THE WORLD OF JOHN OF SALISBURY

EDITED BY MICHAEL WILKS

JOHN OF SALISBURY AS CLASSICAL SCHOLAR

by JANET MARTIN

J OHN of Salisbury long has drawn the attention of scholars as a representative of medieval humanism. Many studies have been devoted to his allusions to the literature of pagan and Christian antiquity.[1] But these studies necessarily have remained somewhat inconclusive because of our ignorance about the nature of John's exemplars of his authors. Assessment of such matters as his interests and tastes, his working methods, his dependence on his authorities, and his originality and independence requires precise knowlege of the nature of his exemplars. Did his manuscript of a given author contain the complete text, a partial text, or merely excerpts? Was the text abridged, interpolated, or in some other way unusual? Was the text in John's exemplar corrupt and thus especially difficult to understand? Was the text accompanied by glosses or notes?

Progress has been made along these lines. A theoretical picture of a number of John of Salisbury's exemplars has emerged from collation against modern critical editions of the extensive excerpts from ancient authors included in his writings, particularly the *Policraticus* or 'Statesman's Book', completed in 1159.[2] The method of collation is based on the principle that agreement in error betrays a common source.[3] If

[1] The outstanding study of this aspect of John's learning remains that by [Hans] Liebeschütz, *Mediaeval Humanism [in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury]* (*Studies of the Warburg Institute* 17: London 1950, repr Nendeln 1968). There is much of value in two older studies by Carl Schaarschmidt: 'Johannes Saresberiensis in seinem Verhältniss zur klassischen Litteratur', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, ns* 14 (Frankfurt 1859) pp 200-34; *Johannes Saresberiensis nach Leben und Studien, Schriften und Philosophie* (Leipzig 1862) pp 81-141. For other comment see the references below and the bibliography by D. E. Luscombe pp 445-57. I am preparing a book on John of Salisbury and the classics.

[2] [Janet] Martin, 'John of Salisbury's Manuscripts [of Frontinus and of Gellius'], *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 40 (London 1977) pp 1-26; [Janet] Martin, 'Uses of Tradition: [Gellius, Petronius, and John of Salisbury'], *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 10 (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1979) pp 57-76. The latter was announced as forthcoming in *Imitation and Adaptation: The Classical Tradition in the Middle Ages*, which has been withdrawn.

[3] For the theory of stemmatics see [Paul] Maas, [*Textual Criticism*], trans Barbara Flower (Oxford 1958); Leighton D. Reynolds and Nigel G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (2 ed Oxford 1974)

John's quotations from a given author contain errors found also in certain manuscripts of that author, it follows that John was using a manuscript closely related to that group of manuscripts. The evidence thus far shows that his manuscript of a given work typically contained a text characteristic of the later, twelfth-century manuscripts of the work and of the English tradition rather than the continental tradition. In spite of John's years of study in France, it seems that he did not bring to Canterbury in 1147-8 a large personal collection of books acquired in France. Rather, he drew his citations from the books he found in the libraries at Canterbury, those of Christ Church and Saint Augustine's Abbey.

A typical and instructive example of the nature of John's exemplars is provided by the *Strategemata* of Frontinus. Sextus Julius Frontinus enjoyed a successful political and military career, including a term as governor of Britain, in the first century of this era.[4] His surviving writings include fragments of a work on land-surveying, an account in two volumes of the water supply of Rome (this work, of great historical value, grew out of his appointment as water commissioner of Rome in AD 97), and the *Strategemata*. The *Strategemata* collects in four books for the use of officers the stratagems successfully employed in the past by Greek and Roman generals. The first three books contain military stratagems in the narrow sense: for example, various ruses by which the starving inhabitants of a besieged city can give the false impression that they have an abundance of food.[5] The fourth book gives examples of the military virtues – discipline, determination, and so forth. Though the *Strategemata* was much read in the later middle ages, in the twelfth century it was still a rare text; only seven of the extant manuscripts were written before 1200. The nineteenth-century editor divided the manuscripts on the basis of their readings into two classes – α (the 'better' class) and β.[6] Collation of John's quotations from the

pp 186-213 with bibliography pp 247-50. For the relevance of the history of the transmission of classical texts to the interpretation of twelfth-century authors, including John, see Leighton D. Reynolds, *The Medieval Tradition of Seneca's 'Letters'* (Oxford 1965) pp 104-24; [Richard W.] Hunt, ['The Deposit of Latin Classics in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance'], *Classical Influences [on European Culture, A.D. 500-1500* (ed R. R. Bolgar:] Cambridge 1971) pp 51-5.

4   *PW* vol 10 pt 1 cols 591-606 *sv* 'Iulius' no 243; also *Supplementband* 14 cols 208-9.

5   Frontinus, *Strategematon libri [quattuor, ed Gotthold Gundermann, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana]* (Leipzig 1888) iii.15, pp 109-10.

6   [Gotthold] Gundermann, 'De [Iuli Frontini] Strategematon libro [qui fertur] quarto', *Commentationes philologae Ienenses* 1 (Leipzig 1881) pp 85-161 esp pp 86-93, 110; Frontinus, *Strategematon libri* pp iii-v, xi-xii. For further details and references for this paragraph and the next see Martin, 'John of Salisbury's Manuscripts' pp 1-5.

Strategemata shows that he was drawing upon a manuscript with the errors characteristic of class β. Thus in Frontinus's chapter 'On Perseverance' (*De constantia*), we read that the inhabitants of a certain city besieged by Hannibal suffered such deprivation that a mouse was sold for two hundred *denarii*, and the seller perished of hunger while the buyer lived. Yet the citizens maintained their loyalty to the Romans. John's version of the story in the *Policraticus* says that the mouse was sold for one hundred (not two hundred) *denarii*, an agreement in error with the β manuscripts, which here read *centum*.[7] The cumulative evidence of such 'conjunctive errors' shows that John's manuscript of Frontinus is to be associated most closely with two manuscripts of the β class, designated *B* and *O*. MS *B* is the twelfth-century BL MS Harley 2729. MS *O* is the early twelfth-century Oxford Lincoln College MS lat 100, which is one of a group of manuscripts associated with William of Malmesbury.[8] In MS *O* William himself wrote some verses addressed to the reader, the table of contents, the last few folia of the text, and corrections and annotations throughout.

John was not, however, using *B* or a similar manuscript; for in some places his quotations are correct where *B* is in error. These 'disjunctive errors' in *B* are such that John could not, one feels, have removed them by conjecture. Thus Frontinus in his chapter 'On Discipline' (*De disciplina*) reports that Publius Nasica, though he had no need of ships, nevertheless decided to build them while in winter quarters so that his troops 'might not inflict harm on allies because of the license arising from leisure'. In the Latin the last phrase is *per otii licentiam*. John's quotation of the story includes this phrase, though in the order *per licentiam otii*.[9] But *B* here reads *per opulentiam* 'as a consequence of overabundance'.[10] This and other disjunctive errors in *B*, which are not found in the *Policraticus*, convince us that John was not drawing upon *B*. Nor did John use *O*, because his text shows no sign of William of Malmesbury's many revisions. In the passage just mentioned concern-

---

[7] Frontinus, *Strategematon libri* IV.v.20, p 132 line 23; Gundermann, 'De Strategematon libro quarto' p 126 line 18; *Policraticus* vi.11, col 603d: 2 p 28 line 17.

[8] On these manuscripts see now [R. M.] Thomson, ['The] "Scriptorium" [of William of Malmesbury'], *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries: Essays Presented to N. R. Ker* (ed M. B. Parkes and Andrew G. Watson: London 1978) pp 117–42 esp pp 129-30 and plates 28, 33.

[9] Frontinus, *Strategematon libri* IV.i.15, p 119 line 5; *Policraticus* vi.11, col 603d: vol 2 p 28 line 13.

[10] Gundermann, 'De Strategematon libro quarto' p 114 lines 19-20. Gundermann's inaccurate reports of *B* and *O*, which are not reported in his 1888 Teubner edition, have been corrected against the manuscripts.

ing Publius Nasica's troops, the first hand of O reads correctly *per otii licentiam* (fol 63rb); but William has marked these words for deletion and has written in the margin as a substitute *per opulentiam*, taken one supposes from a manuscript resembling B. But though John was not using O as revised by William, his exemplar closely resembled O before revision. Though we shall never know the exact circumstances, presumably his exemplar of Frontinus was a copy of O made before William revised it, or was O's exemplar or another copy of this exemplar. The affinity between O before revision and the manuscript used a generation later by John would be explained if William had obtained a copy of Frontinus from Canterbury. We know that William travelled throughout England between about 1115 and about 1140 collecting books for the library at Malmesbury.[11] He visited Canterbury more than once. Alternatively the direction of influence could have been from Malmesbury to Canterbury. This hypothesis seems less likely, seeing that the form of Frontinus's text later used by John at Canterbury shows no sign of William's editorial activity. The Frontinus case is typical. As a rule John draws his citations not from venerable continental manuscripts (as sometimes has been supposed), but from the recently copied books available in the libraries at Canterbury.

Knowledge of the nature of John's exemplars helps to illuminate his working methods. A case in point is the matter of his emendation of the textual errors in his exemplars of ancient literature. Recently the argument has been advanced that conjectural alteration *ingenii ope* was all but unknown in the middle ages.[12] In the medieval scriptorium, it is argued, 'correction was limited to diorthosis and collation, criticism to choice between existing variants.' The chief evidence presented is that of the Carolingian copyists of Lucan, who 'did not innovate *ingenii ope*: on the contrary they seem to have been absurdly content to copy and to cross-copy gibberish with meticulous accuracy, but conjecture they would not'. It is valuable to be reminded that what looks like a conjectural alteration in a manuscript may have another origin, such as correction of the newly copied manuscript against its exemplar or later collations of the completed copy with other manuscripts. In practice it is difficult, often impossible, to determine whether a given alteration in a

---

[11] R. M. Thomson, 'The Reading of William of Malmesbury', *RB* 85 (1975) pp 362-402; 'The Reading of William of Malmesbury: *Addenda et Corrigenda*', *RB* 86 (1976) pp 327-35; '"Scriptorium"' p 117.

[12] [E. J.] Kenney, ['The Character of Humanist Philology'], *Classical Influences* pp 119-28 at pp 120-1.

manuscript's reading is to be attributed to an unknown scholar's conjectural alteration or is to be regarded as a traditional variant, originating in collation. But although the fundamental research on textual scholarship in the Latin west remains to be done, there is evidence that some medieval scholars interfered with their ancient texts more extensively than has been recognized. MS *O* of Frontinus is an example.[13] To be sure, many of William of Malmesbury's alterations in *O* represent merely correction of obvious scribal slips. Other alterations seemingly result from collation; we have seen that William marked the correct *per otii licentiam* for deletion and wrote in the margin the incorrect substitute reading *per opulentiam*, taken presumably from *B* or a manuscript resembling *B*. But some of William's remedies go beyond simple correction and collation. They require supplying a missing word (granted, not necessarily the correct word, nor in the correct position), or interpolation of a text that was correct as it stood, or yet more drastic measures. One passage of several that permits comparison of the methods of William and John occurs in Frontinus's chapter 'On Discipline', where modern editors have marked a lacuna. Frontinus reports a decree of the senate that no reinforcements should be sent to a certain army that had been disgracefully defeated 'unless . . .': here in the manuscripts the last words of the story (*ne auxilia eis summitterentur nisi captis eius*) run directly into the first word (*legionibus*) of the next story, which tells of the banishment of legions that had refused to serve in the Punic war.[14] Confronted with the nonsensical *nisi captis eius legionibus*, both John and William easily recognized that a new statement began with the word *legionibus*. John preserved the notion that the denial of reinforcements was conditional by changing the dangling *nisi captis eius* to *nisi uictis hostibus* ('unless the enemy were conquered'); and he supplied a few words of transition to the next episode (*His uero legionibus*). As a result of John's alterations, the stories read smoothly in the *Policraticus*: 'no reinforcements should be sent unless the enemy were conquered; further, the legions that refused to serve in the Punic war were banished' and so forth. William's remedy was more drastic. In MS *O* as revised the senate's denial of reinforcements is unconditional; for *O*

[13] For a brief treatment of William's revisions see [P. K.] Marshall, [Janet] Martin, and [Richard H.] Rouse, 'Clare College MS. 26 [and the Circulation of Aulus Gellius 1–7 in Medieval England and France'], *Mediaeval Studies* 42 (Toronto 1980) pp 353–94 at pp 386–7.

[14] Frontinus, *Strategematon libri* iv.1, sections 24a–25 p 120 lines 20–2; Gundermann, 'De Strategematon libro quarto' 1, sections 24b–25 p 116 line 4; *Policraticus* vi.12, col 604c: 2 p 29 lines 26–7.

no longer contains the dangling phrase *nisi captis eius*. Instead it presents us with *Le* (of *legionibus*) and a bold horizontal line written apparently by William over an erasure that would nicely accommodate *nisi captis eius* (fol 63vb). John altered the nonsensical words; William, as it seems, erased them. Their methods do not represent conjectural criticism in the modern sense, which aims to produce a text as close as possible to the original.[15] Rather, like the renaissance editors of early printed editions of the classical texts, both John and William aimed at a text that was easily read; and, like the renaissance editors, they (in Kenney's words) 'had few scruples about the methods used to further this objective'.[16]

Knowledge of the nature of John's exemplars allows us also to learn something about his interests and tastes. In the case of Frontinus, nearly all of John's quotations come from book 4, roughly one-third of which is incorporated into the *Policraticus*. But we should not take it for granted that he had no access to the first three books, since he once quotes from book 3 and appears also to allude to the preface of book 1.[17] His focus on book 4 is truly a preference and can be attributed perhaps to its edifying content. Though books 1 through 3, as has been said, contain military stratagems in the narrow sense, book 4 illustrates military virtues such as discipline (*disciplina*) and restraint (*continentia*). If John does not use a given text, one should not leap to the conclusion (a somewhat condescending conclusion at that) that he had had no opportunity to use it. Thus, John's verbatim quotations in the *Policraticus* from Suetonius's *Lives of the Caesars* come not from a complete text of the work but from the brief excerpts made by the Carolingian scholar Heiric of Auxerre.[18] John used Heiric's excerpts from Suetonius, which amount only to about ten pages of printed text, in every book of the *Policraticus*. But John knew more of Suetonius than was in this brief collection; for instance, he refers the reader to Suetonius for the details of the emperor Galba's worship of the goddess Fortuna.[19] Moreover, the full text of Suetonius's *Lives* was fairly accessible in the twelfth century; it is not

[15] Maas p 1.

[16] Kenney p 125.

[17] Martin, 'John of Salisbury's Manuscripts' pp 1-2, 21.

[18] Martin, 'Uses of Tradition', pp 58-59. Heiric's excerpts from Suetonius have been edited by [Maximilian] Ihm, 'Beiträge [zur Textgeschichte des Sueton: 1. Die Suetonexcerpte des Heiric von Auxerre'], *Hermes* 36 (Berlin 1901) pp 343-56; [Riccardo] Quadri, [*I Collectanea di Eirico di Auxerre*], *Spicilegium Friburgense: Collana di Testi per la Storia della Vita Cristiana* 11 (Fribourg 1966) pp 104-13.

[19] C. Suetonius Tranquillus, *De vita Caesarum libri VIII*, ed Maximilian Ihm (Leipzig 1907) *Galba* iv.3, p 274; xviii.2, p 282; *Policraticus* v.4, col 545c: 1 p 292.

unlikely that there was a text at Canterbury. If so, John preferred Heiric's excerpts most likely in part for their convenience for reference and in part for their moralising emphasis. Similarly, if John nowhere shows any acquaintance with the text of Livy but does use the epitome of Roman history written by Florus, taste may have played a role, as well as the rarity of some portions of Livy's text.[20] There is nothing unusual, of course, in John's use of excerpts and epitomes in addition to or instead of complete texts; it is a practice he has in common with many in his day and later, who used excerpts and epitomes rather as if they were reading notes. Indeed, ease of reference was one of the motivations for *authors* of excerpts and epitomes. As Frontinus remarks, conceding that the stratagems he has collected are already to be found in the pages of historians: 'One ought to have consideration for busy men as regards brevity; for it is tedious to pursue separate examples scattered through the vast corpus of historical writings (*per inmensum corpus historiarum*)'. John of Salisbury himself, as he tells us, was such a busy man, who composed his works in the intervals of business.[21]

There is at least one exception to the rule that John drew his classical citations from excerpts or epitomes, when these were available, and from twelfth-century manuscripts of English provenance. This is the *Satyricon* of Petronius.[22] John's source for his quotations from Petronius was anomalous in several respects. Contrary to his normal practice he did not use the *florilegium*; rather he appears to have drawn on all three of the other traditions: the shorter form of the narrative (family *O*), the longer form of the narrative (family *L*), and the *Cena Trimalchionis* (*H*, extant in a single manuscript). Further, of the three extant medieval manuscripts representing the shorter form of the narrative (family *O*),

---

[20] Janet Martin, 'John of Salisbury and the Classics' (Harvard University Ph.D. dissertation 1968) pp 195-6.

[21] Frontinus, *Strategematon libri* bk 1 preface pp 1-2; *Metalogicon*, iii, prologue cols 889a-b p 117, iv.42, col 946b pp 218-19. On the contents and purposes of twelfth-century florilegia see Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, 'The *Florilegium Angelicum*: its Origin, Content, and Influence', *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt* (ed J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson: Oxford 1976) pp 66-114, 455 esp pp 88, 94; R. H. Rouse, 'Florilegia and Latin Classical Authors in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Orléans', *Viator* 10 (1979) pp 131-60; B. Munk-Olsen, 'Note sur quelques préfaces de florilèges latins du XIIe siècle', *Revue Romane* 8 (Copenhagen 1973) pp 185-91.

[22] For further details and references for this paragraph see Martin, 'Uses of Tradition' pp 69-71; for the textual tradition of the *Satyricon* see *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon*, ed Konrad Müller (Munich 1961) pp vii-xxxix esp pp xxxiii-xxxvi; *Petronius: Satyrica* (ed Konrad Müller and trans Wilhelm Ehlers: Munich 1965) pp 381-420 with corrected stemma p 415.

John's source most closely resembled, not the two twelfth-century manuscripts but the oldest, Bern Burgerbibliothek MS 357, written in the second half of the ninth century. Similarly, his source for the rarely-copied *Cena Trimalchionis* presumably was not far removed from a Carolingian ancestor. And the known medieval tradition of the *Satyricon*, which is French, points to his having acquired his atypically venerable exemplars in France. It would appear that although John borrowed from the Canterbury libraries many of the manuscripts he used in the *Policraticus*, he had a personal copy of Petronius. His failure to quote from Livy or the unabridged text of Suetonius *in extenso* was probably due not to lack of opportunity but to lack of interest, especially when more convenient forms of the text were at hand. In contrast he evidently found the *Satyricon* so appealing that he obtained his own copy in spite of the work's extreme rarity.

Thus far I have been offering a conjectural description of John's exemplars. The next step is obvious: can any of his hypothetical exemplars be identified with an extant manuscript? Using the lists of surviving manuscripts compiled by N. R. Ker, I have looked at several hundred manuscripts that once belonged to the two Canterbury libraries, those of Christ Church and Saint Augustine's Abbey, and other libraries having contacts with them.[23] Not surprisingly the results have been rather meagre; many medieval books have been lost. Or, to put the situation more positively, John's exemplars may yet be identified among the large numbers of medieval books that have no marks of origin or provenance. In any case I have found one manuscript with considerable claim to being identified as a manuscript actually used by John. This is Trinity College, Cambridge, MS 0.4.34 (James 1264) of Orosius's influential work *Seven Books of History Against the Pagans*, with marginal glosses.[24] The manuscript was written at Christ Church, Canterbury, about 1100. Casually executed in several hands, with little decoration, the Trinity manuscript has no aesthetic merit. But it may well have more historical interest than has been suspected. John's

---

[23] Neil R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books* (2 ed London 1964).

[24] Montague Rhodes James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge: A Descriptive Catalogue* (4 vols. Cambridge 1900-4) 3 pp 282-5 no 1264; T. A. M. Bishop, 'Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts: Part I', *TCBiblS* 1 (1949-53) pp 432-41 at p 432. MSS 0.4.34 and 0.4.36 (James 1266), the latter destroyed in 1880, appear as item 221 in the catalogue from Christ Church, Canterbury, drawn up for Henry of Eastry (prior 1284-1331); see Montague Rhodes James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge 1903) p. 41.

quotations from Orosius show significant agreement with this manuscript and in several passages reflect its glosses as well. The nature of the text and accompanying glosses offers a useful example of the problems of understanding and interpretation confronting the twelfth-century reader, in this case including quite possibly John of Salisbury.

Orosius's *History Against the Pagans*, completed before the end of AD 417, was written to rebut charges that the adoption of Christianity was to blame for the disasters of the barbarian invasions. Orosius's method has been well described; it was 'to retell the history of the world in a brief form, laying special emphasis on the disasters and calamities of the past in order to show that things had been as bad under the old dispensation, and that contemporary misfortunes were to be attributed rather to the anger of the Christian God at the perennial folly and wickedness of man'.[25] Providing as it did an authoritative interpretation of world history in attractive and relatively brief form, the work enjoyed great popularity in the middle ages. Over two hundred manuscripts, including excerpts and fragments, are extant. Most of John of Salisbury's verbatim quotations from Orosius, about two dozen in all, appear in two chapters of book eight of the *Policraticus*. Here John's subject is the tyrant, his nature and his inevitable confusion and downfall. In chapters 18 and 19 John treats the Roman emperors, remarking that the bad rulers outnumbered the good.[26] He then promises to confirm the suspect authority of Roman history with examples from Christian history.[27] His examples of tyranny in sacred history begin with Nimrod, the mighty hunter before the Lord; he borrows a long account of the career and death of Julian the Apostate from the *Tripartite History*; turning to the England of his own day he then mentions recently deceased public enemies, notably Eustace, son of Stephen, concluding:[28]

> Their malice is notorious, their disgrace well known, and their unhappy endings are a thing of which the present age cannot be ignorant. If someone does not know ancient history, if he does not

[25] J. M. Bately and D. J. A. Ross, 'A Check List of Manuscripts of Orosius', *Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri Septem*', *Scriptorium* 15 (Brussels 1961) pp 329-34 at p 329; some of the stated provenances must be changed in the light of recent work. On Orosius's *apologie historique* see François Paschoud, *Roma Aeterna: Études sur le patriotisme romain dans l'occident latin à l'époque des grandes invasions (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana* 7, Rome 1967) pp 276-92.

[26] *Policraticus* viii.18, col 786b: 2 p 360.

[27] *Policraticus* viii.20, col 793c: 2 p 373.

[28] *Policraticus* viii.21, col 807b: 2 p 396.

know how Cyrus, from whom kings fled, was overthrown by Tamyris, queen of the Scythians, if he does not recall the misfortunes and downfalls of tyrants of old, let him at any rate consider the things that are forced upon his unwilling eyes, and he will see more clearly than the light of day that all tyrants are wretched.

In the chapters concerning the Roman emperors, Orosius's *History* is the chief authority. John quotes substantial passages from Orosius's work, drawing particularly heavily on his accounts of the emperors Caligula, Nero, Commodus, and Severus. John supplements Orosius with the excerpts from Suetonius's *Lives* compiled by Heiric of Auxerre. Clearly he had his exemplars of Heiric's compilation and of Orosius's *History* open before him as he wrote.

As has been said, my collation of John's extensive excerpts from Orosius revealed significant agreement in error with Cambridge Trinity College MS 0.4.34, written at Canterbury about 1100. Thus Orosius's authentic text reports that Julius Caesar, when hard pressed by the enemy, once swam two hundred yards to a ship 'with one hand held high' (*una manu eleuata*), in which he held his papers. Quoting the story, John uses the word *elata* instead of *eleuata* (*una manu elata*: 'with one hand elevated'): this is the reading also of the Trinity manuscript.[29] Again, Orosius wrote that in Nero's reign disasters pressed upon Rome 'in heaps' (*aceruatim*); John and the Trinity manuscript have the more ordinary expression *acerbissime* 'very harshly'.[30] And so on. There are many other agreements in error, both trivial and significant, between John's quotations and the Trinity manuscript.

Collation of the Trinity manuscript alone was not sufficient, however; quite possibly another manuscript, not known to be associated with Canterbury, could resemble John's text even more closely. Fortunately a preliminary classification of the manuscripts has been made by Janet Bately in the course of her study of the Latin exemplar used for king Alfred's translation of Orosius into Old English.[31] Our Trinity manuscript is one of eight manuscripts in her group C iv; I have collated test passages in the C iv manuscripts and in two dozen other related

---

[29] [Paulus] Orosius, *Historiarum [adversum paganos] libri [VII]*, ed Karl Zangemeister, *CSEL* 5 (1882) VI.xv.34, p 402 line 17; *Policraticus* viii.19 col 789c: 2 p 365 line 26; Trinity College, Cambridge, MS 0.4.34 fol 71ᵛ.

[30] Orosius, *Historiarum libri* VII.vii.11, p 455 line 2; *Policraticus* viii.18, col 788b: 2 p 363 line 19; Trinity College, Cambridge, MS 0.4.34 fol 82ʳ.

[31] [Janet M.] Bately, 'King Alfred [and the Latin Manuscripts of Orosius' History]', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 22 (Copenhagen 1961) pp 69–105.

manuscripts, most of English origin. My test collations confirm Bately's classifications for the most part; they show also that there is no *unique* agreement between John's quotations and the Trinity manuscript against every other extant manuscript as regards the text (the glosses are a different matter). Rather, John's quotations most closely resemble the text found in the Trinity manuscript and four others.[32] Further evidence is provided by the glosses found in the Trinity manuscript and some others.[33] The glosses reflect the efforts of medieval readers to understand Orosius, given the intrinsic difficulties of content and style and the further obscurities introduced by serious textual errors. John's quotations from Orosius were influenced by these distinctive glosses. Though the argument, which is too involved to summarize here, perhaps falls short of demonstration, the evidence of text and glosses taken together strongly suggests that John's manuscript more closely resembled the Trinity manuscript than any other extant.

One instance in which John's text was influenced by a marginal gloss occurs in his account of the great fire at Rome in AD 64. Following Orosius, John reports that during the fire Nero, dressed as a tragic actor, declaimed a literary composition. But though Orosius's authentic text says that Nero declaimed the *Iliad* (*Iliadam decantabat*), John offers a more detailed version. According to him Nero 'sang the ode of Heleifeles (*Heleifeles odam sonat*) and recited the priestly hymns of the city in which the splendour of the sun is worshipped'.[34] The text and gloss in the Trinity manuscript account for some of John's unique information about Nero's performance. The word *Iliadam* in *Iliadam decantabat* has been corrupted to the nonsensical *elifeles adam*; similarly in the other C iv manuscripts. Confronted with this corrupt and meaningless text in his exemplar, John changed *adam* to *odam* and so arrived at Nero's singing 'the ode of Heleifeles', which at least is intelligible. What about John's other statement, that Nero 'recited the

---

[32] These are Boulogne-sur-mer Bibl. mun. MS 126, saec. 11, which once belonged to the monastery of Saint Bertin at Saint-Omer; Saint-Omer Bibl. mun. MS 717, saec. 11, which once belonged to the cathedral chapter there; Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 23 ii, saec. 12, which was written at Dover Priory, a dependency of Christ Church, Canterbury; and Paris BN MS lat. 4880 fols 1–48ᵛ, saec. 14.

[33] Paris BN MS lat. 4871 fols 1–98ᵛ, saec. 11, and three mentioned in the preceding note: Boulogne-sur-mer MS 126, Saint-Omer MS 717, and Paris MS 4880. For others containing some of the glosses on Orosius bks 4 and 6 see Bately, 'King Alfred' pp 97–8.

[34] Orosius, *Historiarum libri* VII.vii.6, pp 453–4; *Policraticus* viii.18 col 788a: 2 p 362; 'Heleifeles odam sonat, sacerdotales hymnos ciuitatis in qua solis splendor colitur decantabat'.

priestly hymns of the city in which the splendour of the sun is worship-ped'? The gloss on the corrupt *elifeles adam*—which doubtless was felt to require explanation—goes as follows in the Trinity manuscript:[35]

> Elis is a city of Greece; in which *felos*, that is priests of the Olympic competition, used to recite songs on the days of the games. Whence this noun was formed: *elifeles*, that is 'priest'.

We are to understand that *elifeles adam* means *sacerdotis odam* 'priest's song'. John's correction of *adam* to *odam* and his reference to priestly hymns (*sacerdotales hymnos*) were inspired by the gloss. But he refers the priestly hymns not to Elis and the Olympic games but to an unnamed city devoted to sun-worship. In a useful note on this passage John's editor suggests that he chose to interpret *Heleifeles* as *Heliopolis* 'city of the sun' with reference to Macrobius's *Saturnalia*. Macrobius, a favourite source for John, records that the Assyrians worshipped the sun under the name of Jupiter; they celebrated this sun-god with elaborate ritual in a city called Heliopolis.[36] Webb was unable to decide whether this interpretation of *Heleifeles* as *Heliopolis* was the work of John himself or of some anonymous glossator of Orosius in the manuscript used by John. With our more precise knowledge of John's exemplar of Orosius, we can come closer to the process. John's account in the *Policraticus* is based on the gloss he found in his manuscript, which mentions songs sung at Elis during the Olympic games. But the notion of hymns of a city devoted to sun-worship is John's own, not the glossator's. It is less clear what led him to make this change. Presumably the resemblance between *elifeles* and *heliopolis* played a part. The notion of a city of the sun and of ancient sun-worship was familiar to medieval readers, whether from Macrobius or elsewhere. In fact our glosses contain a passing reference to ancient sun-worship—but in the early pages of the Trinity manuscript (fol 11ʳ), not quoted by John. His interpretation of the text and modification of the gloss he found in his exemplar may owe something also to Orosius's statements, quoted a few lines before, that Nero created the fire as a 'spectacle for his pleasure' (*uoluptatis suae spectaculum*) and that he gave his performance while watching from a tower and 'enjoying, as he said, the beauty of the

---

[35] Trinity College, Cambridge, MS 0.4.34 fol 81v: 'Elys ciuitas grecie est. in qua felos id est sacerdotes olimpiaci agonis decantabant carmina diebus ludorum. Vnde et hoc nomen compositum est. elifeles id est sacerdos'.

[36] Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1.xxiii.10, ed James Willis, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana* (2 vols. Leipzig 1963), 1 p 125.

flames' (*laetusque flammae ut aiebat pulchritudine*).[37] John's new version, referring to hymns celebrating the splendour of the sun, seems highly appropriate—more so than songs about the Olympic games.

Like any other reader, John corrected the obvious errors in his exemplar, sometimes cross-checking with parallel accounts, and reproduced the less obvious ones. Unlike most other readers, one feels, John went beyond mere correction of errors and explanation of obscurities. His attribution to Nero of 'priestly hymns of the city in which the splendour of the sun is worshipped' is not justified by his exemplar, which gives quite another account. Here as elsewhere John treats his authority as raw material to be reshaped at will. To him corruptions and other errors in text and gloss—so obvious to modern scholarship—were both a problem and an opportunity. According to the authentic text of Orosius, the emperor declaimed the *Iliad*; according to an earlier source, Suetonius's *Life of Nero*, he performed a work (perhaps of his own composition) called *Halosis Ilii*, or 'The Capture of Troy'.[38] John of Salisbury, by a process that cannot be characterised as scholarly even by medieval norms, nevertheless arrived at an account that is at least as plausible and certainly as pleasing as the authentic versions. Hymns of sun-worship seem a fit expression of Nero's pleasure in the beauty of the great fire at Rome.

It is clear that John was willing to alter an obviously faulty text; he had little choice if he wanted a readable account. It is clear also, as we have seen with reference to Nero and the great fire, that John adapted texts in order to render them more erudite and more striking. But John's alterations went beyond emendation and embellishment. It is clear that he not infrequently changed the content and significance of the episodes in his exemplars in order to make them more compelling as evidence for his arguments. A series of examples is to be found near the end of book 3 of the *Policraticus*, where John argues that the good prince accepts, even welcomes, criticism, as is proved by examples from the past. The statesmen of Greek and Roman antiquity were so forbearing that when they met with criticism, even insult and abuse, their response was urbane tolerance. (Parenthetically one may recall that this subject had peculiar relevance for John; in 1156, only a few years before writing

---

[37] Orosius, *Historiarum libri* VII.vii.4 and 6, pp 453–4; *Policraticus* viii.18 cols 787d–788a: 2 p 362.

[38] *Nero* xxxviii.2, p 258. Heiric's excerpts do not mention Nero's recitation.

these pages, he had been declared *persona non grata* by Henry II).[39] Having cited several examples of the forbearance shown by Greek statesmen, concluding with Alexander the Great, John turns to Roman examples:[40]

> But let us not borrow our examples of excellence from the Greeks alone. Scipio Africanus, when some charged him with being not particularly combative, said, 'My mother bore me to be a general, not a mere soldier'. Marius, too, when a certain Teuton challenged him to a fistfight, replied that he (*se*: that is, Marius himself) could end his life with a noose if he were eager to die; and besides the prudent man (*sapientem*) seeks victory, not combat.

Now let us compare how these two episodes appear in Frontinus's text:[41]

> Scipio Africanus, when some said that he was not particularly combative, is reported to have replied: 'My mother bore me to be a general, not a mere soldier'. Gaius Marius replied to a Teuton who challenged him and demanded that he step forward, that he (*eum*: that is, the Teuton) could end his life with a noose if he were eager to die. When the other then insisted, Marius confronted him with a gladiator of small height and advanced years and told the Teuton that he himself would fight the winner.

Frontinus's text, which John had before him, offers not the philosophical Marius of gently ironic humour who illustrates the forbearance marking the good prince, but the pugnacious Marius known from the authentic historical record who gives a barbarian insult for insult. John radically altered the meaning of the beginning of the episode by the simple device of changing a pronoun (*eum* to *se*); he then omitted Marius's elaborately staged insult, substituting a philosophical *sententia*: 'The prudent man seeks victory, not combat'. Since we know the nature of John's text, it is clear that he was not the innocent victim of interpolations in his source. Rather he himself has rewritten his text of

---

[39] Giles Constable, 'The Alleged Disgrace of John of Salisbury in 1159', *EHR* 69 (1954) pp 67–76; [*The*] *Letters* [*of John of Salisbury I: The Early Letters (1153-1161).* (ed W. J. Millor, H. E. Butler and C. N. L. Brooke: London 1955)] appendix 2 pp 257–8.

[40] *Policraticus* iii.14 col 508c: 1 p 225. For this paragraph and the next see also Martin, 'John of Salisbury's Manuscripts', pp 18–19.

[41] Frontinus, *Strategematon libri* IV.vii.4–5, pp 134–5.

Frontinus in order to have the example of forbearance his argument requires.

Possibly somewhat discouraged, however, by the drastic revisions necessary, John here abandoned Frontinus and turned to another favourite source, Heiric of Auxerre's excerpts from Suetonius. Among the excerpts concerned with Julius Caesar, we read in Heiric this series of statements:[42]

> He was profoundly annoyed by his baldness, too, and therefore used to comb his thinning hair forward from the crown. Also he used to wear the senatorial tunic with fringes falling to the wrist and to tie his belt loosely. Accordingly Sulla on many occasions warned the nobles to be on their guard against the badly-girt boy. Also he was very fond of pearls and would sometimes judge their weight by comparing them in his hand.

That is what Heiric's text says. Let us now compare John's version, which immediately follows the Marius episode. The italicized words correspond to Heiric's text:[43]

> The first emperor of the Romans, Julius Caesar, endured numerous slights with great forbearance. Since *he was profoundly annoyed by his baldness and used to comb his thinning hair from the back of the head* toward the forehead, an angry soldier said to him: 'It will be easier, Caesar, for you to cure your baldness than for me to have been a coward or ever to be a coward in future while in the Roman army'. *Also he used to wear the senatorial tunic with fringes falling to the wrist and to tie his belt loosely. Accordingly Sulla on many occasions warned the nobles to be on their guard against the badly-girt boy. Moreover, he was very fond of pearls; these he would sometimes judge by comparing their weight in his hand.* When therefore he ordered the unwilling Caecilius to do on the senate's authority a certain thing that seemed to Caecilius unjust, the latter said: 'You will be wearied of pearls before I shall do it'.

Of the three episodes in Heiric, the second was copied out verbatim; but in copying the first and third, John has supplied the insulting speeches. The reader accepts the implication that Caesar heard these slights with exemplary equanimity. Many more examples from Heiric and other

---

[42] The excerpts are from *Iulius* caps 45 and 47; see Ihm, 'Beiträge' p 347; Quadri p 105.

[43] *Policraticus* iii.14 cols 508c-d: 1 pp 225-6.

sources follow, but we need not continue. The leaves of John's manuscript of Heiric's excerpts must have been well-thumbed, for they were used in every book of the *Policraticus*. Collation shows that his manuscript of Heiric resembled the two extant manuscripts forming class β.[44] Neither these nor any other manuscripts of Heiric have a trace of the angry soldier, the rebellious Caecilius, or John's other inventions.

I have emphasised John's practice of manufacturing pseudo-antiques because this aspect of his scholarly activity has been difficult, perhaps, for moderns to accept. In particular there is good reason to suspect that the so-called *Institutio Traiani* (or 'Instruction of Trajan') attributed to Plutarch, which John claims to follow in books 5 and 6 of the *Policraticus*, was invented by John as a pseudo-classical authority and framework for the political ideas he wanted to recommend to his contemporaries. This thesis was argued cogently by Hans Liebeschütz in 1943.[45] More recently some scholars have returned to the earlier view that the *Institutio* was late-antique in origin with medieval interpolations and additions of the Carolingian era or the period of the Investiture Controversy.[46] I do not propose here to go into the involved arguments for and against John's invention of the *Institutio*. I want only to indicate a few ways in which our knowledge of John's classical exemplars helps to clarify matters. John claims that the *Institutio* includes exemplary 'stratagems'. Liebeschütz pointed out that the *exempla* presented as 'stratagems of Plutarch' come actually from Frontinus's *Strategemata* and Heiric's excerpts from Suetonius, two sources freely used (as we have seen) in the *Policraticus*. I have been able to demonstrate that the

---

[44] These are BL MS Additional 19835 fols 1-19, written in the second half of the twelfth century with some fourteenth-century marginal notes in English; and the thirteenth-century Leipzig Stadtbibliothek MS 94 (Rep. I.4.48) fols 92ᵛ-103ᵛ. John's manuscript most closely resembled the latter. For descriptions see Quadri pp 31-2, 45-6, 50; Dorothy M. Schullian, 'The Excerpts of Heiric *Ex libris Valerii Maximi memorabilium dictorum vel factorum'*, *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 12 (Rome 1935) pp 155-8.

[45] Hans Liebeschütz, 'John of Salisbury and pseudo-Plutarch', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 6 (London 1943) pp 33-9, reprinted in *England and the Mediterranean Tradition: Studies in Art, History, and Literature*, Warburg and Courtauld Institutes (Oxford 1945); Liebeschütz, *Mediaeval Humanism* pp 23-6.

[46] [Saverio] Desideri, *La 'Institutio Traiani'*, *Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Filologia Classica* 12 (Genoa 1958) pp 46-7, 68; [Max] Kerner, 'Zur Entstehungsgeschichte [der Institutio Traiani'], *DA* 32 (1976) pp 558-71 with full bibliography; [Max] Kerner, *Johannes von Salisbury [und die logische Struktur seines Policraticus]* (Wiesbaden 1977) pp 180-1. On the organic analogy expounded by 'Plutarch', see now Tilman Struve, *Die Entwicklung der organologischen Staatsauffassung im Mittelalter* (*Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters* 16: Stuttgart 1978) pp 123-48.

alleged stratagems of Plutarch were taken from the very manuscripts of Frontinus and Heiric used throughout the *Policraticus*.[47] There is no possibility, then, that John was deceived by an existing pseudo-Plutarch that included these *exempla* in this form.[48] Rather John himself presented as part of the *Institutio* the passages he was copying from his usual manuscripts of Frontinus and Heiric.

Another matter is that of John's attribution of the *Institutio* to Plutarch, who is not a familiar wisdom-figure in medieval thought. I have suggested elsewhere that John's attention was drawn to Plutarch by a story in the collection of excerpts from Aulus Gellius's *Noctes Atticae* used in the *Policraticus*.[49] According to Gellius, when Plutarch ordered that a certain rascally slave be beaten, the latter accused him reproachfully of having given way to anger unbecoming to a philosopher and inconsistent with his own teaching. At this Plutarch replied calmly that he was not angry and pointed out that his colour was normal, his voice quiet, his gestures restrained. Turning then to the man performing the flogging, he said, 'While this fellow and I continue our discussion, you carry on with the beating'. The story ends with John's approving comment: 'Thus Plutarch: wherein there is no little instruction for those in high places'.[50] John here, near the end of book 4, offers Plutarch's example of strict justice without anger as authoritative counsel to those in positions of power. A few pages later, at the beginning of book 5, he introduces the *Institutio Traiani*. Although Plutarch was not a prominent figure in medieval thought, he took on temporary salience in the excerpts of Gellius used by John. Having attracted John's attention and admiration, Plutarch was transformed by him into a political philosopher who advocated the same views as John himself.

---

[47] Martin, 'John of Salisbury's Manuscripts', pp 1-5, 19-20; Martin, 'Uses of Tradition', p 66.

[48] Compare Desideri, *La 'Institutio Traiani'*, pp 36-42.

[49] The same Gellius anthology was used by William of Malmesbury in his *Polyhistor*; see Martin, 'John of Salisbury's Manuscripts', p 20; Martin, 'Uses of Tradition', pp 64-7; Marshall, Martin and Rouse, 'Clare College MS. 26', pp 370-4; R. M. Thomson, 'William of Malmesbury, John of Salisbury and the *Noctes Atticarum*', *Hommages à André Boutemy* (*Collection Latomus* 145: Brussels 1976) pp 367-89.

[50] Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, I.xxvi. 5-9 ed P. K. Marshall (*Oxford Classical Texts*; 2 vols. Oxford 1968) 1 pp 83-4; *Policraticus* iv.8 cols 530d-531c: 1 pp 265-6. Part of the Gellius anthology is preserved in Oxford Bodleian MS Lat. class. d.39 (formerly London Sion College MS Arc. L.40.2/L.21) fols 153-9, written in England in the middle of the twelfth century; the story of Plutarch and the clever slave appears on fol 158ᵛ.

That John manufactured pseudo-antiques is clear. In the few pages cited above one finds priestly hymns of sun-worship, a philosophical *dictum* attributed to the general Marius, a retort by an angry soldier, and a speech by an otherwise unknown political opponent of Julius Caesar. These efforts are on a small scale, to be sure, but they are of the same kind as the *Institutio Traiani*. I have argued elsewhere that John regularly provided clues permitting his pseudo-classical inventions to be recognized as such by the learned reader. John wrote in part to gain the admiration of other men of letters. While deceiving the majority of his readers, he meant his cleverness to be manifest to a select few, including his friends in the archbishop's curia and elsewhere. To object that John's invention of the *Institutio* would be unlikely in view of his *probità morale* or the erudition of his readers at Canterbury is to miss the point.[51] For John and his friends one of the important uses of the classical tradition, particularly the pseudo-classical inventions and other shared jokes, was precisely the reinforcement of their sense of being a learned elite.

Thus far I have concentrated on prose authors, primarily the historians. But it was the poetry of pagan and Christian antiquity that dominated the medieval literary curriculum.[52] There are several consequences for our understanding of John as a classical scholar. Although I have portrayed him as having his exemplars before him as he wrote the *Policraticus*—and I am persuaded that this was normally the case when he was drawing on Frontinus, Heiric, Orosius, and others—when it comes to the poets it is a different story. Like other medieval writers John as a rule quotes the poets from memory, drawing on the training of his early years. There are many passages of the *Policraticus* that could have been composed without reference to a book. They are rich in allusion to the scriptures and the school authors: Vergil, Lucan, Statius, Ovid, the satirists, and Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*.

A second consequence of the poets' position as school authors is that they were studied in the context of the glosses and commentaries with which they had become associated through the centuries. When studying Vergil, for example, John together with all other medieval readers

---

[51] Martin, 'Uses of Tradition', pp 67-8, 73-6. Compare Desideri, *La 'Institutio Traiani'* pp 25-8, 53-62; Kerner, 'Zur Entstehungsgeschichte' pp 562-7.

[52] On the authors studied in the medieval schools see Günter Glauche, *Schullektüre im Mittelalter: Entstehung und Wandlungen des Lektürekanons bis 1200 nach den Quellen dargestellt, Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung* 5 (Munich 1970); the sections on 'Curriculum Authors' and 'Medieval Canon' and the excursus on 'Early Christian and Medieval Literary Studies' by Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (trans W. R. Trask, *Bollingen Series* 36: Princeton 1973) pp. 48-54, 260-4, 446-67; Hunt p 55.

was the heir of voluminous late-antique commentary on the poet. In a long and elaborate attack on hunting in an early chapter of the *Policraticus* John uses Aeneas as an example of right behaviour in that he shot deer not to seek pleasure, but to sustain life for himself and his comrades. John's reference is to book 1 of the *Aeneid*, where Aeneas is said to have felled seven deer, one for each of his ships.[53] John's moralising interpretation was current already in late antiquity. Servius Auctus comments here: 'Well does he restrict the number; this is a necessary hunt, not a pleasurable one in which a greater number are sought. It was not appropriate for him to attend to pleasure while his comrades suffered in diverse ways'.[54] Another influential late-antique interpretation of Vergil, that found in Macrobius's *Saturnalia*, appears to have suggested to John his extended contrast between queen Dido's luxurious banquet in book 1 of the *Aeneid* and the rustic king Evander's sober meal in book 8.[55] John's criticism of Dido's banquet as *luxuriosum muliebris intemperantiae conuiuium* echoes the views of Macrobius rather than Servius, whose remarks are approving on the whole.[56] The view that the fictions of Vergil and other authors were 'coverings' or 'wrappings' (*integumenta, involucra*) cloaking profound moral and cosmological truths was of course a commonplace.[57] Thus, for example, Latin

---

[53] *Policraticus* i.4 col 39lb: 1 p 22: 'Fuerit auctor Romani generis ceruorum corpora, non uanae uoluptatis solatium, sed sibi et sociis quaesiuit suffragium uitae'; [Vergil] *Aeneid*, 1 lines 192-4 ed R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford 1969 corrected repr 1972) p 109: 'nec prius absistit quam septem ingentia uictor/corpora fundat humi et numerum cum nauibus aequet;/hinc portum petit et socios partitur in omnis'.

[54] *Servii [Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina] commentarii*, ed G. Thilo and H. Hagen (3 vols Leipzig 1881-7) 1 p 76 on *Aeneid* 1 line 192: 'bene definit numerum; necessitatis enim est haec venatio, non voluptatis, in qua plura requiruntur. nec enim conveniebat, sociis diversis modis laborantibus, voluptati operam dare'. The sentence beginning *nec enim* is found only in the conflated scholia known as Servius Auctus or Scholia Danielis. On the codices of Servius and Servius Auctus see now Charles E. Murgia, *Prolegomena to Servius 5: The Manuscripts (University of California Publications: Classical Studies* 11: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1975).

[55] *Policraticus* viii.6 cols 728b-730d: 2 pp 257-62; *Aeneid* 1 lines 723-49 pp 125-6; 8 lines 175-83 p 287.

[56] *Policraticus* viii.6 col 730b: 2 p 261. Compare Macrobius, *Saturnalia* II.i.1, vol 1 p 133: VII.i.14, 1 pp 398-9; quoted in *Policraticus* viii.6 cols 728d-729a: 2 p 258: viii.10 cols 743d-744a: 2 pp 285-6. Compare Servius on *Aeneid* 1 lines 737 ('verecundiam reginae ostendit') and 742 (the song of Iopas: 'bene philosophica introducitur cantilena in convivio reginae adhuc castae'), *Servii commentarii* 1 pp 205-7. The latter judgement may be reflected in John's guarded approval of Iopas's song in *Policraticus* viii.6 col 729b: 2 p 259.

[57] A brief overview is given by [Hennig] Brinkmann, ['Verhüllung (*integumentum*) als literarische Darstellungsform im Mittelalter'], *Der Begriff der Repraesentatio im Mittelalter: Stellvertretung, Symbol, Zeichen, Bild*, ed Albert Zimmermann

writers on the World Soul, including John of Salisbury, habitually refer to the discourse on the Stoic life-principle put in the mouth of Anchises in book 6 of the *Aeneid*.[58] Contemporary debates revived and extended late-antique theories about the relation between imaginative literature and rigorous argument, between poetry and philosophy. Through the teaching of William of Conches and Peter Abelard, John was in touch with these current issues.[59]

In conclusion I want to draw attention briefly to the last two chapters of the *Policraticus*, in which Vergil the moralist, the keen observer of human nature and social behaviour, becomes Vergil the teacher of fundamental theological truth. In chapters 24 and 25 of book 8 John recapitulates major themes of the concluding section of his work, which has argued that John's contemporaries in their pursuit of happiness have taken the misguided 'Epicurean' way that seeks the merely transitory goods of wealth, honours, glory, power, and pleasure.[60] The theme of chapter 24 is that 'Epicureans' never attain their goal of perfect tranquillity. The reason for their pursuit of transitory goods and thus for their unhappiness is to be found in the corrupted nature of humankind

---

(*Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 8: Berlin and New York 1971) pp 314–39. Three comprehensive studies are: [Philippe] Delhaye, ['*Grammatica* et *Ethica* au XIIe siècle']. *RTAM* 25 (1958) pp 59–110 esp pp 75–7, 91–110; [Édouard] Jeauneau, 'L'usage [de la notion d'*integumentum* à travers les gloses de Guillaume de Conches'], *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge* 32 (Paris 1957) pp 35–100, reprinted in [Édouard Jeauneau,] '*Lectio* [*Philosophorum*': *Recherches sur l'École de Chartres*] (Amsterdam 1973) pp 127–92; [Peter] Dronke, [*Fabula: Explorations into the Uses of Myth in Medieval Platonism*] (*Mittellateinische Studien und Texte* 9: Leiden and Cologne 1974) with full bibliography.

[58] *Aeneid* 6 lines 724–51 pp 250–1; *Metalogicon* ii. 11 col 869c p 83. For references to use of this Vergilian passage by William of Conches and others see [*Guillaume de Conches:*] *Glosae* [*super Platonem*], ed Édouard Jeauneau (*Textes Philosophiques du Moyen Âge* 13: Paris 1965) p 145; Édouard Jeauneau, 'Un commentaire inédit sur le chant "O qui perpetua" de Boèce', *Rivista critica di Storia della Filosofia* 14 (Florence 1959) pp 60–80, repr '*Lectio*' pp 311–31 esp pp 322–3; Dronke pp 110–13.

[59] For the teaching of John's masters see Édouard Jeauneau, 'Note sur l'École de Chartres', *Studi medievali* 3 ser 5 (Turin 1964) pp 821–65, repr '*Lectio*' pp 5–49; Jeauneau, 'L'usage'; Dronke esp pp 1–78. William's surviving glosses offer direct evidence of his teaching of ancient texts: Priscian's *Institutiones*, Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*, Macrobius's *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis*, Plato's *Timaeus*, and perhaps Juvenal's *Satires*; see *Glosae* pp 9–16, 49–50. For an overview of John's student years and his theories on education see Kerner, *Johannes von Salisbury* pp 7–58; Klaus Guth, *Johannes von Salisbury (1115/20-1180): Studien zur Kirchen-, Kultur- und Sozialgeschichte Westeuropas im 12. Jahrhundert* (*Münchener Theologische Studien, 1. Historische Abteilung 20*: St Ottilien 1978) pp 23–81, 280–98.

[60] The themes and organization of *Policraticus* bks 7–8 are derived from the third book of Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*: see Liebeschütz, *Mediaeval Humanism* pp 28–33; Delhaye pp 106–9.

after Adam's fall. Vergil, says John, 'through divine wisdom seems to have announced this in his *Aeneid* in the wrappings of fictitious invention (*sub inuolucro fictitii commenti*)' when he described in his six books the six stages of human life and the descent of Aeneas (representing the human soul) to the lower world.[61] John here draws upon a twelfth-century commentary attributed to Bernardus Silvestris that interprets Aeneas as the soul and book 1 of the *Aeneid* as referring to infancy, book 2 to boyhood, and so forth.[62] In book 6 Aeneas descends to the lower world to review the errors of his past life and to learn the true path to beatitude.[63] Citing the opinion of 'those who investigate the meaning of the authors', John says that Vergil 'has shown his power of two-fold teaching by wrapping the secrets of philosophical truth in the fiction of poetic invention'.[64]

In the last chapter of the *Policraticus* John identifies the true path to that perfect beatitude vainly sought by the 'Epicureans'. The path is virtue,

[61] *Policraticus* viii.24 col 817a: 2 p 415.

[62] *Ibid*: 'Nam Eneas, qui ibi fingitur animus, sic dictus eo quod est corporis habitator; *ennos* enim, ut Grecis placet, habitator est, *demas* corpus et ab his componitur Eneas ut significet animam quasi carnis tugurio habitantem. Sic etiam Neptunum ennosigeum eo quod Sigeum inhabitet'. Compare *Commentum [quod dicitur] Bernardi [Silvestris super Sex Libros Eneidos Virgilii]*, ed Julian Ward Jones and Elizabeth Frances Jones (Lincoln, Nebraska and London 1977) p 10: '. . . intellige . . . per Eneam humanum spiritum. Dicitur autem Eneas quasi ennos demas, id est habitator corporis, ennos Grece habitator Latine. Unde Iuvenalis Neptunum Ennosigeum vocat, id est habitatorem Sygei. Demas vero, id est vinculum, corpus dicitur quia anime carcer est'. For bibliography see this edition pp xxv-xxxi; for comment see especially Giorgio Padoan, 'Tradizione e fortuna del commento all' "Eneide" di Bernardo Silvestre', *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 3 (Padua 1960) pp 227-40; [Winthrop] Wetherbee, [*Platonism and Poetry in the Twelfth Century: The Literary Influence of the School of Chartres*] (Princeton 1972) pp 104-11, 124-5; also Brinkmann pp 320-9; J. Reginald O'Donnell, 'The Sources and Meaning of Bernard Silvester's Commentary on the Aeneid', *Mediaeval Studies* 24 (Toronto 1962) pp 233-49. Bernard's primary source, notably for the thesis that the *Aeneid* represents the stages of human life, was Fulgentius's *Vergiliana continentia* written about the end of the fifth century.

[63] *Policraticus* viii.24 cols 817d-818a: 2 p 417. On Bernard's treatment of the four significations of *descensus ad inferos* and the very similar treatment in William of Conches's glosses on the *Consolation of Philosophy* see Jeauneau, 'L'usage' pp 42-51, repr '*Lectio*' pp 134-43; Wetherbee pp 107-10.

[64] *Policraticus* viii.24 col 818a: 2 p 417: 'Constat enim apud eos qui mentem diligentius perscrutantur auctorum Maronem geminae doctrinae uires declarasse, dum uanitate figmenti poetici philosophicae ueritatis (*uirtutis* Webb) inuoluit archana'. Compare the beginning of *Commentum Bernardi* p 1: 'Gemine doctrine observantiam perpendimus in sua Eneide Maronem habuisse, teste namque Macrobio: et veritatem philosophie docuit et ficmentum poeticum non pretermisit'; also Macrobius, *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis* I.ix.8, 2 p 41.

defined as the knowledge and practice of goodness. [65] How is this path to be discovered? Just as humankind first fell into error when Adam stretched out his hand to the forbidden tree of knowlege, so in order to be able to distinguish good and evil and to practice goodness one must return to the tree of knowledge and obtain the bough of virtue growing thereon: 'for only one who has extended the bough of virtue cut from the tree of knowledge can return to the creator of life, that is God'. [66] This profound truth was perhaps perceived by Vergil, though a pagan; for he did not permit his hero Aeneas to return to the Elysian fields and his father Anchises unless he first consecrated this bough (of virtue) to Proserpina. [67] After quoting the Sibyl's description of the golden bough in book 6 of the *Aeneid*, John sums up the philosophical truth cloaked in Vergil's poetic narrative: [68]

> He alone who has plucked the bough of good action from the tree of knowledge recognises what suffering lies hidden in earthly things or what he can accomplish in them. When the bough has been plucked, a second is not lacking for the reason that knowledge and virtue grow and increase in proportion as they are practiced more fully.

The Vergilian description of the golden bough is the last substantial borrowing from the literature of pagan antiquity in the *Policraticus*. John's treatment deserves more detailed analysis than space permits. Briefly, some aspects of his interpretation are to be found in late-antique and medieval commentary: the identifications of Anchises as the heavenly father, of the Sibyl as divine wisdom, and of the golden bough

---

65 *Policraticus* viii.25 col 818d: 2 p 419: 'Via siquidem haec uirtus est, duobus interiecta et artata limitibus, cognitione scilicet et exercitio boni. Nosse namque bonum et non facere meritum dampnationis est, non uia beatitudinis'; Delhaye pp 94-6.

66 *Policraticus* viii.25 col 819d: 2 p 420: 'In arbore ergo scientiae quasi quidam uirtutis ramus nascitur, ex quo tota uita proficientis hominis consecratur. Neque enim ad genitorem uitae, Deum scilicet, alter redit, nisi qui uirtutis ramum excisum de ligno scientiae praetendit'.

67 *Policraticus* viii.25 col 820a: 2 p 420-1: 'Hoc ipsum forte sensit et Maro, qui, licet ueritatis esset ignarus et in tenebris gentium ambularet, ad Eliseos campos felicium et cari genitoris conspectum Eneam admittendum esse non credidit, nisi docente Sibilla, quae quasi *siosbole* consilium Iouis uel sapientia Dei interpretatur, ramum hunc Proserpinae, quae proserpentem et erigentem se a uitiis uitam innuit, consecraret'. See also n 63 above.

68 *Aeneid* 6 lines 136-44 p 231; *Policraticus* viii.25 col 820b: 2 p 421: 'Plane quid penarum lateat in terrenis uel quid in his possit mereri solus agnoscit qui de arbore scientiae ramum bonae operationis auellit. Eoque auulso alter non defuit, quia quo amplius exercentur, eo magis subcrescunt et proficiunt scientiae et uirtutes'.

as learning or virtue.[69] Other aspects appear to be John's own, most importantly the interpretation of the golden bough as *quasi quidam uirtutis ramus* springing from the scriptural tree of knowledge.[70] John concludes by affirming the role of that grace unknown to Vergil: the tree of knowledge is to be identified ultimately as Christ and the Cross.[71] At these moments at the end of the *Policraticus* we see an essential dimension of John as classical scholar, seeking profound Christian truths hidden in the literature of pagan antiquity, particularly in its poetry. It is in the service of these truths that he draws on his reading of the texts and their commentaries and all that his teachers imparted to him in his formative years in France.

Princeton University

[69] On Anchises see *Commentum Bernardi* p 9: 'Anchises enim celsa inhabitans interpretatur quem intelligimus esse patrem omnium omnibus presidentem'; also pp 27-8, 51-2; compare Fulgentius, *Virgiliana continentia*, in *Fabii Planciadis Fulgentii V.C. Opera*, ed Rudolf Helm (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*: Leipzig 1898, enlarged repr Stuttgart 1970) p 102. On the Sibyl see *Commentum Bernardi* p 31: 'Sibilla vero quasi scibule, id est divinum consilium, quod accipimus esse intelligentiam, que dicitur consilium quia per eam homo sibi consulit. Dicitur divinum quia intelligentia non est aliud quam divinorum comprehentio'; compare Servius on *Aeneid* 3 line 445 and 6 line 12, *Servii commentarii* 1 p 421; 2 p 5. On the golden bough see *Commentum Bernardi* p 58: 'Ramus ergo aureus hoc loco intelligitur philosophia . . . Hunc ramum intelligentia monet querere Eneam ut possit meatus ad inferos patere quia qui philosophia caret ei rerum agnitio non patet'; also pp 58-65 passim; compare Servius on *Aeneid* 6 line 136, *Servii commentarii* 2 pp 30-1; and Fulgentius, *Virgiliana continentia* pp 95-8, 101. Unlike John, Bernard follows Servius in explicitly connecting the golden bough with the *littera Pythagoreae* (Y), which signifies the choice in life between virtue and vice; see Wolfgang Harms, *Homo Viator in Bivio: Studien zur Bildlichkeit des Weges, Medium Aevum* (*Philologische Studien* 21: Munich 1970) pp 57-62. On Aeneas as the human soul see n 62 above.

[70] But his emphasis on good action (*bona operatio*) may owe something to Bernard's interpretation of *Aeneid* 6 lines 145-6 ('ergo alte uestiga oculis et rite repertum/carpe manu'): 'ERGO: quia oportet ramum habere, ratione et intellectu et que sunt agenda inquirere et iuxta inventa agere. MANU: operatione'; see *Commentum Bernardi* p 60. John's etymology of Proserpina and his explanation for the regrowth of the bough are not found in the usual commentaries. On the former contrast Fulgentius, *Virgiliana continentia* pp 101-2; *Commentum Bernardi* p 59. On the regrowth of the bough contrast Servius on *Aeneid* 6 line 143, *Servii commentarii* 2 p 31; *Commentum Bernardi* pp 59-60.

[71] *Policraticus* viii.25 cols 820b-821a: 2 pp 421-2. For John's reservations regarding the pagan Vergil's ultimate authority see also *Policraticus* viii.24 col 816d: 2 p 415; viii.25 col 820a: 2 p 420. Of the Roman poets John had special regard for Vergil and Lucan; see the references given by Peter von Moos, 'Lucans *tragedia* im Hochmittelalter, Pessimismus, *contemptus mundi* und Gegenwartserfahrung (Otto von Freising, *Vita Heinrici IV.*, Johann von Salisbury)', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 14 (Kastellaun 1979) pp 127-86 esp pp 167-76 and n 138.