

William Bateman,
Bishop of Norwich, 1344—1355.

COMMUNICATED BY

A. HAMILTON THOMPSON, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A.,
Professor of History in the University of Leeds.

The name of William Bateman is well known and honoured in Cambridge, where, as the founder of Trinity Hall and the finisher of Edmund Gonville's work in establishing the Hall of the Annunciation, he takes a prominent place among the chief benefactors of the University. The main outlines of his career have been traced by more than one writer, and are excellently summarised in the article contributed to the *Dictionary of National Biography* by the late Canon Venables. But, since that article and other accounts were written, the material for his biography has been considerably increased by the publication of certain volumes of the Calendars of Patent Rolls and the Papal Registers; while no writer, so far as I know, except Dr. Jessopp in his study of the Black Death in East Anglia, has made use of such evidence as may be extracted from his register at Norwich. If, from an examination of these and other sources, I can add little of signal importance to what is already known about him, it is possible at any rate to fill up gaps and to state the main facts of his life with greater certainty.

The two earliest sources for his biography are the long eulogy written by Lawrence, Prior of Norwich, at the head of his obituary roll, and printed by Peck in his *Desiderata Curiosa*,¹ and the brief life by Bartholomew Cotton, printed with additions in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*.² William of Norwich, the name by which his contemporaries best knew him, was born, probably in 1298,³ at Norwich, the son of a prominent citizen, William Bateman, and Margaret his wife. We may take on trust Prior Lawrence's flattering account of his early proficiency in the liberal sciences, in which he surpassed all his young contemporaries. From these rudimentary studies he proceeded to the study of civil law at Cambridge. In this part of his career we have nothing but the most general statements to guide us. At any rate, he obtained his doctorate before he had completed his thirtieth year, and not long afterwards in December, 1328, was preferred to the Archdeaconry of Norwich, a suitable reward for a promising lawyer which opened out a good prospect of higher dignity.

The Bishop of Norwich who gave him this preferment was William of Airmyn, a busy prelate who, sent to Avignon by Edward II. in 1325 to secure the pope's assent to the election of the chancellor, Robert Baldock, to the See of Norwich, had used the opportunity to obtain the vacant dignity for himself. It is probable that Airmyn, well known in the papal court, recommended his archdeacon to the notice of Pope John XXII. William of Norwich, at all events, in Prior Lawrence's words, avoided the temptations of a leisured life, spent in unaccustomed divorce from the toils of study, and betook himself to Avignon, where he soon made his

¹ Two vols. in one, 1779, pp. 239-242.

² II., 414-415.

³ The date is approximately fixed by his promotion to an archdeaconry in 1328, when, Prior Lawrence tells us, he was in his thirtieth year.

name, was appointed a papal chaplain, and was advanced through various degrees to an auditorship of the apostolic palace. In 1332 he received an indult, without limitation of time, of non-residence in his archdeaconry and other English benefices, while engaged in the papal service.¹ As a matter of fact, the profits of the archdeaconry, which had no house or fixed source of income apart from visitation fees attached to it, were small. In 1335 he represented that he reaped no benefit from it, and, in consideration of his services as auditor, obtained a reservation of a prebend in the Church of Lincoln.² By the influence of Cardinal Gaillard de la Motte, to whose household he had become attached, this was extended to include a benefice of 100 marks in the same church, on receiving which he was to resign his archdeaconry.³ He had to wait until the Deanery of Lincoln was vacant by the promotion of Anthony Bek as Airmyn's successor at Norwich. Bek was consecrated at Avignon in March, 1337, and it is not clear why the provision of William of Norwich to the deanery was postponed until more than three years later, although there are signs that there was a rival candidate at home.

On 3 August, 1340, however, he obtained his letters of provision,⁴ and some three weeks later started on his first diplomatic mission, as a special envoy from Benedict XII. to King Edward III., urging the king to abandon hostilities with France. Edward was at Ghent, angry at having been obliged to raise the siege of Tournai and conclude a truce, and ascribing his misfortunes to Archbishop Stratford's failure to send him the necessary funds from England. None the less, he received the Pope's message graciously, extended the truce to the

¹ *Cal. Papal Letters*, II., 356.

² *Ibid.*, II., 525.

³ *Ibid.*, II., 524.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II., 548.

following February, and expressed his willingness to accept papal mediation, provided that his claims to the crown of France were properly taken into account. On 18 November Bateman, accompanied by John of Ufford, Archdeacon of Ely, who for a very brief period was to be archbishop-elect of Canterbury nine years later, and John of Thoresby, the future Archbishop of York, set out to Avignon, where he arrived on 12 December, and laid the king's answer before the pope.¹

It is clear that his conduct on this mission was a passport to his favour with Edward III., which he retained for the rest of his life. Very soon after his return to Avignon, he appears at the head of the proctors appointed to urge the king's remonstrance against the election of William Zouche, the Dean of York, to the vacant archbishopric. As treasurer of the exchequer, Zouche had been suspected of fraud: he was charged with treasonable conduct and had been found guilty of murder.² It was not until July, 1342, that these objections were over-ruled and Zouche received consecration from the hands of Clement VI. himself: however little his early career may have prepared him for the episcopal office, his administration of the Diocese of York was diligent and methodical, and he was remembered as a highly respectable prelate. Meanwhile William of Norwich remained at the papal court, managing his affairs in England by attorney.³ It is possible that during this time he may have gone to and fro more than once between the pope and the king. Prior Lawrence definitely states that he went twice as papal nuncio to Edward III. This refers to his missions in 1340 and 1342, but it need not exclude intermediate negotiations.

¹ *Cal. Papal Letters*, II., 582-585, 588-589.

² *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1340-1343, p. 109.

³ *Ibid.*, 1340-1343, p. 158 (10 May, 1343); 1343-1345, p. 224 (11 March, 1343-1344).

His second appointment as nuncio followed closely upon the final settlement of the dispute about the archbishopric of York, when Zouche was consecrated and the king withdrew the candidate in whose interest he had opposed Zouche's claim. At the end of July, 1342, the nuncio set out for England,¹ armed with a number of provisions to English benefices to his household clerks, contingent upon the ability of the bishops and religious houses named in them to find vacant livings in their patronage. To some of these and to kindred documents which throw light upon his family connexions I shall refer later. This time he seems to have remained in England for the best part of a year. There is a note in May, 1343, of a royal pardon to one of his attorneys, Richard of Pulham, at his request. Pulham, a Norfolk man by his name, had taken condemned criminals out of prison and given them shelter, from which they subsequently escaped.² The business, however, with which the nuncio was entrusted was the proposals of Clement VI. for peace between England and France. At the beginning of August, 1343, a date marked by the issue of a safe conduct from the pope, he prepared to return to Avignon with Edward's answer. In his company were John of Ufford, as before, Henry of Chaddesden, Archdeacon of Stow, and Robert Hereward, Archdeacon of Taunton. They were expected at Avignon before Christmas.³ William's stay there was short, for about 12 January, 1344, he was sent back to the king with a message in cypher of which he held the key.⁴

The news of the death of Anthony Bek, Bishop of Norwich, on 19 December, 1343, must have reached the pope within a few days of William's departure; and he lost no time in bestowing the vacant see by reservation

¹ *Cal. Papal Lett.*, I., 3.

² *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1343-1345, p. 29.

³ *C.P.L.*, III., 2.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III., 5.

and provision upon his confidential messenger. On 23 January an announcement was sent to Edward III. recommending the appointment to him,¹ and on 7 February new letters of safe-conduct were sent to England for the bishop-elect.² It is not quite clear when his election by the prior and convent of Norwich took place, but, according to Prior Lawrence, it was before they were acquainted with the terms of the bull of provision.³ Although on 2 March the order was made out in Chancery for the restitution of his temporalities,⁴ the royal assent to the election was apparently withheld as a formal protest against the precipitate disposal of the see by the pope. Edward, it need hardly be said, had no personal objection to a clerk upon whose diplomatic skill he had already learned to rely; and the appointment was certainly popular at Norwich. If, as is more than likely, the candidate had been nominated to Prior William of Claxton and his chapter by the Crown, the prospect of a bishop who was a member of a respected local family and was famous as *utriusque iuris peritorum flos precipuus* was welcome to them, and they elected him by acclamation. But the subsequent arrival of the news that the pope had anticipated their procedure, while received with apparent submission at Norwich, was anything but grateful to the king, at a period when anti-clerical sentiment was in the ascendant and parliament was growing restive at papal encroachments on English benefices. Although the provision of John of Ufford, one of Edward's favourite clerks, to the

¹ *C.P.L.*, III., 6.

² *Ibid.*, III., 8.

³ Nam, cum contigeret (*sic*) ecclesiam nostram Norwicensem viduari sponso pastorali, provisa via eligendi per viam que dicitur Spiritus Sancti (que modernis temporibus rarissime est attrita) in episcopum et pastorem Norwicensis ecclesie unanimiter est electus, cum tamen, nobis ignorantibus, concurrente tempore nostre electionis reservatio summi pontificis, quasi ejusdem Spiritus instinctu, sibi providit de eadem.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1343-1345, p. 200.

Deanery of Lincoln, left vacant by William of Norwich's promotion, in April, 1344, was made at the king's direct request,¹ this did not prevent the despatch of a protest to Avignon by the hand of John of Ufford's brother Andrew, reminding the pope that the provision to the See of Norwich was contrary to the ordinance of parliament, and begging him to desist from making reservations and provisions of bishoprics.²

The pope's answer, reviewing the terms of this protest in a spirit of mild surprise, was returned on 11 July, and meanwhile the bishop-elect had returned to the papal court and had been consecrated by the pope on 23 May. He had left London shortly after 12 March, when he appointed the Prior of Norwich his vicar-general in the diocese during his absence,³ and was in Avignon by 7 April, bringing word that the king was prepared to consider peace, if the pope would put a stop, by his own authority or with the consent of both the contending parties, to breaches of the existing truce.⁴ After 23 May, the chronology of the year is rather difficult to follow. From a safe-conduct, issued nine days before his consecration, it would appear that he paid a hasty visit to the king between that date and 18 July.⁵ On the latter date he was certainly in Avignon, for it was there that, on learning of the death of the Prior of Norwich, he appointed Hamond Belers his vicar-general.⁶ But he was in England again on 3 August, and his departure from Dover at the head of an embassy to the pope with John and Andrew of Ufford and others was timed for the 9th of that month. The papal safe-conduct, however, was not issued until the 19th.⁷ In spite of this delay, he

¹ *C.P.P.*, I, 47.

² *C.P.L.*, III, 9.

³ Register, fo. 41b.

⁴ *C.P.L.*, III, 7.

⁵ *C.P.L.*, III, 8.

⁶ Register, fo. 41b.

⁷ *C.P.L.*, III, 17, 18.

seems to have paid his fourth visit to England within the year before the end of 1344; for on 13 December the pope issued a safe-conduct for him, Henry of Lancaster, Earl of Derby, and Bartholomew Burghersh, Lord Badlesmere, as ambassadors from England.¹

These swift journeys were necessitated by the difficulty of arriving at satisfactory preliminaries for peace between Edward III. and Philip of Valois. The truce, arranged in 1343, was by this time broken; the pope's good faith was suspected, Derby and Burghersh declined to take part in the embassy, and Derby was at the head of his troops in Guienne.² By 17 March, 1345, the Bishop of Norwich, and Michael of Northburgh, later Bishop of London, were at Avignon, explaining the absence of their fellow-envoys. In view of the resumption of war, the English sojourners at the papal court were getting ready to leave. The bishop and his companion must have left almost immediately. A papal letter of 5 April appears at first sight to fix their departure about that date. Following the breakdown of negotiations, the pope's anxiety turned to the attack upon his dealings in the matter of English benefices, and the bishop was instructed to lay this business before the king.³ But, if the letter was not post-dated—and the chronology of papal letters is frequently vitiated by arbitrary dating—it must have been sent after William's departure. Otherwise, it is almost impossible to explain his sudden appearance in his diocese on 15 April at Hemsby, a village on the sea-coast a few miles north of Yarmouth.⁴ It is just conceivable that, travelling by long stages through hostile country and meeting with favourable breezes, he landed there only ten days after leaving Avignon. If so, the news of his coming must have got

¹ *C.P.L.*, III., 18.]

² *Ibid.*, III., 19.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Register, fo. 49b.

abroad rapidly; for the activities of the vicar-general at Norwich were abruptly suspended, and a presentee to the vicarage of St. Michael's at Reepham was waiting at Hemsby for institution.

Edward III. was abroad, and William of Norwich, relieved of diplomatic cares for the time being, was at liberty to take stock of his diocese. There is no record of the date of his enthronement at Norwich. But, during the summer of 1345, he was moving about rapidly between his various manor-houses, and the dates are so distributed that we may fairly assume that these months of constant travelling were occupied in his primary visitation, of which Hemsby may mark the earliest stage. Five days after his visit to Hemsby he was at Blofield, seven miles east of Norwich. It is rather disappointing that there is no trace of his movements for a month after this. On 19 May we find him at his manor of Hoxne on the Suffolk bank of the Waveney, from which he moved after the 23rd to Eccles, an occasional residence of the bishops of Norwich between Thetford and Attleborough. Thence we can trace him through Great Cressingham on the 26th to Gaywood, close to Lynn. From Gaywood he went eastward to Thornage, near Holt. He was here at any rate on 6 June: on the following day he was at North Elmham, and on 10 June at Hevingham, which lies on the road from Aylsham to Norwich. On the 14th he was at St. Benet's Abbey in the marshes by the Bure. These dates point to a regular circuit of the northern part of his diocese, in which inspection of his houses was combined with the work of visitation. This was followed by a more prolonged stay in Suffolk, at South Elmham during the end of June and the first week of July, then at Hoxne, and later at Bacton, north of Stowmarket. In the middle of August he was outside the diocese at his Essex manor

of Terling, between Witham and Chelmsford. He spent the whole of September at Hoxne. On 4 October he was at St. Olave's Priory, between Lowestoft and Yarmouth; but soon afterwards he went to London, where he arrived about the 17th. Back at Hoxne in the middle of November, he was again in London at the beginning of December for a short time. On 16 December, however, he was at Norwich, and he spent Christmas at Hevingham.¹

It would be tedious to continue an account of his doings on these chronological lines. The somewhat bald records of his episcopate show, however, that, in spite of his frequent employment as the chief diplomatist in the king's service, his absences from his diocese were never lengthy. His visits to London at the end of 1345 were caused by the arrival of the Archbishop of Ravenna, his successor as papal nuncio in England, with whom he was commissioned to treat as a plenipotentiary on the king's side.² In the course of 1346 he was in London for a few days in May and, with occasional intervals spent at Terling, from the latter part of August to the beginning of November.³ He was at the parliament which opened on 11 September, sixteen days after the battle of Crécy;⁴ but, although he was named as a trier of petitions at the parliament of January, 1347,⁵ he remained at Norwich during the whole of that period and throughout the greater part of the year.⁶ We know of one short visit to London in November, 1347, and of another in February, 1348, and of a more prolonged visit, with intervals at Terling and Lambourne in Epping Forest in the following May and June.⁷ At the end of

¹ Register, ff 50-52b. For full itinerary see Appendix.

² The commission bears date 8 November: Rymer, *Foedera*, V., 481 C.P.R., 1343-1345, p. 569.

³ Register, ff. 54-56b.

⁴ *Rot. Parl.*, II., 157.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II., 164.

⁶ Register, ff. 57b-65b.

⁷ *Ibid.*, ff. 65, 66 and b, 68b.

September, 1348, he came up to London from Norwich, and left Dover on the 29th to meet the French envoys at Boulogne.¹ He was here and at Calais until 18 November, when he was a party to the truce signed between Calais and Guines.² He returned to Norwich by the end of the year.³ Early in March, 1349, however, he went abroad again on the same business and signed a second treaty near Calais on 2 May.⁴

When the bishop returned to Terling some days later,⁵ the great pestilence had reached East Anglia. Of this period I shall have something more to say presently. The next time he crossed the Channel was on 28 May, 1350, when he remained abroad for two or three weeks.⁶ Although on 28 July he was named as an envoy to the pope on the interminable question of peace,⁷ he did not go, and his only other visit to London in 1350 was for a few days early in October.⁸ It was in this year, according to one chronicler, that he was recommended by Edward III. to the pope for a cardinal's hat, without success.⁹

In 1351 he was in London for the February parliament, not arriving, however, until a few days after its opening.¹⁰ It will be remembered that at that parliament the bishops and abbots, fearing to compromise their spiritual allegiance to the papacy, stood aloof from the discussions which ended in the passing of the first Statute of Provisors. In the middle of June he came to London from Hoxne, and prepared to go to France again. On 25 June he nominated vicars-general during his absence.¹¹ Between then and 27 July he and the other envoys had gone and returned, and on 27 July they were about to

¹ Register, fo. 72; Rymer, V., 643.

² *Ibid.*, fo. 73; Rymer, V., 651.

³ *Ibid.*, fo. 73b.

⁴ *Ibid.*, fo. 79; Rymer, V., 660-661.

⁵ *Ibid.*, fo. 79b.

⁶ *Ibid.*, fo. 122: see Rymer, V., 671.

⁷ Rymer, V., 678.

⁸ Register, fo. 127.

⁹ Geoff. le Baker, ed. Maunde Thompson, p. 112.

¹⁰ *Rot. Parl.*, II., 226; Register, fo. 130.

¹¹ Register, fo. 132.

set out again.¹ The truce which was the result of their second visit was proclaimed on 11 September,² but the bishop by that time was on his way to Hoxne, if he had not already arrived.³

Of visits to London in 1352 there are four, one for parliament in January and February, another in May and June, with a long interval spent at Terling, and brief visits in August and November.⁴ In 1353 he was twice abroad to meet the French envoys, once in February and March and again in November, while he made a further visit to London in May and June.⁵ Again, he was in London in March, 1354,⁶ and, though no appointment of a vicar-general is recorded, he was among the envoys who concluded a truce at Guines on 6 April.⁷ On 6 October he left Dover for a mission to Avignon, from which he never returned.⁸

These absences, taken in the aggregate, amount to a long period. His episcopate lasted nine years and eight months, of which nearly five years must have been passed outside the diocese. But this includes several periods of residence at Terling, where he was in touch with both Norwich and London; and the actual period in which the diocese was left to the care of vicars-general was much shorter. I do not suggest that William of Norwich took a higher view of his duties than most bishops of his age; for to look for an exalted standard of spirituality in a mediæval prelate is to demand too much. His training and tastes were legal, and he was eminently suited for those judicial functions which played so large a part in the relations between a

¹ Rymer, V., 716.

² *Ibid.*, V., 725-726.

³ Register, fo. 133.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ff. 138b-144b.

⁵ *Ibid.*, ff. 145b-149b.

⁶ *Ibid.*, fo. 151b.

⁷ Rymer, V., 784.

⁸ Register, ff. 153b, 154: *cf.* Rymer, V., 794, 808, 809.

bishop and his diocese. He obviously knew the diocese well: not only was he an East Anglian by birth, with family connexions in various parts of Norfolk, but his episcopal estates were so situated that he could hardly fail to obtain a good topographical knowledge, at any rate, of the whole of Norfolk and of a large portion of Suffolk. On the other hand, no mediæval bishop, so far as I know, developed a laudable passion for tramping or driving about his diocese on errands of pastoral encouragement. His visitations, conducted according to a fixed programme, and held at convenient centres in the various rural deaneries, were regulated by a formal routine, and the spirit which guided them was a spirit of correction and admonition, accompanied by a strict attention to the business of collecting fees. It was his business to root out the tares from the Lord's field with the hoe of his correction:¹ when he took his seat in a parish church or the chapter-house of a monastery, he sat *judicialiter pro tribunali*.² He came to search out Jerusalem with candles,³ as a visitor bearing with him pains and penalties. How far he was able or willing to enforce them is another matter into which we need not enter: to him at any rate belonged the task of setting the machinery in motion which brought them to bear upon the offender.

Although a bishop nominally held a visitation of his diocese once in every three years, in practice few bishops exercised their right of visitation in person more than once in their episcopate, and William of Norwich was no exception to the rule. This argues no slackness on

¹ See, e.g., *Visitations of Relig. Houses dio. Linc.* (Linc. Record and Cant. and York Soc.) II., 192: "Cure nobis est mores in populo et clero nobis subditis reformare, virtutes plantare et vicia sarculo correccionis ordinarie euellere et extirpare; propter que visitacio ordinaria noscitur instituta."

² See *Ibid.*, vols. II., III., *passim*.

³ *Scrutabor Hierusalem in lucernis* (Zeph. I., 12).

his part. It meant merely that he relieved his subjects of an expensive burden, whose repeated incidence they could meet only with difficulty and under protest. I have already said that his movements in 1345 indicate the course of a primary visitation of which no official programme survives. But the dates are insufficient to make this absolutely certain, and I am inclined to think that this visitation was not completed at once, but was spread over the early years of his episcopate. It seems to have been continued in December, 1347, when there are dates from three Norfolk priories—Walsingham, Pentney and Blackburn, and there are some slight traces in 1348 and 1349 which may be taken to show that the visitation of the south-eastern parts of Suffolk was left until later. But evidences of his presence at other places than his manor-houses are few and far between. He appears to have visited certain monasteries more than once: Butley and St. Benet's are cases in point. There is a date from Weybourne as late as May, 1354, which points to a special visitation.² None of this evidence, however, is very satisfactory, and there is absolutely nothing to show that at any time he made a personal visitation of the south-western Archdeaconry of Sudbury.

Many years ago, in a well-known paper on *The Black Death in East Anglia*, Dr. Augustus Jessopp told the story of the pestilence as he read it between the lines of William of Norwich's register. It must be owned that the straw for his bricks was extremely scanty, but he made the most out of the long record of institutions to benefices in 1349, which occupies a third of the whole series of such memoranda.³ All that we can say of the bishop himself during this period is that, like most of his brethren, he resided in his diocese. During March

¹ Register, fo. 65 and b.

² *Ibid.*, fo. 152.

³ *Ibid.*, ff. 73b-118.

and April, as we have seen, he had been at Calais on diplomatic business. On 9 March he had committed the care of his diocese to two vicars-general, Richard Lyng and Thomas Methwold, who continued to exercise their office until the beginning of July.¹ The bishop came back to England at the beginning of May and stayed till the end of the month at Terling. Whitsunday fell on 1 June, and during the week after he moved into Suffolk. He was at Ipswich on the 5th, at Butley Priory and Parham, near Framlingham, on the 8th, and at Yarmouth on the 11th.² The reason for this somewhat digressive journey is not clear. Its aim appears to have been Gillingham, close to Beccles, where he was on the 13th and 14th, and where his brother Sir Bartholomew Bateman had recently died.³ He went from Gillingham to Norwich on the 14th.⁴ This, however, was merely a flying visit, as he was back at Terling on the 18th, and in London at the end of June.⁵ But he left London about the first of July for Norwich, probably by the Newmarket route, as we find him at Eccles, near Thetford, on the 3rd.⁶ On his arrival at Norwich, the commission given to the vicars-general expired and from 4 July all the acts recorded for the rest of the year were performed by him in person. From the 9th or 10th to the end of the month he took up his quarters at Hoxne.⁷ On 1 August he moved eastward to South Elmham, and there he stayed until 22 October,⁸ with the exception of a very brief visit to Blofield on 18 August.⁹ From 23 October until the end of the following February he was at Thorpe by Norwich.¹⁰ During this period the pestilence had died

¹ Register, fo. 76b. The last batch of institutions by a vicar-general is dated 3 July (*ibid.*, fo. 89 and b).

² *Ibid.*, fo. 83 and b.

⁵ *Ibid.*, ff. 85-87b.

⁸ *Ibid.*, ff. 100b-112b.

³ *Ibid.*, ff. 83b, 84.

⁶ *Ibid.*, fo. 89.

⁹ *Ibid.*, fo. 104b.

⁴ *Ibid.*, fo. 84.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 92b-100.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, ff. 112b-119b.

down, and the daily batches of presentees who came to the bishop for institution gradually ceased. He spent March and most of April, 1350, at Thornage, until, about 20 April, he returned for a time to his diplomatic business.¹

There is, of course, a temptation to embroider on these bare facts. If we are sentimentally inclined, we may regard the bishop, in this year of stress and suffering, as the mainstay of his stricken diocese, remaining calmly and firmly in its midst, a symbol of stability and patience and a source of consolation to his distracted subjects. It would be just as reasonable, from the opposite point of view, to regard him as enjoying his pleasant country retirement at South Elmham, provided with suitable antidotes to the plague, and surrounded, to use Boccaccio's phrase, with an amiable concert of birds, callous to the suffering of the world about him, and going through his daily levee of candidates for institution—in itself a very formal ceremony—with reluctance. As a matter of fact, during those months in which the national life was disorganised by pestilence, his manor-houses, apart from any question of diocesan duties, were his only obvious place of resort. There he stayed and went through his ordinary routine of work. He might, like the contemporary Bishop of Lincoln, have travelled about the diocese on visitation in the middle of the plague.² But I cannot imagine that, in the circumstances, the advent of a bishop and his clerks in a country village would have been welcomed with enthusiasm, however excellent his intentions; for practical philanthropy and sanitary inspection were no part of a bishop's calling. And all that we can say

¹ Register, ff. 119b-121.

² See the article by the present writer in *Archæol. Journ.*, LXVIII., 301-360.

is that, in staying at home and performing such duties as could be done there, instituting incumbents and holding ordinations in his chapel at the appropriate seasons, he was doing all that could be reasonably expected of a person of his eminence. We may at any rate surmise that he found recreation in his law-books and in pondering over the insoluble problem of international relations.

There was another business, however, which occupied his mind during this period, and to which his register contains no clue. Immediately after his return from Calais in May, 1349, he was defendant in a suit in the King's Bench, and, if he did not appear in person, his stay at Terling was doubtless caused by the desirability of being within easy reach of London during the process. The exemption of the Abbey of St. Edmunds from episcopal jurisdiction was a frequent source of trouble to the See of Norwich, and William of Norwich was neither the first nor the last bishop who attempted to exert authority in Bury and its dependent territory. "Note for an everlasting memorial that in the year of our Lord 1345, one William Bateman, bishop of Norwich, doctor of laws, a follower of Saul and not of Paul, resenting the liberties of the monastery of St. Edmund, was seen to attack them in manifold wise. And, like a second Swegen, while he was eager that they should be made subject to him, which was not right, was mortally pierced by the spear of Edmund, to wit by the infliction of a penalty against those who impugn the saint's liberties and immunities, to the eternal disgrace of himself and his successors."¹ The ascertainable dates show that in 1345 the bishop endeavoured in more than one way to assert his jurisdiction over the abbot

¹ Register of Abbot Curteys, quoted by Blomefield, III., 507.

and convent.¹ They promptly refused, and relying upon their possession of royal charters of privilege, sent their envoy, Sir Richard Freysel, to the king, to sue letters of protection out of Chancery. The bishop, probably expecting that his favour with the king and pope would outweigh his disregard of precedent, excommunicated Sir Richard. The excommunication was published by four commissaries, the Prior of Kersey, Hamond Belers, the bishop's official, Simon of Sudbury, Rector of Wickhambrook, and James, Rector of Wrabness in Essex, whose surname, owing to the loss of the London registers at this period, is undiscoverable. Sir Richard in consequence obtained a writ from Chancery, by which the bishop and his commissaries were summoned before the justices for contempt. They took exception to the summons, and referred their case to the court of the archbishop as judge ordinary. The justices, however, proceeded in the case. The king was abroad, besieging Calais, and they took drastic measures against the offenders. The commissaries were condemned to imprisonment. The prior and Hamond Belers went into hiding, Simon of Sudbury fled to Avignon, but the anonymous rector of Wrabness was taken and put in the abbot's prison at Bury. As for the bishop, his temporalities were seized, and he himself, with his household, in fear of imprisonment, took sanctuary in his cathedral church.²

The date of this enforced retirement is marked by his unusually long residence at Norwich from the end of November, 1346, until late in July, 1347.³ Meanwhile the temporalities of the see were in the king's hands,

¹ The date is approximate. In May, 1351, the suit which followed is said to have been in process for five years, *i.e.*, since early in 1346 (*C.P.L.*, III, 388). See *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey* (Rolls Ser.), III, xi-xv., etc., for fuller details of the quarrel.

² *C.P.L.*, III, 304, 305.

³ Register, ff. 57b-63b.

and were not restored until the end of July.¹ Freysel, however, was claiming £10,000 damages, and in the course of 1346, the bishop, balked of his appeal to the court of Canterbury, had lodged an appeal at Avignon. It was not until February, 1349, that a papal mandate, issued to Ralph Stratford, Bishop of London, and Robert Stratford, Bishop of Chichester, summoned the abbot and his envoy to appear at the Curia.² This summons was of no avail, and the case remained pending in the papal court. Freysel, however, sued for his damages in the Common Bench, and, after the suit had been transferred on a writ of error to the King's Bench, recovered his claim. We may suspect that the claim for £10,000, which, if taken seriously, was monstrous, was advanced as an imposing overture to an easier agreement, and the sum actually recovered by Freysel was 1,000 marks. The honour of the excommunicated envoy was saved; but the king, on 28 May, 1349, as an interested party in the suit of Rex and Freysel *v.* the Bishop of Norwich, remitted the vast fine with the hope that Freysel would do the same. It appears to have been reckoned as equivalent to the fine of 30 talents of gold, imposed by a charter attributed to Harthacnut for attempts to disturb the liberties of the abbot and convent. This, as mentioned in the same letters, was remitted on the understanding that any further attempt of the same kind by the bishop or his successors would render them liable for the same amount.³ The bishop's appeal to the pope, however, was not withdrawn. At a council held in St. Paul's by Archbishop Stratford on 25 September, 1347, William of Norwich spoke boldly of the injuries and encroachments on ecclesiastical liberties of which the temporal power was guilty. "By these means,

¹ *Cal. Close Rolls*, 1346-1349, pp. 338, 340.

² *C.P.L.*, III., 304-305.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1348-1350, p. 297; *see also* Biomefield, III., 507, 508.

unless a due remedy be applied, all personal privileges that concern the persons of the clergy will be overturned, the keys of the Church will be set at naught, and in your own days the liberty of the Church will be reduced to perpetual servitude like that of Pharaoh. Now then, reverend fathers, lift your horns on high, raise your pastoral staves and free your sheep from the teeth of the wolves, considering that, according to Ambrose, you are all as regards your watchful care vicars of that good Shepherd who feared not to lay down His life for His sheep.”¹ As late as 1 May, 1351, a papal mandate ordered the archbishop and two of his suffragans to excommunicate the bishop's opponents who tried to hinder the progress of the appeal.² Before this command arrived in England, the dispute, which now hinged upon the bishop's right to divert the case from the king's courts to the papal tribunal, had been amicably settled. On 11 May Archbishop Islip, William of Edington, Bishop of Winchester, and John of Thoresby, Bishop of Worcester, were parties to an agreement by which the bishop and the abbot undertook to stay proceedings at the Curia.³ The end of the long and costly dispute, as of so many other attempts to break long established privileges, was that the rights of the abbey were vindicated. Nearly a century later, the abbot and convent rejoiced over their repulse of a similar importunacy on the part of one of William's successors. “The monastery of St. Edmund, founded upon a strong rock, stood as a mountain unmovable. And, even as Berith and Astaroth fled from the face of the blessed apostle Bartholomew, so did these impious men flee where no man pursued. And thereafter by God's will were they taken, and duly fell into the pit which they had made for others.”⁴

¹ Quoted in Blomefield, III., 508, 509.

³ *C.P.R.*, 1350-1354, p. 104.

² *C.P.L.*, III., 388.

⁴ *Monasticon*, III., 136.

In his proceedings against Sir Robert Morley, who seems to have taken advantage of the confiscation of the temporalities of the see to intrude upon the bishop's manors and parks, William of Norwich was more fortunate, for the offender was forced to ask for pardon and do public penance.¹ Of this affair there are no detailed records. It is possibly connected with two acts of violence committed against the bishop's ministers in 1350. While he was abroad, in June of that year, a band of malefactors, led by one John of Hales, attacked his commissary general, who was holding a chapter at Haddiscoe, tore up and carried away the documents which he had with him, and threatened him and his clerks with death, if they dared to take action against their assailants.² About the same time, a body of armed men broke up the bishop's hundred court at Hoxne and dragged the bailiff who was holding it from his seat.³ The bishop obtained the appointment of royal commissions to examine both these cases. The second may have been a purely local disturbance. But, with regard to the first, it is perhaps noteworthy that, in the letters patent for the commission, the commissary general is called master Thomas Morle. Actually he was master Thomas Methwold, and the mistake in the name may be attributed to the implication of Sir Robert Morley as the prime mover in these proceedings.

Crown presentations to benefices in the diocese in January, 1350, and March, 1351, were made on the ground that the temporalities were then in the king's hands.⁴ The second of these is a grant of the Archdeaconry of Norfolk to John Harewell, who, after service in the administration of Aquitaine under the Black Prince, was rewarded in 1367 with the bishopric

¹ Wharton, *Ang. Sac.*, II., 415.

² *C.P.R.*, 1348-1350, p. 592.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 596.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 462; 1350-1354, p. 52.

of Bath and Wells. These presentations, however, were made retrospectively, and their reservation was specified when the temporalities were restored in 1347.¹ At the same time, the king expressly retained the liberties of the Borough of Lynn, which had been confiscated for another reason. Early in his episcopate, the bishop and the burgesses and commonalty of his Borough of Lynn fell into dispute, the townsmen brought an action against the bishop, and the bishop's view of frankpledge, court of husting, and general cognisance of pleas within the borough were taken into the king's hand. At the end of March, 1352, a conference was arranged between the conflicting parties. Geoffrey Drewe, the alderman, and thirteen other burgesses, including Robert and Auncel Braunche, whose names recall one of the two magnificent brasses preserved in St. Margaret's Church, were appointed to treat with the bishop. The points at issue were the bishop's right to hold courts in the borough and the demand of the burgesses to elect a mayor. Hitherto, the government of this episcopal borough had been defined by a composition arranged between the burgesses and John Salmon, Bishop of Norwich, 1299-1325. According to this, the bishop was confirmed in free exercise of his courts, and appointed the provost of the commonalty. The new composition of 1352 conceded the election of a mayor to the burgesses, on condition that the mayor-elect should be presented to the bishop or to his high steward at Gaywood within three days of his election, and swear to perform his office faithfully, saving the rights and liberties of the Church of Norwich. In return, the burgesses, under a bond of 500 marks, undertook to abstain from molestation of the bishop's view of frankpledge and other

¹ C.C.R., 1346-1349, p. 338.

courts and pleas. The bond was sealed on Easter Monday, 1352, and the composition was drawn up a week later.¹

I do not propose to speak of William of Norwich's foundation of Trinity Hall in 1350, or of his benefactions to Edmund Gonville's Hall of the Annunciation which gained him the distinction of being reckoned as its co-founder; for the history of his connexion with Cambridge is well known and is his chief claim to the gratitude of posterity. I may note that on 20 Sept., 1351, he visited Rushford, where Gonville had founded a small college of chantry-priests, and that for this purpose he must have gone out of the way in the course of a journey from Hoxne to Gaywood.² But his register makes no note of any special visit to Cambridge, although he more than once travelled to and from London by the road over Newmarket Heath; and the nearest place to Cambridge mentioned in the register is Babraham, through which he passed on 26 April, 1352.³ In this connexion it should not be forgotten that, though Cambridge itself was outside his diocese, the two hundreds of Cambridgeshire, north of the Devil's Dyke and east of the fens, were under his jurisdiction, the western boundary of which ran between Soham, then in the Diocese of Norwich, and the City of Ely.⁴

Even before his promotion to a bishopric, William of Norwich had maintained a large household. In connexion with his second mission from the pope to England in 1342, there is a list of sixteen of his clerks for whom he obtained provisions to benefices—chiefly of an expectative kind, and not necessarily fulfilled—as a reward

¹ Register, ff. 12-13.

² Register, fo. 133.

³ *Ibid.*, fo. 138b.

⁴ See note by the present writer, printed in the *Official Handbook* for the 1300th anniversary of the Diocese of East Anglia, 1930, pp. 28, 29.

for their labours in his service and that of the holy see.¹ None of these was a person who rose to high distinction afterwards. As bishop, however, he attracted into his service, as might be expected of a man so prominent in public affairs, more than one distinguished clerk. Although his relations with the chapter of his cathedral church were consistently friendly, and stood the test of his long residence in the cathedral precincts in 1346 and 1347, yet, as the secular bishop of a monastic church, he naturally relied for assistance in diocesan administration upon secular clerks whose training was akin to his own. It is often light-heartedly stated that, in such cathedrals as Norwich, the bishop was regarded as the abbot of the monastery. But this is true only in so far as, when he was in church, he was treated with the formal respect due to an honorary president of a society: he sat in the choir in the stall which corresponded to that of the abbot in an ordinary monastic church, and, out of respect to him, the real head of the house bore the subordinate title of prior.² But, apart from his position as visitor of the monastery *ex officio*, he had no status in the domestic economy of the priory, and, if he was wise, he refrained from meddling in its affairs or staying for too long at a time in his neighbouring palace. The prior and convent were the permanent trustees of the episcopal estates: their consent was necessary to *ardua negotia* which involved the transfer of property. It was occasionally expedient to associate the prior with one or more vicars-general. But the chief servants of the see, the vicars-general, the official-principal and the archdeacons, were, with this occasional exception, all seculars; and their personal relations with

¹ *C.P.P.*, I., 9, 10.

² For the relation of a bishop to the convent of a monastic cathedral church, see *Durham Cathedral Statutes* (Surtees Soc.) intro., pp. xxi-xxvi.

the bishop were even closer than in dioceses where, if they were also members of a secular cathedral chapter, the defence of its privileges brought them into frequent conflict with the diocesan.

Among William of Norwich's vicars-general appear three successive priors of Norwich, William Claxton, Symon Bozoun and his encomiast Lawrence. But he also appointed a secular for the period before he entered his diocese for the first time as bishop.¹ This was Hamond Belers, a civilian lawyer, the son of the judge Roger Belers, of Kirkby-on-Wreak in Leicestershire, who had been murdered by some of his neighbours towards the end of the reign of Edward II. Belers was rector of Bunny in Nottinghamshire,² and his connexion with the Diocese of Norwich was probably entirely due to personal friendship with the bishop. As we have seen, he was one of the commissaries implicated in the dispute with the Abbey of St. Edmund. In March, 1347, while the bishop and his accomplices were still under the ban of the king's justices, William obtained for him a provision to the vacant Archdeaconry of Norwich.³ This was of no effect, as might be expected: all presentations and collations were in the king's hands, and the archdeaconry was given for the time being to the famous theologian, Thomas Bradwardine.⁴ Belers appears to have severed his connexion with Norwich on his appointment a little later to the subdeanery of Lincoln, which he held for nearly a quarter of a century.⁵

Richard Lyng and Thomas Methwold, who acted as vicars-general in 1348 and 1349, both belonged to the

¹ Register, fo. 41b.

² See *Assoc. Archit. Soc. Reports and Papers*, xxxiv., 13.

³ *C.P.P.*, I., 105; *C.P.L.*, III., 236.

⁴ *C.P.R.*, 1345-1348, p. 251.

⁵ *Assoc. Archit. Soc. Reports and Papers*, xxxiv., 13, 14.

not uncommon type of clerk whose interests were bound up in local diocesan affairs. Lyng, Rector of Reedham, failed to obtain the Archdeaconry of Suffolk, to which the bishop seems to have appointed him during the seizure of the temporalities;¹ but in 1349 he is said to have been Archdeacon of Sudbury.² Later in the year, the Archdeaconry of Norwich was void, and Lyng obtained it.³ The Archdeaconry of Sudbury, which he thus quitted, then passed through rapid changes, the facts of which are uncertain.⁴ It seems, however, to have been quickly resigned by Walter Elveden, who exchanged it for the precentorship of Hereford with Thomas of Winchester in 1349. But before the end of that year it was given to Thomas Methwold. Methwold, who held the important post of official-principal, disappears very soon afterwards, and his place as official was probably taken by Elveden, who, in conjunction with Lyng, was acting as vicar-general at the time of the bishop's death.

In later years, Simon Thebaud of Sudbury, Rector of Wickhambrook, rose to eminence as Bishop of London, Archbishop of Canterbury and Chancellor of England, and met with a tragic end in 1381. He appears to have founded his fortunes in the service of William of Norwich, and probably at Avignon, where, as we have seen, he betook himself in 1346. Other references to him at this date are scanty, but we may infer from a papal mandate in 1352 that he was then acting as the bishop's agent at the Curia,⁵ and he was subsequently one of the executors of his will.⁶

Throughout his official life, William of Norwich was mindful of the spiritual and temporal advantage of his

¹ *C.P.P.*, I., 189.

⁴ Le Neve, *ut sup.*

² Le Neve, *Fasti*, II., 491.

⁵ *C.P.L.*, III., 464.

³ *C.P.P.*, I., 189.

⁶ Executors mentioned in 1355: Simon of Babingley, Ralph Urry, Robert de Walton and John de Wynestone.

kinsfolk. As early as 1332, when he obtained an indult for plenary absolution in the hour of death, similar favours were granted to his father and mother.¹ In 1343, when he was Dean of Lincoln, he sued out the same privilege for his brother Bartholomew Bateman, and his nephew William, Lord Kerdeston,² and for Pernell and Margaret their wives.³ At the same period, at least four of his kinsmen were attached to his household. Benet of Hotham, whose name suggests also a relationship to John of Hotham, Bishop of Ely a few years previously, had provision at his request in 1342 of the rich living of Uffington near Stamford.⁴ John of Littleton, who came from the Diocese of Worcester and was studying law at Bologna, had provision of a canony and prebend in the conventual church of Shaftesbury.⁵ The bishop's nephews, Thomas Winchester of Mendlesham,⁶ and Bartholomew Miniot of Norwich,⁷ were both canons of All Saints, Derby, which is accounted for by the fact that the deanery of that church was annexed to the Deanery of Lincoln, and its prebends were in the dean's gift. Winchester was in residence at Bologna, reading civil law. His provision to the precentorship of Hereford took effect,⁸ but there is no indication that Miniot obtained the prebend in Crediton said to have been vacated by the famous Richard Fitz Ralph, and it had actually been filled up several years before.

¹ *C.P.L.*, II., 380.

² The wife of Roger, first Lord Kerdeston (d. 1337), was called Maud; but her surname is unknown. William, Lord Kerdeston, was born about 1307 and died 1368. It is noteworthy that his second wife was called Alice of Norwich (*Comp. Peerage*, VII., 191-193). Margaret Bacon, his first wife, is said to have died in 1328.

³ *C.P.P.*, I., 23.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I., 8.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I., 31.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I., 10.

⁷ *Ibid.*, I., 13.

⁸ *Le Neve*, I., 485. In Nov., 1349, he exchanged the precentorship of Hereford for the Archdeaconry of Sudbury with Walter Elveden (Hereford Reg. Trillek [Cantilupe and Cant. and York Soc.], p. 406).

Four other nephews appear later on, three of whom, Henry, John and William Winterton, were evidently brothers. These and the fourth, Henry Brandon, had been appointed by their uncle to the rural deaneries of Lynn, Hingham, Sudbury and Ingworth respectively.¹ By a custom very exceptional in England, the local origin of which provides some opportunity for research, the rural deaneries of the Diocese of Norwich were freehold benefices in the bishop's collation. As their average yearly value varied from £2 to 30s., they furnished no very ample living for young clerks in need of promotion; and the bishop appears to have represented this to Clement VI. When Clement died in December, 1352, and was laid to rest in the choir of La Chaise-Dieu, they were still unprovided for; and in the following May Innocent VI. gave them the somewhat barren reward of expectative canonries in the several churches of Salisbury, London, Hereford and Lichfield. The fulfilment of such expectations, where there were long waiting lists of candidates, had always been largely a matter of chance, and the enactment of the Statute of Provisors in 1351 made it even less certain. It does not appear that any of the four obtained his promised preferment. With the fortunes of so many nephews in his care, William of Norwich must often have wished that he had the prebends of a secular cathedral church at his disposal.

On 6 October, 1354, the bishop was at Dover, preparing to start for Avignon, where he was to meet the envoys of the king of France. On that day he appointed Lyng and Elveden his vicars-general.² His departure, however, seems to have been delayed until the end of the month. This last diplomatic mission met with little success: the truce was prolonged till Midsummer, 1355, after which the Black Prince took the field in the series of campaigns

¹ *C.P.P.*, I., 246.

² Register, ff. 153b, 154.

which ended in the battle of Poitiers. But William of Norwich, soon after his arrival at the papal court, fell ill. On 23 December, 1354, he had licence to choose a confessor at the hour of death and make his last will and testament.¹ On 6 January, 1355, the feast of the Epiphany, he died and was buried in the cathedral church of Notre-Dame des Doms before the high altar.² Prior Lawrence tells us that his funeral was attended by the whole college of cardinals and by all the prelates present in Avignon: the ceremony was performed by the patriarch of Jerusalem.³

The news of his death reached Norwich on 24 January. Meanwhile, his household, under the superintendence of his chamberlain, master Thomas of Lexham, was left destitute in foreign parts. None of his nephews was with him: the only name of a probable kinsman among the fifteen clerks whom the pope relieved by provisions on 29 January is that of Lawrence Litelton. Several of these had modest rectories in the Diocese of Norwich: three were rural deans, and one of their deaneries, that of Wangford, was valued only at twenty shillings a year. With one or two exceptions, their names show that they were natives of their master's diocese.⁴ Although one or two obtained later preferment of some value, none of those mentioned rose to any conspicuous distinction in the Church; and their easily bestowed expectations in collegiate churches and prospective benefices in the gift of prelates and monastic bodies were not of a kind which relieved their immediate wants. The chamberlain obtained a plenary indulgence in the hour of death for himself and his mother,⁵ and fifty like indulgences were distributed among the bishop's serving-men and gentlemen-in-waiting.⁶ John Strange,

¹ *C.P.P.*, I., 265.

² Register, fo. 156.

³ Apparently Élie de Nabinal, Cardinal Priest of San Vitale and Archbishop of Nicosia.

⁴ *C.P.P.*, I., 276, 277.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I., 276.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I., 277.

a serjeant-at-arms whom the king had sent to attend upon his envoy, took the opportunity of obtaining a provision for his sixteen-year-old son Geoffrey, who was studying civil law at King's Hall, Cambridge, of a benefice with cure of souls, to take effect when he attained the age of twenty-three.¹

The see, reserved to the pope, was quickly filled on 4 February by the provision of Thomas Percy, Canon of Chichester, a son of Henry, second Lord Percy of Alnwick, and of the lady whose splendid tomb remains on the north side of the altar in Beverley Minster.² The appointment, if not directly suggested by the Crown, met with no opposition from the king or the Chapter of Norwich. The *congé d'élire* was not issued until 17 February,³ but the chapter elected Percy, and the temporalities were restored to him on 14 April.⁴ His consecration, however, was delayed for nearly a year after his predecessor's death, until 3 January, 1356, when he was consecrated by Bishop Edyngton of Winchester at Waverley Abbey.⁵

Of the dignified appearance, stature, virtues and piety of William of Norwich, Prior Lawrence speaks in well studied and evenly balanced phrases.⁶ The bishop's death at the Curia afforded him excellent material for a peroration. "Thus the sun ariseth, thus it setteth, thus it returneth to its own place. It arose when, in the court of Rome, shining forth with the brightness of knowledge, it earned the distinction of the episcopal dignity. It set when, entering its home again for a time, it bereft that court of the splendour of its presence. But it returned

¹ *C.P.P.*, I., 281. ² *C.P.L.*, III., 566. ³ *C.P.R.*, 1354-1358, p. 177.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 199, 200.

⁵ Stubbs, *Reg. Sac. Ang.*

⁶ "Erat autem vultu placidus; specie, decorus; statura, procerus; pietatis gratia, benignus; justitie severitate, districtus; in verbo et opere, singulis compassione, proximus; in vigiliis assiduus; pre cunctis contemplatione suspensus; in salutaris hostie consecratione, frequens et fervidus, interiorem curam, in exteriorum occupatione, non minuens; exteriorum providentiam, in interiorum sollicitudine, non relinquens," etc.

to its own place when, going back thither, where in life it assumed the earliest of its honours, in death it made its burial glorious. Nay, most truly may it be said, the son returneth to his mother's womb, the nursling to its nurse's bosom, while dust returneth to dust, and the spirit unto God who set it on its journey." It is from the set language of this eulogy, from a few brief references in chronicles, from the facts embodied in a series of official documents, and from the dates and a few casual records preserved in the register of William of Norwich, that the details of the life of one of the most munificent benefactors of the University of Cambridge can be recovered; and, dull though such details must be, I trust that, by attempting to bring them together, I have added something to what already has been written about "the chief blossom of those that are skilled in both branches of law" and "the principal ambassador for the restoration of peace between the realms of France and England."

APPENDIX.

The Itinerary of Bishop Bateman.

The following itinerary has been compiled from the dates of documents in Bateman's Register, for the use of which my gratitude is due to Mr. C. B. Bolingbroke, the Diocesan Registrar at Norwich.

1343-4.			1345.		
March 2	London 'in hospicio domini episcopi'		Oct. 17, 20	London	
			Nov. 12, 16, 17	Hoxne	
12	London		26	Lambourne	
1344.			Dec. 1, 3	London	
July 18	Avignon		16	Palace, Norwich	
1345.			20	Hevingham	
April 15	Hemsby		1345-6.		
20	Blofield		Feb. 19	"	
May 19, 23	Hoxne		23	Terling	
26	Eccles; Great Cressingham		March 1	Bacton (Suff.)	
30	Gaywood		10, 18, 20	Thornage	
June 6	Thornage		1346.		
7	North Elmham		April 1, 3	Blofield	
10	Hevingham		13	Norwich	
14	St. Benet's Hulme		19, 20	Eccles	
30	South Elmham		May 10	London	
July 2, 5	" "		15, 23	Lambourne	
9	Hoxne		June 13	"	
17, 22	Bacton (Suff.)		21, 24, 25	Bacton (Suff. 'Baketon Episcopi')	
Aug. 13, 16	Terling		July 21, 24	Hoxne	
31	Hoxne		31	South Elmham	
Sept. 1, 12, 16, 18, 28	" "		Aug. 1, 5, 6	" "	
Oct. 4	St. Olave's Priory		22	London	
9	Letheringham		31	Terling	
14	'Wykes juxta Gippewic'		Sept. 17	London	
			Oct. 3, 13	Terling	
			19, 24, 28	London	
			Nov. 2, 11	Terling	

1346.

Nov. 18 Hoxne
23 Norwich

Dec. 1, 18, 24 „

1346-7.

Jan. 6, 12, 13,
14, 21, 26, 28 „

Feb. 5, 8 „

March 4, 7, 9,
11, 12, 15, 17,
18, 20, 22, 23 „

1347.

March 27, 29 „

April 7, 8, 10,
13, 15, 17, 19,
22, 23, 24, 30 „

May 1, 3, 5, 6,
7, 9, 16, 17, 19 „

June 10, 15, 23,
30 „

July 1, 11, 12,
16, 19 „

23 Yarmouth
25 St. Benet's
Hulme;
Norwich

Aug. 1, 16, 25 Norwich

Sept. 16, 29 Terling

Oct. 14, 17, 20 Norwich

Nov. 8 London
16, 22 Norwich

Dec. 2 Walsingham
12 Pentney
13 Blackburgh
21, 22, 25 Norwich

1347-8.

Jan. 9 Eccles;
Thetford

14, 16, 23, 25 London

Feb. 5, 7, 8, 9 „
22 Norwich

27 South Elmham

March 1 Norwich
5 Thornage

9 Hevingham

12 Blofield

17, 18, 20, 21,
22, 23 Norwich

1348.

April 29 Terling

May 3, 5, 11 „

1348.

May 19 Charing 'juxta
London'

22 Finsbury 'juxta
London'

31 London

June 5 „
6, 17, 19 Terling

July 1 Lambourn

2 London

19 Bacton (Suff.)

22, 23 Hoxne

29 Campsea

31 South Elmham

Aug. 3, 7, 8, 12,
13, 18, 28, 29 „

Sept. 23, 24 London „

29 Dover

Oct. 13 Calais

Dec. 12 Eccles

26, 29, 31 Blofield

1348-9.

Jan. 9 Norwich

13 South Elmham

16 Campsea Ash
('Assh juxta
Campesse ')

20 South Elmham

Feb. 1, 5, 6, 7,

10, 15 Norwich

20 Hevingham

23, 24 Flitcham

25 South Elmham

28 Norwich

March 1, 2 „

7 Ware

9 London

1349.

April 29 Calais

May 13, 16, 17,
26, 29 „

June 5 Terling

8 Ipswich

Butley;
Parham

11 Yarmouth

11, 13 Beccles;

Gillingham

14 Gillingham;

Norwich

18 Terling

19, 20, 26, 28 London

1349.

July 3-8	Norwich
10, 11, 13,	
15-31	Hoxne
Aug. 1-5	South Elmham
6-9	Langley ¹
10, 12, 13, 15,	
16	South Elmham
17, 18	Blofield
19-31	South Elmham
Sept. 1-4, 6-15,	
18, 20-24, 26-30	„ „
Oct. 2-12, 14-20,	
22	South Elmham ²
23-31	Thorpe
Nov. 2, 4-6, 9-11,	
13, 14, 16-21,	
24, 26, 27, 29	„
Dec. 5, 8, 11, 13,	
16, 20-25, 29-31	„

1349-50.

Jan. 1, 2, 6-8, 11,	
12, 19, 20, 22,	
24-26, 29, 30	„
Feb. 1, 3	„
6	Thorpe; Chapter-house, Norwich
11, 14, 19, 20,	
23	Thorpe
March 1-5, 7, 8,	
10, 13, 15, 17,	
20, 22	Thornage

1350.

March 25, 26,	
31	„
April 7, 14, 17,	
21	Thetford
26, 28, 29	London
May 2	„ ³
3	Chelmsford
13, 14	Terling
21	London

1350.

May 27, 28	Dover
June 23, 24	Norwich
July 6	Terling
12	Bacton (Suff.)
15, 17, 18,	
21, 23-26	Thorpe
17, 30, 31	Thornage
Aug. 3, 8, 9,	
10-12, 15, 16,	
18, 22, 23	Thornage
24	Thornage; Palace, Norwich
25-28, 30, 31	Thornage
Sept. 3, 5, 8	„
17, 19	Norwich
21	Hoxne
28	Terling
Oct. 6	London
10	'In camera nostra infra manerium nostrum apud le Charing juxta West- monasterium
18, 23	Terling ⁴
Nov. 6-8	Hoxne
12, 13	South Elmham
14	Norwich
15, 20, 24, 29	South Elmham
Dec. 1, 6, 9, 10,	
13, 15, 17,	
18, 20	„ „
21, 23, 28	Hoxne

1350-1.

Jan. 3-5, 17, 26,	„
28	Norwich
31	Hoxne
Feb. 5, 7-10	„
17, 20, 23	London
March 11	Hoxne

¹ On ff. 27b, 28 of the Register there is a document dated 7 August, "in capella manerii de Southelmham." On 7 August, however, the bishop was at Langley (fo. 102).

² On fo. 27 there is a date, 24 Oct., from South Elmham; but this is probably an error for 24 Sept.

³ A date on 1 May from the Palace at Norwich (fo. 10) must be wrong.

⁴ A date on 15 Oct. from the Palace, Norwich (fo. 12) seems to be wrong.

1350-1.

March 15	Norwich
18, 21, 23, 24	Blofield
1351.	
March 26, 28	"
April 1-3	"
6	North Walsham
9, 11, 13,	
16, 20	Blofield
29	Newmarket (Novum Mercatum)
May 23, 24, 30,	
31	Hoxne
June 3, 5, 8,	
10-13	"
22, 25, 26	London
July 27	"
Sept. 10, 12	Hoxne ¹
20	Rushford (Russhe worth)
27-29	Gaywood
Oct. 1	Massingham
5, 10, 12,	
14, 16	Hoxne
24	London
Nov. 14, 16, 17	Hoxne
22	Thorpe
25	Palace, Norwich
26	Thorpe
28	Hoxne
Dec. 6, 7, 11,	
17, 19, 21	"
1351-2.	
Jan. 8, 9	Hoxne
10	Newmarket
19, 28, 31	London
Feb. 4-6, 10,	
15, 21, 22	"
March 4, 5	"
17, 20, 23	Blofield
1352.	
March 26, 28-31	"
April 5, 7, 10	
14, 17	"
20	Palace, Norwich

1352.

April 21, 24	Blofield
26	Babraham (Badburgham)
May 1, 5	London
9, 14, 17-19,	
25, 29, 30	Terling ²
June 2	"
13, 14	London
17, 22, 23	Terling
July 12	"
17	Sudbury (Subyr ¹)
21, 28, 29	South Elmham
Aug. 5, 6, 8	" "
12	Hoxne
18, 20, 21	London
Sept. 12, 14, 18,	
20	South Elmham
24	Massingham
28	Gaywood
Oct. 4, 5	Thornham (juxta mare)
6	Hevingham; Blofield
11	Blofield
14, 18, 21,	
23, 24	South Elmham
25, 26, 30	Hoxne
Nov. 1, 5-7	"
10	Palace, Norwich
11, 16, 17	Hoxne
30	London
Dec. 19	Hoxne
1352-3.	
Jan. 1	"
9	Long Stratton
10, 11	Thorpe
16, 21, 31	Hoxne
Feb. 1	"
6	Thetford
11	Dartford
1353.	
March 29	Terling
April 20	Rochford (Rougeförde)
25	Ipswich

¹ A date from Hoxne on 26 Sept. (fo. 133) is probably wrong.² There is a wrong date from the Palace, Norwich, on 13 May.

1353.

April 26	Hoxne
May 3, 5, 6	"
17, 19, 20	London
June 8	"
18-20, 23,	
24	Terling
July 1-3	Gaywood
8	Thornage
9	Thornage ; Norwich
16	Norwich
Aug. 7, 15, 17,	
18, 28	Hoxne
Sept. 17, 18	" ¹
21	Newmarket
27, 29, 30	London
Oct. 4	"
18, 22, 24	Terling
Nov. 13	Dover
Dec. 16	London
21, 27	Terling

1353-4.

Jan. 7	"
12	London
22	Easterford
24	Ipswich
30	Norwich

1353-4.

Feb. 9, 15, 18	
20, 21	Hoxne
March 4	"
15, 16	London

1354.

April 24, 27	Terling
May 16	Eccles
17, 19	Hoxne
27	Weybourne (Wabrunne)
30	Massingham
31	Gaywood
June 1	"
6, 9, 10,	
12, 15	Hoxne
16	Palace, Norwich
17, 19, 21, 22	
25, 27, 30	Hoxne
July 2, 7, 8, 10,	
13, 16, 24, 31	South Elmham
Aug. 5, 16	" "
31	Terling
Sept. 28	London
Oct. 6	Dover

1354-5.

Jan. 6	Death at Avignon
--------	---------------------

¹ There is an undated visit to Butley in the course of September (fo. 148).