

M e m o i r
OF
WILLIAM HERBERT DE LOSINGA,

First Bishop of Norwich.

BY THE REV. W. T. SPURDENS.

THE accounts transmitted to us respecting this Prelate, by the ecclesiastical writers and chroniclers of his age, are so contradictory, so improbable, and some of them written in so disparaging a spirit, that there is much in them on which we cannot satisfactorily rely. Still, it is quite evident that Herbert was one of the remarkable men of the twelfth century; and hence we are led to desire a knowledge of all that can yet be recovered concerning him, his real character, and conduct.

On investigating these, we are surprised to find, in the first place, that even his name has been misrepresented. The sobriquet, *Losinga*, certainly formed no part of it, and was, probably, not applied to him till after his death. And as to the meaning of this word, one derives it from an Italian, another from an Anglo-Saxon source, but all connect it with the charge of *Simoniacal bargaining*, with which it appears to have no necessary connexion.

Another sobriquet also,—that of *Galsagus*, or *Galfagus*—seems to have been applied to this Prelate, while Bishop of Thetford; for, in pursuing our inquiry, we soon find that the William Galfagus, inserted in the Lists as the second Bishop of Thetford, the successor of Arfastus, who removed the

See thither from Elmham, can be no other than this same Herbert, who removed it from Thetford to Norwich. In *Domesday Book*, he is always mentioned as the *successor* of Arfastus; and in the same terms he is spoken of by Knyghton and Malmesbury, neither of whom, or of the other ancient chroniclers, refers in any way to William Galfagus.

Now, whether or not Galfagus be a term of disparagement, or what meaning, if any, may be assigned to it, can no longer, that I am aware, be ascertained. Godwin fixes the commencement of this Prelate's episcopacy at Thetford, as the successor of Arfastus, in the year 1085, and that of Herbert six years later; merely remarking his surprise that Malmesbury makes no mention of Galfagus. In the same page he says of Herbert, that he was called by some, William Herbert, which is assented to by Spelman, and confirmed by his being mentioned in the Norman Survey as *William* the Bishop. Weever also, on what authority does not appear, expressly declares: "Upon the death of Arfastus, one William Herbert, *surnamed Galfagus*, for the sum of nineteen hundred pounds, obtained of King William Rufus this Bishopric for himself, and the Abbey of Winchester for his father." From various accounts, also, we learn that the name of his father was Robert Herbert, usually spoken of as "Herbertus Capellanus," to distinguish him from "Herbertus Episcopus," the son.

A similar obscurity hangs over the country of Herbert, and the place of his birth. The short memoir prefixed to the publication of his Epistles at Brussels, in 1845, agrees with, and seems to be derived from, a note of Bishop Godwin. We are told that he was "born in Normandy, at a small village called Exmes,—generally, but erroneously, named Hiemes,—in pago Oximensi." For this we are referred to "Giraldus Cambrensis," with an *alias* of "Oxinnensi," and "Oxunensi." Now, as there is a place not far from Argentin called "Exmes," we might suppose it was meant to be "Eximensi." Still, the

place is a village, and not a *pagus*. I am sorry I have not the means of referring to Giraldus, because all the statements as to the Norman extraction of Bishop Herbert seem to have originated with him; and, in the silence of our own chroniclers on the subject, together with something like good presumptive evidence to the contrary, I am still entitled, I think, to retain my doubts. This evidence, *valeat quantum*, we will proceed to consider.

I will not dwell on the obvious remark, that *Robert Herbert* and *William Herbert*, the names of the father and son, savour more of England than of Normandy; because the name *Herbert* is not infrequent among Normans of this period, especially ecclesiastics; but the word is itself thoroughly Anglo-Saxon, however they may have come by it.

On all hands it seems agreed that the Bishop was a wealthy man; and, if so, he should seem to have been heir to a rich patrimony; for allowing, as some allege, that he was Prior of the Monastery of Fécamp for three years, this is not likely to have rendered him "vir pecuniosus," as Malmesbury calls him, especially as the office was held in subordination to that of Abbot. And even if he enjoyed the still more lucrative Abbacy of Ramsey for about the same period, one would think all the profits of both could hardly have supplied the immense sum which he is stated to have given for his own and his father's advancement. Some refer us to his interest at court, and to the offices he held, as the sources of his great wealth; but the two kings, whose favour he seems somewhat capriciously to have enjoyed, were both very poor themselves. The post of Sewer to Rufus was probably of greater honour than emolument, and bought for as much as it was worth; and the Chancellorship, however lucrative it may have been, came too late; for it was not conferred till 1104, subsequently to the time assigned for his enormous expenditure. I cannot, therefore, but regard the accounts of his prodigious expenses, in respect to

the Cathedral, the Priory, the Palace, and I know not how many parish Churches, as altogether incredible. It is nowhere pretended that his father was one of the *optimates* of the land; and his means must have been very ample indeed, for a private man, in that age, to have enabled the son to do what we are so repeatedly assured that he did, *out of his own estate*.

We have then, in fact, as I before remarked, sufficient grounds for believing that Robert Herbert was a wealthy man. He was certainly also a married man; and even if he were a married priest, a very slight stigma was attached, at that time, to such a relation. It is, however, most likely that he was not in the priesthood till after his son had arrived at eminence as an ecclesiastic, and when, perhaps, he was himself a widower; since the anniversary of him and his wife was ostentatiously celebrated till the Reformation, in Norwich Cathedral, on the day after Midsummer. They had also one other son, in what condition of life does not appear; for the only intimation we have of him is in a very short and facetious letter, written to him by the Bishop (No. 54), in which he addresses him as *his only brother*.

We have, moreover, notices of houses and lands possessed by Herbertus Capellanus, in Norfolk and Suffolk, which certainly look like family possessions, and those not recently acquired; and I have reason to believe that a careful search in Domesday and other records of that age, would place this matter quite out of doubt. My position, and other circumstances, preclude me from such a search: nevertheless, I find in the Norman Survey, what certainly did surprise me, that Bishop Herbert, while he was Abbot of Ramsey, in 1086, held the Church of St. Michael, Tombland, "sed non de Episcopatu:" to which Church appertained 112 acres of land, and six acres of meadow; also the Church of St. Simon and St. Jude, to which belonged three parts of a mill, half an acre of meadow, and a mansion, "et non est de Episcopatu."

Both these Churches, with their appurtenances, we are thus carefully told, were held by Bishop William [Herbert], *not* in right of his bishopric, but of the patrimony of Bishop Almar, —“ de patrimonio Almari Episcopi.”

It is extremely difficult to unravel the mystery connected with this “patrimony.” Almar was the predecessor of Arfastus at Elmham; and these possessions at Norwich appear to have been his *patrimony*, that is, derived from his ancestors, and wholly unconnected with the property of his See. On this ground it was, according to Blomefield, (Norw., p. 738, folio,) that Bishop Herbert considered himself entitled to deal with them, in his various exchanges with the Bigots, as having become *his* patrimony also. The exchanges had in view the acquisition of sufficient space for his Cathedral and its various edifices and precincts. I can only explain this to my own satisfaction, by assuming that the Herberts, either by purchase or inheritance, became possessed of Almar’s patrimony. Take it, however, in any way we please, it matters little to the point for which I notice it here; which is merely to show that the Herberts were most probably Englishmen, and not Normans; for it is obviously improbable that, as a Norman, he should have thus become possessed of estates in Norwich, in 1086 at the latest, when his son, William Herbert, was still Abbot of Ramsey, with no prospect, that we can discover, of ever becoming connected with Norwich as its Bishop. And this probability arises almost to a certainty, when we find that Herbert the father, and the Bishop after him, had possessions also in distant parts of the diocese, consisting of one manor, at least, with lands; with which Almar does not appear in any way connected. But this we shall consider presently.

The suggestions, for they amount to no more, which we possess concerning the place of Bishop Herbert’s birth, are these: Anthony à Wood, on the authority, I suppose, of Giraldus, makes him a Norman, and is followed by the modern

inscription on his tomb in the Cathedral, written by Dean Prideaux; the ancient epitaph, destroyed by the Puritans in the reign of Charles the First, but preserved in Weever, being silent on the subject. Various other writers, among whom is Blomefield, adopt this account. Bishop Godwin is in favour of Oxford; and Cotton even calls him "an Oxford man." But Bale says of him—"in pago Oxunensi in Sudvolgiâ natus;"—and as Bale was not only a good antiquary, but himself a Suffolk man, he is probably right, although he appears not to have found in Suffolk a suitable locality. This, however, Pitts erroneously supposed he had discovered at Orford.

The estates mentioned before, of which I find the Herberts to have been possessed, consist of a carucate of land at Wykes, near Ipswich, afterwards called Wykes Episcopi; and another carucate in the parish of Syleham, which now constitutes the Manor called Monks' Hall, together with the water-mill there.

"William Bigot, Sewer to King Hen. I., gave to the Prior of Thetford all that land in Syleham, (now called Monks' Hall) and the water-mill there: all which Herbert, Bishop of Norwich, conveyed to his Father in exchange for other lands: he being to hold it in as ample a manner as ever Herbert the Chaplain did."

" pro qua terra et manerio de Taverham, quod tunc fuit Comitis Rogeri Bigoti, venerabilis Episcopus Herbertus dedit in excambiam unam carucatam terræ in Silham, et alteram carucatam terræ in Wykes, quas Comes Rogerus dedit monachis suis de Thetforde."—*Extract from the History of the Foundation of the Priory of Norwich, at the end of the Register of Binham Priory.* Dugdale's *Monast.* i. 408.

"Concedo, &c. totam terram similiter de Sileham cum omnibus que ad eandem terram pertinent, sicut Her-

bertus Capellanus melius et liberius et honorificentius eam unquam tenuit, de dono Herberti Norwicensis Episcopi, qui eam patri meo scambiavit, sicut carta ejusdem Episcopi testatur, &c.”—*Extract from the Charter of William Bigot to the Priory of Thetford, founded by Roger Bigot, A° 1103. Dugdale’s Monast. i. 665.*

It appears then, unquestionably, that the Herberts, father and son in succession, held these lands; and the circumstance affords an additional presumptive evidence of great weight, that they were both Englishmen.

In fact, I persuade myself that the evidence is available for more than this; for it not only enables us to infer the nationality of the Bishop, but to conjecture, with great probability, —and probability is all we can now fairly expect in such an inquiry—the *place* of his birth.

The village of Syleham, where I have shown that Robert Herbert, the Bishop’s father, was the possessor of a manor and lands, is in the Hundred of Hoxne (usually pronounced and formerly written Hoxon and Oxon), in the county of Suffolk, and contained a manor, or hamlet, with a separate chapel, called Esham. I need not suggest that such of the ancient writers as were ambitious of a classical style, carefully eschewed such words as “Hundredum,” applied to the civil district which we call “a Hundred,” and employed, instead, the Latin word *pagus*, not very dissimilar in its meaning. Now, here we have at once the rudiments of Giraldus’s account, misunderstood, it may be, and corrupted to adapt it to a preconceived theory. This will be more apparent if we place the two statements in juxtaposition; thus,

“— natus apud Exmes in pago Oxinnensi in Normannia.”
Giraldus, &c.

“— natus apud Esham in pago Oxonensi in Sudvolgia.”
Bale, Pitts, &c.

I would fain persuade myself, then, that I have shown—as far as such a matter is capable of being shown—that Bishop Herbert was not a Norman by birth, but an Englishman, born at his father's manor at Syleham, in the Hundred of Hoxne, in the county of Suffolk.

And now, having pretty well determined, as I think, the place, I wish I could find grounds as reasonable for settling the year of his birth. The facts which are communicated respecting his early life are remarkably few. We know, within a year, when he died; but we are uninformed as to his age. In his first Epistle—to Norman the Ostiary—he speaks of himself as “annositatem proventus ad sexagenariam;” but this helps us very little. Indeed the whole sixty Epistles are marvellously scanty of information, either biographical or historical. They are quite destitute of dates, and make no profession of being chronologically arranged. The series, besides, commences in the writer's sixtieth year.

On a careful consideration, however, of a number of incidental expressions occurring here and there in these Epistles, I have brought myself to conclude that we shall not greatly err, if we assume the Bishop's birth to have occurred somewhere about the year 1045. This will give about twenty-one years to his age at the Norman invasion,—forty-two, at his return with Rufus, and being made Abbot of Ramsey,—forty-six, at his becoming Bishop,—forty-nine, at his removal to Norwich,—fifty-nine, at his being made Chancellor,—and seventy-four, at his death. The same assumption will be found to tally very well with the several known incidents of his career; and, in particular, they will account for his complaint, at the age of sixty, of his time being so much occupied with worldly affairs,—“temporalium perturbationibus negotiorum distractus.”

One incident of his life, with which the Epistles acquaint us, occurs in a letter to Roger, Abbot of Fécamp, (vide *Epist.* 5, and 34,) in which he makes mention of his profession at

the altar of Fécamp; but no date is given. Many writers relate that he bore the office of Prior in this Monastery; and I think that the general tone of expression tends to confirm this statement. It was written while he was settling the government of his monastery at Norwich, for the purpose of obtaining from the Abbot, through Stanard, one of the Norwich brethren dispatched thither for that purpose, minute instructions respecting the customary observances at Fécamp, which he was endeavouring to adopt in his new establishment, so far as he could collect them from Baldwin, or as he could himself, after so many years of occupation in secular matters, recal them to his memory.

The prosecution of his education, it seems, was the first cause of his repair to the continent. As there were no schools previously to the Conquest, but such as formed a part of the establishment of the larger monastic institutions, and as few of these institutions were in existence before that event, it had become customary for persons of wealth and station to send their sons for this purpose to the Abbeys of France, and especially of Normandy. And this custom will account for the constant, and even familiar intercourse which prevailed between the two countries even before the reign of the Confessor. Herbert, therefore, seems to have been sent to Fécamp, with this view; and as he certainly profited in an extraordinary degree, by the pains bestowed upon him, and was manifestly a youth of great promise, we may presume that every endeavour was used to attach him permanently to the institution. At what age he made his profession is not stated. He may, possibly, have been occupied for a time, after the completion of his education, in worldly affairs; for the experience of a cloistered monk does not appear the best school for acquiring such an acquaintance with the court and with the world, as would qualify him for the office of Sewer to one monarch, and of Chancellor to another. We know not how far his civil employments may have been consistent with the

due observance of his monastic rule; but he seems to have borne office under Duke Robert, as he certainly did under Rufus, who was so much pleased with his services that he brought him over to England with him.

In or about the same year, 1087, Herbert was made Abbot of Ramsey; but respecting the length of time in which he held this appointment, it seems difficult to determine from the discrepancy of the statements. The supposed Galfagus has about six years assigned to his episcopate; and the question is whether these are to be given to Arfastus or to Herbert. I am inclined to assign them to the former; assigning thus to him an episcopate of eleven years, and bringing the date of his death down to 1091. We shall thus also have four years for Herbert's government of Ramsey. Now, it seems that, during this period, he bought of Rufus the See of Thetford and the Abbey of Winchester, which purchase is usually, though not invariably, mentioned as one transaction: and though Herbert was, apparently, a shrewd hand at a bargain, I quite agree with Cotton in the belief that he was not more reckless in his simony than the generality of his contemporaries. The clergy were, at this time, divided into two very hostile parties—the seculars and the regulars; and, being a member of the latter, he was so unfortunate as to incur all the malignity of the former. Hence the severe remarks of Malmesbury, and the satirical leonine verses or lampoons, which have floated down to our times. But there may, perhaps, have been other times, when such lines as these might not have been quite inapplicable:

“Proh dolor! Ecclesie nummis venduntur et Ære—

Quid non speremus, si nummos possideamus—?

Omnia nummus habet; quid vult facit, addit, et aufert, &c.”

I have no desire to exculpate any party, but I regard it rather as the sin of the age than of the individual; and I have no doubt that many more flagitious transactions of a similar kind passed, unproved, into forgetfulness.

The bargain, however, unquestionably was made, and the possession of the mitre obtained; and, forthwith, we read that the new prelate was smitten with remorse, hastened to Rome, and laid at the feet of the Pope the insignia of his ill-gotten dignity: moreover, we are told that the successor of St. Peter received him with the utmost kindness, and established him in his See. All this looks very strange; and this sudden conversion, like all sudden conversions, demands, at any rate, a little inquiry. The Pope has before him a self-confessed culprit, and yet receives him as favourably as he could have received an innocent man; for, as to the account of his imposing on him the penance of building the Cathedral, the Priory, and I know not how many parish Churches, all this is simply an absurdity. Not a monarch in Europe had, at the time, the pecuniary resources for performing such a penance. But, if we look a little into the state of affairs between the King of England and the Pontiff, what would otherwise appear inexplicable becomes quite easy to be understood.

I deem it needless to do more than allude to the disputes which had arisen in the preceding reign, between Rufus and Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, respecting investitures. These disputes had driven the Archbishop to the continent; so that, although Herbert was put in possession of the temporalities of his See, he found it impossible to obtain his spiritual rights. He resolved, therefore, on a visit to Rome, as the only means of securing both. No doubt, he also availed himself of the same occasion to obtain the papal concurrence to the transfer of the See to Norwich. The journey, then, was not an imprudent measure in itself; but, being undertaken clandestinely, in defiance of a law that forbade ecclesiastics of rank to leave the kingdom without the royal licence, it was not prudently prosecuted. The Bishop was arrested on the coast, where the King happened to be, with a military force, and so far incurred the royal displeasure, as to be deprived of his ring and his pastoral staff. The misunderstanding, how-

ever, was soon rectified; for as Henry was very desirous of coming to an accommodation with the Pope and the Archbishop, he seems to have licenced him to proceed as a minister of peace. Whether in this he succeeded or not is doubtful; but his own object was fully accomplished, for he returned immediately, and forthwith proceeded to remove the See, in the same year. It may well excite surprise that he did not again become embroiled with his Sovereign; for all accounts agree that he conceded the very point for which Anselm had been so long and so stoutly contending. He laid at the feet of the Pope the insignia of his episcopacy, and received them again, with investiture, from the hands of the Sovereign Pontiff. All this explains sufficiently the merely worldly motives by which the several parties were actuated, and leaves no occasion for our wonder at the favour with which he was received and dismissed by the Papal Court.

The Council of London had, in 1075, directed the removal of Episcopal Sees from villages to chief towns; and, though there is ample proof that the town to which the Conqueror had determined to remove that of the East Angles, was Norwich, yet all writers, ancient and modern, strangely persist in attributing that measure exclusively to Herbert. We can hardly desire a stronger proof of William's intention than the following extract from *Domesday Book*. The Norman scribe, in enumerating the several houses—*mansure*—from which the King hath not his custom, and the reasons for this default, says,

“—et in Burgo sunt adhuc L dom. de quibus non habet
Rex suam consuetudinem

“et in propriâ Curiâ Episcopi xiiij mansure, quas dedit
Wills. Rex Ærfasto ad principalem sedem Episcopatus,
et”

This Blomefield translates :

“In the Borough [that part under the jurisdiction of the

King and the Earl,] there are moreover fifty houses, of which the King hath not his custom

“and in the Bishop’s own Court [or Palace] fourteen mansions which King William gave to Ærfast for the principal seat of the Bishopric”

“So that certainly,” adds Blomefield, in a note, “Norwich was designed for the Bishop’s See, before Herbert’s time, though I never saw any Chronicle that mentions it, neither does any of the Church Records speak a word of it, but all ascribe it wholly to him.” (III., p. 18, 2nd edit.)

The first departure from the Conqueror’s arrangement discovers itself after his death, in the endeavour of Arfastus to substitute for Norwich the rich Abbey of St. Edmund; the motive to which was, that not only might the See recover its jurisdiction over that important ecclesiastical body, but that the magnificent Church recently founded there by Abbot Baldwin, and the erection of which was still in progress, would supersede the necessity of building a Cathedral. The Abbot and Monks of Bury, however, stoutly and successfully resisted the Bishop’s plan; but I cannot understand how the attempt or its failure can be made to explain the very strange measure of fixing the seat of the Episcopacy for a few years at Thetford. Blomefield, however, very unsatisfactorily supposes that Arfastus did this, “that so, residing near Bury, he might the more conveniently carry on his negotiation with the Bury Monks;” as if, by decreasing the distance, he should also decrease the strenuous opposition of the monastic body. Blomefield, indeed, declares that Herbert entered at first into the design of his predecessor; but I am not aware that he has any authority for this, since the interval between his elevation to the See and the execution of the proposed removal was so short, and the occupation of at least a year of that short period in the journey to Rome, leaves no time for the prosecution of any negociation. In fact, as the chroni-

clers say nothing on the subject, it seems probable that, from the very first, the new Bishop proceeded in the undertaking with the smallest possible delay.

The commencement of his residence in Norwich introduces us to a very busy period in the life of Herbert; occupied as he must have been in the edification of his Cathedral, with its Monastery, his Palace, and probably several parish Churches at the same time. We look, however, in vain for any information respecting these matters in his Epistles. Bartholomew Cotton tells us, in his *Chronicle*, that the translation of the Bishopric took place on the 9th day of April, 1094; by which Blomefield understands that he “then caused the Chapter, and his Courts, and his family to remove and fix here.” Now, according to the preceding assumption respecting the time of the Bishop’s birth, he was then forty-nine years of age; and as the first of his Epistles was written in his sixtieth year, there are eleven most active intervening years of which we have no other memorial, than that in about the last of them he was made Chancellor. Had we been possessed of any Epistles written in this interval, they would, perhaps, have afforded us some interesting details—*and perhaps they would not*; for in those which we have, and which were written while the works were in progress, there are no statements, and perhaps not more than a solitary allusion to them. In his fourteenth Epistle, he calls on Ingulfus, Willelmus, and Stanus, *Appares*,* to be more active in the prosecution of some ecclesiastical structure. “Languet opus, et in apparandis materiis nullus vester apparet fervor. Ecce regis et mei ministri fervent in operibus suis; lapides

* “Appares.” So far as this word is explained by Du Cange and others, it means, persons temporarily appointed to discharge the duties of another—*vicarii*. Thus, in the frequent absences of our monarchs on the continent, the noblemen or others invested with the charge of government, *absente rege*, were called, “*Appares d’ni regis*.” I believe these men were overseers of the works.

colligunt, collectos afferunt, campos et plateas, domos et curias implent; et vos torpetis, et concertis digitis ingelati negligentiae bruma, vili otio deficitis prævaticatores." Now, this delineates a lively picture of the hive of workmen at the Cathedral; but it is hardly such a delineation as would have come from the pen of a man of scientific attainments, and skilled in architectural pursuits. We gain incidentally, however, the knowledge that the King was associated with the Bishop in the undertaking, for the workmen are spoken of as "regis et mei ministri."

From the perusal of the Epistles, one arises, I think, much amused, much interested, but much disappointed. Had they come down to us merely as the productions of a Baldwin or an Ingulphus,—of an amiable, an accomplished, and pious recluse, who had passed through all the grades of monastic life, with the reverence, the esteem, and love of the brotherhood,—we should have expected, probably, just what we find in them. But, assuredly, we discover here no feature of the reckless Simoniac, of the wily courtier, of the skilful diplomatist, of the acute lawyer, or (with one solitary exception) of the haughty churchman. The good monk, pious, and kind hearted, and benevolent, meets you every where in his cowl; but you rarely catch a glance at the mitre of the Bishop.

Abundant are the proofs that Herbert was a man of very high literary attainments, measured by the standard of the cloister. There is a pleasing peculiarity in his style, which, without being classical, is by no means offensive; nor is it destitute of a certain elegance and refinement. He appears, moreover, to have been an acute theologian and dialectician; a good scholar for the age in which he lived, and a pleasing and elegant writer. In the character of his Epistles there is a singular charm, which is, somehow, quite unexpected, and wins our prejudices in favour of that of their author. It altogether forces itself upon our conviction; proceeding from a pious simplicity of mind, an amiable cheerfulness of temper,

and a winning *bonhomie*, which cause him now and then, and especially in addressing the young, to forget the gravity of his station and his severe bodily infirmities, and to condescend even to become merry and facetious. To certain lads of his monastery, choristers perhaps, or collets, in particular to two, named Otto and Willelmus, in whose education he appears to take an interest almost suspiciously *paternal*, he unbends in a manner the most unreserved; and it is very amusing to see how these boys, one of whom was but in his fifteenth year, are played with, while they are at the same time admonished, encouraged, and even directed in their studies. To all these good qualities, and to others no less important, decided testimony is borne by Weever, in his *Ancient Funeral Monuments*, p. 788, where, very much quoting from Pitsæus, *de Illustribus Angliæ Scriptoribus ætat. duodec.*, he tells us that Herbert was, “a man earnestly addicted to the studies of all virtues and good learning, milde, affable, comely of personage, gracefull of countenance, blamelesse in his carriage, and pure, innocent, and sincere in the course of his life. The Monkes of Norwich made great meanes and suite to have him canonized as a Saint; but such impediments were alwaies in the way, that it could not be obtained.”

I had once entertained a design of adding to this Memoir a syllabus of the Bishop's Epistles; but, on consideration, I doubted whether the admission of such matter, though it could hardly have failed of proving highly interesting, would be quite in accordance with the views of the Archæological Society; and, besides, I found that my subject had already run out into greater prolixity than I either expected or intended. All that remains, therefore, for me now to do, is briefly to mention the rest of Herbert's career.

Many passages in his Epistles show him to have laboured under infirm health during, at least, his latter years. The activity of his mind seems to have augmented the infirmity of his body: “the sword fretted the scabbard.” He appears,

notwithstanding, to have been always ready to obey his Sovereign's call, or that of the Church; and there are, I think, intimations, that, with more vigour of constitution, he would have been the successor of Anselm at Canterbury. This mental activity led him, in 1116, to embark with Radulfus de Turbine, the new Archbishop, in an embassy to Rome, with a view of arranging the long-disputed points respecting investitures and the Legatine authority in England; but the exertion seems to have been fatal to him. On his return, he fell sick at Placentia, smitten, it would seem, from the accounts of his condition there, with paralysis; and although he became, after some time, sufficiently convalescent to admit of his return by easy stages to Norwich, and even, after that return, to complete many important matters of business, yet nature yielded on the 22nd of July, either of 1119 or 1120—for it is uncertain which—and he was buried before the high altar in his Cathedral Church.
