CHURCH AND STATE IN LATE MEDIEVAL ENGLAND

The Political Activities of the English Episcopate in the Reign of Edward III

Samuel Lane

Thesis submitted for the degree of *Doctor of Philosophy* in History

Michaelmas Term 2022

Word Count: 134,476

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS…….3

NOTE……...5

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS..... 6

LIST OF APPENDICES..... 11

SHORT ABSTRACT..... 13

LONG ABSTRACT..... 14

CHAPTER I – ‘GOOD ADVICE OF THE PRELATES’: BISHOPS AND THE KING’S ADMINISTRATION..... 39

CHAPTER II – ‘THE DEFENCE OF THE REALM’: BISHOPS AND EDWARD III’S WARS….106

CHAPTER III – ‘THANKSGIVINGS AND PRAYERS’: BISHOPS AND ROYAL PROPAGANDA…….. 133

CHAPTER IV – ‘TO DISCUSS AND LEGISLATE FOR THE GOOD STATE OF THE COUNTRY’: BISHOPS AND THE ENGLISH PARLIAMENT……...152

CHAPTER V – ‘VARIOUS TAXES AND TALLAGES’: BISHOPS AND CLERICAL TAXATION……..... 179

CONCLUSION……199

EPILOGUE……..209

APPENDICES…….214

BIBLIOGRAPHY……329

Acknowledgements

Over the course of writing this thesis, I have incurred debts to numerous people. While it is impossible to mention everyone by name, my principal academic debts fall into seven groups, alongside my debts to those outside of academe.

Academically, my first and greatest debts are to Dr Benjamin Thompson, my supervisor, who has forced me to think harder, push my arguments further, and conceptualise my thesis more broadly, and to Dr Rowena E. Archer, who has taught me since I arrived in Oxford, and who has been unfailingly generous, encouraging, and supportive. I can thank neither of them sufficiently; they have both read this thesis in its entirety, offering many invaluable suggestions and criticisms. This work would not exist – at least in the form it currently does – without their help.

Secondly, I am very grateful to a number of other scholars who have discussed my research with me, often in considerable detail. In particular, I am indebted to Professor John Blair and Professor Ian Forrest for being searching Transfer of Status examiners, and to Professor Stephen Baxter and Professor John Watts for being probing, yet kind, Confirmation of Status examiners. However, I am also most grateful to Dr Paul Dryburgh and Dr Andy King, who discussed the military activities of the Edwardian episcopate with me; to Professor Gwilym Dodd and Dr Matt Raven, who spoke with me about patronage and petitioning in Edward III's reign; to Professor Anthony Tuck, who met with me to talk about the role of bishops in the reigns of Edward II and Richard II; to Dr Alexandra Gajda, who invited me to Jesus College to talk about the ideas presented in the epilogue; and to Professor Steven Gunn, who not only spoke about clerical taxation with me, but also gave me permission to cite Dr Roger Highfield's unpublished work, as the latter's literary executor.

Thirdly, I am very lucky to have studied at the University of Oxford for a decade, and especially at Christ Church. My college has been a stimulating place to study the past at both an undergraduate and graduate level, which is in large part due to the learning and conviviality of Dr Katya Andreyev, Dr Sarah Mortimer, and Professor Brian Young. But I am also most grateful to the wonderful librarians at the Bodleian, and to the many other medievalists in Oxford who have taught me and inspired me over the years, including some of those already named, as well as Professor Julia Smith and the late Dr Mark Whittow.

Fourthly, I should like to thank Anne Harriss, who gifted me many of the books which belonged to the late Dr Gerald Harriss. These books – enriched and enlivened by many of Gerald's marginal comments and annotations – proved vital over the lockdown period, when libraries were shut, and helped me to continue reading and thinking about the later Middle Ages.

Fifthly, I am profoundly indebted to the work of Dr Alison McHardy and the late Professor Mark Ormrod. While I sometimes challenge their conclusions in this thesis, I am nevertheless aware of how deeply their work has shaped our understanding of both political life and the Church in Edward III's reign, and indeed the later Middle Ages more widely. Without their research, substantial parts of this thesis simply could not have been written. Moreover, it has been a pleasure to meet them both at conferences, where it was a privilege to discuss with them matters from the career of Richard de Bury to the evidential value of episcopal registers.

Sixthly, as someone who has principally funded my doctoral studies through part-time work, I would like to thank those who have offered me employment. I have loved being part of the Welfare Team at Christ Church, where I have had the opportunity to work with many wonderful people, especially Revd. Clare Hayns. It has also been a great pleasure to teach a number of papers to undergraduate students, and I am indebted to the historians at Brasenose College, Christ Church, Regent's Park, St Catherine's College, and Wycliffe Hall, as well as Oxford's Faculty of History, for giving me opportunities to teach. Similarly, I am very grateful to the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography for appointing me to a Research Fellowship in the latter stages of my DPhil, which enabled me to pursue a discrete project on the translations of English bishops between the Norman Conquest and the Reformation. Moreover, I am also thankful to Christ Church for awarding me a Dixon Scholarship, two book grants, and several conference grants; to the Ecclesiastical History Society for awarding me a Conference Bursary, which permitted me to attend their interesting conference on 'The Church and the Law'; and to the Harlaxton Symposium Committee for awarding me a Dobson Scholarship, which allowed me to take part in their excellent conference on 'Death and Dying'.

Finally, I am grateful to numerous other academic friends and colleagues. This includes my fellow doctoral students at Oxford and elsewhere – especially Des Atkinson, Chloe Fairbanks, Alannah Jeune, Susanna Markert, Katie McHugh, Harry Reddish, and Martin Roberts – who have formed an excellent graduate community of which to be a part. Yet this also includes many more established scholars whom I have met at conferences or elsewhere, and who have helped me in a whole host of different ways, from offering valuable advice to providing copies of their work. Of these, I should single out Dr Virginia Bainbridge, Dr Linda Clark, Dr Sally Dormer, Professor Chris Given-Wilson, Dr David Green, Dr Anthony Gross, Dr Natasha Hodgson, Dr Hannes Kleineke, Dr James Ross, and Professor Robert Swanson.

Outside of academia, I am enormously thankful for the continued assistance, love, and forbearance of my family and my friends. I am especially grateful to my girlfriend, Aoife Miralles; to my grandparents, Alan and Rita Lane, Pamela Moore, and the late Roger Moore; and to my parents, Andrew and Julie Lane, for all their unceasing help. It is to them that this thesis is dedicated.

Note

The COVID-19 pandemic has seriously affected this thesis in several ways. First, and most obviously, it severely disrupted access to libraries and archives, particularly during the lockdown period. Secondly, by creating numerous problems and difficulties for students more broadly, it substantially increased the amount of time that I spent on my pastoral duties as the Senior Warden and Interim Welfare Coordinator at Christ Church. Thirdly, I myself contracted COVID-19 in the summer of 2022, which briefly disturbed the editing of this thesis. As a result of all these difficulties – which not only impeded my work during the COVID-19 lockdown itself, but also lay behind significant subsequent restrictions on my time – I have been able to consult fewer archival sources than I had desired. Instead, I have had to rely to a greater extent on the rich range of printed sources (many of which were helpfully made available online during the lockdown period) and the manuscript material that I had already consulted in the National Archives, the British Library, the Bodleian Library, Christ Church, and the Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre.

There are four other matters that I should note at this juncture. First, in common with other recent Oxford doctoral theses,[1] and in accordance with the History Faculty's *Guide to Referencing and Citation*, which states that 'the only absolute rule is that you must be consistent in the style you use', footnote references have been given in 'short form' throughout this thesis. Of course, full references do appear in the bibliography. Secondly, references to *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England* have been given as '*PROME*', followed by the date of the parliament in question (and the month, if there was more than one parliament in the year), and the section number. Thus, for example, a reference to the twenty-fifth section of the roll for the parliament of 1362 would read: *PROME,* 1362, 25.[2] This largely follows the method for citing the *Parliament Rolls* proposed by Benjamin Thompson in his 'Performing Parliament in the *Rotuli Parliamentorum*'.[3] Thirdly, when quoting from Latin and French sources, I have generally simply given the English translation. However, on occasions, I have also given the original (in square brackets after the English translation), for instance when the original phraseology is important to my argument or when dealing with passages of particular literary interest. Finally, all biblical quotes are from the New King James Version.

[1] See, for instance, Caravaggi, 'Keeping the Peace'.
[2] The numerical divisions in *PROME* are not contemporary; they are derived from the eighteenth-century edition of the *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, published between 1767 and 1777 under the general editorship of the Reverend John Strachey, and were retained for convenience.
[3] Thompson, 'Performing Parliament', p. 61, n. 1.

List of Abbreviations

Anglo-Scottish Relations	*Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1174-1328: Some Selected Documents,* ed. E.L.G. Stones (London, 1965).
'Ann. Lond.'	'Annales Londonienses', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II,* ed. W. Stubbs (2 vols., London, 1882-3), i.
'Ann. Paul.'	'Annales Paulini', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, ed. W. Stubbs (2 vols., London, 1882-3), i.
Anonimalle	*The Anonimalle Chronicle, 1333 to 1381,* ed. V.H. Galbraith (Manchester, 1927).
Anonimalle, 1307-1334	*The Anonimalle Chronicle, 1307-1334,* ed. W.R. Childs and J. Taylor (Leeds, 1991).
Anonymi	*Chronicon Anonymi Cantuariensis,* ed. C. Scott-Stokes and C. Given-Wilson (Oxford, 2011).
Appleby	*The Register of Thomas Appleby, bishop of Carlisle, 1363-1395,* ed. R.L. Storey (Woodbridge, 2006).
Baker	*The Chronicle of Geoffrey le Baker,* ed. D. Preest and R. Barber (Woodbridge, 2012).
Bateman	*The Register of William Bateman, Bishop of Norwich, 1344-1355,* ed. P.E. Pobst (2 vols., Woodbridge, 1996-2000).
'Birchington'	'Stephani Birchingtoni, Monachi Cantuarienis, Historia de Archiepiscopis', in *Anglia Sacra,* ed. H. Wharton (2 vols., London, 1691), i.
BL	London, British Library
Black Death	*The Black Death,* ed. R. Horrox (Manchester, 1994).
Bodleian	Oxford, Bodleian Library
Bransford	*A Calendar of the Register of Wolstan de Bransford, bishop of Worcester, 1339-49,* ed. R.M. Haines (London, 1966).
Brantingham	*The Register of Thomas de Brantyngham, Bishop of Exeter (A.D. 1370-1394),* ed. F.C. Hingeston (2 vols., London, 1901-6).
Brinton	*The Sermons of Thomas Brinton, Bishop of Rochester, 1373-1389,* ed. M.A. Devlin (2 vols., London, 1954).
BRUC	A.B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500* (Cambridge, 1963).
BRUO	A.B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500* (3 vols., Oxford, 1957-9).
Brut	*The Brut, or the Chronicles of England,* ed. F.W.D. Brie (2 vols., London, 1906-8).
Buckingham	*Royal Writs Addressed to John Buckingham, Bishop of Lincoln, 1363-1398: Lincoln Register 12B, A Calendar,* ed. A.K. McHardy (Woodbridge, 1997).
Bury	*Richard d'Aungerville de Bury: Fragments of his Register and other documents,* ed. G.W. Kitchin (Durham, 1910).
Canterbury College	*Canterbury College, Oxford,* ed. W.A. Pantin (4 vols., Oxford, 1947-85).
CCR	*Calendar of Close Rolls*
CChR	*Calendar of Charter Rolls*
CDRS	*Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland,* ed. J. Bain, G.G. Simpson, and J.D. Galbraith (5 vols., Edinburgh, 1881-1986).
CFR	*Calendar of Fine Rolls*
Chartulary	*Chartulary of Winchester Cathedral,* ed. A.W. Goodman (Winchester, 1927).

Chronicon Angliae	*Chronicon Angliae, 1328-1388,* ed. E.M. Thompson (London, 1874).
CMR	*Calendar of Memoranda Rolls (Exchequer), 1326-7,* ed. R.E. Latham (London, 1968).
Collegiate Church	*The Collegiate Church of Ottery St Mary: Being the Ordinacio et Statuta Ecclesie Sancte Mariae de Otery,* ed. J.N. Dalton (Cambridge, 1917).
Concilia	*Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae,* ed. D. Wilkins (4 vols., London, 1737).
CPL	*Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters*
CPMR	*Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall,* ed. A.H. Thomas and P.E. Jones (6 vols., Cambridge, 1926-61), i.
CPP	*Calendar of Petitions to the Pope, 1342-1419,* ed. W.H. Bliss (London, 1896).
CPR	*Calendar of Patent Rolls*
Convocation	*Records of Convocation,* ed. G. Bray (20 vols., Woodbridge, 2005-6).
Councils	*Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church, 871-1313,* ed. F.M. Powicke, C.R. Cheney, D. Whitelock, M. Brett, and C. Brooke (Oxford, 3 vols, 1964-81).
Crécy and Calais	*Crécy and Calais, from the Original Records in the Public Record Office,* ed. G. Wrottesley (London, 1898).
Crécy Casebook	*The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook,* ed. K. DeVries and M. Livingston (Liverpool, 2015).
Decrees	*Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils,* ed. N.P. Tanner (2 vols., London, 1990), i.
DNB	*Dictionary of National Biography*
DRUCC	*Documents Relating to the University and Colleges of Cambridge* (3 vols., Cambridge, 1852).
Edington	*The Register of William Edington, Bishop of Winchester, 1346-1366,* ed. S.F. Hockey (2 vols., Southampton, 1986-7).
EDR	*Ely Diocesan Remembrancer* (26 vols., Cambridge, 1885-1915).
EHD II	*English Historical Documents II, 1042-1189,* 2nd edn, ed. D.C. Douglas and G.W. Greenaway (London, 1981).
EHD III	*English Historical Documents III, 1189-1327,* ed. H. Rothwell (London, 1975).
EHD IV	*English Historical Documents IV, 1327-1485,* ed. A.R. Myers (London, 1969).
EHD V	*English Historical Documents V, 1485-1558,* ed. C.H. Williams (London, 1967).
EMDP	*English Medieval Diplomatic Practice,* ed. P. Chaplais (2 vols., London, 1975-82).
English Works	*The English Works of John Wyclif, Hitherto Unprinted,* ed. F.D. Matthew (London, 1880).
Eulogii	*Continuatio Eulogii: The Continuation of the Eulogium Historiarum, 1364-1413,* ed. C. Given-Wilson (Oxford, 2019).
Fasti	*Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541,* ed. J. Le Neve, H.P.F. King, and J.M. Horn (12 vols., London, 1962-7).
Foedera	*Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae et Cujuscunque Generis Acta Publica Inter Reges Angliae,* ed. T. Rymer (7 vols., London, 1816-19).

French Chronicle	*Chronicles of the Mayors and Sheriffs of London, A.D. 1188 to A.D. 1274, and the French Chronicle of London, A.D. 1259 to A.D. 1343,* ed. H.T. Riley (London, 1863).
Froissart	*Chroniques de J. Froissart,* ed. S. Luce (8 vols., Paris, 1869-88).
Grandisson	*The Register of John Grandisson, Bishop of Exeter (A.D. 1327-1369), With Some Account of the Episcopate of James de Berkeley (A.D. 1327),* ed. F.C. Hingeston (3 vols., London, 1894-99).
Halton	*The Register of John de Halton, Bishop of Carlisle, 1292- 1324,* ed. W.N. Thompson and T.F. Tout (2 vols., London, 1913).
HBC	*Handbook of British Chronology,* ed. E.B. Fryde, D. Greenway, S. Porter, and I. Roy (Cambridge, 1996).
Hethe	*Registrum Hamonis Hethe, Diocesis Roffensis, A.D. 1319-1352,* ed. C. Johnson (2 vols., Oxford, 1948).
Historia Anglicana	*Thomae Walsingham, Quondam Monachi S. Albani, Historia Anglicana,* ed. H.T. Riley (2 vols., London, 1863-4).
Historia Roffensis	BL, MS Faustina B.V.
Historians of the Church of York	*The Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops,* ed. J. Raine (3 vols., 1879-94), ii.
Historical Papers	*Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Registers,* ed. J. Raine (London, 1873).
'Illustrative Documents'	'Illustrative Documents', ed. M. Arvanigian and A. Leopold, in D. Rollason and M. Prestwich (ed.), *The Battle of Neville's Cross, 1346* (Stamford, 1998).
Jean le Bel	*The True Chronicles of Jean le Bel, 1290-1360,* ed. N. Bryant (Woodbridge, 2011).
John of Reading	*Chronica Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis, 1346-1367,* ed. J. Tait (Manchester, 1914).
Kirkby	*The Register of John Kirkby, bishop of Carlisle, 1332-1352, and the Register of John Ross, bishop of Carlisle, 1325-32,* ed. R.L. Storey (2 vols., Woodbridge, 1993-5).
Knighton	*Knighton's Chronicle,* ed. G.H. Martin (Oxford, 1995).
Lanercost	*The Chronicle of Lanercost, 1272-1346,* ed. H. Maxwell (Glasgow, 1913).
Langham	*Registrum Simonis Langham, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi,* ed. A.C. Wood (Oxford, 1956).
Letters of Robert Grosseteste	*Letters of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln,* ed. F.A.C. Mantello and J. Goering (Toronto, 2010).
Lewis Charlton	*The Register of Lewis de Charlton, Bishop of Hereford (A.D. 1361-1369),* ed. J.H. Parry (Hereford, 1913).
Life and Campaigns	*The Life and Campaigns of the Black Prince,* ed. R. Barber (Woodbridge, 1979).
Lit. Cant.	*Literae Cantuarienses,* ed. J.B. Sheppard (3 vols., London, 1887-9).
Martival	*The Registers of Roger Martival, Bishop of Salisbury, 1315-1330,* ed. K. Edwards, C.R. Elrington, D.M. Owen, and S. Reynolds (4 vols., Oxford, 1959-75).
Melsa	*Chronica Monasterii de Melsa,* ed. E.A. Bond (3 vols., London, 1866-9).
Melton	*The Register of William Melton, Archbishop of York, 1317-40,* ed. R.M.T. Hill, R. Brocklesby, T.C.B. Timmins, and D. Robinson (5 vols., Woodbridge, 1977-).
Milemete	*The Treatise De Nobilitatibus, Sapientiis, et Prudentiis Regum,* ed. M.R. James (London, 1913).

Montacute	*Calendar of the Register of Simon de Montacute, Bishop of Worcester, 1334-1337*, ed. R.M. Haines (Worcester, 1996).
Murimuth	*Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum,* ed. E.M. Thompson (London, 1889).
NCA	New College Archives
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*
Orleton (Hereford)	*Registrum Ade de Orleton, Episcopi Herefordensis, 1317-27*, ed. A.T. Bannister (London, 1908).
Orleton (Worcester)	*A Calendar of the Register of Adam de Orleton, Bishop of Worcester, 1327-1333*, ed. R.M. Haines (London, 1979).
Parliamentary Texts	*Parliamentary Texts of the Later Middle Ages,* ed. N. Pronay and J. Taylor (Oxford, 1980).
Philobiblon	*The Love of Books: The Philobiblon of Richard de Bury,* ed. E.C. Thomas (London, 1903).
Political Poems	*Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History Composed During the Period from the Accession of Edward III to that of Richard III,* ed. T. Wright (2 vols., London, 1859-61).
Political Thought	*Political Thought in Early Fourteenth-Century England: Treatises by Walter of Milemete, William of Pagula, and William of Ockham,* ed. C.J. Nederman (Tempe, 2002).
Proctors	*Proctors for Parliament: Clergy, Community, and Politics, c. 1248-1539,* ed. A. McHardy and P. Bradford (2 vols., Woodbridge, 2017-18).
PROME	*Parliament Rolls of Medieval England, 1275-1504,* ed. C. Given-Wilson *et al.* (16 vols., London, 2005).
RDP	*Reports from the Lords Committees Touching the Dignity of a Peer of the Realm* (5 vols., London, 1829).
Register of the Black Prince	*The Register of Edward, the Black Prince, Preserved in the Public Record Office*, ed. A.E. Stamp and M.C.B. Dawes (4 vols., London, 1930-3).
Reign of Richard II	*The Reign of Richard II: From Minority to Tyranny, 1377-97,* ed. A.K. McHardy (Manchester, 2012).
Revolution	*Chronicles of the Revolution, 1397-1400,* ed. C. Given-Wilson (Manchester, 1993).
Rot. Parl.	*Rotuli Parliamentorum,* ed. J. Strachey *et al.* (6 vols., London, 1767-77).
Rot. Scot.	*Rotuli Scotiae in Turri Londinensi* (2 vols., London, 1814).
RPD	*Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense: The Register of Richard de Kellawe, Lord Palatine and Bishop of Durham, 1311-16,* ed. T.D. Hardy (4 vols., London, 1873-8).
Select Documents	*Select Documents of English Constitutional History,* ed. G.B. Adams and H.M. Stephens (London, 1901).
Select Documents, 1307-1485	*Select Documents of English Constitutional History, 1307-1485* ed. S.B. Chrimes and A.L. Brown (London, 1961).
Selected Sermons	*Preaching in the Age of Chaucer: Selected Sermons in Translation,* ed. S. Wenzel (Washington D.C., 2008).
Shrewsbury	*The Register of Ralph of Shrewsbury, Bishop of Bath of Wells, 1329-1363: From the Original in the Registry at Wells* (2 vols., London, 1896).
Stratford	*The Register of John de Stratford, Bishop of Winchester, 1323-1333*, ed. R.M. Haines (Woking, 2010-11).
Sudbury (London)	*Registrum Simonis de Sudbiria, Diocesis Londoniennsis, A.D. 1362-1375* (2 vols., London, 1927-38).
SR	*Statutes of the Realm* (11 vols., London, 1810-28).

Statutes	*Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford* (3 vols., London, 1853).
TCD	*Iohannis Wycliffe, Tractatus De Civili Dominio,* ed. R. Lane Poole, J. Loserth, and F.D. Matthew (4 vols., London, 1885-1904).
TDMD	*Tractatus de Mandatis Divinis Accedit Tractatus De Statu Innocencie,* ed. J. Loserth and F.D. Matthew (London, 1922).
TDOR	*Tractatus De Officio Regis,* ed. A.W. Pollard and C. Sayle (London, 1886).
Thomas Charlton	*Registrum Thome de Charlton, Episcopi Herefordensis, 1327-1344,* ed. W.W. Capes (London, 1913).
TNA	Kew, The National Archives
Tracts	*Tracts and Treatises of John Wyclif,* ed. R. Vaughan (London, 1845).
Trillek	*Registrum Johannis de Trillek, Episcopi Herefordensis, 1344-1361,* ed. J.H. Parry (London, 1912).
Vita Edwardi	*Vita Edwardi Secundi,* ed. W.R. Childs (Oxford, 2005).
Walsingham	*The St Albans Chronicle: The Chronica Maiora of Thomas Walsingham,* ed. J. Taylor, W. Childs, and L. Watkiss (2 vols., Oxford, 2003-11).
Warren's Book	*Warren's Book,* ed. A.W.W. Dale (Cambridge, 1911).
Welton	*The Register of Gilbert Welton, bishop of Carlisle, 1353-1362,* ed. R.L. Storey (Woodbridge, 2009).
Westminster	*The Westminster Chronicle, 1381-1394,* ed. L.C. Hector and B. Harvey (Oxford, 1982).
Winchelsey	*Registrum Roberti Winchelsey, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi,* ed. R. Graham (2 vols., Oxford, 1952-6).
Wykeham	*Wykeham's Register,* ed. T.F. Kirkby (2 vols., Winchester, 1896-99).

List of Appendices:

Appendix 1	List of Edward III's Bishops by (Arch)Diocese
Appendix 2	Bishops from Aristocratic Families
Appendix 3	The Experience of Bishops Before their Elevations to the Episcopate and/or Before the Reign of Edward III
Appendix 4	Bishops who Served the Pope Prior to their Elevations to the Episcopate
Appendix 5	Religious Bishops
Appendix 6	The Higher Education of the Edwardian Episcopate
Appendix 7	The Higher Education of Bishops at the Beginning and End of Edward III's Reign
Appendix 8	Chancellors in the Reign of Edward III
Appendix 9	Treasurers in the Reign of Edward III
Appendix 10	Diplomatic Powers Given to Edward III's Bishops
Appendix 11	Instances on which Edward III Dispatched Commissions of Oyer and Terminer to Investigate Complaints by Bishops whose Lands he had taken into his 'Special Protection'
Appendix 12	Pardons Interceded for in the Reign of Edward III by the Clergy and the Titled Nobility
Appendix 13	Patronage with Recorded Justifications
Appendix 14	Episcopal Translations in the Reign of Edward III
Appendix 15	The Amount of Time in Which Bishops Served the Crown as Diplomats and Ministers
Appendix 16	A Breakdown of the Patronage Received by Bishops in the Reign of Edward III
Appendix 17	Patronage Received by Bishops
Appendix 18	Cases Where Bishops were the Ultimate Beneficiary of Patronage (Where Edward Granted Others a Licence to Grant Property to Them)
Appendix 19	Patronage Granted to Others at the Request of Bishops
Appendix 20	The Patronage Obtained by Bishops: A Summary
Appendix 21	List of Embassies Headed by Bishops from Enrolled Accounts (as Identified by Mirot and Déprez and Corrected by Larson)
Appendix 22	Mortmain Licences Granted to Bishops
Appendix 23	The Chronological Distribution of Patronage Received by Bishops
Appendix 24	Requests for Special Liturgical Efforts Connected with Royal Wars
Appendix 25	List of Parliaments and Representative Councils in the Reign of Edward III
Appendix 26	List of Convocations and Provincial Councils in the Reign of Edward III
Appendix 27	Parliaments and Convocations that met Concurrently
Appendix 28	The Givers of Opening Sermons and Speeches in Edward III's Parliaments
Appendix 29	Parliamentary Triers of Petitions in the Reign of Edward III
Appendix 30	Episcopal Triers of Petitions in the Reign of Edward III – A Summary
Appendix 31	Bishops and SC10 Parliamentary Proxies in the Reign of Edward II
Appendix 32	Bishops and SC10 Parliamentary Proxies in the Reign of Edward III
Appendix 33	Bishops and SC10 Parliamentary Proxies in the Reign of Edward III – A Summary
Appendix 34	Parliamentary Proxies Recorded in Episcopal Registers for the Reign of Edward II

Appendix 35	Parliamentary Proxies Recorded in Episcopal Registers for the Reign of Edward III
Appendix 36	Bishops and Parliamentary Proxies in both SC10 and Registers – A Summary
Appendix 37	John Grandisson's Attendance at Parliaments
Appendix 38	Patronage Received by Bishops During Parliaments
Appendix 39	Patronage Obtained by Bishops for Others During Parliaments
Appendix 40	Clerical Subsidies in the Reign of Edward I
Appendix 41	Clerical Subsidies in the Reign of Edward II
Appendix 42	Clerical Subsidies in the Reign of Edward III
Appendix 43	Direct Lay Taxation in the Reign of Edward I
Appendix 44	Direct Lay Taxation in the Reign of Edward II
Appendix 45	Direct Lay Taxation in the Reign of Edward III
Appendix 46	Papal Subsidies in the Reign of Edward I
Appendix 47	Papal Subsidies in the Reign of Edward II
Appendix 48	Papal Subsidies in the Reign of Edward III
Appendix 49	Overall Amounts Paid by the Clergy in Direct Taxation in the Reigns of Edward I, Edward II, and Edward III
Appendix 50	Overall Amounts Received by the Crown from the Taxation of the Clergy in the Reigns of Edward I, Edward II, and Edward III
Appendix 51	The Amounts Received by the Crown from the Direct Taxation of the Clergy and the Laity in the Reigns of Edward I, Edward II, and Edward III
Appendix 52	The Proportion of Royal Revenue from Direct Taxation Received from Lay Taxation, Clerical Taxation, and Papal Subsidies in the Reigns of Edward I, Edward II, and Edward III
Appendix 53	Amount Paid in Direct Taxation by the Clergy and the Laity on a Decade-by-Decade Basis from 1272 to 1377
Appendix 54	The Income of the Bishops of the Southern Province According to the *Taxatio* of 1291

Short Abstract

This thesis explores the political activities of the English episcopate in the reign of Edward III. It argues that bishops served the king in a variety of different ways during the mid-fourteenth century, as administrators, diplomats, military leaders, propagandists, parliamentarians, and financiers of the crown. Moreover, it highlights how their roles were of great importance for the king and his regime, and how prelates were well-positioned to perform them. However, it also shows that the involvement of bishops in politics did not merely serve the interests of the crown, but also those of the realm, the Church, and the prelates themselves. Nonetheless, the episcopacy was not obliged to support the king, and was indeed capable of opposing him, as was notably the case in the reigns of both Edward II and Richard II. As such, this thesis posits that Edward III's kingship was not marked by an oppressive expansion of royal authority over pliant religious leaders, but rather by a successful alliance between 'Church' and 'State', which stands apart from the tumult, discontent, and quarrels of his father's and grandson's reigns.

Long Abstract

My introduction assesses the relevant historiography, and outlines how my thesis will contribute to it. It surveys how remarkably our understanding of both the late medieval Church and the late medieval nobility has been transformed in the past seventy-five years. However, in spite of this transformation, historians – such as John Thomson, Roy Martin Haines, and Scott Waugh – have continued to write about the later medieval episcopate's involvement in politics in broadly similar ways to their Victorian predecessors. In particular, they have repeated the claim that prelates failed to live up to the examples set by Anselm, Thomas Becket, and Robert Winchelsey, and that they accordingly sacrificed and undermined ecclesiastical interests. My introduction then posits that an exploration of the political activities of Edward III's episcopate is a sound way to re-appraise this subject, since there are plentiful sources illuminating prelates' involvement in politics, and because the Edwardian episcopal bench has been decidedly under-studied, even by the standards of surrounding reigns. Thereafter, it sets out how my thesis will approach Edward III's episcopacy, justifying the decision to consider bishops collectively, and their involvement in politics thematically, before offering a brief prosopographical overview of the Edwardian episcopate, and an assessment of how prelates perceived their duties, responsibilities, and interests. Finally, it makes the point that, while it is necessary to consider the episcopate's political activities thematically, those activities nevertheless intertwined and overlapped, in both theoretical and practical terms.

My first, and longest, chapter – entitled '"Good Advice of the Prelates": Bishops and the King's Administration' – evaluates the involvement of bishops in the king's domestic government and diplomatic service. First, it analyses their place in Edward's administration, considering prelates' roles as chancellors, treasurers, councillors, and diplomats. Secondly, it appraises the value of episcopal ministers and diplomats for the king's regime, highlighting how bishops were often more available, more experienced, more highly educated, wealthier, and of a superior social status than many of the crown's other candidates for ministerial or diplomatic office. This all contributed to their ability to perform their roles (for the most part) effectively and successfully. Thirdly, it considers bishops' motivations for serving in the king's bureaucracy, arguing that prelates were able to reconcile their spiritual and secular duties on both an ideological and practical level; that their political activities could bring substantial benefits to the Church; and that their role in government could also further their own careers. Fourthly, it contemplates the patronage obtained by prelates, showing that episcopal ministers and diplomats received dramatically more patronage than bishops who were not involved in government to the same extent, and demonstrating how bishops could use this not only to advance their own interests, and those of their friends and families, but also those of the *ecclesia anglicana*. Finally, it emphasises that bishops were not obliged to serve the crown in a ministerial or diplomatic capacity, with prelates being able to resign their offices, or retire from their work for a variety of reasons, ranging

from ill health to wanting to devote more of their time to clerical matters. Indeed, when bishops seriously objected to the king's behaviour, they were able to use their understanding of government to assist his opponents and attempt to bring about political reform, as in 1310-11 and 1385-6.

My second chapter – entitled '"The Defence of the Realm": Bishops and Edward III's Wars' – analyses the military activities of the Edwardian episcopate. It assesses bishops' roles in fighting on overseas raids and expeditions, fighting on the Anglo-Scottish border, guarding the peripheries of the English realm, bolstering defensive fortifications, recruiting and arraying forces, and providing Edward's armies with resources and logistical support. It then argues that their martial roles were very important to the crown, and that they were ideally suited to carry them out, with lands throughout the kingdom from which they could base themselves and draw supplies and men; a place at the peak of political society and the Church's administrative structure; and sufficient wealth to provide the crown with manpower and goods at their own cost or without receiving payment for several years. Thereafter, it shows that participating in Edward's wars could serve prelates' political, ecclesiastical, and personal interests. For instance, by helping to ward off Scottish invasions, northern bishops defended not only the realm, but also their diocesan estates and those of their clergy, as well as their personal manors and those of their friends and families. Finally, it shows that bishops could refuse to serve in royal armies, and that they were also prepared to use their military capabilities to oppose the crown should the situation demand, as in 1312, 1327, 1399, and 1405.

My third chapter – entitled '"Thanksgivings and Prayers": Bishops and Royal Propaganda' – evaluates the episcopate's role in disseminating the king's propaganda. First, it sets out how bishops directed the saying of prayers, the holding of processions, and the preaching of sermons *etc.* in support of the crown and the king's expeditions. Secondly, it argues that these propagandist activities made a real impact on the English people, challenging some of the doubts about their efficacy that have previously been raised. Thirdly, it argues that – by organising these special liturgical efforts, which they believed would have a material effect on English military fortunes – bishops furthered the interests of the kingdom, the Church, and their own family members and friends. Lastly, it highlights how bishops were not obliged to preach in support of the government, and that they could also criticise it in trenchant terms in sermons and written texts, as in 1327, 1340-1, 1376, 1397, and 1405.

My fourth chapter – entitled '"To Discuss and Legislate for the Good State of the Country": Bishops and the English Parliament' – considers how bishops participated in Edward III's parliaments. It highlights how they were involved throughout the whole course of parliaments, and in the breadth of parliament's 'functions', from providing the king with counsel to granting taxation. This leads to a consideration of how important bishops were at parliaments, with the king's desperation to have them present at sessions, the disruption caused when they failed to turn up, and the diplomatic of parliamentary material all suggesting that they were vital to assemblies. The chapter then assesses how

attendance at parliaments fulfilled bishops' perception of their role and responsibilities, and indeed served the interests of the kingdom, of the Church, and of prelates themselves, as they assented to statutes that they felt would benefit the political community, presented *gravamina* which represented the concerns of the *ecclesia anglicana*, and obtained patronage which bolstered their own positions. It proceeds to challenge the arguments – made most notably by Mark Ormrod – that prelates increasingly failed to attend parliaments as Edward III's reign progressed. Instead, through analysing a wide range of evidence – from episcopal registers to parliamentary petitions – the chapter demonstrates that prelates appear to have turned up to parliament in increasing numbers, and that they continued to use the assembly as a venue to secure the redress of their grievances. Finally, it shows how the episcopacy were prepared to use parliament as a forum to challenge the king when the need arose, as in 1310, 1327, 1341, 1376, and 1399.

My final chapter – entitled "Various Taxes and Tallages": Bishops and Clerical Taxation' – appraises the episcopate's contribution to royal finances. First, it sets out how prelates played an important role in procuring, collecting, and paying clerical subsidies, lay subsidies, and papal subsidies. Secondly, it evaluates how the episcopacy's contribution to taxes served bishops' political, ecclesiastical, and personal interests, as they – for example – ceded money that was spent on the realm's defence and demanded that the king confirmed clerical privileges as a condition of grants. Thirdly, it highlights how the clergy could refuse to make grants to the crown, as in 1330, 1338, and 1376. Fourthly, it takes issue with the argument that the Church paid tax at an unprecedented level throughout Edward III's reign. In fact, the clergy paid less tax on an annual basis than they had done in the reigns of both Edward I and Edward II, largely due to their success in bargaining with the crown and the dramatic decline in the frequency of papal taxation. Lastly, it suggests that it might have been the limited level of clerical taxation – as opposed to the episcopacy's cowardice – that explains why prelates did not fiercely criticise the crown's financial demands in the latter half of Edward III's reign. This is consistent with how the episcopate was willing to oppose perceived financial threats to the Church in the reigns of both Richard II and Henry IV, most notably in 1384 and 1405.

My conclusion summarises the arguments of my thesis, which have necessarily been compressed in this abstract, and explores their ramifications for our understanding of the later Middle Ages more broadly. It highlights how bishops carried out a wide range of political roles in the reign of Edward III, how their work was of the utmost importance for the crown, and how prelates were ideally situated to discharge their duties. However, it also emphasises that bishops' political activities fulfilled their own expectations of their responsibilities, that their involvement in politics benefited the realm and the Church, and that it could serve their own interests. Moreover, it stresses how bishops were not obliged to dedicate themselves to secular matters, and that they could even – when they disagreed with the direction of royal policy – preach against the government, join opposition movements, and march against the king. The relationship between the crown and the episcopacy was thus symbiotic. When the

king treated the Church with respect – as was the case for the majority of Edward's own reign – he received support, respect, and aid from the prelacy. But when he acted in a high- and heavy-handed manner towards the clergy, that neither served clerical interests nor his own, since the episcopate could ally with disgruntled laymen to oppose – and even topple – unpopular regimes. All this has a number of consequences for the study of later medieval England, above all that political historians should pay close attention to the episcopacy.

The epilogue to my thesis explores how the relationship between the crown and the prelacy changed between the fourteenth century and the Henrician Reformation. In short, it argues that the balance of power between the king and the bishops shifted decidedly in the former's favour over the course of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. While the bishops relied on the king as they always had done – for their own appointments, as well as to protect the Church's liberties, to enforce ecclesiastical censures, and to defend themselves and their lands from domestic disorder and foreign invasion – the king relied on them to a lesser extent, as they appear to have become increasingly less important administratively, diplomatically, financially, and militarily. This seems to have stemmed from the broadening of political society, which gave the king an alternative cadre of literate, competent, and politically engaged men to call upon if he so desired. Although the Reformation was the outcome of many different factors, it is possible that this helps to explain why Henry VIII was able to consider such a bold assault on the Church, far beyond that contemplated by any of his predecessors, when bishops played a more prominent role in public life, and the crown relied on the episcopacy to a greater degree.

The appendices to my thesis set out much of the data on which my conclusions have been founded. There are fifty-four of them, and they mostly divide into four main categories. First, six appendices provide information about the social and educational background of bishops, and their pre-episcopal careers, such as Appendix 2, which details the bishops who came from aristocratic families, and Appendix 6, which summarises the experience of higher education of the Edwardian episcopate. Secondly, nine appendices provide details of the patronage obtained by the episcopacy, such as Appendix 17, which sets out the patronage received by bishops themselves, and Appendix 19, which charts the patronage which was granted to others at the request of prelates. Thirdly, twelve appendices deal with the Edwardian episcopate's attendance at parliaments, such as Appendix 29, which details those appointed as triers of petitions, and Appendix 36, which records the bishops who appointed proctors to represent them at assemblies. Finally, fourteen appendices detail the lay, clerical, and papal subsidies granted in the reigns of Edward I, Edward II, and Edward III, such as Appendix 42, which sets out the clerical subsidies ceded in the reign of Edward III, and Appendix 53, which estimates the amount paid in direct taxation by both the clergy and the laity in each decade between 1272 and 1377.

Introduction

In February 1512, John Colet, dean of St Paul's, delivered one of the most famous sermons of the later Middle Ages.[1] Addressing the convocation of the province of Canterbury, he launched a stinging attack on the shortcomings of the clergy, and argued passionately for the reform of the Church. Describing the state of the Church as 'foul and evil-favoured', he proceeded to castigate many of the apparent abuses of clerics, criticising the 'cruel and odious pestilence' of simony; the problems of absenteeism, from which 'many evils grow'; and the 'filths and uncleanliness' of ecclesiastical courts.[2] Yet one particular concern of Colet's was the involvement of the clergy in secular politics, which 'spotteth and maketh ill favoured the face of the church'. He rebuked how 'priests and bishops nowadays doth busy themselves… [in] secular occupation', and portrayed them as in the thrall of the crown, for 'they dare neither do nor say but such things as they know to be pleasant and thankful to their princes'. In turn, this dishonoured the dignity of priesthood, led to the clerical office being despised, imperilled the souls of the laity, and confused 'the beautiful order and holy dignity of the church'.[3]

Colet's vivid picture of the later medieval Church – as a cesspit of moral vice and decrepitude, subservient to, and exploited by, royal authority – was once accepted by most historians, and was seen as the backdrop to the great religious upheavals of the sixteenth century.[4] This was expressed most explicitly and influentially by A.G. Dickens. Dickens condemned the 'many weaknesses of the Church', including 'the conduct of avaricious and mundane clergymen', the 'genuine abuses' of ecclesiastical courts, and the 'cautious and unimaginative' episcopate, who were 'always busied by secular duties' as 'they spent their lives working for the king' as 'civil servants, ambassadors, and royal councillors'. Indeed, he contended that the Church's failings were such that they 'could hardly have resulted in less than a series of radical readjustments between England and Rome, still more between Church and State, most inevitably of all between the clerical order and lay society'.[5] However, in the last fifty years, a vast body of scholarship has overhauled our understanding of the clergy's moral and pastoral inadequacies.[6] Whereas once later medieval clergy were seen as routinely idle and neglectful, they are

---

[1] For more detailed treatment of this sermon, see Harper-Bill, 'Convocation Sermon'; Gleason, *John Colet,* p. 72; Arnold, *John Colet,* pp. 108-35; and Thompson, 'Polemic', pp. 189-97.
[2] *EHD V,* pp. 652, 657-8.
[3] *Ibid.,* pp. 654-5.
[4] Unless otherwise obvious from the context, this thesis will use 'Church' to refer to the Church as an institution – with its hierarchies, personnel, and administrative machinery – rather than in the sense of all Christian people. Nonetheless, while detailed exploration of this is beyond the scope of this thesis, it must be noted that there was no monolithic 'Church': Thompson, 'Prelates and Politics', p. 89; Ruddick, *English Identity,* p. 260; Forrest, 'Continuity and Change'.
[5] Dickens, *English Reformation,* pp. 42, 326-7.
[6] In addition to the specific examples cited below, see also Scarisbrick, *Reformation and the English People,* pp. 1-60; Haigh, *English Reformations,* pp. 25-87; and Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars.* For a marvellous survey of the work on the later medieval Church in the latter half of the twentieth century, see also Heath, 'Between Reform and Reformation'.

now seen as having been more dutiful and devoted to their flocks.[7] Whereas once priests were thought to have been frequently lecherous and sexually immoral, they are now seen as having been customarily upright members of their communities.[8] Whereas once Church courts were depicted as arbitrary and oppressive, they are now seen as having been more effective and conscientious.[9] And whereas the entire priesthood was once seen as essentially loathed, despised, and hated by a substantial portion of the population, it is now seen as having fulfilled the expectations of most medieval English people.[10] As with all historiographical *bouleversements*, numerous caveats, complexities, and nuances have come to light,[11] but the fact remains that our understanding of the clergy's apparent moral corruption has been transformed, to the extent that it would be all but unrecognisable to most historians writing half a century ago.[12]

In the last seventy-five years, a similarly dramatic historiographical revision has taken place with regard to the later medieval nobility. In the later nineteenth century, the prevailing view was summed up by J.R. Green, who depicted the aristocracy and the crown as existing in almost intrinsic conflict with one another, stemmfing from their essentially divergent interests. He further pronounced that nobles had become 'as lawless and dissolute at home as they were greedy and cruel abroad', with the fifteenth-century magnate's aims consisting of 'little more than a lust for gold, a longing after plunder, after the pillage of farms, the sack of cities, [and] the ransom of captives'.[13] Yet the seminal work of K.B. McFarlane in the mid-twentieth century – followed and developed by his intellectual descendants – has overthrown many of these presumptions.[14] Whereas once the nobility was seen as being in virtually inevitable conflict with the crown, now there is a greater understanding of how royal and aristocratic interests actually intertwined and interlocked, with their respective authorities relying and depending on each other.[15] Whereas once it was thought that the nobility's overriding political focus was bloodshed and self-aggrandisement, now the aristocracy is seen as a group of individuals with a much wider and more sophisticated variety of concerns, objectives, and preoccupations.[16] And whereas magnates were once seen as selfish and unscrupulous, now there is a deeper sense of the importance of the

[7] Coulton, 'Priests and People', pp. 137-8; Thiery, *Polluting the Sacred*, p. 172.
[8] Heath, *Parish Clergy*, pp. 104-8; Marshall, *Heretics and Believers*, pp. 45-6.
[9] Parker, *English Reformation*, pp. 12-13; Harper-Bill, *Pre-Reformation Church*, pp. 54-63.
[10] Conacher, 'Reformation in England', p. 55; Haigh, 'Anticlericalism', pp. 57-9.
[11] See Shagan, *Popular Politics*; Marshall, 'Anticlericalism Revested?', pp. 365-80; and Bernard, *Late Medieval English Church*.
[12] See Groom, 'Piety, Heresy and Anti-clericalism', pp. 381-2; Marshall, '(Re)defining the English Reformation', pp. 564-60; and Aers and Smith, 'English Reformations', p. 426.
[13] Green, *History of the English People*, ii, p. 15.
[14] McFarlane, *Nobility*, pp. 120-1. Other significant studies of the later medieval nobility (in addition to those specifically cited below) include Tuck, *Richard II*; Rawcliffe, *The Staffords*; Given-Wilson, *English Nobility*; Bothwell, *English Peerage*; and Spencer, *Nobility and Kingship*. For other important works which adopt the perspectives outlined below, see also Watts, *Henry VI*; Castor, *King, Crown, and Duchy of Lancaster*; Carpenter, 'Introduction'; and Gundy, *Rebel Earl*.
[15] Tout, *Chapters*, iii, p. 327; Raven, 'Comital Power', p. 274.
[16] Green, *History of the English People*, ii, p. 15; Carpenter, *Locality and Polity*, p. 1.

constitutional ideas, cultures, and practices which they operated within, and sought to uphold, develop, and defend.[17] Of course, there has been dissent and controversy, and various subtleties and exceptions have been pointed out, but once again the broad historiographical landscape has been recast in a radical and stimulating fashion.[18]

However, the clergy's apparent political failings have by no means received the same attention and rehabilitation as their spiritual vices, and the ecclesiastical hierarchy by no means the same interest as their lay counterparts.[19] Accordingly, the image conjured up by Colet in the reign of Henry VIII, and accepted by scholars for hundreds of years – of a Church suffering because of its leaders' deference to the demands of successive kings, with whom their interests naturally conflicted – has in many ways endured, and is still apparent today. The story is a familiar one. Once upon a time, bishops and archbishops had been strong-willed and strong-minded, and engaged in fierce stand-offs with the crown. Anselm had clashed with William Rufus and Henry I; Thomas Becket had suffered martyrdom after rowing with Henry II; Stephen Langton had fought with John; and John Pecham and Robert Winchelsey had figuratively crossed swords with Edward I.[20] Yet in the later Middle Ages, and especially after the archiepiscopate of John Stratford, who did quarrel with Edward III in 1340-1, the story goes that the bishops failed to stand up for the Church against the crown, and instead increasingly yielded to the whims, preferences, and policies of monarchs, even when they ran contrary to ecclesiastical interests.[21]

One can find this story throughout the historiography. It is easily discerned in Victorian scholarship; William Stubbs wrote of how thirteenth-century prelates had 'quarrel[ed] with the royal power… in the spirit of Becket', but that their successors were 'silent or acquiescent', even while others insisted on the reform of abuses.[22] These assessments were by no means confined to academia, but were also manifest in more popular works. For instance, in his *Everyman's History of the English Church,* Percy Dearmer lamented how:

> Under the misrule of Edward II abuses grew up, society was demoralized, the bishops were on the whole of low repute and unpopular; the age of great men was over. This condition continued under Edward III.[23]

---

[17] Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, ii, pp. 305-6; Watts, 'Ideas, Principles and Politics', pp. 111-13, 117-19.
[18] See Britnell and Pollard, 'Introduction', pp. xi-xii; Carpenter, *Wars of the Roses,* pp. 16-26; Burt, 'Local Government', p. 55; and Raven, 'Tout and the Higher Nobility', p. 153.
[19] There have, however, been several stimulating discussions of the subject, of which some of the most interesting are Heath, *Church and Realm*; Swanson, *Church and Society*, pp. 89-139; and Thompson, 'Prelates and Politics'.
[20] For accounts of these episodes, see Southern, *Saint Anselm,* pp. 228-307; Barlow, *Thomas Becket,* pp. 88-250; Powicke, *Stephen Langton,* pp. 75-128; Douie, *Archbishop Pecham,* pp. 302-21; and Denton, *Robert Winchelsey,* pp. 100-211.
[21] For the most thorough account of Stratford's conflict with Edward III, see Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 278-327.
[22] Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, ii, pp. 403, 418. See also Trevelyan, *Age of Wycliffe,* pp. 106-12 and Capes, *English Church,* pp. 63-6, 95-6.
[23] Dearmer, *English Church,* pp. 73-4.

Yet while the harsh verdict on the lay aristocracy was challenged in the 1950s, the negative assessment of their clerical colleagues became even more entrenched. Roger Highfield opined that, after the death of Stratford, 'the leaders of the English Church… were neither as independent nor as outspoken as many of their predecessors had been'; F.D. Blackley bemoaned that bishops in the fourteenth century no longer acted 'like Becket or Peckham [Pecham]'; and William Abel Pantin exclaimed that, in the same period, 'one might have expected to find more men of the calibre of Langton, Grosseteste, Pecham, or Winchelsey, but that was not to be'.[24] These arguments – made by fine scholars in pioneering studies – proved profoundly influential, and have been re-echoed by distinguished historians ever since. For example, John Thomson stated that the higher clergy of the later Middle Ages 'showed no desire to emulate Becket in standing for ecclesiastical liberties against the king'; Roy Martin Haines averred that 'after Stratford, there were few archbishops prepared to stand up to secular authority in the church's interests'; and Scott Waugh remarked that fourteenth-century bishops 'failed to maintain the tradition of staunch defiance of royal power and defence of the church's liberties that stretched back to Anselm'.[25]

Yet despite – or perhaps because of – the ubiquity and acceptance of this story, few scholars have actually examined the political activities of the leaders of the English Church in any depth. Moreover, even those who have done so have principally focused on narrower (although still important) questions rather than challenging, or confirming, this overarching narrative. This may reflect the reluctance of many political historians to consider the Church in any detail,[26] and how many religious historians have shied away from discussing the crown, instead preferring to stick to more purely ecclesiastical matters.[27] Although some excellent work has been done on specific topics, there have been few wide-ranging treatments since R.G. Davies' monumental thesis on the episcopate from 1375 to 1443, in which he conceded that 'the relations between Church and State in England in the later middle ages are as yet only a partially explored subject'.[28] This neglect is all the more striking considering not only the deluge of research on the lay nobility and the pastoral and pious activities of the later medieval clergy, but also the splendid recent work on the monastic superiors of this period,[29] and the commendable studies of the

[24] Highfield, 'Relations', i, p. 303; Blackley, 'English Episcopate', p. 175; Pantin, *English Church,* p. 101.
[25] Thomson, *Transformation of Medieval England,* p. 331; Haines, *Ecclesia Anglicana,* p. 226; Waugh, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 151. This was also substantially the view articulated – albeit in a more subtle fashion – by Simon Walker in his 'Master Richard Andrew', pp. 990-1. Some of the most recent literature on the later medieval English Church does not appear to adopt this attitude towards the episcopate, but it has chiefly been focused on other matters, and consequently has neither explicitly rejected it nor offered a detailed alternative interpretation in its place. See Phillips, 'Bishops, Parliament and Trial by Peers'; Cox, 'Hundred Years War'; and McHardy, 'Kings' Courts'.
[26] McHardy, 'Kings' Clerks', p. 59. See also Forrest, *Trustworthy Men,* p. 6.
[27] Heath, *Church and Realm,* pp. 13-14.
[28] Davies, 'Episcopate in England and Wales', ii, p. 606.
[29] Heale, *Abbots and Priors.*

episcopate's own role in politics, both in previous centuries and the Tudor period.[30] The subject is therefore ripe for re-appraisal, and for determining whether – as with the old criticisms of the clergy's moral failings – many of the established denunciations of their political failings may also be unfair, unfounded, and untenable. An examination of the episcopate's engagement in politics is the obvious way into this, for prelates were the leaders of the later medieval Church, whose forebears were so heralded by both historians and contemporaries, and who themselves earned the rebuke of both Colet and subsequent generations of scholars. Such research will enable the development of a new understanding of the Church's interactions with the 'State' in the later Middle Ages.[31]

In this light, Edward III's reign stands out as an apposite case study. First, it is the longest reign of the later medieval period. This not only means that much material has survived which illuminates the episcopate, but also that it witnessed periods of both spectacular success and devastating failure, which permits the historian to see the full range of bishops' relations with the crown in a coherent and clearly-defined political period. Secondly, it occurred two centuries before the dramatic events of the sixteenth century. This allows prelates' political activities to be considered on their own terms, rather than merely as a precursor to, or potential explanatory factor behind, the Reformation. Thirdly, it represents a highly important moment in English political, socio-economic, and religious history – marked by the beginning of the Hundred Years War, the Black Death, and the emergence of heterodoxy and the first significant challenges to papal authority in England – which is not only interesting in its own right, but also in many ways set the tone for the remainder of the later Middle Ages.[32]

There are also sound historiographical reasons for studying Edward III's bishops. Even by the standards of surrounding reigns, they have been remarkably understudied. While the episcopal bench during almost every other reign of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries has attracted some more recent historiographical attention,[33] the last detailed work on the entirety of Edward III's episcopate has been the studies of F.D. Blackley and Roger Highfield, which date from the 1950s.[34] The work that has subsequently been done on the bishops of the period – which has chiefly taken the form of biographical

[30] For studies of the episcopate's role in politics in previous centuries, see, for example, Marritt, 'Bishops of King Stephen's Reign'; Cosby, *King's Bishops*; and Ambler, *Bishops.* For studies of this in the Tudor period, see Smith, *Tudor Prelates and Politics*; Chibi, *Henry VIII's Bishops*; and Harmes, *Bishops and Power,* pp. 7-20.
[31] While this thesis does periodically use the term 'State' – partly to ensure that it directly addresses the long-established, yet still vibrant, historiography concerned with 'Church-State' relations – it does so bearing in mind that the term is anachronistic, as well as the other reservations about its usage noted by distinguished scholars. See Davies, 'Medieval State'; Watts, *Making of Polities*, pp. 34-5; and Bisson, *Crisis of the Twelfth Century*, esp. pp. 12-14.
[32] For comment to this effect, see Carpenter, *Locality and Polity,* pp. 44-5; Musson and Ormrod, *Evolution of English Justice,* pp. 189-93; and Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 596-8.
[33] See Haines, 'Episcopate during the Reign of Edward II'; Davies, 'Episcopate and Political Crisis, 1386-8'; *idem,* 'Richard II and the Church'; *idem,* 'After the Execution of Archbishop Scrope'; Weber, 'English Bishops, 1399-1413'; George, 'English Episcopate, 1437-50'; Mollere, 'Crown and Mitre, 1461-1483'; and Masek, 'Episcopate in the Reign of Henry VII'.
[34] Blackley, 'English Episcopate'; Highfield, 'English Hierarchy'. Highfield's 'Relations' also considers the latter half of Edward's reign with a focus on the episcopate.

studies of individual prelates;[35] work on Anglo-papal relations, and especially the Statutes of Provisors and Praemunire;[36] general treatments of political or ecclesiastical history, in which bishops crop up almost incidentally;[37] and narrower work examining specific aspects of prelates' activities [38]– has often been insightful and illuminating, but has naturally not sought to address the political involvement of the Edwardian episcopacy in its full breadth. Perhaps unsurprisingly, therefore, there have been calls for more work in this area. As long ago as 1955, William Abel Pantin remarked that 'there is a need for more research' with regard to the episcopate's political activities in this period. More recently, Robert Palmer called for 'a reworking of current perceptions of church-state relations in England' during Edward's reign.[39]

The plentiful sources which illuminate Edward III's episcopate also encourage its study. Of course, our evidential base is far from complete, and the historian wishes that contemporaries were more assiduous in recording certain things – such as the details of evolving parliamentary procedure, and the contents of various sermons that were preached – and for many documents which have lamentably been lost to have survived, such as the episcopal registers of Archbishops Meopham and Stratford of Canterbury.[40] Nonetheless, the richness of the surviving material which illuminates the Church in Edward III's reign has been recognised for some time, and was indeed acclaimed by K.L. Wood-Legh in 1934.[41] These sources can be conveniently divided into three groups: governmental documents, particularly the chancery rolls, which shed much light on bishops' interactions with the crown; ecclesiastical records, especially the episcopal registers, which not only reveal much about Church administration, but are also a neglected source for political history; and 'literary' or 'cultural' sources, including a whole variety of chronicles, sermons, poems, treatises, and much more besides.[42] Of course, such divisions are crude, for clerics (and sometimes the same cleric over the course of a career, or indeed at the same time) were responsible for writing diocesan and royal records, as well as for composing sermons and penning more

[35] See Haines, 'Wolstan de Bransford'; Fryde, 'John Stratford'; Usher, 'Adam de Orleton'; Haines, *Church and Politics*; Partner, 'William of Wykeham'; Haines, *John Stratford*; Martin, 'Richard de Bury'; Aberth, *Criminal Churchmen*; Haines, 'Innocent Abroad'; Davis, *William Wykeham*; and Ormrod, 'King's Secrets'.
[36] See Cheyette, 'Kings, Courts, Cures, and Sinecures'; Pantin, 'Fourteenth Century'; Barrell, 'Ordinance of Provisors'; Palmer, *English Law,* pp. 28-53; Haines, 'Looking Back in Anger'; and Gosling, 'Church, State, and Reformation', pp. 30-49. For important earlier work on this subject, see also Deeley, 'Papal Provision' and Davies, 'Statute of Provisors'.
[37] See Holmes, *Later Middle Ages,* p. 125; Tuck, *Crown and Nobility,* pp. 123-5; Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* pp. 70-94; Keen, *England in the Later Middle Ages,* pp. 102-5; Prestwich, *Three Edwards,* p. 198; Lepine, 'Church and Clergy', pp. 374-5; Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 133; Brown, *Disunited Kingdoms,* p. 145; and Sumption, *Edward III,* p. 53.
[38] See McHardy, 'Promotion of John Buckingham'; Ormrod, 'Origins of the "Sub Pena" Writ'; Page, 'William Wykeham'; Liddy, 'Politics of Privilege'; Haines, 'Sumptuous Apparel'; and Phillips, 'Church, Crown and Complaint'.
[39] Pantin, *English Church,* pp. 99-100; Palmer, *English Law,* p. 29. See also Whatley, 'Gilded not Golden', p. 26.
[40] *Parliamentary Texts,* pp. 32-47; Mifsud, 'John Sheppey', p. 3; Smith, *Guide to Bishops' Registers*, pp. 5-6; McHardy, 'Archbishop Stratford's Register'; Haines, 'Innocent Abroad', p. 555.
[41] Wood-Legh, *Studies in Church Life,* pp. vii-x.
[42] *Ibid.,* pp. vii-x; Davies, 'Episcopate in England and Wales', i, p. 5; McHardy, 'Bishops' Registers and Political History'.

substantial works.[43] Yet the available sources are not only impressive in variety and quantity, but also in quality, particularly because many of them – such as sermons and treatises – record bishops' own words, and thus allow the subjects of this thesis to speak to us directly.

This thesis will therefore paint a new picture of the relations between the crown and the Church in the later Middle Ages, through a case study of the involvement of Edward III's bishops in national politics and the government of the realm. Of course, there remains much else to be said about bishops and politics when the latter is more broadly conceived – regarding Anglo-papal relations, local politics, and clerical rivalries, such as the conflict between Canterbury and York – but limitations of space means that such areas have to be excluded, and it is the involvement of prelates in high politics which has attracted both the consternation of contemporaries and the censure of historians. In considering the involvement of prelates in royal government, this thesis will endeavour to apply much of what has been learnt about the lay aristocracy to their ecclesiastical counterparts. 'Patronage', 'personality', and 'community' – perhaps the most prominent interpretative categories of the latter half of the twentieth century with regard to the lay nobility – all have their place (to varying extents), alongside newer ideas about the importance of ideals and mentalities, as well as the theological, institutional, and socio-economic considerations with which historians of the later medieval Church have traditionally been more familiar.[44] Like their lay colleagues, the bishops were major landowners with extensive estates, significant figures in local and national society, peers who sat in parliament, political actors who operated within an evolving constitutional framework, and individuals with personal enthusiasms, so it is unsurprising that something can be gained by considering them through some of the prisms through which historians have analysed secular society.[45]

The involvement of the episcopate in politics will also be considered thematically, rather than chronologically. Naturally, this approach has some problems – especially the risk that it might portray the politics of the reign as static and unmoving, rather than as constantly shifting and unfolding – but this thesis will attempt to mitigate them by drawing attention to the context behind certain acts, and by explicitly addressing within each chapter how the relations between the crown and the episcopal bench changed as political circumstances evolved. Yet a thematic approach also has considerable benefits. First, it enables focus to be afforded to issues – such as the episcopate's role in disseminating the king's propaganda – which have been unjustly neglected in previous studies, and which fit awkwardly into a political narrative, but which are nevertheless of real interest and importance. Secondly, it allows for an

[43] For instance, Richard de Bury spent much of his career in various levels of the royal administration, before becoming bishop of Durham, at which point he became treasurer and chancellor, and also wrote his *Philobiblon*: Courtenay, 'Bury, Richard'. For broader discussion of this point, see Tout, 'Literature and Learning'.
[44] Watts, 'Introduction', pp. 3, 5. Of course, it is recognised that there has been intense scholarly debate about some of these terms. See, for example, the discussion of 'community' in Carpenter, 'Gentry and Community' and Dodd, 'County and Community', pp. 779-87.
[45] This is not to overlook the fact that there were manifestly also differences between the lay and ecclesiastical elites: Thompson, 'Prelates and Politics', pp. 71-5.

exploration of the features of political life which remained consistent across Edward's reign, and therefore for the development of a more structural understanding of bishops' political activities, their significance, and how they affected both the episcopate and the polity. This facilitates the development of an interpretation which might be more applicable across the later medieval period, rather than one which is strictly tied to the course of events in the mid-fourteenth century. Thirdly, it mitigates the tendency of narrative histories to focus disproportionately on moments of high drama and crisis, and pass over the more prosaic and day-to-day occurrences which filled life between them, and were indeed the norm for the majority of Edward's reign.[46]

This thesis will also consider the episcopate collectively. Again, such an approach has its disadvantages. In particular, a study of all of Edward III's bishops will inevitably lack some of the forensic detail which is possible in an individual study. Relatedly, a collective assessment also precludes any attempt at comprehensiveness, for it is simply impossible to learn everything about all of the eighty-six English and Welsh bishops who lived in Edward's reign.[47] This means that there is still space for more research to be done, and for further examples in support of this thesis' points to be found, for exceptions to the patterns sketched in this thesis to be discovered, and indeed for the overall arguments offered here to be modified and revised. However, a collective approach also has its advantages. As Matt Raven observed in his fascinating study of Edward III's earls, 'more is gained by a collective approach than is lost, since the earls were thought of by contemporaries as a corporate body and considering their collective actions provides insights into their roles and importance within the polity more generally that might be lost in studies of individuals'.[48] These considerations apply just as much to the episcopacy as to the earls, who – while by no means a homogeneous group – were also thought of as a defined body, and similarly held an important place in later medieval political society which this thesis aims to elucidate.[49] Moreover, a collective analysis is of particular value with regard to the Edwardian episcopate. As Joel Rosenthal has perceptively noted, 'general surveys of the fourteenth-century episcopacy understandably focus on the role of a few men rather than looking at a wider assessment of how they stood in relation to their less-active peers and colleagues'.[50] Taking a collective approach forces us to look beyond the famous 'great men' of the episcopal bench – such as Adam Orleton, John Stratford, and William Wykeham, who have all inspired outstanding biographies in their own right – and to consider them in amongst and alongside their colleagues, to gain a rounder and greater sense of episcopal activity as a whole.

[46] It is acknowledged, however, that – as Michael Burger eloquently put it – 'the contours of normal life are clearest when normal life is challenged': Burger, 'Review', p. 156.
[47] Appendix 1.
[48] Raven, 'Comital Power', p. 3.
[49] See also Barrie Dobson's observation that 'the bishops of England lend themselves exceptionally well to unified investigation': Dobson 'Bishops', p. 230.
[50] Rosenthal, 'Edward III's Bishops', p. 291.

But who were these bishops?[51] Of the eighty-six bishops who held office in Edward III's reign, fifteen came from aristocratic families. One of the most prominent of these men was Thomas Arundel, bishop of Ely, who was the third son of Richard Fitzalan, third earl of Arundel and eighth earl of Surrey.[52] Yet they were joined on the episcopal bench by men from knightly families, such as Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury, whose father, Sir Anketil de Martival, had been lord of Noseley in Leicestershire; men from notable urban dynasties, such as William Bateman, bishop of Norwich, whose namesake father had been many times bailiff of Norwich, and indeed represented the city in the parliament of January 1327; and men from more humble backgrounds, such as Walter Reynolds, successively bishop of Worcester and archbishop of Canterbury, who was said to have been the son of a baker.[53] Just under half of Edward's episcopate (forty-one men) had served the crown in some capacity either before becoming a bishop or before the beginning of Edward's own reign. This included twenty-three men with ministerial experience, such as William Zouche, who served twice as treasurer before becoming archbishop of York; twenty-eight men with diplomatic experience, such as John Sheppey, who had treated with both the Castilians and the French before becoming bishop of Rochester; and thirty-two men with other experience of the royal administration, such as John Harewell, who had served as constable of Bordeaux and chancellor of Guienne before becoming bishop of Bath and Wells.[54]

However, bishops enjoyed a range of other careers prior to being elevated to the episcopal bench.[55] For instance, at least eighteen bishops had served the pope, such as Thomas Fastolf, who served as an

---

[51] Edward III's episcopate has already been the subject of detailed prosopographical analysis by Roger Highfield, in his 'English Hierarchy'. However, while Highfield's work was ground-breaking, it is now rather outdated (and in some ways inaccurate), since much has been discovered about the Edwardian episcopate over the last six decades (in large part thanks to the publication of the *ODNB* and the associated research). For other prosopographical treatments of Edward III's episcopate, see Blackley, 'English Episcopate', pp. 1-51; Haines, 'Simon de Montacute', pp. 61-4; and Rosenthal, 'Edward III's Bishops', pp. 291-7. For a prosopographical discussion of the fourteenth-century episcopate more broadly, see Pantin, *English Church*, pp. 9-26. It is essential to note, however, that much remains unknown about Edward's bishops (particularly those who occupied Welsh sees), which means that any prosopographical analysis must remain somewhat tentative.

[52] Appendix 2; Hughes, 'Arundel, Thomas'.

[53] 'Historiae de Episcopis Wigorniensibus', ed. Wharton, p. 532; Elrington, 'Martival, Roger'; Haines, 'Bateman, William'; Wright, 'Reynolds, Walter'.

[54] Appendix 3; Bennett, 'Zouche, William'; Spencer, 'Sheppey, John'; Haines, 'Harewell, John'. In this thesis, 'minister' is used to describe chancellors, treasurers, and keepers of the privy seal. It is recognised, however, that this is rather simplistic, not least because it was only in the course of Edward III's reign that the privy seal office emerged as a separate department of government, and that the keeper of the privy seal emerged as a minister in his own right: Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, p. 78. Several of Edward III's keepers of the privy seal – such as John Thoresby, Michael Northburgh, and William Wykeham – became bishops. However, they customarily resigned the office before, on, or shortly after their elevations to the episcopate. For instance, Thoresby resigned the keepership in September 1347, the same month in which he was installed as bishop of St Davids: *HBC*, pp. 94, 297. This meant that no consecrated bishop occupied the keepership for any significant period of time during Edward III's reign. This is in stark contrast to the fifteenth century, when a number of bishops – including Adam Moleyns, Thomas Rotherham, and Richard Fox – all held the keepership for many years while on the episcopal bench: *HBC*, pp. 95-6.

[55] It should be noted, however, that many of the most influential sees were often in the hands of former royal servants. By way of example, between 1355 and 1361, the (arch)dioceses of Canterbury, London, and York – perhaps the most administratively significant sees in England (since the bishop of London acted as dean to province of Canterbury) – were all in the hands of three former keepers of the privy seal: Simon Islip, Michael

auditor of causes in Avignon for twelve years before becoming bishop of St Davids; at least fifteen were members of religious orders, such as Wulfstan Bransford, who served as prior of Worcester for twenty-two years before becoming bishop of the see; and at least nine had worked in aristocratic households, such as John Gynwell, who served as the attorney-general and auditor of Henry Grosmont, earl (and later duke) of Lancaster, prior to becoming bishop of Lincoln.[56] Indeed, these career paths were by no means mutually exclusive, and many prelates were able to draw on a diversity of experience. Perhaps most notably, Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury, had worked not only as the keeper of the privy seal and as a royal envoy, but also as a papal judge-delegate, one of the Black Prince's household clerks, and as chancellor of the diocese of Lincoln.[57] Moreover, the Edwardian episcopate was broadly highly educated.[58] At least two thirds of Edward's bishops (fifty-seven bishops) had studied at university, of whom at least forty-one had studied in Oxford, five in Paris, and four in Cambridge.[59] Of these men, at least twenty-four had incepted in civil law, fourteen in canon law, and sixteen in theology, with thirty-three attaining a doctorate in one (or more) disciplines.[60] Some acquired a distinguished scholarly reputation, none more so than Thomas Bradwardine, briefly archbishop of Canterbury, who was widely known as 'the profound doctor [Doctor Profundus]'.[61]

Whereas much previous scholarship has focused on the question of whether these prelates lived up to the legacy of their forebears, and acted like Anselm and Becket, this thesis instead seeks to examine their political activities on their own terms and for their own sake.[62] In this light, understanding bishops' political interactions with the crown must be founded on an appreciation of how they perceived their roles and responsibilities, and what they desired from their relations with the king. While naturally there would have been variation in such views between bishops, and indeed bishops' own views on these questions were far from static,[63] broad commonalities and collective ideas can also be discerned.[64] The underlying responsibilities of bishops can crudely be divided into three: their responsibilities to the Church, their responsibilities to the realm, and their personal responsibilities to themselves, their families, and their friends. Of course, such responsibilities could overlap and, indeed, conflict with one

---

Northburgh, and John Thoresby: Churchill, *Canterbury Administration*, i, pp. 355-9; Ormrod, 'Accountability and Collegiality', pp. 78-9.

[56] Appendices 4 and 5; Baker, 'Fastolf, Thomas'; Haines, 'Bransford, Wolstan'; Smith, 'Gynwell, John'.

[57] Swanson, 'Islep, Simon'.

[58] It is important to note that even those bishops who did not attend university were literate and able: Blackley, 'Bishops and Learning'.

[59] The proportion of the episcopal bench who had studied at university increased as Edward's reign progressed. Of the twenty-one bishops he 'inherited', only nine (43%) had studied at university, compared to thirteen (62%) of the bishops when he died: Appendices 6 and 7.

[60] Appendix 6.

[61] Stephens, 'Bradwardine, Thomas'; Leff, 'Bradwardine, Thomas'.

[62] This is not to deny that Anselm and Becket remained important figures in this period. Indeed, John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter, compiled a collection of Anselm's letters and wrote a life of Becket: BL, MS Claudius A XI; Bodleian, MS Bodley 493. See also Steele, 'John Grandisson', pp. 15, 53-5, 213-51.

[63] For instance, see John Stratford's change of stance with regard to the tension he perceived between his diocesan and royal responsibilities: Haines, *John Stratford*, pp. 284-5, 301-2.

[64] For the importance of this, see Carpenter, *Locality and Polity*, pp. 7-8.

another.[65] However, this had been the case for centuries, as Edward's bishops themselves were keenly aware; in John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter's, *Life of Becket*, he described how the conflict between Henry II and Becket had placed the remainder of the episcopal bench 'in a tight spot [*in arto positi*]' between their loyalties to their king and their metropolitan.[66] The Edwardian episcopate – like both their predecessors and their successors – therefore had to navigate a path between a tangle of different interests, ideas, and authorities on an almost daily basis.[67]

Of course, as the leaders of the English Church, bishops had serious ecclesiastical responsibilities. They had obligations to their superiors in the clerical hierarchy, as they owed oaths of obedience to the pope, and – in the case of suffragans – to their metropolitan;[68] to their cathedral churches, as they swore oaths of fidelity to defend their ancient rights, dignities, and liberties;[69] and to their dioceses, as they were bound by oath not to sell, give away, pawn [*impignorabo*], or in any way alienate the possessions of their bishoprics without consulting the pope.[70] They also had responsibilities to the clergy of their sees, as well as to the flocks which they tended. This is highlighted in a letter of John Stratford of January 1341, when he reminded the bishops of the southern province that it was they – and in the last resort the archbishop himself – who bore the ultimate responsibility for the souls of their subjects.[71] These burdens lay behind many of the episcopacy's occupations, such as the carrying out of visitations, the disciplining of unfit priests, and the founding of schools and colleges.[72] All this reflected the general concern of the prelacy, in the words of Simon Meopham, archbishop of Canterbury, that 'the church should flourish in the sweetness of peace, maintain her rights and liberties freely, that the Lord's flock should be watched over with vigilance, and that all whom England brings forth or nourishes may direct

[65] For example, Edward III's episcopate had to grapple with conflicting loyalties to the papacy and to the crown in a great council in 1373. According to the continuation of the *Eulogium Historiarum,* Pope Gregory XI had requested a subsidy from England on the grounds that he was 'the universal lord of all temporal things as Christ's vicar'. The prelates, following William Whittlesey, archbishop of Canterbury, accepted this, stating 'he is the lord of all things; that we cannot deny'. However, in the face of the Black Prince's wrath and a counterargument from a Franciscan, John Mardisley, they backed down, with the prelates again following Whittlesey in his concession that 'I am content that [the pope] should not be [temporal] lord here [in England]': *Eulogii,* pp. 10-13. This episode has been rather contentious. The chronicle itself dated the events to 1374, and the credibility of its story has been seriously doubted; William Lunt, for example, concluded that 'there can be little doubt that this story is a fabrication': *Financial Relations,* ii, pp. 107-8. However, the reasons advanced by Jeremy Catto, not only for the episode having a basis in reality (even while obviously dramatized), but also for it happening in 1373, are persuasive, and have indeed been accepted by most modern scholars: Catto, 'Alleged Great Council'. See also Gransden, *Historical Writing,* ii, pp. 187-8; Aston, *Faith and Fire,* p. 106; and Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 520.

[66] Bodleian, MS Bodley 493, fo. 20r.

[67] Thompson, 'Prelates and Politics'.

[68] Haines, 'Episcopate during the Reign of Edward II', p. 657; Gray, *Oaths,* pp. 87-8.

[69] *Ceremonies and Processions,* ed. Wordsworth, p. 105; Harvey, 'First Entry of the Bishop'.

[70] Gray, *Oaths,* Appendix III, p. 217. Bishops were also bound by canon law to this effect: Thompson, 'Prelates and Politics', pp. 72-3; *idem,* 'Locality and Ecclesiastical Polity', p. 130. Prelates were not merely responsible for maintaining possessions of their sees, but also their privileges, rights, and traditions: Heale, 'Introduction', p. 4.

[71] *Grandisson,* ii, p. 939; Haines, *John Stratford,* p. 292.

[72] Harper-Bill, *Pre-Reformation Church,* pp. 24-35; Frankforter, 'Reformation and the Register', pp. 210-12. See also Burger, *Bishops, Clerks, and Diocesan Governance.*

their steps towards truth and justice'.[73] Every member of the episcopacy was expected to share this broad commitment to the flourishing of the Church, and the protection of its privileges. This was expressed forcefully by Thomas Brinton, bishop of Rochester, in May 1376, when he argued that prelates 'ought to support the church on their shoulders like columns and lay down their lives in defence of its liberties'.[74]

Bishops also had responsibilities towards the realm of England. They had a keen sense of their importance in political society; John Grandisson observed in 1336 that:

> the substance of the nature of the crown is found chiefly in the person of the king as head, and in the peers of the realm as members, who hold of him by a certain homage, and especially the prelates [*et nomeement des Prelatz*]… [no member can be] severed from the crown without dividing the kingdom.[75]

Yet this concise statement had wide ramifications. On the one hand, it highlights the episcopacy's place beneath the king, for the monarch was the explicitly recognised head of the realm.[76] This was re-enforced by the oath which bishops-elect swore to the king for the restitution of their temporalities, by which they acknowledged that they held their temporalities from the king, promised to be obedient to him in all that pertained to their temporalities, and pledged to be attendant to his business and to keep his counsel secret.[77] Edward III emphasised the significance of this oath to his episcopate, writing to Archbishop Stratford in 1341 to remind him that he and the other prelates 'who hold their temporalities at the king's hands by their oath of fealty render loyalty, honour, and reverence'. This was substantially accepted by Stratford, who remarked that he was 'ready to obey the king's majesty in all things, saving the honour of God, the status of the Holy Church, and his own order'.[78] Even aside from the constraints of their oaths, bishops had many other reasons to be loyal to the king, as his longstanding servants, as the recipients of his patronage throughout their careers, and as people who might well have had a great deal of personal respect and affection for him. Indeed, there were sound biblical grounds for respecting royal power; Christ instructed his followers to 'render to Caesar those things which are Caesar's', and St Paul remarked that 'every soul [should] be subject to the governing authorities', since 'there is no authority except God, and the authorities that exist are appointed by God'.[79]

---

[73] *Stratford,* i, p. 139.
[74] *Selected Sermons,* p. 245.
[75] *Grandisson,* ii, p. 840. This short statement has attracted much comment and analysis, for which see Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies,* p. 362; Dunbabin, 'Government', p. 500; Waugh, 'Kingship and the Political Community', p. 216; and *idem*, 'The Court, Politics, and Rhetoric', pp. 67-8.
[76] Watts, *Henry VI,* pp. 22-3, 39.
[77] These oaths were not recorded in episcopal registers, and we consequently rely on a handful of surviving oaths in undated manuscripts for their content. Nevertheless, it is likely that these illustrate the fundamental elements of these oaths in the later medieval period: Gray, *Oaths,* pp. 89-90.
[78] 'Birchington', pp. 29, 37. See also Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 298, 311.
[79] Mark 12:17; Romans 13:1. For discussion of how biblical references of this kind 'created a climate for co-operation' between the clergy and the crown in the Middle Ages, see McHardy, 'Religious Ritual', p. 41.

On the other hand, Grandisson's conception of the crown did not merely note the king's position as the head of the polity, but also the necessity of him ruling in harmony with its other members for the good and stability of the kingdom.[80] In this light, bishops were not simply obliged to obey the king, but also to co-operate with him to further the good governance of the realm. This sentiment was expressed by many of the bishops of the period, with Adam Orleton writing to Edward II that he was 'always ready to give advice and aid in matters touching the peace and tranquillity of the realm'; Walter Reynolds summoning a convocation of his province because he was compelled 'by reason of his assumption of the cares of pastoral office' to hold discussions about what needed to be done for 'the public interest [*rei publice*]'; and Hamo Hethe, bishop of Rochester, ordering his archdeacon to ensure the implementation of the Ordinance of Labourers, since 'our office constrains us to exercise our ministry for the public weal [*utilitatis publice*]'.[81] Bishops' commitment to the polity led to a further series of expectations that they had regarding their role in secular affairs. These were revealed most sharply when they were threatened in the crisis of 1340-1, when Archbishop Stratford proclaimed that the king ought to be counselled 'by [the] good advice of the prelates, peers, great men, and wise of the council of the land'; that bishops ought to have a prominent place in parliament, with him having 'the first voice after that of the king' in assemblies; and that prelates ought to be treated with due 'reverence and honour', especially as he was himself 'the principal peer of the realm'.[82]

While references to the 'official' duties of bishops naturally focus on their responsibilities to the Church and the realm, it should not be forgotten that prelates were also 'real people', with real personalities, enthusiasms, friends, colleagues, and families.[83] They were therefore not immune from many of the other considerations which weighed on individuals in the fourteenth century, from the responsibility to support and provide for their families to the imperative to care for their own souls. For instance, William Melton, archbishop of York, was described by Thomas Stubbs as an ardent promoter of 'all his kinsmen', and succeeded in founding a knightly family, with his heir (also called William Melton) sufficiently wealthy for Sir Anthony Lucy to pay the archbishop £400 in 1340 for his marriage to his daughter.[84] Likewise, Henry Burghersh, bishop of Lincoln, appears to have had a real concern for his soul, and established a chantry in Lincoln Cathedral in 1332, providing for two chaplains to celebrate a daily mass at the altar of St Katherine for himself and his successors, as well as for Edward III and Queen Isabella, and members of his immediate family.[85] Although historians have long been wary about

[80] The corollary of this was an inter-reliance between prelates and the king, or the limbs and the head, which was spelt out by other authors. While – in the words of the *Vita Edwardi Secundi* – 'the limbs fail when the head is removed', it was also the case that – in the words of John Russell, bishop of Lincoln – the head could say to no limb 'I have no nede of the', since 'eche hathe hys necessarie appropred operacion': *Vita Edwardi*, pp. 108-9; Chrimes, *English Constitutional Ideas,* p. 180; Watts, *Henry VI,* p. 23.
[81] *Orleton (Hereford),* p. 132; *Stratford,* i, p. 1; *Black Death,* p. 290; *Hethe,* ii, pp. 884-5.
[82] 'Birchington', pp. 28, 39; *EHD IV,* p. 71. See also Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 289-90, 297-8, 315.
[83] Ambler, *Bishops,* p. 31.
[84] *Historians of the Church of York,* p. 417; Butler, 'Archbishop Melton', pp. 55, 66.
[85] Morganstern, *Gothic Tombs,* pp. 108-15. See also Saul, *English Church Monuments,* pp. 124-5.

the evidential basis for such 'human motives', where evidence does survive, it should not be disregarded, nor should the potential for these factors to have weighed heavily on bishops be dismissed.[86]

What did bishops' perception of their responsibilities mean they desired from their relations with the crown in practice? The turmoil of Edward II's latter years, which provided the immediate backdrop to Edward III's reign, sheds light on this issue. It is evident that bishops did not favour high-handed, vindictive, and vengeful kingship.[87] In the final period of Edward II's reign, the king embraced the counsels of the Despensers with renewed vigour, prompting Froissart's comment that the Younger Despenser had gained so much influence over the king that 'nothing was done without him, and everything was done by him [*sans lui n'estoit riens fait, et par lui estoit tout fait*]'.[88] Consequently, Edward acted with cruelty, financially exploiting his subjects and dispatching arbitrary justice, to the extent that the author of the *Vita Edwardi Secundi* remarked that 'the king's harshness has indeed increased so much today that no one, however great and wise, dares to cross the king's will… for whatever pleases the king, though lacking in reason, has the force of law'.[89] Members of bishops' families were among those caught up in Edward's purges, with Henry Burghersh's uncle (Bartholomew Badlesmere) being captured and executed, and his brother and sister-in-law being imprisoned in the Tower of London.[90] However, bishops themselves were not exempt from similar treatment. For instance, Edward confiscated their temporalities, with Burghersh's being seized between 1322 and 1324 'against law and reason';[91] extorted them, with John Hotham being forced to enter into a bond of £2,000 with the Younger Despenser in 1324;[92] and permitted the theft of their goods, with the king allowing laymen to ransack and loot the belongings of Adam Orleton.[93] Kingship of this kind undercut not only the episcopate's ecclesiastical responsibilities, for it infringed on the liberties and privileges of the Church, but also prelates' secular responsibilities, as it harmed the realm and excluded them from the king's counsels, as well as their personal responsibilities, for their families and friends numbered among those imprisoned and executed. Yet neither did reigning in this manner ultimately benefit the king, since it meant that bishops eventually joined with much of the rest of political society to oppose Edward, which led to his deposition.

---

[86] See, for instance, the cautionary words of K.B. McFarlane, quoted in Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort,* p. v. For particular reference to these difficulties with regard to later medieval bishops, see Davies, 'Episcopate in England and Wales', i, pp. 4-5. For broader discussion of the challenges – and possibilities – of assessing the personal motivations and interests of medieval figures, see Bates, Crick, and Hamilton, 'Introduction', pp. 6-13; Boffey and Davis, 'Preface'; and Prestwich, 'Medieval Biography'.
[87] For this paragraph, in addition to the sources specifically cited below, see Lane, 'Bishops and Deposition'.
[88] *Froissart,* i, p. 12. Froissart described William Wykeham in almost identical terms, for which see p. 47 below.
[89] *Vita Edwardi,* pp. 230-1.
[90] *Brut,* i, pp. 221, 4; 'Ann. Paul.', p. 299.
[91] Holmes, 'Judgement on the Younger Despenser', p. 265; Bennett, 'Burghersh, Henry'.
[92] *CCR, 1323-27,* p. 325; Thompson, 'Fourteenth Century', p. 114.
[93] *Johannis de Trokelowe,* ed. Riley, pp. 140-2. See also Haines, *Church and Politics,* p. 51.

Nonetheless, while bishops did not like tyrannous kingship, neither did they desire weak kingship. This was evident in the middle years of Edward II's reign, in which his rule was incapacitated by the division between him and the magnates, particularly the earl of Lancaster.[94] This rupture in political society hamstrung attempts to defend the northern border, as recounted in rhetorical terms by the *Vita Edwardi Secundi*:

> Oh! How harmful was this quarrel! Oh! How great an occasion for evil! While the king raves against the barons, his enemies are given the confidence to rebel. In this way the whole of Scotland is now lost and the land of Northumbria lies in waste.[95]

This had devastating effects for northern prelates and clergy. Perhaps most notably, John Halton, bishop of Carlisle, was ousted by the Scots from his chief manor of Rose in April 1314; forced to appoint a vicar-general and to withdraw to Lincolnshire in July of that year; compelled to remain there for two years, since he was prevented from 'residing securely in our diocese' by the 'rage of the Scots'; and driven to appeal to Pope John XXII in September 1318, to ask for the living of Horncastle to be annexed to his bishopric, for Scottish raids had not merely left his fields uncultivated, but also 'destroyed and carried away' many of his goods.[96] Furthermore, the tension between the crown and the nobility also prevented Edward from upholding domestic law and order. While countless clergy were affected, this was flouted most spectacularly as far as the episcopal bench was concerned in September 1316, when Sir Gilbert Middleton – with the support of Lancastrian retainers – ambushed the bishop-elect of Durham, Louis Beaumont, alongside his brother and two cardinals, *en route* to his cathedral city for his consecration. Robert Graystones described how the Beaumonts were kidnapped, imprisoned in Mitford Castle, and ransomed, while the cardinals were robbed 'of all their possessions', leaving them to arrive in Durham 'without servants and [with] nothing more than the clothes they were wearing'.[97] Once again, kingship of this nature damaged the episcopacy's ecclesiastical interests, as it imperilled the lands and goods of their sees, as well as the bodies of clergy themselves; their secular interests, as it harmed the public weal, which they had a responsibility to defend; and their personal interests, as their family and friends were also affected by Scottish invasions and the breakdown of law and order. However, such kingship was also evidently not in the interests of the crown itself, and it fuelled growing resistance, which culminated in the summer of 1321, when the Anonimalle chronicler recorded that Marcher barons 'came to London completely armed… with great forces', and threatened, in the words of the *Vita,* that 'they would utterly renounce their homage and set up another ruler' if Edward did not comply with their demands.[98]

---

[94] For a thorough, albeit dated, exploration of the politics of this period, and how it affected the episcopate, see Edwards, 'Personnel and Political Activities'.
[95] *Vita Edwardi,* pp. 146-7.
[96] *Halton,* ii, pp. 96, 99-100. See also Summerson, 'Halton, John'.
[97] *Crime, Law, and Society,* ed. Musson and Powell, pp. 74-5. See also Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster*, pp. 204-6; Prestwich, 'Gilbert de Middleton'; and Haines, *Edward II,* pp. 106-7.
[98] *Anonimalle, 1307-1334,* pp. 100-1; *Vita Edwardi,* pp. 192-3.

As the experience of Edward II's reign therefore demonstrates, prelates benefited from neither weak nor despotic kingship. Instead, they desired a king who could unify political society behind him, protect and uphold their rights, listen to wise counsel, defend the realm from foreign invasion, rule with justice and equity, and impose domestic law and order. This was underlined in an August 1333 mandate of Simon Meopham, which ordered prayers of thanksgiving following the English victory at Halidon Hill. Meopham praised 'the famous victory' which Edward had obtained over the Scots, who had 'attacked and invaded the realm, creating the severest of strife'. Moreover, he declared his hope that Edward, 'after his magnificent beginnings', would 'be happy in the governance of his realm, the re-establishment of laws, and the observance of lawful precepts', which would ensure 'the well-ordered nature of the land' and 'the strengthening of peace for people and Church'.[99] It was Edward II's failure to meet these ideals and expectations which the episcopacy had denounced, as in Edward's deposition articles, which were drawn up at a meeting of 'prelates and nobles' in January 1327, and 'conceived and dictated in the presence of John [Stratford], then bishop of Winchester'.[100] These condemned how the king had harmed 'his realm and his people'; how he had acted 'to the destruction of Holy Church'; how he had lost various lands 'which his father [had] left him in peace'; how he had failed 'to do justice to all'; how he had not given 'himself to the good government of his realm'; and how he had declined 'to listen to good counsel', but had rather 'been controlled and governed by others who have given him evil counsel'.[101]

Such a conception of 'good' and 'bad' kingship, as far as the Church was concerned, reflected not merely what practically benefited prelates, but also longstanding ideas of 'good' monarchy which had developed over millennia. In some senses, these were derived from the models of kingship espoused by the Bible and the Church Fathers, which established a whole host of qualities required by kings, including wisdom, righteousness, the ability to listen to good counsel, and the capability to exercise justice, which was the root of stability in kingdoms.[102] Yet these ideas – developed and debated by successive generations of canon and civil lawyers, theologians, philosophers, and members of the political community more broadly – came to be widely accepted in later medieval England. Indeed, they were reflected in such well-known symbols as the royal seal, which depicted the king armed for battle on one face and seated in judgement on the other, as well as in what Christine Carpenter heralded as the 'two most fundamental documents of the [medieval] constitution', namely Magna Carta and the royal coronation oath.[103] The former confirmed that 'the English Church shall be free, and shall have

---

[99] *Stratford*, i, p. 271.
[100] Fryde, *Tyranny and Fall*, Appendix II, p. 233; Valente, 'Deposition', p. 879; Lane, 'Bishops and Deposition', pp. 135-8.
[101] *Select Documents*, p. 99.
[102] 2 Chronicles 9:8; Proverbs 29:4; Delogu, *Ideal Sovereign*, p. 33; Depold, 'Martial Christ', pp. 146-7; Jones, 'Introduction', pp. 24-31; Fábián, 'King Solomon', pp. 54, 59-60.
[103] Watts, *Henry VI*, p. 21; Carpenter, 'Resisting and Deposing Kings', p. 108. See also Harriss, 'Political Society', p. 32. None of this should imply, however, that the development of these ideas, and their broad

its right undiminished and its liberties unimpaired', and emphasised the need for the monarch to seek the 'common counsel of the kingdom', as well as making a whole host of legal, administrative, and military provisions. Through the latter, the king swore to preserve 'the laws, customs, and liberties granted to the clergy', to keep 'peace and accord in God', and to deliver 'impartial and proper justice'.[104]

This set the tone for Edward III's relations with his bishops. In outline, when his kingship veered too close to tyranny, when his exactions grew too great, and when his behaviour became too high-handed – notably in 1340-1, when Archbishop Stratford complained that he began to act in an arbitrary fashion 'against the great charter, which you are bound to keep and maintain by the oath made at your coronation' – bishops turned to oppose him.[105] Conversely, when his kingship became frailer, when corruption became more blatant, and when the unity of political society broke down – notably in the 1370s, when Thomas Brinton lamented that 'England… which [had] formerly ruled itself in justice is now full of vice without rule', as 'overthrowers of truth and justice' began to take 'the chief share in the government of the kingdom' – bishops also became disaffected and tensions between them and the crown became apparent.[106] Yet for the majority of Edward's reign – when, in the words of Simon Sudbury, bishop of London, the king 'preserved us above all nations in peace and tranquillity' – he broadly provided the rule for which they longed.[107] Bishops had striven for kingship of this kind under Edward's predecessors. In the reign of Edward I, Robert Winchelsey had worked (according to his own account) with 'sincere devotion' to ensure the 'peace and tranquillity of the realm', while in the reign of Edward II, numerous bishops sought to mediate between the king and the earl of Lancaster in the later 1310s, with the aim of restoring 'true harmony and full confidence' between them.[108] Accordingly, while Edward supplied the kingship they sought, bishops lent their financial, administrative, diplomatic, military, and political support to him. Such 'strong' kingship – or, as Richard Partington more eloquently put it, 'kingly competence' – thus bolstered not only the Church but also the crown itself, underlining how the interests of 'Church' and 'State' were often not opposed, but aligned.[109]

---

acceptance in later medieval England, was at all straightforward, or that 'political thought' on the matter of kingship was ever entirely unified and homogenous.

[104] *EHD III,* pp. 307-15, 529; *Select Documents, 1307-1485,* pp. 4-5. See also Spencer, 'Coronation Oath', pp. 38-54 and Carpenter, *Magna Carta*, pp. 37, 116-7, 119, 156-7.

[105] *EHD IV*, pp. 72-3. For the politics of the later 1330s, and the crisis of 1340-1, see Harriss, *King, Parliament, and Public Finance*, pp. 231-312; Prestwich, *Plantagenet England*, pp. 275-7; and Ormrod, *Edward III*, pp. 212-46.

[106] *Brinton*, ii, pp. 316-7; *Selected Sermons*, pp. 244-5, 247. For the politics of the 1370s, see Holmes, *Good Parliament*; Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, pp. 32-9; and Dodd, 'English Politics', pp. 16-19.

[107] *Historical Papers*, p. 410. For overall assessments of Edward's kingship, see McKisack, 'Edward III and the Historians'; Given-Wilson and Prestwich, 'Introduction', pp. 1, 11; Mortimer, *Perfect King*, pp. 4-16, 392-402; and Ormrod, *Edward III*, pp. 589-603.

[108] *Winchelsey*, i, p. 218; *Vita Edwardi*, pp. 144-5.

[109] Partington, 'Noble Service', p. 92. See also John Watts' broader observation that '"Church" and "State" were not continually, or even frequently, at odds; participants in either structure were usually participants in both, and had many interests, both individual and collective, in common': Watts, *Making of Polities*, p. 53.

While this thesis will analyse the political activities of the English episcopate thematically, it should not be forgotten that these activities intertwined and overlapped. Although numerous examples of this could be accumulated, it is perhaps nowhere more obvious than in Edward's negotiations for a grant of taxation in 1337, at the outbreak of the Hundred Years War. The origins of the negotiations lay in the diplomatic mission to the continent led by Henry Burghersh and the newly created earls of Huntingdon and Salisbury. The embassy left England in April that year, and swiftly learnt that Philip VI of France had no desire for peace with Edward.[110] Accordingly, in June, writs of summons for a great council were sent out, inviting almost one hundred men – including fifteen bishops – to 'treat upon certain affairs', which had been brought to the king's attention 'by the envoys whom he had sent to parts beyond the sea'.[111] The council met in late July at Westminster, and decided that conflict with Philip could no longer be avoided.[112]

To ensure that Edward had sufficient political and financial support for his war effort, in case the parliament which was to meet in September failed to grant him an adequate subsidy, he chose to reach out to his subjects more broadly.[113] In August, writs were dispatched from the chancery – headed by the chancellor, Robert Stratford, bishop of Chichester – ordering special meetings of the county courts and assemblies of local clergy.[114] Bishops were then tasked with addressing not only the gatherings of their clergy, but also many of the county assemblies, for instance with Roger Northburgh, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, speaking to the men of Staffordshire in Stafford; Simon Montacute, bishop of Ely, speaking to the men of Cambridgeshire in Cambridge, and the men of Huntingdonshire in Huntingdon; and Thomas Hempnall, bishop of Worcester, speaking to the men of Worcestershire in Evesham.[115] They were instructed to explain to those assembled 'the king's intention and will concerning the defence of the realm against the king of France, who is waging war on it', and to induce them 'to aid the king to the extent of their ability, as it will be necessary for the king to incur great expenses for the public defence [*pro defensione publica*]'.[116]

Their arguments were drawn from a 'schedule', which they were ordered 'to expound to the clergy and people', and which the bishops were separately instructed to ensure was published in every church of their dioceses.[117] This schedule has become known as Edward's 'manifesto'. Its purpose was to

[110] *Foedera*, ii, ii, p. 926; Haines, *John Stratford*, pp. 247-8; Sumption, *Trial by Battle*, pp. 193-6.
[111] *CCR, 1337-9*, p. 139.
[112] Willard, 'Negotiations', pp. 727-8.
[113] Jurkowski, Smith, and Crook, *Lay Taxes*, p. 40.
[114] *CCR, 1337-9*, pp. 254-5. See also Ormrod, *Edward III*, p. 193.
[115] *CPR, 1334-8*, pp. 502-4; *CCR, 1337-9*, pp. 254-5. It should be noted that bishops were joined by laymen when addressing the county gatherings, as in Staffordshire, where Northburgh was joined by Ralph Basset and Roger de Swinnerton: *CPR, 1334-8*, p. 503. In counties distant from episcopal seats, this was left to others, as in Oxfordshire, where the abbots of Abingdon and Osney, alongside John de Stonor, John de Louches, and Thomas de Langele were instructed to address the county community in Oxford: *CPR, 1334-8*, p. 504.
[116] *Foedera*, ii, ii, p. 994; *CCR, 1337-9*, pp. 254-5.
[117] *CCR, 1337-9*, p. 255.

highlight 'the offers made to the king of France by the king of England to avoid war', which were rejected by the French, and thus to demonstrate that 'the king is obliged to spend great sums of money for the war with the king of France'.[118] It is not implausible that the schedule, which was again distributed by the chancery, was drafted by Robert Stratford, or his brother, John.[119] Yet, more certainly, Edward's manifesto made reference to several missions undertaken by bishops. For instance, it notes how Edward 'crossed secretly into France and came to him [Philip], humbly requesting the delivery of his lands, offering and doing to the king as much as he ought and more'. This refers to the secret meeting of Edward and Philip at Pont-Sainte-Maxence in April 1331, when Edward was only accompanied by a small entourage including John Stratford and William Montacute.[120] Furthermore, the manifesto mentions Edward's proposal for the Black Prince to marry Philip VI's daughter, negotiations for which were pursued by John Stratford (with Henry Beaumont and Montacute) in the autumn of 1331, and then again by Stratford and Adam Orleton in the spring of 1332; Edward's suggestions that his brother, John of Eltham, might marry 'any lady of the blood royal', which were delegated variously to Stratford, Orleton, Burghersh, and William Airmyn, bishop of Norwich, between the summer of 1329 and the spring of 1334; and Edward's offers to join Philip on a crusade, which were made in a variety of iterations from late 1331 to the summer of 1336, and pursued by various ambassadors, including Stratford, Orleton, Airmyn, and Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham.[121]

Edward succeeded in securing grants from both the clerical assemblies and the county communities, as from the men of the West Riding of York, who had been addressed by William Melton and others.[122] Yet, in the end, the parliament which commenced in September granted Edward an unprecedented triennial fifteenth and tenth, and the convocation which followed a triennial tenth, whereupon the previous grants were cancelled, and the monies already collected credited towards the new subsidies.[123] Nonetheless, the attempt to secure grants from local and clerical assemblies in the summer of 1337 clearly reveals the interconnectedness of bishops' political activities. In the same episode, we see the work of bishops as diplomats, as their missions both instigated Edward's search for money and provided justifications for his arguments; the work of bishops as civil servants, as an episcopal chancellor orchestrated the administration of proceedings, and might well have penned Edward's manifesto; the work of bishops as royal propagandists, as they communicated the king's messages to his people; the

---

[118] *EHD IV,* pp. 62-3; *CCR, 1337-9,* p. 255.
[119] Haines, *John Stratford,* p. 293.
[120] *EHD IV,* p. 62*; Murimuth,* p. 63. See also Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 179-80.
[121] *EHD IV,* pp. 62-3*; Foedera,* ii, ii, pp. 766, 767, 837, 838, 854, 885, 895, 915, 941; *CPR, 1330-4,* pp. 223, 273, 359, 413, 466, 532, 534, 536; *CPR, 1334-8,* p. 301. See also Tyerman, 'Philip VI', pp. 25-6; Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 180-1; and Dryburgh, 'John of Eltham', pp. 37-9.
[122] *CCR, 1337-9,* pp. 218, 235; *CPR, 1334-8,* pp. 502-4. See also Willard, 'Negotiations', pp. 728-30 and Bryant, 'Financial Dealings', pp. 766-8.
[123] Harriss, *King, Parliament, and Public Finance,* pp. 234-5; Haines, *John Stratford,* p. 251. There is some doubt as to whether the assembly of September 1337 was properly a parliament, or whether it was a representative council: Bryant, 'Financial Dealings', p. 766; *PROME,* September 1337, Introduction; Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 195.

work of bishops as financiers of the crown, as they procured grants from both clergy and laity, and indeed acquiesced to taxation themselves; and the work of bishops in parliament, as they attended the assembly which granted substantial taxes, and brought the attempts of Edward to secure finance directly from local communities to an end.

Bishops' political activities did not merely interlock in practice, but also in contemporary thought. While there was of course recognition of the specific roles that some prelates performed – such as 'chancellor', 'treasurer', 'counsellor', 'envoy', and 'ambassador' – much of the episcopate's broader activity did not involve any new or different titles or labels. Rather, they engaged with such pursuits in their capacity as bishops, and their activities were framed not as discrete 'jobs', but in terms of the episcopal duty to support the polity and the Church. This was the case in relation to attending parliament, to which they were summoned to treat on matters which concerned 'the safety and defence of the realm and of the Church [*salvationem et defensionem regni et ecclesiae*]'; disseminating royal propaganda, which they circulated for 'the defence and safety of the realm and of the Church [*defensionem et salvationem regni et ecclesiae*]'; granting clerical subsidies, which they conceded for 'the safety and defence of the realm and of the Church [*salvationem et defensionem regni et ecclesiae*]'; and organising arrays of the clergy, which they coordinated for 'the safety and defence of the Church and of the realm [*salvationem et defensionem ecclesiae et regni*]'.[124] In many ways, then, these were not distinct occupations, but different sides of the same coin. Consequently, the bishops of Edward III's reign never labelled themselves 'propagandists', 'financiers', 'military leaders', or 'parliamentarians', nor were they referred to as such. Such categorisations are adopted here, not because they were a feature of later medieval discourse, but because they are clear, intelligible, and speak to rich and long-standing historiographies. Nonetheless, although exigencies of structure here demand that the episcopate's political roles must be considered separately, both the political reality and the underlying political thought of the period were considerably more complex than this.

In these circumstances, this thesis will begin by assessing the employment of bishops in the king's administration, particularly as royal ministers and diplomats. Although relatively few bishops at any one time served Edward in these capacities, those that did served the king more intensely than many of their colleagues, and became the prelates most intimately associated with his government. This thesis will then proceed to consider the activities in which the entirety of the episcopate was bound to engage. First, it will evaluate the martial activities of the English bishops and their direct involvement in

[124] See, for instance, *RDP*, iv, p. 611; *Foedera*, ii, ii, p. 990, iii, ii, pp. 876, 993. While these examples have been chosen to highlight the stark linguistic similarities in how different episcopal duties were framed, there were variations on these phrases. Thus, for instance, the prelates in the parliament of 1369 agreed to array the clergy 'in aid and defence of the realm and of Holy Church [*en eide et defense du roialme et de seinte esglise*]': *PROME*, 1369, 26. Phrases of this nature are almost ubiquitous, but for further examples, see *Hethe*, ii, p. 700; *Welton*, p. 100; *Appleby*, p. 49; and *Sudbury (London)*, pp. 75-6. See also Thompson, 'Locality and Ecclesiastical Polity', p. 122.

Edward's wars with France and Scotland. These come first, since the wars were perhaps the dominant political issue of the age, and much of the remainder of bishops' activities depended on them, as they distributed propaganda in support of them, were summoned to parliament to discuss them, and paid taxes to fund them. Secondly, it will discuss the 'propaganda' circulated by bishops, in the form of the prayers, processions, and masses they directed, and the sermons they preached themselves, often in celebration of a great military victory or in advance of a forthcoming royal expedition. Thirdly, it will examine the role of the episcopate in parliament, which was not only the context for some of prelates' most famous sermons, but also where they were summoned to discuss the central issues of the day, and contribute to the legislative, judicial, and financial business of assemblies. Finally, it will appraise bishops' contribution to the king's finances, and in particular their role in procuring, collecting, and paying taxation. This is considered last, as in many ways it was founded on all of the prelates' other activities, as the taxes they paid and collected were administered by episcopal ministers, went towards wars in which they themselves fought, were justified by propaganda campaigns which they themselves led, and were (in part) sanctioned by parliaments which they themselves attended. Moreover, the episcopacy's financial role also allows us to address most squarely the question of why the latter part of Edward III's reign did not witness bishops acting in the manner of Anselm, Becket, Winchelsey, or Stratford. In every chapter, this thesis will not only explore what prelates did, but also how important their work was to the crown, and how this related to their own ecclesiastical, secular, and personal responsibilities. K.B. McFarlane once referred to 'those twin-engines of late medieval government: the English Church and the English State'.[125] This thesis, in short, aims to understand how and why the English bishops helped those engines to fire alongside one another, and what that meant for both the crown and the episcopate itself.

[125] McFarlane, *John Wycliffe,* p. 11.

Chapter I

‘Good Advice of the Prelates’: Bishops and the King’s Administration

Introduction

It is hard to argue that the bureaucracy of Edward III’s regime, and the place of prelates within it, has been neglected by scholars. Over the last century, much ink has been spilled, and much has been revealed, about the workings of government and diplomacy in these years, perhaps most especially by the pioneering work of Thomas Frederick Tout, Bertie Wilkinson, George Peddy Cuttino, Henry Lucas, Mark Ormrod, Pierre Chaplais, Karsten Plöger, Christine Carpenter, and Barbara Bombi.[1] Bishops have been prominent in all these studies, particularly those termed Edward’s ‘principal ministers’ by Mark Ormrod (John Stratford, William Edington, and William Wykeham), and those identified as Edward’s ‘inner circle’ of episcopal diplomats by Joel Rosenthal (Stratford, Adam Orleton, Henry Burghersh, William Airmyn, Richard de Bury, William Bateman, and Simon Sudbury).[2] Yet while prelates have loomed large in this work, its essential concern has not been the bishops themselves, but rather the organs of the king’s administration.[3] This has meant that the subject has nearly always been approached from the crown’s perspective, as opposed to that of the prelates.[4] It is only in more recent work – most notably in illuminating articles by Gwilym Dodd, and in an essay by Rosenthal on episcopal diplomats – that the position of bishops in the English administration has started to be examined from their own point of view.[5] Yet these articles are short;[6] principally syntheses of existing literature, rather than

[1] See especially Tout, *Chapters*; Wilkinson, *The Chancery*; Cuttino, ‘Conduct of English Diplomacy’; *idem, English Diplomatic Administration*; Lucas, ‘Diplomatic Intercourse’; Ormrod, ‘Edward III’s Government’; Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice*; Plöger, *Avignon Popes*; Carpenter, ‘War, Government and Governance’; and Bombi, *Anglo-Papal Relations.* The publication of Christine Carpenter’s Ford Lectures is eagerly awaited.
[2] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 81; Rosenthal, ‘Edward III’s Bishops’, p. 300. See also Ormrod’s comment that ‘each period of the reign tended to be dominated by a single powerful administrator – Stratford in the early stages, Edington in the 1340s and 1350s, and Wykeham in the later years’: Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 81.
[3] For comment to this effect, see McHardy, ‘Kings’ Clerks’, p. 59.
[4] The exception to this is, of course, the excellent biographical treatments of several Edwardian bishops.
[5] Dodd, ‘Clerical Chancellors’, pp. 17-49; *idem*, ‘King’s Judges’, pp. 213-40; Rosenthal, ‘Edward III’s Bishops’, pp. 290-309.
[6] While twenty-nine pages in length, Rosenthal devotes about one third of his article to a prosopographical analysis of Edward’s episcopate, and confines his discussion of how bishops perceived their role in the king’s administration to two pages at the end of his study: Rosenthal, ‘Edward III’s Bishops’, pp. 308-9. Dodd’s articles are somewhat longer, but – with a focus on both the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries – only dedicate a limited amount of space to Edward’s bishops.

explorations of primary sources;[7] and, in the case of Rosenthal's, riddled with factual inaccuracies.[8] There is therefore much still to say about the administrative and diplomatic activities of Edward III's episcopate. Consequently, this chapter will attempt to appreciate holistically the place that prelates held within Edward III's regime, its importance for the crown, and what it meant for the bishops themselves.

The Place of Bishops in Edward III's Administration

First and foremost, it is necessary to ascertain precisely what the role of bishops was within Edward's government. At the heart of his administration was the chancellor. Indeed, William Wykeham argued at his trial of September 1376 that the chancellor was 'second in England after the king, and this office enjoys such authority that whoever is chancellor is not held to account for things concerning his office, but his actions are to be permitted'.[9] While Wykeham's argument failed – for Sir William Skipwith, a justice of the common bench, replied that all royal ministers could be held to account if their actions injured the crown – that it was even contemplated nonetheless shows the importance of the office, and the prestige with which it was regarded.[10] Eleven bishops occupied the chancellorship in Edward III's reign, from John Hotham in 1327-8 to Adam Houghton in 1377.[11] The chancellor headed the largest of all the administrative departments, which had around 100 full-time staff, who were responsible for writing the charters, writs, and letters patent issued in the king's name and validated with his great seal.[12] Episcopal chancellors were kept busy; a commission of oyer and terminer of May 1351, dispatched to investigate complaints made by John Thoresby, referred to the bishop 'constantly attending on [the] business of the king and realm'.[13] Moreover, there is an abundance of evidence about the vast range of activities which they performed in royal service. These varied from the more dramatic, as in February 1327, when John Hotham produced records of Roger Mortimer's trial and judgement in parliament, as part of the process by which they were 'annulled and revoked', to the more prosaic, as

---

[7] This is most apparent in Rosenthal's article, which is overwhelmingly founded on secondary material, and does not refer whatsoever to many key sources, such as the calendars of chancery rolls, the *Rotuli Scotiae,* Rymer's *Foedera,* or any of the chronicles. Dodd's article on clerical chancellors is also largely based on scholarly literature, although it does incorporate some discussion of primary texts. However, his article on bishops as 'king's judges' includes rather more analysis of primary documents, particularly the patent and parliament rolls.

[8] To give but one striking example, Rosenthal claims that John Stratford was accused of surrendering La Réole to the French, whereas this allegation was actually levelled at Alexander Bicknor, archbishop of Dublin. Indeed, Rosenthal appears to have been unaware of the fact that this occurred in 1324-5, in the reign of Edward II, rather than in Edward III's own reign: Rosenthal, 'Edward III's Bishops', p. 308; *Foedera,* ii, i, pp. 600-601. See also Phillips, 'Bicknor, Alexander' and Lydon, 'The Case Against Alexander Bicknor', p. 104.

[9] *Anonimalle,* p. 99.

[10] *Ibid.,* p. 99. For discussion of Wykeham's trial, see Tout, *Chapters,* iii, pp. 310-12; Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 65-6; Shipp, 'William of Wykeham', pp. 91-2; and Dodd, 'Clerical Chancellors', pp. 18-20.

[11] Appendix 8. There were six non-episcopal chancellors (of whom five were laymen, and one a cleric, who eventually became a bishop-elect), who together occupied the chancellorship for about 14.5 years.

[12] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 70. For more detailed accounts of the chancery in this period, see Wilkinson, *The Chancery*; *idem,* 'The Chancery'; and Brown, *Governance,* pp. 45-9.

[13] *CPR, 1350-4,* p. 94. Although such phrases are somewhat formulaic, this does not necessarily render them inaccurate, and it is striking that they are only used in eight of the 132 commissions of oyer and terminer dispatched to investigate bishops' complaints during Edward III's reign.

in October 1339, when Richard Bintworth personally inspected and confirmed a grant which had been made by Anthony Bek, bishop of Durham, to one of his knights in 1297.[14] Importantly, some chancellors also took steps to improve the efficacy of the king's bureaucracy. For instance, John Thoresby seems to have been responsible for the creation in *c.* 1353 of the *sub pena* writ, by which defendants could be summoned before the court of chancery directly and with the threat of monetary penalties if they defaulted. The writ therefore incentivised compliance, circumvented the immunities sometimes claimed by the bailiffs of liberties, and avoided the occasional inefficiencies of sheriffs.[15]

After the chancery, the largest department of government was the exchequer, which was headed by the treasurer and had about sixty permanent members of staff. It was subdivided into the exchequer of receipt (or lower exchequer), which organised the collection and expenditure of royal revenue, and the exchequer of account (or upper exchequer), which audited the returns made by the crown's agents.[16] Thirteen bishops served as treasurer in Edward III's reign, from Adam Orleton in 1327 to Henry Wakefield in 1377.[17] As with chancellors, episcopal treasurers were evidently kept busy; another commission of oyer and terminer, of July 1364, remarked that John Barnet was 'daily occupied about the direction of affairs affecting the state of the realm'.[18] They also performed a wide variety of tasks in the service of the crown, including dealing with foreign bankers, as in March 1332, when William Airmyn acknowledged the receipt of a loan from the Peruzzi and promised to repay the same;[19] keeping abreast of royal finances, as in May 1365, when John Barnet 'testified before the king' that one Thomas Moigne owed the king £63 14s 4d at the date of his death;[20] and organising expenditure, as in May 1377, when Edward ordered Henry Wakefield to pay one Amaury de Valort, a knight from Aquitaine, the daily sum of 2s for his sustenance and the yearly sum of 10 marks for his clothing.[21] Like their counterparts in the chancery, treasurers could also make important administrative reforms; William Edington developed a sophisticated system of preference in the exchequer by giving priority to privy seal warrants over and above other authorisations, such as wardrobe bills.[22] More memorably, they also helped to organise overseas expeditions, with Edington playing an important role in

[14] *CPR, 1327-30,* pp. 141-3; *CPR, 1338-40,* p. 323. It is apparent that Bintworth personally inspected the grant, because the seal attached to it was 'accidentally torn off' while it was in his lap 'for confirmation': *CPR, 1338-40,* pp. 326-7. For the annulment of Roger Mortimer's trial and judgement, see also *CMR,* p. 85 and Dryburgh, 'Roger Mortimer', p. 110.
[15] Ormrod, 'Origins of the "Sub Pena" Writ', pp. 11-20; *idem,* 'Accountability and Collegiality', pp. 67-8.
[16] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 71. For more detailed discussion of the exchequer in this period, see also Buck, 'Reform of the Exchequer'; Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government', pp. 222-310; and Brown, *Governance,* pp. 52-7.
[17] Appendix 9. Over the course of Edward's reign, there were eight non-episcopal treasurers (of whom four were clerics and four were laymen), who held office for a total of about fifteen years, excluding those (like William Edington and Simon Langham) who were elevated to the episcopate while occupying the treasurership.
[18] *CPR, 1364-7,* p. 64.
[19] *CPR, 1330-4,* p. 271.
[20] *CPR, 1364-7,* p. 118.
[21] *CPR, 1374-7,* p. 469.
[22] Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government', pp. 97, 234-7.

financing the *Grande Chevauchée* of 1355 and the Poitiers Campaign of 1356.[23] Yet, perhaps most significantly, both treasurers and chancellors gave counsel to the king. Thus, Edington – who held both offices – offered advice to Edward on a whole range of issues, from works at the Tower of London to trade between Holland and Yarmouth,[24] which lay behind John of Reading's remark that he was a 'friend of the community' who achieved much for 'both the king and the kingdom'.[25]

Chancellors and treasurers also served together, sometimes alongside other bishops, on the royal council, which sat more or less permanently during the legal and financial terms.[26] Sitting on the council could once again keep bishops busy; a commission of June 1363 remarked that Edington (after his retirement as chancellor) was still 'constantly occupied with others of the council about the direction of the king's affairs and realm'.[27] This is perhaps unsurprising, for the surviving accounts of Bartholomew Burghersh – a soldier and nobleman who regularly attended the council in the 1350s – reveal that he spent an average of 232 days each year at the council in the years from 1353 to 1355.[28] Regrettably, our understanding of precisely what the council did – and indeed of precisely what the council was – is hampered since it did not begin to take steps to record its own proceedings and preserve its own archives until the reign of Richard II.[29] Nonetheless, examples of its business can be found in other sources. For instance, it answered and approved petitions, as in April 1345, when Edward granted the petition of John Mautravers 'with the assent of the archbishop of Canterbury [John Stratford], the bishop of Chichester [Robert Stratford], the chancellor [Robert Sadington], the treasurer [William Edington], and others of the council'.[30] It also sometimes dealt with complex legal matters, as in May 1363, when Simon Langham (the chancellor), John Barnet (the treasurer) and other councillors heard a dispute between John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, and Blanche, his wife, on the one hand, and Queen Philippa on the other as to the manor of Snaith and Cowick in Yorkshire.[31] More broadly, it seems that the council was involved in routine decision-making, as well as in giving advice and resolving bureaucratic problems. This appears to have been the thrust of what the commons sought in the Good Parliament of

[23] Tout, *Chapters,* iv, pp. 112-13; Prince, 'Army Wages', pp. 151-7; Madden, *Black Prince,* pp. 29-32, 186-9.
[24] *CPR, 1348-50,* p. 485; *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 104.
[25] *Johannis de Reading,* p. 113. See also Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government', p. 319.
[26] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 75. For the council in this period, see also Baldwin, *King's Council,* pp. 69-102; Morris, 'Introduction', pp. 29-51; Baldwin, 'King's Council'; Prestwich, *Plantagenet England,* pp. 57-8; and Watts, 'Counsel and the King's Council', pp. 66-7. For the avoidance of doubt, 'the royal council' here refers to the council comprised of a group of administrative officials along with a greater or lesser number of prelates and nobles, rather than to the bodies with extensive powers that were imposed on the king at times of crisis, or to the informal dialogue between the king and his subjects: Watts, 'Counsels of Henry VI', p. 282; *idem, Henry VI,* pp. 84-5; Spencer, *Nobility and Kingship,* pp. 52-3.
[27] *CPR, 1361-4,* p. 372.
[28] Baldwin, *King's Council,* pp. 88-9; Brown, *Governance,* p. 34; Verduyn, 'Burghersh, Bartholomew'.
[29] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 74.
[30] *CPR, 1343-5,* p. 535.
[31] *CPR, 1361-4,* pp. 375-6.

1376, when they demanded that the council be afforced with prelates and lords, since the present royal ministers were 'not adequate without other assistance for such great governance'.[32]

In addition to their principal roles as chancellors, treasurers, and members of the royal council, bishops also performed a variety of other, more *ad hoc*, roles in the royal administration. For example, Thomas Charlton was appointed 'keeper of the land of Ireland' in August 1338, a position which he retained until 1340. His duties entailed supervising the Irish exchequer and treasury in Dublin; receiving Irish rebels into the king's peace and pardoning them; retaining men-at-arms for the defence of Ireland; and removing and replacing royal officials as required.[33] Bishops were also prominent on the continual council of twelve (or fourteen) men that was formed at the start of Edward's reign to – in the words of the *Brut* – 'treweliche conseil þe Kyng', while he was 'tendre of age', with Walter Reynolds, William Melton, John Stratford, and Adam Orleton among its members.[34] More significantly, prelates played an important role when the king was outside of the realm.[35] For instance, when Edward made the fourteen-year-old John of Eltham, duke of Cornwall, keeper of the realm in April 1331, he appointed four bishops to 'assist him with counsel and advice';[36] when he did the same with the nine-year-old Black Prince in May 1340, he appointed John Stratford 'to assist him with council and aid';[37] and when he did likewise with the six-year-old Lionel, future duke of Clarence, in July 1345, he appointed another four bishops 'to assist the said Lionel with counsel'.[38] Indeed, in July 1355 – after John of Eltham's death, and when the Black Prince and Lionel were both on the continent with him – Edward appointed three bishops as 'guardians of the realm', alongside Richard, earl of Arundel, Bartholomew Burghersh, and Thomas of Woodstock, future duke of Gloucester.[39] Bishops seem to have embraced their responsibilities when Edward was abroad; in 1340, for example, John Stratford played a central – although not entirely

[32] *PROME*, 1376, 10. See also Holmes, *Good Parliament*, pp. 101-3; Brown, *Governance*, pp. 34-5; and Davis, *William Wykeham*, p. 61.
[33] *CPR, 1338-40*, p. 126. For Charlton's work and responsibilities in Ireland, of which he was also chancellor from October 1337 to his appointment as *custos*, see Richardson and Sayles, *Administration of Ireland*, pp. 86. 95; Otway-Ruthven, *Medieval Ireland*, pp. 256-7; Frame, 'English Policies', p. 88; and *idem*, *English Lordship*, pp. 236-42.
[34] *Brut*, i, p. 254. The size of the council is uncertain, for the *Brut* states that it was constituted of four bishops, four earls, and four barons, while the articles of accusation against Mortimer recorded in Henry Knighton's chronicle suggest that it was composed of four bishops, four earls, and six barons: *Brut*, i, p. 254; *Chronicon Henrici Knighton*, ed. Lumby, i, p. 454. For the establishment of the council, and its swift fall into desuetude, see Mortimer, *Greatest Traitor*, pp. 172-4, 199-204; Haines, 'Episcopate during the Reign of Edward II', p. 692; and Bothwell, 'More Things Change', pp. 73-6.
[35] For a valuable discussion for how the 'home government' operated during Edward III's absences (and how this changed over his reign), see Carpenter, 'War, Government and Governance', pp. 4-7.
[36] The (arch)bishops were Simon Meopham, William Melton, Stephen Gravesend, and William Airmyn: *CCR, 1330-3*, p. 217; *CPR, 1330-4*, p. 98.
[37] *CPR, 1338-40*, p. 528
[38] John Stratford, Ralph Stratford, Robert Stratford, and Thomas Hatfield: *CPR, 1343-5*, p. 487.
[39] Simon Islip, John Thoresby, and William Edington: *Foedera*, iii, i, p. 305; *CPR, 1354-8*, p. 269. Thomas of Woodstock was only six months old.

successful – part in communicating with the king, procuring loans for the government, and organising the collection of subsidies.[40]

Aside from their position in England's domestic government, bishops were also notable participants in royal diplomacy. While there were several efforts to treat with other players, such as the papacy – as in 1373, when John Gilbert went to Avignon to treat, according to the *Anonimalle Chronicle,* 'for perpetual peace between the pope and the king of England' – the vast majority of episcopal missions were concerned with two powers: the French and the Scots.[41] Indeed, of the 150 diplomatic instructions given to bishops in Edward's reign that are recorded in Rymer's *Foedera* and the *Rotuli Scotiae,* seventy-four (49%) concern negotiations with the French, and thirty-three (22%) negotiations with the Scots.[42] Of course, diplomatic negotiations with different polities were by no means discrete from one another. This is perhaps clearest in the negotiations at Bruges in 1375, where the English ambassadors – including Gilbert and Simon Sudbury – pursued discussions with the French and the papacy concurrently (with the papal envoys also mediating in the Anglo-papal discussions), and where it appears likely that the question of the French abandoning the 'auld alliance' was discussed.[43] While on these missions, bishops engaged in a variety of activities. They gave diplomatic gifts, as in 1333, when Richard de Bury presented Pope John XXII with a gilded silver cup and a crystal salt cellar; conveyed formal requests, as in 1334, when Geoffrey le Baker described how John Stratford asked Philip VI to 'recall his forces from helping the Scots'; made diplomatic decisions, as in 1337, when Henry Burghersh was empowered 'to make alliances between the king and persons of power', with discretion as to the means to be employed and the terms offered; and engaged in detailed negotiations, as in 1373, when the Anonimalle chronicler described Simon Sudbury treating with the French, and remaining in Bruges 'for a long time', deliberating over 'various clauses and articles'.[44]

As the leaders of ambassadorial missions, bishops also orchestrated the diplomatic and intelligence-gathering activities of others. These are harder to identify, since much of this work was – by its very

---

[40] Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 270-8. For the majority of the period while the king was overseas, Stratford was neither chancellor nor treasurer, having resigned the former office on 20 June 1340: *Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1129. For Stratford's position at this time as 'principal councillor', see also Tout, *Chapters,* iii, p. 102.
[41] *Anonimalle,* p. 75.
[42] Appendix 10. It should be emphasised that the number of diplomatic instructions given to bishops is not the same as the number of episcopal embassies. On the one hand, bishops were sometimes given numerous powers relating to the same embassy, and sometimes granted powers for missions which never departed. On the other hand, sometimes bishops went on embassies for which no corresponding instructions or diplomatic powers survive (although, naturally, it is impossible to know quite how many such missions there were). In this light, the diplomatic powers granted to bishops offer only an approximate indication as to the polities with which bishops negotiated most frequently. For more detailed discussion as to the sources available for English diplomatic activity, see Chaplais, 'English Diplomatic Documents'; Blust, 'English Clerical Diplomats', pp. 3-13; Plöger, *Avignon Popes,* pp. 4-14.
[43] 'Anglo-French Negotiations', ed. Perroy, esp. p. xvi. For these negotiations, see also Davies, 'Anglo-Papal Concordat'; Holmes, *Good Parliament,* pp. 33-49; and Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 518-21.
[44] TNA, E 101/386/11, m. 1; *Baker,* p. 49; *Anonimalle,* p. 76; Plöger, *Avignon Popes,* Appendix VII, p. 255; *CPR, 1334-8,* p. 423; Sumption, *Trial by Battle,* p. 194.

nature – secret. However, an insight into these pursuits can be gleaned from Archbishop Stratford's detailed expenses account from his mission to France between July 1338 and October 1339.[45] While he was formally appointed 'to bring about a peace between the king [Edward] and Philip de Valois', Stratford also coordinated an espionage network with agents covering large swathes of northern France, as well as the Low Countries.[46] For instance, the archbishop sent Robert de Fécamp to Rouen to take note of the ships that were present there and to probe the sailors for information; Peter Assamari to observe the coast between Dieppe and Calais; Gregory of Florence to Ghent, Bruges, Sluys, and Ypres to discover the cities' dispositions towards the English; and Peter de St Omer to Amiens to estimate the size of the French army assembling there and to discover anything he could about its plans. Just one agent, Bernard de Vaus, was dispatched to survey the shipping on the coast of Flanders and in the ports of Wissant and Calais, to ascertain what he might about the plans and secrets of Philip VI's council in Paris, and to reconnoitre the king of Navarre's troops which were mustering at Douai and Tournai.[47] This information was then relayed to Edward III by Stratford, who sent the king letters from Antwerp and Brussels.[48]

The bishops also played an important role in negotiating with the envoys who were sent to England by a whole host of rulers. Thus, in July 1346, John Stratford, Ralph Stratford, and William Edington were deputed to receive, and treat with, the ambassadors of Alfonso XI, king of Castile, and Louis I, king of Hungary, who were expected to arrive during Edward's absence abroad on the Crécy Campaign.[49] Unsurprisingly, given the fractious state of Anglo-Scottish relations throughout much of the fourteenth century and the shared land border between the two polities, it was the Scots who sent the most envoys to England in Edward III's reign. Bishops were frequently entrusted with meeting them. Hence Thomas Hatfield and Gilbert Welton were among those empowered to negotiate with Scottish representatives at Newcastle in October 1353;[50] John Thoresby, Hatfield, and Welton met with Scottish ambassadors who had been granted safe-conducts to travel to England in August 1360;[51] and Hatfield and Thomas Appleby discussed matters with Scottish envoys at Lilliot Cross, a traditional meeting place in the West March, in May 1373.[52] Indeed, bishops were deeply involved in the whole course of diplomatic relations. This is particularly evident with the betrothal and marriage of Edward and Philippa of Hainault in 1327-8. In October 1327, it was Roger Northburgh who confirmed the terms of the betrothal

[45] TNA, E 101/311/35.
[46] *Foedera,* ii, ii, pp. 1043, 1065, 1068, 1084; *CPR, 1338-40,* p. 194; Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 495-6.
[47] TNA, E 101/311/35; Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 255-7.
[48] TNA, E 101/311/35; Haines, *John Stratford,* p. 256.
[49] *Foedera,* iii, i, p. 85. See also Haines, *John Stratford,* p. 352 and Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 455-6.
[50] They were to discuss the release of David II and the potential for a final peace or an extension of the existing truce: *Foedera,* iii, i, p. 264. See also Rose, 'Bishops and Diocese', p. 90.
[51] They were to discuss the failure of the Scots to strictly observe the Anglo-Scottish truce: *Rot. Scot.,* i, pp. 851-3. See also Rose, 'Bishops and Diocese', pp. 95-6.
[52] They were to discuss further breaches in the Anglo-Scottish truce: *Rot. Scot.,* i, pp. 958-9. See also Rose, 'Bishops and Diocese', pp. 106-7; Neville, 'Keeping the Peace', pp. 1, 13; and *eadem, Violence, Custom and Law,* p. 71.

in Edward's name;[53] in December, Philippa arrived in London in the company of William Airmyn and Adam Orleton, and lodged in John Hotham's townhouse in Holborn;[54] and in the following January, they were married in York Minster by Archbishop Melton.[55]

It is important to remember, however, that the work of bishops as administrators and diplomats interwove to a considerable extent. On the one hand, as Cuttino has shown, the chancery and the exchequer were integral to the smooth functioning of royal diplomacy. For instance, diplomats who were sent abroad relied on ministers to receive their attorneys, reimburse their expenditure, and produce documents such as letters of procuration, credence, protection, and safe-conduct.[56] More broadly, ministers and counsellors might also play a role in the direction of royal diplomacy, advising that overtures be made to certain powers. In May 1336, it was a great council – presided over by Archbishop Stratford, the chancellor, and Henry Burghersh, the treasurer, in the king's absence – which determined that envoys should be sent to the French court to make detailed plans for an Anglo-French crusade, to arrange for a meeting between Philip VI and Edward, and to discuss matters pertaining to Scotland and Gascony.[57] On the other hand, the work of diplomats proved equally vital to the operation of England's domestic administration. For instance, the proceeds of John II's ransom, fixed in the Treaty of Brétigny and confirmed in the Treaty of Calais, helped to bankroll English government for much of the 1360s, while the expensive overtures made by Henry Burghersh to princes of the Low Countries to secure the promise of military assistance against Philip VI in the later 1330s bedevilled those attempting to manage royal finances between 1337 and 1341.[58] Fundamentally, both ministers and diplomats were concerned with the expression and execution of royal wishes, and the furtherance of the crown's objectives, at home and abroad. In this light, it is unsurprising that bishops often served as both diplomats and ministers. Indeed, all of Edward's 'inner circle' of episcopal diplomats also served him as chancellor or treasurer, with the exception of Simon Sudbury, who infamously became chancellor in Richard II's reign.[59] This was most unmistakable in 1360, when William Edington spent two and a half months in Calais negotiating the eponymous treaty, and did not resign the chancellorship, but instead took the great seal and numerous clerks with him, and sent a considerable stream of chancery writs back to England from his desk on the continent.[60]

---

[53] *Jean le Bel*, p. 51; Ormrod, *Edward III*, p. 69.
[54] 'Ann. Paul.', p. 338.
[55] *Anonimalle, 1307-1334,* pp. 138-9; Shenton, 'English Court', pp. 148-50.
[56] Cuttino, *English Diplomatic Administration*, pp. 151-71. See, for instance, *CPR, 1327-30,* pp. 16, 30, 31, 188.
[57] *Foedera*, ii, ii, pp. 940-1; Haines, *Church and Politics*, p. 38.
[58] For John II's ransom and the Treaties of Brétigny and Calais, see 'Ransom of John II', ed. Broome; Grummitt and Lassalmonie, 'Royal Public Finance', p. 144; and Sumption, *Edward III,* pp. 84-5. For Edward III's 'grand alliance' and its financial consequences, see *CPR, 1338-40,* pp. 371-2; Offler, 'England and Germany', pp. 608-24; Nederman, 'Royal Taxation', p. 377; and Ormrod, *Edward III*, pp. 193-211.
[59] Walker, 'Sudbury, Simon'.
[60] *Chapters*, iii, pp. 227-9. It was more customary for diplomats to resign their governmental duties immediately prior to a mission abroad, as in April 1334, when John Stratford surrendered the great seal to his brother in

All this work on the part of bishops was vitally important for Edward III's regime. This was perhaps inevitable, given the variety and significance of the roles which prelates performed, and the power and prestige of the positions they occupied. Yet no episcopal minister was ever omnipotent, for they only exercised the powers of the crown, and consequently relied on the continued support and backing of the king. This meant not only that Edward could remove them from office, but also that they depended on him for direction, as in April 1366, when William Wykeham (then keeper of the privy seal) wrote to Simon Langham (the chancellor) and John Barnet (the treasurer), regarding the administration of the vacant archbishopric of Canterbury, and asked them not to make any arrangements until he had conveyed the king's personal instructions to them.[61] However, the influence of key ministers was considerable. This was recognised by the crown, with Edward pardoning Ralph Stratford in July 1338 on account of his 'charges in the public service and the great place which he holds therein'; by the wider political community, with it being alleged in 1341 that Archbishop Stratford had been 'revered by all as second only to the king himself'; and by the chroniclers, with Froissart famously remarking in relation to Wykeham that 'everything was done by him, and nothing was done without him [*par lui estoit tout fait, et sans lui n'estoit riens fait*]'.[62] Indeed, episcopal ministers were identified as the driving minds behind several of the major political and administrative developments of the period, such as the coinage reform of 1351 – which involved a reduction in the weight of sterling and the introduction of two new silver coins, the groat and half groat – that both Thomas Walsingham and John of Reading attributed to the treasurer, William Edington.[63] Paradoxically, one of the most telling illustrations of prelates' significance in the crown's administration comes from the concerted attack on Wykeham's actions in September 1376. While the accusation that he made 'many errors in his documentation to the prejudice, damage, and harm of the king and his kingdom, and the oppression of his people' appears to have been unfair, its credibility as an allegation nonetheless reveals the importance of the work that bishops carried out for the government, and the tremendous impact that it could have on political society at large.[64]

As for episcopal diplomats, while they also had by no means unfettered power, they were often given considerable authority and discretion in the crown's name.[65] The powers given to the five envoys who negotiated the Treaty of Edinburgh in 1328, including Henry Burghersh and William Airmyn, were not atypical. If they succeeded in reaching an agreement, they were empowered to proclaim the

---

advance of his journey to France to continue the long-running legal processes of Périgueux, Agen, and Montreuil: *CCR, 1333-7,* p. 309; Haines, *John Stratford,* p. 233.

[61] TNA, SC1/56/125. See also Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 88 and Davis, *William Wykeham,* p. 38.

[62] *CPR, 1338-40,* pp. 88, 120; 'Birchington', p. 24; *Froissart,* vii, p. 101. For the *Libellus Famosus* against Archbishop Stratford, in which this allegation is made, see Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 292-6. For Froissart's observation about Wykeham, which is a wry paraphrase of the description of God in John 1:3, see also Tout, *Chapters,* iii, p. 239; Partner, 'Wykeham, William'; and Davis, *William Wykeham,* p. 34.

[63] *Historia Anglicana,* i, pp. 275-6; *John of Reading,* p. 113; Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 371-2.

[64] *Anonimalle,* p. 96. See also pp. 58-9 below.

[65] Fowler, 'Truces', p. 186.

conclusion of peace, and to command its observance; if they failed, they were empowered to arrange safe-conducts for one hundred Scots to come to England for further negotiations.[66] The agreements that bishops forged were also profoundly significant, whether they were relative diplomatic triumphs, such as the Treaty of Calais, or diplomatic humiliations, such as the Treaty of Edinburgh itself, which Adam Murimuth labelled a 'shameful peace', and which, in turn, might have stung Edward into reopening the war with Scotland in 1333.[67] Less famous accords could also prove influential. In July 1351, William Bateman managed to secure a brief ceasefire in the march of Calais. This was valuable, for the captain of Calais, John Beauchamp, and over half the town's garrison had been captured on a raid the previous month; Bateman's diplomatic manoeuvring thus bought time for hastily assembled English soldiers under William Clinton, earl of Huntingdon, to reinforce the town.[68] Yet even when agreements could not be reached, diplomacy could still have far-reaching consequences. This is nowhere more apparent than in Roger Northburgh and Adam Orleton's embassy of May 1328, which sought to vindicate the English claim to the French crown on the death of Charles IV. Had it succeeded – which was never likely – the entire course of Anglo-French relations would have been rather different. But even in failure, it was recognised as being momentous by virtue of it raising the thorny issue of Edward's claim; thirteen years later, in 1341, Archbishop Stratford described Northburgh and Orleton's mission as being 'the greatest occasion for the present war'.[69]

It is therefore plain that bishops occupied a place at the heart of Edward III's administration. Their work was of the utmost significance, as they kept the wheels of the king's administrative and financial machines turning, offered counsel on the most crucial of subjects, and treated on the most sensitive of diplomatic issues. Edward and John Stratford had starkly opposed views of the latter's role in the crisis of 1340-1. The king described his primate as a 'broken reed', on whom he had mistakenly relied to galvanise both his government and his kingdom to support his war abroad, while the archbishop rebuffed this, and likened himself to the 'most strong staff' by which Jacob had crossed the Jordan; he further suggested that Edward might not have been able to cross the channel at all without his assistance, since he had achieved much for the war effort – as chancellor, councillor, and diplomat – on Edward's behalf.[70] Nonetheless, these dramatically differing descriptions agreed on one point: that, foolishly or not, Edward had depended on Stratford, who had been a central pillar on which his government had rested.

The Value of Episcopal Ministers and Diplomats

[66] TNA, C 71/12, m. 5; Stones, 'Mission to Edinburgh', pp. 123-4.
[67] *Murimuth*, p. 56. For the impact of the Treaty of Edinburgh on Edward III, see Sumption, *Trial by Battle*, pp. 123-6; Candy, 'Scottish Wars', pp. 36-8, 42, 48, 264; and Ormrod, *Edward III*, p. 147.
[68] TNA, E 101/26/15; Sumption, *Trial by Fire*, pp. 81-2; Mortimer, *Perfect King*, p. 296.
[69] 'Birchington', p. 29. For Northburgh and Orleton's embassy, see also Perroy, *Hundred Years War*, pp. 80-2; Haines, *Church and Politics*, p. 183; and Sumption, *Trial by Battle*, p. 109.
[70] 'Birchington', pp. 24, 30. See also Haines, *John Stratford*, pp. 293, 300.

In addition to being integral to the king's administration, bishops were well-suited to royal service. This has often been asserted by historians of later medieval England, but seldom justified, and never explored at any length.[71] Yet the crown did not have to employ bishops as its ministers and diplomats; for one quarter of Edward's reign, the chancellorship was not occupied by a bishop; for one third of it, the treasurership was not in episcopal hands; and, according to the research of Léon Mirot and Eugène Déprez, only about 10% of the English missions to France between 1330 and 1377 (which claimed diplomatic expenses) were headed by a bishop.[72] Since Edward could therefore turn to others – both laymen and other clergymen, who were not of episcopal rank – it is worth asking why he valued the service of his bishops, and relied on them again and again. While it is impossible to elucidate every reason for this, since these were many and varied, and sometimes specific to particular situations, several important factors stand out as meriting discussion.[73]

Perhaps most fundamentally, bishops were more available than many others to undertake time-consuming administrative and diplomatic duties. The lay nobility were expected – if they were physically capable – to play a full part in Edward's wars abroad.[74] Thus, many nobles served on numerous campaigns; for instance, in the decade from 1333, there were only three years in which Thomas Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, did not fight in either France or Scotland.[75] Yet even when they were not fighting overseas, the secular aristocracy were occupied by a range of other jobs, including the management of their estates, the leadership of their families, and the government of the shires.[76] Meanwhile, those below the rungs of the aristocracy had to devote themselves to sustaining their livelihoods, whether by engaging in commerce as merchants, by arguing cases as lawyers, or by managing landholdings and investment portfolios as gentry.[77] All these activities necessarily restricted the time which laity had to devote themselves to burdensome governmental business. While bishops also possessed a range of other responsibilities, not least administering their dioceses, these were perhaps easier to delegate. Even under the most assiduous of prelates, much of the day-to-day organisation of their bishoprics was in the hands of others, who customarily coped well even during

[71] For short, but stimulating, discussions of why bishops were well-placed to serve the crown, see Pantin, *English Church,* pp. 13-14; Thompson, 'Prelates and Politics', pp. 76-7; Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 380-1; and Dodd, 'Clerical Chancellors', pp. 22-3.
[72] Mirot and Déprez, *Ambassades Anglaises*; Larson, 'English Embassies', pp. 423-4; Rosenthal, 'Edward III's Bishops', p. 301.
[73] By way of example, when it was necessary in February 1355 for it to be certified in chancery 'on what day and in what year' Richard de Otryngham was collated to the prebend of St Stephen in Beverley Minister, it was undoubtedly helpful that the chancellor was John Thoresby, archbishop of York, who could search with relative ease in the register of his predecessor, William Melton, and signify that the answer was 15 May 1329. The process of signification would doubtless have taken longer, and been more complicated, had the chancellor been anyone other than the archbishop, who held the relevant records in his own possession: *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 178.
[74] McFarlane, *Nobility,* p. 41; Raven, 'Comital Power', pp. 196, 211.
[75] Tuck, 'Beauchamp, Thomas'.
[76] McFarlane, *Nobility,* p. 41.
[77] Dyer, *Making a Living,* pp. 303-7, 343-4; Goldberg, *Medieval England,* pp. 100-24.

lengthy episcopal absences on affairs of state.[78] Bishops were therefore able to dedicate themselves to governmental business in a way that many of their colleagues might have struggled to do.[79]

More generally, the experience possessed by members of the episcopacy equipped them to take their place at the heart of the Edwardian regime.[80] All of Edward's eleven episcopal chancellors had considerable experience in royal administration. For instance, John Hotham had already served as chancellor, holding the position under Edward II from June 1318 to January 1320, before resuming office in January 1327; Robert Stratford had previously been chancellor of the exchequer between 1331 and 1334, and served as keeper of the great seal during his brother's absences in 1331, 1332, and 1335, before replacing him as chancellor in March 1338; and William Wykeham had formerly acted as Edward's secretary from 1361 to 1363, and keeper of the privy seal from 1363 to 1367, before becoming chancellor in September that year.[81] In a similar vein, eleven of the thirteen episcopal treasurers had also been extensively immersed in royal government prior to taking office. For instance, William Melton had served as keeper of the privy seal between 1307 and 1312, treasurer of the wardrobe between 1312 and 1314, and treasurer of the realm between 1325 and 1326, before returning to office in December 1330; Roger Northburgh had been keeper of the privy seal between 1312 and 1316, and keeper of the wardrobe from 1316 to 1322, before being appointed treasurer in June 1340; and Thomas Brantingham had been cofferer for the French campaign of 1359-60 and treasurer of Calais between 1361 and 1368, before assuming the treasurership in June 1369.[82] Many of the bishops involved in royal diplomacy had also formerly served the crown as ambassadors before being elevated to the episcopate. Thus, John Barnet – who was empowered in February 1362 to treat for a marriage between Edmund of Langley and the duchess of Burgundy – had previously participated in the Anglo-French negotiations at Calais in 1360, and treated with French envoys about the governance of Brittany in the spring of 1361.[83] All in all, twenty-two of the thirty-one bishops (71%) who served Edward as a minister or a diplomat while on the episcopal bench had earlier served

[78] Keen, *England in the Later Middle Ages,* p. 170; Rosenthal, 'Bishops of Worcester', pp. 33-6; Burger, *Bishops, Clerks and Diocesan Governance*, pp. 5-7.
[79] See also Christine Carpenter's observation in relation to the mid- and later fifteenth century that 'the lay and noble treasurers would have had many other pressing things beyond the king's ailing finances on their mind': Carpenter 'Deskilling', p. 28. For further discussion of this (with particular reference to the treasurership of Ralph, Lord Cromwell), see also *Ibid.,* p. 20; Grummitt, 'Public Service', pp. 153-4; and Reeves, 'Cromwell, Ralph'.
[80] For broader discussion of the importance of administrative experience and training, see also Tout, *Chapters,* iii, pp. 158-64 and Carpenter, 'Deskilling', pp. 2-4.
[81] Buck, 'Hotham, John'; Haines, 'Stratford, Robert'; Partner, 'Wykeham, William'; Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 21-39; *HBC,* p. 94.
[82] Hill, 'Melton, William'; Haines, 'Northburgh, Roger'; Davies, 'Brantingham, Thomas'. For Brantingham's activities while treasurer of Calais, see also Baker, 'Government of Calais', p. 210.
[83] *Foedera,* iii, i, pp. 520, 612, iii, ii, p. 636; Ormrod, 'Barnet, John'. The duchess of Burgundy was the daughter and heir of Louis de Mâle, count of Flanders. For these negotiations, see also Tuck, 'Edmund, first duke of York'. For the Anglo-French discussions over Brittany, and the context of the civil war in the duchy, see also Jones, *Ducal Brittany,* pp. 12-18.

the crown in at least one of these capacities, compared to only sixteen of the fifty-five bishops (29%) who are not recorded as serving Edward in either of these ways.[84]

The experience of these men was invaluable. The dangers of relying on inexperienced diplomats had long been recognised; William of Sarden, a civil lawyer in the reign of Edward I, cautioned that 'this sort of envoy might, after subtle and clever questions… go beyond his instructions, and perhaps say things which are prejudicial'.[85] Yet expertise was perhaps even more prized in relation to domestic administration. While there were numerous lay diplomats with considerable experience – such as Henry Grosmont, duke of Lancaster, who was a leading figure in royal diplomacy from 1340, when he treated with papal representatives at Valenciennes, to May 1360, when he led negotiations for a peace at Brétigny – there were far fewer laymen with a similar understanding of English government.[86] This is evident with regard to the laymen that Edward chose to serve him in the periods in which he decided against having clerical ministers.[87] For example, the first lay chancellor, Henry Bourchier, had never previously worked in central administration, although he had sat in several parliaments and served on a number of judicial commissions.[88] More notable still was the case of Richard Scrope, treasurer between March 1371 and September 1375. Even though Scrope had formerly enjoyed an active military career, been summoned to parliament, and been appointed to nine commissions of oyer and terminer, he does not appear to have had any specialist financial skills or experience of the Westminster bureaucracy.[89] This presented a problem, as was bracingly exposed in the Good Parliament of 1376. At the centre of much furore in the parliament was a loan of 20,000 marks that had been made to the crown in August 1374.[90] Remarkably, despite having been treasurer, and in charge of financial administration at the time, Scrope conceded that the loan was made 'without my knowledge', and stated that it was made by Lord Latimer and Richard Lyons, when it was actually made by Lyons and John Pyel.[91] In the words of George Holmes:

---

[84] Appendix 3.
[85] *Anglo-Scottish Relations,* pp. 93-4. For discussion of Sarden's warnings, see Prestwich, *Edward I,* p. 491; Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice,* pp. 191-2; and Plöger, *Avignon Popes,* p. 186.
[86] Tout, 'Civil Service in the Fourteenth Century', pp. 199, 202-3; Fowler, *King's Lieutenant,* pp. 34, 210; Ormrod, 'Henry of Lancaster'. For specific examples of Grosmont's missions, see *Foedera,* iii, i, pp. 8-9, 129, 136, 165, 173, 175, 201, 216, 224, 263, 271, 289, 344.
[87] There were some exceptions to this, such as Sir Robert Sadington, who served briefly as treasurer in 1340 and then as chancellor between September 1343 and October 1345. He had previously been both chief baron and deputy treasurer of the exchequer: Summerson, 'Sadyngton [Sadington], Robert'.
[88] Rose, 'Bourchier, Robert'.
[89] Vale, 'Scrope, Richard'.
[90] For discussion of this loan, see Tout, *Chapters,* iii, pp. 297-8; McKisack, *Fourteenth Century,* pp. 391-2; Holmes, *Good Parliament,* pp. 72-3, 102-4; and Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 554. In addition to their loan of 20,000 marks cash, Lyons and Pyel also loaned the crown a further 10,000 marks on the same date (23 August) through the repayment of royal debts.
[91] *Anonimalle,* p. 87.

> It is conceivable that such a man as Scrope, probably with very little interest in or aptitude for such dull clerkly business, genuinely did not know much about what was going on in the Exchequer and was happy to leave the responsibility for financial policy to others.[92]

This perceived negligence, which contributed to one of the great political scandals of the fourteenth century, thus plausibly stemmed from lack of interest, inability, and inexperience, which were much less likely with episcopal ministers, who had often risen through the rungs of the royal bureaucracy precisely because of their aptitude for 'dull clerkly business'.[93]

The literacy of bishops was an obvious asset in the royal administration. It was imperative for ministers and diplomats to have a knowledge of Latin, which was both the official language of record – unrivalled in both the chancery and exchequer – and the formal language of diplomatic relations throughout this period.[94] While Latin was still relatively sparsely known outside the clergy, bishops necessarily had an understanding of the language, which was to a large extent the language of the Church.[95] Indeed, many prelates who became administrators and ambassadors were impressively educated. Of the eleven episcopal chancellors of Edward's reign, eight had studied at university, the only exceptions being John Hotham, William Edington, and William Wykeham, who had all enjoyed lengthy careers in royal administration.[96] Some bishop-chancellors boasted distinguished academic careers; Richard Bintworth, for instance, was principal of Paul Hall in Oxford in *c.* 1316, and Robert Stratford served as chancellor of the same university between 1335 and 1338.[97] Similarly, at least eight of the thirteen episcopal treasurers had received some level of university education,[98] with the exceptions – William Airmyn, Roger Northburgh, William Edington, Thomas Brantingham, and Henry Wakefield – having been promoted through the rungs of the royal bureaucracy.[99] Some bishop-treasurers also won renown for their learning. Perhaps most famously, Richard de Bury was heralded by Petrarch as 'a man with sharp mind and a considerable knowledge of letters'.[100] The same can be

---

[92] Holmes, *Good Parliament,* p. 65.
[93] Although Scrope was not well-placed to assume the treasurership, and does not appear to have kept abreast of important details while in office, this is not to claim that he was either stupid or generally incompetent. On the contrary, he was not accused of corruption himself in the Good Parliament; his conduct in the Parliament earned him widespread respect; and he served creditably as chancellor between October 1378 and January 1380, and again between December 1381 and July 1382: Vale, 'The Scropes', i, pp. 81-4; *eadem*, 'Scrope, Richard'.
[94] See Plöger, *Avignon Popes,* p. 190; Dodd, 'Spread of English', pp. 228, 234; and *idem*, 'Clerical Chancellors', pp. 22-3.
[95] While the learning and literacy of certain of Edward's bishops was once doubted, the educational qualifications of the Edwardian bench have now been convincingly established by F.D. Blackley, in his 'Bishops and Learning'.
[96] Appendices 3 and 6.
[97] Bothwell, 'Bintworth, Richard'; Haines, 'Stratford, Robert'.
[98] Appendix 6.
[99] Buck, 'Airmyn, William'; Davies, 'Edington, William'; Davies, 'Brantingham, Thomas'; Davies, 'Wakefield, Henry'. It is also possible that Roger Northburgh was educated at Cambridge, although the evidence is circumstantial: Haines, 'Northburgh, Roger'.
[100] Petrarca, *Rerum Familiarium Libri*, ed. Bernardo, i, p. 116. For discussion of Petrarch's view on de Bury, see also Cachey, 'Petrarchan Cartographic Writing', p. 83. For discussion of, and debate over, the extent of de Bury's learning more generally, see also Thomas, 'Was Richard de Bury an Imposter?'; Denholm-Young, 'Richard de Bury'; and Martin, 'Richard de Bury', pp. 10-29.

said of episcopal diplomats. Of the twenty-three bishops recorded as serving as royal ambassadors, at least eighteen had studied at university,[101] and the three who had almost certainly not – Airmyn, Edington, and Thomas Hatfield – had all been promoted through the king's administration.[102] Once again, some bishop-diplomats had impressive academic careers. By way of example, Henry Gower – who accompanied Edward to perform homage to Philip VI in 1329, was a member of a commission to renew a truce with the French in the south of France in 1334, and was one of the negotiators at the peace conference at Antoing in 1342 – was a doctor of both civil and canon law, a fellow of Merton College, Oxford, from *c.* 1307, and chancellor of the University of Oxford from 1322 to 1325.[103]

The legal background of certain bishops was particularly useful to Edward III.[104] Three episcopal chancellors – Stratford, Bintworth, and Houghton – possessed doctorates in civil law, and two others had studied the subject.[105] Likewise, four episcopal treasurers had received some formal legal education, most notably Adam Orleton and Thomas Charlton, who had obtained doctorates in canon and civil law respectively. Fourteen episcopal diplomats had also studied law at university, with ten achieving doctorates in one, or both, of its branches.[106] Several of these men had enjoyed prominent legal careers prior to their elevations to the episcopate. Most impressively, Simon Sudbury – a leading diplomat during the latter part of Edward's reign – had incepted as a doctor of civil law, and served for a decade as an auditor of the Rota in Avignon, the highest ecclesiastical court of the Catholic Church.[107] Of course, legal training was by no means a prerequisite for episcopal administrators and diplomats, particularly as the former could acquire expert advice from royal justices, and the latter were often supported on embassies by specialist lawyers.[108] Yet a knowledge of the law undoubtedly helped them, as ministers and ambassadors routinely had to grapple with legal problems when they sat on conciliar tribunals, assessed petitions for clemency, and debated technical issues of sovereignty, homage, and inheritance.[109] If, as Adam Orleton alleged, John Stratford concocted the wording of

---

[101] Appendices 3 and 6.
[102] Haines, 'Hatfield, Thomas'. There are two further bishops who served as diplomats – Roger Northburgh and John Kirkby – who might well have attended university. However, there is no definitive evidence of them doing so: Rose, 'Kirkby, John'; Haines, 'Northburgh, Roger'.
[103] *Foedera,* ii, ii, pp. 764, 880, 1185; Williams 'Gower, Henry'.
[104] In this paragraph, 'law' refers to civil and canon law. While several thirteenth-century bishops – such as William Raleigh – had training in common law and experience as justices, they had no fourteenth-century equivalents: Highfield, 'English Hierarchy', pp. 116-7, 133.
[105] John Thoresby had obtained a bachelor's degree in civil law and Henry Burghersh had studied both civil and canon law at Angers: Appendix 6; Bennett, 'Burghersh, Henry'.
[106] Appendices 3 and 6. It is important to recognise, however, that even those episcopal diplomats (and indeed episcopal chancellors and treasurers) who appear to have lacked a formal legal education might still have had some grounding in the subject; John Kirkby, for example, was recorded as loaning books on both branches of law: Rose, 'Kirkby, John'.
[107] Walker, 'Sudbury, Simon'.
[108] For example, when Adam Orleton and William Airmyn travelled to France to treat for peace in 1330, they were accompanied by John Shoreditch, a professor of civil law: *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 491. See also Dunbabin, 'Careers and Vocations', pp. 584-7 and Haines, 'Shoreditch, Sir John'.
[109] See Lawrence, 'University in State and Church', p. 149; Taylor, 'Plantagenet Claim', pp. 158-64; Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 381; and Dodd, 'King's Judges'.

Edward III's declaration of homage to Philip VI 'out of his own head' in *c.* 1331, this was only possible because of his legal experience and familiarity with Anglo-French relations, borne from doctoral studies in civil law, serving as the dean of the court of arches in the early 1320s, and accompanying Edward II and Isabella to Amiens in 1320 for the performance of homage for Aquitaine.[110] Ultimately, the utility of a legal background for those in royal service is suggested by how sixteen of the thirty-one bishops (52%) who served Edward as a minister or a diplomat had studied law at university to some level, compared to just ten of the forty bishops (25%) who never served the crown in either of those capacities.

Bishops also occupied a place at the peak of political society. This endowed them with the necessary prestige to assume even the most vaunted of positions, whether in domestic administration or international diplomacy. It was expected that those holding ministerial office would be men of appropriate standing; the parliamentary commons petitioned in 1343 that 'the chancellor and treasurer should always be peers of the land or other wise and sufficient men, as has always been custom'.[111] This appears to have reflected a concern that the crown's ministers – who at this point were not bishops – might have lacked independent means and status, and might have accordingly been more susceptible to bribery and corruption.[112] Indeed, no lay chancellor rivalled their episcopal counterparts in status until the earldom of Suffolk was conferred on Michael de la Pole in 1385, and no lay treasurer until Thomas Fitzalan, earl of Arundel, was appointed to the treasurership in 1413.[113] It was just as necessary to have ambassadors of an appropriate status.[114] This had been acknowledged for generations. In July 1286, for example, Edward I sent two ambassadors to Pope Honorius IV – one a knight, and the other of unspecified status – and felt obliged to apologise to him, imploring him 'not to resent the lowliness of these envoys, for the speed required for this matter did not permit the sending of more solemn envoys'.[115] Edward III himself was keenly aware of these expectations, and Froissart wrote of his and his council's great outrage, astonishment, and displeasure when Charles V sent a mere kitchen varlet to deliver his letter of defiance in 1369.[116] Bishops, on the other hand, were

---

[110] Note, however, that Stratford's biographer upbraided Orleton's allegation as a lie: 'Birchington', p. 40. In any event, it is thought that this allegation referred to the revised oath of liege homage agreed in 1331, but this is not specified in the primary material, and is accordingly somewhat unclear: Haines, *John Stratford,* p. 317. Stratford had also accompanied Edward III, while still earl of Chester, to France to do homage for Aquitaine in 1325, after the Saint Sardos War.

[111] *PROME,* 1343, 32. Bishops were, of course, peers of the realm; in calling for a return to what had 'always been custom', the petition of 1343 was in effect a demand for the return of episcopal ministers: Dodd, 'Clerical Chancellors', p. 35.

[112] Dodd, 'Clerical Chancellors', p. 34. The chancellor at the time was Robert Parving, a lawyer, and the treasurer, William Cusance, a canon of Lincoln Cathedral. For the careers of these men, see Magrath, 'Sir Robert Parvyng' and Ormrod, 'Cusance, William'.

[113] Tuck, 'Pole, Michael de la'; Harriss, 'Fitzalan, Thomas'.

[114] For more general discussion of this, see Queller, *Office of the Ambassador*, pp. 152-6; Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice,* pp. 134-7; and Benham, *Peacemaking in the Middle Ages*, pp. 132-3.

[115] *CCR, 1279-1288,* p. 431.

[116] *Froissart*, vii, pp. 110-11, 332-3.

men of appropriate standing to serve as diplomats on even the most high-profile missions without risking offence or requiring apology.

Since, at least by the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* of 1535, the average bishopric in England and Wales was valued at over £1,300, many bishops also enjoyed financial resources commensurate with their status.[117] This left them well-placed for serving the crown, as they were able to draw on their diocesan revenues for their salaries and expenses in a way that other royal servants sometimes struggled to do.[118] Such independent means were important for episcopal diplomats, who often waited a long time for the reimbursement of their costs, were occasionally required to stand surety for the crown for the loans which they negotiated on its behalf,[119] and were sometimes left to foot the bill for their own charges in royal service; John Stratford observed in 1341 that he had only received £300 from Edward for his diplomatic expenses, despite crossing the sea thirty-two times on the king's business.[120] Yet the relative wealth of bishops also left them well-placed to work in the central administration. Chancellors were customarily paid £500 each year towards the cost of supporting themselves and their households, with bishops drawing on their diocesan resources to supplement this meagre sum.[121] However, lay ministers did not have this luxury. Consequently, Robert Bourchier, the first lay chancellor, who held office from 14 December 1340 to 28 October 1341, needed an unprecedented level of financial support. Just six days after he became chancellor, Edward compensated him for a pension of £100 a year which he had lost through leaving the service of the earl of Gloucester.[122] The following month, he was gifted £300 'beyond the usual fee of the chancellor', as well as a further £200 'towards purveyances of plate and other things necessary for the office', to assist him with 'the heavy charges incumbent on him in keeping up the household of the chancery'.[123] In his chancellorship of under a year, Bourchier therefore received perhaps £600 – or more than the

---

[117] *EHD IV*, pp. 726-7. This is not to deny, however, that bishops could face real financial difficulties. Perhaps most dramatically, these led to Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury, leasing all his episcopal manors to a group of canons from his cathedral church for a period of seven years – and agreeing to deliver up to them all his animals, books, ornaments, and jewels *etc.* except for 'two vestments, two chalices, a simple mitre, a pastoral staff, and other ornaments pertaining to the pastoral office for him and his ministers' – in exchange for an annual sum of £200 in 1354-5: *CPR, 1354-8*, p. 190. See also Haines, 'Wyville, Robert'.

[118] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, p. 127; Davis, 'Clerics and the King's Service', pp. 27-8.

[119] In April 1339, for instance, John Stratford, Richard de Bury, and Henry Burghersh were among Edward's sureties for a loan of 340,000 florins which they had arranged with Vivian le Rous, a Jew of Strasbourg: *CPR, 1338-40*, p. 371. See also *CPR, 1338-40*, pp. 372, 384-5, 391.

[120] 'Birchington', p. 29; Haines, *John Stratford*, p. 304. It is unclear quite how much Stratford's expenses might have been, but they were clearly significant and undoubtedly in excess of £300. For discussion of diplomatic expenses more broadly, see also Larson, 'English Envoys'; Hill, *King's Messengers*, pp. 110-11; and Bombi, *Anglo-Papal Relations*, p. 115.

[121] Tout, *Chapters*, iii, p. 156. Episcopal chancellors did occasionally need additional support from the king, as in September 1340, when Robert Stratford was granted an additional £200 'in consideration of his heavy expenses since he became chancellor as well as in maintaining the king's honour as in supporting the charges incumbent on the office'. However, they needed this support frequently than lay chancellors, and required smaller sums: *CPR, 1340-3*, p. 32; Wilkinson, *The Chancery*, pp. 62-3, 113-5; Tout, *Chapters*, iii, pp. 156-7.

[122] *CPR, 1340-3*, p. 75.

[123] *CPR, 1340-3*, p. 84.

chancellor's traditional annual salary – over what an episcopal chancellor might have been paid by the crown. This was draining for the royal coffers, at a time when royal finances were already under significant strain.[124] Indeed, the financial benefit to the crown of having clerical civil servants was recognised in the fourteenth century itself. While Wyclif, writing in his *De Blasphemia*, had no time for the point – characteristically maintaining that the underlying problem with royal finances was the endowment of the clergy – he acknowledged that some argued that it was necessary for the king to have clerical servants, for he could not afford to pay them other than by giving them benefices.[125]

As wealthy men, bishops often owned grand palaces and townhouses in London. While this was naturally less relevant for diplomats dispatched overseas, it was indispensable for bishops working in domestic administration. With the exception of the period from 1333 to 1338, when the crown was preoccupied with Scottish affairs, and the administrative offices accordingly decamped to York, they were principally based in Westminster. As a memorandum of 1345 put it, the recognised 'place of the chancery' was in the south-west portion of Westminster Hall, 'where the chancellor commonly sits at the marble table among the clerks of the chancery for discharging the duties of his office'.[126] Ministers therefore had to live, and maintain their households, close to Westminster. With the supply of episcopal housing in and around London, this was not a problem for episcopal chancellors and treasurers. Yet it did pose a challenge for lay ministers. It appears that only one lay chancellor, Robert Parving, a successful lawyer, attempted to live at his own home, a residence in Aldermanbury. But this clearly proved inadequate, and by December 1342 – little over a year into his chancellorship – he was lodging at the bishop of Worcester's house by the New Temple, where he died on 26 April 1343.[127] All the other lay chancellors seemingly rented episcopal residences: Robert Bourchier also lived at the bishop of Worcester's house; Robert Sadington lodged at the London house of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield; and Robert Thorp and John Knyvet (the two lay chancellors of the 1370s) both used the bishop of Salisbury's residence in Fleet Street.[128] While of course this was not an insurmountable problem for those who were not prelates – as these arrangements testify – it was obviously convenient for the crown to employ episcopal ministers who did not need to make arrangements with others in order to live and work in Westminster.

---

[124] Ormrod, 'Accountability and Collegiality', p. 60. For discussion of Edward III's financial constraints at the time, see *idem*, *Edward III*, p. 230.
[125] *Tractatus de Blasphemia*, ed. Dziewicki, p. 264. Wyclif argued that, if the Church was reduced to a state of pristine poverty, the king would be able to raise sufficient revenue from his kingdom to finance his administration: *Ibid.*, p. 265; Hudson, '*Hermofodrita or Ambidexter*', p. 48. See also Tout, 'Civil Service in the Fourteenth Century', pp. 207-9. Of course, as the royal bureaucracy was gradually laicised in the fifteenth century, the crown had to find other ways of rewarding and supporting its servants: Storey, 'Gentleman-bureaucrats', pp. 97-107; Grummitt, 'Public Service'; Carpenter, 'Deskilling', pp. 16-19.
[126] *CCR, 1343-6*, pp. 639-40. See also Tout, 'Household of the Chancery', p. 152.
[127] *Foedera*, ii, ii, p. 1231; *CCR, 1341-3*, p. 691; Tout, *Chapters*, iii, p. 157, n. 5.
[128] *Foedera*, iii, ii, p. 951; *CCR, 1339-41*, pp. 656-7; *CCR, 1343-6*, pp. 349, 456; *CCR, 1369-74*, p. 563; Wilkinson, *The Chancery*, p. 129.

The range of clerical duties performed by chancellors and treasurers furthered the importance of episcopal ministers to the crown. For instance, the chancellor supervised and confirmed exchanges of benefices which touched on royal rights;[129] approved abbatial elections;[130] and had the duty of visiting all royal hospitals and free chapels, with an order of March 1359 remarking that 'the visitation and disposition of all chapels in the king's patronage in England pertains to the chancellor of England and to no other minister'.[131] Similarly, the treasurer oversaw the supervision of clerical temporalities during vacancies;[132] collected the royal share of clerical taxation;[133] and made certain ecclesiastical appointments, as in June 1354, when John de Norwich was appointed warden of St James' Hospital, Westminster, by William Edington, 'the treasurer, in right of his office'.[134] Of course, lay ministers were perfectly capable of performing many of these obligations. However, bishops were evidently more suited to them.[135] Not only was it more seemly for prelates to act in the king's place with regard to clerical duties, which had become part of the chancellor and treasurer's responsibilities precisely because of the fact that the offices had traditionally been filled by ecclesiastics, but bishops were also vastly more experienced at carrying out many of these duties – such as conducting visitations – than laymen.[136] This might have lain behind the fact that episcopal ministers were often diligent and fastidious in discharging these responsibilities, as in April 1377, when Adam Houghton visited St Stephen's College, Westminster, and censured its canons for their financial problems and poor record-keeping.[137]

More broadly, the entire business of government in the Middle Ages was imbued with a spiritual character. As Sophie Ambler has recently pointed out, the political world of medieval England was in many ways theocratic.[138] English kings and their governments wielded sacred as well as temporal power, bore in mind scriptural examples, meted out secular punishments for moral offences, and relied on the Church to bring to bear spiritual punishments against those who committed crimes against the 'State'.[139] This was arguably even more apparent with regard to diplomacy. As the ground-

[129] For instance, in 1339, Richard Bintworth quashed the king's presentation of one Richard de Byfield to the church of Witherdale in an exchange of benefices with one William de Loughton, since the latter acknowledged 'in the chancery that he never wished to exchange': *CPR, 1338-40,* p. 259.
[130] For instance, in 1365, Simon Langham approved the election of John de Depyng as abbot of Thorney: *CPR, 1364-7,* p. 188.
[131] *CCR, 1354-60,* p. 556.
[132] During vacancies, temporalities customarily passed into the king's hands. A keeper was then appointed to administer these, who accounted for their profits at the exchequer: Churchill, *Canterbury Administration,* i, p. 164.
[133] In November 1362, for instance, Simon Langham received the royal share of the papal subsidy of 100,000 florins: *CPR, 1361-4,* p. 268.
[134] *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 74.
[135] Dodd, 'Clerical Chancellors', p. 24.
[136] Wilkinson, *The Chancery,* pp. 1-10, 30-3; Warren, *Governance,* pp. 184-95; Mayr-Harting, *Religion, Politics and Society,* pp. 183-210.
[137] *CPR, 1377-81,* p. 57; Biggs, *St Stephen's College,* p. 55.
[138] Ambler, *Bishops,* p. 1.
[139] *Ibid.,* p. 1.

breaking work of Frank Funck-Brentano highlighted long ago, religion permeated almost every aspect of medieval diplomacy: not only did diplomatic negotiations frequently involve the papacy, but they were also often conducted at religious centres, such as Avignon, Chartres, and Tours, and in religious buildings, including churches, abbeys, and cathedrals.[140] They were typically accompanied by religious ceremonies, and almost invariably involved clerics, since even when missions were not led by a prelate, they often included deans, canons, monks, friars, doctors, and clerks in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.[141] In these circumstances, when religion was woven into the fabric of government and diplomacy, bishops were natural candidates for leading both departments of state and ambassadorial missions.

Yet bishops' utility to the crown fundamentally rested on something very straightforward, to which their availability, experience, education, societal standing, resources, and clerical status all contributed in varying degrees: their ability to do their jobs. Paradoxically, this becomes evident when the criticisms of them are considered. While there were a handful of controversies surrounding episcopal ministers – as in the winter of 1364-5, when there was a scandal in the exchequer while it was under the control of John Barnet – by far the best documented is the prosecution of William Wykeham in 1376.[142] In the words of Thomas Walsingham, 'among the many charges he [John of Gaunt] laid, falsely it is said, against the bishop, he successfully pinned one upon him of being disloyal to the king during the time he had held the office of chancellor'.[143] The precise charges against Wykeham are detailed in the *Anonimalle Chronicle*, and range from him having 'caused the royal hostages of France to be released and freed', to him having 'reduced and erased' the rolls of chancery in favour of his friend, John Grey of Rotherfield.[144] However, although Wykeham was found guilty, the extent to which he was at fault remains unclear. Wykeham had a perfectly plausible defence to the only charge as to which his response is recorded at any length – his adjusting the rolls in favour of John Grey – namely that the change was in no way to his 'advantage or profit', but simply done as 'a good deed', because the original entry had been 'wrongly enrolled'.[145] Moreover, it seems highly unlikely that the

[140] Funck-Brentano, 'Caractère Réligieux', p. 115.
[141] Blust, 'English Clerical Diplomats', p. 449.
[142] For the scandal of 1364-5, see Tout, *Chapters,* iii, pp. 248-50; Ormrod, 'Barnet, John'; Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 36-7; and Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 484-5. For the prosecution of Wykeham in 1376, and its aftermath, see Holmes, *Good Parliament,* pp. 178-9; Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 63-9; and Tompkins, '"Said the Mistress to the Bishop"', p. 210-12. Although Edward III's attacks on John Stratford between December 1340 and May 1341 are also well-documented, Edward's criticisms were principally centred on events after the archbishop had vacated the chancellorship in June 1340, after which he ceased to occupy any formal post in government: 'Birchington', pp. 23-27. In any event, the king's allegations do not bear scrutiny; it appears that Stratford (and his colleagues) had acted with considerable probity and tenacity, and that the king's financial difficulties and the resulting crisis stemmed principally from his own excessive expenditure and impossible demands: Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 268-305; Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 227-39.
[143] *Walsingham,* i, p. 61.
[144] *Anonimalle,* pp. 97-8.
[145] *Anonimalle,* p. 99. See also Moberly, *William Wykeham,* pp. 132-4 and Dodd, 'Clerical Chancellors', pp. 17-8.

charges were actually motivated by any failings of Wykeham while chancellor, a position that he had vacated some five years previously; as Thomas Walsingham claimed, Gaunt appeared to have been searching for 'an opportunity to harm him in any way or by whatever means he could'.[146] As Gwilym Dodd has remarked, 'if this… rather lame set of "official misconduct" charges… was the best Wykeham's opponents could come up with – and even here it is questionable how much in the wrong Wykeham had been – it suggests that the bishop had actually discharged his office with considerable probity'.[147] That even this most concerted attack on an episcopal minister seems partisan, inequitable, and unfair adds to the impression that bishops customarily acquitted themselves with skill and integrity in high office.

Episcopal diplomats were also clearly competent and effective. Of course, this is not to suggest that they had some form of 'Midas touch'. Sometimes, they made disastrous mistakes, as in December 1337, when Henry Burghersh and his fellow envoys in the Low Countries threw Edward's 'wool scheme' into chaos by seizing the first consignment of 10,000 sacks of wool sent to the continent by the Contract Merchants.[148] However, it is evident that – notwithstanding these occasional mishaps – these men were accomplished negotiators. This is nowhere clearer than in the case of Burghersh himself. He earned the praise of chroniclers, with Henry Knighton describing him as an 'urbanely bold' man of 'great distinction' and 'outstanding powers', and Jean le Bel remarking that he was 'bold and valiant', and that he worked 'long and hard' for Edward with regard to Anglo-French relations.[149] Indeed, according to Froissart, he even won the approval of Philip VI; when he delivered Edward's letter of defiance to him in the spring of 1338, the French king apparently replied that 'you have performed well the task for which you came'.[150] Burghersh's diplomatic skills might well have brought material benefits for Edward. In June 1338, Burghersh finalised a treaty with the Flemings, by which they promised to remain neutral and not to assist France or Scotland in return for the maintenance of free trade and the promise

---

[146] *Walsingham,* i, p. 61. Gaunt's reasons for attacking Wykeham are rather less clear. Walsingham's explanation for this – that he was stung by Wykeham's remark that 'the duke was not the son of the king or queen', but merely a changeling, swapped at birth for a baby girl – is scarcely credible. It is more likely, as Virginia Davis has suggested, that he simply attempted to use Wykeham 'as a scapegoat to deflect criticism for the reversal of the decisions of the Good Parliament': *Walsingham,* i, p. 61; Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 63-5.

[147] Dodd, 'Clerical Chancellors', p. 20. See also Shipp, 'William of Wykeham', pp. 91-2.

[148] The 'wool scheme' was a plan to raise funds for the Hundred Years War (and, in particular, Edward's costly alliances) by allowing the 'Contract Merchants' (led by William de la Pole) to purchase 30,000 sacks of wool on credit and sell them in the Low Countries, in spite of the embargo on wool exports, in return for a loan of £200,000 and ceding temporary control of the customs service to them. The seizure of the first consignment of their wool undermined the whole scheme, riled the merchants, and forced Burghersh into authorising ruinous bargains in a desperate attempt to raise money quickly in early 1338; for instance, 707 sacks of wool, valued by the Contract Merchants at £7,464, were surrendered to one Peter Meyne of Venice in repayment for a loan of just £4,563: Fryde, *William de la Pole,* pp. 74-86; Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 197-8. For further analysis of Edward's 'wool scheme' and the seizure of the wool at Dordrecht, see Hughes, *Social and Constitutional Tendencies,* pp. 26-44; Unwin, 'Estate of Merchants', pp. 187-202; Fryde, 'Edward III's Wool Monopoly'; Harriss, *King, Parliament, and Public Finance,* pp. 235-41; and Sumption, *Edward III,* pp. 39-40.

[149] *Knighton,* pp. 26-9; *Jean le Bel,* pp. 77-8.

[150] *Froissart,* i, pp. 404-5. See also Sumption, *Trial by Battle,* pp. 232-3.

that Edward would not invade.[151] Jean le Bel attributed the success of the negotiations to how Burghersh won over Jacob van Artevelde 'by fine words and other means'.[152]

Ultimately, that episcopal ministers and diplomats worked to Edward's satisfaction, and were consequently vital to the king's regime, is evident in how he repeatedly used them. Laying aside the fact that Edward would not have promoted many of them through the royal bureaucracy and on to the episcopal bench had they been useless, it seems unlikely that he would have employed individual bishops again and again had their work for him been unsatisfactory. For instance, John Stratford served as chancellor on three separate occasions in the 1330s, and spent much of the rest of the decade serving Edward abroad as a diplomat.[153] Likewise, William Bateman was appointed to no fewer than seven missions to treat with the French, as well as to further missions to negotiate with the papacy and the Flemings.[154] Yet this is perhaps illustrated most clearly by William Edington. Treasurers did not customarily hold office for long; in the fourteenth century up to his appointment in 1344, twenty-two men had served as treasurer, some on multiple occasions, for an average stint of just over a year.[155] However, Edington served continually in the office for twelve years and seven months, the longest tenure since William of Ely (1196-1215) and before John, Lord Dynham (1486-1501), and thereafter served as chancellor for another six years and two months.[156] Edward would hardly have retained him for so long had he been ineffective and his work disappointing.[157]

Nonetheless, having bishops in high office did pose difficulties for the crown. The most incendiary of these was the fact that they – as clergymen – were meant to be subject to their own courts and laws and could not be reprimanded by the king's justice in the same manner as laymen. This appears to have aroused the frustration not only of Edward himself – who, according to the *French Chronicle of London,* exclaimed in 1340 that he wanted ministers who could be 'drawn, hanged, and beheaded… should [they] ever be attainted of knavery' – but also of political society more broadly, as in 1371, when a parliamentary petition of 'the earls, barons and commons of England' lamented that 'the governance of the realm had been controlled for a long time by people of Holy Church, who are not liable to the king's justice in all cases, whereby great misfortunes and damages have occurred'.[158]

---

[151] *Foedera,* ii, ii, pp. 1042-3, 1046. See also Lucas, *Low Countries,* pp. 278-9.
[152] Of course, it is hard to determine quite what weighed on the mind of Artevelde at any given point, but Burghersh certainly took the lead in negotiating with him in 1337-8: *Foedera,* ii, ii, pp. 998-9, 1041, 1042-3, 1046; Lucas, *Low Countries,* pp. 257-79.
[153] Haines, 'Stratford, John'.
[154] Appendix 10; Haines, 'Bateman, William'.
[155] This includes acting treasurers: *HBC,* pp. 104-5.
[156] Davies, 'Edington, William'; *HBC,* p. 86.
[157] For discussion of Edington's administrative efficacy, see Highfield, *William of Edington,* pp. 3-5; Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government', pp. 317-20; *idem,* 'Protecolla Rolls'; and Carpenter, 'War, Government and Governance', pp. 11-13, 22.
[158] *French Chronicle,* pp. 284-5; *PROME,* 1371, 15. Edward's apparent outburst in 1340 is one of a number of the more vivid details of the crisis of 1340-1 which are found only in the *French Chronicle of London,* a point which has been noted by historians: Watts, 'Review of *Edward III*', p. 58. However, Mark Ormrod has described the *French Chronicle* as 'well informed' with regard to the crisis (Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 230), and

Consequently, in both 1340 and 1371, episcopal ministers were dismissed and laymen appointed in their place. Indeed, in 1340, Edward apparently swore an oath that 'never in his time should [a] man of Holy Church be his treasurer or chancellor'.[159] That Edward was forced into a remarkable *volte-face* – with the crown appointing clerical ministers again in 1344-5 and 1377 respectively – highlights the great benefits of having the offices of state filled by bishops, which amply compensated for this apparent objection of principle.[160]

With their existing knowledge of both diplomacy and domestic government; their literacy and educational qualifications, particularly those in law; their place at the pinnacle of political society; their financial resources and residences in London; their membership of the clerical estate; and – above all – their sheer talent, competence, and diligence in discharging the tasks with which they were entrusted, it is clear that bishops were ideally-equipped for careers in royal service. This is perhaps most apparent in relation to the chancellorship, the office at the very centre of the royal administration. Lay chancellors were manifestly pale imitations of their episcopal counterparts, as they required additional funds over what bishops had received; aroused concerns about their means and status, which were never raised in relation to bishop-chancellors; and were even forced to live in episcopal houses in London, since their own homes were inadequate. It is therefore unsurprising not simply that Edward employed bishop-chancellors throughout the majority of his reign, but also that every previous king since Henry II had employed at least one episcopal chancellor, and that the chancellorship was customarily occupied by a bishop throughout the fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries, until the coming of religious change with the Henrician Reformation.[161]

Episcopal Motivations for Serving the Crown

The question remains, however: why did bishops work in the royal administration? Were they merely servants of the crown, yielding their own time, efforts, acumen, and resources purely for the king's benefit? Or was the dynamic more symbiotic and mutually beneficial, with prelates gaining something in return for their endeavours on the crown's behalf? Naturally, their royal service benefited the crown and the realm, to which prelates had a set of responsibilities, but did it also serve the interests of the Church and of the bishops themselves? Regrettably, while these questions have been considered from the standpoint of individual bishops in a number of revealing biographical studies,[162] they have

---

many historians have included Edward's comments on this point in their accounts. See Tout, *Chapters*, iii, p. 124; Haines, *John Stratford*, pp. 288-9; and Ormrod, *Edward III*, p. 234.

[159] *French Chronicle*, pp. 284-5.

[160] *HBC*, pp. 86, 105.

[161] *HBC*, pp. 84-8. After Edward III's reign, the non-episcopal chancellors were Richard Scrope (who held office between October 1378 and January 1380); Michael de la Pole (who held office between March 1383 and October 1386); and Thomas Beaufort (who held office between January 1410 and December 1411). There were also a number of temporary keepers of the rolls of chancery, who never formally held office as chancellor: *Ibid.*, pp. 86-8.

[162] See Usher, 'Adam de Orleton', pp. 44-7; Haines, *John Stratford*, pp. 426-31; Davis, *William Waynflete*, pp. 31-4, 154-5; and *eadem*, *William Wykeham*, pp. 38, 52, 170-3.

never been contemplated for the episcopacy as a whole, other than in the most fleeting of fashions.[163] This is, of course, a reflection of the fact that the majority of studies of royal government have focused on the subject from the king's perspective, rather than that of his servants.[164] Yet, when studying the relationship between the monarch and the bishops who served him – or indeed any relationship – the viewpoints of both sides must be taken into account.

Nonetheless, before considering why bishops might have desired to serve the crown, it is necessary to confront the contemporary arguments as to why they should not have pursued careers in the king's administration. It cannot be denied that there were serious ideological objections to bishops serving the crown. These can be traced back to biblical teaching, such as the dictum in St Matthew's Gospel that 'no one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will be loyal to the one and despise the other'.[165] This was seized upon in the fourteenth century, and quoted in the *Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards,* where it was deployed to support the argument that 'temporelte and spirituelte ben to partys of holi chirche and þerfore he þat hath takin him to þe ton schulde nout medlin him with þe toþer'.[166] Yet it was by no means only Wycliffites who criticised bishops for their involvement in royal service. The problems which arose from prelates having a dual allegiance to Church and crown were eloquently highlighted by literary writers; in the prologue to *Piers Plowman,* William Langland drew a contrast between how 'bisshopes and bachelers… that han cure vnder Crist' should 'shryuen hire parisshens/ Prechen and praye for them, and þe poure fede', and how some actually 'seruen þe kyng and his siluer tellen/ In þe Cheker and þe Chauncelrie chalangen hise dettes'.[167] These difficulties were also discussed by philosophers, such as William of Ockham, who drew attention to St Paul's exhortation to St Timothy that 'no soldier of God' should be 'involved in secular business'.[168] Moreover, bishops were keenly aware of these challenges themselves; for instance, John Grandisson, in his copy of the *Canones Apostolorum*, specifically marked the seventh canon, namely that no bishop, priest, or deacon should undertake worldly business, for else he would neglect the cure of souls.[169] Indeed, some English bishops had long held concerns about their colleagues' secular activities. In the previous century, this was a recurrent theme in the letters of Robert Grosseteste, who reminded Edmund of Abingdon, archbishop of Canterbury,

[163] Purely by way of example, Robert Swanson remarked that 'the relationship affecting clerics in state service was blatantly symbiotic: individuals were as dependent on the crown for securing their careers within the church as the crown was dependent on the church for providing through those careers sufficient finance and motivation for continued service': Swanson, *Church and Society,* p. 104. For other succinct discussions of this issue, see Pantin, *English Church,* p. 12; Davies, 'Episcopate in England and Wales', i, pp. 475-6; Harriss, *Shaping the Nation,* p. 313; and Dodd, 'King's Judges', p. 223.
[164] For criticism of this, see McHardy, 'King's Clerks', pp. 59-60.
[165] Matthew 6:24.
[166] Cronin, 'Twelve Conclusions', p. 299.
[167] Langland, *Piers Plowman*, ed. Schmidt, i, p. 12.
[168] 2 Timothy 2:4; Nederman, 'Royal Taxation', p. 160.
[169] Steele, 'John Grandisson', p. 155.

in 1236 of the canonical instruction that 'a bishop… is by no means to take on worldly responsibilities'.[170]

However, the stark binary between secular and sacred employment posed by Lollard writers and some canonists was straightforwardly rejected by many orthodox thinkers in the fourteenth century, who drew on a different set of biblical authorities. These are perhaps most boldly outlined in Roger Dymoke's *Liber Contra XII Errores et Hereses Lollardorum*, his response to the *Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards,* which was presented to Richard II in 1395. In his work, Dymoke set out how the two swords of St Peter indicated that the use of each – spiritual and temporal – was appropriate to the clergy, and also noted how Christ's instruction to St Peter to return his sword to his scabbard, rather than throw it away, implied the compatibility of worldly and religious office.[171] Although modern scholars, such as Anne Hudson, have confessed to finding Dymoke's arguments unpersuasive, this does not mean that they were viewed as such in the fourteenth century. While a wide circulation should not necessarily be taken as a sign of wide acceptance, it is striking that Dymoke's text was extensively circulated, with copies surviving in Oxford, Cambridge, and Paris, and copies recorded as having existed in Crowland Abbey, Glastonbury Abbey, Wells Cathedral, and London.[172] Indeed, Dymoke's understanding had a long pedigree. Even while Robert Grosseteste in the previous century expressed discomfort at the worldly service of clergymen, he still accepted the underlying logic of Dymoke's view. Writing in *c.* 1235, he noted that the two swords were given to St Peter, to whose care 'both ecclesiastical and civil peace and law have been entrusted'. In turn, since prelates 'by themselves take the part and place of Peter', the 'undivided power of both kinds of sword and law' belonged to them.[173] Although the temporal sword was rightly delegated to 'the hand and ministry of secular princes', kings were still 'obliged to draw and sheath the sword they carry at the prompting and command of the princes of the Church', and Grosseteste himself wrote at least six letters to Henry III proffering advice, counsel, and instruction on matters ranging from royal justice to the proper direction of military matters.[174] Moreover, both Dymoke and Grosseteste – alongside a whole host of other writers – also drew attention to the examples of Old Testament figures, such as Moses, Joshua, Eli, and Samuel, who (to varying extents) wielded both swords and administered both laws 'as a

---

[170] *Letters of Robert Grosseteste,* p. 137.
[171] Dymmok, *Liber Contra XII Errores,* ed. Cronin, pp. 146-56.
[172] Hudson, '*Hermofodrita or Ambidexter*', pp. 42-3; *eadem,* 'Dymoke [Dymock], Roger'.
[173] For the history of this argument, which dates back to the Investiture Controversy, and the circles of Emperor Henry IV and Pope Gregory VII, see Basile, 'Templars, Crusades, and Consideration', pp. 3-10.
[174] *Letters of Robert Grosseteste,* pp. 120-1, 326-7, 366-9. While these arguments are expressed more fully in the work of Dymoke and Grosseteste, they were certainly known and deployed in Edward III's reign itself. They are most explicit in the great council of June 1373, which is described in the continuation to the *Eulogium Historiarum*. While the council was not concerned with the place and power of prelates in politics, it did consider papal claims to temporal lordship. In the council, and in the presence of the bishops, Uthred of Boldon argued for the legitimacy of papal claims 'by way of a sermon, taking as his theme "Behold, here are two swords", by which he intended to demonstrate that Peter had both temporal and spiritual powers': *Eulogii,* p. 12. For the great council more generally (including the counterarguments raised by the minor friar, John Mardisley), see *Eulogii,* pp. 12-13 and Catto, 'Alleged Great Council'.

foundation for both temporal and spiritual peace'.[175] There was therefore biblical precedent for marrying spiritual and temporal office.

Furthermore, bishops were convinced of the need to offer counsel to the crown. In part, this was again derived from scriptural example. The contrasting cases of Solomon and Rehoboam were often cited to illustrate the importance of the king receiving, and heeding, appropriate counsel. In January 1341, John Stratford set out to Edward III how:

> It is written in the Book of Kings that Solomon, who was the wisest king that ever was, took to him the most aged men and the wisest of the earth, by whose advice and by his own sense he ever held the land of Israel in quiet and peace, and moreover all the kings that were about him altogether at his will. And after his death reigned his son, Rehoboam, who left the good counsel of his father and of the aged and wise men who had been with his father, and did according to the counsel of young men who wished to please him and knew little; whereby he lost all the land of Israel, save only the twelfth part. In like manner have many kings of Israel and of other lands been brought to trouble by evil counsel.[176]

Bishops also understood the significance of counsel from classical philosophy, with Richard de Bury, in his *Philobiblon*, citing Aristotle's maxim that 'all action depends on counsel'; from Roman and canon law, which propounded the principle that 'what touches all should be approved by all'; and from their own experience, with Adam Orleton recalling in 1334 that the counsel which Edward II received from the Despensers lay behind the despoiling of prelates, and the disinheritance, imprisonment, and banishment of many of the great men of the land.[177] Considering all this, the fact that bishops cared deeply for the wellbeing of the realm, and the nature of the oaths which they swore to the king for the restitution of their temporalities – by which they promised to be attendant to his business and keep his counsel secret – it is unsurprising that many prelates felt that it was natural, right, and proper for them to give advice to the crown. This was underlined by papal command; the well-known letter of Pope Innocent III to his legate, Nicholas, bishop of Tusculum, instructed him to ensure that the men elevated to English bishoprics were 'loyal to the king, profitable to the kingdom, and capable of giving counsel and help'.[178] Moreover, this was also highlighted in contemporary works of political thought, such as the lavishly-illustrated treatise of Walter de Milemete, *On the Nobility, Wisdom, and Prudence of Kings*, which was presented to Edward III in the first months of his reign.[179] When Milemete enjoined Edward to receive 'faithful counsel', it is telling that he accompanied his text with an image of a mitred bishop providing advice to the king.[180] In these

[175] *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, pp. 120-1 (from which the quotation is taken); Dymmok, *Liber Contra XII Errores*, ed. Cronin, pp. 148-9.
[176] *EHD IV*, p. 70.
[177] *Philobiblon*, p. 1; *Chartulary*, pp. 105-7; Ambler, *Bishops*, p. 59; Haines, *Church and Politics*, p. 176.
[178] *Selected Letters of Innocent III*, ed. Semple and Cheney, p. 166.
[179] Michael, 'Iconography of Kingship', p. 22.
[180] Oxford, Christ Church, MS 92, fo. 37b; *Milemete*, p. 74; *Political Thought*, p. 43.

circumstances, it was entirely reasonable that bishops felt equipped to occupy the ministerial positions in which they could counsel the monarch most readily.

Equally strong arguments could be made for bishops' involvement in diplomacy and making peace. Ultimately, these were also derived from scripture, and the abundance of verses in the Bible applauding both peace – with St Paul encouraging St Timothy to pursue 'righteousness, faith, love, and peace' – and peacemakers, with Christ in the Sermon of the Mount proclaiming that 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God'.[181] These points were embraced and echoed in the later Middle Ages; one anonymous sermon of the fourteenth century lamented how 'þe liff of þe Cristen pepull haþ ben euer wars and wars', stated that 'Cristend shedyng of Cristen blode' was a tragedy, and insisted that it was the responsibility of 'men of holychurche' to stand against and prevent that.[182] This perspective was affirmed by bishops involved in royal diplomacy, such as Richard de Bury, who decried the 'harrying furies of war', recognised that God was a 'lover of peace', and called for the establishment of peace and dispelling of wars so that 'our days [might be] tranquil under His protection'.[183] Indeed, prelates explicitly used these arguments to justify their diplomatic efforts; John Stratford considered that all the effort, expense, and danger of his numerous missions to France was justified because they had endeavoured to obviate 'the dangers to both body and soul posed by the threatened war'.[184] Viewed in this framework, bishops' participation in royal diplomatic efforts – which were customarily couched as attempts to avoid armed conflict – was not merely something to assist the crown, but a Christian obligation.

The tensions between the perspective that bishops should not involve themselves in worldly affairs, and the perspective that such involvement was reasonable, legitimate, and indeed a duty are perhaps most apparent in the thoughts and writings of Stratford himself in the winter of 1340-1. On the one hand, he offered perhaps the most poignant statement of the former view: according to Stephen Birchington, in his sermon of 29 December 1340, he acknowledged – with tears in his eyes – how his immersion in royal government had led to the neglect of his spiritual duties, and implored his congregation for their forgiveness, declaring his wish to devote himself exclusively in the future to the exercise of his pastoral office and to the protection of the liberties of the Church. On the other hand, in the same sermon, he proclaimed that it was in the rather worldly forum of parliament that he wished to defend the Church's rights and those of ecclesiastics, as well as to assist both the clergy and the whole community of the realm.[185] Moreover, just three days later, in a letter to Edward III, he articulated how the king had been assisted in the past by the 'good advice of the prelates, peers, great men, and wise of the council of the land', and stated that he now needed to embrace again 'the

[181] 2 Timothy 2:22; Matthew 5:9.
[182] *Middle English Sermons*, ed. Ross, pp. 254-5.
[183] *Philobiblon*, pp. 46, 48, 52.
[184] 'Birchington', p. 29.
[185] *Ibid.*, pp. 21-2; Haines, *John Stratford*, pp. 284-5.

counsel of the great and wise of your land and act in your affairs by them and their counsels' in order to 'govern well' the land. For Stratford, it was a direct consequence of Edward failing to heed their counsel – and instead listening to evil, covetous, and unwise counsel – that the king began to act in an unjust and wrongful fashion, seizing 'various clerks, peers, and other people of the land', in contravention of both Magna Carta and his coronation oath.[186]

While Stratford avowedly longed to abandon secular business and devote himself to his ecclesiastical responsibilities, it was precisely because of the absence of clergy in the king's counsels that the liberties of the Church were now imperilled, and it was in parliament that he wished to fight for those liberties. *Prima facie,* this seems like an impossible quandary, with Stratford caught between inconsistent and conflicting desires to abstain from worldly activities and throw himself into them, both for the good of the Church. Yet one wonders whether it is in this dilemma that a possible solution emerges: so long as counselling the king and attending parliament was done – at least to some degree – with the intention of safeguarding the interests of the Church, they may not have been 'worldly' or 'secular' activities at all, but rather a 'spiritual' enterprise in protecting and upholding the rights of the clergy. This was therefore not distinct from the pastoral office to which Stratford pledged to devote himself, but an integral part of it.

Among this complex and sometimes contradictory tangle of standpoints, and potential ways to square them, it is possible to discern broad consensus on two issues. First, that it was incumbent on bishops to provide at least some degree of counsel and support to the king. This was routinely acknowledged by prelates, stressed by other writers, and was, after all, what bishops-elect pledged to the crown. Second, that it was incumbent on bishops to care for the Church, their dioceses, and the souls in their charge, and that excessive involvement in secular affairs to the point that these duties were neglected was unacceptable. This was also repeatedly accepted by bishops; emphasised by other scholars, both orthodox and heterodox; and made clear by canonical authority. Yet the question of how to balance and apply these views in practice seems to have been left to individual prelates to decide and justify to themselves, to their flocks, and to God. There were a variety of different courses of action available to them, from quiet ministry in their dioceses with the provision of counsel and assistance to the crown on the rarest of occasions, to active royal service as a diplomat or minister of the crown while maintaining oversight of diocesan business.[187] For present purposes, however, the key point is that the prelates who chose the latter path were capable of reconciling their public responsibilities with the teaching of the Church and their own spiritual vocations.[188]

[186] *EHD IV,* p. 71.
[187] Thompson, 'Prelates and Politics', p. 89.
[188] Dodd, 'King's Judges', p. 237.

That bishops could balance their activities in the service of both 'Church' and 'State' is clear on a practical, as well as ideological, level. This is evident in the career of Henry Burghersh, whose episcopate has been painstakingly studied by Nicholas Bennett. Burghersh's involvement in governmental business certainly occupied much of his time; of the forty-four months which he spent successively as treasurer and chancellor between March 1327 and November 1330, there were only eight in which he predominantly resided in his diocese of Lincoln.[189] However, as Bennett has demonstrated, the appointment of a vicar-general while the bishop was in France, the astute use of suffragan bishops, the granting of wider powers to sequestrators, the employment of commissaries to conduct a visitation of his diocese, and the continued activity of Burghersh himself all meant that his absences did not lead to the neglect of either the administration of his see or the souls of his flock.[190] As Virginia Davis highlighted in her excellent biography of the bishop, William Wykeham was also able to successfully marry his political and ecclesiastical responsibilities. In the first four years of his episcopate, from his provision to the bishopric of Winchester in July 1367 to his resignation of the chancellorship in March 1371, Wykeham enjoyed a flourishing career at the royal court.[191] Nevertheless, this did not stop him from attending to the needs of his diocese. He cared for the parish churches of his see; in September 1370, for instance, he dispatched commissioners to investigate the physical condition of the many churches in his cathedral city, since he was concerned that they were becoming derelict due to the poverty brought about by recurrent plague.[192] He also supervised the monastic houses of his bishopric, paying particular attention to the affairs of nunneries, as in February 1369, when he enjoined the abbess of Romsey to admonish one of her nuns, Marion, to 'resume the veil and conform to [the] rule'.[193] Furthermore, he tended to his diocesan manors; his manor of Highclere, for example, saw extensive, and expensive, development during these years, which reached a peak in 1370-1, when £286 6s 6d was received at Highclere in money, grain, and hay from Wykeham's central accounts.[194] It is evident that Wykeham could simultaneously discharge his duties to the realm and to his diocese; his political activities did not undercut his concern for, and endeavours on behalf of, both the people and the buildings entrusted to his care.[195] Thus through diligence, hard work, and assiduousness, even the bishops most bound up in royal administration could devote considerable attention to their sees.

Moreover, the crown appears to have supported bishops in their attempts to balance their royal and ecclesiastical duties. In particular, when bishops were absent for extended periods on royal service,

---

[189] Bennett, 'Beneficed Clergy', i, pp. 92-3.
[190] *Ibid.*, pp. 93-4.
[191] Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 33-9, 53-6.
[192] *Wykeham,* ii, pp. 121-2; Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 109-10.
[193] *Wykeham,* ii, pp. 77-8; Davis, *William Wykeham,* p. 111.
[194] Philpotts, 'Plague and Reconstruction', p. 126. The work at Highclere ranged from the building of a new hall to the extension of its park.
[195] Davis, *William Wykeham,* p. 116; *eadem,* 'William Wykeham's Early Ecclesiastical Career', p. 62.

Edward often took their 'men, lands, rents, and possessions' – both personal and diocesan – into his 'special protection'.[196] This applied to diplomats, as in 1350, when William Bateman was taken into Edward's 'special protection' while he was 'on the king's service at Calais to treat with others of the last truce between the king and his adversaries of France',[197] as well as royal ministers, as in the following year, when John Thoresby enjoyed Edward's 'special protection' because he 'stays in the chancery for the business of the king and his realm'.[198] Edward appears to have taken his duties to defend and safeguard the property under his protection seriously, dispatching at least seventeen commissions of oyer and terminer to investigate and deal with concerns raised by bishops whose possessions had been taken into his care.[199] By way of example, Edward sent commissions in February 1340, when Richard de Bury complained that men had broken into his free warren at Howden in Yorkshire and felled his trees while he had been engaged on diplomatic business; in July 1364, when John Barnet protested that people had stolen his goods, trodden down his crops, and assaulted his servants while he was serving as treasurer; and in February 1371, when William Wykeham complained that 'evildoers' had broken into his parks in Hampshire, hunted his game, and fished in his fisheries while he had been occupied as chancellor.[200] It is therefore unsurprising that even bishops who were not absent from their dioceses sometimes sought the king's protection for their lands, as in August 1348, when John Stratford requested that Edward take his parks and his chases into his care 'so as to protect them from injury', while he was 'so infirm that he cannot rule himself and his property'.[201] Ultimately, it is unclear whether bishops' lands were safer under the king's 'special protection' than they were under the protection of an active and resident diocesan. However, the king's preparedness to take episcopal property into his care at least alleviated some of the risks to prelates' possessions from their being engaged in royal service.

Indeed, a bishop's place at the heart of government enabled him to secure benefits for the Church. It allowed prelates to moderate royal policy in the Church's interests. In Edward III's reign, this is most apparent in the case of the king's conflict with Thomas de Lisle, bishop of Ely, in 1355-6. Their dispute had its origin in the bishop's involvement in a campaign of local harassment against the king's cousin, Blanche, Lady Wake, which led her to petition the crown at the parliament of November 1355 that 'she and her own people may live in peace, since they are greatly menaced from one day to another'.[202] After Edward took her case into his hands, and de Lisle foolishly implied that royal power

---

[196] For further discussion of 'special protection', see Critchley, 'Judicial Protection', pp. 196-7 and Lacey, 'Protection and Immunity', pp. 87-8.
[197] *CPR, 1348-50,* p. 592.
[198] *CPR, 1350-4,* p. 79.
[199] Appendix 11.
[200] *CPR, 1338-40,* p. 486; *CPR, 1364-7,* p. 64; *CPR, 1370-4,* p. 103.
[201] *CPR, 1348-50,* p. 174.
[202] *PROME,* 1355, 30. For fuller analysis of the dispute, which is necessarily compressed here, see Highfield, 'Relations', pp. 141-6; Aberth, *Criminal Churchmen,* pp. 117-33; Dodd, 'Clerical Chancellors', pp. 30-1; and Thompson, 'Fourteenth Century', pp. 105-6.

obstructed him from obtaining justice, members of the episcopacy tried to intervene in the parliament itself. According to the *Historia Eliensis,* Simon Islip and the other bishops present approached the king, fell to their knees, and sued for mercy on de Lisle's behalf, exhorting Edward to receive him back into his grace. However, this was of no avail, perhaps because de Lisle did not help matters by remaining upright himself.[203] Consequently, the king, infuriated that de Lisle had wronged him 'so openly in our full parliament', determined to seize his temporalities immediately after the assembly ended on 30 November.[204] Yet, as Edward headed north to conduct a winter campaign against the Scots, the chancellor, John Thoresby, and the treasurer, William Edington, sought to stall his measures against de Lisle, and did not carry out his commands. Their reasons can only be guessed at, but presumably reflected at least some combination of fellow-feeling towards their colleague on the episcopal bench; alarm that such hasty punishment might set a precedent for further arbitrary seizures of ecclesiastical estates; and concern that Edward's plans were illegal.[205] Nonetheless, what is striking is that Edward's clerical ministers were both able and prepared to neglect his instructions when a fellow bishop was concerned; in a letter of 30 December, Edward pointedly remarked that 'if the matter had touched a great peer of the realm other than a bishop you would have made an altogether different execution'.[206]

Moreover, it seems that Thoresby and Edington took measures to oppose Edward's plans beyond simply disregarding his orders. It appears likely that Edward intended for de Lisle's confiscated estates to be assigned to the chamber, as previous royal forfeitures had been.[207] Yet on 20 January 1356, while the king was still in the north (where he would remain until March), the chamber estate was formally abolished, not by a warrant under one of Edward's personal seals, but rather by a writ under the great seal, issued at Westminster.[208] As Ormrod has argued, the timing and diplomatic of this writ suggest that it represented a decision taken behind the king's back by Thoresby and Edington in a 'pre-emptive strike' against Edward's proposals for the Ely temporalities.[209] In the event, the administrative hurdles erected by Thoresby and Edington did not force Edward to abandon his determination to seize de Lisle's lands, which were eventually confiscated in October 1356, leased out in February 1357, and administered by the wardrobe and exchequer.[210] Yet they were able to delay his plans for almost a year; to force due process to be followed, so that the estates were only confiscated

---

[203] 'Historia Eliensis', ed. Wharton, p. 657; *PROME,* 1355, 30.
[204] Wilkinson, 'Letter of Edward III', pp. 250-1; Aberth, *Criminal Churchmen,* p. 136.
[205] A subsequent council composed of justices, the barons of the exchequer, and the king's serjeants found that Edward's plans were illegal, since de Lisle had yet to be convicted in a court of law, and a statute of 1340 ordained that the crown could not seize clerical temporalities 'without a true and just cause, according to the law of the land, and judgement thereupon given': *SR,* i, p. 294; Richardson and Sayles, 'The Early Statutes', p. 32, n. 73; Aberth, *Criminal Churchmen,* pp. 136-7.
[206] Wilkinson, 'Letter of Edward III', p. 251.
[207] Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government', p. 257.
[208] Tout, *Chapters,* xi, p. 305, n. 2; Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 624.
[209] Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government', pp. 257-8; Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 382, n. 114.
[210] Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government', p. 259; Aberth, *Criminal Churchmen,* pp. 138-9.

after de Lisle was convicted of a felony; and to thereby ensure that the statute of 1340 – which protected clerical temporalities from arbitrary royal seizures – was complied with, rather than flagrantly undermined.[211]

The range of ways in which episcopal ministers and diplomats assisted the Church was by no means limited to the moderation of royal decisions. Perhaps most importantly, episcopal diplomats could secure peace. For instance, John Thoresby, Thomas Hatfield, and Gilbert Welton were involved in negotiating the Treaty of Berwick, and were present when it was sealed in October 1357 as 'ambassadors and deputies on behalf of the noble prince Edward, king of England'.[212] Although the treaty's terms – which provided that David II be released for a ransom of 100,000 marks, payable in ten annual instalments, with a truce to last 'until the sum shall be fully paid' – were never fully executed, it nonetheless paved the way for an uneasy peace between England and Scotland for the remainder of Edward III's reign.[213] This brought respite and relief to their dioceses of York, Durham, and Carlisle, which had all been affected by Scottish raids and invasions. Episcopal ministers also helped to ease the longstanding concerns about clergymen being subject to secular courts. Not only were they able to intercede for clergy in certain cases,[214] but the fact that the chancellor (who occupied an increasingly prominent judicial role) was customarily a bishop,[215] and the fact that prelates often dominated the royal council (where a number of civil cases were heard), allowed the subjection of ecclesiastics to the king's jurisdiction to be somewhat shrouded.[216] If clergy were to be subject to royal justice, this was at least royal justice that was often handed down by fellow clergy. More routinely, bishop-ministers could direct the machinery of government to aid clerics. In September 1327, for example, John Hotham (the chancellor) issued a commission of oyer and terminer to investigate the complaints of Elizabeth, prioress of Stikeswald, that a group of men had carried away her goods, including a cart and three horses, and assaulted her servants. This was expressly recorded as being 'for God'.[217]

---

[211] *SR,* i, p. 294; Aberth, *Criminal Churchmen,* p. 246.
[212] *EHD IV*, p. 101; Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 389. See also *Foedera*, iii, i, pp. 372-4 and *Register of the Black Prince*, iii, p. 291.
[213] Balfour-Melville, *Edward III and David II*, pp. 18-22; Campbell, 'England, Scotland and the Hundred Years War', pp. 200-206.
[214] For example, in July 1334, a Franciscan friar, John de Luceby, was pardoned 'at the instance' of Richard de Bury (the treasurer), of all 'homicides, felonies, robberies, and other trespasses against the peace' of which he had been indicted: *CPR, 1330-4,* p. 560.
[215] In January 1349, for instance, Edward instructed the sheriffs of London to proclaim that 'affairs concerning the common law' be sued before the chancellor, and that affairs concerning 'his special favour' be sued before either the chancellor or the keeper of the privy seal: *CCR, 1346-9,* p. 615. Nonetheless, the matter of the chancellor's developing judicial responsibilities is complex, for which see also Baldwin, *King's Council,* pp. 236-61; Plucknett, *Statutes and their Interpretation*, pp. 121, 169; Wilkinson, *The Chancery*, pp. 47-53; Avery, 'Equitable Jurisdiction', pp. 141-2; and Tucker, 'Court of Chancery'.
[216] Dodd, 'King's Judges', p. 226.
[217] *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 209.

Indeed, there are at least some hints that episcopal ministers were more attentive to the requests of clergy, and more inclined to use the levers of government to benefit clerical interests, than their lay counterparts. This is suggested by an analysis of the pardons obtained in this period. By the fourteenth century, the chancellor had assumed primary responsibility for authorising royal pardons; while certain novel or complex cases might still be forwarded for royal authorisation, he processed the majority himself.[218] In the thirty-six years of Edward's reign in which a bishop served as chancellor, seventy-four pardons were issued through the intercession of those who can be readily identified as clergymen, or just over two a year.[219] Many of these were for other clergy, as in December 1335, when – during the chancellorship of John Stratford – a chaplain called John de Lobenham was pardoned 'for the death of Walter son of Alan atte Kirke of Stretton Magna, and of any consequent outlawry' through the intercession of Richard de Bury.[220] Yet in the eleven years of the reign in which laymen held the chancellorship, clergymen only successfully interceded for fourteen pardons, or just over one a year.[221] In contrast, the titled nobility interceded for 409 pardons when a bishop served as chancellor, or a little over a eleven a year, but 243 pardons in periods in which laymen occupied the chancellorship, or about twenty-two a year.[222] In other words, the clergy successfully interceded for pardons about twice as frequently in periods when the chancellor was a bishop rather than a layman, while the titled nobility did so only half as frequently. Ultimately, what lay behind this is unclear, but it seems plausible that the trend might have reflected a greater willingness to seek the assistance of an episcopal chancellor on the part of the English clergy, or a stronger sympathy with, and willingness to act upon, clerical requests by bishop-chancellors themselves, or both.[223] What appears to be the case, however, is that ecclesiastical interests and desires were better served – at least with regard to pardons – by episcopal ministers than by lay ones.

Bishops' work in the royal administration might have also served their personal interests. They might well have enjoyed their diplomatic activities on the part of the crown. Of course, these duties were by no means always agreeable. Diplomatic missions abroad inevitably meant absence from home, and sometimes necessitated leaving domestic responsibilities – both diocesan and personal – in the hands

[218] Lacey, *Royal Pardon,* pp. 21-2, 59-61.
[219] Appendix 12. 'Readily identifiable' clergymen are those whom Lacey has recorded as being bishops, abbots, chaplains, and confessors *etc.* For discussion of the role of intercessors in securing pardons, see Lacey, *Royal Pardon,* pp. 44-58. For the reasons outlined in the Appendix, the figures used in this paragraph are somewhat approximate, and thus its suggestions are somewhat tentative.
[220] *CPR, 1334-8,* p. 190.
[221] Appendix 12.
[222] *Ibid.*
[223] It is unlikely, however, that this reflected the timing of military campaigns. While nobles secured vast numbers of pardons for their retainers both before and after campaigns, these peaked in 1339 (when Richard Bintworth, bishop of London, was chancellor); 1346-7 (when John Offord, dean of Lincoln, was chancellor); and 1357 (when William Edington, bishop of Winchester, was chancellor): Lacey, *Royal Pardon,* pp. 47-8, 187, 200. One might therefore have expected the nobility to have obtained pardons *more* regularly when there was an episcopal chancellor, rather than less.

of others for significant periods of time.[224] There was also a chance that bishops might encounter some personal risk or danger;[225] that they might face opprobrium in the event that their mission was unsuccessful;[226] and that they might face delays in recovering their expenses, or indeed never recover them at all.[227] However, Joel Rosenthal has recently argued that bishops might have valued their ambassadorial roles. He suggested that:

> During the course of prolonged and frequent absence from diocese and home they would come to know and enjoy a world of comfortable (or luxurious) lodgings, of the pleasant task of doing familiar business with old acquaintances who might have become friends… and of learning the news and gossip of Christendom (which they would have sent home).[228]

Bishops might also have relished the pomp and ceremony of proceedings; Jean le Bel described how, when the English ambassadors, headed by Henry Burghersh, arrived in Valenciennes in May 1337, 'everyone gazed in awe at their splendid appearance: it was as lavish a display as if the king had been there in person, and all who saw them were amazed'.[229] More certainly, they were able to use diplomatic missions to indulge their literary passions. Richard de Bury wrote of how his various journeys abroad permitted him to scour for books and make the acquaintance of booksellers 'over the realms of France, Germany, and Italy', where 'fame of our of love of them [books]' had travelled.[230] Similarly, in 1319, while on a mission to the curia, Adam Orleton met one Laurence Bruton, from whom he borrowed a number of tomes, including Thomas Aquinas' *Summa,* Anselm's *De Similitudinibus,* and Aristotle's *Rhetoric*,[231] and in 1345, John Sheppey appears to have used his embassy to Spain as an opportunity to collect Gascon sermons.[232] Indeed, prelates seem to have adored some of the places which they were given the chance to visit; de Bury, for instance, exclaimed:

---

[224] For instance, Henry Burghersh remained abroad from April 1337 to December 1340 (apart from two short visits to England), carrying out a variety of diplomatic duties for Edward: Bennett, 'Burghersh, Henry'. Prior to leaving in 1337, he appointed Edmund de Bereford to supervise the temporalities of his diocese; Bereford and Bartholomew Burghersh as his attorneys; and Simon Islip (the future archbishop of Canterbury) as his vicar-general: *CPR, 1334-8,* pp. 403, 421.

[225] While travelling to Avignon as archbishop-elect of York in 1340 (to seek confirmation of his election, rather than on royal duties), William Zouche was kidnapped near Geneva, and only released on payment of a ransom and after swearing not to reveal the identity of his captors: Bennett, 'Zouche, William'.

[226] Most famously, Alexander Bicknor was dispatched to Gascony in 1324 to enquire into the St Sardos dispute and was besieged inside La Réole with the earl of Kent when the latter surrendered it to the French. The following year, after his return, Edward II asked Pope John XXII to remove him from office, on the grounds that (among other things), he had advised Kent to surrender the town: *Foedera,* ii, ii, pp. 136-7. For discussion of this episode, see Haines, *Church and Politics,* p. 157; Phillips, 'Bicknor, Alexander'; and *idem, Edward II,* pp. 464-6. See also Lydon, 'Case Against Alexander Bicknor', pp. 103-11.

[227] Haines, 'Simon de Montacute', p. 43; Rosenthal, 'Edward III's Bishops', p. 308.

[228] Rosenthal, 'Edward III's Bishops', pp. 308-9.

[229] *Jean le Bel,* p. 67. See also Sumption, *Trial by Battle,* p. 194.

[230] *Pbilobiblon.,* pp. 54, 61.

[231] *Orleton (Hereford),* pp. 119-20.

[232] Pantin, *English Church,* p. 12.

> O Holy God of gods in Sion, what a mighty stream of pleasure made glad our hearts whenever we had leisure to visit Paris, the Paradise of the world, and to linger there; where the days seemed ever few for the greatness of our love![233]

Bishops might therefore have derived real pleasure, in addition to intellectual and social fulfilment, from their diplomatic service.

Members of the episcopacy might have also enjoyed their work in England's domestic administration. Since many prelates had dedicated much of their lives to the service of the crown, and spent much of their careers ascending the rungs of the royal bureaucracy, it would be unsurprising if they had sought to continue working for the king, in spite of the time commitment, stress, and hard work which their roles sometimes demanded; a pardon issued to John Stratford in June 1338 referred to 'his fruitful services to the king and realm, [and] his heavy charges and anxieties therein'.[234] They might therefore have been – in Gwilym Dodd's phrase – '"civil-service" minded', and have derived personal satisfaction from reaching the zenith of the king's government.[235] This might have been especially the case for the bishops who had been deprived of their positions by Edward II. John Hotham had enjoyed a lengthy career in royal service, as chancellor of the Irish exchequer from 1309 to 1310, escheator north of the Trent from 1309 to 1311, chancellor of the exchequer from 1312 to 1316, when he was elected bishop of Norwich, and treasurer from 1317 to 1318, before eventually becoming chancellor in June 1318.[236] However, he was deprived of the chancellorship in January 1320, and thereafter Edward II's actions against him became increasingly pernicious: in late 1321, the Bridlington chronicler reports that he was summoned to London and fined for an unknown offence; in April 1324, he was pressed for debts of more than £1,000; and in November 1324, he was forced, as noted above, to enter into a bond of £2,000 with the Younger Despenser.[237] It would have been small wonder if he had felt vindicated on his return to office in late January 1327. Of course, such deductions about bishops' personal feelings, emotions, and motivations are necessarily speculative from a distance of seven centuries, but while they cannot be conclusively proved, they should not be disregarded.

What is quite clear is that bishops' time in royal service enabled them to develop a personal relationship with the king. While apparent warmth and fellow-feeling between prelates and Edward III by no means depended on the bishop having held high office, it hardly hindered matters.[238] Richard de Bury enjoyed a close association with the king before his elevation to the episcopate; in December 1332, Edward wrote to the treasurer and barons of the exchequer asking them to audit de Bury's

---

[233] *Philobiblon*, p. 56.
[234] *CPR, 1338-40*, p. 88.
[235] Dodd, 'King's Judges', p. 223.
[236] Buck, 'Hotham, John'.
[237] 'Canonico Bridlingtoniensi', ed. Stubbs, p. 73; Thompson, 'Fourteenth Century', p. 114; Lane, 'Bishops and Deposition', pp. 148-9. See also above, p. 31.
[238] For instance, a grant of June 1335 to Simon Montacute referred to the bishops' 'love towards the king', and the king's 'special affection' for him: *CPR, 1334-8*, p. 120.

unfinished wardrobe accounts while he was keeper of the privy seal, 'because the king cannot be without him'.[239] This closeness appears to have continued after de Bury joined the episcopal bench, with Edward pardoning the executors of his debts due to the crown in April 1345 on account 'of the special affection which the king bore' to him, and with the bishop writing warmly – if somewhat grandiloquently – of this 'victorious prince and splendidly triumphant king of England… whose reign may the Almighty long and peacefully continue'.[240] Similarly, a grant of April 1336 commented on the king's 'sincere affection for John [Stratford], archbishop of Canterbury', while a confirmation of October 1355 referred to Edward III's 'affection for William [Edington], bishop of Winchester, the treasurer', and a licence of May 1363 remarked on 'the king's affection for Simon de Langham, bishop of Ely', who was then serving as chancellor.[241] Since only seven of the 299 acts of patronage received by bishops that have been identified make any reference to the king's 'affection' for the prelate in question, this language should not be dismissed as simply being formulaic.[242] Assuming that bishops reciprocated this apparent monarchical affection – and therefore regarded Edward not with professional coolness, but with a fondness of their own – then they might have, once again, gained a great deal of personal pleasure from working for him, and from furthering his goals.

Many bishops might have also felt profoundly grateful to Edward. Like kings before and after him, Edward transformed the lives of numerous prelates, plucking them up from relative obscurity and rewarding their service to him with a place on the episcopal bench. For instance, Thomas Hatfield probably came from a family of modest local significance in East Yorkshire.[243] Yet he caught Edward's attention as a royal clerk, and owed his promotion to the bishopric of Durham in 1345 to the king.[244] According to Thomas Walsingham, when cardinals expressed reservations about Edward's wish to have Hatfield provided, Pope Clement VI quipped that 'if the king had asked for an ass, he would have obtained his wish this time'.[245] Edward was thus responsible for making Hatfield one of the most powerful men in the kingdom, as the bishop of Durham was a figure of considerable wealth,

---

[239] *CCR, 1330-3,* pp. 517-8. See also Ormrod, 'King's Secrets', p. 169. The close relationship between Edward and de Bury prior to the latter becoming bishop of Durham is also revealed by the famous 'Pater Sancte' letter which Edward sent to Pope John XXII in early 1330. Significantly, the letter was written by the hand of de Bury, who – along with William Montacute – was the only other person who would know about the scheme that he outlined. For further discussion of the letter, see also *EMDP,* i, pp. 21-3; Chaplais, *English Diplomatic Practice,* pp. 100-2; and Ormrod, 'King's Secrets', pp. 166-7.
[240] *CPR, 1343-5,* p. 455; *Philobiblon,* p. 55.
[241] *CPR, 1334-8,* p. 253; *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 309; *CPR, 1361-4,* p. 343.
[242] Appendix 13. See also Bothwell, *English Peerage,* pp. 30-1. For how these grants were identified, see below, p. 77, n. 390.
[243] Hatfield's brother, William, became a knight, but there is no evidence that any of his ancestors were of knightly status: Prestwich, 'Hatfield at War', p. 5. See also Tout, *Chapters,* iii, p. 87, iv, p. 257 and Barker, 'Thomas de Hatfield', pp. 14-15.
[244] Hatfield's administrative career is not well-recorded. However, he was appointed receiver of the chamber in 1338 (his first appearance in the records) and made keeper of the privy seal in 1344: Ormrod, 'Hatfield the Politician', pp. 23-4.
[245] *Chronicon Angliae,* p. 20. For discussion of this story, see also Pantin, *English Church,* p. 13; Palmer, *English Law,* p. 315; Barker, 'Thomas de Hatfield', p. 70; and Harvey, *Episcopal Appointments,* p. 154.

with lands valued at over £3,880 in 1535,[246] and considerable jurisdictional authority, which was expressed most pretentiously by William of Boston, steward of Anthony Bek, in 1303, when he proclaimed that:

> There are two kings in England, namely the lord king of England wearing a crown in sign of his regality, and the lord bishop of Durham, wearing a mitre in place of a crown as a symbol of his regality in the bishopric of Durham.[247]

It would have been utterly unsurprising if Hatfield had felt indebted to Edward for orchestrating his advancement, and consequently have felt glad to represent him in a series of negotiations with the Scots. William Wykeham seems to have risen from even lower social strata to still greater heights. While Wykeham's background is shrouded in uncertainty, it appears that he was the son of Sybil Bowade and John le Longe, a free peasant on the manor of Wickham in Hampshire.[248] From these humble origins, Wykeham rose to prominence through commending himself to Edward, whom he served as clerk of the king's works at Windsor Castle from 1356 to 1361, and as keeper of the privy seal from 1363 to 1367.[249] Edward therefore secured for him the see of Winchester, the richest bishopric in England, recommending his election to the monks of St Swithun's in 1366, and lobbying Pope Urban V for his provision, which was duly obtained in July 1367.[250] Wykeham surely felt gratitude towards the king, and might have been happy to go on and serve him as chancellor.

Naturally, many bishops might also have aspired to further ecclesiastical preferment. Diocesans were translated on sixteen occasions in Edward's reign, invariably to a bishopric of greater wealth or prestige.[251] While these translations sprang from a variety of factors in addition to royal favour, it is clear that most took place at Edward's instigation, or at least with his consent.[252] Prelates might thus have served the crown in the hope of being rewarded with a move to a more distinguished see, a hope which sometimes materialised. While the evidence is equivocal, it seems that Edward's favour lay behind the translations of John Thoresby (the chancellor) from Worcester to York in 1352; of Simon Langham (the chancellor) from Ely to Canterbury in 1366; and of Simon Sudbury (a prominent

---

[246] *EHD IV*, p. 727.
[247] Emsley and Fraser, *Courts of the County Palatine*, p. 1. For the liberties of the palatinate of Durham in this period, see Lapsley, *County Palatine*; Liddy, 'Politics of Privilege'; and *idem, Bishopric of Durham.*
[248] Davis, *William Wykeham*, pp. 3-6.
[249] *Ibid.*, pp. 23-39, 45.
[250] *Ibid.*, pp. 50-1; Davis, 'William Wykeham's Early Ecclesiastical Career', pp. 53, 61. Edward went to some lengths to convince Urban to provide Wykeham to the bishopric, sending Sir John Cobham on two missions to the curia to this end, in October 1366 and June 1367 respectively. On his second mission, Cobham carried forty-eight letters to the papal court, of which thirty-eight concerned Wykeham. Of these, twenty-eight were from the king, seven from the queen, and three from Wykeham himself: Highfield, 'Promotion of William of Wickham', pp. 38-45.
[251] Appendix 14. The only example of a bishop being translated to a diocese of lesser financial value was John Stratford's move from Winchester to Canterbury in 1333. Yet while Winchester was the wealthier bishopric, Canterbury was of course the more prestigious, not only as an archbishopric, but also as the primatial see.
[252] Pantin, 'Fourteenth Century', p. 188; Davies, 'Episcopate in England and Wales', i, pp. 12-16.

diplomat) from London to the same archbishopric in 1375.[253] The sources are most explicit with regard to the chancellor, John Stratford's, translation from Winchester to Canterbury in 1333; Adam Murimuth archly observed that the monks 'made a virtue of necessity' in postulating Stratford, since they knew that he was the royal candidate, and Geoffrey le Baker bluntly remarked that he obtained the primacy 'at the request of the king'.[254] Of the sixteen translations in Edward's reign, six were of bishops then serving as chancellor or treasurer, four of bishops then serving as a royal diplomat, two of bishops who had formerly served Edward as a minister or an ambassador, and just four of bishops who had never served the crown in either of these capacities.[255] In addition, serving as an ambassador offered bishops the chance of impressing, and receiving reward from, the pope, as well as the king. Hence Adam Orleton commended himself to John XXII over the course of numerous missions to Avignon, and was thus translated from Hereford to Worcester in 1327, and later to Winchester in 1333, and John Gilbert impressed Gregory XI during his negotiations with the papacy between 1373 and 1375, and was consequently translated from Bangor to Hereford in September of the latter year.[256]

There was therefore an abundance of reasons why bishops might have elected to serve the crown. For some members of the episcopacy, public service conflicted with their interpretation of biblical and canonical authorities, and their understanding of episcopal office. Yet, for others, serving the crown as a minister or a diplomat was seemingly an instrumental aspect of their spiritual vocations, and a necessary response to the Christian teaching that kings should receive wise counsel and that men should labour to secure peace. For these bishops, not only was their royal service amply justified, but it was also compatible with their ecclesiastical duties, as through a combination of delegation, royal support, and their own industry, they were able to ensure that their dioceses were not neglected. In turn, their activities brought substantial benefits for the Church, as their positions at the heart of government enabled them to moderate royal policy, to respond to clerical requests, and to secure peaces and truces, by which clergy were saved from the devastating effects of foreign raids. Moreover, on a personal level, prelates might have been motivated to work for the king on account of gratitude for the past, since he had played an enormous part in promoting them through the rungs of political society and on to the episcopal bench; satisfaction with the present, since they might well have loved travelling far and wide on diplomatic duties, or have relished working at the head of a bureaucracy which they had spent much of their careers ascending; and hope for the future, since they might have had at least half an eye on the potential for translation to a superior see.

---

[253] Hughes, 'Thoresby, John'; Dohar, 'Langham, Simon'; Davies, 'Episcopal Appointments of 1375', pp. 308, 312.
[254] *Murimuth,* p. 69; *Baker,* p. 47. For more detailed analysis of Stratford's translation, see also Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 48-51.
[255] Appendix 14. Bishops are counted as 'then serving as a royal diplomat' if they served the crown in a diplomatic capacity in the year of their translation.
[256] Haines, *Church and Politics,* pp. 27-30; Haines, 'Orleton, Adam'; Lepine, 'Gilbert, John'.

Patronage

Patronage is one of the most contentious issues in the historiography of the later Middle Ages. Following the seminal work of K.B. McFarlane, it won recognition as – in Michael Prestwich's words – 'an essential lubricant of political society', and became one of the dominant interpretative tools for examining later medieval politics for much of the latter half of the twentieth century.[257] However, in the 1990s, this approach was criticised by a number of 'new constitutional' historians – such as Edward Powell, John Watts, and, perhaps most notably, Christine Carpenter – who argued that patronage had occupied an altogether exaggerated and disproportionate place in most recent accounts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, for there was much more to politics than naked self-interest and the 'personal' desires of kings and nobles.[258] This debate has continued. While many scholars have embraced the insights of this 'new constitutional' history,[259] several recent works have argued that Powell's and Carpenter's criticisms of patronage were themselves over-stated.[260] Indeed, 'patronage' is not merely a historiographical minefield, but also a problematic, and anachronistic, term; in the fourteenth century, it meant only the bestowal of ecclesiastical livings, rather than the distribution of a whole array of grants, offices, and privileges.[261] Yet notwithstanding these difficulties, the question of 'patronage' deserves treatment, for the grants received by bishops might well have motivated them to serve in the king's administration, and because they shed light on the broader debates on the subject, which have hitherto been dominated by scholars of the lay nobility.

Over the course of Edward III's reign, bishops received 299 identified acts of patronage and favour. These fall into five categories.[262] First, bishops were granted 178 licences by the crown. These

---

[257] For the quotation, see Prestwich, 'Royal Patronage', p. 41. For McFarlane's work on the subject, see, most notably, McFarlane, *Nobility*, pp. 103-21. For discussion of the historiography of the later twentieth century with respect to patronage, see Carpenter, 'Political and Constitutional History', pp. 190-3; Bradford, 'Parliament and Political Culture', pp. 27-9; and Gundy, *Rebel Earl,* pp. 7-13.

[258] For instance, they advocated paying greater attention to popular politics, political culture, and political ideas. See Powell, 'After "After McFarlane"'; Carpenter, *Locality and Polity,* pp. 3-8; and Watts, *Henry VI,* pp. 1-9.

[259] See Spencer, 'Royal Patronage'; Gundy, *Rebel Earl,* pp. 13-15; and Partington, 'Noble Service'.

[260] See Hicks, *English Political Culture*, pp. ix, 100-5 and Hefferan, *Household Knights,* pp. 6-8, 230-1, 257. These arguments are broadly unconvincing, for – as Mark Ormrod has observed (and, indeed, as new constitutional historians have often acknowledged) – paying attention, and affording emphasis, to factors such as political culture does not negate the relevance of patronage and personality in later medieval politics; rather, it contextualises these other issues, and allows for the development of a wider and more sophisticated understanding of political life: Ormrod, 'New Political History', p. 49. For wider (and similarly unpersuasive) criticisms of 'new constitutional history', see also McKelvie, *Bastard Feudalism,* pp. 6-7.

[261] Gundy, *Rebel Earl,* p. 14.

[262] Appendix 16. This thesis approaches the question of patronage, and indeed uses the term, with the strictures of Alison Gundy – that 'it should only be used in its narrowest sense… and with the understanding that it is only a convenient descriptive term, not an explanation for a political system' – firmly in mind: Gundy, *Rebel Earl,* p. 14. Thus, it is confined to an exploration of the grants, licences, gifts, exemptions, and pardons granted to bishops, although it is of course acknowledged that a broader array of things could be counted as patronage, and indeed have been by a number of authors. Owing to the COVID-19 situation, which made access to archives impossible, this analysis is based on the grants recorded in the searchable editions of the *Calendar of Patent Rolls*. This renders the examination far from complete, not only because some royal grants were not enrolled in the patent rolls, but also because there is a possibility – if a handful pages were not properly scanned and digitised *etc.* – that even some of the grants which are included in the *Calendar* might have been missed by my

included seventy-one licences to alienate or acquire property in mortmain; fifteen to appropriate churches; six to found hospitals, colleges, or religious houses; and eight to enhance diocesan lands, as in October 1330, when Henry Burghersh was given permission to impark a total of 1,400 acres of land in Buckinghamshire, Huntingdonshire, Lincolnshire, and Oxfordshire.[263] Secondly, prelates obtained seventy-three grants from the king. These included thirty-four grants of land; six of pavage; four of pontage; and eight of jurisdictional privileges, as in May 1350, when Edward granted William Bateman and his successors as bishop of Norwich 'the view of frankpledge in the town [of Bishop's Lynn], a husting to be held there weekly, and cognisance of pleas of contracts, covenants, and trespasses'.[264] Thirdly, bishops acquired forty-three royal pardons, including twelve for acquiring and entering into property without the relevant royal licence; eight for a variety of hunting offences; and five for the escape of clerks from their prisons, as in May 1375, when William Wykeham was pardoned for the flight of three clerks from his gaol in Wolvesey Castle.[265] Fourthly, they received three gifts from the crown, as in March 1331, when Robert Wyvil was given 'the stones of the old cathedral church at Old Sarum and of the houses within the king's castle there' for the repair of Salisbury Cathedral and the construction of the cathedral close.[266] Finally, prelates acquired two exemptions from Edward, as in April 1334, when John Hotham was exempted 'from attendance in person at parliaments and councils… in pity for his bodily weakness'.[267] While some of these grants cost the crown little, such as licences to crenellate, they could nonetheless be of considerable value to their episcopal recipients; Gilbert Welton might well have been pleased to obtain such a licence in June 1355, which permitted him to fortify his manor at Rose, which was not only his principal residence, but also a place of refuge during Scottish raids.[268] However, other grants were more costly for the king, as in February 1328, when William Airmyn was granted £396 10s 11¼d 'out of the wardships and marriages first coming to the king's hands' to recompense him for the profits of some of his manors while they had been confiscated by Edward II.[269]

searches. Nonetheless, while my sample of the patronage received by bishops is regrettably incomplete, it is sufficiently large and random (with there being no suggestion, for example, that the team responsible for the digitisation of the *Calendar of Patent Rolls* endeavoured to make the scans of grants to royal ministers of a higher quality than those given to other members of the episcopate), for deductions to be made and certain conclusions drawn.

[263] *CPR, 1330-4,* p. 16.

[264] *CPR, 1348-50,* p. 551. For the context of this grant, see Phillips, 'Urban Conflict'.

[265] *CPR, 1374-7,* p. 273.

[266] *CPR, 1330-4,* p. 82. The stones were gifted jointly to the bishop and to the dean and chapter of Salisbury Cathedral.

[267] *CPR, 1330-4,* p. 539. Such matters were commonly disposed of by way of 'grants', rather than 'exemptions', as in May 1342, when Wulfstan Bransford received a grant 'that he be excused from attendance at parliaments and councils', on account of his age and preparedness to celebrate Edward II's anniversary at Gloucester: *CPR, 1340-3,* p. 431.

[268] *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 252; Russell, 'Rose Castle', pp. 252-7.

[269] *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 241.

Of the 299 identified acts of patronage, ninety-eight (32%) were made to bishops then serving as chancellor or treasurer. Since bishops spent a total of about sixty-six years serving as ministers across Edward's reign, this means that they received an average of about 1.5 acts of patronage a year while in office.[270] Conversely, bishops who never held ministerial office or served the crown in a diplomatic capacity received only fifty-eight recorded acts of patronage over the cumulative four hundred years in which they occupied their sees, an average of just one act of patronage every seven years.[271] Thus, in an 'average' year, a bishop serving as chancellor or treasurer could have expected to receive over ten times the volume of patronage as their colleagues who never served in the royal administration to the same extent. This can only be sensibly explained by their place in government, which might have both won them royal favour, prompting the king to wish to reward them, and given them a position of influence, enabling and emboldening them to seek and acquire patronage.[272] This is consistent not only with how by far the biggest recipients of royal patronage were three prominent royal ministers – Henry Burghersh, John Stratford, and William Edington – but also with the terms of much of the patronage that they received, such as a pardon to John Stratford of December 1335, which was granted 'in consideration of his great labours and charges in the king's service and of the great place which he holds in the direction of the affairs of the king and the realm'.[273] Such phrases should not be disregarded as mere formulae, since they were relatively sparsely used; only nineteen of the 299 identified acts of patronage explicitly refer to the service which the recipient had rendered to the crown.[274] Moreover, the connection between royal service and patronage is evident when one compares the patronage received by episcopal ministers and that by other occupants of their sees.

---

[270] Appendices 15 and 17.

[271] Appendices 15 and 17.

[272] While bishops might have sought out grants, it is important to remember that they would have struggled to obtain them without royal support. As Mark Ormrod has observed, 'almost all patronage was a matter of grace, to be exercised by the king alone', and prior to the mid-1370s, 'there is little reason to doubt that royal grants represented the wishes and preferences of the king': Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, pp. 56-7. Indeed, Edward took steps to ensure his personal control over patronage; for instance, when he went abroad in 1338, he mandated that no business touching the royal grace should be dealt with by the government in England unless specifically authorised by a writ under the privy seal: Tout, *Chapters*, iii, p. 148.

[273] Appendix 17; *CPR, 1334-8*, p. 193.

[274] Appendix 13. The relative scarcity with which these phrases were deployed suggests that – when they were used – a deliberate decision was made to include them. This analysis is necessarily somewhat tentative, however, because it is founded on the *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, and there is a risk that those calendaring the entries sometimes omitted phrases of this nature. Moreover, it is worth noting that some of these phrases might have come from prelates' own petitions for grants, and thus that they might have reflected their own view of their roles as much as the king's. However, this has been impossible to assess because limited evidence survives concerning petitioning in Edward III's reign: Bothwell, *English Peerage*, p. 30. Although the SC8 series in TNA contains numerous petitions for redress of grievances from the fourteenth century, it does not contain requests for grants, licences, and offices *etc.* It therefore seems that either petitions of this nature were made orally in the fourteenth century, and not confined to writing, or that they were written down (in a precursor of the E28 series which has many fifteenth-century petitions of this nature) but discarded at some point in time, perhaps after they had been viewed by the king. I am grateful to Dr Gwilym Dodd for discussing this problem with me. In any event, even if these phrases did sometimes originate from bishops themselves, their inclusion in the final grant nonetheless suggests that the king agreed to them: Bothwell, *English Peerage*, pp. 31-2. For broader discussion of petitioning, see also Brown, 'Authorization of Letters Patent', pp. 147-9 and Tuck, 'System of Patronage', pp. 4-8.

Henry Burghersh, for example, received twenty-seven acts of patronage during his various stints as chancellor and treasurer (which equates to an average of four acts of patronage a year), whereas his successors as bishop of Lincoln, Thomas Bek and John Gynwell, who never served in the royal administration to the same degree, received just six between them, during episcopates which together lasted for twenty-one years.[275]

Edward also appears to have showered his diplomats with favour. Bishops customarily received royal patronage before they departed for, or after they returned from, ambassadorial assignments, rather than during the diplomatic negotiations themselves. Accordingly, patronage received by prelates in the whole year in which they were employed as diplomats has been considered. Episcopal diplomats received a total of fifty-eight acts of patronage during the cumulative ninety-five years in which they were occupied with diplomacy over Edward's reign.[276] They could therefore expect to receive an average of almost two acts of patronage for every three years in which they led at least one embassy or negotiated at least once with foreign envoys in England. This was over four times the amount of patronage that their colleagues who never served in the royal administration as a minister or a diplomat could have expected to receive. Once again, this can only reasonably be explained by their involvement in royal service. This was made explicit in the wording of many of the grants; in May 1350, for instance, Edward granted William Bateman and his successors as bishop of Norwich extensive municipal rights in the town of Bishop's Lynn, 'for the affection which he bears to the present bishop on account of his good service over the direction of his business'.[277] In addition, the connection between patronage and diplomatic activity is implicit in the timing of many grants. For instance, Adam Orleton received a grant that he should not be 'troubled or molested' regarding goods of the Despensers that he had seized in Gloucestershire on 11 April 1330, the day after he was commissioned to lead (with William Airmyn) negotiations regarding the marriage of Edward's sister, Eleanor, and John, the eldest son of Philip VI.[278] These connections are again apparent when one compares the patronage received by episcopal diplomats to that received by other bishops occupying their sees. By way of example, William Airmyn received five acts of patronage during the eight years in which he was engaged as a royal ambassador between 1327 and 1335, whereas his successor as

[275] Appendix 17. There is no record of Thomas Bek having served the crown at all prior to his elevation to the episcopate, and he did not take a role in either diplomacy or the central administration after he joined the episcopal bench: Haines, 'Bek, Thomas'. On the other hand, John Gynwell is recorded as having been a royal clerk in 1338 and 1340, and as having played some part in the Anglo-French negotiations of 1344. However, he was principally occupied in the service of the earls of Lancaster prior to his elevation to the episcopal bench, and consequently never rose to great heights in the king's administration. Moreover, he never reprised his diplomatic or administrative activities for the crown after he became a bishop: Smith, 'Gynwell, John'.
[276] Appendix 17. For the avoidance of doubt, 'routine' matters like safe-conducts, protection, and permission to appoint attorneys have not been counted as 'patronage'.
[277] *CPR, 1348-50,* p. 551.
[278] *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 507; *Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 785. See also Haines, *Church and Politics,* pp. 32, 234.

bishop of Norwich, Anthony Bek, who had never worked in the royal administration, received none during his episcopate of six-and-a-half years.[279]

What is more, Edward seems to have retained a fondness for bishops who had served him as a minister or a diplomat even after they had retired from, or were simply no longer actively engaged in, royal service. Such bishops received one hundred and ten acts of patronage during the cumulative 443.5 years in which they sat on the episcopal bench, or about one act of patronage every four years.[280] This was nearly double the volume of patronage which their colleagues who never served as a minister or diplomat could have expected to receive over the same period. The disparity appears to have been the consequence of Edward's continuing gratitude towards these men. Again, this is apparent from the terms of the grants; in March 1336, around a year after Airmyn had retired from his career in royal diplomacy, he received a grant that his executors should have 'free administration of his goods, moneys, jewels, animals, and other things for the execution of his will… having regard to his manifold services to Edward I, Edward II, and the king, and to the great place which he has held for the king and the realm'.[281] Likewise, this is clear when one compares the patronage which former ministers and diplomats were given with that given to other bishops of their diocese. For instance, John Hotham, bishop of Ely, received eleven identified acts of patronage in the period of just eight-and-a-half years from his retirement as chancellor in July 1328 to his death in January 1337. In contrast, his successor, Simon Montacute, received just two in his episcopate of eight years.[282]

Edward also granted other parties a licence to grant property to prelates. For example, in May 1338, he granted the prior of the hospital of St John of Jerusalem in England a licence to alienate in mortmain twenty-one acres of land in the suburbs of London to the chancellor, Robert Stratford.[283] Once again, bishops prominent in royal service were more likely to benefit from these grants. Of the eighty identified examples of such patronage, fifteen were for the benefit of bishops then serving the crown as ministers, nine for bishops who served the crown as a diplomat in the year concerned, forty-one for bishops who had formerly served the crown as either a minister or a diplomat, and just fifteen for bishops who never served the crown in either of these capacities.[284] Thus, on average, a bishop serving as a royal minister could have expected to receive such patronage about once every four years; a bishop serving as a diplomat about once every ten; a bishop who had formerly served as a minster or diplomat about once every eleven; and a bishop who never served in these capacities about once every twenty-six. As such, in a 'typical' year of Edward III's reign, episcopal ministers were

[279] Appendix 17; Haines, 'Bek, Anthony'.
[280] Appendices 15 and 17.
[281] *CPR, 1334-8,* p. 239.
[282] Appendix 17. It should be noted that Montacute also received two acts of patronage in his three-year episcopate as bishop of Worcester. Montacute had served as a king's clerk prior to his elevation to the episcopate, but never as a minister or a diplomat: Summerson, 'Montagu, Simon'.
[283] *CPR, 1338-40,* p. 61.
[284] Appendix 18.

about six times more likely to have received this form of patronage than bishops who were never involved in royal service to the same extent; episcopal diplomats about two-and-a-half times; and former ministers or diplomats more than two times.

An even more dramatic picture emerges with regard to the patronage which bishops obtained on behalf of others. Their role in securing grants of this nature was expressed in a variety of ways. For instance, in March 1327, the abbot and convent of Reading were granted a licence to acquire lands and rents in mortmain 'at the request' of Adam Orleton, the treasurer; in April 1362, Richard le Rous was granted a licence to alienate in mortmain 40s of rent to the rector of Boyton Chapel 'at the asking' of William Edington, the chancellor; and in April 1376, Richard Taillour was pardoned of the king's suit in the death of one John Penreth 'at the supplication' of Simon Sudbury, who had returned earlier that month from Bruges, where he had been treating with the French.[285] Of the 208 instances of such patronage which have been identified, ninety-seven were secured by bishops then serving the crown as a minister, forty-three by bishops who served the crown that year as a diplomat, sixty-nine by bishops who had formerly served the crown as a minister or a diplomat, and just seven by those who never served the crown in either capacity.[286] This equates, on average, to episcopal ministers securing patronage of this kind about once every nine months; episcopal diplomats almost once every two years; former bishops and diplomats almost once every six years; and bishops who never served in these capacities about once every fifty-five years. Accordingly, in a 'typical' year across the period, a bishop serving as chancellor or treasurer could have expected to secure about eighty-two times the amount of such patronage as bishops who were never involved in royal service to that extent; a bishop who had served that year as a diplomat about twenty-five times; and a bishop who had formerly worked as a minister or a diplomat about nine times.

All in all, of the 587 instances of patronage examined, which were either for the direct or ultimate benefit of bishops, or obtained by them on behalf of others, 210 were secured by episcopal ministers, 110 by episcopal diplomats, 220 by those who had formerly served as a minister or a diplomat, and just eighty by those who never served the crown in these roles.[287] This meant that bishops who were serving Edward as chancellor or treasurer could have expected to secure an act of patronage every four months; bishops serving that year as a diplomat every ten months; bishops who had previously worked as a minister or a diplomat every two years; and bishops who never worked in either of these capacities every five years. Consequently, in an average year across Edward's reign, an episcopal minister was almost sixteen times more likely to obtain patronage, either for themselves or for others, than their counterparts who never served the crown to the same level; an episcopal diplomat nearly six times; and a bishop who had formerly served as a minister or a diplomat two times. Of course, this is

[285] *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 61; *CPR, 1361-4,* p. 183; *CPR, 1374-7,* p. 260; Appendix 21.
[286] Appendix 19.
[287] Appendix 20.

not to deny that bishops who had played only a limited part in royal service could benefit from the king's patronage, or to suggest that all the patronage received by episcopal ministers and diplomats stemmed from their political activities; like many of their colleagues, they might well have received some in any event. Yet the starkness of these figures leaves it beyond doubt that those who were most immersed in the king's administration – who tended to be those who served him most faithfully and saw him most frequently – were also those most likely to be rewarded by the crown.

In turn, the patronage which bishops received by virtue of their role in the royal administration helped them to fulfil their ecclesiastical responsibilities. In particular, they were able to secure grants which benefited their sees and furthered their diocesan rights. This is especially evident in the episcopate of Henry Burghersh. For instance, he received numerous licences for the alienation of property to himself and his successors in mortmain, as in March 1335, when Edward granted the prior and convent of St Frideswide's, Oxford, a licence to alienate the advowson of the church of St Michael at the North Gate to him.[288] Such licences were valuable, and indeed the church of St Michael proved particularly useful to Richard Fleming, a future bishop of Lincoln, who annexed it to the churches of All Saints and St Mildred's in 1427, before uniting them into a collegiate church, in which he established Lincoln College, Oxford.[289] Likewise, Burghersh also obtained a licence in September 1329 for himself and his successors to repair, raise, crenellate, and turrelate their episcopal palace in Lincoln.[290] This was significant, for not only was crenellation fashionable in fourteenth-century England, but the palace might well have been in need of some repair and updating, since the last recorded building works there had taken place over a century previously.[291] More notably, Burghersh received a grant in August 1330 that the palace and other dwellings within the cathedral close of Lincoln 'shall have the same immunity and ecclesiastical liberty as the cathedral or cemetery thereof, so that any trespassers shall be held to be violators of Holy Church'. This extension of ecclesiastical immunity represented an important concession with regard to the close's legal status, which benefited not just the bishop and his palace, but also the 'dwelling houses of the dean and chapter, canons, vicars, choristers, and other ministers of the cathedral church'.[292] Indeed, Burghersh did not merely receive royal support with regard to his palace in his cathedral city, but also in relation to his other residences; in May 1335, Edward confirmed a grant by the prior and convent of St Andrew's, York, which gave three plots of land (and the houses built on them) to Burghersh, so that 'the bishops of Lincoln should ever have the easements of the said houses and plots to stay in as often as they come to York for Parliaments and Councils, or for any other cause'.[293] Much of this patronage was

[288] *CPR, 1334-8,* p. 90. See also, for example, *Ibid.,* pp. 49, 73, 300.
[289] Clark, *College Histories: Lincoln,* p. 6; Green, *Commonwealth of Lincoln College,* p. 5.
[290] *CPR, 1327-30,* pp. 453-4.
[291] Ambrose, *Bishop's Palace, Lincoln,* pp. 2-3; Emery, *Greater Medieval Houses,* i, p. 177.
[292] *CPR, 1327-30,* pp. 548-9.
[293] *CPR, 1334-8,* pp. 102-3. While the parliament which met in York later that same month was the last parliament to meet in York in Edward's reign, the confirmation was undoubtedly helpful for Burghersh, since

explicitly given to Burghersh because of his role in royal service. For example, the licence to crenellate his episcopal palace was granted 'in consideration of his profitable service and the great place he holds in the direction of the king's affairs', and the grant of the houses in York was confirmed 'in consideration of [the] fruitful services rendered to the king by the bishop in many ways'.[294] In this manner, Burghersh's part in the government of the realm secured material benefits not simply for himself, but also for his successors and his cathedral church.

Bishops were also able to secure patronage for the benefit of their cathedral churches and the clergy of their dioceses more broadly. Much of this was financial in nature, as in April 1336, when Edward granted the prior and convent of Christ Church, Canterbury, that any 'grants of pensions, corrodies, and sustenances from their house, made at any time… shall not prejudice their house as precedents' at the instance of John Stratford, the chancellor.[295] Similarly, his brother, Robert Stratford, a former occupant of the same office, successfully asked Edward in July 1345 that the prior of Cauce and his successors be forever 'quit of taxations, tallages, aids, and contributions granted to the king'.[296] Yet they also acquired a variety of other patronage for the clergy of their sees. This ranged from mortmain licences, as in February 1327, when the prior and convent of Holy Trinity, Norwich, were granted a licence to appropriate in mortmain the church of Chalk at the request of William Airmyn (then serving as a diplomat), to tenurial benefits, as in October 1355, when Edward released the provost and chaplains of St Elizabeth's Chapel, Winchester, from holding the manor of Norton St Valery in knight service at the request of William Edington, the treasurer.[297] Some of the grants obtained by royal ministers for their diocesan clergy were desperately needed. In July 1356, for example, Edward pardoned the alien prior of Stratfield Saye the arrears of his farm for that year, as well as his farm of 100s per annum for the next five years, 'on the information' of Edington. This was vital for the priory, which was apparently in a miserable state: its possessions were allegedly worth less than 12 marks a year, and barely sufficed for the sustenance of the prior and his fellow monk; the house was on the verge of physical ruin; and the prior had already sold the priory wood to pay his farm, 'so that there is now nothing to pay the farm with'.[298] The fondness with which Edward regarded bishops after their lengthy stints in royal service appears to have lain behind much of this patronage, as with the grant to Christ Church, Canterbury, and the release of St Elizabeth's Chapel, Winchester, which were justified by reference to the king's 'affection' for Stratford and Edington respectively.[299]

---

the exchequer was based in York from 1333 to 1338. As treasurer from August 1334 to March 1337, he was frequently resident in the city, and presumably utilised the houses granted to him: Bennett, 'Beneficed Clergy', p. 99.

[294] *CPR, 1327-30,* pp. 453-4; *CPR, 1334-8,* pp. 102-3.

[295] *CPR, 1334-8,* p. 253.

[296] *CPR, 1343-5,* p. 569. This grant was also made at the request of Richard Fitzalan, third earl of Arundel.

[297] *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 10; *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 309. For Airmyn's powers to treat with the French, see *Foedera,* ii, ii, pp. 693-4.

[298] *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 420.

[299] *CPR, 1334-8,* p. 253; *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 309.

Moreover, bishops in royal service could procure patronage for the broader Church, and for clergy from outside their dioceses. Perhaps most obviously, they secured grants of property for churches, as in March 1356, when Edward granted the prior and convent of Coventry a licence to appropriate the church of Honington, 'at the supplication' of John Thoresby, the chancellor.[300] Indeed, sometimes bishops made grants of property themselves, and received licences from the crown in order to enable them to do so. In July 1365, for example, Simon Sudbury, whose diplomatic career had commenced the previous year, was given a mortmain licence to alienate lands and rents to the rector and warden of the parish church of Sudbury.[301] The bishop had close connections with the church – and had, with his father, 'founded and endowed a chapel of four chaplaincies in honour of the Blessed Virgin and St Anne' there at least six years previously – but it lay far outside his diocese of London.[302] Yet bishops also secured rights and privileges for ecclesiastics. In October 1353, Edward gave a grant of pontage for five years to the prior of St Saviour, Bridgend, to enable him to repair 'Holland Bridge', a major causeway through the Lincolnshire fens, at the instance of Simon Islip, who was empowered to treat with the French the following month.[303] This was vital for the priory, which was founded in 1199 by Godwin the Rich of Lincoln on the condition that the canons maintained 'Holland Bridge', but which continually struggled to afford the causeway's upkeep, and indeed petitioned the crown for financial help in this regard in 1307, *c.* 1320, *c.* 1334, and *c.* 1353.[304]

In addition to the benefits for their bishoprics, their diocesan clergy, and the English clergy more widely, episcopal ministers and diplomats also benefitted personally from royal favour. They received a variety of different types of personal patronage. This included the grant of tolls, as in October 1327, when Roger Northburgh was granted pavage in his cathedral city of Lichfield for three years, two days before he was empowered to treat for the king's marriage to Philippa of Hainault; the grant of wardships, as in November 1365, when John Barnet, the treasurer, was granted the wardship of sixteen shillings of rent in Evercreech, Somerset, during the nonage of the heir of Thomas de Rodney; and the grant of alien priory property, as in November 1372, when William Wykeham, the former chancellor, was granted the lands, rents, and services of the alien prior and convent of Mortain in Withyham in Sussex and Piddlehinton in Dorset for the duration of the war with France.[305] One

[300] *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 379.
[301] *Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 744; *CPR, 1364-7,* p. 161.
[302] *CPP,* p. 339.
[303] *CPR, 1350-4,* p. 491; *Foedera,* iii, i, p. 269.
[304] TNA, SC 8/177/8810; SC 8/87/4317; SC 8/340/16046; SC 115/5748; *Petitions from Lincolnshire,* ed. Dodd and McHardy, pp. 125-6.
[305] *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 179; *CPR, 1364-7,* p. 181; *CPR, 1370-4,* pp. 213, 219. In November 1365, Barnet was also granted the marriage of de Rodney's daughter and heir, Margaret: *CPR, 1364-7,* p. 181. Although the life-farm of Mortain's possessions was granted to Wykeham himself, rather than to him and his successors (perhaps reflecting uncertainty as to the duration of the war with France), his successor as bishop of Winchester, Henry Beaufort, eventually succeeded to it in January 1406 (although he first succeeded Wykeham to the life-farm while still bishop of Lincoln, in September 1404): *CFR, 1309-1405,* p. 250; *CFR, 1405-13,* pp. 24-5. See also Thompson, 'Prelates and the Alien Priories', p. 63. For wider discussion of Wykeham's ideas regarding the lands of alien priories, see Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 150-1.

particularly striking example of royal support aiding a bishop concerns John Stratford's translation from Winchester to Canterbury. Not only was this promotion itself the consequence of the king's favour, but royal munificence also made the translation as smooth as possible. In June 1334, Stratford was granted all the produce from his former diocese which had been sown in the preceding winter and spring, 'without rendering anything to the king for the same', and 'without hindrance by the king or any of his ministers'.[306] The following month, he was also gifted all the crops grown in the lands of Canterbury, whether in the time of his predecessor, Simon Meopham, or during the voidance of the see, even though they 'should belong to the king'.[307] It is perhaps significant that these crops were given as a gift, rather than as a grant; as James Bothwell has remarked, gifts were often meant to show favour in a fast and uncomplicated manner, and sometimes reflected seemingly spontaneous largesse.[308] In any event, the gift was expressly justified on the basis of Stratford's 'great services in directing the business of the king and realm'.[309] Through royal favour, Stratford therefore gained not only the fruits of the lands of his new diocese, but also those of his old see, both of which should ordinarily have belonged to the crown. Considering the value of these crops – those growing in the Winchester diocese alone had been valued at the best part of £2,500 in 1324 – this would have been of considerable benefit to him.[310]

The patronage which bishops involved in royal service received did not merely benefit them in their earthly lives, but also in their afterlives. Numerous prelates who served the crown received royal licences and grants to fund masses for their souls after their deaths. For instance, in January 1332, Henry Gower, an occasional royal diplomat, was granted a licence to alienate various lands in mortmain to support three or four chaplains to celebrate divine service daily 'for the soul of the bishop and for the souls of the king's father, mother, and ancestors' in his new foundation of St David's Hospital in Swansea.[311] Similar licences were obtained by bishops including Thomas Brantingham, a former treasurer, who in 1376 was permitted to alienate property to support three chaplains, who were to celebrate divine service 'for the safe estate of the king and bishop' and 'for their souls when they have departed this life' in his cathedral church of Exeter.[312] Yet the pious provision made by William Edington was of an altogether different scale. From 1351, he received numerous licences from the

[306] *CPR, 1330-4,* p. 549.
[307] *CPR, 1330-4,* pp. 539, 565.
[308] Bothwell, *English Peerage,* p. 29.
[309] *CPR, 1330-4,* p. 539.
[310] In 1324, Stratford entered into a recognisance with Edward II of £2,460 5s 10d for 'the corn then growing in the lands of the bishopric [of Winchester] and divers other things': *CCR, 1327-30,* p. 24. This emerged from Edward's orders to Richard Airmyn and William de Pillaund, late keepers of the bishopric of Winchester, to sell Stratford the chattels of the bishopric 'at a reasonable appraisement', although – in view of Edward's anger towards Stratford at the time – the 'reasonableness' of this valuation is open to question: *CCR, 1324-7,* p. 203. See also Fryde, 'John Stratford', pp. 160-1 and Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 148-9.
[311] *CPR, 1330-4,* p. 238. See also *CPR, 1330-4,* pp. 188, 267. For broader discussion of the foundation, see Williams, 'Henry de Gower', pp. 106-7 and *idem,* 'Gower, Henry'.
[312] *CPR, 1374-7,* p. 360.

crown to acquire and assign property to endow a chantry in his home village of Edington, which in 1358 became a house of Bonhommes, where divine service would be celebrated daily for the estate of Edward III and the bishop, their souls after they died, and the souls of the king's progenitors and the bishop's ancestors.[313] In addition to this substantial chantry, Edington also received backing from the crown for other schemes to provide for his soul. In April 1351, while he was treasurer, he secured a licence for the abbess and convent of Romsey to acquire land in mortmain so that they could 'celebrate the anniversary of the said bishop yearly after his death', and in June 1361, while he was chancellor, he was granted a licence to alienate property in mortmain to the abbot and convent of Abbotsbury so that they might 'celebrate his anniversary in their church yearly'.[314] Some of this was explicitly justified on the basis of Edington's work in government, as with the licence to alienate lands to Abbotsbury Abbey, which was granted 'in consideration of the bishop's long service in the realm'.[315] Consequently, royal support – borne of longstanding royal service – enabled bishops like Edington to make substantial provision for their souls. Bishops therefore derived benefit from their service to the crown, not merely in life, but also in death.

Furthermore, bishops involved in royal service were able to procure a range of patronage from the crown for their families, rather than just for themselves. For instance, they could secure pardons for family members, as in February 1355, when Roger and Michael Northburgh successfully supplicated for the pardon of their kinsman, William Maureward, one month after Michael had returned from negotiating in Avignon about English lands and castles in France.[316] Likewise, they could also obtain mortmain licences for their family's ultimate benefit, as in June 1369, when Edward granted William Wykeham, his chancellor, a licence to alienate the manor of Boarhunt Herberd and other lands in mortmain to Southwick Priory.[317] Wykeham duly gave the manor to the priory three months later on 1 October, stating that it was given 'to provide upkeep in perpetuity for certain chantries, pious works, and other divine services'. These were particularised in statutes made by Wykeham the following day, which provided for the appointment of a further five canons, in addition to those already at the priory, to celebrate daily masses for the souls of John and Sybil, Wykeham's parents, who were buried at Southwick.[318] Yet perhaps John Hotham provides the most notable example of a bishop's ability to channel royal favour towards his family, both during and after his chancellorship. In 1327, for example, he was granted the manors of Troughford and Stony Dunham in Cheshire for life, with the

[313] See, for instance, *CPR, 1350-4,* pp. 63, 64, 96; *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 191; and *CPR, 1358-61,* pp. 90, 290. For discussion of Edington Priory, see Jackson, 'Edington Monastery'.
[314] *CPR, 1350-4,* p. 59; *CPR, 1361-4,* p. 38.
[315] *CPR, 1361-4,* p. 38.
[316] *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 183; Appendix 21; *Foedera,* iii, i, p. 289. Note that Michael Northburgh was still bishop-elect and confirmed at this point, and had yet to be installed.
[317] *CPR, 1367-70,* p. 335.
[318] *Cartularies of Southwick Priory,* ed. Hanna, i, pp. 242-4. For more detailed discussion of Wykeham's chantry at Southwick Priory, see Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 107-8.

remainder in tail male to his nephew and namesake.[319] This was followed up in May 1331, when he secured a licence for his nephew to enfeoff the parson of the church of Fen Ditton of the manor of Bodeby, and for the parson to then re-grant it to him for life, with successive remainders in tail to his sons and another man, and with ultimate remainder to their heirs.[320] Three years later, in November 1334, the bishop was granted a licence to enfeoff his nephew of the manor of Fyfield in Essex, with the advowson of its church.[321] The following year, Hotham was granted another licence to give extensive lands in Ireland – which he had acquired from Eleanor de Clare, the widow of Hugh Despenser the Younger – to his great-nephew, yet another John Hotham.[322] Such grants helped the bishops' relatives to establish themselves in positions of some prominence in northern society.[323]

Episcopal friends and servants benefitted from royal patronage too. This is perhaps particularly obvious at the start of Edward's reign. In February 1327, Edmund Shireford – a regular companion of John Stratford – was granted the bailiwick of Bassetlaw in Nottinghamshire for life at the bishop's request, in the same month as Stratford was commissioned to treat for a truce with France.[324] Nine months later, Thomas de Ousthorp – a member of the *familia* of John Hotham, who had accompanied him to Gascony in 1323 to settle disputes between the barons there, and to seek their aid against the Scots – was granted custody of the king's fishpond of Fosse in York 'at the request' of the bishop, who was then serving as chancellor.[325] Similarly, in April 1330, one Robert Palmer was granted a messuage in the parish of St Andrew in Holborn, 'for services to Henry [Burghersh], bishop of Lincoln, the chancellor'.[326] Bishops continued to obtain royal support for their servants as Edward's reign progressed. In July 1361, for instance, John Lestrange – the messenger of William Edington, the chancellor – was exempted from being put 'against his will' on any assizes, juries, attaints, inquisitions, and recognitions, 'out of regard' for the bishop.[327]

While seldom recorded, it is clear that bishops involved in the royal administration could also receive generous gifts, presents, and bribes from members of the wider political community. For instance, according to Thomas Burton, the abbot of Meaux gave 'not inexpensive gifts' to William Edington in *c.* 1360, in order to secure royal permission for the appointment of two men from Beverley to act as

---

[319] *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 195.
[320] *CPR, 1330-4,* p. 118.
[321] *CPR, 1334-8,* p. 46.
[322] *CPR, 1334-8,* p. 164.
[323] Stirling, *The Hothams*, i, pp. 17-21. This is not to claim that the Hothams were a family of no substance beforehand; Bishop Hotham himself was the nephew of William of Hotham, archbishop of Dublin: Haines, 'Hotham, William of'.
[324] *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 6; *Foedera,* ii, ii, pp. 693-4. Shireford had, for example, travelled with Stratford to Paris in 1324 to negotiate with the French: *CPR, 1324-7,* p. 50. For further discussion of their relationship, see Haines, *John Stratford,* p. 104. Stratford had also served as acting treasurer between November 1326 and January 1327: *Ibid.,* pp. 176-7, 187.
[325] *CPR, 1321-4,* p. 267; *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 190.
[326] *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 514.
[327] *CPR, 1361-4,* p. 51.

his attorneys and answer in his place in relation to a complicated dispute about whether the Cellarer family of Wawne in Holderness were villeins of his abbey or of the king.[328] Yet perhaps the most explicit discussion of this comes from Richard de Bury's *Philobiblon.* De Bury recounted how, when he served as treasurer and chancellor, 'we were able to requite a man well or ill, to benefit or injure mightily great as well as small'. Accordingly, he described how people sought to gain his favour. Although his personal gift of preference was books – 'in truth we wanted manuscripts not moneyscripts; we loved codices more than florins, and preferred slender pamphlets to pampered palfreys' – he acknowledged that 'if we had loved gold and silver goblets, high-bred horses, or no small sums of money, we might in those days have furnished forth a rich treasury'. However, when it became known that 'it was more easy for any man to gain our favour by means of books than money', and when people 'saw that we were contented with gifts of this kind', individuals became 'anxious of their own accord to minister to our needs with those things that they were more willing to dispense with than the things they secured by ministering to our services'. Consequently, 'there flowed in, instead of presents and guerdons, and instead of gifts and jewels, soiled tracts and battered codices, gladsome alike to our eye and heart'. In turn, de Bury 'strove to forward their affairs that gain accrued to them', but also noted that 'justice suffered no disparagement'.[329] De Bury's words are borne out by Thomas Walsingham's account of how, when he was keeper of the privy seal (between 1329 and 1334), the abbot of St Albans gave him four books – a Terence, a Virgil, a Quintilian, and St Jerome's *Apology Against Rufinus* – in the hope of him promoting 'the affairs of the house in the court of our lord the king'. This seemingly paid dividends, because 'through the aid of Richard de Bury, keeper of the privy seal', Edward conceded to the abbot a charter, which gave him the right to imprison those under sentence of excommunication.[330]

Indeed, one wonders whether the greater availability of royal patronage for bishops in the king's service enabled them to embark on more ambitious projects than their counterparts. Of course, this is not to deny that bishops who played no significant part in central government could still embark on lavish schemes with the crown's approval; perhaps most notably, John Grandisson founded the collegiate church of Ottery St Mary – a college of eight canons – with Edward's support in 1337.[331] However, few foundations established by bishops who had never served in the king's administration

---

[328] *Melsa,* iii, p. 135; Kennedy, 'Resourceful Villeins', p. 113.
[329] *Philobiblon,* pp. 54-6.
[330] *Walsingham,* ii, pp. 200, 283-4. For further discussion of this incident, see *Bury,* p. xv and Martin, 'Richard de Bury', pp. 14-15.
[331] *Collegiate Church,* pp. 85-6. As well as giving Grandisson permission to found the college (*CPR, 1334-8,* pp. 562, 569), Edward granted Grandisson several mortmain licences concerning his foundation: *CPR, 1334-8,* pp. 20, 105; *CPR, 1338-40,* p. 12. In addition to its eight canons, the college also comprised eleven priests, twelve clerks, eight choristers, and a schoolmaster: *Collegiate Church,* pp. 93-4; Orme, *Medieval Schools,* pp. 216-17. It is perhaps also worth noting that Grandisson himself was a wealthy aristocrat, and that other members of his family – such as his brother, Otho de Grandisson – were also benefactors to the college: Erskine, 'Grandison, John'.

could compete in scale with William Edington's above-mentioned foundation in the village of his birth, or John Stratford's college of St Thomas the Martyr in Stratford – a college of thirteen chantry chaplains – which was founded in 1331 and augmented in 1336, and benefited from numerous examples of royal patronage.[332] This is illustrated most starkly by the Oxbridge colleges established by prelates. Each of the three colleges founded by bishops in Edward's reign were established by men who had enjoyed significant careers in royal service: Canterbury College, Oxford, was founded in 1363 by Simon Islip, a former keeper of the privy seal, and Trinity Hall and the Hall of the Annunciation of the Blessed Mary (now Gonville and Caius College) in Cambridge were both founded by William Bateman in 1350 and 1351 respectively.[333] The other two colleges established by bishops in the fourteenth century were also founded by men who were prominent in the king's administration: Stapeldon Hall (now Exeter College, Oxford) was founded in 1314 by Walter Stapeldon, who served Edward II as a diplomat and later as treasurer, and New College, Oxford, was founded in 1379 by William Wykeham, a former chancellor and a member of Richard II's continual council.[334] Indeed, the two bishops most associated with the foundations of two other Oxbridge colleges in the fourteenth century were also important servants of the king: John Hotham, whom Alan Cobban suspected of being a 'prime mover' behind Edward II's foundation of King's Hall, Cambridge, in 1317, was the treasurer, and Thomas Hatfield, who endowed Durham College, Oxford, in 1381, was a former keeper of the privy seal and frequent diplomat.[335] Since these colleges required royal licences for the alienation of property to them in mortmain, and since the crown was often reluctant to grant such licences, it appears likely that it was the bishops who sat highest in the king's favour, and who occupied the positions of greatest influence in government, who were most able to obtain them.[336] This is suggested by how fifty-three of the sixty-seven (79%) mortmain licences granted to bishops in Edward III's reign were given to those who were either serving the crown as a minister or diplomat, or had previously done so.[337] In this way, government service contributed to

---

[332] For the foundation, see Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 367-81. For examples of licences granted to Stratford to alienate property in mortmain or frank almoin to the college, see *CPR, 1330-4,* pp. 79, 399; *CPR, 1334-8,* pp. 308, 398; *CPR, 1338-40,* p. 6; *CPR, 1340-3,* p. 492.

[333] For the foundation of Canterbury College, see *Canterbury College*, iv, pp. 9-17. For the foundation of Trinity Hall, see Malden, *Trinity Hall*, pp. 1-42; Crawley, *Trinity Hall*, pp. 1-16; and Haines, 'Bateman, William'. For the foundation of the Hall of the Annunciation of the Blessed Mary, see Brooke, *Gonville and Caius*, pp. 13-18. As is well-known, the Hall had previously been founded as 'Gonville Hall' by Edmund Gonville, before being 're-founded' by Bateman as his executor. Yet the question as to whether Gonville founded a college at all, or whether it actually owes its very existence to Bateman, is very much an open one: Brooke, *Gonville and Caius,* pp. 13-14.

[334] For the foundation of Stapeldon Hall, see Maddicott, *Founders and Fellowship*, pp. 26-51. For the foundation of New College, see Storey, 'Foundation', pp. 4-10; Cobban, 'Colleges and Halls', pp. 581-97; Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 143-53; and Tyerman, 'Foundation', pp. 30-7.

[335] For Hotham's influence on the foundation of King's Hall, see Cobban, *King's Hall,* pp. 24-6; Leader, *University of Cambridge,* pp. 79-80; and Cobban, 'English University Benefactors', p. 294. For the foundation and endowment of Durham College, see Hopkins, *Trinity*, pp. 9-10.

[336] *Canterbury College,* p. 9; Raban, *Mortmain Legislation*, pp. 29-71; Davis, *William Waynflete*, p. 32; *eadem, William Wykeham,* p. 151.

[337] Appendix 22.

bishops like Stapeldon, Bateman, and Wykeham leaving legacies which far surpassed that of most of their contemporaries.[338]

The colleges founded by bishops also remind us that one should not draw too crude a distinction between bishops' ecclesiastical, political, and personal responsibilities, and the patronage they obtained towards those ends. Edward supported William Bateman's foundation of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and in May 1351 granted the wardens, fellows, and scholars of the Hall a licence at the bishop's request to acquire in mortmain the advowsons of churches up to the taxable value of £60 a year, and to appropriate them.[339] The plurality of interests served by Bateman's college is clear in his founding statutes, which were sealed in 1353.[340] The Hall was to be of benefit to Bateman's diocese; it was mandated that every fellow should swear an oath to promote 'the honour and advantage [*commodum*] of the church of Norwich', never to act professionally against the bishop and his cathedral church, and always to be ready 'to act on their behalf in any business or lawsuit at their request'.[341] Yet it was also to be of benefit to the kingdom; the Hall was explicitly founded for 'the advantage, rule, and direction of the commonwealth [*reipublicae*]', and it was envisaged that some of its members would follow in Bateman's footsteps and work in public service.[342] Moreover, it was to be of benefit for Bateman's family; there were to be daily prayers for 'the souls of our father, William, and our mother, Margery', as well as for the bishop's own soul after his death, alongside a special service on the anniversary of his passing.[343] The same mixture of religious, national, and personal interests was served by William Wykeham's foundation of New College, Oxford.[344] This sprang from a royal licence of June 1379, procured while Wykeham served on Richard II's continual council, which permitted the alienation in mortmain of a variety of lands to him, and allowed him 'to found therewith a college, hall, or house, to consist of a warden and seventy scholars'.[345] The college was to bolster the Church, through providing an educated secular clergy, and through promoting learning for the defence of the faith; according to its founding charter, its purpose was to 'praise and honour the names of the Crucified and the glorious Mary, His mother', to 'sustain and exalt the

[338] For an analysis of Wykeham's legacy, see Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 143, 159-60, 172-3.
[339] *CPR, 1350-4,* p. 70.
[340] Many of these statutes were repeated in Bateman's statutes for Gonville Hall, which he issued the following year: *DRUCC,* ii, pp. 226-40; Brooke, *Gonville and Caius,* pp. 16-17. For an illuminating discussion of medieval English collegiate statutes more broadly (in which Gonville Hall's statutes are discussed at pp. 16-17), see Davis, 'English Collegiate Statutes'.
[341] *DRUCC,* ii, p. 433; *Warren's Book,* pp. 42-3. See also Crawley, *Trinity Hall,* pp. 4, 13-14.
[342] *DRUCC,* ii, p. 415; *Warren's Book,* p. 28; Crawley, *Trinity Hall,* pp. 2, 4. Trinity Hall was established as a foundation of scholars of civil and canon law, which would have left its members well-placed to take up careers in the royal administration.
[343] *DRUCC,* ii, p. 427-9; *Warren's Book,* pp. 38-9.
[344] This was also the case with Wykeham's foundation of Winchester College. See Leach, *Winchester College,* pp. 64-76; Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 144-6; Shipp, 'William of Wykeham', pp. 172-5.
[345] *CPR, 1377-81,* p. 379. Wykeham was also able to obtain an array of further privileges for both New College and Winchester College while he was chancellor between 1389 and 1391: Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 154-5.

Christian faith', and to 'profit [*profectum*] the Holy Church'.[346] However, it was equally to support the realm: its founding charter also remarked that learned men were 'useful and necessary for the kingdom in many ways'.[347] Further, it was to help the spiritual welfare of Wykeham and his family: the college's statutes, finalised in 1400, prescribed that his obit be celebrated annually; that there would be weekly masses for his soul, and for those of his predecessors and successors as bishop of Winchester; and that masses should also be celebrated for the souls of his father, John, and his mother, Sybil.[348]

An analysis of the favour shown to the ecclesiastical hierarchy contributes to the lively debate about Edward's use of patronage, and questions some of the conclusions offered by historians of the lay aristocracy. First, it challenges arguments that Edward distributed patronage to 'shore up' the loyalty of recipients.[349] In fact, he gave grants disproportionately to bishops such as William Airmyn, William Edington, and William Wykeham, whose loyalty was never in any doubt. Conversely, Edward was rather more frugal with regard to bishops whose fidelity was questionable; for instance, Stephen Gravesend – who was a partisan of his father's and conspired in the earl of Kent's 'rebellion' of 1330 – never received any grants.[350] Secondly, it complicates the perspective that Edward's patronage was calculated to encourage men to continue serving him.[351] While this might have lain behind some of the acts of patronage received by bishops, the majority of them (224 of 379, or 59%) were given to prelates who were not involved in royal administration at the time.[352] Indeed, many grants were given to bishops who were never going to resume any role in government. Thus, in April 1335, Edward granted a mortmain licence to John Hotham, a bishop who had played little part in politics after retiring from the chancellorship in 1328, was suffering from paralysis, and was to die within two years.[353] Thirdly, it nuances suggestions that Edward's patronage was fundamentally

---

[346] NCA, 12415; *Cartae de Fundatione,* p. 14; Shipp, 'William of Wykeham', p. 172; Tyerman, 'Foundation', p. 30. Indeed, the college's statutes emphasised the primacy of theology, specifying that of its seventy fellows, a maximum of twenty should be permitted to read law: *Statutes,* i, p. 3. It is important to note, however, that while colleges like Wykeham's did educate clergymen, this did not necessarily improve the quality of pastoral care, as learned clergy often worked in the upper levels of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, rather than in the parishes: Davis, 'Contribution of University-Educated Secular Clerics', pp. 269-72.

[347] NCA, 12415; *Cartae de Fundatione,* p. 11; Storey, 'Foundation', p. 4.

[348] *Statutes,* pp. 71-4.

[349] Bothwell, 'Largesse and Limitation', p. 1113.

[350] Warner, 'Adherents of Edmund of Woodstock', pp. 791-2. Gravesend refused to take the 'Guildhall Oath' in January 1327 to 'safeguard Isabella, Queen of England, and Edward, eldest son of the King and heir-apparent in their cause against Hugh le Despenser the younger': *CPMR,* pp. 11-12; *Historia Roffensis,* fo. 50r. See also Haines 'Gravesend, Stephen'; *idem,* 'Sumptuous Apparel', p. 891; and Mortimer, 'Plot of the Earl of Kent', pp. 153-4, 165.

[351] Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 597-8; Partington, 'Noble Service', p. 76.

[352] Appendices 17 and 18. This includes grants made for bishops' ultimate benefit, as well as those given to them directly. While this might seem odd considering the fact those who were actively involved in royal service were much more likely to receive grants than their colleagues, it becomes explicable when one realises that only a minority of bishops served in the royal administration at any one time. In a hypothetical 'average' year across Edward's reign, only three or four bishops worked as a diplomat or a minister, and seventeen or eighteen of their counterparts did not: Appendix 15.

[353] *CPR, 1334-8,* p. 94; Buck, 'Hotham, John'.

designed to enable men to serve the crown more effectively.[354] Although a handful of grants to bishops were evidently designed to support them in performing their governmental duties – as in August 1351, when John Thoresby was given the keeping of various lands 'towards his charges in the king's service and in keeping the household of chancery' – these were relatively few and far between. It is hard to see how much of the other patronage received by the episcopacy, from licences to enlarge episcopal parks to permissions to found monastic houses, could have pragmatically assisted them in serving the crown.[355] Moreover, this of course cannot explain why bishops did not only receive grants themselves, but also procured them for numerous others.

Ultimately, the episcopate was in a different position to the lay aristocracy, insofar as patronage was concerned. This perhaps explains why some of the conclusions offered by historians of the secular nobility do not entirely reflect the episcopacy's own experience of patronage. While much of Edward III's patronage went to his 'new' nobility, who often needed lands and wealth to accompany their new status and to serve the crown effectively both at home and abroad, he did not need to support his episcopate in the same way.[356] Bishops already had prestige and wealth from their dioceses, and did not generally require financial assistance from the king.[357] If it was reckoned in the fourteenth century that earls needed a minimum annual income of £1,000, eleven of the seventeen English bishoprics were valued in excess of this, at least by 1535.[358] Indeed, according to the estimates of B.M.S. Campbell, the average bishop had an annual landed income of £1,590 in the early fourteenth century, similar to that of the average earl (£1,600), and six times greater than that of the average baron (£255).[359] Besides, Edward could not realistically have created a 'new' ecclesiastical hierarchy, even if he had wanted to, because he was constrained by the fact that there were only twenty-one sees in England and Wales, and that no new dioceses had been established in his kingdom since the twelfth century. Yet neither did he need to do so, since there was an episcopal vacancy on average every year throughout his reign, and whereas he had only limited say in the succession of noble estates, which customarily passed down through aristocratic families, he exercised enormous influence over the appointment of new bishops.[360] Hence he was able to continually re-shape, revitalise, and replenish

---

[354] Partington, 'Noble Service', p. 76; Raven, 'Comital Power', pp. 77-8.
[355] *CPR, 1330-4,* p. 195; *CPR, 1350-4,* p. 132; *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 93.
[356] For discussion of this, see Bothwell, *English Peerage,* pp. 138-53. Most notably, five of the nine members of the 'new' titled nobility (those holding dukedoms or earldoms) between 1330 and 1377 received substantial patronage (which Bothwell classed as three grants or over), compared to just four of the twenty-five members of the 'old' titled nobility. Likewise, while 'new' members of the parliamentary peerage represented just one quarter of those individually summoned to parliament in this period, they received over half of the patronage given to the nobility: *Ibid.,* pp. 16, 149.
[357] Of course, bishops often relied on royal patronage during their pre-episcopal careers: Rosenthal, 'Training of an Elite Group', p. 48. However, this thesis is essentially concerned with the activities of bishops after they had joined the episcopal bench.
[358] *EHD IV,* p. 725; Given-Wilson, *English Nobility,* p. 37. See also Heal, *Prelates and Princes,* esp. pp. 72-3.
[359] Campbell, 'Agrarian Problem', p. 12.
[360] The influence of the king with regard to episcopal appointments has been emphasised by many historians. See Thompson, *English Clergy,* pp. 12-18; Highfield, 'English Hierarchy', pp. 133-8; Hay, 'Church of England',

his episcopal bench with men who were both able and loyal to him, without being obliged to douse them with patronage.

If Edward did not need to give substantial amounts of patronage to his bishops, why did he do so? Of course, there was an element of supporting prelates to ensure that they could adequately serve him, which lay behind grants such as that given to Thoresby in 1351. Edward might also have sought to use patronage to prove that he was very different from his father, who was notoriously tight-fisted with regard to the vast majority of the peerage.[361] This is perhaps the most logical explanation for why the volume of patronage received by the episcopacy peaked in the first part of Edward's reign, before progressively tailing off; bishops received an average of twelve acts of patronage a year between 1327 and 1339, seven between 1340 and 1359, and five between 1360 and 1377.[362] Several of Edward's grants might also have been motivated by piety and charity, as in May 1336, when he granted a licence to acquire property in mortmain up to an annual value of £10 to Hamo Hethe, a bishop who had never served in his administration, so that he could 'found a hospital for poor persons in the town of Hethe [Hythe]'.[363] Yet one can hardly deny, as suggested above, that Edward gave patronage as a reward to those who had served him, perhaps as a result of feelings of gratitude, appreciation, and affection. This is consistent not only with the wording of many grants, but also with contemporary works of political thought; the *Secreta Secretorum*, a copy of which appears to have been presented to Edward after his accession to the throne, emphasised how the king should distribute largesse to 'suche as haue deservid it'.[364] Naturally, these ideas were embraced by prelates; Thomas Brinton, for example, told convocation in 1376 that 'the king is held to reward in a noble way those who serve him'.[365] Thus the second-biggest recipient of grants from the king was William Edington, a man who commended himself to Edward on account of his diligent service as chancellor, treasurer, and diplomat, but who neither needed financial support from the crown, as the bishop of the wealthiest diocese in England, nor for his loyalty to be purchased, as a conscientious royal servant for over a

---

p. 41; Heath, *Church and Realm*, pp. 138-42; Harriss, *Shaping the Nation*, pp. 313-4; Harvey, *Episcopal Appointments*, pp. 153-4; and McDonald, 'Bishop Bateman', p. 27.

[361] For Edward II's 'meanness', particularly in the latter years of his reign (except, of course, to the Despensers and other 'favourites'), see Buck, *Politics, Finance and the Church*, pp. 163-96; Childs, 'Finance and Trade', pp. 20-1; and Phillips, *Edward II*, pp. 419-22. For contemporary comment about this, see, most notably, *Vita Edwardi*, pp. 230-1.

[362] Appendix 23. While part of this might reflect the fact that bishops were very occupied in royal service in the 1330s (a period of intense diplomatic and military activity), this is unlikely to account for the entirety of the picture, not only because much of this patronage went to those who only played a limited part in government, but also because bishops were intensively involved in crown service throughout the remainder of Edward's reign.

[363] *CPR, 1334-8*, p. 264.

[364] *Secreta Secretorum*, ed. Steele, pp. 7-8. See also Ormrod, *Edward III*, pp. 13-14; Escobedo, *Milemete Treatise*, pp. 51-9; and Raven, 'Comital Power', pp. 42-3. For broader discussion of fourteenth-century thought on this point, see Spencer, 'Royal Patronage', p. 44; *idem*, *Nobility and Kingship*, pp. 87-8; and Raven, 'Comital Power', p. 55.

[365] *Selected Sermons*, p. 252; *Brinton*, ii, p. 320.

decade before he was elevated to the episcopate.[366] In turn, the very real prospect of receiving reward from the king might have motivated bishops to serve in Edward's administration.[367] This was recognised by Walter de Milemete, who wrote of how men sometimes served the king 'in the hope of future renumeration', and 'because of the hope of future rewards'.[368] More broadly, however, this all highlights how Edward's patronage was affected by a wider array of considerations, despite the picture which historians of his relations with the lay nobility have painted of him being calculating, circumspect, and somewhat parsimonious in his distribution of favour.[369]

Yet our understanding of the patronage which Edward gave to his bishops also contributes to debates beyond the fourteenth century. In recent literature, there has been a tension between scholarship which has maintained that 'ideas' had some part to play in political life in the later Middle Ages, and that which has insisted instead that politics was dominated by patronage, and that everyone was ultimately out for what they could get.[370] The latter view is perhaps epitomised in J.R. Lander's oft-cited observation that:

> fundamentally based as it was on property and personalities, political life was even more of a jungle [in the fifteenth century] than it is today, when it is at least to some extent tempered by principles.[371]

However, the study of the favour distributed to Edward III's bishops underlines that this perspective is simplistic and unconvincing. While bishops did obtain grants from which they personally benefited, it is questionable whether they sought to acquire these in some sordid 'scramble for patronage', rather than perceiving the grants they received as something which substantially aligned with their ideals and responsibilities. For instance, by receiving property in places like London and York, they not only

---

[366] Highfield, *William of Edington*, pp. 3-7; Davies, 'Edington, William'.
[367] Dodd, 'King's Judges', p. 223. This is not to suggest that Edward himself necessarily offered patronage as an inducement for men to serve him, rather than distributing it as a reward for faithful service (although of course these are not mutually exclusive), but simply to observe that the very existence of these rewards might have encouraged men to devote themselves to royal service. Historians' defensiveness about the notion that patronage might have driven men to serve the crown stems, at least in part, from a justified objection to the idea that monarchs had to 'buy' the support of their subjects: Carpenter, *Wars of the Roses*, pp. 43-4; Spencer, 'Royal Patronage', pp. 21, 30; Gundy, *Rebel Earl*, p. 14. However, just because kings did not have to 'purchase' loyalty with patronage, it does not follow that the prospect of patronage might not have incentivised men to work in their administrations. To offer a decidedly imperfect modern analogy: if a charity offered generous rewards to its most loyal volunteers, it may simply do so to thank them, and to recognise their hard work and dedication. Nonetheless, while people might have volunteered for the charity in any event – on account of respect for its aims, admiration for its work, the inspirational leadership of its founder and chairperson, or the simple joy of volunteering *etc.* – it would not prevent the rewards from rousing existing volunteers to volunteer more, or indeed from persuading new individuals to start volunteering.
[368] *Political Thought*, pp. 37-8.
[369] Bothwell, 'Use of Annuities'; *idem*, *English Peerage*, pp. 154-60; Ormrod, *Edward III*, pp. 597-8; Partington, 'Noble Service', pp. 75-6; Raven, 'Comital Power', pp. 75-8, 144-72; *idem*, 'Earldom Endowments'; Hefferan, *Household Knights*, pp. 229-57.
[370] Carpenter, *Locality and Polity*, pp. 6-7. For various perspectives on this issue, see Prestwich, 'Ordinances of 1311', pp. 1-2; Powell, 'After "After McFarlane"'; Carpenter, 'Introduction', pp. 8-9; Ormrod, 'New Political History', pp. 41-2; Spencer, *Nobility and Kingship*, pp. 87-9; and Hefferan, *Household Knights*, pp. 5, 229-31.
[371] Lander, 'Family, "Friends", and Politics', p. 37.

acquired pleasant residences in which they could enjoy stays, but were also able to attend councils and parliaments more conveniently, and hence fulfil their duties to the realm with greater efficacy.[372] By receiving alien priory property, they not only gained a source of income, but were also able to keep ecclesiastical lands from being secularised, and thus prevent the dignity of the Church from being eroded.[373] And by receiving pardons, they not only ensured that they faced no legal sanctions themselves, but also mitigated any risk of imperilling the benefit of clergy by being hauled before lay courts.[374] Moreover, by no means all patronage acquired by bishops was to their direct or exclusive benefit. Prelates who stood high in royal favour also obtained tax reliefs for religious houses, which prevented them from becoming impoverished; secured new jurisdictional rights for the canons of their cathedral churches, which enhanced their status and authority; and acquired mortmain licences for themselves and others to endow educational institutions, which duly educated generations of English clerics, all of which contributed to the prosperity of the English Church.[375] A consideration of the favour shown to Edward's bishops thus underlines two simple, but crucial, points. The first is that principles and self-interest were by no means mutually exclusive, as bishops derived personal profit, material comfort, and legal benefit from patronage which furthered their duties to the Church and the realm.[376] The second, even more fundamental, is that patronage was not intrinsically distinct from ideals; rather it was a means by which those ideals could be pursued and put into practice.

Bishops who served in the royal administration thus stood to gain much from royal patronage. They obtained many more grants than prelates who were less involved in royal service, both while they were working in government and during their retirements. This, at least in part, reflected the king's gratitude for their efforts. The range of favour which the episcopacy received – from pardons for illicitly hunting in royal parks to licences to found houses of Carmelite friars – was considerable, and might well have incentivised bishops to serve the crown.[377] In his treatise on kingship, Walter de Milemete postulated that, when a good king's subjects were assembled together, they would discuss with one another how:

> This noble lord, to whom we have offered our service, has conferred gifts upon us from his largesse and shown courteous regard for our labours, for he has liberally given his gifts to us according to what we deserve.[378]

[372] See, for example, *CPR, 1334-8,* p. 103 and *CPR, 1370-4,* p. 435.
[373] *CPR, 1370-4,* pp. 213, 219; Thompson, 'Prelates and the Alien Priories', pp. 71-5.
[374] *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 133; *CPR, 1374-7,* p. 237; Dodd, 'King's Judges', pp. 225-6.
[375] See *CPR, 1330-4,* p. 81; *CPR, 1343-5,* p. 569; *CPR, 1350-4,* p. 494; and *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 103.
[376] That self-interest and political ideas were not mutually exclusive has been emphasised by several scholars over the last thirty-five years. See Carpenter, *Locality and Polity,* pp. 624-6; Powell, 'After "After McFarlane"', pp. 10-12; and Watts, 'Ideas, Principles and Politics', pp. 116-18.
[377] See, for example, *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 133 and *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 93.
[378] *Political Thought,* p. 38.

Although the context of Milemete's discussion suggests that he might have had members of the lay nobility in mind, many of Edward's bishops who had devoted themselves to public service could have said the same.

It is therefore evident that the opportunity to obtain patronage was one of many reasons why fourteenth-century bishops might choose to serve the crown. Of course, human motivations are complex, multifaceted, and subject to change; what stirred one bishop to work in the royal administration might have been very different from what motivated another, or indeed that same bishop at another point in time. Ultimately, we do not know – with the limitations of our evidence, the intricacies of psychology, and the distance of over six centuries – whether an individual bishop served the crown because they considered it a vital part of their spiritual calling, because they felt grateful to Edward for his part in their previous promotions, or because they sought further reward.[379] Indeed, none of these reasons are mutually exclusive. But what we do know is that there were ample reasons for serving Edward as a minister or a diplomat, which many bishops evidently deemed adequate. Through serving the crown, bishops benefitted the realm, as they provided Edward with counsel, ensured the effective functioning of his administration, and handled difficult negotiations with foreign powers. Yet they also benefitted the Church. Not only were prelates customarily able to balance their royal and diocesan duties to ensure that their bishoprics were not neglected, but they also used their positions of influence to moderate royal policies that were antithetical to ecclesiastical interests, and obtained patronage for their dioceses, their cathedral churches, religious houses, and members of the clerical estate more broadly. Moreover, they also benefited themselves, since they might have genuinely enjoyed working in royal service, since they were empowered to make generous pious provision for their souls, and since they were able to acquire grants for their servants, companions, and relatives. Ralph Shrewsbury might have been the most saintly of Edward's bishops, and dedicated his episcopal career to ministering in his diocese.[380] Yet it is at least questionable whether he achieved as much for the *ecclesia anglicana* – let alone for himself and his kin – as prelates who served the crown, such as John Thoresby, who frustrated Edward's plans to exact hasty vengeance on Thomas de Lisle, and thus prevented him from riding roughshod over clerical liberties; Thomas Hatfield, who helped conclude the Treaty of Berwick, which did much to save northern clergy from the terror, violence, and destruction of Scottish raids; and William Bateman, whose Cambridge colleges have educated numerous clergymen and clergywomen.

The Voluntary Nature of Episcopal Service to the Crown

That those prelates who served in the king's administration did so willingly is confirmed by the fact that they simply did not have to do so. However, the decisions of bishops to resign their offices, retire

[379] Dodd, 'King's Judges', p. 223.
[380] Lepine, *Brotherhood of Canons*, pp. 10-11; *idem*, 'Shrewsbury, Ralph'.

from royal service, or decline to carry out particular instructions has rarely been highlighted by historians. While a handful of dramatic incidents – such as Edward's decision to dismiss Roger Northburgh and Robert Stratford in 1340 – have attracted a substantial amount of comment, and individual resignations and retirements have received treatment in biographical studies, the subject as a whole has never been discussed in any depth. Nonetheless, it underlines a crucial point: that bishops were not mitred puppets on a royal string, but independent actors with agency. Had they simply been unwilling and unwitting servants of the crown, who had no choice in the matter, the question of their potential motivations for serving the king would only have been of hypothetical and incidental interest. But that they had the capability, independence, and freedom not to serve the crown, but still chose to do so, shows that their reasons for pursuing careers in public service were of vital importance.

Perhaps the most obvious moment for bishops to withdraw from their public offices and devote themselves to their diocesan responsibilities was on their elevation to the episcopate. Thus, John Buckingham, who had enjoyed a lengthy career in royal service from at least April 1347, and served as keeper of the privy seal from June 1360 to June 1363, ceased at once to hold any formal position in government after he became bishop of Lincoln in the latter month.[381] Instead, he became customarily resident in his diocese, and busied himself with pastoral matters, including the extirpation of heresy, the support of the Carthusian order, and the investigation of allegations of bastardy.[382] This also applied with those prominent in diplomacy prior to their becoming bishops. Michael Northburgh was annually involved in various diplomatic missions from 1348 until his consecration as bishop of London in 1355, which involved treating with the Flemings, arranging truces with the French, attempting to procure a definite peace, and negotiating terms for the release of Charles of Blois, whom the English had captured in 1347.[383] Yet, while he went 'beyond the seas on the king's service' to treat with the French while bishop-elect of London, he did not resume any ambassadorial work after his consecration in July 1355.[384] Regrettably, the loss of his episcopal register hampers our understanding of his diocesan undertakings, but there are signs that he took his sacred responsibilities seriously; he suggested to Sir Walter Mauny that they should co-found a Carthusian monastery in London,[385] and he has been proposed by scholars as the English translator of Marguerite Porete's *Mirror of Simple Souls*.[386] There are no indications that Edward was unsatisfied with the work of

[381] McHardy, 'John Buckingham and Thomas Beauchamp', pp. 48-9; McHardy, 'Buckingham, John'.
[382] *Buckingham,* pp. xviii-xix, 90-4; McHardy, 'Promotion of John Buckingham', pp. 134-5; McHardy, 'Buckingham, John'.
[383] Haines, 'Northburgh, Michael'. Northburgh had also been heavily involved in domestic administration, most notably as keeper of the privy seal between September 1350 and August 1354.
[384] *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 99; Kingsford, 'Northburgh, Michael de'; Appendices 10 and 21.
[385] Michael Northburgh died in 1361, but the Charterhouse was eventually founded in 1371 by Mauny. Nonetheless, Northburgh has generally been regarded as co-founder: *CPR, 1370-4,* p. 44; Knowles, 'London Charterhouse', pp. 159-60.
[386] Field, 'The Master and Marguerite', p. 140; Lerner, 'New Light', pp. 104-7.

either Buckingham or Northburgh, and it therefore seems that their withdrawal from their governmental roles reflected their own decisions to spend more of their time on ecclesiastical affairs.

Even after they had joined the episcopal bench, bishops could still choose to withdraw from royal service. Of course, some prelates did not opt to leave their administrative and diplomatic positions of their own volition. These included bishops who were sacked, such as Robert Stratford and Roger Northburgh, who were dismissed as chancellor and treasurer respectively in December 1340,[387] as well as those who died in office or on ambassadorial missions, such as Richard Bintworth, who served as chancellor until his death in December 1339, and William Bateman, who died at the papal court on a royal mission in January 1355.[388] Yet many fourteenth-century bishops did voluntarily choose to leave crown employ. For instance, promotion to the archiepiscopacy might prompt prelates to relinquish their public offices; Walter Reynolds resigned the chancellorship just seven weeks after his enthronement as archbishop of Canterbury in February 1314, and thereafter declined to hold any official governmental position.[389] They might also resign their positions to devote themselves fully to urgent ecclesiastical business; it has been suggested, for example, that William Courtenay gave up the chancellorship after less than two months in November 1381 so that he could dedicate himself to the suppression of Wycliffite heresy, which threatened – according to his summons to a council of the southern province – 'to subvert the position of the entire church and of our province of Canterbury and the peace of the realm'.[390] More prosaically, they might retire from royal service on account of their ill health; it appears that Adam Orleton's withdrawal from diplomatic duties after his mission to Paris in the summer of 1336 reflected his increasing debility, which prompted him to write in January 1338 of the failing sight in his left eye, and to excuse himself from attending convocation in September that year on account of his 'serious infirmity'.[391] More mundanely still, bishops might vacate their offices because they had simply had enough of public service; John Barnet resigned the treasurership, and ceased active involvement in government, after the resumption of the war with France in 1369, perhaps because he felt that someone younger and more energetic might be better

[387] *Baker,* pp. 62-3. The sacking of Stratford and Northburgh has attracted a considerable literature. See Tout, *Chapters,* iii, pp. 120-2; Fryde, 'Edward III's Removal', pp. 159-61; Haines, *John Stratford,* p. 282; and Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 231.
[388] Bothwell, 'Bintworth, Richard'; *Bateman,* ii, p. 102. See also *CPP,* i, p. 265; Thompson, 'William Bateman', pp. 129-30.
[389] Wright, *Church and Crown,* pp. 258-9; Wright, 'Reynolds, Walter'. Reynolds was the first archbishop of Canterbury to also serve as royal chancellor since Hubert Walter, over a century beforehand.
[390] The council was summoned to meet at the house of the Blackfriars in London in May 1382: Lambeth Palace, Reg. Courtenay, fo. 25; Tout, *Chapters,* iii, p. 380; Dahmus, *William Courtenay,* pp. 162-3. Other explanations for Courtenay's resignation as chancellor include that he was wary of incurring the same fate as Sudbury (Tout, *Chapters,* iii, p. 380), that he was removed from office because he had lost the confidence of the commons (Saul, *Richard II,* p. 81), and that he fell victim to John of Gaunt's attempts to re-establish himself as the dominant power in government, since the duke could not permit his old adversary to hold high office (Dahmus, *William Courtenay,* p. 163). Of course, as both Tout and Dahmus recognised, these explanations are not mutually exclusive.
[391] Haines, *Church and Politics,* p. 40.

placed to cope with the increased demands of wartime, or because he just did not want to face those pressures himself.[392]

Episcopal ministers could also decline to implement certain royal commands of which they disapproved.[393] John Thoresby's and William Edington's refusal to follow Edward's instructions in relation to Thomas de Lisle's temporalities at the end of 1355 was not unprecedented.[394] In fact, in November 1350, Thoresby himself appears to have been involved in a similar episode. On the nineteenth of that month, he delivered the great seal to the king, who in turn passed it to his steward, John Grey of Rotherfield, ordering him 'to open it and to seal a commission and a writ therewith', before returning it to Thoresby.[395] There was no advantage to Edward in having his documents sealed by his steward, rather than his chancellor, and the most logical explanation for this rigmarole was that Thoresby refused to take responsibility for the sealing of instruments to which he objected.[396] This is perhaps explained by the nature of the commission in question, which has not been identified to date. Yet it seems likely that it relates to the commission given to a panel – consisting of John Grey himself, the earls of Warwick, Arundel, and Huntingdon, and the king's chamberlain – to proceed in judgement on William Thorp, the former chief justice of the king's bench, who had confessed in his trial before them to receiving bribes.[397] It is possible that Thoresby – who would have known Thorp from their work in the king's administration – took exception to, or at least wanted no part in, the punishment of his former colleague, who was duly sentenced to be hanged.[398]

Further examples of comparable refusals can be found in the surrounding reigns, including by ministers who also served Edward. In November 1389, William Wykeham, once again chancellor, refused to seal letters patent or close in accordance with the king's command. Richard II therefore wrote furiously to him, commanding him to temporarily hand over the great seal to the prior of the Order of St John and three knights, so that they could use it instead.[399] The subject of the quarrel between Wykeham and the king is not known. However, the issue in dispute is clear in the

---

[392] Tout, *Chapters,* iii, pp. 260-1; Ormrod, 'Barnet, John'. Barnet died in 1373, four years after the resumption of the war.
[393] While the following paragraphs naturally focus on episcopal ministers, lay ministers could act similarly: Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes*, pp. 320-1.
[394] See above, pp. 68-70.
[395] *Foedera,* iii, i, p. 211; *CCR, 1349-54,* p. 275.
[396] Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes,* pp. 320-1.
[397] *CPR, 1350-4,* p. 30; Kaeuper, 'Thorp, Sir William'. The commission concerning Thorp is the only known commission sealed on 19 November 1350, and the other known business transacted under the great seal that day was routine and hardly like to arouse particular concern.
[398] Thorp was sentenced on 24 November 1350. In the event, he was pardoned his life by Edward on the same day, and on 10 March 1351, he was provided with a full pardon and restored to his goods and lands. Yet this might not have appeared evident to Thoresby on 19 November 1350, as Edward appears to have been incensed, interpreting Thorp's misdeeds as a scandalous breaking of the personal bonds between sovereign and justice: *CPR, 1350-4,* p. 30; Kaeuper, 'Thorp, Sir William'.
[399] Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes,* p. 321; Saul, *Richard II,* p. 254; Davis, *William Wykeham,* p. 92. For Thomas Arundel's refusal to accept the signet as sufficient warrant for the great seal when he became chancellor in 1386, see also Tuck, *Richard II,* p. 70; Saul, *Richard II,* p. 126; and Carpenter, 'Deskilling', p. 14.

disagreement between John Langton, chancellor and bishop of Chichester, and Edward II in the first half of 1308. Perhaps unsurprisingly, it was Piers Gaveston, the royal favourite who aroused the loathing of the political elite, as – in the words of the *Vita Edwardi Secundi* – someone who 'lorded it over them like a second king, to whom all were subject and none equal'.[400] After Edward reluctantly conceded in the parliament of April 1308 that Gaveston would be sentenced to exile and the estates of his earldom restored to the crown, Langton – despite royal requests – repeatedly refused to acknowledge Gaveston as earl of Cornwall. Langton's response to Edward's instructions to send a writ of *liberate* to the treasurer and chamberlains of the exchequer, instructing them to pay £1,180 to Gaveston for his expenses is typical; the king's privy seal writ to the bishop referred to 'nostro dilecto et fideli nostro Petro de Gavaston, comiti Cornubie', while the ensuing great seal writ referred only to 'nostro dilecto et fideli nostro Petro de Gavaston'.[401] The failure of Langton to comply with Edward's wishes even with regard to the diplomatic of Gaveston's title appears to have convinced Edward that he needed to personally supervise the production of great seal letters apropos the favourite's exile, perhaps because he feared that his chancellor would simply refuse to effect his commands. Accordingly, on 15 June, Edward asked for Langton to give the seal to Adam Osgodby, keeper of the chancery rolls, who would in turn deliver it to him at Windsor, before returning it to Langton five days later.[402] In the intervening period, several documents were read and sealed before the king which concerned Gaveston, in which his name was invariably followed by his comital title, most notably his appointment as the royal lieutenant in Ireland.[403]

Indeed, if a bishop was particularly perturbed by royal policy, he could not merely refuse to have any part in effecting it, but also resign his office. According to the chronicler Robert Avesbury, this is what happened in June 1340, when John Stratford resigned the chancellorship. In Avesbury's account, Stratford travelled to Orwell, where he found the king preparing to sail to the Low Countries. He remonstrated with Edward to wait and gather a stronger fleet before departing, for Philip VI had assembled a great force of armed ships. When Edward impetuously brushed aside this warning – and later, after receiving similar words of caution from the admiral of the east coast, Robert Morley, and his lieutenant, John Crabbe, declared 'I will cross the sea in spite of you… you, who are afraid when there is nothing to be frightened of, can stay at home' – Stratford relinquished his post and surrendered the great seal.[404] While historians have been divided on the veracity of Avesbury's narrative, it nonetheless reflects an understanding that an episcopal chancellor could vacate his office

[400] *Vita Edwardi*, pp. 4-5.
[401] *PROME*, April 1308, Introduction; Chaplais, *Piers Gaveston*, pp. 44-6.
[402] *CCR, 1307-13*, p. 68. Edward also kept the great seal in his possession on 9-10 June, but what – if any – use he made of it on this occasion is not known: Maxwell-Lyte, *Historical Notes*, p. 320; Chaplais, *Piers Gaveston*, p. 48.
[403] *CPR, 1307-13*, p. 83; Chaplais, *Piers Gaveston*, pp. 48-51.
[404] *Murimuth*, pp. 310-11.

if he vehemently objected to the king's plans.[405] More certainly, it appears that this is what happened with John Thoresby in November 1356. Although the close roll does not record the reason for Thoresby's resignation of the chancellorship, it does state that it 'was at his own request' that Edward discharged him from the keeping of the great seal.[406] Considering that this occurred the month after the crown's confiscation of the Ely temporalities, to which Thoresby had been resolutely opposed, it has been convincingly suggested that he stood down in response to the humiliation suffered by his colleague on the episcopal bench.[407]

Moreover, when monarchs acted in especially inappropriate, scandalous, and damaging ways, bishops with experience in the royal administration could join with others in attempts to effect political reform. This is especially evident in the reigns of Edward's father and grandson.[408] By 1310, the political community had grown frustrated with Edward II, owing, at least in part, to his unseemly relations with Gaveston. After a stand-off with Edward II in parliament – in which, according to the *Vita Edwardi Secundi,* the baronage threatened that 'unless the king granted their proposals, they would not have him for king, nor keep the fealty that they had sworn to him' – two former episcopal chancellors, John Langton and Ralph Baldock, were among those elected by a group of prelates, earls, and barons to 'regulate the state of the royal household and of the kingdom'.[409] They might have played a key role in drafting the resulting Ordinances, which were published in September 1311, since the document – in addition to ordering Gaveston's expulsion – imposed a number of technical regulations on Edward II's regime, on matters from the appointment of sheriffs to the ways in which royal officers rendered accounts at the exchequer. This suggests that the Ordinances' authors had a detailed knowledge of the king's administration.[410] Bishops were arguably even more prominent in

---

[405] On the one hand, Avesbury would have known Stratford as the registrar of his court. However, on the other hand, his dramatic rendering of events contrasts with the official record, which simply says that the archbishop resigned his post on account of 'the infirmity and impotence of his body': *Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1129; Lucas, 'John Crabbe', pp. 346-7; Haines, *John Stratford,* p. 269-70; Ormrod, 'Avesbury, Robert'; *idem, Edward III,* pp. 220-1; Barber, *Edward III,* p. 119.

[406] *Foedera,* iii, i, p. 344; *CCR, 1354-60,* p. 332.

[407] Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government', p. 258; Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 382-3; Dodd, 'Clerical Chancellors', pp. 31-2.

[408] Perhaps the closest thing to this in Edward III's reign was when William Wykeham played a leading role in the impeachment of William Latimer in the Good Parliament of 1376, which is discussed below (at pp. 173-4). However, while this is an example of a bishop (and ex-chancellor) supporting an attempt to secure political reform, it is materially different from the crises of Edward II's and Richard II's reigns, for the Good Parliament was fundamentally a response to Edward's chronic incapacity, likely borne of persistent ill health, and the damaging repercussions of this. Rather than being a reaction against royal activity, it was therefore a reaction against royal *inactivity* and its consequences. See Ormrod, *Reign of Edward II,* pp. 14-17; *idem, Edward III,* pp. 529-31, 549-50; and Sumption, *Edward III,* pp. 94-101.

[409] *Vita Edwardi,* pp. 18-19; *CPR, 1307-13,* p. 215. For the background to the Ordinances, see Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster,* pp. 90-117; Phillips, *Edward II,* pp. 162-3; and Spencer, 'Inadequate Kingship', pp. 83-4. For the careers of Baldock and Langton, see Trueman, 'Personnel of Mediaeval Reform', pp. 252, 254; Tipping, rev. Buck, 'Baldock, Ralph'; and Buck, 'Langton, John'. Note that Langton was chancellor at the time of his election as one of the ordainers, but that he was removed from his post in May 1310.

[410] Prestwich, 'Ordinances of 1311', p. 14; Lane, 'Prelates and Political Reform', pp. 45-6. For the text of the Ordinances, see *EHD III,* pp. 529-39, and for a full discussion of them, see Davies, *Baronial Opposition,* pp. 368-82.

the numerous attempts to regulate Richard II's government, which arose after he sought to exercise his royal will more forcefully in the mid-1380s. Thus, for example, William Wykeham (a former chancellor), Thomas Brantingham (a former treasurer), and John Fordham (a former keeper of the privy seal) were among the nine lords who composed a bill of ten proposals for financial reform, after they were appointed in the parliament of 1385 to 'survey his [Richard II's] estate and enquire into revenues to reduce costs'.[411] Wykeham and Brantingham also served, alongside William Courtenay (a former chancellor), Thomas Arundel (the newly-appointed chancellor), and John Gilbert (the newly-appointed treasurer), on the commission of fourteen lords established during the 'Wonderful Parliament' of 1386 to effectively, in the words of Thomas Favent, 'ordain, consult, and complete all the business of the king and the kingdom in the following judicial year'.[412] Most dramatically, as chancellor, Thomas Arundel opened the Merciless Parliament of 1388, calling for it to be determined:

> How the great disputes, trouble, and dissensions which had arisen in the kingdom for want of good government in the past might best be ended and calmed, the king better advised, and the kingdom better governed; good peace, quiet, and tranquillity everywhere nourished and maintained; the law better observed and executed; right and justice done as well to the poor as to the rich; extortion, oppression, fraud, and false maintenance entirely ousted and destroyed; malefactors and maintainers in the land better punished and chastised; and the good and loyal best cherished and rewarded.[413]

In the ensuing parliament, many of Richard's friends, servants, and supporters were tried, and at least eight condemned to death and executed.[414] Meanwhile, Wykeham was appointed to another committee of five lords, who were required to be 'in constant attendance upon him [Richard II]', so that 'he should do nothing without their consent'.[415] When kings behaved in a persistently improper manner, bishops could therefore use the skills and knowledge that they had amassed in years of royal service to restrain the king, reform his administration, and attempt to restrict his power.

All in all, it is plain that bishops were not obliged to serve in Edward's government. In fact, at any one time, only a minority of the episcopate did so. Prelates could retire from their public offices or diplomatic work at any time, and for any reason, from ill health to wanting to devote more of their time to ecclesiastical affairs. If they disagreed with royal policies, they could not only refuse to implement Edward's instructions, but also resign their offices, depriving him of their talents and

---

[411] *Reign of Richard II,* pp. 135-7. For discussion of this, see Palmer, 'Impeachment', pp. 96-101; Tuck, *Richard II,* pp. 100-1; Davis, *William Wykeham,* p. 81; and Fletcher, *Richard II,* pp. 140-3.
[412] *Reign of Richard II,* p. 163. For the full text of the commission's terms, see *Ibid.,* pp. 157-62. For discussion of the commission, see Goodman, *Loyal Conspiracy,* pp. 12-15; Ormrod, 'Government by Commission'; Saul, *Richard II,* pp. 160-6; and Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 83-5.
[413] *PROME,* February 1388, 1.
[414] For discussion of the 'Merciless Parliament', see Goodman, *Loyal Conspiracy,* pp. 41-8; Tuck, *Richard II,* pp. 121-32; Saul, *Richard II,* pp. 191-5; and *PROME,* February 1388, Introduction. It should be noted, however, that Arundel (and the other bishops) played no part in the trials themselves, for they were canonically debarred from participating in trials which would result in the spilling of blood: Davis, *William Wykeham,* p. 86.
[415] *Westminster,* pp. 331-2. For discussion of this, see Goodman, *Loyal Conspiracy,* p. 47; Saul, *Richard II,* p. 196; and Davis, *William Wykeham,* p. 87.

experience. Indeed, when a king's behaviour became a serious cause for concern, bishops could use their understanding of government to assist his critics and attempt to bring about political reform. However, the history of bishops' work in Edward's administration is not one of an endless cycle of spats, resignations, refusals to effect his wishes, and attempts to limit his power and reform his regime. For the majority of his reign, prelates worked smoothly with the king, diligently carried out his demands, held ministerial office for many years, and worked time after time as royal diplomats. This flowed from the fact that bishops broadly supported Edward's policies (or at least found them acceptable), and were convinced that the benefits of their royal service – for the realm, for the Church, and for themselves – were more than satisfactory, and sufficient compensation for their labours on his behalf.

Conclusion

Ultimately, this all underlines that the bishops who worked in the royal administration enjoyed a symbiotic relationship with the king for the majority of Edward's reign. The king benefited enormously from their endeavours both at home and abroad, and from the experience, resources, legal skills, and status which they brought to his government. Yet bishops also benefited enormously from their positions at the centre of his regime, which they could use to assist their dioceses, aid clergymen in need, and obtain royal patronage for themselves, their families, and their friends. In 1341, John Stratford asserted that priests should be 'the fathers and mentors of kings, princes, and all the faithful', and set out the responsibilities of a 'good prince', namely 'to restore broken and shaken [*concussas*] churches, to build new ones, to honour the priests of God, and to protect them with the utmost reverence'.[416] Through pursuing careers in royal service, bishops positioned themselves superbly to act as the king's mentors. But they were also able to take steps to ensure that the power of the crown was directed towards the ends that Stratford outlined, as they procured licences for clergy to repair churches and hermitages; obtained royal permission for the construction of new churches and chantries; impeded royal proposals which were contrary to the honour of ecclesiastics; and helped to defend the livelihoods of clergymen and clergywomen by negotiating truces. Edward III enjoyed a posthumous reputation as, in the words of Thomas Walsingham, a man 'devoted to God', who 'respected and honoured the ministers of the Church'.[417] Of course, this was in no small part due to his personal piety, but it was also facilitated by the bishops who formed the cornerstones of his government.[418]

---

[416] 'Birchington', p. 28.
[417] *Walsingham,* i, pp. 988-9.
[418] Ormrod, 'Personal Religion'. See also Mortimer, *Perfect King,* pp. 109-13; Roger, 'St George's College', pp. 18-33, 121-7; and Biggs, *St Stephen's College,* pp. 27-34. Of course, while it is a matter beyond the scope of this thesis, bishops also played an important role in supporting the king with projects that have been regarded as expressions of his personal piety. Thus, for instance, William Edington played a key role in Edward's foundation of St Stephen's College, Westminster; he might have encouraged the king to establish the college,

and, more certainly, he wrote the college statutes and inspected its ongoing building works: Biggs, *St Stephen's College,* pp. 35-6. Edington was also deeply involved in the foundation of St George's, Windsor: Roberts, *St George's Chapel,* p. 149; Jefferson, 'MS Arundel', p. 373; Davis, *William Wykeham,* p. 23. The colleges were both founded on the same date: 6 August 1348. Similarly, Edington was the central ecclesiastical figure within the Order of the Garter, the chivalric order whose spiritual home was St George's Chapel: James, *Palaces,* p. 121; Collins, *Order of the Garter,* p. 31; Davis, *William Wykeham,* p. 23; Barber, *Edward III*, pp. 283-4.

Chapter II

‘The Defence of the Realm’: Bishops and Edward III’s Wars

The seal of Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham, is remarkable. On the obverse, he is portrayed as a conventional bishop: seated on his episcopal throne, wearing his mitre, and holding his crozier. Yet on the reverse, he is shown mounted on a caparisoned charger, bearing a shield, donning a helmet, and charging off to war, sword sheathed by his side. This reveals an unfamiliar aspect of episcopal identity: the bishop as a soldier, as a warrior, and as a military leader.[1] While bishops’ martial assistance to the crown has frequently been mentioned by scholars, it has never been satisfactorily explored. For instance, Scott Waugh and Mark Ormrod, in their general treatments of Edward III’s reign, dealt with the issue in a single paragraph.[2] Even more detailed research into prelates’ martial activities has tended to either focus on specific bishops, such as Hatfield himself – whom Nicholas Barker hailed as ‘the bishop Odo of his time’ – or on particular facets of their involvement, such as their organisation of military arrays of the clergy in the last decade of Edward III’s reign.[3] The absence of a broad study has led to historiographical confusion about the extent of the episcopacy’s military involvement. On the one hand, Roger Highfield commented that ‘war directly affected only a few members of the English hierarchy’, while on the other, Waugh claimed that ‘this was the age of the warrior bishop’.[4] Consequently, this chapter will survey the martial activities of the Edwardian episcopate afresh, arguing not only that many bishops were personally involved in military matters, but also that this was of great importance for the king’s regime, and that it served prelates’ own interests as well as those of the crown.

Perhaps the most dramatic way in which bishops militarily served the crown was through participating in raids and expeditions outside of the realm. John Kirkby took part in a raid into Scotland in September 1337, which the *Lanercost Chronicle* reported marched ‘into Teviotdale, Moffatdale, and Nithsdale, driving off cattle and burning houses and corn’; Henry Burghersh – deemed ‘a shrewd manager of fighting men’ by Henry Knighton – fought in Edward III’s expedition to Flanders of 1338-9, with a retinue of five bannerets, twenty-four knights, and seventy-five squires; and Thomas Hatfield was involved in a *chevauchée* launched from Calais in 1355, in which Robert Avesbury thought he fought

[1] Tracy and Budge, *Medieval Episcopal Thrones,* p. 127 (figs. 4.36 [a] and [b]). For discussion of Hatfield’s seal, see Barker, ‘Thomas de Hatfield’, p. 56 and Prestwich, ‘Hatfield at War’, pp. 5, 18
[2] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 132; Waugh, *Reign of Edward III,* pp. 149-50. For other brief mentions of bishops’ military activities in broader works, see McKisack, *Fourteenth Century,* p. 298; Swanson, *Church and Society,* pp. 118-21; Thompson, ‘Prelates and Politics’, p. 76; and King and Etty, *England and Scotland,* p. 162.
[3] Barker, ‘Thomas de Hatfield’ (quotation on p. 2); McNab, ‘Military Arrays’. See also, for example, Chew, ‘Ecclesiastical Tenants-in-Chief’; Schwyzer, ‘Arms and the Bishop’; Oliver, ‘Battling Bishops’; and Prestwich, ‘Hatfield at War’.
[4] Highfield, ‘Relations’, i, p. 221; Waugh, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 149.

with a retinue of one hundred men-at-arms and eighty mounted archers.[5] Undoubtedly the most celebrated campaign in which a bishop fought was that of Crécy. According to Adam Murimuth, Thomas Hatfield sailed from Portsmouth with Edward's army on 11 July 1346, and thereafter he played an important part in managing the English forces; the *Acta Bellicosa* described how the English army was divided into three divisions while it marched across France, with 'the vanguard under the prince of Wales, the centre under the king, and the rearguard under the bishop of Durham'.[6] Indeed, Hatfield fought at the Battle of Crécy itself, with his presence at the battle being noted by chroniclers including Geoffrey le Baker, Jean le Bel, and Froissart, and the following day conducted the funeral of Blind John of Bohemia.[7]

Bishops also fought within England to defend the kingdom, particularly on the northern border with Scotland. Most fighting on this front took the form of relatively small skirmishes. Thus, Thomas Walsingham described how, when the Scots invaded the realm in October 1345, and looted their way to Penrith, John Kirkby – along with other local lords – raised men to repel them, and surrounded the encamped Scottish troops with a small force. In the ensuing melee, 'the bishop was pulled from his horse by the Scots, and nearly captured', but he was eventually freed and restored to his mount by the bravery of his men, who ultimately prevailed due to their persistence and the approach of reinforcements.[8] While the details of Walsingham's account remain open to question, it nonetheless gives a good sense of the sort of fighting in which both lay and ecclesiastical lords were typically engaged in the north of England. However, prelates also fought in full-scale battles, of which the most notable took place the following year, in October 1346. William Zouche, archbishop of York, was at the heart of the proceedings at the Battle of Neville's Cross: he was recognised as the overall leader of the English forces; he blessed soldiers before the battle, with the Lanercost chronicler describing how he 'called his men together, and blessed them all, which, by the Grace of God, had a good effect'; he fought in the English army himself, with Thomas Sampson locating him in the second rank of the English forces; and he appears to have exercised some practical leadership on the battlefield, with the Lanercost chronicler adding that he was the 'leader of the second rank'.[9]

More commonly, bishops were found guarding the peripheries of the English realm, rather than engaging in fighting themselves. They sometimes held official positions to this effect. John Kirkby was appointed as Warden of the West March in 1346; Gilbert Welton similarly between July 1359 and

---

[5] *Lanercost,* pp. 305-7; *Knighton,* pp. 28-9; *Murimuth,* p. 427-9. See also Rose, 'Bishops and Diocese', pp. 71-2; Prince, 'Strength of English Armies', p. 361; Ayton, 'Edward III and the English Aristocracy', p. 180; and Prestwich, 'Hatfield at War', p. 9.
[6] *Murimuth,* p. 199; *Life and Campaigns,* p. 29.
[7] *Baker,* pp. 74-5; *Jean le Bel,* pp. 181-2; *Crécy Casebook,* pp. 262-3.
[8] *Historia Anglicana,* i, pp. 266-7. See also Rose, 'Bishops and Diocese', p. 83.
[9] 'Illustrative Documents', pp. 132, 135, 140. Note that the evidence is contradictory as to Zouche's precise location on the battlefield: Thomas Sampson and the Lanercost chronicler placed in the second rank of the English forces, whereas the Anonimalle chronicler placed him in the third: *Ibid.,* pp. 135, 140, 145.

October 1361, as well as briefly in both 1355 and 1356; and Thomas Appleby likewise in 1366 and between February 1367 and November 1375. Thomas Hatfield was also repeatedly made Warden of the East March between 1359 and 1377.[10] The duties held by Wardens were set out in Edward's letter appointing Welton in July 1359, and entailed both military and administrative matters, including conserving truces, arraying forces, and 'organising them in companies and leading them against the Scots if truces are broken and England invaded'.[11] Bishops also held other offices which involved martial duties. Thus Thomas Charlton served as keeper of Ireland between June 1338 and April 1340, which required him to oversee military matters, as in July 1339, when he was instructed to ensure that 'all the castles and dangerous places in that land' were sufficiently prepared to meet potential threats.[12] Likewise, in June 1339, John Grandisson served as one of the keepers of the maritime land in Devon, which entailed serving as an overall local commander, with responsibilities including guarding the coast, resisting invaders whether they came by sea or land, and taking all steps necessary for the safety of the realm.[13] Similarly, Robert Wyvil served as the keeper of the Isle of Wight in the summer of 1339, and was referred to as staying on the island and supervising its defence 'against attacks by foreign foes'.[14] This position was by no means a sinecure; the Isle had been raided in the summer of 1336, when the French boarded English vessels, scuttled some ships, and seized the rest, and was to be raided again in August 1340, when French soldiers were eventually driven back to their vessels, but only after they had inflicted great damage on the island and heavy casualties on its defenders.[15]

Prelates were also expected to attend to strategic areas on a more *ad hoc* basis. These included coastal regions, which were the landing grounds for any French attack. For example, in June 1339, Ralph Shrewsbury was ordered to stay 'with all his power upon the custody of the maritime lands' of Dorset; in March 1360, Simon Islip was commanded 'to defend the coast of the country [in Kent] against invasion'; and in July 1373, William Wykeham was instructed to see to the 'safety and defence' of Southampton and its approaches 'against the malice of our enemies'.[16] In addition, bishops were asked to supervise the Welsh border, which could also be a troubled region, as in July 1335, when Thomas Charlton was ordered to 'sharply repress malefactors and disturbers of the king's peace', and suppress

[10] *Rot. Scot.*, i, pp. 669-70, 782, 790, 839, 910-11, 913-15, 923, 935, 939, 935, 948-9, 951, ii, p. 2. Hatfield was named as a Warden in 1359, 1367, 1368, 1369, 1370, 1371, 1372, and 1377. See also Rose, 'Bishops and Diocese', pp. 93-4; *idem*, 'Appleby, Thomas'; Schwyzer, 'Arms and the Bishop', p. 291; and Liddy, *Bishopric of Durham*, p. 166. John Kirkby was also appointed 'keeper' of the West March in 1343 and 1344, and Appleby also held office as Warden of the West March in Richard II's reign in both 1377 and 1379: *Rot. Scot.*, i, pp. 638-9, 656; Rose, 'Appleby, Thomas'.
[11] *Welton*, p. 75. For wider discussions of the responsibilities held by Wardens of the Marches, see also Reid, 'Office of the Warden'; Storey, 'Wardens of the Marches', pp. 593-4; and Schwyzer, 'Arms and the Bishop', pp. 307-8.
[12] *CCR, 1339-41*, p. 244.
[13] *CCR, 1339-41*, p. 226. For the responsibilities held by keepers of the maritime land, see Hewitt, *Organization of War*, p. 7; *idem*, 'Organization of War', p. 77; and Alban, 'Coastal Defence', pp. 59-62.
[14] *CPR, 1338-40*, p. 311. See also *CCR, 1339-41*, p. 331.
[15] Sumption, *Trial by Battle*, pp. 164, 347.
[16] *CCR, 1339-41*, p. 216; *CPR, 1358-61*, p. 411; *Foedera*, iii, ii, p. 988.

'a threatened rising of the Welsh… from whose unbridled inconstancy very many evils have been seen to arrive'.[17] However, the most persistent zone of instability throughout Edward's reign was undoubtedly the Anglo-Scottish border, which was frequently subject to disorder, raids, and full-scale invasions. Consequently, northern bishops – even those who were not then appointed as Wardens of the Marches – were often asked to protect the border, as in February 1337, when John Kirkby was commanded 'to repulse the Scots if they invade, and to attack them if he can'; July 1341, when Richard de Bury was ordered to see to 'the defence of the realm against the Scots'; and February 1372, when Thomas Hatfield was told to 'draw with speed towards the marches of Scotland, there continually to abide with all his power, his household, and his retinue', so that he could 'march with strong hand against the said enemies [the Scots], should they presume to invade the realm'.[18]

In addition to simply guarding these troubled regions, bishops were relied upon to bolster their defensive fortifications. They were sometimes asked to oversee the repair of urban walls. For example, Gilbert Welton was instructed to supervise the repair of the walls and gates of Carlisle in March 1354, since Edward was 'anxious that it [Carlisle] should be secure… as it is in the march near the king's enemies', and Thomas Brantingham was ordered to compel the clerks of Exeter 'to contribute to the repair of the city's walls and ditches' in June 1377, because it was feared that 'the French are proposing to land in England and attack Exeter'.[19] More significantly, they were also entrusted with the control of royal castles. Thus Roger Northburgh was appointed custodian of Caerphilly Castle in February 1327 and John Kirkby was granted custody of Carlisle Castle in June 1340.[20] As custodians, they were responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of their castles, as well as the leadership of their garrisons, in sometimes strained financial circumstances; by June 1343, Kirkby was owed £432 for his garrison's wages.[21] Indeed, bishops also possessed their own castles, which they were sometimes ordered to maintain by the crown. Most notably, the bishops of Durham held Norham Castle, the major English fortress on the south bank of the River Tweed.[22] In view of the castle's strategic position in the north – it having been unsuccessfully besieged by the Scots for nearly a year in 1318, for seven months in 1319, and more briefly in 1322 – it is perhaps unsurprising that the king wanted it to be defensible, ordering Thomas Hatfield to refortify it in February 1367.[23]

---

[17] *Thomas Charlton,* pp. 59-60; *CCR, 1333-7,* p. 510.
[18] *Kirkby,* i, p. 79; *CPR, 1340-3,* p. 253; *CCR, 1369-74,* p. 361. Hatfield was not serving as a warden of the East March at the time.
[19] *Welton,* pp. 108-9; *CPR, 1377-81,* pp. 3-4.
[20] *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 12; *CFR, 1337-47,* p. 140.
[21] Summerson, *Medieval Carlisle,* i, p. 275.
[22] For discussion of the strategic value of Norham, see Liddy, *Bishopric of Durham,* p. 166 and Cornell, 'Cleared of Castles', pp. 254-5.
[23] *Rot. Scot.,* i, pp. 909-10.

Furthermore, bishops helped to recruit men for the kingdom's defence and for Edward's campaigns. They personally assembled troops from their own lands, households, and estates, as in March 1338, when Adam Orleton 'assembled men-at-arms as well as other members of his household and his tenants… to repel an invasion of the French who had invaded the realm with a large fleet and burned Portsmouth and other towns'; June 1339, when Ralph Shrewsbury mobilised 'his men, servants, and others of his retinue' to help guard the Dorset coast from French attack; and September 1341, when Richard de Bury provided 'twenty men-at-arms and as many mounted bowmen for the king's service in Scotland' from his palatinate of Durham, since there were fears of 'an imminent invasion from our Scottish enemies'.[24] Moreover, bishops also helped in the wider arraying of men for the defence of the realm. For instance, in July 1339, Simon Montacute was 'attendant upon the arraying of men' in Cambridgeshire, and 'ready to set out with the keeper of England against the king's enemies, should they presume to invade the realm'; in January 1356, Simon Islip and John Sheppey were instructed to assist the arrayers of Kent in mobilising men, for 'the defence of the country [*ad defensionem patriae*]' against the malice of the French; and in July 1372, Adam Houghton was ordered to 'array all defensible men [in his diocese of St Davids] so that they may be ready to repel the malice of the king's enemies, who are now upon the sea with a great fleet of ships of war awaiting a fitting time to invade the lands and lordships of Wales'.[25]

Episcopal assistance in recruiting forces culminated in the last decade of Edward's reign, when they were tasked with supervising arrays of the clergy, which Mark Ormrod termed 'the medieval equivalent of a home guard'.[26] This followed the parliament of June 1369, in which:

> the king, praying all the prelates assembled there that they would consider the great perils and damages which could occur by chance to the realm and Church of England because of this war, ordered that if by chance his enemy enters the realm to destroy and subvert it, they will give their aid in defence of the realm and array their subjects (themselves and all the religious as well as parsons, vicars and all other people of holy Church whatsoever) to repulse the malice of his enemies, if by chance they intend to enter the realm.[27]

The prelates assented to this request, agreeing 'that they would do this, in aid and defence of the realm'. Consequently, Edward wrote to all of his bishops in July 1369 (and in a similar vein in 1372 and 1373), notifying them that the French were preparing 'to invade the realm, to overcome and destroy the king, his realm and people and to overthrow his dominion and the Church of England', and ordering them to:

> cause all abbots, priors, men of religion, and other ecclesiastical persons of his diocese to be armed, arrayed, furnished with arms every man between the aforesaid ages [sixteen and sixty] according to his estate, possessions and means, and put in thousands, hundreds, and twenties, so that they shall be ready with other [of] the king's lieges to march against the said enemies within

[24] *CPR, 1338-40,* p. 134; *CCR, 1339-41,* p. 216; *Bury,* p. 141; *CPR, 1340-3,* p. 348.
[25] *CCR, 1339-41,* p. 233; *Foedera,* iii, i, p. 315; *CPR, 1370-4,* p. 238.
[26] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 132. While the last decade of Edward's reign saw the most systematic preparations for the arraying of the clergy, such arrays were not unprecedented. See, for example, *Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1072, iii, i, p. 142.
[27] *PROME,* 1369, 26.

> the realm, with God's help to overcome and destroy them, defeating and crushing their insolence and malice.[28]

Bishops appear to have diligently implemented these commands. This is suggested by the detailed instructions which Thomas Brantingham sent to six clerks in July 1372, mandating precisely how clergy should be arrayed in his diocese of Exeter. For instance, he demanded that those with benefices worth over £100 should appear with five armed men and six archers; those with benefices worth over £40 should have two armed men and two archers; and stipendiary priests should present themselves with a bow and sheaf of arrows.[29] While these forces were never put to the test, their potential was considerable, with more than 11,789 clerics being arrayed in accordance with a similar royal mandate in 1415, and more than 15,487 in 1418.[30]

As well as fighting, guarding, and recruiting, bishops also provided valuable resources and logistical support for the defence of the realm. They provided company, food, and accommodation for the king and his entourage, as on 10 June 1336, when Edward dined with Richard de Bury in Durham on his way to the Scottish border, and on 11 May 1337, when he dined with the same bishop and the earls of Northampton and Gloucester as they marched northwards to Stirling Castle.[31] Similarly, prelates also provided movable goods for Edward's campaigns. For example, in October and November 1336, de Bury was asked 'to provide wheat and oats within his liberty, and to send them to Newcastle-upon-Tyne, for the king's army in Scotland'; in May 1368, Thomas Appleby was requested to send the king 'two packhorses with saddles, harnesses and cloths… to provide transport for his army'; and in July 1372, Adam Houghton was ordered 'to provide victuals, arms, and armour… for the munition of all his [Edward III's] castles and fortresses in Wales'.[32] But rather than simply supplying the crown themselves, they also helped to administer the crown's resources appropriately. This is particularly evident in 1340, after Richard de Bury was among those instructed in April of that year to receive the subsidies yielded by Yorkshire, Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmorland, Lancashire, Nottinghamshire, and Derbyshire, for 'the payment of the wages of the men-at-arms and others in the king's service in the north and other sums necessary for the said service'.[33] De Bury and his colleagues then spent the proceeds, as in July, when they were instructed to pay sums to William de Felton, constable of Roxburgh; August, when they were told to do likewise with Hugh de Haverington, who was holding the town of Perth until Thomas Ughtred could take over; and October, when they were ordered to reimburse merchants from Lynn and Barton-upon-Humber for 'the victuals which they

[28] *CCR, 1369-74,* pp. 38-9; McNab, 'Military Arrays', p. 294.
[29] *Brantingham,* i, pp. 271-2.
[30] McNab, 'Military Arrays', p. 312.
[31] Mortimer, *Perfect King,* pp. 129, 140; Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 616-7.
[32] *RPD,* iv, pp. 202-3, 207-8; *Appleby,* p. 37; *CPR, 1370-4,* p. 238.
[33] *CPR, 1338-40,* p. 516.

undertook to provide for the munition of the castles of Edenburgh [Edinburgh] and Stryvelyn [Stirling]'.[34]

In this light, it is evident that many bishops were directly involved in the English war effort. While relatively few fought in spectacular set-piece battles or served on foreign campaigns, these were by no means the only ways in which the episcopate could militarily assist the crown. Prelates did not only fight themselves, both in England and abroad, but they also served in official positions with martial responsibilities; defended the northern border against Scottish incursions; guarded the English coast from French invasion; saw to the upkeep of castles and urban fortifications; recruited troops for the realm's defence; arrayed the clergy as a makeshift 'home-guard'; supported the crown with resources and logistical assistance; and occasionally took steps to bolster the security of Wales and Ireland. The crown could not rely upon a small band of bellicose bishops to provide such a wealth of martial support. Instead, Edward depended on bishops from throughout the southern province to protect the realm's coasts and array forces to ward-off anticipated French invasions; depended on bishops from throughout the northern province to respond to threats posed by the Scots; and depended on every bishop, in the last decade of his reign, to oversee the arraying of the clergy of their dioceses. Accordingly, the history of episcopal military activities in Edward III's reign cannot be confined to a handful of 'great' bishops, like Thomas Hatfield, or a handful of 'great' events, such as the Battles of Crécy and Neville's Cross. Rather, it was far broader and more all-encompassing, and included a great number of their colleagues on a great number of occasions.

But how important was the episcopate's involvement in military matters? The closely-contested nature of medieval battles meant that bishops' involvement in engagements could prove decisive. This is perhaps clearest at the Battle of Crécy. Froissart described how, during the battle, the Black Prince and his battalion were 'pushed back' by their French foes 'in a very fierce clash', so that forces led by Thomas Hatfield and the earl of Northampton 'had to come to their rescue'.[35] Although scorn has been poured on this tale by several modern historians – with Michael Prestwich observing that it 'might have a little more plausibility if it came from an English source', and Nicholas Barker cautioning that Froissart's account was 'the only one to mention Hatfield in this capacity' – there are reasons to lend it credence.[36] Most obviously, Froissart is by no means the only author to mention Hatfield rescuing the Black Prince; for instance, an anonymous citizen of Valenciennes also recounted how 'the Prince of Wales was labouring such that he was put on his knees twice', until 'to his rescue

[34] *Rot. Scot.*, i, pp. 596, 601; *CCR, 1339-41*, pp. 554, 582.
[35] *Froissart*, iii, p. 423; *Crécy Casebook*, pp. 270-1.
[36] Prestwich, 'Battle of Crécy', p. 149. For other accounts which explicitly cast doubt on this narrative, see Barker 'Thomas de Hatfield', pp. 83-4 and Prestwich, 'Hatfield at War', pp. 14-15. For historiography which has, on the other hand, accepted this incident as genuine (or at least likely), see Burne, *Crécy War*, p. 181; Ayton, 'Crécy and the Chroniclers', pp. 303-4, 316-7; and Barber, *Edward III*, pp. 236-7. Several other accounts of the battle simply omit direct reference to Hatfield, such as Sumption, *Trial by Battle*, p. 529; Green, *Black Prince*, p. 39; and Jones, *Black Prince*, p. 106.

came the bishop of Durham and many valiant knights'.[37] Moreover many of these accounts were indeed English. By way of example, the *Anonimalle Chronicle* reported that the 'bishop of Durham, the earl of Suffolk, and the earl of Huntingdon, and their men, hastily brought succour and comfort' to the Black Prince, who had 'fought strongly and vigorously and endured heavy and punishing blows', being 'evilly and villainously wounded and almost taken and defeated'.[38] Likewise, Geoffrey le Baker described how 'the prince was compelled to fight kneeling down against the masses of the enemy who poured around him', with the consequence that 'the bishop of Durham was sent with twenty knights to help the prince'.[39] In a similar vein, the *Meaux Abbey Chronicle* asserted that 'many times in this conflict the French were repulsed and many times they recovered, but at last, the bishop of Durham coming to the aid of Edward the Prince of Wales, they were defeated'.[40] Considering the number of sources which testify to Hatfield's rescue of the Black Prince, and the variety of their origins, it is likely not only that the bishop played a notable part in one of the most dramatic battles of the later Middle Ages – as reflected in a Sienese chronicle's remark that 'such was the death toll and damage inflicted on the king of France that it shall always be remembered with astonishment' – but also that he might well have saved the life of one of the central figures in fourteenth-century English politics, whom Froissart later described as a 'most valiant man and noble prince'.[41]

Of course, the Battle of Crécy was far from the only engagement in which episcopal involvement was of value to the crown. The Battle of Neville's Cross was one of the key battles in the Wars of Scottish Independence, as both English and Scottish authors accepted. John Fossor, the prior of Durham, saw it as 'bringing to an end the pitiful discord which prevailed between English and Scots over the course of many years', while Walter Bower, the abbot of Incholm, lamented 'how disastrously David, king of Scotland, was defeated and captured along with his army on account of his attack on the lands of the Church of St Cuthbert!'[42] Although Fossor wrote shortly after the Battle, he was perceptive, for after 1346, the focus of Anglo-Scottish conflict moved north of the English border, and following the release of David II in 1357, there were no more serious Scottish raids into English territory until after Edward III's death.[43] In orchestrating the response to the Scottish invasion – with Geoffrey le Baker describing how the archbishop called together the northern lords and their forces – as well as through serving as

[37] *Crécy Casebook,* pp. 208-9.
[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 250-1.
[39] *Baker,* p. 74. While le Baker does mention the Black Prince being in danger and Hatfield being dispatched to rescue him, he claims that 'the bishop found the prince and his men leaning on their lances and swords, drawing breath and taking a moment's rest over the long mountains of the dead, as they waited for the enemy to return from his treat': *Baker,* p. 74. In view of the number of the other sources – both English and French – which suggest that Hatfield's 'rescue' was genuinely a rescue, this aspect of his account must be rejected.
[40] *Crécy Casebook,* pp. 300-1.
[41] *Crécy Casebook,* pp. 146-7; *Froissart,* viii, p. 224.
[42] 'Illustrative Documents', pp. 133, 154.
[43] Grant, 'Disaster at Neville's Cross', p. 35. For broader discussion of the Battle of Neville's Cross and its consequences, see also DeVries, *Infantry Warfare,* pp. 176-87; Rogers, 'Scottish Invasion', pp. 51-2; Sumption, *Trial by Fire,* pp. 143-8; and King and Etty, *England and Scotland,* pp. 50-1.

one of the English leaders during the battle itself, William Zouche played a significant role in a vital victory.[44] Smaller martial episodes, rather than set-piece battles, could also be important. For instance, in November 1337, the Scots laid siege to Edinburgh Castle. This was only relieved by a short campaign, in which – according to the *Lanercost Chronicle* – John Kirkby and other northern lords 'marched together to Edinburgh, broke up the siege, put the Scots to flight, and re-established Sir John de Stirling [the castle's warden]… for the safer custody of the King of England's castle'.[45] In this way, a small expedition in which a bishop was prominent overcame a major threat to English-held territory in the east of Scotland, and won the gratitude of the king, who wrote to Kirkby in December, thanking the bishop for his 'good bearing at the relief of Edinburgh Castle'.[46] Consequently, the battles, raids, and campaigns to which prelates contributed – both small and great – could have very real implications for the English war effort.

The episcopate's guarding of the realm and holding of martial offices was also of importance to Edward III. If the English victory at Neville's Cross, the capture of David II, and his subsequent release paved the way for a series of awkward truces with the Scots, it by no means ensured their maintenance.[47] This task was left, to a significant extent, to the Wardens of the Marches, who were charged not simply with urging the Scots to comply with truces,[48] but also with ensuring that Englishmen did the same.[49] Furthermore, the episcopal supervision of the northern border might well have been a deterrent to Scottish aggression; in the wake of Neville's Cross, the knowledge that an archbishop and an assortment of northern lords could inflict a crushing defeat on a royal army headed by the king of Scotland – even while the English monarch and many of his nobles were fighting on the continent – probably deterred the Scots from invading as much as any technical truce.[50] Yet, more certainly, the arrangements for the defence of England permitted Edward to campaign abroad. This was made explicit in numerous letters from the crown, particularly to the northern bishops. For instance, in July 1344, Edward wrote to John Kirkby, informing him that 'with the assent of the lords and at the request of the commons in the present parliament, he intends to go overseas to defend the realm and recover his rights', and accordingly

[44] *Baker,* p. 77.
[45] *Lanercost,* p. 308.
[46] *Kirkby,* i, p. 80; Rose, 'Bishops and Diocese', p. 72.
[47] Campbell, 'England, Scotland, and the Hundred Years War', p. 196; Rose, 'Bishops and Diocese', pp. 85-6; Grant, 'Disaster at Neville's Cross', p. 35.
[48] For instance, in *c.* 1367, Thomas Appleby wrote to David II, regarding a 'recent riot in the West March', which was 'on a greater scale than there had been for a long time'. He reminded the Scottish king that such riots were 'contrary to the truce'; cautioned him that such breaches might 'lead to acts of war'; asked him to 'to make measures by good counsel to stop such disturbances'; and reassured him that he would himself 'urge restraint by the people of his country, so that there is peace in the march': *Appleby,* p. 13.
[49] For example, in June 1368, Thomas Appleby was instructed 'not to allow *chivauchees* [sic] or injuries to provoke the Scots to seek revenge', even if the Scots 'enter the realm to rob or otherwise harm the king's subjects'. Instead, he was to 'inform the king, in writing, about the manner of invasion by the Scots, what they did, and about their array and arms': *Appleby,* p. 36.
[50] I am grateful to Dr Andy King for discussing this point with me.

instructed the bishop to 'defend the march of Scotland with a number of men'.[51] Similarly, in March 1372, he wrote to Thomas Appleby, telling him that 'he is about to go abroad and defend England from enemies', and correspondingly ordered the bishop to 'go to one of his castles near the march with his entourage until the king returns in order to defend it against the Scots, should they presume to invade'.[52] Prelates were relied upon for these purposes, since much of the secular aristocracy followed the king abroad to fight, and was therefore incapable of defending England herself.[53] Thus, the presence of bishops and their men enabled Edward and his nobility to fight on the continent by safeguarding the kingdom from opportunistic invasion.[54]

Bishops' recruitment of men and provision of supplies was also crucial for Edward's armies. Finding men was often a particular challenge for expeditions abroad, as in November 1337, when Edward complained to John Kirkby that he was struggling to assemble an army 'to repel the Scots', because 'many who should have gone at the king's order have not arrived, and others came and left without leave, so hindering the plans… and imperilling the king, his entourage, and the realm itself'.[55] Prelates' provision of often substantial numbers of troops for these campaigns – as in 1346, when Thomas Hatfield's retinue of 294 men constituted about a quarter of the English rearguard at the Battle of Crécy – was therefore of great assistance to the king.[56] Yet manpower was also a recurrent problem for England's defensive garrisons, as in September 1340, when Richard de Bury was informed that the garrison at Berwick-upon-Tweed had been depleted from a proper level of sixty men-at-arms, three hundred hobelars, and forty archers to just fifteen men-at-arms and one hundred and forty hobelars and archers. The efforts of de Bury, Henry Percy, and Ralph Neville in finding more men to replenish Berwick's garrison were therefore of the utmost necessity.[57] More generally, it was helpful to have as many men as possible mobilised for the defence of the realm, especially at times when an imminent invasion was anticipated, or when the king and much of the nobility were away on campaign. However, while assembling men was necessary for military success, it was by no means sufficient. The importance of keeping English armies and garrisons adequately provisioned also cannot be overstated, since a lack of proper supplies could hinder and stymie Edward's war

---

[51] *Kirkby,* i, p. 158.
[52] *Appleby,* p. 64. These are by no means the only examples of such letters. For instance, Appleby himself received a similar letter in March 1370, in which Edward informed him that 'he plans to be in the port of Orwell on 1 May and sail with his army to defend the kingdom of England', and consequently ordered him 'to stay with his household in his lands in the West March and do what he considers best for its security': *Ibid.,* p. 48.
[53] For discussion of this, see Prestwich, 'English at the Battle', pp. 2-3 and Ayton, 'Battle of Crécy', pp. 15-16.
[54] McKisack, *Fourteenth Century,* p. 126.
[55] *Kirkby,* i, p. 78.
[56] *Crécy and Calais,* pp. 193-6; Ayton, 'English Army at Crécy', pp. 245-51. Hatfield's retinue was the seventh largest individual retinue in the English army, and was composed of three bannerets, forty-eight knights, 162 esquires, and eighty-one mounted archers. While the evidence is less clear, it appears that bishops also provided a substantial number of troops for campaigns into Scotland; it seems, for example, that Hatfield himself supplied many men for Edward's 'Burnt Candlemas' campaign of 1356: Rogers, *War Cruel and Sharp,* pp. 337-9; Barker, 'Thomas de Hatfield', pp. 121-5.
[57] *Rot. Scot.,* i, p. 602. See also Martin, 'Richard de Bury', p. 140.

effort. This is evident in the Scottish capture of Stirling Castle in April 1342, when the *Pluscarden Chronicle* claimed that the fortress was yielded by defenders 'despairing of succour', and Sir Thomas Rokeby, the castle's commander, noted that it was 'surrendered to the Scots, from defect of victual'.[58] The episcopate's role in finding troops, in sourcing supplies, and in properly administering them was therefore a crucial aspect of Edward's military success.

Bishops were also ideally suited to carrying out their military roles. There are three principal reasons for this. First, they had lands and estates throughout the kingdom, including along the coasts of England and along the Anglo-Welsh and Anglo-Scottish borders. This did not simply enable them to source crops and other goods in strategic areas, from which they could be conveniently supplied to garrisons and mustering armies, without excessive transportation times and costs, but also gave them ideal locations from which they could base themselves and draw men. Thus, when Anthony Bek was tasked with defending the Norfolk coastline in February and March 1339, he stayed 'in places upon the sea coast where his manors are situated', where he also found men 'for the custody of the maritime land there'.[59] Secondly, bishops occupied a place at the peak of both political society and the Church's sophisticated administrative structure. This gave them the necessary status in the localities to act as arrayers of men, but also permitted them to direct arrays of clergy, and delegate martial tasks when they themselves were otherwise engaged, as in November 1339, when it was noted that Henry de Bradeweye, Archbishop Stratford's steward, was 'attendant upon the safe custody of the maritime land' in Kent, while 'the archbishop is staying in parts beyond the sea'.[60] Finally, bishops were relatively wealthy. This allowed them to provide the crown with men and supplies at their own cost or without receiving payment for several years. Sometimes, this was specifically required by the king; in July 1372, Adam Houghton was asked to provide victuals and weaponry for the king's Welsh castles 'at his own cost'.[61] However, more often this reflected the realities of royal financial administration, as in March 1337, when Richard de Bury sent £246 11s 4d of crops – consisting of 896 quarters of corn and 556 quarters and three bushels of oats – to the receiver of the king's provisions in Newcastle-upon-Tyne 'for the king's army in Scotland', and was forced to wait over five years for payment.[62] More dramatically still, in August 1349, John Kirkby claimed that he had not received full payment from the exchequer of wages for men-at-arms, hobelars, and archers with whom he had 'stayed upon the march of Scotland… in defence of England' fourteen years previously, in 1335.[63] Such delayed payments might well have financially crippled people who lacked bishops' resources.

---

[58] *Liber Pluscardensis,* ed. Skene, ii, p. 219; *CDRS,* iii, p. 252.
[59] *CCR, 1339-41,* pp. 91, 109.
[60] *CCR, 1337-9,* p. 614. Stratford was engaged on diplomatic business in Flanders and northern France: Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 258-60, 496.
[61] *CPR, 1370-4,* p. 238.
[62] *RPD,* iv, pp. 202-3, 207-9; *Issues of the Exchequer,* ed. Devon, p. 150. De Bury eventually received reimbursement in November 1342.
[63] *CCR, 1349-54,* p. 50. See also Rose, 'Bishops and Diocese', p. 87.

Therefore, not only were many bishops directly involved in military matters, but their involvement was also of real importance to Edward III's regime. Through fighting, they played a noteworthy role in crucial battles, skirmishes, and raids; through serving as Wardens of the March, they helped to maintain a semblance of stability in the north of England; through guarding the realm, they deterred foreign incursions and enabled the king to campaign abroad; through recruiting forces, they provided men to partake in the king's expeditions, man his garrisons, and defend his kingdom; and through their logistical support, they sourced and administered pivotal supplies. Moreover, they were also perfectly poised to provide the help which they proffered, with lands throughout England from which to base themselves, recruit men, and draw supplies; significant wealth, which enabled them to remain solvent in spite of the crown's somewhat erratic approach to reimbursement; and a place at the summit of society, which gave them the position required to mobilise others, organise arrays of the clergy, and delegate duties when they were absent themselves. Like both their scriptural and historical forbears – from the seven priests whose trumpets brought down the walls of Jericho to Anthony Bek, bishop of Durham, who was a leading figure in Edward I's Scottish campaigns – Edward III's bishops played a significant role in the wars of their own age.[64]

Yet why did bishops support Edward III's war effort? *Prima facie,* this was something which conflicted with canonical principles. The eighteenth canon of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 restricted priests' involvement in military affairs, mandating that 'no cleric may be put in command of mercenaries or crossbowmen or suchlike men of blood'.[65] More colourfully, the thirteenth canon of the 1138 Council of Westminster quoted the words of Pope Nicholas I that it was 'ridiculous and inappropriate for a cleric to take up arms and go to war [*ridiculum et inconveniens est clericum arma sustollere et ad bella procedure*]'.[66] However, these prohibitions were principally concerned with the spilling of blood; the eighteenth canon of the Fourth Lateran Council also prohibited clergy from pronouncing 'a sentence involving the shedding of blood' and practicing 'the art of surgery', and the thirteenth canon of the Council of Westminster rationalised its strictures by referring to how martial service might lead 'to the shedding of blood'.[67] Yet much of the episcopate's martial involvement – from arraying forces to administering supplies – did not entail them personally spilling blood. Canonists were much more open to these other activities; Sicard of Cremona – in what Frederick Russell suggested was the best expression of a consensus that formed among decretists – argued that, while bishops should not engage in bloodshed themselves, it was licit for them to provide soldiers, to travel with armies, and to exhort men to fight a just war.[68] Indeed, some canon lawyers were even ambiguous about whether priests should be able to bear arms and shed blood. Rolandus cited a lengthy series of biblical examples of

[64] Joshua 6:1-21; Fraser, 'Bek, Anthony'.
[65] *Decrees,* p. 244.
[66] *Councils,* i, ii, p. 777.
[67] *Decrees,* p. 244; *Councils,* i, ii, p. 777. See also Gerrard, 'Military Activities', p. 164 and *idem,* 'Fighting Clergy', pp. 285-7.
[68] Russell, *Just War,* p. 109.

priests and prophets who used weapons – such as Phineas, who used a spear to run through two adulterers, and Samuel, who killed King Agag with a sword – and further averred that 'it does not seem illicit for clerics to carry weapons by the command of a prince, because we know that both the blessed Maurice and George did this'.[69] The apparent canonical prohibition on bishops involving themselves in military matters was therefore less clear-cut than it might initially appear.[70] This was something that the bishops of the fourteenth century understood and seized upon. According to the continuation of the *Eulogium Historiarum,* when Henry Despenser was confronted by lords who stated that 'it was not lawful for a bishop to wage war', he responded that 'in the cause of God and the pope he certainly could'.[71]

Bishops appear to have accepted the justice of Edward's wars. Many prelates were aware of theological thought regarding just wars; John Grandisson, for instance, wrote 'note concerning just war [*nota de justis bellis*]' in the margin of his copy of St Augustine's *City of God,* by the passage reading 'the commandment forbidding killing was not broken by those who have waged wars in the authority of God'.[72] By the fourteenth century, there were three principal criteria for a just war.[73] First, conflicts had to have a 'just cause'. This was ideally the defence of one's lands or goods from aggression, as underlined by Hostiensis' observation that 'all laws, from natural to civil, permit the repelling of force with force'.[74] Secondly, they had to be waged by a 'proper authority'. This could be a sovereign prince, as highlighted in Innocent IV's remark that 'war, properly speaking, can only be declared by a prince who does not have a [temporal] superior'.[75] Finally, a just war had to be fought with a 'correct intention'. This was stressed by St Augustine, who argued that wars should be 'waged in a spirit of benevolence', with the aim of 'securing a peaceful society that is pious and just'.[76] Prelates seem to have been satisfied that Edward's war with Scotland fulfilled these conditions. This is evident in Archbishop Meopham's mandate of August 1333, which ordered prayers following the king's victory at Halidon Hill. In his description of the Scots as 'those sons of pride and atrocious persecutors of the name of England, who in these days have attacked and invaded the realm', he accepted that Edward was merely fighting a

---

[69] *Summa Magistri Rolandi,* ed. Thaner, pp. 96-8; Gerrard, 'Military Activities', pp. 158-9. For the biblical authorities used by Rolandus (referred to above), see Numbers 25:8 and 1 Samuel 15:33. Rolandus did, however, eventually conclude that 'it is permitted for no cleric to bear arms'.
[70] For discussion of this, see Duggan, *Armsbearing and the Clergy,* p. 142; Gerrard 'Fighting Clergy', esp. pp. 287-8; *idem,* 'Chivalry, War and Clerical Identity', pp. 104-5; and Kotecki, Maciejewski, and Ott, 'Clergy and War', pp. 3-4.
[71] *Eulogii,* p. 47.
[72] Steele, 'John Granddison', p. 157.
[73] While almost all authors accepted that just wars required a just cause, a proper authority, and a correct intention, some canonists added further criteria. For instance, Raymond of Peñafort insisted that a war could only be just if it was fought by laymen, rather than clerics, and if it was a last resort: *Ethics of War,* ed. Reichberg, Syse, and Begby, pp. 134-47. For wider discussion of medieval thought regarding just wars, see Russell, *Just War*; *idem,* 'Just War'; Cox, *John Wyclif*; and *idem*, 'Hundred Years War', pp. 95-6.
[74] Cox, *John Wyclif,* pp. 47-8.
[75] *Ibid.,* p. 36.
[76] *Augustine: Political Writings,* ed. Atkins and Dodaro, p. 38. See also Cox, *John Wyclif,* pp. 27, 89.

defensive war following egregious attacks on his lands: the quintessential 'just cause'. Similarly, through emphasising how the war was waged by 'the hand of our most serene prince, the king', he acknowledged that the conflict was led by a 'proper authority'. Lastly, by voicing his hope that the victory would lead to 'the re-establishment of laws, the observance of lawful precepts… [and] the strengthening of peace for people and Church', he suggested that the war was fought with a 'correct intention', namely the establishment of a just and peaceful society.[77]

Although Edward's war with France was rather more controversial – as revealed in John Wyclif's pointed argument in his *De Officio Regis* that 'since a king ought to desire his kingdom for the sake of doing meritorious work, he should not strive to conquer two kingdoms' – his bishops nonetheless seem to have broadly accepted the justice of his quarrel.[78] While rolls do not survive for any of the five parliaments called between March 1337 and February 1339, it is evident that prelates assented to Edward's war with the French. Thomas Gray, for example, recorded that 'at this same parliament [of March 1337], it was decided by the King's Council, on advice of the clergy, that he should no longer refrain from pressing his right and claim to the crown of France'.[79] Similarly, while Thomas Brinton's sermons witheringly derided the faults of the English government and war effort in the 1370s, it is striking that he never doubted the legitimacy of the conflict. Instead, he explained the failure of campaigns through the broader sins of the English people, which caused God to withdraw his favour from them.[80] Yet the higher clergy's belief in the justice of the war with France is most explicitly highlighted in a *c.* 1345 sermon of Richard FitzRalph, the dean of Lichfield and the future archbishop of Armagh, which rebuked someone who had apparently declared that a defensive war was acceptable, but that attacking France across the channel was sinful.[81] FitzRalph championed the justice of Edward's cause; he declared that England and France were properly one kingdom, the indivisible realm and dominion of the English king, who held the rule of both territories by hereditary right. Likewise, FitzRalph emphasised that the war was waged by a 'proper authority'; he highlighted that it was not merely fought by the English king (and true king of France), but also in accordance with 'the judgement of our realm'. Finally, he proposed that the war might be fought with a 'correct intention'; he implored his audience to pray that it would result in a 'just peace', so that all men might 'live piously and justly', enjoying 'a quiet and tranquil life'.[82]

Episcopal belief in the justice of Edward's cause was only re-enforced by his success. Military success or failure was understood to be dependent on the will of God. This was made explicit in the sermon delivered after the Battle of Crécy by Thomas Bradwardine, the future archbishop of Canterbury:

---

[77] *Stratford.*, i, p. 271.
[78] *TDOR*, p. 262.
[79] *Scalacronica*, ed. King, p. 103.
[80] *Brinton*, i, p. 47. See also Ruddick, 'National Sentiment', pp. 11-13.
[81] For discussion of this sermon, see also Owst, *Preaching*, pp. 204-5 and Walsh, *Richard FitzRalph*, pp. 228-9.
[82] BL, MS Lansdowne 393, fo. 26b.

> Whatever God wills to be or to happen, will occur; whomever God wills to win, will win; whomever God wishes to reign, will reign. For all things are disposed by His irresistible will.[83]

Consequently, victory was often interpreted as self-justifying, and as evidence of the propriety of Edward's campaigns, his own divine backing, and the sinfulness of his foes.[84] Bradwardine went on to emphasise this point, drawing a striking parallel between the victory of Edward at Crécy and the biblical victories of David:

> There was with the so-called king of France the strongest of knights: the king of Bohemia, the king of Majorca, and another almost-king, namely the Roman Emperor-elect, and dukes, counts, and barons and soldiers of Lorraine, Bohemia, Hainault, Savoy, Germany, Provence, Genoa, and many foreigners from other parts of the whole world. Just as it once was, thus it was then: the kings of the earth stood up, and the princes came together against the Lord and against the anointed of the Lord.[85]

The message of Bradwardine's quotation from the second psalm is clear: just as the justice of King David's cause was manifest in his divinely-inspired defeat of numerous enemies of Israel, so Edward's defeat of so many continental foes revealed the propriety of his purpose. A similar point was made – albeit to a less vivid extent – in another sermon of Richard FitzRalph's from late 1346, in which he argued that Edward's victories were God-given signs of the validity of his claim to the throne of France, and that the king's success was proof of divine favour.[86] In this light, it is unsurprising that Edward sought to highlight the celestial contribution to his victories. For instance, in the royal writ to Simon Meopham describing his victory at Halidon Hill, which Meopham duly dispatched to his suffragans along with his mandate requiring prayers, the king couched the battle in sacral terms:

> Our Scottish enemies… came against us and our army near Berwick on the Monday after the feast of St Margaret the Virgin, that is 19th July, and in a spirit of obduracy, pride, and malice prepared themselves for battle. He, by the power of his goodness, miraculously scattered them, delivering them into our hand under his victorious guidance. We, confident in our cause, trusting in Him who grants safety to kings with fear of the Lord, but not rejoicing in the destruction of men, overcame in the field of battle, thanks to the Most High without great loss of men, and now by God's favour the town and castle have surrendered.[87]

Accordingly, Edward's success showed that God was on his side, and must have offered compelling evidence of the justice of his cause to even the most sceptical of prelates.

The episcopate also saw their participation in Edward's wars as part of their responsibilities to the realm and the Church. One of their most important duties to the kingdom was to contribute to its defence. It is important to note, however, that their duty was not strictly 'feudal'. While the vast majority of the English and Welsh bishops were required, as tenants-in-chief of the crown, to provide either troops or

---

[83] Offler, 'Victory Sermon', pp. 7, 17-8. For discussion of Bradwardine's sermon, see *Ibid.,* pp. 1-14; Ayton, 'Crécy and the Chroniclers', p. 287; and Ruddick, 'National Sentiment', p. 15.
[84] See Cox, *John Wyclif,* p. 61 and Lane, 'Propaganda, Piety and Politics', p. 30.
[85] *Crécy Casebook,* pp. 66-7.
[86] BL, MS Lansdowne 393, fol. 37r-v; Walsh, *Richard FitzRalph,* p. 230.
[87] *Stratford,* i, p. 270.

a cash commutation in exchange for their temporalities, these obligations cannot adequately explain their martial service.[88] There were several major problems for Edward in demanding *servicium debitum.* First, the enforcement of tenurial obligations became increasingly difficult; when the government called out the feudal host in 1327, the scutages due – from those who did not offer corporeal military service – were still in arrears a decade later.[89] Secondly, the value of such service had been undermined by the gradual reduction of knights demanded from tenants-in-chief throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; for instance, the bishop of Ely's recognised quota fell from forty knights to six, and the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield's from fifteen to two.[90] Thirdly, the usefulness of *servicium debitum* was further undercut by the fact that the diocese of Carlisle – one of the most militarily important dioceses in the kingdom – was free of strict martial obligations to the crown, perhaps in consequence of frequently being in Scottish hands during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when 'knight service' developed and became formalised.[91] Fourthly, the scope of feudal service was limited; while tenants-in-chief were obliged to raise and provide troops, there was never any obligation for them to serve as constables of castles, keepers of the maritime land, or captains of the Isle of Wight and so on.[92] Finally, such service was unpopular. Although this was most dramatically underscored in 1297, when an outcry thwarted Edward I's plans to take a feudal host overseas, there were still concerns about tenurial demands being abused in Edward III's own reign. In his first parliament, the community petitioned that 'henceforth nobody shall be distrained to go to war against their will… in lands where they are not bound to do service'.[93] It is therefore unsurprising that the crown progressively abandoned demanding 'knight service' as a means of conscripting forces.[94] Indeed, the government only called out the full feudal levy once in Edward III's entire reign, in 1327.[95]

---

[88] This is a large and complicated subject, which has attracted a substantial literature, to which this paragraph is heavily indebted. See, for example, Chew, *Ecclesiastical Tenants-in-Chief*, esp. pp. 1-36; Prince, 'Indenture System'; Lewis, 'Last Medieval Summons', pp. 1-2, 14-15; Powicke, *Military Obligation*, esp. pp. 182-209; Palmer, 'Last Summons'; Schwyzer, 'Arms and the Bishop', pp. 7-8; and Prestwich, 'Why Did Englishmen Fight'. The exempt bishops were those of Carlisle and Rochester (the latter of whom received their temporalities from the archbishops of Canterbury): Churchill, *Canterbury Administration,* i, pp. 279-83; Schwyzer, 'Arms and the Bishop', p. 7.

[89] Edward later had to abandon his attempts to collect these arrears. See Chew, 'Scutage', pp. 39-41; *idem, Ecclesiastical Tenants-in-Chief,* pp. 58-9; and McKisack, *Fourteenth Century,* pp. 234-5.

[90] There does not appear to have been any formal reassessment. However, successive kings appear to have accepted tenants-in-chief serving with reduced contingents, with the consequence that – over time – this reduced service came to be all that was 'recognised' as being due (for military matters) from tenants-in-chief's holdings: Chew, *Ecclesiastical Tenants-in-Chief*, pp. 29-33.

[91] *Ibid.,* p. 12.

[92] Round, 'Knight Service', pp. 246-62; Holt, 'Knight-Service', pp. 100-101.

[93] *PROME,* January 1327, C 49/83, 10. The crown ignored this petition: Prince, 'Army and Navy', p. 349. For the outcry over Edward I's feudal demands in 1297, see Rothwell, 'Confirmation of the Charters', pp. 25-6; Prestwich, *Edward I,* pp. 416-7; and Spencer, *Nobility and Kingship,* pp. 235-45.

[94] See Prince, 'Indenture System', pp. 283-6; Allmand, *Hundred Years War,* pp. 94-5; Ayton, 'English Armies', pp. 22-3; and *idem*, 'Armies and Military Communities', pp. 219-21.

[95] This appears to have been the only occasion in our period on which bishops provided 'feudal' service to the crown: Prince, 'Army and Navy', pp. 344-6. There was, however, a feudal summons to a few tenants-in-chief with lands in Ireland in January 1332, and further summons – in March 1333, the winter of 1334, March 1335, October 1337, and November 1342 – to selected tenants-in-chief, who were ordered in a 'quasi-feudal' fashion

Instead, bishops were bound to provide military assistance to the crown through a much more general obligation: that of every Englishman to defend the realm.[96] This was articulated most explicitly by Edward III in a mandate of May 1336, when he stated that 'each and every one of the said kingdom [England] is bound to defend the same [kingdom] against enemy attacks as powerfully and manfully as they can [*omnes et singuli de dicto regno ad defensionem ejusdem contra inimicorum aggressus potentius et virilius quo poterunt astringuntur*]'.[97] This duty was reflected in the Assize of Arms of 1181 and the Statute of Winchester of 1285, the latter of which was 'revised' and expanded in the 1330s, to mandate that men with £40 of lands and rents should have a horse and appropriate arms for themselves and a companion, and those with £20 a horse and arms for themselves 'for the defence of the realm'.[98] Prelates were sometimes specifically ordered to provide forces on this basis; in October 1338, for instance, Hamo Hethe was commanded to send troops 'according to the quantity of his lands in the Isle of Shepeye [Sheppey] to that island to stay there for its safe custody against the enemy assembled in divers ships to invade it'.[99] Yet, more generally, this obligation underpinned the arrangements for local defence and the mechanisms for the arraying of troops, in which bishops were intimately involved.[100] However, even without the weight of this expectation, bishops might well have felt compelled to help defend the kingdom. The suffering caused by French and Scottish raids was well-known; the *Chronicle of the Anonymous of Canterbury* described not only the Sack of Winchelsea by French forces in 1360, but also how stories of it circulated across the kingdom:

> And for the whole of that Sunday [15 March 1360] the said Frenchmen remained in Winchelsea, plundering and burning and doing whatever harm they could, ravishing women, and eating meat regardless of the fact that it was Lent… News of these misdeeds of the French spread throughout England at once, striking fear into the inhabitants along the coast.[101]

As people who sought to protect the commonalty, it would have been unsurprising if bishops had felt moved to support the king in defending his realm and people, regardless of ancient obligations and expectations. This logic was forcefully expressed by Richard FitzRalph in his sermon of *c.* 1345, when he argued that:

---

to raise troops for the king's service. Yet bishops were not among those summoned on any of these occasions: *RDP,* iv, pp. 407-8, 442-3, 487-8, 544-5; *Rot. Scot.,* i, pp. 292-3, 302, 306-7. See also Lewis, 'Last Medieval Summons', p. 1, n. 2.

[96] This is another complicated subject, and what the king expected – and required – of his subjects changed over Edward III's reign. See Prince, 'Army and Navy', pp. 355-7; Powicke, *Military Obligation,* pp. 182-210; Ayton, 'English Army', pp. 258-62; Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare,* pp. 75-80, 119-25; and *idem, Hundred Years War,* pp. 78-82.

[97] *Rot. Scot.,* i, p. 422.

[98] *EHD II,* pp. 449-51; *EHD III,* pp. 460-2; *Rot. Scot.,* i, p. 216; *CPR, 1334-8,* pp. 137-9. See also Powicke, *Military Obligation,* pp. 190-1, 194-5 and Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare,* pp. 80, 121-5.

[99] *CCR, 1337-9,* p. 609.

[100] See Hewitt, *Organization of War,* pp. 4-16; Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare,* pp. 121-5; and Gribit, *Henry of Lancaster's Expedition,* p. 36.

[101] *Anonymi,* pp. 60-1.

> The law of nature requires that we pray for the king, and support our troops with resources, for he is the protector and defender of the people.[102]

Of course, prelates also fulfilled their ecclesiastical duties by participating in Edward's war effort as defenders of the Church. While raids and invasions could destroy the houses, lands, and goods of laypeople, they could also devastate bishops' sees. The harm inflicted on the dioceses of northern prelates in the first half of Edward's reign by Scottish raids was vividly described by chroniclers and letter writers. For instance, Thomas Sampson recounted how the Scots, during their invasion of 1346:

> trespassed into the region of Carlisle and parts of Westmorland near Tynedale and Teesdale, through the county of Extildesham [Hexham], and into the bishopric of Durham, burning, destroying, plundering, looting, and creating all the havoc and all the dishonour that they could.[103]

The level of damage caused by raids is confirmed by record evidence, such as a royal inquiry of the same year, which found that over fifty manors, hamlets, and towns surrounding Carlisle 'were all totally burnt and destroyed by the Scots' during just one raid in 1345.[104] Such destruction created major problems for prelates, as is most apparent during the episcopate of John Kirkby. Scottish incursions affected the religious of his diocese; in July 1334, Kirkby granted the abbot and convent of Holm Cultram possession of Wigton Church and its revenues, for 'they had been impoverished by Scottish raids', to the extent that they could not afford 'the burden of supporting two priests celebrating services in the church' alongside their 'other costs of hospitality and charity'.[105] Invasions also impoverished the wider clergy of his see; in December 1338, they collectively petitioned Kirkby to levy procurations for two papal nuncios under a lower assessment, because 'the revenues of benefices in the march of England were destroyed by invasions, depredations, and fires', which meant that it would be 'impossible [for them] to live on what is left' after payment at the higher rate.[106] Moreover, the threat of Scottish invasion disrupted Kirkby's own business; in December 1341, he postponed a visitation of Carlisle for three years, because 'wars and hostile incursions [*guerras et hostiles incursus*]' were expected, and those waiting for the visitation were 'anxious to save themselves and their goods'.[107] Indeed, Scottish armies had devastated Kirkby's diocesan lands and revenues to the extent that he had to write to Pope John

---

[102] BL, MS Lansdowne 393, fo. 26b.
[103] 'Illustrative Documents', p. 134.
[104] Rogers, 'Scottish Invasion', pp. 54-5. See also Summerson, *Medieval Carlisle,* i, p. 272.
[105] *Kirkby,* i, pp. 34-5.
[106] *Ibid.,* i, p. 83, ii, pp. 34-5. The petition itself is undated, but its date has been estimated based on surrounding entries in Kirkby's register. The nuncios were Cardinals Peter of St Praxede's and Bertrand of St Mary's in Aquilo, who were dispatched by Benedict XII to negotiate with both Edward III and Philip VI in June 1337: *Ibid.,* p. 82; Lunt, *Financial Relations,* ii, pp. 624-31.
[107] *Kirkby.,* i, p. 126, ii, p. 50.

XXII to explain that he was unable to pay common services for papal confirmation of his election because 'the see has been wasted by the long wars between England and Scotland'.[108]

The Scottish threat to northern sees was thus too great to ignore. Northern prelates were effectively left with two options: to fight the Scots, or to attempt to come to terms with them. The latter was popular in Edward II's reign; Louis Beaumont, bishop of Durham, bought off the Scots on at least eight separate occasions between 1311 and 1327, at a cost of between £4,266 and £5,333.[109] Yet it was also an unattractive choice, as is evident on the one known occasion on which it was tried during Edward III's majority: when Richard de Bury resorted to raising a tax to bribe the Scots to leave his lands untouched in February 1343.[110] The bribe was expensive, as de Bury endeavoured to raise £168 13s 4d 'to be paid to the Scots for a truce, and the expenses of the same'.[111] In addition, it was of limited effectiveness; by August 1343 – just six months after he attempted to raise the tax – de Bury was once again making frantic preparations to meet another Scottish attack, ordering the prior of Durham to collect men-at-arms and proceed to the marches to repel the anticipated invasion.[112] As Sheridan Martin succinctly put it, 'this attempt to pay off the enemy [evidently]… proved worthless'.[113] Moreover, coming to terms with the Scots was not always tolerated by the king; while there is no direct record of Edward III's response to de Bury's actions in February 1343, the following year he ordered the bishop to raise five hundred hobelars from his palatinate 'for the defence of the realm', making it clear that he would contemplate no such overtures towards the Scots again.[114] It is therefore small wonder that, when David II offered to spare the lands and manors of de Bury's successor as bishop of Durham, Thomas Hatfield, in exchange for 1,000 marks of silver, Hatfield refused his offer.[115] Conversely, by opposing the Scots in arms, bishops could not only hope to prevent the devastation of their sees in the immediate term, but also to achieve longer-term success and respite from further invasion (as after Neville's Cross), as well as gaining royal gratitude, rather than risking royal displeasure. As such, prelates were not simply protecting England's borders, but also defending their diocesan lands, manors, and properties, as well as those of their clergy and their subjects. Accordingly, they were not merely fighting for the king and his realm; they were also

---

[108] *Ibid.*, i, p. 32. This letter is also undated, but was probably penned around April 1334, for another letter was written on 20 April 1334 to the Cardinal of St Prisca, 'asking that he will support the bishop's petitions to the pope seeking relief for his church, which has been impoverished by the Scottish wars'.
[109] Fraser, 'Beaumont, Louis de'.
[110] There is some confusion as to whether this incident should properly be dated to February 1343 or February 1344. For discussion of this issue, see Martin, 'Richard de Bury', p. 148, n. 141. See also Lapsley, *County Palatine,* p. 39.
[111] 'Durham Records', p. 85. Specific evidence survives of the manor of Stockton being assessed for £22 9s 1/4d; the manor of East Sadberge for £16 17s 4d; the manor of Erington for £32 0s 11 1/4d; and the manor of Darlington for £44s 19s 6 1/2d: *Ibid.*, pp. 85, 89, 98. See also *Bury,* pp. 159-60 and *RPD,* iv, pp. 273-7.
[112] *Bury,* pp. xxxii-xxxiii, 179; *RPD,* iv, pp. 250-1.
[113] Martin, 'Richard de Bury', pp. 148-9.
[114] *RPD,* iv, pp. 262-3.
[115] *Historia Roffensis,* fo. 93v; Barker, 'Thomas de Hatfield', p. 94. This incident took apparently took place in 1346.

fighting for the Church. This was often emphasised by Edward III, as in June 1345, when he asked both John Kirkby and Thomas Hatfield to guard the English march 'against our Scottish enemies' for 'the safety and defence of the Church and the realm'.[116]

Bishops' martial activities also served their personal interests. This is apparent during the archiepiscopate of William Melton. While he was called upon to defend the Anglo-Scottish March less frequently than his colleagues occupying the sees of Carlisle and Durham, he still contributed to the defence of the realm. He provided 1,000 quarters of barley and 500 quarters of wheat to the English garrison at Berwick in December 1338, and was ordered to arm and array 1000 archers and 200 men-at-arms in Yorkshire 'for the defence of the marches against Scottish invasion' in October of the following year.[117] However, by taking these steps, Melton was not simply defending the realm and his diocesan lands, but also his personal estates. These included property in Kirkbymoorside, Sand Hutton, and Kirkbywharf, all of which were in danger from Scottish raids.[118] Indeed, these properties were not simply a source of income in Melton's own life, but also part of the valuable estate which he bequeathed to his namesake nephew, who also benefited from an annual pension of 100s from Whitby Abbey.[119] Moreover, other of Melton's kinsmen and associates similarly depended on livings in northern England, such as Richard Melton, who was a canon of Osmotherley in the Yorkshire Moors, and John Thoresby – Melton's former chaplain and attorney – who was rector of Elwick Hall in the palatinate of Durham.[120] Whitby Abbey, Osmotherley, and Elwick Hall had all been affected by Scottish raids. For instance, the abbot and convent of Whitby complained in February 1316 that their 'corn and other victuals' had been destroyed 'by the frequent inroads of the Scots'.[121] Thus, when Melton contributed to the defence of the northern marches, he helped to defend his own property and income, as well as that of his family and his associates.

It is also possible that some bishops might have had a personal interest in, and perhaps even enthusiasm for, warfare. Numerous prelates had served on campaigns prior to their elevation to the episcopate, such as Roger Northburgh, who had been captured at Bannockburn in 1314, and his nephew, Michael Northburgh, who had served on the Crécy Campaign in 1346. It would hardly be surprising if they had retained an interest in military matters after becoming bishops.[122] Indeed, some bishops appear to have

---

[116] *Rot. Scot.,* i, p. 663.
[117] *Rot. Scot.,* i, pp. 554, 573-4. See also Schywzer, 'Arms and the Bishop', pp. 210-12.
[118] McNamee, *Wars of the Bruces,* pp. 73-105. Indeed, Kirkbymoorside had been devastated during the Scottish raid of 1322.
[119] Borthwick Institute, Register 9A, fo. 55v; Butler, 'Archbishop Melton, pp. 65-6.
[120] Borthwick Institute, Register 9A, fo. 125v; *Melton,* v, pp. 93, 111; *CPR, 1330-4,* pp. 471, 473; *BRUO,* iii, p. 1863; Hughes, 'Thoresby, John'. Of course, Thoresby later became archbishop of York.
[121] *CPR, 1313-17,* p. 389; Waites, *Moorland and Vale-Land Farming,* p. 12; McNamee, *Wars of the Bruces,* pp. 73-105.
[122] *Murimuth,* pp. 212-14; Tout, *Place of Edward II,* p. 102; Haines, 'Northburgh, Michael'; *idem,* 'Northburgh, Roger'. For Michael Northburgh's letters describing the Crécy Campaign, one of which recounted the capture of Caen, 'which is larger than any [city] in England except for London' and celebrated how 'none of our gentlemen

actually enjoyed fighting, and to have relished opportunities to engage in conflicts. Thus Thomas Hatfield not only fought against the Scots and the French, but also declared to Pope Gregory XI in 1371 that he was ready 'to come in person, accompanied by an armed force, to the defence of the Roman Church in Italy'.[123] Although he never proceeded to Italy – possibly because he was required to remain in England by Edward, who ordered him to guard against Scottish invasions – this nonetheless shows his willingness to fight, even in campaigns in which he was manifestly not obliged to participate.[124] Yet perhaps the bishop with the most remarkable enthusiasm for all matters martial was Henry Despenser.[125] John Capgrave described the bishop as 'a soldier… valorous in all things', and claimed that – as a young man – he 'seemed to thirst after warfare only', travelling to Italy to fight for the pope against rebels, since 'at that time England was enjoying perfect peace'.[126] Even while a prelate, Despenser's military interests proved undimmed. In addition to contributing to the arraying of clergy in the last decade of Edward III's reign, he supressed the Peasants' Revolt in East Anglia, with Henry Knighton describing how he 'appeared with a strong armed force, and disturbed the evildoers at their work… [dealing] with them as they deserved'; led a crusade to Flanders in 1383; and marched (rather fruitlessly) against Bolingbroke's invasion in 1399, with Thomas Walsingham noting that 'there was nobody with a mind to harm the duke of Lancaster except the bishop of Norwich, who had mustered as large a force of fighting men as he could' and 'came in a hostile mood against the duke'.[127] If Walsingham can be believed, Despenser's personal preparedness to enter the fray was most evident in 1381, when he encountered rebels in North Walsham, close to the heart of his diocese, and responded swiftly and brutally:

> Without delay the warrior bishop, ready to fight in open battle and indignant at the audacity of the ruffians, ordered his trumpeters and buglers to sound. He himself seized a lance in his right hand, sharply spurred his horse and threw himself on the rebels with such force and courage that he reached the ditch like a whirlwind… The warlike priest, like a wild boar gnashing its teeth, spared neither himself nor his enemies. He chose to fight where the danger was greatest, stabbing one man, wounding another, and knocking down a third.[128]

---

were killed except for one squire who was wounded and died two days later', see *Life and Campaigns,* pp. 15-17, 23-5.

[123] *CPL, 1362-1404,* p. 98. Hatfield offered to help Gregory XI in his war with the Visconti, for which see Dale, 'The Visconti', pp. 16-22.

[124] See Haines, 'Hatfield, Thomas'; Barker, 'Thomas de Hatfield', pp. 124-5; and Prestwich, 'Hatfield at War', p. 18.

[125] For more general historiographical discussion of Despenser's martial enthusiasms, see Oliver, 'Battling Bishops' and Guard, *Chivalry, Kingship and Crusade,* p. 200.

[126] *Book of the Illustrious Henries,* ed. Hingeston, p. 198. Despenser fought for Pope Urban V, presumably also against the Visconti: Davies, 'Despenser, Henry'.

[127] *Knighton,* pp. 224-5; *Westminster,* pp. 38-41; *Walsingham,* ii, pp. 142-3, 148-9.

[128] *Peasants' Revolt,* ed. Dobson, p. 260. For discussion of this episode, the details of which are subject to debate, see Eiden, 'Joint Action', pp. 21-2; Dunn, *Great Rising,* pp. 131-2; and Barker, *England, Arise,* pp. 348-51.

It is therefore evident that participation in Edward's wars could serve prelates' political, ecclesiastical, and personal interests in an abundance of different ways. Whether an individual bishop supported the crown's war effort because they deemed Edward's campaigns just, and consequently felt a moral duty to participate in them; because they sought to fulfil their responsibilities to the kingdom, and to defend the realm; because they wanted to protect their diocese and the English Church from invasion; because they wished to safeguard their own lands, as well as those of their family and friends; or because they simply enjoyed fighting – or some combination of these reasons – is difficult to determine, and likely varied between individual prelates and over time. Yet what is beyond doubt is that bishops felt that they had sufficient reasons to serve Edward in a martial capacity, and that they therefore did so in some form – from fighting on the field of battle to holding office as a Warden of the March – in every decade of his reign.

Nevertheless, bishops could not be forced to serve the king militarily against their own wishes. For instance, in October 1369, Thomas Appleby protested that he could not fulfil some of his duties as Warden of the West March 'without prejudice to his conscience and his episcopal status'. Edward duly discharged the bishop from the duties to which he objected.[129] Likewise, in 1337, the king sent John Kirkby three letters requesting his presence with ten men-at-arms at a muster in Newcastle, which was to take place on 6 December, so that he could proceed into Scotland with the earls of Arundel and Salisbury 'to destroy the king's enemies'.[130] Edward's final letter explained that the earls had been tasked with reporting the names of those 'who fail to arrive or depart without leave, whoever they might be' to the crown, and threatened to punish their disobedience 'as an example, so that others will be loyal in future'.[131] However, although Kirkby briefly appeared in Newcastle on 6 December, he then departed. This prompted the earls to write to the bishop on 22 December, urging him to comply with the king's command. They also sent Ranulph Dacre to Kirkby, in the hope that Dacre might persuade him to join the invasion. But Kirkby still refused to serve, stating that he lacked 'other men at his command save those poorly raised to welcome the earls in the marches'; that he did not have 'the means to stay in the march or take part in the war… [since] the Scots have ravaged his lands'; and that he needed to travel to Oxfordshire by 13 January for a 'plea… touching his church's rights'.[132] As such, it is plain that – whether by securing Edward's consent and agreement, or simply by ignoring the crown's repeated demands – it was possible for bishops to refuse to provide the king with military assistance. This gives

[129] *Appleby,* p. 43; Rose, 'Bishops and Diocese', pp. 98-9. Unfortunately, the precise duties to which Appleby objected are unspecified. However, that Edward asked him to continue to assist 'in the defence of the march against enemies and malefactors' – while freeing him from the duties he disliked – implies that it might not have been the purely martial aspects of the wardenship which the bishop resented, as opposed to some of the other burdensome and time-consuming parts of the role, including the issuing of safe-conducts and the receiving of men into the king's peace: *Appleby,* p. 43; Rose, 'Bishops and Diocese', p. 94.
[129] *Appleby,* p. 43.
[130] *Kirkby,* i, pp. 76, 78.
[131] *Ibid.,* i, p. 78.
[132] *Ibid.,* i, pp. 81-2; Rose, 'Bishops and Diocese', pp. 72-3.

rise to two important points. First, the fact that both Appleby and Kirkby were evidently prepared to shun martial responsibilities, but nonetheless chose to embrace them on many other occasions, suggests that their service at other times was assistance that they were happy and willing to give. Secondly, and more broadly, that there are very few signs of bishops expressing concerns about, and refusing involvement in, martial matters, even though they clearly had the opportunity to do so, implies that the episcopacy's participation in the defence of the realm was something with which they were comfortable and content.

While prelates could refuse to serve the crown militarily, they could also mobilise their military resources against the crown's wishes. Perhaps the most intriguing example of this was a curious episode in 1340, when Richard de Bury's officers captured at sea a ship called *La Madeleyne*, imprisoned its captain (one Clays of Sluys in Flanders) in Norham Castle, and impounded the vessel and its cargo. The merchants of Sluys petitioned Edward III, claiming that the ship had been taken by the French near Calais, who forced Clays and his crew to transport 'certain persons' to Scotland. Accordingly, Edward wrote to de Bury in July 1340, asking the bishop to investigate, and to release Clays, the ship, and its cargo 'without delay', so that the merchants of Flanders would be satisfied.[133] However, de Bury refused to comply with the royal order. Instead, according to a later royal writ, he told the king that:

> Clays was taken in the said ship [*La Madeleyne*] on his way to Scotland as an enemy of our realm of England [*tanquam inimicus nostri regni angliae*], and he was taking in that ship Randekinus de la More and other Scots and manifold victuals in aid of the realm of Scotland and of our enemies, and on Clays were found letters of conduct for himself, the ship and all goods therein, from both Philip of Valois and David Bruce.

Edward was therefore compelled to renew his order in October, once again instructing de Bury to release Clays, *La Madelyne*, and its cargo 'without delay', on the grounds that he wanted to grant the petition of the merchants of Sluys, and thus to show favour to the men of Flanders.[134] Regrettably, it is unclear what transpired.[135] Yet what is striking is that de Bury declined to obey Edward's order for at least three months, in spite of his knowledge – as one of the prelates who witnessed the political and commercial treaty which Edward had concluded with the Flemings earlier that year – of the king's wish to foster good relations with Flanders.[136] In that light, de Bury's snub of Edward's command, in favour of continuing to imprison a perceived enemy of the realm and thus inhibiting the Scottish war effort, speaks volumes about his personal commitment to England's conflict with Scotland, over and above – and, indeed, contrary to – royal instructions. But it also underlines that the crown could not always rely on prelates to use their martial resources – including, in this instance, men, ships, and a castle – for ends of which it approved.

---

[133] *CCR, 1339-41,* p. 629.
[134] *RPD,* iv, pp. 242-3; *CCR, 1339-41,* p. 561.
[135] Martin, 'Richard de Bury', pp. 141-2. It is perhaps likely, however, in view of the firmness of the king's command and the absence of further correspondence on the subject, that Edward got his way.
[136] Déprez, *Les Préliminaires,* p. 296.

Some bishops were prepared to engage in more brazen acts of disorder. There are several examples of this during Edward III's reign. For instance, the *Historia Roffensis* described how John Grandisson resisted Archbishop Meopham's attempted visitation of Exeter in 1332, by fortifying his cathedral with 'machines, arms, and other apparatus of war' to prevent the archbishop's entrance. In the event, some of Meopham's followers were injured in the ensuing scuffles, and a pitched battle was only avoided by the personal intervention of the king, who persuaded the archbishop to desist from holding his visitation for the time being.[137] Similarly, Adam Murimuth wrote of how Archbishop Stratford's proposed visitation of Norwich in 1343 was opposed by Anthony Bek, who put the cathedral, monastery, and episcopal palace into a state of defence, so that Stratford resorted to excommunicating the bishop and prior and placing the diocese under interdict.[138] More brutally, when the mayors and bailiffs of Carlisle began an inquest without royal warrant into an affray between two of John Kirkby's servants and the servant of a local magnate, at least thirty-one armed men were dispatched, 'with the bishop's assent', from the garrison of Carlisle Castle, and cut proceedings short with a volley of arrows, which killed a bystander and wounded nine others.[139] Yet perhaps most famously, Thomas de Lisle and his retinue engaged in a series of violent acts in his diocese, as in July 1354, when his officials burned down property claimed by Lady Wake in Colne, Huntingdonshire, and in August 1355, when he was thought to have been behind the murder of William Holm in 'Gunnoklye' wood near Somersham, Cambridgeshire.[140] Indeed, Lady Wake complained in parliament in November 1355 that de Lisle had 'burned her houses contrary to the peace and the law of the land', and that he was prepared to 'pester and torment her for her whole life'.[141]

Most serious, however, was the preparedness of bishops to march against the crown. The closest matters got to this in Edward III's reign was in January 1329.[142] By the end of 1328, it appeared that civil war – between the government on the one hand, and Henry, earl of Lancaster, and his followers on the other

---

[137] *Historia Roffensis,* fo. 60v-1r. For other (and broadly similar) accounts, see 'Ann. Paul.', pp. 356-7 and *Murimuth,* p. 65 For further discussion of this episode, see also Haines, 'Innocent Abroad', pp. 574-5 and *idem, Simon Mepham,* p. 50.

[138] *Murimuth,* p. 147. See also Haines, *Archbishop Stratford,* pp. 67-8; Harper-Bill, 'Medieval Church', pp. 305-6; and Haines, 'Bek, Anthony'.

[139] TNA, C 49/46/16, mm. 5, 8-10; *CPR, 1343-5,* p. 588. See also Summerson, *Medieval Carlisle,* i, pp. 276-8.

[140] 'Historia Eliensis', ed. Wharton, pp. 657-8; *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 128; Aberth, *Criminal Churchmen,* pp. 119-58 (esp. pp. 119-20, 131). Nonetheless, the allegations against Lisle must be regarded with due scepticism and should not be construed as meaning that he was either a wanton thug or a criminal mastermind: Thompson, 'Fourteenth Century', pp. 105-6.

[141] *PROME,* 1355, 30.

[142] One might wonder why bishops never marched against the crown in either 1340-1 or 1376. While this is a difficult question, part of the answer might be that there were a variety of methods in which the episcopacy (and, indeed, political society more broadly) could criticise the government and attempt to bring about political reform, of which raising arms against the crown was the most serious (and the mechanism of 'last resort'). However, in both 1340-1 and 1376, other methods of 'resistance' to the government achieved results – at least in the short term – rendering armed opposition unnecessary. For discussions of the seriousness of militarily opposing the king – and the risks inherent in doing so – see Bellamy, *Law of Treason,* pp. 11-14; Watts, *Henry VI,* pp. 42-5; and Valente, *Theory and Practice,* pp. 32-41.

– was imminent.[143] Several bishops – including Simon Meopham, John Stratford, and Stephen Gravesend – thus met with a number of nobles and barons in London to discuss how to proceed.[144] Indeed, Meopham wrote to the king on 23 December, citing both his coronation oath and Magna Carta, and asking him to desist from advancing 'in force against certain peers and others of the land, to the great peril of the realm'. This was to no avail, for on 29 December, the king announced that he was prepared to 'advance in force' against his opponents.[145] According to the *Historia Roffensis*, it was agreed in London that Meopham and Gravesend would therefore proceed to the king with the earls of Kent and Norfolk (Edward's uncles) to persuade him to refrain from conducting his *chevauchée.* If they failed, they were ready 'to meet and resist the king with an armed force' of their own. In the event, Meopham outstripped his companions, and advanced towards the royal army – which was assembled in the vicinity of Bedford – to convey this message, his cross and banner held defiantly erect. Although the archbishop-elect was swiftly won over by Isabella and Mortimer when he reached them, this episode nevertheless shows the potential for bishops to participate in schemes threatening violent resistance.[146]

That bishops could act militarily against the crown, as well as in support of it, is even clearer in the surrounding reigns of the fourteenth century. Prelates appear to have been prepared to oppose the king on several occasions in Edward II's reign. For instance, in 1312, according to the Pauline annalist, bishops made secret plans for military defence of the Ordinances with the lay baronage at a meeting in London; in 1321, according to a later presentment, Adam Orleton dispatched nine men to support the rebellion against the king in the Welsh Marches; and in 1326, according to Geoffrey le Baker, Alexander Bicknor, Adam Orleton, Henry Burghersh, and John Hotham 'assembled a great army together with the queen', which succeeded in bringing about Edward's capture, imprisonment, and deposition.[147] Bishops were also implicated in the deposition of Richard II in 1399; the *Vita Ricardi Secundi* noted that Thomas Arundel, the exiled archbishop of Canterbury, was among the initial band of sixty followers with whom Bolingbroke invaded the realm, and that the latter's forces were thereafter joined by John Trefnant, bishop of Hereford, at whose episcopal palace Bolingbroke stayed.[148] Problems recurred in the reign of

[143] For Henry of Lancaster's 'rebellion' of 1328-9, of which the events described formed a climactic part, see Holmes, 'Rebellion'; Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 200-5; *idem,* 'Innocent Abroad', pp. 561-5; *idem, Edward II,* pp. 205-10; Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 75-7; and Hartrich, 'Urban Identity', esp. pp. 101-4.
[144] *Historia Roffensis,* fo. 52r; 'Ann. Paul.', pp. 343-4.
[145] *CPMR,* pp. 85-6.
[146] *Historia Roffensis,* fo. 52r.
[147] 'Ann. Paul.', pp. 203-4; TNA, JUST 1/1388, m. 2v; *Baker,* p. 21. However, Roy Martin Haines has cast doubt not only on the allegations concerning Orleton's behaviour in 1321, but also on the idea that prelates hastened to Isabella's forces to provide her with military assistance in 1326: Haines, *Church and Politics,* pp. 135-45, 154-61. Nonetheless, all the bishops mentioned by Murimuth were certainly with Isabella's army by 26 October 1326, a little over a month after her invasion, since documentary evidence survives of them all witnessing the election of Prince Edward (the future Edward III) as *custos* of the realm: *CCR, 1323-7,* p. 655.
[148] *Revolution,* pp. 126, 128. For further discussion of Bolingbroke's invasion, and the episcopacy's contribution to it, see also Saul, *Richard II*, pp. 407-11; Biggs, *Three Armies,* pp. 241, 260; and Given-Wilson, *Henry IV,* pp. 127-34. According to Adam Usk, Bolingbroke stayed at Trefnant's episcopal palace in Hereford on 2 August 1399: *Adam Usk,* ed. Given-Wilson, pp. 52-5.

Henry IV himself, most notably during the Yorkshire Risings of 1405, when Thomas Walsingham wrote of how Richard Scrope, archbishop of York:

> was delighted to be seen in arms amongst them [the rebels], and to be spurring them on, admonishing and encouraging them to persist in their intention, promising undoubted pardon for their sins and full remission to all those whose lot it might be to be slain in this cause.[149]

The willingness of bishops – including men like Adam Orleton, Anthony Bek, John Grandisson, Henry Burghersh, and Thomas Arundel, who were all active in the defence of the realm in Edward III's reign – to raise arms against the king or his peace throughout the long fourteenth century underscores that the episcopate's martial resources were not inevitably mobilised to aid the government. In turn, this suggests that Edward's ability – over almost the entirety of his reign – to channel the episcopate's military capacity behind him, rather than against him, was a notable achievement, as opposed to something that could be taken for granted.

It is therefore apparent that, although there were numerous reasons for bishops to give the crown military support, they were by no means always its obliging servants. This is suggested by how they could ask to be discharged from some of their martial responsibilities, by how they could refuse some of their soldierly burdens, and by how they could raise arms in opposition to the government. However, that prelates only rarely complained about their military duties, only infrequently declined martial service, and were sometimes prepared to involve themselves independently in the king's wars implies that they were willing to give their military assistance to Edward III. Indeed, that bishops never truly marched against the crown while Edward occupied the throne was not a foregone conclusion. It was rather a reflection of how he generally ruled in accordance with the episcopacy's wishes, needs, and expectations, something which his father and grandson failed to do.[150]

All in all, it is evident that the episcopate was a significant element of England's socio-military structure in Edward III's reign, but also that their participation in that structure benefited them as well as the crown. In providing the crown with martial service, both in England and abroad, many bishops played an important part in the defence of the realm. This also furthered their own interests, as they not only fulfilled their perception of their responsibilities, but also protected their dioceses, their personal estates, and those of their family and friends. Nevertheless, although the episcopate's military potential could be mobilised to buttress the crown's martial endeavours, prelates were also capable of allying with lay barons to oppose – and even topple – unpopular regimes. The episcopacy's military backing to Edward III for much of his reign thus speaks to his success in meeting the demands of his episcopate, and of

---

[149] *Walsingham*, ii, pp. 444-5. For discussion of the Yorkshire Risings, and Scrope's active role within the disorder, see also Walker, 'Yorkshire Risings'; Ormrod, 'Archbishop in Revolt'; and Given-Wilson, *Henry IV*, pp. 267-70. For an alternative view, which (in crude outline) emphasises the role of Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland, and minimises the importance and agency of Scrope, see McNiven, 'Betrayal of Archbishop Scrope'.

[150] Lane, 'Bishops and Deposition', pp. 144-51; Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, pp. 122-4; Dahmus, 'Richard II and the Church', esp. pp. 432-3.

uniting their interests with his own. Thomas Hatfield's seal may well be remarkable in depicting a bishop engaged in warfare, but it portrayed a reality which would have been familiar to many of his colleagues. In the fourteenth century, the English Church Militant was not merely engaged in spiritual warfare against sin, but also embroiled in the conflicts of Edward III with his foreign foes.[151]

[151] For illuminating discussion of the 'Church Militant' and the 'Church Triumphant' in Edward III's reign, see Burgess, 'St George's College', pp. 64-71.

Chapter III

‘Thanksgivings and Prayers’: Bishops and Royal Propaganda

In the early years of the reign of Richard II, a song was composed to mourn the death of ‘Edward the thridde the noble kniht’. Its author likened the English polity to a ship, which was once dreaded throughout Christendom, and capable of weathering all ‘stormes smale and grete’, with Edward III as its rudder, Duke Henry of Lancaster as its barge, the ‘gode comunes’ as ‘the schipes mast’, and the ‘gode preȝeres’ of the nation as ‘the wynd that bleuȝ the schip with blast’.[1] Yet in spite of the implied importance of the prayers directed by the clergy, the subject of the Church’s role in distributing royal propaganda and thereby supporting English campaigns has been but lightly treated in the historiography. Although discussed briefly by scholars including H.J. Hewitt, John Barnie, Robert Swanson, Clive Burgess, and Andrea Ruddick,[2] it has been covered most thoroughly in two relatively succinct articles by W.R. Jones and Alison McHardy respectively.[3] While McHardy seems to have been unaware of Jones’ earlier article, both authors nonetheless reach broadly similar conclusions about the strengths and weaknesses of Edward III’s exploitation of clerical propaganda.[4] In short, they both agree that the Church was a useful vehicle through which to disseminate the king’s messages in Edward’s reign, and indeed in the fourteenth century more broadly. This was articulated most explicitly by Jones, who averred that the Church was successfully ‘employed as a kind of royal "news service," or "propaganda agency," for influencing public opinion’, and that ‘the crown’s use of the liturgy of the church and the office of priesthood to appeal for the moral and material support of the people represented a significant addition to the techniques of statecraft available to English sovereigns’.[5]

Nevertheless, Jones and McHardy also identified several shortcomings in the Church’s ability to circulate propaganda. First, doubts have been expressed as to the diligence of English bishops in spreading royal messages; McHardy cautioned that some of Edward III’s propagandist efforts might have been something of a damp squib, because documents like his manifesto of 1337 were only rarely

---

[1] *Political Poems*, i, pp. 216-17. For discussion of this song, see Coleman, *Medieval Readers*, pp. 71-8; Morgan, ‘Political After-Life’, pp. 863-4; and Carlson, *John Gower*, pp. 59-61.
[2] Hewitt, *Organization of War*, pp. 161-3; Barnie, *War in Medieval Society*, pp. 31, 112; Swanson, *Church and Society*, p. 118; Burgess, ‘Medieval English College’, pp. 17, 23; Ruddick, ‘National Sentiment’. See also, for instance, Owst, *Preaching*, pp. 202-9; McHardy, ‘Liturgy and Propaganda’; *eadem*, ‘Religious Ritual’, pp. 47-54; Dobson, ‘Bishops’, p. 236; Allmand, *Hundred Years War*, pp. 137-41; Heath, *Church and Realm*, pp. 107-10; Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, pp. 132-4; Aberth, *Brink of the Apocalypse*, pp. 76-9; and Green, *Hundred Years War*, pp. 66-8.
[3] Jones, ‘Church and Royal Propaganda’; McHardy, ‘Use of Propaganda’.
[4] While McHardy does not cite Jones’ article in the work mentioned above, despite its manifest relevance, she did cite it in some of her earlier work: McHardy, ‘English Clergy’, p. 175.
[5] Jones, ‘Church and Royal Propaganda’, pp. 20, 30.

copied into episcopal registers.[6] Secondly, even when bishops did pass instructions to their clergy, the extent to which lower clergy acted upon them has also been doubted, with Jones observing that 'there is little evidence for judging the efficiency or conscientiousness of the lesser clergy in implementing the king's requests'.[7] Thirdly, the impact of clerical propaganda on the populace has also been queried; McHardy remarked that 'the attitude of Edward's subjects to these special liturgical efforts is by no means clear'.[8] Moreover, the clergy's contribution to royal propaganda campaigns has also been seen as yet another example of their meek complaisance to the king, with Jones terming them the 'involuntary political propagandists of the crown', and McHardy referring to the bishops as the 'obliging, all-purpose workhorses of the realm… [who] obeyed the royal will and propagated the arguments of royal aims and necessity'.[9] This chapter will challenge these arguments, and – after surveying the nature and purpose of clergy's role as propagandists – will argue not only that the inadequacies of their involvement have been over-stated, but also that the episcopate's role in disseminating propaganda served their own interests as well as those of the crown.

The principal mechanisms through which the Church disseminated royal propaganda in Edward III's reign have already been thoroughly explored by McHardy.[10] In essence, the crown requested special services for a whole variety of reasons, including for the cessation of plague, as in 1348, 1361, and 1369; for the success of specific peace negotiations, as in 1337 and 1372; and for the health of the king and the soul of the Black Prince, notably in 1376.[11] Nevertheless, the majority of clerical efforts fall into two categories:[12] endeavours to procure divine and earthly support in advance of a royal expedition, as in October 1334, when Edward demanded prayers and other works of piety for the success of his expedition 'to check the perverse malice' of the Scots,[13] and endeavours to thank God for, and publicise news of, military victories, as in April 1367, when the king directed bishops to organise thanksgivings following 'the victory of the Prince of Wales [at Nájera]… over Henry the Bastard of Spain'.[14] On these occasions, the Church assisted the crown in four main ways. First, it organised prayers in support of the king, as in August 1346, when Thomas de Lisle ordered that the *Kyrie Eleison* and *Pater Noster* be said 'for the king's success in the French war'.[15] Secondly, it orchestrated processions, as in October 1356, when John Grandisson ordered 'solemn processions with the response *Summe Trinitati* and the response *Felix Namque*' to celebrate the Black Prince's victory at Poitiers, and the capture of 'John of Valois,

[6] McHardy, 'Use of Propaganda', p. 172.
[7] Jones, 'Church and Royal Propaganda', p. 22.
[8] McHardy, 'Use of Propaganda', p. 183.
[9] Jones, 'Church and Royal Propaganda', p. 20; McHardy, 'Use of Propaganda', p. 174.
[10] McHardy, 'Use of Propaganda', pp. 175-81.
[11] Aberth, *Brink of the Apocalypse,* Appendix 4, pp. 266-70; *Black Death,* pp. 113-4.
[12] To give an example from one specific diocese, Alison McHardy calculated that 34 of the 51 (or two thirds) of the special prayers ordered in the diocese of Lincoln during the Hundred Years War were occasioned principally by the war: McHardy, 'Liturgy and Propaganda', pp. 216-7.
[13] *Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 896-7. See also Appendix 24.
[14] *Langham,* pp. 161-3. See also Appendix 24.
[15] *EDR,* 1893-5, pp. 181, 212.

who unjustly occupied the kingdom [of France]'.[16] Thirdly, it performed additional masses for the king, as in August 1370, when Thomas Appleby arranged special masses every Wednesday and Friday throughout his diocese while English forces prepared to invade France 'in defence of the realm and recovery of the king's right'.[17] There was a mass appropriate for almost every occasion, including the mass for peace, in which the office called for hostilities to end and for God to 'protect us in tranquillity'; the mass for the king, in which the post-communion prayer called for him to 'overcome all his enemies'; and the mass in time of war, in which the oration called for 'our enemies not to have dominion over us', and for 'the tranquillity of peace' to return.[18] Finally, clergy also preached sermons in aid of the king's cause,[19] as in the 1330s, when a sermon attributed to Archbishop Stratford declared that the Scottish war was just, because it was fought 'for law, for faith, and for country'; 1346, when Thomas Bradwardine described how 'when this first line [of English troops at Crécy] attacked all the strength of the enemy, they won; when they came together again, they conquered; and when they fought a third time, they triumphed'; 1369, when Simon Sudbury, according to Froissart, gave 'several great and beautiful sermons', in which he 'repeatedly lamented that the king of France had with great wrong renewed the war, and did so against right and against reason'; and 1375, when Thomas Brinton urged his audience at St Paul's Cross to 'fight for your country'.[20]

In addition to this customary repertoire of prayers, processions, masses, and sermons, the Church also engaged in more *ad hoc* exercises in royal propaganda. For instance, clergy were sometimes called upon to publish specific documents.[21] Thus, in August 1346, Edward sent a schedule to his bishops, giving details of his invasion of Normandy, from his initial landing at La Hogue to his capture of Caen. The document itself is a much-overlooked source for the early stages of the Crécy Campaign, but for present purposes what is important is that Edward asked the episcopate to circulate the text 'for their comfort and consolation and that of the entire English people'.[22] Similarly, in the same month, the earl of Huntingdon returned to London with a copy of a secret Franco-Norman agreement of March 1337, which had been discovered at Caen and contained plans for an invasion of England. According to Adam

[16] *Grandisson,* ii, p. 1191.
[17] *Appleby,* p. 53.
[18] *Sarum Missal,* ed. Wickham-Legg, pp. 395, 397, 411-2.
[19] It should be noted that relatively few sermons survive from Edward III's reign. The only surviving collections of episcopal sermons from the period are those of Richard FitzRalph, archbishop of Armagh, John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, and Thomas Brinton, bishop of the same see. These survive alongside a handful of individual sermons from other authors, like Thomas Bradwardine's Crécy Sermon. However, it must be noted that both Bradwardine's sermon and the majority of those by Sheppey and FitzRalph were penned before their respective authors' elevation to the episcopate. For discussion of this, see Misfud, 'John Sheppey', p. 3.
[20] Hereford Cathedral Library, MS P.5 XII, fo. 80v; *Crécy Casebook,* pp. 68-9; *Froissart,* vii, p. 126; *Brinton,* i, pp. 42-3, 48. For discussion of these sermons, see also Haines, 'Cerberus of War', pp. 156-7; Oberman and Weisheipl, 'Sermo Epinicius'; Offler, 'Victory Sermon'; Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections,* p. 306; and Allmand, *Hundred Years War,* p. 53.
[21] Other endeavours ordered included bell-ringing, litanies, vigils, and fasts. See, for instance, *Concilia,* iii, pp. 28 and 34-5 (for the variety of measures ordered by Archbishop Islip in 1353 and 1355).
[22] *Foedera,* iii, i, p. 88; *CCR, 1346-9,* p. 145; *Bransford,* p. 321; *Shrewsbury,* ii. pp. 534-5; *Trillek,* pp. 279-80.

Murimuth, Archbishop Stratford was instructed to read it out before a large gathering of clergy and laity in St Paul's Churchyard, to expose the perfidy of the French.[23] Overall, what is clear is that the Church possessed a formidable arsenal of methods to convey the king's message to his people and seek divine support for the crown's campaigns, from public processions, which could tour busy and bustling market-places,[24] to private prayers, which could be said alone by those who could not make it to their parish churches.[25]

As a vital cog in the administrative machinery of the Church, the bishops were of central importance in the ecclesiastical distribution of such propaganda.[26] In the first instance, they were the initial recipients of royal demands for prayers and other spiritual assistance. Edward often addressed such requests to the archbishops of each province, who in turn ordered their suffragans to comply with the crown's instructions.[27] In March 1338, Edward wrote to Archbishops Stratford and Melton, asking for 'prayers for his campaign abroad in defence of his rights', the latter of whom simply quoted the royal writ to John Kirkby, bishop of Carlisle, and ordered him to organise 'prayers for the safety of the king and his army' in Carlisle Cathedral and the parish, collegiate, and conventual churches of his diocese.[28] This process was slightly more complicated in the province of Canterbury, due to the bishop of London's role as dean of the province, which meant that the archbishop customarily distributed instructions through him. Thus, in August 1336, Edward asked Archbishop Stratford to organise prayers commending 'our said Lord the King to the highest Lord of armies', on occasion of war with the Scots. In turn, Stratford instructed Stephen Gravesend, bishop of London, 'to enjoin all our brethren and suffragan co-bishops of Canterbury' to ensure that their clergy carried out the royal command, and the bishop duly dispatched the archbishop's mandate.[29] Alternatively, Edward could write to bishops individually and directly,[30] as in June 1340, when he wrote informing them of the 'great victory of his fleet' at Sluys, and asking them to organise 'public services of thanksgiving' in their dioceses; August 1342, when he did likewise, ordering bishops to 'arrange masses, prayers, and processions' throughout

---

[23] *Murimuth,* p. 211. For discussion of this schedule and its propagandist value, see Jones, 'Church and Propaganda' pp. 27-8 and Sumption, *Trial by Battle*, pp. 511-12.
[24] See, for instance, the mandate of William Edington in advance of the Crécy Campaign for processions 'on market-days going around the church or through the market-place, as the weather permits': *Edington,* i, p. 8.
[25] See, for example, the instructions of John Stratford regarding prayers in advance of the same campaign, in which he offered an indulgence of thirty days for those who were prohibited by means of distance from reaching their parish churches for special services if they said the *Pater Noster* and *Ave Maria* five times themselves: *Trillek.,* pp. 273-4.
[26] For summaries of the machinery by which the Church distributed royal propaganda, see Jones, 'Church and Propaganda', pp. 21-2; McHardy, 'Religious Ritual', pp. 47-54; and Aberth, *Brink of the Apocalypse,* p. 76.
[27] This replicated the system used for summoning the clergy to convocations and parliaments.
[28] *Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1025; *Kirkby,* i, pp. 82-3; ii, pp. 371-2.
[29] *Shrewsbury,* i, p. 272.
[30] Edward also wrote occasionally to the heads of the preaching orders in England and to individual religious houses with similar requests: Jones, 'Church and Royal Propaganda', p. 21. Moreover, when a see was vacant and Edward wished to write directly to diocesans, he wrote to its guardian of spiritualities, as in June 1373, when he addressed 'the guardian of the spirituality of the bishopric of Ely during the vacancy of that see' in the period between the episcopates of John Barnet and Thomas Arundel: *CCR, 1369-73,* p. 563.

their sees in aid of his forthcoming expedition to France; and August 1374, when he did the same, requesting prayers for himself and his realm in advance of the earl of March's expedition to Brittany.[31] Many of these instances coincided with periods in which the archbishops were indisposed or otherwise engaged: in June 1340, Archbishop Stratford appears to have been suffering from ill health; in August 1342, Archbishop Zouche was on the continent, after having been consecrated in Avignon on 7 July; and in August 1374, the archbishopric of Canterbury was vacant, following the death of William Whittlesey in June.[32]

Bishops were also responsible for communicating royal requests to their subordinates through their diocesan channels; augmenting them with precise details as to how they would be implemented; and offering indulgences for those who obeyed the king's commands.[33] For instance, in June 1355, Gilbert Welton received letters from Edward III, which requested 'prayers and processions… for the safety of the king and of his army in France'. Thereafter, he issued a mandate to the official of Carlisle quoting those letters, specifying that processions were to occur 'on the fourth and sixth days of every week in St Mary's, Carlisle, and all parish and conventual churches in the diocese', and offering 'an indulgence of 40 days for those participating'.[34] The same applied in September 1359, when William Edington received a mandate from Archbishop Islip, via Michael Northburgh, which ordered 'prayers for the success of the expedition' which was about to sail to France. He commanded the archdeacon of Winchester 'to make known the appeal for… prayers for the army'; specified that the prayers for the king should be supplemented by processions and almsgiving; and offered a 40-day indulgence for those who participated.[35] It was hoped that these indulgences would incentivise the laity's participation in these special liturgical efforts; Ralph Stratford's mandate of August 1342 for masses, sermons, and processions 'in support of his [Edward III's] expedition to France and of the army sent against the Scots', stated that their purpose was 'by God's mercy to stimulate further the minds of the faithful'.[36] Prelates were therefore a vital part of the Church's organisational structure, which enabled the delivery of royal propaganda into every parish in the land.

But how effective was all this? As noted above, McHardy suggested that a lack of zeal on the part of prelates might have meant that some of Edward III's efforts made 'less impact than we would have supposed', on the grounds that:

---

[31] *Foedera*, ii, ii, pp. 1129, 1209, iii, ii, p. 1009; *CCR, 1341-3*, p. 650; *CCR, 1374-7*, p. 96; *Thomas Charlton*, p. 65; *RPD*, iii, pp. 499-500; *EDR*, 1893-5, p. 329.
[32] Haines, *John Stratford*, p. 270; Bennett, 'Zouche, William'; Swanson, 'Wittleseye, William'; Walker, 'Sudbury, Simon'. Whittlesey died on 5 or 6 June 1374.
[33] Jones, 'Church and Royal Propaganda', p. 21.
[34] *Foedera*, iii, i, p. 303; *Welton*, p. 18.
[35] *Foedera*, iii, i, p. 442; *Edington*, ii, p. 49.
[36] *Bransford*, p. 206.

> When in 1337, for example, Edward issued a manifesto explaining the causes of the French war, this was copied into the register of the Archbishop of York, William Melton, but otherwise made no impact on ecclesiastical records.[37]

This is despite the fact that every bishop was instructed in August of that year to cause the manifesto to 'be published in every church of the[ir] diocese[s] and in other fitting places'.[38] However, McHardy's argument overlooks important elements. Considering the number of bishops' registers which have been lost, including those of John Stratford and Robert Stratford, we cannot be sure as to how widely the manifesto was copied.[39] McHardy's claim is also founded on an implicit assumption that, had the bishops diligently circulated the manifesto, they would have copied it into their registers. This is far from certain. In fact, as McHardy goes on to demonstrate, there was little reason for diocesans to copy Edward's manifesto. Unlike the records of admissions and institutions, it was a document whose currency was of limited duration. Similarly, unlike, for instance, the commands of courts, it demanded no return, and entailed no penalties for non-compliance.[40] Moreover, even taking the argument on its own terms, there is also no reason to believe that the manifesto's appearance in Archbishop Melton's register marked its only foray into ecclesiastical records. For example, the manifesto is referred to in the register of John Grandisson, into which a royal writ has been copied that ordered the bishop to expound the contents of 'the enclosed schedule' to the populace 'in the vulgar tongue'.[41] The manifesto is even copied out in full in the registers of both Ralph Shrewsbury and Simon Montacute, together with the accompanying royal writ, which refers to the 'schedule of offers made by us to the French King to avoid war between us and him', and orders prelates to 'cause the contents to be expounded to the clergy and people'.[42] The schedule appears to have been circulated as the king requested; Montacute issued a mandate to his official, commanding him to execute the king's instructions, and 'to have the schedule read out in [the] mother tongue in the Church of St Mary's, Cambridge'.[43] In light of the fact that prelates were manifestly not required to copy either Edward's manifesto or the royal writ into their registers, the decision of some bishops to do so speaks rather more of their dedication to the cause of royal propaganda than their sloppiness in ensuring its spread.

This is consistent with the broader evidence that bishops were diligent in their fulfilment of royal demands of this nature. Their conscientiousness is most striking in their efforts to excuse themselves for non-compliance. For instance, in 1342, Robert Stratford was frustrated in following a royal command to 'cause the chapter of his cathedral church, and the clergy of his diocese, to pray for the king in his last passage beyond the seas'. Although he 'sent some of his servants with letters to the

---

[37] McHardy, 'Use of Propaganda', p. 172.
[38] *CCR, 1337-9,* pp. 244-5. See also Willard, 'Negotiations for a Grant', p. 728.
[39] Smith, *Bishops' Registers*, pp. 6, 43-4.
[40] McHardy, 'Use of Propaganda', pp. 179-80.
[41] *Grandisson,* i, pp. 300-1. The manifesto was written in French.
[42] *Shrewsbury,* i, pp. 334-6; *EDR,* 1891-2, p. 577.
[43] *EDR,* 1891-2, p. 577.

chapter', they were assaulted by thirty-three named men and others, who 'took the letters from these servants at Chichester, and tore them up'.[44] It is revealing that Stratford felt it necessary to protect himself against his failure to enforce the royal writ by obtaining an oyer and terminer commission against those men, not simply to investigate their broader crimes, but also for the specific complaint that they intercepted his letters regarding prayers for the king's expedition.[45] Likewise in January 1349, John Trillek, bishop of Hereford, received a royal mandate requesting prayers for 'the king's victory over the enemy, who treacherously attacked Calais during a truce', and asking that they be completed by 9 March.[46] By 23 February, Trillek realised that he was unable to fully execute the mandate by then, 'due to the shortness of time', but felt obliged not only to apologise for his delay, but also to promise full compliance with the mandate in due course.[47] Bishops evidently felt compelled to excuse their failure to comply with royal requests, whether by instigating legal procedures or merely offering apologies. That evidence for these steps being taken is very rare suggests that bishops were ordinarily assiduous with regard to organising special liturgical efforts.

Nevertheless, episcopal endeavours would have counted for very little had lower clergy been feckless in carrying out their instructions. A bishop could not organise prayers, orchestrate processions, sing mass, and preach sermons in support of the king's campaigns simultaneously in each church of his diocese. Instead, prelates relied on their subordinates to effect their instructions on the ground. Yet the evidence suggests that the lower clergy embraced exercises in royal propaganda, as indeed the waspish criticism levelled at their support of the crown's war effort by heterodox writers implies. John Wyclif was particularly vocal in this vein. In his *Of the Seven Deadly Sins,* he argued that clergy 'should be labourers for peace, but in word and deed they favour war'; in his *De Mandatis Divinis,* he remarked that 'the bishops and clergy of our kingdom instigate [people] to war'; and in his *De Officio Regis,* he complained of how clergy did not encourage 'peace and concord', but instead stirred the laity 'to war'.[48] These sentiments were endorsed by other fourteenth-century Wycliffite writers, including the anonymous author of the *Order of Priesthood,* who denounced warmongering priests who 'conforten hem [the populace] to fiȝtte', and who cried '*ora pro nobis* abouten þe grete stretis þat god distroie here cristene breþeren & ȝeue hem schort lif, euyl sped & wicked ende'.[49] These barbed criticisms only make sense if lower clergy were really obeying episcopal commands, rather than sitting idly by.

---

[44] This should not be interpreted as symptomatic of a popular opposition to either royal propaganda or the war effort, but rather as one of a series of incidents in which those named resisted Stratford, since it was also alleged that they 'assaulted him, arrested him, [and] shut the gates of the city', did not 'permit him to have access to his church', and 'assaulted his men and servants': *CPR, 1340-3,* p. 587.
[45] *CPR, 1340-3,* p. 587; Jones, 'Church and Royal Propaganda', p. 22.
[46] *Concilia,* ii, p. 752; *Trillek,* p. 149.
[47] *Trillek,* pp. 149-50. The delay might have reflected Trillek's attempts to manage the effects of the Black Death in his diocese, which kept him occupied for much of the year: *Ibid.,* pp. 145-61; Lepine, 'Trillek, John'.
[48] *Tracts,* p. 69; *TDMD,* pp. 410-11; *TDOR,* pp. 276-7. See also Cox, *John Wyclif,* pp. 57, 156.
[49] *English Works,* pp. 164, 176.

Writers of a more orthodox persuasion also recognised the preparedness of the lower clergy to persuade their flocks to embrace Edward III's wars. This was recognised in some of the surviving sermon texts, such as a sermon given in London by Richard FitzRalph in *c.* 1345. FitzRalph cautioned his fellow priests not to make their wartime sermons too passionate and bloodthirsty, since it was excessive and inappropriate for congregations to be stirred to pray that God 'pour out the blood of our enemies'.[50] FitzRalph's anxiety presumably stemmed from a concern that parish priests embraced royal propaganda too eagerly; his worries would have been without foundation had clergy simply ignored official instructions. Chroniclers also occasionally alluded to episcopal commands for ceremonies being executed. Froissart remarked that, on the resumption of the Hundred Years War in 1369, Edward III followed Charles V in ordering 'grand processions' to urge God to heed the necessities of his kingdom, which he required 'all of his subjects' to join, 'by the constraint of the prelates [*par constrainte des prelas*]'.[51] Since Froissart apparently did not work from chancery writs and bishops' registers, his anecdote probably reflects the fact that such processions took place, rather than merely being ordered and negligently passed over by the lesser clergy.[52] This is even more apparent in his account of the government's response to the prospective French invasion of 1386, where he wrote that 'all over the country, in towns and cities, religious processions were instituted three times weekly, and observed in a spirit of deep devotion and contrition'.[53] Froissart might have been well-informed as to the events he described, particularly those of early 1369, since he formed part of Philippa of Hainault's circle from *c.* 1361 to her death on 15 August 1369.[54] Furthermore, the reliability of the lower clergy in implementing royal requests is also implied by the messages of thanks sent by the crown, as in May 1368, when the Black Prince wrote to Thomas Appleby, 'thanking the bishop for arranging processions and prayers and asking for them to be continued so that, by God's grace, he may have greater success'.[55] Unless the government had grounds for believing that their instructions had been widely followed, it seems unlikely that they would have thanked prelates in this way, as opposed to demanding to know why their requests had been thwarted. Consequently, while the occasional clues as to the activities of lower clergy in sermons, chronicles, and royal letters are too scattered and infrequent to constitute conclusive testimony, they nonetheless all suggest that commands regarding prayers and processions were customarily obeyed.

This is confirmed by a remarkable episode.[56] On 5 February 1370, William Wykeham wrote to the archdeacons of his diocese of Winchester, and reminded them that he had commanded 'processions to

---

[50] MS Lansdowne 393, fo. 26v. See also Owst, *Preaching*, pp. 203-4; Jones, 'Church and Propaganda', p. 22; and Walsh, *Richard FitzRalph*, p. 229.
[51] *Froissart*, vii, pp. 125-6.
[52] Palmer, 'Book I', p. 8; *Froissart: Chronicles*, ed. Brereton, pp. 12-17.
[53] *Froissart: Chronicles*, ed. Brereton, p. 306.
[54] Jones, 'Froissart, Jean'.
[55] *Appleby*, p. 36.
[56] For discussion of this episode, see Davis, *William Wykeham*, p. 106 and McHardy, 'Use of Propaganda', pp. 183-4.

be made and masses celebrated and other devout prayers to be said and continued in all monasteries, churches, and other sacred places of our diocese'. He had ordered this after learning of 'the dangers of war and of the invasions of our external enemies who are preparing to attack, invade, and crush the borders of the realm of England'. Notwithstanding the clarity of his instructions, he had been informed that 'the clergy and people subject to us are now slacking off from these masses, processions, and prayers which, while they made them, brought them defence from on High'. This news apparently distressed him 'to the depth of our [his] heart'. Accordingly, he ordered his clergy 'to revive from all slackness sufficient masses and processions to the praise of the divine name so dormant in our diocese'.[57] Three days later, on 8 February 1370, he wrote in a similar vein to the prior of Winchester, referring to his previous mandate to organise prayers of 16 April 1369, and instructed him not to 'desist from praying until we order you otherwise'.[58] This incident makes clear that, while lower clergy did not necessarily obey episcopal instructions, bishops could hear of their failure and berate their recalcitrance. That evidence for this is so sparse suggests that the English clergy were usually conscientious in organising and implementing special liturgical efforts on behalf of the English crown.[59] Moreover, even in this exceptional case, one should not assume a general apathy to prayers for the realm on the part of Wykeham's clergy, since Wykeham's rebuke of them came more than nine months after his initial order. It is perhaps hardly surprising that they felt able to stop complying strictly with his instructions after a period of almost a year.

Whether these endeavours had any impact on Edward's subjects is a more difficult question to answer. It is clear that the episcopacy's liturgical efforts did not convert every Englishman into a valiant partisan for the war effort. By way of example, John Bromyard alleged that English armies proceeded not with the prayers of the people behind them, but instead 'with the curses of many… for they march, not at the king's expense or their own, but at the expense of the churches and the poor'.[60] However, several strands of evidence exist which suggest that clerical efforts did indeed have a significant effect on the hearts and minds of the English people. The first of these is, once again, the comments of heterodox writers. John Wyclif himself argued that ecclesiastical encouragement for the war had very real ramifications: in his *De Civili Dominio,* he lamented how secular lords fought in the war with France in consequence of 'the exhortation and counsel to fight' given by the bishops of England and other warmongering clergy, and in his *De Mandatis Divinis,* he claimed that English forces in France were stirred to commit 'rape, extortion, and theft' by 'the evil counsel' of clerics.[61] These sentiments were echoed by other

[57] *Wykeham*, ii, p. 105; McHardy, 'Use of Propaganda' pp. 183-4.
[58] *Wykeham*, ii, pp. 108-9.
[59] Alison McHardy observed that Wykeham's letters of 1370 were 'unique' in the context of Edward III's reign: McHardy, 'Use of Propaganda', pp. 183-4.
[60] Owst, *Literature and Pulpit,* p. 338. This quote has been mistakenly attributed to Thomas Brinton by both Nicholas Wright and David Green: Wright, *Knights and Peasants*, p. 36; Green, *Hundred Years War,* p. 70 (although Green does attribute the same quote correctly to Bromyard on p. 91 of his book).
[61] *TCD*, ii, pp. 267-8; *TDMD*, p. 411. See also Cox, *John Wyclif*, p. 59.

early Wycliffite writers; the anonymous author of the *Order of Priesthood* suggested that the 'sikernesse of here [priests'] veyn preieris þat ben cursed of god' had persuaded men to 'fiȝtte aȝenst [other] cristene men in false werris for pride & coueitise'.[62]

Beyond heretical writers, orthodox clergymen themselves occasionally observed how the populace were inspired – sometimes mistakenly – by religious teaching. Richard FitzRalph referred to how 'less learned men' every so often erred greatly in their prayers for the king and his nobility, by 'demanding from God that he give them corporeal triumph in battle over their foes', whereas they should have instead prayed that the king 'may obtain a just peace'.[63] Even if the effects of royal propaganda were rather more extreme than FitzRalph deemed desirable, the important point is that he evidently considered it to have had an impact. In a similar vein, chroniclers periodically observed the consequences of clerical measures on behalf of the crown. Adam Murimuth was in no doubt that the sermon Archbishop Stratford preached outside St Paul's in August 1346, on the deceitfulness of the French, as well as the accompanying procession, would rouse the people 'to esteem the king more fervently and pray more devoutly for his expedition in order that he may keep the people safe from Gallic machinations'.[64] Since Murimuth was exceptionally well-informed and well-connected, his comments about the likely efficacy of such propaganda carry substantial force.[65] Moreover, the government itself expressly recognised the potential of bishops' preaching. Perhaps most notably, Edward's envoys to the papacy in late 1340, on the king's own instructions, referred to a sermon which Stratford had delivered in early 1337. Stratford had seized on Philip VI's remark that 'all will not be well until a single king rules both England and France', and taken up this theme with enthusiasm before a large congregation of prelates, earls, barons, and others in London. According to Edward, the response to the sermon was so positive that it prompted him to call a parliament, which in turn agreed to the opening of hostilities with the French in March 1337.[66]

Nonetheless, some contradictory evidence does survive. This prompted Andrea Ruddick to question 'the extent to which the laity genuinely engaged in these activities on behalf of their nation'.[67] Some commentators were concerned that special liturgical efforts suffered from poor attendance; Thomas

---

[62] *English Works,* p. 176.
[63] BL, MS Lansdowne 393, fo. 26b. See also Owst, *Preaching,* p. 204 and Walsh, *Richard FitzRalph,* pp. 228-9.
[64] *Murimuth*, pp. 221-2.
[65] Murimuth had connections to Stratford, as his vicar-general in 1339; the crown, as an occasional servant of both Edward III and his father; and London, as a canon of St Paul's and as the executor of Stephen Gravesend: C.L. Kingsford, rev W. Childs, 'Murimuth, Adam'.
[66] Déprez, *Les Préliminaires,* Appendix 13, p. 424; *CPL, 1305-42,* pp. 584-5; Haines, *John Stratford,* p. 307. Of course, Edward's account must be regarded with due scepticism, since he was constructing a case against Stratford to the papal curia in the aftermath of a humiliating truce with France. He was therefore always likely to stress the archbishop's involvement, rather than minimise his importance. However, his account cannot be disregarded, not only because his own testimony – which he apparently 'very often impressed' on his agents – offers an unparalleled insight into the events which led to the outbreak of war, but also because it would not have helped his case to concoct claims which were fanciful or wholly implausible.
[67] Ruddick, 'National Sentiment', p. 16.

Brinton, in a sermon of *c.* 1377, lamented that, if an illegal duel were held in London tomorrow, the capital would scarcely be able to hold all the rich men who would turn up to watch, but if a procession was ordered to pray for the king and the kingdom, barely one hundred people would congregate.[68] This led some prelates to worry that the prayers they directed might be jeopardised. In a waspish letter of 1359, which ordered pious activities in support of the Reims Campaign, Archbishop Islip castigated those who conducted business and got drunk instead of attending church to pray for royal expeditions. Islip warned that such behaviour was not only to the grave peril of individuals' souls, but also capable of undermining the effectiveness of the prayers he specified.[69] However, these contemporary concerns must be set in proper context. First, the fact that so many clergymen maintained their belief in the value of praying for English campaigns, in spite of the understanding that low attendance might undermine these pious efforts, suggests that such improper conduct was relatively rare. Secondly, as Ruddick herself accepted, despite the existence of these fourteenth-century fears:

> it remains the case that a significant proportion of the population would have participated in these processions, masses, and prayers ordered by the government; had attendance really been as low as some clerical literature implied, the persistence and, indeed, increased frequency of these orders throughout the period would seem rather odd.[70]

Finally, that only a small minority of episcopal mandates ordering prayers voice any anxieties about a poor response, even though prelates clearly could use them to highlight their fears, implies that these worries were far from ubiquitous. As such, although the Church's propaganda did not always receive a warm reception, there is little reason to doubt that it had a significant impact on a significant portion of the English populace.

Accordingly, it seems that the Church's efforts in support of Edward III's campaigns were indeed important. From singing masses to publishing schedules, the clergy had the means to galvanise the community behind forthcoming expeditions and to circulate news of recent victories. This had a variety of effects. In addition to seeking assistance from God and offering him due thanks, ecclesiastics kept the public abreast of Edward's campaigns, by notifying them of both planned and past endeavours; justified Edward's wars, by explaining the equity of his cause; and reassured the population that their taxes were being put to good use, by drawing attention to the martial successes that were funded therefrom. In the most general sense, the clergy also involved the whole kingdom in the war effort, by literally enabling congregations to participate in prayers and processions dedicated to its cause. Indeed, Edward's subjects appear to have been broadly receptive to his messages, and through the diligence of both the episcopate and the lower clergy, his government had an avenue through which it could convey them to his people. The existence of this channel of communication – which enabled royal sentiments

---

[68] *Brinton,* i, pp. 198-9. For this sermon of Brinton's, see also Ruddick, 'National Sentiment', p. 16 and *eadem, English Identity,* p. 287.
[69] *Concilia,* iii, pp. 42-3. For analysis of this letter, see also Ruddick, 'National Sentiment', p. 16 and *eadem, English Identity,* pp. 286-7.
[70] Ruddick, *English Identity,* p. 288.

drafted in Westminster to be echoed in every corner of England – underpins the Church's utility to the crown as a distributor of propaganda. In an age before the printing press and before mass literacy, the Church offered the king perhaps his most reliable means of communicating with the majority of his realm. As David Green put it, 'every parish and monastic church gave the Crown a direct link to the population – from the centre to the periphery – and a means of accessing local communities'.[71] According to Froissart, when the Hundred Years War resumed in 1369, both Edward III and Charles V chose to reach out to their people, because 'it was necessary for both kings, since they were both determined to make war, to show the people the order and the cause of their quarrels, so that they might with better wills help and aid their lords'. It is telling that, when describing the methods that the monarchs adopted, the chronicler only mentioned the prayers, preaching, and processions of the clergy.[72] In this light, it is unsurprising that the ecclesiastical dissemination of royal propaganda – in which bishops were vital, not only as priests who gave rousing sermons themselves, but also as a central organisational link within the Church's administrative structure – was of great importance to Edward III.

Yet for all bishops' utility to Edward III, it does not follow that they were the 'involuntary political propagandists of the crown'.[73] Prelates appear to have firmly accepted the justice of Edward's wars with France and Scotland.[74] However, this also seems to have applied with the other expeditions for which they were asked to pray, such as the Black Prince's Nájera Campaign of 1367, which Thomas Brinton argued was fought 'to restore a rightful king to his kingdom and defeat tyranny' in a 1376 sermon.[75] In this manner, by complying with royal orders to organise special liturgical efforts, bishops were not merely acceding to the crown's demands, but embracing, bolstering, and supporting a course which they themselves deemed right. This is suggested by William Edington's mandate of March 1346, in which he described the king's request for prayers as 'humble and just', since Edward was forced to respond to Philip VI breaking the Anglo-French truce and 'striving to overthrow the English nation'.[76] That prelates considered it right and proper to organise prayers in support of Edward's wars was perhaps made most explicit in Archbishop Meopham's instructions to Stephen Gravesend in April 1333. Meopham remarked that he had 'given attention' to the king's 'laudable proposal' that he might order prayers for his forthcoming expedition against the Scots, and concluded that – in circumstances where Edward's enemies had 'hostilely invaded' the kingdom – 'the debt of justice… require[d] that with many sighs devout intercessions should be directed to God'.[77]

---

[71] Green, *Hundred Years War,* pp. 66-7.
[72] *Froissart,* vii, pp. 125-6.
[73] Jones, 'Church and Royal Propaganda', p. 20.
[74] See above, pp. 118-20.
[75] *Brinton,* ii, p. 355.
[76] *Edington,* i, p. 8.
[77] *Stratford,* i, p. 257.

Episcopal belief in the value of their efforts was reinforced by the understanding that their prayers could have a real impact. This was highlighted in Simon Montacute's mandate of November 1334. Montacute observed that 'scripture bears witness' to the power of 'devout prayer', which could affect 'the outcome of wars', sometimes pleasing 'the divine wisdom that the sword devours now these, now those'.[78] William Wykeham offered a specific scriptural precedent in letters of 1370, when he described how, while Moses 'poured out devout prayers of supplication', the Israelites 'conquered their enemies', but, when Moses 'ceased to pray, his people were vanquished'.[79] Ultimately, all this reflects the idea – as articulated in a mandate of Simon Meopham from April 1333 – that 'all powers' rest in the hands of 'the Most High King', who 'by the assiduous intercessions of the just may be moved to show compassion with respect to the ambushes of those who trouble us'.[80] Bishops, then, did not perceive the prayers they ordered to be idle puff or platitudes. On the contrary, they felt that they could have profound earthly consequences for causes which they held dear.

In these circumstances, organising special liturgical efforts furthered bishops' 'political' responsibilities to the English realm. Edward continually highlighted how the campaigns for which he sought clerical support were conducted for the defence of the kingdom. For instance, in June 1345, he asked for prayers, masses, and processions for the success of an expedition to France, which he planned 'for the defence of our realm of England'.[81] Likewise, in August 1370, he requested special liturgical efforts for 'the safety and peace' of the English army who were fighting abroad 'in defence of the realm'.[82] Sometimes, the king elaborated on this theme; in a writ of June 1335, which requested pious support for an expedition to Scotland, he declared that he was proceeding northwards 'for the defence… of the realm, of his rights, and of his subjects', in the hope that he might 'curb the increase of their [the Scots'] malice', and bring 'his subjects and people perpetual peace'.[83] The episcopate evidently accepted Edward's point, and perceived him as fighting for the good of his realm; Gilbert Welton – when instructing the prior and official of Carlisle to organise prayers and processions for Edward's expedition to France in November 1359 – remarked that Edward fought for 'the salvation of the kingdom'.[84] Moreover, bishops were confident that the prayers they organised could help Englishmen, both at home and abroad. This is perhaps most vividly expressed in a sermon of Thomas Brinton of *c.* 1375, which referred to news that English forces in France were 'besieged by their adversaries'. The bishop remarked that 'I know of no better refuge for their liberation or defence than to be watchful with one accord in prayers', because 'vigils of prayers kept by us can help them'.[85] By orchestrating prayers for English

[78] *Montacute*, p. 209.
[79] *Wykeham*, ii, p. 105. See also Davis, *William Wykeham*, p. 106.
[80] *Stratford*, i, p. 257.
[81] *Foedera*, iii, i, p. 45.
[82] *Appleby*, p. 53.
[83] *Foedera*, ii, ii, p. 910; *Montacute*, p. 249.
[84] *Welton*, p. 51.
[85] *Brinton*, ii, p. 325.

campaigns, prelates therefore conceived of themselves as contributing to the defence of the realm, the protection of English armies, and the safety of the kingdom and its people.

Such contributions also served the interests of the Church. When requesting prayers, Edward couched his expeditions as being for the benefit of the Catholic faith. This was another consistent refrain in royal writs, as in July 1333, when the king described his capture of Berwick as being 'for the defence of the Church', and July 1373, when he asserted that John of Gaunt's proposed expedition to France would sail 'for the defence of Holy Church'.[86] Edward sometimes laboured his point in greater detail, as in April 1333, when he set out how his war against the Scots was for 'the honour of the Holy Universal Church and for the increase of the Catholic faith [*honorem sanctae universalis ecclesiae et catholicae fidei incrementum*]'.[87] Once again, bishops endorsed Edward's arguments, and acknowledged that he fought for the good of the Church. In August 1336, Archbishop Stratford's mandate ordering prayers for Edward's expedition to Scotland described the king as departing 'for the preservation and safety of… the English Church'.[88] In a similar vein, in August 1350 – while directing special liturgical efforts – Archbishop Islip described the king's plans to resist a feared Castilian invasion as being 'for the protection of the Holy Church [*pro tuitione sanctae ecclesiae*]'.[89] Indeed, bishops seem to have been convinced that the prayers they ordered could safeguard the *ecclesia anglicana*, as well as the realm; in his letters of February 1370, William Wykeham suggested that the pious activities which had brought 'defence from on High' in the past had benefited the clergy as much as their lay counterparts.[90] Clearly, from the episcopacy's perspective, such efforts helped to protect the Church, the clergy, and the Christian faith from harm.

Moreover, prelates' dissemination of propaganda also served their personal interests. Bishops knew many of those who fought in Edward's armies, for whose safety and success they prayed. For example, William Montacute, first earl of Salisbury, was close to several bishops. In addition to attending parliaments, great councils, and royal gatherings alongside numerous prelates, and serving on diplomatic missions with the likes of John Stratford, Richard de Bury, and Henry Burghersh, he was the elder brother of Simon Montacute, and the brother-in-law of John Grandisson.[91] His relationship with Grandisson appears to have been particularly warm, and the bishop seems to have acted as his attorney.[92] Moreover, Grandisson opted to include Montacute's arms in the windows of St Gabriel's Chapel in Exeter Cathedral, in bosses in a chamber in his episcopal palace in Exeter, and on the altar

[86] *Foedera*, ii, ii, p. 866, iii, ii, p. 983.
[87] *Ibid.*, ii, ii, p. 859.
[88] *Concilia*, ii, pp. 582-3; *Montacute*, p. 233.
[89] *Concilia*, iii, p. 3. In reality, the Castilian invasion threat was illusory; while the Castilian fleet did briefly threaten English naval supremacy in the Channel, Peter I 'the Cruel' of Castile swiftly came to terms with Edward, and agreed to become a party to the French truce with England in August 1350 (the same month in which Islip ordered prayers): Ormrod, *Edward III*, pp. 327-8.
[90] *Wykeham*, ii, pp. 105, 108-9.
[91] *Foedera*, ii, ii, pp. 966, 1065, 1084; Summerson, 'Montagu, Simon'; Darracott, *The Grandissons*, pp. 13-14.
[92] Parker, 'Patronage and Service', p. 27.

screen in his foundation of Ottery St Mary.[93] Likewise, the Black Prince came to know many bishops. He was related, albeit more distantly, to Thomas Arundel and William Courtenay;[94] he fought on campaigns with bishops including Thomas Hatfield, Michael Northburgh, and Thomas Bradwardine;[95] and he sponsored the careers of several prelates, such as John Harewell, who had served the Prince as constable of Bordeaux between 1362 and 1364, and as chancellor of Guienne between 1364 and 1370.[96] Yet, of everyone on the episcopal bench, the Prince was perhaps closest to William Edington: the bishop served on his council from 1347 until his own death in 1366; was responsible for his affairs while he was abroad between 1355 and 1357; lent him money; and added his name to the list of those for whom prayers were to be offered at Edington Priory.[97] Thus, when bishops ordered prayers for the success of expeditions in which Montacute or the Black Prince fought – as they did on at least fourteen occasions between 1333 and 1369 – they were not merely seeking divine aid for the good of the realm and of the Church, but also for people who were their colleagues, their friends, and their relatives.[98]

That bishops supported royal propaganda efforts because they furthered their own interests and fulfilled their own view of their responsibilities – rather than because they were compelled to – is confirmed by how they were prepared to publicly criticise the government when they disagreed with its decisions. This is most evident at the two points in Edward's reign when his relations with the episcopate, and indeed with political society more broadly, reached their lowest ebb: in 1340-1 and the 1370s. When royal and episcopal interests diverged, it is striking how readily bishops were able to turn their sermons from propagandist tools deployed on the crown's behalf to stinging weapons with which to attack the government. In 1340-1, this commenced with a sermon by Archbishop Stratford on 29 December, the commemoration of the passion of St Thomas Becket, which was described by Stephen Birchington. Taking as his theme a passage from Ecclesiastes, 'in his time he did not fear the prince', Stratford roundly rebuked the royal regime. He declared that there were men at the king's side who hated him; accused the king's friends of arresting chancery clerks, knights, and justices in defiance of Magna Carta; and alleged that the king was surrounded by those who outrageously defamed him. This culminated in Stratford's pointed pronouncement of sentences of greater excommunication against all those who diminished the liberties of the church of Canterbury, disturbed the peace of the realm, infringed Magna

[93] *Collegiate Church,* pp. 58-60; Darracott, *The Grandissons,* pp. 68-70, figs. 34-6; Blaycock, 'Exeter's Bishop's Palace', p. 274.
[94] Arundel was the great-great grandson of Henry III, and Courtenay the great-grandson of Edward I: Hughes, 'Arundel, Thomas'; Swanson, 'Courtenay, William'.
[95] *Crécy Casebook,* pp. 344, 346. Northburgh and Bradwardine had not yet been elevated to the episcopate when they participated in the Crécy Campaign alongside the Black Prince.
[96] Haines, 'Harewell, John'. According to Thomas Walsingham, Harewell owed his see to the Prince: *Chronicon Angliae,* p. 58.
[97] *Register of the Black Prince,* iv, p. 327; Green, 'Household and Military Retinue', i, p. 222; Highfield, *William of Edington,* pp. 6-7. See also Barber, *Black Prince,* p. 241.
[98] Specifically, bishops ordered prayers for campaigns in which either Montacute or the Black Prince served in 1333, 1334, 1335, 1337, 1338, 1339, 1346, 1350, 1355, 1356, 1359, 1363, 1369, and 1369: Appendix 24; Ormrod, 'Montagu, William'; Jones, *Black Prince,* pp. xviii-xxiv.

Carta, laid hands on ecclesiastical property, imprisoned clerks or prevented their release, and defamed individuals, particularly greater clergy.[99] The archbishop swiftly re-affirmed his message in a widely-circulated letter to Edward III himself, which claimed that:

> By evil counsel, abetted by certain people of this land who are not so wise as they need to be, and by the counsel of others who seek rather their own profit than your honour or the safety of the land, you begin to seize various clerks, peers, and other people of the land, and to make unseemly process against the law of the land, and against the great charter, which you are bound to keep and maintain by the oath made at your coronation.

Stratford accompanied his swingeing criticism by a pointed reference to Edward II's reign, and the consequences of succumbing to poor counsel: 'what happened to him for that cause you, sire, know well'.[100] This was the closest that anyone came in Edward III's reign to citing a precedent for deposition. Thereafter, Stratford followed his attack with further sermons – the texts of which are regrettably undated, but which clearly relate to this period of opposition to the crown – and a flurry of letters to his suffragans, which lamented royal exactions, levies, and tallages, and enjoined them to ensure that their subjects treated both churches and churchmen with due honour.[101]

The evidence for withering episcopal criticism of the government is even more vivid from the 1370s. Rather than reflecting new heights of ecclesiastical bitterness, this instead reflects the survival of Thomas Brinton's sermon collection, which provides evidence of unparalleled eloquence for the clerical anger of the period. In another sermon of *c.* 1375, the bishop rather unfavourably – and, from the crown's perspective, rather unhelpfully – contrasted the victories of the early years of Edward III's reign with the defeats of his later years:

> During the time of our king the kingdom of England was called the kingdom of kingdoms in the manner of Rome, because it had so many victories and captured so many kings, and occupied so many dominions… But I fear that on account of our sins our kingdom grows weak and crumbles, and God, who was accustomed to be English, now withdraws from us.[102]

This reproach is most ferocious in a sermon of May 1376, preached during the Good Parliament.[103] Brinton renewed his criticism of the crown's war effort, deriding how the English were 'neither strong nor fortunate in battle' at that time; lamented adultery among the lords of the realm, which he feared 'would be the occasion of the destruction of this kingdom'; and castigated the *luxuria* of those at court, which he argued 'confounds the person, takes away grace, damns the soul, overcomes the intelligence,

---

[99] 'Birchington', pp. 21-2; Haines, *John Stratford*, pp. 284-6.
[100] *EHD IV*, pp. 70-2. For historiographical discussion of this letter, see Haines, *John Stratford*, pp. 289-90 and Ormrod, *Edward III*, pp. 235.
[101] Haines, *John Stratford*, pp. 287-8, 291-2
[102] *Brinton*, i, p. 47. See also Cox, 'Natural Law', p. 154
[103] For this sermon, see Fletcher, 'Virtue and the Common Good'. It is also commented on, more briefly, in other works, including Holmes, *Good Parliament*, pp. 103-4, 144-5; Given-Wilson, *Royal Household*, pp. 147-8; Dodd, 'A Parliament Full of Rats', pp. 6-10; and Ormrod, *Edward III*, p. 555. Brinton's sermon is also discussed from a more literary perspective in Owst, 'Langland's Prologue', pp. 270-9; *idem*, *Literature and Pulpit*, pp. 582-5; Kellogg, 'Bishop Brunton'; Hanna, *London Literature*, pp. 251-2; and Strakhov, 'Deschamps, Brinton, Langland, and the Hundred Years' War', pp. 259-69.

and ruins the name and reputations of every person in whom it dwells'.[104] He also expressed broader concerns about the realm and its governance, asserting that:

> It is plain that the kingdom of England which formerly abounded in wealth is now poor and penniless, which formerly was resplendent with grace is now graceless and shameful, and which formerly ruled itself in justice is now full of vice without rule.[105]

Nonetheless, he reserved his bitterest condemnation for Alice Perrers, who was clearly the subject of his remark that 'it is neither fitting nor safe that all the keys of the kingdom should hang at the girdle of a single woman'.[106] However, Brinton was by no means the only ecclesiastic to berate the government in the 1370s. In fact, he explicitly referred to how:

> There is something known and preached almost everywhere: that people who lead vicious and scandalous lives have long held the chief share in the governance of the kingdom'.[107]

Thus, while churchmen were happy to preach in support of the crown and refrain from criticising the government when they saw fit, they were equally happy to censure it when the circumstances demanded.

Episcopal preparedness to rebuke the government publicly is even more evident in the events leading to the overthrow of Edward II. Adam Orleton admitted in 1334 that he had preached in support of Isabella in October 1326 on the theme 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed'. This was a reference to the antagonism between Isabella and her children on the one hand, and the Younger Despenser on the other, whom he described as 'the seed of the first tyrant Satan, who would be crushed by the Lady Isabella and her son, the Prince'.[108] Orleton's sermon was used as an introduction to the publication of Isabella's 'statement of intent', which accused Despenser of being 'a tyrant and enemy of God and of the Holy Church', and decried not only the government's imprisonment, banishment, and execution of many of the great men of the realm, but also its tallages and other exactions, which had oppressed the people.[109] More famously, the *Forma Deposicionis* recorded that bishops preached pointed sermons in the parliament in which Edward was deposed. On 13 January 1327, Orleton, then bishop of Hereford, spoke on the theme of 'where there is no governor, the people shall fall', and noted the 'many and great intolerable defects' in the king's government; John

---

[104] *Brinton,* ii, p. 318; *Selected Sermons,* p. 248. As Fletcher notes, *luxuria* is a difficult concept to translate, since it combines elements of both 'lechery' and 'luxury', and was used as a catch-all term for the temptations of the flesh: Fletcher, 'Virtue and the Common Good', p. 307.
[105] *Brinton,* ii, p. 317; *Selected Sermons,* p. 247.
[106] *Brinton,* ii, p. 321; *Selected Sermons,* p. 253.
[107] *Brinton,* ii, p. 316; *Selected Sermons,* p. 244.
[108] *Grandisson,* iii, p. 1545.
[109] *Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 169. There has been considerable historiographical confusion as to the purpose and context of this sermon. See Haines, *Church and Politics,* pp. 164-5; Buck, *Politics, Finance and the Church,* pp. 221-2; Doherty, 'Isabella, Queen of England', pp. 158-9; Mortimer, *Greatest Traitor,* pp. 154-5; and Phillips, *Edward II,* pp. 509-10. Nonetheless, the only things which can be confidently deduced (from Orleton's own account in his *Apologia*) is that the sermon was preached as an introduction to Isabella's 'statement of intent', and consequently that it was delivered on or after 15 October 1326, when the statement was first published: *Grandisson,* iii, p. 1545. Any further comment is fated, in the absence of new evidence, to remain speculative.

Stratford, then bishop of Winchester, spoke on the theme 'my head aches', and discussed the 'many indecencies and bad evils' which had been inflicted on the Church and on the kingdom during Edward's reign; and Walter Reynolds, archbishop of Canterbury, addressed the assembly on the theme 'the voice of the people is the voice of God', and invited them to consent to the replacement of the king with his son. To this, they replied 'Let it be done! Let it be done! Amen'.[110]

Prelates were also prepared to criticise the crown after Edward III's death. For instance, according to the continuation of the *Eulogium Historiarum*, Thomas Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, responded to his sentence of exile in the parliament of 1397 by delivering 'a lengthy sermon to the king [Richard II] denouncing the extravagance which ruled the lives of those about him, and the greed and extravagance that was everywhere at court, through which they were corrupting the whole realm'.[111] The episcopacy could also censure the government by distributing incendiary texts. This was perhaps most apparent in the Northern Rising of 1405, when Thomas Walsingham described how Archbishop Scrope had articles 'published in the highways and byways of the city of York, and publicly fastened to the doors of monasteries' in the vernacular. These lambasted 'the bad governance in the kingdom', the 'injustices and calumny committed against the estates, both spiritual and temporal', and the 'extortionate and oppressive demands of the king', which would lead to the 'ultimate impoverishment and ruin' of his subjects.[112] Bishops – including men like Orleton and Arundel, who were members of Edward III's own episcopal bench – were thus quite prepared to upbraid the ruling regime when they were affronted by it. They were not muted figures, who were content to sit idly by. Consequently, their decision to refrain from criticising the crown, and indeed to speak and act in support of it, throughout the majority of Edward's reign is best explained not by their obliging nature, but by the king's messages and policies being ones with which they themselves were satisfied and content.

The episcopal contribution to Edward III's regime as propagandists must therefore be seen as assistance which bishops desired to offer, in accordance with their own interests, wishes, and perception of their responsibilities, as opposed to a service which they timidly yielded in deference to royal authority. By orchestrating liturgical efforts in support of the crown's campaigns, prelates advanced martial causes in which they appear to have truly believed; trusted that they would bolster the defence of the kingdom; sought to contribute to the protection and preservation of the English Church; and endeavoured to help their friends, colleagues, and relatives in the field. Their consequent willingness to disseminate royal propaganda, and enthusiasm for its cause, is evident in how they customarily followed Edward's instructions without criticism or complaint. Ultimately, however, the discretionary nature of episcopal help in this capacity is apparent in prelates' preparedness to withdraw their support and castigate the

[110] Fryde, *Tyranny and Fall,* Appendix II, p. 234. See also Phillips, *Edward II,* pp. 528-9.
[111] *Revolution,* p. 68.
[112] *Walsingham,* ii, pp. 442-3. See also Ormrod, 'Archbishop in Revolt', pp. 31-4; Liddy, 'Scrope's Rebellion', pp. 65-71; and Given-Wilson, *Henry IV,* p. 268.

government when they disagreed with its policies and disapproved of its corruption. On the one hand, this reveals that bishops were prone to speak their mind when they opposed the royal government, but on the other, it implies that their words in support of it might well have reflected their own views.

As such, the clerical distribution of royal propaganda served the interests of both the Church and the crown to a rather greater extent than has been appreciated. Ecclesiastical administrative machinery – in which the bishops were vital – offered Edward an unparalleled channel of communication with his subjects. Thanks to the diligence of the episcopate and the lower clergy in effecting royal requests, this was a channel which worked effectively, and the prayers which were said, the masses which were sung, the sermons which were preached, and the processions which were organised clearly made a very real impact on the English people. Yet such clerical support was not a foregone conclusion. The words and activities of churchmen could be deployed for or against the crown: to defend government exactions, or to condemn them; to justify Edward's campaigns, or to voice concerns as to their failure; and to praise the propriety of the royal regime, or to scold its delinquency. That the Church sought to help rather than hinder Edward's cause throughout the majority of his reign thus reflects his successful kingship, and his cultivation of shared interests with his episcopate, rather than any meek complaisance on the part of the English prelacy.

Chapter IV

‘To Discuss and Legislate for the Good State of the Country’: Bishops and the English Parliament

The role of bishops, and of the clergy more generally, in medieval parliaments has long been neglected. In the 1930s, Maude Violet Clarke noted that ‘the ecclesiastical avenue to the history of Parliament is, perhaps, the only one which has not yet been fully opened up’. As she explained, on the one hand, ‘the researches of modern scholars into the administrative history of the English Church have been highly specialised, and they have not yet been extended into the frontier lines where lay and ecclesiastical activity meet’, while on the other, ‘secular historians, as a rule, have either ignored it [the clergy’s position in parliament] or have turned towards it only a flickering and uncertain attention’.[1] Despite Clarke’s strictures, the wealth of available sources, and the pioneering work of Dorothy Weske, Theodore Plucknett, Jeffrey Denton, Phil Bradford, Gwilym Dodd, John Maddicott, and Alison McHardy, among others, the place of prelates in parliament has remained relatively unexplored, especially when compared to the enormous volume of research which has been undertaken on their lay counterparts.[2] This is the case to the extent that, as recently as 2017, Phil Bradford and Alison McHardy were able to observe that ‘the clergy are the forgotten men of the medieval English parliament’.[3]

In spite of this neglect, a perception has still arisen that English bishops shunned parliament, especially in the latter stages of Edward III’s reign. This view is articulated most explicitly in the work of Mark Ormrod, who in 1990 argued that:

> We are left with the distinct impression that participation in parliament was confined to a hard core of ‘political’ bishops, abbots and proctors. The clergy themselves probably regarded this as a modest constitutional achievement, since it showed that the crown was incapable of forcing clerics to attend secular courts. Ironically, however, it was to be highly damaging to the other ambitions of the church, for it isolated the clergy from the rest of political society and hindered their efforts to obtain concessions from the crown. This situation… was already becoming evident after the 1350s, and was considerably to strengthen the crown’s position in relation to its clerical subjects during Edward III’s later years.[4]

Ormrod repeated this argument in even more forthright terms in 2000, when he asserted that ‘the clergy largely abandoned parliament’, with the consequence that only a few bishops and abbots ‘continued to

---

[1] Clarke, *Representation and Consent*, p. 16. Since Clarke started work on her book in 1930, and completed it shortly before her death in 1935 (before it was published posthumously the following year), it is impossible to know quite when she penned her observations on the clergy and parliament.
[2] See, for example, Weske, *Convocation*; Plucknett, ‘Parliament’; Denton, ‘Clergy and Parliament’; Bradford, ‘Parliament and Political Culture’, pp. 71-92, 161-5; Dodd, *Justice and Grace*, pp. 55-6, 96-103; Maddicott, *English Parliament*; and McHardy, ‘Representation of the Clergy’.
[3] *Proctors*, i, p. i.
[4] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, p. 131.

attend parliament in person'.[5] The basis for this conclusion is somewhat unclear. Nevertheless, it appears to flow from Ormrod's idea that 'the church appears to have stopped using parliament as a means of advancing its demands', on the grounds that 'no lists of clerical *gravamina* were recorded on the parliament rolls between 1352 and 1376, and the crown made no further statutory concessions to the church [after the early 1350s] until the very last parliament of the reign'.[6] Using the great range of material available – including the parliament rolls, the statute rolls, the episcopal registers, the chancery rolls, the chronicles, and the recently published records of parliamentary proxies – it is in fact possible not only to provide a more detailed account of the episcopate's role in Edward III's parliaments, but also to challenge Ormrod's arguments that Edward's reign witnessed a decline of episcopal interest in, and influence over, parliament.

Parliament was by no means a static institution in this period. Rather, it was one which developed and evolved.[7] By the end of Edward's reign, it met more infrequently, possessed a more distinct identity,[8] transacted a more established range of business,[9] had more settled procedures,[10] and boasted a more fixed membership than it had at the beginning.[11] While Edward's earlier parliaments met variously at Westminster, York, Northampton, Salisbury, and Winchester, parliament always gathered at Westminster after 1335,[12] sometimes concurrently with the convocation of Canterbury's assemblies in St Paul's.[13] These developments are parallelled in the surviving documentary evidence, as the

---

[5] Ormrod, 'England', p. 291.
[6] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, p. 141.
[7] For the development of parliament, both before and during this period, see Wilkinson, 'Latimer's Impeachment', p. 82; Harriss, *King, Parliament and Public Finance*; Maddicott, *English Parliament*; and Fletcher, 'Political Representation', pp. 222-5.
[8] While the distinction between parliaments and great councils became clear by the end of Edward's reign, it was decidedly blurred with respect to some of his earlier representative assemblies; to give but one example, the assembly which met at Lincoln in September 1327 was described variously in writs as a 'parliament' and as a 'council': *PROME*, September 1327, Introduction. It is therefore unsurprising that this distinction has inspired a considerable historiographical debate, for which see Plucknett, 'Parliament', pp. 83-4; Richardson and Sayles, 'Parliaments of Edward III', pp. 66-7; Wilkinson, 'Nature of Parliament', pp. 26-36; and Bradford, 'Parliament and Political Culture', pp. 57-60.
[9] Perhaps most importantly, in the earlier years of Edward's reign, the king sometimes requested taxes from representative councils, rather than parliaments (as in the assemblies of September 1336, September 1337, and July 1338). However, after 1340, Edward accepted that direct subsidies should only be negotiated in parliament (and, in 1362, conceded that this applied to indirect taxes too). See *PROME*, 1362, Introduction, 26; Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, pp. 61-3, 208; and Keen, *England in the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 125-31.
[10] For instance, in the first part of Edward's reign, there were a variety of arrangements for auditing petitions. However, after 1362, the form settled upon was for one committee to try petitions from England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales, and for another to do so for petitions from Gascony and all other foreign lands: Bradford, 'Parliament and Political Culture', p. 159.
[11] For example, in the early years of Edward III's reign, there was considerable variety in the number of abbots summoned; no abbots were summoned to the parliament of January 1327, but nineteen were to the parliament of February 1328: *Proctors*, i, p. xxxix; *PROME*, February 1328, Introduction. However, although there were some fluctuations (with, for instance, the abbot of Osney being exempted from parliamentary attendance in 1346), the list of abbots summoned stabilised after 1339: *Proctors*, i, p. xxxix.
[12] Indeed, between 1327 and 1335, parliament met at Westminster on just seven occasions, and met elsewhere on eight occasions: Appendix 25.
[13] The convocation of Canterbury met at the same time as eight of Edward's forty-eight parliaments. However, this might have become more established towards the end of his reign; convocation met in London during his

parliament rolls became more standardised in both form and content after the early 1340s.[14] Nevertheless, there was some continuity. In particular, in all the parliaments from the 1290s to the end of Edward III's reign, two groups of people always received reliable summons to assemblies: the titled nobility and the bishops of England and Wales.[15]

Bishops played a prominent role throughout parliaments. Indeed, they were routinely involved in the formal opening of assemblies. According to the *Modus Tenendi Parliamentum*, 'an archbishop or bishop or higher clerk… ought to preach on one of the first days of the parliament', with their sermon 'enjoin[ing] the whole parliament that they with him should humbly beseech and pray God for the peace and tranquillity of the King and the kingdom'. Thereafter, the *Modus* continued, 'the chancellor of England or the chief justice or some fit, honest and eloquent justice or clerk' should declare 'the causes of parliament first in general and then in particular'.[16] While the evidence is fragmentary, it appears that these two orations might have merged over time,[17] at least when an episcopal chancellor gave the opening speech,[18] as they did on numerous occasions over the course of Edward III's reign.[19] Thus, when Adam Houghton opened the parliament of January 1377, and 'declare[d] the reason why this parliament was summoned', his address bore many of the characteristics of a sermon,[20] and quoted the Gospels, the Pauline epistles, the Psalms, and the Acts of the Apostles.[21] Regardless of their precise

---

last three parliaments. It is perhaps worth noting that the convocation of York generally only met after parliaments, perhaps (in part) because its bishops were often outside the province during parliamentary assemblies. Thus, for instance, during Edward's last parliament, which ran from 27 January to 2 March 1377, the convocation of Canterbury met in London between 3 February and 2 March, but the convocation of York only assembled at St Peter's in York on 15 April: Appendices 26 and 27.

[14] Ormrod, 'Rolls of Parliament', esp. pp. 40-1. See also Thompson, 'Performing Parliament', p. 64.

[15] Bradford, 'Parliament and Political Culture', pp. 122, 272. While other groups were summoned to each assembly – such as the lower nobility – their summons were more irregular and subject to experimentation, with the number of barons receiving personal summons varying from a handful to over one hundred: *Ibid.*, p. 100. Indeed, bishops were not merely summoned to parliament themselves, but they also played a role in summoning others. In particular, the lower clergy were not summoned personally to parliament, but instead summoned indirectly by the *praemunientes* clause included in the writs sent to bishops. For discussion of this process, see *Proctors*, i, p. xlv; Denton and Dooley, *Representatives*, pp. 18-22; and Denton, 'Clergy and Parliament', pp. 91-2.

[16] *Parliamentary Texts*, p. 84. It is worth noting that, while the *Modus* – which was probably penned towards the end of Edward II's reign – is an invaluable source for the historian of the later medieval parliament, it is also a highly controversial text, and in some ways demonstrably inaccurate. See Galbraith, 'Modus Tenendi Parliamentum'; Bradford, 'Parliament and Political Culture', pp. 186-98; and Phillips, 'Parliament', pp. 41-6.

[17] Watts, 'Parliamentary Sermons', p. 33; Dodd, 'Clerical Chancellors', p. 42. The only explicit reference in the parliament rolls of Edward III's reign to a 'sermon' being delivered discretely from the main opening address comes from the parliament of March 1332, when Simon Meopham declared 'the reason why the parliament had been summoned… in the form of a sermon', before the chancellor, John Stratford, gave a more detailed explanation of the king's objectives: *PROME*, March 1332, 5.

[18] It may be presumed that, when the opening speech was delivered by a layman, any sermon was given separately by a bishop: *PROME*, 1377, Introduction.

[19] Bishops gave the opening speech in at least eleven of Edward's parliaments: Appendix 28. However, this is likely to be a substantial underestimate, considering that the person who gave the opening speech cannot be identified for half of Edward's parliaments.

[20] Although the parliament rolls never directly refer to Houghton's speech as a sermon, several historians have done so. See, for instance, Tout, *Chapters*, iii, p. 314; Lacey, *Royal Pardon*, p. 115; and Ruddick, 'National Sentiment', pp. 14-15.

[21] *PROME*, 1377, 4-12.

theme, these opening speeches always occupied an integral place in parliament: setting out the matters which the king wanted the lords and commons to discuss; updating those assembled on the king's thoughts, accomplishments, and needs; justifying requests for taxation; and inviting the presentation of petitions.[22] In the parliament of October 1339, John Stratford updated those present of 'the position of our lord the king overseas', and informed them that 'he would need to have aid of a very great sum of money in order to save his honour and to bring his business, which was so weighty and important, to a satisfactory conclusion'.[23] Likewise, when William Wykeham opened parliament in 1371, he notified the assembly of Charles V's intention to seize Edward's lands in France and 'send a great army of men-at-arms and others into this land to destroy and conquer it'; asked those present to 'counsel him [Edward] as to how his realm can be safely protected and the navy preserved and maintained against the malice of the said enemies'; and invited 'those who would put forward their petitions' to 'deliver them to the clerks assigned for this', so that 'they would be properly answered'.[24]

After the opening address, and indeed sometimes even beforehand, bishops played a crucial role in orchestrating the procedure of parliaments, and ensuring that they progressed relatively smoothly and productively. This is particularly clear in Simon Langham's role in the parliament of May 1368.[25] He addressed difficulties arising from the failure of people to arrive on time: on 1 May, he 'declared to the lords and commons how the king greatly thanked them for coming on the first day', but postponed parliament until the 4 May because 'some of the great men and commons had not yet arrived or appeared'.[26] On 4 May itself, he gave the opening speech and invited 'all those who should feel themselves aggrieved of anything [to] put forward their petitions', but also gave specific directions regarding the assembly's management: directing 'the prelates, dukes, earls and barons… to be in the White Chamber on the morrow, halfway between prime and tierce', and ordering the commons 'to be in the Lesser Hall', presumably at the same time.[27] He also led discussions with the lords on 5 May: informing them of the 'many negotiations' which had taken place with David Bruce about 'the claim and right that the king has in Scotland'; telling them that, at the last such negotiation, David had indicated that he would only agree to peace 'if the entirety of the realm of Scotland was reserved' to himself and his heirs; and asking them if they could see any way to obtain peace without sacrificing the king's 'right and claim'. To this, they replied that 'they could not see or declare any way to negotiate peace so that it would not fall openly in the disinheritance of the king, of his heirs, and of his crown… which thing they should not assent [to] on any account', thus effectively sanctioning the resumption of

[22] See Harriss, *King, Parliament, and Public Finance*, pp. 314-20; Edwards, *Second Century*, pp. 3-4; Dodd, *Justice and Grace*, pp. 112-13; and Caddick, 'Painted Chamber', pp. 30-2.
[23] *PROME*, October 1339, 4.
[24] *Ibid.*, 1371, 1. It is probable that the summary of this speech in the parliament rolls was composed by Wykeham: Davis, *William Wykeham*, p. 55.
[25] Langham was archbishop of Canterbury, and had been chancellor until the previous year.
[26] *PROME*, 1368, 1.
[27] *Ibid.*, 1368, 2.

war should the situation necessitate it.[28] Finally, Langham also requested taxation from the parliament, thanking those assembled 'for the many aids which they had made to him [Edward]', and suggesting that their grant of the *maltolt* be renewed on account of the king's 'great charges' both on the continent and in the Scottish march.[29] Langham received a positive response, and parliament granted Edward the *maltolt* 'from the feast of Michaelmas next coming for two full years', in recognition of 'the great expenses that he needed to make'.[30] In this way, bishops like Langham acted as the king's spokesmen throughout parliaments: stage-managing assemblies, articulating the crown's view in discussions, and imploring those present to respond positively to royal requests.

Finally, prelates were often involved in initiatives which sprang from parliaments, but which continued long after the assemblies themselves. For instance, in the parliament of March 1340, the commons complained that 'divers tallages have been granted to our lord the king in the past, by which the commonalty of his land are so greatly impoverished that they can scarcely live', but that those 'goods have largely failed to reach the lord king, to the great impediment of the king and of his business'. Accordingly, they asked for an enquiry 'into where the said goods have gone, and [that] loyal account be rendered for them… [by] the merchants or collectors'.[31] A commission was thus established to 'hear the accounts of Sir William de la Pole, John Charnels, Master Paul Monteflour and of all others who have received the king's money, wool, and other goods, and to make final issue according to law and reason'. Among others, this commission included John Stratford, Richard de Bury, and Roger Northburgh.[32] Although the assembly ended on 10 May 1340, the work of the commission continued, with Edward ordering them on 6 July to view William de la Pole's 'account for a certain number of sacks of wool and all other things received by him at Antwerp in Brabant and in Flanders and elsewhere in parts beyond the sea and in England for the king's cause', but 'not to proceed to render it before the king's return to England'.[33] Indeed, the commission was renewed the following year, albeit with a slightly altered membership: Stratford and Northburgh no longer appeared, but were replaced by Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury.[34]

Bishops were not simply involved throughout the whole duration of parliaments, but were also instrumental in all of the institution's principal 'functions': the provision of counsel, the granting of

[28] *Ibid.*, 1368, Introduction, 7.
[29] *Ibid.*, 1368, 8. The *maltolt* had been granted in the parliament of January 1365 and was due to expire at Michaelmas 1368: *Ibid.*, 1368, Introduction.
[30] *Ibid.*, 1368, 9.
[31] *Ibid.*, March 1343, Appendix, 1 (Article 2). For discussion of this, see also Harriss, *King, Parliament, and Public Finance*, pp. 261-3; *idem*, 'Emergence of the English Parliament', p. 45; and Ormrod, *Edward III*, pp. 218-19.
[32] *PROME*, March 1343, 22.
[33] *CCR, 1339-41*, p. 488.
[34] *CPR, 1340-3*, p. 238.

taxation, the dispensation of justice, and the passage of legislation.[35] Although the precise arrangements for bishops discussing matters and offering counsel varied considerably from parliament to parliament, their advice was regarded as one of the key reasons for their attendance.[36] This was emphasised in the writs of summons sent to prelates. In November 1350, for example, they were exhorted to be present at the assembly meeting in February of the following year, to offer counsel for 'the good government of the English kingdom and the king's other lands'.[37] It was also accepted that their counsel should be given freely; when Roger Mortimer was condemned in November 1330, one of the charges against him was that, during the parliament of October 1328, he interrupted 'prelates who were assembled in a house in order to give counsel on the business of our lord king and of his realm', and 'threatened them with loss of life and limb if any of them were so bold as to do or say anything against his will'.[38] In these circumstances, the episcopacy advised upon matters of the utmost significance, and their opinions appear to have been afforded significant respect. For instance, in the parliament of June 1369, they contemplated whether Edward should 'resume and use the title of the king of France', and answered, after 'mature deliberation', that he should indeed do so. This was a verdict with which the rest of the assembly subsequently agreed, which led to Edward resuming the title on the final day of the parliament.[39] Their guidance was similarly consequential in the parliament of March 1337, which

---

[35] Of course, it should be emphasised that parliament's 'functions' evolved, overlapped, and interrelated. For discussion of the fourteenth century parliament's 'functions', see McKisack, *Fourteenth Century,* p. 191; Harriss, 'Formation of Parliament', pp. 35, 42-52; Sayles, *Functions,* pp. 48-58; Dodd, 'Crown, Magnates and Gentry', p. 5; and Bradford, 'Parliament and Political Culture', pp. 124-74.

[36] This variety is particularly apparent in the earlier years of Edward's reign. Thus, in March 1332, disorder within England was discussed by the 'prelates and the proctors of the clergy… by themselves', and by the 'earls, barons, and other great men… by themselves'; in the parliament of September 1332, the dangers of Scottish aggression were discussed by the 'prelates by themselves', by the 'barons and other great men by themselves', and by the 'knights of the counties themselves'; and in the parliament of January 1333, Scottish affairs were discussed by the 'the archbishop of York, the bishops of Ely, Winchester, Lincoln, Chester, and Norwich, the earl Warenne and the earl of Warwick, the lord of Percy, Sir Henry Beaumont, Sir Hugh Courtenay, and Sir William de Clinton… by themselves', by 'the other prelates, earls, and barons and the proctors by themselves', and by 'the knights of the counties and the commons by themselves': *PROME,* March 1332, 5; *Ibid.,* September 1332, 3; *Ibid.,* January 1333, 6.

[37] *RDP,* iv, pp. 587-8; *CCR, 1349-54,* pp. 278-9; *Edington,* ii, p. 91.

[38] *PROME,* November 1330, 1. It is, of course, a more difficult question to ascertain how frank episcopal counsel really was. Yet there are signs that some members of the episcopate did offer honest views, which the crown may not have wanted to hear. This was recognised at the parliament of January 1333, when Geoffrey le Scrope, the chief justice of the king's bench, divided those present into three groups: an inner circle of bishops and lords who could be relied upon to follow the official line; the remainder of the lords spiritual and temporal; and the knights and burgesses of commons. The presence of several bishops in the second group suggests that they were prepared to give independent-minded advice, and indeed those assembled never did reach agreement: after five days of discussion, Archbishop Stratford announced that it had still 'not been fully agreed what the king ought to do', and terminated their deliberations: *Ibid.,* January 1333, 6-7; Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 153.

[39] *PROME,* 1369, Introduction, 8. Although counsel of this nature might have sometimes have been 'a cosmetic exercise' – since the king knew what answer he wanted, parliament knew the answer that the king wanted to hear, and the king knew what he had to concede to hear it – it was nonetheless (at the very least) an important formal step, since there was a firm expectation that he had to gain his subjects' consent for significant actions touching the realm: Harriss, *King, Parliament and Public Finance,* pp. 233-4; Bradford, 'Parliament and Political Culture', pp. 127-8. In particular, even though the Ordinances of 1311 – which prescribed that 'the king ought not to undertake the act of war against anyone… without the common assent of his baronage, and that in parliament' – had been repealed, it nonetheless came to be expected that the king would secure parliament's assent for his wars: *EHD III,* p. 533; Harriss, 'Formation of Parliament', p. 40.

accepted the inevitability of the coming war with France.[40] Although no formal record of its proceedings survive, Archbishop Stratford's views appear to have been particularly important. Edward III wrote in October 1340 that it had been agreed that his rights in France should be pursued, if necessary 'by force of arms', by the 'counsel of all the prelates, earls, barons and other nobles and people there present, but especially of the lord archbishop of Canterbury'.[41]

Bishops also played a part in the financial aspects of parliaments, and in particular the granting of taxation. This is especially well-recorded in the parliament of January 1365. An episcopal chancellor, Simon Langham, presented the crown's case for taxation; he set out how Edward's revenues 'could not suffice to provide half of his expenses', and conveyed the king's request that the assembly might grant him a subsidy 'in salvation of his estate and honour'. Prelates then carefully considered the crown's demands; with the other lords, they 'debated among them[selves] how and in what way he [Edward] could best be aided'. Finally, bishops joined with the rest of the political community to make a grant of taxation to the king: 'each of the prelates, dukes, earls, and other great men, by himself and of one accord and assent, and the commons also, made a grant to the king from the wool, leather, and woolfells which are exported out of the realm [the *maltolt*]'.[42] Of course, there were variations to this procedure, as parliament could make grants of fifteenths and tenths, rather than grants of the *maltolt*;[43] could refuse outright to make a grant to the king, as notably happened in the Good Parliament of 1376;[44] and could make their grant contingent on particular conditions, as in November 1373, when the 'lords and commons of England' granted the king two fifteenths and tenths, with the second only to be paid if 'the wars of the king and of his crown last that long'.[45] Yet the fact remains that bishops were vital not only in the granting of clerical subsidies, which were customarily ceded in convocations, but also in the granting of parliamentary taxation.

Bishops were also involved in parliament's judicial functions. These were many and varied. Most dramatically, parliament was occasionally the forum for high-profile trials, as in November 1330, when Roger Mortimer was found guilty of various crimes by a court of 'earls, barons, and peers', and sentenced to be 'drawn and hanged as a traitor and enemy of the king and of the realm'.[46] More routinely, however, parliament exercised its judicial role through hearing and responding to petitions,[47] whether 'common' petitions, which purported to seek changes which benefited the wider commonalty,

---

[40] *PROME*, March 1337, Intro; Harriss, *King, Parliament and Public Finance*, pp. 233-4; Sumption, *Trial by Battle*, p. 180.
[41] Déprez, *Les Préliminaires*, Appendix 12, p. 424.
[42] *PROME*, 1365, 9. See also Harriss, *King, Parliament, and Public Finance*, pp. 498-9.
[43] The crown was also capable of requesting, and parliament of granting, taxation in a variety of other forms, such as the twentieth of 1327 and the two ninths and fifteenths of 1340: Jurkowski, Smith, and Crook, *Lay Taxes*, pp. 36-7, 43-6.
[44] *PROME*, 1376, Introduction.
[45] *Ibid.*, 1373, 6, 12.
[46] *Ibid.*, November 1330, 1.
[47] Bradford, 'Parliament and Political Culture', p. 148.

or 'singular' petitions, which were customarily presented in the name of an individual or single entity.[48] The former were passed directly to the king and his council by the clerk of the parliament, while the latter were handled by triers of petitions, who disposed of them in whatever way seemed appropriate, often by referring them to the most appropriate branch of the central administration, where they might receive final judgement.[49] There were normally two groups of triers of petitions: one dealing with petitions from England, and the other with petitions from 'foreign lands'.[50] Prelates were always prominently represented among the triers; across Edward's reign, they formed a quarter of those who tried petitions for both England and for 'foreign lands'.[51] In addition, episcopal ministers were enjoined to provide specialist guidance to those trying petitions; in the parliament of 1351, for example, the triers were ordered to consult with the chancellor (John Thoresby), and the treasurer (William Edington), 'when necessary, and when they are able to attend'.[52]

Prelates were also heavily involved in the legislative business of parliaments. At the obvious level, they gave their assent to statutes;[53] the Statute of Pleading was issued in 1362 'with the assent of the said prelates, dukes, earls, barons, and commons assembled in the present parliament'.[54] More significantly, they might have also helped to create the demand for legislation; the same statute was justified on the basis that:

> the prelates, dukes, earls, barons, and all the commons have shown to the king the great misfortunes that have befallen the realm because the laws, customs, and statutes of the said realm were not commonly known in the same, because they were pleaded, declared, and judged in the French language.[55]

Episcopal ministers also drafted legislation for approval in parliament, whether in response to specific petitions, parliamentary pressure, or royal initiative. For instance, the authorship of the Ordinance of the Staple, which was confirmed as a statute in the parliament of 1354, has been attributed to John

---

[48] Edwards, *Second Century,* pp. 46-8; Dodd, *Justice and Grace,* p. 127.
[49] Dodd, *Justice and Grace,* pp. 91, 105-6, 134; *idem,* 'Parliament and Political Legitimacy', pp. 181-2. See also Rayner, 'Forms and Machinery'.
[50] In the parliament of January 1348, however, separate triers of petitions were also appointed for 'petitions from the clergy': *PROME,* January 1348, 2-3. Moreover, after 1362, the 'English' committee also handled petitions from Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, which left the 'foreign lands' committee to deal simply with petitions from beyond the British Isles: *Ibid.,* 1362, 2; Dodd, *Justice and Grace,* p. 108.
[51] Appendix 29.
[52] *PROME,* 1351, 5.
[53] By *c.* 1340, it was customary for statutes to be passed by the king in parliament with the assent of the lords and commons, even if what 'assent' meant is hard to ascertain: Bradford, 'Parliament and Political Culture', pp. 166-72. However, the requirement for legislation to receive assent from the lords and commons clearly evolved over the course of the fourteenth century; at the turn of the century, it is plain that statutes did not need parliamentary approval, but by the turn of the fifteenth, it is evident that the assent of all three estates was felt necessary by the crown: Sayles, *Functions,* pp. 54-7; Keen, *England in the Later Middle Ages,* p. 75; Harriss, *Shaping the Nation,* pp. 70-1.
[54] *PROME,* 1362, 39; *SR,* i, pp. 375-6.
[55] *PROME,* 1362, 38; *SR,* i, pp. 375-6. For a detailed analysis of the Statute of Pleading, see Ormrod, 'Use of English'.

Thoresby.[56] The statute directed, among other things, that creditors could sue for the recovery of mercantile debts before the mayors of the new staples, rather than through the common law courts, after which matters might be sent into chancery, where the debtor's lands and goods would be assessed, and a writ issued to allow the creditor to take possession of them.[57] While this enabled creditors to obtain swifter, cheaper, and more satisfactory justice, it also enhanced the judicial authority of the chancery, which appears to have been a consistent objective for Thoresby.[58] This level of involvement reveals that prelates were very direct participants in the parliamentary process.

Given this, it is unsurprising that the episcopacy was vital to the successful functioning of parliament. Nowhere is this clearer than in the parliament of December 1332, where the absence of a sufficient number of prelates caused the assembly to come to a premature end. Those present were asked whether Edward should invade Scotland and claim overlordship of the land. However, according to the parliament roll:

> in full parliament the prelates by themselves, the earls and barons by themselves, and the knights of the counties by themselves, and then all in common, answered that on such important and onerous business touching the king, his people and his realm so closely they did not dare or feel able to give counsel without the advice of the prelates, of whom only three, namely the archbishop of York, the bishops of Lincoln, and of Carlisle [and] the abbots of York and Selby, had arrived, and of the other great men of the realm who had not arrived at that time.[59]

Consequently, they asked Edward to postpone the parliament until the following January, and 'to command most strongly the prelates and the other great men who were absent to be there at the said time and place so that the business would no longer be delayed by their absence', to which request the king acceded.[60] Although the fact that the assembly took place in the depths of winter cannot have helped, the absence of so many bishops appears to have reflected the fact that the parliament took place in York, which inflamed the long-running tensions between the archbishops of Canterbury and York over precedence and the bearing of crosses in one another's provinces.[61] This is alluded to in the parliament roll itself, which records that Edward ordered that 'the business of the king and realm should not be delayed then [the following January] on account of the dispute between the archbishops of Canterbury and of York concerning the carrying of their crosses'. To this end, he 'forbade anyone, on pain of forfeiting all that he could, from preventing the carrying of crosses'.[62] Whatever the reason, that

---

[56] Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government', pp. 57-8.
[57] *SR,* i, pp. 348-9; Goddard, *Credit and Trade,* pp. 5-6.
[58] Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government', pp. 57-8; Musson, 'Second "English Justinian"', pp. 82-4.
[59] *PROME,* December 1332, 1.
[60] *Ibid.*, December 1332, 1.
[61] It is striking that only one bishop from the southern province, Henry Burghersh, attended the parliament. For the history of the 'Canterbury-York dispute', see Bethell, 'William of Corbeil'; Brett, *English Church,* pp. 28-33, 38-42, 45-8; Mayr-Harting, *Religion, Politics and Society,* pp. 29-33, 56-64; and Denton, *Robert Winchelsey,* p. 258.
[62] *PROME,* December 1332, 1.

the absence of prelates could bring parliament to an untimely end reveals how essential they were to its operation.

This is underlined by the general disruption caused when bishops were late to parliaments. In the earlier years of Edward III's reign, this happened on several occasions. In the parliament of March 1332, the assembly began with two articles being read before those assembled, which forbade the carrying of weapons and the playing of games during the session. However, the parliament roll records that 'no more was done that day', because 'the archbishop of Canterbury [Simon Meopham] and some other great men of the realm, who had been summoned to the said parliament, had not yet come'.[63] Accordingly, business was postponed until the following day, when Meopham arrived and could declare 'the reason why the parliament had been summoned… in the form of a sermon'.[64] The same applied in the parliament of January 1333, when 'nothing more was done' on the opening day after the transaction of some introductory business, 'because the prelates and the other great men had still not fully arrived at the parliament'. Matters were again postponed until the next day, when Sir Geoffrey le Scrope, the chief justice, addressed the assembly and proceedings began in earnest.[65] Repeated assemblies thus failed to commence properly until an appropriate number of bishops had gathered.

Edward was sometimes desperate to ensure that his bishops were in attendance. He often requested that bishops attend assemblies in person, rather than sending proctors in their stead. Thus, when summoning Roger Martival to the parliament of October 1328, Edward stated that he did not intend to admit any proctor for the bishop 'except for a necessary reason', because of 'the arduousness of the business concerned'.[66] Indeed, the crown sometimes sent supplementary letters to prelates – as to Hamo Hethe in March 1340, John Trillek in August 1346, and Simon Sudbury in January 1366 – which reinforced their writs of summons and exhorted them to attend in person.[67] Edward's keenness to have his bishops present in parliament is especially evident in the lengths to which he went to enable Thomas Hatfield to attend the assembly of April 1354. He ordered his officers to deliver the bishop three of the ships arrested by them, so that he could use them 'for bringing his victuals to London'.[68] At a time of war, when shipping was highly sought after, providing three ships for the bishop so that he might be conveyed speedily to Westminster, but still with the majesty required by his household, can only be interpreted as an indication of Edward's desire to ensure that the prelate attended the parliament in person and on time.[69]

---

[63] *Ibid.*, March 1332, 2-4.
[64] *Ibid.*, March 1332, 5.
[65] *Ibid.*, January 1333, 5, 7.
[66] *Martival*, iii, p. 211.
[67] *Hethe*, ii, pp. 644-6; *Trillek*, ii, pp. 282-3; *Sudbury (London)*, pp. 62-3.
[68] *CCR, 1354-60*, p. 10. For discussion of this episode, see also Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, p. 131.
[69] Barker, 'Thomas de Hatfield', p. 115.

Ultimately, this all reflected the special position that bishops held within parliament, and the fact that much of parliament's business relied on them. Certain petitions could only be satisfactorily answered after consultation with the prelates. For instance, in the parliament of 1362, the commons asked Edward to 'speak with all the archbishops and bishops', so that they might restrict the salaries of chaplains, who:

> Have become so scarce [owing to the 'great pestilence'] that they will not live with less than 10 or 12 marks, to the great grievance and oppression of the people.

Edward subsequently raised the matter with the bishops, who decreed that chaplains should not be paid 'more than 6 marks by any pretext whatsoever', and that chaplains who did not attend to the cure of souls should be paid no 'more than 5 marks without the[ir] bishop's dispensation'.[70] Yet, more generally, the legitimacy of parliament's actions depended on the participation of prelates. This was dramatically revealed in the reign of Edward II. According to the *Historia Roffensis*, when the baronage banished the Despensers from the realm by parliamentary award in 1321, the prelates remained outside Westminster Hall, and declared the following day that 'they in no way agreed to their [the Despensers'] exile'.[71] This critically undermined the award, and the Younger Despenser successfully argued in 1322 that it had been invalid and illegal since it 'was made without the assent of the prelates, who are peers in parliament'.[72]

The central place which bishops were afforded in parliament was underpinned by their place at the peak of political society. This can be discerned in the precedence they were given in the diplomatic of almost all the material concerning parliament. On the one hand, as individuals, they were named first in the lists of summons, the lists of the triers of petitions, and the lists of the lords assigned to commune with the commons.[73] On the other hand, collectively, as 'prelates', they were invariably listed before the earls and barons, including in the lists of those who consented to taxation, those assembled in parliament, and those who gave assent to statutes.[74] This status was made most explicit in the *Modus Tenendi Parliamentum.* Its author considered 'the archbishops, bishops, abbots, and priors who hold by barony' to form 'the second grade' in parliament, below only the king, and above all others.[75] In 1365, Chief Justice Robert Thorpe noted that 'parliament represents the body of the realm'.[76] As a key constituent of the realm's body, the episcopate was essential to parliament's success.

---

[70] *PROME,* 1362, 23.
[71] *Parliamentary Texts,* pp. 168-9. For the banishment of the Despensers, and the episcopate's role in proceedings, see also *PROME,* 1321, Introduction; Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster,* pp. 280-93; and Lane, 'Bishops and Deposition', pp. 142-3.
[72] *CCR, 1318-23,* p. 543. Despenser also criticised the award on a number of other grounds, including that he was given no opportunity to answer the allegations against him.
[73] See, for example, *RDP,* iv, pp. 384-6; *PROME,* January 1348, 2-3; *Ibid.,* 1372, 5-6; *Ibid.,* 1376, 8.
[74] See, for example, *SR,* i, p. 378; *PROME,* 1352, 54; *Ibid.,* 1369, 10; *Ibid.,* 1377, 1.
[75] *Parliamentary Texts,* p. 91.
[76] Musson, 'Second "English Justinian"', p. 76.

Episcopal involvement in parliament not only served the interests of the crown, but also fulfilled bishops' own perception of their role and responsibilities. These were articulated most clearly in the period of political strain from 1339 to 1341. According to Stephen Birchington, when Archbishop Stratford was prevented from entering the Painted Chamber by two serjeants-at-arms in April 1341, he set out his view of his own place and privileges in parliament, telling them that he, as archbishop of Canterbury, should have 'the first voice after the king' in assemblies.[77] Stratford was equally clear about the parliamentary duties of other bishops. In a letter of March 1339, he enjoined his suffragans 'not to withdraw from parliament or public councils'. Instead, they were to attend them as 'good shepherds', not simply to serve as defenders 'of the liberties of the Church and of justice', but also to 'speak and give counsel for the public weal'.[78] This reflects bishops' understanding of their place in political society, and, more strikingly, their belief in the value and potential of parliament as an institution. This was praised most eloquently by Thomas Brinton in the sermon he delivered during the Good Parliament of 1376:

> Now, among the institutions that were established in England in the past, one practice of great renown and excellence is still in use: the Lords and Commons are called together to Parliament to discuss and legislate for the good state of the country.[79]

Attendance at parliaments could also serve the episcopacy's ecclesiastical, political, and personal interests more materially. Their place in parliament enabled them to present *gravamina* to the king, one aspect of their involvement in assemblies that has received attention.[80] Clerical *gravamina* survive six times in the parliamentary records of Edward III's reign: in January 1327, when thirteen complaints were bought forward by the prelates, of which eight were answered favourably;[81] in 1341, when eight articles were presented, of which all were answered favourably, at least in part;[82] in 1344, when seven grievances were expressed, all of which were embodied in a statute;[83] in 1352, when twelve articles were put forward, which were largely answered positively in the statute *Pro Clero*;[84] in 1376, when ten *gravamina* were presented, of which only three were answered favourably;[85] and in January 1377, when

---

[77] 'Birchington', pp. 39-40.
[78] *Shrewsbury,* pp. 357-8. For discussion of this letter, see also Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 266-7.
[79] *Selected Sermons,* p. 244; *Brinton,* ii, p. 316.
[80] For discussion of the clergy's parliamentary *gravamina*, see Jones, 'Bishops, Politics, and the Two Laws', pp. 225-39; Bradford, 'Parliament and Political Culture', pp. 161-5; Dodd, *Justice and Grace,* pp. 243-54; and Phillips, 'Church, Crown and Complaint', pp. 192-250.
[81] *PROME,* 1327, Canterbury Register I, 1-13.
[82] *Ibid.,* 1341, 18-32. An example of the crown's only partially favourable response to clerical grievances can be found with regard to the second article, which asked for the provisions of Magna Carta to be upheld, and 'newly affirmed by oath'. However, while Edward ordered that 'the Great Charter and the privileges which the petition mentions shall be upheld in all points', he declined their request for this to be affirmed 'with a new oath': *Ibid.,* 1341, 20, 28.
[83] *Ibid.,* 1344, 23-4; *SR,* i, pp. 302-3.
[84] *PROME,* 1352, 57-69; *SR,* i, pp. 325-6. For discussion of this statute, see also below, pp. 188-9.
[85] *PROME,* 1376, 199-208.

six complaints were advanced, which were mostly answered positively.[86] This process could bring substantial benefit to the English Church. In 1344, in response to the prayers of 'the archbishop of Canterbury [John Stratford], the bishops, and other prelates and the clergy', Edward agreed (among other things) that 'no archbishop or bishop should be impeached' before lay justices 'unless the king orders it specially', and that 'no [writs of] prohibition should be issued, except in cases where the king has, and should rightly have, cognisance'.[87]

It seems likely that bishops brought forward other collective petitions that were not formally recorded on the parliament rolls. This is perhaps most evident in the parliament of March 1340. Although no clerical *gravamina* appear on the roll for the assembly, the preamble to one of the parliament's statutes notes that it arose from grievances 'shewed unto us by the Reverend Father in God, John [Stratford] Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of England, and the other prelates and clergy of our realm… in our parliament holden at Westminster'.[88] Stratford had apparently highlighted how some royal servants had oppressed members of the clergy, and accordingly asked for remedy. The statute, which was then issued 'at the request of the said prelates and clergy', made several important concessions. Its first clause restricted purveyance from clerics; its second imposed limitations on the royal right to present to benefices during episcopal vacancies; its third promised that the crown would not seize temporalities 'without a true and just cause'; its fourth mandated that escheators would refrain from damaging ecclesiastical lands during vacancies; and its fifth empowered royal ministers and councillors to prevent servants of the crown from doing anything to the prejudice of churches 'in time of vacations'.[89] Like other members of parliament, the bishops knew how to use the institution for their own purposes.

Even without the formal use of petitions, bishops could bolster the English Church by using their influence as a body and by interceding with the king. This was apparent in the parliament of September 1334, when the episcopacy intervened in favour of Adam Orleton. The bishop had been translated by Pope John XXII from Worcester to Winchester in December 1333.[90] This had enraged Edward, who declined to recognise the translation, refused to release the Winchester temporalities, and ordered the sheriff of Southampton to inhibit obedience to 'Adam, who claims to be bishop of Winchester, and [who] is unfit for that or any other bishopric'.[91] Edward's anger had not been assuaged by the parliament of September 1334, to which Orleton was not summoned.[92] However, according to Adam Murimuth,

---

[86] *Ibid.*, January 1377, 80-5.
[87] *Ibid.*, 1344, 23.
[88] *SR*, i, p. 292.
[89] *Ibid.*, i, pp. 293-4.
[90] *CPL, 1305-42*, p. 397.
[91] *Chartulary*, p. 108; Haines, *Church and Politics*, p. 37. Edward was infuriated not only because John XXII had disposed of the wealthiest English bishopric without consulting him, but also because his own candidate for Winchester – Simon Montacute – had been relegated to Worcester. For further discussion of Orleton's translation, see also Usher, 'Adam de Orleton', pp. 44-6; Haines, *Church and Politics*, pp. 36-7, 61-3; and Haines, 'Looking Back', pp. 390-2.
[92] *RDP*, iv, pp. 427-8; Plucknett, 'Parliament', p. 94, n. 2.

the pleas of John Stratford 'and of other of the bishops present in the parliament' succeeded in securing Orleton's reconciliation with Edward and the return of his temporalities.[93] This story is echoed by Geoffrey le Baker, who recounted how 'the king listened to the prayers of his bishops at a parliament in London and graciously refunded these temporalities'.[94] The chroniclers' accounts are consistent with the timing of events, as Edward authorised the restitution of Orleton's temporalities on 23 September 1334, the final day of the parliament.[95] This development was a source of great rejoicing for the convent of Orleton's new cathedral; Alexander Herriard, prior of Winchester, wrote to his brethren on 28 September, describing Orleton's reception by the king as 'joyous news', and directing the monks to 'assemble in church, ring the bells, and sing a solemn Te Deum to the accompaniment of the organs, glorifying God and their patron saints'.[96]

Of course, the episcopate did not need to act collectively in order to secure the redress of their grievances. Sometimes a proportion of prelates petitioned the crown, as in the parliament of September 1331, when 'certain prelates' informed the king that Sir Thomas Ferrers 'held the church of Aylestone, in Leicestershire, by force, contrary to the sentences and judgements given thereupon in the court Christian'. This prompted Edward to order that 'some suitable men… be assigned to go to the said place, and to enquire of all that has been done there, and to inform the king, and also to hear and determine [the matter] if it be necessary'.[97] Similarly, individual bishops could submit 'private petitions'. In the parliament of 1369, John Buckingham complained about the process of *quare impedit* launched by the crown against himself, the prior of Kenilworth, and Thomas Southam, archdeacon of Oxford.[98] This arose from a disputed presentation to the church of Iffley in Oxfordshire, to which Edward had presented one Richard Pencrich in March 1368, claiming that the benefice was in his gift 'by reason of the late voidance of the priory [of Kenilworth]'.[99] Buckingham's petition met with a favourable response. Edward asked the chancellor, William Wykeham, to call the parties and the lords of parliament together to deal with the matter. They duly assembled in chancery, and decided that Pencrich ought not to hold the benefice and that he should have his presentation annulled.[100]

Indeed, bishops could also use their privileged access to the king and his ministers in parliaments and representative councils to lobby, more informally, for patronage that could benefit the Church.[101] This

---

[93] *Murimuth*, p. 70. See also 'Ann. Paul.', pp. 360-1.
[94] *Baker*, p. 49.
[95] *Chartulary*, p. 118; *CPR, 1334-8*, p. 21; *PROME*, September 1334, Introduction.
[96] *Chartulary*, p. 118.
[97] *PROME*, September 1331, 12.
[98] *Ibid.*, 1369, Appendix, 1.
[99] *CPR, 1367-70*, p. 93.
[100] *PROME*, 1369, Appendix, 1. Pencrich's claim was weak, since, although Edward had presented him during a vacancy at Kenilworth Priory, the Priory had long lost the advowson of Iffley; its prior had granted the advowson to the bishop of Lincoln in 1266, who in turn had granted it to the archdeacon of Oxford by 1279: Wood and Cole, 'Iffley', p. 202.
[101] It is important to include patronage granted in 'representative councils', as well as in parliaments, not only to give the fullest picture of the episcopate's engagement with representative assemblies, but also because these

is suggested by the fact that they secured grants more frequently during such assemblies than they did at other times.[102] Over the course of Edward's reign, bishops received sixty-four grants during parliaments or representative councils, or just over one grant for every month of a sitting. This was more than twice as frequently as they received patronage outside of these assemblies, when they secured, on average, a grant every two-and-a-half months.[103] The same applied with the grants which they procured on behalf of others, which they received, on average, once every four weeks during parliaments and representative councils, almost five times more frequently than outside of these assemblies, when they obtained such a grant every four months.[104] Parliaments and representative councils were particularly useful venues to seek patronage for bishops who were not serving as royal ministers, and who saw the king less routinely than their ministerial colleagues. Non-ministerial bishops secured patronage for themselves almost four times as frequently during such assemblies as they did outside of them, and patronage for others almost ten times as frequently, while episcopal ministers merely received patronage for themselves twice as frequently, and patronage for others only one-and-a-half times as frequently. Many of the grants that bishops secured during parliaments supported the *ecclesia anglicana*. For instance, on the first day of the parliament of March 1340, Ralph Shrewsbury obtained a licence to construct a cathedral close in Wells, 'for the glory of God, the honour of the cathedral church of Wells and the saints whose bodies lie therein, and the security and quiet of the canons and ministers resident there'.[105] Likewise, on the penultimate day of the parliament of June 1344, John Stratford secured a pardon for the abbot and convent of Winchcombe for acquiring property in mortmain without the appropriate royal licence.[106] In a similar fashion, in the final week of the parliament of January 1352, Simon Islip procured a pardon for William Fox, parson of the church of Lea in Lincolnshire, for abducting a nun from Broadholme Priory.[107] Prelates were therefore able to use their access to the king in parliaments to secure patronage for the benefit of their dioceses, monastic houses, and individual clergymen.

Attending parliament also helped bishops to discharge their 'political' responsibilities, furthering the interests of the English realm. For instance, they could intercede for lay members of political society, as in September 1331, when prelates 'prayed most especially' on behalf of Hugh le Despenser, son of

---

were similarly places in which bishops had an opportunity to lobby the crown. It would also be wholly arbitrary to exclude them in the early years of Edward's reign, where, as noted above, they were sometimes almost indistinguishable from parliaments. These reasons also underpin why consideration is given to the proctors appointed for representative councils, rather than simply those appointed for parliaments.

[102] For the sake of this analysis, both the week before parliaments and representative councils formally opened, and the week after they formally closed, when bishops were often in the place in which assemblies met, have also been counted as part of the 'parliamentary session'.

[103] Appendix 38.

[104] Appendix 39.

[105] *CPR, 1338-40*, p. 466.

[106] *CPR, 1343-5*, pp. 321-2.

[107] *CPR, 1350-4*, p. 225.

the Younger Despenser, who was duly released 'from prison and from custody'.[108] Although there is no direct evidence for why bishops intervened in favour of Despenser, it is plausible that they were moved either by a sense of justice, since he had been imprisoned for five years in spite of never having been tried or sentenced for any crime, or by a sense of trying to bring about reconciliation, stability, and harmony in the wake of the vicissitudes of both Edward II's reign and Isabella and Mortimer's regime.[109] Prelates could also give their assent to statutes which they felt would benefit the political community. Thus, in the parliament of April 1341, a number of statutes were passed 'by the assent of the prelates, earls, barons, and others', including one which mandated the uniformity of weights and measures throughout the realm.[110] The law specifically sought to ease 'the grief of the people', but it also tallied with broader episcopal concerns; a 1375 sermon of Thomas Brinton castigated 'false merchants', who 'violate and contravene the rule of justice' by manipulating measures, weights, and scales 'to deceive the next man'.[111] Of course, statutes which benefited the wider landholding classes also benefited the landholding episcopacy. The Ordinance of Labourers of 1349 and the Statute of Labourers of 1351 had 'the assent of the prelates, nobles and others of his [Edward III's] council' and the 'assent of the prelates, earls, barons and other great men and of the said commons' respectively. These laws were designed to control the supply and cost of labour; to control the activities which had led 'to the great damage of the great men and to the impoverishment of all the commonalty'; and to bolster the position of employers.[112] The level of episcopal support they enjoyed is evident from William Edington's instruction to his clergy to publish the 1349 ordinance 'in the vulgar tongue… on Sundays and feasts when there is the greatest concourse of people', and to 'encourage their people to work and keep the ordinances', and from Thomas Hatfield's decision to copy the 1351 statute into his chancery roll, the only statute that can be found there.[113]

Attending parliament could also be in bishops' personal interests. Some prelates appear to have found assemblies dull; William Dene described how Hamo Hethe was so bored in the parliament of March 1337 that he spent a whole day 'staring at the walls' of the Painted Chamber.[114] But it is possible that others enjoyed proceedings, relishing the opportunity to meet other clergymen and magnates, to reunite with old friends, and to discuss the major issues of the day. More certainly, parliaments and representative councils presented opportunities for bishops, not least the chance to procure patronage from the crown that could advance their own interests, as well as those of the English Church. In the

---

[108] *PROME,* September 1331, 8.
[109] Warner, *Hugh Despenser,* pp. 154-6, 158. In the previous year, in one of his first acts as an independent ruler, Edward III had granted permission for the honourable burial of the Younger Despenser's remains: *Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 804; Westerhof, *Death and the Noble Body,* pp. 125-6; Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 139.
[110] *SR,* i, pp. 281, 285.
[111] *Brinton,* i, pp. 214-15; *Black Death,* p. 139.
[112] *PROME,* 1351, 47. For discussion of the Ordinance and Statute of Labourers, see Poos, 'Social Context', pp. 29-30; Bennett, 'Compulsory Service', pp. 7-10; and Bailey, *After the Black Death,* pp. 77-9.
[113] *Edington,* ii, p. 97; Britnell, 'Feudal Reaction', p. 29.
[114] *Historia Roffensis,* fo. 97v. See also Haines, 'Bishops and Politics', p. 608.

first parliament of Edward III's reign, Henry Burghersh secured the marriage of his cousin, Giles Badlesmere, for whom he later arranged the auspicious match of Elizabeth Montacute, the daughter of Sir William Montacute, future earl of Salisbury.[115] The following year, in the parliament of February 1328, John Langton obtained a licence to alienate property to the dean and chapter of his cathedral church of Chichester 'to keep an obit yearly for the bishop after his death'.[116] Similarly, in the parliament of January 1361, Ralph Shrewsbury secured the king's permission that he 'be excused attendance at [future] parliaments, councils, or any other assemblies made by the king and his heirs', on account of how he was now 'enfeebled and broken by age'.[117] Bishops were therefore not reluctant to use parliament to advance their varied interests.

As such, just as bishops were pivotal to parliament, so parliament was pivotal to them. Prelates recognised that they were expected to attend the assembly, and they performed their roles conscientiously. Moreover, bishops profited themselves from turning up to sessions, as they were able to seek – and secure – reform of many of the issues that vexed them, as well as to ask for – and acquire – patronage. All this meant that attendance at parliament could further the fulfilment of prelates' responsibilities to the Church, to the realm, and to themselves, their families, and their souls. While parliament furthered the king's business and dealt with public matters – such as the granting of taxation, the offering of counsel, and the passage of legislation – it also offered an invaluable forum for other members of political society, of which bishops were a crucial part, to advance their own interests.[118] This was explicitly recognised by Archbishop Reynolds, who implored all the summoned clergy of his province to be present for the first parliament of Edward III's reign, 'so that they may discuss and ordain matters in a manner conducive to the Church's benefit [*utilitati ecclesie*]'.[119]

What then of Ormrod's arguments that only a 'hard core of "political" bishops' actually engaged with parliament; that this situation worsened from the 1350s onwards; and that the episcopate stopped using assemblies as a venue to ventilate their grievances? Of the eighty-six bishops of Edward III's reign, in fact only six were exonerated for life from attendance in parliament.[120] These prelates had sound reasons for missing assemblies; Roger Northburgh, for instance, was excused attendance from future parliaments in November 1348 'because he is growing old and has lost his sight'.[121] Similarly, while

---

[115] *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 17. For discussion of Badlesmere and Montacute's marriage, see Ormrod, 'Montagu, William'; Swabey, *Medieval Gentlewoman,* p. 35; and Lawrence, 'Secular Patronage', p. 92.
[116] *CPR, 1327-30,* p. 235.
[117] *CPR, 1358-61,* p. 530.
[118] See Harriss, 'Formation of Parliament', pp. 40-52; Dodd, *Justice and Grace,* pp. 317-25; and Bradford, 'Parliament and Political Culture', pp. 271-6.
[119] *Stratford,* i, pp. 69-70.
[120] These bishops were John Hotham, Wulfstan Bransford, Roger Northburgh, John Paschal, Reginald Brian, and Ralph Shrewsbury: *CPR, 1330-4,* p. 539; *CPR, 1338-40,* p. 546; *CPR, 1340-3,* p. 431; *CPR, 1348-50,* p. 211; *CPR, 1350-4,* p. 70; *CPR, 1354-8,* p. 31; *CPR, 1358-61,* p. 530. See also Roskell, 'Attendance of the Lords', p. 202.
[121] *CPR, 1348-50,* p. 211.

evidence survives of bishops appointing proctors to represent them in parliaments and representative councils on 222 occasions between 1327 and 1377, this translates to an average of fewer than four bishops, out of a possible twenty-one, absenting themselves from each of Edward's assemblies. Far from a decline, this actually represents broad continuity from Edward II's reign, when bishops appointed proctors to represent them on 106 occasions, or an average of just over four bishops for each of his parliaments and representative councils.[122] In any case, prelates sending proctors often had sensible reasons for absence, as with Thomas Appleby, who absented himself from the parliament of 1368 because he was 'prevented by physical infirmity from attending parliament to consent to its common decisions for the welfare of the realm'.[123] On the contrary, many prelates actively involved themselves in parliaments, with bishops serving as triers of petitions on 160 occasions throughout Edward III's reign, which equates to an average of eight serving for each assembly for which records survive.[124] This culminated in the Good Parliament of 1376, when eighteen bishops served as triers of petitions,[125] with only one English bishop failing to do so, namely Robert Stretton, who appears to have been suffering from ill health.[126]

In these circumstances, it is unsurprising that many bishops participated in parliament who cannot be identified as forming part of a 'hard core of "political" bishops'. Perhaps the *example par excellence* of this is John Grandisson. As the archetype of a diligent fourteenth-century diocesan, he has often been suspected of remaining aloof from political affairs, and of refraining from attending parliaments: Roy Martin Haines averred that he was 'reluctant to attend parliament', and Gwilym Dodd offered him as an example of a bishop who seldom attended assemblies because he chose to devote his energies 'to running the administration and affairs of his diocese'.[127] Grandisson was certainly a dedicated pastor. He went on regular visitations;[128] promoted education in his diocese;[129] and was customarily resident: his register, which is unusually detailed between his enthronement on 22 August 1328 and the end of 1347, locates him within his diocese on 1,326 occasions (86% of them), compared to just 131 occasions (14% of them) outside of it. However, while it would have been understandable if Grandisson had persistently missed parliaments – not least because his see was one of the furthest from both London

[122] Appendices 31-6. Of course, the evidence for the appointment of proctors is not comprehensive. However, it has been suggested by Phil Bradford and Alison McHardy that 'if SC10 [even without supplementation by the material from episcopal registers] is not a complete record of proxy appointments, it probably gives a fairly accurate picture of how individual bishops related to parliament, at least in the fourteenth century': *Proctors,* i, p. xxxv.
[123] *Appleby,* p. 63.
[124] Appendix 29.
[125] This includes Robert Wickford, archbishop of Dublin.
[126] Appendix 29; Swanson, 'Stretton, Robert'.
[127] Haines, *John Stratford,* p. 79; Dodd, *Justice and Grace,* p. 101.
[128] For instance, Grandisson conducted a visitation of Cornwall between June and August in 1336, and a visitation of his cathedral in June 1337: *Grandisson,* iii, pp. 1527-8.
[129] For instance, in addition to founding his college at Ottery St Mary, Grandisson made new statutes for the collegiate church of Crediton; extended grammar school scholarships at St John's Hospital in Exeter; and sent detailed instructions to schoolmasters: Erskine, 'Grandisson, John'.

and York – this was far from the case.[130] Although the parliament rolls themselves only identify Grandisson as present at a single assembly, in January 1333, when he served as a trier of petitions, his register locates him at thirteen parliaments between the beginning of his episcopate and 1347. This represented half of the parliaments that took place during the period, and the bishop even made the lengthy journey to York on three occasions.[131] Unfortunately, few episcopal registers possess anything like the detail of Grandisson's, which allows the historian to reconstruct his movements in considerable detail. But Grandisson's register nevertheless shows not only that bishops often turned up to assemblies in which there is no other record of them appearing, but also that prelates who were relatively distant from royal administration frequented parliaments.

Yet Grandisson was by no means the only conscientious diocesan to attend parliament with some regularity. Throughout Edward's reign, bishops like Simon Montacute, Lewis Charlton, and Thomas Appleby routinely took part in assemblies: Montacute attended at least five parliaments between 1336 and 1343; Charlton served as a trier of petitions on five occasions between 1362 and 1368; and Appleby served as a trier of petitions in both 1369 and 1376.[132] None of these prelates were particularly prominent in the king's administration. After arriving in his diocese of Worcester in September 1334, Montacute hardly left it until he was translated to Ely in March 1337; his register locates him in his see on 550 occasions (99.5% of them) compared to just three (0.5% of them) outside of it.[133] Not only was Montacute resident, but he also appears to have been a dedicated pastor: he conducted a thorough visitation of his see between November 1335 and June 1336; corrected abuses when he found them, as at Alcester Abbey in January 1336; and won the respect of the monks of his cathedral church, who, according to the *Historia Eliensis*, regarded him as 'our most kindly father and pastor'.[134] As befitting a prelate who imposed stricter residence requirements on his clergy, Charlton was also customarily resident in his bishopric of Hereford, leaving only to attend parliaments and convocations. Of the 101 entries in his register which identify his location, ninety-seven locate him as being in his diocese, and just four as being elsewhere.[135] In addition, Charlton conducted visitations, as in the spring of 1363, when he visited the deanery of Frome. He also personally conducted the fifty ordinations which took place in his see during his episcopate, and took steps to mitigate the impact of plague in his bishopric, as in March 1364, when he united the parishes of Puddlestone and Whyle, which had been depopulated by pestilence.[136] Similarly, Appleby was normally resident in his diocese of Carlisle; only one of the

[130] Exeter, Grandisson's cathedral city, is 170 miles from London, and 270 miles from York.
[131] Appendix 37.
[132] *Montacute*, pp. 43-4, 58-9, 339, 342; Appendix 29; Summerson, 'Montagu, Simon'. It is worth noting that these bishops might also have attended other parliaments; Appleby wrote to one of the archbishops in *c.* 1368 (prior to either of the parliaments in which he is known to have tried petitions), referring to a discussion they had 'while they were sitting together in the exchequer during the last parliament': *Appleby*, p. 26.
[133] *Montacute*, pp. 335-42.
[134] *Ibid.*, pp. xxv, 278-81, 338-40; 'Historia Eliensis', ed. Wharton, p. 651.
[135] *Lewis Charlton*, pp. 1-22; Dohar, 'Charlton, Lewis'.
[136] *Lewis Charlton*, pp. 7-8, 8-10, 76-122.

219 entries in his register that give his location in Edward III's reign records him being outside his see.[137] Indeed, he also conducted frequent visitations – visiting Carlisle Cathedral in March 1366, Lanercost Priory in July 1368, and the city and deanery of Carlisle in September 1373 – and appears to have cared for the educational needs of his bishopric, for instance licencing one John de Midelton to hold grammar schools in Carlisle in May 1371.[138] The prevalence of bishops such as Montacute, Charlton, and Appleby in parliament – all of whom appear to have been devoted diocesans, and none of whom ever held any form of ministerial office – renders any notion that episcopal attendance in parliament was confined to a handful of dedicated royal servants unconvincing.[139]

The suggestion that episcopal attendance worsened from the 1350s is equally ill founded. Indeed, on the evidence of proxy letters, episcopal attendance in parliament actually seems to have improved. From 1327 to 1349, an average of almost five bishops sent letters recusing themselves from each parliament or representative council (159 bishops across thirty-five assemblies), while from 1350 to 1377, this falls to fewer than three bishops (sixty-three bishops across twenty-three parliaments and representative councils).[140] This represented not merely a fall in the average number of bishops absenting themselves, but also a fall in the proportion of bishops among those excusing themselves; bishops were responsible for 22% of the proxy letters in the SC10 series from 1327 to 1350, but just 17% of them from 1350 to 1377.[141] Not only did fewer bishops absent themselves, but more seem to have actively participated in Edward's parliaments as his reign went on. This is evident with regard to their role as triers of petitions. The average number of bishops serving as triers of English petitions rose steadily throughout the reign, with an average of three per parliament in the 1330s, two in the 1340s, three in the 1350s, five in the 1360s, and six in the 1370s. The same applied with the average number of bishops trying petitions for foreign lands, which rose from three per parliament in the 1330s and 1340s, and two in the 1350s, to four per parliament in the 1360s, and five in the 1370s. In sum, an average of just five bishops per parliament tried petitions in the assemblies for which records survive from 1327 to 1349, while nine bishops did so from 1350 to 1377.[142] Far from distancing themselves from assemblies, prelates seem to have played an increasingly prominent role in parliaments.

But what of Ormrod's claim that episcopal influence in parliament diminished and that bishops 'stopped using parliament as a means of advancing its demands'?[143] While it is undeniably the case that no *gravamina* are found on the parliament rolls between 1352 and 1376, the conclusions arising from this are problematic. Grievances were normally compiled and presented to parliament in response to

[137] *Appleby*, pp. 1-113. The entry which records Appleby being outside his see is a note, which penned in London in June 1376, while he was attending the Good Parliament: *Ibid.*, pp. 106-7.
[138] *Ibid.*, pp. 7, 36, 44, 65.
[139] Appendix 15.
[140] Appendix 36.
[141] Appendix 33.
[142] Appendix 30.
[143] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, p. 141.

requests for clerical taxation.[144] Between 1352 and 1376, such requests were received, and granted, in May-June 1356, February 1360, January-February 1370, May 1371, and December-February 1373-4. One might therefore have expected clergy to put forward *gravamina* in the parliaments following those requests, in April 1357, May 1360, February 1371, November 1372, and April 1376. Yet aside from the many complaints expressed in the Good Parliament of April 1376, there is no evidence that this was the case. However, this seems to be a case of absence of evidence, rather than evidence of absence. In particular, the clergy do seem to have compiled a list of grievances associated with their subsidy of 1356, with the convocation of Canterbury mandating in May 1356 that their payment of a second tenth was conditional on 'the *gravamina* of the Church' being corrected.[145] It is entirely possible – and indeed likely – that their complaints were raised and discussed in the parliament of April 1357, but unfortunately the roll for the assembly does not survive.[146] Similarly, *gravamina* were evidently compiled in 1360, given the convocation of Canterbury again making reference to 'the *gravamina* of the clergy and Holy Church' when granting a tenth on 21 April 1360. These might well have been presented in the parliament of May 1360, but the roll for the meeting does not survive.[147] The convocation of Canterbury also made their grant of February 1370 on the condition that Edward corrected 'the *gravamina* of the clergy, about the liberties of the Church'.[148] Although no record of these grievances can be found on the parliament roll for the assembly that took place in February 1371, this is not a guarantee that no such complaints were brought forward.[149] As such, the absence of *gravamina* on the rolls of parliament from 1352 to 1376 probably represents a lack of evidence – and in particular the loss of rolls for two parliaments in which clerical grievances were likely ventilated – rather than a newfound reluctance of the episcopate to present their grievances in parliament.[150]

Ormrod's argument is also based on the assumption that collective *gravamina* were the only means through which the Church could advance its demands in parliament, but this was manifestly not the case. There is ample evidence that bishops still utilised other mechanisms for securing redress of their grievances – from private petitioning to informal lobbying – throughout the latter stages of Edward's reign. To offer just one example, Thomas Hatfield promoted the interests of his palatinate by bringing forward several petitions in parliaments during the 1360s and 1370s. One matter appears to have especially exercised him, namely the seizure of the profits of the ferry at Berwick-on-Tweed by one John de Bolton, late chamberlain of Berwick. This undermined the bishop's claim to be 'lord of the soil

[144] See Weske, *Convocation,* pp. 149-67; Jones, 'Bishops, Politics, and the Two Laws', p. 238; and Phillips, 'Church, Crown and Complaint', p. 195.
[145] *Convocation,* ii, p. 271.
[146] *PROME,* 1357, Introduction.
[147] *Convocation,* ii, p. 284; *PROME,* 1360, Introduction.
[148] *Convocation,* ii, p. 303.
[149] As noted above (at p. 163), the statute of Lent 1340 stemmed from grievances that were showed to the king by various bishops, but which were not recorded on the parliament roll: *SR,* i, p. 292.
[150] Such a reluctance would, of course, run contrary to the fact that prelates presented *gravamina* in the parliaments of both 1376 and 1377: *PROME,* 1376, 199-208; *Ibid.,* 1377, 80-5.

of the river [Tweed] as far as the thread in the middle of the said water wherever it adjoins his demesne', which meant that he and his predecessors had taken 'all profits arising from the same, [such] as fisheries, fixings of weirs and mills, and passage tolls of ships and boats'.[151] Hatfield thus petitioned for restitution in the parliament of May 1366, which led to a commission being formed to investigate his complaint in February of the following year.[152] Seemingly dissatisfied with the result, Hatfield appears to have raised his complaint again in the parliament of 1373, which prompted a further two commissions to be ordered to investigate the matter in 1374, as a result of 'a representation of Thomas, bishop of Durham, exhibited before king and council in parliament'.[153] Hatfield revived the issue for a final time in the Good Parliament of 1376; in November of that year, Edward ordered his justices to 'view the record and process' of the dispute, in consequence of a 'petition presented in the last parliament' by the bishop, which 'prayed for remedy'.[154] That Hatfield raised his complaint in at least three of the parliaments of Edward's later years – and, indeed, continued to present parliamentary petitions in Richard II's reign – leaves no doubt that prelates still viewed the assembly as a venue for seeking remedies for their problems.[155]

Suggestions that bishops failed to engage with parliament, particularly as Edward's reign progressed, are consequently most unconvincing. Throughout the period, the evidence of proxy letters and the lists of triers of petitions, which enables an assessment of clerical attendance in parliament, shows that many bishops turned up to assemblies, even those who were conscientious pastors and diligent diocesans. Similarly, over the course of the reign, prelates used parliament as a venue for obtaining redress of grievances, as aptly illustrated by how they brought forward formal *gravamina* in both Edward's first and final parliaments.[156] Indeed, on the surviving evidence, episcopal engagement with parliament increased as the king's reign went on, with fewer bishops appointing proctors to represent them, and more bishops serving as triers of petitions. This culminated in the Good Parliament of 1376, a parliament better known for the explosive political drama it witnessed, but which also saw an unprecedented number of bishops involving themselves in the parliamentary process.

Bishops did not, however, meekly defer to the crown during parliaments. In fact, they were prepared to use assemblies to criticise the government, and to press for the reform of political abuses. In Edward III's reign, this was most evident in the parliaments of 1341 and 1376.[157] In 1341, parliament met in the midst of a serious crisis, which had its origins in the king's financial problems and his frustration at the

[151] *CPR, 1364-7*, p. 427.
[152] SC 8/44/2153; *CPR, 1364-7*, p. 427.
[153] *PROME*, 1373, Appendix, 7; *CPR, 1370-4*, p. 495; *CPR, 1374-7*, p. 64.
[154] SC 8/44/2185; *CCR, 1374-7*, p. 401.
[155] SC 8/105/5217; SC 8/107/5317.
[156] Phillips, 'Church, Crown and Complaint', pp. 284-345.
[157] Harriss, 'Formation of Parliament', pp. 32, 55-9.

failure of his government to raise sufficient funds to sustain his war effort.[158] Edward returned from the continent, and embarked on a 'purge' of his domestic administration: imprisoning numerous clerks; summarily dismissing Robert Stratford from the chancellorship and Roger Northburgh from the treasurership; and plotting to try them for their offences and to proceed against John Stratford. Unsurprisingly, Edward's actions – which inflamed worries about clerical and ministerial privileges – led to criticism, discontent, and recrimination. This reached a climax in parliament, where two serjeants-at-arms, Ralph Stafford and John Darcy, refused to allow Archbishop Stratford into the Painted Chamber, in which the proceedings were taking place. However, according to Stephen Birchington, the archbishop stood firm, refused to leave the spot until he had heard from the king, and declared that he was prepared to die for the right of his church.[159] Following considerable outrage – with John de Warenne, earl of Surrey, apparently rebuking how 'those who are foremost are shut out, while there sit other men of low rank who have no business to be here' – Edward was forced to relent, and permitted Stratford to enter the Painted Chamber and sit among his peers.[160] In the aftermath, John Grandisson, Ralph Shrewsbury, Ralph Stratford, and Robert Stratford sat on a committee of lords to consider the legal issues raised by the crisis. Its recommendations included that 'the peers of the land should not be arrested or brought to judgement except in parliament and by their peers', and that 'the franchise of Holy Church, the Great Charter, and the Charter of the Forest shall be upheld in all their points'. These were duly enshrined in a statute at the end of the session.[161] This was manifestly, in Mark Ormrod's phrase, 'a public apology' for the arbitrariness of Edward's attacks on Northburgh and the Stratfords.[162] The uncompromising determination of the archbishop, and the work of a number of his suffragans, thus helped to make the parliament of 1341 a bruising, embarrassing, and discomfiting one for the king.

The Good Parliament of 1376 also met during a period of political turbulence, but one which ultimately arose from Edward's ill health and gradual withdrawal from government. This robbed the political community of the leadership it required, and also created opportunities for unscrupulous courtiers such as William Latimer, Richard Lyons, and Alice Perrers.[163] The episcopacy joined in the attacks on these individuals, and in the attempts to revitalise the king's administration. According to the *Anonimalle Chronicle,* the intercommuning committee – which included William Courtenay, Thomas Appleby, Henry Despenser, and Adam Houghton, as well as four earls and four barons – 'assented' to the points of the commons which had been raised before John of Gaunt on 12 May. These excoriated, among other things, how the king was surrounded by 'certain councillors and servants who are not at all loyal or

[158] For wider discussion of the crisis of 1340-1, see Wilkinson, 'Protest of the Earls'; Fryde, 'Edward III's Removal'; Harriss, *King, Parliament, and Public Finance,* pp. 231-312; Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 278-327; and Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 227-40.
[159] 'Birchington', p. 39.
[160] *French Chronicle,* p. 288; Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 237.
[161] *PROME,* 1341, 6-7; *SR,* i, pp. 295-6.
[162] Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 239.
[163] See Holmes, *Good Parliament,* pp. 63-9; Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 60-1; and Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 549.

profitable to him or the kingdom', and constituted a direct assault on the royal court.[164] Several of these points were re-echoed in a sermon preached by Thomas Brinton on 18 May, in which he specifically denounced Perrers, and urged the assembly not merely to 'publicly denounce transgressors of the law', but also to 'insist on due correction'.[165] Likewise, on 24 May, the lords in parliament – which presumably included at least some prelates – agreed with the commons' proposals that the king should dismiss Alice Perrers and add three bishops, three earls, and three barons to his council, which Edward had to accept.[166] The role of the prelates was more prominent in relation to the impeachment of William Latimer. Not only was Latimer tried 'by the prelates and the lords' and sentenced by them to imprisonment until he made a suitable fine,[167] but William Wykeham also took the lead in managing the trial. Indeed, according to the Anonimalle chronicler, he refused Latimer's requests for a written copy of the allegations against him and for time to take counsel, replying:

> It was not necessary to have counsel or delay, for no one knew his deeds better than himself, and for that reason he should reply without other advice and without adjournment.[168]

It should not be forgotten that many of the crown's parliamentary concessions in both 1341 and 1376 were short-lived: the statute regarding trial by peers was annulled on 1 October 1341; William Latimer was pardoned on 8 October 1376; and Alice Perrers was pardoned on 22nd of the same month.[169] However, both parliaments nonetheless show that bishops could make assemblies uncomfortable, difficult, and troubling for the monarch and his regime.

---

[164] *Anonimalle,* pp. 85-6; *PROME,* 1376, 8. See also Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 553-4. The intercommuning committee was established in parliament 'to go to the… commons to assist them, and to discuss and commune with them': *PROME,* 1376, 8. While frustratingly little evidence survives as to its activities and how its members were chosen, it is possible that bishops were instrumental in its formation. According to Thomas Walsingham, the commons initially sought to consult four bishops, 'so that they might respond more prudently to the king's demands with the benefit of the bishops' advice', before the bishops joined the commons in asking for four barons to join them, who in turn demanded the assistance of four lords, thus leading the formation of the full committee: *Walsingham,* i, pp. 2-5; Holmes, *Good Parliament,* pp. 139-40. It should perhaps be noted that – although the parliament roll names the bishops on the committee as Courtenay, Appleby, Despenser, and Houghton – Walsingham substitutes Thomas Brinton for Houghton, and the Anonimalle chronicler John Harewell for the same bishop: *Walsingham,* i, pp. 2-3; *Anonimalle,* p. 84. For further discussion of the intercommuning committee in the Good Parliament, see also Edwards, *The Commons,* pp. 14-15; Holmes, *Good Parliament,* pp. 101-4, 139-41; and *PROME,* 1376, Introduction. Although the intercommuning committee of 1376 has attracted substantial historiographical attention, it was not wholly unprecedented; there is evidence of intercommuning in the 1340s, and a committee was formed in the parliament of 1373 to assist the commons in considering the crown's request for a grant of taxation: *PROME,* 1373, 5-6; Bryant, 'Some Earlier Examples'; Dodd, 'Crown, Magnates and Gentry', pp. 85-7.

[165] *Brinton,* ii, pp. 316, 321; *Selected Sermons,* pp. 244, 253.

[166] *Anonimalle,* pp. 90-2. See also Holmes, *Good Parliament,* p. 105; Davis, *William Wykeham,* p. 61; and Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 554-5. The bishops appointed to the council were Simon Sudbury, William Wykeham, and William Courtenay.

[167] On the insistence of the commons, Latimer was then subjected to the greater penalty of being 'removed from all the king's offices and special and privy counsels': *PROME,* 1376, 28. For more detailed discussion of Latimer's trial, and the charges against him, see Given-Wilson, 'Court and Household', pp. 195-216.

[168] *Anonimalle,* p. 93; Davis, *William Wykeham,* p. 62.

[169] *SR,* i, pp. 295, 297; *CPR, 1374-7,* pp. 353-4, 364-5. See also Ormrod, 'Recovery of Royal Authority', pp. 4-5; *idem, Reign of Edward III,* pp. 14-15, 37-8; *idem, Edward III,* pp. 238-46, 566-7; Given-Wilson, 'Perrers, Alice'; Holmes, 'Latimer, William'.

Bishops proved to be even more dogged critics of the crown in the parliaments of Edward II and Richard II. In the early years of Edward II's reign, alongside other members of the political community, prelates used parliament as a forum to try to reform the king's government and regulate his relationship with Piers Gaveston. In the parliament of April 1308, Edward was forced to banish Gaveston from the realm, a decision supported by Archbishop Winchelsey, who described him as 'the root of dissension in the kingdom', and went so far as to pronounce him excommunicate should he come back.[170] After Gaveston did return in June 1309, bishops renewed their criticism of Edward's favourite and his regime. This was evident in the parliament of February 1310, in which they joined with the earls and barons to present a petition to the king. They lamented numerous abuses, including the 'attacks which your ministers make on the goods of the Holy Church', and called for them to be redressed by the ordinance of the baronage.[171] This led to the election of Ordainers, of whom seven were bishops, and the drafting of the Ordinances of 1311, which denounced Gaveston as 'the evident enemy of the king and his people' and again sentenced him to exile.[172] The episcopacy's preparedness to use parliament to attack Edward II was clearest in the final parliament of his reign, in which he was deposed. In addition to preaching excoriating sermons, and helping to draw up the articles of accusation, prelates played a vital role in stage-managing proceedings. It was Adam Orleton who formally asked those assembled on 12 January 1327 whether they wanted Edward to remain as king, or whether he should be replaced by his son.[173] The following day, the majority of the episcopate took an oath to 'safeguard Isabella, Queen of England, and Edward, eldest son of the King of England and heir-apparent'.[174]

Richard II faced an equally trenchant episcopal bench.[175] Bishops were prominent in the 'Wonderful Parliament' of 1386, which succeeded in removing unpopular councillors and imposing an

[170] *Simonis de Gandavo,* ed. Flower and Dawes, i, p. 238; Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster,* p. 88; Phillips, *Edward II,* p. 150. Edward succeeded in obtaining papal annulment of Gaveston's excommunication on *c.* 21 May 1309: Chaplais, *Piers Gaveston*, pp. 58-9; Phillips, *Edward II*, pp. 150-5.

[171] 'Ann. Lond.', p. 168-9. See also *PROME,* February 1310, Introduction; Denton, *Robert Winchelsey*, p. 261; and Lane, 'Prelates and Political Reform', p. 33.

[172] *EHD III,* pp. 532-3; *CPR, 1307-13,* p. 215. The episcopal Ordainers were Robert Winchelsey, archbishop of Canterbury, Ralph Baldock, bishop of London, John Langton, bishop of Chichester, Simon of Ghent, bishop of Salisbury, John Salmon, bishop of Norwich, John Monmouth, bishop of Llandaff, and David Martin, bishop of St Davids.

[173] It appears that Orleton's question did not an elicit an overwhelming response, which meant that the parliament was adjourned until the following day, when the people duly assented to Edward's replacement: Valente, 'Deposition', pp. 855-9; Phillips, *Edward II,* pp. 525-9; Lane, 'Kenilworth Embassies', p. 66.

[174] The (arch)bishops who took the oath on 13 January were Walter Reynolds, Alexander Bicknor, John Stratford, Roger Martival, John Droxford, John Langton, John Eaglescliffe, William Airmyn, Roger Northburgh, John Hotham, Henry Burghersh, Hamo Hethe, Thomas Cobham, and Adam Orleton: *CPMR,* pp. 11-14.

[175] Richard II's bishops were as ready to challenge him in councils as they were in parliaments. Thus, in early 1385, according to the *Westminster Chronicle,* 'the archbishop of Canterbury [William Courtenay] and other leading churchmen… were bitter in their complaints against those councillors who moved in the king's immediate circle'. This prompted Richard to leap 'to his feet with a volley of threats at him [Courtenay]', and later to attempt to run the archbishop with his sword: *Westminster,* pp. 116-17.

unprecedented commission of reform on the king.[176] As members of the upper house, they were presumably among those who demanded that Richard remove the chancellor and treasurer from their posts; insisted that the king return from Eltham Palace to Westminster to attend the assembly personally; and tried and sentenced the ex-chancellor Michael de la Pole, earl of Suffolk.[177] Furthermore, according to Henry Knighton, it was Thomas Arundel, bishop of Ely, and Thomas of Woodstock, duke of Gloucester, who visited the king at Eltham, where they lambasted 'the unjust ministers of the king, who have mismanaged the affairs of the king and the kingdom', and made a thinly-veiled reference to the deposition of his great-grandfather:

> They [the people] have an ancient law, which not long since, lamentably, had to be invoked, which provides that if the king, upon some evil counsel, or from wilfulness and contempt, or moved by his violent will, or in any other improper way, estrange himself from his people, and will not be governed and guided by the laws of the land, and its enactments and laudable ordinances, and the wholesome counsel of the lords and nobles of the kingdom, but wrong-headedly, upon his own unsound conclusions, follows the promptings of his untempered will, then it would be lawful with the common assent and agreement of the people of the realm to put down the king from his royal seat, and raise another of the royal lineage in his place.[178]

Although Richard kept his throne in 1386, he was deposed thirteen years later, in the parliament of September 1399.[179] Bishops performed key roles throughout this assembly: Richard Scrope, archbishop of York, and Thomas Trefnant, bishop of Hereford, announced Richard's resignation to parliament;[180] Thomas Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, asked those assembled whether they would agree to the king's deposition, to which they apparently replied 'yes, yes, yes';[181] and John Trevor, bishop of St Asaph, helped to draft, and publicly read out, the formal sentence of deposition.[182] It then fell to Arundel and Scrope to lead the newly-acclaimed king, Henry IV, to the throne.[183] Thereafter, Arundel preached a sermon which contrasted Henry's maturity and manliness with Richard's childishness and wilfulness.[184] All this was justified in the official document known as the 'Record and Process', which charged Richard with – among other things – giving away 'the goods and possessions of the crown to

---

[176] For wider discussions of the 'Wonderful Parliament', see Aston, *Thomas Arundel,* pp. 160-3; Roskell, *Impeachment of Michael de la Pole,* pp. 49-55; Saul, *Richard II,* pp. 157-64; and Davis, *William Wykeham,* pp. 83-4.
[177] *Knighton,* pp. 332-5; *PROME,* 1386, 5-12. Since the Wonderful Parliament is frustratingly poorly documented, it is difficult to identify precisely who was involved in every aspect of its proceedings. However, Knighton – who provides the most useful account of the assembly – repeatedly refers to the lords and commons deciding things with 'one assent' and with 'common assent', which implies that the bishops present agreed – or at least did not actively disagree – with the parliament's resolutions: Saul, *Richard II,* pp. 159-60.
[178] *Knighton,* pp. 357-61.
[179] This parliament has unsurprisingly inspired a considerable literature. See Richardson, 'Richard II's Last Parliament'; Wilkinson, 'Deposition of Richard II'; Saul, *Richard II,* pp. 420-4; and Given-Wilson, *Henry IV,* pp. 140-7.
[180] *Revolution,* pp. 165, 171-2. The 'Manner of King Richard's Renunciation' attributed this simply to Scrope, but the 'Record and Process' attributes it to both Scrope and Trefnant.
[181] *Ibid.,* p. 165.
[182] *Ibid.,* p. 185.
[183] *Ibid.,* p. 166.
[184] *Ibid.,* p. 166; Given-Wilson, *Henry IV,* p. 147. See also Fletcher, *Richard II,* pp. 1-6.

unworthy persons', imposing 'needlessly grievous and intolerable burdens on the people', and sentencing Arundel to exile 'without any reasonable or legitimate cause'.[185] In the reigns of both Edward II and Richard II, therefore, prelates were able and willing to challenge, confront, chastise, and ultimately condemn the king in parliaments.

There can be no doubt that the episcopate remained interested in, and vitally important for, parliament throughout the entirety of Edward III's reign, and indeed throughout the entirety of the fourteenth century. Bishops played an important role in almost every phase of parliamentary assemblies, and in all of parliament's principal functions. Their prominence in parliament not only underpinned the crown's wish to have them present at assemblies, and the disarray into which sessions fell when they were not present, but also the opportunities for them to fulfil their roles, both political and ecclesiastical, and to advance their personal interests. For the majority of Edward's reign, episcopal engagement with parliament thus benefited both the crown and the episcopate. On the one hand, without episcopal attendance and co-operation, the crown could not claim that it had received counsel or consent from the entire political community, which undermined any attempts to have its decisions approved or to pass legislation, and brought the assembly of December 1332 to a premature end. On the other hand, if bishops failed to turn up to assemblies, they lost a splendid opportunity to speak on behalf of the Church and the common weal; to contribute to discussions about the affairs of the realm and about statutes which might affect them; and to petition the crown – formally or informally – for redress and patronage which would benefit their dioceses, the kingdom, and themselves. However, bishops were not glibly subservient to the crown in parliament. When they saw fit, they were prepared to use the assembly to rebuke the king, the court, and the government. That this only happened relatively infrequently in Edward III's reign thus speaks to the harmonious, fruitful, and constructive relationship which the king cultivated with his episcopate, rather than to the bishops' deference and servility. This was something that Edward's father and grandson found out to their ultimate cost in the parliaments of 1327 and 1399.

[185] *Revolution,* pp. 172-3, 181. The 'Record and Process' is a controversial text. While it was enrolled in the parliament rolls and circulated to several monastic houses, it might not have been drawn up in its final form until some time after the parliament of September 1399. It might, therefore, not have been a true record of the charges actually read out in parliament. However, even if it was revised at a later date, it is likely that it at least contains the gist of the charges read out before the assembly, since it substantially tallies with the evidence of 'The Manner of King Richard's Renunciation', a broadly independent source: *Ibid.*, pp. 165, 168-9, 172-84.

Chapter V

‘Various Taxes and Tallages’: English Bishops and Clerical Taxation

The financial importance of the English Church to the English crown has long been recognised. Mark Ormrod declared that ‘for all the administrative and moral support which it provided, the Church was most useful to Edward III as a source of [financial] supplies’.[1] While the crown financially profited from the Church in a number of ways, including through the collection of loans, the receipt of mortmain fines, and the seizure of disobedient prelates’ temporalities, by far the most fundamental was the levying of taxation. As Robin McCallum put it, taxes were ‘the clergy’s main contribution’ to the king’s finances, ‘generating revenue that vastly exceeded the value of their loans’.[2] Indeed, it has been suggested that Edward III taxed the Church more effectively than ever before. In particular, Ormrod argued that ‘in financial terms at least, it is clear that Edward III enjoyed both unparalleled and unrivalled authority over the English church’; Rory Cox averred that he ‘was able to secure unprecedented levels of taxation from… Convocation’; and McCallum referred to ‘his ability to secure unprecedented sums in clerical taxation’.[3] For Ormrod, this was the outcome not only of Edward’s effective rule, but also of the episcopacy’s feeble, ineffectual, and inept leadership in the latter part of the king’s reign. He asserted that, by the 1370s, the crown ‘undoubtedly used the Church’s political weakness as an excuse to extract very large sums of money’, with ‘barely a murmur from the bishops’, in a manner that ‘would have been unthinkable in the time of… Winchelsey and Stratford’.[4]

Although there has been some insightful work on clerical taxation in the later Middle Ages in recent years, this has principally been concerned with the mechanisms through which taxes were levied, and how subsidies benefited the king and his campaigns, rather than seeking either to challenge Ormrod’s thesis or to explore how the clergy themselves perceived, responded to, and benefited from the sums that they granted to the crown.[5] The subject is therefore, as Maureen Jurkowski argued, ‘much-

[1] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 134.
[2] McCallum, ‘Ecclesiastical Creditors’, p. 1388.
[3] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 137; Cox, ‘Hundred Years War’, p. 89; McCallum, ‘Ecclesiastical Creditors’, p. 1418.
[4] Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 143.
[5] See, for example, Jurkoswki, ‘Clerical Taxation’, esp. pp. 55-9; Bernard, *Late Medieval English Church*, pp. 22-3; Heale, *Abbots and Priors,* pp. 193-4, 207-8; Moore and Bell, ‘Financing’, p. 69; and Cox, ‘Hundred Years War’, pp. 88-90. For valuable older studies of clerical taxation – which precede Ormrod’s work – see, for instance, Weske, *Convocation,* esp. pp. 147-79; Lunt, *Financial Relations*; McHardy, ‘English Clergy’, pp. 171-3; *eadem,* ‘Clerical Taxation’; and Heath, *Church and Realm,* pp. 113-18. While Ormrod’s views regarding clerical taxation in Edward III’s reign are expressed most fully and forcefully in his *Reign of Edward III,* he has

neglected', perhaps in consequence of its 'situation on the periphery of the fields of both ecclesiastical and economic history', with the result that 'with few exceptions, it has not attracted the attention of practitioners of either discipline'.[6] As such, this chapter will attempt to reconsider the history of clerical taxation in the fourteenth century, and to address the negative picture that has been painted of it. While bishops played a key role in the procurement and collection of subsidies from the clergy, which were critical to the financial health of Edward III's regime, it is apparent that the Church was actually relatively lightly taxed in his reign. Moreover, it is evident that the taxes paid by churchmen advanced their own interests, as well as those of the king, and that the episcopate did not suffer from a collective crisis of confidence following the demise of Archbishop Stratford in 1348.

Before discussing clerical taxation in greater depth, it is important to outline some of the other ways through which the clergy contributed to royal coffers.[7] Clergymen could lend money to the crown, as in 1339-40, when Simon Montacute loaned £100 to the king.[8] They also often paid fines for royal licences to alienate or acquire lands in mortmain. Thus, in July 1373, the abbot and convent of Boxley paid 30s for a mortmain licence for William Reade to alienate property to them.[9] The king also occasionally confiscated the temporalities of troublesome bishops, which he could then farm out; after Edward seized Thomas de Lisle's temporalities in October 1356, he leased out the estates to one John Wesenham for 3,740 marks (or almost £2,500) in February of the following year.[10] Furthermore, he also appropriated the property held by alien priories between 1337 and 1360, and from 1369 to the end of his reign, which raised an income of £3,548 for the crown in the year from Michaelmas 1374 to Michaelmas 1375.[11] However, the revenues from all these sources paled in comparison to the amount that the crown secured from the Church by means of taxation. For instance, across Edward's reign, the clergy loaned almost £24,300 to the king. This was no mean sum, but it was only about 4% of what they appear to have paid to the crown in taxes.[12]

---

also discussed the subject elsewhere. See, for example, Ormrod, 'Crown and the English Economy', pp. 159-67; *idem,* 'Rebellion of Archbishop Scrope'; and *idem, Edward III,* p. 113.

[6] Jurkowski, 'Clerical Taxation', p. 53.

[7] The following is by no means a comprehensive list of the mechanisms through which the crown financially profited from the Church.

[8] *CPR, 1338-40,* p. 40. Regrettably, the precise date on which Montacute made the loan is unknown, but the crown made arrangements for repayment in April 1340. For further discussion of clerical loans to the crown, see Butler, 'Archbishop Melton', pp. 61-2; Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* pp. 135-6; and McCallum, 'Ecclesiastical Creditors'.

[9] *CPR, 1370-4,* pp. 331-2. For discussion of this, see also Raban, *Mortmain Legislation,* pp. 55-63.

[10] *CCR, 1354-60,* p. 392. This was reduced to 3,000 marks (or about £2,000) in July 1357: *CCR, 1354-60,* pp. 413-14. See also Thompson, 'Fourteenth Century', p. 105.

[11] Holmes, *Good Parliament,* p. 70. For broader discussion of the crown's seizure of alien priories, see also Morgan, 'Alien Priories', esp. pp. 205-7; McHardy, 'War on the Church'; and Thompson, 'Prelates and the Alien Priories', esp. pp. 52-3.

[12] McCallum, 'Ecclesiastical Creditors', p. 1392.

The clergy were directly taxed in three ways during Edward III's reign: through clerical subsidies to the crown, papal taxation, and contributing to lay subsidies.[13] Of these, by far the most important was direct clerical taxation by the English government. These taxes were granted by the convocations of Canterbury and York, and generally took the form of clerical tenths, but also took the form of a special subsidy of £50,000 in 1371, and a clerical poll tax in 1377, though this only yielded £800.[14] Clerical tenths represented a tenth of the value of ecclesiastical property, levied on the basis of a *taxatio* or valuation originally carried out in 1291, and revised in 1318, and were customarily assessed at around £18,000.[15] The assessments for clerical subsidies in Edward's reign amounted to around £472,000, of which about £402,000 eventually ended up in royal coffers.[16] This represented around two thirds of the crown's tax revenue from the Church, and a quarter of its total income from direct taxation.[17]

Prelates played an instrumental role in the granting of these subsidies. Archbishops summoned the provincial councils and convocations in which they were granted, and then oversaw proceedings: celebrating mass at the opening of the assembly, examining the certificates and proxies of those present, and pronouncing contumacious those who had been summoned but had not attended.[18] The

---

[13] Ecclesiastics also contributed to indirect taxes, such as the customs and the wool subsidy, but – as Jeffrey Denton has observed – 'the clergy's contributions to… [such dues] are impossible to calculate', and therefore have to be 'excluded from consideration' when attempting a quantitative analysis of the taxes paid by the English clergy: Denton, *Robert Winchelsey*, p. 297.

[14] Weske, *Convocation*, pp. 257-9; Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, pp. 136, 205. The special subsidy of 1371 was collected by different mechanisms in the different provinces. In the southern province, it was essentially raised by the beneficed clergy paying a tenth and a half, and by the balance being paid by a new valuation on the possessions of the unbeneficed and the exempt. In the northern province, the beneficed were required to pay one-and-a-quarter tenths, and the unbeneficed a tenth of their stipends: *Convocation*, iii, pp. 313-6; *Convocation*, xiii, p. 171; Ormrod, 'Experiment in Taxation', p. 65. The clerical poll tax of 1377 was charged at two rates: every beneficed person was to pay 1s, and every other cleric over the age of fourteen (who was not a mendicant) was to pay 4d: *Convocation*, iii, pp. 346-9.

[15] McKisack, *Fourteenth Century*, p. 287; McHardy, 'Clerical Taxation', pp. 169-70; Ormrod, 'Experiment in Taxation', p. 64. However, the assessments varied slightly year-on-year, depending on specific exemptions due to poverty *etc.*: Weske, *Convocation*, pp. 156-65; Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, p. 205.

[16] Appendix 42. It should be noted that many of the figures in this chapter are based on the estimates of other scholars (and especially those of Mark Ormrod). These estimates are the product of a vast amount of research and study and are accordingly 'accepted' figures; for instance, they are used throughout Rory Cox's 'Hundred Years War', which was published in 2019, and throughout Robin McCallum's 'Ecclesiastical Creditors', which was published in *The English Historical Review* last year. However, they are nevertheless estimates, and the figures in this chapter therefore have some margin for error. It is thus possible that some of the conclusions offered here may have to be revised following further, more detailed research. Nonetheless, at the very least, this chapter shows that the current orthodoxy regarding clerical taxation in the fourteenth century cannot be sustained on the basis of the currently accepted figures. The precise sources for the figures used here are set out in the relevant appendices.

[17] Appendix 52.

[18] See, for instance, *Convocation*, iii, pp. 264-71, 300-1, xiii, pp. 122-9. Our understanding of how convocations worked is necessarily reliant on the Canterbury provincial council of 1356, and the Canterbury convocations of 1370, 1371, 1373, and 1377, because they are the convocations of Edward III's reign for which most procedural evidence survives: Weske, *Convocation*, pp. 129-39. Unfortunately, details are remarkably scarce concerning the convocations of the northern province; the only such assembly in our period for which 'Acts of the Convocation' survive is that of 1351, and even these are dominated by the details of a complaint from Thomas Hatfield: *Convocation*, xiii, pp. 124-7.

episcopacy also customarily received the king's request for a subsidy; in the Canterbury provincial council of May 1356, Edward sent Walter Mauny to set out his case for a subsidy to the archbishop, bishops, and proctors of the absent bishops assembled in the chapel of the Blessed Virgin Mary in St Paul's.[19] Bishops then conveyed the king's case for taxation to the convocation. Thus, in April 1371, Simon Sudbury highlighted how the king needed a subsidy so that he could see to 'the defence of the kingdom and the repulsion of enemies'.[20] Thereafter, they discussed the prospective taxes among themselves and helped to negotiate with the lower clergy.[21] For instance, in the Canterbury convocation of January 1370, the lower clergy were unwilling to accede to the king's request for a grant of three tenths, only being prepared to grant two. Archbishop Whittlesey therefore stressed that two tenths would 'by no means be sufficient [*minime sufficiebat*]' for the king's burdens. He informed the lower clergy that the prelates had already agreed to make a grant of three tenths to the king themselves, and urged his bishops to take the proctors of their dioceses aside to discuss the subsidy with them. Ultimately, this prompted the lower clergy to reconsider and to grant Edward a tenth for three years in the hope that he would address their grievances.[22] Likewise, when the clergy refused to make any grant during the Canterbury convocation of December 1373, Simon Sudbury asked them to deliberate further and to formulate their grievances. This led to them relenting and granting a single tenth on the following day.[23]

The work of bishops with regard to clerical subsidies did not end when convocation drew to a close. They were also responsible for orchestrating the collection of taxes in their bishoprics. Although some bishops elected to make themselves directly accountable to the exchequer, most appointed deputy collectors.[24] In May 1337, for example, Ralph Shrewsbury appointed the prior of Bath 'to levy and collect the moneys of the tenths' in his diocese of Bath and Wells.[25] Nevertheless, even overseeing the work of deputy collectors could represent a considerable administrative burden for prelates. For instance, in February 1328, John Stratford decided to replace the prior of Merton as deputy collector with the archdeacon of Surrey; to order the prior to 'make an account or reckoning… of the whole

[19] *Convocation*, iii, p. 267.
[20] *Convocation*, iii, p. 309. On other occasions, bishops permitted royal commissioners to address the assembled clergy directly, as in the Canterbury convocation of 1373, when they allowed William Montacute, earl of Salisbury, William Latimer, Guy Brian, and John Knyvet to request a subsidy on account of Edward's 'necessary and imminent' expenses in relation to the war with France. However, even when this occurred, bishops still helped to make the king's case; in 1373 itself, Sudbury followed the commissioners' demand with a further explanation 'in the vulgar tongue' of the king's needs: *Ibid.*, iii, p. 328.
[21] In the Canterbury convocation of 1356, for instance, it is recorded that the archbishop and bishops withdrew into the chapter house of St Paul's to a hold a discussion, while the abbots, priors, deans, and others remained together with the proctors of the clergy: *Ibid.*, iii, pp. 267-8.
[22] *Ibid.*, iii, pp. 302-3. Whittlesey also allowed royal commissioners to address the clergy.
[23] *Ibid.*, iii, pp. 329-330. Sudbury addressed the clergy on 2 December, and they made their grant on 3 December.
[24] For instance, John Eaglescliffe made himself directly accountable to the exchequer in 1334, although it is unlikely that he performed much of the actual labour of collection himself: Lunt, 'Clerical Subsidies', pp. 234-6.
[25] *Shrewsbury*, ii, pp. 331-2.

time in which he was collector and receiver of the subsidy'; and to empower the archdeacon 'to levy arrears, if any, and to do what might be necessary in the premises'.[26] Indeed, bishops also had to engage in a flurry of other administrative tasks thrown up by subsidies, as in May 1329, when Adam Orleton was required to investigate claims by the prior of Ware that he was being taxed on temporalities in the archdeaconry of Worcester that he did not actually possess.[27] Moreover, bishops also paid their own share of taxes, and threatened recalcitrant clergy with sanctions in order to ensure payment.[28] Thus, in August 1335, Thomas Charlton succeeded in persuading the abbot of Wigmore to pay the tenth granted the previous year, but only after threatening him with both excommunication and distraint.[29] The episcopate was therefore involved at every stage of a clerical subsidy's life: procuring them, administering them, paying them, and collecting them.

After clerical tenths, the clergy's next most important assistance to royal finances was their contribution to lay taxation. Ecclesiastics were taxed for lay subsidies on their movable goods found on their lands that had not been assessed for clerical taxes. These were chiefly either their personal possessions or property that they had acquired in their corporate capacity after 1291.[30] As the royal instructions to the collectors of the parliamentary subsidy of 1297 put it, 'this taxation shall be made upon the goods of the clergy as well as the laity, [regarding] their goods which are not annexed to their churches'.[31] Unfortunately, there is no way of precisely determining the proportion of lay taxes which were thus paid, although there is a historiographical consensus that this amounted to around 15% of the total sum.[32] With assessments for lay taxes in Edward III's reign totalling around £1,234,000, of which about £1,121,000 was actually collected, the clergy's share of the assessments can be estimated at approximately £179,000, of which around £157,000 might have been paid into royal coffers.[33] This represented around a quarter of the taxes paid to the crown by the clergy in Edward's reign, and about a tenth of the king's overall income from direct taxation.[34]

Bishops were influential in the management of these lay subsidies, for which they often asked parliament. Thus, in the parliament of October 1339, Archbishop Stratford set out to the assembly

---

[26] *Records of Merton Priory,* ed. Heales, p. 228.
[27] Lunt, 'Clerical Subsidies', p. 243. Orleton verified the prior's claims, and the latter was duly accorded a rebate on the tax that he had paid.
[28] The amount paid by the episcopate was likely to have been considerable; the income of the bishops of the southern province alone was valued at around £15,000 in the *Taxatio* of 1291: Appendix 54.
[29] *Thomas Charlton,* p. 56; Lunt, 'Clerical Subsidies', p. 253.
[30] Willard, 'English Church', p. 219; *idem, Parliamentary Taxes,* p. 102; Johnson, 'Lay Taxes', p. 208.
[31] *Rot. Parl.,* i, p. 240. The lands included in the *Taxatio* of 1291 became known as those 'annexed to their churches'; those lands not included became known as those 'not annexed to their churches'. This formula was used repeatedly in the reign of Edward I, and (with variants) throughout the reign of Edward II. It was dropped in the reign of Edward III, and does not reappear until the reign of Richard II (and then in a slightly different form), but there does not appear to have been any substantial change in practice: Willard, 'English Church', pp. 219-21.
[32] Denton, *Robert Winchelsey,* pp. 297-8; Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 160.
[33] Appendix 45.
[34] Appendix 52.

how Edward needed 'to have aid of a very great sum of money in order to save his honour and to bring his business, which was so weighty and so important, to a satisfactory conclusion'.[35] Moreover, they gave their assent to taxes as peers in parliament. This was often explicitly recorded on the parliament roll; in 1372, for instance, it was noted that the 'prelates, prince [the Black Prince], dukes, earls, barons and commons… granted to the king a fifteenth for one year'.[36] Furthermore, bishops contributed to these subsidies themselves.[37] However, with a handful of exceptions,[38] prelates were less involved in the assessment, administration, and collection of these taxes – aside from on a national level, since the treasurer, who was often a bishop, oversaw the whole process. Instead, parliamentary subsidies were usually coordinated in the localities by the two principal taxers and collectors in each county, who worked with a network of sub-taxers not only to collect payments, but also, prior to 1334, to assess individuals for each successive tax. These men were customarily laymen, and often knights, who were typically resident within their counties.[39]

The final clerical contribution to royal finances was their payment of papal subsidies, of which a portion usually went to the crown. The three papal taxes of Edward III's reign yielded approximately £96,700, of which about £50,000 went to the English government, and £46,700 to the papacy.[40] This represented less than a tenth of the taxes paid by the clergy to the English crown in Edward's reign, and only about 3% of Edward's income from direct taxation.[41] The slightness of this sum, however, mainly reflects the infrequent levying of papal subsidies in this period, with no papal taxes being granted between 1336 and 1362. This was the longest respite from such taxes enjoyed by the English clergy since at least 1199.[42] In turn, the reprieve was an outcome of the Avignon papacy's expedient friendship with successive Valois kings, which left pontiffs unwilling to finance the opponents of the French monarchy.[43] This was implicit in a letter from Clement VI to Edward III of April 1348, in

---

[35] *PROME*, October 1339, 4. For the responses of the lords and commons, and the former's grant of a tenth of the corn, fleeces, and new-born lambs produced on their estates, see *Ibid.*, 1339, Introduction.
[36] *Ibid.*, 1372, 11.
[37] Since the clerical property assessed for lay taxation was principally in the hands of prelates and religious houses, it is likely that the episcopacy contributed a substantial portion of the 'clerical share' of these taxes: Denton, *Robert Winchelsey*, p. 57; Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 160.
[38] For instance, the archbishop of York and his officials were allowed to assess and levy lay taxes within the liberty of Hexham: *CCR, 1339-41*, p.148.
[39] The history of lay taxation in this period is complex, not least because there was a fundamental change in 1334, when (in summary) the practice of reassessing individuals for each successive tax was abandoned and replaced by levying a fixed charge on each community. It should also be noted that, in some counties – such as Yorkshire – there were more than two taxers and collectors. Although taxers were most frequently laymen, in 1334 (when special effort was made to secure an honest assessment) a leading ecclesiastic in each county (such as an abbot, dean, or prior) was appointed with a king's clerk to oversee assessments. They were not, however, responsible for collecting the consequent sums. For further discussion of lay taxation in this period, see Johnson, 'Lay Taxes', pp. 203-7; Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, pp. 164-5; and Jurkowski, Smith, and Crook, *Lay Taxes*, pp. xxix-xxxiii.
[40] Appendix 48.
[41] Appendix 52.
[42] Lunt, *Financial Relations*, ii, p. 95.
[43] See Mollat, *Popes at Avignon*, pp. 249-68; Heath, *Church and Realm*, p. 117; and Zutshi, 'Avignon Papacy', pp. 658-9.

which the former conceded that he had granted Philip VI the products of a papal tenth for two years, but refused to grant Edward's own 'petition touching the same'.[44] In the end, papal taxes were only levied on three occasions:[45] in 1330, before the war with France had broken out;[46] in 1362, during a period of peace after the signing of the Treaty of Calais in 1360;[47] and in 1375, following the Truce of Bruges.[48]

The bishops played a prominent part in managing these papal subsidies. In the first instance, it was they who received the pope's demands for taxation, as in January 1330, when the English and Welsh bishops received notice of John XXII's request for a quadrennial tenth.[49] At this point, bishops might meet to discuss the pope's requests. In April 1361, for example, the archbishops of Canterbury and York summoned the convocations of both their provinces to meet in Westminster, where they deliberated over Innocent VI's plea for financial help, and resolved to offer him a voluntary subsidy of 100,000 florins, which was duly accepted, rather than risking the imposition of a mandatory tenth, which was worth about 125,000 florins.[50] Thereafter, they made arrangements for the subsidy to be collected, as in July-August 1330, when suffragan bishops published papal letters 'to warn all to pay a moiety of the tenth' by the required date;[51] appointed sub-collectors, as in October 1375, when William Wykeham directed the rectors of Cheriton, North Stoneham, and Crawley to levy the subsidy

---

[44] *CPL, 1342-62*, p. 37.

[45] A papal tax was ordered on a fourth occasion, but came to nothing (as far as the papacy was concerned). In 1333, John XXII ordered the clergy 'to pay a tenth of all their rents and profits for six years in support of… the crusade under the command of Philip, king of France': *CPL, 1305-42*, p. 369. However, in 1336, when it became apparent that the crusade would no longer be launched, the convocations of Canterbury and York granted two tenths to the king, on the condition that the sexennial tenth should be revoked. This meant that the crown received the part of the subsidy already collected, with only enough extra to be levied to complete the payment of a biennial tenth: *Convocation*, iii, pp. 143-5, xiii, pp. 70-2; Lunt, *Financial Relations*, ii, pp. 93-4.

[46] The papal subsidy ordered by John XXII in 1330 was for the clergy 'to pay a tenth of all their benefices for four years; one half being for the necessities of the Roman church, and the other half for the king': *CPL, 1305-42*, p. 494. These provisions were broadly followed and fulfilled: Lunt, *Financial Relations*, ii, pp. 87-8.

[47] The papal subsidy granted in 1362 was not a straightforward papal tax. It had its origins in the letters of September 1360 from Innocent VI to Edward III and the English bishops, requesting 'help in repressing the presumption of Barnabas Visconti', who had invaded 'the patrimony of the Roman church': *CPL, 1342-62*, p. 631. A grant was eventually made by the clergy in April 1362, when they ceded the pope a voluntary subsidy of 100,000 florins in lieu of a potentially greater income tax: *Edington*, ii, p. 53; Lunt, *Financial Relations*, ii, pp. 96-7. However, the pope, 'considering the risk of sending so large a sum to the court of Rome and that John, king of France, is bound to the king [for an amount] exceeding the said florins', decided to assign the subsidy to Edward III 'in part payment of the said king's [John II's] debt'. The entire sum was thus received by the royal treasury in October 1365: *CPR*, 1364-7, p. 164.

[48] The subsidy eventually granted in 1375 originated in letters of Gregory XI of 1372, in which he demanded a subsidy from the clergy 'for the defence of the church in Italy against the sons of iniquity, Barnabas and Galeatius de Vicecomitibus [Visconti]': *CPL, 1362-1404*, pp. 115-6. As part of the negotiations at Bruges, it was agreed in July 1375 that the English clergy should pay a subsidy (entirely for the pope's own uses) of 60,000 florins, and that, 'if peace be made between Kings Edward and Charles, they shall pay 40,000 florins more': *CPL, 1362-1404*, p. 101. The full sum was duly paid, mostly before March 1378: Lunt, *Financial Relations*, ii, pp. 112-14.

[49] *CPL, 1305-42*, p. 494.

[50] *Convocation*, iii, pp. 287-9, xiii, 151; *Edington*, ii, p. 53. In the event, the subsidy produced in excess of 100,000 florins, since the episcopacy overestimated the rate of taxation required to produce the sum: Lunt, *Financial Relations*, ii, pp. 101-2.

[51] *Shrewsbury*, i, p. 56.

in the archdeaconry of Winchester, and the archdeacon of Surrey to levy it in his own archdeaconry;[52] and paid their share of subsidies, as in November 1333, when William Melton paid 50 marks towards an instalment of the quadrennial tenth imposed three years earlier.[53] Furthermore, they chased for the payment of arrears, and imposed sanctions on those who did not pay.[54] John Grandisson excommunicated John de Maunte, dean of St Buryan, for failing to pay the instalment of the papal tenth due in June 1333, and ordered that his sentence be proclaimed every Sunday and festival, with bells and candles, in every conventual, collegiate, and capitular church in the archdeaconry of Cornwall.[55]

Bishops were uniquely suited to performing their responsibilities in connection with clerical taxation. Clerical and papal subsidies were organised and collected through the Church's administrative structures, and depended on the involvement and leadership of prelates, who occupied a place at the head of those structures. This was perhaps most obvious in convocations, the successful functioning of which depended on the archbishops of each province. When an archbishop was absent or unwell, they could depute another bishop or bishops to act in their place. Thus Archbishop Stratford appointed his brother, Robert, to convene and preside over the Canterbury convocation that took place in October 1338, while he was engaged in diplomatic negotiations on the continent.[56] Similarly, Archbishop Whittlesey commissioned Simon Sudbury, John Barnet, and Adam Houghton to act in his stead during the Canterbury convocation of April 1371, when he was detained from coming to London by illness.[57] However, when an archbishop failed to make adequate preparations, the assembly could descend into disarray. This was evident when Whittlesey fell ill in the middle of the Canterbury convocation of January 1370, and was unable to empower a bishop to act in his place. His chancellor, Nicholas de Warmyngton, was merely able to prorogue the convocation from day-to-day for two days, until the archbishop was able to return and the business of the assembly, including the discussions over whether to grant the king an additional tenth, was able to resume.[58]

Bishops were clearly key figures in the granting, collection, and management of clerical taxes. They persuaded convocation and parliament to grant subsidies, appointed collectors, and shouldered the burden of the resultant administration, which entailed everything from investigating errors to demanding the satisfaction of arrears. This constituted a vital service to the crown, for clerical

---

[52] *Wykeham*, ii, p. 242.
[53] Borthwick Institute, Register 9A, fo. 62.
[54] In June 1363, Archbishop Islip wrote to Simon Sudbury and ordered him to command those of his clergy who had not yet paid their share of the subsidy granted the previous year to do so. Sudbury was to excommunicate those who still refused to pay, forbid their communion with the faithful, and place an interdict on their benefices, with a threat of his own suspension if he did not comply: *Sudbury (London),* pp. 186-7, 195-7.
[55] *Grandisson,* ii, p. 706; Lunt, *Financial Relations,* ii, p. 79. Grandisson did not absolve de Maunte of his sentence, or relax the sequestration of the fruits of his church, until 16 August 1336.
[56] *Convocation,* iii, pp. 153-5; Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 72, 495.
[57] *Convocation,* iii, pp. 306-12.
[58] *Ibid.*, iii, pp. 301-3; Weske, *Convocation,* pp. 134-5.

taxation was hugely important to royal finance. Together, the clerical subsidies granted by the convocations of Canterbury and York, the clergy's contribution to lay subsidies, and the papal subsidies yielded around £610,000 for the crown throughout Edward III's reign. This represented almost 40% of royal income from direct taxation.[59] Furthermore, individual subsidies could support the king's finances at key moments. The papal subsidy imposed in January 1330, which yielded £35,000 for the king, was levied at a time when, according to the papal bull authorising the subsidy, 'wars and various turbulences' had emptied the royal treasury and caused great debts to be incurred, which meant that Edward required the aid of the mother church.[60] Likewise, grants and prospective grants could have a catalytic effect on royal finances by incentivising the laity to consent to taxation. This was clear in the parliament of February 1371, when the lords and commons only granted the parish subsidy of £50,000 on the expectation that the clergy should grant an equal sum to the crown, which they duly confirmed.[61]

While the episcopal role in procuring, and paying, clerical taxation was important to the crown, it equally fulfilled prelates' own conception of their responsibilities. Of course, arguments were sometimes raised against this. Nevertheless, the episcopacy had long recognised the duty of the Church to assist the king financially when he was in need, in spite of others' objections. This was evident in the convocation of the southern province held in 1316. According to the *Vita Edwardi Secundi*, the lower clergy refused a subsidy for Edward II's Scottish war:

> because no part of ecclesiastical goods ought to be granted to laymen without special papal authority, and also because, by reason of the high price of grain and the poor year, when the king's share and other necessaries had been put aside, rectors would not have anything to give to the poor.

However, the prelates replied to this that:

> papal authority need not be sought in this case; because, since the king was being attacked within the borders of his own kingdom, he should be supported by the community as one who was undertaking a matter of common concern… likewise so necessary a contribution ought not to be hindered by the unfruitfulness of the year.

---

[59] Appendix 51.

[60] *Lit. Cant.*, i, pp. 323-4. The royal finances do appear to have been in a parlous state in January 1330. In 1327-8, Isabella and Mortimer had committed over £17,000 of war wages and incurred debts of more than £10,000, having spent over £50,000 of Edward II's personal treasure: Willard, 'Crown and its Creditors', p. 13; *idem, Parliamentary Taxes,* pp. 21-2; Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 68. The crown's financial position does not seem to have improved in the following years, with the government relying on loans from the Bardi, who advanced at least at least £30,000 between August 1328 and November 1330 to support the king's household, the costs of diplomacy, and the repayment of royal debts: Ormrod, *Edward III,* p. 74. See also Fryde, 'Loans', pp. 201-8.

[61] *PROME,* 1371, 6, 10, 11; Ormrod, 'Experiment in Taxation', pp. 62, 64-5. It is perhaps worth emphasising that, while the laity made their grant on the *expectation* that the clergy would make an equal grant to the king, it was not a *condition* of the laity's grant that the clergy would do so. The circumstances of February 1371 were thus very different to those of November 1384, for which see pp. 196-7 below.

The prelacy's arguments eventually won the day, and 'at length the proctors of the clergy… granted an ecclesiastical tenth to the lord king'.[62] This broad position was repeatedly adopted by the prelates before and during Edward III's reign.[63] Thus, for example, Simon Sudbury urged the convocation of Canterbury to grant the king a subsidy in April 1371 for 'the defence of the kingdom and the repulsing of our enemies', and on account of 'the necessity of our said lord the king'.[64] Perhaps unsurprisingly, the episcopacy's view was consistent with that of the crown. Edward III wrote to Archbishop Reynolds in September 1327, and instructed him that, 'in so urgent a matter touching Church and crown [as the Scottish invasion of England]', the 'prelates of the realm… were obliged to help, not only with counsel but also by providing subsidies'.[65] Political 'theorists', such as William Ockham, also agreed; in his *An Princeps,* he argued that:

> the prelates and clerics subject to him [Edward III] are bound to offer him help in his just war [with France] not only from their private property but also from the goods of the Church, and that the pope himself can in no way prohibit them [from so doing].[66]

Moreover, the episcopacy's contribution to clerical taxation also served their political, ecclesiastical, and personal interests. The taxes they secured, collected, and paid naturally benefited the realm, which they had a duty to protect. This was continually emphasised by the crown; the writ to John Kirkby for collecting the triennial tenth granted by the convocation of York in 1336 referred to it being for 'our war with Scotland and the defence of our realm [*guerram nostrum Scotiae ac defensionem regni nostri*]', while the writ to Wulfstan Bransford concerning the biennial tenth granted by the southern province in 1346 stated that it was for his campaign against the French and the 'defence and safety of our realm [*defensionem et salvationem regni nostri*]'.[67] Yet this was also accepted by the episcopate. Archbishop Sudbury thus informed the king in 1377 that his province had conceded a subsidy for 'the safety… [and] necessary defence [*propter salvationem… necessariam defensionem*]' of 'your realm of England'.[68] While these words were of course formulaic, they were by no means baseless, as clerical taxation contributed meaningfully to the defence of the kingdom. Notably, a portion of the three tenths granted by the northern province in 1344 was spent on paying the English soldiers who fought – and won – at Neville's Cross in 1346. A clerical subsidy therefore helped to bring about a period of relative peace and stability in the northern marches.[69]

---

[62] *Vita Edwardi,* pp. 132-3.
[63] See Clarke, *Representation and Consent,* pp. 333-5; Harriss, 'Aids, Loans and Benevolences', pp. 5-11; and *idem, King, Parliament and Public Finance,* pp. 79, 318-20.
[64] *Convocation,* iii, p. 309.
[65] *Stratford,* i, pp. 96-7.
[66] *Political Thought,* p. 154. See also Nederman, 'Royal Taxation', p. 327 and Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 136.
[67] *Convocation,* iii, p. 243, xiii, p. 70.
[68] *Ibid.,* iii, p. 347.
[69] Prestwich, 'English at the Battle', pp. 3-7.

However, clerical taxation also benefited the English Church. Again, this was consistently highlighted by the crown; the royal writ to Archbishop Islip regarding the collection of two tenths offered by his province in 1351 noted that they had been granted for 'the necessary defence of the Church', in view of the 'imminent dangers [*periculis imminentibus*]' that it faced.[70] This was also affirmed by the episcopacy. Archbishop Melton's certificate concerning the tenth granted by his province in 1327 averred that it had been conceded for 'the defence of Holy Church itself [*defensionem sanctae ipsius ecclesiae*]', against 'the hostile incursions of the Scots [*contra hostiles incursus Scotorum*]'.[71] Likewise, William Whittlesey's mandate to the bishop of London (Simon Sudbury) to levy the special subsidy granted by the convocation of Canterbury in 1371 referred to it being for 'the protection and defence of the entire English Church [*tuitionem ac defensionem totiusque Ecclesiae Anglicanae*]'.[72] Clerical subsidies bolstered the defence of the English Church in a number of ways. For instance, they contributed to the maintenance of garrisons that protected the English coastline, and the nearby churches and ecclesiastical estates; to the raising of armies that defended the Anglo-Scottish border, and the abbeys, priories, hospitals, and churches in the vicinity; and to the construction of defensive fortifications, such as Queenborough Castle on the Isle of Sheppey, which not only guarded the broad approach to the Thames, but also the bishop of Rochester's own lands on the Isle.[73]

By making their grants of clerical taxation conditional on the redress of their grievances, the clergy were able to secure further benefits for the Church. This is perhaps clearest in 1351-2. On 2 May 1351, the convocation of Canterbury promised the king a tenth payable at Midsummer (24 June) and on the Feast of St Andrew (30 November), and a further tenth payable the following year, provided that he heard their grievances and duly corrected them.[74] Seventeen days later, the convocation of York also granted Edward two tenths, with the second tenth dependent on him redressing a list of their grievances.[75] The clergy's complaints were formally presented to the king in the parliament of January 1352 by Archbishop Islip 'on behalf of [all] the clergy of the land'. They were made up of twelve points, and ranged widely, from the general – such as a plea for Edward 'to grant and confirm to them all the liberties, privileges, and rights granted and given to the Holy Church by him and his noble progenitors before this time' – to the particular, including a petition that:

> the case of the said bishop [of Exeter] may be duly examined in this parliament; and if the judgement given on the same shall be found to be unjust and unreasonable, it shall be repealed.[76]

---

[70] *Convocation,* iii, p. 257.
[71] *Ibid.,* xiii, p. 39.
[72] *Ibid.,* iii, p. 313.
[73] See, for instance, *RPD,* p. 241; *CCR, 1337-9,* p. 609; *CCR, 1339-41,* p. 582; Martin, 'Richard de Bury', pp. 137-8; Prestwich, 'English at the Battle', p. 6; Emery, *Greater Medieval Houses,* iii, p. 283; and Ormrod, *Edward III,* pp. 451-2.
[74] *Convocation,* iii, pp. 255-6.
[75] *Ibid.,* xiii, pp. 127-8.
[76] *PROME,* 1352, 57-69.

Edward accepted many of these demands, at least in part, ordering that 'the franchises and privileges granted to the clergy before this time should be confirmed and upheld', and agreeing that the bishop of Exeter's complaints 'shall be heard and examined, and that justice shall be done to him'.[77] This was indeed the case; six months later, as a result of the 'supplication [that] has been made to the king on behalf of the bishop', Edward dropped his *quare non admisit* case against Grandisson, and acquitted him of the fine that he had been ordered to pay by the justices of the King's Bench in 1350.[78] Perhaps the most important of Islip's demands was that Edward confirmed the benefit of clergy for clerks accused of felonies, prompted by the case of a priest in Lincoln who was 'detained in prison for one year and more after he was claimed by his ordinaries'. This was also conceded by Edward, who accepted that:

> it is upheld by common law that a clerk questioned concerning felony before secular justices, if he claims his [benefit of] clergy and is interrogated by the ordinaries, he shall not be sent back to the gaol.[79]

These points, and others, were duly enshrined in the statute *Pro Clero*.[80] Accordingly, the clergy accepted that their conditions had been met; a royal letter of October 1352, ordering Islip to appoint collectors for the second year of the tenth, remarked that 'the conditions upon the grant for the second year sought by the clergy in the last parliament have now been completed and accepted by the clergy'.[81] In this manner, by demanding a *quid pro quo* for their taxes, the clergy, led by Archbishop Islip, managed to secure substantial concessions from the crown regarding ecclesiastical rights.[82]

The episcopate's role in raising clerical taxes also served their personal interests. First, and perhaps most importantly, just as ecclesiastical taxation contributed to the defence of the realm and the defence of the Church, it also contributed to the defence of bishops' personal property. The royal measures for the defence of Kent in 1339 – which included the maintenance of coastal fortifications and the bolstering of the garrison of Dover Castle – not only helped to safeguard the English

---

[77] *Ibid.*, 1352, 58, 67.
[78] *CPR, 1350-4,* pp. 312-3; Whatley, 'Gilded not Golden', p. 127. See also Phillips, 'Bishops, Parliament and Trial by Peers', pp. 293-9.
[79] *PROME,* 1352, 61.
[80] *SR,* i, pp. 324-6. For discussion of the statute, see also Jones, 'Bishops, Politics, and the Two Laws', pp. 231-3; McHardy, 'Church Courts', p. 166; Phillips, 'Church, Crown and Complaint', pp. 235-40; and Gosling, 'Church, State, and Reformation', p. 325. The statute does not refer to Grandisson specifically, but does refer to how episcopal temporalities had been 'taken into the King's hands for Contempts done to him upon Writs of Quare non admisit' and promised that 'no such Taking shall from henceforth be made', as well as setting down that any related fines should be 'reasonable': *SR,* i, p. 326.
[81] *CCR, 1349-54,* p. 449; *Convocation,* iii, pp. 260-1.
[82] While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to explore the debate in any depth, it is perhaps worth nothing that some doubt has been cast on how substantial these concessions really were, most notably by Matthew Phillips: Phillips, 'Church, Crown and Complaint', pp. 239-40. However, the historiographical consensus (to which the author subscribes) is that the concessions of 1352 (culminating in the statute *Pro Clero*) were truly significant. See Lepine, 'Church and Clergy', p. 375; Swanson, 'Islep, Simon'; and (most especially) Whatley, 'Gilded not Golden', pp. 78, 127.

coastline, but also the substantial lands of Henry Burghersh and his family in the region.[83] Secondly, bishops' financial support of the crown might have eased their own advancement. McCallum has suggested that William Edington's decision to lend £2,505 to the crown between 1346 and 1356 'may have been a factor in his promotion from treasurer to chancellor' in the latter year.[84] Thirdly, prelates' procurement and payment of taxes funded the royal administration, and consequently facilitated the reimbursement of the expenses which they and their colleagues incurred during the course of their military, diplomatic, financial, and administrative service to the crown. Thus, in 1340, John Kirkby was paid £333 14s 4d from the wool subsidy collected in Cumberland, to which he had himself contributed.[85] In a similar vein, in June 1370, Thomas Hatfield was assigned 2,000 marks from the triennial tenth yielded by his diocese of Durham and the archdiocese of York for the repayment of a loan that he had made of an equivalent amount.[86]

Considering how clerical taxation served the episcopacy's interests, it is perhaps unsurprising that – while ecclesiastics were prepared to refuse to grant subsidies – they rarely did so, and instead accepted their obligation to support the polity financially. In fact, there were only three occasions in Edward III's reign when the clergy refused royal requests for taxation. In 1330, the convocation of Canterbury declined to grant a subsidy to the king on the grounds that they could barely support the burden of the quadrennial tenth that had been imposed by the pope; that the subsidy voted by the laity was sufficient for the king's needs; and that they had already granted him a tenth in 1327, the conditions of which had not been fulfilled. Eight years later, in 1338, the convocation of York resisted royal demands for a tenth because of their impoverishment due to the Scottish war. Finally, in 1376, the southern province claimed immunity from royal taxation on account of the fact that a papal subsidy was already being collected.[87]

Yet while the taxes paid by the clergy could bring considerable benefits to the English realm, the English Church, and the English bishops themselves, it is clear that prelates did not support taxation that was excessive, onerous, and oppressive.[88] There was therefore some sense of a sliding scale between taxation that was reasonable and just and taxation that was intolerable, that imperilled the liberties of the *ecclesia anglicana*, and that risked undermining its other responsibilities. However, the clergy were actually relatively lightly taxed in Edward III's reign. During his kingship, they paid

---

[83] *CCR, 1339-41,* pp. 11, 69, 150, 174, 208; Bennett, 'Beneficed Clergy', p. 21.
[84] McCallum, 'Ecclesiastical Creditors', pp. 1406, 1412. It should be noted, however, that this is mere supposition on McCallum's part, and that – while Edington's lending might have been *a* factor in his promotion – it was unlikely to have been one of *the* major ones; the bishop's appointment to the chancellorship doubtless reflected, first and foremost, his competence and diligence as treasurer over the previous twelve years: Ormrod, 'Edward III's Government', pp. 318-20; *idem, Edward III,* pp. 383-4; Davies, 'Edington, William'.
[85] *CCR, 1349-54,* p. 50; *Kirkby,* i, p. 100; Rose, 'Bishops and Diocese', p. 87.
[86] *Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 454.
[87] 'Ann. Paul.', p. 348; *Convocation,* iii, pp. 79-81; Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 138; Weske, *Convocation,* pp. 155, 259. As is well known, the laity also refused taxation in 1376.
[88] Haines, 'Conflict in Government', pp. 221-2, 232, 234.

about £656,100 in taxes, or £13,000 a year. On an annual basis, this was around 20% less than they had paid in the reign of his grandfather, when they had paid about £570,500, or £16,300 a year; around 4% less than they had paid in the reign of his father, when they had paid about £270,200, or £13,500 a year; and around 15% less than they had paid across the two reigns, when they had paid a total of about £840,700, or £15,300 a year.[89] This was all the more remarkable because of the enormous rise in the levels of direct taxation paid by the laity; between 1272 and 1327, laymen had paid about £613,700, or £11,200 a year, but in Edward III's reign, they paid about £963,600, or £19,300 a year: an increase of over 70%.[90] All this meant that, while the clergy paid the lion's share of the crown's income from direct taxation in the reigns of both Edward I and Edward II, the laity contributed more than 60% of it in the reign of Edward III.[91] This was something of an achievement for the clergy, who were always keen to avoid – as they put it during the Canterbury provincial council of 1356 – being 'in an inferior position to the commonalty of the laity'.[92]

The fall in the amount of taxation paid by the clergy was principally a reflection of the collapse in the number of papal tenths levied on the English Church. In the reign of Edward III, the clergy actually paid more in both clerical tenths and their share of lay taxation than they had done in the reigns of his two predecessors. In particular, the amount that they paid in clerical tenths essentially doubled, from about £213,500 (or £3,900 a year) between 1272 and 1327 to about £402,100 (or £8,000 a year) in Edward III's own reign.[93] But this was not enough to displace the dramatic decline in the value of papal taxation, which fell from about £482,800 (or £8,800 year), of which the crown received about £346,700 (or £6,300 a year) between 1272 and 1327 to £96,700 (or £1,900 a year), of which the crown only received about £50,000 (or £1,000 a year) in Edward III's reign.[94] In the reigns of Edward I and Edward II, papal subsidies had represented about 57% of the clergy's tax burden, about 49% of what the king received in taxes from the Church, and about 26% of the crown's overall income from direct taxation. However, in the reign of Edward III, these figures fell to about 15%, 8%, and 3% respectively.[95] In many ways, this new 'landscape' of clerical taxation that developed in Edward III's reign – marked by the rise of clerical tenths and the fall of their papal equivalents – was beneficial for both the crown and the Church. On the one hand, the king benefited from no longer being as reliant on securing papal permission for subsidies, which was often an expensive process,[96] and sometimes a

[89] Appendix 49.
[90] Appendix 51.
[91] Appendix 51.
[92] *Convocation,* iii, p. 270.
[93] Appendix 49.
[94] Appendices 49 and 50.
[95] Appendices 49 and 52.
[96] For instance, the mission Edward II sent to John XXII in December 1316, which secured a single papal tenth, was a costly affair; it was rumoured in Avignon that the English gifts were worth 30,000 florins in total. Moreover, following the return of the embassy, John XXII's brother, Peter Doze, was granted a pension of £600 a year: *Murimuth,* p. 26; *CPR, 1317-21,* p. 46; Lunt, 'Clerical Tenths', p. 170.

fruitless one.[97] He also exerted greater control over the collection of clerical tenths, [98] and ultimately enjoyed a wider discretion as to how they were spent.[99] On the other hand, the clergy benefited from being in a much better position to negotiate with the crown, as opposed to the pope, in relation to subsidies.[100] They were thus able to secure concessions, such as those that they obtained in 1352, and additionally saw clerical tenths, unlike papal tenths, being spent on causes that directly helped them.[101]

While the decline of papal taxation lay behind the relatively low levels of taxes paid by the English clergy in Edward III's reign, their success in negotiations with the crown was also vital. This was perhaps clearest in 1356.[102] During the provincial council of the southern province, which met at St Paul's in May, royal commissioners asked 'the prelates and clergy of the province' to 'concede to the king a tenth for six years'.[103] At first, the lower clergy were unwilling to make any grant to the crown whatsoever. Instead, they argued that:

> the clergy who have always stood by the king and have aided him as much as possible [should be] excused from a further burden being placed upon the Church.[104]

They supported their case by making reference to how they had already paid large sums to the crown at a time when their benefices afforded scarcely half of their former income, and by pointing out that

---

[97] The refusal of Clement VI to grant Edward III's request for a papal tenth in 1348 has already been noted, but it was by no means unique: *CPL, 1342-62*, p. 37. For example, John XXII rebuffed the embassy sent by Edward II in 1320 to secure a papal tenth: *CCR, 1318-23*, p. 225; Lunt, *Financial Relations*, i, pp. 409-10.

[98] In particular, the king could demand that taxes granted by the English clergy be paid by a certain date, a power which the pope reserved to himself with papal taxes. This allowed the crown to collect clerical subsidies much more quickly. Thus, the moiety granted by the convocations of both Canterbury and York in September 1294 was collected in three phases (by 1 November 1294, 17 April 1295, and 8 June 1295), with the result that the clergy were ordered to pay £100,000 within nine months of the September council, of which about £70,000 was in fact collected. By contrast, the most contemporaneous papal subsidy – the sexennial tenth imposed in 1291 – did not start being collected until spring 1291, with the final instalment (of the three tenths eventually levied) due on 3 May 1294. It therefore took around thirty-eight months to collect about £57,000, of which the king received about £33,000. As such, the moiety was collected at around eight times the rate of the papal subsidy: Lunt, *Financial Relations*, i, pp. 355-6; Denton, *Robert Winchelsey*, p. 76; Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', pp. 161, 163.

[99] Popes often imposed far more stringent conditions on how subsidies were spent than the convocations of Canterbury and York. For instance, Gregory XI promised Edward I the yield of the sexennial tenth he imposed in 1274 on the condition that he took up the cross. This meant that the king was repeatedly deprived access to its profits for his war with Wales: Lunt, *Financial Relations*, i, pp. 334-46.

[100] The clergy had essentially no position from which to negotiate with respect to papal subsidies; when the pope commanded the clergy to pay a tenth, their consent was not required and they had no option but to obey or suffer ecclesiastical penalties: Lunt, 'Clerical Tenths', p. 179.

[101] While (as has been discussed) much of the taxation granted to the crown was spent on the defence of the realm, the disinterest – and, indeed, hostility – which the clergy could feel towards the projects on which papal subsidies were expended was manifest in the Good Parliament of 1376, when they complained that 'as soon as the pope will have money to maintain his wars in Lombardy or elsewhere, to spend or for the ransom of some of his friends who are French prisoners taken by the English, he will have a subsidy from the clergy of England': *PROME*, 1376, 107.

[102] For discussion of the following episode, see also Weske, *Convocation*, pp. 158-62; Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, pp. 140-1; and *idem*, *Edward III*, p. 376.

[103] *Convocation*, iii, p. 267.

[104] *Ibid.*, iii, pp. 269-70.

the king had conceded in the parliament of November 1355 that no fifteenth or tenth should be taken from the laity for the duration of the wool subsidy (1356-62).[105] Furthermore, the lower clergy expressed their grievances in highly colourful terms, claiming that:

> the keys of the Church are despised, and furthermore the Catholic faith is endangered and the greatest danger to souls is incurred [*claves ecclesiae contemnuntur, quinimmo fides periclitatur catholica, et maximum incurritur periculum animarum*].[106]

Nevertheless, they eventually relented and conceded a single tenth, the second half of which was conditional on 'the grievances of the prelates and clergy… be[ing] corrected effectually.[107] While records do not survive as to how the convocation of York reached its decision, it similarly granted the king a single tenth, of which the second half was again dependent on their complaints being addressed.[108] Although both provinces ceded the second half of the tenth and dropped many of their conditions in the following year, when Edward ordered special convocations to discuss the defence of the Church and the realm, the clergy had nonetheless succeeded in resisting the fullness of the king's demands and paying only one tenth when he had wanted six.[109] What is more, they also imposed conditions as to how the subsidy would be collected. In particular, they insisted that impoverished clergy would not be liable for the burdens of the tenth, and stipulated that an episcopal certificate should be sufficient evidence for an ecclesiastic's poverty, thus precluding any attempt from the government to exact the subsidy from those who could least afford its burdens.[110] This steadfast negotiation helped to prevent the fall in the amount that the Church paid in papal subsidies from being entirely replaced by an increased level of taxation by the crown.

All this goes some way to explaining the apparent failure of the episcopacy in the latter stages of Edward III's reign to live up to the example set by Archbishops Winchelsey and Stratford in their determination to resist, withstand, and oppose the crown and its demands. It is important to remember that neither archbishop was an inveterate adversary of the government, but that both turned to opposition following periods of extraordinary royal pressure.[111] This was most notably the case in 1297 and 1340-1, when both archbishops criticised royal policies in bold terms;[112] excommunicated

---

[105] *Ibid.*, iii, pp. 269-70.
[106] *Ibid.*, iii, p. 270. See also Thompson, 'Polemic', p. 202.
[107] TNA, SC 1/38/82; *Convocation,* iii, pp. 270-1.
[108] TNA, SC 1/56/4; *Convocation.*, xiii, p. 134.
[109] TNA, SC 1/38/80; *Convocation*, iii, pp. 273-7, xiii, pp. 136, 139-143.
[110] *Convocation*, iii, p. 271, xiii, pp. 134-5. Conditions of this nature were repeatedly attached to grants in the latter half of Edward III's reign. See, for instance, *Ibid.*, iii, pp. 256, 284, 301-3.
[111] Winchelsey maintained cordial relations with Edward I for the first two years after his return to England on 1 January 1295. For example, he agreed to grant the king a tenth in the parliament of 1295 'for the common defence from the gravest dangers'; he supported the king's campaigns in Wales by using his powers of excommunication and absolution against Welsh rebels; and he agreed to repay a debt to the king 'with all possible speed' in light of the crown's great financial need in December 1296: *Winchelsey*, i, pp. 69-70, 149-50; Denton, *Robert Winchelsey*, pp. 80-96.
[112] Denton, *Robert Winchelsey*, pp. 112-13, 119-21, 146-7; 'Birchington', pp. 27-36.

those who laid hands on ecclesiastical property, in defiance of the king's wishes;[113] and helped to pressure the crown into making substantial concessions in parliament.[114] The crises of 1297 and 1340-1 both had immediate triggers, in the form of Edward I's decision to press for a subsidy from the southern province – in spite of the papal bull *Clericis Laicos*, which banned all clerical taxation without papal consent – and Edward III's decision to 'purge' his domestic administration after his return from Flanders. However, it is also clear that they followed several years of simmering clerical resentment about the king's financial demands.[115] In 1297, the lower clergy protested that the conditions of the tenth they had granted in 1295 had not yet been fulfilled, and lamented how:

> For twenty years and more the Church had been burdened by making subsidies in the hope of obtaining a restoration of its freedom.[116]

They clearly also recalled not only the forced scrutiny by royal agents of money held in churches and monasteries in June 1294, which prompted the Dunstable annalist to exclaim that 'so sacrilegious an act had never been heard of before', but also the moiety that had been granted in September of that year, which the continuator of Gervase of Canterbury described as making the clergy sorrowful, because of the extortion of half of their income.[117] In 1341, Archbishop Stratford was even more explicit about the strains of clerical taxation. On 28 January, he wrote to the new chancellor and complained about how the level of taxes, and the manner in which they were collected, infringed 'ecclesiastical privileges and liberties'. Moreover, on 30 January, he wrote to the bishops of his province and bemoaned how the Church was 'burdened with numerous exactions, levies, and infamous tallages'. Indeed, in February or March, he wrote to the king himself and attacked the way in which 'the clergy and the Church are oppressed with various taxes and tallages', which had long constituted 'a heavy burden' on ecclesiastics.[118]

In view of the clashes in 1297 and 1340-1, it is perhaps unsurprising that both Winchelsey and Stratford were driven to opposing the crown at the end of two decades marked by exceptional levels of ecclesiastical taxation. Indeed, the 1290s and 1330s were by far the two highest taxed decades for the Church in the whole period from 1272 to 1377. In the 1290s, the clergy paid around £272,800 in taxes (or £27,300 a year), while in the 1330s, they paid around £226,900 (or £22,700 a year). This was over £86,000 and £40,000 more (or *c.* 47% and 22% more) than ecclesiastics had paid in the

---

[113] *Councils,* ii, ii, pp. 1173-6; 'Birchington', p. 22. See also Denton, *Robert Winchelsey,* pp. 154-60 and Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 285-9.
[114] Winchelsey's role in securing the confirmation of the charters (Magna Carta and the Charter of the Forests) in the parliament of 1297 is clear in the account of Walter of Guisborough, who stated that it arose from 'many consultations and various discussions [between the earls and the king] by the mediation of the venerable father the archbishop of Canterbury, namely mr Robert Winchelsey': *EHD III,* p. 220. For Stratford's role in the parliament of 1341, see above, pp. 172-3.
[115] Denton, 'Winchelsey, Robert'; Haines, *John Stratford,* pp. 278-84.
[116] *Councils,* ii, ii, pp. 1156-7; Denton, *Robert Winchelsey,* pp. 102-3.
[117] 'Annales de Dunstaplia', ed. Luard, p. 399; *Councils,* ii, ii, p. 1132.
[118] *Historia Anglicana,* i, pp. 234-5; *Grandisson,* ii, p. 939; 'Birchington', pp. 33-4.

1310s, the next most highly taxed decade in the period, when they paid around £186,200 (or £18,700 a year). Furthermore, this was over £92,000 and £46,000 more (or *c.* 52% and 26% more) than the clergy paid in the 1340s, the next most highly taxed decade in Edward III's reign, when they paid around £180,000 (or £18,000 a year).[119] Even more startlingly, this was over £142,000 and £96,000 more (or *c.* 110% and 75% more) than ecclesiastics paid in an 'average' decade in Edward III's reign, when the mean value of subsidies paid was about £130,000 (or £13,000 a year).[120] It was in these times of immense financial strain, challenge, and pressure for the Church that champions of clerical rights emerged.

In this light, it may be that no such champion emerged in the latter half of Edward's reign because the conditions in which such leaders were forged never recurred. In the periods 1350-9, 1360-9, and 1370-7, the Church merely paid about £67,100 (or £6,700 a year), £33,600 (or £3,400 a year), and £128,000 (or £16,000 a year). This was about 75%, 88%, and 41% p.a. less than the clergy had paid in the 1290s, and 70%, 85%, and 30% p.a. less than they had paid in the 1330s. Indeed, these three decades were by far the lowest taxed of any three throughout the period from 1272 to 1377. Overall, the clergy paid about £228,700 between 1350 and 1377 (or £8,500 a year), which was about 46% p.a. less than they had paid between 1272 and 1299, when they paid about £445,600 (or £15,900 a year); 48% p.a. less than they had paid between 1300 and 1329, when they paid about £492,300 (or £16,400 a year); and 47% p.a. less than they had paid between 1320 and 1349, when they paid about £487,000 (or £16,200 a year). Remarkably, while the clergy paid about half as much tax between 1350 and 1377 than they had done between 1300 and 1329, the laity paid more: paying about £292,800 (or £9,800 a year) in the first three decades of the fourteenth century, and about £294,000 (or £10,900 a year) between 1350 and 1377.[121] As such, it seems likely that the Church had the capacity to pay more in taxes in the latter years of Edward III's reign, but that the clergy avoided this through skilful haggling, hard bargaining, and steadfast persistence, such as that shown in the provincial council of 1356.[122] That the Church never produced another Winchelsey or Stratford in the second half of Edward's reign may, therefore, not have been because there was insufficient courage, talent, or ability on the episcopal benches, but rather because there were never sufficient burdens on the clergy to produce a crisis in which determined, dogged, and defiant opposition to the crown was required. While of course the political contexts were different, it is nonetheless striking, in view of the

[119] Appendix 53.
[120] Appendices 49 and 53.
[121] Appendix 53. This is most dramatically underscored in the 1350s (a decade that saw numerous English expeditions to both France and Scotland), when the laity paid about £125,500 in taxes (more than they had done in 1300-9, 1310-19, and 1320-9), while the clergy paid only £67,100, less than they had in any decade since the 1280s.
[122] Of course, this was also helped by the fact that England was not at active war with France or Scotland for the majority of the 1360s, which meant that the crown sought only sought a clerical subsidy once in the decade: Appendix 42.

archbishops' very different reputations,[123] that during the archiepiscopate of Simon Islip (1349-66), the Church paid around three times less tax, and secured a fuller confirmation of its liberties, than it had done during the archiepiscopate of Robert Winchelsey (1294-1313), all without the need for any 'heroic' resistance to the king and his government.[124] The absence of a great ecclesiastical champion after Stratford might therefore have been an indication of the strength, as opposed to the weakness, of the *ecclesia anglicana*.

That the relative absence of episcopal resistance to the crown in the latter stages of Edward III's reign stemmed from the relative absence of royal impositions, rather than a newfound cowardice, is further suggested by how bishops were prepared to criticise both the level of royal taxation and other perceived financial threats to the Church in the reigns of Richard II and Henry IV. In the parliament of November 1384, William Courtenay reacted with fury to the laity's promise to grant the king two fifteenths and tenths on the condition that the clergy granted him two tenths.[125] According to Thomas Walsingham, the archbishop:

> vehemently opposed this condition, saying that it should not be undertaken, especially as the Church should be free and in no respect taxed by the laity. Indeed, he said that he would sooner risk his life for this cause, than allow the Holy Church in England to be so enslaved.[126]

Walsingham's tale is broadly corroborated, albeit in more sober terms, by the account in Courtenay's archiepiscopal register. This recorded that the archbishop stressed how the liberties of the Church meant that it neither could, nor should, 'be forced to observe a condition of this kind', and that Courtenay further vowed that he:

> would never treat with the clergy about granting any subsidy to the king, nor would he summon convocation for that cause until the said condition be rejected and deleted [*numquam*

---

[123] On the one hand, Roger Highfield described Simon Islip as someone who behaved more like a permanent government servant and less like an independent churchman, and noted his 'tradition of intense loyalty to the king' and how he was 'willing to do his [Edward III's] bidding'. Indeed, Highfield went so far as to say that 'in the mirror of the policy of Islip… can be seen the foregone conclusion of Warham's dilemma in 1532': Highfield, 'English Hierarchy', pp. 137-8. On the other hand, Jeffrey Denton praised Winchelsey's 'total opposition' to some of the king's financial demands; how he 'gained the upper hand in matters of taxation'; and how he was a formidable 'defender of ecclesiastical rights': Denton, 'Winchelsey, Robert'.

[124] Between 1349 and 1366, the Church paid around £100,700 in direct taxation (or £5,900 a year), while between 1294 and 1313, it paid about £352,500 (or £18,500 a year): Appendices 40-8. The statute *Pro Clero* was also a broader confirmation of clerical liberties than *Confirmatio Cartarum,* in that it confirmed 'all the privileges and franchises granted heretofore to the said clergy', but also made further provisions: *EHD III,* pp. 308, 485-6; *SR,* i, pp. 324-6. It is perhaps worth noting that Jeffrey Denton claimed that the clergy paid £457,000 to the king alone (excluding their contributions to lay subsidies) between 1294 and 1313. However, his figure is not only the result of mistaken arithmetic (because, even on his own figures, the amount the clergy paid to the king excluding their contributions to lay subsidies was only £394,500), but is also calculated on the basis of assessments, not yields: Denton, *Robert Winchelsey,* pp. 297-301. See also Prestwich, *Edward I,* p. 408, n. 25.

[125] For the following episode, see Weske, *Convocation,* pp. 169-72, 209-10; Dahmus, *William Courtenay,* pp. 166-7; and Davies, 'Richard II and the Church', p. 97. Courtenay had also taken issue with royal taxation – albeit in slightly more muted terms – in 1373, when he stated in convocation that 'unless the burdens so frequently and unjustly placed upon him and his church of Hereford were made to end by the king and his council, the king would not have one penny from him or the clergy of his diocese': *Convocation,* iii, p. 331.

[126] *Walsingham,* i, pp. 778-9. Walsingham erroneously dates this episode to 1385.

> *decetero cum clero suo super aliquo subsidio regi concedendo tractaret; nec convocacionem faceret hac de causa, donec dicta conditio rejecta fuerit et deleta*].[127]

While the commons were enraged by Courtenay's protest, the king acquiesced to his demands, and ordered the condition to be removed.[128] In the reign of Henry IV, episcopal concerns at the burden of taxation stirred not just stern words, but also armed resistance.[129] Between 1399 and 1405, the northern province granted four tenths to the crown, and the southern province five-and-a-half, with clergy from both provinces also contributing to four fifteenths and tenths and various other aids and taxes, such as a subsidy of £12,000 that was levied on income.[130] Archbishop Scrope took issue with the weight of these subsidies. According to the continuator of the *Eulogium Historiarum*, before setting out with 'an army of townsmen, villeins, priests, and monks', the archbishop preached in his cathedral church, and argued 'that the clergy and people should be relieved from that habitual burden of unendurable taxes'.[131] Scrope's worries about the taxation of the Church were also reflected in his 'manifesto', as reproduced by Thomas Walsingham, in which he lambasted 'the insupportable burdens which affect all grades of the clergy', and in the 'Ten Articles' that were attributed to him, in which he attacked 'the innumerable collections of money from both the clergy and the people'.[132] It is therefore apparent that, even after Edward III's reign, bishops were prepared to fiercely resist the financial demands placed upon them. Their relative quiescence in that regard in the 1350s, 60s, and 70s was therefore probably a reflection not of pusillanimity, but of how they deemed the manner and level of clerical taxation both tolerable and proportionate.

As such, a rather more upbeat and positive picture should be painted of clerical taxation in the reign of Edward III, at least from the perspective of the Church itself, in contrast with the gloomy and pessimistic one preferred by most historians. The taxes that the clergy paid – which bishops played an essential role in procuring, managing, and collecting – were an enormously important component of royal finance, and constituted almost 40% of Edward's income from direct taxation. Yet ecclesiastics were actually relatively lightly taxed in Edward III's reign; they paid about 15% less tax than they had done over the reigns of his father and his grandfather, in circumstances when the laity paid about 70% more. Moreover, paying taxes fulfilled the episcopacy's own perception of their responsibilities, and helped to fund the defence of the Church, the realm, and bishops' personal estates. Indeed, through negotiating firmly with the crown, the clergy were also able to secure significant concessions, which

---

[127] *Convocation,* iv, p. 81.
[128] *Ibid.,* iv, pp. 81-2; *Walsingham,* i, pp. 778-81.
[129] For discussion of this, see Ormrod, 'Rebellion of Archbishop Scrope'.
[130] Jurkowski, Smith, and Crook, *Lay Taxes,* pp. 72-7; Ormrod, 'Rebellion of Archbishop Scrope', p. 168.
[131] *Eulogii,* pp. 132-3.
[132] *Walsingham,* ii, pp. 442-3; *Historians of the Church of York,* pp. 302-3. There are questions as to which of the versions of Scrope's demands are the most 'authentic', but these are beyond the scope of this thesis. The important point for present purposes is that all the relevant sources complain about the burdens of clerical taxation: McNiven, 'Scrope, Richard'; Ormrod, 'Archbishop in Revolt', pp. 31-8; *idem*, 'Rebellion of Archbishop Scrope', pp. 163-4.

included the royal confirmation of their rights, privileges, and liberties. Ultimately, it was probably the successes which ecclesiastics achieved in their negotiations with the crown – rather than any lack of episcopal confidence or ability – that meant that the oppressive financial exactions of the 1290s and 1330s were never replicated, and accordingly that there was no need for a dramatic stand-off with the king. While it was never something of which they boasted – perhaps in case it undermined their hand in negotiating with the crown – the prelacy's handling of ecclesiastical taxation actually did much to benefit both the government and the *ecclesia anglicana* throughout Edward III's reign.

Conclusion

At some point in the 1330s, Archbishop Stratford delivered a sermon which now survives in the library of Hereford Cathedral.[1] He castigated the Scots in the most forthright of fashions, describing how they perpetrated 'evils, thefts, and homicides', how they raped 'widows and virgins', and how they broke 'the peace of the people and of our lord the king'. Accordingly, the war being waged against them was just, for it was fought 'for law, for faith, and for country'. Stratford regarded Edward III as equal to the challenge of fighting the Scots, remarking that 'we believe today that God gives to us a king who fights our war for us, and that God fights for him'. Indeed, Edward did not merely fight the Scots, but he also did so for the right reasons: 'he goes forth for his people and for the Church of God, not for money or temporal things'. Yet, Stratford observed, kings were not merely important to their kingdoms as warriors, but also as the backbones of their realms more generally, since 'the wise king conserves his people', with the consequence that 'if you wish to ask for the health of the people, [you should] ask for the health of the king'. It was therefore incumbent on the English clergy to pray for the king, because 'nothing on earth can be better than to pray for the people, except to bring forth special prayers for the royal estate'. In turn, these prayers safeguarded the king and helped to bring him prosperity. In Stratford's view, the king relied on, protected, and fought for the Church and his people, and the Church and the people equally relied on, protected, and fought for their king. It was a moral – and, indeed, a Christian – duty for the clergy to aid the king with prayers, but this was not selfless charity on their part, since their own security and wellbeing depended on the strength of the crown. For Stratford, there was thus no intrinsic tension, opposition, or conflict between royal and ecclesiastical power. In fact, rather than being mutually antagonistic, the Church and the crown were mutually reinforcing and interdependent.

Stratford's sermon neatly encapsulates many of the principal arguments of this thesis. Bishops performed a tremendous range of political activities in the reign of Edward III. Among a plethora of other things, they attended diplomatic conferences, parliaments, and great councils; they served as ministers, ambassadors, and wardens of the northern marches; and they oversaw the smooth running of parliamentary assemblies, the collection of subsidies from the clergy of their dioceses, and the saying of prayers for the success of the king's ventures abroad. Furthermore, they were involved in the whole breadth of politics. Thus, they not only fought in battles and skirmishes, but also negotiated treaties, kept truces, and organised masses and processions for peace. Likewise, they not only justified Edward's policies to foreign rulers, and to laity and clergy alike in their own sees, but also helped to

[1] Hereford Cathedral Library, MS P. 5. xii, ff. 79v-81r. For this sermon, see Macray, 'Sermons', pp. 85-7; Haines, 'Some Sermons', p. 429; Depold, 'Martial Christ', pp. 150-7; and *eadem,* 'Christ as King', pp. 24-7. While the sermon is undated, its reference to John of Eltham, who died in September 1336, means that it was presumably delivered before then.

shape the direction of royal policy through serving as chancellors and treasurers, attending parliament, and offering the king counsel in an array of different guises. Some political responsibilities were only shouldered by a handful of bishops; for instance, only thirteen of Edward's eighty-six bishops served him as treasurer, only eleven as chancellor, and only one as keeper of the Isle of Wight. However, others were borne by the whole episcopacy; every bishop was required to pay and collect their share of taxes, to distribute the crown's messages in their bishoprics, and to supervise arrays of the clergy as a makeshift 'home guard' during the last decade of Edward's reign. As such, almost every bishop was involved in politics, and, collectively, bishops were involved in almost every aspect of political life.[2]

The activities performed by the episcopate were of the utmost importance to the crown and to the kingdom. Individual bishops occupied places at the heart of government and diplomacy, where the agreements they negotiated or failed to negotiate, the revenue they collected or failed to collect, and the policies they implemented or failed to implement could all have profound consequences. More broadly, prelates made an invaluable contribution to the dissemination of propaganda, as the special liturgical efforts they organised on the crown's behalf appear to have made a very real impact on the English people; to the functioning of parliament, since they played important roles throughout assemblies; to the defence of the realm, where their provision of men, resources, and supplies facilitated the king's campaigns abroad; and to royal finances, since they secured about £610,000 in taxes for the crown from the clergy, which represented approximately 40% of Edward's income from direct taxation. In some respects, episcopal support was merely useful – rather than critical – for the crown; for instance, Edward was able to employ laymen as chancellors in the 1340s and 1370s, even if they aroused more concerns from the commonalty and proved more of a drain on royal coffers than their episcopal counterparts, with the result that he swiftly returned to appointing prelates. Yet, in other arenas, bishops were simply essential. This was perhaps especially evident in parliament, where sessions just did not have legitimacy in the episcopate's absence, and were accordingly postponed or delayed if an insufficient number of bishops were present. The episcopacy was therefore integral to the fourteenth-century polity. A century later, in 1483-4, John Russell, bishop of Lincoln, explained his vision of the 'politike body of Englonde'. Under the head, 'the souuerayne lord the kynge', there were three 'principalle membres', namely 'thestate of the lordys spiritualle, thestate of the lordes temperalle, and thestate of the cominallete'. Each of these members were fundamental to the body as a whole, and none could say 'to the leste or vilest of them alle, I have no need of the', because 'eche

[2] While it might be suspected that every bishop played some role in politics, there are a handful for whom no record of their involvement after their elevation to the episcopal bench survives, such as Thomas Bradwardine, who died in August 1349, having been archbishop of Canterbury for just thirty-eight days: Leff, 'Bradwardine, Thomas'.

hathe hys necessarie appropred operacion'.[3] Russell's idea of how imperative the bishops were to the body politic would have made at least as much sense to observers in fourteenth-century England.

Bishops were also ideally situated to perform their duties to the realm. Of course, the reasons for this are too many and varied to be elucidated in full here, but some common themes stand out. For instance, prelates' place at the peak of political society endowed them with the necessary prestige to assume the highest offices in government, to lead the most solemn of embassies, and to serve as guardians of the realm when the king was overseas. Likewise, their wealth allowed them to make generous loans to the crown, to draw on their diocesan incomes to supplement the meagre salaries which they received as ministers, and to wait for protracted periods prior to receiving repayment of their diplomatic and military expenses. Moreover, their position at the summit of the Church's administrative structure enabled them to command processions to be held throughout the kingdom, to supervise arrays of the clergy, and to collect clerical taxes. In part, these factors explain why the prevalence of prelates in politics was not unique to Edward III's reign, but common throughout much of medieval English history. Just as William Zouche, archbishop of York, inspired English forces to victory against the Scots at the Battle of Neville's Cross in 1346, so had his predecessor, Thurstan, in the Battle of the Standard in 1138; just as John Stratford, archbishop of Canterbury, served as chancellor in the 1330s, so had his predecessor, Hubert Walter, in the first decade of the thirteenth century; and just as John Gilbert, bishop of Hereford, went on several embassies to the French court in the 1370s, so had his predecessor, Peter d'Aigueblanche in the 1240s.[4] Bishops' support was vital to the crown, and they were perfectly poised to offer it.

However, the episcopacy's relationship with the crown was not one-sided. While bishops' political endeavours furthered the king's objectives, they also fulfilled their own expectations of their roles. On a moral and ideological level, most prelates were convinced of the need to support the crown, and of the compatibility of their worldly duties with their spiritual office. Although some bishops held contrary views, those at the centre of the king's administration appear to have regarded their royal service as meritorious; by providing the king with wise counsel as his minsters, they could ensure that he did not follow the example of Rehoboam, and by endeavouring to procure peace on diplomatic missions, they strove to avoid the dangers to both body and soul posed by war. The remainder of the episcopate recognised that they possessed broader political responsibilities, such as attending parliaments, where they could speak on behalf of both the Church and the commonalty. Most importantly, they seem to have been persuaded of the justice of Edward's wars in both France and

[3] Chrimes, *English Constitutional Ideas,* p. 180. For further discussion of this sermon and this metaphor within it, see also Watts, *Henry VI*, p. 23; Hanham, 'Text and Subtext', p. 309; Watts, 'Bishop Russell's Parliamentary Sermons', p. 37. For the 'organic analogy' in the fourteenth century, see also Born, 'The Perfect Prince', pp. 488-504 and Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, pp. 213-32.
[4] Burton, 'Thurstan'; Stacey, 'Walter, Hubert'; Vincent, 'Aigueblanche, Peter d''. None of this is to suggest, however, that the episcopacy's place in politics did not evolve over time.

Scotland – which they considered to have a just cause, to be waged by a proper authority, and to be fought with a correct intention – which was only confirmed by his success on the battlefields of Halidon Hill and Crécy. In consequence, they accepted their duty to bolster the king's war effort, whether by ordering prayers to be said in support of expeditions abroad, by procuring taxes to fund military expenditure, or by guarding the peripheries of the realm themselves. As, in Richard de Bury's words, 'leaders of the commonwealth', bishops accepted that they had a responsibility to involve themselves in the kingdom's affairs.[5] Their political activity was thus not merely obsequious service to the crown, but rather the performance of commitments which they acknowledged and embraced.

Yet, by involving themselves in politics, bishops also discharged their responsibilities on a practical level, rather than just an intellectual one. Perhaps most obviously, their political activities benefited the kingdom. For instance, by attending parliament and urging Edward to restore disgraced magnates, such as Hugh le Despenser, son of the Younger Despenser, they helped to heal potential wounds in political society. Equally, by serving as constables of royal castles and maintaining defensive fortifications, from Carlisle to Exeter, they helped to protect the realm, and to ameliorate the pain, hardship, and suffering wrought by foreign raids. In a similar vein, by negotiating treaties and truces with other powers – such as the Treaty of Berwick, which facilitated a precarious peace between England and Scotland that existed for the remainder of Edward's reign – they brought England respite from invasions and conflict. More prosaically, simply by serving as competent royal ministers, they ensured that English government kept functioning; the corruption, inefficiencies, and confusion which bedevilled the English administration in the 1370s under lay ministers served almost nobody well.[6] Thus bishops' work sometimes had a very significant impact on the lives and livelihoods of the English people, whose interests they had a duty to protect and serve.

However, the episcopacy's political activities aided the Church as well as the realm. Through granting taxes, but only on the condition that the king confirmed ecclesiastical privileges; through attending parliaments, where they obtained statutes which enshrined their rights; and through serving as royal ministers, and moderating policies which threatened to jeopardise clerical liberties, they helped to ensure that the Church's dignity was not substantially undercut or eroded. In addition to defending the entire *ecclesia anglicana*, bishops' political efforts also benefited their individual sees. By working in the king's administration, they could obtain new grants of land or privileges for their bishoprics; by petitioning in parliament, they could seek redress for infractions of their diocesan rights; and by fighting in battles such as Neville's Cross, they could safeguard their sees from invasions, which might destroy their own palaces, burn their own manors, and devastate their own revenues. Moreover, prelates' secular duties could also help their diocesan clergy. Through holding the chancellorship,

[5] *Philobiblon*, p. 88.
[6] Tout, *Political History*, p. 433; *idem*, *Chapters*, iii, pp. 281-92; Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, pp. 92-3; Mortimer, *Perfect King*, pp. 372-4.

they were able to secure royal pardons for clergymen; through asserting control over the collection of clerical subsidies, they were able to ensure that poorer clergy were spared the burdens of taxation; and through agreeing truces with the Scots as diplomats, northern bishops not only helped the wider English populace, but also aided the clerics of their sees, by defending them from raids which had previously impoverished them.

The episcopacy's political roles also benefited bishops personally. This is not to claim that serving the crown was a source of untrammelled joy and bliss for bishops: episcopal diplomats could face opprobrium if their missions reached an unsatisfactory outcome; warrior-bishops could encounter real personal peril when fighting against the French and Scots; and episcopal ministers could find their work stressful, expensive, and laborious. However, it seems that many bishops might have genuinely enjoyed their secular duties. This is perhaps especially the case for those who served as royal ministers, who were able to work at the apex of a bureaucracy which they had often spent their lives ascending, and alongside a monarch with whom they might have had an excellent relationship, and to whom they might have been profoundly grateful. But others might also have found fulfilment from their responsibilities: by attending parliaments, prelates were able to discuss the major issues of the day and meet with old friends and colleagues; by fighting overseas with Edward, certain bishops were able to indulge their martial enthusiasms; and by travelling to the continent, episcopal ambassadors were able to visit places they loved, indulge their bibliographic interests, and both travel and entertain in great style. Yet bishops did not merely derive pleasure from their political service, but also profit. Through serving the crown, they might receive generous bribes from those seeking to gain their favour, be rewarded with patronage by a thankful king, or indeed secure translation to a superior see. Similarly, by both paying and praying for the realm's defence – as well as through contributing to it militarily themselves – prelates also protected their own lands and estates. Nonetheless, the benefits of royal service were not restricted to bishops themselves. Through their involvement in politics, bishops were able to assist their families, friends, and servants, for instance by obtaining patronage directly for them, by amassing lands and wealth which could in turn be distributed to them, and by securing permission to establish chantries in which they could be honoured.

Nevertheless, bishops were not obliged to devote themselves to secular matters. Prelates could retire from diplomatic and administrative service, resign their ministerial offices, refuse to serve in royal armies, fail to attend parliament, and decline to grant taxation. Indeed, they could even – when they disagreed with the direction of royal policy – preach against the government, join opposition movements, and march against the king. This culminated in the reigns of Edward II and Richard II, when bishops including Adam Orleton, John Stratford, and William Wykeham – who were all prominent servants of the crown in Edward III's reign – variously joined armed risings against the monarch, preached blistering sermons against him in parliament, and participated in attempts to severely curtail royal power. However, for the majority of Edward's reign, bishops gladly supported

the king and buttressed his government, rather than seeking to oppose it. Their decision to assist the crown thus stemmed not from compulsion, but instead from their satisfaction that their political activities, and Edward's regime itself, adequately served and upheld their own interests, those of the Church, and those of the realm more widely.

As such, an altogether new picture emerges of the episcopate's role in politics. Almost every bishop played their part in the government of the English realm. Owing to their wealth and status, among other factors, they were ideally suited to performing these activities, which were of profound importance to the crown and the kingdom. However, bishops did not have to serve the crown; they could choose to oppose the king, rather than support him. But for most of Edward's reign, prelates helped his government faithfully, loyally, and effectively. This flowed not only from their broad acceptance of Edward's policies, but also from the fact that their royal service advanced their own interests, as well as the king's. On an intellectual level, bishops recognised the importance of their engagement in political life, and how their secular and spiritual duties were reconcilable. Likewise, on a practical level, they saw how their political activities furthered their responsibilities to the Church, as they could uphold clerical liberties, protect their dioceses, and assist individual clergymen; to the realm, as they could defend the kingdom, secure longed-for truces, and facilitate the proper functioning of government; and to themselves, their families, and their friends, as they could indulge their own passions, advance their own careers, and acquire patronage for those whom they loved.

Ultimately, this all underlines that the relationship between the episcopate and the crown – and, more broadly, that between 'Church' and 'State' – was symbiotic. This had long been understood, and was perhaps expressed most eloquently by Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury, in a letter to Henry II of early 1160:

> When princes show due reverence to priests, and priests render faithful service to princes, then do kingdoms enjoy that true peace and tranquillity that must always be the goal of our desire. But if they clash, one against the other, in all their might, then the vigour of the secular will be impaired no less than the ecclesiastical, since according to the word of the Most High, 'a kingdom divided against itself is laid waste'.[7]

While Theobald's words were penned in the twelfth century, they retained their sagacity in the fourteenth. In the reigns of Edward II and Richard II, the crown treated the Church, and, indeed, the English kingdom, with both high- and heavy-handedness.[8] This resulted in suffering not only for the Church – with Edward II's deposition articles recording that he had 'destroyed Holy Church', and his great-grandson's that he had 'wickedly infringed the liberties of the Church approved in the Great

[7] *Letters of John of Salisbury*, ed. Millor and Butler, rev. Brooke, i, p. 190.
[8] For Edward II's reign, see Edwards, 'Political Importance', pp. 339-43; Haines, 'Episcopate during the Reign of Edward II', pp. 682-91; and Lane, 'Bishops and Deposition', pp. 145-51. For Richard II's reign, see Dahmus, 'Richard II and the Church', pp. 422, 432; Davies, 'Richard II and the Church', pp. 104-6; and Wilks, 'Thomas Arundel'.

Charter' – but also for the realm.[9] However, such behaviour led to disaster, rather than prosperity, for the crown itself, as clergymen joined with members of the nobility and commonalty to oppose and depose the king. Yet, for most of Edward III's reign, the bishops provided the king with 'faithful service' – in the form of financial, parliamentary, military, propagandistic, administrative, and diplomatic support – and in return received what they sought from the crown, in the shape of a broad respect for their liberties, a commitment to the realm's defence, and the maintenance of domestic law and order.[10] In this light, it is apparent that the scholarly tradition which uses the ferocity of episcopal resistance to the crown as a barometer to assess the vitality of the Church and its leadership proceeds from a fundamentally misplaced starting point. It was not a sign of the Church's strength that prelates had to desperately fight to protect its rights, nor was it a sign of its weakness that bishops could maintain collegial relations with the crown in the knowledge that its privileges were broadly respected. Rather than lamenting how the bishops of the fourteenth century failed to follow the examples of Anselm, Becket, Langton, and Winchelsey in opposing the king, historians should instead give them due credit for achieving much for both the Church and the crown through fostering a culture of mutual respect and co-operation.[11] While they were their own men, who lived in their own times, in this sense they followed in the footsteps of a different – but no less praiseworthy – set of their predecessors, which included archbishops like Lanfranc, Theobald himself, and Hubert Walter.[12]

All this has major ramifications for our understanding of later medieval history. This thesis has already painted a substantially different picture of the Edwardian episcopate, and has made contributions to numerous other smaller – although still significant – historiographical debates, such as those over the purpose and importance of patronage and the efficacy of royal propaganda. Yet what does this all mean to scholars who are not specifically working on one of these debates, or on the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century prelacy? Perhaps most fundamentally, in highlighting how bishops were at the very heart of politics in later medieval England, it suggests that a greater number of scholars should give careful consideration to the episcopate. Despite it almost being a truism that prelates were politically important, a number of recent historians have sought to sideline the episcopacy. To give but one example, Michael Prestwich mentions bishops on a mere handful of occasions in his *The Three Edwards*, and devotes almost as much attention to Bishop Stubbs, the great

[9] *Select Documents,* p. 99; *PROME,* 1399, 46.
[10] McKisack, *Fourteenth Century*, pp. 270-1; Mortimer, *Perfect King*, pp. 393-8; McCallum, 'Ecclesiastical Creditors', p. 1418.
[11] In fact, disputes with the crown were often ruinous for the Church. For instance, the dispute over Stephen Langton's election as archbishop of Canterbury in 1206 disrupted the Church's pastoral work, as Pope Innocent III directed that no church service should occur in England except for the baptism of children and the penance of the dying (although this left some room for interpretation and was subsequently mitigated in several respects), and was certainly very costly; the Red Book of the Exchequer recorded that some £100,000 of Church revenue was seized by the king during the Interdict: Cheney, 'Papal Interdict'; *idem,* 'King John's Reaction', pp. 129-31, 148-50; Barratt, 'Revenue of King John', pp. 837-8.
[12] Cowdrey, *Lanfranc,* pp. 228-31; Barlow, 'Theobald'; Cheney, *Hubert Walter,* pp. 181-6.

nineteenth-century historian, as he does to any of his medieval forebears.[13] In the preface to the same author's *Plantagenet England*, he declares that he will consider the Church only 'where relevant'.[14] However, this is a flawed premise from which to proceed for any author who wishes to tackle medieval English politics, in which bishops were not simply omnipresent, but also vital. Their roles, their motivations, their interests, and their concerns all therefore demand – and repay – close attention. Just as any historian of high politics in the Middle Ages would not – or at least, should not – dream of excluding either the crown or the nobility from their studies, neither should they contemplate marginalising the episcopacy.

The arguments of this thesis also correspond with, and build on, the developments which have taken place over the last seventy-five years with regard to our understanding of the lay peerage. Just as historians have now come to realise that the nobility had no natural conflict of interest with the crown, that they had wider aims than simple self-aggrandisement, and that they had a real awareness of broader constitutional principles and values, this thesis has shown that these conclusions can be extended to the episcopacy too. The corollary of this is that 'kingly competence' – the factor which has been identified as lying behind Edward's successful relations with the lay hierarchy, and which ensured that the mutual interests which bound together political society were protected, rather than jeopardised – was also fundamental to his positive, productive, and profitable relationship with his episcopate.[15] However, this does not simply confirm what historians now appreciate and accept, but also advances our knowledge further. While the lay nobility were undoubtedly the king's principal agents with regard to warfare, and major players alongside the episcopacy in parliament, diplomacy, and financial matters, they were much less involved in the dissemination of royal propaganda, in the running of central administration, and in the procuring of clerical subsidies.[16] The extension of these arguments to the episcopate means that 'kingly competence' must now be seen as critical not merely in relation to war and the crown's dealings with the nobility, but also in relation to a wider breadth of royal activity, a wider breadth of English government, and, indeed, a wider breadth of English politics.

Close study of Edward III's episcopate further sheds light on several broader themes discussed by ecclesiastical historians. Just as the trenchant criticisms which were once levelled at the clergy for sexual immorality, corruption, and absenteeism are now seen as exaggerated and over-stated, so this can also be said of the denunciations of their secular service. In fact, while the involvement of prelates

---

[13] Prestwich, *Three Edwards*, p. 191.
[14] Prestwich, *Plantagenet England*, p. ix. For comment on this, see Forrest, 'Trust and Doubt', pp. 164-5.
[15] Partington, 'Noble Service', p. 92.
[16] This is not to deny that the nobility did have some involvement in all these spheres. For example, nobles joined the episcopacy to explain the causes of Edward's war with France to the special assemblies of the county courts in 1337; Richard, Lord Scrope, served as treasurer in the 1370s; and aristocrats occasionally attended convocations to put forward the king's case for taxation to the clergy.

in political life could certainly give rise to tensions, it accomplished much for the Church, from the protection of its liberties on a national level to the exemption of impoverished monastic houses from paying taxation on a local one. The clergy's apparent political inadequacies are therefore as ripe for reappraisal as their apparent pastoral failings. This forcibly reminds scholars that – while there were undeniably weaknesses and fault lines in the later medieval Church – it was not an institution in terminal and inexorable decline, just waiting to breathe its final breath. Rather, it remained vibrant and vigorous, and the Reformation which brought it to an end was neither inevitable nor desperately sought after by the majority of the English people.[17]

[17] See Haigh, 'Introduction', pp. 3-5; Harper-Bill, 'Convocation Sermon', pp. 209-10; Thompson, 'Prelates and the Alien Priories', pp. 74-5. Note, however, the powerful counter-argument advanced in Thompson, 'Locality and Ecclesiastical Polity', pp. 144-5.

Epilogue

Nevertheless, irrespective of whether or not the Reformation was wanted, it certainly happened. And how, it might be asked, is that explicable in light of the picture painted here of the Church enjoying a symbiotic relationship with the crown, in which the episcopacy depended on the king and the king on his bishops? This is too large a question to be answered in full here, but a few brief – and tentative – thoughts can be offered. It seems, in short, that the balance of power between the Church and the crown shifted decidedly in the king's favour over the course of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. By the time that Henry VIII's matrimonial issues arose, the episcopacy still relied on the king, but the king did not rely on his episcopacy to the same extent.[1]

In many spheres of political life, it seems that bishops became progressively less important. Of course, this is not to argue that the episcopate had become politically irrelevant by Henry VIII's reign – as, most notably, the eminence of Cardinal Wolsey in the 1520s demonstrates – but merely to suggest that the crown's dependence on prelates might have lessened. Most tentatively, it seems that bishops made a less significant contribution to royal finances; whereas they procured clerical subsidies assessed at the value of *c.* £9,400 p.a. across Edward III's reign, they only procured such sums to a value of less than £9,000 p.a. between 1486 and 1534,[2] notwithstanding the considerable inflation which occurred in the interim.[3] Likewise, it appears that the episcopacy lost ground in the king's diplomatic service over the 'long fifteenth century'; while Mary Blust counted 143 occasions on which bishops served as ambassadors in Edward III's reign (or an average of three p.a.), Andrew Chibi could only count nine such occasions in Henry VIII's reign prior to 1534 (or 0.3 p.a.), despite the profusion of diplomatic activity over those years.[4] More certainly, in the matter of central

---

[1] In addition to the various sources cited below, see also Harriss, 'Government and Statecraft', pp. 13-17.

[2] The issue of clerical taxation in the Tudor period is a difficult one and is in need of further study. The oft-cited figure of clerical subsidies yielding £9,000 p.a. between 1485/6 and 1534 (see, for instance, Swanson, *Church and Society*, p. 116; Bernard, *Late Medieval English Church*, p. 22; and Marshall, *Heretics and Believers*, p. 76) is ultimately derived from Scarisbrick, 'Clerical Taxation', p. 50, where he suggests that the amount promised to the king by way of clerical taxation between 1486 and 1534 was '*close on* £9,000 p.a.' (my italics). It is regrettably impossible to go beyond this point and broach the question of the yield of clerical taxation in this period with any confidence without more research, for Scarisbrick's methodology – 'assuming that all that was promised was in fact paid' – is, to put it kindly, suspect. Conversely, C.F. Dietz's older approach – of working from the subsidy rolls and other exchequer records to uncover what actually *was* paid – produced a much lower figure, of approximately £256,000 over the period, or just over £5,000 a year: Dietz, *Government Finance*, pp. 227-8. The true figure is doubtless somewhere between these two, as on the one hand, subsidies never yielded the full amount promised, but on the other, the subsidy rolls do not record the fullness of what was paid, not least because the grants made in 1489 are not enrolled in the subsidy rolls: Scarisbrick, 'Clerical Taxation', pp. 49-50; Dietz, *Government Finance*, p. 227.

[3] As a crude indication, calculations derived from the National Archive's 'currency converter' suggests that £9,600 in 1330 was approximately equal to £13,630 in 1520: https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency-converter/# (accessed 20 January 2022).

[4] Blust, 'English Clerical Diplomats', Appendix I, p. 449; Chibi, *Henry VIII's Bishops,* pp. 278-81, 287-34. In both cases, this excludes diplomatic activity undertaken by future bishops before they were elevated to the episcopate (such as Edward Fox's diplomatic work in France and Scotland between 1532 and 1534, prior to his nomination to the see of Hereford in 1536), and before the reigns in question (such as Geoffrey Blythe, bishop

government, John Watts has illuminatingly traced the decline in the proportion of clerics bearing influence around the king over the period from 1461 to 1529.[5] This was accompanied by the laicisation of the treasurership, which meant that, although treasurers were customarily bishops in Edward III's reign, no bishop held the post between 1470 and 1618.[6]

The decline in the episcopate's importance in both martial matters and propaganda appears to have been even more dramatic. Whereas several Edwardian bishops had served as wardens of the marches in Edward III's reign, laymen held a monopoly over this office in the Tudor period.[7] Likewise, whereas English bishops were called upon to array the clergy for the realm's defence in the later fourteenth century, this practice seems to have fallen into abeyance after 1418.[8] This was matched by the episcopacy's increasing absence from the battlefield itself; whereas Edward's army at Neville's Cross was led by Archbishop Zouche, no bishop appeared in the English ranks at Flodden.[9] Moreover, while Edward III depended on his bishops to circulate documents like his manifesto of 1337 – instructing them to 'expound' its contents to the people and order its publication in all the churches of their dioceses – Henry VIII was able to circumvent his episcopacy by mounting full-blown propaganda campaigns using the printing press, which enabled texts to be read and distributed by the tax-paying public themselves. This was apparent in 1512-13, when a series of works were published for the crown, including an account of the Battle of Flodden, verses attacking James IV of Scotland, and an allegorical poem, *The Gardyners Passetaunce*, which justified the war against France.[10] Similarly, whereas Edward principally reached out to his people through liturgical efforts organised by the prelacy, Tudor monarchs increasingly wrote directly to urban authorities, sheriffs, and justices of the peace, ordering them to organise celebrations for military victories, the conclusion of peaces, and the birth of royal children.[11]

---

of Coventry and Lichfield's, service as an ambassador to Ladislaus II of Bohemia in 1502): Chibi, *Henry VIII's Bishops*, pp. 290, 296. Whether this difference reflects, to any meaningful extent, differing methodologies or approaches on the part of Blust and Chibi is unclear, but – *prima facie* – a *c.* 90% decrease is unlikely to be accounted for by this means alone. For broad analysis of the growth of diplomacy during the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, see Watts, 'Plantagenet Empire', pp. 416-9.

[5] Watts, 'Personnel and Policy', pp. 208-12.

[6] *HBC*, pp. 105-8. For analysis of this, see Carpenter, 'Deskilling', pp. 19-20, 28-9.

[7] Etty, 'Tudor Revolution?', pp. 266-8. Bishops remained involved in northern defence under the Tudors, but in a lesser capacity; for instance, Richard Fox, then bishop of Durham, was appointed co-deputy warden of all three marches in 1495, and John Kite, bishop of Carlisle, served briefly as the treasurer of wars for Thomas, Lord Dacre, warden of the East March in 1522: *Ibid.*, pp. 157, 166-9.

[8] McNab, 'Military Arrays', pp. 294-5.

[9] It is perhaps worth noting that the battles of Neville's Cross and Flodden bear comparison with one another, for they both occurred when the king (and much of the English aristocracy) were fighting abroad. For the avoidance of doubt, English bishops also do not appear to have fought in other early Tudor battles, such as the Battle of the Spurs (1513) and the Battle of Solway Moss (1542).

[10] Gunn, *Early Tudor Government*, p. 191; Thornton, 'Introduction of Printing', pp. 48-9.

[11] Gunn, 'War, Dynasty and Public Opinion', pp. 135-40; Gunn, Grummitt, and Cools, *War, State, and Society*, pp. 269-70; Gunn, *English People at War*, p. 127.

The gradual erosion of the episcopate's prevalence in political life was enabled by the expansion of political society throughout the later medieval period, in which a growing portion of the population became politically engaged, as well as equipped for, and involved in, governance.[12] This is clear in the origins of many of those who occupied positions once filled by bishops – such as John, Lord Dynham, who served as treasurer between 1486 and 1501 – who were of gentry stock, rather than from established aristocratic families.[13] Some men rose from lowlier backgrounds still; Sir Reynold Bray was the second son of a surgeon, but became the coordinator of Henry VII's financial policies until his death in 1503, and even served as a stopgap treasurer in 1486.[14] This is perhaps nowhere more dramatic than in the case of the man who orchestrated much of the Henrician Reformation's opening stages: Thomas Cromwell. Unlike the 'chief ministers' of Edward III's reign – John Stratford, William Edington, and William Wykeham – he was not a bishop, and nor was he of noble blood. Instead, in the withering words of the Venetian ambassador, 'this Cromwell was a person of low origin and condition; he is now Secretary of State, the king's prime minister, and has supreme authority'.[15]

While men from relatively humble backgrounds had been able to rise to positions of power in Edward III's reign – like Stratford, Edington, and Wykeham themselves – they principally did so through the Church, and consequently acquired a separate allegiance, a separate identity, and a separate set of responsibilities and commitments. By the Tudor period, this was no longer necessary. None of this meant that the Tudor kings were unable to call upon the clergy, or to use the organisational structures and geographical reach of the Church, for instance by continuing to use clerical channels to organise prayers and processions, such as those for the success of Henry VII's campaigns in 1489 and 1492.[16] Yet it did mean that the king had an alternative cadre of men to call upon if he wished, and that he could communicate with his people without clerical mediation if he so desired, with a political society that was prepared to read, copy, and pass on texts published by the crown without ecclesiastical intervention.[17] The broadening of political society, therefore, by no means brought bishops' involvement in politics to an end, but it did – over time – reduce their pervasiveness in government, and the crown's reliance on them.[18] However, bishops' own reliance on the crown remained undimmed, as they relied on the king for their own appointments, as well as to protect the Church's

[12] Harriss, 'Political Society', esp. pp. 33-4. See also Challet and Forrest, 'The Masses', p. 279.
[13] Gunn, *New Men*, p. 90; Hicks, 'Dynham, John'.
[14] Gunn, *New Men*, p. 7.
[15] *Calendar of State Papers…Venice*, ed. Brown, Brown, and Hinds, v, no. 54.
[16] Gunn, Grummitt, and Cools, *War, State, and Society*, p. 265.
[17] Gunn, *Early Tudor Government*, p. 191.
[18] See also Gerald Harriss' remark that 'the old clerical service supported by ecclesiastical revenues was rapidly disappearing in the fifteenth century, and with it much of the influence and prestige which the Church traditionally enjoyed with the Crown': Harriss, *Shaping the Nation*, p. 45.

liberties, to enforce ecclesiastical censures, and to defend themselves and their lands from both domestic disorder and foreign invasion.[19]

This has ramifications for our understanding of the Reformation. The expansion of political society – and the emergence of an increasingly engaged, increasingly literate, increasingly educated, and increasingly influential laity below the ranks of the aristocracy – was once a cornerstone of the Reformation narrative, when it was thought that reform emerged from popular antipathy towards the oppressive Catholic Church.[20] Yet it had no place in the 'top down' interpretation of the Reformation espoused by revisionists, in which the crown imposed religious change on a populace which had been broadly satisfied with the provisions of later medieval Catholicism.[21] Although the importance of a widened political society has been placed back on the agenda in more recent work, which has stressed how people from more ordinary backgrounds resisted, 'collaborated' with, and helped to shape the course of reform, it might have also been of fundamental importance in the crown's own decision-making.[22]

This is evident when one compares the Reformation itself to what A.G. Dickens termed the 'abortive Reformation', namely Wycliffite heresy.[23] Although the crown had briefly employed John Wyclif in the 1370s, there are no signs that either Edward III or Richard II embraced any of his more radical ideas which developed over the course of the decade.[24] Indeed, unlike prominent evangelicals such as Thomas Cranmer, Nicholas Shaxton, and Hugh Latimer in the 1530s, Wyclif was never appointed to the episcopal bench, and was even frustrated of the prebend of Caistor in Lincoln Cathedral.[25] There are many possible reasons for this, including Edward's infirmity, Richard's youth, the apparently traditional piety of both monarchs, and Wyclif's own limited administrative experience and talents.[26] Yet, in part, this was also due to the strength of the episcopate, for bishops – and especially William Courtenay – led the opposition to Wyclif, which ultimately led to the royal council (according to Thomas Netter) imposing silence upon him in 1377-8, after which he faded somewhat from public view, and ceased to enjoy any meaningful political career.[27] In turn, this reflects the strength of the episcopacy's position within the polity; while an incensed John of Gaunt apparently swore to 'break not only the bishop's [Courtenay's] arrogance, but that of all the bishops of England', he could not

---

[19] Thompson, 'Prelates and Politics', pp. 81-3.
[20] See Dickens, *English Reformation,* p. 326.
[21] See Haigh, 'Introduction'.
[22] See Shagan, *Popular Politics,* esp. pp. 12-8; Lowe, *English Reformation,* pp. 3-4, 107-8; and Palmer, 'Politics, Corporation and Commonwealth', pp. 183, 338-45.
[23] Dickens, *English Reformation,* p. 22.
[24] Rex, *Lollards,* pp. 25-51; Harriss, *Shaping the Nation,* pp. 376-83.
[25] Lloyd, 'John Wyclif'; Rex, *Lollards,* p. 26; Hudson and Kenny, 'Wyclif, John'; MacCulloch, 'Cranmer, Thomas'; Wabuda, 'Latimer, Hugh'; *eadem*, 'Shaxton, Nicholas'.
[26] Ormrod, 'Personal Religion', p. 854; Saul, *Richard II,* pp. 292-326; Rex, *Lollards,* p. 27.
[27] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum,* ed. Shirley, p. 271. See also Dahmus, *William Courtenay,* pp. 31-63; *idem,* 'John Wyclif', pp. 58-61; Rex, *Lollards,* pp. 26-32; and Hudson and Kenny, 'Wyclif, John'.

afford to do so while they were vital in guarding the southern coast, defending the northern border, and managing the government's propaganda efforts.[28] However, when Henry VIII saw the possibilities of religious change, these considerations could not hold him back, or could only restrain him to a more limited extent. This did not make the Reformation in any sense inevitable, and many other factors – such as the crown's dynastic problems and the influence of evangelicals – moulded the path of Henrician reform.[29] But it may help us to explain why Henry VIII was able to consider such a bold, sweeping, and dramatic assault on the Church, far beyond that contemplated by any of his fourteenth-century predecessors, when the bishops played a more prominent part in public life, and when the crown relied on the episcopacy to a greater degree.[30] In this light, it was not the prevalence of clerics in secular affairs which inspired and facilitated reform, but their relative absence, especially after the fall of Wolsey, who had shielded the Church from various attacks in the 1520s.[31] Accordingly, the interdependence of the crown and the episcopacy in Edward III's reign – which placed bishops at the heart of government – was not a sign of the Church's weakness, but rather its strength.

[28] *Walsingham*, i, pp. 82-3. This episode occurred after Courtenay had rebuked Wyclif and his supporters in February 1377.
[29] Gunn, 'Dudley and the Church', pp. 525-6.
[30] For discussion of the episcopal 'resistance' to Henrician reform in the late 1520s and early 1530s, which was fated to fail, see Dobson, 'Bishops', p. 228; Marshall, *Heretics and Believers*, pp. 175-6, 183-4, 194-6, 210; and *idem*, 'Thomas Becket'.
[31] Gwynn, *King's Cardinal*, pp. 352-3.

Appendices

Appendix 1: List of Edward III's Bishops by (Arch)Diocese

Archbishops of Canterbury:

Beginning of Archiepiscopate	End of Archiepiscopate	Name of Archbishop
1 October 1313*	16 November 1327	Walter Reynolds
5 June 1328	12 October 1333	Simon Meopham
26 November 1333*	23 August 1348	John Stratford
Provided to see on 24 September 1348, but never consecrated	*20 May 1349*	*John Offord*
19 July 1349	25 or 26 August 1349	Thomas Bradwardine
20 December 1349	26 April 1366	Simon Islip
24 July 1366*	28 November 1368 (resignation of the see, having been appointed a cardinal on 22 September 1368)	Simon Langham
11 October 1368*	5 or 6 June 1374	William Whittlesey
4 May 1375*	14 June 1381	Simon Sudbury

Archbishops of York:

Beginning of Archiepiscopate	End of Archiepiscopate	Name of Archbishop
25 September 1317	5 April 1340	William Melton
7 July 1342	10 or 19 July 1352	William Zouche
16 August 1353*	6 November 1373	John Thoresby
4 June 1374	30 April 1388*	Alexander Neville

Bishops of Bangor:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
9 November 1309	26 January 1328	Anian Sais
12 June 1328	22 March – 15 April 1357	Matthew Englefield
17 September 1357	8 January 1366	Thomas Ringstead
11 December 1366 (date of provision, as date of consecration is unknown)	24 September 1370	Gervase de Castro
21 April 1371 (date of provision, as date of	(Prior to) 3 February 1372	Hywel ap Gronow

consecration is unknown)		
17 March 1372 (date of provision, as date of consecration is unknown)	12 September 1375*	John Gilbert
2 July 1376*	24 June 1398	John Swaffham

Bishops of Bath and Wells:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
9 November 1309	9 May 1329	John Droxford
3 September 1329	14 August 1363	Ralph Shrewsbury
24 December 1363*	15 December 1366*	John Barnet
7 March 1367	Between 29 June and 14 July 1386	John Harewell

Bishops of Carlisle:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
24 February 1325	(Prior to) 4 May 1332	John Ross
19 July 1332	(Prior to) 3 December 1352	John Kirkby
21 April 1353	Between 6 November 1362 (the last date in his episcopal register) and 31 December 1362	Gilbert Welton
18 June 1363	5 December 1395	Thomas Appleby

Bishops of Chichester:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
19 September 1305	(Prior to) 19 July 1337	John Langton
30 November 1337	9 April 1362	Robert Stratford
(Prior to) 18 August 1362	11 October 1368*	William Lenn
2 September 1369	18 August 1385	William Reade

Bishops of Coventry and Lichfield:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop

27 June 1322	22 November 1358	Roger Northburgh
27 September 1360	28 March 1385	Robert Stretton

Bishops of Durham:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
26 March 1318	24 September 1333	Louis Beaumont
19 December 1333	14 April 1345	Richard de Bury
1 June 1345	8 May 1381	Thomas Hatfield

Bishops of Ely:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
3 October 1316	14 January 1337	John Hotham
14 March 1337*	20 June 1345	Simon Montacute
24 July 1345	23 June 1361	Thomas de Lisle
20 March 1362	24 July 1366*	Simon Langham
15 December 1366*	7 June 1373	John Barnet
9 April 1374	3 April 1388*	Thomas Arundel

Bishops of Exeter:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
22 March 1327	24 June 1327	James Berkeley
18 October 1327	16 July 1369	John Grandisson
12 May 1370	23 December 1394	Thomas Brantingham

Bishops of Hereford:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
22 May 1317	25 September 1327*	Adam Orleton
18 October 1327	11 January 1344	Thomas Charlton
29 August 1344	20 November 1360	John Trillek
3 October 1361	23 May 1369	Lewis Charlton
17 March 1370	12 September 1375*	William Courtenay
12 September 1375*	5 May 1389*	John Gilbert

Bishops of Lincoln:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
20 July 1320	4 December 1340	Henry Burghersh
7 July 1341	2 February 1347	Thomas Bek
23 September 1347	5 August 1362	John Gynwell
25 June 1363	(Resigned the see on) 12 July 1398	John Buckingham

Bishops of Llandaff:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
20 June 1323*	2 January 1347	John de Eaglescliffe
(Prior to) 20 February 1344 (during the lifetime of Eaglescliffe)	11 October 1361	John Paschal
15 December 1361*	(Prior to) 22 June 1382	Rodger Craddock

Bishops of London:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
14 January 1319	8 April 1338	Stephen Gravesend
12 July 1338	8 December 1339	Richard Bintworth
12 March 1340	17 April 1354	Ralph Stratford
12 July 1355	9 September 1361	Michael Northburgh
20 March 1362	4 May 1375*	Simon Sudbury
12 September 1375*	9 September 1381*	William Courtenay

Bishops of Norwich:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
15 September 1325	27 March 1336	William Airmyn
30 March 1337	18 December 1343	Anthony Bek
23 May 1344	6 January 1355	William Bateman
2 January 1356	8 August 1369	Thomas Percy
20 April 1370	23 August 1406	Henry Despenser

Bishops of Rochester:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
26 August 1319	4 May 1352	Hamo Hethe
10 March 1353	19 October 1360	John Sheppey
6 February 1362	6 March 1364*	William Whittlesey
26 May 1364	Between 12 and 25 December 1372	Thomas Trillek
6 February 1373	4 May 1389	Thomas Brinton

Bishops of St Asaph:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
12 January 1315	(Prior to) 9 October 1345	Daffyd ap Bleddyn
c. 1 August 1346	3 February 1357	John Trevor
19 July 1357 (date of provision, as date of consecration is unknown)	October or November 1375	Llywelyn ap Madoc
25 May 1377	9 April 1382	William Spridlington

Bishops of St Davids:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
30 September 1296	9 March 1328	David Martin
12 June 1328	(Prior to) 4 May 1347	Henry Gower
23 September 1347	4 September 1349*	John Thoresby
26 September 1350	22 October 1352*	Reginald Brian
22 October 1352 (date of provision, as date of consecration is unknown)	June 1361	Thomas Fastolf
12 January 1362	13 February 1389	Adam Houghton

Bishops of Salisbury:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
28 September 1315	14 March 1330	Roger Martival
15 July 1330	4 September 1375	Robert Wyvil
9 December 1375	3 April 1388*	Ralph Erghum

Bishops of Winchester:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
26 June 1323	26 November 1333*	John Stratford
1 December 1333*	18 July 1345	Adam Orleton
14 May 1346	7 October 1366	William Edington
10 October 1366	27 September 1404	William Wykeham

Bishops of Worcester:

Beginning of Episcopate	End of Episcopate	Name of Bishop
22 May 1317	27 August 1327	Thomas Cobham
28 September 1327*	1 December 1333*	Adam Orleton
8 May 1334	14 March 1337*	Simon Montacute
30 March 1337	21 December 1338	Thomas Hempnall
21 March 1339	6 August 1349	Wulfstan Bransford
4 September 1349*	17 October 1352*	John Thoresby
22 October 1352*	10 December 1361	Reginald Brian
20 March 1362	25 November 1363*	John Barnet
6 March 1364*	11 October 1368*	William Whittlesey
11 October 1368*	18 November 1373	William Lenn
28 October 1375	11 March 1395	Henry Wakefield

(Arch)episcopates are dated (unless otherwise stated in the tables) from either the date of consecration (in the case of bishops' first sees) or the date of papal provision (in the case of translations, which are indicated by an asterisk next to the date). (Arch)episcopates are dated (unless otherwise specified in the tables) to either the date of death or the date of papal provision to a new see in the case of translations (which are, again, indicated by an asterisk next to the date).

Source: *HBC*, pp. 228-98; *ODNB.*

Appendix 2: Bishops from Aristocratic Families

Thomas Arundel	Third son of Richard (II) Fitzalan, earl of Arundel, and his wife, Eleanor (daughter of Henry, earl of Lancaster).
Louis Beaumont	Third son of Louis de Brienne, vicomte of Beaumont in Maine (in right of his wife, Agnes).
Anthony Bek	Member of a baronial family from Lincolnshire; second son of Walter Bek; younger brother of Sir John Bek, lord of Normanby.
Thomas Bek	Member of a baronial family from Lincolnshire; third son of Walter Bek; younger brother of both Sir John Bek and Anthony Bek.
James Berkeley	Fourth son of Thomas, Baron Berkeley, and his wife, Joan (daughter of William Ferrers, earl of Derby).
Reginald Brian	Son of Guy Brian, Baron Brian, and his second wife, Elizabeth Despenser, daughter of William Montacute, first earl of Salisbury.
Henry Burghersh	Son of Robert, Lord Burghersh, and his wife, Maud (and nephew of Sir Bartholomew Badlesmere).
Lewis Charlton	Son of John, Lord Charlton, and his wife, Hawise de la Pole (and nephew of Thomas Charlton).
Thomas Charlton	Son of Robert Charlton and brother of John, Lord Charlton (member of the baronial family of the Charltons of Powys).
William Courtenay	Fourth son of Hugh Courtenay, tenth earl of Devon, and his wife, Margaret de Bohun (daughter of Humphrey de Bohun, fourth earl of Hereford).
Henry Despenser	Fourth son of Sir Edward Despenser (second son of Hugh Despenser the Younger) and his wife, Anne (daughter of William, Lord Ferrers).
Henry Gower	Descended from a noble family.
John Grandisson	Second son of Sir William Grandisson (heir of Otto Grandisson, head of the English branch of the noble Savoyard family), and his wife, Sybil (younger daughter of Sir John de Tregoz).
David Martin	Fifth son of Nicholas Fitzmartin, lord of Cemais in Pembrokeshire, and his wife, Isabel; member of a powerful baronial family which had been prominent in Wales and the West Country since the Norman Conquest.
Simon Montacute	Second son of William Montacute, second Lord Montacute, and his wife, Elizabeth de Montfort (and younger brother of William Montacute, who became earl of Salisbury).
Alexander Neville	Younger son of Ralph Neville, Lord Neville, and his wife, Alice (daughter of Hugh, Lord Audley); younger brother of John Neville, Baron Neville.
Thomas Percy	Fifth son of Henry Percy, Lord Percy, and his wife, Idonea (daughter of Robert, Lord Clifford).

Sources: *ODNB*; Highfield, ‘English Hierarchy’.

Appendix 3: The Experience of Bishops Before Their Elevations to the Episcopate and/or Before the Reign of Edward III

Bishop	Chancellor	Treasurer	Diplomat	Experience as a Minister prior to Edward III's Reign and/or Elevation to the Episcopate	Experience as a Diplomat prior to Edward III's Reign and/or Elevation to the Episcopate	Experience of Royal Service in some other capacity prior to Edward III's Reign and/or Elevation to the Episcopate
William Airmyn		✓	✓		✓	✓
Thomas Appleby			✓			
Thomas Arundel						
John Barnet		✓	✓		✓	
William Bateman			✓		✓	
Louis Beaumont						
Anthony Bek						
Thomas Bek						
James Berkeley						
Richard Bintworth	✓			✓	✓	✓
Daffyd ap Bleddyn						
Thomas Bradwardine				✓	✓	
Wulfstan Bransford						
Thomas Brantingham		✓		✓	✓	✓
Reginald Brian						
Thomas Brinton						
John Buckingham				✓		✓
Henry Burghersh	✓	✓	✓			
Richard de Bury	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Gervase de Castro						
Lewis Charlton						
Thomas Charlton		✓	✓	✓		✓

Thomas Cobham					✓	✓
William Courtenay						
Roger Craddock						
Henry Despenser						
John Droxford				✓		✓
John Eaglescliffe						
William Edington	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Matthew Englefield						
Ralph Erghum						
Thomas Fastolf					✓	
John Gilbert			✓			
Henry Gower			✓			
John Grandisson						
Stephen Gravesend						
Hywel ap Gronow						
John Gynwell					✓	✓
John Harewell					✓	✓
Thomas Hatfield			✓	✓		✓
Thomas Hempnall						
Hamo Hethe						
Adam Houghton	✓		✓		✓	✓
John Hotham	✓			✓	✓	✓
Simon Islip			✓	✓	✓	✓
John Kirkby			✓			
Simon Langham	✓	✓	✓	✓		
John Langton				✓		✓
William Lenn					✓	
Thomas de Lisle					✓	
Llywelyn ap Madoc						

David Martin						
Roger Martival						
William Melton		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Simon Meopham						
Simon Montacute						✓
Alexander Neville						
Michael Northburgh				✓	✓	✓
Roger Northburgh		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Adam Orleton		✓	✓		✓	✓
John Paschal						
Thomas Percy						
William Reade						
Walter Reynolds				✓	✓	
Thomas Ringstead						
John Ross						
Anian Sais						
John Sheppey		✓			✓	✓
Ralph Shrewsbury						
William Spridlington						
Simon Sudbury			✓		✓	
John Stratford	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Ralph Stratford			✓			✓
Robert Stratford	✓			✓		✓
Robert Stretton					✓	✓
John Swaffham						
John Thoresby	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
John Trevor						
John Trillek						
Thomas Trillek						
Henry Wakefield		✓				✓

Gilbert Welton			✓			✓
William Whittlesey					✓	
William Wykeham	✓			✓	✓	✓
Robert Wyvil				✓		✓
William Zouche				✓		✓

Sources: *ODNB*; *HBC*; Highfield, ‘Relations’, ii, pp. 483-685.

Appendix 4: Bishops who Served the Pope Prior to their Elevations to the Episcopate

Bishop	Auditor of the Sacred Palace	(Other) Papal Judge/ Judge-delegate	Papal Penitentiary	Papal Chaplain	Papal Nuncio/Diplomat	Papal Soldier
Thomas Appleby			✓			
William Bateman	✓			✓	✓	
Anthony Bek				✓		
Thomas Brinton			✓		✓	
Richard de Bury				✓		
Henry Despenser						✓
Thomas Fastolf	✓	✓				
John Gilbert					✓	
John Grandisson				✓	✓	
Simon Islip		✓				
William Lenn	✓			✓		
Thomas de Lisle			✓			
Simon Montacute				✓		
Adam Orleton	✓			✓		
Thomas Ringstead			✓		✓	
John Ross	✓					
Simon Sudbury	✓				✓	
Robert Stratford				✓		

Sources: *ODNB*; Highfield, 'Relations', ii, pp. 483-685.

Appendix 5: Religious Bishops

	Benedictine	Augustinian	Dominican	Franciscan	Carmelite
Thomas Appleby		✓			
Wulfstan Bransford	✓				
Thomas Brinton	✓				
Gervase de Castro			✓		
Roger Craddock				✓	
John Eaglescliffe			✓		
John Gilbert			✓		
Thomas Hempnall	✓				
Hamo Hethe	✓				
John Kirkby		✓			
Simon Langham	✓				
Thomas de Lisle			✓		
John Paschal					✓
Thomas Ringstead			✓		
John Sheppey	✓				
John Swaffham					✓

Source: *ODNB*; Highfield, ‘English Hierarchy’.

Appendix 6: The Higher Education of the Edwardian Episcopate

Bishop	Receipt of a University Education	University Attended (if known)	Receipt of a Legal Education	Recorded Legal Degrees	Recorded Other Degrees	Service to Edward III as Chancellor	Service to Edward III as Treasurer	Service to Edward III as a Diplomat
William Airmyn							✓	✓
Thomas Appleby	✓	Oxford?	✓	BCnL				✓
Thomas Arundel	✓	Oxford			BA			
John Barnet	✓	Oxford?	✓	BCL			✓	✓
William Bateman	✓	Cambridge	✓	DCL				✓
Louis Beaumont								
Anthony Bek	✓	Oxford			DTh			
Thomas Bek	✓	Oxford?	✓	DCnL	Mag			
James Berkeley	✓	Oxford?			MA; DTh			
Richard Bintworth	✓	Oxford	✓	DCL	Mag	✓		
Daffyd ap Bleddyn								
Thomas Bradwardine	✓	Oxford			BA; MA; BTh; DTh			
Wulfstan Bransford								
Thomas Brantingham							✓	
Reginald Brian	✓	Oxford?		BCL; LicCL				
Thomas Brinton	✓	Oxford	✓	DCnL				
John Buckingham								
Henry Burghersh	✓	Angers; Oxford?	✓			✓	✓	✓
Richard de Bury	✓	Oxford				✓	✓	✓
Gervase de Castro	✓	?			DTh			
Lewis Charlton	✓	Oxford			MA; BTh; LicTh			
Thomas Charlton	✓	Oxford	✓	DCL	Mag		✓	✓
Thomas Cobham	✓	Cambridge; Paris; Oxford	✓	DCnL	MA; DTh			
William Courtenay	✓	Oxford	✓	LicCL; DCL				
Roger Craddock								
Henry Despenser	✓	Oxford	✓	BCL; LicCL				

John Droxford								
John Eaglescliffe								
William Edington						✓	✓	✓
Matthew Englefield								
Ralph Erghum	✓	Oxford	✓	DCL; DCn&CL				
Thomas Fastolf	✓	Cambridge?	✓	DCL				
John Gilbert	✓	Oxford; Paris?			DTh			✓
Henry Gower	✓	Oxford	✓	DCL; DCnL; DCn&CL	MA			✓
John Grandisson	✓	Oxford; Paris	✓					
Stephen Gravesend	✓	Oxford?; Paris			Mag			
Hywel ap Gronow								
John Gynwell	✓	Oxford						
John Harewell	✓	Oxford	✓	BCL				
Thomas Hatfield								✓
Thomas Hempnall	✓	Oxford						
Hamo Hethe								
Adam Houghton	✓	Oxford	✓	DCL		✓		✓
John Hotham						✓		
Simon Islip	✓	Oxford	✓	LicCn&CL	Mag			✓
John Kirkby	?							✓
Simon Langham	✓	Oxford				✓	✓	✓
John Langton	?	Oxford?						
William Lenn	✓	Oxford	✓	DCL; DCn&CL				
Thomas de Lisle	?	Cambridge?						
Llywelyn ap Madoc								
David Martin								
Roger Martival	✓	Oxford; Paris			MA; DTh			
William Melton	✓	Oxford					✓	✓
Simon Meopham	✓	Oxford			MA; DTh			
Simon Montacute	✓	Oxford			MA			
Alexander Neville	✓	Oxford	✓		MA			
Michael Northburgh	✓	Oxford	✓	DCL	MA			

Roger Northburgh	?	Cambridge?					✓	✓
Adam Orleton	✓	Oxford	✓	DCnL	Mag		✓	✓
John Paschal	✓	Cambridge			DTh			
Thomas Percy								
William Reade	✓	Oxford			MA; DTh			
Walter Reynolds								
Thomas Ringstead	✓	Cambridge?			DTh			
John Ross	✓	Oxford	✓	DCL	Mag			
Anian Sais								
John Sheppey	✓	Oxford			DTh		✓	
Ralph Shrewsbury	✓	Oxford	✓	DCnL	MA; DTh			
William Spridlington								
Simon Sudbury	✓	Cambridge?	✓	LCnL; DCL				✓
John Stratford	✓	Oxford	✓	DCL		✓		✓
Ralph Stratford	✓	Oxford; Bologna?	✓	BCL: DCn&CL	MA			✓
Robert Stratford	✓	Oxford			MA	✓		
Robert Stretton								
John Swaffham	✓	?			DTh			
John Thoresby	✓	Oxford	✓	BCL	Mag	✓		✓
John Trevor	✓	Oxford			MA; BTh			
John Trillek	✓	Oxford; Paris			Mag			
Thomas Trillek	✓	Oxford	✓	LicCn&CL	MA			
Henry Wakefield							✓	
Gilbert Welton	✓	Oxford	✓	DCL				✓
William Whittlesey	✓	Cambridge; Oxford	✓	BCn&CL; DCL; DCn&CL	MA;			
William Wykeham						✓		
Robert Wyvil								
William Zouche	✓	Oxford?	✓	BCL	MA			

Source: *BRUC; BRUO*; *ODNB*; *Fasti*; Edwards, 'Social Origins'; Highfield, 'English Hierarchy'.

N.B. The abbreviations used above are adopted from *BRUO*. In alphabetical order, these are: BA (bachelor of arts); BCnL (bachelor of canon law); BCL (bachelor of civil law); BCn&CL (bachelor of civil and canon law); BTh (bachelor of divinity or theology); LicCnL (licentiate in canon law); LicCL

(licentiate in civil law); LicCn&CL (licentiate in civil and canon law); DCnL (doctor of canon law); DCL (doctor of civil law); DCn&CL (doctor of canon and civil law); DTh (doctor of divinity or theology); and Mag (Magister).

Appendix 7: The Higher Education of Bishops at the Beginning and End of Edward III's Reign

Bishops at the Beginning of Edward III's Reign	University Attendance	Bishops at the End of Edward III's Reign	University Attendance
John Droxford		John Harewell	✓
Walter Reynolds		Simon Sudbury	✓
John Ross	✓	Thomas Appleby	✓
John Langton	?	William Reade	✓
Louis Beaumont		Thomas Hatfield	
John Hotham		Thomas Arundel	✓
James Berkeley	✓	Thomas Brantingham	
Adam Orleton	✓	John Gilbert	✓
Roger Northburgh	?	Robert Stretton	
Henry Burghersh	✓	John Buckingham	
Stephen Gravesend	✓	William Courtenay	✓
William Airmyn		Henry Despenser	✓
Hamo Hethe		Thomas Brinton	✓
Roger Martival	✓	Ralph Erghum	✓
John Stratford	✓	William Wykeham	
Thomas Cobham	✓	Henry Wakefield	
William Melton	✓	Alexander Neville	✓
Anian Sais		John Swaffham	✓
John Eaglescliffe		Roger Craddock	
Dafydd ap Bleddyn		William Spridlington	
David Martin		Adam Houghton	✓

Source: *HBC*; Appendix 6.

Appendix 8: Chancellors in the Reign of Edward III

Date on which men assumed the chancellorship	Date on which men vacated the chancellorship	Chancellor
28 January 1327	1 March 1328	John Hotham, bishop of Ely
2 July 1328	28 November 1330	Henry Burghersh, bishop of Lincoln
28 November 1330	28 September 1334	John Stratford, successively bishop of Winchester and archbishop of Canterbury
28 September 1334	6 June 1335	Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham
6 June 1335	4 March 1337	John Stratford, archbishop of Canterbury
24 March 1337	6 July 1338	Robert Stratford, bishop of Chichester
6 July 1338	8 December 1339	Richard Bintworth, bishop of London
28 April 1340	20 June 1340	John Stratford, archbishop of Canterbury
12 July 1340	1 December 1340	Robert Stratford, bishop of Chichester
14 December 1340	28 October 1341	Sir Robert Bourchier
28 October 1341	26 August 1343	Sir Robert Parving
29 September 1343	26 October 1345	Sir Robert Sadington
26 October 1345	20 May 1349	John Offord
16 June 1349	27 November 1356	John Thoresby, successively bishop of St Davids, bishop of Worcester, and archbishop of York
27 November 1356	21 February 1363	William Edington, bishop of Winchester
21 February 1363	After 18 July 1367	Simon Langham, successively bishop of Ely and archbishop of Canterbury
10-17 September 1367	24 March 1371	William Wykeham, bishop of Winchester
26 March 1371	29 June 1372	Sir Robert Thorp
5 July 1372	11 January 1377	Sir John Knyvet
11 January 1377	29 October 1378	Adam Houghton, bishop of St Davids

Source: *HBC*, p. 86.

Appendix 9: Treasurers in the Reign of Edward III

Date on which men assumed the treasurership	Date on which men vacated the treasurership	Treasurer
28 January 1327	28 March 1327	Adam Orleton, bishop of Worcester
28 March 1327	2 July 1328	Henry Burghersh, bishop of Lincoln
2 July 1328	16 September 1329	Thomas Charlton, bishop of Hereford
16 September 1329	1 December 1330	Robert Wodehouse
1 December 1330	1 April 1331	William Melton, archbishop of York
1 April 1331	29 March 1332	William Airmyn, bishop of Norwich
29 March 1332	*c.* 9 March 1334	Robert Ayleston
c. 9 March 1334	1 August 1334	Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham
1 August 1334	24 March 1337	Henry Burghersh, bishop of Lincoln
24 March 1337	10 March 1338	William Zouche
10 March 1338	31 December 1338	Robert Wodehouse
31 December 1338	5 May 1340	William Zouche
5 May 1340	26 June 1340	Sir Robert Sadington
26 June 1340	1 December 1340	Roger Northburgh, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield
15 January 1341	30 October 1341	Sir Robert Parving
30 October 1341	12 April 1344	William Cusance
12 April 1344	29 November 1356	William Edington, bishop of Winchester (from 1345)
29 November 1356	19 October 1360	John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester
23 November 1360	20 February 1363	Simon Langham, bishop of Ely (from 1362)
20 February 1363	27 June 1369	John Barnet, successively bishop of Worcester, bishop of Bath and Wells, and bishop of Ely
27 June 1369	27 March 1371	Thomas Brantingham, bishop of Exeter (from 1370)
27 March 1371	26 September 1375	Richard Scrope, lord Scrope of Bolton
26 September 1375	14 January 1377	Sir Robert Ashton
14 January 1377	19 July 1377	Henry Wakefield, bishop of Worcester

Source: *HBC*, p. 105.

Appendix 10: Diplomatic Powers Given to Edward III's Bishops

Date	Power	Bishops Empowered	Source
22 February 1327	To treat for a truce with the French	John Stratford, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 693.
22 February 1327	For treat regarding all matters in dispute with the French	John Stratford, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 693.
22 February 1327	To treat with the French and to pardon offences in Aquitaine	John Stratford, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 693.
22 February 1327	To treat about making submission to the king of France	John Stratford, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 694.
22 February 1327	To treat for the friendship and alliance of the king of France	John Stratford, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 694.
24 March 1327	To treat with the pope	Adam Orleton	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 698.
8 October 1327	To treat for the marriage of Edward and Philippa of Hainault	Roger Northburgh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 718.
8 October 1327	To contract the marriage of Edward and Philippa of Hainault	Roger Northburgh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 719.
23 November 1327	To treat with the Scots	William Melton, Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 723.
23 November 1327	To treat for an Anglo-Scottish truce	William Melton, Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 724.
23 November 1327	To grant safe-conducts to Scottish ambassadors	William Melton, Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 724.
1 March 1328	To treat for a marriage between Princess Joan and David Bruce	Henry Burghersh, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 730.
16 May 1328	To treat regarding Edward's claim to the crown of France, and his consequent rights	Adam Orleton, Roger Northburgh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 743.
14 April 1329	To accompany the king while he performed homage at Amiens	Thomas Charlton, Henry Burghersh, Henry Gower	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 764.
16 June 1329	To treat for a marriage between Princess Eleanor and the eldest son of the French king	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 766.
16 June 1329	To treat for a marriage between John of Eltham, earl of Cornwall, and one of the daughters of the French king	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 766.
20 September 1329	To treat with Philip VI	William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 772.

3 December 1329	To treat with Philip VI	William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 775.
27 January 1330	To treat with Philip VI	Adam Orleton, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 777.
27 January 1330	To treat with for a marriage between Princess Eleanor and John, the eldest son of Philip VI	Adam Orleton, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 777.
27 January 1330	To treat for a marriage between John of Eltham, earl of Cornwall, and Mary, daughter of Philip VI	Adam Orleton, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 777.
5 February 1330	To resume the Process of Montreuil	Adam Orleton, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 778.
5 February 1330	To resume the Process of Périgord	Adam Orleton, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 778.
10 April 1330	To continue the negotiations begun at Amiens	Adam Orleton, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 785.
10 April 1330	To treat for a marriage between Princess Eleanor and John, son of Philip VI	Adam Orleton, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 785.
8 July 1330	To treat with Philip VI about unresolved issues	Roger Northburgh, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 794.
8 July 1330	To estimate, and treat about, the debts of Edward III to Philip VI	Roger Northburgh, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 794.
8 July 1330	To treat for a marriage between Princess Eleanor and John, son of Philip VI	Roger Northburgh, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 794.
16 January 1331	To treat with Philip VI	Adam Orleton	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 805.
16 January 1331	To treat about the mutual debts of Philip VI and Edward III	Adam Orleton	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 806.
16 January 1331	To treat of all matters in dispute between Philip VI and Edward III	Adam Orleton	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 806.
16 February 1331	To treat for the enforcement of the Treaty of Northampton/Edinburgh	William Melton	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 802.
20 October 1331	To treat for a marriage between Princess Eleanor and the count of Gueldres	John Stratford, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 825.
12 February 1332	To treat for a marriage between Princess Eleanor and the count of Gueldres	John Stratford, William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 832.
26 April 1332	To treat for an Anglo-French crusade	John Stratford, Adam Orleton	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 837.
26 April 1332	To treat for an interview between Edward III and Philip VI	John Stratford, Adam Orleton	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 837.
26 April 1332	To treat for a marriage between the Black Prince	John Stratford, Adam Orleton	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 838.

	and Joanna, daughter of Philip VI		
24 February 1333	To treat for a marriage between John of Eltham, earl of Cornwall, and Joan, daughter of Ralph, count of Eu	Adam Orleton	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 854.
30 September 1333	To reform the state of Ponthieu	William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 870.
26 March 1334	To resume the Processes of Agen and Périgueux	William Airmyn, Henry Gower	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 880.
30 March 1334	To receive the homage of the duke of Brittany	John Stratford	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 883.
30 March 1334	To treat with Philip VI regarding Aquitaine	John Stratford	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 883.
30 March 1334	To treat for an interview between Edward III and Philip VI	John Stratford	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 883.
30 March 1334	To treat for a marriage between John, earl of Kent, and the daughter of some French noble	John Stratford	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 883.
31 March 1334	To reform the state of Ponthieu	John Stratford	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 884.
9 April 1334	To treat for a marriage between John of Eltham, earl of Cornwall, and Mary, daughter of the count of Blois	John Stratford	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 885.
9 April 1334	To treat with any French nobles for a marriage for John of Eltham, earl of Cornwall	John Stratford	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 885.
31 April 1334	To treat with any relevant party concerning the county of Ponthieu	John Stratford	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 886.
30 September 1334	To treat with Philip VI	John Stratford	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 894.
30 September 1334	To treat for an interview between Philip VI and Edward III, and for an Anglo-French crusade	John Stratford	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 895.
18 July 1335	To treat with Philip VI	William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 914.
18 July 1335	To treat for an Anglo-French crusade	William Airmyn	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 915.
6 July 1336	To treat for an interview between Philip VI and Edward III; to treat for an Anglo-French crusade; and to discuss issues pertaining to Scotland and Gascony	Richard de Bury, Adam Orleton	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 941.
6 July 1336	To treat regarding processes in the French courts	Richard de Bury, Adam Orleton	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 942.

6 July 1336	To treat with David Bruce	Richard de Bury, Adam Orleton	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 942.
15 April 1337	To treat with Louis, count of Flanders, and the cities of Bruges, Ghent, and Ypres	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 966.
15 April 1337	To treat with English allies about establishing wool staples	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 966.
18 April 1337	To treat with Philip VI about Aquitaine	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 966.
19 April 1337	To treat with any persons about entering into alliances with Edward	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 967.
19 April 1337	To treat about a marriage between Princess Joan and the eldest son of Louis, count of Flanders	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 967.
3 October 1337	To treat for a perpetual peace with France	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 998.
3 October 1337	To treat with Philip VI and David Bruce	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 998.
3 October 1337	To treat with English allies about establishing wool staples	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 998.
3 October 1337	To treat with Louis, count of Flanders, about a marriage between his eldest son and Princess Joan	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 998.
3 October 1337	To treat with Louis, count of Flanders, and the cities of Bruges, Ghent, and Ypres	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 999.
3 October 1337	To make alliances with people at their discretion	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 999.
3 October 1337	To treat with the Holy Roman Emperor, Louis IV	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 999.
3 October 1337	To grant any royal lands, either currently held or prospective, to such people as they think fit	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 999.
3 October 1337	To grant money to such people as they see fit	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1000.
7 October 1337	To treat with David Bruce for a peace or truce	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1001; *Rot. Scot.*, i, p. 508.
30 April 1338	To retain Radulph, joint lord of Haute Ville, for Edward's service	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1032.
12 May 1338	To treat for a marriage between the Black Prince and one of the daughters of the duke of Brabant	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1036.
21 June 1338	To treat with Philip VI	John Stratford, Richard de Bury	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1043.

15 November 1338	To treat with Philip VI	John Stratford, Richard de Bury, Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1065.
15 December 1338	To treat with Philip VI	John Stratford, Richard de Bury, Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1068.
1 July 1339	To treat with Philip VI	John Stratford, Richard de Bury, Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1084.
2 January 1340	To treat with Philip VI	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1104.
2 January 1340	To treat with papal nuncios	Henry Burghersh	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1104.
28 April 1340	To treat for a truce or final peace with the Scots	Richard de Bury	*Rot. Scot,* i, p. 590.
10 April 1341	To treat with Philip VI	Richard de Bury	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1156.
4 January 1342	To treat with French ambassadors	Henry Gower	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1185.
10 February 1342	To treat with the Scots	Richard de Bury	*Rot. Scot,* i, p. 621.
3 April 1342	To treat for a peace with David Bruce	Richard de Bury	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1191.
3 April 1342	To treat for a truce with David Bruce	Richard de Bury	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1191; *Rot. Scot.*, i, p. 624.
24 May 1342	To treat with Philip VI, and the king's allies about the French war	Ralph Stratford	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1196.
18 April 1343	To treat with the Scots for the preservation of the truce	Richard de Bury, John Kirkby	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 1230.
3 August 1344	To present letters to the pope	William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 18.
4 August 1344	To treat with the ambassadors of Philip VI before the pope	William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 19.
8 November 1345	To treat with the papal nuncio	John Stratford, Ralph Stratford, William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 62.
11 July 1346	To open diplomatic correspondence and treat with ambassadors in the king's absence	John Stratford, William Edington, Ralph Stratford	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 85.
25 September 1348	To treat for peace with France	William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 85.
11 October 1348	To treat with the count and people of Flanders	William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 175.
10 March 1349	To treat for a peace or a truce with France	William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 182.
13 April 1349	To prorogue the truce with France	William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 184.
15 May 1350	To treat for a peace or a truce with France	William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 196.
15 May 1350	To take an oath on the king's behalf	William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 196.
14 October 1350	To treat for peace with the Scots	Thomas Hatfield	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 205; *Rot. Scot,* i, p. 736.

27 June 1351	To treat for a peace or truce with France	William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 225.
28 June 1351	To treat with the Scots for a final peace and the ransom of David Bruce	Thomas Hatfield	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 225; *Rot. Scot,* i, p. 741.
11 July 1351	To treat with the Scots for a peace and the ransom of David Bruce	Thomas Hatfield	*Rot. Scot.,* i, pp. 741-2.
26 July 1351	To treat for a peace with the French	William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 227.
27 July 1351	To prorogue the truce with the French	William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 227.
4 September 1351	To receive David Bruce's oath for his entry into, and return from, Scotland	Thomas Hatfield	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 230.
29 October 1351	To treat for peace with the Scots	Thomas Hatfield	*Rot. Scot,* i, pp. 745.
1 February 1352	To treat with the Scots for a final peace and the ransom of David Bruce	Thomas Hatfield	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 237.
26 March 1352	To treat with the Scots about a peace and the release of David Bruce	Thomas Hatfield	*Rot. Scot,* i, p. 749.
28 March 1352	To treat with the Scots and give them safe-conducts	Thomas Hatfield	*Rot. Scot,* i, p. 750.
19 February 1353	To reform the peace with France	Simon Islip, William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 253.
10 July 1353	To prorogue the truce with the French	Simon Islip, William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 260.
15 October 1353	To treat with the Scots for the liberation of David Bruce and a final peace	Thomas Hatfield, Gilbert Welton	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 264; *Rot. Scot,* i, pp. 761.
6 November 1353	To treat with the French	Simon Islip, William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 269.
30 March 1354	To treat with the French for a truce or final peace	William Bateman	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 275.
18 June 1354	To treat with Scottish envoys	Thomas Hatfield, Gilbert Welton	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 279.
28 August 1354	To treat with French ambassadors before the pope	William Bateman, Michael Northburgh*	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 283.
28 August 1354	To treat for a final peace, and to renounce the king's claims	William Bateman, Michael Northburgh*	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 283.
28 August 1354	To submit to the pope's decision in matters under discussion	William Bateman, Michael Northburgh*	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 284.
5 October 1354	To receive David Bruce and liberate him from prison	Thomas Hatfield, Gilbert Welton	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 286; *Rot. Scot.,* i, p. 771.
30 October 1354	To treat concerning the king's lands and castles in France before the pope	William Bateman, Michael Northburgh*	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 289.

8 July 1355	To treat with the archbishop of Rouen and the duke of Bourbon	Michael Northburgh*	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 305.
11 July 1355	To treat concerning violations of the Anglo-French truce	Michael Northburgh*	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 308.
25 March 1356	To treat with the Scots for a peace and the liberation of David Bruce	Thomas Hatfield, Gilbert Welton	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 325; *Rot. Scot.,* i, p. 791.
16 August 1357	To treat with the Scots for a ten-year truce and the liberation of David Bruce	John Thoresby, Thomas Hatfield, Gilbert Welton	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 365.
16 August 1357	To receive David Bruce	John Thoresby, Thomas Hatfield, Gilbert Welton	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 367.
16 August 1357	To deliver David Bruce	John Thoresby, Thomas Hatfield, Gilbert Welton	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 367.
8 July 1359	To treat with the Scots	Thomas Hatfield, Gilbert Welton	*Rot. Scot.,* i, p. 839.
20 August 1360	To treat with the Scots	John Thoresby, Thomas Hatfield, Gilbert Welton	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 506; *Rot. Scot,* i, p. 851.
8 February 1362	To treat for a marriage between Edmund of Langley and the duchess of Burgundy	John Barnet	*Foedera,* iii, i, p. 636.
25 June 1362	To treat with David Bruce for a final peace	John Thoresby, Thomas Hatfield, Gilbert Welton	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 659; *Rot. Scot,* i, pp. 864.
7 July 1362	To prorogue the truce with Charles of Blois	William Edington, Simon Langham	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 662.
23 September 1362	To prorogue the truce with Charles of Blois	William Edington, Simon Langham	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 677.
20 July 1364	To treat for a marriage between Edmund of Langley and Margaret, duchess of Burgundy	Simon Sudbury	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 744.
5 June 1370	To treat regarding the conservation of the Anglo-Scottish truce	Thomas Appleby	*Rot. Scot,* i, p. 939.
5 July 1370	To discuss the conservation of the Anglo-Scottish truce	Thomas Hatfield	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 895.
19 February 1372	To treat with Charles V	Simon Sudbury	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 934.
20 February 1372	To grant safe-conducts to Frenchmen	Simon Sudbury	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 934.
8 January 1373	To treat for peace with Charles V	Simon Sudbury	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 969.
16 March 1373	To discuss the Anglo-Scottish truce	Thomas Appleby	*Rot. Scot,* i, p. 958.
25 July 1373	To treat for the correction of the Anglo-Scottish truce	Thomas Appleby	*Rot. Scot,* i, p. 960.
26 July 1374	To treat with papal nuncios	John Gilbert	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1007.

29 August 1374	To treat with Scottish commissioners about the settlement of disputes concerning Jeddeworth Forest	Thomas Appleby	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1011; *Rot. Scot,* i, p. 965.
20 February 1375	To treat for peace with France	Simon Sudbury	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1024.
21 February 1375	To make a truce with France	Simon Sudbury	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1025.
28 February 1375	To redress injuries to the Flemings	John Gilbert	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1026.
20 September 1375	To treat with Charles V	Simon Sudbury	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1039.
23 September 1375	To prorogue the truce with France	Simon Sudbury	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1040.
20 October 1375	To treat with the count of Flanders, and the communities of Flanders and Friesland	Simon Sudbury	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1042.
12 June 1376	To treat for peace with France	John Gilbert	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1053.
12 June 1376	To grant safe-conducts to French ambassadors	John Gilbert	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1054.
2 August 1376	To receive money from Charles V	John Gilbert	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1059.
20 February 1377	To treat with Charles V	John Gilbert	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1073.
11 March 1377	To treat with the count and communities of Flanders	John Gilbert	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1074.
26 March 1377	To treat with France	Adam Houghton, John Gilbert	*Foedera,* iii, ii, p. 1076.

*connotes a bishop-elect

Other Identifiable Episcopal Diplomatic Missions:

Date	Mission	Bishop	Reference
April 1331	To accompany Edward to pay homage to Philip VI	John Stratford	*Foedera,* ii, ii, p. 815; *PROME,* September 1331, Introduction.
1348	To accompany Princess Joan for her marriage to Peter of Castile	John Kirkby	*Foedera,* iii, i, pp. 151, 176.
1360	To negotiate the Treaty of Calais	William Edington	Numerous chronicle and record sources (see, for instance, those cited in Tout, *Chapters,* iii, pp. 227-9).

1370	To stand surety for Charles the Bad's visit to the English court	Thomas Hatfield	Ormrod, *Edward III*, p. 508.
1373	To treat with the pope on a variety of matters	John Gilbert	*CPL, 1362-1404*, pp. 125-6; Lepine, 'Gilbert, John'.
1375	To treat with the pope at Bruges	Adam Houghton	*CPL, 1362-1404*, p. 144; Workman, *John Wyclif*, i, pp. 246-50.

Appendix 11: Instances on which Edward III Dispatched Commissions of Oyer and Terminer to Investigate Complaints made by Bishops whose Lands he had taken into his 'Special Protection'

Date Commission Dispatched	Episcopal Complainant	Reason for the Episcopal Lands being under Edward's 'Special Protection'	Source
14 February 1340	Richard de Bury	Serving as a diplomat	*CPR, 1338-40,* p. 482.
14 February 1340	Richard de Bury	Serving as a diplomat	*CPR, 1338-40,* p. 486.
8 June 1340	Richard de Bury	Serving as a diplomat	*CPR, 1338-40,* p. 558.
8 June 1340	Richard de Bury	Serving as a diplomat	*CPR, 1338-40,* p. 558.
8 June 1340	Richard de Bury	Serving as a diplomat	*CPR, 1338-40,* p. 558.
1 September 1350	William Bateman	Serving as a diplomat	*CPR, 1348-50,* p. 592.
27 February 1351	John Thoresby	Serving as chancellor	*CPR, 1350-4,* p. 79.
27 February 1351	John Thoresby	Serving as chancellor	*CPR, 1350-4,* p. 79.
18 May 1351	John Thoresby	Serving as chancellor	*CPR, 1350-4,* pp. 94-5.
8 July 1353	John Thoresby	Serving as chancellor	*CPR, 1350-4,* p. 511.
8 September 1354	John Thoresby	Serving as chancellor	*CPR, 1354-8,* p. 127.
12 June 1363	Simon Langham	Serving as chancellor	*CPR, 1361-4,* p. 372.
17 June 1363	William Edington	Serving as a councillor	*CPR, 1361-4,* p. 372.
20 June 1363	William Edington	Being 'constantly occupied in the king's affairs'	*CPR, 1361-4,* p. 374.
20 June 1364	William Edington	Being 'constantly occupied with the king's business	*CPR, 1361-4,* p. 544.
10 July 1364	John Barnet	Serving as treasurer	*CPR, 1364-7,* p. 64.
13 February 1371	William Wykeham	Serving as chancellor	*CPR, 1370-4,* p. 103.

Appendix 12: Pardons Interceded for in the Reign of Edward III by the Clergy and the Titled Nobility

Clerical Intercessors:

Name of Intercessor	Total Number of Pardons for which they Successfully Interceded	Pardons Successfully Interceded for under Episcopal Chancellors*	Pardons Successfully Interceded for under Lay Chancellors	Pardons Successfully Interceded for under John Offord, dean of Lincoln
Peter Abbeville, prior of Lenton	3	3		
Thomas Appleby, bishop of Carlisle	2	2		
John Barnet, bishop of Ely	1	1		
William Bateman, bishop of Norwich	2	2		
Robert of Battle, abbot of Battle	1	1		
John Benham, abbot of Chertsey	1	1		
Ralph Bourne, abbot of St Augustine's, Canterbury	1	1		
John Buckingham, bishop of Lincoln	5	5		
Henry Burghersh, bishop of Lincoln	4	4		
Henry Burghersh, bishop of Lincoln, and Thomas Bradeston	1	1		
Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham	9	8	1	
Cardinals of St Praxeds and St Mary in Aquiro	1	1		
William Cloune, abbot of Leicester	1	1		
William Edington, bishop of Winchester	13	13		
William Edington and Thomas Brembre	1	1		
John Harewell, bishop of Bath and Wells	2		2	
Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham	21		1	20
Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury	7	7		
Ralph Kilmessan, bishop of Down	1		1	
John Kirkby, bishop of Carlisle	1	1		
Simon Langham, prior of Westminster	1	1		
John Leek, chaplain	1	1		
Dean and Chapter of Lincoln Cathedral	1	1		
William Melton, archbishop of York	1	1		
Richard Mirymouth, chaplain	1	1		
William Mugge, dean of St George, Windsor	4	3	1	
John Offord, archdeacon of Ely	1		1	
Alexander Ramsey, abbot of Barlings	1	1		
Audrouin, abbot of Cluny	3	3		
Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells	1			1
Joan Stotevill, nun of Brodholme	1			1
John Stratford, archbishop of Canterbury	10	4	5	1
John Stratford, archbishop of Canterbury, and Henry Lancaster	1	1		
John Stratford, archbishop of Canterbury and Robert Stratford, bishop of Chichester	1		1	

Cardinal of Tusculum and Cardinal of St John and St Paul	1			1
John Woderove, confessor	1		1	
Richard Wynklee, confessor	5			5
Richard Wynklee, confessor, and Richard Norwich	1	1		
Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury	3	3		
Total Number of Pardons	117	74	14	29
Pardons Obtained Per Year	2.3	2.1	1.3	9.7

(Lay) Noble Intercessors:

Name of Intercessor	Total Number of Pardons for which they Successfully Interceded	Pardons Successfully Interceded for under Episcopal Chancellors*	Pardons Successfully Interceded for under Lay Chancellors	Pardons Successfully Interceded for under John Offord, dean of Lincoln
Richard Fitzalan, earl of Arundel	46	17	13	16
Richard Fitzalan, earl of Arundel, and Geoffrey Saye	2	2		
Richard Fitzalan, earl of Arundel, and Hugh Stafford, earl of Stafford	1	1		
Richard Fitzalan, earl of Arundel, and Walter Mauny	1		1	
Richard Fitzalan, earl of Arundel, and John, his brother	1	1		
Enguerrand de Coucy, earl of Bedford	3	3		
John, duke of Brabant	1	1		
John de Montfort, duke of Brittany and earl of Richmond	5	3	2	
Henry Beaumont, earl of Buchan	3	3		
Edmund of Langley, earl of Cambridge	2	1	1	
Edmund of Woodstock, earl of Kent	3	3		
Edward of Woodstock, prince of Wales and duke of Cornwall	224	172	4	48
Lewis, count of Flanders	1	1		
Eleanor, duchess of Guelders	1	1		
Reginald, duke of Guelders and Bavaria	1	1		
Humphrey de Bohun, earl of Hereford and Essex	6	2	4	
Juliana, countess of Huntingdon	2	2		
William Clinton, earl of Huntingdon	10	5	3	2
Isabella, countess of Bedford	15	13	2	1
Joan of Kent, princess of Wales	3	3		
John of Eltham, earl of Cornwall; Henry, earl of Lancaster; William Montacute; and Henry Ferciis	1	1		
John of Gaunt, earl of Lancaster	26	9	17	

Margaret, countess of Kent	1	1		
Henry, earl of Lancaster, and Henry Grosmont, earl of Derby	6	2	4	
Henry of Grosmont, earl of Derby and duke of Lancaster	304	63	105	136
Henry of Grosmont, earl of Derby and duke of Lancaster; William de Bohun, earl of Northampton; and Roger Mortimer, 2nd earl of March	1	1		
Lionel of Antwerp, duke of Clarence and earl of Ulster	13	12		1
Edmund Mortimer, earl of March	3	1	2	
Roger Mortimer, 1st earl of March	8	8		
Roger Mortimer, 2nd earl of March	5	5		
Roger Mortimer, 1st earl of March, and Gilbert Talebot	1	1		
Mary, countess of Norfolk	3	3		
William de Bohun, earl of Northampton	75	19	46	10
William de Bohun, earl of Northampton, Thomas Beauchamp, Robert Ufford, and William Clinton	1			1
Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland	4	1	3	
Agnes, countess of Pembroke	2	2		
Mary, countess of Pembroke	2	1	1	
John Hastings, earl of Pembroke	7	2	5	
Edmund, earl of Cambridge and Queen Philippa	1	1		
John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster; William de Bohun, earl of Northampton; and the queen	1	1		
William Montacute, 1st earl of Salisbury	11	9	2	
William Montacute, 2nd earl of Salisbury	7	4	3	
William Montacute, 1st earl of Salisbury, and John Pulteneye	1	1		
Hugh Stafford, earl of Stafford	2		2	
Ralph Stafford, earl of Stafford	14	9	2	3
Ralph Ufford, earl of Suffolk	26	5	4	17
William Ufford, earl of Suffolk	3	1	2	
John Warenne, earl of Surrey	3	3		
Thomas Beauchamp, earl of Warwick	40	8	15	17
Total Number of Pardons	903	409	243	252
Pardons Obtained Per Year	18.1	11.4	22.1	84

Source: Lacey, *Royal Pardon,* pp. 194-212.

Notes: * Regrettably (but understandably) Helen Lacey's appendices give only the year in which pardons were granted, rather than the precise date. Accordingly, any pardons granted in the years 1341-5 and 1371-6 have been deemed to have been granted under a lay chancellor (although in the last two months of 1345, and the first three months of 1371, there was an episcopal chancellor); any pardons granted in the years 1346-8 have been deemed to have been granted under the chancellorship

of John Offord (which was, in fact, the case); and any pardons granted during the remainder of Edward's reign have been deemed to have been granted under an episcopal chancellor (although in the last month of 1340 and the first month of 1377 the chancellor was a laymen, and in the first five months of 1349, John Offord [admittedly then archbishop-elect of Canterbury] continued in office): *HBC*, p. 86.

Appendix 13: Patronage with Recorded Justifications

Bishop	Date	Type of Patronage	Justification	Reference
Henry Burghersh	15 April 1329	Grant	'To save his father's soul from peril and to recompense the bishop… for his expense at Stanhope and elsewhere in the service of the king after he assumed the governance of the realm'	*CPR, 1327-30,* p. 384.
Henry Burghersh	27 September 1329	Licence	'in consideration of his profitable services and the great place he holds in the direction of the king's affairs'	*CPR, 1327-30,* p. 453.
Henry Burghersh	9 August 1330	Grant	'for the affection which the king bears to Henry, bishop of Lincoln, the chancellor'	*CPR, 1327-30,* p. 548.
John Stratford	15 July 1334	Gift	'for his great services in directing the business of the king and realm'	*CPR, 1330-4,* p. 539.
John Stratford	15 July 1334	Gift	'in regard to his great labours in the direction of the affairs of the king and his realm'	*CPR, 1330-4,* p. 565.
John Kirkby	23 October 1334	Licence	'for the affection which he bears to John, the present bishop'	*CPR, 1334-8,* p. 36.
Richard de Bury	5 June 1335	Grant	'in consideration of his labours and charges in the service of Edward II and the present king'	*CPR, 1334-8,* p. 117.
Richard de Bury	5 June 1335	Grant	'in consideration of his labours and charges in the service of Edward II and of the present king'	*CPR, 1334-8,* p. 120.
Simon Montacute	7 June 1335	Licence	'in recognition of the constancy of the faith and love towards the king and the various labours in his service of William de Monte Acuto, the bishop's kinsmen, as well as for the special affection which the king bears to the bishop'	*CPR, 1334-8,* p. 120.
John Stratford	29 December 1335	Pardon	'in consideration of his great labours and charges in the king's service and of the great place which he holds in the direction of the affairs of the king and the realm'	*CPR, 1334-8,* p. 193.
William Airmyn	14 April 1336	Grant	'having regard to his manifold services to Edward I, Edward II, and the king, and to the great place which he has held for the king and realm'	*CPR, 1334-8,* p. 239.
John Stratford	7 June 1338	Pardon	'in consideration of his fruitful services to the king and realm, his heavy charges and anxieties therein, and the high place which he has long held in the direction of public affairs'	*CPR, 1338-40,* p. 88.
Robert Stratford	16 July 1338	Pardon	'in consideration of his charges in the public service and the great place which he holds therein'	*CPR, 1338-40,* p. 120.

Robert Stratford	10 September 1340	Grant	‘in consideration of his heavy expenses since he became chancellor as well as maintaining the king’s honour in supporting the charges incumbent on the office’	*CPR, 1340-3*, p. 32.
Richard de Bury	26 April 1345	Grant	‘for the special affection which the king bore to Richard, late bishop of Durham’	*CPR, 1343-5*, p. 455.
John Kirkby	14 May 1346	Pardon	‘in consideration of the good service of the bishop’	*CPR, 1345-8*, p. 83.
John Stratford	16 March 1348	Licence	‘at the request of the John de Stretford, archbishop of Canterbury, who has long laboured with effect in the direction of the business of him [the king] and the realm’	*CPR, 1348-50*, pp. 58-9.
Roger Northburgh	20 November 1348	Grant	‘in remembrance of his services to Edward I, Edward II, and to the present king’	*CPR, 1348-50*, p. 211.
William Bateman	28 May 1349	Pardon	‘in consideration of the bishop's good bearing and the great place which he holds for him as well as of his good faith and verity in the said business’	*CPR, 1348-50*, p. 297.
William Bateman	16 May 1350	Grant	‘for the affection which he bears to the present bishop on account of his good service over the direction of his business’	*CPR, 1348-50*, p. 551.
John Thoresby	12 August 1351	Grant	‘towards his charges in the king's service and in the keeping of the household of chancery’	*CPR, 1350-4*, p. 132.
Ralph Stratford	7 March 1352	Licence	‘of his special affection for the bishop’	*CPR, 1350-4*, p. 239.
John Gynwell	28 February 1358	Pardon	‘for the honour of God and of the church of St Mary, Lincoln, and the king's affection for John, bishop of that place'	*CPR, 1358-61*, pp. 18-19.
William Edington	18 June 1361	Licence	‘in consideration of the bishop's long service in the realm’	*CPR, 1361-4*, p. 38.
William Wykeham	20 May 1368	Pardon	‘in consideration of his long service to the king and of the great place which he held, and holds, in divers ways in the king's business’	*CPR, 1367-70*, p. 120
John Harewell	10 November 1371	Pardon	‘in consideration of his manifold services to him [the king]’	*CPR, 1370-4*, p. 146.

Appendix 14: Episcopal Translations in the Reign of Edward III

Bishop	Royal Minister at the Date of Translation	Royal Diplomat in the Year of Translation	Royal Diplomat prior to the Year of Translation	Date (of the Papal Bull of Provision)	Diocese from which the Bishop was Translated	Diocese to which the Bishop was Translated
Adam Orleton		✓		28 September 1327	Hereford	Worcester
John Stratford	✓			26 November 1333	Winchester	Canterbury
Adam Orleton		✓		1 December 1333	Worcester	Winchester
Simon Montacute				14 March 1337	Worcester	Ely
John Thoresby	✓			4 September 1349	St Davids	Worcester
John Thoresby	✓			17 October 1352	Worcester	York
Reginald Brian				22 October 1352	St Davids	Worcester
John Barnet	✓			25 November 1363	Worcester	Bath and Wells
William Whittlesey			✓	6 March 1364	Rochester	Worcester
Simon Langham	✓			24 July 1366	Ely	Canterbury
John Barnet	✓			15 December 1366	Bath and Wells	Ely
William Lenn				11 October 1368	Chichester	Worcester
William Whittlesey			✓	11 October 1368	Worcester	Canterbury
Simon Sudbury		✓		4 May 1375	London	Canterbury
William Courtenay				12 September 1375	Hereford	London
John Gilbert		✓		12 September 1375	Bangor	Hereford

Sources: *ODNB*; *HBC.*

N.B. This table excludes translations which were never ‘completed’, such as Reginald Brian’s translation from Worcester to Ely in 1361, when the bishop died before the process could be finalised, and William Edington’s translation from Winchester to Canterbury in 1366, when the Canterbury monks postulated him to the archbishopric, but the bishop declined the postulation: Haines, ‘Brian, Reginald’; Davies, ‘Edington, William’.

Appendix 15: The Amount of Time in Which Bishops Served the Crown as Diplomats and Ministers

Bishop	Number of years for which the bishop served Edward III as a minister	Number of years in which the bishop served Edward III as a diplomat	Number of years in which the bishop did not serve as a minister or a diplomat, having previously served the crown in at least one of those capacities	Length of episcopate for bishops who never served the crown as either a diplomat or a minister
William Airmyn	1	8	1.5	-
Thomas Appleby	-	3	2.5	-
Thomas Arundel	-	-	-	3
John Barnet	6	1	4	-
William Bateman	-	7	3	-
Louis Beaumont	-	-	-	6.5
Anthony Bek	-	-	-	6.5
Thomas Bek	-	-	-	4.5
James Berkeley	-	-	-	0.5
Richard Bintworth	1.5	-	-	-
Daffyd ap Bleddyn	-	-	-	18
Thomas Bradwardine	-	-	0.5	-
Wulfstan Bransford	-	-	-	10.5
Thomas Brantingham	1	-	6	-
Reginald Brian	-	-	-	10.5
Thomas Brinton	-	-	-	4.5
Thomas Buckingham	-	-	14	-
Henry Burghersh	6.5	6	3.5	-
Richard de Bury	1.5	7	3.5	-
Gervase de Castro	-	-	-	4
Lewis Charlton	-	-	-	7.5
Thomas Charlton	1	1	14	-
Thomas Cobham	-	-	0.5	-
William Courtenay	-	-	-	7
Roger Craddock	-	-	-	14.5
Henry Despenser	-	-	-	7
John Droxford	-	-	1.5	-
John Eaglescliffe	-	-	-	19
William Edington	15	3	3	-
Matthew Englefield	-	-	-	29
Ralph Erghum	-	-	-	1.5
Thomas Fastolf	-	-	9	-
John Gilbert	-	5	-	-

Henry Gower	-	3	15	-
John Grandisson	-	-	-	41
Stephen Gravesend	-	-	-	11
Hywel ap Gronow	-	-	-	1
John Gynwell	-	-	15	-
John Harewell	-	-	10	-
Thomas Hatfield	-	10	22	-
Thomas Hempnall	-	-	-	1.5
Hamo Hethe	-	-	-	25
Adam Houghton	0.5	2	14	-
John Hotham	1	-	8	-
Simon Islip	-	1	14.5	-
John Kirkby	-	2	9	-
Simon Langham	6.5	1	1	-
John Langton	-	-	10.5	-
William Lenn	-	-	11	-
Thomas de Lisle	-	-	16	-
Llywelyn ap Madoc	-	-	-	18
David Martin	-	-	-	1
Roger Martival	-	-	-	3
William Melton	0.5	2	10.5	
Simon Meopham	-	-	-	5
Simon Montacute	-	-	-	12
Alexander Neville	-	-	-	3
Michael Northburgh	-	-	6	-
Roger Northburgh	0.5	3	28.5	-
Adam Orleton	0.5	7	11.5	
John Paschal	-	-	-	17.5
Thomas Percy	-	-	-	13.5
William Reade	-	-	-	8
Walter Reynolds	-	-	1	-
Thomas Ringstead	-	-	-	8.5
John Ross	-	-	-	5.5
Anian Sais	-	-	-	1
John Sheppey	4	-	3.5	-
Ralph Shrewsbury	-	-	-	34
William Spridlington	-	-	-	0.5
Simon Sudbury	-	6	7	-
John Stratford	6	8	7	-
Ralph Stratford	-	3	9.5	-
Robert Stratford	1.5	0	23.5	-
Robert Stretton	-	-	17	-
John Swaffham	-	-	-	1
John Thoresby	7.5	3	17	-

John Trevor	-	-	-	10.5
John Trillek	-	-	-	16
Thomas Trillek	-	-	-	8.5
Henry Wakefield	0.5	-	-	-
Gilbert Welton	-	6	4	-
William Whittlesey	-	-	13.5	-
Willam Wykeham	3.5	-	6.5	-
Robert Wyvil	-	-	45	-
William Zouche	-	-	10	-
Total	66	95	433.5	400

Source: *ODNB*; *HBC*; *Foedera*; *Rot. Scot.*; Blust, ‘Clerical Diplomats’.

Appendix 16: A Breakdown of the Patronage Received by Bishops in the Reign of Edward III

Broad 'Category' of Patronage	Sub-Category	Number of Instances
Licences		
	Mortmain Licences	71
	Licences to Grant Property (Aside from in Mortmain or Frank Almoin)	37
	Licences to Appropriate Churches	15
	Licences to Crenulate or Impark *etc.*	14
	Licences to Alienate in Frank Almoin	8
	Licences to Found Hospitals, Colleges, or Religious Houses	6
	Other Licences	27
	Total	178
Grants		
	Direct Grants of Land	16
	Grants of Wardships	13
	Grants of Privileges	8
	Grants of Pavage	6
	Grants of Pontage	4
	Grants of Reversions	3
	Grants of Alien Priory Property	2
	Other Grants	21
	Total	73
Pardons		
	Pardons for Acquiring and Entering into Property Without Licence	12
	Pardons for Hunting Offences	8
	Pardons of Financial Debts to the Crown	6
	Pardons for the Escape of Clerks from Episcopal Prisons	5
	Other Pardons	12
	Total	43
Gifts		
	Gifts of Crops	2
	Gifts of Stones	1
	Total	3
Exemptions		
	Exemption from Attendance at Councils and Parliaments *etc.*	1
	Other Exemptions	1
	Total	2
Total		299

Source: *CPR.*

Appendix 17: Patronage Received by Bishops

Bishop	Number of Acts of Patronage Received while serving Edward III as Chancellor or Treasurer	Number of Acts of Patronage Received in the Year(s) in which they served Edward III as a Diplomat	Number of Acts of Patronage Received after they had served the Crown as either a Minister or a Diplomat	Number of Acts of Patronage Received having never served the Crown as either a Minister or a Diplomat	Number of Acts of Patronage Received (Total)
William Airmyn	1	5	1	-	6
Thomas Appleby	-	0	0	-	0
Thomas Arundel	-	-	-	0	0
John Barnet	1	1	1	-	3
William Bateman	-	3	1	-	4
Louis Beaumont	-	-	-	2	2
Anthony Bek	-	-	-	0	0
Thomas Bek	-	-	-	1	1
James Berkeley	-	-	-	0	0
Richard Bintworth	0	-	0	-	0
Daffyd ap Bleddyn	-	-	-	0	1
Thomas Bradwardine	-	-	0	-	0
Wulfstan Bransford	-	-	-	2	2
Thomas Brantingham	0	-	1	-	1
Reginald Brian	-	-	-	1	1
Thomas Brinton	-	-	-	2	2
John Buckingham	-	-	0	-	0
Henry Burghersh	26	11	3	-	31
Richard de Bury	4	1	1	-	6
Gervase de Castro	-	-	-	0	0
Lewis Charlton	-	-	-	0	0
Thomas Charlton	0	0	1	-	1
Thomas Cobham	-	-	0	-	0
William Courtenay	-	-	-	0	0
Roger Craddock	-	-	-	0	0
Henry Despenser	-	-	-	0	0
John Droxford	-	-	0	-	0
John Eaglescliffe	-	-	-	1	1
William Edington	28	4	3	-	31
Matthew Englefield	-	-	-	1	1
Ralph Erghum	-	-	-	0	0
Thomas Fastolf	-	-	0	-	0
John Gilbert	-	1	-	-	1
Henry Gower	-	2	4	-	6
John Grandisson	-	-	-	16	16

Stephen Gravesend	-	-	-	0	0
Hywel ap Gronow	-	-	-	0	0
John Gynwell	-	-	5	-	5
John Harewell	-	-	2	-	2
Thomas Hatfield	-	1	0	-	1
Thomas Hempnall	-	-	-	0	0
Hamo Hethe	-	-	-	3	3
Adam Houghton	1	1	1	-	2
John Hotham	4	-	11	-	15
Simon Islip	-	1	12	-	13
John Kirkby	-	0	1	-	5
Simon Langham	2	0	1	-	3
John Langton	-	-	1	-	1
William Lenn	-	-	1	-	1
Thomas de Lisle	-	-	1	-	1
Llywelyn ap Madoc	-	-	-	0	0
David Martin	-	-	-	0	0
Roger Martival	-	-	-	0	0
William Melton	0	0	6	-	6
Simon Meopham	-	-	-	0	0
Simon Montacute	-	-	-	4	4
Alexander Neville	-	-	-	0	0
Michael Northburgh	-	-	1	-	1
Roger Northburgh	0	1	6	-	7
Adam Orleton	1	4	2	-	6
John Paschal	-	-	-	1	1
Thomas Percy	-	-	-	0	0
William Reade	-	-	-	1	1
Walter Reynolds	-	-	0	-	0
Thomas Ringstead	-	-	-	0	0
John Ross	-	-	-	0	0
Anian Sais	-	-	-	0	0
John Sheppey	3	-	0	-	3
Ralph Shrewsbury	-	-	-	21	21
William Spridlington	-	-	-	1	0
Simon Sudbury	-	5	2	-	7
John Stratford	19	14	13	-	34
Ralph Stratford	-	1	2	-	3
Robert Stratford	1	-	2	-	3
Robert Stretton	-	-	1	-	1
John Swaffham	-	-	-	0	0
John Thoresby	1	0	3	-	4
John Trevor	-	-	-	0	0
John Trillek	-	-	-	0	0
Thomas Trillek	-	-	-	1	1
Henry Wakefield	0	-	-	-	0

Gilbert Welton	-	2	1	-	3
William Whittlesey	-	-	2	-	2
Willam Wykeham	6	-	9	-	15
Robert Wyvil	-	-	6	-	6
William Zouche	-	-	1	-	1
Total	98	58	109	58	299

Source: *CPR.*

Appendix 18: Cases Where Bishops were the Ultimate Beneficiary of Patronage (Where Edward III Granted Others a Licence to Grant Property to Them)

Bishop	Number of Such Cases While Serving as Chancellor or Treasurer	Number of Such Cases in the Year(s) in which they Served as a Diplomat	Number of Such Cases after they had Served as either a Minister or a Diplomat	Number of Such Cases having never served as either a Minister or a Diplomat	Number of Such Cases (Total)
William Airmyn	-	1	-	-	1
Thomas Appleby	-	0	0	-	0
Thomas Arundel	-	-	-	0	0
John Barnet	0	-	1	-	1
William Bateman	-	0	0	-	0
Louis Beaumont	-	-	-	-	0
Anthony Bek	-	-	-	0	0
Thomas Bek	-	-	-	6	6
James Berkeley	-	-	-	0	0
Richard Bintworth	0	-	0	-	0
Daffyd ap Bleddyn	-	-	-	0	0
Thomas Bradwardine	-	-	0	-	0
Wulfstan Bransford	-	-	-	1	1
John Brantingham	0	-	0	-	0
Reginald Brian	-	-	-	0	0
Thomas Brinton	-	-	-	0	0
John Buckingham	-	-	1	-	1
Henry Burghersh	7	1	8	-	16
Richard de Bury	0	0	0	-	0
Gervase de Castro	-	-	-	0	0
Lewis Charlton	-	-	-	0	0
Thomas Charlton	0	0	1	-	1
Thomas Cobham	-	-	0	-	0
William Courtenay	-	-	-	0	0
Roger Craddock	-	-	-	0	0
Henry Despenser	-	-	-	0	0
John Droxford	-	-	0	-	0
John Eaglescliffe	-	-	-	0	0
William Edington	6	0	1	-	7
Matthew Englefield	-	-	-	0	0
Ralph Erghum	-	-	-	0	0
Thomas Fastolf	-	-	0	-	0
John Gilbert	-	0	-	-	0
Henry Gower	-	1	1	-	2
John Grandisson	-	-	-	2	2
Stephen Gravesend	-	-	-	1	1
Hywel ap Gronow	-	-	-	0	0

John Gynwell	-	-	2	-	2
John Harewell	-	-	0	-	0
Thomas Hatfield	-	1	1	-	2
Thomas Hempnall	-	-	-	0	0
Hamo Hethe	-	-	-	1	1
Adam Houghton	0	0	2	-	2
John Hotham	0	-	4	-	4
Simon Islip	-	0	3	-	3
John Kirkby	-	0	0	-	0
Simon Langham	0	0	0	-	0
John Langton	-	-	1	-	1
William Lenn	-	-	0	-	0
Thomas de Lisle	-	-	0	-	0
Llywelyn ap Madoc	-	-	-	0	0
David Martin	-	-	-	0	0
Roger Martival	-	-	-	0	0
William Melton	0	0	2	-	2
Simon Meopham	-	-	-	0	0
Simon Montacute	-	-	-	0	0
Alexander Neville	-	-	-	0	0
Michael Northburgh	-	-	0	-	0
Roger Northburgh	0	0	1	-	1
Adam Orleton	0	0	0	-	1
John Paschal	-	-	-	0	0
Thomas Percy	-	-	-	1	1
William Reade	-	-	-	0	0
Walter Reynolds	-	-	0	-	0
Thomas Ringstead	-	-	-	0	0
John Ross	-	-	-	0	0
Anian Sais	-	-	-	0	0
John Sheppey	0	-	0	-	0
Ralph Shrewsbury	-	-	-	2	2
William Spridlington	-	-	-	0	0
Simon Sudbury	-	0	2	-	2
John Stratford	0	3	3	-	6
Ralph Stratford	-	1	2	-	3
Robert Stratford	1	-	2	-	3
Robert Stretton	-	-	0	-	0
John Swaffham	-	-	-	0	0
John Thoresby	0	2	1	-	3
John Trevor	-	-	-	0	0
John Trillek	-	-	-	1	1
Thomas Trillek	-	-	-	0	0
Henry Wakefield	0	-	-	-	0
Gilbert Welton	-	0	0	-	0
William Whittlesey	-	-	0	-	0

Willam Wykeham	1	-	1	-	2
Robert Wyvil	-	-	0	-	0
William Zouche	-	-	2	-	2
Total	15	9	41	15	80

Source: *CPR.*

Appendix 19: Patronage Granted to Others at the Request of Bishops

Bishop	Number of Acts of Patronage Obtained for Others while serving as a Minister	Number of Acts of Patronage Obtained for Others while serving as a Diplomat	Number of Acts of Patronage Obtained for Others after serving as either a Minister or a Diplomat	Number of Acts of Patronage Obtained for Others having never served as either a Minister or a Diplomat
William Airmyn	0	3	0	-
Thomas Appleby	-	0	0	-
Thomas Arundel	-	-	-	0
John Barnet	0	0	1	-
William Bateman	-	7	2	-
Louis Beaumont	-	-	-	0
Anthony Bek	-	-	-	0
Thomas Bek	-	-	-	0
James Berkeley	-	-	-	0
Richard Bintworth	0	-	-	-
Daffyd ap Bleddyn	-	-	-	0
Thomas Bradwardine	-	-	0	-
Wulfstan Bransford	-	-	-	0
Thomas Brantingham	0	-	0	-
Reginald Brian	-	-	-	0
Thomas Brinton	-	-	-	0
Thomas Buckingham	-	-	2	-
Henry Burghersh	2	4	0	-
Richard de Bury	2	7	2	-
Gervase de Castro	-	-	-	0
Lewis Charlton	-	-	-	0
Thomas Charlton	0	0	0	-
Thomas Cobham	-	-	0	-
William Courtenay	-	-	-	0
Roger Craddock	-	-	-	0
Henry Despenser	-	-	-	0
John Droxford	-	-	0	-
John Eaglescliffe	-	-	-	0
William Edington	72	6	2	-
Matthew Englefield	-	-	-	0
Ralph Erghum	-	-	-	1
Thomas Fastolf	-	-	0	-
John Gilbert	-	0	-	-

Henry Gower	-	0	0	-
John Grandisson	-	-	-	0
Stephen Gravesend	-	-	-	1
Hywel ap Gronow	-	-	-	0
John Gynwell	-	-	0	-
John Harewell	-	-	1	-
Thomas Hatfield	-	2	28	-
Thomas Hempnall	-	-	-	0
Hamo Hethe	-	-	-	0
Adam Houghton	0	0	0	-
John Hotham	5	-	4	-
Simon Islip	-	1	5	-
John Kirkby	-	0	-	-
Simon Langham	1	0	0	-
John Langton	-	-	1	-
William Lenn	-	-	0	-
Thomas de Lisle	-	-	0	-
Llywelyn ap Madoc	-	-	-	0
David Martin	-	-	-	0
Roger Martival	-	-	-	0
William Melton	0	0	1	-
Simon Meopham	-	-	-	0
Simon Montacute	-	-	-	1
Alexander Neville	-	-	-	0
Michael Northburgh	-	-	0	-
Roger Northburgh	0	0	1	-
Adam Orleton	3	4	1	-
John Paschal	-	-	-	0
Thomas Percy	-	-	-	0
William Reade	-	-	-	0
Walter Reynolds	-	-	0	-
Thomas Ringstead	-	-	-	0
John Ross	-	-	-	0
Anian Sais	-	-	-	0
John Sheppey	1	-	0	-
Ralph Shrewsbury	-	-	-	4
William Spridlington	-	-	-	0
Simon Sudbury	0	1	0	1
John Stratford	6	7	5	-
Ralph Stratford	-	0	0	-
Robert Stratford	0	-	3	-
Robert Stretton	-	-	0	-
John Swaffham	-	-	-	0

John Thoresby	3	0	1	-
John Trevor	-	-	-	0
John Trillek	-	-	-	0
Thomas Trillek	-	-	-	0
Henry Wakefield	1	-	0	-
Gilbert Welton	-	1	0	-
William Whittlesey	-	-	0	-
Willam Wykeham	1	-	3	-
Robert Wyvil	-	-	6	-
William Zouche	-	-	0	-
Total	97	43	69	7

Source: *CPR.*

Appendix 20: The Patronage Obtained by Bishops - A Summary

	By Episcopal Ministers	By Episcopal Diplomats	By Bishops no longer serving as either a Minister or a Diplomat	By Bishops who never served as either a Minister or a Diplomat
Number of Acts of Patronage Directly Received	98	58	110	58
Number of Acts of Patronage Ultimately Received	15	9	41	15
Number of Acts of Patronage Acquired for Others	97	43	69	7
Total Number of Acts of Patronage Obtained	210	110	220	80

Source: *CPR*; Appendices 17-19.

Appendix 21: List of Embassies Headed by Bishops from Enrolled Accounts (as Identified by Mirot and Déprez and Corrected by Larson)

9 March – 13 April 1327	William Airmyn
9 March – 31 May 1327	John Stratford
25 March 1327 – 22 February 1328	Adam Orleton
(?) – (?) 1328	Henry Burghersh; William Airmyn
31 January – 25 March 1330	William Airmyn
31 January – 25 March 1330	Adam Orleton
11 April – 1 June 1330	Adam Orleton
20 April – 17 June 1330	William Airmyn
16 July – 6 September 1330	William Airmyn
16 July – 6 September 1330	Roger Northburgh
23 January – 25 March 1331	Adam Orleton
9 November 1332 – 21 January 1333	William Airmyn
22 February – 20 November 1333	Richard de Bury
30 September 1333 – 8 January 1334	William Airmyn
6 April – 3 July 1334	John Stratford
8 August – 30 October 1335	William Airmyn
12 July – 29 September 1336	Richard de Bury
21 July – 5 September 1336	Adam Orleton
4 October 1337 – 21 July 1338	Henry Burghersh
9 July 1338 – 10 October 1339	Richard de Bury
26 September – 16 December 1348	William Bateman
14 March – 7 May 1349	William Bateman
22 May – 21 June 1350	William Bateman
16 February – 17 March 1353	William Bateman; Simon Islip
6 November – 15 December 1353	William Bateman
12 November – 15 December 1353	Simon Islip
18 March – 17 April 1354	William Bateman
4 October 1354 – 6 January 1355	William Bateman; Michael Northburgh*
19 July – 13 September 1364	Simon Sudbury
21 February – 26 May 1365	Simon Sudbury
21 February – 9 April 1372	Simon Sudbury
7 January – 24 February 1373	Simon Sudbury
27 July 1374 – 10 January 1375	John Gilbert
28 February – 9 May 1375	John Gilbert
15 October 1375 – 6 April 1376 (a separate entry survives, which also covers the period 20 February – 6 April 1376)	Simon Sudbury
7 July – 13 September 1376	John Gilbert

*bishop-elect

Source: Mirot and Déprez, *Les Ambassades Anglaises*, as corrected by Larson, 'English Embassies', (and as corrected, in turn, by Haines, *Church and Politics*, pp. 231-4).

Appendix 22: Mortmain Licences Granted to Bishops

Name of Bishop	Date of Mortmain Licence	Was the Bishop a Royal Diplomat or Minister (either at the date of the licence or at some point beforehand)?	Reference
Adam Orleton	3 February 1329	✓	*CPR, 1327-30*, p. 366.
John Langton	1 September 1330	✓	*CPR, 1327-30*, p. 551.
John Stratford	25 February 1331	✓	*CPR, 1330-4*, p. 79.
John Stratford	23 June 1331	✓	*CPR, 1330-4*, p. 147.
John Stratford	8 September 1331	✓	*CPR, 1330-4*, p. 165.
John Stratford	8 September 1331	✓	*CPR, 1330-4*, p. 166.
Henry Gower	27 January 1332	✓	*CPR, 1330-4*, p. 238.
Henry Gower	31 March 1332	✓	*CPR, 1330-4*, p. 267.
John Stratford	5 February 1333	✓	*CPR, 1330-4*, p. 399.
John Stratford	21 November 1333	✓	*CPR, 1330-4*, p. 481.
John Stratford	4 July 1334	✓	*CPR, 1330-4*, p. 559.
Henry Gower	24 September 1334	✓	*CPR, 1334-8*, p. 20.
John Grandisson	26 September 1334		*CPR, 1334-8*, p. 20.
William Airmyn	23 September 1334	✓	*CPR, 1334-8*, p. 21.
John Hotham	2 April 1335	✓	*CPR, 1334-8*, p. 94.
John Grandisson	26 May 1335		*CPR, 1334-8*, p. 105.
John Grandisson	26 May 1335		*CPR, 1334-8*, p. 105.
John Stratford	8 April 1336	✓	*CPR, 1334-8*, p. 242.
Hamo Hethe	11 May 1336		*CPR, 1334-8*, p. 264.
John Stratford	10 July 1336	✓	*CPR, 1334-8*, p. 304.
Adam Orleton	24 June 1336	✓	*CPR, 1334-8*, p. 308.
John Stratford	4 July 1336	✓	*CPR, 1334-8*, p. 308.
John Stratford	18 March 1337	✓	*CPR, 1334-8*, p. 398.
John Stratford	12 February 1338	✓	*CPR, 1338-40*, p. 6.
John Grandisson	18 February 1338		*CPR, 1338-40*, p. 12.
John Grandisson	18 February 1338		*CPR, 1338-40*, p. 84.
John Grandisson	9 June 1338		*CPR, 1338-40*, p. 88.
John Grandisson	2 October 1338		*CPR, 1338-40*, p. 151.
John Stratford	1 April 1340	✓	*CPR, 1338-40*, p. 444.
John Stratford	1 August 1342	✓	*CPR, 1340-3*, p. 492.
Simon Montacute	24 July 1343		*CPR, 1343-5*, p. 104.
John Stratford	25 February 1345	✓	*CPR, 1343-5*, p. 439.
Simon Montacute	5 May 1345		*CPR, 1343-5*, p. 460.
John Stratford	16 November 1347	✓	*CPR, 1345-8*, p. 430.
Roger Northburgh	30 January 1348	✓	*CPR, 1348-50*, p. 28.
Roger Northburgh	30 January 1348	✓	*CPR, 1348-50*, p. 38.
John Stratford	3 May 1348	✓	*CPR, 1348-50*, p. 88.
John Stratford	23 July 1348	✓	*CPR, 1348-50*, p. 130.
Ralph Shrewsbury	3 December 1348		*CPR, 1348-50*, p. 215.
Ralph Shrewsbury	19 June 1349		*CPR, 1348-50*, p. 307.
William Edington	22 July 1349	✓	*CPR, 1348-50*, p. 348.
Simon Islip	20 November 1349	✓	*CPR, 1348-50*, p. 422.
William Edington	21 May 1351	✓	*CPR, 1350-4*, p. 96.

William Bateman	20 July 1351	✓	*CPR, 1350-4*, p. 124.
William Edington	24 November 1351	✓	*CPR, 1350-4*, p. 184.
Simon Islip	14 May 1352	✓	*CPR, 1350-4*, p. 267.
Simon Islip	23 May 1352	✓	*CPR, 1350-4*, p. 269.
Ralph Shrewsbury	24 August 1352		*CPR, 1350-4*, p. 321.
Robert Wyvil	23 October 1354	✓	*CPR, 1354-8*, p. 116.
Thomas Hatfield	7 February 1357	✓	*CPR, 1354-8*, p. 508.
Michael Northburgh	20 November 1357	✓	*CPR, 1354-8*, p. 644.
William Edington	20 September 1359	✓	*CPR, 1358-61*, p. 270.
William Edington	2 March 1360	✓	*CPR, 1358-61*, p. 340.
William Edington	7 June 1361	✓	*CPR, 1361-4*, p. 27.
William Edington	18 June 1361	✓	*CPR, 1361-4*, p. 38.
William Edington	28 June 1361	✓	*CPR, 1361-4*, p. 38.
Simon Islip	20 October 1361	✓	*CPR, 1361-4*, p. 139; *Canterbury College,* iii, p. 1.
John Barnet	28 June 1362	✓	*CPR, 1361-4*, p. 226.
Simon Langham	25 May 1363	✓	*CPR, 1361-4*, p. 343.
William Edington	24 September 1363	✓	*CPR, 1361-4*, p. 390.
William Edington	6 October 1363	✓	*CPR, 1361-4*, p. 400.
Simon Sudbury	28 July 1365	✓	*CPR, 1364-7*, p. 161.
William Whittlesey	15 October 1365	✓	*CPR, 1364-7*, p. 170.
Simon Langham	17 September 1367	✓	*CPR, 1367-70*, p. 5.
John Thoresby	12 November 1369	✓	*CPR, 1367-70*, p. 319.
William Wykeham	18 June 1369	✓	*CPR, 1367-70*, p. 335-6.
John Thoresby	4 February 1371	✓	*CPR, 1370-4*, p. 40.
William Reade	1 July 1373		*CPR, 1370-4*, pp. 321-2.
Simon Sudbury	21 February 1375	✓	*CPR, 1374-7*, p. 77.
Thomas Brinton	26 June 1375		*CPR, 1374-7*, p. 117.
Thomas Brantingham	10 October 1376	✓	*CPR, 1374-7*, p. 360.

Note: The licences in this table include licences to acquire and assign, as well as alienate, property in mortmain.

Appendix 23: The Chronological Distribution of Patronage Received by Bishops

Years	Number of Acts of Patronage Received by Bishops	Average Number of Acts of Patronage Received Per Year
1327-39	159	12.2
1340-59	134	6.7
1360-77	86	5.1

Source: *CPR.*

Appendix 24: Requests for Special Liturgical Efforts Connected with Royal Wars

Date of Royal Writ (Unless Otherwise Stated)	Purpose	Reference***
5 April 1333	For the king's army proceeding against the Scots	*Melton*, iii, pp. 118-9.
23 April 1333	For the king's success in his expedition against the Scots	*Foedera*, ii, ii, p. 858; *CCR, 1333-7*, p. 107.
22 July 1333	To give thanks following the king's capture of Berwick from the Scots	*Foedera*, ii, ii, p. 866; *CCR, 1333-7*, p. 128; *Stratford*, i, p. 270.
23 October 1334	For the success of the king's expedition against the Scots	*Foedera* ii, ii, p. 896-7; *CCR, 1333-7*, p. 347; *Montacute*, pp. 209-10.
18 June 1335	For the king's triumph over the Scots	*Foedera*, ii, ii, p. 910; *CCR, 1333-7*, pp. 502-3; *Montacute*, pp. 248-9.
19 August 1336 (date of archiepiscopal mandate)	For success against the Scots	*Montacute*, pp. 232-3.
2 June 1337 (date of archiepiscopal mandate)	For the king and his army proceeding against the Scots	*Shrewsbury*, i, pp. 305-6.
28 March 1338	For the safety of the king campaigning abroad	*Foedera*, ii, ii, p. 1025; *Kirkby*, i, pp. 82-3.
16 July 1338	For the safety of the king's crossing, and for his expedition across the sea	*CCR, 1337-9*, p. 520.
15 August 1339	For the success of the king's expedition to France	*Foedera* ii, ii, p. 1089; *CCR, 1339-41*, p. 258; *Bransford*, pp. 286-7.
28 June 1340	Following victory at the Battle of Sluys	*Foedera*, ii, ii, p. 1129; *Hethe*, ii, p. 652.
20 August 1342	For the king's expedition to France and for the army sent against the Scots	*Foedera*, ii, ii, p. 1209; *CCR, 1341-3*, p. 650; *RPD*, iii, pp. 499-500.
15 June 1345	For the success of the king's expedition against Philip of Valois	*Foedera*, iii, i, p. 45; *CCR, 1343-6*, p. 588; *Bransford*, p. 315.
27 February 1346	For the king's success in war against the French	*Foedera*, iii, i, p. 70; *CCR, 1346-9*, p. 45; *Edington*, i, pp. 7-8.
6 May 1346	For the success of the earl of Lancaster's expedition in Gascony*	*Foedera*, iii, i, p. 81; *CCR, 1346-9*, p. 65.
3 August 1346	For the king and his army in France	*Foedera*, iii, i, p. 88; *CCR, 1346-9*, p. 145; *Edington*, ii, p. 3.
25 October 1348	For the success of the king's expedition to France	*Foedera*, iii, i, p. 176; *CCR, 1346-9*, p. 599.
12 January 1350 (date of archiepiscopal mandate)	Following royal success against the treacherous French	*Concilia*, ii, p. 752.
10 August 1350	For success against the Spanish	*Foedera*, iii, i, p. 201; *CCR, 1349-54*, p. 266; *Shewsbury*, ii, p. 643.

1 June 1355	For the king, who is compelled to renew war against the French	*Foedera*, iii, i, p. 303; *CCR, 1354-60*, p. 210.
1 June 1356	For the king, the duke of Lancaster, and the army	*Edington*, ii, p. 42.
10 October 1356	Following the Battle of Poitiers	*Foedera*, iii, i, p. 341; *CCR, 1354-60*, p. 334; *Edington*, ii, p. 43.
12 August 1359	For success in the French war and the expedition of the king and the Black Prince	*Foedera*, iii, i, p. 442; *CCR, 1354-60*, p. 645; *Edington*, ii, p. 49.
29 May 1363 (date of episcopal mandate)**	For the success of the Black Prince's expedition to Aquitaine	*Edington*, ii, p. 56.
August/September 1366 (precise date unknown)	For success in wars	Lincoln, Reg. 12, fo. 34v, in McHardy, 'Use of Propaganda', p. 192.
5 February 1367 (date of archiepiscopal mandate)	For the king and the Black Prince in advance of the Nájera Campaign	Lincoln, Reg. 12, fo. 41, in McHardy, 'Use of Propaganda', p. 192.
2 May 1367 (date of archiepiscopal mandate)	Following victory at Nájera	*Langham*, pp. 161-3.
28 April 1369	For the king, the queen, the Black Prince, and the duke of Lancaster, following the resumption of the war with France	*Wykeham*, ii, pp. 82-3.
8 August 1370	For the king's sons and others who were in transit in defence of the realm	*Appleby*, p. 53.
5 May 1372	For the king, the Black Prince, the duke of Lancaster, and the king's other sons in the context of the French war	Lincoln, Reg. 12, fo. 107, in McHardy, 'Use of Propaganda', p. 192.
11 August 1372	For protection against an anticipated Spanish invasion	*Foedera*, iii, ii, p. 960; *CCR, 1370-4*, p. 460.
16 June 1373	For the success of the duke of Lancaster's planned expedition to France	*Foedera*, iii, ii, p. 983; *CCR, 1369-74*, p. 563.
20 August 1374	For the prosperity of the realm and the cessation of the Anglo-French war	*Foedera*, iii, ii, p. 1009; *CCR, 1374-7*, p. 96; *Wykeham*, ii, p. 218.
8 May 1375	For the success of the expedition of Edmund, earl of Cambridge, and John, duke of Brittany	*Foedera*, iii, ii, p. 1028; *CCR, 1374-7*, p. 224.
27 October 1376 (archiepiscopal mandate)	For peace, and the cessation of the Anglo-French war	*Wykeham*, ii, p. 265.

* This request went simply to the bishop of London, as well as to the priors of the Carmelites, Augustinians, and Dominicans in London.

** Insofar as can be discerned, these prayers were only ordered in the diocese of Winchester.

*** In the interests of space, only one reference to an episcopal register has been included for each request, even when requests were copied into several registers. For instance, the request of June 1335 can be found in at least four registers – those of Archbishop Melton of York, and bishops Wyvil of Salisbury, Montacute of Worcester, and Burghersh of Lincoln.

This Appendix is indebted to Alison McHardy's 'Prayers for Success in War', an appendix to her article on Edward III's exploitation of propaganda: McHardy, 'Use of Propaganda', pp. 190-2. McHardy's work is, however, principally founded on the evidence of episcopal registers; she only refers to the *Calendars of Close Rolls* relatively infrequently, and does not cite Rymer's *Foedera* at all. The purpose of this Appendix is therefore to provide convenient references to the surviving material in governmental records. Moreover, combing through the calendars of chancery rolls has also uncovered several requests for prayers – such as those of July 1338 – which were missed by McHardy.

Appendix 25: List of Parliaments and Representative Councils in the Reign of Edward III

Date(s) of Assembly	Place	Designation*
7 January – 9 March 1327	Westminster	Parliament
15 – 23 September 1327	Lincoln	Council
7 February – 5 March 1328	York	Parliament
24 April – 14 May 1328	Northampton	Parliament
31 July – 6 August 1328	York	Council
16 – 31 October 1328	Salisbury	Parliament
9 – 22 February 1329	Westminster	Parliament
11 – 21 March 1330	Winchester	Parliament
26 November – 9 December 1330	Westminster	Parliament
30 September – 9 October 1331	Westminster	Parliament
16 – 21 March 1332	Westminster	Parliament
9 – 12 September 1332	Westminster	Parliament
4 – 11 December 1332	York	Parliament
20 – 27 January 1333	York	Parliament
21 February – 2 March 1334	York	Parliament
19 – 23 September 1334	Westminster	Parliament
26 May – 3 June1335	York	Parliament
11 – 20 March 1336	Westminster	Parliament
23 – 27 September 1336	Nottingham	Council
3 – 16 March 1337	Westminster	Parliament
26 September – 4 October 1337	Westminster	Council
3 – 14 February 1338	Westminster	Parliament
26 July – 2 August 1338	Northampton	Council
3 – 17 February 1339	Westminster	Parliament
13 October– *c.* 3 November 1339	Westminster	Parliament
20 January – 19 February 1340	Westminster	Parliament
29 March – 10 May 1340	Westminster	Parliament
12 – 26 July 1340	Westminster	Parliament
23 April – 27/8 May 1341	Westminster	Parliament
16 October - ? 1342	Westminster	Council
28 April – 20 May 1343	Westminster	Parliament
18 April - ? 1344	Westminster	Council
7 – 28 June 1344	Westminster	Parliament
11 – 20 September 1346	Westminster	Parliament
14 January – 12 February 1348	Westminster	Parliament
31 March – 13 April 1348	Westminster	Parliament
9 February – 1 March 1351	Westminster	Parliament
13 January – 11 February 1352	Westminster	Parliament
16 – 25 August 1352	Westminster	Council
23 September – 12 October 1353	Westminster	Council
28 April – 20 May 1354	Westminster	Parliament
23 – 30 November 1355	Westminster	Parliament
17 April – 8/16 May 1357	Westminster	Parliament
5 – 27 February 1358	Westminster	Parliament
15 May - ? 1360	Westminster	Parliament
24 January – 18 February 1361	Westminster	Parliament
13 October – 17 November 1362	Westminster	Parliament
6 – 30 October 1363	Westminster	Parliament

20 January – 17 February 1365	Westminster	Parliament
4 – 11 May 1366	Westminster	Parliament
1 – 28 May 1368	Westminster	Parliament
3 – 11 June 1369	Westminster	Parliament
24 February – 29 March 1371	Westminster	Parliament
8 – 17 June 1371	Winchester	Council
3 – 24 November 1372	Westminster	Parliament
21 November - 10 December 1373	Westminster	Parliament
28 April – 10 July 1376	Westminster	Parliament
27 January – 2 March 1377	Westminster	Parliament

* In the early years of Edward's reign in particular, these designations are rather arbitrary, as the distinction between representative councils and parliaments was often rather blurred. These are, nonetheless, the titles of the assemblies as given in the writs of summons (although, occasionally, sessions were described in different ways in those writs). For further discussion, see the introductions to each parliament in *PROME*.

Source: Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, pp. 208-9; *PROME*; *Proctors*, ii, pp. 540-1.

Appendix 26: List of Convocations and Provincial Councils in the Reign of Edward III

Date of Convocation or Provincial Council*	Province	Designation	Place
16/17 January 1327**	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
12 October 1327	York	Convocation	York
4 November 1327	Canterbury	Convocation	Leicester Abbey
27 January – 10 February 1329	Canterbury	Provincial Council	St Paul's, London
After 3 September 1329	Canterbury	Convocation	Lambeth
16 April 1330	Canterbury	Convocation	Lambeth
25 April 1330	York	Convocation	York?
4 September 1332	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
10 January 1334	Canterbury	Convocation	Northampton
17 January 1334	York	Convocation	York
26 September 1334	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
19/24 October 1334	York	Convocation	York
11 March 1336	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
6 May 1336	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
30 September 1336	Canterbury	Convocation	Conventual Church of the Blessed Mary, Leicester
21 October 1336	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
30 September – 1 October 1337	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's and St Bride's, London
12 November 1337	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
1 October 1338	Canterbury	Convocation	St Bride's, London
8 February 1339	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
After 10 October 1339	York	Diocesan Council?	St Peter's, York
27 January – 17 February 1340	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's and the Church of the Friars Preachers, London
9 February 1340	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
11 December 1340	York	Convocation	York
19 October 1341	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
9 October 1342	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
14 – 21 October 1342	Canterbury	Provincial Council	St Paul's, London
9/11 December 1342	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
31 May 1344	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
25 June 1344	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
4 May 1346	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
16 October 1346	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
29 January 1347	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
1 October 1347	Canterbury	Provincial Council	St Paul's, London
13 June 1348	York	Convocation	York
2 May 1351	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
18 May 1351	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
7 December 1355	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
16 – 24 May 1356	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
3 June 1356	York	Convocation	York
26 April 1357	Canterbury	Convocation	St Bride's, London
19 May 1357	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York

3-9 February 1360	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
12 February 1360	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
31 May 1361	Canterbury and York***	Convocation	St Mary's, Southwark
7 October 1361	Canterbury	Provincial Council	St Paul's, London
2 December 1363	Canterbury	Convocation	London
21 January – 1 February 1370	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
4 February 1370	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
12/24 April – 3 May 1371	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
8 May 1371	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
10 July 1371	York	Convocation	York?
30 May 1373	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
6 October 1373	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
1-7 December 1373	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
6 February 1374	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
23 June 1376	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
28 July 1376	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York
3 February – 2 March 1377	Canterbury	Convocation	St Paul's, London
15 April 1377	York	Convocation	St Peter's, York

* Where only a single date has been given, this is the date for which the convocation was summoned; where a range of dates have been given, these represent the dates (insofar as is known) in which it met.

**Although this convocation was summoned, it seems most unlikely that it ever met: *Convocation,* iii, p. 84.

*** This was a joint session, in which the convocations of both provinces met in order to grant a subsidy to the pope: *Convocation,* iii, pp. 287-9, xiii, p. 151.

Sources: Weske, *Convocation,* pp. 244-59, 280-7; *HBC,* pp. 595-7; *Convocation,* iii, pp. 87-351, xiii, pp. 35-188.

Appendix 27: Parliaments and Convocations that met Concurrently

Date(s) of Parliament	Concurrent Convocation or Provincial Council of the Province of Canterbury
7 January – 9 March 1327	
7 February – 5 March 1328	
24 April – 14 May 1328	
16 – 31 October 1328	
9 – 22 February 1329	✓
11 – 21 March 1330	
26 November – 9 December 1330	
30 September – 9 October 1331	
16 – 21 March 1332	
9 – 12 September 1332	
4 – 11 December 1332	
20 – 27 January 1333	
21 February – 2 March 1334	
19 – 23 September 1334	✓
26 May – 3 June 1335	
11 – 20 March 1336	✓
3 – 16 March 1337	
3 – 14 February 1338	
3 – 17 February 1339	
13 October– *c.* 3 November 1339	
20 January – 19 February 1340	✓
29 March – 10 May 1340	
12 – 26 July 1340	
23 April – 27/8 May 1341	
28 April – 20 May 1343	
7 – 28 June 1344	
11 – 20 September 1346	
14 January – 12 February 1348	
31 March – 13 April 1348	
9 February – 1 March 1351	
13 January – 11 February 1352	
28 April – 20 May 1354	
23 – 30 November 1355	
17 April – 8/16 May 1357	✓
5 – 27 February 1358	
15 May - ? 1360	
24 January – 18 February 1361	
13 October – 17 November 1362	
6 – 30 October 1363	
20 January – 17 February 1365	
4 – 11 May 1366	
1 – 28 May 1368	

3 – 11 June 1369	
24 February – 29 March 1371	
3 – 24 November 1372	
21 November - 10 December 1373	✓
28 April – 10 July 1376	✓
27 January – 2 March 1377	✓

Source: Appendices 25 and 26.

Appendix 28: The Givers of Opening Sermons and Speeches in Edward III's Parliaments

Parliament	Opening Sermon	Opening Speech	Royal office held (by the giver of the opening speech)
January 1327			
February 1328			
April 1328			
October 1328			
February 1329			
March 1330			
November 1330			
September 1331		John Stratford	Chancellor
March 1332	Simon Meopham	John Stratford	Chancellor
September 1332		John Stratford	Chancellor
December 1332		Sir Geoffrey le Scrope	Chief Justice
January 1333		Sir Geoffrey le Scrope	Chief Justice
February 1334			
September 1334			
May 1335			
March 1336			
September 1337			
February 1338			
February 1339			
October 1339		John Stratford	N/A
January 1340			
March 1340			
July 1340			
April 1341			
April 1343		Sir Robert Parving	Chancellor
June 1344		Sir Robert Sadington	Chancellor
September 1346			
January 1348		Sir William Thorp	Chief Justice
March 1348		Sir William Thorp	Chief Justice
February 1351			
January 1352		Sir William Shareshull	Chief Justice
April 1354		Sir William Shareshull	Chief Justice
November 1355		Sir Walter Maunny	N/A
April 1357			
February 1358			
May 1360			
January 1361			
October 1362		Sir Henry Green	Chief Justice

October 1363		Simon Langham	Chancellor
January 1365		Simon Langham	Chancellor
May 1366		Simon Langham	Chancellor
May 1368		Simon Langham	
June 1369		William Wykeham	Chancellor
February 1371		William Wykeham	Chancellor
November 1372		Sir John Knyvet	Chancellor
November 1373		Sir John Knyvet	Chancellor
April 1376		Sir John Knyvet	Chancellor
January 1377		Adam Houghton	Chancellor
		The giver of the opening speech can be identified for twenty-four of Edward's parliaments. It was given by a bishop on eleven of these occasions.	The opening speech was given on fourteen occasions by the chancellor, on eight occasions by chief justices, and on three occasions by others.

Source: *PROME;* Haines, *John Stratford.*

Appendix 29: Parliamentary Triers of Petitions in the Reign of Edward III

Parliament	Triers of Petitions for England	Number of Bishops Trying Petitions for England	The % of Those Trying Petitions for England who were Bishops	Triers of Petitions for "Foreign Lands"	Number of Bishops Trying Petitions for "Foreign Lands"	The % of Those Trying Petitions for "Foreign Lands" who were Bishops	Total Number of Bishops Trying Petitions in the Parliament	The % of Those Trying Petitions in the Parliament who were Bishops
January 1333	William Melton, archbishop of York John Hotham, bishop of Ely Roger Northburgh, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield Sir Hugh Courtenay Sir William Zouche Sir Henry Scrope Sir John Stoner Sir William Denham Sir Richard Aldborough	3	33%	Henry Burghersh, bishop of Lincoln William Airmyn, bishop of Norwich John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter Sir Ralph Basset Sir Richard Grey Sir Thomas Bacon Sir Geoffrey of Edenham	3	43%	6	38%
March 1340	Ralph Stratford, bishop of London Roger Northburgh, bisop of Lichfield Robert Stratford, bishop of Chichester Anthony Bek, bishop of Norwich Earl of Arundel Earl of Huntingdon Lord Wake Lord Berkeley Sir Nicholas Cantilupe Sir Richard Willoughby	4	31%	Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham Simon Montacute, bishop of Ely Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Earl of Northampton Sir Ralph Basset Sir Roger Grey Lord Willoughby Sir Anthony Lucy Sir Robert Sadington Sir John Inge Sir John Shardlow John Hildesley Sir Robert Shorditch	3	21%	7	26%

	Sir John Stonor Sir William Shareshull Sir William Scot			Sir Robert Scarborough				
March 1340	Ralph Stratford, bishop of London Roger Northburgh, bisop of Lichfield Robert Stratford, bishop of Chichester Anthony Bek, bishop of Norwich Earl of Arundel Earl of Huntingdon Lord Wake Lord Berkeley Sir Nicholas Cantilupe Sir Richard Willoughby Sir John Stonor Sir William Shareshull Sir William Scot	4	31%	Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham Simon Montacute, bishop of Ely Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Earl of Northampton Sir Ralph Basset Sir Roger Grey Lord Willoughby Sir Anthony Lucy Sir Robert Sadington Sir John Inge Sir John Shardlow John Hildesley Sir Robert Shorditch Sir Robert Scarborough	3	21%	7	26%
April 1341	Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Earl of Northampton Earl of Arundel Lord Wake Sir Thomas Berkeley Sir Robert Sadington Sir William Scot Sir Thomas Heppescotes	2	22%	Simon Montacuate, bishop of Ely Thomas Charlton, bishop of Hereford Earl of Huntingdon Earl of Devon Sir John Charlton Sir Roger Hillary Sir Robert Scarborough Sir Roger Bakewell	2	25%	4	24%
April 1343	Robert Wyvil,	2	20%	Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham	2	20%	4	20%

	bishop of Salisbury John Kirkby, bishop of Carlisle Earl of Warwick Earl of Suffolk Lord Percy Sir Thomas Berkeley Sir William Scot Sir John Stonor Sir Robert Sadington Sir William Shareshull			Anthony Bek, bishop of Norwich Earl of Huntingdon Earl of Devon Sir Ralph Nevill Sir Anthony Lucy Sir Roger Hillary Sir John Shardlow Sir William Basset Sir Roger Bakewell				
June 1344	Robert Stratford, bishop of Chichester Ralph Stratford, bishop of London Abbot of St Albans Prior of Rochester Earl of Huntingdon Earl of Devon Lord Wake Lord Percy Lord Berkeley Sir Nicholas Cantilupe Sir John Stonor Sir Richard Willoughby Sir Roger Hillary	2	15%	Roger Northburgh, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells Simon Montacute, bishop of Ely Abbot of Westminster Abbot of Saint Augustine's, Canterbury Earl of Suffolk Earl of Oxford Sir William Scot Sir William Shareshull Sir Roger Bakewell	3	33%	5	23%
September 1346	Robert Stratford, bishop of Chichester Abbot of Westminster Lord Wake Sir William Scot Sir John Stonor Sir William Shareshull	1	14%	William Bateman, bishop of Norwich Prior of Rochester Sir Thomas Berkeley Sir Richard Willoughby Sir Roger Hillary	1	20%	2	17%

	Sir William Thorp.							
January 1348	Ralph Stratford, bishop of London John Gynwell, bishop of Lincoln John Thoresby, bishop of St Davids Abbot of St Albans Abbot of Waltham Prior of Rochester Lord Wake Lord Percy Lord Berkeley Sir Ralph Nevill Sir William Thorp Sir Robert Sadington Sir John Stonor Sir xx [illegible] Sir William Herlaston	3	20%	William Bateman, bishop of Norwich Thomas de Lisle, bishop of Ely Earl of Lancaster Earl of Oxford Earl of Suffolk Baron Stafford Sir Walter Mauny Sir Roger Hillary Sir William Shareshull Sir William Basset Sir Roger Bakewell (In this parliament, William Edington, bishop of Winchester, and John Thoresby, bishop of St Davids, alongside the chancellor, keeper of the privy seal, earls of Lancaster, Arundel, and Huntingdon, Baron Stafford, and Sir Richard Talbot, Sir William Thorp, Sir Robert Sadington, and Sir John Stowford, also appeared as triers of 'petitions from the clergy')	4 (including 2 trying petitions from the clergy)	18%	7	18%
February 1351	Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury Ralph Stratford, bishop of London	3	23%	William Bateman, bishop of Norwich Robert Stratford, bishop of	2	22%	5	23%

	John Gynwell, bishop of Lincoln Earl of Northampton Earl of Arundel Earl of Huntingdon Abbot of Westminster Abbot of Waltham Baron Stafford Sir Ralph Nevill Sir John Stonor Sir Roger Hillary Sir Richard Willoughby			Chichester Earl of Lancaster Earl of Warwick Earl of Suffolk Sir Richard Talbot Sir Thomas Bradstone Sir William Shareshull Sir John Stouford				
January 1352	Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury Ralph Stratford, bishop of London John Gynwell, bishop of Lincoln Earl of Northampton Earl of Arundel Earl of Huntingdon Abbot of Westminster Abbot of Waltham Lord Percy Sir Ralph Nevill Sir William Shareshull Sir John Stonor Sir Roger Hillary Sir Richard Willoughby	3	21%	William Bateman, bishop of Norwich Robert Stratford, bishop of Chichester The earl of Warwick The earl of Stafford The lord d'Albret Sir Richard Talbot Sir Thomas Bradstone Sir William Shareshull Sir John Stouford	2	22%	5	22%
April 1354	Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury John Gynwell,	3	21%	William Bateman, bishop of Norwich Robert	2	22%	5	22%

	bishop of Lincoln John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester Earl of Northampton Earl of Arundel Earl of Huntingdon Abbot of Westminster Lord Percy Sir Ralph Nevill Sir William Shareshull Sir Roger Hillary Sir Richard Willoughby Sir William Thorpe Sir Henry Green			Stratford, bishop of Chichester Duke of Lancaster Earl of Warwick Earl of Stafford Sir Guy Brian Sir William Shareshull Sir John Stouford Sir Thomas Seton				
October 1362	Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury Simon Sudbury, bishop of London Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham John Barnet, bishop of Worcester Lewis Charlton, bishop of Hereford William Whittlesey, bishop of Rochester Abbot of Gloucester Abbot of Waltham Earl of Lancaster Earl of Arundel Earl of Angus Lord Nevill Sir Henry Green Sir Robert	6	40%	Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Robert Stretton, bishop of Chester William Lenn, bishop of Chichester Abbot of Evesham Prior of the hospital of Saint John Earl of Suffolk Earl of Salisbury Lord Mauny Sir Henry Scrope Sir John Mowbray John Knyvet	3	27%	9	35%

	Thorp Sir William Skipwith							
October 1363	William Edington, bishop of Winchester Simon Sudbury, bishop of London Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Thomas Percy, bishop of Norwich Abbot of Saint Albans Abbott of Westminster Abbot of Saint Augustine's, Canterbury Duke of Lancaster Earl of Cambridge Earl of Hereford Earl of Arundel Earl of Suffolk Lord Mowbray Lord Percy Lord Beaumont Lord Clifford Sir Ralph Nevill Sir Guy Brian Sir Henry Green Sir Robert Thorp Sir William Skipwith John Knyvet	4	19%	Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham Lewis Charlton, bishop of Hereford Thomas Trillek, bishop of Rochester Adam Houghton, bishop of Saint Davids William Lenn, bishop of Chichester Abbot of Waltham Abbot of Evesham Prior of the hospital of Saint John Earl of Stafford Earl of Salisbury Earl of Angus Lord Despenser Lord Roos Sir Walter Mauny Sir Henry Scrope Sir Roger Beauchamp Sir John Mowbray Thomas Ingelby	5	28%	9	23%
January 1365	William Edington, bishop of Winchester Simon Sudbury, bishop of London Robert Wyvil,	4	20%	Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham Lewis Charlton, bishop of Hereford William Whittlesey,	4	22%	8	21%

	bishop of Salisbury Thomas Percy, bishop of Norwich Abbot of Saint Albans Abbot of Westminster Abbot of Waltham Abbot of Saint Augustine's, Canterbury Duke of Lancaster Earl of Cambridge Earl of Hereford Earl of Arundel Earl of Suffolk Lord Percy Sir Ralph Nevill Sir Guy Brian Sir Henry Green Sir Robert Thorp Sir William Skipwith Sir John Knyvet			bishop of Worcester Adam Houghton, bishop of Saint Davids Abbot of Bury Saint Edmunds Abbot of Reading Abbot of Abingdon Prior of the hospital of Saint John Earl of Stafford Earl of Salisbury Earl of Devon Earl of Angus Lord Despenser Sir Walter Mauny Sir Henry Scrope Sir Roger Beauchamp Sir John Mowbray Sir Thomas Ingelby				
May 1366	William Edington, bishop of Winchester Simon Sudbury, bishop of London John Buckingham, bishop of Lincoln Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Thomas Percy, bishop of Norwich Abbot of Saint Albans Abbot of Westminster Abbot of Waltham	5	24%	Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham Lewis Charlton, bishop of Hereford William Whittlesey, bishop of Worcester Adam Houghton, bishop of Saint Davids Abbot of Bury Saint Edmunds Abbot of Glastonbury Abbot of Reading Prior of the hospital of Saint John	4	22%	9	23%

	Abbot of Saint Augustine's, Canterbury Duke of Lancaster Earl of Cambridge Earl of Hereford Earl of Arundel Earl of Suffolk Lord Percy Sir Ralph Nevill Sir Guy Brian Sir John Knyvet Sir Robert Thorp Sir Thomas Ludlow Sir William Finchden			Earl of Stafford Earl of Salisbury Earl of Devon Earl of Angus Lord Despenser Sir Walter Mauny Sir Roger Beauchamp Sir John Mowbray Sir Thomas Ingelby Sir William Witchingham				
May 1368	Simon Sudbury, bishop of London John Buckingham, bishop of Lincoln Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Thomas Percy, bishop of Norwich Abbot of Saint Albans Abbot of Westminster Abbot of Waltham Abbot of Saint Augustine's, Canterbury Duke of Lancaster Earl of Cambridge Earl of Hereford Earl of Arundel Earl of Suffolk Earl of Salisbury	4	19%	Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham Lewis Charlton, bishop of Hereford William Whittlesey, bishop of Worcester Adam Houghton, bishop of Saint Davids Abbot of Bury Saint Edmunds Prior of the hospital of Saint John Earl of Stafford Earl of Devon Earl of Angus Sir Walter de Mauny Sir Roger Beauchamp Sir John Mowbray Sir Thomas Ingelby Sir William Witchingham	4	29%	8	23%

	Lord Percy Sir Ralph Nevill Sir Guy Brian Sir John Knyvet Sir Robert Thorp Sir Thomas Ludlow Sir William Finchden							
June 1369	William Whittlesey, archbishop of Canterbury Simon Sudbury, bishop of London John Buckingham, bishop of Lincoln Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Thomas Percy, bishop of Norwich Thomas Appleby, bishop of Carlisle Abbot of Westminster Abbot of Waltham Abbot of Saint Augustine's, Canterbury Duke of Lancaster Earl of Hereford Earl of Arundel Earl of Warwick Earl of Suffolk Earl of Salisbury Lord Percy Sir John Nevill Sir Guy Brian Sir John Knyvet Sir Robert	6	27%	Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham The bishop of Hereford (see note below) William Reade, bishop of Chichester Adam Houghton, bishop of Saint Davids The abbot of Saint Albans The abbot of Bury Saint Edmunds The abbot of Peterborough The abbot of Evesham The prior of the hospital of Saint John The earl of Stafford The earl of Devon The earl of Angus Sir Roger Beauchamp Sir John Mowbray Sir Thomas Ingelby Sir William Wichingham	4	25%	10	26%

	Thorp Sir Thomas Ludlow Sir William Finchden							
February 1371	William Whittlesey, archbishop of Canterbury Simon Sudbury, bishop of London John Buckingham, bishop of Lincoln Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury John Barnet, bishop of Ely William Wykeham, bishop of Winchester Abbot of Westminster Abbot of Waltham Abbot of Saint Augustine's, Canterbury Earl of Hereford Earl of Arundel Earl of Pembroke Earl of March Earl of Salisbury Lord Latimer Sir John Nevill Sir Guy Brian Sir Roger Beauchamp Sir John Knyvet Sir Robert Thorp Sir Thomas Ludlow Sir William Finchden	6	38%	Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham The bishop of Bath and Wells Adam Houghton, bishop of Saint Davids William Reade, bishop of Chichester Abbot of Saint Albans Abbot of Peterborough Abbot of Evesham Earl of Stafford Earl of Warwick Earl of Devon Earl of Angus Earl of Suffolk Sir Walter de Mauny Sir Ralph Basset of Drayton Sir John Mowbray Sir Thomas Ingelby Sir William Wichingham	4	24%	10	30%
November 1372	King of Castile and Leon and Duke of	7	30%	Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham	5	31%	12	31%

	Lancaster William Whittlesey, archbishop of Canterbury Simon Sudbury, bishop of London William Wykeham, bishop of Winchester John Buckingham, bishop of Lincoln John Barnet, bishop of Ely William Courtenay, bishop of Hereford William Lenn, bishop of Worcester Abbot of Westminster Abbot of Waltham Abbot of Bury Saint Edmunds Earl of Cambridge Earl of Hereford Earl of Arundel Earl of March Earl of Salisbury Lord Despenser Lord Roos Sir Guy Brian Sir John Cavendish Sir William Finchden Sir Thomas Ludlow Sir Thomas Ingelby			John Harewell, bishop of Bath and Wells Henry Despenser, bishop of Norwich Adam Houghton, bishop of Saint Davids William Reade, bishop of Chichester Abbot of Crowland Abbot of Abingdon Abbot of Colchester Earl of Warwick Earl of Stafford Earl of Suffolk Sir John Charlton of Powys Sir Ralph Basset of Drayton Sir John Mowbray Sir William Wichingham Sir Roger Meres				
November 1373	William Whittlesey, archbishop of Canterbury Simon Sudbury, bishop of London William	4	24%	Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham John Harewell, bishop of Bath and Wells William Reade, bishop of	3	33%	7	26%

	Wykeham, of Winchester William Courtenay, bishop of Hereford Abbot of Westminster Abbot of Bury Saint Edmunds Abbot of Saint Augustine's, Canterbury Earl of Cambridge Earl of Arundel Earl of Salisbury Sir William Zouche Sir Guy Brian Sir Henry Scrope Sir John Cavendish Sir William Finchden Sir Thomas Ludlow Sir Thomas Ingelby			Chichester Abbot of Abingdon Earl of March Lord Clifford Sir Amory St Amand Sir Richard Stafford Sir William Wichingham Sir Roger Kirkton				
April 1376	King of Castile and Léon, Duke of Lancaster Simon Sudbury, archbishop of Canterbury William Courtenay, bishop of London William Wykeham, bishop of Winchester John Buckingham, bishop of Lincoln Thomas Arundel, bishop of Ely Adam Houghton, bishop of St Davids Ralph	9	36%	Alexander Neville, archbishop of York Robert Wickford, archbishop of Dublin Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham John Harewell, bishop of Bath and Wells John Gilbert, bishop of Hereford William Reade, bishop of Chichester Henry Despenser, bishop of Norwich Thomas Appleby, bishop of	9	41%	18	38%

	Erghum, bishop of Salisbury Thomas Brantingham, bishop of Exeter Henry Wakefield, bishop of Worcester Abbot of Westminster Abbot of Bury St Edmunds Earl of Cambridge Earl of March Earl of Arundel Earl of Warwick Earl of Suffolk Lord Percy Lord Roos Lord Zouche of Harringworth Sir Guy Brian Sir John Cavendish Sir Robert Belknap Sir William Wichingham Sir Thomas Ingelby			Carlisle Thomas Brinton, bishop of Rochester Abbot of Abingdon Earl of Stafford Earl of Angus Lord Basset of Drayton Lord Bardolf Lord Clifford Sir Guy Brian Sir Amory St Amand Sir Henry Scrope Sir Richard Stafford Sir William Wichingham Sir Roger Kirkton Sir Roger Fulthorp				
January 1377	King of Castile and Léon, Duke of Lancaster Earl of Cambridge Sir Thomas Woodstock, constable of England Simon Sudbury, archbishop of Canterbury William Courtenay, bishop of London John Buckingham, bishop of Lincoln Thomas Arundel,	5	22%	Alexander Neville, archbishop of York Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham Henry Despenser, bishop of Norwich John Gilbert, bishop of Hereford Thomas Brinton, bishop of Rochester Abbot of Waltham Earl of March Earl of Suffolk Lord Roos Lord Basset of	5	28%	10	24%

	bishop of Ely Ralph Erghum, bishop of Salisbury Abbot of Westminster Abbot of St Augustine's, Canterbury Earl of Arundel Earl of Warwick Earl of Salisbury Earl of Stafford Lord Percy Lord Latimer Lord Nevill Lord Fitzwalter Sir Guy Brian Sir John Knyvet Sir John Cavendish Sir Robert Belknap Sir William Skipwith			Drayton Lord Clifford Sir John Montacute Sir Henry Scrope Sir Richard Stafford Sir Thomas Ingelby Sir William Wichingham Sir Roger Kirkton Sir Roger Fulthorp				
21		86 (average 4 bishops per parliament)	Average 25%		72 (average 3.5 bishops per parliament)	Average 27%	160 (average 7.5 bishops per parliament)	Average 25.5%

Source: *PROME.*

N.B. The parliament of 1348 did not hear new petitions, but merely those that were put forward but not addressed in the last parliament. For the avoidance of doubt, the parliaments not included on the table above are those for which the names of the triers of petitions do not survive.

The case of the bishop of Hereford in the parliament which sat from 3-11 June 1369 is curious. The parliament roll is clear that the bishop was assigned to be one of the 'triers of petitions from Aquitaine and other lands and regions overseas and the Channel Islands': *PROME*, 1369, 7. However, Lewis Charlton, the last bishop of Hereford, had died on 23 May 1369 (Dohar, 'Charlton, Lewis') and William Courtenay, the next bishop of Hereford, was only provided to the see on 17 August 1369, and consecrated and enthroned the following March and September respectively (Swanson, 'Courtenay, William').

Appendix 30: Episcopal Triers of Petitions in the Reign of Edward III – A Summary

Decade	Number of Parliaments	Total Number of Bishops Trying Petitions for England	Average Number of Bishops Trying Petitions for England per Parliament	Total Number of Bishops Trying Petitions for 'Foreign Lands' (including Petitions from the Clergy)	Average Number of Bishops Trying Petitions for 'Foreign Lands' (including Petitions from the Clergy) per Parliament	Total Number of Bishops Trying Petitions	Average Number of Bishops Trying Petitions per Parliament
1320s	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1330s	1	3	3	3	3	6	6
1340s	6	14	2	15	3	29	5
1350s	3	9	3	6	2	15	5
1360s	6	29	5	24	4	53	9
1370s	5	31	6	26	5	57	11
1327-1349	7	17	2	18	3	35	5
1350-1377	12	69	5	56	4	125	9

Source: Appendix 29.

Appendix 31: Bishops and SC10 Parliamentary Proxies in the Reign of Edward II

Parliament or Representative Council	Bishops Appointing a Proctor to Represent Them	Number of Bishops Appointing Proctors to Represent Them	Total Number of People Appointing Proctors to Represent Them	Percentage of Bishops among those Appointing Proctors to Represent Them
October 1307	Richard Swinfield, bishop of Hereford Thomas Wouldham, bishop of Rochester Ralph Baldock, bishop of London Robert Orford, bishop of Ely Walter Haselshaw, bishop of Bath and Wells	5	25	20%
March 1308	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
April 1308	Llewelyn de Bromfield, bishop of St Asaph Gruffydd ap Iorweth, bishop of Bangor	2	2	100%
October 1308	Richard Swinfield, bishop of Hereford	1	2	50%
April 1309	Llewelyn de Bromfield, bishop of St Asaph Richard Swinfield, bishop of Hereford	2	24	8%
July 1309	Richard Swinfield, bishop of Hereford Robert Orford, bishop of Ely Simon of Ghent, bishop of Salisbury David Martin, bishop of St Davids	4	4	100%
February 1310	Richard Swinfield, bishop of Hereford Llewelyn de Bromfield, bishop of St Asaph John Monmouth, bishop of Llandaff	3	3	100%
August 1311	N/A	0	4	0%
February 1312	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
August 1312	Llewelyn de Bromfield, bishop of St Asaph	1	4	25%
March 1313	William Greenfield, archbishop of York Richard Kellaw, bishop of Durham Llewelyn de Bromfield, bishop of St Asaph Anian Sais, bishop of Bangor	4	28	14%
July 1313	John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln John Ketton, bishop of Ely Simon of Ghent, bishop of Salisbury Henry Woodlock, bishop of Winchester Thomas Wouldham, bishop of Rochester John Salmon, bishop of Norwich Richard Swinfield, bishop of Hereford	7	9	78%

September 1313	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
April 1314	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
September 1314	Richard Swinfield, bishop of Hereford David Martin, bishop of St Davids Thomas Wouldham, bishop of Rochester Gilbert Segrave, bishop of London John Monmouth, bishop of Llandaff Anian Sais, bishop of Bangor Simon of Ghent, bishop of Salisbury	7	12	58%
January 1315	Richard Swinfield, bishop of Hereford William Greenfield, archbishop of York Thomas Wouldham, bishop of Rochester John Halton, bishop of Carlisle John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln Simon of Ghent, bishop of Salisbury John Ketton, bishop of Ely Richard Kellaw, bishop of Durham	8	43	19%
January 1316	Richard Swinfield, bishop of Hereford Gilbert Segrave, bishop of London John Ketton, bishop of Ely John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln John Monmouth, bishop of Llandaff William Maidstone, bishop of Worcester Walter Langton, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield Thomas Wouldham, bishop of Rochester	8	46	17%
January 1318	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
October 1318	John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln Anian Sais, bishop of Bangor Adam Orleton, bishop of Hereford	3	36	8%
May 1319	Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury John Droxford, bishop of Bath and Wells Walter Reynolds, archbishop of Canterbury David Martin, bishop of St Davids Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph John Monmouth, bishop of Llandaff Louis Beaumont, bishop of Durham John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln Thomas Cobham, bishop of Worcester	9	41	22%
January 1320	Anian Sais, bishop of Bangor John Halton, bishop of Carlisle	2	5	40%
October 1320	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
July 1321	Anian Sais, bishop of Bangor John Halton, bishop of Carlisle	2	32	6%

May 1322	Roger Northburgh, bishop-elect of Coventry and Lichfield John Monmouth, bishop of Llandaff David Martin, bishop of St Davids Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury	4	62	6%
November 1322	Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph John Monmouth, bishop of Llandaff Thomas Cobham, bishop of Worcester John Halton, bishop of Carlisle Louis Beaumont, bishop of Durham	5	22	23%
February 1324	John Halton, bishop of Carlisle Anian Sais, bishop of Bangor Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph	3	30	10%
October 1324	N/A	0	2	0%
June 1325	Anian Sais, bishop of Bangor Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph	2	19	11%
November 1325	Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury Anian Sais, bishop of Bangor Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph Louis Beaumont, bishop of Durham David Martin, bishop of St Davids	5	40	13%
23 parliaments		4 (87)	(495)	18%

Source: *Proctors*, i, pp. 7-70.

Appendix 32: Bishops and SC10 Parliamentary Proxies in the Reign of Edward III

Parliament or Representative Council	Bishops Appointing a Proctor to Represent Them	Number of Bishops Appointing Proctors to Represent Them	Total Number of People Appointing Proctors to Represent Them	Percentage of Bishops among Those Appointing Proctors
January 1327	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
September 1327	Hamo Hethe, bishop of Rochester Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury John Droxford, bishop of Bath and Wells Anian Sais, bishop of Bangor Stephen Gravesend, bishop of London	5	20	25%
February 1328	Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury David Martin, bishop of St Davids	2	9	22%
April 1328	Louis Beaumont, bishop of Durham	1	3	33%
July 1328	Stephen Gravesend, bishop of London Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury Henry Gower, bishop of St Davids	4	15	27%
October 1328	John Langton, bishop of Chichester Hamo Hethe, bishop of Rochester William Melton, archbishop of York Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor Louis Beaumont, bishop of Durham Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter John de Eaglescliffe, bishop of Llandaff	8	34	24%
February 1329	Louis Beaumont, bishop of Durham Henry Gower, bishop of St Davids Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph	3	8	38%
March 1330	Louis Beaumont, bishop of Durham William Melton, archbishop of York Hamo Hethe, bishop of Rochester Thomas Charlton, bishop of Hereford John Langton, bishop of Chichester Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph John Ross, bishop of Carlisle Simon Meopham, archbishop of Canterbury	10	35	29%

November 1330	John Ross, bishop of Carlisle John de Eaglescliffe, bishop of Llandaff John Langton, bishop of Chichester Louis Beaumont, bishop of Durham	4	33	12%
September 1331	Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells Louis Beaumont, bishop of Durham John de Eaglescliffe, bishop of Llandaff Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph William Melton, archbishop of York	6	24	25%
March 1332	John Langton, bishop of Chichester Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph	2	46	4%
September 1332	Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor	2	7	29%
December 1332	Louis Beaumont, bishop of Durham Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells John Hotham, bishop of Ely John Stratford, bishop of Winchester	6	26	23%
January 1333	Stephen Gravesend, bishop of London John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter John Langton, bishop of Chichester Henry Gower, bishop of St Davids Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor Louis Beaumont, bishop of Durham Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph Simon Meopham, archbishop of Canterbury Hamo Hethe, bishop of Rochester	9	23	39%
February 1334	John Langton, bishop of Chichester Hamo Hethe, bishop of Rochester Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells Henry Gower, bishop of St Davids Stephen Gravesend, bishop of London John Hotham, bishop of Ely Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor Thomas Charlton, bishop of Hereford	9	38	24%

Sept 1334	Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph John Langton, bishop of Chichester Simon Montacute, bishop of Worcester	3	26	12%
May 1335	Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor Hamo Hethe, bishop of Rochester John de Eaglescliffe, bishop of Llandaff Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph Thomas Charlton, bishop of Hereford Simon Montacute, bishop of Worcester John Langton, bishop of Chichester Henry Gower, bishop of St Davids John Langton, bishop of Ely	12	45	27%
March 1336	John de Eaglescliffe, bishop of Llandaff John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter William Melton, archbishop of York Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells John Langton, bishop of Chichester John Hotham, bishop of Ely Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph Henry Gower, bishop of St Davids	8	31	26%
March 1337	John de Eaglescliffe, bishop of Llandaff	1	11	9%
Sept 1337	John de Eaglescliffe, bishop of Llandaff Henry Gower, bishop of St Davids Thomas Hempnall, bishop of Worcester Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor	6	29	21%
Feb 1338	Henry Gower, bishop of St Davids William Melton, archbishop of York	2	6	33%
July 1338	Henry Gower, bishop of St Davids	1	2	50%
Feb 1339	Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor Henry Gower, bishop of St Davids	2	10	20%
Oct 1339	John de Eaglescliffe, bishop of Llandaff William Melton, archbishop of York	3	27	11%

	Anthony Bek, bishop of Norwich			
Jan 1340	Wulfstan of Bransford, bishop of Worcester Anthony Bek, bishop of Norwich Henry Gower, bishop of St Davids John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor	6	19	32%
March 1340	Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph Wulfstan of Bransford, bishop of Worcester Henry Gower, bishop of St Davids Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells John de Eaglescliffe, bishop of Llandaff	5	31	16%
July 1340	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
April 1341	Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph Anthony Bek, bishop of Norwich John de Eaglescliffe, bishop of Llandaff Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor	4	17	24%
April 1343	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
April 1344	William Zouche, archbishop of York Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham Wulfstan Bransford, bishop of Worcester Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of Asaph Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor	5	10	50%
June 1344	John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter Wulfstan of Bransford, bishop of Worcester John de Eaglescliffe, bishop of Llandaff Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor Daffyd ap Bleddyn, bishop of St Asaph Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham William Zouche, archbishop of York	7	29	24%
September 1346	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
January 1348	Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury William Zouche, archbishop of York Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells Wulfstan of Bransford, bishop of Worcester Roger Northburgh, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield	6	30	20%
March 1348	John Trillek, bishop of Hereford	2	8	25%

	Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells			
February 1351	Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor	2	10	20%
January 1352	Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells	3	29	10%
August 1352	John Kirkby, bishop of Carlisle John Paschal, bishop of Llandaff Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells	3	3	100%
September 1353	John Trillek, bishop of Hereford John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester	2	18	11%
April 1354	Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells Thomas Fastolf, bishop of St Davids	2	23	9%
November 1355	Matthew Englefield, bishop of Bangor Thomas Percy, bishop of Norwich Robert Stratford, bishop of Chichester Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells	4	22	18%
April 1357	John Thoresby, archbishop of York Robert Stratford, bishop of Chichester Ralph Shrewsbury, bishop of Bath and Wells John Trillek, bishop of Hereford Thomas Fastolf, bishop of St Davids John Paschal, bishop of Llandaff	6	29	21%
February 1358	John Trillek, bishop of Hereford Roger Northburgh, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter	3	18	17%
May 1360	N/A	0	3	0%
January 1361	Thomas de Ringstead, bishop of Bangor Thomas Fastolf, bishop of St Davids John Thoresby, archbishop of York	3	7	43%
October 1362	Gilbert Welton, bishop of Carlisle John Thoresby, archbishop of York John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter	3	25	12%
October 1363	John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter John Buckingham, bishop of Lincoln John Thoresby, archbishop of York	3	25	12%
January 1365	N/A	0	2	0%
May 1366	N/A	0	1	0%
May 1368	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
June 1369	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
February 1371	Roger Craddock, bishop of Llandaff John Thoresby, archbishop of York	7	26	27%

	William Courtenay, bishop of Hereford Roger Stretton, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Thomas Trillek, bishop of Rochester Simon Sudbury, archbishop of Canterbury			
November 1372	Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Thomas Hatfield, bishop of Durham Thomas Brantingham, bishop of Exeter John Thoresby, archbishop of York	4	25	16%
November 1373	Robert Stretton, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Henry Despenser, bishop of Norwich Thomas Brantingham, bishop of Exeter Adam Houghton, bishop of St Davids John Buckingham, bishop of Lincoln	6	28	21%
April 1376	Robert Stretton, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield	1	18	6%
January 1377	Thomas Appleby, bishop of Carlisle Robert Stretton, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield Thomas Brantingham, bishop of Exeter	3	29	10%

Source: *Proctors*, i, pp. 70-232.

Appendix 33: Bishops and SC10 Parliamentary Proxies in the Reign of Edward III – A Summary

Decade	Average Number of Bishops Appointing Proctors per Parliament (with the Total Number for the Period in Brackets)	Average Number of People Appointing Proctors per Parliament (with the Total Number for the Period in Brackets)	Average Percentage of Bishops among Those Appointing Proctors
1320s (6 parliaments for which evidence survives)	4 (23)	15 (89)	26%
1330s (17 parliaments for which evidence survives)	5 (86)	25 (419)	20.5%
1340s (7 parliaments for which evidence survives)	5 (35)	21 (144)	24%
Average 1327-1349 (30 parliaments for which evidence survives)	5 (144)	22 (652)	22%
1350s (8 parliaments for which evidence survives)	3 (25)	19 (152)	16%
1360s (6 parliaments for which evidence survives)	2 (9)	11 (63)	13%
1370s (5 parliaments for which evidence survives)	5 (25)	25 (126)	20%
Average 1350-1377 (19 parliaments for which evidence survives)	3 (59)	18 (341)	17%
Average 1327-77 (49 parliaments for which evidence survives)	4 (203)	20 (993)	20%

Source: Appendix 32

Appendix 34: Parliamentary Proxies Recorded in Episcopal Registers for the Reign of Edward II

Parliament or Representative Council	Bishop(s) Appointing a Proctor	Number of Bishops Appointing a Proctor
March 1308	Richard Swinfield, bishop of Hereford	1
October 1308	Walter Stapeldon, bishop of Exeter	1
April 1309	John Halton, bishop of Carlisle John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln Henry Woodlock, bishop of Winchester	3
July 1309	John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln	1
August 1311	Richard Kellaw, bishop of Durham John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln	2
August 1312	Walter Stapeldon, bishop of Exeter John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln	2
March 1313	Richard Kellaw, bishop of Durham John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln Ralph Baldock, bishop of Durham	3
July 1313	Richard Kellaw, bishop of Durham John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln	2
September 1313	Richard Kellaw, bishop of Durham	1
September 1314	John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln	1
January 1316	Richard Swinfield, bishop of Hereford John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln	2
May 1319	John Dalderby, bishop of Lincoln	1
January 1320	Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury Thomas Cobham, bishop of Worcester	2
May 1322	Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury	1
November 1322	Walter Reynolds, archbishop of Canterbury Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury	2
February 1324	John Halton, bishop of Carlisle	1
November 1325	Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury	1

Source: *Proctors*, ii, pp. 431-4, 436, 439-41, 443-5.

Appendix 35: Parliamentary Proxies Recorded in Episcopal Registers for the Reign of Edward III

Parliament or Representative Council	Bishop(s) Appointing a Proctor	Number of Bishops Appointing a Proctor
September 1327	John Droxford, bishop of Bath and Wells Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury John Stratford, bishop of Winchester	3
February 1328	John Droxford, bishop of Bath and Wells	1
July 1328	John Droxford, bishop of Bath and Wells John Stratford, bishop of Winchester Roger Martival, bishop of Salisbury	3
October 1328	John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter	1
November 1330	John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter	1
January 1333	John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter	1
March 1337	John Kirkby, bishop of Carlisle	1
February 1339	John Kirkby, bishop of Carlisle	1
January 1340	Wulfstan Bransford, bishop of Worcester	1
March 1340	Wulfstan Bransford, bishop of Worcester	1
July 1340	Wulfstan Bransford, bishop of Worcester	1
April 1343	Wulfstan Bransford, bishop of Worcester	1
April 1344	Richard de Bury, bishop of Hereford John Trillek, bishop of Hereford Wulfstan Bransford, bishop of Worcester	3
June 1344	John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter Thomas Bek, bishop of Lincoln Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury Wulfstan Bransford, bishop of Worcester	4
September 1346	Thomas Bek, bishop of Lincoln Wulfstan Bransford, bishop of Worcester	2
January 1348	William Zouche, archbishop of York	1
March 1348	John Gynwell, bishop of Lincoln William Zouche, archbishop of York	2
February 1351	William Zouche, archbishop of York	1
January 1352	William Zouche, archbishop of York	1
August 1352	John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter	1
November 1355	Gilbert Welton, bishop of Carlisle	1
October 1363	John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter John Buckingham, bishop of Lincoln	2
February 1371	William Whittlesey, archbishop of Canterbury	1
November 1372	Thomas Brantingham, bishop of Exeter	1
November 1373	Thomas Brantingham, bishop of Exeter	1
January 1377	Thomas Appleby, bishop of Carlisle	1

Source: *Proctors*, ii, pp. 431, 433-7, 439, 442-6.

Appendix 36: Bishops and Parliamentary Proxies in both SC10 and Episcopal Registers - A Summary

Period	Number of Parliaments or Representative Councils (Total)	Number of Bishops Appointing Proctors (Total)	Average Number of Bishops Appointing Proctors per Parliament
Edward II's Reign	26	106	4
1327-49	35	159	4.5
1350-77	23	63	2.7
Edward III's Reign	58	222	3.8

Source: Appendices 31-5.

Appendix 37: John Grandisson's Attendance at Parliaments

Parliament	Was Grandisson Present?	Location	Evidence	Source
February 1328	Yes	York	Grandisson was in York from 6 to 10 March	*Grandisson,* iii, p. 1524.
April 1328	Yes	Northampton	Grandisson was in Hayford, near Northampton (his headquarters while at the assembly) between 28 April and 16 May	*Grandisson,* iii, p. 1524.
October 1328	No	Salisbury		
February 1329	No	Westminster		
March 1330	Yes	Winchester	Grandisson was in Winchester on 11 March	*Grandisson,* iii, p. 1525.
November 1330	No	Westminster		
September 1331	Yes	Westminster	Grandisson was in London from 3 to 20 October	*Grandisson,* iii, p. 1526.
March 1332	Yes	Westminster	Grandisson was in London from 20 February to 28 March	*Grandisson,* iii, p. 1526.
September 1332	Yes	Westminster	Grandisson was in London from 8 to 16 March	*Grandisson,* iii, p. 1526.
December 1332	No	York		
January 1333	Yes	York	The Parliament Rolls identify Grandisson as a trier of petitions	*PROME,* 1332, 2.
February 1334	Yes	York	Grandisson was in York from 26 February to 3 March	*Grandisson,* iii, p. 1527.
September 1334	No	Westminster		
May 1335	No	York		
March 1336	No	Westminster		
March 1337	Yes	Westminster	Grandisson was in London from 8 to 17 March	*Grandisson,* iii, p. 1528.
February 1338	Yes	Westminster	Grandisson was in London from 7 February to 10 March	*Grandisson,* iii, p. 1528.
February 1339	No	Westminster		

October 1339	Yes	Westminster	Grandisson was in Lambeth on 22 October and 21 November	*Grandisson,* iii, p. 1528.
January 1340	No	Westminster		
March 1340	No	Westminster		
July 1340	No	Westminster		
April 1341	Yes	Westminster	Grandisson was in London on 16 and 28 May	*Grandisson,* iii, p. 1529 (and chronicle evidence).
April 1343	Yes	Westminster	Grandisson was in London from 3 to 18 May	*Grandisson,* iii, p. 1529.
June 1344	No	Westminster		
September 1346	No	Westminster		
26 parliaments	13 parliaments			

Appendix 38: Patronage Received by Bishops During Parliaments

Nature of Grants	Number of Grants	Average Number of Grants on a Monthly Basis
Patronage Received by Episcopal Ministers During Parliaments or Representative Councils*	16	0.27
Patronage Received by Episcopal Ministers Outside of Parliaments or Representative Councils	80	0.15
Patronage Received by Bishops who were not Ministers During Parliaments or Representative Councils	48	0.8
Patronage Received by Bishops who were not Ministers Outside of Parliaments or Representative Councils	155	0.28
Patronage Received by All Bishops During Parliaments and Representative Councils	64	1.07
Patronage Received by All Bishops Outside of Parliaments and Representative Councils	235	0.43

* 'During Parliaments and representative councils' includes, for the purpose of this analysis, the week either side of assemblies, when bishops were often still at the place in which meet assemblies met.

Source: *CPR*; Appendices 8, 9, and 25.

Appendix 39: Patronage Obtained by Bishops for Others During Parliaments

Nature of Grants	Number of Grants	Average Number of Grants on a Monthly Basis
Patronage Obtained for Others by Episcopal Ministers During Parliaments or Representative Councils*	14	0.23
Patronage Obtained for Others by Episcopal Ministers Outside of Parliaments or Representative Councils	83	0.15
Patronage Obtained for Others by Bishops who were not Ministers During Parliaments or Representative Councils	58	0.96
Patronage Obtained for Others by Bishops who were not Ministers Outside of Parliaments or Representative Councils	53	0.1
Patronage Obtained for Others by All Bishops During Parliaments or Representative Councils	72	1.2
Patronage Obtained for Others by All Bishops Outside of Parliaments or Representative Councils	136	0.25

* During 'parliamentary assemblies or representative councils' includes, for the purpose of this analysis, the week either side of assemblies.

Source: *CPR*; Appendices 8, 9, and 25.

Appendix 40: Clerical Subsidies in the Reign of Edward I:[a]

Canterbury[b]		York[c]		Assessment[d]	Yield[e]
Date Granted	Subsidy	Date Granted	Subsidy		
1279	Triennial 15th	N/A	N/A	£16,000	£12,800
N/A	N/A	1280	Biennial 10th	£4,000	£3,400
1283	Biennial 20th	N/A	N/A	£8,000	£6,400
N/A	N/A	1286	Triennial 30th	£2,000	£1,300
1290	10th	1290	10th	£10,000	£6,600
1294	Moiety/ half	1294	Moiety/ half	£105,300	£68,900
1295	10th	1295	10th	£21,000	£11,200
1296/7	5th	1296/7	5th	£42,000	£23,200
1297	10th	1297	5th	£30,800	£25,100
Total				£239,100	£158,900
Average (mean) per year of reign, 1272-1307 (35 years)				£6,800	£4,500

Notes:

(a) For this table, and all those following, sums of money have been expressed to the nearest hundred, and percentages to the nearest whole percent.

(b) The information in these columns is taken from Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 569 and Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 161.

(c) The information in these columns is also taken from Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 569 and Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 161.

(d) For 1279-89, all assessment information is from Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 569. For 1290-1297, the figures are from Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 161.

(e) For the year 1290 and thereafter, these figures are all taken from Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 161. For the Canterbury subsidies of 1279 and 1283, H.S. Deighton's research revealed that their yields were high, but provided no percentage estimate, so their yields have been estimated for present purposes at 80% of their assessments (on the basis that the highest known percentage yield of a Canterbury subsidy in Edward I's reign was 80% for the tenth of 1297). For the York subsidy of 1280, Deighton also considered this to be high-yielding, so its yield has been estimated at 84.3% of its assessment (on the basis that the highest known percentage yield of a York subsidy in Edward I's reign was 84.3% in 1297). For the York subsidy of 1286, evidence survives that it was collected, but too little to determine quite how effectively, and accordingly its yield has been estimated at 65% of its assessment (the mean of the known percentage yields of subsidies collected from the province of York during Edward I's reign). See Deighton, 'Clerical Taxation by Consent', pp. 161-9.

Appendix 41: Clerical Subsidies in the Reign of Edward II

Canterbury		York		Assessment	Yield
Date Granted	Subsidy	Date Granted	Subsidy		
1307	15th	1307	15th	£14,000	£13,100
1313	4d in the mark	N/A	N/A	Unknown	£0*
N/A	N/A	1314	8-12d in the mark	£2,300	£1,800
1315	10th	N/A	N/A	£16,200	£12,600
1316	10th	1316	10th	£21,000	£19,700
N/A	N/A	1319	10th	£2,900	£2,700
1322	5d in the mark	1322	5d in the mark	£5,300	£4,700
Total				£61,700	£54,600
Average (mean) per year of reign, 1307-27 (20 years)				£3,100	£2,700

* For the complicated history of this subsidy, see Denton, 'Walter Reynolds and Ecclesiastical Politics', pp. 254-6.

Source: Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 163.

Appendix 42: Clerical Subsidies in the Reign of Edward III

Canterbury		York		Assessment	Yield
Date Granted	Subsidy	Date Granted	Subsidy		
1327	10th	1327	10th	£18,800	£17,000
1334	10th	1334	10th	£19,000	£16,900
1336 (March)	10th	1336 (May)	10th	£19,000	£16,600
1336 (September)	10th	1336 (October)	10th	£19,100	£16,700
1337	3 10ths	1337	3 10ths	£57,000	£45,000
1338	10th	N/A	N/A	£16,000	£14,000
1340	10th	1340	2 10ths	£20,000	£17,000
1342	10th	1342	10th	£18,000	£16,000
1344	3 10ths	1344	3 10ths	£54,000	£48,000
1346	2 10ths	1347	2 10ths	£36,000	£32,000
1351	2 10ths	1351	2 10ths	£36,000	£30,000
1356	10th	1356	10th	£18,000	£15,000
1360	10th	1360	10th	£18,000	£15,000
1370	3 10ths	1370	3 10ths	£54,000	£45,000
1371	Special subsidy	1371	Special Subsidy	£50,000	£42,100
1373	10th	1374	10th	£18,000	£15,000
1377	Poll tax	1377	Poll tax	£1,000	£800
Total				£471,900	£402,100
Average (mean) per year of reign, 1327-77 (50 years)				£9,400	£8,000

Source: Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, p. 205.

Appendix 43: Direct Lay Taxes in the Reign of Edward I

Date of Grant[a]	Subsidy[b]	Total Assessment[c]	Total Yield[d]	The Clergy's Estimated Assessment[e]	Estimated Yield from the Clergy[f]	Estimated Yield from the Laity (Total Yield – Estimated Clerical Contribution)
1275	15th	£82,000	£76,700	£20,500	£19,200	£57,500
1283	30th	£47,800	£44,700	£12,000	£11,200	£33,500
1290	15th	£117,000	£114,400	£29,300	£28,700	£85,700
1294	10th and 6th	£81,800	£75,000	£8,000	£7,300	£67,700
1295	11th and 7th	£52,900	£46,000	£9,000	£7,800	£38,200
1296	12th and 8th	£38,500	£37,300	£6,500	£6,300	£31,000
1297	9th	£34,400	£32,900	£6,000	£5,700	£27,200
1301	15th	£49,800	£45,100	£12,500	£11,300	£33,800
1306	30th and 20th	£35,300	£33,400	£8,500	£7,900	£25,500
Total for Reign		£539,500	£505,500	£112,300	£105,400	£400,100
Average (mean) per year of reign, 1272-1307 (35 years)		£15,400	£14,400	£3,200	£3,000	£11,400

Notes:

(a) The information in this column is taken from Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 569 and Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 153.

(b) The details in this column are also taken from Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 569 and Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 153.

(c) The assessments for the years 1275 and 1283 are taken from Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 569. The assessments for the remainder of the years are taken from Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 153.

(d) For the years 1290-1306, the yields are taken from Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 153. For the years 1275 and 1283, the yield has been estimated as 93.5% of the total assessment, since this is the mean percentage yield for the remainder of Edward's reign: Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 153.

(e) For the years 1294, 1295, 1296, 1297, 1301, and 1306, the figures in this column are taken from Denton, *Robert Winchelsey*, pp. 299-300. In 1275, 1283, and 1290, the clergy – as in 1301 and 1306 – were taxed on all their temporalities (rather than merely those excluded from the *Taxatio* of 1291): Willard, 'English Church and Lay Taxes', pp. 217-8; *idem*, *Parliamentary Taxes*, pp. 93-5; Denton, *Robert Winchelsey*, p. 237. The clergy's contribution for those years has been estimated at 25% of the total assessment, following Denton's calculations regarding their assessments in 1301 and 1306: Denton, *Robert Winchelsey*, p. 300.

(f) The figures in this column are calculated on the basis that the tax produced a substantially similar yield from both clergy and laity. If (as in 1290) the tax overall yielded 97.8% of its assessment, it is estimated that the clergy would have yielded 97.8% of their own assessment.

Appendix 44: Direct Lay Taxes in the Reign of Edward II

Date of Grant[a]	Subsidy[b]	Total Assessment[c]	Total Yield[d]	The Clergy's Estimated Assessment[e]	Estimated Yield from the Clergy[f]	Estimated Yield from the Laity (Total Yield – Estimated Clerical Contribution)
1307	20th and 15th	£38,400	£35,500	£6,500	£6,000	£29,500
1309	25th	£33,900	£32,600	£5,500	£5,300	£27,300
1313	20th and 15th	£38,600	£37,000	£5,800	£5,600	£31,400
1315	20th and 15th	£37,200	£34,300	£5,600	£5,200	£29,100
1316	16th and 15th	£39,300	£38,800	£5,900	£5,800	£33,000
1319	18th and 12th	£37,000	£35,100	£5,500	£5,200	£29,900
1322	10th and 6th	£42,500	£39,300	£6,400	£5,900	£33,400
Total for Reign		£266,900	£252,600	£41,200	£39,000	£213,600
Average (mean) per year of reign, 1307-1327 (20 years)		£13,300	£12,600	£2,100	£2,000	£10,700

Notes:

(a) The information in this column is taken from Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 153.
(b) The details in this column are also taken from Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 153.
(c) The assessments in this column are taken from Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 153.
(d) The information in this column is taken from Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 153.
(e) For the years 1307 and 1309, information is taken from Denton, *Robert Winchelsey,* pp. 300-1. For the remainder of years, the clerical assessment has been estimated as 15% of the total assessment – the 'ballpark' figure suggested by Mark Ormrod (Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 160) and J.H. Denton (Denton, *Robert Winchelsey*, pp. 297-8).
(f) The figures in this column are calculated on the basis that the tax produced a substantially similar yield from both clergy and laity. If (as in 1309) the tax overall yielded 96.2% of its assessment, it is estimated that the clergy would have yielded 96.2% of their own assessment.

Appendix 45: Direct Lay Taxes in the Reign of Edward III

Date of Grant[a]	Subsidy[b]	Total Assessment[c]	Total Yield[d]	The Clergy's Estimated Assessment[e]	Estimated Yield from the Clergy[f]	Estimated Yield from the Laity (Total Yield – Estimated Clerical Contribution)
1327	20th	£25,400	£23,400	£3,800	£3,500	£19,900
1332	15th and 10th	£34,300	£32,400	£5,100	£4,800	£27,600
1334	15th and 10th	£37,300	£36,600	£5,600	£5,500	£31,100
March 1336	15th and 10th	£38,500	£37,500	£5,800	£5,600	£31,900
September 1336	15th and 10th	£38,500	£36,800	£5,800	£5,500	£31,300
1337	3 15ths and 10ths	£114,600	£102,700	£17,200	£15,400	£87,300
1338	Tax in wool[g]	£79,400	£73,000	£11,900	£10,900	£62,100
1340	9th	£100,000	£65,000	£15,000	£9,800	£55,200
1341	Tax in wool[g]	£151,100	£131,200	£22,700	£19,700	£111,500
1344	2 15ths and 10ths	£76,100	£73,800	£11,400	£11,100	£62,700
1346	2 15ths and 10ths	£76,400	£73,600	£11,500	£11,100	£62,500
1348	3 15ths and 10ths	£115,200	£101,800	£17,300	£15,300	£86,500
1352	3 15ths and 10ths	£114,900	£110,300	£17,200	£16,500	£93,800
1357	15th and 10th	£38,100	£37,300	£5,700	£5,600	£31,700
1360	15th and 10th	£38,000	£6,000	£5,700	£900	£5,100
1371	Parish subsidy	£50,000	£49,900	N/A[h]		£49,900
1372	15th and 10th	£37,800	£36,000	£5,700	£5,400	£30,600
1373	2 15ths and 10ths	£75,600	£72,000	£11,300	£10,700	£61,300
1377	Poll tax	£22,600	£21,600	N/A[i]		£21,600
Total for Reign		£1,263,800	£1,120,900	£178,700	£157,300	£963,600
Average (mean) per year of reign, 1327-1377 (50 years)		£25,300	£22,400	£3,600	£3,100	£19,300

Notes:

(a) The information in this column is taken from Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, p. 204.

(b) The details in this column are also taken from Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, p. 204.
(c) The assessments in this column are again taken from Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, p. 204.
(d) The yields in this column are taken from Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, p. 204.
(e) The clerical assessments in this column have been estimated as 15% of the total assessment – the 'ballpark' figure suggested by Mark Ormrod (Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 160) and J.H. Denton (Denton, *Robert Winchelsey*, pp. 297-8).
(f) The figures in this column are calculated on the basis that the tax produced a substantially similar yield from both clergy and laity.
(g) It is perhaps worth noting why the 1338 and 1341 taxes on wool are included here as direct lay subsidies, rather than as wool subsidies (which are excluded here). This is because the 1338 tax on wool (which was, to an extent, imitated in the 1341 tax) was first direct tax on wool; the tax was apportioned according to the schedules of assessments used for fifteenths and tenths (at the rate of a stone of wool for every 2s of the assessment): Jurkowski, Smith, and Crook, *Lay Taxes*, pp. 43-6.
(h) The 1371 parish subsidy of £50,000 appears to have been solely levied on the laity, with the clergy having to pay an equal special subsidy of £50,000: Jurkowski, Smith, and Crook, *Lay Taxes*, p. 54; Ormrod, 'Experiment in Taxation', pp. 61-2.
(i) The lay poll tax of 1377 was equally solely levied on the laity, with there being a separate clerical poll tax in the same year: Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, pp. 136, 204-5; Jurkowski, Smith, and Crook, *Lay Taxes*, p. 56-7.

Appendix 46: Papal Subsidies in the Reign of Edward I

Date Collected	Subsidy	Assessment	Yield	Yield for Crown
1274-81[(a)]	Sexennial 10th	£130,000	£128,400	£66,700
1292-96[(b)]	Sexennial 10th (of which the last two years were never levied)	*c.* £130,000	£82,000	£44,000
1301-4[(c)]	Triennial 10th	£63,000	£62,000	£42,900
1306-7[(d)]	Biennial 10th	£42,000	£33,800	£31,800
Total		£365,000	£306,200	£185,400
Average (mean) per year of reign, 1292-1307 (35 years)		£10,400	£8,700	£5,300

Notes:

(a) The sexennial tenth initially levied in 1274 escaped the notice of Michael Prestwich and Mark Ormrod in their work on the clerical contribution to finances in Edward I's reign (Prestwich, *Edward I,* p. 569 and Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III,* p. 240, n. 114). However, the subsidy has been covered at length by W.E. Lunt, from whose work all these figures have been drawn: Lunt, *Financial Relations,* i, pp. 311-346 (esp. p. 346); *idem*, 'Papal Taxation in England', pp. 401-17

(b) All details regarding this tax have been taken from Lunt, *Financial Relations,* i, pp. 346-365 (esp. pp. 364-5).

(c) For the collection dates, assessment, and yield for the crown of this tax, see Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 163. For the overall yield of the tax, see Lunt, *Financial Relations,* i, pp. 380-1. For further discussion of the tax, see *Ibid.,* pp. 366-81.

(d) For the collection dates, assessment, and yield for the crown of this tax, see Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 163. For the overall yield of the tax (of which the king obtained all but £2,000), see Lunt, *Financial Relations,* i, pp. 383-4 and Denton, *Robert Winchelsey,* p. 300. For further discussion of the tax, see Lunt, *Financial Relations,* i, pp. 382-95.

Appendix 47: Papal Subsidies in the Reign of Edward II

Date Collected[a]	Subsidy[b]	Assessment[c]	Yield[d]	Yield for Crown[e]
1309-12	Triennial 10th	£61,200	£57,600	£43,200
1313	10th	£21,800	£18,900	£18,900
1313-4	First year of a sexennial 10th (other five years not collected)	£21,800	£18,500	£18,500
1318	10th	£19,500	£16,400	£16,400
1319-20	10th (province of Canterbury only)	£16,600	£16,200	£16,200
1320-1	10th	£19,600	£14,800	£14,800
1323-4	Biennial tenth	£38,500	£34,200	£33,300
Total		£199,000	£176,600	£161,300
Average (mean) per year of reign, 1307-27 (20 years)		£10,000	£8,800	£8,100

Notes:

(a) All information in this column derives from Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 163.
(b) All details in this column also come from Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 163.
(c) The figures in this column, once again, come from Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 163.
(d) Apart from the triennial tenth of 1309-12, the king took the entire profits of these papal subsidies. As such, thus figures for the crown's yield in Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 163 reflect the overall amount yielded by the clergy. For the triennial tenth, see Lunt, 'Clerical Tenths', pp. 157-63 (esp. p. 163). The precise estimation has been arrived at by assuming, as per Lunt, that the percentage yield for the royal and papal shares was similar, and thus by using the percentage yield of the royal share (94% of £45,929) and applying it to the papal share (of £15,309), before adding the two together.
(e) The information in this column is taken from Ormrod, 'Crown and English Economy', p. 163. The figure for 1323-4 has been adjusted to take into account the fact that Edward II paid £875 of the proceeds to the Pope – either as a gift (as Edward II claimed) or as the first instalment of his share of the tenth (as Pope John XXII thought): 'Clerical Tenths', p. 178.

Appendix 48: Papal Subsidies in the Reign of Edward III

Date Granted	Subsidy	Assessment	Yield	Yield for Crown
1330[a]	Quadrennial 10th	£76,100	£70,000	£35,000
1362[b]	'Gracious subsidy'	£19,000	£17,700	£15,000
1375[c]	Subsidy following negotiations at Bruges	£10,100	c. £9,000	N/A
Total		£105,200	£96,700	£50,000
Average (mean) per year of reign, 1327-77 (50 years)		£2,100	£1,900	£1,000

Notes:

(a) For the quadrennial tenth of 1330-3, see Lunt, *Financial Relations*, ii, pp. 75-88, from which the date granted, subsidy details, and assessment information have been taken. For the yield for the crown, see Ormrod, *Reign of Edward III*, p. 205. The overall yield has been estimated by doubling the yield for the crown, since Lunt concluded that 'there is no reason to suppose that the pope did not receive from the tenth approximately the same amount as the king: Lunt, *Financial Relations*, ii, p. 88.

(b) All information regarding the subsidy granted in 1362 has been taken from Lunt, *Financial Relations*, ii, pp. 95-103 (esp. p. 102).

(c) All information regarding this subsidy has come from Lunt, *Financial Relations*, ii, pp. 103-114 (esp. p. 111-2).

Appendix 49: Overall Amounts Paid by the Clergy in Direct Taxation in the Reigns of Edward I, Edward II, and Edward III

	Lay Taxation	Papal Subsidies	Clerical Taxation	Total
Edward I's Reign (Total)	£105,400	£306,200	£158,900	£570,500
Edward I's Reign (per year)	£3,000	£8,700	£4,500	£16,300
Edward I's Reign (Percentage)	18%	53%	28%	
Edward II's Reign (Total)	£39,000	£176,600	£54,600	£270,200
Edward II's Reign (per year)	£2,000	£8,800	£2,700	£13,500
Edward II's Reign (Percentage)	15%	65%	20%	
1272-1327 (Total)	£144,400	£482,800	£213,500	£840,700
1272-1327 (per year)	£2,600	£8,800	£3,900	£15,300
1272-1327 (percentage)	17%	57%	25%	
Edward III's Reign (Total)	£157,300	£96,700	£402,100	£656,100
Edward III's Reign (per year)	£3,100	£1,900	£8,000	£13,000
Edward III's Reign (Percentage)	24%	15%	61%	

Source: Appendices 40-8.

Appendix 50: Overall Amounts Received by the Crown from the Taxation of the Clergy in the Reigns of Edward I, Edward II, and Edward III

	Lay Taxation	Papal Subsidies	Clerical Taxation	Total
Edward I's Reign (Total)	£105,400	£185,400	£158,900	£449,700
Edward I's Reign (per year)	£3,000	£5,300	£4,500	£12,800
Edward II's Reign (Total)	£39,000	£161,300	£54,600	£254,900
Edward II's Reign (per year)	£2,000	£8,100	£2,700	£12,700
1272-1327 (Total)	£144,400	£346,700	£213,500	£704,600
1272-1327 (per year)	£2,600	£6,300	£3,900	£12,800
Edward III's Reign (Total)	£157,300	£50,000	£402,100	£609,400
Edward III's Reign (per year)	£3,100	£1,000	£8,000	£12,100

Source: Appendices 40-8.

Appendix 51: The Amounts Received by the Crown from the Direct Taxation of the Clergy and the Laity in the Reigns of Edward I, Edward II, and Edward III

	Total Received from Laity	Total Received from Clergy	Total Received	Percentage Received from Laity	Percentage Received from Clergy
Edward I's Reign (Total)	£400,100	£449,700	£849,800	47%	53%
Edward I's Reign (per year)	£11,400	£12,800	£23,300		
Edward II's Reign (Total)	£213,600	£254,900	£468,500	46%	54%
Edward II's Reign (per year)	£10,700	£12,700	£23,400		
1272-1327 (Total)	£613,700	£704,600	£1,318,300	47%	53%
1272-1327 (per year)	£11,200	£12,800	£24,000		
Edward III's Reign (Total)	£963,600	£609,400	£1,573,000	61%	39%
Edward III's Reign (per year)	£19,300	£12,100	£31,500		

Source: Appendices 40-8.

Appendix 52: The Proportion of Royal Revenue from Direct Taxation Received from Lay Taxation, Clerical Taxation, and Papal Subsidies in the Reigns of Edward I, Edward II, and Edward III

	Lay Taxation		Papal Subsidies		Clerical Taxation		Royally instigated Taxation	
	% of Income Received from Clergy	% of Total income	% of Income Received from Clergy	% of Total Income	% of Income Received from Clergy	% of Total income	% of Income Received from Clergy	% of Total income
Edward I's Reign	23%	59%	41%	22%	35%	19%	59%	78%
Edward II's Reign	15%	54%	63%	34%	21%	12%	37%	66%
1272-1327	20%	58%	49%	26%	30%	16%	51%	74%
Edward III's Reign	26%	71%	8%	3%	66%	26%	92%	97%

Source: Appendices 40-8.

Appendix 53: Amount Paid in Direct Taxation by the Clergy and the Laity on a Decade-by-Decade Basis from 1272 to 1377

Decade*	Amount Paid by Clergy**	Amount Paid by Clergy per Year	Amount Paid by Laity	Total Paid	Percentage Paid by Clergy	Percentage Paid by Laity
1272-9	£147,600	£18,500	£57,500	£205,100	72%	38%
1280-9	£25,200	£3,380	£33,500	£58,700	43%	57%
1290-9	£272,800	£27,300	£249,800	£522,600	52%	48%
1300-9	£139,400	£13,900	£116,100	£255,500	55%	45%
1310-9	£186,200	£18,700	£123,400	£309,600	60%	40%
1320-9	£80,100	£8,000	£53,300	£133,400	52%	48%
1330-9	£226,900	£22,700	£271,300	£498,200	46%	54%
1340-9	£180,000	£18,000	£378,400	£558,400	32%	68%
1350-9	£67,100	£6,700	£125,500	£192,600	35%	65%
1360-9	£33,600	£3,400	£5,100	£38,700	87%	13%
1370-7	£128,000	£16,000	£163,400	£291,400	44%	56%

* Where taxes were collected over two decades, they have been listed in the one in which they were principally collected. Thus, for instance, the papal grant that was collected between 1274 and 1281 has been classed as being collected in the 1270s.

** The amount paid by clergy reflects the total amount they ceded – to both king and pope.

Source: Appendices 40-8.

Appendix 54: The Income of the Bishops of the Southern Province According to the *Taxatio* of 1291

Bishopric	Episcopal Income
Canterbury	£1965 3s 10.75d
Bangor	£159 9s 4d
Bath and Wells	£609 19s 3d
Chichester	£472 12s 11.75d
Coventry and Lichfield	£377 12s 2d
Ely	£2000
Exeter	£502 19s 4.75d
Hereford	£526 8s 11.5d
Lincoln	£1000
Llandaff	£115 1s 4d
London	£1000
Norwich	£666 13s 4d (1000 marks)
Rochester	£308 13s 11d
Salisbury	£984 11s 3d
St Asaph	£188 16s 2d
St Davids	£124 17s
Winchester	£2,977 15s 7.5d
Worcester	£520 1s 0.75d

Note: Sadly, Jeffrey Denton died before he could complete his research on how the northern province was treated in the *Taxatio* of 1291. Accordingly, the table above is confined to the bishops of southern province.

Source: https://www.dhi.ac.uk/taxatio/forms?form=episcopal (the *Taxatio* database produced by Jeffrey Denton *et al.*, accessed 5 September 2022).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Unpublished Sources

Chippenham, Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre

D1/2/1 (The Episcopal Register of Simon of Ghent, bishop of Salisbury, 1297-1315)

D/1/2/3 (The Episcopal Register of Robert Wyvil, bishop of Salisbury [in two volumes], 1330-1375)

D1/2/4 (The Episcopal Register of Ralph Erghum, bishop of Salisbury, 1375-88)

Hereford, Cathedral Library

MS P.5 XII (A fourteenth-century manuscript containing sermons attributed to John Stratford, archbishop of Canterbury)

Kew, The National Archives

C 49 (Parliamentary and Council Proceedings)

C 71 (Scotch Rolls)

E 28 (Exchequer: Council and Privy Seal Records)

E 101 (Exchequer Accounts)

E 403 (Exchequer Issue Rolls)

JUST 1/1388 (Roll of Presentments from the Inquiry into the Identity of the Rebels in Worcestershire, Herefordshire, and Gloucestershire, 1323)

SC 1 (Ancient Correspondence)

SC 8 (Ancient Petitions)

London, British Library

MS Faustina B.V. (The *Historia Roffensis*, attributed to William Dene)

MS Lansdowne 393 (Sermons of Richard FitzRalph, archbishop of Armagh, 1300-1360)

MS Claudius A XI (A fourteenth-century copy of 416 of Anselm's letters compiled by, or on behalf of, John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter)

London, Lambeth Palace Library (accessed *via* microfilm at the Bodleian Library)

Reg. Courtenay (The Archiepiscopal Register of William Courtenay, archbishop of Canterbury, 1381-96)

Oxford, Bodleian Library

MS Bodley 132 (A thirteenth-century copy of various works of St Augustine, which was owned and annotated by John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter)

MS Bodley 150 (A thirteenth-century copy of a number of works, principally by St Augustine, which was owned and annotated by John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter)

MS Bodley 493 (A composite manuscript containing John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter's, 'Life of St Thomas of Canterbury', *c.* 1400)

Oxford, Christ Church

MS 92 (The Treatise of Walter de Milemete, 1327)

Oxford, New College

MS 21415 (The Foundation Charter of New College, Oxford, 1379)

York, Borthwick Institute (all accessed via the *York's Archbishops Registers Database,* at https://archbishopsregisters.york.ac.uk/browse/registers?collection=h702q6403)

Register 9A (The Archiepiscopal Register of William Melton, archbishop of York, 1317-40)

Register 9B (The Archiepiscopal Register of William Melton, archbishop of York, 1317-40)

Register 10 (The Archiepiscopal Register of William Zouche, archbishop of York, 1342-52)

Register 11 (The Archiepiscopal Register of John Thoresby, archbishop of York, 1352-73)

Published Sources:

Adae Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarumi, ed. E.M. Thompson (London, 1889).

'The Anglo-French Negotiations at Bruges', ed. E. Perroy, in *Camden Miscellany XIX* (London, 1952).

Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1174-1328: Some Selected Documents, ed. E.L.G. Stones (London, 1975).

'Annales de Bermundeseia', in *Annales Monastici*, ed. H.R. Luard (5 vols., London, 1863-8), iii.

'Annales de Dunstaplia', in *Annales Monastici*, ed. H.R. Luard (5 vols., London, 1863-8), iii.

'Annales Londonienses', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, ed. W. Stubbs (2 vols., London, 1882-3), i.

'Annales Paulini', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, ed. W. Stubbs (2 vols., London, 1882-3), ii.

'Annales Prioratus de Wigornia' in *Annales Monastici*, ed. H.R. Luard (5 vols., London, 1863-8), iv.

Anonimalle Chronicle, 1307 to 1334, ed. W.R. Childs and J. Taylor (Leeds, 1991).

The Anonimalle Chronicle, 1333 to 1381, ed. V.H. Galbraith (Manchester, 1927).

Augustine: Political Writings, ed. E.M. Atkins and R. Dodaro (Cambridge, 2001).

Bartholomaei de Cotton Monachi Norwicensis Historia Anglicana, ed. H.R. Luard (London, 1859).

The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook, ed. M. Livingston and K. Devries (Liverpool, 2015).

The Black Death, ed. R. Horrox (Manchester, 1994).

The Book of the Illustrious Henries by John Capgrave, ed. F.C. Hingeston (London, 1858).

The Book of John de Schalby, Canon of Lincoln (1299-1333), Concerning the Bishops of Lincoln and their Acts, ed. J.H. Srawley (Lincoln, 1949).

The Brut, or the Chronicles of England, ed. F.W.D. Brie (2 vols., London, 1906-8).

Calendar of Ancient Correspondence Concerning Wales, ed. G. Edwards (Cardiff, 1935).

Calendar of Charter Rolls

Calendar of Close Rolls

Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland, eds. J. Bain, G.G. Simpson, and J.D. Galbraith (5 vols., Edinburgh, 1881-1986).

Calendar of Fine Rolls

Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells, ed. W.H.B. Bird (2 vols., London, 1907-14).

Calendar of Memoranda Rolls (Exchequer), 1326-7, ed. R.E. Latham (London, 1968).

Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Papal Letters

Calendar of Patent Rolls

Calendar of Petitions to the Pope, 1342-1419, ed. W.H. Bliss (London, 1896).

Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall, ed. A.H. Thomas and P.E. Jones (6 vols., Cambridge, 1926-61).

A Calendar of the Register of Henry Wakefield, Bishop of Worcester, 1375-1395, ed. W.P. Marett (Worcester, 1972).

Calendar of the Register of John de Drokensford, Bishop of Bath and Wells, ed. E. Hobhouse (London, 1887).

Calendar of the Register of Richard Scrope, Archbishop of York, 1398-1405, ed. R.N. Swanson (2 vols., York, 1981-5).

Calendar of the Register of Simon de Montacute, Bishop of Worcester, 1334-1337, ed. R.M. Haines (Worcester, 1996).

A Calendar of the Register of Wolstan de Bransford, Bishop of Worcester, 1339-49, ed. R.M. Haines (London, 1966).

A Calendar of the Register of Adam de Orleton, Bishop of Worcester, 1327-1333, ed. R.M. Haines (London, 1979).

Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, ed. R. Brown, H.F. Brown, and A.B. Hinds (38 vols., London, 1864-1947).

Canterbury College, Oxford, ed. W.A. Pantin (4 vols., Oxford, 1947-85).

Cartae de Fundatione Collegii Beatae Mariae Wynton in Oxon, A.D. MCCCLXXIX (Oxford, 1879).

Cartularium Monasterii de Rameseia, ed. W.H. Hart and P.A. Lyons (3 vols., London, 1884-1893).

Cartulary of Oseney Abbey, ed. H.E. Slater (6 vols., Oxford, 1929-36).

The Cartularies of Southwick Priory, ed. K.A. Hanna (2 vols., Winchester, 1988-9).

Ceremonies and Processions from the Cathedral Church of Salisbury, ed. C. Wordsworth (Cambridge, 1901).

Chartulary of Winchester Cathedral, ed. A.W. Goodman (Winchester, 1927).

Chronica Monasterii de Melsa, ed. E.A. Bond (3 vols., London, 1866-9)

Chronica Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis, 1346-1367, ed. J. Tait (Manchester, 1914).

The Chronicle of Adam Usk, ed. C. Given-Wilson (Oxford, 1997).

The Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds, 1212-1301, ed. A. Gransden (London, 1964)

The Chronicle of Geoffrey le Baker, ed. D. Preest and R. Barber (Woodbridge, 2012).

'Chronicle of Robert Graystanes', in *Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres: Gaufridus de Coldingham, Robertus de Graystanes, et Willielmus de Chambre,* ed. J. Raine (London, 1839).

Chronicles of the Mayors and Sheriffs of London, 1188-1274 and the French Chronicle of London, 1259-1343, ed. H.T. Riley (London, 1863)

Chronicles of the Revolution, 1397-1400, ed. C. Given-Wilson (Manchester, 1993).

Chronicon Angliae, 1328-1388, ed. E.M. Thompson (London, 1874).

Chronicon Anonymi Cantuariensis: The Chronicle of the Anonymous of Canterbury, ed. C. Given-Wilson and C. Scott-Stokes (Oxford, 2008)

Chronicon Henrici Knighton, ed. J.R. Lumby (2 vols., London, 1889-1895).

Chroniques de J. Froissart, ed. S. Luce (8 vols., Paris, 1869-88).

The Church in London, 1375-1392, ed. A.K. McHardy (London, 1977).

A Collection of all the Wills, now known to be extant, of the Kings and Queens of England, ed. J. Nichols (London, 1780).

The Collegiate Church of Ottery St Mary, Being the Ordinacio et Statuta Ecclesiae Sancte Mariae De Otery Exon. Diocesis, A.D. 1338, 1339, ed. J.N. Dalton (Cambridge, 1917).

Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, ed. D. Wilkins (4 vols, London, 1737).

Continuatio Eulogii: The Continuation of the Eulogium Historiarum, 1364-1413, ed. C. Given-Wilson (Oxford, 2019).

'Continuatio Historiae de Episcopis Wigorniensibus', in *Anglia Sacra,* ed. H. Wharton (2 vols., London, 1691), i.

Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church, 871-1313, ed. F.M. Powicke, C.R. Cheney, D. Whitelock, M. Brett, and C. Brooke (Oxford, 3 vols, 1964-81).

Crécy and Calais from the Original Records in the Public Record Office, ed. G. Wrottesley (London, 1898).

Crime, Law, and Society in the Later Middle Ages, ed. A. Musson and E. Powell (Manchester, 2009).

Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, ed. N.P. Tanner (2 vols., London, 1990), i.

Documents Relating to the University and Colleges of Cambridge (3 vols., Cambridge, 1852).

'Durham Records: Calendar of the Cursitor's Records' in *The Thirty-First Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records* (London, 1870).

Dymmok, Roger. *Liber Contra XII Errores et Hereses Lollardorum,* ed. H.S. Cronin (London, 1922).

English Coronation Records, ed. L.G.W. Legg (Westminster, 1901).

English Medieval Diplomatic Practice, ed. P. Chaplais (2 vols., London, 1975-82).

English Historical Documents II, 1042-1189, 2nd edn, ed. D.C. Douglas and G.W. Greenaway (London, 1981).

English Historical Documents III, 1189-1327, ed. H. Rothwell (London, 1975)

English Historical Documents IV, 1327-1485, ed. A.R. Myers (London, 1969).

English Historical Documents V, 1485-1558, ed. C.H. Williams (London, 1967).

Epistolae Academicae Oxon. (Registrum F): A Collection of Letters and Other Miscellaneous Documents Illustrative of Academical Life and Studies at Oxford in the Fifteenth Century, ed. H. Anstey (2 vols., Oxford, 1898).

The Ethics of War: Classic and Contemporary Readings, ed. G.M. Reichberg, H. Syse, and E. Begby (Oxford, 2006).

Eynsham Cartulary, ed. H.E. Salter (2 vols., Oxford, 1907-8).

Fasciculi Zizaniorum Magistri Johannis Wyclif, ed. W.W. Shirley (London, 1858).

Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1300-1541, ed. J. Le Neve, H.P.F. King, and J.M. Horn (12 vols., London, 1962-7).

Flores Historiarum (3 vols., London, 1890), iii.

Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae et Cujuscunque Generis Acta Publica Inter Reges Angliae, ed. T. Rymer (7 vols., London, 1816-19).

Froissart: Chronicles, ed. G. Brereton (London, 1968).

'Gesta Edwardi de Carnarvon Auctore Canonico Bridlingtoniensi', in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II,* ed. W. Stubbs (2 vols., London, 1882-3), ii.

Hemingby's Register, ed. H.M. Chew (Devizes, 1963).

'Historia Eliensis', in *Anglia Sacra,* ed. H. Wharton (2 vols., London, 1691), i.

The Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops, ed. J. Raine (3 vols., 1879-94), ii.

Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Registers, ed. J. Raine (London, 1873).

The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury, ed. W. Stubbs (2 vols., London, 1879-80), ii.

The Holy Bible: New King James Version (Nashville, 2017).

'Illustrative Documents', ed. M. Arvanigian and A. Leopold, in D. Rollason and M. Prestwich (eds.), *The Battle of Neville's Cross, 1346* (Stamford, 1998).

'Inventories of Plate, Given to the College of Winchester, and to the College Chapel, by William of Wykeham, the Founder, and Subsequent Benefactors', ed. W.H. Gunner, *The Archaeological Journal,* 10 (1853).

Iohannis Wyclif: Tractatus de Blasphemia, ed. M.H. Dziewicki (London, 1893).

Iohannis Wycliffe, Tractatus De Civili Dominio, ed. R. Lane Poole, J. Loserth, and F.D. Matthew (4 vols., London, 1885-1904).

Issues of the Exchequer, Being a Collection of Payments Made Out of His Majesty's Revenue from King Henry III to King Henry VI Inclusive, ed. F. Devon (London, 1837).

The Itinerary of Edward III and his Household, 1327-1345, ed. C. Shenton (Kew, 2007).

Johannis de Trokelowe et Henrici de Blaneforde, Chronica et Annales, ed. H.T. Riley (London, 1866).

Knighton's Chronicle, 1337-1396, ed. G.H. Martin (Oxford, 1995).

The Chronicle of Lanercost, 1272-1346, ed. H. Maxwell (Glasgow, 1913).

William Langland, *Piers Plowman: A Parallel-Text Edition of the A, B, C and Z Versions*, ed. A.V.C. Schmidt (2 vols., London, 1995).

The Lay Folks' Catechism, ed. T.F. Simmons and H.E. Nolloth (London, 1901).

The Letters and Charters of Gilbert Foliot, Abbot of Gloucester (1139-48), Bishop of Hereford (1148-63), and London (1163-87), ed. Z.N. Brooke, A. Morey, and C.N.L. Brooke (Cambridge, 1967).

The Letters of John of Salisbury, ed. W.J. Millor and H.E. Butler, rev. C.N.L. Brooke (2 vols., London, 1955-79).

The Letters of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, ed. F.A.C. Mantello and J. Goering (Toronto, 2010).

The Liber Epistolaris of Richard de Bury, ed. N. Denholm-Young (Oxford, 1950).

Liber Pluscardensis, ed. F.J.H. Skene (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1877-80).

Life and Campaigns of the Black Prince, ed. R. Barber (Woodbridge, 1979).

Literae Cantuarienses: The Letter Books of the Monastery of Christ Church, Canterbury, ed. J.B. Sheppard (3 vols., London, 1887-9).

Le Liverie de Reis de Brittanie e Le Liverie de Reis de Engleterre, ed. J. Glover (London, 1865).

The Love of Books: The Philobiblon of Richard de Bury, ed. E.C. Thomas (London, 1903).

Middle English Sermons, ed. W.O. Ross (London, 1940).

The Mirror of Simple Souls, ed. C. Kirchberger (London, 1927).

Nicolai Triveti Annalium Continuatio, ed. A. Hall (Oxford, 1722).

Original Papal Letters in England, 1305-1415, ed. P.N.R. Zutshi (Vatican City, 1990).

Parliamentary Texts of the Later Middle Ages, ed. N. Pronay and J. Taylor (Oxford, 1980).

Parliamentary Writs, ed. F. Palgrave (2 vols., London, 1827-34).

The Peasants' Revolt of 1381, ed. R.B. Dobson, 2nd edn (London, 1983).

Petitions from Lincolnshire, c. 1200-c.1500 ed. G. Dodd and A.K. McHardy (Woodbridge, 2020).

Petrarca, F. *Rerum Familiarium Libri,* ed. A.S. Bernardo (3 vols., New York, 1975-85).

Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History Composed During the Period from the Accession of Edward III to that of Richard III, ed. T. Wright (2 vols., London, 1859-61).

Political Thought in Early Fourteenth-Century England: Treatises by Walter of Milemete, William of Pagula, and William of Ockham, ed. C.J. Nederman (Tempe, 2002).

Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden, ed. C. Babington and J.R. Lumby (9 vols., London, 1865-86), viii.

Preaching in the Age of Chaucer: Selected Sermons in Translation, ed. S. Wenzel (Washington D.C., 2008).

Proctors for Parliament: Clergy, Community, and Politics, c. 1248-1539, ed. A. McHardy and P. Bradford (2 vols., Woodbridge, 2017-18).

'The Ransom of John II, King of France, 1360-1370', ed. D.M. Broome, in *Camden Miscellany XIV* (London, 1926).

Records of Convocation, ed. G. Bray (20 vols., Woodbridge, 2005-6).

The Records of Merton Priory in the County of Surrey, Chiefly from Early and Unpublished Documents, ed. A. Heales (Oxford, 1898).

The Registers of Bishop Henry Burghersh, 1320-1342, ed. H. Bennett (5 vols., Woodbridge, in progress, 1999-).

The Register of Edward, the Black Prince, Preserved in the Public Record Office, ed. A. Stamp and M.C.B. Dawes (4 vols., London, 1930-33).

The Register of the Diocese of Worcester during the Vacancy of the See, usually called 'Registrum Sede Vacante', ed. J.W. Willis Bund (5 vols., Oxford, 1893-7).

The Register of Gilbert Welton, Bishop of Carlisle, 1353-1362, ed. R.L. Storey (Woodbridge, 1999).

The Registers of John de Sandale and Riguad d'Asserio, Bishops of Winchester (A.D. 1316-1323), with an Appendix of Contemporaneous and Other Illustrative Documents, ed. F.J. Baigent (London, 1897).

The Register of John de Grandisson, Bishop of Exeter, 1327-1369, with Some Account of the Episcopate of James de Berkeley, 1327, ed. F.C. Hingeston (3 vols., London, 1894-9).

The Register of John de Halton, Bishop of Carlisle, 1292- 1324, ed. W.N. Thompson and T.F. Tout (2 vols., London, 1913)

The Register of John Kirkby, Bishop of Carlisle, 1332-1352, and the Register of John Ross, Bishop of Carlisle, 1325-1332, ed. R.L. Storey (2 vols., Woodbridge, 1993-5).

The Register of John Salmon, Bishop of Norwich, 1299-1325, ed. E. Gemmill (Woodbridge, 2019).

The Register of John de Stratford, Bishop of Winchester, 1323-1333, ed. R.M. Haines (2 vols., Woking, 2010-11).

The Register of Lewis de Charlton, Bishop of Hereford (A.D. 1361-1369), ed. J.H. Parry (Hereford, 1913).

The Register of Ralph of Shrewsbury, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1329-1363, From the Original in the Registry at Wells, ed. T.S. Holmes (2 vols., London, 1895-6)

The Register of Robert Hallum, Bishop of Salisbury, 1407-17, ed. J.M. Horn (London, 1982).

'The Register of Roger de Norbury, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, from A.D. 1322 to A.D. 1358: An Abstract of Contents and Remarks', ed. E. Hobhouse, in *Collections for a History of Staffordshire I* (Birmingham, 1880).

The Registers of Roger Martival, Bishop of Salisbury, 1315-1330, ed. K. Edwards, C.R. Elrington, D.M. Owen, and S. Reynolds (4 vols., Oxford, 1959-75).

The Register of Simon Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1375-1381, ed. D.F. Logan (Woodbridge, 2020).

The Register of Thomas Appleby, Bishop of Carlisle, 1363-1395, ed. R.L. Storey (Woodbridge, 2006).

The Register of Thomas de Brantyngham, Bishop of Exeter, 1370-1394, ed. F.C. Hingeston (2 vols., London, 1901-06).

The Register of Thomas de Cobham, bishop of Worcester, 1317-1327, ed. E.H. Pearce (London, 1930).

The Register of Walter de Stapeldon, Bishop of Exeter, 1307-1326, ed. F.C. Hingeston (London, 1892).

The Register of Walter Langton, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, 1296-1321, ed. J.B. Hughes (2 vols., Woodbridge, 2001-2007).

The Register of Walter Reynolds, bishop of Worcester, ed. R.A. Wilson (London, 1927).

The Register of William Bateman, Bishop of Norwich, 1344-1355, ed. P.E. Pobst (2 vols., Woodbridge, 1996-2000).

The Register of William Edington, Bishop of Winchester, 1346-1366, ed. S.F. Hockey (2 vols., Winchester, 1986-7).

The Register of William Greenfield, Lord Archbishop of York, 1306-1315, ed. W. Brown and A.H. Thompson (5 vols., Durham, 1931-40).

The Register of William Melton, Archbishop of York, 1317-1340, ed. R.M.T. Hill, R. Brocklesby, T.C.B. Timmins, and D. Robinson (5 vols., Woodbridge, 1977-).

The Registers or Act Books of the Bishops of Coventry and Lichfield, Book Five, Being the Second Register of Bishop Roger de Stretton, A.D. 1360-1385, ed. R.A. Wilson (London, 1905).

The Registers or Act Books of the Bishops of Coventry and Lichfield, Book Four, Being the Register of the Guardians of the Spiritualities During the Vacancy of the See, and the First Register of Bishop Roger de Stretton, A.D. 1360-1385, ed. R.A. Wilson (London, 1907).

'Registers of Simon Montacute, Thomas de Lisle, and Thomas Arundel', ed. J.H. Crosby, *Ely Diocesan Remembrancer,* 54-113 (1889-94).

Registrum Ade de Orleton, Episcopi Herefordensis, 1317-27, ed. A.T. Bannister (London, 1908).

Registrum Hamonis Hethe, Diocesis Roffensis, A.D. 1319-1352, ed. C. Johnson (2 vols., Oxford, 1948).

Registrum Henrici Woodlock, Diocesis Wintoniensis, A.D. 1305-1316, ed. A.W. Goodman (2 vols., Oxford, 1940-1).

Registrum Johannis de Trillek, Episcopi Herefordensis, A.D. MCCCXLIV-MCCCLXI, ed. J.H. Parry (London, 1912).

Registrum Johannis Gilbert, Episcopi Herefordensis, A.D. MCCCLXXV-MCCCLXXXIX, ed. J.H. Parry (London, 1916).

Registrum Ludowici de Charltone, Episcopi Herefordensis, A.D. MCCCLXI-MCCCLXX, ed. J.H. Parry (London, 1914).

Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense: The Register of Richard de Kellawe, Lord Palatine and Bishop of Durham, 1311-1316, ed. T.D. Hardy (4 vols, London, 1873-8).

Registrum Radulphi Baldock, Gilberti Segrave, Ricardi Newport, et Stephani Gravesend, Episcoporum Londoniensium, 1304-1338, ed. R.C. Fowler (London, 1911).

Registrum Ricardi de Swinfield, Episcopi Herefordensis, 1283-1317, ed. W.W. Capes (London, 1909).

Registrum Roberti Mascall, Episcopi Herefordensis, A.D. MCCCCIV-MCCCCXVI, ed. J.H. Parry (Oxford, 1917).

Registrum Roberti Winchelsey, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi, ed. R. Graham (2 vols., Oxford, 1952-6).

Registrum Simonis Langham, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi, ed. A.C. Wood (Oxford, 1956).

Registrum Simonis de Gandavo, Diocesis Saresbiriensis, 1297-1315, eds. C.T. Flower and M.C.B. Dawes (2 vols., Oxford, 1934).

Registrum Simonis de Sudbiria, Diocesis Londoniensis, A.D. 1362-1375, ed. C. Jenkins (London, 1927-38).

Registrum Thome de Charlton, Episcopi Herefordensis, AD MCCCXXVII-MCCCXLIV, ed. W.W. Capes (London, 1913).

Registrum Willelmi de Courtenay, Episcopi Herefordensis, AD MCCCLXX-MCCCLXXV, ed. W.W. Capes (London, 1914).

The Reign of Richard II: From Minority to Tyranny, 1377-97, ed. A.K. McHardy (Manchester, 2012).

Reports from the Lords Committees Touching the Dignity of a Peer of the Realm (5 vols., London, 1829).

Richard d'Aungerville of Bury: Fragments of his Register and Other Documents, ed. G.W. Kitchin (London, 1910).

The Riverside Chaucer, ed. L.D. Benson and F.N. Robinson, 3rd edn (Oxford, 2008).

Rotuli Parliamentorum, ed. J. Strachey *et al.* (6 vols., London, 1767-77).

Rotuli Scotiae in Turri Londinensi (2 vols., London, 1814).

Royal Writs Addressed to John Buckingham, Bishop of Lincoln, 1363-1398: Lincoln Register 12B, A Calendar, ed. A.K. McHardy (Woodbridge, 1997).

The St Albans Chronicle: The Chronica Maiora of Thomas Walsingham, ed. J. Taylor, W. Childs, and L. Watkiss (2 vols., Oxford, 2003-11).

The Sarum Missal, Edited from Three Early Manuscripts, ed. J. Wickham-Legg (Oxford, 1916).

Scalachronica: The Reigns of Edward I, Edward II, and Edward III, as Recorded by Sir Thomas Gray, ed. H. Maxwell (Glasgow, 1907).

Scalacronia, 1272-1363, ed. A. King (Woodbridge, 2019).

Select Charters, 9th edn., ed. W. Stubbs, rev. H.W.C. Davis (Oxford, 1913).

Select Documents of English Constitutional History, 1307-1485, ed. A.L. Brown and S.B. Chrimes (London, 1961).

Select Documents of English Constitutional History, ed. G.B. Adams and H.M. Stephens (London, 1901).

Selected Letters of Innocent III Concerning England, ed. W.H. Semple and C.R. Cheney (London, 1953).

Selections from English Wycliffite Writings, ed. A. Hudson (Cambridge, 1978).

The Sermons of Thomas Brinton, Bishop of Rochester, 1373-1389, ed. M.A. Devlin (2 vols., London, 1954).

The Simonie: A Parallel-Text Edition, ed. D. Embree and E. Urquhart (Heidelberg, 1991).

Society at War: The Experience of England and France During the Hundred Years War, ed. C. Allmand (Edinburgh, 1973).

Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford (3 vols., London, 1853).

Statutes of the Realm (11 vols., London, 1810-28).

'Stephani Birchingtoni, Monachi Cantuarienis, Historia de Archiepiscopis', in *Anglia Sacra,* ed. H. Wharton (2 vols., London, 1691), i.

Die Summa Magistri Rolandi, ed. F. Thaner (Vienna, 1874).

Thomae Walsingham, Quondam Monachi S. Albani, Historia Anglicana, ed. H.T. Riley (2 vols., London, 1863-4).

Three Prose Versions of the Secreta Secretorum, ed. R. Steele (London, 1898).

Tractatus de Mandatis Divinis Accedit Tractatus De Statu Innocencie, ed. J. Loserth and F.D. Matthew (London, 1922).

Tractatus De Officio Regis, ed. A.W. Pollard and C. Sayle (London, 1886).

Tracts and Treatises of John Wyclif, ed. R. Vaughan (London, 1845).

Tropenell Cartulary, ed. J.S. Davies (2 vols., Devizes, 1908).

The True Chronicles of Jean le Bel, 1290-1360, ed. N. Bryant (Woodbridge, 2011).

The Treatise De Nobilitatibus, Sapientiis, et Prudentiis Regum, ed. M.R. James (London, 1913).

Warren's Book, ed. A.W.W. Dale (Cambridge, 1911).

The Westminster Chronicle, 1381-1394, ed. L.C. Hector and B.F. Harvey (Oxford, 1982).

Willelmi Rishanger: Chronica et Annales, 1259-1307, ed. H.T. Riley (London, 1865).

Wykeham's Register, 1366-1404, ed. T.F. Kirby (2 vols., Winchester, 1896-9).

Vita Edwardi Secundi, ed. W.R. Childs (Oxford, 2005).

Secondary Material

Books and Articles

Aberth, J. 'The Black Death in the Diocese of Ely: The Evidence of the Bishop's Register', *The Journal of Medieval History,* 21 (1995), pp. 275-87.

—— 'Crime and Justice under Edward III: The Case of Thomas de Lisle', *The English Historical Review,* 107 (1992), pp. 283-301.

—— *Criminal Churchmen in the Reign of Edward III: The Case of Bishop Thomas de Lisle* (University Park, Penn., 1996).

—— *From the Brink of the Apocalypse: Confronting Famine, War, Plague, and Death in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 2001).

Aers, D. and Smith, N. 'English Reformations', *The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies,* 40 (2010), pp. 425-38.

Alban, J.R. 'English Coastal Defence: Some Fourteenth-Century Modifications Within the System', in R.A. Griffiths (ed.), *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1981), pp. 57-78.

Allington-Smith, R. *Henry Despenser: The Fighting Bishop* (Dereham, 2003).

Ainsworth, P. *Jean Froissart and the Fabric of History* (Oxford, 1990).

Allmand, C. 'Diplomacy in Late-Medieval England', *History Today,* 17 (1967), pp. 546-53.

—— *Henry V* (London, 1992).

—— *The Hundred Years War* (Cambridge, 1988).

Ambler, S. *Bishops in the Political Community of England, 1213-1272* (Oxford, 2017).

—— 'The Montfortian Bishops' in A. Jobson (ed.), *Baronial Reform and Revolution in England, 1258-1267* (Woodbridge, 2016), pp. 138-51.

—— 'The Montfortian Bishops and the Justification of Conciliar Government in 1264', *Historical Research,* 85 (2012), pp. 193-209.

Ambrose, T. *The Bishop's Palace, Lincoln* (Lincoln, 1980).

Ambühl, R. and Dodd, G. 'The Politics of Surrender: Treason, Trials and Recrimination in the 1370s', in R. Ambühl, J. Bothwell, and L. Tompkins (eds.), *Ruling Fourteenth Century England: Essays in Honour of Christopher Given-Wilson* (Woodbridge, 2019), pp. 227-62.

Archer, R.E. 'The Estates and Finances of Margaret of Brotherton, c. 1320-1399', *Historical Research,* 60 (1987), pp. 264-80.

—— 'Parliamentary Restoration: John Mowbray and the Dukedom of Norfolk in 1425' in R.E Archer and S. Walker (eds.), *Rulers and Ruled in Late Medieval England: Essays Presented to Gerald Harriss* (London, 1995), pp. 99-116.

—— 'Rich Old Ladies: The Problem of Late Medieval Dowagers', in A.J. Pollard (ed.), *Property and Politics: Essays in Later Medieval English History* (Gloucester, 1984), pp. 15-35.

Arnold, J. *Dean John Colet of St Paul's: Humanism and Reform in Early Tudor England* (New York 2007).

Arvanigian, M. 'The Durham Gentry and the Scottish March, 1370-1400: County Service in Late Medieval England', *Northern History,* 42 (2005), pp. 257-73.

Aston M. *Faith and Fire: Popular and Unpopular Religion, 1350-1600* (London, 1993).

—— 'The Impeachment of Bishop Despenser', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 38 (1965), pp. 127-48.

—— 'Lollardy and Sedition, 1381-1431', *Past and Present,* 17 (1960), pp. 1-44.

—— *Thomas Arundel: A Study of Church Life in the Reign of Richard II* (Oxford, 1967).

Autrand, F. 'France Under Charles V and Charles VI', in M. Jones (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History VI, c. 1300-c. 1415* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 422-41.

—— ‘The Peacemakers and the State: Pontifical Diplomacy and the Anglo-French Conflict in the Fourteenth Century’, in P. Contamine (ed.), *War and Competition between States* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 249-77.

Avery, M.E. ‘The History of the Equitable Jurisdiction of Chancery Before 1460’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 42 (1969), pp. 129-44.

Axworthy, R.L. ‘Lyons, Richard’, *ODNB.*

Ayton, A. ‘Armies and Military Communities in Fourteenth-Century England’, in P. Coss and C. Tyerman (eds.), *Soldiers, Nobles and Gentlemen: Essays in Honour of Maurice Keen* (Woodbridge, 2009), pp. 215-39.

—— ‘The Battle of Crécy: Context and Significance’, in A. Ayton and P. Preston (eds.), *The Battle of Crécy, 1346* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 1-34.

—— ‘Crécy and the Chroniclers’, in A. Ayton and P. Preston (eds.), *The Battle of Crécy, 1346* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 287-350.

—— ‘The Crécy Campaign’, in A. Ayton and P. Preston (eds.), *The Battle of Crécy, 1346* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 25-108.

—— ‘Edward III and the English Aristocracy at the Beginning of the Hundred Years War’, in M. Strickland (ed.), *Armies, Chivalry and Warfare in Medieval Britain and France* (Stamford, 1998), pp. 173-206.

—— ‘The English Army at Crécy’, in A. Ayton and P. Preston (eds.), *The Battle of Crécy, 1346* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 159-252.

—— ‘The English Army and the Normandy Campaign of 1346’, in D. Bates and A. Curry (eds.), *England and Normandy in the Middle Ages* (London, 1994), pp. 253-68.

—— ‘English Armies in the Fourteenth Century’, in A. Curry and M. Hughes (eds.), *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War* (Woodbridge, 1994), pp. 21-38.

—— ‘Military Service and the Dynamics of Recruitment in Fourteenth-Century England’, in A.R. Bell, A. Curry, A. Chapman, A. King, and D. Simpkin (eds.), *The Soldier Experience in the Fourteenth Century* (Woodbridge, 2011), pp. 9-59.

Ayton, A. and Preston, P. ‘Topography and Archery: Further Reflections on the Battle of Crécy’, in A. Ayton and P. Preston (eds.), *The Battle of Crécy, 1346* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 351-78.

Bachrach, D.S. ‘The Ecclesia Anglicana goes to War: Prayers, Propaganda, and Conquest during the Reign of Edward I of England, 1272-1307’, *Albion,* 36 (2004), pp. 393-406.

Bailey, M. *After the Black Death: Economy, Society, and the Law in Fourteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 2021).

—— *The Decline of Serfdom in Late Medieval England: From Bondage to Freedom* (Woodbridge, 2014).

Baker, J.H. ‘Fastolf, Thomas’, *ODNB.*

Baker, R.L. ‘The Government of Calais in 1363’, in W.C. Jordan, B. McNab, and T.F. Ruiz (eds.), *Order and Innovation in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honor of J.R. Strayer* (Princeton, 1976), pp. 207-14.

Baldwin, J.F. ‘The King’s Council’, in W.A. Morris and J.R. Strayer (eds.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1940-50), i, pp. 128-60.

—— *The King’s Council in England During the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1913).

Balfour-Melville, E.W.M. *Edward III and David II* (London, 1954).

Barber, R. *Edward III and the Triumph of England: The Battle of Crécy and the Company of the Garter* (London, 2013).

—— *Edward, Prince of Wales and Aquitaine: A Biography of the Black Prince* (London, 1978).

—— ‘Jean Froissart and Edward, the Black Prince’, in J.J.N. Palmer (ed.), *Froissart: Historian* (Woodbridge, 1981), pp. 25-35.

Barker, J. *Conquest: The English Kingdom of France, 1417-1450* (London, 2009).

—— *England, Arise: The People, the King and the Great Revolt of 1381* (London, 2014).

Barlow, F. *The English Church, 1066-1154* (London, 1979).

—— ‘Theobald’, *ODNB.*

—— *Thomas Becket* (London, 1986).

Barnie, J. *War in Medieval Society: Social Values and the Hundred Years War, 1337-99* (London, 1974).

Barraclough, G. *Papal Provisions* (Oxford, 1935).

Barratt, N. ‘The Revenue of King John’, *The English Historical Review,* 111 (1996), pp. 835-55.

—— ‘Tout and the Exchequer’, in C.M. Barron and J.T. Rosenthal (eds.), *Thomas Frederick Tout (1855-1929): Refashioning History for the Twentieth Century* (London, 2019), pp. 171-84.

Barrell, A.D.M. ‘The Ordinance of Provisors of 1343’, *Historical Research,* 64 (1991), pp. 264-77.

Barron, C. ‘The Art of Kingship: Richard II, 1377-1399’, *History Today,* 35 (1985), pp. 30-7.

—— ‘The Deposition of Richard II’, in J. Taylor and W.R. Childs (eds.), *Politics and Crisis in Fourteenth-Century England* (Gloucester, 1990), pp. 132-49.

—— *London in the Later Middle Ages: Government and People, 1200-1500* (Oxford, 2004).

—— ‘The Reign of Richard II’, in M. Jones (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History VI, c. 1300-c. 1415* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 297-333.

Bates, D., Crick, J., and Hamilton, S. ‘Introduction’, in D. Bates, J. Crick, and S. Hamilton (eds.), *Writing Medieval Biography, 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Frank Barlow* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 1-14.

Bayley, C.C. ‘The Campaign of 1375 and the Good Parliament’, *The English Historical Review,* 55 (1940), pp. 370-83.

Bean, J.M.W. ‘Percy, Henry, Second Lord Percy’, *ODNB.*

Bellamy, J.G. ‘Appeal and Impeachment in the Good Parliament’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 39 (1966), pp. 35-46.

—— *Criminal Law and Society in Late Medieval and Tudor England* (Gloucester, 1984).

—— *The Law of Treason in England in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1970).

Benedictow, O.J. *The Black Death, 1346-1353: A Complete History* (Woodbridge, 2004).

Benham, J. *Peacemaking in the Middle Ages: Principles and Practice* (Manchester, 2011).

Bennett, M.J. *Community, Class and Careerism: Cheshire and Lancashire Society in the Age of Sir Gawain and the Green Night* (Cambridge, 1983).

—— ‘Edward III’s Entail and the Succession to the Crown, 1376-1471’, *The English Historical Review,* 113 (1998), pp. 580-609.

—— *Richard II and the Revolution of 1399* (Stroud, 1999).

Bennett, J.M. ‘Compulsory Service in Late Medieval England’, *Past and Present,* 209 (2010), pp. 7-51.

Bennett, N.H. ‘Burghersh, Henry’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Dalderby, John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Zouche, William’, *ODNB.*

Bernard, G.W. ‘Henry VIII: Catholicism Without the Pope?’, *History,* 101 (2016), pp. 201-21.

—— *The King’s Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church* (New Haven, 2005).

—— *The Late Medieval English Church: Vitality and Vulnerability before the Break with Rome* (London, 2012).

Betcherman, L.R. ‘The Making of Bishops in the Lancastrian Period’, *Speculum,* 41 (1966), pp. 397-419.

Bethell, D. ‘William of Corbeil and the Canterbury York Dispute’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 19 (1968), pp. 145-59.

Blackley, F.D. ‘Bishops and Learning in the Reign of Edward III’, *Report of the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Historical Association,* 37 (1958), pp. 35-49.

—— ‘Isabella and the Bishop of Exeter’, in T.A. Sandquist and M.R. Powicke (eds.), *Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson* (Toronto, 1969), pp. 220-35.

Biggs, D. ‘A Plantagenet Revolution in Government? The Officers of Central Government and the Lancastrian Usurpation of 1399’, *Medieval Prosopography,* 20 (1999), pp. 191-211.

—— ‘The Reign of Henry IV: The Revolution of 1399 and the Establishment of the Lancastrian Regime’, in N. Saul (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England I* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 195-210.

—— *Three Armies in Britain: The Irish Campaign of Richard II and the Usurpation of Henry IV, 1397-1399* (Leiden, 2006).

Biggs, E. ‘Negotiating and Creating Collegiate Statutes in the Fourteenth Century’, in G. Dodd and C. Taylor (eds.), *Monarchy, State and Political Culture in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2020), pp. 21-38.

—— *St Stephen’s College, Westminster: A Royal Chapel and English Kingship, 1348-1548* (Woodbridge, 2020).

Bisson, T.N. *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship and the Origins of European Government* (Princeton, 2015).

Blaycock, S. ‘Exeter’s Bishop’s Palace’, in D. Rollason (ed.), *Princes of the Church: Bishops and their Palaces* (Abingdon, 2017), pp. 266-84.

Boffey, J. and Davis, V. ‘Preface’, in J. Boffey and V. Davis (eds.), *Recording Medieval Lives: Proceedings of the 2005 Harlaxton Symposium* (Donington, 2005), pp. xi-xii.

Bolton, J.L. *The Medieval English Economy, 1150-1500* (London, 1980).

—— ‘“The World Upside Down”: Plague as an Agent of Economic and Social Change’, in W.M. Ormrod and P.G. Lindley (eds.), *The Black Death in England* (Donington, 1996), pp. 17-78.

Bombi, B. *Anglo-Papal Relations in the Early Fourteenth Century: A Study in Medieval Diplomacy* (Oxford, 2019).

—— ‘Benedict XII and the Outbreak of the Hundred Years’ War’, in I. Bueno (ed.), *Pope Benedict XII (1334-1342): The Guardian of Orthodoxy* (Amsterdam, 2018), pp. 191-216.

—— ‘Petitioning Between Avignon and England in the First Half of the Fourteenth Century’, in W.M. Ormrod, G. Dodd, and A. Musson (eds.), *Medieval Petitions: Grace and Grievance* (York, 2009), pp. 64-81.

Bothwell, J. ‘Bintworth, Richard’, *ODNB.*

—— *Edward III and the English Peerage: Royal Patronage, Social Control and Political Mobility in Fourteenth Century England* (Woodbridge, 2004).

—— ‘Edward III, The English Peerage, and the 1337 Earls: Estate Redistribution in Fourteenth-Century England’, in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 35-52.

—— ‘Edward III and the “New Nobility”: Largesse and Limitation in Fourteenth-Century England’, *The English Historical Review,* 112 (1997), pp. 1111-40.

—— ‘An Emotional Pragmatism: Edward III and Death’, in G. Dodd and C. Taylor (eds.), *Monarchy, State and Political Culture in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2020), pp. 39-70.

—— ‘The More Things Change: Isabella and Mortimer, Edward III, and the Painful Delay of a Royal Minority (1327-1330)’, in C. Beem (ed.), *The Royal Minorities of Medieval and Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 2008), pp. 67-102.

—— ‘“Until He Receive the Equivalent in Land and Rent”: The Use of Annuities as Endowment Patronage in the Reign of Edward III’, *Historical Research,* 70 (1997), pp. 146-69.

Born, L.K. ‘The Perfect Prince: A Study in Thirteenth- and Fourteenth-Century Ideals’, *Speculum,* 3 (1928), pp. 470-504.

Bouch, C.M.L. *Prelates and People of the Lake Counties: A History of the Diocese of Carlisle, 1133-1933* (Kendal, 1948).

Bowker, M. *The Henrician Reformation: The Diocese of Lincoln under John Longland, 1521-1547* (Cambridge, 1981)

—— *The Secular Clergy in the Diocese of Lincoln, 1495-1520* (Cambridge, 1968).

—— 'The Supremacy and the Episcopate: The Struggle for Control, 1534-1540', *Historical Journal,* 18 (1975), pp. 227-243.

Boyle, L.E. *Pastoral Care, Clerical Education, and Canon Law, 1200-1400* (London, 1981).

Brandt, W.J. 'Remarks on Thomas Brinton's Authorship of the Sermons in MS Harley 3760', *Mediaeval Studies,* 21 (1959), pp. 291-6.

Bray, J.R. 'Concepts of Sainthood in Fourteenth-Century England', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester,* 66 (1984), pp. 40-77.

Brett, M. *The English Church under Henry I* (Oxford, 1975).

Britnell, R.H. 'Bishop Hatfield's Legacy', in A. Bash (ed.), *Thomas Hatfield: Bishop, Soldier, and Politician* (Durham, 2012), pp. 47-56.

—— *Britain and Ireland, 1050-1530: Economy and Society* (Oxford, 2004).

—— 'Feudal Reaction After the Black Death in the Palatinate of Durham', *Past and Present,* 128 (1990), pp. 28-47.

Britnell, R.H. and Pollard, A.J. 'Introduction', in R.H. Britnell and A.J. Pollard (eds.), *The McFarlane Legacy: Studies in Late Medieval Politics and Society* (Stroud, 1995), pp. xi-xviii.

Brockliss, L.W.B. *The University of Oxford: A History* (Oxford, 2016).

Brooke, C.N.L. *A History of Gonville and Caius College* (Woodbridge, 1985).

Brown, A.D. *Church and Society in England, 1000-1500* (Basingstoke, 2003).

—— *Popular Piety in Late Medieval England: The Diocese of Salisbury, 1250-1550* (Oxford, 1995).

Brown, A.L. 'The Authorization of Letters Patent under the Great Seal', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 37 (1964), pp. 125-56.

—— *The Governance of Late Medieval England, 1272-1461* (London, 1989).

Brown, M. *Disunited Kingdoms: People and Politics in the British Isles, 1280-1460* (Harlow, 2013).

Bryant, W.N. ‘The Financial Dealings of Edward III with the County Communities’, *The English Historical Review,* 83 (1968), pp. 760-71.

—— ‘Some Earlier Examples in Intercommuning in Parliament, 1340-1348’, *The English Historical Review,* 83 (1970), pp. 54-8.

Buck, M.C. ‘Airmyn, William’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Droxford, John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Hotham, John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Hythe, Hamo’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Langton, John’, *ODNB.*

—— *Politics, Finance and the Church in the Reign of Edward II: Walter Stapeldon, Treasurer of England* (Cambridge, 1983).

—— ‘The Reform of the Exchequer, 1316-1326’, *The English Historical Review,* 98 (1983), pp. 241-60.

—— ‘Salmon, John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Stapeldon, Walter’, *ODNB.*

Burgess, C. ‘“By Quick and by Dead”: Wills and Pious Provision in Late Medieval Bristol’, *The English Historical Review,* 102 (1987), pp. 837-58.

—— ‘An Institution for all Seasons: The Late Medieval English College’, in C. Burgess and M. Heale (eds.), *The Late Medieval English College and its Context* (York, 2008), pp. 3-27.

—— ‘St George’s College, Windsor: Context and Consequences’, in N. Saul (ed.), *St George’s College Windsor in the Fourteenth Century* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 63-96.

Burger, M. *Bishops, Clerks, and Diocesan Governance in Thirteenth-Century England: Reward and Punishment* (Cambridge, 2012).

—— ‘Review of S.T. Ambler, *Bishops in the Political Community of England, 1213-1272* (Oxford, 2017)’, *The Mediaeval Journal,* 7 (2017), pp. 256-8.

Burne, A.H. *The Crécy War: A Military History of the Hundred Years War from 1337 to the Peace of Brétigny, 1360* (London, 1955).

Burt, C. *Edward I and the Governance of England, 1272-1307* (Cambridge, 2012).

—— ‘Local Government in Warwickshire and Worcestershire under Edward II’, in B. Thompson and J. Watts (eds.), *Political Society in Later Medieval England: A Festschrift for Christine Carpenter* (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 55-73.

Burton, J. ‘Thurstan’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘William of York’, *ODNB.*

Butler, L.H. ‘Archbishop Melton, His Neighbours, and His Kinsmen, 1317-1340’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 2 (1951), pp. 54-68.

Butterfield, A. *The Familiar Enemy: Chaucer, Language, and Nation in the Hundred Years War* (Oxford, 2009).

Cachey, T.J. ‘Petrarchan Cartographic Writing’, in S. Gersh and B. Roest (eds.), *Medieval and Renaissance Humanism: Rhetoric, Representation and Reform* (Leiden, 2003).

Caddick, J. ‘The Painted Chamber at Westminster and the Openings of Parliament, 1399-1484’, *Parliamentary History,* 38 (2019), pp. 17-33.

Cam, H.M. *Liberties and Communities in Medieval England: Collected Studies in Local Administration and Topography* (Cambridge, 1944).

Campbell, B.M.S. ‘The Agrarian Problem in the Early Fourteenth Century’, *Past and Present,* 188 (2005), pp. 3-70.

—— *The Great Transition: Climate, Disease and Society in the Late-Medieval World* (Cambridge, 2016).

Campbell, J. ‘England, Scotland, and the Hundred Years War in the Fourteenth Century’, in J. Hale, R. Highfield, and B. Smalley (ed.), *Europe in the Late Middle Ages* (London, 1965), pp. 184-216.

Carpenter, C. ‘Bastard Feudalism in England in the Fourteenth Century’, in S. Boardman and J. Goodare (eds.), *Kings, Lords and Men in Scotland and Britain, 1300-1625: Essays in Honour of Jenny Wormald* (Edinburgh, 2014), pp. 59-92.

—— ‘The Beauchamp Affinity: A Study of Bastard Feudalism at Work’, *The English Historical Review,* 95 (1980), pp. 514-32.

—— ‘England: The Nobility and Gentry’, in S.H. Rigby (ed.), *A Companion to Britain in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 261-82.

—— ‘Gentry and Community in Medieval England’, *The Journal of British Studies,* 33 (1994), pp. 340-80.

—— ‘Henry VI and the Deskilling of the Royal Bureaucracy’, in L. Clark (ed.), *The Fifteenth Century IX: English and Continental Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 1-37.

—— ‘Introduction: Political Culture, Politics and Cultural History’, in L. Clark and C. Carpenter (eds.), *The Fifteenth Century IV: Political Culture in Late Medieval Britain* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 1-20.

—— ‘Law, Justice and Landowners in Late Medieval England’, *The Law and History Review*, 1 (1983), pp. 205-37.

—— *Locality and Polity: A Study of Warwickshire Landed Society, 1401-99* (Cambridge, 1992).

—— ‘Political and Constitutional History: Before and After McFarlane’, in R. Britnell and A.J. Pollard (eds.), *The McFarlane Legacy: Studies in Late Medieval Politics and Society* (Stroud, 1995), pp. 175-206.

—— ‘Resisting and Deposing Kings in England in the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries’, in R. von Friedeburg (ed.), *Murder and Monarchy: Regicide in European History, 1300-1800* (Basingstoke, 2004), pp. 99-121.

—— ‘War, Government and Governance in England in the Later Middle Ages’, in L. Clark (ed.), *The Fifteenth Century VII: Conflicts, Consequences and the Crown in the Late Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 1-22.

—— *The Wars of the Roses: Politics and the Constitution in England, c. 1437-1509* (Cambridge, 1997).

Carpenter, C. and Mattéoni, ‘Offices and Officers’, in C. Fletcher, J.P. Genet, and J. Watts (eds.), *Government and Political Life in England and France,* c. *1300* – c. *1500* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 78-115.

Carpenter, D.A. ‘Archbishop Langton and Magna Carta: His Contribution, His Doubts, and His Hypocrisy’, *The English Historical Review*, 126 (2011), pp. 1041-65.

—— *Henry III: The Rise to Power and Personal Rule, 1207-1258* (New Haven, 2021).

—— *Magna Carta* (London, 2015).

—— *The Minority of Henry III* (London, 1990).

—— *The Reign of Henry III* (London, 1996).

—— *The Struggle for Mastery: Britain, 1066-1284* (London, 2004).

—— *Magna Carta* (London, 2015).

Capes, W.C. *The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (London, 1900).

Carlson, J.B. *John Gower: Poetry and Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 2012).

Castor, H. *The King, the Crown, and the Duchy of Lancaster: Public Authority and Private Power, 1399-1461* (Oxford, 2000).

Catto, J. 'An Alleged Great Council of 1374', *The English Historical Review,* 82 (1967), pp. 764-71.

—— 'The Burden and Conscience of Government in the Fifteenth Century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 17 (2007), pp. 83-99.

—— 'Chichele, Henry', *ODNB.*

—— 'Conclusion', in J.I. Catto and T.A.R. Evans (eds.), *The History of the University of Oxford II: Late Medieval Oxford* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 769-83.

—— 'Dissidents in an Age of Faith? Wyclif and the Lollards', *History Today*, 37 (1987), pp. 46-52.

—— 'The Foundation', in J. Catto (ed.), *Oriel College: A History* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 12-34.

—— 'The King's Servants', in G.L. Harriss (ed.), *Henry V: The Practice of Kingship* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 75-95.

—— 'Religion and the English Nobility in the Later Fourteenth Century', in H. Lloyd-Jones, V. Pearl, and B. Worden (eds.), *History and Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R. Trevor-Roper* (London, 1981), pp. 43-55.

—— 'Religious Change under Henry V', in G.L. Harriss (ed.), *Henry V: The Practice of Kingship* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 97-115.

—— 'Wyclif and Wycliffism at Oxford, 1356-1430', in J.I. Catto and T.A.R. Evans (eds.), *The History of the University of Oxford II: Late Medieval Oxford* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 175-261.

—— 'The Wycliffite Bible: The Historical Context' in E. Solopova (ed.), *The Wycliffite Bible: Origin, History and Interpretation* (Leiden, 2016), pp. 11-26.

Challet, V. and Forrest, I., 'The Masses', in C. Fletcher, J.P. Genet, and J. Watts (eds.), *Government and Political Life in England and France,* c. *1300* – c. *1500* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 279-316.

Chaplais, P. ‘English Diplomatic Documents to the End of Edward III’s Reign’, in D.A. Bullough and R.L. Storey (eds.), *The Study of Medieval Records: Essays in Honour of Kathleen Major* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 30-56.

—— *English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages* (London, 2003).

—— *Piers Gaveston: Edward II’s Adoptive Brother* (Oxford, 1994).

Charles, B.G. and Emmanuel, H.D. ‘Notes on Old Libraries and Books’, *National Library of Wales Journal,* 6 (1950), pp. 353-72.

Cheney, C.R. *Episcopal Visitation of Monasteries in the Thirteenth Century* (Manchester, 1931).

—— *Hubert Walter* (London, 1967).

—— ‘King John and the Papal Interdict’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* 31 (1948), pp. 295-318.

—— ‘King John’s Reaction to the Interdict on England’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 31 (1949), pp. 129-50.

Chew, H.M. ‘The Ecclesiastical Tenants-in-Chief and Writs of Military Summons’, *The English Historical Review,* 41 (1926), pp. 161-9.

—— *The English Ecclesiastical Tenants-in-Chief and Knight Service, Especially in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (London, 1932).

—— ‘Scutage in the Fourteenth Century’, *The English Historical Review,* 38 (1923), pp. 19-41.

Cheyette, F. ‘Kings, Courts, Cures, and Sinecures: The Statute of Provisors and the Common Law’, *Traditio,* 19 (1963), pp. 295-349.

Chibi, A.A. *Henry VIII’s Bishops: Diplomats, Administrators, Scholars and Shepherds* (Cambridge, 2003).

Childs, W. ‘Finance and Trade Under Edward II’, in J. Taylor and W. Childs (eds.), *Politics and Crisis in Fourteenth Century England* (Gloucester, 1990), pp. 19-37.

—— ‘“Welcome, my Brother”: Edward II, John of Powderham and the Chronicles, 1318’, in I.N. Wood and G.A. Loud (eds.), *Church and Chronicle in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to John Taylor* (London, 1991), pp. 149-63.

Chrimes, S.B. *English Constitutional Ideas in the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1936).

—— *An Introduction to the Administrative History of Mediaeval England* (Oxford, 1952).

Christelow, S.M. ‘Chancellors and Curial Bishops: Ecclesiastical Promotions and Power in Anglo-Norman England’, in C. Harper-Bill (ed.), *Anglo-Norman Studies XXII* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 49-69.

Churchill, I.J. *Canterbury Administration: The Administrative Machinery of the Archbishopric of Canterbury, Illustrated from Original Records* (2 vols., London, 1933).

Clanchy, M.T. *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307,* 3rd edn (Chichester, 2013).

Clark, A. *University of Oxford College Histories: Lincoln* (London, 1898).

Clarke, M.V. *Medieval Representation and Consent: A Study of Early Parliaments in England and Ireland, with Special Reference to the Modus Tenendi Parliamentum* (London, 1936).

Cobban, A.B. *The King's Hall Within the University of Cambridge in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1969).

—— ‘Colleges and Halls, 1380-1500’, in J.I. Catto and T.A.R. Evans (eds.), *The History of the University of Oxford II: Late Medieval Oxford* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 581-633.

—— ‘English University Benefactors in the Middle Ages’, *History,* 86 (2001), pp. 288-312.

—— *The Medieval English Universities: Oxford and Cambridge to c. 1500* (Aldershot, 1988).

—— *The Medieval Universities: Their Development and Organization* (London, 1975).

Coleman, J. *Medieval Readers and Writers, 1350-1400* (London, 1981).

Collins, H.E.L. *The Order of the Garter, 1348-1461: Chivalry and Politics in Late Medieval England* (Oxford, 2000).

Conacher, J.B. ‘The Reformation in England: A Reconsideration of Henry VIII’s Break from Rome’, *Canadian Catholic Historical Association Report,* 22 (1955), pp. 39-57.

Cooper, J.P.D. ‘“O Lorde save the king”: Tudor Royal Propaganda and the Power of Prayer’, in G.W. Bernard and S.J. Gunn (eds.), *Authority and Consent in Tudor England: Essays Presented to C.S.L. Davies* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 179-96.

Cooper, T.N. ‘The Papacy and the Diocese of Coventry and Lichfield, 1360-1385’, *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae,* 25 (1987), pp. 73-103.

Cornell, D. ‘A Kingdom Cleared of Castles: the Role of the Castle in the Campaigns of Robert Bruce’, *The Scottish Historical Review,* 87 (2008), pp. 233-57.

Cosby, E.U. *Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England: A Study of the Mensa Episcopalis* (Cambridge, 1993).

—— *The King's Bishops: The Politics of Patronage in England and Normandy, 1066-1216* (Basingstoke, 2013).

Cox, R. 'The Hundred Years War and the Church', in A. Curry (ed.), *The Hundred Years War Revisited* (Basingstoke, 2019), pp. 85-110.

—— *John Wyclif on War and Peace* (Woodbridge, 2014).

—— 'A Law of War? English Protection and Destruction of Ecclesiastical Property During the Fourteenth Century', *The English Historical Review,* 128 (2013), pp. 1381-1417.

—— 'Natural Law and the Right of Self-Defence According to John of Legnano and John Wyclif', in C. Given-Wilson (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England VI* (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 149-69.

Coulton, G.G. *Chaucer and his England* (London, 1909).

—— *Froissart: The Chronicler of European Chivalry* (London, 1930).

—— 'Priests and People before the Reformation', in his *Ten Medieval Studies,* 3rd edn (Cambridge, 1930), pp. 123-65.

Courtenay, W.J. 'Bury, Richard', *ODNB.*

Cowdrey, H.E.J. *Lanfranc: Scholar, Monk, Archbishop* (Oxford, 2003).

Crawley, C. *Trinity Hall: The History of a Cambridge College, 1350-1975* (Cambridge, 1976).

Critchley, J.S. 'The Early History of the Writ of Judicial Protection', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 45 (1972), pp. 196-213.

Cronin, H.S. 'The Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards', *The English Historical Review,* 22 (1907), pp. 292-304.

Crook, J. and Kusaba, Y. 'The Perpendicular Remodelling of the Nave: Problems and Interpretation' in J. Crook (ed.), *Winchester Cathedral: Nine Hundred Years, 1093-1993* (Chichester, 1993), pp. 215-30.

Crouch, D. *Medieval Britain, c. 1000 – 1500* (Cambridge, 2017).

Currin, J.M. 'England's International Relations 1485-1509: Continuities Amidst Change', in S. Doran and G. Richardson (eds.), *Tudor England and its Neighbours* (Basingstoke, 2005), pp. 14-43.

Curry, A. ‘France and the Hundred Years War’, in D. Potter (ed.), *France in the Later Middle Ages, 1200-1500* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 90-116.

—— *Henry V: From Playboy Prince to Warrior King* (London, 2015).

—— *The Hundred Years War, 1337-1453,* 2nd edn (Basingstoke, 2003).

Cuttino, G.P. *English Diplomatic Administration, 1259-1339,* 2nd edn (Oxford, 1971).

—— *English Medieval Diplomacy* (Bloomington, 1985).

—— ‘Historical Revision: The Causes of the Hundred Years War’, *Speculum,* 31 (1956), pp. 463-77.

—— ‘The Process of Agen’, *Speculum,* 19 (1944), pp. 161-78.

Dahmus, J.H. ‘John Wyclif and the English Government’, *Speculum,* 35 (1960), pp. 51-68.

—— ‘Richard II and the Church’, *The Catholic Historical Review,* 39 (1954), pp. 408-33.

—— *William Courtenay, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1381-1396* (London, 1966).

Dale, S. ‘*Contra Damnationis Filios:* The Visconti in Fourteenth-Century Papal Diplomacy’, *The Journal of Medieval History,* 33 (2007), pp. 1-32.

Darracott, A. *The Grandissons: Their Built and Chivalric Legacy* (Maidenhead, 2014).

Davies, C. ‘The Statute of Provisors of 1351’, *History,* 38 (1953), pp. 116-33.

Davies, C.S.L. ‘Fox, Richard’, *ODNB.*

Davies, J.C. *The Baronial Opposition to Edward II: Its Character and Policy* (Cambridge, 1918)

—— ‘The Despenser War in Glamorgan’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 9 (1915), pp. 21-64.

Davies, R.G. ‘After the Execution of Archbishop Scrope: Henry IV, the Papacy, and the English Episcopate’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Institute,* 59 (1976-7), pp. 40-74.

—— ‘Alexander Neville, Archbishop of York, 1374-1388’, *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal,* 47 (1975), pp. 87-101.

—— ‘The Anglo-Papal Concordat at Bruges, 1375: A Reconsideration’, *Archivum Historiae Pontificae,* 19 (1981), pp. 97-143.

—— ‘The Attendance of the Episcopate in English Parliaments, 1376-1461’, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society,* 129 (1985), pp. 30-81.

—— ‘Brantingham, Thomas’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Despenser, Henry’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Edington, William’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘The Episcopal Appointments in England and Wales of 1375’, *Mediaeval Studies,* 44 (1982), pp. 306-32.

—— ‘The Episcopate’, in C.H. Clough (ed.). *Profession, Vocation, and Culture in Later Medieval England: Essays Dedicated to the Memory of A.R. Myers* (Liverpool, 1982), pp. 51-89.

—— ‘The Episcopate and the Political Crisis in England of 1386-8’, *Speculum,* 51 (1976), pp. 659-93.

—— ‘Fordham, John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Martin V and the English Episcopate, with Particular Reference to his Campaign for the Repeal of the Statute of Provisors’, *The English Historical Review,* 92 (1977), pp. 309-44.

—— ‘Merk, Thomas’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Richard II and the Church’, in A Goodman and J.L. Gillespie (eds.), *Richard II: The Art of Kingship* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 83-106

—— ‘Richard II and the Church in the Years of “Tyranny”’, *The Journal of Medieval History,* 1 (1975), pp. 329-62.

—— ‘Rushook, Thomas’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Thomas Arundel as Archbishop of Canterbury, 1396-1414’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 24 (1973), pp. 9-21.

—— ‘Wakefield, Henry’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Walden, Roger’, *ODNB.*

Davies, R.R. ‘The English State and the “Celtic” Peoples, 1100-1400’, *The Journal of Historical Sociology,* 6 (1993), pp. 1-14.

—— ‘The Failure of the First British Empire? England’s Relations with Ireland, Scotland and Wales, 1066-1500’, in N. Saul (ed.), *England in Europe, 1066-1453* (London, 1994), pp. 121-32.

—— *The First English Empire: Power and Identities in the British Isles, 1093-1343* (Oxford, 2000).

—— ‘The Medieval State: The Tyranny of a Concept?’, *The Journal of Historical Sociology,* 16 (2003), pp. 280-300.

Davis, V. ‘Clerics and the King’s Service in Late Medieval England’, in C. Barralis, J.P. Boudet, F. Delivré, and J.P. Genêt (eds.), *Église et état, église ou état? Les clercs et la genèse de l'état modern* (Paris, 2014), pp. 25-33.

—— ‘The Contribution of University-Educated Secular Clerics to the Life of the English Church’, in C.M. Barron and J.C. Stratford (eds.), *The Church and Learning in Later Medieval Society: Essays in Honour of R.B. Dobson, Proceedings of the 1999 Harlaxton Symposium* (Donington, 2002), pp. 255-72.

—— 'The Making of English Collegiate Statutes in the Later Middle Ages’, *History of Universities,* 13 (1993), pp. 1-23.

—— ‘Preparation for Service in the Late Medieval Church’, in A. Curry and E. Matthew (eds.), *The Fifteenth Century I: Concepts and Patterns of Service in the Fifteenth Century* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 38-51.

—— *William Waynflete: Bishop and Educationalist* (Woodbridge, 1993).

—— ‘William Waynflete and the Wars of the Roses’, *Southern History,* 11 (1989), pp. 1-22.

—— *William Wykeham: A Life* (London, 2007).

—— ‘William Wykeham’s Early Ecclesiastical Career’, in M. Rubin (ed.), *European Religious Cultures: Essays Offered to Christopher Brooke on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday* (London, 2008), pp. 49-65.

Dearmer, P. *Everyman’s History of the English Church* (London, 1909).

Deeley, A. ‘Papal Provision and Royal Rights of Patronage in the Early Fourteenth Century’, *The English Historical Review*, 43 (1928), pp. 497-527.

Deighton, H.S. ‘Clerical Taxation by Consent, 1279-1301’, *The English Historical Review*, 68 (1953), pp. 161-92.

Delogu, D. *Theorizing the Ideal Sovereign: The Rise of the French Vernacular Royal Biography* (Toronto, 2008).

Denholm-Young, N. ‘Richard de Bury (1287-1345)’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 20 (1937), pp. 135-68.

Denton, J.H. ‘Canterbury Archiepiscopal Appointments: The Case of Walter Reynolds’, *The Journal of Medieval History,* 1 (1975), pp. 317-27.

—— ‘The Clergy and Parliament in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries’, in R.G. Davies and J.H. Denton (eds.), *The English Parliament in the Middle Ages* (Manchester, 1981), pp. 88-108.

—— ‘The “Communitas Cleri” in the Early Fourteenth Century’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 51 (1978), pp. 72-8.

—— ‘The Competence of the Parish Clergy in Thirteenth-Century England’, in C.M. Barron and J.C. Stratford (eds.), *The Church and Learning in Later Medieval Society: Essays in Honour of R.B. Dobson, Proceedings of the 1999 Harlaxton Symposium* (Donington, 2002), pp. 273-85.

—— ‘The Making of the *Articuli Cleri* of 1316’, *The English Historical Review,* 101 (1986), pp. 564-95.

—— ‘Winchelsey, Robert’, *ODNB.*

—— *Robert Winchelsey and the Crown, 1294-1313: A Study in the Defence of Ecclesiastical Liberty* (Cambridge, 1980).

—— ‘Walter Reynolds and Ecclesiastical Politics, 1313-1316: A Postscript to *Councils & Synods, II*’, in C.N.L. Brooke, D.E. Luscombe, G.H. Martin and D. Owen (eds), *Church and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to C.R. Cheney* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 247-74.

—— ‘The Valuation of the Ecclesiastical Benefices of England and Wales in 1291-2’, *Historical Research,* 66 (1993), pp. 231-50.

Denton, J.H. and Dooley, J.P. *Representatives of the Lower Clergy in Parliament, 1295-1340* (London, 1987).

Depold, J.R. ‘Christ as King and Kings as Christ’, *Medieval Sermon Studies,* 64 (2020), pp. 22-34.

Déprez, E. *Les Préliminaires de la guerre de cent ans* (Paris, 1902).

Devlin, M.A. ‘Bishop Thomas Brinton and his Sermons’, *Speculum,* 14 (1939), pp. 324-44.

DeVries, K. *Infantry Warfare in the Early Fourteenth Century* (Woodbridge, 1996).

—— ‘The Tactics of Crécy’, in M. Livingston and K. Devries (eds.), *The Battle of Crécy: A Casebook* (Liverpool, 2015), pp. 447-67.

Dickens, A.G. *The English Reformation* (London, 1964).

—— ‘The Shape of Anticlericalism and the English Reformation’, in E.I. Kouri and T. Scott (eds.), *Politics and Society in Reformation Europe: Essays for Sir Geoffrey Elton on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Basingstoke, 1987), pp. 379-411.

Dickinson, J.C. *An Ecclesiastical History of England: The Later Middle Ages, from the Norman Conquest to the Eve of the Reformation* (London, 1979).

Dietz, C.H. *English Government Finance, 1485-1558* (Illinois, 1921).

Diller, G.T. ‘Froissart: Patrons and Texts’, in J.J.N. Palmer (ed.), *Froissart: Historian* (Woodbridge, 1981), pp. 145-60.

Dobson, R.B. ‘The Bishops of Late Medieval England as Intermediaries between Church and State’, in J-P. Genet (ed.), *Etat et église dans la genèse de l’etat modern* (Madrid, 1986), pp. 226-38.

—— ‘Neville, Alexander’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘The Political Role of the Archbishops of York in the Reign of Edward I’, in P.R. Coss and S.D. Lloyd (ed.), *Thirteenth Century England III* (Woodbridge, 1991), pp. 47-64.

Dodd, G. ‘The Clerical Chancellors of Late Medieval England’, in M. Heale (ed.), *The Prelate in England and Europe, c. 1300-c. 1560* (York, 2014), pp. 17-49.

—— ‘County and Community in Medieval England’, *The English Historical Review*, 134 (2019), pp. 777-820.

—— ‘English Politics and the Hundred Years War’, in A. Curry (ed.), *The Hundred Years War Revisited* (Basingstoke, 2019), pp. 1-32.

—— *Justice and Grace: Private Petitioning and the English Parliament in the Late Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2007).

—— ‘The Lords, Taxation and the Community of Parliament in the 1370s and Early 1380s’, *Parliamentary History*, 20 (2001), pp. 287-310.

—— ‘A Parliament Full of Rats? *Piers Plowman* and the Good Parliament of 1376’, *Historical Research*, 79 (2006), pp. 21-49.

—— ‘Parliament and Political Legitimacy in the Reign of Edward II’, in G. Dodd and A. Musson (eds.), *The Reign of Edward II: New Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 165-89.

—— ‘Petitions from the King’s Dominions: Wales, Ireland and Gascony, c. 1290-1350’, in P. Crooks, D. Green, and W.M. Ormrod (eds.), *The Plantagenet Empire, 1259-1453: Proceedings of the 2014 Harlaxton Symposium* (Donington, 2016), pp. 187-215.

—— ‘Reason, Conscience and Equity: Bishops as the King’s Judges in Later Medieval England’, *History*, 99 (2014), pp. 213-40.

—— ‘Richard II and the Transformation of Parliament’, in G. Dodd (ed.), *The Reign of Richard II* (Stroud, 2000), pp. 71-84.

—— ‘The Spread of English in the Records of Central Government, 1400-1430’, in E. Salter and H. Wicker (eds.), *Vernacularity in England and Wales, c. 1330-1550* (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 225-66.

Dodd, G. and Petit-Renaud, S. ‘Grace and Favour: The Petition and its Mechanisms’, in C. Fletcher, J.P. Genet, and J. Watts (eds.), *Government and Political Life in England and France,* c. *1300* – c. *1500* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 240-78.

Dohar, W.J. *The Black Death and Pastoral Leadership: The Diocese of Hereford in the Fourteenth Century* (Philadelphia, 1995).

—— ‘Charlton, Lewis’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Langham, Simon’, *ODNB.*

Doherty, P. *Isabella and the Strange Death of Edward II* (London, 2003).

Douie, D.L. *Archbishop Pecham* (Oxford, 1952).

Dryburgh, P. ‘Living in the Shadows: John of Eltham, Earl of Cornwall (1316-36)’, in J. Bothwell and G. Dodd (eds.), *Fourteenth Century England IX* (Woodbridge, 2016), pp. 23-48.

Du Boulay, F.R.H. ‘Charitable Subsidies Granted to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1300-1489’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 23 (1950), pp. 147-64.

—— ‘The Fifteenth Century’, in C.H. Lawrence (ed.), *The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle Ages* (London, 1965), pp. 197-242.

—— *The Lordship of Canterbury: An Essay on Medieval Society* (London, 1966).

Duffy, E. ‘The English Reformation after Revisionism’, *Renaissance Quarterly,* 59 (2006), pp. 720-31.

—— *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400-1580,* 2nd edn (London, 2005).

Duggan, L.G. *Armsbearing and the Clergy in the History and Canon Law of Western Christianity* (Woodbridge, 2013).

Dunbabin, J. ‘Careers and Vocations’, in J.I. Catto (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford I: The Early Oxford Schools* (Oxford, 1984), pp. 565-606.

—— ‘Government’, in J.H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought, c. 350-c. 1450* (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 477-519.

—— ‘The Political World of France, *c.* 1200 – *c.* 1336’, in D. Potter (ed.), *France in the Later Middle Ages, 1200-1500* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 23-46.

Dunn, A. *The Great Rising of 1381* (Stroud, 2002).

Dunning, R.W. ‘Patronage and Promotion in the Late Medieval Church’, in R.A. Griffiths (ed.), *Patronage, the Crown, and the Provinces in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1981), pp. 167-80.

Dyer, C. *An Age of Transition? Economy and Society in England in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2005).

—— *Lords and Peasants in a Changing Society: The Estates of the Bishopric of Worcester, 680-1540* (Cambridge, 1980).

—— *Making a Living in the Middle Ages: The People of Britain, 850-1520* (New Haven, 2002).

—— *Standards of Living in the Later Middle Ages: Social Change in England, c. 1250-1520* (Cambridge, 1989).

Edwards, J.G. *The Commons in Medieval English Parliaments* (London, 1958).

—— *The Second Century of the English Parliament* (Oxford, 1979).

Edwards, K. *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages: A Constitutional Study with Special Reference to the Fourteenth Century* (Manchester, 1949).

—— ‘The Political Importance of the English Bishops During the Reign of Edward II’, *The English Historical Review*, 59 (1944), pp. 311-47.

—— ‘The Social Origins and Provenance of the English Bishops during the Reign of Edward II’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 9 (1959), pp. 51-79.

Emden, A.B. *A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500* (Cambridge, 1963).

—— *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500* (3 vols., Oxford, 1957-9).

Eiden, H. ‘Joint Action Against ‘Bad’ Lordship: The Peasants’ Revolt in Essex and Norfolk’, *History*, 83 (1998), pp. 5-30.

C.R. Elrington, ‘Martival, Roger’, *ODNB*

Elton, G.R. *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell* (Cambridge, 1972).

—— *Reform and Reformation: England, 1509-1558* (London, 1977).

Emery, A. *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales, 1300-1500* (3 vols., Cambridge, 1996-2006).

Emerson, B. *The Black Prince* (London, 1976).

Emsley, K. and Fraser, C.M. *The Courts of the County Palatinate of Durham: From Earliest Times to 1971* (Durham, 1984).

Erskine, A. ‘Grandison, John’, *ODNB.*

Escobedo, L.K. *The Milemete Treatise and Companion Secretum Secretorum: Iconography, Audience, and Patronage in Fourteenth-Century England* (Lewiston, 2011).

Fábián, L. ‘The Biblical King Solomon in Representations of Western European Medieval Royalty’, in E. Woodacre, L.H.S. Dean, C. Jones, R.E. Martin, and Z.E. Rohr (eds.), *The Routledge History of Monarchy* (London, 2019), pp. 54-69.

Ferguson, J. *English Diplomacy, 1422-1461* (Oxford, 1972).

Field, S.L. ‘The Master and Marguerite: Godfrey of Fontaines’ Praise of *The Mirror of Simple Souls*’, *The Journal of Medieval History,* 35 (2009), pp. 136-49.

Fletcher, C. ‘Charles VI and Richard II: Inconstant Youths’, in J. Boffey and V. Davis (eds.), *Recording Medieval Lives: Proceedings of the 2005 Harlaxton Symposium* (Donington, 2009), pp. 85-101.

—— ‘Corruption at Court: Crisis and the Theme of *Luxuria* in England and France, c. 1340-1422’, in S. Gunn and A. Janse (eds.), *The Court as a Stage: England and the Low Countries in the Later Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 28-38.

—— ‘Manhood and Politics in the Reign of Richard II’, *Past and Present,* 189 (2005), pp. 3-39.

—— ‘Political Representation’, in C. Fletcher, J.P. Genet, and J. Watts (eds.), *Government and Political Life in England and France,* c. *1300* – c. *1500* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 217-39.

—— *Richard II: Manhood, Youth, and Politics, 1377-99* (Oxford, 2008).

—— ‘Virtue and the Common Good: Moral Discourse and Political Practice in the Good Parliament, 1376’, in K.L. Jansen and M. Rubin (eds.), *Charisma and Religious Authority: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Preaching, 1200-1500* (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 197-214.

Forrest, I. ‘Continuity and Change in the Institutional Church’, in J.H, Arnold (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Christianity* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 185-200.

—— *The Detection of Heresy in Late Medieval England* (Oxford, 2005).

—— ‘Lollardy and Medieval History’, in M. Bose and J.P. Hornbeck II (eds.), *Wycliffite Controversies* (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 121-34.

—— ‘The Politics of Burial in Late Medieval Hereford’, *The English Historical Review*, 125 (2010), pp. 1110-38.

—— ‘Trust and Doubt: The Late Medieval Bishop and Local Knowledge’, in F. Andrews, C. Methuen, and A. Spicer (eds.), *Studies in Church History 52: The Church and Doubt* (Cambridge, 2016), pp. 164-85.

—— *Trustworthy Men: How Inequality and Faith Made the Medieval Church* (Princeton, 2018).

Fowler, K. *The King’s Lieutenant: Henry of Grosmont, First Duke of Lancaster, 1310-1361* (London, 1969).

—— ‘Introduction: War and Change in Late Medieval France and England’, in K. Fowler (ed.), *The Hundred Years War* (London, 1971), pp. 1-27.

—— ‘Truces’, in K. Fowler (ed.), *The Hundred Years War* (London, 1971), pp. 184-215.

Frame, R. ‘England and Ireland, 1171-1399’, in M. Jones and M. Vale (eds.), *England and her Neighbours, 1066-1453* (London, 1989), pp. 139-56.

—— *English Lordship in Ireland, 1318-1361* (Oxford, 1982).

—— ‘English Policies and Anglo-Irish Attitudes in the Crisis of 1341-1342’, in J. Lydon (ed.), *England and Ireland in the Later Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of Jocelyn Otway-Ruthven* (Blackrock, 1981), pp. 113-29.

—— *The Political Development of the British Isles, 1100-1400* (Oxford, 1995).

Frankforter, A.D. ‘The Reformation and the Register: Episcopal Administration of Parishes in Late Medieval England’, *The Catholic Historical Review,* 63 (1977), pp. 204-24.

Fraser, C.M. ‘Beaumont, Louis de’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Bek, Anthony’, *ODNB.*

—— *A History of Anthony Bek, Bishop of Durham, 1283-1311* (Oxford, 1957).

—— ‘Kellaw, Richard’, *ODNB.*

Fryde, E.B. ‘Edward III’s Wool Monopoly of 1337: A Fourteenth-Century Royal Trading Venture’, *History,* 37 (1952), pp. 8-24.

—— ‘Loans to the English Crown, 1328-31’, *The English Historical Review,* 60 (1955), pp. 198-211.

—— ‘Parliament and the French War, 1336-40’, in T.A. Sandquist and M.R. Powicke (eds.), *Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson* (Toronto, 1969), pp. 250-69.

—— *William de la Pole: Merchant and King’s Banker* (London, 1988).

Fryde, N. ‘Edward III’s Removal of His Ministers and Judges, 1340-1’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 48 (1975), pp. 149-61.

—— ‘John Stratford, bishop of Winchester, and the Crown, 1323-30’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 44 (1971), pp. 153-61.

——*The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II, 1321-1326* (Cambridge, 1979)

Funck-Brentano, F. ‘La Caractère Réligieux de la diplomatie du Moyen Âge’, *Revue d’histoire diplomatique,* 1 (1887), pp. 113-25.

Galbraith, V.H. ‘Articles laid before the Parliament of 1371’, *The English Historical Review,* 34 (1919), pp. 579-82.

—— ‘The *Modus Tenendi Parliamentum*’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes,* 16 (1953), pp. 81-99.

Gaposchkin, M.C. *The Making of Saint Louis: Kingship, Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 2008).

Gasquet, F.A. ‘A Forgotten English Preacher’, in his *The Old English Bible, and Other Essays,* 2nd edn (London, 1908), pp. 54-86.

Genet, J-P. ‘The Government of Later Medieval France and England: A Plea for Comparative History’, in C. Fletcher, J.P. Genet, and J. Watts (eds.), *Government and Political Life in England and France,* c. *1300* – c. *1500* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 1-23.

Gerrard, D. ‘Chivalry, War and Clerical Identity: England and Normandy, c. 1056 – 1226’, in R. Kotecki and J. Maciejewski (eds.), *Ecclesia et Violentia: Violence Against the Church and Within the Church in the Middle Ages* (Newcastle, 2014), pp. 102-21.

—— *The Church at War: The Military Activities of Bishops, Abbots and Other Clergy in England, c. 900-1200* (London, 2016).

—— ‘Fighting Clergy, Church Councils and the Contexts of Law: The Cutting Edge of Orthodoxy or the Ambiguous Limits of Legitimacy?’, in A.P. Roach and J.R. Simpson (eds.), *Heresy and the Making of European Culture: Medieval and Modern Perspectives* (London, 2013), pp. 275-88.

Gibbs, M.E. and Lang, J. *Bishops and Reform, 1215-1272, With Special Reference to the Lateran Council of 1215* (Oxford, 1934).

Gilchrist, J. *The Church and Economic Activity in the Middle Ages* (London, 1969).

Given-Wilson, C. ‘The Bishop of Chichester and the Second Statute of Praemunire, 1365’, *Historical Research,* 63 (1990), pp. 128-42.

—— *Edward II* (London, 2016).

—— *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages: The Fourteenth-Century Political Community* (London, 1987).

—— ‘The Exequies of Edward III and the Royal Funeral Ceremony in Late Medieval England’, *The English Historical Review,* 124 (2009), pp. 257-82.

—— ‘Fitzalan, Richard, third earl of Arundel and eighth earl of Surrey’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Fitzalan, Richard, fourth earl of Arundel and ninth earl of Surrey’, *ODNB.*

—— *Henry IV* (London, 2016).

—— ‘The King and the Gentry in Fourteenth-Century England’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 37 (1987), pp. 87-102.

—— ‘Later Medieval England, 1215-1485’, in N. Saul (ed.), *The Oxford Illustrated History of Medieval England* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 102-36.

—— ‘“The Manner of King Richard’s Renunciation”: A “Lancastrian Narrative”?’, *The English Historical Review,* 108 (1993), pp. 365-70.

—— ‘Perrers, Alice’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Richard II and his Grandfather’s Will’, *The English Historical Review,* 93 (1978), pp. 320-37.

—— ‘Richard II and the Higher Nobility’, in A. Goodman and J. Gillespie (eds.), *Richard II: The Art of Kingship* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 107-28.

—— ‘Royal Charter Witness Lists, 1327-1399’, *Medieval Prosopography*, 12 (1991), pp. 35-93.

—— *The Royal Household and the King’s Affinity: Service, Politics and Finance in England, 1360-1413* (New Haven, 1986).

—— ‘Royal Wills, 1376-1475’, in L. Clark (ed.), *The Fifteenth Century XVII: Finding Individuality* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 1-16.

—— ‘Wealth and Credit, Public and Private: the Earls of Arundel, 1306-1397’, *The English Historical Review*, 106 (1991), pp. 1-26.

Given-Wilson, C. and Prestwich, M. ‘Introduction’, in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 1-12.

Gleason, J.B. *John Colet* (Berkeley, 1989).

Goddard, R. *Credit and Trade in Later Medieval England, 1353-1532* (London, 2016).

Goldberg, P.J.P. ‘Introduction’, in P.J.P. Goldberg (ed.), *Richard Scrope: Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr* (Donington, 2007), pp. 1-16.

—— *Medieval England: A Social History, 1250-1550* (London, 2004).

Goldberg, P.J.P., Riddy, F., and Taylor, M. ‘Introduction: After Ariès’, in P.J.P. Goldberg and F. Riddy (eds.), *Youth in the Middle Ages* (York, 2004), pp. 1-10.

Golding, B. ‘Medford, Richard’, *ODNB*.

Goodman, A. *Joan, the Fair Maid of Kent: A Fourteenth-Century Princess and her World* (Woodbridge, 2017).

—— *The Loyal Conspiracy: The Lords Appellant Under Richard II* (London, 1971).

—— *John of Gaunt: The Exercise of Princely Power in Fourteenth-Century Europe* (Harlow, 1992).

—— ‘Sir Thomas Hoo and the Parliament of 1376’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 41 (1968), pp. 139-49.

Gottfried, R.J. *Bury St Edmunds and the Urban Crisis: 1290-1539* (Princeton, 1982).

Gransden, A. *Historical Writing in England* (2 vols., London, 1974-82).

Grant, A. ‘Disaster at Neville’s Cross: The Scottish Point of View’, in D. Rollason and M. Prestwich (eds.), *The Battle of Neville’s Cross, 1346* (Stamford, 1998), pp. 15-35.

—— ‘Fourteenth-Century Scotland’, in M. Jones (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History VI, c. 1300-c. 1415* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 345-74.

Grassi, J.L. ‘Royal Clerks from the Archdiocese of York in the Fourteenth Century’, *Northern History,* 5 (1970), pp. 12-33.

—— ‘William Airmyn and the Bishopric of Norwich’, *The English Historical Review,* 70 (1955), pp. 550-61.

Graves, E.B. ‘The Legal Significance of the Statute of Praemunire of 1353’, in C.H. Taylor (ed.), *Anniversary Essays in Medieval History by Students of Charles Homer Haskins* (Boston, 1929), pp. 57-80.

Gray, J.M. *Oaths and the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 2012).

Greatrex, J. *Biographical Register of the English Cathedral Priories of the Province of Canterbury, c. 1066 to 1540* (Oxford, 1997).

Greaves, D. ‘Calais under Edward III’, in G. Unwin (ed.), *Finance and Trade under Edward III* (Manchester, 1918), pp. 312-50.

Green, D. *The Battle of Poitiers, 1356* (Stroud, 2002).

—— *The Black Prince* (Stroud, 2001).

—— *Edward the Black Prince: Power in Medieval Europe* (Harlow, 2007).

—— *The Hundred Years War: A People’s History* (New Haven, 2014).

Green, J.C. *A History of the English People* (4 vols., London, 1878-80).

Green, V. *The Commonwealth of Lincoln College, 1427-1977* (Oxford, 1979).

Greenway, W. ‘The Election of John of Monmouth, Bishop of Llandaff, 1287-97’, *Morgannwg Transactions of the Glamorgan History Society,* 5 (1961), pp. 3-22.

Gribit, N.A. *Henry of Lancaster’s Expedition to Aquitaine, 1345-6: Military Service and Professionalism in the Hundred Years’ War* (Woodbridge, 2016).

Griffiths, R.A. *The Reign of Henry VI: The Exercise of Royal Authority, 1422-1461* (London, 1981).

Groom, M. ‘England: Piety, Heresy and Anti-clericalism’, in S.H. Rigby (ed.), *A Companion to Britain in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 381-95.

Grummitt, D. *Henry VI* (London, 2015).

—— ‘Public Service, Private Interest and Patronage in the Fifteenth-Century Exchequer’, in L. Clark (ed.), *The Fifteenth Century III: Authority and Subversion* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 149-62.

—— *A Short History of the Wars of the Roses* (London, 2012).

Grummitt, D. and Lassalmonie, J.-F. ‘Royal Public Finance’ (*c.* 1290-1523)’, in C. Fletcher, J.P. Genet, and J. Watts (eds.), *Government and Political Life in England and France,* c. *1300* – c. *1500* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 116-49.

Guard, T. *Chivalry, Kingship and Crusade: The English Experience in the Fourteenth Century* (Woodbridge, 2013).

Gundy, A.K. *Richard II and the Rebel Earl* (Cambridge, 2013).

Gunn, S. *Early Tudor Government, 1485-1558* (Basingstoke, 1995).

—— *The English People at War in the Age of Henry VIII* (Oxford, 2018).

—— ‘Edmund Dudley and the Church’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 51 (2000), pp. 509-26.

—— ‘The French Wars of Henry VIII’, in J. Black (ed.), *The Origins of War in Early Modern Europe* (Edinburgh, 1987), pp. 28-51.

—— *Henry VII’s New Men and the Making of Tudor England* (Oxford, 2016).

—— ‘Structures of Politics in Early Tudor England’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 5 (1995), pp. 59-90.

—— ‘War, Dynasty and Public Opinion in Early Tudor England’, in G.W. Bernard and S.J. Gunn (eds.), *Authority and Consent in Tudor England: Essays Presented to C.S.L. Davies* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 131-49.

Gunn, S., Grummitt, D., and Cools, S. *War, State, and Society in England and the Netherlands, 1477-1559* (Oxford, 2007).

Gunn, S and Jamme, A. ‘Kings, Nobles and Military Networks’, in C. Fletcher, J.P. Genet, and J. Watts (eds.), *Government and Political Life in England and France,* c. *1300* – c. *1500* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 41-77.

Gwynn, P. *The King’s Cardinal: The Rise and Fall of Thomas Wolsey* (London, 1990).

Haigh, C. ‘Anticlericalism and the English Reformation’, in C. Haigh (ed.), *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 56-74.

—— *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford, 1993).

—— ‘Introduction’, in C. Haigh (ed.), *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 1-17.

—— ‘The Recent Historiography of the English Reformation’, in C. Haigh (ed.), *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 19-33.

Haines, R.M. ‘Adam Orleton and the Diocese of Winchester’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 23 (1972), pp. 1-30.

—— *The Administration of the Diocese of Worcester in the First Half of the Fourteenth Century* (London, 1965).

—— ‘The Administration of the Diocese of Worcester ‘Sede Vacante’, 1266-1350’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 13 (1962), pp. 156-71.

—— *Archbishop John Stratford: Political Revolutionary and Champion of the Liberties of the English Church, ca. 1275/80 – 1348* (Toronto, 1986).

—— *Archbishop Simon Mepham, 1328-1333: A Boy Amongst Men* (Philadelphia, 2012).

—— ‘Baldock, Robert’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Bateman, William’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Bek, Anthony’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Bek, Thomas’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Bishops and Politics in the Reign of Edward II: Hamo de Hethe, Henry Wharton, and the *Historia Roffensis*’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 44 (1993), pp. 586-609.

—— ‘Bransford, Wolstan’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Brian, Reginald’, *ODNB.*

—— *The Church and Politics in Fourteenth-Century England: The Career of Adam Orleton, c. 1275-1345* (Cambridge, 1978).

—— ‘Cobham, John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Conflict in Government: Archbishops versus Kings, 1279-1348’ in J.G. Rowe (ed.), *Aspects of Late Medieval Government and Society: Essays Presented to J.R. Lander* (Toronto. 1986), pp. 213-45.

—— ‘A Defence Brief for Bishop Adam de Orleton’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 50 (1977), pp. 232-42.

—— *Ecclesia Anglicana: Studies in the English Church of the Later Middle Ages* (Toronto, 1989).

—— ‘An English Archbishop and the Cerberus of War’, in W.J. Sheils (ed.), *Studies in Church History 20: The Church and War* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 153-70.

—— ‘The Episcopate during the Reign of Edward II and the Regency of Isabella and Mortimer’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 56 (2005), pp. 657-709.

—— ‘Erghum, Ralph’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Ghent, Simon’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Gravesend, Stephen’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Greenfield, William’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Harewell, John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Hatfield, Thomas’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Hemenhale, Thomas’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Hotham, William of’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘An Innocent Abroad: The Career of Simon Mepham, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1328-33’, *The English Historical Review,* 112 (1997), pp. 555-96.

—— *King Edward II: His Life, His Reign, and its Aftermath, 1284-1330* (Montreal, 2003).

—— ‘Langton, Walter’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Lisle, Thomas’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Looking Back in Anger: A Politically Inspired Appeal Against John XXII’s Translation of Bishop Adam Orleton to Winchester (1334)’, *The English Historical Review,* 116 (2001), pp. 389-404.

—— ‘Maidstone, Walter’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Mepham, Simon’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Northburgh, Michael’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Northburgh, Roger’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Offord, John’, *ODNB*

—— ‘Orleton, Adam’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Sandale, John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Shoreditch. Sir John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Simon de Montacute, brother of William, earl of Salisbury, bishop of Worcester (1333-37) and Ely (1337-45)’, in N. Saul (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England I* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 37-71.

—— ‘Some Sermons at Hereford Attributed to Archbishop John Stratford’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 34 (1983), pp. 425-37.

—— ‘Stratford, John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Stratford, Ralph’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Stratford, Robert’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Sumptuous Apparel for a Royal Prisoner: Archbishop Melton’s Letter, 14 January 1330’, *The English Historical Review*, 124 (2009), pp. 885-94.

—— ‘Winchester Diocese under John Stratford, 1323-1333’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 64 (2013), pp. 277-95.

—— ‘Wolstan de Bransford: Prior and Bishop of Worcester, *c.* 1280-1349’, *The University of Birmingham Historical Journal,* 8 (1962), pp. 97-113.

—— ‘Wyville, Robert’, *ODNB.*

Hamilton, J.S. ‘Despenser, Hugh, the younger’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Edward II: Favourites, Loyalty and Kingship’, in R. Ambuhl, J. Bothwell, and L. Tompkins (eds.), *Ruling Fourteenth-Century England: Essays in Honour of Christopher Given-Wilson* (Woodbridge, 2019), pp. 77-92.

—— ‘Gaveston, Piers’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Lords Ordainer, 1310-1313’, *ODNB.*

—— *Piers Gaveston, Earl of Cornwall, 1307-1312: Politics and Patronage in the Reign of Edward II* (Detroit, 1988).

Hanham, A. 'Text and Subtext: Bishop John Russell's Parliamentary Sermons, 1483-4', 54 (1999), *Traditio,* pp. 301-22.

Hanna, R. *London Literature, 1300-1380* (Cambridge, 2005).

Harding, A. 'Burnell, Robert', *ODNB.*

—— *England in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1993).

—— *The Law Courts of Medieval England* (London, 1973).

Hare, J. 'The Architectural Patronage of Two Late Medieval Bishops: Edington, Wykeham and the Rebuilding of the Winchester Cathedral Nave', *Antiquaries Journal,* 92 (2012), pp. 273-305.

Harmes, M.K. *Bishops and Power in Early Modern England* (London, 2013).

Harper-Bill, C. 'Archbishop John Morton and the Province of Canterbury, 1486-1500', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 29 (1978), pp. 1-21.

—— 'Dean Colet's Convocation Sermon and the Pre-Reformation Church in England', *History,* 73 (1988), pp. 191-210.

—— 'The English Church and English Religion after the Black Death', in W.M. Ormrod and P.G. Lindley (eds.), *The Black Death in England* (Donington, 1996), pp. 79-123.

—— 'The Medieval Church and the Wider World', in I. Atherton, E. Fernie, C. Harper-Bill, and H. Smith (eds.), *Norwich Cathedral: Church, City and Diocese, 1096-1996* (London, 1996), pp. 281-313.

—— *The Pre-Reformation Church in England, 1400-1530* (London, 1989).

Harriss, G.L. 'Aids, Loans, and Benevolences', *The Historical Journal,* 6 (1963), pp. 1-19.

—— *Cardinal Beaufort: A Study of Lancastrian Ascendancy and Decline* (Oxford, 1988).

—— 'The Commons' Petitions of 1340', *The English Historical Review,* 78 (1963), pp. 625-54.

—— 'The Dimensions of Politics', in R.H. Britnell and A.J. Pollard (eds.), *The McFarlane Legacy: Studies in Late Medieval Politics and Society* (Stroud, 1995), pp. 1-20.

—— 'Financial Policy', in G.L. Harriss (ed.), *Henry V: The Practice of Kingship* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 159-80.

—— ‘Fitzalan, Thomas, fifth earl of Arundel and tenth earl of Surrey’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘The Formation of Parliament, 1272-1377’, in R.G. Davies and J.H. Denton (eds.), *The English Parliament in the Middle Ages* (Manchester, 1984). pp. 29-60.

—— ‘Introduction: The Exemplar of Kingship’, in G.L. Harriss (ed.), *Henry V: The Practice of Kingship* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 1-30.

—— *King, Parliament, and Public Finance in Medieval England to 1369* (Oxford, 1975).

—— ‘The Management of Parliament’, in G.L. Harriss (ed.), *Henry V: The Practice of Kingship* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 137-58.

—— ‘Medieval Government and Statecraft’, *Past and Present,* 25 (1963), pp. 8-39.

—— ‘Political Society and the Growth of Government in Late Medieval England’, *Past and Present,* 138 (1993), pp. 28-57.

—— *Shaping the Nation: England 1360-1461* (Oxford, 2005).

—— ‘War and the Emergence of the English Parliament, 1297-1360’, *The Journal of Medieval History,* 2 (1976), pp. 35-56.

Hartrich, E. ‘Urban Identity and Political Rebellion: London and Henry of Lancaster’s Revolt, 1328-9’, in W.M. Ormrod (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England VII* (Woodbridge, 2012), pp. 89-106.

Harvey, B. *Westminster Abbey and its Estates in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1977).

Harvey, K. *Episcopal Appointments in England, c. 1214-1344: From Episcopal Election to Papal Provision* (Farnham, 2014).

—— ‘The First Entry of the Bishop: Episcopal *Adventus* in Fourteenth-Century England’, in J.S. Hamilton (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England VIII* (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 43-58.

Harvey, M. *England, Rome and the Papacy, 1417-1464: The Study of a Relationship* (Manchester, 1993).

Hatcher, J. *Plague, Population, and the English Economy, 1348-1530* (London, 1977).

Heal, F. *Of Prelates and Princes: A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate* (Cambridge, 1980).

Hatt, C.A. *English Works of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester: Sermons and Other Writings, 1520 to 1535* (Oxford, 2002).

Hay, D. ‘The Church of England in the Later Middle Ages’, *History*, 53 (1968), pp. 35-50.

Heale, M. *The Abbots and Priors of Late Medieval and Reformation England* (Oxford, 2016).

—— *The Dependant Priories of Medieval English Monasteries* (Woodbridge, 2004).

—— ‘Introduction’, in M. Heale (ed.), *The Prelate in England and Europe, 1300-1560* (York, 2014), pp. 1-13.

—— ‘Monastic Attitudes to Abbatial Magnificence in Late Medieval England’, in M. Heale (ed.), *The Prelate in England and Europe, 1300-1560* (York, 2014), pp. 261-76.

Heath, P. ‘Between Reform and Reformation: The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 41 (1990), pp. 647-78.

—— *Church and Realm, 1272-1461* (London, 1988).

—— *The English Parish Clergy on the Eve of the Reformation* (London, 1969).

Hefferan, M. ‘Edward III’s Household Knights and the Crécy Campaign of 1346’, *Historical Research,* 92 (2019), pp. 24-49.

—— ‘Family, Loyalty and the Royal Household in Fourteenth-Century England’, in C. Given-Wilson and D. Green (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England XI* (Woodbridge, 2019), pp. 129-54.

—— *The Household Knights of Edward III: Warfare, Politics and Kingship in Fourteenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2021).

Hewitt, H.J. *The Black Prince’s Expedition of 1355-1357* (Manchester, 1958).

—— ‘The Organization of War’, in K. Fowler (ed.), *The Hundred Years War* (London, 1971), pp. 75-95.

—— *The Organization of War under Edward III, 1338-62* (Manchester, 1966).

Hicks, M. *Bastard Feudalism* (London, 1995).

—— ‘Dynham, John, Baron Dynham’, *ODNB.*

—— *English Political Culture in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 2002).

—— *The Wars of the Roses* (New Haven, 2010).

Highfield, J.R.L. ‘Correspondence’, *History*, 39 (1954), pp. 331-2.

—— 'The Early Colleges', in J.I. Catto (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford I: The Early Oxford Schools* (Oxford, 1984), pp. 225-64.

—— 'The English Hierarchy in the Reign of Edward III', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 6 (1956), pp. 115-38.

—— 'A Note on the Introduction of English into the Proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury in the Reign of Edward III', *Medieval Aevum,* 19 (1950), pp. 60-3.

—— 'The Promotion of William of Wickham to the See of Winchester', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 4 (1953), pp. 37-54.

—— *William of Edington: A Lecture Given at the Friends' Festival, 1962* (London, 1962).

Hill, M.C. *The King's Messengers, 1199-1377: A Contribution to the Study of the Royal Household* (London, 1961).

Hill, R. 'An English Archbishop and the Scottish Wars of Independence', *The Innes Review,* 22 (1971), pp. 59-71.

—— 'Melton, William', *ODNB.*

Hilton, R.H. *The Decline of Serfdom in Medieval England* (London, 1969).

Holmes, G.A. *The Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1957).

—— *Europe: Hierarchy and Revolt, 1320-1450* (Oxford, 1975).

—— *The Good Parliament* (Oxford, 1975).

—— 'Judgement on the Younger Despenser, 1326', *The English Historical Review,* 70 (1955), pp. 261-7.

—— *The Later Middle Ages, 1272-1485* (Edinburgh, 1962).

—— 'Latimer, William, fourth Baron Latimer', *ODNB.*

—— 'Mare, Sir Peter de la', *ODNB.*

—— 'The Rebellion of the Earl of Lancaster, 1328-9', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 28 (1955), pp. 84-96.

Holt, J.C. 'The Introduction of Knight-Service in England', in his *Colonial England, 1066-1215* (London, 1997), pp. 81-101.

Hopkins, C. *Trinity: 450 Years of an Oxford College Community* (Oxford, 2005).

Horrox, R. *Richard III: A Study of Service* (Cambridge, 1989).

Hoskin, P. 'Swinfield, Richard', *ODNB.*

Housley, N. *The Avignon Papacy and the Crusades, 1305-1378* (Oxford, 1986).

Hudson, A. 'Dymoke [Dymock], Roger', *ODNB.*

—— '*Hermofodrita or Ambidexter*: Wycliffite Views on Clerks in Secular Office', in M. Aston and C. Richmond (eds.), *Lollardy and the Gentry in the Later Middle Ages* (Stroud, 1997), pp. 41-51.

—— 'A New Look at the *Lay Folk's Catechism*', *Viator,* 16 (1985), pp. 243-58.

—— *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988).

Hudson, A. and Kenny, A. 'Wyclif, John', *ODNB.*

Hughes, D. *A Study of Social and Constitutional Tendencies of the Early Years of Edward III* (London, 1915).

Hughes, J[ill]. 'Walter Langton and his Family', *Nottingham Medieval Studies,* 35 (1991), pp. 70-6.

Hughes, J[onathan]. 'Arundel, Thomas', *ODNB.*

—— 'Thoresby, John', *ODNB.*

Jackson, J.E. 'Edington Monastery', *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine,* 20 (1881), pp. 241-306.

Jacob, E.F. 'Archbishop John Stafford', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 12 (1962), pp. 1-23.

—— *The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485* (Oxford, 1961).

James, T.B. *The Palaces of Medieval England, c. 1050-1550: Royalty, Nobility, the Episcopate and their Residences from Edward the Confessor to Henry VIII* (London, 1990).

Jefferson, L. 'MS Arundel and the Earliest Statutes of the Order of the Garter', *The English Historical Review,*109 (1994), pp. 356-85.

Jenkins, J. '"Despite the Prohibition of the Lord Bishop": John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter (1327-69), and the Illusion of Episcopal Power', in P.R. Coss, C. Dennis, M. Julian-Jones, and A. Silvestri (eds.), *Episcopal Power and Local Society in Medieval Europe, 900-1400* (Turnhout, 2017), pp. 271-89.

—— ‘Monasteries and the Defence of the South Coast in the Hundred Years War’, *Southern History,* 34 (2012), pp. 1-23.

Jewell, H. ‘English Bishops as Educational Benefactors in the Late Fifteenth Century’, in R.B. Dobson (ed.)., *The Church, Politics, and the Patronage in the Fifteenth Century* (Gloucester, 1984), pp. 148-67.

Johnson, C. ‘The Collectors of Lay Taxes’, in W.A. Morris and J.R. Strayer (eds.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1940-50), ii, pp. 201-26.

Johnson, J.H. ‘The King’s Wardrobe and Household’, in W.A. Morris and J.R. Strayer (eds.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1940-50), i, pp. 206-49.

Jones, C. ‘Introduction’, in E. Woodacre, L.H.S. Dean, C. Jones, R.E. Martin, and Z.E. Rohr (eds.), *The Routledge History of Monarchy* (London, 2019), pp. 23-37.

Jones, M. *The Black Prince* (London, 2017).

Jones, M.C.E. ‘The Crown and the Provinces in the Fourteenth Century’, in D. Potter (ed.), *France in the Later Middle Ages, 1200-1500* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 61-89.

—— *Ducal Brittany, 1364-1399* (Oxford, 1970).

—— ‘The Last Capetians and Early Valois Kings, 1314-1364’, in M. Jones (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History VI, c. 1300-c. 1415* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 388-421.

—— ‘Froissart, Jean’.

—— ‘Relations with France, 1337-1399’, in M. Jones and M. Vale (eds.), *England and her Neighbours, 1066-1453* (London, 1989), pp. 239-58.

Jones, W.R. ‘Bishops, Politics, and the Two Laws: The Gravamina of the English Clergy, 1237-1399’, *Speculum,* 41 (1966), pp. 209-45.

—— The English Church and Royal Propaganda During the Hundred Years War’, *The Journal of British Studies,* 19 (1979), pp. 18-30.

—— ‘Relations of the Two Jurisdictions: Conflict and Cooperation in England during the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries’, *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History,* 7 (1970), pp. 79-210.

—— ‘The Two Laws in England: The Later Middle Ages’, *The Journal of Church and State,* 11 (1969), pp. 111-31.

Jurkowski, M. ‘The History of Clerical Taxation in England and Wales, 1173-1663: The Findings of the E 179 Project’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 67 (2016), pp. 53-81.

Jurkowski, M, Smith, C.L., and Crook, D. *Lay Taxes in England and Wales, 1188-1688* (London, 1998).

Kaeuper, R.W. ‘Royal Finance and the Crisis of 1297’, in W.C. Jordan, B. McNab, and T.F. Ruiz (eds.), *Order and Innovation in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honor of J.R. Strayer* (Princeton, 1976), pp. 103-10.

—— ‘Thorp, Sir William’, *ODNB.*

—— *War, Justice and Public Order: England and France in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1988).

Kantorowicz, E.H. *The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957).

Kaminsky, H. ‘The Great Schism’, in M. Jones (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History VI, c. 1300-c. 1415* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 674-96.

Keen, M.H. *Chivalry* (London, 1984).

—— *England in the Later Middle Ages,* 2nd edn (London, 2003).

—— ‘The Influence of Wyclif’, in A. Kenny (ed.), *Wyclif in his Times* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 127-46.

—— ‘Wyclif, the Bible, and Transubstantiation’, in A. Kenny (ed.), *Wyclif in his Times* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 1-16.

Kellogg, E. ‘Bishop Brunton and the Fable of the Rats’, *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America,* 50 (1935), pp. 57-68.

Kemp, E.W. ‘History and Action in the Sermons of a Medieval Archbishop: The Bishop of Chichester’, in R.H.C. Davis and J.M. Wallace-Hadrill (ed.), *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 349-65.

Kennedy, M.J.O. ‘Resourceful Villeins: The Cellarer Family of Wawne in Holderness’, *The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal,* 48 (1976), pp. 107-18.

King, A. ‘Chivalry in the Hundred Years War’, in A. Curry (ed.), *The Hundred Years War Revisited* (Basingstoke, 2019), pp. 133-52.

—— ‘Crisis? What Crisis? 1297 and the Civil War that Never Was’, in A. King and A. Spencer (eds.), *Edward I: New Interpretations* (York, 2020), pp. 163-84.

—— ‘The Death of Edward II Revisited’, in J. Bothwell and G. Dodd (eds.), *Fourteenth Century England IX* (Woodbridge, 2016), pp. 2-21.

—— *Edward I: A New King Arthur?* (London, 2016).

King, A. and Etty, C. *England and Scotland, 1286-1603* (Basingstoke, 2015).

King, A. and Pollard, A.J. ‘“Northumbria” in the Later Middle Ages’, in R. Colls (ed.), *Northumbria: History and Identity, 547-2000* (Chichester, 2007), pp. 68-87.

Kingsford, C.L. ‘Northburgh, Michael de’, *DNB.*

—— (rev. Childs, W.) ‘Murimuth, Adam’, *ODNB.*

Knecht, R.J. ‘The Episcopate and the Wars of the Roses’, *The University of Birmingham Historical Journal,* 6 (1957-8), pp. 108-31.

Knowles, D.C. *The Episcopal Colleagues of Archbishop Thomas Becket* (Cambridge, 1951).

—— ‘The London Charterhouse’, in J.S. Cockburn, H.P.F. King and K.G.T. McDonnel (eds.), *A History of the County of Middlesex I* (London, 1969), pp. 159-68.

—— *The Religious Orders in England* (3 vols., Cambridge, 1948-61).

Kotecki, R., Maciejewski, J., and Ott, J.S. ‘The Medieval Clergy and War: A Historiographical Introduction’, in their *Between Sword and Prayer: Warfare and Medieval Clergy in Cultural Perspective* (Leiden, 2017), pp. 1-23.

Lacey, H. ‘Protection and Immunity in Later Medieval England’, in T.B. Lambert and D. Rollason (eds.), *Peace and Protection in the Middle Ages* (Durham, 2009), pp. 78-96.

—— *The Royal Pardon: Access to Mercy in Fourteenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 2009).

Lander, J.R. *Conflict and Stability in Fifteenth-Century England* (London, 1969).

—— ‘Family, “Friends”, and Politics in Fifteenth-Century England’, in R.A. Griffiths and J.W. Sherbourne (eds.), *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages: A Tribute to Charles Ross* (Gloucester, 1986), pp. 27-40.

Lane, S. ‘The Bishops and the Deposition of Edward II’, in R. McKitterick, C. Methuen, and A. Spicer (eds.), *Studies in Church History 56: The Church and the Law* (Cambridge, 2020), pp. 131-51.

—— ‘The Deposition of Edward II: The Kenilworth Embassies’, in J. Bothwell and J.S. Hamilton (eds.), *Fourteenth Century England XII* (Woodbridge, 2022), pp. 65-78.

—— '"Differences and Discordes": Conflict Between Civic and Ecclesiastical Authorities in Late Medieval Salisbury, 1302-1539', in N. Hodgson, A. Fuller, J. McCallum, and N. Morton (eds.), *Religion and Conflict in the Medieval and Early Modern Worlds: Identities, Communities, and Authorities* (London, 2020), pp. 189-203.

—— 'The Political Career of William Ayscough, Bishop of Salisbury, 1438-50', in L. Clark (ed.), *The Fifteenth Century XVI: Examining Identity* (Woodbridge, 2018), pp. 63-82.

—— 'Prelates and Political Reform: The Bishops and the Ordinances of 1311', in C. Given-Wilson and D. Green (eds.), *Fourteenth Century England XI* (Woodbridge, 2019), pp. 31-55.

—— 'Propaganda, Piety and Politics in the Fifteenth Century: Henry V's Vernacular War Letters to the City of London, 1417-21', in L. Clark (ed.), *The Fifteenth Century XVII: Finding Individuality* (Woodbridge, 2020), pp. 17-34.

Lapsley, G.T. 'Archbishop Stratford and the Parliamentary Crisis of 1341', in H.M. Cam and G. Barraclough (ed.), *Crown, Community and Parliament in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1951), pp. 231-72.

—— *The County Palatine of Durham: A Study in Constitutional History* (Cambridge, Mass., 1924).

Larson, A. 'English Embassies during the Hundred Years' War', *The English Historical Review,* 55 (1940), pp. 423-31.

—— 'The Payment of Fourteenth-Century English Envoys', *The English Historical Review,* 54 (1939), pp. 403-14.

Lawrence, C.H. 'The University in State and Church', in J.I. Catto (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford I: The Early Oxford Schools* (Oxford, 1984), pp. 97-150.

Lawrence, M. 'Secular Patronage and Religious Devotion: The Despensers and St Mary's Abbey, Tewkesbury', in N. Saul (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England V* (Woodbridge, 2008), pp. 78-93.

Le Patourel, J. 'Edward III and the Kingdom of France', *History,* 43 (1958), pp. 172-89.

—— *Feudal Empires: Norman and Plantagenet* (London, 1984).

—— 'The King and the Princes in Fourteenth-Century France', in J.R. Hale, J.R.L. Highfield, and B. Smalley (eds.), *Europe in the Late Middle Ages* (London, 1965), pp. 155-83.

—— 'The Origins of the War', in K. Fowler (ed.), *The Hundred Years War* (London, 1971), pp. 28-50.

Leach, A.F. *A History of Winchester College* (London, 1899).

Leader, D.R. *A History of the University of Cambridge I: The University to 1546* (Cambridge, 1988).

Leff, G. 'Bradwardine, Thomas', *ODNB.*

Lepine, D.N. *A Brotherhood of Canons Serving God: English Secular Cathedrals in the Later Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 1995).

—— 'Charlton, Thomas', *ODNB.*

—— 'England: Church and Clergy', in S.H. Rigby (ed.), *A Companion to Britain in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 357-80.

—— 'Gilbert, John', *ODNB.*

—— 'Lenn, William', *ODNB.*

—— 'Trillek, John', *ODNB.*

—— 'Trillek, Thomas', *ODNB.*

—— 'Shrewsbury, Ralph', *ODNB.*

Lerner, R.E. 'New Light on *The Mirror of Simple Souls*', *Speculum,* 85 (2010), pp. 91-116.

Lewis, N.B. 'The Last Medieval Summons of the English Feudal Levy, 13 June 1385', *The English Historical Review,* 73 (1958), pp. 1-26.

Liddiard, R. 'Introduction', in R. Liddiard (ed.), *Late Medieval Castles* (Woodbridge, 2016), pp. 1-17.

Liddy, C.D. *The Bishopric of Durham in the Late Middle Ages: Lordship, Community and the Cult of St Cuthbert* (Woodbridge, 2008).

—— 'Hatfield the Bishop', in A. Bash (ed.), *Thomas Hatfield: Bishop, Soldier, and Politician* (Durham, 2012), pp. 35-46.

—— 'The Politics of Privilege: Thomas Hatfield and the Palatinate of Durham, 1345-81' in J.S. Hamilton (ed.) *Fourteenth Century England IV* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 61-79

—— *War, Politics and Finance in Late Medieval English Towns: Bristol, York and the Crown, 1350-1400* (Woodbridge, 2005).

—— 'William Frost, the City of York and Scrope's Rebellion of 1405', in P.J.P. Goldberg (ed.), *Richard Scrope: Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr* (Donington, 2007), pp. 64-85.

Little, A.G. 'The Authorship of the Lanercost Chronicle', *The English Historical Review,* 31 (1916), pp. 269-79.

Lloyd, M.E.H. ‘John Wyclif and the Prebend of Lincoln’, *The English Historical Review,* 61 (1946), pp. 388-94.

Lowe, B. *Commonwealth and the English Reformation: Protestantism and the Politics of Religious Change in the Gloucester Vale, 1483-1560* (Farnham, 2010).

Lowry, E.C. and Levett, A.E. ‘Clerical Proctors in Parliament and Knights of the Shire, 1280-1374’, *The English Historical Review,* 48 (1933), pp. 443-55.

Lucas, H.S. ‘John Crabbe: Flemish Pirate, Merchant, and Adventurer’, *Speculum,* 20 (1945), pp. 334-50.

—— *The Low Countries and the Hundred Years’ War, 1326-1347* (Ann Arbor, 1929).

—— ‘The Machinery of Diplomatic Discourse’, in W.A. Morris and J.R. Strayer (eds.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1940-50), i, pp. 300-31.

Lunt, W.E. ‘Clerical Tenths Levied in England by Papal Authority During the Reign of Edward II’, in C.H. Taylor and J.L. La Monte (eds.), *Haskins Anniversary Essays in Mediaeval History* (Boston, 1929), pp. 157-78.

—— ‘The Collectors of Clerical Subsidies Granted to the King by the English Clergy’, in W.A. Morris and J.R. Strayer (eds.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1940-50), ii, pp. 227-80.

—— *Financial Relations of the Papacy with England, 1327-1534* (2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1939-62).

—— ‘The First Levy of Papal Annates’, *The American Historical Review,* 18 (1912), pp. 48-64.

—— *Papal Revenues in the Middle Ages* (2 vols., New York, 1934).

—— ‘Papal Taxation in England in the Reign of Edward I’, *The English Historical Review,* 30 (1915), pp. 398-417.

—— ‘A Papal Tenth Levied in the British Isles from 1274 to 1280’, *The English Historical Review,* 32 (1917), pp. 49-89.

Lydon, J.F. ‘The Case Against Alexander Bicknor, Bishop and Peculator’, in B. Smith (ed.), *Ireland and the English World in the Late Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of Robin Frame* (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 103-11.

Macray, W.D. ‘Sermons for the Festivals of St. Thomas Becket, etc. Probably by Archbishop Stratford’, *The English Historical Review,* 8 (1893), pp. 85-91.

MacCulloch, D. ‘Cranmer, Thomas’, *ODNB.*

—— *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English County, 1500-1600* (Oxford, 1986).

—— *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (London, 1996).

—— *Thomas Cromwell: A Life* (London, 2018).

Madden, M. *The Black Prince and the Grande Chevauchée of 1355* (Woodbridge, 2018).

Maddicott, J.R. *The English Peasantry and the Demands of the Crown, 1294-1341* (Oxford, 1975).

—— *Founders and Fellowship: The Early History of Exeter College, Oxford, 1314-1592* (Oxford, 2014).

—— *The Origins of the English Parliament, 924-1327* (Oxford, 2010).

—— ‘The Origins of the Hundred Years War’, in N. Saul (ed.), *England in Europe, 1066-1453* (London, 1994), pp. 133-43.

—— *Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-1322: A Study in the Reign of Edward II* (Oxford, 1970).

Magrath, J.R. ‘Sir Robert Parvyng, Knight of the Shire for Cumberland, and Chancellor of England’, *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society,* 14 (1919), pp. 30-91.

Malden, H.E. *Trinity Hall* (London, 1902).

Marshall, P. ‘Anticlericalism Revested? Expressions of Discontent in Early Tudor England’, in C. Burgess and E. Duffy (eds.), *The Parish in Late Medieval England* (Donnington, 2006), pp. 365-80.

—— *The Catholic Priesthood and the English Reformation* (Oxford, 1994).

—— *Heretics and Believers: A History of the English Reformation* (New Haven, 2017).

—— ‘(Re)Defining the English Reformation’, *The Journal of British Studies,* 48 (2009), pp. 564-86.

——*Reformation England, 1480-1642,* 2nd edn (London, 2012).

—— ‘Thomas Becket, William Warham and the Crisis of the Early Tudor Church’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 71 (2020), pp. 293-315.

Maxwell-Lyte, H.C. *Historical Notes on the Use of the Great Seal of England* (London, 1926).

Mayr-Harting, H. *Religion, Politics and Society in Britain, 1066-1272* (Harlow, 2011).

McCallum, R. ‘The Crown’s Ecclesiastical Creditors: Loans from the English Church to Edward II and Edward III, 1307-1377’, *The English Historical Review*, 136 (2021), pp. 1385-1418.

—— ‘Loans from English Provincial Towns to the Crown During the Reigns of Edward II and Edward III’, *Historical Research,* 91 (2018), pp. 605-27.

McDonald, P. ‘Bishop Bateman and Bury St Edmunds: The Two Laws Clash’, *The English Historical Review*, 135 (2020), pp. 1-28.

McEntegart, R. ‘Towards an Ideological Foreign Policy: Henry VIII and Lutheran Germany, 1531-47’, in S. Doran and G. Richardson (eds.), *Tudor England and its Neighbours* (Basingstoke, 2005), pp. 74-105.

McFarlane, K.B. *John Wycliffe and the Beginnings of English Nonconformity* (London, 1952).

—— *Lancastrian Kings and Lollard Knights* (Oxford, 1972).

—— *The Nobility of Later Medieval England: The Ford Lectures for 1953 and Related Studies* (Oxford, 1973).

McHardy, A. ‘Bishop Buckingham and the Lollards of Lincoln Diocese’, in D. Baker (ed.), *Studies in Church History 9: Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 131-45.

—— ‘Bishops’ Registers and Political History: a Neglected Resource’, in P. Hoskin, C. Brooke, and B. Dobson (eds.), *The Foundations of Medieval English Ecclesiastical History: Essays Presented to David Smith* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 173-93.

—— ‘Buckingham, John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Church Courts and Criminous Clerks in the Later Middle Ages’, in M.J. Franklin and C. Harper-Bill (eds.), *Medieval Ecclesiastical Studies in Honour of Dorothy Owen* (Woodbridge, 1995), pp. 165-83.

—— ‘Clerical Taxation in Fifteenth-Century England: The Clergy as Agents of the Crown’, in R.B. Dobson (ed.), *The Church, Politics, and Patronage in the Fifteenth Century* (Gloucester, 1984), pp. 168-92.

—— ‘The Effects of War on the Church: The Case of the Alien Priories in the Fourteenth Century’, in M. Jones and M. Vale (eds.), *England and her Neighbours, 1066-1453* (London, 1989), pp. 277-96.

—— ‘The English Clergy and the Hundred Years War’, in W.J. Sheils (ed.), *Studies in Church History 20: The Church and War* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 171-8.

—— ‘John Buckingham and Thomas Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick’, *Nottingham Medieval Studies,* 19 (1975), pp. 48-52.

—— ‘Kings’ Clerks: The Essential Tools of Government’, in R. Ambuhl, J. Bothwell, and L. Tompkins (eds.), *Ruling Fourteenth-Century England: Essays in Honour of Christopher Given-Wilson* (Woodbridge, 2019), pp. 59-76.

—— ‘Kings’ Courts and Bishops’ Administrations in Fourteenth-Century England: A Study in Cooperation’, in R. McKitterick, C. Methuen, and A. Spicer (eds.), *Studies in Church History 56: The Church and the Law* (Cambridge, 2020), pp. 152-64.

—— ‘The Loss of Archbishop Stratford’s Register’, *Historical Research,* 70 (1997), pp. 337-41.

—— ‘Liturgy and Propaganda in the Diocese of Lincoln During the Hundred Years War’, in S. Mews (ed.), *Studies in Church History 18: Religion and National Identity* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 215-27.

—— ‘The Promotion of John Buckingham to the See of Lincoln’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 26 (1975), pp. 127-35.

—— ‘Religious Ritual and Political Persuasion: The Case of England in the Hundred Years War’, *International Journal of Moral and Social Studies,* 3 (1988), pp. 41-59.

—— ‘The Representation of the Clergy in Parliament’, in G. Dodd (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England X* (Woodbridge, 2019), pp. 47-66.

—— ‘Richard II: A Personal Portrait’, in G. Dodd (ed.), *The Reign of Richard II* (Stroud, 2000), pp. 11-32.

—— ‘Some Reflections on Edward III’s Use of Propaganda’, in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 171-92.

McKelvie, G. *Bastard Feudalism, English Society and the Law: The Statutes of Livery, 1390-1520* (Woodbridge, 2020).

McKisack, M. ‘Edward III and the Historians’, *History,* 45 (1960), pp. 1-15.

—— *The Fourteenth Century, 1307-1399* (Oxford, 1959).

McNab, B. ‘Obligations of the Church in English Society: Military Arrays of the Clergy, 1369-1418’, in W.C. Jordan, B. McNab, and T.F. Ruiz (eds.), *Order and Innovation in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honor of J.R. Strayer* (Princeton, 1976), pp. 293-314.

McNamee, C. *The Wars of the Bruces: Scotland, England and Ireland, 1306-1328* (East Linton, 1997).

Menache, S. *Clement V* (Cambridge, 1998).

Michael, M. 'The Iconography of Kingship in the Walter of Milemete Treatise', *The Journal of the Warburg and Courtald Institutes,* 57 (1994), pp. 35-47.

Miller, E. *War in the North: The Anglo-Scottish Wars of the Middle Ages* (Hull, 1960).

Mirot, L. and Déprez, E. *Les Ambassades Anglaises pendant la Guerre de Cent Ans, Catalogue Chronologique, 1327-1450* (Paris, 1900).

McNiven, P. 'The Betrayal of Archbishop Scrope', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Institute,* 54 (1971-2), pp. 173-213.

—— 'Scrope, Richard', *ODNB.*

Moberly, G.H. *Life of William Wykeham* (London, 1887).

Mollat, G. *The Popes at Avignon, 1305-1378,* trans. J. Love (London, 1963).

Moore, T.K and Bell, A.R. 'Financing the Hundred Years War', in A. Curry (ed.), *The Hundred Years War Revisited* (Basingstoke, 2019), pp. 57-84.

Morgan, D.A.L. 'The Political After-Life of Edward III: The Apotheosis of a Warmonger', *The English Historical Review,* 112 (1997), pp. 856-81.

Morgan, M.M. 'The Suppression of Alien Priories', *History,* 26 (1941), pp. 204-12.

Morganstern, A.M. *Gothic Tombs of Kinship* (Pennsylvania, 2000).

Morris, W.A. 'Introduction', in W.A. Morris and J.R. Strayer (eds.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1940-50), i, pp. 2-80.

Mortimer, I. 'The Death of Edward II in Berkeley Castle', *The English Historical Review,* 120 (2005), pp. 1175-1214.

—— *The Greatest Traitor: The Life of Sir Roger Mortimer, 1st Earl of March, Ruler of England, 1327-1330* (London, 2003).

—— *The Perfect King: The Life of Edward III, Father of the English Nation* (London, 2006).

—— 'The Plot of the Earl of Kent, 1328-30', in his *Medieval Intrigue: Decoding Royal Conspiracies* (London, 2010), pp. 153-74.

Musson, A. ‘Second “English Justinian” or Pragmatic Opportunist? A Re-Examination of the Legal Legislation of Edward III’s Reign’, in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 69-88.

Musson, A. and Ormrod, W.M. *The Evolution of English Justice: Law, Politics and Society in the Fourteenth Century* (Basingstoke, 1999).

Myers, A.R. *England in the Later Middle Ages,* 2nd edn (Harmondsworth, 1966).

—— ‘The Wealth of Richard Lyons’, in T.A. Sandquist and M.R. Powicke (eds.), *Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson* (Toronto, 1969), pp. 301-29.

Nederman, C.J. ‘Royal Taxation and the English Church: The Origins of William of Ockham’s *An Princeps*’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 37 (1986), pp. 377-88.

Neville, C. ‘Keeping the Peace in the Northern Marches in the Later Middle Ages’, *The English Historical Review,* 109 (1994), pp. 1-25.

—— *Violence, Custom and Law: The Anglo-Scottish Border Lands in the Later Middle Ages* (Edinburgh, 1998).

Nicholson, R.G. *Edward III and the Scots: The Formative Years of a Military Career* (London, 1965).

—— *Scotland: The Later Middle Ages* (Edinburgh, 1974).

—— ‘The Siege of Berwick, 1333’, *The Scottish Historical Review,* 40 (1961), pp. 19-42.

North, J.D. ‘Rede, William’, *ODNB.*

Oberman, H.A. and Weisheipl, J.A. ‘The “Sermo Epinicius” Ascribed to Thomas Bradwardine’, *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et litteraire du Moyen Age,* 25 (1958), pp. 295-329.

O’Day, R. *The Debate on the English Reformation* (London, 1986).

Offler, H.S. ‘England and Germany at the Beginning of the Hundred Years’ War’, *The English Historical Review,* 54 (1939), pp. 608-31.

—— ‘Thomas Bradwardine’s “Victory Sermon” in 1346’, in A.I. Doyle (ed.), *Church and Crown in the Fourteenth Century: Studies in European History and Political Thought* (Aldershot, 2000), pp. 1-40.

Oliver, A.E. ‘Battling Bishops: Late Fourteenth-Century Episcopal Masculinity Admired and Decried’, in C. Harper-Bill (ed.), *Medieval East Anglia* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 272-86.

Oliver, C. *Parliament and Political Pamphleteering in Fourteenth-Century England* (York, 2010).

Orme, N. ‘Berkeley, James’, *ODNB.*

—— *Exeter Cathedral: The First Thousand Years, 400-1550* (Exeter, 2009).

—— *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of English Kings and Aristocracy, 1066-1530* (London, 1984).

—— *Going to Church in Medieval England* (New Haven, 2021).

—— *Medieval Schools: From Roman Britain to Renaissance England* (New Haven, 2006).

Ormrod, W.M. ‘Accountability and Collegiality: The English Royal Secretariat in the Mid-Fourteenth Century’, in K. Fianu and D.J. Guth (eds.), *Écrit et Pouvoir dans les Chancelleries Médiévales* (Louvain, 1997), pp. 55-86.

—— ‘Agenda for Legislation, 1322 – *c.* 1340’, *The English Historical Review,* 105 (1990), p. 1-33.

—— ‘An Archbishop in Revolt: Richard Scrope and the Yorkshire Rising of 1405’, in P.J.P. Goldberg (ed.), *Richard Scrope: Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr* (Donington, 2007), pp. 28-44.

—— ‘For Arthur and St George: Edward III, Windsor Castle and the Order of the Garter’, in N. Saul (ed.), *St George’s Chapel Windsor in the Fourteenth Century* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 13-34.

—— ‘Avesbury, Robert’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Barnet, John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Bohun, William de, first earl of Northampton’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Clinton, William, earl of Huntingdon’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Coming to Kingship: Boy Kings and the Passage to Power in Fourteenth-Century England’, in N.F. McDonald and W.M. Ormrod (eds.), *Rites of Passage: Cultures of Transition in the Fourteenth Century* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 31-49.

—— ‘The Crown and the English Economy, 1290-1348’, in B.M.S. Campbell (ed.), *Before the Black Death: Studies in the ‘Crisis’ of the Early Fourteenth Century* (Manchester, 1991), pp. 149-83.

—— ‘Cusance, William’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘The Domestic Response to the Hundred Years War’, in A. Curry and M. Hughes (ed.), *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War* (Woodbridge, 1994), pp. 83-101.

—— *Edward III* (London, 2011).

—— ‘Edward III’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Edward III and his Family’, *The Journal of British Studies,* 26 (1987), pp. 398-422.

—— ‘Edward III and the Recovery of Royal Authority in England, 1340-60’, *History,* 72 (1987), pp. 4-19.

—— ‘England: Edward II and Edward III’, in M. Jones (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History VI, c. 1300-c. 1415* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 271-96.

—— ‘England in the Middle Ages’, in R. Bonney (ed.), *The Rise of the Fiscal State in Europe, c. 1200 – 1815* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 19-52.

—— ‘An Experiment in Taxation: The English Parish Subsidy of 1371’, *Speculum,* 63 (1988), pp. 58-82.

—— ‘Fifty Glorious Years: Edward III and the First English Royal Jubilee’, *Medieval History,* 1 (2002), pp. 13-20.

—— ‘Government by Commission: The Continual Council of 1386 and English Royal Administration’, *Peritia,* 10 (1996), pp. 303-21.

—— ‘Hatfield the Politician’, in A. Bash (ed.), *Thomas Hatfield: Bishop, Soldier, and Politician* (Durham, 2012), pp. 21-34.

—— ‘Henry of Lancaster [Henry of Grosmont], first duke of Lancaster’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘The King’s Secrets: Richard de Bury and the Monarchy of Edward III’, in A. Kettle, C. Given-Wilson, and L.E Scales (eds.), *War, Government and Aristocracy in the British Isles, c. 1150-1500: Essays in Honour of Michael Prestwich* (Woodbridge, 2008), pp. 163-78.

—— ‘Knyvet, Sir John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Lionel, duke of Clarence’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Montagu, William, first earl of Salisbury’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘The New Political History: Recent Trends in the Historiography of Late Medieval England’, in T. Dahlerup and P. Ingesman (eds.), *New Approaches to the History of Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Copenhagen, 2009), pp. 37-59.

—— ‘On – and off – the Record: The Rolls of Parliament, 1337-77’, *Parliamentary History,* 23 (2004), pp. 39-56.

—— ‘The Origins of the “Sub Pena” Writ’, *Historical Research,* 61 (1988), pp. 11-18.

—— ‘The Peasants’ Revolt and the Government of England’, *The Journal of British Studies,* 29 (1990), pp. 1-30.

—— ‘The Personal Religion of Edward III’, *Speculum,* 64 (1989), pp. 849-77.

—— *Political Life in Medieval England, 1300-1450* (Basingstoke, 1995).

—— ‘The Politics of Pestilence: Government in England after the Black Death’, in W.M. Ormrod and P.G. Lindley (eds.), *The Black Death in England* (Stamford, 1996), pp. 147-81.

—— ‘The Protecolla Rolls and English Government Finance, 1353-1364’, *The English Historical Review,* 102 (1987), pp. 622-32.

—— *The Reign of Edward III* (Guildford, 1990)

—— ‘Thorpe, Sir Robert’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Ufford, Robert, first earl of Suffolk’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘The Use of English: Language, Law, and Political Culture in Fourteenth-Century England’, *Speculum,* 78 (2003), pp. 750-87.

—— ‘The Rebellion of Archbishop Scrope and the Tradition of Opposition to Royal Taxation’, in G. Dodd and D. Biggs (eds.), *The Reign of Henry IV: Rebellion and Survival, 1403-13* (York, 2008), pp. 162-79.

—— ‘The Trials of Alice Perrers’, *Speculum,* 83 (2008), pp. 366-96.

—— *Winner and Waster and its Contexts: Chivalry, Law and Economics in Fourteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 2021).

—— *Women and Parliament in Later Medieval England* (Basingstoke, 2020).

Otway-Ruthven, J. *A History of Medieval Ireland* (London, 1968).

—— *The King’s Secretary and the Signet Office in the XVth Century* (Cambridge, 1939).

Owst, G.R. ‘The “Angel” and the “Goliardeys” of Langland’s Prologue’, *Modern Language Review,* 20 (1925), pp. 270-9.

—— *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England: A Neglected Chapter in the History of English Letters and of the English People,* 2nd edn (Oxford, 1961).

—— *Preaching in Medieval England: An Introduction to Sermon Manuscripts of the Period, c. 1350-1450* (Cambridge, 1926).

Page, M. ‘William Wykeham and the Management of the Winchester Estate, 1366-1404’ in W.M. Ormrod (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England III* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 99-120.

—— ‘Woodlock, Henry’, *ODNB.*

Palmer, J.J.N. ‘Book I (1325-1378) and its Sources’, in J.J.N. Palmer (ed.), *Froissart: Historian* (Woodbridge, 1981), pp. 7-24.

—— *England, France and Christendom, 1377-99* (London, 1972).

—— ‘England, France, the Papacy and the Flemish Succession, 1361-69’, *Journal of Medieval History,* 2 (1976), pp. 339-64.

—— ‘The Impeachment of Michael de la Pole in 1386’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 42 (1969), pp. 96-101.

—— ‘Introduction’, in J.J.N. Palmer (ed.), *Froissart: Historian* (Woodbridge, 1981), pp. 1-6.

—— ‘The Last Summons of the Feudal Army in England’, *The English Historical Review,* 83 (1968), pp. 771-5.

—— ‘The Parliament of 1385 and the Constitutional Crisis of 1386’, *Speculum,* 46 (1971), pp. 477-90.

—— ‘The War Aims of the Protagonists and the Negotiations for Peace’, in K. Fowler (ed.), *The Hundred Years War* (London, 1971), pp. 51-74.

Palmer, R.C. *English Law in the Age of the Black Death, 1348-1381* (London, 1993).

Pantin. W.A. ‘A Benedictine Opponent of John Wyclif’, *The English Historical Review,* 43 (1928), pp. 73-77.

—— *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1955)

—— ‘The Fourteenth Century’, in C.H. Lawrence (ed.), *The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle Ages* (London, 1965), pp. 159-94.

Parker, T.M. *The English Reformation to 1558* (London, 1950).

Partington, R. ‘Edward III’s Enforcers: The King’s Sergeants-at-Arms in the Localities’, in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 89-106.

—— ‘The Nature of Noble Service to Edward III’, in B. Thompson and J. Watts (eds.), *Political Society in Later Medieval England: A Festschrift for Christine Carpenter* (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 74-92.

Partner, P. ‘William of Wykeham and the Historians’, in R. Cusance (ed.), *Winchester College: Sixth-Centenary Essays* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 1-36.

—— ‘Wykeham, William’, *ODNB.*

Pearce, E.H. *Thomas de Cobham, Bishop of Worcester, 1317-1327: Some Studies Drawn from his Register, with an Account of his Life* (London, 1923).

Pennington, K. *Pope and Bishops: The Papal Monarchy in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* (Philadelphia, 1984).

Perroy, E. *The Hundred Years War,* trans. W.B. Wells (London, 1962).

Peters, E. *The Shadow King: Rex Inutilis in Medieval Law and Literature, 751-1327* (New Haven, 1970).

J.R.S. Phillips, *Aymer de Valence: Earl of Pembroke, 1307-24* (Oxford, 1972).

—— ‘Bicknor, Alexander’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Edward II’, *ODNB.*

—— *Edward II* (London, 2010).

—— ‘Parliament in the Reign of Edward II’, in G. Dodd (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England X*, pp. 25-46.

—— ‘Tout and the Reign of Edward II’, in C.M. Barron and J.T. Rosenthal (eds.), *Thomas Frederick Tout (1855-1929): Refashioning History for the Twentieth Century* (London, 2019), pp. 107-22.

Phillips, M. ‘Bishops, Parliament and Trial by Peers: Clerical Opposition to the Confiscation of Episcopal Temporalities in the Fourteenth Century’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 67 (2016), pp. 288-305.

—— ‘Urban Conflict and Legal Strategy in Medieval England: The Case of Bishop’s Lynn, 1346-1350’, *Urban History,* 42 (2015), pp. 365-80.

Philpotts, C. ‘Plague and Reconstruction: Bishops Edington and Wykeham at Highclere, 1346-1404’, in N. Saul (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England I* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 115-29.

Plöger, K. *England and the Avignon Popes: The Practice of Diplomacy in Late Medieval England* (London, 2005).

Plucknett, T.F.T. ‘The Origin of Impeachment’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 24 (1942), pp. 47-71.

—— ‘Parliament’, in W.A. Morris and J.R. Strayer (eds.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1940-50), i, pp. 81-127.

—— *Statutes and their Interpretation in the First Half of the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1922).

Poole, A.L. *Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 1087-1216,* 2nd edn (Oxford, 1955).

Poos, L.R. ‘The Social Context of Statute of Labourers Enforcement’, *The Law and History Review,* 1 (1983), pp. 27-52.

Potter, D. ‘Introduction’, in D. Potter (ed.), *France in the Later Middle Ages, 1200-1500* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 1-22.

—— ‘The King and his Government under the Valois, 1328-1498’, in D. Potter (ed.), *France in the Later Middle Ages, 1200-1500* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 155-81.

Powell, E. ‘After “After McFarlane”: The Poverty of Patronage and the Case for Constitutional History’, in D.J. Clayton, R.G. Davies, and P. McNiven (eds.), *Trade, Devotion and Governance: Papers in Late Medieval History* (Stroud, 1994), pp. 1-16.

—— *Kingship, Law, and Society: Criminal Justice in the Reign of Henry V* (Oxford, 1989).

Powell, J.E. and Wallis, K. *The House of Lords in the Middle Ages: A History of the House of Lords to 1540* (London, 1968).

Power, E. *Medieval English Nunneries, c. 1275 to 1535* (Cambridge, 1922).

Powicke, F.M. *Henry III and Lord Edward: The Community of the Realm in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford, 1947).

——*Stephen Langton* (Oxford, 1928).

—— *The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307* (Oxford, 1953).

Powicke, M. ‘Edward II and Military Obligation’, *Speculum,* 31 (1956), pp. 92-119.

—— ‘The English Aristocracy and the War’, in K. Fowler (ed.), *The Hundred Years War* (London, 1971), pp. 122-34.

—— *Military Obligation in Medieval England: A Study in Liberty and Duty* (Oxford, 1962).

Prestwich, M. *Armies and Warfare in the Middle Ages: The English Experience* (London, 1996).

—— ‘The Battle of Crécy’, in A. Ayton and P. Preston (eds.), *The Battle of Crécy, 1346* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 139-58.

—— ‘The Court of Edward II’, in G. Dodd and A. Musson (eds.), *Edward II: New Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 61-75.

—— ‘Currency and the Economy of Early Fourteenth-Century England’, in N.J. Mayhew (ed.), *Edwardian Monetary Policy* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 45-58.

—— *Edward I* (London, 1988).

—— ‘Edward I’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘England and Scotland during the Wars of Independence’, in M. Jones and M. Vale (eds.), *England and her Neighbours, 1066-1453* (London, 1989), pp. 181-97.

—— ‘The English at the Battle of Neville’s Cross’, in D. Rollason and M. Prestwich (eds.), *The Battle of Neville’s Cross, 1346* (Stamford, 1998), pp. 1-14.

—— *English Politics in the Thirteenth Century* (Basingstoke, 1990).

—— ‘Gilbert de Middleton and the Attack on the Cardinals’ in T. Reuter (ed.), *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Karl Leyser* (London, 1992), pp. 179-94.

—— ‘Medieval Biography’, *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History,* 40 (2010), pp. 325-46.

—— ‘A New Version of the Ordinances of 1311’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 57 (1984), pp. 189-202.

—— ‘The Ordinances of 1311 and the Politics of the Early Fourteenth Century’, in J. Taylor and W. Childs (eds.), *Politics and Crisis in Fourteenth Century England* (Gloucester, 1990), pp. 1-18.

—— *Plantagenet England, 1225-1360* (Oxford, 2005).

—— ‘Royal Patronage Under Edward I’, in P.R. Coss and S.D. Lloyd (ed.), *Thirteenth Century England I* (Woodbridge, 1986), pp. 41-52.

—— *A Short History of the Hundred Years War* (London, 2018).

—— ‘Thomas Hatfield at War’, in A. Bash (ed.), *Thomas Hatfield: Bishop, Soldier, and Politician* (Durham, 2012), pp. 5-20.

—— *The Three Edwards: War and State in England, 1272-1377,* 2nd edn (London, 2003).

—— *War, Politics and Finance under Edward I* (London, 1972).

—— ‘Why did Englishmen fight in the Hundred Years War?’, *Medieval History,* 2 (1992), pp. 58-65.

Prevenier, W. ‘The Low Countries, 1290-1415’, in M. Jones (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History VI, c. 1300-c. 1415* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 297-333.

Prince, A.E. ‘The Army and Navy’, in W.A. Morris and J.R. Strayer (eds.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1940-50), i, pp. 332-92.

—— ‘The Indenture System under Edward III’, in J.G. Edwards, V.H. Galbraith, and E.F. Jacob (ed.), *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait* (Manchester, 1933), pp. 283-97.

—— ‘The Payment of Army Wages in Edward III’s Reign’, *Speculum,* 19 (1944), pp. 137-60.

—— ‘The Strength of English Armies in the Reign of Edward III’, *The English Historical Review,* 46 (1931), pp. 353-71.

Putnam, B.H. ‘Minimum Wage-Laws for Priests After the Black Death, 1348-1381’, *The American Historical Review,* 21 (1915), pp. 12-32.

—— ‘The Transformation of Keepers of the Peace into the Justices of the Peace, 1327-80’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 4th series, 12 (1929), pp. 19-48.

Queller, D.E. *The Office of the Ambassador in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1967).

Raban, S. *Mortmain Legislation and the English Church, 1279-1500* (Cambridge, 1982).

Rawcliffe, C. *The Staffords: Earls of Stafford and Dukes of Buckingham, 1394-1521* (Cambridge, 1978).

Raven, M. ‘Diplomacy, Counsel and the Nobility of Fourteenth-Century England: The Diplomatic Service of Edward III’s Earls, 1337-60’, *The Journal of Medieval History,* 47, pp. 62-88.

—— ‘The Earldom Endowments of 1337: Political Thought and the Practice of Kingship in Late Medieval England’, *The English Historical Review,* 136 (2021), pp. 498-529.

—— ‘Financing the Dynamics of Recruitment: King, Earls, and Government in Edwardian England, 1330-60’ in G. Baker, C. Lambert, and D. Simpkin (ed.), *Military Communities in Late Medieval England: Essays in Honour of Andrew Ayton* (Woodbridge, 2018), pp. 105-23.

—— ‘Magnate Counsel and Parliament, c. 1340-77: The Place of the Lords in the Era of the Commons’, *Parliamentary History,* 38 (2019), pp. 309-24.

—— ‘Tout and the Higher Nobility under the Three Edwards’, in C.M. Barron and J.T. Rosenthal (eds.), *Thomas Frederick Tout (1855-1929): Refashioning History for the Twentieth Century* (London, 2019), pp. 153-68.

Rayner, D. ‘The Forms and Machinery of the “Commune Petition” in the Fourteenth Century’, *The English Historical Review,* 56 (1941), pp. 198-233.

Reid, R.R. ‘The Office of the Warden of the Marches; its Origin and Early History’, *The English Historical Review,* 32 (1917), pp. 479-96.

Reeves, A.C. ‘Cromwell, Ralph, first Baron Cromwell’, *ODNB.*

—— *Lancastrian Englishmen* (Washington DC).

Reynolds, S. ‘There were States in Medieval Europe: A Response to Rees Davies’, *The Journal of Historical Sociology,* 16 (2003), pp. 550-55.

Rex, R. *Henry VIII and the English Reformation,* 2nd edn (Basingstoke, 2006).

—— *The Lollards* (Basingstoke, 2002).

Richardson, G. ‘Eternal Peace, Occasional War: Anglo-French Relations Under Henry VIII’, in S. Doran and G. Richardson (eds.), *Tudor England and its Neighbours* (Basingstoke, 2005), pp. 44-73.

Richardson, H.G. ‘Clement V and the See of Canterbury’, *The English Historical Review,* 56 (1941), pp. 97-103.

—— ‘The Commons and Medieval Politics’, in H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles (eds.), *The English Parliament in the Middle Ages* (London, 1981), pp. 21-48 (ch. xxiv).

—— ‘The English Coronation Oath’, *Speculum,* 24 (1949), pp. 44-75.

—— ‘Richard II’s Last Parliament’, *The English Historical Review,* 52 (1937), pp. 39-47.

Richardson, H.G. and Sayles, G.O. *The Administration of Ireland, 1122-1377* (Dublin, 1963).

—— ‘Early Coronation Records’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 13 (1936), pp. 129-45.

—— ‘The Early Records of the English Parliaments: The English Parliaments of Edward I’, in their *The English Parliament in the Middle Ages* (London, 1981), pp. 129-55 (ch. v).

—— ‘The Early Records of the English Parliaments: The English Parliaments of Edward II’, in their *The English Parliament in the Middle Ages* (London, 1981), pp. 71-89 (ch. xvi).

—— ‘The Early Statutes’, in their *The English Parliament in the Middle Ages* (London, 1981), pp. 1-56 (ch. xxv).

—— *The Governance of Mediaeval England from the Conquest to Magna Carta* (Edinburgh, 1963).

—— ‘The King’s Ministers in Parliament, 1272-1307: The Parliaments of Edward I’, in their *The English Parliament in the Middle Ages* (London, 1981), pp. 529-52 (ch. vi).

—— ‘The King’s Ministers in Parliament, 1307-1327: The Parliaments of Edward II’, in their *The English Parliament in the Middle Ages* (London, 1981), pp. 194-205 (ch. xvii).

—— ‘The King’s Ministers in Parliament, 1327-1377: The Parliaments of Edward III’, in their *The English Parliament in the Middle Ages* (London, 1981), pp. 377-99 (ch. xxii).

—— ‘Parliaments and Great Councils in Medieval England’, in their *The English Parliament in the Middle Ages* (London, 1981), pp. 1-49 (ch. xxvi).

—— ‘The Parliaments of Edward III’, in their *The English Parliament in the Middle Ages* (London, 1981), pp. 66-82, 1-19 (ch. xxi).

Roberts, A.K.B. *St George’s Chapel, Windsor Castle, 1348-1416: A Study in Early Collegiate Administration* (Windsor, 1948).

Rogers, C.J. ‘The Anglo-French Peace Negotiations of 1354-60 Reconsidered’, in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 193-214.

—— ‘Edward III and the Dialectics of Strategy, 1327-1360’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4 (1994), pp. 83-102.

—— ‘The Scottish Invasion of 1346’, *Northern History,* 34 (1998), pp. 51-69.

—— *War Cruel and Sharp: English Strategy Under Edward III* (Woodbridge, 2000).

Rose, R.K. ‘Appleby, Thomas’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Bourchier, Robert, first lord Bourchier’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Kirkby, John’, *ODNB.*

Rosenthal, J.T. ‘The Bishops of Worcester in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries: Easy Come, Easy Go’, *Midland History,* 37 (2012), pp. 17-44.

—— ‘Edward III’s Bishops as His Diplomats’, in P. Crooks, D. Green, and W.M. Ormrod (eds.), *The Plantagenet Empire* (Donington, 2016), pp. 290-309.

—— ‘Even Money That Your Bishop Has Come and Gone: Episcopal Appointments and Translations in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth- Century England’, in L.E. Mitchell, K.L. French, and D.L. Biggs (eds.), *The Ties that Bind: Essays in Medieval History in Honor of Barbara Hanawalt* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 71-85.

—— ‘The Training of an Elite Group: English Bishops in the Fifteenth Century’, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society,* 60 (1970), pp. 1-54.

Roskell, J.S. *The Commons and their Speakers in English Parliaments, 1376-1523* (Manchester, 1965).

—— *The Impeachment of Michael de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, in 1386 in the Context of the Reign of Richard II* (Manchester, 1984).

—— ‘The Problem of the Attendance of the Lords in Medieval Parliaments’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 29 (1956), pp. 153-204.

Ross, C. *Edward IV* (London, 1974).

—— *Richard III* (London, 1981).

Rothwell, H. ‘The Confirmation of the Charters, 1297’, *The English Historical Review,* 60 (1945), pp. 16-35, 177-91, 300-15.

Round, J.H. ‘The Introduction of Knight Service into England’, in his *Feudal England* (London, 1895), pp. 225-316.

Rubin, M. *The Hollow Crown: A History of Britain in the Late Middle Ages* (London, 2005).

Ruddick, A. *English Identity and Political Culture in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2013).

—— ‘National Sentiment and Religious Vocabulary in Fourteenth-Century England’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 60 (2009), pp. 1-18.

Russell, A. ‘Rose Castle’, in R.S. Rait (ed.), *English Episcopal Palaces: Province of York* (London, 1911), pp. 235-306.

Russell, F.H. ‘Just War’, in R. Pasnau and C. van Dyke (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2010), ii, pp. 593-606.

—— *The Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1975).

Saul, N. ‘The Despensers and the Downfall of Edward II’, *The English Historical Review,* 99 (1984), pp. 1-33.

—— *English Church Monuments in the Middle Ages: History and Representation* (Oxford, 2009).

—— *For Honour and Fame: Chivalry in England, 1066-1500* (London, 2012).

—— ‘Introduction’, in N. Saul (ed.), *St George’s Chapel Windsor in the Fourteenth Century* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 1-12.

—— ‘The Kingship of Richard II’, in A. Goodman and J.L. Gillespie (eds.), *Richard II: The Art of Kingship* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 37-58.

—— *Richard II* (London, 1997).

Sayles, G.O. ‘The Deposition of Richard II: Three Lancastrian Narratives’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 54 (1981), pp. 257-70.

—— *The Functions of the Medieval Parliament of England* (London, 1988).

—— *The King’s Parliament of England* (London, 1975).

—— *The Medieval Foundations of England* (London, 1948).

Scammell, J. ‘The Origins and Limitations of the Liberty of Durham’, *The English Historical Review,* 81 (1966), pp. 449-73.

Scarisbrick, J.J. ‘Clerical Taxation in England, 1485 to 1547’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 11 (1960), pp. 41-54.

—— ‘Fisher, Henry VIII and the Reformation Crisis’ in B. Bradshaw and E. Duffy (eds.) *Humanism, Reform and the Reformation: The Career of Bishop John Fisher* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 155-68.

—— *Henry VIII* (London, 1968).

—— ‘The Pardon of the Clergy, 1531’, *The Cambridge Historical Journal,* 12 (1956), pp. 22-39.

—— *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford, 1984).

Scattergood, J. ‘Skelton and the Elegy’, *The Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy,* 84 (1984), pp. 333-47.

Shagan, E. *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 2003).

Sharpe, J. *Sharpe’s Peerage of the British Empire* (2 vols., London, 1833).

Shenton, C. ‘Edward III and the Coup of 1330’, in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 13-34.

Sherborne, J. *War, Politics and Culture in Fourteenth-Century England* (London, 1994).

Small, G. ‘The Crown and the Provinces in the Fifteenth Century’, in D. Potter (ed.), *France in the Later Middle Ages, 1200-1500* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 130-54.

—— ‘French Politics During the Hundred Years War’, in A. Curry (ed.), *The Hundred Years War Revisited* (Basingstoke, 2019), pp. 33-56.

Smith, D.M. *Guide to Bishops’ Registers of England and Wales: A Survey from the Middle Ages to the Abolition of Episcopacy in 1646* (London, 1981).

—— ‘Gynwell, John’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘A Reconstruction of the Lost Register of the Vicars-General of Archbishop Thoresby of York’, *Borthwick Institute Bulletin,* 3 (1983-6), pp. 29-61.

—— ‘A Reconstruction of the York “Sede Vacante” Register, 1352-3’, *Borthwick Institute Bulletin,* 1 (1975-8), pp. 75-90.

Smith, L.B. *Tudor Prelates and Politics, 1536-1558* (Princeton, 1953).

Smith, W.E.L. *Episcopal Appointments and Patronage in the Reign of Edward II: A Study in the Relations of Church and State* (Chicago, 1938).

Snape, M.G. ‘Skirlawe, Walter’, *ODNB.*

Southern, R. *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge, 1990).

Spencer, A.M. ‘The Coronation Oath in English Politics, 1272-1399’, in J. Watts and B. Thompson (eds.), *Political Society in Later Medieval England: A Festschrift for Christine Carpenter* (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 37-53.

—— ‘Dealing with Inadequate Kingship: Uncertain Responses from Magna Carta to Deposition, 1199-1327’, in A.M. Spencer and C. Watkins (eds.), *Thirteenth Century England XVI* (Woodbridge, 2017), pp. 71-88.

—— ‘The Lay Opposition to Edward I in 1297: Its Composition and Character’, in J. Burton, P. Schofield, and B. Weiler (eds.), *Thirteenth Century England XII* (Woodbridge, 2009), pp. 92-106.

—— *Nobility and Kingship in Medieval England: The Earls and Edward I, 1272-1307* (Cambridge, 2014).

—— ‘Royal Patronage and the Earls in the Reign of Edward I’, *History,* 93 (2008), pp. 20-46.

Spencer, H.L. *English Preaching in the Late Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1993).

—— ‘Sheppey, John’, *ODNB.*

Stacey, R.C. ‘Walter, Hubert’, *ODNB.*

Steel, A. *The Receipt of the Exchequer, 1377-1485* (Cambridge, 1954).

Stevenson, E.R. 'The Escheator', in W.A. Morris and J.R. Strayer (eds.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1940-50), ii, pp. 109-67.

Stirling, A.W. *The Hothams, being the Chronicles of the Hothams of Scorborough and South Dalton from their hitherto unpublished Family Papers* (2 vols., London, 1918).

Stones, E.L.G. 'The Anglo-Scottish Negotiations of 1327', *The Scottish Historical Review,* 30 (1951), pp. 49-54.

—— 'The English Mission to Edinburgh in 1328', *The Scottish Historical Review,* 28 (1949), pp. 121-32.

Storey, R.L. 'Episcopal King-Makers in the Fifteenth Century', in R.B. Dobson (ed.), *The Church, Politics, and Patronage in the Fifteenth Century* (Gloucester, 1984), pp. 82-98.

—— 'The Foundation and the Medieval College, 1379-1530', in J. Buxton and P. Williams (eds.), *New College, Oxford, 1379-1979* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 3-44.

—— 'Gentlemen Bureaucrats', in C.H. Clough (ed.), *Profession, Vocation, and Culture in Later Medieval England: Essays Dedicated to the Memory of A.R. Myers* (Liverpool, 1982), pp. 90-129.

—— *Thomas Langley and the Bishopric of Durham, 1406-1437* (London, 1961).

—— 'The University and Government, 1430-1500', in J.I. Catto and T.A.R. Evans (eds.), *The History of the University of Oxford II: Late Medieval Oxford* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 709-46.

—— 'The Wardens of the Marches of England towards Scotland, 1377-1489', *The English Historical Review,* 72 (1957), pp. 593-615.

Strakhov, E. '"But who will bell the cat?": Deschamps, Brinton, Langland, and the Hundred Years' War', *The Yearbook of Langland Studies,* 30 (2016), pp. 253-76.

Stratford, J. and Webber, T. 'Bishops and Kings: Private Book Collections in Medieval England', in E. Leedham-Green and T. Webber (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland I, to 1640* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 178-217.

Stephens, W.R.W. 'Bradwardine, Thomas', *DNB.*

Stubbs, W. *The Constitutional History of England in its Origin and Development* (3 vols., Oxford, 1874-8).

Summerson, H. 'Brinton, Thomas', *ODNB.*

—— ‘Halton, John’, *ODNB.*

—— *Medieval Carlisle: The City and the Borders from the Late Eleventh to the Mid-Sixteenth Century* (2 vols., Kendal, 1993).

—— ‘Montagu [Montacute], Simon’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Sadyngton [Sadington], Robert’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Welton, Gilbert’, *ODNB.*

Sumption, J. *Edward III* (London, 2016).

—— *The Hundred Years War I: Trial By Battle* (London, 1990).

—— *The Hundred Years War II: Trial By Fire* (London, 1999).

—— *The Hundred Years War III: Divided Houses* (London, 2009).

—— *The Hundred Years War IV: Cursed Kings* (London, 2015).

Swabey, F. *Medieval Gentlewoman: Life in a Gentry Household in the Later Middle Ages* (Stroud, 1999).

Swanson, R.N. ‘Bureaucrat, Prelate, Traitor, Martyr: Sketching Scrope’, in P.J.P. Goldberg (ed.), *Richard Scrope: Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr* (Donington, 2007), pp. 17-27.

—— *Church and Society in Late Medieval England* (Oxford, 1989).

—— ‘Courtenay, William’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Episcopal Income from Spiritualities in Later Medieval England: The Evidence for the Diocese of Coventry and Lichfield’, *Midland History,* 13 (1988), pp. 1-20.

—— ‘Islep, Simon’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Stretton, Robert’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Universities, Graduates, and Benefices in Late Medieval England’, *Past and Present,* 106 (1985), pp. 28-61.

—— ‘Wittleseye [Whittlesey], William’, *ODNB.*

Tatnall, E.C. ‘John Wyclif and *Ecclesia Anglicana*’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 20 (1969), pp. 19-43.

Taylor, C.D. 'Edward III and the Plantagenet Claim to the French Throne', in J.S. Bothwell (ed.), *The Age of Edward III* (York, 2001), pp. 155-70.

—— 'Henry V: Flower of Chivalry', in G. Dodd (ed.), *Henry V: New Interpretations* (York, 2013), pp. 217-47.

—— 'War, Propaganda and Diplomacy in Fifteenth Century France and England', in C. Allmand (ed.), *War, Government and Power in Late Medieval France* (Liverpool, 2000), pp. 70-91.

—— '"Weep Thou for Me in France": French Views of the Deposition of Richard II', in W.M. Ormrod (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England III* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 207-22.

Taylor, J. *English Historical Literature in the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1987).

—— 'The Good Parliament and its Sources', in J. Taylor and W.R. Childs (eds.), *Politics and Crisis in Fourteenth-Century England* (Gloucester, 1990), pp. 81-96.

Theilmann, J.M. 'Caught Between Political Theory and Political Practice: The Record and Process of the Deposition of Richard II', *History of Political Thought,* 25 (2004), pp. 599-619.

Thiery, D. *Polluting the Sacred: Violence, Faith, and the 'Civilizing' of Parishioners in Late Medieval England* (Leiden, 2009).

Thomas, E.C. 'Was Richard de Bury an Imposter?', *The Library,* 1 (1889), pp. 335-40.

Thompson, A.H. *The English Clergy and their Organization in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1947).

—— 'The Pestilences of the Fourteenth Century in the Diocese of York', *The Archaeological Journal,* 71 (1914), pp. 97-154.

—— The Registers of John Gynwell, Bishop of Lincoln, for the Years 1347-1350', *The Archaeological Journal,* 68 (1911), pp. 300-60.

—— 'William Bateman, Bishop of Norwich', *Norfolk Archaeology,* 25 (1933-5), pp. 102-37.

Thompson, B. 'The Academic and Active Vocations in the Medieval Church: Archbishop John Pecham', in C.M. Barron and J. Stratford (eds.), *The Church and Learning in Later Medieval Society: Essays in Honour of R.B. Dobson, Proceedings of the 1999 Harlaxton Symposium* (Donington, 2002), pp. 1-24.

—— 'The Fourteenth Century', in P. Meadows (ed.), *Ely: Bishops and Diocese, 1109-2009* (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 70-121.

‘Habendum et tenendum: Lay and Ecclesiastical Attitudes to the Property of the Church’, in C. Harper-Bill (ed.), *Religious Belief and Ecclesiastical Careers in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 1991), pp. 197-238.

—— ‘Locality and Ecclesiastical Polity: The Late Medieval Church between Duality and Integration’, in B. Thompson and J. Watts (eds.), *Political Society in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 113-45.

—— ‘Monasteries, Society and Reform in Late Medieval England’, in J. Clark (ed.), *The Religious Orders in Pre-Reformation England* (Woodbridge, 2002), pp. 165-95.

—— ‘Performing Parliament in the *Rotuli Parliamentorum*’, in M. Gragnolati and A. Suerbaum (eds.), *Aspects of the Performative in Medieval Culture* (Berlin, 2010), pp. 68-100.

—— ‘The Polemic of Reform in the Late-Medieval English Church’, in B. Thompson, A. Suerbaum, and G. Southcombe (eds.), *Polemic: Language as Violence in Medieval and Early Modern Discourse* (Aldershot, 2015), pp. 183-222.

—— ‘Prelates and the Alien Priories’, in M. Heale (ed.), *The Prelate in England and Europe, 1300-1560* (York, 2014), pp. 50-75.

—— ‘Prelates and Politics from Winchelsey to Warham’, in L. Clark and C. Carpenter (eds.), *The Fifteenth Century IV: Political Culture in Late Medieval Britain* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 69-95.

Thompson, B. and Verger, J. ‘Church and State, Clerks and Graduates’, in C. Fletcher, J.P. Genet, and J. Watts (eds.), *Government and Political Life in England and France, c. 1300-c. 1500* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 183-216.

Thomson, J.A.F. *The Later Lollards, 1414-1520* (Oxford, 1965).

—— *The Transformation of Medieval England, 1370-1529* (London, 1983).

Thornton, T. ‘Propaganda, Political Communication and the Problem of English Responses to the Introduction of Printing’, in B. Taithe and T. Thornton (eds.), *Propaganda: Political Rhetoric and Identity, 1300-2000* (Stroud, 1999), pp. 41-60.

Thrupp, S.L. *The Merchant Class of Medieval London* (Ann Arbor, 1948).

Tipping, H.A. (rev. Buck M.C.), ‘Baldock, Ralph’, *ODNB.*

Tompkins, L. ‘“Edward III’s Gold-Digging Mistress”: Alice Perrers, Gender, and Financial Power at the English Royal Court, 1360-1377’, in C. Sarti (ed.), *Women and Economic Power in Premodern Royal Courts* (Amsterdam, 2020), pp. 59-72.

—— '"Said the Mistress to the Bishop": Alice Perrers, William Wykeham and Court Networks in Fourteenth-Century England', in R. Ambühl, J. Bothwell, and L. Tompkins (eds.), *Ruling Fourteenth Century England: Essays in Honour of Christopher Given-Wilson* (Woodbridge, 2019), pp. 205-226.

T.F. Tout, 'The Captivity and Death of Edward of Carnarvon', in his *The Collected Papers of Thomas Frederick Tout, with a Memoir and Bibliography* (3 vols., Manchester, 1932-4), iii, pp. 145-90.

—— *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England* (6 vols., Manchester, 1920-33).

—— 'The English Civil Service in the Fourteenth Century', in his *The Collected Papers of Thomas Frederick Tout, with a Memoir and Bibliography* (3 vols., Manchester, 1932-4), iii, pp. 191-222.

—— 'The Household of the Chancery and its Disintegration' in his *The Collected Papers of Thomas Frederick Tout, with a Memoir and Bibliography* (3 vols., Manchester, 1932-4), ii, pp. 143-72.

—— 'John of Halton, Bishop of Carlisle', in his *The Collected Papers of Thomas Frederick Tout, with a Memoir and Bibliography* (3 vols., Manchester, 1932-4), ii, pp. 101-42.

—— 'Literature and Learning in the English Civil Service in the Fourteenth Century', *Speculum,* 4 (1929), pp. 365-89.

—— *The Place of the Reign of Edward II in English History, based upon the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in 1913* (Manchester, 1914).

—— *The Political History of England from the Accession of Henry III to the Death of Edward III, 1216-1377* (London, 1905).

Tracy, C. and Budge, A. *Britain's Medieval Episcopal Thrones: History, Archaeology, and Conservation* (Oxford, 2015).

Trevelyan, G.M. (with an introduction by Tuck, J.A.), *England in the Age of Wycliffe* (London, 1972).

Trueman, J.H. 'The Personnel of Mediaeval Reform: The English Lords Ordainers of 1310', *Mediaeval Studies,* 21 (1959), pp. 247-71.

Tuck, J.A. 'Beauchamp, Thomas, eleventh earl of Warwick', *ODNB.*

—— *Crown and Nobility, 1272-1461* (London, 1985).

—— 'Edmund [of Langley], first duke of York', *ODNB.*

—— 'Lords Appellant', *ODNB.*

—— 'Pole, Michael de la, first earl of Suffolk', *ODNB.*

—— ‘Richard II’, *ODNB.*

—— *Richard II and the English Nobility* (London, 1973).

—— ‘Richard II’s System of Patronage’, in F.R.H. Du Boulay and C.M. Barron (eds.), *The Reign of Richard II: Essays in Honour of May McKisack* (London, 1971), pp. 1-20.

—— ‘Thomas [of Woodstock], duke of Gloucester’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Vere, John de, seventh earl of Oxford’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Vere, Robert de, ninth earl of Oxford’, *ODNB.*

Tucker, P. ‘The Early History of the Court of Chancery: A Comparative Study’, *The English Historical Review,* 115 (2000), pp. 791-811.

Tyerman, C. *England and the Crusades, 1095-1588* (London, 1988).

—— ‘The Foundation and the Medieval College’, in C. Tyerman (ed.), *New College* (London, 2010), pp. 30-7.

—— ‘The Founder’, in C. Tyerman (ed.), *New College* (London, 2010), pp. 26-29.

—— ‘Philip VI and the Recovery of the Holy Land’, *The English Historical Review,* 100 (1985), pp. 25-52.

Ullmann, W. *The Origins of the Great Schism: A Study in Fourteenth-Century Ecclesiastical History* (London, 1948).

—— *The Papacy and Political Ideas in the Middle Ages* (London, 1976).

Unwin, G. ‘The Estate of Merchants, 1336-65’, in G. Unwin (ed.), *Finance and Trade under Edward III* (Manchester, 1918), pp. 179-255.

Usher, G.A. ‘The Career of a Political Bishop: Adam de Orleton (c. 1279-1345)’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 22 (1972), pp. 33-47.

Valente, C. ‘The Deposition and Abdication of Edward II’, *The English Historical Review,* 113 (1998), pp. 852-81.

—— *The Theory and Practice of Revolt in Medieval England* (Aldershot, 2003).

Verduyn, A. ‘Burghersh, Bartholomew, the elder’, *ODNB.*

Vale, B. ‘Scrope, Richard, first Baron Scrope of Bolton’, *ODNB.*

Vale, M.G.A. *The Ancient Enemy: England, France, and Europe from the Angevins to the Tudors, 1154-1558* (London, 2007).

—— 'Courts', in C. Fletcher, J.P. Genet, and J. Watts (eds.), *Government and Political Life in England and France,* c. *1300* – c. *1500* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 24-40.

—— 'England, France and the Origins of the Hundred Years War', in M. Jones and M. Vale (eds.), *England and her Neighbours, 1066-1453* (London, 1989), pp. 199-216.

—— *Henry V: The Conscience of a King* (New Haven, 2016).

—— *The Origins of the Hundred Years War: The Angevin Legacy, 1250-1340* (Oxford, 1996).

Vergier, J. 'The Universities', in M. Jones (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History VI, c. 1300-c. 1415* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 66-81.

Vincent, N. 'Aigueblanche, Peter d'', *ODNB.*

Virgoe, R. 'The Composition of the King's Council, 1437-61', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 43 (1970), pp. 134-60.

Wabuda, S. 'Latimer, Hugh', *ODNB.*

—— 'Shaxton, Nicholas', *ODNB.*

Waites, B. *Moorland and Vale-Land Farming in North-East Yorkshire: The Monastic Contribution in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (York, 1967).

Walker, S. 'Between Church and Crown: Master Richard Andrew, King's Clerk', *Speculum,* 74 (1999), pp. 956-91.

—— 'John [of Gaunt], duke of Aquitaine and duke of Lancaster, styled king of Castile and León', *ODNB.*

—— *The Lancastrian Affinity, 1361-1399* (Oxford, 1990).

—— 'Percy, Sir Henry', *ODNB.*

—— 'Profit and Loss in the Hundred Years War: The Subcontracts of Sir John Strother, 1374', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 58, pp. 100-6.

—— 'Richard II's Views on Kingship', in R.E. Archer and S. Walker (eds.), *Rulers and Ruled in Late Medieval England: Essays Presented to Gerald Harriss* (London, 1995), pp. 49-63.

—— ‘Rumour, Sedition and Popular Protest in the Reign of Henry IV’, *Past and Present,* 166 (2000), pp. 31-65.

—— ‘Sudbury, Simon’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘The Yorkshire Risings of 1405: Texts and Contexts’, in G. Dodd and D. Biggs (eds.), *Henry IV: The Establishment of the Regime, 1399-1406* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 161-84.

Walsh, K. *Richard FitzRalph in Oxford, Avignon, and Armagh: A Fourteenth-Century Scholar and Primate* (Oxford, 1981).

Warner, K. ‘The Adherents of Edmund of Woodstock, Earl of Kent, in March 1330’, *The English Historical Review,* 126 (2011), pp. 779-805.

—— *Edward II: The Unconventional King* (Stroud, 2014).

—— *Hugh Despenser the Younger and Edward II: Downfall of a King’s Favourite* (Barnsley, 2018).

Warren, W.L. *The Governance of Norman and Angevin England, 1086-1272* (London, 1987).

—— ‘A Reappraisal of Simon Sudbury, bishop of London (1361-75), and archbishop of Canterbury (1375-81)’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 10 (1959), pp. 139-52.

Watt, H. ‘Archbishops’ Registers Revealed: Church, State and Society in the Registers of the Archbishops of York, 1225-c.1650’, in G. Dodd and C. Taylor (eds.), *Monarchy, State and Political Culture in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2020), pp. 188-209.

Watts, J.L. ‘Conclusion’, in C. Fletcher, J.P. Genet, and J. Watts (eds.), *Government and Political Life in England and France, c. 1300-c. 1500* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 351-76.

—— ‘Counsel and the King’s Counsel in England, c. 1340-c. 1540’, in J. Rose (ed.), *The Politics of Counsel in England and Scotland, 1286-1707* (Oxford, 2016), pp. 64-86.

—— ‘The Counsels of Henry VI, c. 1435-1445’, *The English Historical Review,* 106 (1991), pp. 279-98.

—— *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship* (Cambridge, 1996).

—— ‘Ideas, Principles and Politics’, in A.J. Pollard (ed.), *The Wars of the Roses* (Basingstoke, 1995), pp. 110-33.

—— ‘Introduction’, in B. Thompson and J. Watts (eds.), *Political Society in Later Medieval England: A Festschrift for Christine Carpenter* (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 1-8.

—— *The Making of Polities: Europe, 1300-1500* (Cambridge, 2009).

—— '"New Men", "New Learning" and "New Monarchy": Personnel and Policy in Royal Government, 1461-1529', in B. Thompson and J. Watts (eds.), *Political Society in Later Medieval England: A Festschrift for Christine Carpenter* (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 199-228.

—— 'The Plantagenet Empire and the Continent: Retrospect and Prospect', in P. Crooks, D. Green, and W.M. Ormrod (eds.), *The Plantagenet Empire* (Donington, 2016), pp. 403-20.

—— '"The Policie in Cristen Remes": Bishop Russell's Parliamentary Sermons of 1483-4', in S. J. Gunn and G. W. Bernard (eds.), *Authority and Consent in Tudor England* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 33-60.

—— 'Pole, William de la, first duke of Suffolk', *ODNB.*

—— 'The Pressure of the Public on Later Medieval Politics', in L. Clark and C. Carpenter (eds.), *The Fifteenth Century IV: Political Culture in Late Medieval Britain* (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 159-80.

—— 'The Problem of the Personal: Tackling Corruption in Later Medieval England, 1250-1550', in R. Kroeze, A. Vitoria, and G. Geltner (eds.), *Anti-Corruption in History: From Antiquity to the Modern Era* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 91-102.

—— 'Review of *Edward III* by W. Mark Ormrod', *Annual Bulletin of Historical Literature,* 96 (2012), pp. 57-9.

Waugh, S.L. 'The Court, Politics, and Rhetoric in England, 1310-1330', in D.R. Knechtges and E. Vance (eds.), *Rhetoric and the Discourses of Power in Court Culture: China, Europe, and Japan* (Seattle, 2005), pp. 36-72.

—— 'England: Kingship and the Political Community, 1272-1377', in S.H. Rigby (ed.), *A Companion to Britain in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 208-23.

—— *England in the Reign of Edward III* (Cambridge, 1991).

Waugh, W.T. 'The Great Statute of Praemunire', *The English Historical Review,* 37 (1922), pp. 173-205.

Wenzel, S. *Latin Sermon Collections from Later Medieval England: Orthodox Preaching in the Age of Wyclif* (Cambridge, 2005).

Weske, D.B. *Convocation of the Clergy: A Study of its Antecedents and Rise, with Special Emphasis upon its Growth and Activities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (London, 1937).

Westerhof, D. *Death and the Noble Body in Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2008).

Whatley, C. ‘Temporalities Be Taken: Edward III, Unruly Ecclesiastics and the Fight for the Benefices of Exeter, 1337-60’, in J.S. Hamilton (ed.), *Fourteenth Century England VIII* (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 59-82.

Wilkinson, B. ‘The Authorisation of Chancery Writs under Edward III’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* 8 (1924), pp. 107-39.

—— ‘The Chancery’, in J.F. Willard, W.A. Morris and W.H. Dunham (eds.), *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336* (3 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1940-50), i, pp. 162-205.

—— *The Chancery under Edward III* (Manchester, 1929).

—— *The Constitutional History of England, 1216-1399* (3 vols., London, 1948-58).

—— ‘The Coronation Oath of Edward II’, in J.G. Edwards, V.H. Galbraith, and E.F. Jacob (eds.), *Essays in Honour of James Tait* (Manchester, 1933), pp. 405-16.

—— ‘The Deposition of Richard II and the Accession of Henry IV’, *The English Historical Review,* 54 (1939), pp. 215-39.

—— ‘English Politics and Politicians of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries’, *Speculum,* 30 (1955), pp. 37-48.

—— *The Later Middle Ages in England, 1216-1485* (London, 1969).

—— ‘Latimer’s Impeachment and Parliament in the Fourteenth Century’, in his *Studies in the Constitutional History of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (Manchester, 1937), pp. 82-107.

—— ‘A Letter of Edward III to his Chancellor and Treasurer’, *The English Historical Review,* 42 (1927), pp. 248-51.

—— ‘The Nature of Parliament’, in his *Studies in the Constitutional History of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (Manchester, 1937), pp. 15-54.

—— ‘The Protest of the Earls of Arundel and Surrey in the Crisis of 1341’, *The English Historical Review,* 46 (1931), pp. 177-93.

—— ‘The Sherburn Indenture and the Attack on the Despensers, 1321’, *The English Historical Review,* 63 (1948), pp. 1-28.

Wilks, M. ‘Thomas Arundel of York: The Appellant Archbishop’, in D. Wood (ed.), *Studies in Church History Subsidia 12: Life and Thought in the Northern Church, c. 1100 – c. 1700: Essays in Honour of Claire Cross* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 62-86.

Willard, J.F. ‘The Crown and its Creditors, 1327-33’, *The English Historical Review*, 42 (1927), pp. 12-19.

—— ‘Edward III’s Negotiations for a Grant in 1337’, *The English Historical Review*, 21 (1906), pp. 727-31.

—— ‘The English Church and the Lay Taxes of the Fourteenth Century’, *University of Colorado Studies*, 4 (1907), pp. 217-25.

—— *Parliamentary Taxes on Personal Property, 1290 to 1334* (Cambridge, Mass., 1934).

—— ‘The Taxes upon Movables in the Reign of Edward I’, *The English Historical Review*, 28 (1913), pp. 517-21.

—— ‘The Taxes upon Movables in the Reign of Edward II’, *The English Historical Review*, 29 (1914), pp. 317-21.

—— ‘The Taxes upon Movables in the Reign of Edward III’, *The English Historical Review*, 30 (1915), pp. 69-74.

Williams, G. ‘Gower, Henry’, *ODNB.*

—— ‘Henry de Gower: Bishop and Builder’, in his *The Welsh and their Religion: Historical Essays* (Cardiff, 1991), pp. 93-116.

—— *The Welsh Church from Conquest to Reformation* (Cardiff, 1962).

Wood, D. *Clement VI: The Pontificate and Ideas of an Avignon Pope* (Cambridge, 1989).

Wood, S. and Cole, J.C. ‘Iffley’, in M.D. Lobel (ed.), *A History of the County of Oxford V* (London, 1957), pp. 189-205.

Wood-Legh, K.L. *Studies in Church Life in England under Edward III* (Cambridge, 1934).

Workman, H.E. *John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church* (2 vols., Oxford, 1926).

Wright, D.P. ‘Langton, Thomas’, *ODNB.*

Wright, J.R. *The Church and the English Crown, 1305-1334: A Study Based on the Register of Archbishop Walter Reynolds* (Toronto, 1980).

—— ‘Reynolds, Walter’, *ODNB.*

Wright, N. *Knights and Peasants: The Hundred Years War in the French Countryside* (Woodbridge, 1998).

Zutshi, P.N.R. 'The Avignon Papacy', in M. Jones (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History VI, c. 1300-c. 1415* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 651-73.

Unpublished Theses

Barker, N.A. 'If the king had asked for an ass, he would have received his wish, this time': A Study of the Career of Thomas de Hatfield, bishop of Durham (1345-1381), as a Royal Servant, 1336-1357' (unpublished University of Durham MA thesis, 2003).

Basile, T. 'Templars, Crusades, and Consideration: A Study of Bernard of Clairvaux's Allegory of the Two Swords' (unpublished McMaster University MA thesis, 2009).

Bradford, P.J. 'Parliament and Political Culture in Early Fourteenth Century England' (unpublished University of York PhD thesis, 2007).

Bennett, N.H. 'The Beneficed Clergy in the Diocese of Lincoln during the Episcopate of Henry Burghersh, 1320-1340' (2 vols., unpublished University of York PhD thesis, 1989).

Blackley, F.D. 'The English Episcopate in the Reign of Edward III' (unpublished University of Toronto PhD thesis, 1952)

Blust, M.S. 'The English Clerical Diplomats, 1327-1461' (unpublished Loyola University Chicago PhD thesis, 1976).

Candy, C.A. 'The Scottish Wars of Edward III, 1327-1338' (unpublished University of Durham PhD thesis, 2004)

Caravaggi, L. 'Keeping the Peace in a Late-Medieval Polity: Conflict and Collaboration in Bologna in the Age of Dante' (unpublished University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 2020).

Cuttino, G.P. 'The Conduct of English Diplomacy in the Fourteenth Century' (unpublished University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 1938).

Davies, R.G. 'The Episcopate in England and Wales, 1375-1443' (unpublished University of Manchester PhD thesis, 3 vols., 1974).

De Mezerac-Zanetti, A. 'Liturgical Developments in England under Henri VIII (1534-1547)' (unpublished University of Durham PhD thesis, 2011).

Depold, J.R. 'The Martial Christ in the Sermons of Late Medieval England' (unpublished University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 2015).

Dodd, G. ‘Crown, Magnates and Gentry: The English Parliament, 1369-1421’ (unpublished University of York PhD thesis, 1998).

Doherty, P. ‘Isabella, Queen of England, 1296-1330’ (unpublished University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 1977).

Dryburgh, P. ‘The Career of Roger Mortimer, First Earl of March (c. 1287-1330)’ (unpublished University of Bristol PhD thesis, 2002).

Edwards, K. ‘The Personnel and Political Activities of the English Episcopate During the Reign of Edward II’ (unpublished University of London MA thesis, 1937).

Etty, C. ‘Tudor Revolution? Royal Control of the Anglo-Scottish Border, 1483-1530’ (unpublished University of Durham PhD thesis, 2005).

Foss, D.B. ‘The Canterbury Archiepiscopates of John Stafford (1443-52) and John Kemp (1452-4) with Editions of their Registers’ (2 vols., unpublished University of London PhD thesis, 1986).

George, J.M. ‘The English Episcopate and the Crown, 1437-50’ (unpublished University of Columbia PhD thesis, 1976).

Gerrard, D.M.G. ‘The Military Activities of Bishops, Abbots, and Other Clergy in England, c. 900 – 1200’ (unpublished University of Glasgow PhD thesis, 2011).

Given-Wilson, C.J. ‘The Court and Household of Edward III, 1360-1377’ (unpublished University of St Andrews PhD thesis, 1976).

Gosling, D.F. ‘Church, State, and Reformation: the Use and Interpretation of *Praemunire* from its Creation to the English Break with Rome’ (unpublished University of Leeds PhD thesis, 2016).

Green, D. ‘The Household and Military Retinue of Edward the Black Prince’ (unpublished University of Nottingham PhD thesis, 2 vols., 1998).

Haines, R.M. ‘Bishop Bransford’ (unpublished University of Durham MLitt thesis, 1954).

Henriques, U.R.Q. ‘Grievances of the English Clergy in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries, with Special Reference to the Gravamina of 1309’ (unpublished University of Oxford BLitt thesis, 1940).

Highfield, J.R.L. ‘Relations between the Church and the English Crown from the Death of Archbishop Stratford to the Opening of the Great Schism, 1349-78’ (unpublished University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 2 vols, 1951).

Hughes, J.B. ‘The Episcopate of Walter Langton, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, with a Calendar of his Register’ (unpublished University of Nottingham MPhil thesis, 1992).

Kaner, R.A. ‘The Management of the Mobilization of English Armies: Edward I to Edward III’ (unpublished University of York PhD thesis, 1999).

Marritt, S.P. ‘The Bishops of King Stephen’s Reign’ (unpublished University of Glasgow PhD thesis, 2002).

Martin, S.S. ‘Richard d’Aungerville de Bury, 1287-1345’ (unpublished Emory University PhD thesis, 1986).

Masek, R. ‘The English Episcopate in the Reign of Henry VII’ (unpublished University of Illinois PhD thesis, 1965).

Mifsud, G. ‘John Sheppey, Bishop of Rochester, as a Preacher and Collector of Sermons’ (unpublished University of Oxford BLitt thesis, 1953).

Mollere, N.Y. ‘Crown and Mitre, 1461-1483: The Episcopate during the Reign of Edward IV’ (unpublished Tulane University PhD thesis, 1993).

Ormrod, W.M. ‘Edward III’s Government of England, c. 1346-1356’ (unpublished University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 1984).

Palmer, J.H.S. ‘Politics, Corporation and Commonwealth: The Early Reformation in Canterbury, c. 1450-1559’ (unpublished University of Kent PhD thesis, 2016).

Parker, J.M. ‘Patronage and Service: The Careers of William Montagu, earl of Salisbury, William Clinton, earl of Huntingdon, Robert Ufford, earl of Suffolk, and William Bohun, earl of Northampton’ (unpublished University of Durham MA thesis, 1985).

Phillips, M. ‘Church, Crown and Complaint: Petitions from Bishops to the English Crown in the Fourteenth Century’ (unpublished University of Nottingham PhD thesis, 2013).

Piroyansky, D. ‘Cults of Political Martyrs in Late Medieval England’ (unpublished University of London PhD thesis, 2005).

Raven, M. ‘The Earls of Edward III, 1330-1360: Comital Power in Mid-Fourteenth Century England’ (University of Hull PhD thesis, 2018).

Roger, E.C. ‘St George’s College, Windsor Castle, in the Late-Fifteenth and Early-Sixteenth Centuries’ (unpublished University of London PhD thesis, 2015).

Rose, R.K. ‘The Bishops and Diocese of Carlisle: Church and Society on the Anglo-Scottish Border, 1292-1395’ (unpublished University of Edinburgh PhD thesis, 1983).

Schwyzer, H.B. ‘Arms and the Bishop: The Anglo-Scottish War and the Northern Episcopate, 1296-1357’ (unpublished University of California PhD thesis, 1999).

Shenton, C. ‘The English Court and the Restoration of Royal Prestige, 1327-1345’ (unpublished University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 1995).

Shipp, A. ‘William of Wykeham and the Founding of Winchester College’ (unpublished University of Exeter PhD thesis, 2008).

Steele, M.W. ‘A Study of the Books Owned or Used by John Grandisson, Bishop of Exeter (1327-1369)’ (unpublished University of Oxford PhD thesis, 1994).

Tingle, L. ‘Royal Women, Intercession, and Patronage in England’ (unpublished University of Cardiff PhD thesis, 2019).

Vale, B. ‘The Scropes of Bolton and of Masham, c. 1300 – c. 1450: A Study of a Northern Noble Family with a Calendar of the Scrope of Bolton Family Cartulary’ (unpublished University of York DPhil thesis, 2 vols., 1987).

Weber, C.M. ‘The English Bishops, 1399-1413: Their Political Role in the Reign of Henry IV’ (unpublished University of Toronto PhD thesis, 1962).

Whatley, C. ‘Gilded not Golden: Clerical Resistance and Royal Authority in the Age of Edward III’ (unpublished University of Houston MA thesis, 2014).

Websites

https://www.dhi.ac.uk/taxatio/forms?form=episcopal (The *Taxatio* database produced by Jeffrey Denton *et al.*, accessed 5 September 2022).

https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency-converter/# (The ‘Currency Converter’ produced by The National Archives, accessed 20 January 2022).