the pope as their commander-in-chief.[195] Consequently, he implores Becket to "turn over in your mind the words of the oath" and observe its similarities to rites of ordination by priests, again paralleling military and priestly vocations, to encourage the perception they should ideally serve in cooperation.[196] Moreover, John plays on the disparity within the oath between obeying "the prince" and the ultimate duty of dying for the "commonwealth", to argue that a 'true' *miles* "shall keep inviolate the faith which he owes first to God and afterwards to the prince".[197] Accordingly, he tells of Christian legionaries retained by the pagan emperors Diocletian and Julian who served Rome loyally but disobeyed their orders when they were counterproductive to the Church's interests.[198] Having made his case, John presents his

---

[192] Ibid.
[193] Ibid., 6.7, trans. John Dickinson, 196.
[194] Ibid., 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, trans. John Dickinson, 196-197, 198-200, 201-202.
[195] Ibid.
[196] Ibid., 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 198.
[197] Ibid., 6.9, trans. John Dickinson, 201.
[198] Ibid.

reconstruction of Vegetius' oath for Becket's contemporary application, in the most strikingly

transgressive passage of his oeuvre:

> what is the office of the duly ordained soldiery? To defend the Church, to assail
> infidelity, to venerate the priesthood, to protect the poor from injuries, to pacify the
> province…high praises of God are in their throat, and two-edged swords are in their
> hands to execute punishment on the nations and rebuke upon the peoples, and to bind
> their kings in chains and their nobles in links of iron.[199]

The language, though outwardly rebellious, recalls Becket to Biblical teaching as the lines

from "high praises" to "links of irons" are an exact quote of Psalm 149:6-8, which exults the piety of

those who would fight any foe to preserve their faith.[200] Moreover, the principal medieval

commentary on this Psalm by Augustine regarded it as a kind of proto-Gelasian decree where the two-

edged sword represents the unity of "temporal" and "eternal" power wielded by the faithful and the

fettering of kings and nobles underscores a Christian's overriding loyalty due to God.[201] Thus John

was not presenting some rebellious threat but simply layering his definition of a "true" *miles* as

ultimately loyal to the Church through a lineage of Christian teaching that would have been difficult

to dispute, particularly given Becket's upbringing as a churchman. This characterisation of "true"

milites precisely contrasts with the *milites* of *Entheticus*. Where John had criticised Antipater and

Mandroger as harming churchmen while relying on protection under the king's banner, here 'true'

milites, fight the abuses of "kings" and "nobles" for the Church. Where the 'executioners' had

usurped the law, John's proposed *milites* would swear to uphold it.

Having laid Vegetius' solution to the issue of ensuring *milites* were 'true' to their societal

purpose, John returns Becket's thoughts to contemporary reality. He admits that Becket would

struggle to find any among the contemporary English military class that were both meritocratically

---

[199] Ibid., 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 199.
[200] Both the Latin Vulgate and John use "*exaltationes Dei in gutture eorum, et gladii ancipites in manibus eorum ad faciendam vindictam in nationibus, increpationes in populis ad alligandos reges eorum in compedibus, et nobiles eorum in manicis ferreis*"; compare Psalm 149:6-8; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* vol 2, 6.8, ed. C.C.J. Webb (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), 23.
[201] Augustine of Hippo, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, vol. 6, 149, trans. Anon (London: James Parker & Co, 1857), 442-445.

selected and sworn to an oath of martial conduct.[202] Yet he suggests all, by their Christianity, are

bound by "a tacit oath" obligating them to fight for "the Church".[203] Moreover, he suggests Becket

could encourage the English adoption of a new French custom, the chivalric vigil, to develop a culture

of religious binding *milites* to protect the Church. Outside of *Policraticus*, early thirteenth-century

writings report of French *milites* being inducted into their military status through a rite where they

would spend the duration of a night before an altar, defending it physically by not sitting or lying

down and spiritually via constant prayer.[204] The practice seems to have started at least by the 1150s

for John reports to Becket that:

> the solemn custom has now taken root that on the day on which a man is girt with the belt of a soldier he goes solemnly to the church, and placing his sword on the altar like a sacrificial offering, and making as it were a public profession, he dedicates himself to the service of the altar and vows to God the never-failing obedience of his sword…[205]

Thus, John answered his early writings' anxieties on the anti-ecclesiastical attitude he had

observed among English *milites* by seeking to obligate Becket to address the root cause, the failure of

the royal court to place restrictions on military behaviour. These chapters of Book Six mix

ecclesiastical doctrine and Classical authority to push Becket to re-determine who composed

England's military class and institute oath-swearing practices that could prevent repetition of the

depredations of King Stephen's 'executioners' on churchmen. The custom of the chivalric vigil

presented a contemporary practice the chancellor could import to Henry II's household-*milites* and

thus disseminate to *milites* across the kingdom, which would disqualify some courtly *milites* by

physical inaptitude and would ritually indoctrinate *milites* to the political demands of the Church.

Having laid out his solution, John returns to the narrative of a military crisis in England that Becket

needed to address with it.

---

[202] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 6.10, trans. John Dickinson, 203.
[203] Ibid.
[204] Duby, *The Three Orders*, 298-299.
[205] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 6.10, trans. John Dickinson, 203-204.

'False' *Milites*: John's Delegitimisation of Contemporary Military Elites

Across the remaining chapters of Book Six we find evidence of John's efforts to use this definition of 'true' *milites* to delegitimise specific persons in contemporary English politics as 'false' *milites* in the eyes of Becket. Hosler has noted the blatant attack John makes on the martial worth of the Marcher Lords holding the Welsh border.[206] I have further attributed two of Book Six's 'false' *miles* archetypes to make subtle allusions to Henry II's generals and household-*milites* generally. The critiqued individuals were men Becket personally dealt with through his chancellorship and most were known enemies of Canterbury, evidencing the proposition that *Policraticus* intimately reflected John's political circumstances.

In furtherance of that idea, John obfuscates his critiques with Classical references so that they might not be intercepted and understood by any of the royal household-*milites* he criticises, who were around Becket at Toulouse.[207] In comparison, he feels comfortable critiquing the Marcher Lords by name, who were not with Becket in Southern France.[208] Clearly, John's critiques carried serious ramifications for the political reputations of these *milites* and he worried about their potential for violent retribution. He even prefaces Book Six by pleading that *milites* offended by *Policraticus* should spare him, as he simply recites Plutarch (a lie as previously shown).[209]

Over the middle chapters of Book Six John thus makes three efforts to delegitimise the martial worth of specific *milites* close to Becket, both to portray them as exemplars of England's military inadequacies and to encourage the chancellor to remove them from court life. His definition of a 'false' *miles* immediately alludes to the careers of some England's most powerful *milites* at the time. Given John's 'true' *miles* must be selected meritocratically and must be bound to the law, a

---

[206] Hosler, *John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance*, 42, 51, 85, 139, 158.
[207] Specifically Richard de Lucy (d. 1179), Robert de Dunstanville (d. 1166/7), Henry FitzGerald (d. 1174), Henry of Essex (d. 1170), Richard de Camville (d. 1176) have been evidenced to be present in the campaign at Toulouse; Jane Martindale, '"An unfinished business": Angevin politics and the siege of Toulouse, 1159", *Anglo-Norman Studies* XXIII (2000), 129-130.
[208] John at least believed the Marchers were in place in their castles on the Welsh border when he completed *Policraticus*; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.6, trans. John Dickinson (New York: Knopf, 1927), 193-195.
[209] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.Prologue, trans. John Dickinson (New York: Knopf, 1927), 171-172.

'false' *miles* "forces his way into the service", is independently minded, disobedient, and pursue their self-interest over that of the Church so "as to narrow the empire of Christ".[210] John layers this opinion with a loose paraphrasing of a speech of Cicero, referring to such *milites* as akin to the usurpers assembled by the senator Catiline to threaten Rome's Republic and thus more accurately called "*latrones*".[211] If Becket recalled Cicero's use of the word in the speech he might have interpreted *latrones* by its more Classical meaning, "thieves".[212] Yet Duby notes in the late twelfth-century writers were increasingly using the word to mean "mercenaries".[213] Could John have intended both meanings? If so thieving mercenaries who contravene the Church and act independently likely drew Becket's mind to the armies of King Stephen during the Anarchy. In fact, Becket was still surrounded by *milites* from the Anarchy for Henry II had extended an olive branch to some of Stephen's vanquished generals by awarding them ministries at the royal court.[214] For example, Richard de Lucy (d.1179) who had led Stephen's pillaging-raids through the Thames Valley in 1153, Henry II made Justiciar of England in 1154, presumably to considerable disquiet among England's churchmen.[215] The role made him the highest legal officer in the land despite lacking a ecclesiastical background like the previous officer-holder, Roger, Bishop of Salisbury.[216] Like a 'false' *miles*, John may have seen de Lucy 'forcing' his way into service without merit and against ecclesiastical interests. John thus may have harboured political motives to so mirror his descriptions of 'false' *milites* on the career of de Lucy and thus stigmatise him in the eyes of Becket. Admittedly, whether this was the intention of the reference to Cicero's *latrones* and whether Becket understood the allusion is hard to ascertain exactly.

---

[210] Ibid., 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 198-199.
[211] Ibid.; Cicero, *In Catilinam* 1.27, https://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/cat1.shtml.
[212] Cicero, *In Catilinam* 1.27, https://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/cat1.shtml; Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, '*latro*', accessed 9 January 2023, available from: https://logeion.uchicago.edu/latro.
[213] Duby, *The Three Orders*, 265; Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, '*latro*', accessed 9 January 2023, available from: https://logeion.uchicago.edu/latro.
[214] Richard Huscroft, *Ruling England: 1042-1217,* 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 2016), 152.
[215] Emilie Amt, 'Lucy, Richard de (d. 1179), soldier and administrator' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed 11 January 2023, available from https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/17149.
[216] Ibid.; B.R. Kemp, 'Salisbury, Roger of (d. 1139)' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed 11 January 2023, https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-23956.

Nevertheless, considering of the pattern demonstrated by the next two instances of John's reputational smears against high-status *milites* in England, it remains a legitimate possibility.

On multiple occasions, John identifies the 'false' *miles* archetype as being defined by vanity. He suggests Becket might recognise them around him by the *milites* who heap the most glory upon themselves to psychologically cope with their failure to meet God's standards of military conduct.[217] John spends an extended passage portraying a nameless group military "braggarts", that Becket might see at "*aula*", the term in medieval British Latin for the royal dining hall.[218] It is my contention that the description of these *milites* near to Becket at the king's table subtly identified them to the chancellor as the household-*milites* Henry II had selected as generals in the Toulouse campaign. Via Jane Martindale's research we can identify at least five of the individuals to whom John appears to be referring, who were all with Becket on the Toulouse campaign.[219] John likely considered them all dangers to Canterbury's influence, for each had fought in the Anarchy and had been implicated in anti-ecclesiastical activities. By way of brief summary they were: the aforementioned Richard de Lucy; Richard de Camville (d.1176), who had fought for Stephen; Robert de Dunstanville (d.1166/1167), who had taken misappropriated ecclesiastical funds from the excommunicated Earl of Cornwall; Henry Fitzgerald (d.1174), who possibly assisted Geoffrey de Mandeville's attack on Ramsey Abbey; and Henry of Essex (d.1170), likely infamous to John and Becket alike from their shared time at Canterbury as he had harassed Archbishop Theobald into fleeing across England in 1152.[220]

---

[217] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 198.
[218] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.3-4, trans. John Dickinson, 184-188.
[219] Specifically Richard de Lucy (d. 1179), Robert de Dunstanville (d. 1166/7), Henry FitzGerald (d. 1174), Henry of Essex (d. 1170), Richard de Camville (d. 1176); Jane Martindale, '"An unfinished business": Angevin politics and the siege of Toulouse, 1159', *Anglo-Norman Studies* XXIII (2000), 129-130.
[220] Emilie Amt, 'Lucy, Richard de (d. 1179), soldier and administrator.' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/17149; Nicholas Vincent, 'Camville, Richard de (d.1191), in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/47247; Kathleen Thompson, 'Dunstanville, de, family (per. c. 1090–c. 1292),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/54504; David Crouch, 'Reginald, earl of Cornwall (d. 1175)' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-

John suggests to Becket that the banqueting and revelry of these men is a luxury that degrades their martial edge and indicates their psychological insecurities.[221] He claims:

> the more boastful they are in the hall, the more certain it is that when it comes to the issue of an actual battle, they will send ahead their servants into the fight in droves under the lead of Sanga, while they…trail behind the rear guard…[222]

The above reference to "Sanga", another instance of John obscuring invective with Classicism, refers to a foolish slave from the Roman comedy *Eunuchus* (161 BC) who ridiculously arms himself with a sponge.[223] Significantly Sanga's master is Thraso who is a braggart *miles* more interested in pleasure than warfare, a further analogue with the feasting *milites* of the royal household.[224] A close reading begins to reveal how acerbic this satire would have been to Becket. John associates the pleasures of court life with the "braggarts" failing to actually face battle, mirroring *Entheticus*' previous critiques about the degrading effect of political involvement on martial virtues.[225] Additionally, the chancellor had seen these "braggarts" dither about attacking Toulouse throughout 1159 and instead propose sending off raiding parties against the surrounding regions, conceivably what John ridicules with the imagery of them shirking combat while "Sanga", representing lower-status *milites*, is sent to fight.[226] John may well have been tapping into a known annoyance of Becket's for he had been the sole general keen to besiege Toulouse immediately.[227] Most specifically, the above passage reflected the recent career of the one "braggart" John had most cause to

---

org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/23319; Nicholas Vincent, 'Fitzgerald, Henry (d. 1170x74), in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/48115; C.W. Hollister, 'Mandeville, Geoffrey de, first earl of Essex (d. 1144), magnate' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/17927; Emilie Amt, 'Essex, Henry of (d. after 1163), administrator and baron', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/47254.

[221] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.3-4, trans. John Dickinson, 184-188.

[222] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.3, trans. John Dickinson, 184.

[223] Terence, *Eunuchus*, 775-779, http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/ter.eunuchus.html.

[224] van Laarhoven, *John of Salisbury's Entheticus Maior and Minor*, 387.

[225] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.3, trans. John Dickinson, 184; John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior*, 1301-1314, 1363-1434 trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 190-191, 196-199.

[226] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.3, trans. John Dickinson, 184; John Hosler, 'The Brief Military Career of Thomas Becket' *Haskins Society Journal* 15 (2004): 93.

[227] John Hosler, 'The Brief Military Career of Thomas Becket' *Haskins Society Journal* 15 (2004): 93.

reputationally ruin, Henry of Essex. At the Battle of Counsylth (1157) Henry of Essex had abandoned

his troops, dropped the royal standard and fled to the rear-guard, as the quote above replicates.[228] John

would seem to have been playing to Becket's memories, for the chancellor had accompanied that

particular campaign.[229] Despite his desertion, Henry had retained his military honours at the royal

table, similar to the boasting cowards of *Policraticus*' description.[230] I thus propose this section to

again seek the political disenfranchisement of one of Canterbury's enemies through John's linkage of

his 'false' *milites* with the royal household-*milites*.

The defamatory intention becomes more apparent when *milites* beyond the court are targeted.

In *Policraticus* 6.8 John compares and contrasts the "toil" of 'true' *milites* with the predilection of

'false' *milites* to gluttony and sloth.[231] In this regard, we encounter *Policraticus'* delegitimisation of

the martial identity of England's 'Marcher Lords'.[232] Marcher Lordships were privileges afforded by

the king to some military landowners on the Welsh border to build their own castles, institute their

own laws and wage war independently to combat frequent Welsh raiding.[233] Yet over John's life up to

the completion of *Policraticus* in 1159, Marcher effectiveness had proven questionable. The

distractions of the Anarchy had meant England "bowed out of Wales" for most of the 1130s and

1140s, causing many southern Welsh Marches to be lost.[234] Henry II's first campaigns as king in 1157

had attempted to assist re-assertion of Marcher hegemony but had met with defeats and disciplinary

---

[228] Emilie Amt, 'Essex, Henry of (d. after 1163), administrator and baron', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed 11 January 2023, available from https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/47254.

[229] John Hosler, 'The Brief Military Career of Thomas Becket' *Haskins Society Journal* 15 (2004): 90-92.

[230] Emilie Amt, 'Essex, Henry of (d. after 1163), administrator and baron', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed 11 January 2023, available from https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/47254.

[231] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 198-200.

[232] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.6, 6.16, trans. John Dickinson, 193-195, 226-228.

[233] John Cannon and Robert Crowcroft, '*Wales, march (or marches)'* in *Dictionary of British History*, 3rd ed., ed. John Cannon and Robert Crowcroft (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), accessed 11 January 2023, https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780191758027.001.0001/acref-9780191758027-e-3575; L.H. Nelson, *The Normans in South Wales, 1070-1171* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966), 124-129.

[234] David Crouch, 'The March and the Welsh Kings' in *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign,* ed. Edmund King (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), accessed 11 January 2023, https://academic-oup-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/book/11022/chapter/159360080.

fiascos among the frontier *milites*.[235] Hosler thus explains John's aggressive critique of Marcher

milites as an expression of generalised English anxiety at the growing military momentum of a

"barbaric" people on England's doorstep.[236] Yet, these critiques employ the same theme of courtly

degradation of martial abilities as John's invective on Henry II's household-*milites*, seemingly

evidencing these formed part of his attack on *milites* involved in the political process generally.

evidencing that they formed part of his attack on milites involved in the political process generally. It

is harder to link specific Marcher *milites* with anti-ecclesiastical behaviours like those of the

aforementioned royal *milites*. However, in their executive powers and particularly by their ability to

construct their own castles, an enduring symbol of the abuses of *milites* in the Anarchy, John appears

to have viewed the Marcher Lords as the epitome of the problem of *milites* unbound by law, as

expressed in *Entheticus* and his early letters. He frames the Welsh resurgence as a natural product of

the laxity allowed to Marcher *milites* through their political independence:

> …sleeping until daylight, postponing honourable duties to fornication, pursuing
> sensual pleasure the live-long day, [Marchers] are better acquainted with the cithern,
> the lyre, the tambourine and the note of the organ at the banquet, than with the sound
> of the clarion or trumpet in the camp…[237]

The auditory contrast of "cithern", "lyre", "tambourine", "organ" (soft instruments played for

the interior entertainments of English courts) with the loud instruments of the battlefield, furthers my

contention that John's critique of these *milites*, sought to demonstrate how their courtliness and thus

their political involvement was irreconcilable with their soldierly class identity. He warns Becket that

the Marchers will continue to fail while they keep their political privileges, "terrible disasters always

accompany or follow in the train of luxury".[238]

John touts the comparative success of the Welsh, who fight from "caverns and hiding-places

in the woods", as proof-positive of the integral connection of *milites* with the natural world, a

---

[235] John Beeler, *Warfare in England 1066-1189* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966) 242-244.
[236] Hosler, *John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth Century Renaissance*, 158.
[237] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.6, trans. John Dickinson, 194.
[238] Ibid., 6.6, trans. John Dickinson, 193.

connection Marchers had severed with their petty courts and private castles.[239] John even adds

urgency to the matter, stating the Welsh "almost reduce to surrender and make tributary the very

Palatine counts", ironic given the Marcher Lords' purpose had been to reduce Wales to an English

tributary.[240] John thus presents political disenfranchisement of these *milites* as part of the chancellor's

obligation to ensure England's border security. His other recourse in proving *milites* do not deserve

political power, are crude pejoratives. We must remember that John lived within a "face"-culture

where the socially-expected response to insult was physical vengeance, so the following attacks

evidence John's dedication to ruining these men's reputation.[241] In respect of their domesticity in their

private castles, John suggests the Marchers are like a "dog" to the Welsh "wolf".[242] In respect of their

recent routs from Welsh attack he implores Becket to encourage the Marchers "wives and mothers"

to, in the manner of the Persian women discussed by the Roman historian Justin, stand behind the

English battle-line with their genitals exposed to indicate that if they retreated from the Welsh further

they might as well crawl back into their wombs.[243] Sharing such crude invective with Becket, John

could hardly be more blatant about his intention through *Policraticus* to subordinate these *milites* who

had penetrated English politics.

---

[239] Ibid.
[240] Ibid., 6.16, trans. John Dickinson, 227; James Gillespie, 'Marches of Scotland and Wales' in *Medieval England: An Encyclopaedia*, ed. Paul E Szarmach, M. Teresa Tavormina, and Joel T. Rosenthal (New York: Routledge, 1998), 490.
[241] Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings*, 581.
[242] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.6, trans. John Dickinson, 194.
[243] Ibid., 6.16, trans. John Dickinson, 228; Justin, *Historia Philippicae et Totius Mundi Origines et Terrae Situs* 1.6, http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/justin/1.html.

In light of this courtly corruption of England's leading *milites*, John refers Becket once again to the authoritative counsel of Classical literature to determine who the Crown might find it better to place reliance in. Throughout Book Six, he repeats Vegetius' nostalgic visions of humble foot-soldiers departing farms to establish Rome's empire.[244] In my opinion, John intended to use Vegetius' praises of Rome's legionaries as an analogue for England's oft-unutilised minor freeholders and villein-warriors (discussed in Chapter One). He stresses the agrarian experience common to both, quoting Vegetius in a passage that could easily describe the poverty and labour services owed by villein-warriors.

> ignorant of the pleasures of the bath and other luxuries, simple-minded, content with little food, their limbs hardened to endure all manner of toil, and with whom it was a habit from their country life to wield a sword, dig a ditch and carry a load…[245]

Obverse to the courtly lifestyle associated with *milites* in politics, John presents the austerity of agrarian-*milites* as proof of their suitability to his view of 'true' soldiering, similar to his praise of the rustic virtue of "cavern"-dwelling Welsh raiders.[246] My interpretation that *Policraticus* intimately reflected England's political context shines here because John appeals to Becket's financial concerns. He intimates that the treasury could cut costs relying on the knight-service of agrarian-*milites* rather than supporting household-*milites* for "it is useless to maintain a well-fed soldier who is habituated to the pleasures of good living".[247]

Next, he quotes *De Re Militari* on suitable occupations for recruitment, "smiths, ironworkers, wood-choppers…", and unsuitable ones, "singers, gamesters, and fowlers".[248] This section substantially reveals John's use of Vegetius' voice to mask and make palatable his provocations

---

[244] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.2, 6.4, 6.5, 6.7, 6.19, trans. John Dickinson, 180-183, 186-189, 190-192, 196-197, 238-242.
[245] Ibid., 6.2, trans, John Dickinson, 181; Vegetius, *De Re Militari* 1.3, https://www.loc.gov/resource/rbc0001.2014rosen0061/?sp=1&st=image.
[246] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.6, trans. John Dickinson, 193.
[247] Ibid., 6.2, trans, John Dickinson, 181.
[248] Ibid; Vegetius, *De Re Militari* 1.7, https://www.loc.gov/resource/rbc0001.2014rosen0061/?sp=1&st=image.

against the contemporary order. The suitable occupations excerpted from *De Re Militari* align generally with the proletarian work of the humble, rural *milites* I contend John was promoting.[249] In contrast, the trio of unsuitable occupations he quotes, "singers, gamesters, and fowlers" each align with pastimes earlier sections of *Policraticus* had described as popular at English courts. [250] John had criticised each one for producing incompetent public servants, implying in turn that *milites* involved in political life ought be stricken from England's military ranks.[251] Yet "singers, gamesters, and fowlers" does not appear in any manuscripts of *De Re Militari* modern historians have access to.[252] Was John putting words in the mouth of Vegetius as he had with Plutarch or was this simply a corruption in the manuscript he copied from? Regardless, we see John's serious reformative intent in these contrasting quotations, using the veneer of an ancient wisdom to disparage *milites* at the courts and to justify the Crown instead entrusting the least political of *milites*, humble agrarian warriors, with the responsibilities of state violence.

The climatic chapters of Book Six then deals with the corresponding question: if England's military class should be composed of lower-status enfeoffed *milites*, what must Becket do with the current crop of higher-status *milites* pushing their way into English politics at the expense of the Church? Having framed England's military problems as related to behavioural failings (sin even – consider the qualities of 'false' *milites* in the section above: greed, gluttony, pride, sloth), John is able to frame the procedural resolution of them in terms of canon law. His voice takes on the authoritative tone of a canon lawyer advising another churchman on the correct course, thus avoiding the humble

---

[249] The labour services Scammell notes as owed periodically throughout the week by small freeholder *milites* and villein-warriors to their lord or to the king embraced nearly all manual labour tasks, with wood-chopping a common one in the sources. More specialised work like metal craft would be particularly more common among military villeins and small freeholders who could use their lighter burden of required labour services to serve as tradespersons to their community. Jean Scammell, 'The Formation of the English Social Structure: Freedom, Knights, and Gentry, 1066-1300', *Speculum* 68, no. 3 (July 1993): 591, 599, 600-601,; Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta 1087-1216*, 39-43.

[250] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 6.2, 6.3, trans, John Dickinson, 181, 184; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 1.4, 1.5, 6.3, trans. Joseph B. Pike, 13-26, 26-29.

[251] Ibid.

[252] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 6.2, trans, John Dickinson, 181; *De Re Militari* 1.7, https://www.loc.gov/resource/rbc0001.2014rosen0061/?sp=1&st=image.

petitionary tone to the chancellor that had failed in *Entheticus*. John claims that simply being a 'false'

miles amounts to sacrilege, as it offends the Gelasian doctrine which legitimises their military power.

Citing the Code of Justinian, he names the appropriate penalty to be "death".[253] Having laid out all the

'false' *milites* that surround Becket, John thus draws Book Six towards its conclusion by demanding

the chancellor execute all those *milites* who had made their way in politics to the English Church's

detriment. He even increases the stakes one last time in an appeal to Becket's stewardship of the

king's soul:

> if the prince puts not forth his sword against such offenders, beyond doubt he
> provokes against himself the two-edged sword which the Son of Man bears in His
> mouth, a sword which is quick and sure beyond all others, which cleaves the body
> and the soul and sends them to Gehenna…"[254]

Such provides clear support for my divergence from past scholarship in interpreting

Policraticus as an attempt by John to rectify Canterbury's political concerns in their immediate

context.

Conclusion

In *Policraticus* Book Six we are treated to John's clearest expression of his view of *milites* as

problematic to the Christian polity if not properly defined in their duties. His solution of promoting a

'true' military ethos of service to the Church and eliminating England's 'false' *milites* would spur a

prolific reform campaign we shall examine in Chapter Three. Nonetheless, the chancellor did not heed

to John's elaborate case. Ironically, in the next decade after John had so charged him to kill England's

courtly *milites*, the same problematised cadre would be the ones to kill Becket.

---

[253] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 6.13, trans. John Dickinson, 218.
[254] Ibid., 6.13, trans. John Dickinson, 219.

Chapter 3: Propagating Military Reform
(1163-1180)

"the soldier has become something that can be made; out of a formless clay, an inapt body, the machine required can be constructed; posture is gradually corrected; a calculated constraint runs slowly through each part of the body, mastering it, making it pliable, ready at all times, turning silently into the automatism of habit; in short, one has 'got rid of the peasant' and given him 'the air of a soldier'"

(Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison,
trans. Alan Sheridan, 135)

Figure 5 – St Caesarius of Terracina attempts to stop a miles from participating in ritual suicide. Taken from the Passionale (Lives of Saints) produced in the early 12th century at St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury.

(London, British Library, Arundel 91, f.188, *Detail of historiated initial,* England (Canterbury), *https://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/ILLUMIN.ASP?Size=mid&IllID=12278*)

This chapter will survey John's later writings: a history, two hagiographies and a second letter collection. They are John's least studied works, generally only finding readership as sources for the dramatic dispute of the 1160s between Henry II and the Archbishop of Canterbury. No studies have considered their social commentary on *milites*. Nevertheless, contextualising these later texts with John's earlier assertions on *milites* uncovers consistent restatement and reframing of the military theories John developed in *Entheticus* and *Policraticus*. I find dichotomies of 'true' and 'false' *milites* even within works ostensibly unconcerned with the socio-political role of the English soldiery, evidencing John had developed something of an obsession with his theory. Moreover, I argue that analysing these later works together reveals a deliberate campaign of normative reform from 1162 until 1170, with John directing his ideas on ideal military behaviour to prominent churchmen, as normatively influential authorities, but also to *milites* themselves. This pattern alters only with the December 1170 assassination of the Archbishop of Canterbury by *milites* of the royal household. Thereon, John's final works of the 1170s abandon his Policratian idealism, instead returning to the monolithic problematisation of *milites* typical of *Enthethicus* and his early letters. I contend such a transformation of the characterisation of *milites* in John's later works evidences his military writings acutely reflected England's political context and sustains my thesis that he consistently wrote about *milites* across the course of his life with a critical eye and an acute desire for reform.

That John remained interested in communicating with English society at all given the events of his later career further evidences his obsession with England's situation. In May 1162, a council of English bishops and nobles elected Becket, who John had so fervently written to in *Entheticus*, in his early letters and in *Policraticus*, as the new Archbishop of Canterbury following the passing of Theobald.[255] Karen Bollerman and Cary Nederman contend this threw John's career into disarray as Becket likely wanted to expunge the inner administration of an individual who had been so publicly

---

[255] Karen Bollerman & Cary Nederman, "John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket", 74-75.

critical of him.[256] Consequently, John's letter-writing on behalf of Canterbury abruptly stops in the manuscripts, ending his official role as secretary.[257] Now without a powerful patron in England, John sufficiently feared retaliatory violence for his past outspokenness that he fled in 1163 to France, residing until 1170 at Peter Cellensis's Abbey of St-Rémi.[258] Bollerman and Nederman describe John over those seven years as occupying an informal position as an *emeritus* of the curia of Theobald, utilising the former Archbishop's repute among leading churchmen to make petitions, offer advices and engage in ambassadorial travels on behalf of Canterbury, without any official engagement.[259]

Back in England, Becket shocked Henry II, who had hoped to dominate the English Church through his former chancellor, by zealously defending Canterbury's liberties. [260] As early as July 1163, Becket denied the king's right to demand scutage from the Church.[261] This was the very tax which he, while chancellor, had pushed on a protesting Theobald years before.[262] Then, at Clarendon in January 1164, Henry II legislated to extend royal jurisdiction over certain clerical crimes, effectively subordinating the Church's canon courts to the king's laws.[263] Under threat, Becket acquiesced, but then reneged and fled to France.[264] Their dispute would continue until 1170 under great acrimony, with Becket excommunicating and censuring Crown officials and Henry II confiscating ecclesiastical property and arresting Becket's supporters.[265]

Becket's support of the Church under attacks of secular government rehabilitated his character to John such that by 1166 John's letters about the ongoing dispute develop a "language of

---

[256] Ibid.

[257] W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), i.

[258] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2 (1163-1180)*, 136, ed. W.J. Millor SJ and C.N.L. Brooke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979) 1-15; Bollerman & Nederman, "John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket", 75-76.

[259] Bollerman & Nederman, "John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket", 76; van Laarhoven, *John of Salisbury's Entheticus Maior and Minor*, 6-9.

[260] Huscroft, *Ruling England: 1042-1217,* 188-189.

[261] Frank Barlow, *Thomas Becket* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 88-89.

[262] Ibid.

[263] Huscroft, *Ruling England: 1042-1217*, 189-190.

[264] Ibid.

[265] Frank Barlow, *The Feudal Kingdom of England 1042-1216* (London: Routledge, 2014), 248-251; Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 124-127, 193.

persecution", rendering Becket's principled defence of Church privileges as a Christlike self-sacrifice.[266] Yet John remained independent, never going to meet Becket in France during their parallel exiles there.[267] He re-joined Canterbury's official ranks only in 1170, preparing Becket's return to England after a settlement was reached with Henry II.[268] Yet following the settlement, Becket chose to re-establish his authority in England by excommunicating Roger de Pont-L'Évêque, Archbishop of York, whom Henry II had used as England's chief churchman in Becket's absence.[269] This enraged Henry II, famously causing four *milites* of the royal court to travel to Canterbury and storm the cathedral.[270] Writing a letter to the Bishop of Poitiers weeks later, John lamented the tragic irony of what followed.[271] In the cathedral, while celebrating mass with Becket, whom John had once urged to reform English military criminality, he had watched as leading English *milites* "sliced off the crown of [the Archbishop's] head" and "used their evil swords, when he was dead, to spill his brain and cruelly scattered it" on the church pavers.[272]

John's resulting trauma shines through in the dramatic change in his descriptions of *milites* post-1170. John writes on the assassination, which would have provided perfect evidence for the need for his Policratian reforms, in stridently fearful language with no analysis of the assassins' soldierly obligations or their relation to English military ethos. His final letters record disillusionment with the military class generally, shifting from a message of reforming *milites* to advising churchmen on how to protect themselves from them. Ultimately, John would retreat from English society, becoming

---

[266] Bollerman & Nederman, "John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket", 77-78.
[267] W.J. Millor & C.N.L. Brooke, *The Letters of John of Salisbury: Volume Two (1163-1180)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), xx.
[268] Bollerman & Nederman, "John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket", 80.
[269] Huscroft, *Ruling England: 1042-1217*, 190.
[270] Bollerman & Nederman, "John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket", 80.
[271] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2 (1163-1180)*, 305, ed. W.J. Millor SJ and C.N.L. Brooke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 724-739.
[272] Bollerman & Nederman, "John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket", 80; John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2 (1163-1180)*, 305, ed. W.J. Millor SJ and C.N.L. Brooke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979) 732-733; Huscroft, *Ruling England: 1042-1217*, 190-191.

bishop of his beloved Chartres in 1176, where he had first encountered the renaissance thought that had spurred *Policraticus*, and where, in 1180, he died.

The Life of Anselm – Modelling the 'true' *miles* (1162-1163)

Utilising John's repute as an *emeritus* of Theobald's curia and his contacts in the papal curia, Becket commissioned him in 1162 to write a hagiography of Anselm (d.1109), a former Archbishop of Canterbury, to brief Anselm's canonisation proceedings to Pope Alexander III (d.1181) at the Council of Tours in 1163.[273] In its function in a canonisation brief, John's *Life of Anselm* is a succinct and persuasive account outlining Anselm's career and requisite miracles. In turn, John's work is largely an abridgement of a previous hagiography of Anselm by Eadmer (d.1126), a companion of the former Archbishop, often to the point of line by line reproduction.[274] However, my use for John's *Life of Anselm* stems from those instances where John deliberately strays from Eadmer's account in his task of securing Anselm's sainthood. Ronald E. Pepin has already noted a number of rhetorical departures including John's repeated likening of Anselm to the apostles and other saints.[275] Yet, in a piece meant for consideration by the pope, John also rewrites sections on a mythic *miles*, Cadulus, promulgating him as a personification of the Policratian theory of the 'true' *miles* to Western Christendom's most normatively influential figure.

Eadmer's version	John of Salisbury's version
…people crowded to [Anselm] from diverse parts to seek his counsel. At this the devil was sharply pricked with envy, and he tried to turn them aside from this purpose by secret deceits if possible, or otherwise by open threats. For instance, **there was a knight called Cadulus, who was one**	The devil envied the salvation of many which [Anselm] brought about. He even laid ambushes for those who flocked to him from every quarter. To pass over others in silence for the present, **a certain knight named Cadulus became devout and offered himself entirely**

[273] Ronald Pepin, 'John of Salisbury as a Writer' in *A Companion to John of Salisbury,* ed. Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 165.
[274] Ibid.
[275] Ibid., 166.

night keeping vigil and saying prayers to God, when he heard the devil shouting and making an uproar outside the church where he was, in a voice like that of his squire, bewailing that the lodging had been broken into by robbers who had seized and carried off the knight's horses and all his goods, which would never be recovered unless he came quickly. But the knight made no movement, **thinking it a greater evil indeed to cease praying than to lose his goods. At this the devil was grieved at the contempt with which he was treated** and, turning himself into the likeness of a bear, leaped headlong through the roof of the church and landed in front of him, hoping to disturb the knight in what he was doing by the horror and noise of his fall. But the knight remained quite still and braved the monster unmoved. After this he wished to build his life on a more holy foundation, and he approached Anselm with the intention of obtaining his advice on this matter. While he was hastening on his way, the wicked Enemy broke forth into a human cry at his side, uttering these words: "Cadulus, Cadulus, where are you going?" At these words the knight stopped, wishing to know who it was who had spoken, and the devil repeated his words saying, "Where are you going Cadulus? What is it that so strongly compels you to visit that hypocrite prior? Certainly his reputation is quite at variance with the manner of his life. So my earnest advice is that you should return quickly, in case you are led astray by him and trapped in the folly which now leads you on. For his hypocrisy has already deceived many and, having buttered them up with vain hopes, has stripped them and left them destitute." When he heard these words and recognised that it was the devil who spoke, he fortified himself with the sign of the cross and continued on his way, ignoring the Enemy. And what then? He listened to Anselm and having denied himself and renounced the world, he gave himself up to a religious life and became a monk at Marmoutier…[276]

to the Lord in prayer. And behold, he heard a voice outside the church like that of his squire wretchedly lamenting that the horses and all his possessions had been snatched away by robbers. **Yet the knight persisted in prayer, regarding the loss of his devotion of greater value than the loss of his property**. The Enemy, aggrieved over the **steadfastness** of the **devout knight**, assumed the shape of a bear and, rushing down from the ceiling in front of him, he tried to hinder Cadulus as he prayed by the terror of his fall and his frightful appearance. But the persevering knight remained unconcerned and laughed at the monster. Finally he came out of the church. As he walked he heard a voice saying clearly to him: "Cadulus, where are you going? Where are you going Cadulus? Why do you go to the prior, that hypocrite? He will strip of your goods as is his custom and hurl you into the fount of error. Surely you will be sorry then, since his reputation is far removed from his way of life." But hearing the voice and seeing no-one, having fortified himself with the sign of the cross and prayers, he came to Anselm and, on his advice, Cadulus put on the monk's habit in the monastery at Marmoutier in the district of Tours…[277]

---

[276] Eadmer, *The life of St. Anselm. Archbishop of Canterbury*, xxv, trans. R.W. Southern (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd. 1962), 42.
[277] John of Salisbury, *The Life of Anselm*, 5, trans. Ronald E. Pepin (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2009), 34.

Both hagiographies include the Cadulus anecdote approximately a quarter of the way through Anselm's life as part of their evidence for his early saintliness while he was the young prior of Bec Abbey, Normandy. Eadmer's version uses Cadulus, a high status *miles* (signified by his accompanying horses and squire)*,* to exemplify Anselm's saintly gravitas, in that he was able to influence society so far beyond his monastic cloister that a high-status *miles* in Cadulus would discard his esteemed social position for a monastic life on Anselm's advice. Yet, in spite of being saddled with a greater persuasive onus in presenting the case for Anselm's sainthood to the pope, John diverts from this focus on Anselm's pious influence to instead write about martial ethos when he gets to the Cadulus anecdote.

John applies the axiom from *Policraticus* 6.8 that *milites*, if they obey their duty to the Church, are as holy as priests, perhaps even moreso: "soldiers that do these things are saints".[278] Thus, John emphasises the pious example set by Cadulus as a *miles*. Rather than setting Cadulus as circumstantially praying in a chapel at the time the Devil's attacks begin as Eadmer does, John links his vigil with his military identity; he had "became devout" while a *miles* and prays as part of that vocation.[279] Consequently, despite John being tasked with promoting Anselm's saintliness in writing this text, he seemingly chooses to detract from Eadmer's version of Anselm's miraculous transformation of a *miles* to a monk, in favour of sacralising the military side-character, Cadulus. Herein, we find the first sign John is attempting to embed his military theory in this otherwise unrelated piece.

In the context of the twelfth-century, a *miles* becoming "devout" as Cadulus is described, could allude to a taking of the Crusader vow.[280] However, the imagery of Cadulus steadfastly and solitarily praying in the chapel most obviously resonates with John's own descriptions of the chivalric

---

[278] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 200.
[279] John of Salisbury, *The Life of Anselm*, 5, trans. Ronald E. Pepin (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2009), 34.
[280] James Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law and the Crusader* (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969) 30-31.

vigil, encouraged as the initiation rite of 'true' *milites* in *Policraticus* 6.10.[281] In fact, John's version

repeatedly describes Cadulus as if he is a 'true' *miles* of *Policraticus*, alluding to specific oaths and

regulations throughout his account taken directly from his 1159 treatise, demonstrating these ideas

were becoming engrained into John's worldview. His reader, the pope, likely would not have

understood the references to *Policraticus*, as we have no evidence he had read it. Yet by setting

Cadulus as "devout" from the start, John's account becomes a celebration of the value of a *miles*

following a general vow to serve the Church. Conveniently for John, each of Eadmer's parables of

Cadulus' trials neatly align with the regulations of 'true' *milites* described in *Policraticus*; he

disregards materiality when he is robbed, exhibits bravery in the face of mortal danger and disregards

orders (twice made by the Devil) that would break his obligations to the Church.[282] However, John

tweaks these stories to further credit Cadulus' success specifically to his nature as a *miles* sworn to

devoutness.

In the case of the robbery, Eadmer writes of Cadulus thinking negatively, weighing the evils

of losing his property versus ceasing prayer.[283] John changes the characterisation to celebrate

Cadulus' martial quality of following his orders, i.e. his vow to prayer, akin to *Policraticus*'

pronouncement that 'true' *milites* must obey ecclesiastical interests even to the point that they "bind

their kings in chains… wherein each follows not his own will but the deliberate decision of God".[284]

Therefore, John's Cadulus does not think at all about the robbery but "persists in prayer, having more

devotion than the expenses of possessions".[285] Then, where Eadmer simply tells of the Devil raging at

his own failure to frighten the *miles*, John's version includes the Devil voicing specific blame on the

constantia ("constancy") of Cadulus, a term repeatedly used by John in *Entheticus*, his letters and in

Policraticus to describe a Stoic ethos which counters the *nugae* and Epicureanism of England's

---

[281] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 6.10, trans. John Dickinson, 203-204.
[282] Ibid., 6.2, 6.3, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, 6.11, trans. John Dickinson, 180-183, 184-185, 196-197, 198-200, 201-202, 205-208.
[283] Eadmer, *The life of St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury*, 15, trans. R.W. Southern, 42.
[284] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 199-200.
[285] John of Salisbury, *Vita Anselmi*, V, in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne, vol. 199 (1855), 1019 (my translation): *miles tamen in oratione persistit, pluris habens devotionis quam possessionis dispendium.*

courts.[286] That Cadulus' *constantia* explicitly relates to a rejection of materiality for faith only further evidences John's application of his Policratian principles here. Furthermore, where Eadmer's Cadulus resolves to visit Anselm after the strange experience of his vigil, John's Cadulus is described as on the way to Anselm before the story even begins, presumably as part of his becoming "devout".[287] Thus when the Devil discourages his visit to Anselm in the third trial, John omits Cadulus stopping to listen to the mysterious interloper's commands.[288] In my view this was because in John's envisioning of Cadulus as a 'true' *miles* the call of the Church would overrule the objections of a lay passer-by.

John's choice to alter Eadmer's account, wherein Cadulus dispenses of his military vocation to be saved, to a celebration of the value of *milites* to the Church when regulated by pious vows, demonstrates his continued obsession with promoting military reform (even with the pope as his reader). At the very least, the *Life of Anselm* shows that *Policraticus* and the social problems it addressed still dominated John's conception of political role and ethos of *milites* to the point where, three to four years on, he felt obliged to correct Eadmer's portrayals. At most, the hagiography exhibits John's first attempt at packaging his Policratian view of *milites* into an ideology that could transcend the political treatise genre. Should Anselm have been canonised off the back of this hagiography (which did not eventuate) the inclusion in the Anselm mythos of John's Cadulus could have propagated his norms of military duty far beyond the audience of *Policraticus*. Further and, importantly, via oral tradition, John's example of Cadulus' martial piety could have reached the ears of *milites*, who usually could not read. This imputed motive is not far-fetched given the efforts John invested in the subsequent texts discussed in this chapter to propagate a new military ideology.

---

[286] Eadmer, *The life of St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury*, 15, trans. R.W. Southern, 42; John of Salisbury, *The Life of Anselm*, 5, trans. Ronald E. Pepin, 34; John of Salisbury, *Vita Anselmi*, V, in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne, vol. 199 (1855), 1019; (select examples of such use of "*constantia*" include the following): John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 3.15, 5.7 in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne, vol. 199 (1855), 510; John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2 (1163-1180)*, 305, ed. W.J. Millor SJ and C.N.L. Brooke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979) 730, 736.
[287] Eadmer, *The life of St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury*, 15, trans. R.W. Southern, 42; John of Salisbury, *The Life of Anselm*, 5, trans. Ronald E. Pepin, 34.
[288] John of Salisbury, *The Life of Anselm*, 5, trans. Ronald E. Pepin, 34.

Historia Pontificalis – Modelling 'false' *milites* (1164-1166)

Just as John appropriated mythic Cadulus to promote his ideal military ethos to the papacy, in his *Historia Pontificalis* John mobilises history to evidence the disastrous effects of *Policraticus*' 'false' *milites*. The *Historia* is a memoir of John's experiences of the papal curia from 1148 to 1152 (between the end of his academic studies and his employment as Canterbury's secretary).[289] It is dedicated to Peter Cellensis, John's long-time friend and host at St-Rémi Abbey during his exile of 1163-1170.[290] Peter proof-read *Policraticus* in Autumn 1159, making it more likely he understood *Historia*'s many references to it.[291] *Historia* may have even been meant for his sole readership.[292] For one, there is no mention of the memoir in any sources of the period, suggesting its lack of dissemination.[293] Additionally, the text revels in controversial descriptions including provocative caricatures of pontiffs and liberal consideration of heresies, suggesting John's confidence in his privacy of audience. [294] *Historia* is also John's only long-form text which is devoid of Classical references, suggesting John did not see a need for rhetorical flourishes.[295] If these aforementioned factors do indicate the private nature of the memoir, then *Historia* presents invaluable insight for this thesis into John's informal characterisation of *milites* outside the persuasive efforts of his other texts.

Fortuitously, *Historia* features *milites* in its coverage of the failed Second Crusade (1145-1149) where King Louis VII of France (d. 1180) and King Conrad III of Germany (d.1152) had led armies to restore the Crusader County of Edessa, which had fallen to the Seljuk Turks in Anatolia.[296] Continual confusion, ambushes and changes in strategy afflicted their armies such that by their arrival in the Holy Land, Edessa was left alone with the Crusaders choosing to besiege Damascus instead,

---

[289] Marjorie Chibnall, *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), xix.
[290] Ibid., xxv.
[291] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1, The Early Letters (1153–1161)*, 111, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 180-182.
[292] Chibnall, *Historia Pontificalis*, xlvii.
[293] Ibid., xxiv.
[294] Ronald E. Pepin, 'John of Salisbury as a Writer' in *A Companion to John of Salisbury,* Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 167-168.
[295] Chibnall, *Historia Pontificalis*, xxv.
[296] Laurence Marvin, 'Crusade, Second' in *The Encyclopaedia of War* (New York: Wiley, 2011), https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1002/9781444338232.wbeow152.

only for a collapse in morale to cause them to abandon the siege after four days and return home.[297]

John personally witnessed none of this, basing his account on rumours that had filtered back to the papal curia.[298] His account explains the Crusade's failure upon conjectures on the moral failings of the Crusaders themselves, in the absence of facts regarding strategic and logistical issues. In turn, these conjectures consistently figure these failings through the characteristics of *Policraticus*' 'false' *milites*. Consequently, *Historia* further evidences the engraining of Policratian military theory into John's worldview. Where John had used the dichotomy of 'true' and 'false' *milites* as a rhetorical device to encourage reform in *Policraticus*, here in private writing, we find evidence of John's genuine belief in it as a phenomenological force in history.

Addressing the German and French contingents separately, and so emphasising their nationalistic failure to unite as Crusaders in service of the Church, John describes the defeats of both armies as self-inflicted. For the Germans:

> Conrad's army was destroyed first through the recklessness of the Germans…saying that the Franks were nothing to them, and they would wait for no one whatsoever until Edessa…pressing on in the full flush of pride they were so tortured by starvation in the desert that many died; later they were so harried by the infidels that at last they sent ambassadors to the most Christian king who consented to wait for them.[299]

Such describes the Second Battle of Dorylaeum (October 1147) where the German Crusaders, attempting to beat the French to Edessa, passed into the Anatolian desert with inadequate supplies.[300] They suffered casualties as high as 90% when, dehydrated and starving, they came under attack by Turkish horse-archers.[301] The survivors joined the French contingent.[302]

---

[297] Ibid.

[298] Chibnall, *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury*, xliii-xliv.

[299] John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, 5, 24, trans. Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 12, 54.

[300] Johnathan Phillips, *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 175-180.

[301] Ibid.; Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades: The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100–1187 (Vol. 2)* (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1952), 268.

[302] Laurence W. Marvin, 'Crusade, Second' in *The Encyclopaedia of War* (New York: Wiley, 2011), https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1002/9781444338232.wbeow152.

The Turks barely make an appearance in John's account which otherwise frames the German Crusaders as defeated from the start by their moral inadequacy for their task. For their "recklessness", John employs the word *temeritate* which twelfth-century English sources frequently used in the sense of "oath-breaking".[303] Indeed, John's Letter 304 (1170) uses it to forcefully refer to the treason implicit in Henry II having Becket assassinated, betraying the ruler's Gelasian obligation to use his secular powers to protect the Church.[304] Hence, John ascribes the German Crusaders with a similar outrageous usurpation of their social role when leaving behind the French to chase glory. By ignoring their primary duty to the interests of the Church in the effective carrying out of the Crusade John's critique of the German thus emulates *Policraticus'* 'false' *milites* who similarly "although they may have been called, yet do not obey the law according to their oath, but deem the glory of their military service to consist in…proclaiming their own praises and flattering and extolling themselves".[305] Indeed, the focus on pride parallels John's attacks uncovered in Chapter Two on the *milites* of the royal household, who lay about courtly banquets "butchering bloodlessly the Saracens" in tall tales.[306] Over half a decade on, John sets out what happens when such 'false' *milites* actually face Saracens.

John correspondingly writes of the French campaign:

> the Franks were imperilled by the rashness and negligence of Geoffrey de Rancon, leader of the advance guard and standard bearer of the king… from that moment, the French army which even before had had neither military discipline nor a strong hand to dispense justice and correct faults, lost all hope of ordered strategy…[307]

Such recalls the Battle of Mount Cadmus (January 1148) where the French army, attempting to bypass a Seljuk army via a pass in the Taurus Mountains, recklessly became separated through the

---

[303] Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, '*temeritas*', accessed 20 December 2022, https://logeion.uchicago.edu/temeritas.
[304] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 304, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 720-721.
[305] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 199.
[306] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 6.16, trans. John Dickinson, 226.
[307] John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, 5, 24, trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 12, 54.

gorges.[308] The Turks exploited the consequent weaknesses in their line to inflict heavy casualties, severely diminishing Crusader morale.[309]

In his now established habit of blaming high-status *milites* for their promotion of the 'false' military ethos John focuses on Geoffrey de Rancon's neglect of his leadership responsibilities as a *miles* (being a commander and standard bearer) as well as his influential social rank (de Rancon was lord of Château de Taillebourg and household-*miles* to Eleanor of Aquitaine, Queen of France).[310] He charges him with *negligentia* meaning "negligence" but more specifically carrying the sense from Roman law of a legal breach of duty, akin to the oath-breaking meaning implied by the aforementioned use of *temeritate*.[311] This refers to de Rancon's insubordination of the Crusader strategy, for he had led the advance guard beyond the stopping point assigned to him, affording the Turks their penetration of the Crusader lines.[312] Notably, John does not include the Turks' attack in his telling such that the devastation of the Franks is described as if solely caused by the advance guard's vainglorious march. In this way, John portrays de Rancon's folly as echoing *Policraticus*' axiom that 'false' *milites*, in their prideful ethos, "blush" at following orders "as savouring in their eyes not so much of military discipline as of the shameful restraints of slavery", rendering them liabilities in battle.[313]

This Policratian connection is only strengthened by John's pronouncement that de Rancon's example prematurely left the Crusade without any chance of success, as it demonstrated the Franks lacked "a strong hand to dispense justice".[314] With a wry nod to Peter's recollections of proof-reading

---

308 Runciman, *A History of the Crusades: The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100–1187 (Vol. 2)*, 272.
309 Ibid.
310 John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, 5, trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 12; Ralph Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine – Queen of France, Queen of England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 49.
311 Harry Thurston Peck, *Harpers Dictionary of Classical Antiquities*, 'negligentia', accessed 20 December 2022, https://logeion.uchicago.edu/negligentia.
312 Runciman, *A History of the Crusades: The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100–1187 (Vol. 2)*, 272.
313 John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 6.3, trans. John Dickinson, 184.
314 John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, 5, trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 12.

Policraticus, John juxtaposes the lack of punishment for de Rancon's insubordination by his fellow Crusaders with his startling expression in *Policraticus* that 'true' *milites* unthinkingly imposed justice, even if that meant throwing "their nobles [like de Rancon] in chains of iron".[315]

In this way, John's *Historia* evidences my assertion his Policratian theory on the divinely-ordained bounds of military behaviour had come dominate John's worldview. Here it colours John's perception of history such that the Crusaders' enemies, the Turks, are sidelined from his account. John instead narrowly links the failure of the Second Crusade with the 'false' military ethos of its Christian participants which lost them divine favour. That it was a text likely meant for the sole readership of his friend Peter further evidences John's genuine belief in his military theory. Three to five years later he still held to this belief, repeating a similar aetiology in Letter 287 to another friend, John of Canterbury: "[the Second Crusade] taught the lesson that gifts offered from…wrongdoing are not pleasing to God".[316]

Later Letters – The Policratian Reform Campaign (1163-1170)

Out of his sanctuary at St-Rémi, John dispatched nearly two-hundred letters from 1163 to 1170.[317] Sometimes these were responses to other churchmen seeking the advice of a learned *emeritus* of Theobald's court, but they frequently appear to be John's unsolicited moralising opinions. Their breadth of addressees is staggering. Where John's early letters exhibit 43 recipients, his later letters were addressed to a total of 101 recipients, many of whom he wrote to only once, indicating John's interest in widely spreading his ideas to fresh audiences.[318] Isolating the letters dealing with *milites* reveals a pronounced trend of John writing to community leaders in rural England who were the normative authorities over the agrarian-*milites Policraticus* had championed as a replacement for

---

[315] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 6.1, 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 173, 199; Jonathan Phillips, *The Second Crusade: Extending the frontiers of Christendom* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 201.
[316] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 287, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 632-635.
[317] Ibid., 811-812.
[318] Ibid., 830-832.

problematic courtly *milites*.[319] I have found six remarkable letters of this type, which evidence John encouraging these figures to disseminate extracts of *Policraticus* as guiding principles to the *milites* under their supervision.[320] We have no evidence John personally knew many of these individuals while he resided in England, yet away in France, watching Henry II's *milites* suppress Becket's faction and confiscate ecclesiastical property, he felt compelled to intervene with the theory he had developed. Again, these actions support my thesis that John not only remained keenly interested in military reform across his entire lifetime, but also demonstrate his critiques responded and adapted to his changing political context. Of the twelve later letters of 1163 to 1170 concerning *milites*, three will be examined below, chosen for the explicitness of their reformatory message.

Letter 269 (c.1164-1169) addresses Nicholas Decanus, Sheriff of Essex.[321] The surname John refers to him by, "Decanus", carries several differing yet significant meanings. If John took its meaning from his much consulted *De Re Militari* of Vegetius, it could identify Nicholas as a *miles* himself, as that text uses *decanus* to refer to a commander of ten soldiers.[322] This is quite possible given Sidney Painter's survey of English sheriffs from 1199-1205 found 69% to be *milites*.[323] Yet equally in the alternative, John's early letters feature the word in at least four letters to refer either to low-ranking monastic officers or secular canons in charge of collegiate churches.[324] Therefore, it is possible a past connection in the world of ecclesiastical administration provided John with a rare line of communication given that as a sheriff, Nicholas was an agent of the hostile English king.[325]

---

[319] Ibid; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 6.2, trans. John Dickinson, 181-183.

[320] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 168, 181, 187, 240, 269, 272, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 100-117, 198-205, 230-251, 456-461, 542-545, 552-571, 830-832.

[321] Ibid., 269, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 542-545.

[322] C.T. Lewis & Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, '*decanus'*, accessed 2 January 2023, https://logeion.uchicago.edu/decanus; Vegetius, *De Re Militari* 2.8, https://www.loc.gov/resource/rbc0001.2014rosen0061/?sp=1&st=image.

[323] Sidney Painter, *The Reign of King John* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1966) 91-92.

[324] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1 (1153-1161)*, 92, 94, 107, 118, ed. W.J. Millor SJ and H.E. Butler (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1955), 142, 145, 169-171, 193; Dictionary of Medieval Latin in British Sources, '*decanus'* accessed 2 January 2023, https://logeion.uchicago.edu/decanus.

[325] Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings 1075-1225*, 149.

As sheriff, Nicholas exercised immense influence over behavioural norms in his community in rural Essex. Most significantly, sheriffs presided over country court, which according to the *Laws of Henry I* (circa. 1115) were attended by all local administrators and enfeoffed *milites*.[326] Without rural access to any standardised law of England, county courts developed and followed their own customary laws.[327] Consequently, sheriffs judging the cases brought before these courts could determine local practices and knowledge for generations to come.[328] Sheriffs equally exercised formidable executive power in being charged with the collection of all court fines, estate forfeitures and quotidian royal dues, in pursuit of which twelfth-century English kings successively afforded them generous license for violence.[329] In turn, sheriffs held particular influence over *milites* as it was their duty to mobilise and command the local enfeoffed *milites* if their knight-service was demanded by the English king.[330] In sum, the opportunity to write to Nicholas afforded John a rare chance to address an individual with genuine coercive influence over the body of *milites* John had perceived as the Church's 'true' soldiery in *Policraticus*. If his surname indeed indicates a clerical background, he may have been especially amenable to John's advices.

To such a person, John chooses to summarise *Policraticus*' expression of the Gelasian doctrine which theorises secular military violence should conform with ecclesiastical interests. The opening sentence of the letter imparts a short etymology lesson; *comites,* the title for England's "earls", originally translates to "comrades" or "attendants" as it referred to the warrior-followers of ancient rulers.[331] Thus, John argues, England's aristocracy, their officials and even "you" (Nicholas) as a sheriff are reasonably encompassed within the military class but "summoned by the king" to positions of superficial distinction, just as bishops are ultimately still mere priests simply called "by

---

[326] Ibid., 149.
[327] Ibid., 149, 151-153.
[328] Ibid.
[329] Austin Lane Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta 1087-1216* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), 387-389.
[330] Ibid., 387.
[331] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 269, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 542-545; Dictionary of Medieval Latin in British Sources, '*comes*' accessed 2 January 2023, https://logeion.uchicago.edu/comes.

the pope to exercise pastoral care".[332] With this, John replicates the Gelasian thinking from *Policraticus* 6.5 which suggests *milites* ought parallel the sense of service and obedience of priests, in that their responsibility for affairs of life and death ought consecrate them into a more morally restrictive life.[333] The next portion of the letter makes us of the popular metaphor for the Gelasian doctrine of the two swords (also used in *Policraticus*).[334] With this John lectures Nicholas that *milites* are granted 'the sword' of coercive violence by the Church on the tentative arrangement that their violence serves "divine law" and not merely assists the power of secular rulers "to carry out the bloody sentences of tyrants".[335] John echoes the problem he had formulated in *Entheticus* that a society which tolerates unrestrained military behaviour has its "sacred laws yield place to the decrees of executioners".[336] The replication of the doctrine from its Policratian articulation is evident from the comparison below:

Policraticus 4.3	*Letter to Nicholas Decanus*
(The Church) has this sword, but she uses it by the hand of the prince (the "hand" referring to *milites*), upon whom she confers the power of bodily coercion, retaining to herself authority over spiritual things in the person of the pontiffs…[337]	(*Milites*) carry the sword, not to carry out the bloody sentences of the tyrants of old, but in obedience to the divine law to serve the public good according to its rule, to the punishment of evil-doers…[338]

---

[332] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 269, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 544-545.

[333] Ibid.; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 6.5, trans. John Dickinson, 190.

[334] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 269, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 544-545; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 4.3, 6.5, 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 9, 190, 198-199.

[335] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 269, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 544-545.

[336] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior and Minor*, 1416, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 196-197.

[337] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus,* 4.3, trans. John Dickinson, 9.

[338] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 269, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 544-545.

On this premise, John warns Nicholas that he and the *milites* under his authority in Essex ought remember the tenuous sanction for their profession in the eyes of God: "I pray you may carry out what the king demands in such a way that He [meaning God] be not offended who takes away the spirit of kings…whose spouse the Church is".[339] This would very likely have been an especially pointed juxtaposition for Nicholas, for John knew as the king's agent in Essex, he would likely be required to mobilise some the local agrarian-*milites* to participate in the waves of ecclesiastical confiscations and arrests Henry II was conducting to retaliate against Becket.[340] The reminder that God "takes away the spirit of kings" presents as an especially forceful encouragement toward disloyalty to the royal agent.[341]

In turn, Letter 269 follows a jurisprudential mode in its argument wherein John packages a clear definition of *milites* and a legal rule as to the limits of their permissible violence for easy consumption by a normative authority and dissemination into the knowledge of his beloved low-status, rustic *milites*. Such evidences John's interest in making his Policratian ideas applicable to the running of English society.

Letter 187 (c.1166) to Baldwin, archdeacon of Totnes, a market-town for Devon's agriculturists, offers even firmer evidence of John's rural agitations.[342] Archdeacons were deputies of bishops, dispatched to the isolated corners of a bishopric to supervise parish churches and maintain the moral standards of rustic communities.[343] In England, they seemingly developed a culture of employing the local agrarian-*milites* to enforce their authority. This was sufficiently palpable that the *Decretals* (1234) of Pope Gregory IX include a letter to ecclesiastical authorities in Coventry and Chester demanding a local archdeacon disband his small army and cease violently extorting the

---

[339] Ibid.
[340] Barlow, *The Feudal Kingdom of England 1042-1216*, 248-251; Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 124-127, 193.
[341] Ibid.
[342] Ibid, 187, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 230-251.
[343] Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings 1075-1225*, 388-389.

laity.[344] Given the subject-matter of Letter 187, John certainly believed archdeacons held influence over rural *milites*.

Importantly, the archdeacon addressed in this letter reported to Bartholomew, Bishop of Exeter (d.1184), a neutral party in the Becket dispute, and whom John entreated to oppose royal aggression five times from 1163 to 1170.[345] Perhaps, John hoped to sway the bishop by propagandising to his deputy. Perhaps, more simply, when Henry II had dethroned most Becket sympathisers from authoritative positions, the archdeacon of a neutral party to the dispute presented, potentially like that of Nicholas Decanus, a rare chance to communicate with an amenable person wielding authority over rural *milites*.

The letter begins by remonstrating English *milites* as a profession at large for participating in Henry II's persecutions. John uses the word *speculatores* ("guards") to refer to *milites* throughout.[346] In doing so, John emphasises their failed duty to serve the Church by reminding Baldwin of the Biblical lesson of Ezekiel 33:6 which states that "guards" who fail to protect their charges by omission, shall face punishment as if they performed the attack.[347] Pointedly, John references some of these "guards" as working with "the thief", "(they) even act as guides and instructors and drag him headlong into thefts and violent looting".[348] This most obviously references Henry II's household-*milites* who were given near total freedom from 1164 on to re-possess ecclesiastical estates connected with Becket's cause in a revival of the military evictions which had enraged John in his letters of the

---

[344] Ibid., 389; Gregory IX, *Decretals*, 1.23.6, Herzog August Library, accessed 2 January 2023, http://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/Chronologia/Lspost13/GregoriusIX/gre_1t23.html.
[345] Audrey MacDonald, '*Bartholomew (d.1184)*' in *The Oxford Companion to British History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780199567638.001.0001/acref-9780199567638-e-365; John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 150, 168, 171, 174, 288, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 48-49, 100-117, 122-127, 138-153, 636-649.
[346] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 187, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 230-251.
[347] Ibid. 187, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 230-231; Ezekiel 33:6.
[348] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 187, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 230-231.

1150s.[349] John may well have been recalling Ranulf de Broc, Henry II's marshal (i.e. commander of cavalry) who Becket had excommunicated in the months prior to this letter for seizing and apparently despoiling the Canterbury Cathedral and who John had referred to as 'thief' and 'looter' plaguing the English Church in an 1166 letter to Baldwin's superior.[350] In *Policraticus* the same couplet of "*furta et rapinas*" ("thefts and violent looting") is used to refer to the crimes of 'false' *milites* who "assail the law which they have undertaken to defend", a crime which 'true' *milites* must punish.[351] We see the long development of John's problematisation of *milites* encapsulated in this pronouncement. In *Entheticus* John had conceived of Anarchy-era lootings as a inevitable consequence of England's military culture lacking a sense of justice.[352] In *Policraticus*, his solution had been to argue 'true' soldiering was defined by defence of "divine law".[353] Now in this letter he exports the solution as practical advice. Note, John's adaptation to his audience again here. Where John had based his argument to sheriff Nicholas Decanus upon legal references to the letter of the Gelasian doctrine, his arguments to Baldwin, a rural moraliser, rely on citations of the Bible in the aforementioned quotations of Ezekiel.

In the letter's latter portions, John concludes his moral critique of military participation in the king's persecutions of the Church by suggesting Baldwin owes a priestly duty to preach resistance to his local *milites*.[354] Replicating the language of *Policraticus* 6.8 wherein *milites*' duties to divine law extend even potentially, "to bind their kings in chains", John exhorts the archdeacon's military followers to fight for God above all and protect the Church: "for every point in the divine law one

---

[349] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 124-126.

[350] Ibid., 125, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 147; John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 168, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 112-113.

[351] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, VI.XI in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne, vol. 199 (1855), 602; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.11, trans. John Dickinson, 205.

[352] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior and Minor*, 1416, trans. Jan van Laarhoven, 196-197.

[353] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 199.

[354] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 187, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 234-251.

must fight, stand up against the powers and with all one's strength strive to overthrow whatever attacks charity".[355]

In Letter 240 (c.1166-1168), John writes to another archdeacon, Baldwin of Sudbury, attempting to convince him that successful resistance to the king by humble, rural *milites* is achievable.[356] John builds his argument on his experiences in Italy of warfare between the Guelphs, who supported Pope Alexander III in pursuit of the continued independence of their urban communes, and Ghibellines, who supported the overriding authority of Holy Roman Emperor Frederick Barbarossa.[357] He cites to Baldwin the victories of Lombard infantry militias against Barbarossa's mounted knights as evidence for God's support for *milites* fighting for a spiritual cause.[358] In doing so, John cannot help but identify their success with their resemblance to his Policratian vision of 'true' *milites* as an "armed hand" exacting divine justice, describing them to Baldwin as God's "lifted… hand to punish".[359] Contrastingly, Barbarossa's mounted knights are, despite their high status, described as *latrones* ("bandits") in replication of *Policraticus* term for 'false' *milites*.[360]

Fascinatingly, John includes himself in the campaign against the Holy Roman Emperor: "we have shut Frederick up in Pavia and lay siege to him; we have restored the bishops expelled by the schismatics; we have ground the face of the wicked".[361] Further, throughout the letter he refers to himself as a *miles*, even suggesting the righteousness of the campaign could call him away from priesthood: "if you hear that I have changed my name and am soldiering in Italy, do not be

---

[355] Ibid., 187, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 234-235.
[356] Ibid., 240, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 456-461.
[357] Johnathan Sands Wise & Sarah Jane Murphy, '*Guelph Party and Ghibelline Party*' in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/display/10.1093/acref/9780198662624.001.0001/acref-9780198662624-e-2578?rskey=Wy3dYD&result=1.
[358] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 240, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 458-461.
[359] Ibid., 459; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 6.1, trans. John Dickinson, 173.
[360] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 240, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 458-459, John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 198-199, (n.b. John specifically uses the neologism "*collatrones*" which Millor and Brooke translate as "fellow robbers");
[361] Ibid.

surprised".[362] I contend the ideological experience of Guelph-Ghibelline warfare as a conflict fought on one side by ecclesiastical forces had reinforced his view expressed in *Policraticus*, that *milites* and priests were parallel disciplines to a literalist extreme.

Directing these sentiments to a fellow priest, John explicitly suggests Baldwin owes a duty to resist the king and must encourage Sudbury's *milites* to similar action. He argues Becket's supporters are England's only true *milites* in their steadfast suffering for the Church, "serving labourious military service, in which we fight beasts for the freedom of our country", shaming the military class by comparison.[363] John then shifts to positive reinforcement by suggesting divine rewards await those who fight the king. He argues Becket's supporters will receive their "*stipendia*", the term used in contemporary British sources primarily to refer to military wages, and that such reward will constitute casting "the public enemy (Henry II) into chains" (reminiscent of the oath in *Policraticus* that *milites* "bind their kings in chains").[364]

All three letters demonstrate John's efforts to propagate arguments he had developed in *Policraticus* to rural authorities that they might involve their *milites* on the side of Becket. Through them we see John's interest in applying his studies to English politics, as he draws on the legal and ethical strictures governing Christian involvement in military violence to demand *milites* resist Henry II's persecution of the Church. That these attempts to influence English military ethos and identity were made while John was exiled in France, patently challenges the traditional historiography which saw these military opinions as ivory tower musings.

---

[362] Ibid., 456-461.
[363] Ibid., 458 (my translation): *laboriosae militae, qua pro libertate patriae pugnamus ad bestias*.
[364] Ibid.; Dictionary of Medieval Latin in British Sources, '*stipendium*', accessed 3 January 2023, https://logeion.uchicago.edu/stipendium; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 199.

Yet John's ambitious reform campaign abruptly stops after witnessing Becket's assassination on 29 December 1170. Most tellingly, this shines through in the *Life of Becket*, a hagiography he completed in early 1171 in a rapid effort to get Becket canonised.[365] Admittedly, it is a short work (approximately 20 pages) yet about a fifth of it is spent on Becket's assassination without any analytical consideration of the assassins.[366] John acknowledges them as *milites* but, in breaking from a habit that marks each of the earlier works surveyed in this thesis, he provides no socio-political analysis of their actions.[367] The missed opportunities are obvious. The assassins, Reginald FitzUrse, Hugh de Morville, William de Tracy, and Richard le Breton, were all *milites* of the royal household, John's favourite target in *Entheticus* and *Policraticus* for evidencing the moral decay of the English military ethos.[368] Despite his past attacks on such military elites, he never identifies them by name or questions the example they set for other *milites*. The murder had eerily proven correct John's prediction in *Policraticus* that 'false' *milites* perform their service "chiefly in stabbing with swords or tongues the clergy".[369] Yet, John does not even label the assassins as *latrones* as per his usual practice of identifying 'false' *milites*. Instead, in a sign of John's reversion of attitudes, he calls them "*carnifices*" ("executioners") which John had used in *Entheticus* to express his horror at Stephen's church-looting marauders.[370] After traumatically observing a life-long colleague decapitated by the cream of the English military crop, John appears to abandon his reformatory mission, afraid for his life.

---

[365] Ronald E. Pepin, *Anselm and Becket – Two Canterbury Saints' Lives by John of Salisbury* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2009), 12-15.

[366] John of Salisbury, *The Life of Becket*, 22-28, trans. Ronald E. Pepin (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2009), 89-95.

[367] John of Salisbury, *Vita S. Thomae*, 24 in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne, vol. 190 (1854) available from: https://www.mlat.uzh.ch/browser?path=38/20457/6401/11449&text=11449.

[368] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 235-236.

[369] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.8, trans. John Dickinson, 199.

[370] John of Salisbury, *Vita S. Thomae*, 24 in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne, vol. 190 (1854) available from: https://www.mlat.uzh.ch/browser?path=38/20457/6401/11449&text=11449.

Nonetheless, while he may have abandoned his reform campaign, John's obsession with the

social problem of the military class persisted. Of his letters of 1171 to 1173, half discuss *milites*.[371] As

per his mode in the *Life of Becket*, these are typified by a return to the simplistic problematisation of

milites that characterised John's *Entheticus* and early letters, devoid of any solutions but warning

churchmen to avoid them.

Like the *Life of Becket*, John's Letter 305 (early 1171) to his friend John of Canterbury,

repeatedly labels Becket's assassins as "*carnifices*".[372] Unlike the *Life of Becket*, in the private setting

of a letter John feels sufficiently comfortable to offer some analysis. His account of Becket's

martyrdom bears some echoes of Policratian thought by ascribing Becket with the cause of the 'true'

miles exactly: "he fought to the death to preserve God's law and to make nought abuses which came

from ancient tyrants" (recalling his words to Nicholas Decanus, "*veterum tirannorum*" "of ancient

tyrants").[373] Correspondingly, his assassins perform the "sacrilege" of 'false' *milites*, in killing the

Archbishop and desecrating England's holiest cathedral.[374] Yet John detaches these causes from the

military profession. Becket, though described in military language in his martyrdom, is not lauded as

an exemplar of military ethos but as an example for all Christians.[375] In turn, his assassins are not

denigrated as shaming their profession but treated as if they lack agency and simply play a part in a

crime fated by God to reveal the egregious tyranny of the king.[376]

On this basis, in Letter 307 (early 1172) to William, Archbishop of Sens, John effectively

renounces his military reform campaign, claiming the murder to have proven *milites* incapable of

rising above wanton murder.[377] He specifies that Becket's murder occurred not through the choice of

---

[371] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*, 305, 307, 310, ed.
W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 724-739, 742-749, 754-761.
[372] Ibid., 305, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 732-733.
[373] Ibid., 305, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 727.
[374] Ibid., 305, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 731.
[375] Ibid., 305, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 726-733.
[376] Ibid., 305, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 727, 729, 731.
[377] Ibid., 307, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 745.

four individuals but the wantonness of "the office of the *milites*" generally.[378] Contemporary events

would only deepen this loss of faith in the military class. From 1173 to 1174, England's *milites* took

sides in a civil war between Henry II and his own wife and children.[379] Fearing renewed military

depredations upon churchmen like in the last civil war, John wrote Letter 310 (1173) to Peter

Cellensis, his former host at St-Rémi.[380] He warns him that the abbey's properties in English territory

may be looted: "your properties in our land, however are exposed to many dangers. Our powerful

men…have turned into wolves".[381] Thus, we find the same dehumanising wolf metaphor used in

Entheticus where John writes of the license given by Stephen to William of Ypres' pillagers, and in

Policraticus where John writes of the savagery of the Welsh. [382]

He reasons that such men have proven their abandonment of the military social contract,

taught to him by Robert Pullen and the seed of his Policratian views on the oath of 'true' *milites* as "a

shield for the protection of the weak".[383] The reality of the new civil war is described as: "those who

should keep the enemy at bay are themselves taking to plunder".[384] Consequently, John astonishingly

signals his complete abandonment of his reform campaign by urging Peter's monks fortify their

properties and transform themselves into the kind of Church defenders he had once propounded for

milites themselves. He writes:

> …it is urgently necessary for the brothers in your house to go from fortress to fortress
> pursuing thieves and robbers [here as *latrones*, John's term for 'false' *milites*]. Thus it
> would seem to us…altogether a good idea…to send some good monks suited to the
> monastery's needs, who could be a comfort to them and answer callers when the
> others are away…if a larger number of monks is seen there, it will doubtless be
> shown more respect from the local people and the evil designs of wrongdoers will be
> more easily put down.[385]

---

[378] Ibid.
[379] Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings*, 54-57.
[380] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180),* 310, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 754-761.
[381] Ibid., 310, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 759.
[382] John of Salisbury, *Entheticus Maior*, 1306, 1315-1319, trans. Jan van Laarhoven (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 190; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 6.6, trans. John Dickinson, 194.
[383] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, 4.2, trans. John Dickinson, 8.
[384] John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180),* 310, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 757.
[385] Ibid., 310, ed. W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke, 759-761.

Conclusion

These attempts to repackage, simplify and popularise his socio-political theory of *milites* for new audiences speaks to John's serious intent on affecting normative change in England with his military ideas, even as dangers mounted over the final decades of his life. In that light, this chapter best evidences why scholarship ought reconsider John's legacy as commentator on his time.

Conclusion: A Hidden Legacy?

This thesis has inquired into the conception of *milites* across John of Salisbury's life and written production. My investigations have revealed a cogent military ideology present across his entire corpus, which intimately correlated with his personal experience of the evolution of *milites* in English politics and society.

Chapter One demonstrates to scholarship that John's military writing began earlier than *Policraticus* (1159) which has tended to be the sole source examined for evidence of his conception of *milites*. Instead, my study reveals John's *Entheticus Maior* (1141-1155) and his early letters (1153-1161) as not only key sources for John's personal problematisation of *milites* but also as evidence of a lawless English military culture that coalesced during the Anarchy and persisted into England's post-war reconstruction. By carefully unravelling John's cryptic allusions in his poem for Becket I have revealed which specific *milites* of the royal court he blamed for the permeation of this problematic culture, and evidenced John's efforts, as early as 1155, to have the chancellor enact military reform. In turn, my analysis of John's early letter-writing evidences his cognisance of conflict between *milites* and churchmen across English society more broadly, contextualising his efforts in *Policraticus* to re-assess who ought belong in their ranks. Consequently, Chapter One offers future scholars examining the military views of *Policraticus* a background in John's objections to the social position taken by English *milites* of the 1150s, whereby they might avoid mischaracterising John of Salisbury as disinterested in contemporary military practices.

Chapter Two reinforces this by not only demonstrating *Policraticus'* problematisation of *milites* to correspond with the fears of *Entheticus* and the early letters but also clarifying the efforts of Book Six to impel Chancellor Becket to reform English *milites*. In revealing John's efforts to overcome the persuasive failure of *Entheticus* through shrouding his personal opinions in Book Six with Classical quotations, I have highlighted how specific many of his suggestions were. John is observed attempting to redefine the military profession as one owing service to the Church at time

when the military element of Henry II's court opposed the privileges of Canterbury, and making reputational attacks on the military leaders in Becket's company with insults derived from Cicero, Terence and others. By Book Six's end, John openly demands Becket execute such 'false' *milites*. Chapter Two thus provides that body of social and political historians who have previously characterised John as 'out-of-touch' with military reality with ample evidence of the specificity and gravity of Book Six to England's situation in 1159.

In Chapter Three, I have charted the wider dissemination of John's military ideology out of *Policraticus* and into effectively all of his remaining writing. It is my finding that the efforts of these later works constituted a coordinated reform campaign. As the *Historia Pontificalis* (1164-1166) and his later letters (1161-1170) show, into the late 1160s John genuinely believed that a 'false' military ethos could and had roused God's disfavour to Christian states. He consequently attempted to popularly promote the 'true' military ethos of *Policraticus* while stigmatising the behaviours of the military ethos he had problematised. In the *Life of Anselm* (1162-1163) we find an attempt to inject *Policraticus*' Church-protecting military archetype into Catholic mythos. In turn, in John's letters of 1161-1170 I have found remarkable evidence of attempts to instil England's middle bureaucracy with *Policraticus'* military views, after appeals to the Chancellery had failed the previous decade. But the assassination of Becket brought John's reform campaign to a halt. My analysis of the *Life of Becket* (1171) and John's last letters (1171-1180) suggests the aging cleric altered his approach, disillusioned with the prospect of reform but still problematising England's *milites*.

Witnessing Becket's assassination by leading English *milites*, John may have believed his critiques had fallen on deaf ears. However, the surprising afterlife of his works testifies to the complexity and influence of his ideology. The impact of *Policraticus* is relatively well-understood. Frédérique Lachaud has traced quotation and reference to the work by writers all over Christendom

across the twelfth to fifteenth-centuries.[386] With respect to its military opinions, she notes Peter of

Blois (d.1211), a correspondent of John's, employing lines from Book Six to critique *milites* at the

household of an archdeacon, in what could be a continuation of John's reform campaign I described in

Chapter Three.[387] She further notes popular use of John's descriptions of military duties among

chivalric writers from the twelfth to fifteenth-centuries.[388]

Yet, my study has revealed the presence of John's military ideology through his whole

corpus. What of the legacy of these other texts? In the course of this study I have happened upon

several instances where John's earlier and later military ideas seem to influence writers of the twelfth

and thirteenth-centuries, demonstrative of the validity they held in contemporary perceptions. His

early letters seem to have influenced English stereotypes about military rapaciousness, with Walter

Map (d.1210) near-exactly reproducing the warnings in John's Letter 91 about the conspiracies of the

Hospitallers in his own writings of the 1180s.[389] In turn, John's letter to Nicholas Decanus (c.1164-

1166) ostensibly had the desired effect of influencing jurisprudence, for its definition of *milites* is

included one hundred years later in Henry de Bracton's compilation of England's laws.[390] Should

future studies trace the military influence of these lesser-studied works as widely as Lachaud traces

the filiation of *Policraticus*, an argument could well be made for the military ideology I have

elucidated here as a potent intellectual tradition in subsequent medieval thought.

At the very least, this thesis ought to provoke a reassessment of John of Salisbury's

usefulness for historians. Where previously scholarship considered John's military thoughts to be

---

[386] Frédérique Lachaud, 'Filiation and Context: The Medieval Afterlife of *Policraticus*' in *A Companion to John of Salisbury,* ed. Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 377-438.
[387] Ibid., 381-385.
[388] Ibid., 398, 401, 416-417, 428, 430-431.
[389] Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, 23, trans. M. R. James, ed. C.N.L. Brooke & R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), https://www-oxfordscholarlyeditions-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/display/10.1093/actrade/9780198222361.book.1/actrade-9780198222361-div2-61; compare John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 1, The Early Letters (1153–1161)*, 91, trans. W.J. Millor, H.E. Butler, 140.
[390] Henry de Bracton, *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae*, 2.32.9-35, trans. Samuel E. Thorne, ed. George Woodbine (Harvard: Harvard Law School Library, 2003), https://amesfoundation.law.harvard.edu/Bracton/Unframed/English/v2/32.htm#TITLE37.

marginal to his utility for understanding medieval politics and society, I have demonstrated his

writings on *milites* to be as sophisticated and contextually-minded as his ideas on royal power and

tyrannicide. His unique vision of the socio-political role of *milites* forms an integral part of his

intellectual legacy. Even John predicted so himself, for in his treatise on education, *Metalogicon*

(1159), which does not otherwise address *milites*, he still claimed that his career served to "teach three

arts…third civil law, second medicine, but first and foremost, the affairs of the military".[391]

---

[391] John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon*, 2.6, in *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne, vol. 199 (1855), 863 (my translation): *tres artes…doceo…prima militaris, secunda medicinalis, tertia iuris civilis.*

Bibliography

<u>Primary sources</u>

Augustine of Hippo. *Enarrationes in Psalmos*. Translated by Anon. London: James Parker & Co, 1857.

Augustine of Hippo. *De Civitate Dei*. Translated by Henry Paolucci. *The Political Writings of Saint Augustine*. Washington, D.C: Regnery, 1996. Quoted in Geoffrey Koziol, *The Peace of God*. York, Arc Humanities Press, 2018.

Bernard of Clairvaux. *In Praise of the New Knighthood* in *The Medieval Military Orders*. Translated by M. Barbara and K. Bate. Edited by Nicholas Morton. London: Routledge, 2013.

Cicero. *In Catilinam* 1, https://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/cat1.shtml.

de Bracton, Henry. *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae*. Translated by Samuel E. Thorne. Edited by George Woodbine. Harvard: Harvard Law School Library, 2003. https://amesfoundation.law.harvard.edu/Bracton/Unframed/English/v2/32.htm#TITLE37.

Eadmer. *The life of St. Anselm. Archbishop of Canterbury*. Translated by R.W. Southern. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd. 1962.

Gratian. *Decretum Gratiani*, https://go-gale-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/ps/i.do?p=MLFP&u=usyd&id=GALE%7CGN0103750595&v=2.1&it=r.

Gregory IX. *Decretals*, Herzog August Library. Accessed 2 January 2023. http://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/Chronologia/Lspost13/GregoriusIX/gre_1t23.html.

John of Salisbury. *Entheticus in Policraticum*. In John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*. Translated by Joseph B. Pike. Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press, 1938.

John of Salisbury. *Entheticus Maior*. Translated by Jan van Laarhoven. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

John of Salisbury. *Historia Pontificalis*. Translated by Marjorie Chibnall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.

John of Salisbury. *Metalogicon*. Translated by Daniel D. McGarry. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955.

John of Salisbury. *Policraticus*. Edited by C.C.J. Webb. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.

John of Salisbury. Policraticus. In *Patrologia Latina*. Edited by J.P. Migne, vol. 199 (1855).

John of Salisbury. *Policraticus*. Translated by John Dickinson. New York: Knopf, 1927.

John of Salisbury. *Policraticus*. Translated by Joseph B. Pike. Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press, 1938.

John of Salisbury. *The Letters of John of Salisbury, vol. 2, The Later Letters (1163–1180)*. Edited by W.J. Millor, S.J. & C.N.L. Brooke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

John of Salisbury. *The Letters of John of Salisbury*. *volume 1 (1153-1161)*. Edited by W.J. Millor SJ
and H.E. Butler. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1955.

John of Salisbury. *The Life of Anselm*. Translated by Ronald E. Pepin. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of
Mediaeval Studies, 2009.

John of Salisbury. *The Life of Becket*. Translated by Ronald E. Pepin. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of
Mediaeval Studies, 2009.

John of Salisbury. *Vita Anselmi*. In *Patrologia Latina*. Edited by J.P. Migne, vol. 199 (1855).

John of Salisbury. *Vita S. Thomae*. In *Patrologia Latina*. Edited by J.P. Migne, vol. 190 (1854).

Josephus. *Antiquitates Iudaicae*. Translated by William Whiston. Salt Lake City UT: Project
Gutenberg, 2001, https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/2848/pg2848-
images.html#link142HCH0001.

Justin, *Historia Philippicae et Totius Mundi Origines et Terrae Situs*,
http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/justin/1.html.

Map, Walter. *De Nugis Curialium*. Translated by M. R. James. Edited by C.N.L. Brooke & R.A.B.
Mynors. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983. https://www-oxfordscholarlyeditions-
com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/display/10.1093/actrade/9780198222361.book.1/actrade-
9780198222361-div2-61.

Pullen, Robert. *Sententiarum Logicarum Libri VIII*. In *Patrologia Latina*. Edited by J.P. Migne.
Volume 186 (1854).

Robert II of France. 'Peace Oath' in Roland Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War And Peace - A Historical Survey And Critical Re-evaluation*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.

Robert of Torigni. 'Chronicle,' in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, edited by R. Howlett. 4 vols. Rolls Series 82 (London, 1889), 4:202. In Jean Scammell. 'The Formation of the English Social Structure: Freedom, Knights, and Gentry, 1066-1300'. *Speculum* 68, no. 3 (July 1993): 591-618.

Terence. *Eunuchus*, http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/ter.eunuchus.html.

Vegetius. *De Re Militari*, https://www.loc.gov/resource/rbc0001.2014rosen0061/?sp=1&st=image.

William of Malmesbury. *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*. In R*erum Anglicarum Scriptores Post Bedam Praecipui, ex vetustissimis codicibus manuscriptis nunc primum in lucem editi.* G. Bishop, R Nuberie & R. Barker Typographi Regii, London 1596, https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=QUlhAAAAcAAJ&hl=en.

William of Malmesbury. *De Gestis Regum Anglorum, Historia Novella*. Translated by J.A. Giles. London: Henry Bohn, 1847.

Secondary sources

Allmand, C.T. 'Vegetius'. In *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Medieval Warfare and Technology*. Edited by Clifford J Rogers. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. Accessed 20 January 2023. https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780195334036.001.0001/acref-9780195334036-e-0949.

Allmand, C.T. *The De Re Militari of Vegetius: the Reception, Transmission and Legacy of a Roman Text in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Amt, Emilie. 'Essex, Henry of (d. after 1163), administrator and baron'. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/47254.

Amt, Emilie. 'Lucy, Richard de (d. 1179), soldier and administrator'. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/17149.

Amt, Emilie. *The Accession of Henry II in England: Royal Government Restored, 1149-1159*. Bury St Edmunds: St Edmundsbury Press, 1993.

Andrea, Alfred. *Encyclopaedia of the Crusades*. Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 2003.

Baker, John. *An Introduction to English Legal History*. 5th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Barlow, Frank. *The Feudal Kingdom of England 1042-1216*. London: Routledge, 2014.

Barlow, Frank. *Thomas Becket*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Bartlett, Robert. *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings 1075-1225*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Beeler, John. *Warfare in England 1066-1189*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966.

Bisson, T.N. 'The Lure of Stephen's England: Tenserie, Flemings, and a Crisis of Circumstance'. In *King Stephen's Reign (1135-1154)*. Edited by Paul Dalton, Graeme J. White, 171-181. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2008.

Bloch, Marc. *Feudal Society*. Translated by L.A. Manyon. Oxford: Routledge, 1962.

Bollerman, Karen & Nederman, Cary. 'John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket'. In *A Companion to John of Salisbury*. Edited by Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, 63-104. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Brundage, James. *Medieval Canon Law and the Crusader*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Cannon, John & Crowcroft, Robert. 'lord chancellor'. In *Dictionary of British History*. 3rd edition. Edited by John Cannon and Robert Crowcroft. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780191758027.001.0001/acref-9780191758027-e-2136.

Cannon, John & Crowcroft, Robert. '*Wales, march (or marches)*'. In *Dictionary of British History*, 3rd ed. Edited by John Cannon and Robert Crowcroft. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. Accessed 11 January 2023, https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780191758027.001.0001/acref-9780191758027-e-3575.

Carpenter, David. *The Struggle for Mastery: Britain 1066–1284*. London: Penguin, 2003.

Contamine, Philippe. *War in the Middle Ages*. Translated by Michael Jones. London: Blackwell
    Publishers, 1984.

Cross, F.L. & Livingstone, E.A. '*anathema*'. In *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*.
    Edited by F.L. Cross & E.A. Livingstone. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. Accessed
    15 January 2023, https://www-oxfordreference-
    com.ezproxy.library/10.1093/acref/9780192802903.001.0001/acref-9780192802903-e-281.

Cross, F.L. & Livingstone, E.A. 'Pullen, Robert'. In *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*.
    Edited by F.L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
    https://www-oxfordreference-
    com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780192802903.001.0001/acref-
    9780192802903-e-5653.

Crouch, David. 'Reginald, earl of Cornwall (d. 1175)'. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
    accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-
    org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/23319.

Crouch, David. 'The March and the Welsh Kings'. In *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*. Edited
    by Edmund King. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994. Accessed 11 January 2023,
    https://academic-oup-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/book/11022/chapter/159360080.

Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, '*latro*'. Accessed 9 January 2023.
    https://logeion.uchicago.edu/latro.

Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources. '*temeritas'.* Accessed 20 December 2022.

https://logeion.uchicago.edu/temeritas.

Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources. '*carnificina'.* Accessed 16 November 2022,

https://logeion.uchicago.edu/carnificina.

Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources. '*miles'.* Accessed 29 January 2023.

https://logeion.uchicago.edu/miles.

Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources. '*nugae'.* Accessed 16 November 2022,

https://logeion.uchicago.edu/nugae.

Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources. '*ordo'.* Accessed 16 November 2022,

https://logeion.uchicago.edu/ordo.

Dictionary of Medieval Latin in British Sources, '*decanus'.* Accessed 2 January 2023.

https://logeion.uchicago.edu/decanus.

Dictionary of Medieval Latin in British Sources. '*stipendium'.* Accessed 3 January 2023,

https://logeion.uchicago.edu/stipendium.

Ditcham, Brian. 'Review: John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth-Century', *The*

Sixteenth Century Journal 45, no. 1 (Spring 2014): 173-175.

Duby, Georges. *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press,

1980.

Eales, Richard. 'William of Ypres, styled count of Flanders (d. 1164/5), soldier'. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023. Accessed 21 January 2023, https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-29465.

Gillingham, John. 'Review: John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance'. *War in History* 21, no. 2 (April 2014): 252-254.

Giraud, Cédric & Mews, Constant. 'John of Salisbury and the Schools of the 12th Century'. In *A Companion to John of Salisbury*. Edited by Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, 31-62. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Grellard, Christophe & Lachaud, Frédérique. 'Introduction'. In *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, , edited by Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, 1-30. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Hermand-Schebat, Laure. 'John of Salisbury and Classical Antiquity" in *A Companion to John of Salisbury*. Edited by Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, 180-214. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Hollister, C.W. 'Mandeville, Geoffrey de, first earl of Essex (d. 1144), magnate'. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023. Accessed 21 January 2023, https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-17927.

Hollister, C.W. 'Mandeville, Geoffrey de, first earl of Essex (d. 1144), magnate'. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/17927.

Hollister, C.W. 'The Aristocracy'. In *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, edited by Edmund King. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994. Accessed 11 January 2023. https://academic-oup-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/book/11022/chapter/159353140.

Hosler, John. 'Henry II' In *The Encyclopaedia of War*. New York: Wiley, 2011. Accessed 31 November 2022. https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1002/9781444338232.wbeow277.

Hosler, John. 'The Brief Military Career of Thomas Becket'. *Haskins Society Journal* 15 (2004): 88-100.

Hosler, John. *John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth Century Renaissance*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Huscroft, Richard. *Ruling England: 1042-1217*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge, 2016.

James Gillespie, 'Marches of Scotland and Wales'. In *Medieval England: An Encyclopaedia*. Edited by Paul E Szarmach, M. Teresa Tavormina, and Joel T. Rosenthal, 490. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Jotischsky, Andrew. *Crusading and the Crusader States*, 2nd edition. London: Routledge, 2017.

Kagay, Donald. 'scutage'. In *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxford University

Press, 2010. Accessed 20 November 2022. https://www-oxfordreference-

com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780198662624.001.0001/acref-

9780198662624-e-5274.

Kaueper, Richard. *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press,

1999.

Kemp, B.R. 'Salisbury, Roger of (d. 1139)'. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Accessed

11 January 2023, https://www-oxforddnb-

com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-

9780198614128-e-23956.

King, Edmund. 'Introduction'. In *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*. Edited by Edmund King.

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994. Accessed 11 January 2023. https://academic-oup-

com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/book/11022/chapter/159352123.

Lachaud, Frédérique. 'Filiation and Context: The Medieval Afterlife of Policraticus'. In *A Companion

to John of Salisbury.* Edited by Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, 377-438.

Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Langan, John. 'The Elements of St. Augustine's Just War Theory'. *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 12,

no. 1 (Spring 1984): 19-38.

Lewis, C.T. & Short, Charles. A Latin Dictionary. '*decanus*'. Accessed 2 January 2023.

https://logeion.uchicago.edu/decanus.

Liebeschütz, Hans. 'John of Salisbury and Pseudo-Plutarch'. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 6 (1943): 33-39.

Liebeschütz, Hans. *Mediaeval Humanism in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury* (1968). Cited in Irene O'Daly, *John of Salisbury and the Medieval Roman Renaissance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018).

Lowe, Ben 'Peace and Truce of God'. In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Medieval Warfare and Military Technology*. Edited by Clifford J Rogers. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780195334036.001.0001/acref-9780195334036-e-0698.

Lowe, Ben. 'just war, just motive'. In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Medieval Warfare and Military Technology*. Edited by Clifford J Rogers. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780195334036.001.0001/acref-9780195334036-e-0498.

Luscombe, D.E. & Evans, G.R. 'The Twelfth-Century Renaissance'. In *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought 350-1450*. Edited by J.H. Burns, 306-338. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

MacDonald, Audrey. '*Bartholomew (d.1184)*'. In *The Oxford Companion to British History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780199567638.001.0001/acref-9780199567638-e-365.

Marenborn, John. *Pagans and philosophers: the problem of paganism from Augustine to Leibniz*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.

Martindale, Jane. '"An unfinished business": Angevin politics and the siege of Toulouse, 1159", *Anglo-Norman Studies* XXIII (2000): 115-154.

Marvin, Laurence. 'Crusade, Second'. In *The Encyclopaedia of War*. New York: Wiley, 2011, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1002/9781444338232.wbeow152.

Nederman, Cary & Campbell, Catherine. 'Priests, Kings, and Tyrants: Spiritual and Temporal Power in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*'. *Speculum* 66, no. 3 (July 1991): 572-590.

Nederman, Cary. 'A Duty to Kill: John of Salisbury's Theory of Tyrannicide'. *Review of Politics* 50, (1988): 365-389.

Nederman, Cary. 'John of Salisbury's Political Theory'. In *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, edited by Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, 258-288. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Nederman, Cary. 'Review: John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance', *Mediaevistik* 27 (2014): 367-369.

Nelson, L.H. *The Normans in South Wales, 1070-1171*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966.

Nicholson, Helen. *Medieval Warfare: Theory and Practice of War in Europe, 300-1500*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan: 2004.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 'soldier'. Accessed 29 January 2023.

    https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/soldier_1?q=soldier.

Painter, Sidney. *The Reign of King John*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1966.

Peck, Harry Thurston. Harpers Dictionary of Classical Antiquities. *'negligentia'*. Accessed 20

    December 2022. https://logeion.uchicago.edu/negligentia.

Peltzer, Jörg. 'Henry II and the Norman Bishops'. *English Historial Review* 119 (November 2004):

    1202-1229.

Pepin, Ronald. 'John of Salisbury as a Writer'. In *A Companion to John of Salisbury*. Edited by

    Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, 147-179. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Philip Reynolds, 'Medieval Period'. In *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of the Bible and the Law*. Edited by

    Brent A. Strawn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. Accessed 19 January 2023,

    https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref:obso/9780199843305.001.0001/acref-

    9780199843305-e-90.

Phillips, Johnathan. *The Second Crusade: Extending the Frontiers of Christendom*. New Haven: Yale

    University Press, 2007.

Poole, Austin Lane. *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta 1087-1216*. Oxford: Clarendon Press,

    1951.

Prestwich, Michael. 'Review: John of Salisbury: Military Authority of the Twelfth-Century

    Renaissance', *The Journal of Military History* 78, no. 1 (January 2014): 347-348.

Ristuccia, Nathan. 'The Image of an Executioner: Princes and Decapitations in John of Salisbury's Policraticus'. *Humanitas* 29, no. 1-2 (2016): 157-183.

Runciman, Steven. *A History of the Crusades: The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East, 1100–1187 (Vol. 2)*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1952.

Sassier, Yves. 'John of Salisbury and Law'. In *A Companion to John of Salisbury*. Edited by Christophe Grellard and Frédérique Lachaud, 235-257. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Scaglione, Aldo. *Knights at Court: Courtliness, Chivalry, & Courtesy from Ottonian Germany to the Italian Renaissance*. Berkeley CAL University of California Press, 1992.

Scammell, Jean. 'The Formation of the English Social Structure: Freedom, Knights, and Gentry, 1066-1300'. *Speculum* 68, no. 3 (July 1993): 591-618.

Slater, Laura. *Art and Political Thought in Medieval England c. 1150-1350*. Martlesham, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2019.

Stringer, Keith. *The Reign of Stephen: Kingship, Warfare, and Government in Twelfth-century England*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Syvänne, Ilkka. 'Vegetius'. In *The Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity*. Edited by Oliver Nicholson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. Accessed 13 January 2023. https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780198662778.001.0001/acref-9780198662778-e-4949.

Thompson, Kathleen. 'Dunstanville, de, family (per. c. 1090–c. 1292),'. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/54504.

Thomson, Rodney. 'John of Salisbury and William of Malmesbury: currents in twelfth century humanism'. In *The World of John of Salisbury*. Edited by Michael Wilks, 117-126. London: Blackwell Publishers, 1994.

Turner, Ralph. *Eleanor of Aquitaine – Queen of France, Queen of England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

van Laarhoven, Jan. *John of Salisbury's Entheticus Maior and Minor*. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Vincent, Nicholas. 'Camville, Richard de (d.1191). In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/47247.

Vincent, Nicholas. 'Fitzgerald, Henry (d. 1170x74). In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Accessed 11 January 2023, https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/10.1093/ref:odnb/48115.

Warren, W.L. *Henry II*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press, 1973.

Whatley, Gordon. 'The Uses of Hagiography: The Legend of Pope Gregory and the Emperor Trajan in the Middle Ages'. *Viator* 15 (1 January 1984): 25-63.

Wise, Johnathan Sands & Murphy, Sarah Jane. 'Guelph Party and Ghibelline Party'. In *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. https://www-oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/display/10.1093/acref/9780198662624.001.0001/acref-9780198662624-e-2578?rskey=Wy3dYD&result=1.