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ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of relationships between king Henry III of England and those men, who during 1226-1272 became bishops/archbishops, or who merely emerged as episcopal/archiepiscopal candidates. The work deals with nearly seventy nominees and follows the chronological order of episcopal elections, or attempted promotions in the period. Generally, no effort has been made to highlight the contacts that may have existed between the king and a particular aspirant, after his acceptance or rejection by the principal authorities.

The historiographical chapter of the thesis argues that the negative assessment given by most English writers on the reign of Henry III has been intimately connected not only to a modern nationalistic bias, but also to the growing nationalistic prejudice of the thirteenth century monastic chroniclers.

In line with the general position of the crown - which, on the whole, affected the type of men that would be advanced to diocesan duties - the period of 1226-72 was marked by various phases. While in the years of 1226-35 Henry's attempts to influence the composition of the episcopate remained moderate, the situation was quite the opposite in 1236-58. The change was partly effected by the king's establishment of stronger Continental ties following his marriage in 1236. The conservative years, hallmarked by the advancement of a relatively large number of courtiers to the episcopacy, came to an end with the beginning of the baronial reform movement in 1258. For the next seven years Henry was essentially powerless to influence episcopal promotions. Royal consolidation after 1265 implied that in the remaining years of Henry's reign only men of tested loyalty would gain episcopal or archiepiscopal rank.

The thesis concludes that Henry III's ecclesiastical policy in respect of episcopal candidates served foreign policy objectives, and that, in the context of the age, such an approach was a realistic one. In an attempt to rebuild the Continental empire,
following the loss of territories by king John, Henry III came to rely on his Savoyard and Poitevin relatives as allies, on a broader European diplomatic and political stage. That Henry III failed in his final objective was essentially the outcome of deep-seated socio-political trends ultimately favouring the emergence of national monarchies. Nevertheless, the king's ecclesiastical policy - since it successfully upheld the tradition of courtier-bishops - left an important and positive legacy for the future Edward I and to the English monarchy on the whole.
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PREFACE

This work is a study of relationships between king Henry III of England and those men, who during 1226-1272 became bishops/archbishops, or who merely emerged as episcopal/archiepiscopal candidates.

The thesis deals with nearly seventy nominees and follows the chronological order of episcopal elections, or attempted promotions in the period. Generally, no effort has been made to highlight the contacts that may have existed between the king and a particular aspirant after his acceptance or rejection by the principal authorities.

Henry III's attitude towards the candidates was largely determined by his earlier links with them, and it formed a vital component of royal ecclesiastical policy that has never before been studied as a coherent whole, and has thus been given its first full, modern treatment.

The historiographical chapter of the thesis argues that the negative assessment given by most English writers on the reign of Henry III has been intimately connected not only to a modern nationalistic bias, but also to the growing nationalistic prejudice of the thirteenth century monastic chroniclers. From a broader, 'transnational' perspective, however, Henry III's reign can be reassessed in a more balanced way.

The king's ecclesiastical policy in respect of episcopal candidates had followed a strict logic; it had served foreign policy objectives, and in the context of the age, such an approach was a realistic one. In an attempt to rebuild the Continental empire, following the loss of territories by king John, Henry III came to rely on his Savoyard and Poitevin relatives as allies, on a broader European diplomatic and political stage. Yet the royal efforts to appoint 'foreign' men to the English episcopacy, were, on the whole, quite moderate. The king's attitude towards the candidates was also shaped by the fact that each bishopric had its own relative 'value' in terms of financial resources, strategic or geographical position, size, etc.
That Henry III failed in his final objective was essentially the outcome of deep-seated socio-political trends ultimately favouring the emergence of national monarchies. Seen in this light, one of the most important legacies of Henry III's ecclesiastical policy for the future Edward I was that despite the various political troubles of the era, the tradition of courtier-bishops - whose general support of the crown was necessary, if England was to remain a viable European power - became more entrenched with time.

In line with the general position of the crown - which, on the whole, affected the type of men that would be advanced to diocesan duties - the period of 1226-72 was marked by four distinct phases. While in the years of 1226-35, Henry's attempts to influence the composition of the episcopate remained very moderate, reflecting yet the uncertainties of the times after the long minority, the situation was quite the opposite in 1236-58. The change was partly brought about by the appearance of the king's general confidence, a factor which itself was connected to Henry's marriage in 1236 and a much stronger establishment of Continental ties. Not surprisingly, in the period of 1236-45 the king made, perhaps, his most strenuous efforts - which are treated in a separate chapter - to shape the episcopal body according to the crown's interests.

The conservative years, hallmarked by the advancement of a relatively large number of courtiers to the episcopacy, came to an end with the beginning of the baronial reform movement in 1258. For the next seven years Henry was effectively powerless to have his say in episcopal promotions. But naturally, royal consolidation after the battle of Evesham implied that in the remaining years of Henry's reign only men of tested loyalty, i.e. mostly courtiers, would gain episcopal or archiepiscopal rank.

Attempt has also been made in the work to pinpoint those non-political factors that appear to have played a role in the elevation or rejection of a particular nominee.

The study principally rests upon the court records of Henry III, and it is assumed that the king had an overall familiarity with those matters and names that are contained in these sources. For the exact date of various events, the thesis mostly relies
on the third, 1986 edition of the Handbook of British Chronology, even when it might not be specifically indicated by a footnote.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Annales Monastici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>Annales de Burton, <em>AM</em>, vol. I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Rolls</td>
<td>Calendar of Charter Rolls, Henry III - Edward I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Rolls</td>
<td>Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLR</td>
<td>Calendar of Liberate Rolls, Henry III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Calendar of Patent Rolls, Henry III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRR</td>
<td>Curia Regis Rolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunstable</td>
<td>Annales de Dunstaplia, <em>AM</em>, vol. III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giles, Matthew Paris</td>
<td>Matthew Paris’ English History, ed., J.A. Giles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles, Roger of Wendover</td>
<td>Roger of Wendover’s Flowers of History, ed., J.A. Giles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook of British Chronology</td>
<td>E.B. Fryde and others, ed., Handbook of British Chronology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist. Ang.</td>
<td>Matthaei Parisiensis, Historia Anglorum, ed., F. Madden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osney</td>
<td>Annales de Oseneia et Chronicon Thomae Wykes, AM, vol. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>Public Record Office, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewkesbury</td>
<td>Annales de Theokesberia, AM, vol. I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>Annales de Waverleia, AM, vol. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>Annales de Wintonia, AM, vol. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>Annales de Wigornia, AM, vol. IV.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

KING HENRY III OF ENGLAND IN MODERN HISTORIOGRAPHY
More than seven hundred years separate us from the reign of king Henry III of England, yet ironically it is only in the last few decades that he has been treated with discernible sympathy by historians. In Dante’s *Divina Commedia* Henry was portrayed as a simpleton, an opinion that echoed the judgements of two of the most illustrious English chroniclers of the thirteenth century, Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris.¹

These two St Albans monks had, in fact, more justification to regard the king in such terms than the great Florentine poet, who was a contemporary of Edward I and his son, rather than of Henry III.²

Richard Vaughan, a leading authority on Matthew Paris, deems the chronicler’s picture of Henry III "on the whole ... a vicious, spiteful caricature", that was the result of Matthew’s various prejudices.³ Indeed, for the chronicler, Henry’s character fared only slightly better than that of John who had personified the worst of the vices.⁴ For Matthew Paris, Henry’s [supposed] avarice and greed became an almost constant theme. The king appeared as a "dropsical thirster after gold ... [who] cheated Christians as well as Jews out of their money, food, and jewels, with such greediness that it seemed as if a new Crassus was arisen from the dead"⁵ Henry was a "vigilant and indefatigable searcher after money" and the lynx of Merlin’s prophecy, which penetrated "everything, since there was not a purse in England that it did not penetrate and shake out the contents".⁶ The chronicler also regarded the king perfidious for infringing John’s

---


4. Ibid., 146.


6. Ibid., 293; vol. III, 84.
charter of the church's liberties, Magna Carta and his coronation oath. Yet Henry was also seen as politically weak, one who with a "downcast look" informed the bishop of Rochester in 1256 - in response to an injury supposedly inflicted on the bishopric by the archbishop of Canterbury - that he was powerless to reprimand the archbishop as he could not "cause offence or grief to his family, especially the queen".

Matthew Paris saw the history of the age essentially in terms of conflict between king and magnates and between the English church and the papacy. He was, on the whole, inimical to the English crown as well as to Rome, although his resentment of authority did not have a firm theoretical or ideological ground, but was merely based on a general conception that any authority would be inherently antagonistic to the rights and liberties of the wider community in England. Not surprisingly, hardly any aspect of Henry's governance received other than openly hostile treatment from the chronicler of St Albans. Henry is severely denounced, for example, for oppressing the English church by interfering in episcopal and abbatial elections, abusing royal rights over vacant bishoprics and abbeys, and for permitting [excessive] papal taxation in the realm. As Matthew Paris put it: it was Henry's custom to plunder vacant bishoprics with "rapacious hands".

---


8. Ibid., 163; According to Vaughan, *Matthew Paris*, 146, the chronicler also denounced Henry for his tyrannical nature, favouritism, and his enjoyment of flattery. That some of these characteristics would be incompatible, i.e. political weak-mindedness and tyrannical traits, probably did not occur to Matthew Paris. To these negative qualities of the king, Matthew further added the charge of duplicity, Gransden, *Historical Writing*, 369; Giles, *Matthew Paris*, vol. II, 490.


Matthew took a particularly strong stand against the influence of Henry's foreign relatives, the Savoyards and the Poitevins, in English affairs, and against favours being bestowed on them. The king "lost the affection of his natural subjects ... [since] he enticed all the foreigners he could to his side, enriched them, and, despising and despoiling his English subjects, intruded aliens into their place". Under 1252 Matthew wrote:

"through the many-shaped cunning of Satan, the people of England in general, - barons, knights, citizens, merchants, and labourers, and especially religious men, were labouring under a most pestilential infliction; for the higher ranks of the foreigners imposed on the lower classes so many laborious services, and harassed them by so many robberies and injuries, that of all nations existing, England appeared to be in the lowest condition".

Although, Matthew may not have been English by blood, he had clearly exhibited English nationalistic sentiments, not only by denouncing the king’s Savoyard and Poitevin relatives, but by inveighing against other nationalities, e.g. the Welsh, the Greeks and the Flemings.

For the chronicle, solution for the ills of the age lay at limiting royal and papal power in England. Henry III was to be impelled - by the baronage, representing the community of the realm - to observe the existing charters of liberties and privileges, in particular, the coronation oath and Magna Carta, as well as traditional customs. Similarly, papal trespasses in England were to be checked by respecting customs and established privileges.

Despite the fact that Matthew Paris' remedies had a 'constitutional' flavour

15. Ibid., 510.
18. Ibid., 371.
about them, it would be anachronistic to apply such terms to him, for his world-view was largely shaped by his monastic status. In the struggle between vested interests and the ever increasing power of the monarchy and papacy his stand was firmly supportive of the former, yet the role that he had ascribed to the ‘community’ was merely to limit the crown’s authority, but not to supplant it. The chronicler believed in a static, hierarchical society, where what was ultimately needed was a strict adherence to the status quo.

Nineteenth and early twentieth century historiography, on the whole, skilfully elaborated the paradigm of thirteenth century monastic writers both in respect of Henry III’s negative character and in the interpretation of the political history of the decades that followed the issuing of Magna Carta. With the works of William Stubbs, published in the 1870’s, the ‘nationalistic’ and ‘constitutional’ exposition of thirteenth century history was at its peak, reflecting a quintessential Victorian explication of the chronicles, which the author knew with unprecedented intimacy. In the writings of Roger of Wendover, Thomas of Eccleston and Matthew Paris the nascent national feeling of the thirteenth century, which now for the first time would encompass lay magnates in England, was already evident. And as for the ‘constitutional’ stand, most of Stubbs’ assumptions had been implicitly present in the work of such an early nineteenth century

19. Ibid., 371; Vaughan, Matthew Paris, 141.
22. Ibid., 368, 490; As Clanchy, England and its Rulers, 241-43 makes it clear English national identity was not in itself a novel phenomenon in the thirteenth century: it had survived the Norman conquest and was maintained in the Benedictine monasteries as well as by the language spoken by the serfs. Similarly, the ‘anti-foreign’ attitude of the monastic chroniclers had its precedent in the twelfth century already. The re-alignment of the magnates would have, however, crucial wider social consequences.
historian as Henry Hallam, and later in that century, in the writings of J. R. Green. Nevertheless, Stubb's merit was that he had presented a coherent picture with much greater mastery of source material than anyone before him. Without lessening the achievements of the generation of historians that followed him, it is fair to say that the 'Stubbsian model', although in itself not radically original, had endured for some seventy years and dominated in one way or another historical thought on the thirteenth century.

For Stubbs, the reign of Henry III, and in fact the whole period between 1215 and 1295, was characterised by a "national" struggle for the realisation of the rights and liberties of Magna Carta against the monarchy. This contest was incessant with alternating results for the two parties: during the personal rule of Henry III [1234-58], for example, "evil influences" revived. The king had lacked "all elements of greatness" - in contrast, Henry's adversary, Simon de Montfort, was a great "opponent of tyranny". And like his father, Henry III was devoid of sense of truth, or justice; John's successor had inherited both personal enemies and improper notions in respect of the nature of English royalty. Stubbs maintained that everything 'great' that had come about in England in 1216-72 was a result of opposition to Henry, rather than of

23. H. Hallam, View of the State of Europe During the Middle Ages (London, John Murray, 1846, first published, 1818), vol. II, 108-115; J. R. Green, A Short History of the English People (London, Mcmillan, 1891, first published, 1874), 128, 144-46, 152-54. Nationalism was much more evident in the work of J. R. Green than in that of Hallam, and this should be perhaps seen in the context of the British imperial achievement of the nineteenth century.


26. Ibid., 4.

27. Ibid., 102-03.

28. Ibid., 103.
cooperation. The author interpreted history primarily in terms of constitutional development and thus Magna Carta represented a watershed in English medieval history.

"The Great Charter is ... the act of the united nation ... it is the first effort of a corporate life that has reached full consciousness ...".

John's death had saved the kingdom for his son and during the minority of Henry III, the regent and the justiciar, Hubert de Burgh, worked for the benefit of the English nation. More importantly, with the coming of age of Henry

"... the Poitevin favourites the feudal aspirants, the papal negotiators, the unconstitutional advisers, rise ... and, alternately or in concert, urge the weak, unsteady king forward in a course ... of opposition to the wishes of his people".

The slowly accumulating indignation of the nation thus culminated in the conflict of 1258-65. During the years of upheavals the aristocratic oligarchy, supported by popular sympathies, had virtually supplanted the authority of the crown. And although it was Henry who eventually prevailed over this oligarchy, constitutional reforms advanced by the barons were assured; the nation's desire thus had been appeased and England rose to an unprecedented growth during the reign of Edward I.

Two of the earliest, influential historians to look beyond the 'Stubbsian model' of the thirteenth century were F.W. Maitland and T.F. Tout. Although Maitland's

---

29. W. Stubbs, The Early Plantagenets (London, Longmans and Green, 1877, first published, 1874), 154. This sweeping charge was implicitly maintained in the Constitutional History.


32. Ibid., vol. II, 3, 4, 12-46.

33. Ibid., 4.

34. Ibid., 4.

35. Ibid., 4.

36. Ibid., 4-5.
Constitutional History - written as lectures as early as 1887, but not published until 1908 - was not based on original research, it was, in a sense, a work free of undue biases.\textsuperscript{37} By hinting that financial difficulties of Henry were to some extent responsible for the baronial struggles of the reign, the author added a novel dimension to the underlying causes for the discord in that period.\textsuperscript{38} Ultimately, however, it was the king's "faithless" and "shiftless" personal policy, coupled with his "extravagance" that had brought about the war.\textsuperscript{39} In line with the assumptions of 'constitutional historiography' of the nineteenth century, Maitland claimed that the essence of thirteenth century English history was the struggle for parliament.\textsuperscript{40} There had occurred a development in the very nature of the national assembly in the period: from the "feudal assembly of the barons" there evolved an "assembly of the three estates of the realm" in England.\textsuperscript{41}

While Maitland focussed his work on an analysis of various thirteenth century developments, e.g. of law and of the Concilium Regis, his contemporary, T.F. Tout, was one of the first of British historians to turn his attention to the archives.\textsuperscript{42} For Tout, mildness, kindness, the horror of violence and other attractive qualities made Henry III the first king since the Conqueror whose private life could not be condemned by thirteenth-century contemporaries.\textsuperscript{43} However, Henry failed in precisely those attributes which were vital for kingship: the king lacked stability of purpose and was

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{37} H.A.L. Fisher, preface to F.W. Maitland, \textit{The Constitutional History of England} (Cambridge U.P., 1908), VI.
\item \textsuperscript{38} \textit{Ibid.}, 70.
\item \textsuperscript{39} \textit{Ibid.}, 17, 102.
\item \textsuperscript{40} \textit{Ibid.}, 16.
\item \textsuperscript{41} \textit{Ibid.}, 16, 69-70.
\item \textsuperscript{42} \textit{Ibid.}, 91; F.W. Maitland and F. Pollock, \textit{The History of English Law} (Cambridge U.P., 1978, first published, 1895), 174; The point about Tout's pioneering method is made by Stacey, \textit{Politics}, VII.
\item \textsuperscript{43} T.F. Tout, \textit{The History of England, 1216-1377} (London, Longmans and Green, 1905), 52.
\end{itemize}
easily influenced; he was, moreover, "restless" and "timid", "jealous" and "self-assertive".\(^{44}\) Henry's twenty-five years of personal government, inaugurated by the fall of the current favourite, Peter des Roches, generated opposition in all classes, as well as in the church.\(^{45}\) Tout implicitly assumed that Magna Carta was essentially a feudal document, for in the early thirteenth century patriotism and the passion for liberty had been merely emerging forces; in contrast, the Provisions of Oxford in 1258 signified the end of the "feudal period" and the coming of the "national idea", since the great lords were no longer content to rule their own estates in isolation.\(^{46}\) The author significantly departed from the 'Stubbsian model' by claiming that those foreigners who came to England during the thirteenth century were not necessarily 'evil', and by characterising Simon de Montfort in moderate terms.\(^{47}\)

Notwithstanding the amount of material that had been produced on Henry III in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, the first penetrating study appeared only in 1932. Although R.F. Treharne's work on the years of baronial upheavals cast Henry in a very negative, and arguably much biased light, it gave what is still the fullest account.\(^{48}\) For Treharne, the conflict of 1258 arose not primarily because of discontent over "Angevin centralisation", but as a result of the king's directing the "centralised system of government" in an unacceptable way.\(^{49}\) Thus there existed a marked contrast between the crown's execution of domestic and foreign policies. While the former was characterised by "negative and defensive manoeuvring", Henry also attempted to achieve

\(^{44}\) Ibid., 53.
\(^{45}\) Ibid., 52.
\(^{46}\) Ibid., 5, 100-1.
\(^{47}\) Ibid., 54-55, 81-82, 123.
\(^{49}\) Ibid., 46-47.
too many costly objectives in foreign affairs.\textsuperscript{50} And interestingly, although the king showed himself "silly beyond redemption" in the Sicilian business [an attempt to obtain the crown of Sicily for his second son, Edmund], he exhibited remarkable consistency in his ecclesiastical policy directed towards the subordination of the clergy.\textsuperscript{51}

Another work which is still of considerable importance decades after its first publication is F.M. Powicke's magisterial study on Henry III.\textsuperscript{52} Powicke openly acknowledged the influence of Stubbs and Maitland on his own historical thinking, but in balance he probably owed more to the latter.\textsuperscript{53} He attempted to approach his task "the best way, in which Maitland always approached it, from the heart of the subject, by what people thought and said and felt, and without pre-conceptions".\textsuperscript{54} Powicke sought to write "social history, not in a sense in which the term is generally used, but in the sense of social life, relations, and forces in political action".\textsuperscript{55} In the final analysis, for Powicke political and social history were "two aspects of one process".\textsuperscript{56}

And the end result, nevertheless, was that the author's work was permeated with what one modern historian, R.C. Stacey, termed "an air of vaguely Victorian constitutionalism".\textsuperscript{57} Although Powicke's underlying assumptions are generally not easily discernible, he arguably viewed the baronial conflict within such parameters. The "settlement made by the Provisions [of Oxford] was a written constitution ... it was an agreement, not an expression of sovereign power; its validity was upheld or denied by

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 49.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 51, 56.
\item \textsuperscript{52} F.M. Powicke, \textit{King Henry III and the Lord Edward} (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1947), vol. I-II.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Ibid., V.
\item \textsuperscript{54} Ibid., V-VI.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Ibid., V.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Ibid., V.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Stacey, \textit{Politics}, VII.
\end{itemize}
reference to the moral principles which either side believed to be implied in its relations with the other".58

Powicke departed, however, from the 'nationalistic' interpretation of the history of the thirteenth century in quite a significant way: he gave an extremely negative assessment of Hubert de Burgh [who, according to Stubbs, had been a benefactor of the English nation], and in contrast to Stubbs' opinion viewed the two Poitevins at court, Peter des Roches and des Riveaux, in an essentially positive light.59 More importantly, Powicke did not see the years of baronial upheavals as being initiated by national feelings; rather the friction was originally effected by the Sicilian business coupled with the magnates' desire to reform the royal administration.60 And the author did not see England's relationship with France during the reign of Henry III as being influenced by a national sentiment.61 In balance, Powicke's assessment of the reign of the king was positive [in contrast to that of Stubbs]: although Henry was an "amateur statesman", but interestingly, a "querulous realist", who was continually overshadowed by Louis of France, England was "more united, more prosperous, more richly endowed, more beautiful in 1272 than it was in 1216".62

Although Powicke's work effectively closed modern study on Henry III as a whole for several decades, there emerged, nevertheless, a number of writers who dealt with the period on a less extensive scale. B. Wilkinson, whose primary interest lay at constitutional and political history of England in the high and later Middle Ages,

58. Powicke, Henry III, 422-23; see also Ibid., 418. It is of note, however, that for Powicke, the crisis of 1233-34 [leading to the dismissal of Poitevins at court] was more important than the assertion of baronial will in 1258-65, Ibid., 143.

59. Ibid., 70, 75-77, 84-85.

60. Ibid., 376-77, 384; See also M. Prestwich, English Politics in the Thirteenth Century (London, Macmillan, 1990), 79-80; Prestwich argues that Powicke wished to see "the thirteenth century as an era of internationalism to match the post-war idealism of the period when he wrote", Ibid., 79. Much of Powicke's work would have been written, however, during the war years.


62. Ibid., 156, 588.
pointed out that Henry III’s reign should be assessed in the context of wider thirteenth century socio-political developments, which would have tested the greatest of English kings.63 Henry’s political problems were not "all of his own making; many were the outcome of forces which neither he nor his subjects understood".64 For Wilkinson the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were characterised by a rapid development of the "institutions of government, the first beginnings of nationalism, the growth of wealth, the changing conditions of warfare and the decline of the relative force of the ideal of the Catholic church".65 Seen in this light, the king was not an enemy of his subjects’ liberties, nevertheless, his elevated concept of monarchy was ultimately antagonistic to those.66 This was the essence of the conflict between Henry and the wider community; the age was not yet able, however, to put a permanent constraint on royal power.67

Another historian who operated within what can be broadly termed the 'development thesis of the thirteenth century', was G.W.S. Barrow. Like Wilkinson [and to a lesser extent Maitland] Barrow implicitly assumed that explanations to various problems in the period could be primarily found not in personalities, but rather in the context of socio-political [and economic] evolution. According to Barrow, the thirteenth century had witnessed in England a transition from a "primitive feudal state to a political society", which made re-evaluation of the relationship between crown and community necessary.68 And both Henry and the barons had experienced difficulty in adjustment to the "revolution in government"

66. Ibid., 17; Wilkinson, Later Middle Ages, 53.
68. G.W.S. Barrow, Feudal Britain (London, Edward Arnold, 1979, first published, 1956), 263.
beginning in the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{69} Considering this background, it was no coincidence, that Barrow, like Wilkinson, characterised the king in moderate terms.\textsuperscript{70}

By emphasising the broader developments of the thirteenth century, as opposed to personal qualities of individuals, Henry naturally appeared in a more positive light and, arguably, on purely theoretical grounds too, the acceptance of such a historiographical model was quite justified. The 'nationalistic' interpretation invariably portrayed the king in a negative way, not only because the historians of the nineteenth century accepted at face value, and indeed affirmed the sentiments of thirteenth century chroniclers, but because, as Clanchy pointed out, they identified "English national character ... with baronial liberty and parliament which Henry had [supposedly] opposed".\textsuperscript{71} The attitude of nineteenth and early twentieth century writers was in retrospect understandable, for they implicitly reflected the "growth of competitive feeling among the European nations [at the time] ... [and] instead of examining the similarities between medieval rulers, historians of each nation picked out individual traits in their own kings which they thought revealed incipient national character".\textsuperscript{72} In the final analysis, granted that the development of national identity, which ultimately led to the creation of a 'nation state' had been given a decisive impetus in England during the thirteenth century, it is clear that Henry was not able to assemble the 'nationalistic' forces in the service of the monarchy, and hence he became a victim and anti-hero of both thirteenth century and modern 'nationalistic' writers.\textsuperscript{73}

From the wider, i.e. 'transnational' perspective, however, Henry's reign, on the

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., 256, 263.


\textsuperscript{71} Clanchy, \textit{England and its Rulers}, 230.

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., 214.

\textsuperscript{73} The development of English national identity on the part of the baronage would have been given a sense of inevitability in the second half of the 1240's by which time the magnates were obliged to choose between their lands in England and France and surrender one or another, Powicke, \textit{Henry III}, 170.
whole, is much better understood. Arguably, the king, and indeed other thirteenth century rulers as well, had conceived domestic and European politics primarily in such terms, and these ran against the emerging 'nationalistic' interests. For one modern writer, E.L. Cox, the essence of Henry's endeavours, and in a way of the whole reign made perfect sense: following the loss of Plantagenet territories in central and northern France, the king sought expansion in Europe elsewhere, and in the process made attempts to employ those who seemed to have been the most promising allies, i.e. the Savoyards, the Poitevins, and the papacy. Such a policy, which ultimately was directed against Louis IX of France, and which necessitated the use of English resources, was in a way the only course of action to take. As Clanchy put it: if the king "had been able to foresee the growth of the French state and had conceded ... the inevitable by granting Louis IX all his overseas possessions, Henry would have been so discredited that he might have exposed England itself to invasion". Seen from this perspective, the ultimate blame for the troubles of Henry's reign lay not with the king, but with the magnates, for they, on the whole, showed not a great deal of enthusiasm to defend or expand the crown's interests abroad, yet would not accept capitulation to Louis IX.

While some of Clanchy's ideas carry valuable historiographical and historical insights, his view of Henry's kingship is openly disputed by another contemporary writer, D.A. Carpenter. Thus while Clanchy holds that Henry's overall objectives was the pursuit of "sole royal power", Carpenter argues that the king did not advocate the theory

---

75. Ibid., 454, In this light, it is important to note that until 1259, Henry had styled himself duke of Normandy and Aquitaine, and count of Anjou, Powicke, Henry III, 169.
76. Cox, Eagles of Savoy, 454.
of royal absolutism during 1234-58. Indeed, Carpenter goes even further by claiming that during the personal rule of Henry there had emerged a "pattern of magnate rule in the shires" at the expense of royal control. In sharp contrast to the Stubbsian model, for Carpenter, the king, although he "had a fierce temper, ... appears as amiable, easy-going, and sympathetic towards petitioners". And Henry pursued a policy of "appeasement" towards the baronage in order to maintain peace and stability. For the magnates the years of Henry's personal rule were those of laxity, rather than of royal intrusion, and many had profited in the process. In the long term, the crown's failure to uphold its control at a local level was a development which was to continue into the fourteenth century. Carpenter's exposition of the baronial conflict of 1258-65 is also radically different from the 'nationalistic' view: for the author the conflict was not between disadvantaged outsiders and the crown, but rather one "within the court of Henry III".

R.C. Stacey, an author of one of the latest studies on Henry, views the dispute in essentially the same way as Carpenter: the king's conflict in reality occurred within the "court party"; but it was not, contrary to the assumptions of so many earlier historians, a logical and inevitable culmination of royal policy stretching for several decades. The factors that had brought about the revolt emerged only in the decade immediately prior

79. Ibid., 40, 69.
80. Ibid., 61.
81. Ibid., 40, 60, 67.
82. Ibid., 40.
83. Ibid., 40.
84. Ibid., 63.
85. Stacey, Politics, 258.
to 1258. Various elements, including the "utter lunacy of the Sicilian obligations", led to the crown's financial collapse by 1258, but even then, the political conflict may have been avoided had it not been provoked by Henry's excessive favour towards the Poitevins. Stacey holds that Henry was a "changeable man", easily influenced by those around him. And the king's reign was a complex one, due to the fact that Henry had been able to learn "from mistakes, both his father's and his own". On the whole, Henry's kingship was of a "reactive" nature, especially in respect of royal financial policy.

The latest generation of historians do not fail to point to national sentiments in thirteenth century English politics, in particular in respect of the baronial upheaval of 1258-65, but they have clearly discarded, and with justification, the 'nationalistic' bias of some of the earlier writers. Needless to say, M. Prestwich's recent reappraisal of the era also operates within such a historiographical paradigm. In respect of Henry's kingship, Prestwich essentially follows Clanchy: the king "saw himself as God's vicar on earth, with an obligation to look after the affairs of his subjects". And while for Clanchy, the king was a "tough, opinionated and mercurial" politician, Prestwich regards

---

86. Ibid., 259.
87. Ibid., 258; On these points too, Stacey is basically in agreement with Carpenter for whom the immediate reasons for the conflict included the hatred of the Poitevins, and a general perception, in the context of the Sicilian affair, that Henry III was not up to his tasks, Carpenter, 'King, Magnates, and Society', 62-63; See also Clanchy, England and its Rulers, 14, for an essentially similar view.
88. Stacey, Politics, 95.
89. Ibid., 258.
90. Ibid., 258-59.
93. Ibid., 14; Clanchy, England and its Rulers, 223.
Henry as a "curious mixture of piety, arrogance and weakness". Elsewhere Prestwich accepts the verdict of Carpenter: the king's attitude towards the magnates was conciliatory in order to maintain peace. Prestwich's work presents a brief but useful digest on Henry, although he too, fails to appreciate and assess the reign from a Continental perspective, on the line suggested by Cox.

In comparison to the amount of political history that has been produced on Henry, the king's relation with the English church remains one topic that still awaits critical treatment. For Stubbs, Henry's ecclesiastical policy naturally would be laden with conflict. The fact that king John had submitted to Rome was one legacy his son could not ignore, and thus the successive popes manipulated Henry chiefly in order to obtain money from England. Henry came to permit various practices, e.g. collection of direct subsidies, foreign intrusion into English livings, episcopal and abbatial election disputes and the growth of judicial claims of Rome which gave rise to serious resentment in England. Stubbs implicitly assumed that what Henry gained in return from the papacy was vital support to execute his domestic policy. Apart from the writings of Powicke, perhaps, English historiography has not really departed from this core of interpretation; for Clanchy, for instance, Henry had a consistent policy of "exploiting papal power to humble the English clergy and promote royal interests".

The most detailed study on Henry III's relation with the church, that of Gasquet

94. Compare also Clanchy's claim that Henry III created an "impressive theatricality of the monarchy" with that of Prestwich: Henry "did much to establish the theocratic, or sacral, elements of his kingship", Ibid., 230, 282; Prestwich, English Politics, 11, 15.

95. Ibid., 42.

96. Ibid., 84-85. Prestwich's main interest, it may be noted, lies not with Henry III, but with Edward I, as his biography on the latter demonstrated.


98. Ibid., 57-58.

first published in 1905, remained on the whole, within the Stubbsian model. Gasquet implicitly argued that the king's policy towards the church in England was essentially determined by royal and papal financial needs. Henry was depicted as a manipulator of both the English church and Rome: at times of papal financial demands on England, the king would side with his ecclesiastics, and was tacitly supported by the nobility in the refusal. When it was Henry, however, who was in need of funds, he sought the backing of Rome to the detriment of the English church. That the king relied to a great extent on the papacy was one of John's legacies, but in any rate, Henry could not base his authority on the unruly nobles. One of the unintentional by-product of Gasquet's work was that the king emerged as one, who performed, in reality, a 'tightrope act' and the interesting fact was that it had worked for so long. This, in itself, suggested that Henry possessed more shrewdness than he was credited with by nineteenth century historical writing. Gasquet failed to make any significant connection, however, between the crown's ecclesiastical policy and the general political background in England, which would have explained more fully many of Henry's actions. Similarly, no reasons were given for the king's dire financial situation, which put royal authority and ecclesiastical policy under tremendous limitations. The author wrote in an overly apologetic tone towards the papacy, yet saw Henry's efforts to promote French relatives basically through the eyes of English 'nationalistic' writers. Henry naturally did not emerge in a positive light from such angles; his character, claimed Gasquet, "always inclined him to lean upon some one or other".

While Gasquet's study had represented a prime example of positivistic historical writing, lacking elements of an analytical approach, Marion Gibbs' work on the composition of the English episcopacy during Henry's reign, first published in 1934, was

100. F. Gasquet, Henry the Third and the Church (London, George Bell, 1905).
101. Ibid., 143, 166-67, 155-56, 305.
102. Ibid., 155.
a much more serious achievement. Gibbs found that the diocesans of the period had
their early careers either as monks, court administrators or magnates, i.e. curiales,
scholars, or risen from the ranks of the secular clergy.103 Naturally, between the four
types of early careers there had existed overlaps and thus a particular prelate may have
had a varied background prior to his episcopal appointment.104 In numerical terms,
out of the seventy-eight examined bishops, only eight had been elevated from the
monasteries, while forty-two curiales became advanced - an indication of at least one
clear trend, i.e. the end of a tradition of great monk-bishops of the earlier centuries.105
Forty of the diocesans of Henry’s reign had university education, and out of these
twenty-three had been engaged in diocesan work at the time of their election.106

Gibbs’ work gave an extremely useful orientation, but considering the amount of
evidence found in the court records of Henry III on various individuals it fell short of a
truly detailed study. And it was not a primary purpose of the author to highlight the
king’s relationship with those individuals who at some point of time in their career had
come forward as episcopal candidates. This thesis aims to fill both of these gaps and
demonstrate that the king’s ecclesiastical policy in respect of episcopal nominees was

103. M. Gibbs and J. Lang, Bishops and Reform, 1215-1272 (Oxford U.P., 1934), 5-
52.
104. Ibid., 185-200.
105. Ibid., 3-5.
106. Ibid., 4, 52, 192-99.
essentially shaped by his wider European objectives.\textsuperscript{107} Seen from this perspective, Henry was above all, a realist.

The king, claimed Powicke, was interested in the affairs of Christendom and felt he could relate to new movements in Western society.\textsuperscript{108} In Western European history, the thirteenth century closed a period of growth in economy, population, urbanisation and commerce, beginning in about the mid-eleventh century.\textsuperscript{109} The thirteenth century also witnessed the expansion of papal monarchy, and paradoxically, increasing secularisation in society, which was, in fact, closely related to the development of nationalistic sentiments.\textsuperscript{110} The emergence of the Dominicans, the Franciscans, and also of the universities, the growing importance of the towns were, in particular, hallmarks of the age of Henry III.\textsuperscript{111} The friars, it may be noted, were leading intellectuals in a highly intellectualised period of the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{112} The thirteenth century was also an age when the papacy took an increased attention in English affairs.\textsuperscript{113} In England, by this time, the great days of monasticism were over, and new emphasis on religious life was provided by the early enthusiasm of the friars, but here too the signs of decay were already visible by the 1250's.\textsuperscript{114} Within wider

\textsuperscript{107} Another subject dealt with by M. Gibbs was the conduct of episcopal elections in the period. In theory episcopal elections were to be conducted freely by the cathedral chapter; in practice various forces were at play most of the time. It will suffice to state here that, according to Gibbs, Henry had been successful to directly intrude his own candidate only once, \textit{Ibid.}, 54, 88. As it will be seen, however, many of the king's actions indirectly influenced the outcome of elections.

\textsuperscript{108} Powicke, \textit{Henry III}, 73.


\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Ibid.}, 106, 109, 111-117, 115, 121.

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Ibid.}, 272-73, 277.

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Ibid.}, 298-99.

\textsuperscript{113} Gibbs and Lang, \textit{Bishops and Reform}, 54.

society, clerical abuses and the educational standards of the clergy attracted their share of criticism, although this in itself was not a novel phenomenon.\textsuperscript{115}

When king John had submitted to Innocent III in 1213, Henry was merely a boy and the medieval papacy stood at its zenith; within ninety years pope Boniface VIII would receive humiliating blows at Anagni and the vision of \textit{Respublica Christiana} would gravely suffer at the hands of a determined secular ruler. These two events, perhaps better than anything else, symbolised the evolving state of Western European society and church in the thirteenth century.

\textsuperscript{115} Ibid., 90-110, 210-42.
CHAPTER II

THE YEARS OF UNCERTAINTY, 1226-35
Although in January 1227, the nineteen years old Henry III had declared himself full of age at the council of Oxford, the beginning of the king's de facto rule brought no sudden changes neither in the political, nor in the ecclesiastical affairs of the kingdom.¹ Henry's coming of age in 1227 was itself a culmination of a gradual process, since declarations of majority had already been made in 1220, 1221, 1223 and possibly also in 1225. The adjustment of political factions in these years and the fact that in 1227 there were no new men introduced to the court establishment by the king ensured that for some time things would remain essentially undisturbed.

The declaration of 1227 implied, however, that Henry had become the source of promotion and advancement by conferring titles, favours etc., and the re-creation of the royal household, extinct from 1216. After January 1227 the king could be approached by-passing the justiciar, and the door was open to those who formerly had been unable to seek favours due to Hubert de Burgh's tight control over the court.²

Henry's concern with ecclesiastical affairs did not arise only after the final declaration of majority, for he had already shown strong interest in one episcopal promotion prior to 1227. Following the death of the bishop of Durham, Richard Marsh, in May 1226, the king intended to intrude his chaplain, Luke - who was incidentally also de Burgh's confessor - to the see.³ The monks had rejected this candidate and by 20 October 1226 elected one Master William Scot [alias of Stichill], but he was in turn opposed by the crown.⁴

1. Giles, Roger of Wendover. vol. II, 485-86; For what follows, see Stacey, Politics, 1-44.

2. De Burgh was appointed justiciar in 1215 and justiciar of England for life in 1228. By 1225, following the demise of Henry's personal guardian, Peter des Roches, de Burgh's dominance of the royal council was complete. The justiciar was deprived of his office in September 1232, See also Handbook of British Chronology, 72.


Despite the fact that William had served for eight years as an archdeacon of Worcester, he had a decisive shortcoming from the point of view of Henry: he had been born in Scotland, and thus most probably was suspect of his ultimate loyalties. In Durham a co-operative bishop was needed to be able to withstand the 'Scottish threat', although the early years of Henry III's rule generally had lacked aggressiveness between England and Scotland. In a broader perspective too, the king's concern was quite natural, for there had not been a precedent of a Scottish bishop governing Durham during Norman and Plantagenet rule.

The dispute had been finally resolved by Gregory IX. The Durham monks at the end had their way, for their representatives in Rome were able to persuade the pope to accept another candidate of theirs, Richard Poore, bishop of Salisbury.

Gregory IX's decision to translate Richard to Durham seemed to have come as something of a surprise to Henry, although his proctors undoubtedly were still at Rome. Nevertheless, the king had promptly assented to the appointment of the new bishop, and Richard obtained the temporalities of the see on 22 July 1228.

Henry's attitude to the pope's settlement was well summed up in a letter written

---

5. Ibid., 31, 106.
6. The Scottish concern was a traditional one for the English monarchy, a conscious attitude that had dated back as early as the times of king Stephen, in the first half of the twelfth century. It originated from the political affairs of 1135-54 when the king of Scotland formulated his claim over Northumberland, Cumberland and Westmoreland. King John attempted to solve the conflict by a marriage arrangement. In the end, the king of Scotland married Henry III's sister and Alexander II relinquished the Scottish demand of these northern counties in 1237, Powicke, Henry III, 269; Stacey, Politics, 20; Barrow, Feudal Britain, 248-49; F. Barlow, The English Church 1066-1154 (London, Longman, 1979), 102; A. Saltman, Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury (London, Athlone Press, 1956), 120-21.
9. Gasquet, Henry III, 123; Powicke, Henry III, 73; Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 81-82.
by Philip de Arden, the agent of Ralph Neville, the royal chancellor. Accordingly, the king:

"liked [the translation of Richard to Durham] ... well enough, but was greatly annoyed that his advice had not been obtained in the matter; and he would have been as much vexed if his own brother had been appointed this way".¹¹

From the crown's point of view, the election procedure had not been observed. When, for example, under somewhat similar circumstances Innocent III had appointed Stephen Langton to Canterbury in 1206, king John refused to accept him as archbishop and suffered the consequences. Henry III, however, had good reasons not to oppose the bishop of Durham in any way, for Richard had for long loyally served the monarchy in various capacities. In fact, Richard's election to Salisbury in 1217 was supported by the papal legate for precisely this reason.¹²

At the time of the civil war, for example, in August 1217, the bishop of Salisbury blessed the English fleet going against Eustace, the Monk, who for some time had controlled the Channel for Louis of France.¹³ In 1223 Richard was a member of the delegation sent to the French king to press for the return of Normandy to Henry III.¹⁴ The bishop of Salisbury was also actively assisting de Burgh at court in 1223-26, a fact of particular importance, in the light of the justiciar's dominant position after the fall of des Roches.¹⁵

The amount of evidence on Richard Poore prior to his translation to Durham [and beyond] is considerable, since he had already before 1228 reached the highest echelons of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, but naturally this was not the case of all

---


¹² In 1215-17 Richard had been bishop of Chichester. For a summary of his career, Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 25-27.

¹³ Worcester, 408.

¹⁴ Dunstable, 81.

¹⁵ Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 26.
episcopal candidates. Henry Sandford was archdeacon of Canterbury when elected on 26 December 1226 to the bishopric of Rochester, yet hardly anything is known about his relation to the crown prior to his promotion. The advancement was either a result of unhindered deliberation of the convent, or procured by the archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen Langton, who was Henry's close associate in diocesan work.

There appears to have been a lack of contact between Henry III and Henry Sandford prior to 1227, although the king may have been aware that the elect had been in royal service in 1208. Henry III may have also felt that he trusted the archbishop's 'protégé': the king and Langton had been on sufficiently good terms at this time and they came to serious disagreement only in 1228 concerning privileges in Canterbury.

This did not at all affect the crown's attitude to Henry Sandford: on the contrary, as a sign of high confidence the king had sent him [along with an episcopal colleague] to the pope in 1228, in a rather important matter of representing the crown in the case concerning the election of Walter de Eynesham to Canterbury, following the death of Langton.

While the Rochester election showed that when a suitable episcopal candidate was brought forward by the procedures of canon law, Henry III had no objections, the attempted promotion of Walter de Eynesham highlighted just the opposite: the king

---

16. Giles, Roger of Wendover, vol. II, 487. In the Rochester elections the king had no formal powers of "either consent or refusal", instead it was the archbishop of Canterbury who exercised this right, Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 89. This is not to say, however, that 'expedient elections' were not made in that bishopric: see Lawrence of St Martin.

17. Henry's election was confirmed by the archbishop on 7 February 1227, and he was consecrated on 9 May. When Langton died in July 1228 the bishop of Rochester was appointed to execute his will and he "kept alive" the archbishop's memory, Giles, Roger of Wendover, vol. II, 487; Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 27, 28, 85; Fasti, vol. II, 77; Close Rolls 1227-31, 110.


19. Dunstable, 107; Gasquet, Henry III, 118.

20. Walter was elected on 3 August 1228, Giles, Roger of Wendover, vol. II, 508-9; Patent Rolls 1225-32, 228.
was prepared to spare no effort to be rid of unwanted nominees. Walter was a simple monk of Christ Church, Canterbury at the time of his election, against whom Henry had plenty of objections, some undoubtedly serious, others maybe just formal.\textsuperscript{21}

The king alleged that the candidate was

"useless to himself [to Henry III] and to the kingdom; [his] father ... had been convicted of theft and been hung; ... [and the elect] had taken part against king John ... at the time of the interdict."\textsuperscript{22}

There may have been also a serious fault with Walter's morals if it was true, as claimed by the suffragan bishops of Canterbury, that he had "formerly violated a nun and had had children by her".\textsuperscript{23}

A co-operative archbishop in Canterbury was of essential interest for the monarchy, and the king, even if the charges against Walter are viewed with a certain amount of scepticism, could hardly be sure in 1228 that his relation with the monk-archbishop would be a harmonious one. Henry may have rightly thought also that Walter was simply not up to such a position, for since the Norman rule in England there had not been a precedent of a monk having been advanced to the archbishopric of Canterbury.\textsuperscript{24}

The accusation of political animosity during John's reign was perhaps the gravest one against Walter: for the king this must have been of much greater concern in 1228, than the preservation of a Canterbury tradition, for the consolidation of the regime after the years of minority was of paramount importance.

It is notable that Walter never refuted any of the charges against him, but whether this implied that he had accepted their validity, or simply thought it more

\textsuperscript{21} Fasti, vol. II, 6. Walter appears to have been a son of a clerk of Ensham [Oxford], Patent Rolls 1216-25, 78.

\textsuperscript{22} Giles, Roger of Wendover, vol. II, 509.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 509.

\textsuperscript{24} On the contrary, the early careers of those archbishops, from Lanfranc to Stephen Langton, on the whole, had been quite illustrious, Fasti, vol. II, 3-6.
advisable to base his case in Rome on the fact he had been canonically elected, one cannot say.25

In the end Henry paid an overly excessive price to attain his objective, for he had promised the pope a "tenth part of all movable property from all England and Ireland".26 Gregory IX naturally had quickly accepted this offer and annulled, in January 1229, the election of Walter.27 The pope had been aided financially in his political struggle against Frederick II, while the king had achieved an important political objective at home. Henry appears to have had no trust of Walter: as late as 1231 an order was issued to the bailiff of Dover to prohibit his return to England.28

The metropolitan election dispute did not last long, for Gregory IX provided to the archbishopric Richard Grant, the chancellor of Lincoln, on 19 January 1229.29 The pope was guided in his decision by the agents of the crown in Rome, who produced a letter from the king and some of the English bishops proposing Master Richard.30 The chancellor, they claimed, was a man of "eminent wisdom and learning" and his promotion would be beneficial to the church and the monarchy in England.31 Gregory IX in this case needed no special persuasion, for there had been a few people at hand at the curia, including the English proctors, the bishop of Rochester and that of Coventry, whose opinion of the chancellor was quite favourable.32

Henry, for all his recommendation of Richard, appears to have trusted others in this instance, for it seems, he did not have anything to do with the chancellor before

27. Ibid., 519.
In contrast to the antagonistic attitude that Walter de Eynesham had received, the king authorised a payment of one hundred marks to the chancellor, on the same day royal assent to the promotion was given, as a gift from the crown. De Burgh's attitude to Richard was also favourable: he granted, sometime between 14 September 1227 and 6 October 1229 the benefice of the church of Tunstall [Kent] to him.

With the translation of Richard Poore from Salisbury, the canons of the see elected on 9 September 1228 a successor, who appears to have been completely unknown to Henry III. Robert Bingham had been a canon of Salisbury himself; he was a theologian with a fine reputation, and he would foster the legacy of his predecessor.

The king did not hesitate, and on 25 September he informed the papacy that he had assented to the verdict of the Salisbury electors. Whether it was Henry's subsequent lack of confidence in the theologian, or the bishop's own inner disposition, the fact was that Robert stayed away from unnecessary involvement in the affairs of the crown as an ecclesiastic. There was one notable exception: Robert proved to be far from silent in 1233, when de Burgh was making attempts to escape from the anger of the king. When the fallen justiciar was dragged from a church where he had found refuge, the first bishop to attack the violators by excommunicating them was Robert

33. Royal assent to Richard's promotion was given on 24 March 1229, on which day the temporalies of Canterbury were also restored. Richard was consecrated on 10 June, Close Rolls 1227-31, 162-63; Giles, Roger of Wendover, vol. II, 531.

34. CLR 1226-40, 122.

35. De Burgh was conferred all lands in Tunstall on 14 September 1227, seven months after he had been created earl of Kent, Charter Rolls 1226-57, 60, 101; Stacey, Politics, 35.


37. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 34.

38. Robert was consecrated on 27 May 1229, Giles, Roger of Wendover, vol. II, 530; Patent Rolls 1225-32, 205.

39. Contact between Henry and Robert in 1232-46 was almost purely official; for the relevant entries: CPR 1232-47, 528, index.
Bingham. Matters did not end there for Robert, and he and his colleague, the bishop of London, procured the release of de Burgh and his return to the sanctuary. Naturally, this thwarted Henry’s designs for the time being. The king may have felt justified in this decision three years earlier not to assign the castle of Salisbury - which presumably had been under Richard Poore’s control at one stage - to Robert.

It must have been during the demise of de Burgh in 1232-33 that Henry first may have realised the latent dangers associated with unknown candidates in episcopal positions: they would be, on the whole, much less accommodating towards him, and prone to independent action precisely because they could feel no special ‘loyalty’ to the crown resulting from earlier connections. The bishop of Salisbury and the bishop of London, Roger Niger, were such kind of prelates.

Roger’s promotion to the episcopacy in 1229 was dispute-free. He had been probably elected in November-December 1228, and then presented to the king who duly gave his assent and ordered the restoration of temporalities on 27 April 1229. Prior to his elevation Roger had been a canon of St Paul’s, London, as archdeacon of Colchester from 1218.

He and Henry had one thing in common: they viewed the arrival of the Franciscans in England in the 1220’s with much sympathy, but whether the king knew about Roger’s attitude in 1229, and thus was affected in any way by it, is impossible to

41. Ibid., 558, 572; Tewkesbury, 87. Support to the fallen justiciar was also given by his "old friend and confessor", Luke, who was by this time the archbishop of Dublin, Powicke, Henry III, 83, 139. Considering this friendship, de Burgh may have also played a role in the attempt to intrude Luke to Durham in 1226.
42. CLR 1226-40, 172, 281.
44. He was consecrated on 10 June 1229, Ibid., 514-15, 531; Close Rolls 1227-31, 169-70.
establish. The nature of the movement made the friars active in the towns and this must have been especially the case in London. Logically, Roger would have first come in contact with the Mendicants in that city, since he was a canon of St Paul’s. Like Robert Bingham, Roger also turned out to be quite reserved from secular involvements in the interest of the monarchy, although during the twelve years of his episcopacy he was moderately favoured by royal grants.

Apart from Richard Grant and Roger Niger, there was also another elect consecrated in Canterbury on 10 June 1229: Hugh of Northwold, abbot of Bury St Edmunds. His election to Ely between 10 January and 3 February 1229 had been "willingly accepted" by Henry, and the temporalities of the see were restored on 26 May. By this time the king must have, to some extent, been preoccupied with his planned expedition to Poitou, and this, in principle, would have lessened the likelihood of royal involvement in an election dispute. There was no reason, however, to refuse the promotion of the abbot, the first episcopal candidate since 1226 to whom Henry could relate well.

Hugh had risen to be head of St Edmunds as a simple monk in 1213, when he probably still was a young man. King John rejected this promotion at that time, and

46. A contemporary English Mendicant chronicler referred to Roger as of "holy memory", Thomas of Eccleston. The Coming of the Friars Minor, ed., E.G. Salter, (London, J.M. Dent, 1926), XI-XIII, 6, 73. The reaction that the friars received from the English episcopate was overwhelmingly positive. As for Henry, he had from the beginning viewed the friars with considerable affection, Moorman, Church Life in England, 371-72.

47. Thomas of Eccleston. The Coming of the Friars Minor, 196.

48. CPR 1232-47, 173, 211; Close Rolls 1231-34, 22, 59; Close Rolls 1234-37, 116; For a gift of deer in 1240, Close Rolls 1237-42, 214.


50. Ibid., 514; Patent Rolls 1225-32, 234-35, 249-50; Close Rolls 1227-31, 177.


for the next two years there ensued a complicated conflict ending in a victory for the abbot-elect.\textsuperscript{53} Hugh was a man of principles, for he declined to 'purchase' his confirmation from John.\textsuperscript{54} He also proved to be one with capabilities, endowed with moderation and perseverance, and even in later years, as a bishop of Ely, Hugh adhered to his simple monastic habit.\textsuperscript{55}

Bury St Edmunds was one of the greatest of thirteenth century Benedictine houses in England, towards which Henry had a genuine affection to such an extent that he named in 1245, his second son in memory of the saint, the fallen king of East-Anglia.\textsuperscript{56}

Although Antonia Gransden claims that Henry III [and Edward I] frequently visited the abbey, this was not the case in 1225-July 1229.\textsuperscript{57} Following Hugh's consecration in June 1229, Henry's first recorded stay appears to have taken place in August for the duration of at least four days.\textsuperscript{58} Matters may have needed royal attention in the abbey, now that Hugh had been elevated to a more important post.

The king's interest in the abbot of St Edmunds' first took a definite shape on 10 January 1227 when Hugh, along with three laymen, was appointed as an itinerant justice for Norfolk.\textsuperscript{59} In 1227 Henry favoured the abbey [and consequently Hugh] in various ways: on 30 January a charter issued at Westminster granted protection to the inhabitants of St Edmunds and their landed property, and also on the same day land in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{53} Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 9.
\item \textsuperscript{54} Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey, ed., T. Arnold, (London, Rolls Series, 1890), vol. II, 105-9, 124.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 27-130; Hist. Ang., vol. II, 305.
\item \textsuperscript{56} The Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds, XII.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Ibid., XII.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Patent Rolls 1225-32, 301-2; CLR 1226-40, 140.
\item \textsuperscript{59} Patent Rolls 1225-32, 154.
\end{itemize}
Suffolk was bestowed on them. Furthermore, on 5 April the monks were granted a right to hold markets at their manors in Redgrave [Suff.] and Southwold [Suff.] on Thursdays, and to have yearly fairs at these places.

At St Edmunds a mint was in operation which seems to have started work in, or before 1216. Both the crown and the abbot were involved in the business and their agreement concerning it had been ten years old in 1226. Whatever the exact arrangement was, Hugh appears to have received a sum of ten pounds from Henry III twice a year. The king ordered on 6 November 1226 the keepers of the exchange [cambii] of London, to make one payment to the abbot for Michaelmas term. Hugh probably was in London at around this time to collect the money, and maybe also on other business, and he could have met Henry as well. The next authorisation for payment - for Easter term - was issued on 26 April 1227, while the amount that was due in the autumn appears to have been delivered to St Edmunds by a royal messenger.

The abbot appears to have collected his due for the last time early May 1229; the messenger that was sent to the abbey on 26 May - on the same day the temporalities of Ely were restored - most likely carried letters from the king informing Hugh of the decision. Arguably, this financial arrangement between the crown and the abbot was largely a result of a personal understanding, for after October 1229 nothing is known about it. Royal goodwill towards Hugh was well demonstrated six years later, when the bishop of Ely undertook, along with two others, the important mission of escorting

---
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the future queen of England, Eleanor, from the court of Raymond IV of Provence.  
Henry must have been quite pleased, for in 1237 Hugh was commissioned to take part in the English delegation to be sent to the conference summoned by Frederick II at Vaucouleurs in France.

With the death of Richard Grant in August 1231, there emerged three consecutive candidates to the archbishopric of Canterbury: all supported by the king, none by Gregory IX. The first of these, Ralph Neville, bishop of Chichester from 1224, and royal chancellor from 1226, was postulated by the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, on 22 September 1231.

It was for the first time that the electors attempted to promote on their own will a curialis, and the prospect of such a development was quite favourable to the crown: a trusted courtier seldom, if hardly ever, would make an uncooperative prelate. From the chapters' point of view, the nomination of such men averted the potential royal intrusion of even less desirable candidates. In certain cases the electors would make a compromise from the very start in order to please the king, and avoid the financial, or the various other problems associated with a possible litigation. Seen from this perspective, the Canterbury electors had made an astute political decision in 1231: they undoubtedly knew that Henry would not refuse a nominee, whose influence at court at the time was outranked only by de Burgh. Such political realities, on the whole, were well grasped by the electors during Henry's reign and these kind of 'expedient

68. The meeting did not in fact take place, since it had been cancelled by the emperor, Ibid., 53-54.
69. Giles, Roger of Wendover, vol. II, 543; Fasti, vol. II, 6. Ralph appears to have been keeper of the king's seal from 1218, Handbook of British Chronology, 85.
71. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 91.
72. Stacey, Politics, 17.
promotions' would re-occur from time to time.

As a bishop of Chichester, Ralph was essentially an absentee in his see, and hardly excelled in the capacity of an ecclesiastic.\textsuperscript{73} As a chancellor, however, he attained due recognition. Ralph had been appointed to control the chancery for life on 12 February 1227, and was one of the keepers of the realm during the king's Gascon expedition in 1230.\textsuperscript{74} The chancellor generally was not involved in the factional struggles of court politics, preferring a neutral stand of his own; nor did he make attempts to affect Henry in political affairs.\textsuperscript{75}

Ralph's two brothers were also connected to the monarchy. Hugh Neville served the crown as chief justice of the forests; Nicholas, a clerk, was presented to ecclesiastical benefices by Henry in 1229 and 1232.\textsuperscript{76}

Not surprisingly, merely two days after Ralph's postulation, Henry approved the choice of the Canterbury monks.\textsuperscript{77} The bishop of Chichester, however, may have been sceptical about the outcome of the matter, for he refused to defray the expenses of the monks' delegation to Rome, to ratify the promotion. His caution proved to be justified when Gregory IX, acting on the opinion of the archdeacon of Canterbury, annulled on 20 December 1231 the election.\textsuperscript{78}

The king could not have been pleased with the pope's decision, still he did not pursue the case further. A new candidate, John of Sittingbourne, the prior of Christ Church, was proposed on 16 March 1232, and he immediately left for Rome to seek

\textsuperscript{73} Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 18.

\textsuperscript{74} Charter Rolls 1226-57, 9; Patent Rolls 1225-32, 339-40; Close Rolls 1227-31, 342.
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\textsuperscript{76} Patent Rolls 1225-32, 139, 140, 150, 246, 247, 319, 459, 467; Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 188. For examples of various favours to Ralph just in 1227: Charter Rolls 1226-57, 8, 9, 16, 31, 43, 44, 51, 54, 63.

\textsuperscript{77} Fasti, vol. II, 6.

\textsuperscript{78} Giles, Roger of Wendover, vol. II, 543.
papal confirmation. The elect had been a monk of Christ Church prior to 1222, when he succeeded to govern the monastic cathedral, and he must have been well advanced in age by 1232 when Gregory IX found him "too old and simple" to take up the archiepiscopal office. On these grounds, the pope suggested John to resign despite the fact that the nominee had proved to be learned in theology. The prior consequently "humbly renounced the election ... [on 12 June], and asked leave to return home".

The candidate was of different type than Hugh of Northwold, but Henry, nevertheless, accepted the choice of the Canterbury monks when the prior visited him before his journey to Rome. The king could have met John before this meeting in the second half of March 1232, since he was in Canterbury for various lengths of time in February, October and November 1227, July 1228, September 1229, February 1230 and December 1231.

In the two years before his election, the prior of Christ Church had been involved in a number of litigations. In 1230-31 John was engaged in a legal dispute with the crown regarding the township and harbour of Sandwich [Kent], and the suit was postponed several times. The prior also had to consider another suit in 1231, although, undoubtedly, the matter of this case was less important than the one involving Sandwich: it concerned ploughed land in Mersea [Essex], and the other litigant party

79. Licence to elect was granted on 7 March 1232, Patent Rolls 1225-32, 465; Giles, Roger of Wendover, vol. II, 547.
80. Ibid., 552; Fasti, vol. II, 11.
82. Ibid., 547.
83. CLR 1226-40, 57; Patent Rolls 1225-32, 111, 168, 194, 307, 455; Close Rolls 1227-31, 2, 209, 252, 302. In October 1229 - not long after Henry's visit to Canterbury in September - a royal letter of protection was issued to the prior and monks of Christ Church, or Holy Trinity, Patent Rolls 1225-32, 273.
84. Close Rolls 1227-31, 339, 490.
was one John de Walflet. At the beginning of the dispute John appears to have deputed Henry III as an attorney and then for unknown reasons designated one Ralph de Burgh. Another legal disagreement considered by the judges of the king in 1231 was connected to the seemingly unjustified action of Richard Grant, archbishop of Canterbury, to seize and ‘unlawfully’ hold livestock belonging to the prior. John also contended the claims of Canterbury bailiffs, who demanded a certain service of him, and deputed one brother Richard de Berkesour to represent his interest against that of Reginald de Cornhull.

To what extent the prior of Christ Church was right in any of these disputes is not known, nor is Henry’s concern in these matters. The king, however, could not have been too troubled, for just two days after his visit to Canterbury he bestowed, on 15 December 1231, - when the question of Ralph Neville’s postulation was still undecided in Rome - a small land in the city on the cathedral priory of Christ Church.

Yet Henry had no special reasons to support the promotion of John, and probably was bidding his time, for he could hardly have thought that the aged prior would last too long as an archbishop. The king may have had similar considerations in regard to Gregory IX, who was ninety-four years old in 1232.

Ironically, the more the Canterbury monks tried to select the best nominee for
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88. It appears that Reginald represented the bailiffs, or perhaps was one of them himself: it was him, who ought to have discharged John of the service. Of the precise type of this ‘service’ nothing is known. Reginald may have been related to Henry de Cornhull, chancellor of St Paul’s, London, in 1217-c.1242, who was ambassador to Rome in 1228 and 1231. If so, Reginald certainly was in a better position to acquire help from men of importance at court, Ibid., 141, 476, 601; Fasti, vol. I, 26.
89. Charter Rolls 1226-57, 142; Patent Rolls 1225-32, 455.
Henry the less they succeeded. Their next candidate, John Blund, a royal clerk, and teacher of theology at Oxford, had the support of not only the king, but also that of Peter des Roches, the bishop of Winchester. This expedient election on 26 August 1232, highlighted a radical change of influence at court with the demise of de Burgh.

The justiciar, as we have seen, played no role in episcopal elections after 1226, and even in the attempted promotion of Luke, his contribution remains merely hypothetical: de Burgh's political influence in 1226-32 stopped short at ecclesiastical matters. He appears to have lost control at court due to his administration's inability to cope with the crown's financial demands, which in itself was the outcome of a factional situation at Westminster. By 1232 de Burgh had no real support neither in the countryside, nor at court, and at the end Henry also turned against him.

The objectives of des Roches in 1232 were clear: he sought to destroy the justiciar, his personal enemy, and rectify the damage suffered following the lost factional clashes of 1223-24. The bishop's faction was firmly in control by the summer of 1232. Des Roches' nephew, Peter des Riveaux, gained authority of a remarkable extent, since he was appointed by this time as treasurer, keeper of the wardrobe, and of the mint, sheriff of twenty-one counties, and holder of other court offices. The success of the Poitevin regime in 1232 was primarily due to the king's belief that it would be able to overhaul the financial system, as well as the willingness of a considerable number of
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magnates to ruin de Burgh, and to the strong support of the losing faction of 1223-24.96 The Poitevins were doomed to fail, however, for essentially the same reason as the justiciar: their position at court was also of factional character, and largely as a result of this, they could not deliver real financial advantages to the crown.97

Des Roches made no secret of his preferences in the Canterbury election. John Blund,

"after his election ... received a thousand marks of silver as a present from Peter bishop of Winchester, besides another thousand marks which that bishop had lent him to help him in obtaining his promotion".98

They appear to have been friends and if so, it was only natural that des Roches' own position would have been much bolstered by a cooperative archbishop that John promised to be.

Henry accepted the candidate not only because he could not really refuse a Poitevin favourite in 1232; John had a steady career in the service of the crown from 1227. During the 1220's John had been teaching at the university in Paris, but he probably left the city in 1226.99 Although he already was a reputable scholar, following his return to England John appears to have begun work as a clerk and royal envoy in March 1227.100 Along with colleagues, he undertook a Continental mission - most likely to Rome - in 1228, the trip having initially been financed by certain wealthy merchants in Siena.101 When he returned, Henry granted him a yearly allowance of twenty pounds from the exchequer. The terms were valid until a "suitable ecclesiastical
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benefice” was not provided, and John received the first payment of ten pounds in September 1228.\textsuperscript{102}

John was next entrusted to travel to Kerry [Montgomery] on Henry’s order on 28 October 1228; twenty days earlier some of the royal treasures had been carried to the city, and thus John’s mission was most likely connected to that.\textsuperscript{103} In 1230 John had had a seat at the exchequer himself, and in the following year he most probably taught at Oxford, and received wine and wood as a gift from the crown.\textsuperscript{104} Like John of Sittingbourne before him, John Blund, who was by 1233 canon of Chichester, had travelled to Rome also in vain, for on 1 June 1233 the pope quashed his election, this time because the candidate was a pluralist without dispensation.\textsuperscript{105}

Gregory IX now radically solved the matter by ‘directing’ the monks of Canterbury to elect Master Edmund of Abingdon, treasurer of Salisbury.\textsuperscript{106} So confident was the pope in the outcome of the case, and consequently in the cooperation of the king, that he sent the pallium to Edmund without delay.\textsuperscript{107} Gregory IX’s ‘anticipation’ had proved to be correct and on 20 September 1233 the treasurer was elected; Henry gave his assent on 10 October.\textsuperscript{108}

Well before his elevation to the archiepiscopal see, Edmund already had had a distinguished career behind him, first as a lecturer in Arts at Oxford in c.1203-1209, then as a teacher of divinity from about 1214 to 1222.\textsuperscript{109} Prior to his election he was
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treasurer of Salisbury for twelve years.\textsuperscript{110}

The king had known Edmund for a number of years before 1233. He had, in fact, met him at the end of July 1228, when the treasurer of Salisbury, along with the dean, the chancellor, and the succentor of the see came to Windsor to seek election license following the translation of Richard Poore to Durham.\textsuperscript{111}

Edmund had been involved in a lawsuit with the citizens of Calne [Wilt.] in 1230.\textsuperscript{112} During ‘Hilary term’ in 1230, i.e. between January and Easter 1230, a day was appointed for the hearing of the case by the judges of the bench, and it was agreed that until that time the treasurer and his men would enjoy protection from all demands.\textsuperscript{113} Henry could have been present at the trial.

Edmund appears to have been in need of royal protection in the following year as well. In April 1231, William Cantilupe, a knight, was commanded not to annoy Edmund, for the treasurer enjoyed the canonical liberties of Salisbury, which had been endorsed by the king.\textsuperscript{114} Similar orders were also sent to the bailiffs of Marlborough and Chippenham [Wilts.], and to the constable of Devizes [Wilts.].

Sometime before the middle of 1231 the treasurer of Salisbury was entrusted with the keeping of sixty marks on Henry's behalf.\textsuperscript{115} In July of that year the sheriff of Wiltshire received orders to go in person to Salisbury and take the money under safe conduct to the sheriff of Gloucester.\textsuperscript{116} The king naturally sent a corresponding order
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to Edmund as well.

Undoubtedly, the treasurer of Salisbury was far from having the kind of support in 1233 that had been behind John Blund at the time of his attempted elevation; Henry, at best, could merely relate to Edmund. While the king may have thought that the treasurer was reliable enough, he could hardly have suspected that Edmund would turn mercilessly against the Poitevins at court. The archbishop-elect quickly took political sides in the baronial rebellion of 1233-34 which was essentially directed against the court faction of des Roches. During a council at Westminster in February 1234, the bishops, guided by Edmund, had presented a long speech warning Henry of the dangers of favouring the Poitevins excessively, and they threatened to excommunicate the king and his advisers, unless change was forthcoming.

Similarly, in the next two councils held at Westminster and Gloucester respectively, the archbishop pursued a strong anti-Poitevin line hardly pleasing the king. Following the meeting of the prelates and magnates on 9-10 April 1234, Henry capitulated and effectively dismissed his Poitevin councillors; during the council of 29 May 1234, Edmund somewhat humiliated the king by tacitly implicating him in the murder of the rebel leader, Richard Marshal.

One of John Blund's colleagues in the university at Paris was Ralph Maidstone. Unlike John, Ralph seems to have left the city in 1229, when as a result of a minor disturbance the schools were disbanded. Ralph left the Continent to teach at Oxford and in June 1231 he appeared as the university's chancellor. On 22 September 1231 Ralph had been appointed dean of Hereford, and he may have met the
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122. He was also archdeacon of Chester at this time, Close Rolls 1227-31, 520.
king around the end of that month, during a royal visit to the city.\footnote{123}

Hereford was a remote, yet critical see as a result of its proximity to Wales; Henry III never allowed it to be ruled by less than totally reliable men.\footnote{124} In 1231-34 royal presence in the bishopric was provoked by Llywelyn's campaign [in 1231] and the revolt of late 1233 and early 1234 in the Marches, the south-west, and the southern Midlands led by the 'confederates' of Richard Marshal.\footnote{125} In the war of 1233-34 Llywelyn of Wales supported the rebels.

During 1231-34 the king had plenty of opportunity to meet the dean and evaluate his character, since he was in Hereford for various lengths of time in September 1231, December 1232, August, September, November and December 1233.\footnote{126} Henry had developed in these years trust for Ralph to such an extent that he ratified on 30 September 1234 his election to the bishopric of Hereford.\footnote{127}

The king had already made a small favour in the summer of 1231, when at the request of Ralph, Robert Grosseteste, the future bishop of Lincoln, and of others, he agreed to release certain individuals found in the royal forest with bows and arrows.\footnote{128} In the following year Ralph received four deer from the crown as a gift, and when Henry travelled to Hereford, in December 1232, the dean was given a letter of protection which also covered his "men and possessions" in Lidney [Gloucester].\footnote{129}

Ralph appears to have kept an essentially low profile for about the next one and
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a half years, but this was probably due to the fact that the king virtually spent the autumn and winter of 1233 in Hereford and this gave ample opportunity to discuss matters personally. And later Henry would not forget Ralph: on the same day when election licence was issued to the Hereford chapter in 1234, an order was given to deliver deer to the dean as a royal gift.130

Following the election, which fell between 21 August and 30 September 1234, there appeared a flood of gifts and grants given to Ralph from the crown, and this may have reflected a conscious attempt on the part of the king to actively involve the bishop in royal service.131 For the time being this was successful: Ralph was engaged in the negotiations with Wales in 1235-37 and conducted, along with Hugh of Nortwold, Eleanor of Provence to England.132 For reasons of his own, however, the bishop of Hereford later resigned his see, and joined the Franciscans in 1239.133

In the summer of 1231, John Blund, Ralph Maidstone and Robert Grosseteste, archdeacon of Leicester, all worked in Oxford in various capacities.134 Essentially on their request, but also as a result of a petition of the whole university, Henry agreed to release some men who had been probably poaching in a royal forest, although it seems, without any success.

While Ralph was chancellor at Oxford in 1231, Robert had occupied the same position much earlier, in c.1215-21.135 Robert was archdeacon of Leicester [Lincoln] from 1229 to 1232, when he resigned his office due to illness, although still retained the

130. Ibid., 65; Close Rolls 1231-34, 504.
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prebend of Leicester until his elevation to the bishopric of Lincoln in 1235.\(^{136}\) He was also Reader to the Franciscans at Oxford for six years prior to advancement to the episcopacy.\(^{137}\)

Oddly enough, while the king favoured the friars Minors in that city in quite a significant way the same was not true in relation to their lecturer. Between 1229 and 1235 Henry bestowed timber on the Oxford Franciscans on no less than eight occasions, and without exception this was supplied from the forests of Brill [Bucks.] and Shotover [Oxford].\(^{138}\) It was perhaps a typical gesture of the king's charity that on 11 May 1233 order was given to the sheriff of Oxford to fell twenty trees in Shotover and have it carried to the houses of the Minorites [incidentally, the Dominicans were also given the same amount of timber], and that on Friday after Michaelmas [29 September] the Mendicants of the city were given meals by royal command.\(^{139}\)

And yet the king had clearly known Robert in these years. On 23 June 1234 Henry stayed in Oxford where he issued a mandate to the mayor and bailiffs of the city instructing them to expel prostitutes from the town. It was specified that either the chancellor of Oxford, or Robert Grosseteste, or friar Robert Bacon may order the arrest of these women, if still found in the city after a certain number of days.\(^{140}\)

The king's numerous visits to Oxford in 1229-35 - well over a dozen - made his

\(^{136}\) Robert was elected on 25 March 1235; royal assent was given on 5 April; temporalities restored on 16 April; consecration took place on 17 June 1235, Osney, 82; CPR 1232-47, 98, 100; Fasti, vol. III, 3, 34, 77.

\(^{137}\) Thomas of Eccleston. The Coming of the Friars Minor, 66.

\(^{138}\) Close Rolls 1227-31, 468, 510; Close Rolls 1231-34, 178, 217, 392, 457, 500; Close Rolls 1234-37, 104.

\(^{139}\) In the autumn of 1233 the Franciscans and the Dominicans [not just those in Oxford] received from the king seven hundred yards of cloth of white and grey colour, and one hundred pairs of shoes, CLR 1226-40, 215, 233-34.

\(^{140}\) Henry also prohibited the hiring out of rooms to prostitutes, and concubines of the clergy under pain of supreme penalty, Close Rolls 1231-34, 568.
neglect of Robert even more conspicuous.\textsuperscript{141} Henry’s itinerary in the days preceding Robert’s consecration at Reading on 17 June 1235 probably confirmed such an attitude. The place of the planned ceremony was a subject of dispute between Edmund of Abingdon and the monks of Canterbury, who protested against Robert being consecrated outside the archiepiscopal see.\textsuperscript{142} In the end, the monks gave way. Henry was in fact at Reading on 12 June 1235, by which time the location of the ceremony was most probably settled, and yet he did not wait in the city to attend it, but had left for Woodstock.\textsuperscript{143} Arguably, the king was less than eager to witness the consecration of Robert by the archbishop of Canterbury. And although the elect received a gift of venison from the crown for the occasion, this most likely signified largely formality, and not genuine sentiment.\textsuperscript{144}

The reputation of Robert Grosseteste, as a scholar was already a distinguished one at the time of his elevation to the episcopacy, and he became in due course one of the most eminent ecclesiastics of the age.\textsuperscript{145} His qualities did not allow him to seek any favours from the crown, and thus prior to his election he appears to have received none. As for Henry, he could not really disapprove the choice of the Lincoln chapter in 1235, considering the restrictive influence of Edmund and the memory of the rebellion of 1233-34. There was, at the end, no reason not to accept the elect, since the king could relate to Robert through the Oxford Franciscans.

\textsuperscript{141} See under ‘Oxford, letters close dated at’, Close Rolls 1227-31, 679, index; Close Rolls 1231-34, 676, index. Henry was of course in France in May-October 1230.

\textsuperscript{142} Giles, Roger of Wendover, vol. II, 602. For the problem of the precise date of Robert’s consecration, Fasti, vol. III, 3. In balance, 17 June 1235 can be accepted.

\textsuperscript{143} Close Rolls 1234-37, 100-12.
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CHAPTER III

UNWANTED CANDIDATES AND ROYAL FAVOURITES, 1236-45
The case of Simon of Elmham, bishop-elect of Norwich, is of special interest, since after William Scot he was the first candidate whose proposed elevation had been bitterly opposed by Henry. When the king officially learnt the death of Thomas Blundeville, the bishop of Norwich, from the envoy consisting of the sacristan and a monk of the priory, he granted licence to elect on 22 August 1236, while in Nottingham.\(^1\) The precise date of the election of Simon, who was, in fact, the prior of Norwich is not known, but it had occurred before 9 November 1236, for on that day Master Tresmund, proctor of Master John de Ferentino, archdeacon of Norwich, informed Henry of the outcome.\(^2\)

Master Tresmund also disclosed the king the reasons as to why John de Ferentino opposed to the election to such an extent that he had decided to appeal to Gregory IX in order to prevent the giving of royal assent.\(^3\) The explanations were acceptable to Henry and thus he informed Edmund of Canterbury of his intentions to support the appeal.\(^4\) On 27 November 1236 the king appointed one William of Kilkenny as his proctor, with powers to involve the papacy if it seemed expedient.\(^5\) In the summer of 1237 Gregory IX committed the case to the papal legate whom Henry informed about William in October.\(^6\) On 5 December 1237 the guardian of the bishopric of Norwich was ordered to send five witnesses to the legate to testify to the "servile condition" of Simon.\(^7\) On the same day the sheriff of Norfolk was sent a similar command, but now the witnesses had to prove the prior's involvement in simony. It was

\begin{enumerate}
\item CPR 1232-47, 156.
\item Ibid., 167; John de Ferentino was also a papal chamberlain, Fasti, vol. II, 64.
\item CPR 1232-47, 167.
\item Ibid., 167.
\item Henry informed the pope about William's appointment on 23 January 1237, Ibid., 169, 174. William of Kilkenny became bishop of Ely in 1255.
\item The king also appointed other proctors in 1238, Ibid., 199, 208; Cal. Papal Letters, vol. I, 163.
\item CLR 1226-40, 299.
\end{enumerate}
alleged that the

"abbot and monks of Bonrepos [France, dep. Morbihan] granted to the prior [Simon] and monks of Norwich the right of patronage of the church of Bawburgh [Norfolk] and of a moiety of the church of Barford [Norfolk], in order that they [the prior and monks] should confirm to them [the abbot and monks] for their own uses certain other churches ...".8

More specifically, Simon and his electors were charged to be

"guilty of simony in buying from the abbot of Bonrepos the patronage of the churches of Bawburgh, Immingham [Lincoln], and Cossey [Norfolk]".9

The prior was also accused of accepting money in return of granting entry to certain individuals into the Norwich monastic community, and of incontinence, since he had a daughter.10

Simon had been characterised in very different terms by Matthew Paris, whose anti-papal and anti-royal sentiment often produced a distorted picture. To the chronicler, the prior was "a religious and discreet man" whose "election, although duly made, displeased the king".11 The precise reasons for Henry's objections to Simon were not elaborated on, but it was also claimed that the king was not alone in his opposition.12 All in all, 'their' "reasonings and objections" were "ridiculous" and in the ensuing period of vacancy, it was suspected, that certain "misdeeds" had been committed.13

Simon succeeded prior William, as head of Holy Trinity, Norwich not long after July 1235.14 Henry does not appear to have known Simon before 1236, and could not have met him in Norwich between July 1235 and November 1236, since he did not visit

8. Ibid., 300.
10. Ibid., 163.
12. Ibid., 50.
13. Ibid., 50.
the city at that time. Thus at the beginning of the dispute the king was solely relying on the information of Tresmund, or rather that of de Ferentino, in relation to the prior. Master Tresmund was not only the archdeacon's proctor, but also his nephew, and most likely had a personal interest in the cause of his relative.\(^\text{15}\)

Henry never applied pressure, however, on the monks to choose the archdeacon: on the contrary, he seems to have had another candidate in mind for the see.\(^\text{16}\) This was William Raleigh, chief justice coram rege in 1234-39, and the king's main councillor in 1236-39, who in 1239 would indeed become bishop of Norwich.\(^\text{17}\) In 1239

"the monks of Norwich, seeing that they had now waited a long time, [i.e. since Henry's opposition to Simon in 1236] because they had not elected ... William [Raleigh] as their bishop, by which election they would not have offended the king, or any one else, ... met together and elected the said William Raleigh as their bishop".\(^\text{18}\)

William's election to the see represents no special interest in as much as his high position at court well explained why Henry had wanted him to the bishopric. The public records naturally offer countless entries on him prior to 1239 [and beyond]: just for the years of 1234-37 the Close Rolls alone, for example, list around ten occasions on which William received gifts from his sovereign.\(^\text{19}\) What would be of interest, however, is Raleigh's involvement in the Winchester dispute of 1238-45.

Thus the Norwich monks gave in to the practice of choosing a curialis as their pastor for peace's sake, but it definitely seems that if Henry encouraged them to elect his councillor in 1236-39 he did it in quite a discreet way. As for Simon of Elmham, he had most likely been engaged in some malpractice, but perhaps not to the extent, de Ferentino and Henry would have like the papal legate to believe. The case dragged on

\(^{15}\) CPR 1232-47, 163.


\(^{17}\) Ibid., 161; CRR 1233-37, XXI; Stacey, Politics, 281.

\(^{18}\) Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. I, 166; William may have played a role in supporting the royal appeal against Simon, Stacey, Politics, 129.

\(^{19}\) Close Rolls 1234-37, 699, index.
until 17 January 1239, when Gregory IX quashed the election of the prior. The king’s experiences with Robert Bingham and Roger Niger already highlighted the dangers of canonically elected, but unknown nominees, in episcopal positions, but now the candidate was not even impeccable which probably made Henry’s anxiety worse. After the advancement of Edmund, Henry must have especially realised the need to put more effort in influencing the composition of the episcopal body. Naturally, cooperation with de Ferentino constituted a good opportunity to keep out an undesirable nominee from Norwich, and the thorough tainting of Simon’s reputation an expedient way to achieve it.

In 1236 there also emerged a very different episcopal candidate from the prior of Norwich: Walter Cantilupe a member of a distinguished family with well established connections to the crown.20 The advancement of Walter, a courtier, to the see of Worcester must have been warmly welcomed by the king at the time; the bishop’s support twenty-odd years later of Simon de Montfort could not have been but disappointing for Henry.21 In 1236 the king supported the promotion of Walter not only as a result of his personal merits, but also those of his father and brother. This factor did not escape the attention of Matthew Paris, who in commenting on the election praises not Walter, but his father, William.22

The elder Cantilupe had served both king John and Henry III as steward of the household in 1204-22.23 He held office in difficult times and his loyalty was proven in the years of the interdict, during John’s struggle with the barons, and when the cause of

20. Following the death of William de Blois, licence to elect to the Worcester convent was issued on 24 August 1236. Walter was elected six days later. Royal assent was given on 9 September; temporalities restored on 27 September 1236. The elect was consecrated on 3 May 1237 at Viterbo, CPR 1232-47, 157-58; Worcester, 428; Close Rolls 1234-37,316.


young Henry III needed to be upheld against the insurgent magnates. His first son, William, was also one of king John's counsellors. The younger William acted as steward of the household in 1239-51 and as keeper of the great seal for some time between August 1238 and April 1240.\footnote{IWd., 75, 85.} It was Walter's brother, who in April 1231 received an order not to annoy Edmund, then treasurer of Salisbury, contrary to the canonical liberties of the see.\footnote{See Edmund of Abingdon.} He had been keeper of the town of Shrewsbury [Salop] before December 1233, although it seems, only for a short time, and was involved in the following year in the execution of the will of Ranulph de Blundeville, earl of Chester.\footnote{CPR 1232-47, 35, 80.}

In the spring of 1236 William the younger went on to pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela, provided with a royal letter of protection.\footnote{Ibid., 138, 140.}

The two Williams were naturally favoured according to their standing at court: in 1227-37, for example, just the Close Rolls list no less than eight grants, and twenty four occasions on which various gifts were given to them by the crown.\footnote{Close Rolls 1227-31, 662, index; Close Rolls 1231-34, 622, index; Close Rolls 1234-37, 603; index.}

Walter had already been established at court in 1227 when he was sent to Rome, along with a companion, by Henry on a certain business. The trip cost around four hundred and fifty marks and a large part of the money had been advanced by Siena merchants who were re-paid in 1228.\footnote{Patent Rolls 1225-32, 148-49; CLR 1226-40, 80, 88.} Although the king intended to send Walter on another expedition in 1229, this appears to have been cancelled; at any rate, the clerk seems to have been closely in touch with the court, for in April 1230, on his behalf licence was given to three Italian merchants to trade in England for one year.\footnote{Ibid., 118-19; Patent Rolls 1225-32, 336.}
In 1232 Walter was designated as a proctor of the crown, concerning a special business in England commissioned by Gregory IX; both the bishop of Ely and the archdeacon of Norwich were notified of the assignment. In the same year Walter was also appointed as justice itinerant in the Midlands. The next important assignment came in 1235, when the clerk came to be involved in the negotiation of the peace treaty between Henry III and Louis IX of France.

In 1236 certain itinerant justices had fined Walter for two marks for a certain reason at the county court in Hertfordshire. The incident would merit no interest, but for the fact that it did not escape the king's attention, who on 17 July directed the bishop of London, to whom it had been assigned to exact the amount for the church, to pardon Walter.

The elect of Worcester left England probably in February 1237 carrying Henry's message to the Roman court. He had been supplied with a letter of protection and a rather generous amount of two hundred marks for his expenses. Walter was in Viterbo at the beginning of May 1237, but already back in England at the end of July, when the king ordered a delivery of a lavish gift of more than two dozen deer to him. This was arguably no coincide: for Henry hardly anyone, except perhaps Ralph Neville, among the previous sixteen candidates in 1226-36 had a better recommendation for an episcopal promotion than the son of William Cantilupe.

Apart from the Norwich controversy the crown came to face another election dispute in 1237, one in the see of Durham. Richard Poore had died on 15 April 1237,
and three days later the king appointed a custodian to the bishopric. On 5 May election licence was granted and on 1 June the monks advanced their prior, Thomas Melsonby. Henry, however, came to oppose the candidate and appointed his first proctors in October 1237.

The Durham dispute of 1237-40 had certain similar elements to that of the Norwich controversy following the election of Simon of Elmham. Both candidates received a favourable treatment from Matthew Paris: like Simon, Thomas was also a "religious and discreet man", who had been canonically elected. Both men had been priors in their respective sees, although not for the same length of time. Thomas is first mentioned as head of the Durham monastic community on 11 June 1234, and thus he had been a prior for about three years before his election to the bishopric. Slightly more is known about Thomas' early career than about Simon's, since the former also appears as a prior of a cell at Coldingham [Berwicks] on 24 September 1229. Thomas probably spent the years of 1229-34 as a head of that group.

About six months after the appointment of the first royal proctors, the papacy directed at the end of April 1238 the archbishop of York to examine the case of the Durham controversy. The agents of the king had claimed that Simon was an enemy

---

40. Despite the fact that this phrase was most probably merely formalistic, it nevertheless implied good qualities for the chronicler, Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. I, 53.
41. Thomas was elected prior of Durham after 4 March 1234, perhaps before 25 March, Fasti, vol. II, 35.
42. Ibid., 35. Coldingham is unidentifiable in D. Knowles and C.N.L. Brooke, eds., The Heads of Religious Houses in England and Wales, 940-1216 (Cambridge U.P., 1972), 271-72. The cell may have come into existence after 1216.
to royal interests an believed to be involved in simony. 44 Gregory IX issued another mandate in connection with the case in September 1238, directed amongst others, to Robert Grosseteste. 45 By this time a comprehensive list of charges appears to have been drawn up against the prior. In addition to the previous accusations, it had been also asserted that Thomas was

"the illegitimate son of a female servant, a homicide, simoniac, guilty of other crimes, and illiterate; which the king was ready to prove". 46

Thomas furthermore was accused of swearing fealty to the king's enemy, Alexander II of Scotland. 47 Walter de Gray, the metropolitan, at first had conceded the allegations of Simon's hostility and simony, although he refused to allow the royal agents to prove them, then recanted his stand on the indictment of simony, but not on the charges of hostility. 48

The Durham dispute of 1237-41 is briefly discussed by Marion Gibbs and she is mistaken to hold that Henry intended to appoint William of Valence to the see in this period. 49 Correction must be made to the author's assertion on two accounts. First, Gibbs confuses the two 'Williams' who had gained the favour of the king at one time or another, i.e. William of Valence and William, bishop-elect of Valence. Thus the author refers to the former as a 'Savoyard' which he was not. 50 Second, primary evidence fails to indicate that William, bishop-elect of Valence, was ever being recommended by Henry to the Durham electors in 1237-39. The relevant sections from Matthew Paris' 44. Cal. Papal Letters, vol. I, 172.
45. Ibid., 176.
46. Ibid., 176.
47. Ibid., 183-84.
48. Ibid., 176, 184.
49. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 87.
50. Ibid., 87. William of Valence, or of Lusignan was Henry III's half-brother, son of Hugh X of Lusignan and Isabella of Angouleme and was born after 1220. William, bishop-elect of Valence, or William of Savoy was the uncle of Eleanor of Provence and died in November 1239, see Powicke, Henry III, 848, 853.
Chronica Maiora, on the basis of which Gibbs seems to have made her claim refer, in fact, to another election dispute.51

Like in the case of Simon of Elmham, the charges against Thomas were probably also exaggerated by the crown in order to make sure that the prior did not succeed. The truth of the matter probably lay not far from Walter de Gray’s final verdict and if so, the king had a good reason to oppose the promotion of Thomas to the still sensitive see of Durham.52 Henry’s personal knowledge of Thomas in June 1237 probably amounted to hardly anything, although he could have met the prior in Durham in September 1236 during a visit.53 It was perhaps a telling sign of the lack of contacts between them that it was only on 6 May 1237 - just one day after the Durham election licence had been issued - that the king came to ‘remember’ the monastic community in this northern see by granting them a gift.54

Richard Wendene, bishop of Rochester in 1238-50 belonged to a different category than Thomas, or even Walter Cantilupe and Simon of Elmham. He was not a curialis, but served as a cleric prior to his elevation, free of any charges of malpractice. Richard’s activities at Rochester, before and after 1238, are very poorly illuminated by the court records, and this may have been largely due to his saintly character which most likely refrained him from unnecessary involvement in secular affairs.55

The Rochester election was held on 26 March 1235, a little over a month after

51. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 87. This controversy concerned the electors of Winchester in 1238: the king in this instance tried to have William, bishop-elect of Valence, promoted as bishop of that see. Overall, it is possible that despite her references, Gibbs had in mind, while writing, another relative of Henry III, Aymer de Valence, who was also a son of Hugh X of Lusignan. This may have been so, because Aymer received the support of the king in the Durham election of 1249, and a year later in Winchester, Hist. Ang., vol. III, 44, 86. For Aymer, see further.


53. Charter Rolls 1226-57, 223; Close Rolls 1234-37, 312. For an obscure legal case in April-June 1234 which involved Thomas, but not the king: CRR 1233-37, 204.

54. Close Rolls 1234-37, 440.

55. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 47.
the death of Henry Sandford. The candidate was presented for confirmation not to Henry III, but to Edmund of Canterbury who in fact refused to approve him.\textsuperscript{56} The ensuing suit between the monks of Rochester and the archbishop, involving Gregory IX as well, had lasted for more than three years, and Richard became consecrated only on 21 November 1238 by Edmund.\textsuperscript{57} The case of the Rochester dispute is discussed by Marion Gibbs in a fairly detailed way. The essential point of the controversy was whether the monastic cathedral of Rochester, like all other cathedral churches in England, had a right to a free election - in line with canon law and king John's charter allowing free elections - or whether the supposedly traditional claim of the archbishop of Canterbury to designate the bishop of Rochester should stand.\textsuperscript{58} In the end, Gregory IX decided on 20 March 1238 in favour of Richard and the convent of Rochester.\textsuperscript{59}

During the controversy the king supported neither the metropolitan, nor the opposing party.\textsuperscript{60} That Henry knew Richard prior to 1235 cannot be proven, but the king probably had heard of him from Henry Sandford. Richard had been the bishop's official and rector of Bromley [Kent] and he had worked in the diocese for at least eight years.\textsuperscript{61} And certainly relations between the king and Henry Sandford were quite good in 1234-35 to explain Henry III's implicit acceptance of Richard. The bishop of Rochester, for example, along with the bishop of Coventry, were commissioned to

\textsuperscript{56} Giles, Roger of Wendover, vol. II, 602.

\textsuperscript{57} Waverley, 319; Fasti, vol. II, 77.

\textsuperscript{58} Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 74-5.


\textsuperscript{60} Henry may have been pleased, however, with the outcome of the case, for excessive authority in the hands of Edmund most likely would not have been desired by him. For an assessment of Edmund, see Richard Wich, bishop of Chichester from 1245.

negotiate peace with Llywelyn and Richard Marshal in 1234. Following the reconciliation of the king and the malcontents, Henry Sandford was appointed as a custodian of a number of castles, and some land formerly controlled by earl Richard.

On 15 August 1234 the bishop of Rochester witnessed an enrolment of a patent roll writ at Abingdon in the presence of the king and acted in the same capacity on 26 September at Marlborough. He was also at court on 4 December at Reading.

Henry Sandford's ambassadorship in France in the following year ended with his death at the end of February.

The first official contact between Henry III and Richard appears to have occurred only after the Rochester election. This episode is of special importance, since it suggests Richard's cooperation with his sovereign, even though only on a minor scale.

At some point of time between March 1235 and August 1238, the elect of Rochester installed, at royal request, one Fobert de Dovr' to the church of Tunbridge [Kent].

Even this intrusion of relatively mild extent provoked opposition, however, and the case had been referred to the papal legate, Otho, who consequently decided in favour of the ejected parson. The injustice had then been pointed out to Henry III, who accordingly directed the sheriff of Kent to remove the nominee, Fobert de Dovr', from the living until final settlement was reached.

Richard Wendene's very low profile as bishop is quite conspicuous not only in the light of the king's numerous visits to Rochester in 1238-50, but also because the

---

62. CPR 1232-47. 41, 43, 55, 59; Powicke, Henry III, 135.
63. CPR 1232-47. 45, 59.
64. Ibid., 64-5, 70-71.
68. Ibid., 89-90.
see's geographical position ensured relatively easy communication with the crown. Unlike his predecessor, Henry Sandford, Richard came very close to realise the ideal of separation of the church from the secular interests of the monarchy, yet his death was recorded in the *Chronica Majora* without an eulogy.

In contrast, Matthew Paris noted in detail in the same source the achievements of the bishop of Winchester, Peter des Roches, following his death on 9 June 1238.

What then ensued was a six year long dispute over the episcopal candidates of Winchester, which only ended by Henry's formal acceptance of William Raleigh with the restoration of the bishopric's temporalities on 10 September 1244. The controversy had centred on three men to whom the king related in very different ways: Ralph Neville, the chancellor, William of Savoy, the queen's uncle, and William Raleigh. While negotiations were in progress Raleigh became bishop of Norwich in 1239. The main thrust of the story of the Winchester dispute is found in Matthew Paris' *Chronica Majora*, and of modern authorities, Powicke gave a detailed reconstruction.

In the first phase of the controversy Henry emphatically had made it known to the monks of Winchester that he had wanted William of Savoy to be elected to the see. The electors, however, had intended to advance William Raleigh, a judge of considerable distinction. Matthew Paris recorded the furious reply of the king:

"You [the monks of Winchester] refused the bishop elect of Valentia [Valence],

---

69. See, ‘Rochester, letter close dated at’, in the relevant volumes of *Close Rolls*.

70. Giles, *Matthew Paris*, vol. II, 400; It should be pointed out that the index of Giles’ edition, vol. III, 515, wrongly identifies Richard Wendene with his namesake, who was a canon of St Paul’s, London. See *Fasti*, vol. I, 64, 76.


74. Giles, *Matthew Paris*, vol. I, 133-36. It is more practicable to examine the main participants of the Winchester controversy one by one, without adhering to a strict chronological order, since Raleigh became elected to Norwich in 1239. The second phase of the dispute began with the death of William of Savoy in November 1239.
saying that he was a man of blood, and have now elected William Raleigh, who has killed more men with his tongue than any one else with a sword.75

As far as the monks were concerned, they were willing to yield on their choice of Raleigh for the time being, Henry, however, did not see room for a compromise. The electors now postulated Ralph Neville whom the king also came to oppose claiming, ironically, that the chancellor was "impetuous, passionate, and perverse", while the monks were "fools" to demand him.76 At the end, the royal appeal to the pope to annul the election of Ralph was successful, but as Matthew Paris asserted largely due to the "large gifts and promises of money" to Gregory IX.77

A fair amount is known about the English activities of Henry's protégé, William of Savoy.78 He had arrived in England in January 1236 with his niece, Eleanor, and within months he became a chief royal counsellor.79 From that time, until his final departure from England in the summer of 1238, and, in a sense, until his death in November 1239, his influence at court was of primary importance.80 By 9 April 1236

75. Ibid., 136; It will serve no purpose here to discuss William of Savoy's military career in the light of this remark, but as Cox, Eagles of Savoy, 78-79, pointed out, the political circumstances had been different on the Continent than in England where law and order was essentially secured by central authority. The see of Valence was an imperial fief, and like any bishop in the Empire of the thirteenth century, William was required to aid both the emperor and the pope in their struggle. At the local, diocesan level, when basic security was not provided neither by the pope, nor the emperor, the bishop had to use all available means to protect normal order. Savoy, i.e. the Rhône valley region was a "juridical no-man's land" where various claims to territory and jurisdiction were often decided by war, and where William, as bishop [-elect] of Valence for fifteen years, worked with success "as a military governor of his small principality". Overall, it is this background that Cox claimed had not been appreciated by Matthew Paris, and it seems neither by the Winchester monks.


77. Ibid., 133, 137; The chancellor's election was quashed on 17 February 1239, Cal. Papal Letters, vol. I, 178.

78. For a good account of the life and background of William from a wider European perspective see Cox, Eagles of Savoy, 3-80, passim. For an "English" point of view on William, see Stacey, Politics, 93-132, passim.

79. Ibid., 96-99.

80. Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. I, 7-8; Cox, Eagles of Savoy, 48-9; Stacey, Politics, 93-132, passim.
William was already on sufficiently good terms with the king to issue a letter of protection to a canon of Lincoln.81 In June the bishop-elect of Valence had been appointed as an arbiter, along with three others, of a case that concerned a taking of a ship with merchandise during the war at the time of king John's reign.82 And in the autumn of 1236 the Savoyard received a substantial reward when Henry granted him the English lands of the deceased count of Brittany, including the honour of Richmond.83 That the king had a good deal of trust for William was revealed by his intention to send him, as one of his envoys, to a meeting with the representatives of the Scottish crown.84 As it turned out, William was unable to go, since he had left England for a brief period of time around 26 February 1237.85 Henry's itinerary shows that he had accompanied his relative to Dover - a most impressive sign of attachment.86 The Savoyard's English properties were left in charge of one of the royal clerks, John de Gatesden, and Henry granted financial protection to William's host in England against those debts that had been presumably accumulated by the bishop-elect of Valence.87

By 23 June 1237 the queen's uncle was back in England, and back in his high position, by directing a writ of liberate at court.88 Two of William's clerks gained

81. CPR 1232-47, 140.
82. Ibid., 150; For similar cases consigned to William and certain others for judgement, Ibid., 168, 170.
83. The grant exempted, however, the land of Hinton [Cambridge]. In this letter 'patent' William was referred to as being "in the king's service", Ibid., 156; Close Rolls 1234-37, 310-11.
84. CPR 1232-47, 177.
85. Ibid., 176; For the problem of William's movements, Cox, Eagles of Savoy, 60. It seems from the above entry in the Patent Rolls that William's arrival was anticipated before Michaelmas 1237.
86. CPR 1232-47, 175-76.
87. Ibid., 176.
88. CLR 1226-40, 277; It appears that prior to his departure in February 1237 William had given a personal gift to Henry - a cup, or mazer. The king appreciated the present, for he had ordered in May that some additional works be carried out on it with silver and gold, Ibid., 268. For a personal present from Henry to the Savoyard, Ibid., 288.
ecclesiastical benefices in February-March 1238: Master Walter de Dyva in the bishopric of Durham, and Master Peter d’Aigueblanche in the archdeaconry of Richmond.\textsuperscript{89} The elect of Valence appears to have stayed with the king at Marlborough in c. 19-22 March 1238, where he issued a number of letters ‘patent’.\textsuperscript{90} In addition, the Savoyard had been appointed by 19 March as one of the three executors of the will of the queen of Scotland.\textsuperscript{91}

Ironically, by the time the Winchester dispute really developed with the postulation of Ralph Neville some time before 28 August 1238, William had left England never to return.\textsuperscript{92} He arrived to the Continent with Henry de Trubleville and some English troops to assist Frederick II in his offensive in northern Italy, and already on 23 August the Savoyard’s forces accomplished a victory in the battlefield by routing the enemy forces intending to relieve the siege of Brescia.\textsuperscript{93}

William’s extraordinary rise at the English court in 1236-38 was signalled not so much by the grants and gifts that he had received, but by the fact that he quickly attained a position among the royal counsellors to direct various orders himself.\textsuperscript{94} The king’s attachment to, and designs with the bishop-elect of Valence not only mirrored his deep personal attachment to him: Savoyard support for the English crown was vital for

\textsuperscript{89} CPR 1232-47, 211. D’Aigueblanche became bishop of Hereford in 1240.
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., 214.
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., 214.
\textsuperscript{92} Close Rolls 1237-42, 95; CPR 1232-47, 221; Stacey, Politics, 124, 126.
\textsuperscript{93} Cox, Eagles of Savoy, 65-8; On 9 February 1239 Henry had ordered the repayment of one thousand marks that had been advanced by Florentine merchants for the expedition, CLR 1226-40, 365.
\textsuperscript{94} In these years the queen’s uncle issued letters ‘close’ on no less than eight occasions: Close Rolls 1234-37, 300, 325, 405, 409, 492, 495; Close Rolls 1237-42, 34, 38.
Henry's Continental ambitions. William died quite unexpectedly, however, on c. 1 November 1239, and when Henry

"heard this mournful news, [he] could not restrain himself for grief, but tore his clothes, and threw them into the fire, and, giving vent to loud lamentations, refused to accept consolation from any one."  

It appears that it was for the first time that a death of a relative affected the king to such an extent. Henry also gave instructions to engage no less than eighteen chaplains "to celebrate divine service ... for the soul of ... the late elect of Valence".  

As far as Ralph Neville was concerned, he came to weather the king's anger after the Winchester monks had postulated him, instead of William of Savoy. Henry's initial reaction was strong and he divested the chancellor of the custody of the great seal on 28 August 1238. Ralph appears to have been also deprived of the financial benefits of the office shortly afterwards, and on 20 June 1240 he was ordered to surrender all his privileges which he had obtained from the crown during the years of service. The bishop of Chichester remained titular chancellor, however, and on 5 May 1242 he continued with the supervision of the great seal until his death on 1-4 February 1244. In 1238-41 the king made no real attempts to compensate Ralph for the unjust treatment due to the Winchester monks' decision. In May 1242, however, just a few days before the departure of the royal expedition to Poitou and Gascony,

95. Cox, Eagles of Savoy, 454; According to Stacey, Politics, 124, Henry's "overzealous efforts in 1238 and 1239 to have William elected bishop of Winchester reflected the king's awareness that he could not safely bring William back to England simply as a councillor". Eleanor, in fact, also strongly desired the episcopal promotion of William, Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 396.

96. Ibid., vol. I, 241; Cox, Eagles of Savoy, 76.

97. These services were performed daily for the duration of one year, and the chaplains received a stipend, CLR 1226-40, 436, 440. See also Close Rolls 1237-42, 164, 233.

98. Ibid., 95; Charter Rolls 1226-57, 235.


100. CPR 1232-47, 290; Handbook of British Chronology, 85.
Henry had realised that there was a need for the bishop's expertise. As a sign of old confidence, Ralph was also entrusted, along with the constable of Dover, to organise the defence of the English coast.

The king took his old servant's loyalty granted irrespective of the past, but restoration to high office did not carry corresponding material rewards for Ralph after 1242. The death of the chancellor did not affect Henry in the same way as that of William of Savoy; Ralph, however, had bequeathed to the king an emerald and a ruby ring in his will.

We must now return to William Raleigh, for it is on him that the second phase of the Winchester dispute centred. Moreover, in the period between the departure of William of Savoy from England and his death, i.e. summer 1238 -November 1239 this royal judge became the bishop of Norwich. Sometime before 10 April 1239 the monks of Coventry and the canons of Lichfield, faced with an election, also chose William Raleigh as their pastor, but he declined in favour of Norwich. In connection to these two events Matthew Paris made an important claim: the electors apparently had decided on William as a way of a compromise to royal interest, mindful

101. The king returned to England only in September 1243. During his absence the keeper of the seal was Silvester Everdon, bishop of Carlisle in 1247-54, CPR 1232-47, 290; Handbook of British Chronology, 38, 85.

102. CPR 1232-47, 305.

103. For two grants of no great value to Ralph in January 1244, Ibid., 415.

104. Close Rolls 1242-47, 159.

105. The relevant dates of the Norwich election are as follows: William was elected on 10 April 1239; the temporalities of the see were restored between 4 June and 26 July 1239; the bishop-elect was consecrated on 25 September 1239, The Chronicle of Bury St Edmunds, 10; CLR 1226-40, 392, 403; Waverly, 323; Fasti, vol. II, 57. It should be remembered that William became bishop of Norwich following the annulment of Simon of Elmham's election.

of the advantages of advancing a courtier.\textsuperscript{107} And, indeed, they proved to be correct, since the king showed no 'hesitation' to admit William to a bishopric in the summer of 1239. This seemed to have been the crux of the matter: Henry had no reason to refuse, and even appears to have wanted Raleigh to have Norwich as a reward, and thus he definitely did not want him to have Winchester.

To return briefly to the chronology of events: following the annulment of Ralph Nevill's election by Gregory IX in February 1239, the Winchester electors again decided in favour of William Raleigh in the summer of 1240.\textsuperscript{108} The king's opposition to the judge, however, was firm and Henry was successful, by using legal and other means, to prevent the translation of the bishop of Norwich to Winchester for more than four years.\textsuperscript{109} Indeed Henry was unrelenting even after Gregory IX had confirmed the candidate on 17 September 1243, upon which he appealed to Rome in December.\textsuperscript{110} It was only after the pope's rejection of this appeal on 28 February 1244, and after negotiations between the king and William that Henry surrendered his claims in the autumn of 1244.\textsuperscript{111}

While the king's antagonism to his old servant was consistent in this case, his motives were not. In 1238 William was rejected by the crown in favour of William of Savoy, but in the summer of 1240 those considerations could no longer apply. After the death of the Savoyard, however, Henry had intended to advance another uncle of the queen, Boniface of Savoy, to the same see. Boniface subsequently became elected to Canterbury on 1 February 1241, after which there naturally was no point for the king to

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., 161, 166; The practice of electing a trusted curialis has already been referred to. It, however, did not always work, as the case of the Winchester dispute effectively demonstrated. In Norwich, as we have seen, discreet pressure appears to have been applied by the crown to elect Raleigh.

\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., 246, 337-38.

\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., 379-81, 458, 462-63, 480-81, 487-489, 530-536; vol. II, 6-7, 31-2.


force the Winchester monks to accept him. Thus it is important to point out that Henry's motivation in rejecting William Raleigh to Winchester in 1238 was different to that of in the period between the death of William of Savoy and the election of Boniface to Canterbury, and also to that of in the interval between February 1241 and September 1244, when the king finally gave in. It is of interest therefore to look briefly at some of the circumstances of the summer election of 1240, keeping in mind the role of Boniface, since these were the principal factors that highlighted Henry's attitude to Raleigh at this time.

About three weeks after the death of William of Savoy, the king appointed sede vacante Andrew, the third-prior of St Swithun, Winchester, as a head of that cathedral monastery. Andrew would have been useful to Henry, since he had earlier actively supported the royal attempt to have William of Savoy elected to the see. Incidentally, on 11 December 1239, thus very shortly after his elevation, Andrew was given an imprest by the king, and received another favour in the form of a grant on 24 December. In the summer of 1240 Henry's interests in the Winchester election, i.e. his wish to have Boniface promoted, was advocated by Andrew, and out of the seven electors the prior and two others voted for the queen's uncle. As it turned out, the crown's endeavour to install another Savoyard into the English episcopacy was again frustrated and thus the relationship between Henry and William Raleigh greatly suffered. With royal backing, the prior of Winchester purged the cathedral of those monks who had defied the will of the king and elected the bishop of Norwich.

112. Fasti, vol. II, 7. For Boniface, see further.
114. He must have done so, however, in the capacity of a third-prior, and not as prior as Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. I, 240-41 would suggest.
As far as Henry's motives were concerned in opposing William after the election of Boniface to Canterbury, no obvious cause stood out. Although Matthew Paris gave the core of the description of this power struggle, he merely offered a somewhat superficial explanation of the king's reasons in resisting the bishop-elect of Winchester. Accordingly, Henry was driven first by "inveterate anger [which later] had hardened into lasting hatred"; furthermore he "was restrained by no consideration whatever" and acted on the "impulse of his own will".118 Doubtless, the king's actions in this case were somewhat drastic in comparison to those in other election disputes, but William was a weighty figure and Henry, it seems, never offered half-hearted resistance to those bishops-elect that he decided to reject. A negative personal consideration most likely affected the king against William, but there also must have been a good deal of sheer stubbornness in his exertion, a quality not necessary harmful in a medieval monarch. Furthermore, Henry could not have been oblivious to the financial advantages of the vacancy. Winchester was the richest bishopric in England which supplied the crown, during the years of the dispute, with about twenty thousand pounds and with plenty of opportunities to present favourites to ecclesiastical benefices. The notion of the impulsive handling of the controversy by the king is also contradicted by the claims of Powicke and Southern: Henry pretty much knew when to give in, and this was at the time when it became clear that his legal manipulations would not succeed.119

It appears that following the reconciliation between the king and the bishop of Winchester, there were no bitter residues left in their relations, at any rate, not as far as Henry was concerned. William had even the chance to authorise four letters 'close' in...

118. Ibid., 462-63.

119. One of the conditions of William's acceptance was that the bishop should not remove those who had gained ecclesiastical benefices through Henry since the commencement of the dispute, Ibid., 534; Powicke, Henry III, 273; Southern, Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages, 129.
Like in the case of another old servant, Ralph Neville, the king was prepared to revive the old ties without bothering about the past.

While William Raleigh was not prepared to take up episcopal duties in the unattractive see of Coventry and Lichfield in 1239, one of his colleagues at court, Hugh Pattishall, the treasurer was willing to do so. The bishopric had become vacant with the death of Alexander Stavensby in December 1238, and although the electors had then put forward two consecutive candidates who would have been quite acceptable to the crown, to their misfortune both of them declined for reasons of their own. The monks of Coventry and the canons of Lichfield had been, however, consistent in their category of nominees and for the third time also elected a courtier whom the king had no reason to refuse. The exact date of Hugh's election is unknown: it had occurred in September-December 1239, after which the temporalities were restored on 1 January 1240.

The promotion of the treasurer by the time the Winchester dispute was well under way demonstrated with a certain sense of irony how easy it was for a trusted curialis to gain episcopal advancement - provided Henry did not have any specific schemes of his own. Like in the case of Walter Cantilupe, Hugh's father, Simon, also served king John, although not as a steward of the household but as a justice.

120. Close Rolls 1247-51, 100, 106, 146, 249. It should be pointed out that the CPR 1232-47, 621, index, gives several incorrect references to William after 1244. These are on pages 450, 477, 489, 496, 499, 501, 502, and deal with the bishop of Norwich by the time William was translated to Winchester.


123. Considering that Raleigh was elected to Norwich on 10 April 1239, the election of Farnham and his subsequent decline would have taken place around June-August 1239. Thus Hugh must have been elected in September-December 1239. See Handbook of British Chronology, 253, which only gives 1239. Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. I, 173-74, 255; Close Rolls 1237-42, 164-65.

124. Hugh was consecrated on 1 July 1240, Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. I, 277.

125. Ibid., 174; Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 189.
Hugh became treasurer in June 1234, following the fall of the Poitevins from power, but he already had had some connection with the crown before that. In 1225, for example, Hugh was a witness at court. More importantly, some time before February 1233 he had acquired the custody of the lands of one Nigel de Mowbray. Hugh appears to have been well acquainted by this stage with Ralph Neville, Walter Mauclerc, the bishop of Carlisle, and Hubert de Burgh.

Hugh's wages as treasurer of the exchequer seem to have amounted to one hundred marks a year. While in office he "had conducted himself irreproachably" according to Matthew Paris. Not surprisingly, in the seven years prior to his death in 1241, Hugh was presented with gifts on at least eleven, and with grants on no less than eight occasions. The treasurer may have been also involved in ecclesiastical work as canon of St Paul's, London [in the capacity of the prebendary of Nesden] in 1239. On 17 January 1240 - soon after the restoration of temporalities of Coventry - the king granted an imprest of four hundred marks to Hugh and in the following month a little more than thirty-two pounds were advanced to the elect as a gift. It was also a sign of Henry's appreciation of his ex-treasurer that on 26 April 1240 he had paid for his mitre worth just under twenty pounds - a gesture that appears

126. Handbook of British Chronology, 103.
128. CPR 1232-47, 10.
129. Ibid., 10.
130. By an interesting comparison the dowry of Henry's sister, Isabella, was settled at thirty thousand marks, Ibid., 75, 114, 188. See also Ibid., 132, for a minor favour to the treasurer's brother, Walter [involving Hugh].
134. CLR 1226-40, 439, 450.
to have been seldom exercised by the crown.135

By this time, of course, the king may have been aware of the resignation on 8 April of the elect of Durham, Thomas Melsonby. Four of those monks who came to the papal curia to represent the case of their prior died in Rome, but whether their death was natural, or brought about by someone on the royal side is not known. Matthew Paris excluded neither possibility, although the incident undoubtedly suited the crown.136

The Durham election licence was granted on 13 November 1240, although Henry already had candidates in mind.137 These were Peter d'Aigueblanche, the bishop-elect of Hereford, and Boniface of Savoy, the queen's uncle.138 The king was not really prepared, however, to press for their promotion in Durham and the monks were able in the end to elect their own man, Nicholas Farnham, the royal physician on 2 January 1241.139 Since the nominee was thoroughly acceptable, Henry let the matter drop and gave his assent to the election of Nicholas on 10 February 1241.140 Matthew Paris praised the elect for being a man of "laudable morals and knowledge", who had had an outstanding university career on the Continent as well as in England in the decades prior to his elevation; Nicholas also became "pre-eminently distinguished" in the "art of medicine".141 Henry was far from being indifferent to a man of such standing, and he

135.  Ibid., 461.
137.  CPR 1232-47, 238.
139.  Ibid., 320-21; Close Rolls 1234-37, 145; Fasti, vol. II, 31.
140.  CPR 1232-47, 244. Especially since d'Aigueblanche became consecrated to Hereford on 23 December 1240, and Boniface elected to Canterbury on 1 February 1241. For them, see further.
and Eleanor attended the consecration ceremony on 9 June 1241 at Gloucester.\textsuperscript{142}

The king had been on good terms with Nicholas from at least as early as 1227: just after four months of the declaration of majority in January, Henry had ordered the bailiffs of Southampton to present him, then a royal clerk, with one tun of wine.\textsuperscript{143} Henry was already aware in January 1227 of the impending departure of Nicholas to the Continent, since he had issued a letter of protection for him in that month.\textsuperscript{144} The clerk probably had returned to England in late autumn 1229, as he was a recipient of a gift from the crown in November, and within six years Nicholas became a royal physician.\textsuperscript{145} In 1237 Nicholas was called upon, along with William Raleigh and Ralph Neville, to settle an account rendered by John de Gatesden, clerk of the queen's wardrobe.\textsuperscript{146} In October 1237 the chaplain of the royal physician was presented to the church of Knowle [Dorset] in the diocese of Salisbury, and also in the same month Henry pardoned some prisoners at Nicholas' request.\textsuperscript{147} The king and his physician had come to a common understanding in 1238 on one problem, namely the vicarage of the church of Essendine [Rutland] and they issued an ordinance sometime before 19 May in regard to it.\textsuperscript{148} In the course of next year Nicholas was involved in a relatively minor affair of making arrangements for a lady, whom Henry had proposed to make a nun at Tarrant Crawford [Dorset].\textsuperscript{149} In July 1239 the physician also had the task of

\begin{quote}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[142.] Ibid., 359, for the problem of the precise date of the consecration, see further. See also Handbook of British Chronology, 241, for an uncertain date.
\item[143.] CLR 1226-40, 33.
\item[144.] Patent Rolls 1225-32, 106.
\item[146.] CPR 1232-47, 196.
\item[147.] Ibid., 204; Close Rolls 1234-37, 507.
\item[148.] Apart from Essendine Nicholas also held a benefice in Bourton [Gloucester], CPR 1232-47, 220, 233.
\item[149.] CLR 1226-40, 374.
\end{enumerate}
\end{quote}
supplying one Roger le Panetier, who was lying ill at Woodstock with money. About a year later Nicholas received ten oak-trunks from the forest of Kinver [Stafford] as a royal gift.

Nicholas' services, first as a clerk, then a physician, and also - as Matthew Paris claimed - as a confessor to the royal couple were well rewarded. Nicholas undoubtedly moved in high circles: he was a "familiar counsellor" of the king and Eleanor, moreover, he was on good terms with the papal legate, Otho, the bishop of Carlisle, and other royal advisers. Not surprisingly Henry accepted the election of Nicholas to Durham with "pleasure". There may have been special reasons for the king to undertake his journey from London to Gloucester in those first days of June 1241, but, at any rate, he most likely looked forward to seeing his former servant and take part in a lavish feast. Henry certainly was not bothered with official business on the day of the consecration - judged by the records of the court.

Mention has already been made of Peter d'Aigueblanche, a clerk of William of Savoy, who was presented by the crown to the church of St Michael on Wyre in March 1241.

150. Ibid., 399.
151. Ibid., 479. On 22 May 1241 Henry gave orders to have a total of twenty bucks carried to Gloucester - undoubtedly for the consecration feast of Nicholas, CLR 1240-45, 52. Although the Fasti, vol. II, 31-2, and the Handbook of British Chronology, 241, give either 26 May or 9 June 1241 as possible consecration dates, the latter date is more probable. There is no reason to doubt that the king attended the ceremony at Gloucester. In fact, judging by the rather large gift of twenty bucks he had already known on 22 May that he would be attending it. But Henry certainly was not in Gloucester on 26 May - he arrived at the town most probably on 8 or 9 June - as he was still in Abingdon [Berks.] on 7 June, some seventy kilometres from Gloucester, Close Rolls 1237-42, 307-8.
152. As a physician and confessor Nicholas managed well, Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. I, 321. The Close Rolls list at least ten presents given to Nicholas in 1227-41. These normally were wood and wine: Close Rolls 1227-31, 265, 287, 316; Close Rolls 1231-34, 411; Close Rolls 1234-37, 496; Close Rolls 1237-42, 5, 81, 84, 109, 205.
154. Ibid., 322.
155. CPR 1232-47, 252-53.
Then as we have seen, in 1240 the king had made feeble attempts to intrude him to Durham, before the election of Nicholas Farnham. And yet Henry probably did not know Peter before January 1236, for it seems the clerk had come to England only with the entourage of William of Savoy, i.e. with that of Eleanor of Provence.\footnote{156}

Peter subsequently had left England in 1238 with William of Savoy, but returned after the death, in November 1239, of Henry's favourite. His background - he was also a Savoyard of high social rank - and his association with William secured his appointment at the English court, on 4 February 1240, as keeper of the wardrobe.\footnote{157} Peter probably expected such an outcome, and if so this would have explained his quick return from the Continent.

Following the resignation of the bishop of Hereford, Ralph Maidstone, a chance arose for the king to obtain the see for his trusted foreign courtier. The opportunity was not lost by Henry and the Hereford electors - although they had their own candidate - were incapable to withstand royal intrusion resulting in the election of Peter on 24 August 1240.\footnote{158} The king confirmed the election on 6 September, and later attended the consecration ceremony held in St Paul's church at London on 23 December 1240.\footnote{159}

The case of Peter d'Aigueblanche invites some comparison with that of Nicholas Farnham. The point at the fore is that this Savoyard, as a result of his background, had

\footnote{156} Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 189. For incorrect references to Peter in 1234 and 1237: CPR 1232-47, 73, 190, 519. These, in fact, relate to Ralph Maidstone.

\footnote{157} Prior to this appointment Peter seems to have acquired the archdeaconry of Shropshire, Handbook of British Chronology, 79; Peter "belonged to a junior branch of the great Savoyard house of Briancon, whose chiefs were viscounts of the Tarentaise", W.N. Yates, 'Bishop Peter de Aquablanca (1240-1268): a Reconsideration', Journal of Ecclesiastical History 22 (1971), 303.

\footnote{158} This original candidate was a "certain canon of Lichfield, a praiseworthy man, who ... seeing that bad times were impending ... resigned his claim", Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. I, 290.

\footnote{159} Ibid., 290, 311; Peter seems to have resigned from office by 15 December 1240, CPR 1232-47, 240.
managed within the space of two years, i.e. in 1240-42, to obtain just about more attention in material terms than Nicholas for more than a decade prior to his elevation. The claim is proved by the Close Rolls alone: Peter had been given in this relatively short period of time gifts on no less than ten occasions; grants on at least seven instances; he had directed two letters 'close' and had a house lent to on the occasion of his consecration feast.160 The elect of Hereford also received from the crown a gold mitre worth fourteen marks.161

Peter's entrance to very high circles was quite meteoric after his second arrival in England, and stood in sharp contrast to the steady early career of Nicholas Farnham. The clerk may have inherited some of the king's affection originally reserved for William of Savoy, but more importantly Henry must have been well aware that foreigners, i.e. the Savoyards, even if not relations, could be fully trusted with sensitive bishoprics such as Hereford essentially because they could turn to no one in England, but the crown. And the king could not expect substantial Savoyard support of his Continental ambitions unless he forged strong links by installing Eleanor's relatives in positions of power and importance in England. The bishop, not surprisingly, proved to be, on the whole, a reliable supporter of the English monarchy.162 Looking back in 1268, when Peter died, Henry could have overall felt justified in putting, what seemed like extreme confidence in the clerk in 1240-42, even though the bishop of Hereford became a target of sizeable 'nationalistic' opposition over the years.

Not all had the good fortune of being supported by the king like d'Aigueblanche, and this was certainly true in the case of those who would rise to the episcopacy from the ranks of the clergy. Prime example of the latter kind of men was Roger of

---


161. CLR 1226-40. 502.

Salisbury. He became consecrated as bishop of Bath on 11 September 1244.\textsuperscript{163} From Henry's point of view, Roger must have been precisely in the same category as Richard Wendene, bishop of Rochester. Both Richard and Roger appear to have been very little involved in the affairs of the crown not only before their elevation, but even after, i.e. as bishops in their respective sees. The king's initial candidate for the bishopric of Bath was a Poitevin, Peter Chaceporc, keeper of the wardrobe, but Henry later withdrew the nomination.\textsuperscript{164} The early retreat was arguably a realistic decision, for the king's chances to influence matters would have been seriously weakened by the simple fact that he was campaigning in France.

The date of Roger's election fell between the death of his predecessor, Jocelin of Wells, on 19 November 1242, and 24 March 1243.\textsuperscript{165} On this latter date Henry informed the dean and chapter of Wells that although the prior and monks of Bath had postulated a candidate, i.e. Roger, he recognised also the claim of Wells, according to which in the election their advice had not been sought, despite their right to participate.\textsuperscript{166} The king was in Bordeaux at the time and he pledged to await papal decision in the matter.\textsuperscript{167} Despite opposition from Wells, Innocent IV had confirmed the elect on 3 February 1244 and this was followed by the giving of royal assent on 10 May.\textsuperscript{168} The whole affair is omitted in Matthew Paris' main chronicle, it is claimed, however, that Roger had been very much learned in theology and had also "polite


\textsuperscript{164} \textit{Close Rolls} 1242-47, 59; \textit{Handbook of British Chronology}, 79.

\textsuperscript{165} Giles, \textit{Matthew Paris}, vol. I, 438. For a somewhat misleading date of the election, see \textit{Handbook of British Chronology}, 228.

\textsuperscript{166} \textit{CPR} 1232-47, 369.

\textsuperscript{167} Ibid., 369.

\textsuperscript{168} \textit{Cal. Papal Letters}, vol. I, 205, 206, 208; Innocent IV also ruled that in future elections should be made on equal terms between the chapter of Wells and the convent of Bath, \textit{CPR} 1232-47, 425.
manners".169

According to Marion Gibbs, Roger was precentor of Salisbury cathedral from 1228 to 1244.170 As mentioned in the previous chapter, on 29 July 1228 Edmund of Abingdon, treasurer of Salisbury, the dean, the chancellor and the successor of the see were given licence to elect following the translation of Richard Poore to the bishopric of Durham. The successor was Roger, who was, therefore, not precentor yet at this time.171 Thus if Gibbs is nevertheless correct in her claim then Roger’s appointment to the higher position must have come after 29 July 1228, perhaps after the successful journey of the Salisbury delegation.172 At any rate, Roger had met Henry in late July 1228 in Windsor. He died a little less than twenty years later, in December 1247, as a bishop of extremely low profile, who seems to have been in debt to the king.173

In the bishopric of London, a man of very different background to that of Roger of Salisbury became promoted following the death of Roger Niger in September 1241. Fulk Basset belonged to the same category as Walter Cantilupe: Henry approved their advancement to the episcopacy not so much as a result of their personal merits, but as a consequence of their family background.

Shortly before Christmas, when the London canons gathered to elect a new pastor, the king’s wish was hardly that of promoting Fulk’s career. On the contrary, Henry had wished to see Peter d’Aigueblanche as bishop of London and he urged the

170. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 197.
172. Roger occurs as a precentor in June 1234, to whom a royal letter of protection was given, CPR 1232-47, 56.
chapter of St Paul's to that effect. By this time Peter had been bishop of Hereford for about a year and the king wanted to translate his favourite to a more central and probably more profitable diocese. Henry, however, was not prepared to disapprove the electors' decision to choose Fulk and gave his assent on 28 January 1242. On the same day the king also notified the papacy of his decision and requested confirmation of the bishop-elect. The rather long delay resulting in the consecration of Fulk only on 9 October 1244 was caused by the vacancy on the papal throne in 1241-43, as well as in Canterbury in 1240-45, and Henry himself was campaigning in France from May 1242 to September 1243. In the end, the new pope, Innocent IV, issued a mandate on 16 December 1243 to the archbishop-elect of Canterbury to confirm Fulk, and his order was executed on 23 January 1244 by the would-be metropolitan, Boniface of Savoy. Henry probably had benefited financially from the delay, for he restored the temporalities of London only on 16 March 1244.

The king had no reason to be disappointed over his failure to translate d'Aigueblanche: like in Durham, where the royal candidates had been Savoyards in 1240, the bishopric of London was also filled up by someone he could rightly regard as a supporter, if only because Fulk's high social rank. The Bassets were a well established family in Headington, near Oxford, and elsewhere in the Midlands; Fulk's father, Alan had been lord of Wycombe and other manors in the south and west of England, and a friend of king John. Alan died in 1232 and was succeeded by Fulk's elder brother,

175. Ibid., 270.
177. Innocent IV was informed that Fulk's elevation had been supported by fourteen out of twenty-three canons, Cal. Papal Letters, vol. I, 203; Fasti, vol. I, 3.
178. CPR 1232-47, 421.
179. Powicke, Henry III, 128.
Gilbert.\textsuperscript{180}

"He had served King Henry on the Marches, been keeper of the forest of Dean, and, more significant, castellan of Devizes and keeper of Chippenham forest."\textsuperscript{181}

Gilber, in due course, had become one of the leaders of the rebellious barons in 1233-34 and an ally of Richard Marshal, but he was restored to royal favour when the revolt ended.\textsuperscript{182} More importantly, Gilbert had become a royal counsellor in 1234, and his [past] services could not be ignored by Henry while evaluating Fulk’s advancement in 1242.\textsuperscript{183} When Gilbert died in 1241, Fulk inherited the Basset estates.\textsuperscript{184}

Not much is known, however, about Fulk’s activities prior to his elevation to the episcopacy. The younger brother had been provost of Beverly [York] from at least 20 June 1234 to probably 1239 [or early 1240], when he became dean of York.\textsuperscript{185} As provost of Beverly, Fulk was sent to France, along with the archdeacon of Canterbury, and the archdeacon of Coventry in the autumn of 1235, in an attempt to secure the keeping of peace between Henry III and Louis IX.\textsuperscript{186}

Marion Gibbs is mistaken to claim that Fulk had held the deanery of York until 1241.\textsuperscript{187} Fulk met the king on 28 April 1242 [three months after royal assent to his election had been given], at Winchester, where he acted as witness at court, and was referred to as dean at the time.\textsuperscript{188} Merely four days later Fulk, still as dean, received

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{180} Ibid., 128.
  \item \textsuperscript{181} Ibid., 128.
  \item \textsuperscript{182} Ibid., 128-29; 140.
  \item \textsuperscript{183} Ibid., 155.
  \item \textsuperscript{184} Ibid., 128.
  \item \textsuperscript{185} CPR 1232-47, 116.
  \item \textsuperscript{186} CPR 1232-47, 57; Cal. Papal Letters, vol. I, 161; Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 198; Fulk’s successor in Beverly was, by March 1240, William of York, bishop of Salisbury in 1247-56.
  \item \textsuperscript{187} Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 198.
  \item \textsuperscript{188} Charter Rolls 1226-57, 270.
\end{itemize}
a rather large quantity of venison as a gift from his sovereign.189 And when
Innocent IV had requested Boniface in December 1243 to confirm the elect of London,
he also referred to Fulk as dean of York.190 It would thus seem that the heir of the
Basset estates did not relinquish the deanery, but held on to office until his
consecration.

Fulk's other brother, Philip, pursued a secular career of his own and became
Henry's justiciar in 1261.191 The Bassets' ultimate loyalties lay with the monarchy
during the critical years beginning in 1258: Philip became an opponent of Simon de
Montfort, while Fulk was far from being sympathetic to the baronial cause, unlike some
of his episcopal colleagues.192 The bishop of London did not live to see the full
development of the political struggle, for he died in May 1259.193

As far as the 1240's were concerned, however, the conservative mood of the
electors was evident not only in Coventry, Canterbury, Durham, Hereford and London,
but in Chichester as well.194 It seemed that the Chichester canons had been content
with a rule of a courtier-bishop, and following the death of Ralph Neville in February
1244, they had opted for a safe candidate in the person of Robert Passelewe, a highly
valued curialis.195

Robert was at one stage a clerk of Fawkes de Breauté, a rebel, and in 1224 he
was sent to Rome by those dissatisfied barons who objected to the authority of

189. Close Rolls 1237-42, 420. Venison [eight bucks] was also supplied by the crown
for Fulk's consecration feast: Close Rolls 1242-47, 222.


193. Osney, 122.

194. It was already evident form the election of Ralph Neville to Winchester in 1238.
As we have seen, all elections in 1238-44, with the exception of that of Roger of
Salisbury, resulted in the promotion of a trusted courtier.

195. Royal assent to Robert's election was given on 19 April 1244, CPR 1232-47, 423.
Hubert de Burgh. In 1225 Robert accompanied Fawkes to the papal curia and assisted him to defend his cause. The clerk later became reconciled with Henry and attached himself to the Poitevins. With the fall of des Roches and des Rievaux, Robert also had lost the favour of the king, but again managed to regain it in 1235-36.

There were more immediate reasons, however, for Henry's support of the elect of Chichester in 1244. Sometime in 1242-43 Robert had pointed out to the king that by fining the 'encroachers' of royal forests money could be raised by the crown. Henry had listened to the advice, and appointed Robert as a forest judge, with the result that a few thousand marks were, in fact, collected before 1244. Matthew Paris described the circumstances of the Chichester election, and his picture contradicts the claim of Marion Gibbs, according to which the king had persuaded the chapter to elect Robert. In reality, the electors chose Robert not as a result of coercion, but on their own accord, i.e. in order to avoid any possible complications and disputes. It has already been seen that such elections had become almost a normal occurrence from 1238, and Robert's attempted promotion appears to have been a typical case.

Henry naturally became much pleased with the financial results of his forest judge's inquisition and, as Matthew Paris put it, due to this Robert "obtained the king's

200. Ibid., 40.
201. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 88.
202. It is true that following Robert's election, Henry made considerable efforts to have him accepted in Rome through his agent. In a strict sense, however, this did not make Robert the king's candidate, Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 49-50.
favour in a wonderful degree". This development did not escape the attention of
the Chichester canons, and they

"began to think ... [Robert] a fit and very useful person to undertake the rule of
their church ... hoping, therefore, to please God and the king, as well as to
obtain the king's favour and protection ... elected the said Robert Passelewe
their bishop".

Undoubtedly, as it had happened on a good few occasions elsewhere, the Chichester
electors' chief considerations in 1244 were political, rather than religious.

Robert's prominence in 1235-44 is thoroughly proved by the sheer amount of
references to him in the public records. The Close Rolls, for example, hold no less than
fifty four entries on him in this period. These comprise mandates, grants, gifts and
various appointments impossible to discuss here in any detail. Robert worked closely
with the guardians of the realm during Henry's Continental expedition in 1242-43 and
was well rewarded for his services. He had been sheriff of Southampton in 1242;
prebendary of three churches belonging to St Paul's, London in 1242-43; keeper of the
bishopric of Bath and of St Edward's abbey, Shaftsbury [Dorset] in 1243, and
archdeacon of Lewis [Sussex] after 5 March 1244. Robert, in brief, was a curialis of
high capabilities and of standing for whom royal support desirable for an episcopal
promotion would have been a normal order of the day.

The further evolution of the case of the Chichester election is also of interest,
since it connects us to Richard Wich, who eventually became the bishop of the see in
1245. Henry's judge and favourite was prevented from advancing to the episcopacy by
the elect of Canterbury, Boniface, who annulled Robert's election with the backing of

203. Ibid., 40.
204. Ibid., 41.
206. Ibid., 284, 298, 421; Close Rolls 1242-47, 52, 78, 84, 107, 284; CLR 1240-45, 192,
certain bishops, e.g. Robert Grosseteste. Matthew Paris implied that it was the rather harsh way in which Robert had conducted his inquisitions as a forest judge that was responsible on the part of Boniface and the others to reject the elect. Boniface subsequently had intruded, without advising the king, Richard Wich, who became opposed, however, by the crown. The dispute ended only with the restoration of temporalities to Richard on 21 July 1246. By this time, the hopes that Robert may have initially held, had probably been dashed with the consecration of Richard at Lyons on 5 March 1245, despite the efforts of Henry's agents in Rome to reverse the verdict of the metropolitan.

Mention has already been made of Boniface of Savoy on a number of occasions: although he had become elected to the archbishopric of Canterbury on 1 February 1241, it was not until 15 January 1245 that he was consecrated by Innocent IV at Lyons. The king had a chance to gain detailed information about Boniface after the arrival of Eleanor and her entourage to England in January 1236. And like William of Savoy, Boniface was also fortunate enough to gain, within a short period of time, a great deal of royal support.

The first sign of Henry's goodwill towards Boniface was already evident shortly after the death of William of Savoy in November 1239, after which the king intended simply to substitute one uncle of the queen for another to the see of Winchester. In the summer election of 1240, however, the Winchester monks again ignored Henry's wish and postulated William Raleigh for the second time as their bishop. The king's attempts of intrusion were aided by an 'insider' in Winchester: Andrew supported the


efforts to advance both William and Boniface of Savoy, first in a capacity of a third-prior, then following his own elevation by Henry, as a prior. It was only understandable that after Boniface’s election to Canterbury in February 1241, the king did not pursue the uncle’s promotion to Winchester further. What was somewhat ironic, however, was that Robert Grosseteste had turned to the elect requesting him to bring an end to the long vacancy in Winchester.

The elevation of the queen’s uncle to the archbishopric was not by any means the sincere desire of the Canterbury monks: as in most elections in the period, it reflected political expedience rather than religious considerations. Matthew Paris claimed that Henry had come to an understanding with the electors whereby in return of royal support from the denunciations of Stephen Langton, archdeacon of Canterbury - in connection with the absolution of an earlier excommunication by Edmund of Abingdon - they would promote Boniface. The monks were also aware that there existed a tacit agreement between the king and the papacy to promote Eleanor’s relative and thus their final decision to accept Boniface was most probably the wisest under the circumstances. The rest of the case is of interest only in its main points: the electors requested papal confirmation sometime before 25 March 1241; despite vacancy on the papal throne, Henry asked approval from Rome on 17 February 1243; Innocent IV confirmed the election on 16 September 1243, and the temporalities of the archbishopric were restored sometime between 27 February and 1 May 1244.

The extreme irony of the whole affair was that despite various efforts and reservations

---

212. Boniface’s role in the Winchester controversy in 1240-41 has already been referred to.


in England to promote the Savoyard, Boniface appears to have come to the kingdom only in 1244, and in this light it is hardly surprising that the court records make no mention of him prior to the Canterbury election. Nothing is known about the contacts between Henry and Boniface - who was also provost of Belley cathedral in France - prior to 1240-41, and this is most likely so, because there were no contacts.\textsuperscript{217} The king's unreserved support for Boniface was partly dictated by his general appreciation of the Savoyards which in turn reflected Henry's political designs and ambitions on the Continent.\textsuperscript{218}

The king certainly anticipated the uncle's arrival in 1244: he ordered the sheriff of Kent on 22 January to buy a rather large quantity of sixty tuns of wine, and to place it in the cellar of the archbishopric as a royal gift.\textsuperscript{219} It is also of interest that while Peter d'Aigueblanche had received from Henry a golden mitre worth fourteen marks, the value of the mitre given to the archbishop-elect sometime before 17 November 1244 was three hundred marks.\textsuperscript{220} The differentiation probably reflected not only the relative insignificance of Hereford in comparison to Canterbury, but also the importance of Boniface, who was after all a relative, unlike Peter.

\textsuperscript{217} Ibid., 7.

\textsuperscript{218} Clanchy, \textit{England and its Rulers}, 230-35. See also Richard Wich for Henry's other reason for wishing that a family member governed Canterbury.

\textsuperscript{219} CLR 1240-45, 212.

\textsuperscript{220} CLR 1226-40, 502; CLR 1240-45, 277.
CHAPTER IV

THE CONSERVATIVE YEARS, 1245-58
There must have been some anxiety felt in Norwich about the state of affairs in the see, following the death of Thomas Blundevill in 1236: while the elect, Simon of Elmham, became rejected by Henry, William Raleigh would leave the bishopric for Winchester. Under these circumstances, the monks of Norwich had faced with a prospect of a fresh episcopal election, and sometime before 9 July 1244 they chose Walter Suffield, canonist at Paris, as their pastor.¹

By the time of Walter's election, Raleigh had been opposed by the king for about four years, i.e. since the summer election of 1240 in Winchester. When the monks of Norwich learnt that despite Henry's objections to Raleigh the papacy had confirmed on 17 September 1243 the Winchester election, they requested from the crown licence to elect their new bishop.² This the king firmly refused on 3 December 1243, because he still thought that his new December appeal to Innocent IV would bear fruit.³ The papacy, however, again decided in favour of Raleigh on 28 February 1244.⁴ The point at the fore is that although the exact date of Walter Suffield's election is not known, considering this background, it most probably fell between 28 February and 9 July 1244, since it is unlikely that Henry would have allowed the Norwich monks to proceed without knowing the outcome of his December appeal. At any rate, whatever reservations the king may have had about fresh elections, when at the end Walter was presented he had not any objections.

Henry would have liked very much to see Raleigh remaining in Norwich, but when it became clear that this would not be the case, he accepted Walter, for as the

---

1. On this day royal assent was given to the election of Walter, CPR 1232-47, 431; Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. I, 459.


3. Ibid., 409, 412-13; From these entries it is clear that Walter's election had not yet occurred in December 1243.

chronicler claimed, there had existed "no motive for opposition" to him. The giving of royal assent was quickly followed by the restitution of the temporalities of the see on 17 July 1244: by this time the king must have given up all hopes of Raleigh remaining in Norwich, although negotiations with the judge continued until the autumn of 1244. On 26 February 1245 the Paris canonist was consecrated at Norwich.

Walter was connected to an important Norfolk family and he did not seem to have lacked in good qualities useful for episcopal work; Matthew Paris, at any rate, praised him in his usual terms. Nevertheless, Walter presents an already familiar case in as much as the court records appear to be completely silent on him prior to 1244. That Walter had nothing to do with the English crown before 1244 is most likely, and the negative evidence of the chronicles also supports this view. The occasional promotion of such men to the episcopacy showed that despite the possible danger they represented for the crown, an unknown background in itself did not automatically provoked royal opposition.

The bishop of Norwich, however, had no intentions to avoid contacts with the court, unlike some of his colleagues, in any rate, not in the first few years of his episcopacy. The king may have met Walter for the first time just one month after the consecration ceremony, during his brief visit to Norwich at the end of March 1245, on his way to Bromholme [Norfolk]. Another meeting at Norwich could have occurred

5. Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. I, 459; The chronicler implied that Walter's election was conducted according to the procedures, i.e. licence to elect was sought and granted beforehand.

6. Ibid., 530-36; vol. II, 6-7, 31-32; Close Rolls 1242-47, 211.


exactly three years later, when the king stayed in the city on 24 March 1248.\textsuperscript{10} According to Matthew Paris there were two definite encounters between Henry and Walter in 1245-48. In a religious ceremony in the autumn of 1247 at Westminster both the king and the bishop of Norwich participated: Henry carried the ‘Holy Blood’ and on the same day Walter performed mass.\textsuperscript{11} Undoubtedly less personal was their most likely next meeting during the February parliament of 1248, attended by Walter, eight other prelates, and certain magnates.\textsuperscript{12}

Favours to the bishop of Norwich were given on an extremely moderate scale in 1245-48. These included a grant in 1245 to hold a weekly market and a yearly fair in Thornham [Norfolk], and a letter of protection on 6 October 1248, just before Walter’s trip to Rome.\textsuperscript{13} Considering that from the king’s point of view, the Paris canonist was advanced from virtual obscurity to the English episcopacy, Walter could hardly expect too much attention from the crown in the first few years after his elevation. Yet in 1245-48 Henry and the bishop of Norwich appeared to have developed a normal working relationship.

The promotion of Richard Wich to the see of Chichester has already been touched upon: Boniface intruded him following the annulment of Passelewe’s election, without seeking Henry’s approval. The king challenged the ‘election’ of Richard for a period of little more than two years, from the time of the Chichester ‘election’ on 3 June 1244, to the restoration of the temporalities of the bishopric on 21 July 1246.\textsuperscript{14} Indeed, Henry formally persisted in his opposition even after Richard’s consecration at Lyons on 5 March 1245 and the rejection of Passelewe’s candidacy by the papacy in

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{10} CLR 1245-51, 171; Close Rolls 1247-51, 35.
  \item \textsuperscript{11} Giles, \textit{Matthew Paris}, vol. II, 240-41.
  \item \textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 245-55.
  \item \textsuperscript{13} Charter Rolls 1226-57, 289; CPR 1247-58, 28; Hist. Ang., vol. III, 36.
  \item \textsuperscript{14} Ibid., vol. II, 488; Close Rolls 1242-47, 442.
\end{itemize}
July. At the end, the king appears to have bowed to papal pressure, but already, before the restitution of temporalities, Henry had ordered on 30 March 1246 that the cost of those two mitres which had been presented to the bishop of Coventry, and of Chichester be paid by the treasury.¹⁵

The crown's animosity to Richard in 1244-46 cannot solely be explained in terms of support given to Passelewe: it was to a large extent connected to the way in which Boniface had conducted the whole Chichester affair. This theme explicitly rings through in the account of Matthew Paris: Henry was "vehemently enraged" when he had learnt of the actions of the archbishop-elect.¹⁶ The principal grievance of the king was that he had not been consulted, and informed beforehand, and this must also have been the main argument of the crown's agents at the papal court.¹⁷ Henry undoubtedly had a point, for such an execution of affairs had been unprecedented from 1226, and certainly, apart from the translation of Richard Poore in 1228, the king had his part, which might have varied at times in its extent, in all episcopal elections or promotions.¹⁸ To make Henry's injury worse, Boniface, who was responsible for the whole affair had been a royal nominee himself, and a recipient of unreserved royal support before June 1244.

The life of Richard Wich had become a focus of interest and admiration after his death in 1253 to such an extent that a biography was written about him around 1270 by a Dominican, Ralph Bocking.¹⁹ Using this and other sources, Marion Gibbs claimed that Richard had been chancellor of Oxford in 1235-38; chancellor of Edmund of Abingdon in c.1238-40, and studied theology with the Dominicans in Orleans in

¹⁵. CLR 1245-51, 37; See Roger Weseham.
¹⁷. Ibid., 41, 61.
¹⁸. The Rochester elections, as we have seen, constituted an exception.
Richard's chancellorship in Oxford during 1235-38 appears to be, however, dubious; Richard seems to have held this post only in 1240. Furthermore, he may have taken up his chancellorship in Canterbury in 1237, but perhaps as early as 1235.

Richard's association with Edmund of Abingdon would have most likely affected Henry's judgement of the elect of Chichester. The relation between the king and the archbishop had never been a particularly happy one, and by 1240 extra pressure must have been added to it by the Winchester dispute. It was felt that Henry had breached the rights of the church and Edmund, along with other bishops and nobles, protested against such a conduct of affairs at a meeting in London during January 1240. We must pause for a moment over one of Lawrence's general conclusion on the archbishop, since it seems to explain at one important level why the king had a strong desire to see a family member as a metropolitan after Edmund's death in November 1240.

"He [Edmund] seems if anything to have been over-aggressive. His readiness to employ spiritual sanctions in defence of the archbishop's temporal rights is striking, and exemplifies one of the less agreeable developments in the period." Henry, it appears, had no reason to sympathise with the archbishop, at any rate, not in the years immediately prior to 1240. Furthermore, the king could not have failed to know about the chancellor of Canterbury - Richard had been the "most distinguished

---

20. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 195, 197.
23. Lawrence, St. Edmund of Abingdon, 171, seems to suggest that Henry's intrusion in Hereford was also a subject of this protest in January 1240. But, in fact, d'Aigueblanche was elected only in August 1240. The author also implies that the January meeting occurred between Henry and Edmund. In reality, it was not a private meeting, but attended also by bishops, nobles as well as the legate, Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. I, 256.
24. Lawrence, St. Edmund of Abingdon, 172; Stacey, Politics, 220-21.
member" of the familia of Edmund. By the virtue of his office Richard had a privileged position shared only by a few other officials in the archbishop's council. Among these pre-eminent members of the familia, it was Richard who seems to have kept Edmund's company most of the time. The chancellor travelled with the archbishop to the Continent in 1237, and also accompanied him at the time of Edmund's final departure from England in 1240. The king was most probably aware of the closeness of the archbishop and Richard in this period by the sheer reason of their position in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. And certainly Henry had a good reason to believe in 1244-46 that Richard would turn out to be an ecclesiastic in Chichester in a similar mould to that of Edmund. This would have been an unwanted development for the crown. The Chichester election thus provided the king with a bitter combination that he naturally did not wish to swallow, hence his rejection of Richard for more than a year after the Lyons consecration. For Henry, Boniface had created a rather dangerous precedent that was worth a most stubborn fight; to make matters worse, Richard seemed to have been precisely the type of man, with his background, that the king had wanted to evade. Yet in June 1244 Henry undoubtedly had more reason to be infuriated by the queen's uncle than by the elect of Chichester.

The advancement of Roger Weseham [dean of Lincoln from 1240] to Coventry and Lichfield in 1245, had a few common aspects with that of Richard Wick to Chichester. The king paid for their rather inexpensive mitres on the same day in

25. Lawrence, St. Edmund of Abingdon, 146.
26. Ibid., 147.
27. Ibid., 147.
28. Ibid., 147; The claim of Richard's trip abroad with Edmund in 1237 certainly contradicts the notion that he was chancellor of Oxford in that year.
29. Strictly speaking, however, the court records do not bear out that Henry knew Richard prior to 1244.
March 1246, and both Richard and Roger had been consecrated by Innocent IV at Lyons. Like Richard, Roger was also promoted without Henry's assent and thus he became opposed by the king for some time. The bishop of Coventry was more fortunate, however, in as much as he had gained the temporalities of his see earlier than Richard, i.e. on 25 March 1246.

The promotion of Roger closed a rather long period of vacancy after the death of Hugh Pattishall in December 1241. The ensuing years provided Henry with financial benefits, and opportunities for ecclesiastical preferments and these were possible essentially as a result of vacancies in Canterbury and Rome. On 14 January 1242, when the king granted a licence to elect to the delegation of the chapter of Lichfield and the convent of Coventry, he did not think of intrusion in any way. Henry had met at this time one William of Montpellier, a monk of Coventry, who came to Westminster, along with a colleague, in the matter of the election licence. This William would be elected, in 1245, as bishop of Coventry, but as a result of resistance including that of the king, he would later resign his claim. Despite their meeting in January 1242, Henry did not really know William, moreover, the king's rather valued agent in ecclesiastical matters, Lawrence of St Martin, opposed the elect with full vigour. There may have been other reasons, but Henry did not seem to have favoured candidates with a monastic background - the king had his own motives to

32. CLR 1245-51, 37; Roger was consecrated on 4 July 1245, Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 61.
35. CPR 1232-47, 270.
36. Ibid., 270.
38. Ibid., 59; Lawrence of St Martin became bishop of Rochester in 1251. He represented Henry in Rome in the matter of the Winchester election in 1243-44, and in the case of Robert Passelewe, Ibid., 49; CPR 1232-47, 409.
oppose such men before, but the net result was that in 1226-44 only Hugh of Nortwold, abbot of St Edmunds, gained episcopal appointment. In the end, William of Montpellier, like John of Sittingbourne before him so many years earlier, humbly withdrew his claim.

The promotion of Roger Weseham took place in the summer of 1245. Both the dean and the bishop of Lincoln were at Lyons when Roger was provided to Coventry and Lichfield by Innocent IV, at the request of Grosseteste, on 17 May 1245. The crown's agent at the curia was undeniably correct in claiming that Henry had not been consulted at all, and apart from the examples of Richard Poore and Richard Wich the king was not used to this kind of treatment. While Henry’s opposition to Wich was to a large extent personal, such considerations did not apply to Roger. The dean of Lincoln had been known to the king from the late 1230's, although in 1240-45 he received only minimum amount of attention from the crown. Even this was of official nature: in 1242 the dean and chapter of the cathedral church St Mary, Lincoln had received a letter of protection from Henry during the contention between the crown and Grosseteste concerning among others, visitational rights. The king would not have met Roger in Lincoln between 1240 and 1245 since he did not visit the city in those years.

Official business between Henry and Roger was incomparably more intense some years earlier, during 1236-40, when Roger had held the archdeaconry of Oxford. This, no doubt, was partly due to Oxford's central position in a geographical sense, and to the fact that the city accommodated a university. In most aspects, Oxford was more central in the affairs of the kingdom then the relatively remote town

40. Ibid., 60-61.
41. CPR 1232-47, 331. For a suit between Grosseteste and Roger in 1242, which also concerned Henry, Ibid., 332; Close Rolls 1237-42, 435-36.
42. Close Rolls 1234-37, 731; Fasti, vol. III, 36-37.
of Lincoln. The king had spent various amounts of time in Oxford during February and November 1236; June, August and November 1237; May and October 1238, and on these occasions Roger may have met his sovereign. Henry was also aware in April 1236 of a court case involving Roger and one Ralph Pirot. During his time at Oxford the archdeacon received four letters ‘patent’ and one letter ‘close’ containing mandates directed to him.

Since Henry clearly had known Roger during his years in Oxford, it seems likely that he was also aware of the archdeacon’s earlier connection to the town. The fact was that prior to taking up duties as an archdeacon Roger had been Reader to the Franciscans at Oxford. The king was attached to the Mendicants and may have considered in 1245-46 Roger’s past link as a factor which in balance called for an acceptance of the Lyons consecration, despite the injury caused, in fact, by the whole affair.

Roger’s advancement was in many ways similar to that of Richard Wich, yet at the end, the former had an evident advantage. Unlike in the case of Richard, there was nothing in Roger’s past which would have negatively affected the king in his deliberation to accept the fait accompli of the Lyons consecration. Hence there was less resistance on the part of the crown to heed the urging of the papacy to admit the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield to his see.

While Richard Wich and Roger Weseham had the privilege of being ordained by Innocent IV, the consecration of the elect of Exeter, Richard Blund, on 22 October

43. Close Rolls 1234-37, 244, 395-96, 461, 486-87, 539, 562-63; Close Rolls 1237-42, 107, 128.
44. Close Rolls 1234-37, 258.
45. CPR 1232-47, 183, 184, 226, 233; Close Rolls 1234-37, 533.
47. CPR 1232-47, 476. It is quite likely, as Matthew Paris claimed, that Henry had also been urged by others around him to restitute the temporalities of the see to Roger, Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 168.
1245 at Reading must have been a more modest ceremony.\textsuperscript{48} Blund's advancement to the episcopacy, however, did not bring about royal opposition, and the bishop even received six deer as a gift from the king for the consecration feast.\textsuperscript{49}

The Exeter election occurred sometime before 30 January 1245, a day when Henry gave his assent to the promotion of Richard.\textsuperscript{50} It was an event that does not appear to have merited the attention of the chroniclers, and was most likely conducted free of any outside interference. The bishopric undoubtedly benefited from the advancement of Richard: he was a man of good qualities - according to Matthew Paris; Richard also had a university education, and acquired practical experience in diocesan affairs as chancellor of Exeter in the years prior to 1245.\textsuperscript{51}

It is not known whether the king knew Richard prior to 1245, but it is most likely that he did not. The court records, in any case, permit to draw no other conclusion, and even the possibility of an encounter between Henry and the chancellor of Exeter should be discounted [i.e. in Exeter], since the king does not seem to have visited the town in the eleven years from 1234 to 1245. Henry did not show much personal interest in the see during these times, and was quite prepared to accept a man, as a prelate, who had worked under bishop William Briwere.

Richard Blund's predecessor had governed the bishopric for twenty years and his uncle was at one stage a prominent counsellor of king John.\textsuperscript{52} In the period from the early 1230's to 1244 William Briwere's involvement in the affairs of the crown seemed to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{48} Ibid., 118.
\item \textsuperscript{49} Close Rolls 1242-47, 342.
\item \textsuperscript{50} CPR 1232-47, 448. Blund's predecessor, William Briwere, had died in November 1244.
\item \textsuperscript{51} The temporalities of the see were restored on 8 April 1245, Ibid., 448, 450; Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 118.
\item \textsuperscript{52} Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 188.
\end{itemize}
have been quite moderate, and he correspondingly was a recipient of royal favours.53 Of these engagements - such as being a witness on a number of occasions, and acting in the capacity of a judge in a case involving the king and the bishop of Bath - the most important one would have been his appointment to accompany Henry’s sister, Isabella, to the Continent in 1235.54

Recent troubles in ecclesiastical matters, i.e. the Winchester dispute, the problems associated with Passelewe, Wich and Weseham, may have also prompted Henry to stay away from interfering in Exeter, where he had lacked real interest anyway. All these must have been secondary motives, since Henry essentially had no desire to meddle in episcopal elections, unless for a particular reason.

Judging by the first six years of his episcopacy, Richard had chosen to remain aloof from the affairs of the monarchy. Contact between the bishop and the king was merely official in 1245-51, and even that was on a small scale.55 Richard appears to have belonged to a certain category of men - those, who were not prepared to be really involved in wider affairs even after their episcopal promotion. Richard Wendene, as we have seen, was one of such kind. Henry may have met Richard Blund for the first time only on 6-7 August 1250, when he visited Exeter - the king certainly could not have been present at the consecration ceremony of the elect on 22 October 1245, as he was in north Wales from late August until late October in that year.56

53. Close Rolls 1234-37, 81, 264, 486.
54. CPR 1232-47, 102, 105, 126, 135, 267.
55. Ibid., 482; CPR 1247-58, 18, 121, 496, 577; Close Rolls 1242-47, 428; Close Rolls 1247-51, 211.
56. CPR 1232-47, 460-62; CPR 1247-48, 72, 74; Close Rolls 1242-47, 362-66; Close Rolls 1247-51, 310-11.
In the promotion of William of York, provost of Beverly, to Salisbury in 1247, three already familiar elements were present. William had been a curialis of high stature before his election, and accordingly, the public records have a substantial amount of material on him; he seems to have been chosen by the canons of the see in an effort to make sure that the king would approve the nominee; and as it had been anticipated Henry happily approved the election of a thoroughly trusted man to the episcopacy. Six years later, in the parliament of 1253, the king would claim that William belonged to those bishops who had gained their appointment through his intervention. Such a contradiction in the Chronica Majora points to the occasional unreliability of Matthew Paris, although it does seem also to emphasise the thin line that had existed between a voluntary, expedient election of a curialis and discreet royal intrusion - as far as the chronicler could, or cared to tell. On the face of it, the king might have been suspect of intrusion every time a royal administrator was promoted, in fact, occasional interventions kept expedient elections re-occurring. In the interplay of secular and ecclesiastical interests, compromise on the part of the electors was bound to be perpetuated indefinitely. William could have been promoted, in the final analysis, either way.

The provost of Beverley appears to have started his career as a justice itinerant in 1226, and he pursued his judicial profession until at least 1248. In 1226 when William had first established his association with the crown, Henry was still a minor of

57. It appears that William became provost of Beverley not long before March 1240, Close Rolls 1237-42, 181, 210; Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. I, 280. As we have seen, William's predecessor in Beverley was Fulk Basset.

58. Robert Bingham, bishop of Salisbury, died in November 1246; William's election took place on 8 December and Henry gave his assent on 10 December 1246; the temporalities of the see were restored on 29 January 1247; William was consecrated either on 7 or 14 July 1247, Close Rolls 1237-42, 496-97; CPR 1232-47, 494; Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 196-97.


60. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 189; Dunstable, 178.
nineteen years, but it seems with a good memory: in the parliament of 1253 the king would also remind the bishop of Salisbury that he had "raised [him in 1226] ... from a very low degree". Of all the public records the Close Rolls demonstrate the best William's judicial activities from 1226 to 1246; his career in the service of the monarchy seems to have been uninterrupted. He was justice in eyre in at least nineteen various counties in 1231-42, and in a few of these he worked more than once. The significance of these assignments can be really appreciated from the fact that some of them had not escaped the attention of the monastic chroniclers in the late 1230's and early 1240's. Up to the time of Henry's acceptance of the elect of Salisbury, William was referred to in the Close Rolls on no less than eighty occasions, and this is already an indication of a long and steady career at a rather important level. The two deer that William had received from his sovereign in the summer of 1231 must have been one of the first royal gifts ever given to him, and naturally there were many other favours to come in the ensuing years. Just the Close Rolls list seven gifts in 1243-46.

Following the claim of Walter Rhodes, Marion Gibbs believed that during Henry's Continental expedition in 1242-43 William had been one of the three guardians of the realm. The assertion is essentially based on the Chronicle of Dunstable which,

62. Close Rolls 1231-34, 633, index; Close Rolls 1234-37, 620-21, index; Close Rolls 1237-42, 583, index. William was also justice of the Bench in 1234, Close Rolls 1231-34, 565, 570.
63. Tewkesbury, 97, 99, 107, 118; Dunstable, 155; Waverley, 328.
64. See under 'William de Eboraco' in the index of the relevant volumes of the Close Rolls.
65. Close Rolls 1227-31, 520.
in fact, is erroneous in this matter. All this highlights that the chronicle evidence, and in particular the *Annales Monastici*, on such vital points should be scrutinised against the court records. While William was not designated to such an important position in 1242-43, he certainly was very close to the centre of governmental power during the king's absence.

Just before his departure, Henry had appointed on 5 May 1242 the archbishop of York as guardian of England, with the bishop of Carlisle and William Cantilupe as his counsellors, and at this point of time no mention was made of William of York. However, the king was mindful of the interest of the provost of Beverley to such an extent that one day later he empowered the archbishop to confer on him the first vacant prebend in the church of St Paul's, London. On 21 May 1242 - soon after the king's arrival in France - William was present in Westminster with the custodians of the realm, attending to business. And when in August 1242 Henry sent his almoner, as a messenger from France, he had informed his most important caretakers in England, including the provost of Beverley. Following the king's return to England [in September 1243] William acted as a witness on at least two occasions in October with

---

68. *Dunstable*, 159.


70. The second prebend would go to another important *curialis*, Robert Passelewe, but with a specific proviso, *Ibid.*, 289. William may have had a special interest in St Paul's, since it was only in March 1242 that he became prebendary there by Henry's favour, *Ibid.*, 277. In the end he appears to have gained two prebends in London by late October 1242, *Ibid.*, 277, 305. It was also the sign of the king's goodwill that William became presented to the church of Gayton [Lincoln] on 8 July 1236 which may not have entirely suited the judge - on 12 November 1236 someone else was granted this benefice, *Ibid.*, 153, 167. The presentation of William to the church of Kirkham [Lancaster] on 22 August 1236 had proved to be equally unsuccessful since, as Henry later acknowledged in February 1237, the advowson of this church did not belong to him but to Richard of Cornwall, *Ibid.*, 156, 175.


the former guardians of the realm.\textsuperscript{73} From October 1243 to December 1246 the provost was never out of favour, or trust at the royal court.\textsuperscript{74} It may have seemed formalistic, nevertheless, a letter 'patent' issued on 10 December 1246 acknowledged that William had "laboured faithfully in the business of ... [Henry III] and the realm".\textsuperscript{75} If the king wanted a highly trusted curialis to succeed Robert Bingham in Salisbury, he certainly had one in the person of the provost of Beverly.

Besides William of York there was also another administrator - Silvester Everdon - who gained a bishopric in 1247. Silvester had been Henry's chancellor from November 1244, and he, interestingly, refused to accept his first election in September 1246 to Carlisle.\textsuperscript{76} On the face of it, the electors sincerely 'wished for' a curialis as their pastor, and they chose Silvester for the second time, shortly before 9 November 1246, on which day royal assent was given.\textsuperscript{77} The chancellor subsequently accepted the honour - partly motivated by religious anxiety - and became consecrated on 13 October 1247.\textsuperscript{78}

Unlike in the case of William of York, Silvester's election - the first one - was definitely influenced by the crown. The chancellor rejected the September election because "it seemed to him to be vicious", i.e. he was, no doubt, unsympathetic to the king's methods to influence the Carlisle monks.\textsuperscript{79} Silvester was in a position to know better the dealings of Henry than Matthew Paris, who had at first attached no negative comments to these autumn events of 1246. Nevertheless, the chronicler became

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., 397-98.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., 427, 437, 442, 448, 458, 476, 484.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., 494. For a grant in 1245, at the request of William, to Nicholas, his brother: Charter Rolls 1226-57, 286.
\textsuperscript{76} Close Rolls 1242-47, 266; Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 182, 197.
\textsuperscript{77} CPR 1232-47, 492; Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 197.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., 197; Fasti, vol. II, 20. The temporalities of the see were restored on 8 December 1246, Close Rolls 1242-47, 489.
\textsuperscript{79} CPR 1232-47, 488.
informed at some point of time about royal intrusion in Carlisle. In the parliament of 1253 the king was reproached for not observing the liberties of the church, in particular, in respect of elections. The complaint was delivered by the delegation of prelates consisting of Boniface, William of York, Silvester Everdon, and the elect of Winchester, Aymer de Valence.  

That the archbishop should take part in this proceeding would have been viewed by Henry as quite hypocritical and this may have been also true in respect of the bishop of Salisbury. Concerning Silvester and the Carlisle election of 1246 the account of Matthew Paris now corresponded with the records of the court. In the words of the king:

"And you, Silvester of Carlisle, who so long have licked up the crumbs of the chancery, and been a petty clerk of my clerks, how many theologians and reverend persons have I put aside to raise you to a bishopric."  

The relatively insignificant standing of Silvester as a curialis prior to 1242 is verified by the public records and this is particularly evident considering William of York's steady career before his election. Silvester, on the other hand, had been appointed to three important positions. He had acted as keeper of the seal of the chancery under Ralph Neville during Henry's expedition in 1242-43; worked as chancellor in November 1244-November 1246; and as keeper of the seal of the wardrobe in March-November 1246.  

Silvester's links to the crown were already very old in 1246; they went back at


81. A similar charge could have been directed against Aymer too. For Aymer see further.

82. Ibid., 23. Just to what extent - if any - Henry was meddling in the second election of Silvester is not clear. It would not have been surprising if after the employment of the king's methods resulting in the first election, the monks of Carlisle needed no further persuasion. Silvester, on the other hand, may have needed some inducement to accept the bishopric.

83. CPR 1232-47, 290; Close Rolls 1242-47, 266; Charter Rolls 1226-57, 291; Handbook of British Chronology, 85.
least to the late 1220's as he was a recipient of royal gifts in March and April 1230. By this time Silvester had definitely been in the service of the king, most probably in the chancery, since he was listed among those who would accompany Henry in the French expedition of 1230. Prior to this, in December 1229, Silvester, in the capacity of a parson of the church of Ongar [Essex] received a grant to hold a fair and a feast at the time of the festivity of the Nativity of St Mary [8 September]. During the 1230's Silvester remained a minor figure and Henry's later charge that he was a 'petty clerk' undoubtedly had an element of truth in it. If Silvester came from a lower social rank, as claimed by Marion Gibbs, than his limited profile during these years may have well demonstrated the difficulty of making one's presence really felt at court without a weighty background. The chancery clerk, nevertheless, managed to have his modest amount of favours in the 1230's. These tangible benefits from the crown seem to have included no more than letter of presentation to the church of Geddington [Northampton] in 1231; five oaks in 1233 to make a granary; "special protection for the men, lands, things and rents" of Silvester for the duration of his continental pilgrimage in 1235; a gift in 1237 and 1238.

In the light of Silvester's role in the 1230's his rise to prominence from 1242 seemed rather unexpected. If the king's support of his chancellor in 1246 to gain a bishopric was logical enough, Silvester's designation to hold the seal of the chancery under Neville in 1242-43 seemingly was not. Doubly so, as apart from one insignificant entry, the court records appear to be silent on Silvester in September 1238-May 1242.

In January 1241 the clerk was referred to as a canon of Chichester, a position which he probably had owed to his association in the chancery with Ralph Neville, the bishop of that see.  

Henry’s realisation that Silvester deserved to be really rewarded for his long services came in May 1242, just before the Gascon expedition. From this point onwards, Silvester’s standing at court markedly improved. Henry had probably reasoned that the clerk’s experience in the matters of the chancery made him an ideal candidate to work under Neville, while the expedition was in progress. The king was undoubtedly correct in estimating Silvester’s abilities, since the clerk became a “skilled” chancellor - according to Matthew Paris. Already in October 1242, Henry instructed from Gascony his main representative in England, the archbishop of York, to provide Silvester with an ecclesiastical benefice in the value of eighty marks a year. In the four and a half years following May 1242, Silvester obtained more favours than for the whole period from 1229 to 1242. Apart from court appointments, his probably biggest prize at this time was the grant of the archdeaconry of Chester from the king on 6 January 1245. Silvester was also designated briefly as a guardian of the bishopric of Chichester, following the death of Ralph Neville in February 1244.  

Despite so many years at court, Silvester hardly played role as a royal witness in the issuing of documents, although on 20 May 1945 he had an opportunity to do so at

---

90. CLR 1240-45, 27; Silvester’s prebend was most probably Milton [Kent]. Since the Chichester fair belonged to this prebend, it brought Silvester 20s. annually in an agreement with the bishop, CLR 1245-51, 17-18.

91. CPR 1232-47, 290.


93. CPR 1232-47, 332.


95. Ibid., 447.

96. CLR 1245-51, 17-18; By April 1245 the keeper of the bishopric was Bernard of Savoy, Close Rolls 1242-47, 352.
Woodstock. A little less than a year later, two weeks before Easter Sunday in 1246, Silvester was at Westminster and dined with Henry. After the meal the archdeacon had received from the king the seal of the royal wardrobe, his last important appointment before his elevation to the bishopric of Carlisle.

Relevant information on William of Bitton I, archdeacon of Wells, bishop of Bath and Wells from 14 June 1248, is extremely scarce. William's predecessor, Roger of Salisbury had occupied the see for a little more than three years when he died on 21 December 1247. The chapter of Wells and the convent of Bath had been given licence to elect a week later, and William was chosen before 24 February 1248. The archdeacon's promotion, however, does not appear to have been a result of a free election, but of local, i.e. secular interference.

"The church of Wells had possibly particular reason for complaint [as a result of external influence]; the related families of the Giffards and the Byttons were strongly represented in the cathedral offices, and three of their members, William Bytton I, and his nephew, William Bytton II, and M. Walter Giffard were promoted to the episcopal see within the reign of Henry III".

98. Ibid., 284.
99. Ibid., 291.
100. Ibid., 291. The keeper of the wardrobe at this time was Peter Chaceporc, archdeacon of Wells, Handbook of British Chronology, 79.
102. Royal assent to the election of William was given on 4 May; the temporalities of the see were restituted on 20 July 1248, CPR 1247-58, 4, 14; Close Rolls 1247-51, 67; Handbook of British Chronology, 228.
103. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 90. Prior to the advancement of Roger of Salisbury to Bath, Henry, as we have seen, had his candidate to the bishopric in the person of Peter Chaceporc. Following Roger's death, however, the king nominated no one to succeed him.
104. Ibid., 90. Some of William's other relatives were his brother, John, canon of Wells and pluralist in 1248-51; Thomas, clerk and pluralist in 1251, and Thomas' father, Robert. As an archdeacon, William was a pluralist himself in 1245, Cal. Papal Letters, vol. I, 212, 246, 254, 267, 275. For the Giffards, see further. See also William of Bitton II.
Even so, the Bittons’ importance was probably purely local, meriting no attention from the king, at any rate, not in the years c.1232-48. Not surprisingly, prior to 1247 there seemed to have been merely one occasion of contact between the crown and William, and even that was of an official nature.\textsuperscript{105} On the basis of such minimal evidence, it can only be presumed that Henry knew the archdeacon before the Bath election.\textsuperscript{106} The possibility of a meeting between the king and William in Wells during 1237-47 must be excluded, since the last royal visit to the town occurred in June 1236.\textsuperscript{107} In all probability, William was no more than an obscure archdeacon for the king in 1247-48, in a see where Henry had no particular interest.

William did not evade involvement in the affairs of the crown as an ecclesiastic, while the king quickly came to appreciate the qualities of the bishop: already, in 1250, Henry considered sending William to Rome as an agent.\textsuperscript{108} Royal trust in William was again demonstrated three years later when the bishop was appointed as one of the proctors to arrange the marriage contract between prince Edward and the sister of the king of Castile.\textsuperscript{109} On his way back from Spain, the bishop of Bath visited Henry in France during January-February 1254, and acted as witness at court on a number of occasions.\textsuperscript{110} In 1257 William had been engaged in another prominent assignment: he

\textsuperscript{105} In 1243 a mandate was directed to the archdeacon of Wells, \textit{CPR} 1232-47, 407. See also a mandate in 1243 that was never sent, \textit{CPR} 1266-72, 722.

\textsuperscript{106} William had held the archdeaconry from before 1243. He most likely relinquished his office, in line with his promotion. His successor by 1249 was Peter Chaceporc, keeper of the wardrobe in 1241-54, \textit{CPR} 1247-58, 37; \textit{Handbook of British Chronology}, 79.

\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Close Rolls} 1234-37, 361. But it cannot be proven from the public records that William was archdeacon of Wells in June 1236.

\textsuperscript{108} \textit{CPR} 1247-58, 80, The objective of the mission would have been rather important: it concerned Henry’s proposed crusade.

\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Ibid.}, 192, 219, 230.

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Ibid.}, 263, 265, 266, 271, 294, 309, 370, William’s high standing at court at this time may be surmised from the fact that in six of the seven instances he was listed first of all the other witnesses.
was to represent the king in the Sicilian business at the papal curia. And it appears that Henry had specially requested the bishop to undertake this task. Judging by these nine years, i.e. from 1248 to 1257, the king would have been quite pleased with the once unnoticed William.

Henry's realisation that the promotion of a family member, or a favourite was not in all cases worth a fight, if the electors were ready to postulate someone, i.e. a curialis, whose elevation would be welcomed in normal circumstances, was already evident in Durham with the election of Nicholas Farnham, despite the king's intention to advance either Peter d'Aigueblanche or Boniface of Savoy. And again, a similar scenario arose in London with the elevation of Fulk Basset, although Henry had intended to translate d'Aigueblanche from Hereford. And for the third time, a similar situation emerged, again in Durham, following the resignation of Nicholas Farnham in February 1249. Henry had granted licence to elect on 5 April, although he also demanded the advancement of his half-brother, Aymer de Valence. The king's designs at this stage were quite serious: upon the objections of the monks Henry threatened to keep the bishopric vacant for "eight or nine years or more" so that Aymer would be of mature age to qualify for admission. The electors had reacted to this quickly, and chose Walter Kirkham dean of York, on 21 April 1249. Henry may have contemplated an appeal, but not for too long, since on 27 September he gave his assent to the election. This was followed by the restoration of the temporalities on

111. Ibid., 564, 566, 625.
112. Ibid., 564.
113. Ibid., 39; Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 292-94. Henry entrusted one of his clerks, Lawrence of St Martin, to persuade the monks to elect Aymer. For Lawrence, see further; he became bishop of Rochester in 1251.
114. Ibid., 293-94.
116. CPR 1247-58, 48.
20 October, and the dean subsequently was consecrated on 5 December 1249.117

In 1249 Walter would have been regarded as a curialis of long standing, despite the fact that he left the court in 1237 to do pastoral work.118 Walter began working for the crown - as early as 1224 - as keeper of the wardrobe, acting jointly with Walter Brackley.119 Kirkham appears to have been associated with the wardrobe - excluding the period between September 1231 and May 1234 - until late October 1236, although in January 1237 he was still in royal service. His position in 1224-36 varied: in 1229-31 he had acted as a subordinate, with Brackley as his colleague, but became chief official in May 1234, following the dismissal of Peter des Riveaux.120 The clerk's position at court was imposing even during September 1231 - May 1234, when he had no formal rank in the household treasury. Walter acted, for instance, as guardian of the archbishopric of Canterbury after the death of Richard Grant in August 1231.121 More importantly, in 1231-34 Walter had issued countless letters 'close' and 'patent', and received numerous gifts and favours.122 His importance at the time is perhaps aptly summed up by the fact that even the otherwise trivial matter of his horse being stolen had found its way into the court records in 1233.123

Walter left the royal household sometime after January 1237, following a most

118. CLR 1226-40, 3, 10, 15; Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 15.
119. Handbook of British Chronology, 79.
120. CLR 1226-40, 244, 250, 253; Between September 1231 and May 1234 Peter des Riveaux was treasurer of the chamber and the wardrobe, Handbook of British Chronology, 79.
121. Close Rolls 1231-34, 54; He was also keeper of the issues of the archbishopric, CLR 1226-40, 198, 214, 221.
123. Close Rolls 1231-34, 301.
likely strenuous service of at least thirteen years.\textsuperscript{124} His contacts with the monarchy were not terminated, but remained minimal for twelve years - until the Durham election. Typically, in this period Walter appears to have received gifts from his sovereign only on three occasions, one in 1241, 1244 and 1248.\textsuperscript{125} On 22 March 1241 Walter also had a chance to meet Henry when he had acted as a witness at court.\textsuperscript{126} And in 1244 the king directed Walter - who was dean of York by this time - the abbot of St Mary's, York and the sheriff of York to prohibit a proposed tournament in the bishopric.\textsuperscript{127} Walter's ties with the crown in 1237-49 amounted to almost nothing in comparison to those in the 'early years', but they undoubtedly served their purpose, for Henry remembered his old servant and thought of him well, even after a rather long time, to an extent that he was prepared to abandon his plans with his half-brother in Durham.

Henry's prudent 'concessions' in allowing the episcopal promotion of curiales 'at the expense' of a relative, or as in the case of d'Aigueblanche, a Savoyard favourite, worked well in Durham and London, but when it came to the richest see in England, the king could hardly overlook his most basic interest. For Henry, Winchester was a very important see not only because of the bishopric's wealth and position: the king felt that he was entitled to a special treatment on the part of the electors, since he was born and baptised in the city [of Winchester].\textsuperscript{128} It was hardly surprising that following the

\textsuperscript{124} Naturally, after May 1234, Walter, as keeper of the wardrobe, continued to enjoy the esteemed position at court that he had been accustomed to earlier. Close Rolls 1234-37, 662, index. For the last references on him in 1237: CPR 1232-47, 196; Close Rolls 1234-37, 491; CLR 1226-40, 253.

\textsuperscript{125} Close Rolls 1237-42, 309; Close Rolls 1242-47, 223; Close Rolls 1247-51, 67.

\textsuperscript{126} Charter Rolls 1226-57, 270-71.


\textsuperscript{128} Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 396.
death of William Raleigh in the autumn of 1250, Henry was prepared again to go to considerable trouble to secure the election of his nominee. That this royal candidate should be Aymer would not have been unforeseen by contemporaries, especially by those who had been aware of the king’s very recent attempts in Durham.

The pressure that the king applied to the monks of Winchester was undoubtedly strong: Henry even took the trouble of persuading the electors himself in the cathedral church of St Swithin, after he had sent two of his most experienced clerks for that purpose. In the end, the electors bowed to royal will and postulated Aymer on, or very shortly after 5 November 1250; by 10 November the king probably gave his formal assent to the advancement of his half-brother. Papal confirmation followed shortly

---

129. Ibid., 394-99.

130. Ibid., 397-98; Winchester, 92; Close Rolls 1247-51, 376. Although the Fasti vol. II, 86, based on the Winchester and Osney chronicles gives 4 November as the date of the election this seems a day, or a few days too early. The claim of Matthew Paris that Henry persuaded the monks himself cannot be doubted, especially because of the graphic description of the whole affair by the chronicler. In any case, the court records prove that the king was at Winchester from 5 to 8 November 1250, Close Rolls 1247-51, 373, 374, 375. Prior to this, Henry stayed at Marwell [Hants.] from 30 October to 4 November 1250, CLR 1245-51, 312; CPR 1247-58, 79. Thus the election of Aymer would have hardly occurred before the king’s arrival in Winchester on 5 October. The notion that Henry had persuaded the convent just after the death of Raleigh [the bishop died shortly before 1 September 1250] can be discarded, since in the period from c.15 August to 5 November the king did not visit the city.
after, on 14 January 1251, but the elect was not consecrated until 16 May 1260.131

Aymer was the son of Hugh of Lusignan and Henry III's mother, Isabella of Angoulême, and he first appears to have come to England in 1246, by which time the family's fortunes in Poitou were over.132 The king's relation to Aymer in the ensuing four years is best described as an unbounded flood of favours in the course of which the brother was looked after even in minor matters.133 One of the first signs of royal

131. Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 433; Fasti, vol. II, 86. In his conflict with Frederick II, Innocent IV naturally would have liked to enlist all the support he could get from Henry III and the Savoyards. Strictly speaking, however, by the time of the papal confirmation of Aymer, the contest with Frederick II was over, since the emperor had died on 13 December 1250. Nevertheless, the papal struggle continued in its earnest with the heirs of Frederick II during the 1250's. Innocent IV knew Aymer, since the half-brother had been a papal chaplain in 1250. The pope most probably had also been aware that Aymer was unfit for episcopacy, but he could not resist the wish of Henry at such a critical time.

Various factors contributed to the fact that Aymer was consecrated only a decade after his election. Chief of these appears to have been a financial disincentive: the elect was not only allowed to use the revenues of the bishopric, but until his consecration, the incomes of his other churches. As for Henry, he, no doubt, had a better chance to share some of the revenues of Winchester if its bishop was a relative. During the course of the baronial disturbances, Aymer and his three brothers, as well as other Poitevins, had been forced to leave England on 18 July 1258, Trehame, Baronial Plan of Reform, 78; Cal. Papal Letters, vol. I, 260; Powicke, Henry III, 385; Cox, Eagles of Savoy, 188, 230, 271-73; Dictionary of National Biography, vol. I, 759.

132. By his own marriage, and that of his mother, Henry III was both connected to the Savoyards and the Lusignans, i.e. the counts of La Marche in France. Initially, both houses represented the king's main support on the Continent. In balance, the Savoyards proved to be of much greater help. It was Henry's principal objective in foreign policy to rebuild the Plantagenet empire and as a compensation for the loss of territories in central and northern France he had made attempts of expansion elsewhere: in southern France, in the Empire, and in Sicily. In these designs the support of the papacy and of the Savoyards became increasingly important. The house of Savoy backed the English military campaigns in southern France, helped Henry III and Louis IX to a peace, promoted English aspirations for the crown of Sicily, and interests in the Alps and the kingdom of Arles.

In contrast, Hugh of Lusignan was an unstable ally of Henry and, in any case, he had finally submitted to Louis IX in 1241-42. Isabella died a recluse in 1246. Despite their similar Continental background and common family ties, the Savoyards, e.g. Peter and Boniface had no great affection for Henry's needy half-brothers, such as Aymer, Powicke, Henry III, 172-73, 181-82, 185, 188-92, 195; Cox, Eagles of Savoy, 113, 115-17, 180, 234-35, 272-73, 454.

133. Already in July 1242, during the Gascon campaign, Henry had intended to advance Aymer to an ecclesiastical benefice in England, CPR 1232-47, 312.
goodwill was the presentation of Aymer to the church of Tisbury [Wilt.] on 25 June 1246.\textsuperscript{134} The next ecclesiastical benefice that the brother obtained seems to have been in Kirkham [Lancaster] in January 1247.\textsuperscript{135} By May 1247 a dwelling was organised for Aymer in Oxford where he would spend about a year studying in the course of 1247-48.\textsuperscript{136} Henry’s brother does not seem to have spent much time at the court in 1246-50; in the summer of 1247 he was, for example, in Salisbury where he had received wine and rabbits as a royal gift.\textsuperscript{137}

Aymer most probably had arrived in Oxford not long before 14 November 1247, and it seems, he was immediately insulted in the city.\textsuperscript{138} The king’s brother had been very unpopular in Oxford: he was, in fact, disliked to such an extent that his baker was killed there in 1248 and Aymer himself was again attacked in 1250.\textsuperscript{139} The brother, however, could console himself with an easy life while at the schools in 1248, with plenty of gifts and money from Henry.\textsuperscript{140}

The parson of Kirkham seems to have lacked a set place of residence in the two years following the completion of his studies: he may have been at court for periods of

\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., 483-84.

\textsuperscript{135} Ibid., 496; To be more specific: these presentations in Tisbury and Kirkham in practical terms implied the appointment of Aymer as parson of these churches, Close Rolls 1247-51, 113.

\textsuperscript{136} CLR 1245-51, 121, 174; Aymer’s landlord in Oxford was one Geoffrey de Stockwell, a "burgess", and Henry naturally would pay the rent to him for his brother.

\textsuperscript{137} In Salisbury, Aymer appears to have stayed in the house of the chancellor of the bishopric, Ibid., 128-29.

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid., 158; Close Rolls 1247-51, 4.

\textsuperscript{139} Ibid., 4, 25, 26, 296.

\textsuperscript{140} Ibid., 33, 40, 42, 80, 86, 92; CPR 1247-58, 16; CLR 1245-51, 158, 159-60, 167, 169, 170, 172, 174, 184, 197, 198, 203, 210. By 1248 Aymer also became canon of St Paul’s, London, Close Rolls 1247-51, 37.
time during 1249-50, but not in a position to act as a witness, or issue royal orders.\textsuperscript{141}

In any case, Aymer had obtained two additional benefices and was granted a wardship in 1249.\textsuperscript{142} Aymer was favoured in a different manner than another relative of Henry, William of Savoy, in the late 1230's. The king did not allocate his half-brother a position of influence at court, but favoured him as he could in other ways. Indeed, the variety of seemingly trivial presents to Aymer in 1247-50, such as silver dishes, bream, bucks, firewood, a palfrey, wine, timber etc. proved that for Henry family concerns were always a matter of extreme importance.\textsuperscript{143}

The king's confidence in dealing with the monks of Winchester in November 1250 was likely bolstered by the fact that on 19 October his clerk of Savoyard sympathies, Lawrence of St Martin had been elected as bishop of Rochester.\textsuperscript{144} If the monks were willing to make such a pragmatic decision on their own accord, in a see where the crown had no formal powers of assent, or refusal, why would not the Winchester electors, after a little inducement? Thinking on such lines must have been further encouraged by the recent advancement of William of York, Silvester Everdon, and Walter Kirkham - three curiales in the three years prior to 1250.

For Henry, Lawrence's past link with William of Savoy, a relative to whom he had been dearly attached must have mattered greatly. The bishop-elect had belonged to the household of William, and he accompanied his master on the Continental trip which

\textsuperscript{141} Aymer may have left England briefly in the autumn of 1249, as fourteen marks were spent on his transportation at Dover sometime before 13 October, CLR 1245-51, 263.

\textsuperscript{142} CPR 1247-58, 42, 47, 49; Close Rolls 1247-51, 206. Hardly anything is known about the activities of Aymer in the ten months prior to his election.

\textsuperscript{143} CLR 1245-51, 135, 169; Close Rolls 1247-51, 33, 40, 80, 86, 134, 143, 166, 176, 201. Henry's relation to Aymer should, of course, be viewed in the context of his general, and arguably generous, attitude towards the Lusignan brothers. It should be noted, that the Savoyards, e.g Peter and Boniface of Savoy were not included in the expulsion of the aliens, i.e. the Poitevins in 1258, Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 76-79.

terminated at William’s death at Viterbo in the late autumn of 1239. When William died, rumours arose that Lawrence had instigated his poisoning, but he successfully refuted the charge. Indeed, in the light of the clerk’s subsequent connection to the king and the house of Savoy, such an involvement seems unlikely. Just when exactly Lawrence first came to be employed by William is not known: he may have come with the Savoyard to England in 1236. The possibility that Lawrence first met William at the English court in 1236 cannot be altogether excluded, but in that year the clerk was a total nonentity, since he had had no connection with the crown in the 1230’s.

In the service of William of Savoy, Lawrence had met another Savoyard working for the uncle of the queen: Peter d’Aigueblanche. Both returned to England after the death of William, although Peter may have arrived earlier, since he was already appointed as keeper of the wardrobe on 4 February 1240. His colleague did not have the social standing - and he was an Englishman - for such a meteoric rise, but he came to be employed by Henry in the 1240’s. Lawrence was already in England in June 1241, as he was a recipient of a royal gift at that time. In November 1242 the clerk was on his way back to the Continent, in the service of the crown, and in fact going to Henry who was then conducting his Gascon expedition. It was only after the completion of this campaign that the king had really begun to take notice of Lawrence.

From late 1243 through 1245 the clerk acted as a royal agent at the papal curia in the matter of the Winchester dispute, and in the case of Robert Passelewe's

148. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 190.
149. Close Rolls 1237-42, 312.
150. CLR 1240-45, 162.
election. For Henry both of these suits were highly important. Ironically, despite the fact that these proceedings were ultimately of no avail to the king, Lawrence did not lose favour at the English court. The royal proctor was back in England, most probably in the summer-autumn of 1244, but embarked on the return journey to the pope again in November. Not long before the departure, in August 1244, Lawrence was presented to the church Faccombe [Southampton] - one of his first tangible rewards from Henry.

Lawrence was still at the papal curia in June 1245, when his commission was confirmed by the king. At the same time, Henry had empowered Lawrence to consent, on his behalf, to any translation of an English bishop in case it was decided on either by the pope and his cardinals, or the royal envoys. This authorisation was already a telling sign of the Faccombe parson’s position, and the fact that in 1245 Henry had regarded Lawrence qualified enough to participate in possible peace negotiations between the church and the Emperor, was an indication of the clerk’s diplomatic abilities. At the papal curia the king’s clerk was also engaged in doing diplomatic work not related to ecclesiastical matters: he had discussed with Innocent IV, for instance, the question of English rights in Provence on numerous occasions in 1243-45. During 1246-summer 1249, Henry appears to have employed Lawrence in
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152. CLR 1240-45, 277, 279.
153. CPR 1232-47, 433. Also in 1244, Lawrence was appointed as a royal counsellor, in charge of ecclesiastical affairs, Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 486-87; Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 190. Still in the same year, Lawrence’s brother, William, was presented to the church of Coleraine [Derry, Ireland], CPR 1232-47, 429.
154. Ibid., 455.
155. Ibid., 454.
156. Ibid., 463.
England. In 1246, when the king decided to forbid the clergy to consent to papal taxation, he had used the parson of Faccombe to convey his wish to all concerned.

Another important assignment came in the spring of 1249, when the clerk was entrusted to urge the monks of Durham to elect Aymer de Valence. This proved to be fruitless, but because the king was content with Walter Kirkham, he could hardly blame Lawrence too much for his failure. Henry did not appear to have been disappointed with his clerk, and thus Lawrence's next foreign mission came in May 1249, when he was again sent to Innocent IV. The parson was on the Continent at the time of his election to Rochester in October 1250, and he appears to have been at the papal curia when Innocent IV confirmed him sometime before 20 February 1251. Lawrence was consecrated on 9 April and returned to England in the autumn of 1251;

158. CLR 1245-51, 79, 122, 237.
160. Ibid., 44.
161. CLR 1245-51, 237; CPR 1247-58, 42.
162. Cal. Papal letters, vol. I, 267; Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 435; CPR 1247-58, 79, 80; Fasti, vol. II, 77. Royal assent to the election of Lawrence was given by 23 February 1251, CPR 1247-58, 88. Henry may not have had powers of either consent or refusal in the Rochester elections, as claimed by Marion Gibbs, but this is not to say that the monks did not make an expedient election in October 1250. The king may have lacked formal powers in the see, but in the context of the papal-imperial struggle in which Innocent IV was eager to enlist the support of Henry, and in the light of the fact that both Boniface and Lawrence were on the Continent at the time, able to convey the king's wishes easily to the pope, the electors decision was a compromise indeed.

Curiously, Boniface had opposed the election of Lawrence at first, Hist. Ang., vol. III, 87. The archbishop, however, soon changed his mind and confirmed the elect on 9 February 1251, Fasti, vol. II, 77. The reasons of Boniface's initial reactions are not entirely clear. Despite family ties and common interests with the king, the Savoyard may have wished to have his own 'ecclesiastical independence' from the crown and in this scheme the 'slavish' executioner of Henry's policy, Lawrence, as a suffragan bishop, had no place. More plausibly perhaps, Boniface may have been alarmed, that despite Lawrence's Savoyard sympathies he had supported Aymer, a Lusignan, not only in the Durham election but later in Winchester as well, Cal. Papal Letters, vol. I, 267.
he was enthroned after 24 October.  

Henry's trust in his clerk during the 1240's was well mirrored by the latter's career, and explained the considerable amount of tangible rewards that Lawrence received which, in a sense, culminated in a bishopric in 1251. Lawrence's benefices in 1245-46 included the prebends of Chichester, Lichfield, Grantham [Lincoln], Salisbury, the parsonage of Llanbadarn-Fawr [Cardigan] and the archdeaconry of Coventry.

The wave of episcopal promotions of curiales beginning with the advancement of William of York came to a temporary halt following the enthronement of Lawrence of St Martin in 1251. By the time of the next episcopal election on 20 May 1253, the king probably was already preoccupied with his imminent Gascon expedition. Henry had made considerable efforts to prevent the advancement of Richard Wich to Chichester, but when the bishop died in the spring of 1253 he let the events run their course in the diocese.

The king gave licence to elect on 14 April, and subsequently the chapter decided on the chancellor of Chichester, John Climping. Merely three days had passed after the election and Henry gave his assent to the advancement of John. The temporalities of the see were restored on 27 May 1253, just one week after the election, a strong indication that the king was concerned with other matters, and had no wish to

163. Fasti, vol. II, 77; Close Rolls 1247-51, 493, 519, For the enthronement feast Henry had given a gift of venison. The archbishop of Canterbury did not attend the gathering: he was on the Continent from June 1250 to November 1252, Cox, Eagles of Savoy, 179, 234.


165. CPR 1232-47, 448, 449, 467, 488, 492, 494.

166. CPR 1247-58, 231; Handbook of British Chronology, 239.


168. CPR 1247-58, 193.
be delayed with episcopal issues. John was consecrated on 11 January 1254 - by the time Henry had been in France for about five months.

From the crown's point of view the chancellor of Chichester was a nonentity in 1253. John appeared as a chancellor in 1247 and 1253, and even if it is assumed that he had occupied this post in the period between these years, no connection can be discovered between him and the king. The possibility of a meeting between them in Chichester must be ruled out, since Henry did not visit the city in these years.

In the summer of 1253 the king was prepared to accept the canonical election of John: he probably had neither desire, nor time to intrude, but above all, there was no reason not to accept the chancellor's promotion. A few months after the consecration ceremony, on 17 May 1254, John was appointed as one of the three collectors of the tenth of ecclesiastical benefices for the proposed royal crusade. Although Henry was not in England at this time, he most probably had approved beforehand John's designation for this rather important task. For the king financial matters were usually of primary concern, and he probably had reasoned that John's background, free from secular involvement, would be beneficial in lending the whole collection process considerable religious overtones.

During Henry's Continental expedition Henry Lexington, dean of Lincoln, became elected on either 21 or 30 December 1253 as bishop of Lincoln - some two


170. The king had stayed on the Continent from August 1253 to late December 1254, CPR 1247-58, 241-388.

171. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 197; CPR 1247-58, 193.

172. Ibid., 370.

173. A letter 'patent' issued by the guardians of the realm on 23 May 1254 stated that the bishop of Norwich, the bishop of Chichester and the abbot of Westminster had been appointed at the "king's instance", Ibid., 377. The court records fail to support the claim of Dunstable, 188, according to which John had been sent to Spain in 1253, as an ambassador. The chronicler, in this instance, probably confused John with William of Bitton I.
months after the death of Robert Grosseteste. Lincoln was the largest, though not the wealthiest diocese in the English church, and naturally the king would have liked a trusted man to govern it. Henry had a specific candidate in mind, and this was Peter d'Aigueblanche, whom he again wished to have translated from Hereford.

The king's appreciation of the Savoyard had been unremitting, for, as we have seen, this was for the third time that Henry had wished to see Peter in a more attractive bishopric than Hereford.

The dean, however, had decided to make the best out of the situation and lost no time crossing the channel to seek royal approval, although his position before the king must have been quite awkward, since Henry had earlier explicitly asked him [and the chapter] to elect d'Aigueblanche. Moreover, at this point of time, Henry Lexington could have expected opposition from Boniface also, who, in fact, had excommunicated the dean and the chapter of Lincoln, following a dispute concerning the right to patronage during vacancy. Matthew Paris claimed that the elect was "afraid to appear before the king", and it is likely that Lexington was quite unsure of the whole outcome, despite the fact that his brother, John, had been steward of the household from 1242. John had also acted as temporary keeper of the great seal in Gascony during most of the campaign of 1242-43, and as chancellor in 1247-48 and 1249-50. His influence at court was indisputable: he had attested countless letters 'close' in 1251-53, and worked in England while the expedition of 1253-54 was in

174. Fasti, vol. III, 4; Election licence was granted by the king in Bazas, Gascony, on 20 November 1253, CPR 1247-58, 252.
176. See Nicholas Farnham and Fulk Basset.
178. Ibid., 54.
179. Ibid.,60; Handbook of British Chronology, 75; Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 190.
progress in France.\textsuperscript{181}

Another brother of the elect, Robert, had a judicial career very similar to that of William of York. As a judge, Robert had already been employed by the crown in the 1220's, and from this time onwards, until his death in 1250, he was retained in service, and received his due amount of rewards from his sovereign.\textsuperscript{182}

Interestingly, the amount of contact between the king and Henry Lexington was quite minimal prior to 1254. Two of the brothers, Henry and John, had been witnesses at court in January 1235, and the former acted again in such a capacity in September 1237.\textsuperscript{183} But Henry Lexington did not follow the secular career path of his brothers. He had been treasurer of Salisbury for sometime before 1245, although his activities then were not registered by the records of the court.\textsuperscript{184} It appears that by the end of 1245 Henry Lexington had been advanced to the deanery of Lincoln, the office which he came to hold until his promotion to the bishopric.\textsuperscript{185} Yet even as a dean, Henry's connection to the crown proved to be essentially official, and extremely small scale, but this should be perhaps seen in the context of the king's far from amicable relationship with Robert Grosseteste.\textsuperscript{186}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{181} Close Rolls 1251-53, 572, index; CPR 1247-58, 235, 237, 361, 362, 372, 374-75. In the first half of the 1250's John had also been entrusted with other responsibilities: he had been chief justice of the forest north of Trent in 1252-55; constable of the castles of Scarborough and Pickering [York] in 1253-55, and of the castle of Bamborough [Northumberland] in 1253, Ibid., 165, 173, 193, 204, 435,449.
\item \textsuperscript{182} See 'Robert de Lexinton' in the relevant volumes of the Close Rolls beginning with the year of 1227. For evidence that Robert and John were brothers: Charter Rolls 1226-57, 231.
\item \textsuperscript{183} Ibid., 215, 231.
\item \textsuperscript{184} Fasti, vol. III, 10. Henry's resignation from Salisbury may have been connected to the fact that in 1245 the papal nuncio, Master Martin, had seized the revenues of his office, Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 53.
\item \textsuperscript{185} Fasti, vol. III, 10.
\item \textsuperscript{186} Close Rolls 1247-51, 370; CPR 1247-58, 252. In June 1252 Henry Lexington had received a grant of free warren from the king in some of his demesne lands, Charter Rolls 1226-57, 393.
\end{itemize}
All considered, the king could hardly reject his Stewart's brother, especially since he had less control over the events while on the Continent. Henry Lexington was an unobjectionable candidate despite the fact that it was not he, but his brothers who had been closely connected to the crown, and, in balance, to pursue the translation of the Savoyard to a more central see was not worth the effort for Henry III. The elect's case was similar to that of Walter Cantilupe and Fulk Basset, although Henry Lexington certainly did much less than them to prove himself to the king, and relied much more on the importance [past and present] of his immediate family members. Not surprisingly, although the king gave his approval to the election of Henry it was not "with a good heart". It all must have been 'the result' of Henry Lexington's reserved [as far as secular affairs were concerned] nature: even as bishop, he appeared to have been involved in the affairs of the crown, only when necessary. The king seems to have completely neglected Henry - whether consciously or not - until after the election, as far as giving gifts were concerned. In this respect, Henry III's attitude was quite different to John and Robert Lexington: family connections mattered nothing in comparison to the fact that Henry had never worked for the crown prior to 1254.

While the king was in Gascony, Silvester Everdon died in an accident in the spring of 1254. The bishop of Carlisle was riding a restless horse when "the animal's foot struck against a tuft of earth, and the rider fell on his back, dislocating his limbs and joints". By the time the queen appointed a guardian to the see on 24 March, Henry had been in Mielan [Lot-et-Garonne] for three weeks following a journey of

187. Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. III, 61. Royal assent was given on 18 February 1254; the temporalities were restored by the queen on 1 April, CPR 1247-58, 268, 366. For the problem of the precise date of Henry's consecration, Fasti, vol. III, 4; the ceremony was undoubtedly held in the summer of 1254.

188. CPR 1247-58, 373, 386, 413, 429, 441, 445, 466, 503, 531, 536, 582, 615, 623, 630, 643, 650. The chronicle evidence, on the whole, also bears out this assertion.


about a hundred and thirty kilometres from Bazas [Lot-et-Garonne]. The king was still in Mielan on 25 May 1254, when he granted licence to elect to the monastic cathedral, although a royal preference for the promotion of the prior of Newbrough [York] was made clear. This prior was John Skipton, the king's chaplain, who was accompanying Henry to Gascony and was clearly hoping for advancement. The monks, however, decided upon a different candidate, Thomas Vipont, rector of Greystoke [Cumb.], who became elected sometime before 10 September. The regent, Richard of Cornwall, did not push the case of his brother's protege, and assented to the promotion of Thomas on 5 November 1254; the temporalities were restored on 24 December, few days before the king's arrival from France. Henry had made no objections and Thomas was consecrated on 7 February 1255.

For the king the new bishop belonged to the category of those men about whom he knew very little prior to their episcopal advancement. According to Gibbs, Thomas was "probably connected with the baronial house of Vipont, powerful in the north, where its members did much administrative work for the Crown". Elsewhere, the author claimed that Thomas was "related to Robert Vipont, a member of a great local family, influential at court". The overall picture was somewhat different to that of

192. Ibid., 280-92.
195. Richard granted the restoration of temporalities of Carlisle from Dover, where he had been waiting for the arrival of his brother from at least 20 December. Henry was still in Boulogne, however, on 25 December, most probably waiting for favourable weather conditions. By 29 December 1254 the king was at Canterbury on his way to London, via Rochester, CPR 1247-58, 388, 391-93.
197. Gibbs and Lang, Bishop and Reform, 190.
198. Ibid., 91.
Gibbs.

The records of the court confirm that the Viponts were a landed family in the north, with their estates concentrated in Cumberland and Westmoreland. As Thomas Vipont was rector of Greystoke, Cumberland, a family connection seems certain, even though it cannot be substantiated by the court records of Henry III. Gibbs failed to specify, however, whether Thomas had been related to Robert Vipont, the elder, or the younger.

The former was a figure of certain importance: he had been sheriff of Westmoreland and Cumberland for some years prior to 1225, and acted as witness at court in March 1227. Robert the elder had died in 1228, but Henry could have remembered him in 1254 in connection with Thomas' election. The heir to the estates was John, still a minor in 1228; Idonea, the wife of Robert died in 1241. Idonea's connection to the crown in the 1230's was of no significance: she does not appear to have been engaged in administrative work for the king, or if she was, it must have been of most routine nature that had merited no attention in the records. Her 'influence' at court was limited to hardly more than a royal grant in 1237.

By 1233 John had gained control over the Vipont estates, but his involvement in the affairs of the kingdom in the eight years that followed amounted to almost nothing. He seems to have died in the same year as Idonea, and since John's heir, Robert 'the younger', was a minor, Henry had appointed custodians.


202. Ibid., 187; Close Rolls 1237-42, 341.

203. Close Rolls 1234-37, 457.

204. CPR 1232-47, 10; Close Rolls 1234-37, 331, 350.

It is of note that in the period from the early 1240's to around 1255, when Robert came of age, the Viponts - apart from unimportant or irrelevant references - are not dealt with in the court records.206

The impression is that the family's connection to the crown in 1228-54 hardly amounted to much more than merely a link of most basic proportions. The Viponts may have been powerful in the north by the sheer importance of their land, but they did not really perform more in these years for Henry than what probably was merely customary administrative work.207 Nor did they have consequential influence at court in 1228-54. John may have felt that the was too young to be engaged in additional responsibilities; he may have been too involved in estate business, or simply uninterested. His son, Robert, was a minor until after Thomas' election, and all other members of the family were essentially of marginal importance. The Viponts' relation to the crown was hardly out of normal in the final analysis: they were a local, middling family in a far away area in the north, and John had died relatively young to be really able to prove himself in wider affairs. Of Robert the younger, it may be added that the political turmoil of 1263 found him on Simon de Montfort's side.208

To return to Thomas, he had been most likely related to Robert the elder, perhaps he was his younger brother, but theoretically, he also could have been his son, i.e. the younger brother of John. Gibbs did not exclude the possibility of magnate influence in the Carlisle election of 1254; in balance this seems unlikely, since the electors would have hardly taken the young Robert too seriously at that time.209 Had there been a Vipont of real influence in 1254 he would not have escaped the attention


208. Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 302.

209. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 90 - 91. This is not to say, however, that the Viponts did not have an 'indirect' influence on the electors: indeed they most probably did.
of the crown. For Henry, Thomas had emerged from obscurity, but at least the king could relate to the elect’s family background, and trust his expertise in local affairs.

On 25 December 1254, at the time when the king was eagerly waiting in Boulogne, earl Richard restituted the temporalities of the see of Ely to its bishop-elect, William of Kilkenny, the royal chancellor. William did not accompany Henry to France, but remained in England in charge of the kingdom, along with Richard of Cornwall and the queen. His election in the autumn of 1254 came after the death of Hugh of Northwold, whom the king had known for so many years. Henry had welcomed, as in most cases, the advancement of a curialis to the episcopacy, and he gave his assent on 15 November 1254.

All this may have seemed quite a natural culmination of a career for William: he had been acquainted with the king for more than twenty years, worked for the crown most of this time, received his due recognition, and became chancellor in the end. William, as a royal clerk, had already been trusted enough in 1236 to authorise a letter ‘close’. In the 1230’s, William’s most important assignments had been connected to his trips to the papal curia in 1234, and in 1236-38, when the clerk acted

---

211. CPR 1247-58, 206 - 379, passim; Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 190.
213. CPR 1247-58, 382; William was consecrated on 15 August 1255, Fasti, vol. II, 46.
214. The clerk’s most tangible rewards from the crown also included ecclesiastical presentations, e.g. to the church of Poorstock [Dorset] in 1235; Worfield [Salop] in 1236; Dungarvan [Waterford, Ireland] in 1251, CPR 1232-47, 93,159; CPR 1247-58, 108. In the first half of the 1250’s William also held pretends in the diocese of London, Fasti, vol. I, 33-34, 44.
as a royal proctor in the Norwich election dispute. William's mission to Frederick II in 1235 must have also required considerable responsibility. The clerk was back in England in the summer of 1238, directed a letter 'close' in September, then quite unexpectedly, it seems, left the court. After a rather promising start, William was absent for nine years, and like Walker Kirkham, he may have retired to do pastoral work. William had reappeared only in 1247, when he was again sent on a Continental mission by Henry. By 1249 the clerk was appointed as a controller of the royal wardrobe, a position which he held until 1252.

The king appears to have lost none of his trust of William after the clerk's long absence. On, or around 21 February 1250, William had been entrusted with the keeping of the great seal with Peter des Riveaux, and sometime between 28 May and the end of the year, he was given sole responsibility.

---

216. CPR 1232-47, 74, 169, 174, 193, 199, 200, 223; CLR 1226-40, 253, 280, 301, 302. In the light of William of York's and Silvester Everdon's rather gradual rise in the beginning of their career, it is of note that Kilkenny appears in the public records somewhat suddenly, in an already established position at court. This becomes even more baffling if the claim of Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 14, that William of Kilkenny came from a lesser social status is accepted. The explanation may be that William is to be identified with one William of Kilkenny, chancellor if Kilkenny [Kilkenny] and bishop-elect of Ossory [Ireland] in 1231-32. No attention appears to have been made to this connection by modern writers. Henry III most probably knew 'this' William, as he had consents to his election in June 1231, and was aware of the fact that the elect resigned his claim in May 1232. Indeed, the fact that William of Kilkenny, the king's clerk, was a canon of St. Canice, in the diocese of Ossory in 1250 is hardly a coincidence and makes the above connection real, Patent Rolls 1225-32, 438, 473; CPR 1247-58, 82; Handbook of British Chronology, 369.
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221. Ibid., 85; Close Rolls 1247-51, 266; CLR 1245-51, 288; Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. II, 353.
1251, William gained another big prize - the archdeaconry of Coventry. From 18 April 1253 William began to be styled as chancellor: Henry by this time may have thought that the clerk's standing should be officially finalised before the Continental expedition.

The first election following the king's return from the Continent demonstrated a number of things, most notably Henry's sometimes unrealistic confidence in his attempts to affect episcopal promotions. England's longest serving ecclesiastic, Walter de Gray, archbishop of York, died in May 1255, and although Matthew Paris claimed that "the king used all the means in his power to delay and impede the election of an archbishop...in order that he might the longer, and with greater freedom, pillage the possessions of that archbishopric", licence to elect was already granted to the chapter on 28 May 1255. Henry had visited York at least twice during August - September 1255 and, no doubt, he made it known then that he had wished to see Aymer de Valence in the position of the archbishop. The elector's choice, however, fell on the dean of York, Sewal de Bovill, who was postulated c. October 1255. The king had known the nominee, but naturally rejected his advancement, although not for long, since the papacy came to confirm the dean, and consequently Henry did not see any point in further resistance. Although the king also had other reasons to oppose Sewal, the

222. CPR 1247-58, 82; Close Rolls 1247-51, 463. The public records do not bear out the claim of Charles Kingsford in the Dictionary of National Biography, vol. XI, 104, that William was made archdeacon sometime prior to 1248.

223. CPR 1247-58, 188. Following Henry's arrival to Westminster from Dover in the early days of January 1255, William returned the great seal and resigned his chancellorship on 5 January, Charter Rolls 1226-57, 438; Handbook of British Chronology, 85. William did not keep the seal continuously from 1250 to 1255, as claimed by Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 190, but had surrendered it on 16 May 1253 for sometime, due to sickness, Close Rolls 1251-53, 354.
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temporalities of the archbishopric were restored on 4 May 1256, and the elect was consecrated on 23 July 1256.228

The formal basis of the royal objection was that the dean was of illegitimate birth, a claim which could not be denied by the opposing party.229 There were, however, other considerations as well. Financial motives were probably also at play: for Henry the archbishopric became vacant for the first time and he could have felt - as Matthew Paris suggested - that sharing some of its revenues was long overdue. During the vacancy the king also had made a number of presentations in York, but these were not excessive.230 Henry may have also felt uneasy about Sewal’s earlier association with Edmund of Abingdon, despite the fact that the archbishop had been dead for fifteen years.231 Sewal at one stage had been a pupil and friend of Edmund, and this connection could not have been to the king’s liking.232 Henry had opposed the appointment of Richard Wich some years earlier, partly as a result of his experience with Edmund, but now with the archbishopric of York more was at stake than the bishopric of Chichester in 1244-46.

The king knew Sewal prior to 1255, but their relationship had been strictly official. The connection ran back to at least 1244, in which year Sewal, as chancellor of Oxford University had attached his seal, along with others, to a protestation in a certain

228. CPR 1247-58. 471; Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. III, 182. It was, no doubt, the delay in the restitution of the temporalities that made Matthew Paris to complain, yet on the whole, a delay of about six months was not unusual.

229. Cal. Papal Letters, vol. I, 328. Although Sewal already must have had papal dispensation to be priest and dean, it appears that special dispensation was also necessary to be able to enter episcopal, or archiepiscopal rank. Sewal was granted this with papal approval of his advancement, Ibid., 185, 328, 377-78. Also, an illegitimate person, even with special dispensation had to be postulated, not elected, Ibid., 378. This distinction was essentially legalistic.


232. Ibid., 182, 281.
matter against the crown. In 1249, following Walter Kirkham’s promotion, Sewal became dean of St Peter’s, York. Sometime before 8 January 1252, the dean, along with the precentor of York, appeared at court where they gave a testimony in relation to the financial requirements of certain nunneries. The king, in fact, had spent a number of days in the city of York in the first week of January 1252, and he most likely met Sewal then, for the dean had also other matters to discuss with him. Sewal did not have to wait long to see his sovereign again: he was acting as a witness at Westminster on 29 April 1252. While Sewal kept a relatively low profile in the ensuing two years, he was involved in a dispute between the city of York and the archiepiscopacy in 1255.

Henry could hardly be accused of favouritism towards Sewal - apart from a grant in 1257, he appears to have never given him gifts or grants. The king’s customary consecration present was also very modest, even more so considering that Sewal was archbishop-elect. Sewal’s appointment in July 1257, as one of the arbitrators to settle a dispute between Alexander of Scotland and certain nobles was most probably a result of the archbishop’s sheer importance at north, rather than a sign of Henry’s overwhelming trust of him. From the beginning to 1258, when Sewal died, the king

233. CPR 1232-47, 442; Sewal already had held the chancellorship of the university in 1238, The Historical Register of the University of Oxford, 16.
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appears to have had his own reservations about him. In 1255-56, however, the king had exploited the fact that Sewal did not have special dispensation, and although this was, no doubt, only an excuse, technically Henry was right. More importantly, in 1255-56 the king's initial confidence in episcopal matters was doubly evident from his designs with Aymer, for it is most likely that Henry had been certain that he could install another relative or protege in Winchester in the event his half-brother become translated to York.

The archbishop's case offers certain parallels with that of Giles of Bridport, the successor of William of York in the bishopric of Salisbury. Sewal and Giles had a similar background: they were university graduates, had diocesan experience and rose to be deans prior to their advancement to the episcopacy. Henry had known them both before their election; he had to some extent favoured Giles, which was not true in the case of Sewal. In any rate, the king's connections to both of them remained rather minimal.

Giles already well established himself in the ecclesiastical hierarchy by 1237, and was also known at court: as an archdeacon of Berkshire, he had received firewood in December from his sovereign. Four years later the archdeacon of Berkshire, along with forty-seven other archdeacons, was directed a mandate. Whether this concerned Giles, or someone else, is not known, but for us it matters not a great deal, since the contact was highly impersonal anyway.

By 1255 Giles had been advanced to the deanery of Wells. Henry's notice of him became more definite as the modest amount of royal favours indicated. On 18 May 1255 Giles was granted a right to hold a weekly market and a yearly fair at

---
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Wedmore [Somers.], and in the autumn he received gifts on two occasions from the king. The dean of Wells met his sovereign in the second week of February 1256 at Woodstock, since he was a member of the delegation to whom the Salisbury election licence was actually given. Giles' promotion by the chapter had occurred without any interference and on 15 April 1256 Henry gave his approval. And it was a telling sign of the king's attitude to the elect that he sent him in the summer of 1256 to the papal court as a royal envoy. The journey had its own dangers, but for Giles it was a success since he was allowed by the pope to retain his former revenues. The elect returned in the beginning of 1257, and was consecrated on 11 March 1257, adding to the number of those prelates whom Henry did not initially know too well, but certainly had no reason to reject.

During Giles' Continental mission the monks of Ely chose, after deliberation, a new bishop on 13 November 1256. This election, which followed the death of William of Kilkenny did not please Henry, for he had intended to advance his chancellor, Henry of Wingham. The king undoubtedly could have thought that such designs were quite reasonable, since it was only two years earlier that the monks of Ely had voluntarily elected the then chancellor, William of Kilkenny. Henry was not even in England at
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252. Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. III, 197-98, 235. The chancellor had no wish, however, to obtain the bishopric through intrusion and urged the king to cease his efforts. Henry of Wingham became elected to London in 1259.
that time, and yet the Ely electors needed no royal 'guidance'. In contrast, the situation was quite different in November 1256. The monks became firmly determined to advance just the opposite kind of man to that of William and promoted their sub-prior, Hugh Balsham. The king consequently refused, on 22 November 1256, to accept the monks' decision, although only formal objections could be made against Hugh. Henry's resolve to reject Hugh's promotion was bolstered by the fact that the archbishop of Canterbury was firmly on the royal side. Boniface had examined the elect, but failed to find grounds for disapproval; he, nevertheless, sought the help of friends at the papal curia against Hugh. The archbishop had a candidate of his own for Ely: Adam Marsh, a Franciscan. Boniface appears to have had no legal rights to object neither to the canonical Ely election, nor the person of the elect, and the fact that his actions were designed to please the king just showed how determined Henry was in this matter.

That Henry hardly knew Hugh in 1256 certainly did not help the case of the elect. Normally such a circumstance did not prevent a candidate to gain episcopal advancement, but when it came to nominees with a monastic background - a relatively rare occurrence - it became of importance to the crown. Hugh of Northwold had had a good relationship with Henry and was advanced to a bishopric in 1229; in contrast, the essentially unnoticed Simon of Elmham, Thomas Melsonby, and William of Montpellier failed at the end. The dispute which centred on Hugh Balsham could not
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fail to demonstrate a prejudice at court against monks. From c. 1234 to 1256 Hugh appears to have been mentioned in the court records only once; the matter concerned a legal case in 1255.\textsuperscript{259} As for Henry, he may have met the sub-prior of Ely during his visits to the see, although these were not numerous in 1247-56.\textsuperscript{260} Despite all opposition, Hugh was successful in promoting his own cause by going to Rome in person and obtaining papal confirmation on 6 October 1257.\textsuperscript{261} He was consecrated by Alexander IV on 14 October, and then returned to England.\textsuperscript{262} The king, presented with a fait accompli, made the wisest decision under the circumstances and restored the temporalities of Ely soon after, on 15 January 1258.\textsuperscript{263}

At least it must have been pleasing for Henry that after the elections of Sewal de Bovill and Hugh Balsham, there emerged a candidate in Coventry and Lichfield on 31 January 1257, whom he could support without reservations, although had not intended at first to advance. This was Roger Longespee, the king’s nephew, promoted by the electors not as a result of royal intrusion, but through the efforts of Richard of Cornwall.\textsuperscript{264} Henry’s initial nominee for the see, following the resignation of Roger Weseham, was his treasurer from 1252, Philip Lovel.\textsuperscript{265} The king’s design bore no result, but naturally, Henry could hardly oppose the advancement of his kinsman, and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{259} Close Rolls 1254-56, 179.
\item \textsuperscript{260} Close Rolls 1247-51, 108, 425, 531; Close Rolls 1251-53, 157, 257; Close Rolls 1254-56, 283, 402.
\item \textsuperscript{261} Giles Matthew Paris, vol. III, 222; Fasti, vol. II, 46.
\item \textsuperscript{262} Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. III, 256.
\item \textsuperscript{263} CPR 1247-58, 612.
\item \textsuperscript{264} Ibid., 540; Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. III, 217.
\item \textsuperscript{265} According to the Handbook of British Chronology, 103, Lovel was archdeacon of Coventry, for which, however, there is no evidence in the public records for the years 1252-57. If the above evidence is, nevertheless, correct than Henry’s wish to have the treasurer promoted - in the context of other episcopal elections - certainly was not unreasonable.
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on 6 February - merely six days after the election - royal assent was given.\textsuperscript{266} The elect's family ties ensured the goodwill of the crown, but this is not to say that Henry had viewed all his relatives in equal terms. The king's attitude to Roger prior to 1257 was largely determined by the fact that the nephew was of illegitimate birth.\textsuperscript{267}

The Longespees were a great baronial family; William Longespee I [Longsword], created earl of Salisbury in 1198, was a natural son of king Henry II.\textsuperscript{268} This William [died 1226], although had deserted the cause of king John at one stage, took allegiance to the young Henry by early 1217 - at a critical time for the English crown.\textsuperscript{269} His son, William Longespee II [died 1250], supported the monarchy against the Welsh and Richard Marshal in 1233; joined Richard of Cornwall on a crusade in 1240; accompanied the king in his Gascon campaigning two years later, and led an expedition to recover the Holy Sepulchre in 1247-50.\textsuperscript{270} Another member of the family, Stephen - most probably the brother of William II - served the crown with distinction. He married the countess of Ulster and was appointed seneschal of Gascony in 1255.\textsuperscript{271}

Despite Marion Gibbs' reference to William II as being Roger's father, it is not really clear to whom the elect was paternally connected.\textsuperscript{272} Gibbs suggested that William II was born c. 1212, however, there is solid evidence that Roger had already been a clerk in 1238, and thus he could hardly have been born after c. 1220 at the time
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when William II was supposed to have been around eight years old. Either William II was born before c. 1205, or Roger could have been a son of William Longespee I, who died in 1226.

Although the English court records do not show any association between Henry and his nephew, in 1238 the king and Richard of Cornwall petitioned the pope that the papal legate made "such a provision as he shall see fit to Roger". Their request, no doubt, wished primarily to remove the impediment of illegitimacy from Roger's career who was then, as mentioned, a clerk. In this objective, the king and his brother were successful. In November 1239 Roger was again granted dispensation - again through the interference of Henry and earl Richard - to be advanced to a bishopric, if canonically elected.

The nephew was left to make his own way in the world after 1239, and he became by 1257 sub-deacon and canon of Lichfield, and a papal chaplain. Roger had gained episcopal advancement through secular intrusion, but the bishopric did not end up with an outsider as its pastor.

Another episcopal candidate who gained Henry's approval in the course of 1257 was Simon Walton, a royal justice. His career rather resembled that of William of York, with the exception that Simon had never quite made it to the highest echelons of political power in the service of the crown. Simon's election to Norwich on 4 June
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276. Burton, 378; CPR 1247-58, 540. The king's reasons for neglecting Roger [in relative terms] are not easy to discern. Henry may have simply had a certain bias against people born out of marriages. The king's own marital conduct, arguably, showed an example, since he was the first English monarch after William II without illegitimate issues, Handbook of British Chronology, 34 - 38.
1257 followed the death and entombment of Walter Suffield. Typically, the king's reaction to a promotion of a curialis was swift and positive, as if to make sure that the monks of Norwich did not change their minds. Royal assent was granted six days later, and by 11 August the temporalities of the see were also restored. Whether the Norwich election was canonical - but an expedient one nevertheless, or tainted with simony through the actions of the royal judge himself - as asserted by Gibbs [relying on the evidence of the chronicle of London] - cannot be decisively settled. Justices like Simon were certainly in a position to promote their own cause at times independently of the crown. At any rate, the judge does not appear to have been the type to refrain from simony. In fact, after the Norwich election he "sent messengers in all haste to... Rome, where, by means of profuse bribes, he obtained a dispensation authorising him to retain his former revenues for four years...." Henry was not involved in these proceedings which naturally served his interests without a financial sacrifice.

If Marion Gibbs and William Hunt are correct in their claim that Simon had been presented to a benefice in 1206 by king John, then the elect's connection to the crown in 1257 was extraordinarily old. Simon's years allowed such a link, since in

---
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1265 the papal legate was directed to find a coadjutor for the bishop of Norwich "on account of his age and weakness". Gibbs' another assertion that the elect did judicial work from 1246 - based on the evidence of E. Foss - is somewhat misleading, since Simon had already been employed to handle legal cases in 1228 and 1235 - 36.

It seems that Simon's relation to Henry rose above the official level in 1236, when the judge received his first reward from the sovereign in form of two oak-trunks. Simon was in royal service in January 1237. He travelled to the Continent in this position, having received a customary letter of protection on 26 January, but must have been back by 25 October 1237 on which date he was given a gift of four oak-trunks. The servant had kept a very low profile for about the next four years, although he acquired additional gifts on two occasions in 1238, and the king nearly appointed him as a proctor in 1241.

Simon's first employment of real importance came after the death of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield in December 1241. By June 1242 the judge was appointed as guardian of the bishopric, a post which he appears to have kept until the restoration of the temporalities to Roger Weseham in March 1246. That the see was unoccupied for quite some time was essentially a result of vacancies in Canterbury and Rome, but it was also caused by Henry's refusal to accept the election of William of Montpellier in 1245. In these years Simon received gifts only on about three occasions, but the king
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listened to what he had to say and trusted him in financial matters. The judge had advised Henry in 1243 - most probably after the king's return from the Continent in September - that the mill of Feckenham [Worc.] was in need of a repair, and thus the bailiffs of the place were given corresponding royal orders in December. In the autumn of 1245, while the king's Welsh expedition was in progress, Simon was commissioned to organise a delivery of three thousand marks from London to Chester.

That Henry was pleased with Simon's handling of his work was indicated by a grant in January 1246, and the fact that in that year the servant's career as an itinerant judge really had begun. In the eleven years that followed, Simon, as a practising justice, was never out of favour at court, and pursued his occupation without long interruptions. Apart from gifts and grants, Simon appears to have collected a yearly allowance from the crown in this period in the value of about thirty marks. There were also the seemingly trivial favours which were, in fact, very much an indication of the king's goodwill towards him. In 1252 Henry confirmed a gift made by the abbot of St Mary, Evesham [Worc.] to Simon; in 1255 the king granted, at the instance of his judge, one James de Etindon a free warren in Warwickshire, and also as a result of Simon's request exempted one Alexander de Besford, and one Thomas de Lega in 1256 from possible judicial, or administrative obligations in the service of the


291. CLR 1240-45, 209. Henry's interest in Feckenham was no coincidence, since he had a manor there. In 1250 the keeper of this manor was Simon, CLR 1245-51, 301.

292. CLR 1240-45, 322-23; Cox, Eagles of Savoy, 168.


294. The rather numerous entries in the Close Rolls alone prove the point. See the index in the relevant volumes.

295. CLR 1245-51, 218, 288, 346; CLR 1251-60, 52, 98, 186.
In April 1257 Simon was appointed as justice of the Bench - a position in which he had already worked in 1251 - and as the elect of Norwich, Simon's first gift from Henry comprised three deer, supplied from the forest of Feckenham in July 1257.

Simon's secular career was impressive, but he had never reached the status to issue royal orders himself, or to be a royal counsellor. As a court witness, he appears to have acted merely on one occasion during all those years. He was an important servant, who had never been given independence, however, to perform on his own for the monarchy. This Simon did not seem to mind, and he was firmly on the royalist side during the baronial disturbances in 1263.

Apart from Roger Longespee and Simon Walton another episcopal candidate, anointed at Canterbury on 10 March 1258 by Boniface, was Walter Bronescombe, the elect of Exeter. His nomination on 23 February 1258 was followed very quickly by the restoration of the bishopric's temporalities on 6 March 1258, and the subsequent consecration ceremony four days later.

During the reign of Henry III the two elected bishops of Exeter, Richard Blund and Walter Bronescombe, had been chancellors in their sees prior to episcopal advancement. About their elections the chroniclers appear to have been silent and

---
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on both occasions the assent of the king was quickly obtained. Considering also that in relative terms, Henry did not show much personal interest in Exeter from c. 1234 to 1258, one is drawn to conclude that Walter's election was most likely a canonical one. Unlike some of the courtier-bishops, with secular careers stretching at times for two decades, Walter's association with the crown only went back to 1250. He was most likely attached in the early 1240's to the household of William Raleigh, to whom he had owed his first significant benefice, the archdeaconry of Surrey in the diocese of Winchester. The appointment probably came between September 1244 - after Raleigh finally had gained the temporalities of his see - and April 1245. In August 1245 the papacy confirmed the bishop's dispensation to the archdeacon to hold three benefices. For reasons of his own the king had ignored Walter during 1245-50, but with the death of Raleigh in the autumn of 1250, and the subsequent royal efforts to promote Aymer de Valence, a chance presented itself for the archdeacon to do service to the crown. Walter's support contributed to the election of Henry's half-brother and established the beginning of a successful career at court. Even before the election of Aymer on 4 November 1250, the king may have thought that his appreciation of Walter's qualities was overdue, since the archdeacon by that time had been a papal chaplain, with a good relationship with Innocent IV.

Henry had wasted no time and a little over two weeks after the Winchester election Walter was already on his way to Lyons as a royal envoy. The expedition proved to be quite short, as the archdeacon was a recipient of a gift from the king in

303. Ibid., 72, 74; See also Richard Blund.
305. Fasti, vol. II, 94.
February the following year, but he was again sent to the papal court in November 1251 to be in charge of royal affairs. Walter seems to have spent about three uninterrupted years from 1252 at the curia, and he was well rewarded by Innocent IV and Alexander IV for his work. The archdeacon was back in England, but most probably just for a short period of time in 1256. It is likely that Walter was at the papal court not only during 1257, but also at the time of the Exeter election. For the chapter, the promotion of the chancellor, in the light of his other positions, was arguably quite a desirable and logical step to take.

That for Henry the elevation of a courtier to the episcopacy had been preferable second only to the advancement of a favourite, or a relative, was also true in relation to Robert de Chaury, bishop of Carlisle from 14 April 1258. Robert’s election, sometime before 12 February 1257 followed the resignation of the previous nominee, Robert de Sancta Agatha in December 1256. De Chaury’s consecration had been partly delayed by the opposition of the archbishop of York on the grounds of the candidate’s illegitimacy, but this objection was overruled by the papacy on 19 June 1257. The king gladly accepted the promotion of a man who previously had served in the household of the queen and gave his assent on 12 February 1257, notwithstanding the legal problem of the elect’s birth.

Robert’s career at court had already been well established in 1243 in which year
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he was a clerk of Eleanor's wardrobe and received from Henry an ecclesiastical benefice in the value of thirty marks in the diocese of York.\textsuperscript{317} The next seven years were relatively uneventful, as Robert simply worked in his position without any special assignments.\textsuperscript{318} It would appear that his immediate superior for some time in this period was one Guy de Palude, who was keeper of the queen's wardrobe in 1246-47.\textsuperscript{319}

Robert was involved in 1250 in a minor affair of providing - this time as Eleanor's almoner - the leprous sisters of Windsor with a royal gift, and received a present himself in 1252.\textsuperscript{320} Then for reasons of his own Robert resigned the church of Rowde [Wilts.] sometime in the first half of 1253.\textsuperscript{321} Naturally, when Henry had departed for France in August, Robert stayed with Eleanor. The clerk received gifts on two occasions from the queen in the spring of 1254, and was involved in the task of placing some treasures in the castle of Porchester [Hants.] in March.\textsuperscript{322}

Clearly, Robert's employment had many aspects, as he was also referred to as the queen's chandler in that year.\textsuperscript{323} Robert most probably accompanied Eleanor to the Continent at the end of May 1254, since the court records were silent on him in the second half of 1254.

The highlight of the clerk's secular career came very shortly after the royal couple returned to England at the end of December. In January 1255 Robert had been appointed chamberlain of the exchequer, yet surprisingly hardly anything specific remained known about his activities from this time onwards to the January - February
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election of 1257. However, by the king's favour Robert was granted the church of Badsworth [York] in January 1255; he received another gift in 1256, and became archdeacon of Bath, most likely between July 1256 and 22 January 1257.

Robert's career at the royal court was not unimpressive, despite the impediment of his illegitimate birth, and considering also that he had to make himself noticeable to Henry through the queen. Had it not been for these factors, he probably would have enjoyed more attention from the king. Still, the archdeacon had no reason to complain, since he had been the first in 1226-58 [and in fact remained the only one up to 1272] to gain a bishopric from the household of Eleanor.
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CHAPTER V

THE TIMES OF TURBULENCE

THE LOSS OF ROYAL INFLUENCE, 1258-65
By the time of the next episcopal election after that of Robert de Chaury, the king had been deeply involved in a political struggle with his barons, largely caused by his own desire to obtain the throne of Sicily for his son, Edmund. From 1254 the 'Sicilian business' gradually came to dominate all of Henry's pursuits, although it provoked a serious opposition from the magnates of the realm, who were simply not prepared to accept the enormous cost of this royal commitment. In 1254 the king accepted the papal offer for the crown of Sicily without realising that in return he would have to sacrifice "two or three times the annual revenue of the kingdom". The English barons were not, however, entirely unsympathetic to these plans. In May 1258 - following various negotiations with the pope - it was agreed that an attempt would be made to collect a subsidy for the Sicilian expedition in return of reform of royal administration and more moderate terms from Alexander IV. Henry had acceded to these resolutions and an embassy left for Rome to persuade the pope to collaborate.

In June 1258 a committee consisting of twelve members of the royal council and twelve representatives of the baronage met in Oxford to put an administrative rearrangement in place. Their plan, the 'Provisions of Oxford' primarily aimed to curb both the role of the crown over administrative personnel, and the authority of certain officers of the king. It also set out to expel unacceptable relatives of Henry from the English court. More importantly, the Oxford meeting established a 'council of fifteen', which effectively came to gain political control in England for the next eighteen months. The balance of political power had shifted so drastically that Henry had to assent to the expulsion of his half-brothers, and in July 1258 four of the Lusignans reluctantly departed from Dover.

During these dramatic days, sometime after 4 July 1258, the dean of York,
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Godfrey Ludham, became elected as bishop of that see.⁴ The king, hardly in a position for much manoeuvring, gave his assent on 25 July, although his knowledge of Godfrey did not amount to a great deal.⁵

In 1251 Godfrey, as precentor of St Peter’s church, York was amerced for a forest trespass before the itinerant justices in the county of Nottingham.⁶ The fine had amounted to forty marks and somehow Henry came to know about the whole affair.⁷ And as a result of certain financial considerations of his own, the king ordered that Godfrey pay ten out of these forty marks to one Ernald Cotin during Christmas 1251.⁸

It has already been stated that sometime before 8 January 1252, the dean of York - Sewal de Bovill - along with the precentor - Godfrey Ludham - appeared at the royal court to give testimony in relation to the financial requirements of certain nunneries.⁹ Godfrey had already paid Ernald Cotin his ten marks by the first week of January 1252, and thus his debt came to thirty marks.¹⁰ Now, on 8 January 1252, Henry decided that this money should be used to support those nunneries instead of being directly paid to the exchequer.¹¹ In this first week of January the king spent a few days in York and had an opportunity to see both Sewal and Godfrey at work in

---
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their diocese.\textsuperscript{12}

As Sewal had become dean following Walter Kirkham's promotion in 1249, Godfrey was also advanced to the deanery in 1256 with the elevation of Sewal to the archiepiscopacy.\textsuperscript{13} As a dean, however, Godfrey appears to have failed to merit any attention from Henry and even official business between them was conducted probably on only one occasion.\textsuperscript{14} Considering the importance of York, and the fact that in 1255-56 there had already been attempts made on the part of the crown to see Aymer de Valence as archbishop, Henry was probably far from being pleased with the consecration of Godfrey.\textsuperscript{15}

The second episcopal nominee, whose advancement Henry was in no position to control as a result of the wide ranging authority of the council of fifteen after the summer of 1258, was Richard Gravesend.\textsuperscript{16} For the king there could not have been much difference between Godfrey Ludham and Richard at around this time: both candidates had been deans prior to their elevation, but more importantly, Henry's knowledge about them was quite minimal in both cases.\textsuperscript{17}

Richard's election to Lincoln on 21 or 23 September 1258 was quickly followed by the giving of royal assent on 13 October, and the subsequent consecration ceremony at Cambridge on 3 November.\textsuperscript{18} It appeared in the autumn of 1258 that the baronial

\textsuperscript{12} CPR 1247-58, 124.
\textsuperscript{13} Gibbs and Lang, \textit{Bishops and Reform}, 198.
\textsuperscript{14} Close Rolls 1256-59, 78 - 79.
\textsuperscript{15} Godfrey's relatives could have included Eustace Ludham - perhaps his father - sheriff of Yorkshire before 1227, CLR 1226-40, 33, 83; Close Rolls 1227-31, 156. Eustace was also a forest justice in 1231, sheriff of Nottinghamshire prior to 1233, and a commissioner of tallage in 1241, \textit{Ibid.}, 574, 585; Close Rolls 1231-34, 212; Close Rolls 1237-42, 303; CPR 1232-47, 263.
\textsuperscript{16} Powicke, \textit{Henry III}, 392.
\textsuperscript{17} Fasti, vol. III, 4.
\textsuperscript{18} Licence to elect in Lincoln was granted on 24 August 1258 following the death of Henry Lexington. The temporalities of the see were restored on 17 October, CPR 1247-58, 651, 653; Giles, \textit{Matthew Paris}, vol. III, 305, 307; Fasti, vol. III, 4.
administrative control of the kingdom was quite a conducive element in the process resulting in episcopal promotions, for at least Henry was powerless to raise effective objections to canonical nominees, or promote his curiales. In summer - autumn of 1258 the electors not surprisingly had refrained from making an expedient election to appease the king, since now, it seemed, there was no need to.

For about twenty years prior to his election Richard worked as an ecclesiastic in three important posts. He was treasurer of Hereford from before 1239 to c. 1250, when he became archdeacon of Oxford. This latter office Richard presumably had held until 1254, for by August 1254, he appeared as a dean of Lincoln and a rector of Ross in the diocese of Hereford. As a dean, Richard worked under bishop Henry Lexington until 1258. The connection between Henry III and the treasurer of Hereford dated back to at least as early as 1242. In October of that year both the king and Richard were in Bordeaux, and the treasurer, who was then on his way back to England had received a royal letter of ‘safe-conduct’ for his journey. By the spring of 1253 Richard had been appointed as a chaplain of J. [sic.], cardinal of St Laurence’s in Lucina [? Lucena, Spain]. Even in the capacity of the dean of Lincoln, Richard’s involvement in the wider affairs of the kingdom, and in the secular matters of his diocese seems to have been quite moderate. He was appointed by the pope - while Henry was in France in 1254 - along with the dean of London to carry out a mandate against the violators of Magna Carta. Sometime before November 1255, Richard and

19. Ibid., 37.


21. CPR 1232-47, 331; This entry appears to be one of the earliest ones on Richard in the court records.


the canons of the see petitioned the king for a building extension of their church.24 In
the following year the dean of Lincoln received a papal indult to keep all his present
benefices with an additional one.25

From the point of view of the church, the advancement of both Godfrey
Ludham and Richard Gravesend - deans of dioceses where they later would become
bishops - was quite a logical culmination of an ecclesiastical career. And it was most
probably desirable too, if for no other reason than for the fact that both Godfrey and
Richard were far removed from the secular concerns of the monarchy. Under these
circumstances they were perhaps ideally suited to take up episcopal responsibilities
whatever the final verdict would be on their achievements as bishops. Henry, however,
could not be sure of Richard's loyalties in the critical year of 1258. More important
still, considering that a few years earlier the king had intended to have d'Aigueblanche
translated to Lincoln, and the fact that then not even the dean, Henry Lexington, whose
one brother had been steward of the household, another an important justice, was sure
whether Henry III would accept him instead if the Savoyard favourite, the promotion of
Richard Gravesend to the largest diocese in England most likely would have provoked
opposition of some extent from the crown under normal circumstances. In this respect
too, Richard's position was highly analogous to that of Godfrey Ludham. If the king
had any apprehensions in 1258, and he most probably did, these proved to be correct as,
in fact, Richard came to support Simon de Montfort in the conflict with the crown.26

Ironically, the next episcopal candidate following the promotion of the dean of
Lincoln was just the opposite kind of man to both Richard Gravesend and Godfrey
Ludham. This is of interest because at the time when the royal chancellor, Henry of
Wingham, became elected to London - sometime before 29 June 1259, on the day the

24. CPR 1247-58, 506.
26. Dunstable, 240; Osney, 181; Powicke, Henry III, 408.
king gave his assent to the nomination - the political balance of power was still
definitely in favour of the reforming barons, even though their initial enthusiasm had
waned.27

The London election once again reflected political expediency more than
anything else, but now the canons, considering the current circumstances, thought it
desirable to select someone who would be acceptable to both parties, i.e. the king and
the leading magnates.28 The chancellor would naturally be unobjectionable to
Henry III, and as far as the baronial reformers were concerned, they had already
renewed Henry's appointment in 1258.29 The electors in London were, actually, not
the first in 1259 to consider Henry of Wingham as their pastor. The Winchester monks
had also intended to advance him, following the banishment of Aymer and his brothers
in the summer of 1258, clearly because they had thought "that the king would not accept
any one whom they elected as bishop unless it was a particular friend of his own".30
Such logic on the part of both the Winchester and London electors in 1259 may have
been the result of a view that the essentially secular objectives of the reform movement
would not dislocate royal rights in relation to ecclesiastical affairs, whatever radical
changes there could be achieved in the administration of the kingdom by the barons.
The fact that Henry III was quite prepared to see his chancellor to govern Winchester -
the bishopric the king was arguably the most sensitive about - in the event Aymer could
not obtain consecration from the pope, was a telling sign, perhaps even more so than his
assent to the London election, of the excellent relations between them.31 And this was

27. CPR 1258-66, 29; Fasti, vol. I, 3; Powicke, Henry III, 397-406. The temporalities
of London were restored on 11 July, CPR 1258-66, 29-30.

28. Henry of Wingham was hardly alien, however, to the London canons, as he was
dean of St Martin's-le-Grand from 1255, Close Rolls 1254-56, 169; CPR 1247-58, 423.


31. Ibid., 315-16.
not so surprising, considering that Henry III had already wanted to advance the chancellor to Ely against Hugh Balsham in 1256. In the end, Henry of Wingham became consecrated as bishop of London on 15 February 1260, just before the king's arrival at St Omer, following a ratification of a treaty with Louis of France.

For the chancellor this was a culmination of an extremely successful career spanning eighteen years at court. Henry had already been promised an ecclesiastical benefice on 6 May 1242 in the see of York in the event of a suitable vacancy. The king was at Portsmouth at the time, and two days later he had set sail to France only to return in September 1243. Henry of Wingham was a clerk of the king's uncle, Peter of Savoy, who had come to England in 1241. The clerk's association with Peter was a factor of considerable importance, since this turned out to be an excellent recommendation in the eyes of the king. When Henry III had left for Gascony the clerk was left behind, but very soon, i.e. by the end of May, and certainly by June 1242, he was carrying out work for the crown through the authority of the regent, the archbishop of York. It was through the orders of the king - although he was in France - that Henry was sent to the fair of Lynn [Norfolk] along with a colleague in July 1242 to purchase cloth for the royal household. In September 1242 the clerk was given a more important task which led him to the Cinque Ports, and from there he most

32. Ibid., 215, 235.
34. CPR 1232-47, 289. The view of Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 191, that Henry of Wingham was an exchequer clerk in 1241 is not supported by the court records.
38. CPR 1232-47, 300; CLR 1240-45, 141.
probably left England to join Henry III’s expedition.39 Somewhere along the way Henry of Wingham had lost his horses, but he was reimbursed for the cost, and returned to England around the end of April 1243 with letters of credence from the king.40

The clerk did not stay long in the kingdom. By August 1243 he was on his way back to Gascony, and it is from this point onwards that Henry's career at court truly began.41 Probably in the second week of September 1243 - about two weeks before Henry III's return to England - the clerk had gained his first major assignment: he was appointed in charge of Gascon financial affairs in close collaboration with its seneschal.42 As a second man in command, Henry was left behind after the king's departure, and when he returned to England he resumed working for the monarchy at a high level.43 Between 1246 and 1251 Henry was a royal escheator, and from 1255 to 1260, chancellor.44

Judging by the extraordinary number of more than two hundred references in the public records, illuminating Henry's secular career, it is undoubted, that the king's attachment to him prior to 1260 would have equalled in most respects his affection towards a dearest relative. Arguably, Henry of Wingham would have been one of the most successful clerks of the king of all time by probably most yardsticks. Just as far as ecclesiastical presentations were concerned, the clerk became a parson of more than ten various churches in 1247-58, a number far too great even for the 'average' high standing

39. CPR 1232-47, 303; CLR 1240-45, 172.
40. Ibid., 176; Close Rolls 1242-47, 20.
41. CLR 1240-45, 189.
42. CPR 1232-47, 405-6.
43. Ibid., 422-23, 436, 467; CLR 1240-45, 247; Close Rolls 1242-47, 455.
44. CPR 1232-47, 482; CPR 1247-58, 393; Close Rolls 1242-47, 455; Close Rolls 1247-51, 545; Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 191; Handbook of British Chronology, 85.
All considered, the relation between the king and Henry is of greatest interest in those early years of 1242-43. The clerk, no doubt, had benefited then from belonging to the household of Peter of Savoy, but it was only natural that before Henry III entrusted him in a serious way, he had first tested his abilities. For Henry of Wingham this testing period was short, from c. May 1242 to September 1243, and the important work in Gascony thereafter may have found him somewhat unprepared.

When the king had reached Dover from France with a few hundred foreign mercenaries on 23 April 1260 his political situation in England looked bleak. The reforming barons, under the leadership of Simon de Montfort, appeared to have enlisted even the support of young Edward. During the meetings of the council in April, de Montfort bitterly attacked the justiciar for sending money to Henry III in France and intended to prevent the coming of foreign troops with the king at all cost. The earl of Leicester's alliance with the magnates at this time seemed secure and he camped with his forces and with Edward, north of the Thames, while the southern side was held by the earl of Gloucester, main opponent of de Montfort. When Henry landed in Dover one of his immediate objectives was to secure the loyalty of London. The king had reached the city on 30 April and took up residence in the palace of the bishop, near St Paul's church. The tension which ensued between the royalists and the reformers was broken by earl Richard and Boniface of Canterbury, for they had managed to reconcile

46. Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 232.
47. Ibid., 228.
48. Ibid., 228-29.
50. Ibid., 31-32.
51. Ibid., 32.
Edward with his father. This proved to be an event of decisive importance and from this point onwards Henry was able to gradually reassert his authority, although not yet on a permanent basis. By May-June 1260 the royalist members of the council, and consequently the king, governed the realm, essentially without hindrance. The October parliament of 1260, although could not check the trend favourable to the monarchy, naturally turned out to be less royalist than the council, and Henry had to realise that the scheme of government envisaged at Oxford in 1258 was not entirely forgotten. It was a setback for the crown that Hugh Bigod, the royalist justiciar, had been replaced by a friend of de Montfort, and Henry of Wingham left his office also, to take up episcopal responsibilities. The reform movement, nevertheless, came to a definite halt on 28 December 1260, when the council established by the Oxford parliament in 1258 ceased to issue orders.

Around the time of the meeting of the autumn parliament beginning on 13 October 1260, Robert Stichill, the bishop elect of Durham, came to London to seek royal assent for his promotion. Robert had been a prior of a cell at Finchale, Durham, and his canonical election on 30 September 1260 followed the death of Walter Kirkham. Already on 20 August, the king felt confident enough to act against the provisions of Oxford and committed the guardianship of the see to John Mansel without

52. Ibid, 32.
53. Ibid, 32-40.
54. Ibid, 34.
55. Ibid, 34; Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 244-45.
56. Ibid, 244-45; Treharne and Sanders, Documents of the Baronial Movement, 34 - 35.
57. Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 245-50; Treharne and Sanders, Documents of the Baronial Movement, 35-40.
Another sign of Henry's new-found confidence was his attempt to meddle in the Durham election process to effect the promotion of one of the royal clerks. Robert was not out of touch, however, with political realities and threatened to refer the case to the October parliament. This chance the king was not prepared to take, however, he kept Robert waiting in London for nearly two weeks before granting assent on 25 October 1260. Henry may have been still calculating his scopes of action, but it is also possible that, since the prior was staying at court, the king simply wished to be well acquainted with him. In any case, the prior of Finchale had made a good impression on the king. Henry's conduct made perfect sense: he had always been sensitive about the bishopric of Durham, and was not in a habit of accepting monastic candidates, particularly those, whose previous connection to the crown had been quite minimal.

The king's first definite meeting with Robert appears to have taken place in Westminster in the early days of April 1249. At that time Robert was only a monk of Durham and he, along with a colleague, came to the king to seek election licence following the resignation of Nicholas Farnham. In November 1255 the prior of Finchale, who presumably was Robert, had been involved, along with the sub-prior of Durham, in a purely official business of delivering money due to Nicholas from

61. Ibid., 385; Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 243.
62. Ibid., 243.
64. Ibid., 385.
65. The temporalities of the see were restored on 5 December 1260, CPR 1258-66, 132. Robert was consecrated on 13 February 1261, Yonge, Matthew of Westminster's Flowers of History, vol. II, 391; Fasti, vol. II, 32.
66. CPR 1247-58, 39.
Undoubtedly, candidates with a background of Robert in normal circumstances would have been likely rejected by the king. In October 1260 these normal circumstances did not yet return, despite the tremendous ground gained by the crown after those tense days in London during the spring. Robert may have made himself acceptable to Henry during his visit to London, nevertheless, his advancement was essentially a result of the political balance of the time.

The change of a political equilibrium beginning in the summer of 1258 was quite favourable, amongst others, to the monks of Winchester, for after the expulsion of Aymer in July an opportunity presented itself, notwithstanding the legal problem, to advance someone else to the bishopric. As seen, the monks’ first choice fell on Henry of Wingham, but because the chancellor thought it more advisable to accept his nomination to London, they had to look for another candidate.

For quite some time after July 1258 there prevailed a general confusion of interests by the various parties in relation to Winchester. As far as the monks were concerned, they had already come to an understanding with the magnates in July 1258 that they would treat the king’s half-brother as being effectively deposed. Yet this was certainly not the way Henry and his chancellor viewed the case after the latter’s election to Winchester in the first half of 1259, when they thought that Aymer’s consecration by the pope and his return was still possible. It was another sign of a

67. Ibid., 448. For another official engagement on the part of the prior in November 1259 - when the king had no real authority: Close Rolls 1259-61, 139.

68. For Aymer’s ill-treatment of the monks and his high-handed attitude, see Gasquet, Henry III, 304-19.

69. Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 79.

70. Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. III, 315-16; By the autumn of 1259, considering the political situation, the king had realised that Aymer’s comeback would be unfeasible, despite the demands of the papal nuncio in England. On 23 September 1259, and 18 January 1260 he had written to Alexander IV, informing him of this development. The second letter had been sent from St Denis, Royal Letters, vol. II, 138-40, 150-52; Cal. Papal Letters, vol. I, 364.
dramatic decrease of Henry's authority in the second half of 1258 that the new guardian of the bishopric, Nicholas de Hadlou, was appointed not by him, but by the magnates of the council on 24 December 1258. Yet as seen, the monks' choice of Henry of Wingham was no coincidence: the candidate had to be acceptable to the king as well.

Very soon after it became evident that the chancellor would not take up episcopal responsibilities in Aymer's see, i.e. after the royal assent to the London election on 29 June 1259, licence to elect in Winchester was granted on 15 July. The next nominee of the monks was their prior, Andrew London, who on 29 July had obtained royal assent to his advancement. Two important modern authorities wrongly date Andrew's election to 3 February 1261. In fact, on that day another candidate was chosen, William Taunton, abbot of Middleton [Dorset].

That the monks intended to advance Andrew and William was logical enough, for they both had been priors of Winchester in the 1250’s. As a monk, William succeeded as head of the house of St Swithun's in February 1250, nine months before Aymer's election to the see. Relations between him and Henry's relative were obviously not good, for by February 1255 Aymer expelled William and intruded his nominee, Andrew London. The king supported this rather radical move at the time and by prohibiting the making of any loans to William, or the monks, he helped his half-brother to keep litigation costs down. William, nevertheless, did appeal to Rome and

71. CPR 1258-66, 7.
72. Ibid., 30.
73. Ibid., 35.
74. Handbook of British Chronology, 276; Fasti, vol. II, 86-87, 90. This was Andrew’s ‘second’ election in which he had only obtained six out of sixty four - while William acquired fifty four votes, Cal. Papal Letters, vol. I, 378. See also below.
75. Fasti, vol. II, 90.
77. CPR 1247-58, 396-97.
although he ultimately was unsuccessful Alexander IV was by no means unsympathetic towards him.\textsuperscript{78} As for Henry, he was prepared to accept William in another position and thus gave his assent to the election of the former prior, as abbot of Middelton in December 1256.\textsuperscript{79}

Ironically, Andrew London came to be also frustrated by litigation in Rome, while William came to have a chance ‘to avenge’ in February 1261 the injustices inflicted on him. As a prior of St Swithun’s, Andrew must have played a decisive role in those negotiations with the barons in July 1258 - days before Aymer’s departure from England - which resulted in their agreement to regard the king’s half-brother as finally deposed. The fact that Andrew resigned from the priory on 12 July 1258, but was re-elected on the same day through the influence of the earl of Gloucester, well reflected that it was one thing to banish Aymer, another to demote his former protégé.\textsuperscript{80}

Andrew’s position in the ensuing months became more and more secure: he had been confirmed by an official of Boniface in August, and received papal dispensation for illegitimacy to hold a bishopric in December 1258.\textsuperscript{81} As seen, royal approval to his election to Winchester was granted on 29 July, and on 2 August 1259 Andrew received a not insignificant grant from the council of the magnates.\textsuperscript{82} He only had to have papal assent to his consecration - since Aymer was still alive - but this Andrew could not

\textsuperscript{79} CPR 1247-58, 532. 
\textsuperscript{80} It cannot be excluded that Henry, who most probably would have liked Andrew to remain a prior, had a private understanding with the earl, who later became de Montfort’s main opponent and leader of the ‘royalist reformers’. Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 79, undoubtedly seems correct in claiming that the barons’ intrigues with the monks at this time were ‘obscure’. In any case, the king had ample opportunity to discuss matters with the earl of Gloucester, as he was also in Winchester for at least a week, from c.4 July to c.11 July 1258, CPR 1247-58, 640-41; Winchester, 97; Treharne and Sanders, Documents of the Baronial Movement, 40; Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 285. 
\textsuperscript{82} CPR 1258-66, 36; CLR 1251-60, 484.
obtain. Alexander IV was adamant about his support of Aymer even after Henry had ceased to back him and he consecrated the Lusignan in May 1260. Naturally, this made Andrew's chances hopeless, and change only came about with Aymer's death in December 1260. By this time, however, the Winchester monks had decided that they wanted their 'original' prior, William Taunton, as their pastor. In the election of 3 February 1261 the vast majority voted for William, and Andrew's support consequently was minimal. The rather complicated 'second Winchester controversy', spanning essentially from the time of Aymer's election in 1250 was effectively solved by the new pope, Urban IV when he had quashed both Andrew's and William's election by 22 June 1262, and provided on that day John Gervais to the bishopric.

Henry most likely had learnt about John's appointment in France, for he decided to leave England on 14 July 1262, a little over three weeks after the termination of the Winchester vacancy. In the one and a half years after December 1260, when the council of fifteen had directed its last orders, the king remained firmly in control. Henry was actively supported by the papacy against the baronial opposition, while the magnates themselves were divided and de Montfort left for the Continent in the autumn of 1261.

While in France, the king interviewed John, who was on his way back to England, having been consecrated in Rome around 10 September 1262. Henry

86. Ibid., 378; Winchester, 99; Fasti, vol. II, 86-87. John, it seems, had obtained his position through bribery, but in any rate, he was in Rome until around mid-September 1262, Dictionary of National Biography, vol. X, 885.
88. Treharne and Sanders, Documents of the Baronial Movement, 35-40.
89. Dunstable, 219; Fasti, vol. II, 87. The temporalities of Winchester were restored on 18 October 1262, CPR 1258-66, 229.
possibly became aware then that the bishop of Winchester had baronial sympathies, as indeed John like so many of his episcopal colleagues, came to assist the reform party.\textsuperscript{90}

Henry must have also reflected on the fact that he had known his former clerk for nearly three decades.

John seems to have gained his very first assignment from the crown in 1234, when he was sent to Ireland as an envoy.\textsuperscript{91} Nine years later, as the king's approver, he was taken and detained in a prison of Rochester.\textsuperscript{92} This was certainly odd, but at least John's maintenance was taken care of through a royal order to the sheriff of Kent.\textsuperscript{93} John's future career was not harmed by the incident, and by Henry's favour he became presented to a church in Exeter in 1246.\textsuperscript{94} Around this time John must have been also on fairly good terms with Richard of Cornwall. John, as a clerk of Exeter, "learned in physical science", was granted dispensation from the papacy in early 1248 - at the request of the earl - to hold an additional benefice.\textsuperscript{95}

The clerk's career continued in a steady way during the 1250's. John had accompanied the king to Gascony in 1253, although he was sent back to England by late May 1254 on business.\textsuperscript{96} John also played an important role in securing papal confirmation for Sewal de Bovill's postulation to the archbishopric of York in the spring of 1256.\textsuperscript{97} By this time John had become chancellor of York, and in this capacity he


\textsuperscript{91} CPR 1232-47, 37; Close Rolls 1231-34, 368. In the following year John was given a letter of protection without term; this entry in CPR 1232-47, 116, refers to him as John Gervais of Exeter.

\textsuperscript{92} CLR 1240-45, 186.

\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., 186.

\textsuperscript{94} CPR 1232-47, 475. In 1246 John was referred to as a physician: Close Rolls 1242-47, 442.


\textsuperscript{96} CPR 1247-58, 235; CLR 1251-60, 177; Close Rolls 1253-54, 245.

travelled to Rome with two canons and a proctor to represent the cause of the dean.98 In return of this support, Sewal nominated John to the bishopric of Carlisle in the spring of 1257 after he had refused to confirm the clerk of the queen, Robert de Chaury.99 The plan came to naught, but the chancellor could, nevertheless, claim that from Sewal he had obtained a tangible reward - the prebend of Fenton [York].100 The fact that John was indirectly involved in the Carlisle dispute, which after all, worked against royal interests did not seem to have bothered Henry. In May 1257, a little over a month before the papacy overruled Sewal’s objection in favour of Robert de Chaury, John received a gift from the crown, and in the following year he was presented to a benefice by the king.101

Little is known about the chancellor of York in 1258-62. By the summer of 1260 he had been appointed a papal chaplain and at the same time he was granted dispensation to receive a bishopric by Alexander IV.102 John left for Rome at some stage, most probably after the summer of 1260, where he appears to have stayed until his consecration in 1262. If the king ever harboured any feelings of reproach towards him for supporting Simon de Montfort, these were only partly justified, since John’s career had never really been too entwined with the crown. Moreover, as chancellor of York, John was essentially independent of the monarchy. He had been a mid-ranking curialis whom Henry had known for nearly three decades. And yet, considering the general importance of Winchester for the crown, the promotion of such a man to the bishopric normally would not have been acceptable to the king. In 1262, however, in

98. Ibid., 328. Judging by the records of the court, John had obtained the chancellorship only shortly after January 1256, since he was referred to as the king’s clerk not only in 1255, but January 1256, Close Rolls 1254-56, 28, 264.


100. By September 1258, i.e. not long after the death of Sewal in May, John resigned the prebend, CPR 1247-58, 652.


the context of wider political circumstances, Henry could not realistically afford to alienate his ally, the papacy, by going against the *fait accompli* of John's consecration in Rome.

Not long before the king's departure to the Continent in the summer of 1262, two canons of Chichester arrived in London on official business. Their bishop, John Climping, had died on 18 May, and two representatives of the chapter, Master Stephen Bersted and Master John de Coruleto came to see Henry to inform him, and receive election licence as custom required. The king granted their wish on 26 May 1262 in Westminster, and within less than a month one of the canons, Stephen Bersted was elected.

The evidence, or the lack of it, appears to indicate that Henry did not know Stephen prior to May 1262, and yet he accepted the canons' choice without hesitation. On 20 June 1262 the temporalities of the see were restored, following Boniface's confirmation of the elect. No doubt, Stephen must have been far from being the king's ideal candidate for a bishopric, but the archbishop had already approved him, and although Henry was politically secure, he hardly needed an election dispute before his imminent trip to France. Moreover, it was only in early 1262 that a former bishop of Chichester, Richard Wich, became canonised, and to reject a free election result in the same see a few months later would have perhaps provoked a bigger outcry than it was worth. Doubly so, since the king had promoted at the papal court the request

to recognise Richard as a saint.\textsuperscript{109}

Stephen had been, in fact, Richard's chaplain, but whether Henry knew about this cannot be established.\textsuperscript{110} At any rate, the king could have hardly met Stephen in Chichester, since he did not visit the city during Richard's episcopacy. Stephen's association with Richard and his total detachment from the affairs of the crown prior to 1262 made it perhaps natural that he, as bishop, came to support the cause of Simon de Montfort.\textsuperscript{111} Again, whether this was anticipated, or thought of by the king is not known, but in the summer of 1262 Henry probably did not weigh too much Stephen's suitability for he simply could not yet afford any election controversies.\textsuperscript{112}

Just one day prior to the king's departure from Dover on 14 July 1262, the bishop of London, Henry of Wingham died.\textsuperscript{113} Henry's reaction was quite swift, for one of the first things he did upon arrival at Boulogne on 16 July was to present some of his clerks to ecclesiastical benefices that had formerly belonged to the bishop.\textsuperscript{114} And although Henry naturally had left a government in charge in England, as far as the London church was concerned he formally kept matters firmly under his own control.\textsuperscript{115} It was the king who granted election licence to the dean and chapter of St Paul's on 23 July 1262 in Amiens, although, undoubtedly, it would have been simpler for
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the canons to seek such approval from the regent, Philip Basset. The electors had advanced the dean of St Paul's, Richard Talbot, and notified Henry of their decision, which in turn was accepted by the king on 6 September. Henry was staying in the monastery of St Germain des Pres, Paris, at the time and it was also from here that he directed a mandate on 26 September 1262 to restore the temporalities of London. Undoubtedly, the king was far from having any anxieties about the advancement of the dean, since Richard was, in fact, the nephew of the former bishop of London, Fulk Basset, and thus closely related to the regent, Philip Basset as well. But Richard died on 28 September 1262 and the whole election procedure had to start anew. Again, two canons were sent to Henry in France and consequently licence to elect was granted on 12 October; on 13 November the chapter had decided on the archdeacon of Oxford, Henry of Sandwich, and the king gave his assent on 4 December, by which time he was on his way back to England through Amiens and Boulogne. Although the king approved Henry of Sandwich, he could not have viewed him in a way, he viewed Richard Talbot.

Henry of Sandwich's social background amounted to a family of small landholders in Kent and as such it was no match for Richard's illustrious relatives. The

116. CPR 1266-72, 727; Handbook of British Chronology, 38.
117. CPR 1266-72, 730.
118. Ibid., 730-31; Close Rolls 1261-64, 153.
120. Fasti, vol. I, 3. The elect died following his visit to Henry to obtain confirmation. He contracted the epidemic which had broken out in early September at Henry's court in France and which killed some sixty people of the household. Both Henry and Eleanor fell ill, Treherne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 288; Treherne and Sanders, Documents of the Baronial Movement, 41.
121. CPR 1266-72, 734, 739; Fasti, vol. I, 3. For Henry's itinerary from April 1258 to January 1264: Treherne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 383-87.
122. Henry had landed in Dover on 20 December 1262. The temporalities of London were restored on 15 January 1263 and Henry of Sandwich was consecrated on 27 May, CPR 1258-66, 240; Fasti, vol. I, 3.
Oxford archdeacon's father - also named Henry - had been a knight in Kent, and there is evidence of his activities as early as 1225, when the king was still a minor.\textsuperscript{123} The highlight of his career seems to have come in 1230, when he was appointed warden of the port of Sandwich [Kent].\textsuperscript{124} The elder Henry's immediate superior was Bertram de Crioil, constable and warden of Dover and also warden of Sandwich, and together they had been responsible for the arrests of some ships on the coast in 1230.\textsuperscript{125} The relationship between the king and Henry failed to develop much further, however, and the knight seems to have retired by the mid-1230's.\textsuperscript{126}

One of Henry's sons, Simon, followed in the footsteps of his father in as much as he also pursued a secular career.\textsuperscript{127} Simon and some of his colleagues were given a relatively minor commission in 1234 which involved an investigation concerning jews in Canterbury.\textsuperscript{128} But like his father, Simon also remained a minor figure who was never really favoured at Henry III's court and even his official engagements were scarce.\textsuperscript{129} He died by 1265; his heir, Juliana, had married one William de Leyburn and they inherited the manor of Preston in Kent.\textsuperscript{130}

It appears that one John was also a member of the 'Sandwich family', most likely Simon's younger brother.\textsuperscript{131} John seems to have been slightly more important than Simon and his knighting in 1247 did not escape Henry III's attention who, in fact,

\begin{enumerate}
\item[123.] Patent Rolls 1216-25, 563.
\item[124.] Patent Rolls 1225-32, 364.
\item[125.] Ibid., 364; Close Rolls 1227-31, 362, 363, 365, 373.
\item[126.] Close Rolls 1231-34, 316; Close Rolls 1234-37, 163, 191.
\item[127.] CRR 1225-26, 40, 90; Close Rolls 1231-34, 575. The elder Henry's wife was Joan, Close Rolls 1251-53, 358.
\item[128.] Close Rolls 1231-34, 583.
\item[129.] Close Rolls 1234-37, 516; Close Rolls 1237-42, 486; CLR 1240-45, 140; Close Rolls 1247-51, 220.
\item[130.] CPR 1258-66, 465.
\item[131.] John had land in Bilsington [Kent] in 1249, Close Rolls 1247-51, 177.
\end{enumerate}
contributed to the occasion with a gift. During the disturbances of 1258 John could not evade his 'responsibilities' and as a knight of Kent he contributed to the county inquisitions on various offences, as he was directed by the council. But in the turbulent years of 1258-65 John appears to have stayed away from too much engagement, and this is all the more conspicuous since the Cinque Ports, including Sandwich, gave Simon de Montfort considerable support in 1263-65. Nevertheless, John was instructed in December 1264 - undoubtedly by de Montfort's orders, who was in actual control of the realm - to assist the local barons in preventing the re-supply of the castle of Pevensey [Sussex] which had been held for the king.

The younger Henry of Sandwich also had a brother, named Stephen. Thus Henry of Sandwich, the knight, had at least four sons, two of whom followed a secular career, and two an ecclesiastical one. Stephen belonged to the latter category, although the possibility that he had begun his adult years with an entirely different vocation cannot be altogether excluded: we know of one Stephen of Sandwich, who had been involved in shipping in 1230. Stephen had occupied various positions in the church. He was prebendary of Weldland, from 1248 to sometime before 1255, and that of Mapesbury from before 1255 to an unknown date, in the diocese of London. Stephen also held the archdeaconry of Essex in 1253-65, and in Lincoln, the prebend of

133. CPR 1247-58, 645-46.
134. Close Rolls 1259-61, 457; Close Rolls 1261-64, 197, 378; Close Rolls 1264-68, 121; Treharne and Sanders, Documents of the Baronial Movement, 304.
136. The Fasti, vol. III, 107, holds that the connection is probable; see further as to why it is most likely.
Welton Ryval in 1264-65. He seems to have spent his life essentially independent of the affairs of the crown and died not long before 8 April 1265.

By becoming a bishop in 1263, Henry of Sandwich undoubtedly was the most successful of the four sons of Henry, the knight. Yet in November 1262 the London electors just as easily could have chosen the archdeacon of Essex, Stephen, than Henry who was then archdeacon of Oxford. At any rate, Henry of Sandwich had at least minimal contacts with the crown prior to 1262, unlike his brother. Henry had been a clerk and a prebendary in 1238 to whom license was given by Gregory IX to hold an additional benefice. Through a mandate of the king, Henry was involved twelve years later in a minor affair of accompanying a young lady, who was to marry the nephew of John Mansel, an important curialis. And like Stephen before him, Henry also held the prebend of Weldland, presumably from c.1257-59 to 1262-63.

---

139. Ibid., 14; vol. III, 107-08. As an archdeacon, Stephen was given licence twice to hold an additional benefice, Cal. Papal Letters, vol. I, 283, 352. See further, however, on the problem of the date of Stephen's death.

140. It is notable that the Fasti, vol. I, 14, incorrectly claims that Stephen died by April 1275, and what is more, asserts that Stephen's death is wrongly assigned to Easter 1265. The Fasti, vol. III, 108, also states that Stephen died by April 1275 and elsewhere it is stated that Stephen was archdeacon of Essex until August 1265, or later, Fasti, vol. I, 61, 84.

Yet it is seen from CPR 1258-66, 417 that Stephen, the prebendary or parson of Buckland [Berks.], died by 8 April 1265. The story begins with Hamo de Creuquer, tenant in chief, who married Maud de Averanches, an heiress. From this marriage four daughters were born. One of them, Agnes, married John of Sandwich! Another daughter, Isolda, married one Nicholas de Lenham and their son, John, was twelve years old in 1262-63. Isolda and Nicholas must have died by July 1263, for a guardian was designated to the young John at this time, CPR 1258-66, 267. This guardian, Eubulo de Montibus, a former steward of the household, through this appointment also gained the manor and advowson of Buckland. Thus it was hardly a coincidence that Stephen had become parson of this church - it really had belonged to one of his not too distant relatives!, Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem, vol. I, 171-172.

141. Henry of Sandwich had been archdeacon from 1259 to 1263, Fasti, vol. III, 37.


143. CPR 1247-58, 167.

Although the king had no obvious reasons not to endorse the promotion of Henry of Sandwich to such a central see as London, we cannot be quite certain whether he would have accepted him, for example, in the 'conservative' 1240's. The bishopric, as we have seen, was not unimportant to the king: after the death of Roger Niger, Henry had intended to advance d'Aigueblanche to it, and compromised only with the elevation of Fulk Basset whose family was much higher on the social and political scale than that of Henry of Sandwich. And the son of the small landholders was certainly no match for the former bishop of London, the highly successful Henry of Wingham. The king was not in a position, however, to reject the election of Henry of Sandwich in the winter of 1262-63.

When Henry III returned to England in December 1262 he faced a political situation that was vastly different from that of at the time of his departure. Several factors were at play. The death of the earl of Gloucester in July 1262 effectively brought to an end a powerful counterbalance to the authority of de Montfort. Although Richard had never been openly on the royal side, "his selfish conservatism and his jealousy of Earl Simon had played a leading part in disintegrating the baronial resistance and in destroying the Provisional Government ...". Yet far from cultivating the goodwill of Richard's successor, Gilbert de Clare, the crown had alienated him through various acts, which in turn led to an alliance between England's most powerful lord, and earl Simon in May 1263.

Equally unproductive was lord Edward's treatment of his steward, Roger de Leybourne. Edward confiscated Roger's estates in the dispute, but the steward came to be supported by an influential section of the baronage, including not a few of

146. Ibid., 285.
147. Treharne and Sanders, *Documents of the Baronial Movement*, 41-42.
the Marcher lords.\textsuperscript{149} In the end the relatively petty squabble brought about a disturbance of peace in the Marches and in Kent where the steward's lands were located.\textsuperscript{150}

The Marcher lordships were also disturbed in a more serious way. The two year long truce with Wales came to an end in August 1262, and the Welsh were intent on an invasion.\textsuperscript{151} The aggression which had begun in November was very successful, but it was largely due to the disunity of the Marchers.\textsuperscript{152} Following the death of the earl of Gloucester, the Marcher lords became essentially leaderless, for they did not trust the king.\textsuperscript{153} This was partly the result of the political events of 1260-62, but now with the Welsh invasion, dissatisfaction and enmity towards the crown gained a new dimension, for the troubles had been blamed on a royal favourite, the Savoyard bishop of Hereford.\textsuperscript{154}

Under these circumstances, when de Montfort returned to England in April 1263 he could rally those with a grievance once again together.\textsuperscript{155} In May, earl Simon met Gilbert de Clare and other barons at Oxford where the provisions of 1258 were given a new life.\textsuperscript{156} Henry had refused to cooperate and this in turn resulted that the barons in Oxford, the Marcher lords, and other insurgents joined their forces.\textsuperscript{157} By June 1263 civil war was effectively under way, with the Welsh having made a tacit agreement
with de Montfort to collaborate against the crown.\textsuperscript{158}

The rather grave political difficulties beginning in the second half of 1262 again presented a situation in which Henry could have hoped less and less to find scope to influence episcopal elections. The bishop-elect of Salisbury, Walter de la Wyle, like Henry of Sandwich, had encountered no opposition from the crown. Walter’s canonical election on 22 January 1263 had been officially accepted by the king on 10 April, when the temporalities of the see were restituted.\textsuperscript{159} Prior to his advancement Walter had been chaplain of bishop Robert Bingham, and then succentor of Salisbury, but his contacts with the monarchy remained of no consequence through the years.\textsuperscript{160} In 1256 Walter was granted a minor favour from the king: in return of a fine he was discharged until 1263 from doing judicial duties at the court of hundred in Faircross [Berks.].\textsuperscript{161} This was the kind of legal work in which Walter had been involved, in fact, as far back as 1233.\textsuperscript{162}

Walter was consecrated, along with Henry of Sandwich, by John Gervais on 27 May 1263 at Canterbury.\textsuperscript{163} De Montfort’s prominent episcopal allies, the bishops of Chichester, Lincoln and Worcester assisted John, who was himself an adherent of the earl.\textsuperscript{164} The ceremony was, in fact, a gathering of the core of those from the church,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{158} Ibid., 42; Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 303.
  \item \textsuperscript{159} Licence to elect following the death of Giles of Bridport was granted on 25 December 1262, CPR 1258-66, 238, 254; Winchester, 100. Walter seems to have originated from Wild [la Wyle, in Norton Hampstead, Berks.] where he had held some land in 1246, Close Rolls 1242-47, 475, 678.
  \item \textsuperscript{160} Close Rolls 1231-34, 307; CPR 1247-58, 529. The claim in Winchester, 100, that Walter was sub-dean of Salisbury appears to be mistaken. The court records do not bear this out, nor does Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 198, [using the evidence of Sarum Charters]. Walter was referred to as succentor in 1256, CPR 1247-58, 529, and in 1262, Osney, 132.
  \item \textsuperscript{161} CPR 1247-58, 529.
  \item \textsuperscript{162} Close Rolls 1231-34, 307. For a somewhat obscure and unimportant reference to Walter in March 1263: CPR 1258-66, 251.
  \item \textsuperscript{163} Osney, 133-34; Powicke, Henry III, 463.
  \item \textsuperscript{164} Ibid., 463, 484.
\end{itemize}
who ended up on the barons' side: Richard Gravesend, Stephen Bersted, John Gervais, Henry of Sandwich, Walter de la Wyle and Walter Cantilupe.\textsuperscript{165} As far as the bishop of London was concerned, his support of de Montfort was perhaps quite natural, not only because the episcopal body on the whole was sympathetic to the barons, but also as a result of the fact that his family had never had particularly strong ties with the crown to warrant special loyalty.\textsuperscript{166} The bishop of London may have also been influenced to some extent by the anti-royal stand in 1263-65 of Sandwich, his home-town. His own sense of owing anything to Henry III would have been quite minimal in 1263: he appears to have received a gift from the king only once, and even that was of most insignificant proportions - one deer in 1261.\textsuperscript{167}

Henry of Sandwich, Walter de la Wyle, Richard Gravesend had had weak ties with Henry III prior to their advancement, while Stephen Bersted appears to have had none at all. Given this fact, their political preference may not have been surprising at all to the king. Since the promotion of Godfrey Ludham to York in 1258 Henry had lost, to all intents and purposes, control over episcopal elections, and that most of those elected after Godfrey came to champion de Montfort was the gravest consequence of this development for the crown. And certainly, if the king's cousin, Roger Longespee, the bishop of Coventry, and the illustrious Walter Cantilupe of Worcester sided with de Montfort, how could the king expect support from these recently promoted ecclesiastics, some of whose elevation would hardly have been dispute-free in normal

\textsuperscript{165} Ibid., 463, 484; Yonge, \textit{Matthew of Westminster's Flowers of History}, vol. II, 442-43.

\textsuperscript{166} Powicke, \textit{Henry III}, 438-40, 464-64, 474, 484.

\textsuperscript{167} Close Rolls 1259-61, 437. In reference to the designation of Ralph Sandwich, a knight, as keeper of the wardrobe in January 1265 - when Simon was in actual control - it should be pointed out, that he appears to have been not connected to the Sandwich family. The records also suggest that he was essentially a non-entity to Henry III at this time. His appointment was one of the many signs of radicalism of the baronial rule, \textit{Handbook of British Chronology}, 79.
circumstances? Still, in the weeks following the consecration of Walter de la Wyle, Henry was most probably less preoccupied with him, than with the fact that Salisbury itself had been seized by Montfortian forces in the civil war.  


169. Treharne and Sanders, *Documents of the Baronial Movement*, 42.
CHAPTER VI

ROYALIST CONSOLIDATION AND THE
RETURN OF THE COURTIER-BISHOPS, 1265-72
As the examples of Henry of Wingham and Richard Talbot indicated, episcopal electors had not always been unsympathetic to royal interests in the turbulent years beginning in 1258 by promoting lesser known or unknown men who would later turn against the king. And indeed, it seemed paradoxical that on 22 May 1264, just eight days after the battle of Lewis, in which the king was not only defeated, but captured, along with Richard of Cornwall, the electors of Bath and Wells would choose a curialis as their pastor.\footnote{CPR 1258-66, 319; Treharne and Sanders, Documents of the Baronial Movement, 47.} This man was Master Walter Giffard, canon of Wells, whose connections to the monarchy made him a natural proponent of the crown.\footnote{Royal assent was given on 28 May 1264, CPR 1258-66, 319.}

Incidentally, when following the death of William of Bitton I, election licence was sought, one of the two canons of Wells coming to the king for that purpose was Godfrey Giffard, the brother of Walter.\footnote{Election licence was granted on 15 April 1264, Ibid., 312. Godfrey became bishop of Worcester in 1268.} The Giffards and the Bittons were related families, and if they had a strong influence in the Wells cathedral church, as claimed by Gibbs, then Walter’s election must essentially be seen independent of the political background of 1264 revolving around Henry and de Montfort.\footnote{Cal. Papal Letters, vol. I, 261; Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 90.} In retrospect, i.e. after the defeat of the earl of Leicester in 1265, the king probably reflected much less on the circumstances of Walter’s advancement than on the fact that the bishop of Bath and Wells had become one of his staunchest episcopal supporters.\footnote{Treharne and Sanders, Documents of the Baronial Movement, 196-97. The temporalities of the see were restored on 1 September 1264, CPR 1258-66, 343. Walter was consecrated on 4 January 1265 by the bishop of Hereford in Paris - a telling sign of his loyalty to the crown. For the difficulties surrounding his consecration, Powicke, Henry III, 461. The barons were infuriated by such a ‘desertation’ on the part of the elect and destroyed Walter’s manors which in turn prompted the bishop of Bath to excommunicate de Montfort and his associates, Osney, 164.}

Both Walter and Godfrey were well rewarded after the upheavals came to an end. On 8 August 1265, just four days
after the death of de Montfort at Evesham, Walter had been appointed chancellor in which office he was succeeded by Godfrey in March 1267.6

A letter 'patent' sent by Henry to Boniface in France on 30 May 1264, just eight days after the Bath election, allows one to estimate the extent of the king's appreciation of Walter at the time.7 Henry had already assented to the canon's advancement two days earlier, and now requested the archbishop to do all that was necessary to have Walter consecrated.8 The fact that the king had wasted no time in conveying his wish to Boniface was an indication itself, but what is more, he referred to Walter as one whom he held in "special commendation".9

Henry had already known the elect's father, Hugh Giffard, in the late 1220's.10 Hugh had been a constable of the Tower in London in 1234-38, although he must have been regarded more than merely one of the countless mid-ranking officials of the crown.11 He had been a member of the royal household in 1236, and for his services as a constable he received a yearly wage of twenty pounds, and two robes in addition.12 In the second half of 1239 Hugh's career had taken a somewhat different turn, for he became keeper of the household of Henry's firstborn son, Edward, in addition to his job as supervisor of works at the Tower.13 The new position was not only more profitable to Hugh, it had established a very close relationship with the royal family which

---

6. CPR 1258-66, 594, 637, 661; Treharne and Sanders, Documents of the Baronial Movement, 55; Handbook of British Chronology, 85.
7. CPR 1258-66, 319.
8. Ibid., 319; Powicke, Henry III, 461.
11. Close Rolls 1231-34, 581, 582; Close Rolls 1234-37, 258, 265; CLR 1226-40, 328; CPR 1232-47, 234; Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 192.
12. CPR 1232-47, 140. Hugh's official status at this time would have been 'knight of the royal household', Charter Rolls 1257-1300, 67.
13. Close Rolls 1237-42, 156; CLR 1226-40, 393, 403, 405.
benefited not only him and his wife, Sybil, but their own children, most notably Walter and Godfrey. Hugh remained in charge of the finance of Edward's household - which later also included the other children of the king - until his death in 1246. Henry could not have been indifferent to the death of Hugh in the summer of 1246, for he had ordered the distribution of some alms for the soul of his former servant - a gesture not merited by average crown officials after they died.

Hugh's wife, Sybil, came from a family of good social standing which may have given her confidence to work alongside her husband. She was a midwife of the queen, attending the birth of Edward in 1239, but whether she assisted at the birth of the other children of Eleanor is not quite clear. At any rate, her "diligence exhibited towards the queen" in 1239 was so much appreciated that she was awarded a yearly grant of ten pounds for life. Sybil did not fade away in the court records after the death of her husband. Her skills as a midwife must have been well remembered, for in 1249 she looked after the lying in of Henry's sister-in-law, Joan de Valencia. And it was somewhat odd, that she - being a woman received, along with her son Walter, the custody of the castle of Oxford in June 1256. Sybil was still receiving gifts from the crown in 1261-62, by the time the career of two of her sons, that of Godfrey and Walter

16. CLR 1240-45, 68, 69. By December 1246 a new guardian to Edward had been appointed, CPR 1232-47, 495.
17. CLR 1226-40, 418. Sybil was connected to the Craucumbe family through her sister, Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 192.
18. CLR 1226-40, 418.
21. CPR 1247-58, 479.
had been well established. 22

Hugh and Sybil had at least four sons and one daughter, Alice, who married in 1242. 23 Compared to Walter and Godfrey, the two other sons, Hugh and William, were of secondary importance. William was promised an ecclesiastical benefice in April 1242; Hugh may have been luckier in as much as he actually gained a benefice in September, while the king was in France. 24 Hugh had been the king's clerk in November 1242 and gained another preferment, the church of Newland [Gloucester] at this time. 25 When he resigned the latter parsonage five years later, his brother, Walter, was immediately presented to it. 26

William did not follow an ecclesiastical career and in March 1246 had been appointed constable of the castle of Hadleigh [Essex], a position which he held until at least August 1248. 27 William and Hugh had one thing in common: they remained conspicuously in the background essentially until the real rise of Walter and Godfrey beginning in 1265. Even then Hugh's importance was negligible, as he appeared as a supervisor of works at Hereford in 1271. 28 William may have been more fortunate, or just more determined after the years of baronial troubles. He had received all of a sudden a number of gifts from the king in 1266-67, and in 1270 became sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk and constable of the castle of Norwich. 29 Hugh the younger,

22. Close Rolls 1259-61, 418; Close Rolls 1261-64, 23.
23. CLR 1240-45, 117; CPR 1258-66, 503.
24. CPR 1232-47, 283, 303.
25. CPR 1266-72, 718.
27. CPR 1232-47, 476; CLR 1245-51, 60, 196. William had met Henry in August 1248 - he was a witness at court at Woodstock [Oxford], Charter Rolls 1226-57, 333.
28. Close Rolls 1268-72, 326.
William, and to some extent Godfrey Giffard, all owed something for their later advancement to Walter.

Two of the Giffard brothers, Walter and Godfrey, had received from Henry three bucks for their inception feast in June 1251.30 By this time Walter had been papal subdeacon and chaplain for at least ten months.31 As an heir to the Giffard estates, Walter received what appears to have been his first grant from Henry in January 1253.32 Then for some time during the course of 1254-55 he had worked as an escheator in Devon before being appointed with his mother as guardian of the castle of Oxford.33 Sybil seems to have been relieved, however, from her responsibilities by January 1258.34

When Walter was replaced in his position as keeper of Oxford in June 1258 the decision came not from the king, but from the magnates inaugurating their rule of the realm from that city at that time.35 The arrangement was most likely a political one on the side of the barons, and if so, it was clear that they had had no trust for the parson of Newland. If Walter needed any consolation, it would have been the fact, that in those days of June 1258, there had been at least a dozen replaced custodians created by the orders of the council of fifteen in England.36 Walter may have been further alienated from the barons' cause in November 1259, when he was ordered, along with

32. Charter Rolls 1226-57, 414; Charter Rolls 1257-1300, 67, the grant merely involved free warrens, but its significance lay in the fact that it had been enrolled in the Charter Rolls.
33. Close Rolls 1253-54, 66; Close Rolls 1254-56, 69, 92; CLR 1251-60, 300; CPR 1247-58, 479.
34. CLR 1251-60, 422; Close Rolls 1256-59, 188.
35. CPR 1247-58, 637-39.
36. Incidentally, the castle of Hadleigh [Essex] also gained a new custodian, but by this time William Giffard had nothing to do with it, Ibid., 637-39.
Godfrey, to give up those mills in Oxford which they had leased from Henry.\textsuperscript{37} Following the king's re-assertion of authority during 1260, the parson of Newland had catapulted into real eminence in January 1261 with his appointment as a proctor at the French court.\textsuperscript{38} By February 1262, i.e. during the time of Henry's control, Walter's name had been dropped from the rather long list of those proctors who were sent to the Continent in respect of the same matter, and his place appears to have been taken over by his younger brother, Godfrey.\textsuperscript{39} Walter probably had retired to Wells, but he was not forgotten by the king, as the present of some deer given to him in December 1263 indicated.\textsuperscript{40}

The elder Giffard brother's later career is only of interest in as much as to say that he did not, in fact, rule the see of Bath and Wells for too long. The archbishopric of York had become vacant with the death of Godfrey Ludham in January 1265, and after the quashing of the election of one William Langton and the refusal of St Bonaventura to take up episcopal duties in England, the pope provided Walter to York in October 1266.\textsuperscript{41} There was no reason, of course, for Henry not to want to see his chancellor gaining a higher ecclesiastical status, and thus by a royal order the temporalities of York were restituted to Walter on 26 December 1266.\textsuperscript{42}

Of all the Giffard brothers, it was Godfrey who had benefited most from the successful career of his elder brother, Walter. When Godfrey's Continental assignment

\textsuperscript{37} CPR 1258-66, 60. It was in the autumn of 1259 that the council of fifteen had reached the zenith of its powers, Trearne and Sanders, \textit{Documents of the Baronial Movement}, 25.

\textsuperscript{38} CPR 1258-66, 137, 156-57.

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 156-57, 198, 212.

\textsuperscript{40} These deer were to be supplied by the justice of forest south of the Trent, from the forest of Gillingham [Wilts.], \textit{Close Rolls} 1261-64, 330.

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Cal. Papal Letters}, vol. I, 431; CPR 1266-72, 19; Gibbs and Lang, \textit{Bishops and Reform}, 74.

\textsuperscript{42} CPR 1266-72, 19.
beginning in 1262 came to an end, he probably returned to Wells.43 The canon appears to have kept a low profile until 1264, but when he had visited Henry, along with colleagues, in April in the matter of the election licence, the situation was set to change.44 During a most critical time - one day before the battle of Lewis - the king took the trouble to collate to Godfrey the prebend of Dulcot [in Wells].45

Following the election of his brother, Godfrey took part in the delegation sent to the Continent, i.e. to Boniface, to obtain archiepiscopal cooperation to the advancement of Walter.46

After the battle of Evesham, and no doubt to a large extent as a result of Walter's appointment as chancellor in the first half of August 1265, Godfrey also gained a major prize by late October: the chancellorship of the exchequer.47 Gifts from the crown, along with ecclesiastical preferments, consequently became a normal order of the day.48 Henry bestowed on Godfrey the prebend of Beverly in November 1265, that of York in February 1266, and the archdeaconry of Wells on 3 March 1267.49 Walter had resigned the chancellorship due to his translation to York and thus the king entrusted Godfrey by 3 March 1267 to continue the work of his elder brother.50

43. CPR 1258-66, 198, 212, 312.
44. Ibid., 312.
45. Ibid., 317; Treharne and Sanders, Documents of the Baronial Movement, 47.
46. CPR 1258-66, 319.
47. The Handbook of British Chronology, 85, merely states that Godfrey was chancellor of the exchequer in May 1266, and this is probably based on a single entry in CPR 1258-66, 594. See, however, CLR 1260-67, 183, 194, 209, 242, 280. By 3 March 1267 Godfrey became chancellor. On this, see further.
48. Close Rolls 1264-68, 11-12, 58, 60, 69, 214, 305, 308, 319, 325, 336, 351, 430. For gifts in the period of 1268-72, see above all, Close Rolls 1268-72, 630, index.
49. These two prebends were granted to Godfrey during a vacancy in the archbishopric, CPR 1258-66, 498-99, 557; Henry also had the opportunity to grant the archdeaconry of Wells as a result vacancy in Bath and Wells, CPR 1266-72, 43.
50. Ibid., 43; The day of the month is not specified in the Handbook of British Chronology, 85.
Godfrey had obtained another important position, the archdeaconry of York, although probably not from the king, but from his brother, the archbishop.51

Considering the background and station of Godfrey, and the fact that the second half of the 1260's would have been quite conducive, as a result of the royalist reaction to the promotion of curiales to the episcopacy, the chancellor's election to Worcester in the summer of 1268 was hardly surprising.52 By the same token, Henry's acceptance of his chancellor's advancement would not have been unexpected.53 The king even allowed Godfrey to keep the bishopric's income during the vacancy which by custom belonged to the crown.54

That Henry accepted the papal decision to have Nicholas of Ely translated from Worcester to Winchester in 1268 was a potent sign of confidence on his part in this man.55 Winchester had always been a most sensitive see for the king, but Nicholas had enjoyed the appreciation of the crown even before his advancement to Worcester in 1266, for he proved to be a manageable and impartial curialis during the difficult years


52. The election took place between 2 May and 8 June 1268, following the translation of bishop Nicholas of Ely to Winchester on 2 March 1268, CPR 1266-72, 222; Close Rolls 1264-68, 544; Fasti, vol. II, 87, 101-02. For Nicholas, see below.

53. The temporalities of Worcester were restituted on 13 June 1268, CPR 1266-72, 238; Fasti, vol. II, 101-02. The Handbook of British Chronology, 279, appears to be incorrect in dating the restitution of temporalities to 24 May 1268, and thus the election of Godfrey between 2 and 24 May. Godfrey was consecrated on 23 September, Fasti, vol. II, 102.

54. One of Henry's reasons for this was Godfrey's "service from boyhood in the king's household", CPR 1266-72, 238. Just what these 'services' were is not clear - certainly not from the court records - as Godfrey first appeared in these sources only in the 1250's, as an adult. Still, considering that a boy's activities would not have found their way into the records, the evidence of this single entry in the Patent Rolls cannot be disregarded.

55. The king restituted the temporalities of Winchester to Nicholas on 2 May 1268, CPR 1266-72, 222.
of 1260-63.\textsuperscript{56}

Henry had already known Nicholas well enough in August 1249 to consider him as one of his proctors at the Roman curia in the event he could not come to an understanding with the abbot of St Genevieve, Paris in a certain matter.\textsuperscript{57} The initial disagreement, however, did not develop into a dispute and thus Nicholas' services were never needed in this case. Despite the fact that Nicholas was archdeacon of Ely from at least as early as 1249, he remained very much in the background until 1260.

Quite unexpectedly Nicholas was propelled into the office of a royal chancellor, through what effectively was the remaining influence of the baronial party, in October 1260.\textsuperscript{58} And although Henry by this time would have been in a position to put up a fight against such appointments he had accepted the promotion of the archdeacon.\textsuperscript{59} The king even favoured the chancellor, although by all accounts only modestly. Thus he presented the chaplain of Nicholas, Robert de Beccles, to a vicarage on 23 January 1261 - almost a month after the council of fifteen had effectively lost control at the end of 1260.\textsuperscript{60} As Henry was re-asserting his authority he replaced Nicholas with Walter Merton as his chancellor in July 1261.\textsuperscript{61} The demotion was not the result of the king's

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{56} Nicholas was elected to Worcester on 9 May 1266; royal assent was given on 8 June; temporalities restored on 18 June; the consecration took place on 19 September 1266, \textit{CPR 1258-66}, 603, 607; \textit{Worcester}, 456; \textit{Fasti}, vol. II, 101.

\textsuperscript{57} \textit{CPR 1247-58}, 46; It is not clear why Gibbs and Lang, \textit{Bishops and Reform}, 192, regarded the above entry "one piece of uncertain evidence, that Nicholas of Ely had any connection with the court before 1260". There can be no question that the \textit{Patent Rolls} refer to the same Nicholas, as he was then archdeacon of Ely - a position which he still had at the time of his election to Worcester, \textit{CPR 1258-66}, 603; \textit{Fasti} vol. II, 51.

\textsuperscript{58} \textit{CPR 1258-66}, 97; Treharne and Sanders, \textit{Documents of the Baronial Movement}, 34-35.

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 34-35; Treharne, \textit{Baronial Plan of Reform}, 244-46.

\textsuperscript{60} \textit{CPR 1258-66}, 139.

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 165, 166. By the time of his replacement, or to be more precise, by March 1261 Nicholas had been appointed as papal chaplain, \textit{Close Rolls 1259-61}, 463; \textit{Cal. Papal Letters}, vol. I, 422.
\end{footnotesize}
\end{flushleft}
dissatisfaction with the archdeacon. On the contrary, Henry openly acknowledged that he had held Nicholas "in special commendation for his good service".62 The dismissal of Nicholas - and Hugh le Despenser, the justiciar - in the summer of 1261 appears to have been principally a political manoeuvre on the part of the crown. It served to "vindicate Henry III's assertion that the provisions were annulled, the Council non-existent, and the royal choice of officials unfettered and free" - although the king had no personal objections neither against the chancellor nor the justiciar.63

Nicholas left the court, and it is most likely that he returned to Ely, since by royal orders he was to receive bucks from the forest of Wabridge [Huntingdon] in the last week of July 1261.64 The archdeacon seems to have worked in his see during 1262. In July 1262 he had been empowered, by a royal grant to the bishop of Ely, to look after judicial matters, along with two colleagues, while Hugh Balsham was on the Continent.65 And in September 1262 the king even had the time in St Germain des Pres [Seine] to direct the justice of forest south of the Trent, Alan la Zuche, to supply Nicholas with more deer, again from the forest of Wabridge.66

Henry had returned to England in December 1262 finding a rapidly deteriorating political situation, and following the death of the royal treasurer in March 1263, he decided to appoint the archdeacon of Ely to the vacant post.67 As Nicholas' demotion in 1261, his advancement in the spring of 1263 also served a wider political purpose for

62. CPR 1258-66, 166.
63. Other officials were also replaced, including the twenty-two sheriffs appointed by the council in the winter of 1259-60, Ibid., 162-64; Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 262-63.
64. CLR 1260-67, 48; Close Rolls 1259-61, 415.
65. CPR 1258-66, 221.
67. Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 192, is mistaken to claim that Nicholas had become treasurer in 1262. The archdeacon gained office probably not long before 6 May 1263, CPR 1258-66, 257; Handbook of British Chronology, 104.
the king: now Henry wished to placate some of his baronial antagonists in the face of
the gathering storm. The magnates certainly had lost none of their enthusiasm for the
archdeacon, for as soon as they gained control over the crown he was made chancellor
again on 19 July 1263.

By October 1263, however, the situation radically altered yet again in favour of
the monarchy. Henry had dismissed the ‘baronial chancellor’, Nicholas, yet again,
probably in late October and designated John Chishull, archdeacon of London, for the
post. Nicholas seems to have been still a treasurer at around this time, but John
Chishull would take over this office some time in November as well - if only for a brief
period.

Nothing appears to be known about the archdeacon of Ely between his discharge
from high office in the autumn of 1263 and his election to Worcester in May 1266. He
had been largely a political tool for the crown during 1260-63; whether he had realised
this mattered much less for the king than the fact that Nicholas remained a firmly
impartial official despite the baronial trust put in him. Undoubtedly, Nicholas was
untroublesome in the eyes of Henry: when he became needed no more, he simply left
the court. These may have been the archdeacon's main assets for the crown for which

68. Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 296.
69. CPR 1258-66, 271; Treharne and Sanders, Documents of the Baronial
Movement, 42.
70. Ibid., 43.
71. Charter Rolls 1257-1300, 50; Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 330; Handbook
of British Chronology, 85.
72. Ibid., 104. Just when exactly Nicholas had resigned the treasury is not clear.
Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 330, asserts that when Nicholas was
appointed chancellor in July 1263, he was succeeded by Henry, prior of St
Radegund's, Kent. However, the prior "had either died, or had been dismissed
by the King, for there was, in November, 1263, no Treasurer at the Exchequer",
ibid., 330. Yet, on the eve of All Saints [1 November] 1263 Nicholas, as
treasurer [sic.], and John Chishull, as chancellor appeared as witnesses at
Westminster, Charter Rolls 1257-1300, 50.
73. Treharne, Baronial Plan of Reform, 245.
the bishopric of Winchester was, in a sense, a fitting reward.

As we have seen, monastic nominees to the English episcopacy rarely had much business to do with the monarchy before their elevation, and Roger Skerning, prior of Norwich, elected bishop of Norwich after the battle of Evesham was no exception.74 And it was even rarer that the court records explicitly revealed the king's attitude towards candidates around the time of their promotion. Henry openly acknowledged, however, in February 1266 that Roger and the convent of Norwich "were constantly faithful ... [to him] and Edward his son in all the time of the disturbance in the realm".75 This was a factor important enough, and in the context of the period understandably so, to override the king's basic dislike of monastic candidates to bishoprics. Not surprisingly, on 9 February 1266, less than three weeks after Roger's election, Henry assented to the choice of the Norwich monks.76

The king may have remembered that a little less than eleven years earlier, in May 1257, he had had a chance to meet Roger when he had granted election licence to the monks of Norwich, following the death of Walter Suffield.77 The letter of authorisation from Westminster was carried back to the convent by an envoy which consisted of the sacristan and Roger Skerning, who had been a monk at that time.78 As seen, Simon Walton was subsequently nominated to the see in June 1257, but Roger was also promoted, for he succeeded the prior of Norwich, Simon of Elmham, who had

74. Roger was elected on 23 January 1266, Fasti, vol. II, 57. The battle of Evesham on 4 August 1265 in which de Montfort was killed and his forces effectively destroyed marked the end of a period of turbulence, despite the fact that local resistance to the crown continued well into 1266. But never again would the king be in a situation where political realities would force him to abandon his say in an advancement of a particular man to the episcopacy, Treharne and Sanders, Documents of the Baronial Movement, 545-57.

75. CPR 1258-66, 555.

76. The temporalities of Norwich were restituted on 17 March, Ibid., 548, 570. Roger was consecrated on 4 April 1266, Fasti, vol. II, 58.

77. CPR 1247-58, 557.

78. Ibid., 557. See Simon Walton.
died in the same month.79 Roger had governed the cathedral monastery until his advancement to the bishopric in 1266; he never met Henry, however, in Norwich during this time. Although the king came to the city in March 1256, his next visit would only take place in September 1272, not long before his death on 16 November.80

With the translation of Walter Giffard to York in the autumn of 1266 the bishopric of Bath and Wells became vacant, although only for a short period. It was a telling sign of the Giffard's and Bitton's local influence that in the following year, on 10 February, a family member was chosen yet again to govern the see: William of Bitton II, probably a nephew of Walter Giffard's predecessor, William of Bitton I.81 Henry could not overlook the fact that the elect was connected to both families and restored the temporalities of the bishopric on 4 March 1267; a decision that hardly required any deliberation.82 Doubly so, since William II, as archdeacon of Wells, worked under William of Bitton I, who had stayed well clear of any involvement with the barons during the years of turmoil.83

In February 1251 - by which time William I had been bishop of Bath for nearly three years - William the younger was merely a clerk, but one who was important enough to receive dispensation from Innocent IV to hold two benefices.84 The same favour was also granted to Thomas of Bitton, and in both cases papal goodwill came

80. CPR 1247-58, 512; Close Rolls 1268-72, 524-25; CLR 1267-72, 228-29.
82. CPR 1266-72, 44.
about through the intercession of bishop William.85

The younger William's advancement to the deanery of Wells probably came in 1255, or shortly after, following the death of his predecessor, Peter Chaceporc in December 1254.86 It was most likely primarily due to the benevolence of his uncle, rather than that of the king, since Henry at this time had had no reason of his own to promote the nephew of the bishop, and there appears to be no record of any such royal presentation. While William I was bishop of Bath, the archdeacon had lived conspicuously in the background, but there is reason to believe that this was a result of his own disposition, rather than that of his uncle. It was probably William II, who made an appeal, along with quite a few others, to the royal court towards the end of 1263 to rectify what seems to have been a miscarriage of justice in an otherwise apparently trivial case.87 Following the death of his uncle, the archdeacon was given a letter of protection from the crown, once in 1265, and in 1266.88

On 3 March 1267, or perhaps a few days earlier, William II, already as bishop-elect of Bath, had visited Henry at Cambridge and resigned in his presence the

85. William I naturally did not forget about his own brother, John, a canon of Wells, and about his clerk, Nicholas, recipients of similar benefits from the pope in 1251. John had already received, in fact, papal dispensation to hold additional benefices in 1248.

It is worth mentioning that it was not only the two Williams who ended up in an episcopal chair. Thomas, although still a precentor of Wells in 1269, was one of the collectors of tenth in Baths and Wells during 1267-68; he would eventually become dean of Wells, and in 1292 bishop of Exeter, Ibid., 246, 254, 267, 269, 275; CPR 1266-72, 55, 176, 330; Osney, 332; Handbook of British Chronology, 246. For these Bittons, see also William of Bitton I.

86. Peter was also keeper of the wardrobe and he accompanied Henry to France in 1253-54. He died on 24 December just as the king was ready to embark from Boulogne back to England. Incidentally, when on his way back from Spain William I visited Henry at Bazas [Gironde] in January-February 1254, he also had a chance to meet his archdeacon, CPR 1247-58, 265, 388. See also William of Bitton I.

87. CPR 1258-66, 356.

88. John of Bitton also received two letters of protection, one each in 1265 and 1266. He appears to have been a reeve of Cumbe [probably Templecombe, Somerset, in the vicinity of Wells] in 1265. In March 1266 he was referred to as provost of Wells, Ibid., 444-45, 563, 581.
archdeaconry of Wells, which office the king immediately granted to Godfrey Giffard.\textsuperscript{89} William II was consecrated in the following month, but even as a bishop, his relation with Henry remained of no consequence.\textsuperscript{90} As Marion Gibbs pointed out, William II had belonged to that small group of 'magistri-bishops' whose members had "local reputation as saints"; the bishop of Bath "so excelled the other bishops in fame of his sanctity that Robert Kilwardby, archbishop-elect of Canterbury, [the provincial of the Dominicans] insisted [in 1273] on being consecrated by him".\textsuperscript{91}

William II died on 4 December 1274, a little over two years after Henry's death, and was buried on the "south side of the choir of his cathedral church".\textsuperscript{92} The tomb began to attract pilgrims, although William II was never canonised.\textsuperscript{93} Perhaps nothing illustrated better the belief in the good charms emanating from William II's spiritual powers than the fact, if it is true, that people in Somerset regarded up until the seventeenth century "the aid of the good bishop ... especially effectual for the cure of toothache".\textsuperscript{94} While some of these claims can be disputed, their historical value is that they point to a strong spiritual disposition of William, which well explained his consistently introverted attitude towards the monarchy.

One ecclesiastic of Henry III's reign, very different from the type of William of

\textsuperscript{89.} This was, of course, a day or two before the king restored the temporalities of the see to William II, \textit{CPR 1266-72}, 43, 49.

\textsuperscript{90.} \textit{Close Rolls 1268-72}, 269, 538: quittances for William II; \textit{CLR 1267-72}, 139, 181: concerning payments from the bishop's farm.


\textsuperscript{92.} \textit{Ibid.}, 553.

\textsuperscript{93.} \textit{Ibid.}, 553.

\textsuperscript{94.} \textit{Ibid.}, 553.
Bitton II, was the successor of Peter d'Aigueblanche in Hereford, John Breton. He came from a family whose two members at least, i.e. his father, William, and uncle, Ranulf, had been important administrators for the crown. John, a canon of Hereford, had been a rather active justice himself prior to his promotion, and the advancement of such a man to the episcopacy well indicated the conservative nature of times that returned following the royalist victory at Evesham.

While John's connection to William is taken for granted, it does not seem to be realised that Ranulf Breton, keeper of the wardrobe in 1229-31, had been, in fact, William's brother. Both Ranulf and William had been well known at court by the mid-1220's, but their subsequent careers took rather dissimilar turns. Ranulf's career had been intense, but relatively short; it peaked from c.1225-26 to September 1231, when he was dismissed from office. If Powicke is correct in claiming that Ranulf had been one of Hubert de Burgh's chaplains, then this made perfect sense, for it was in the same period that the justiciar's influence had been of primary importance at court. John's uncle had never recovered his eminent position after September 1231, although

---

95. John was elected on c.6 January 1269, and on 12 January, i.e. very shortly after the election, royal assent was given. The temporalities of the see were restored on 20 April. John was to be the last candidate consecrated as bishop in Henry's reign. The ceremony took place on 2 June 1269, Osney, 221; Winchester, 107; CPR 1266-72, 312, 332.

96. Dunstable, 130; CLR 1267-72, 104; Close Rolls 1231-34, 52-53; Giles, Matthew Paris, vol. I, 175-76; Gibbs and Lang, Bishops and Reform, 192; Handbook of British Chronology, 79.


98. Of all the public records, the Patent Rolls 1225-32, illustrate this most clearly, although p.545 lists 'Ralph', 'Randolf', 'Ranulf', but most probably means the same man. It will suffice to say here that in 1225-31 Ranulf gained at least three, or four ecclesiastical benefices. For a number of grants to him in 1227-31: Charter Rolls 1226-57, 11, 79, 93, 106, 107, 129. The CLR 1226-40, 519, index, demonstrates well the abrupt end of Ranulf's career- the last entry was dated in April 1230.

he did not disappear either from the records.\textsuperscript{100} He died around early December 1246, by the time the life of William's wife came to a rather radical turning point.\textsuperscript{101}

Sometime before October 1246 one Richard de Gosbeck, lord of the town of Gosbeck [Suffolk] and rector of its church

"ravished her who was the wife of William le Breton against the king's peace, and married her".\textsuperscript{102}

Such incidents involving family members of royal servants were rare, but if Margery was the mother of John, as it is implicitly suggested by the public records, then she must have been an attractive woman despite her age, as Richard had a lot to lose by such actions, as indeed he had lost his lordship and rectory.\textsuperscript{103} If all the records are correct, and in particular in regard of names, then Margery probably was in her forties in 1246 and, in fact, she must have already been a grandmother, for by 1254 John had a wife, or to be more precise, had had a wife also named Margery and a teenage daughter, Olive.\textsuperscript{104}

The younger Margery and Olive appeared to have been directly involved in a very sordid crime sometime before December 1254. They were sued by the victim, one Godfrey de Millers, who claimed that Margery and Olive had removed "his testicles" and committed "other felonies against him"; the women had consequently fled and became outlawed, but later were pardoned by the king.\textsuperscript{105} Undoubtedly, neither William

\textsuperscript{100} Close Rolls 1231-34, 442; Close Rolls 1237-42, 374, 351, 422.

\textsuperscript{101} Of all his benefices Ranulf had kept at least two: the deanery of Wimborne Chapel [Dorset] and the prebend of Salisbury [Wilts.], Close Rolls 1242-47, 490; CPR 1232-47, 489, 494; Patent Rolls 1225-32, 231, 275.

\textsuperscript{102} CPR 1232-47, 489; Close Rolls 1242-47, 500.

\textsuperscript{103} CPR 1232-47, 489.

\textsuperscript{104} CPR 1247-58, 387. If Olive was a teenager in 1254 then John could have been born in c.1220, and Margery the elder no later perhaps than in c.1205.

\textsuperscript{105} Margery had her 'high connections': pardon was granted at the request of the chamberlain of Louis IX of France, \textit{Ibid.}, 387.
Breton, nor his son, John, seemed to have been too lucky with their wives.106

William died by February 1266 after about a four decade long strenuous career as a royal justice.107 His standing at court was more secure in the long run than that of Ranulf: William had never reached the highest echelons of power, but never was abruptly dismissed either. He worked in a great variety of positions over the years, e.g. as sheriff of Kent before 1235; justice of the Jews from 1234 to 1238, or after; collector of tallage in 1236; commissioner in a murder case in 1244; co-guardian of the bishopric of Norwich in 1257 etc.108 For most of the time from the late 1240's William had worked as an itinerant justice.109

Henry's justices had left behind a great number of details as to their activities and so it was not only in the case of William Breton, but his son as well. Yet it is difficult to establish John's early years, since there appeared to have been another John Breton as 'late' at least as 1251, and it is impossible to tell at times to 'which one' the records refer to.110 However, it must have been William's heir who was, amongst other things, a sheriff at Hereford in 1254-57; a bailiff of some of Edward's castles in 1257; a Continental envoy of Henry and Edward in 1259-60; and steward of Edward in 1261.111

It is notable that during the years of political disturbances John had supported

106. William also had two daughters, Close Rolls 1256-59, 76, 385.
107. CPR 1258-66, 559.
108. Dunstable, 130; CLR 1267-72, 104, 252; Close Rolls 1231-34, 569; Close Rolls 1234-37, 302; CPR 1232-47, 169, 228, 423.
110. Thus it is questionable whether it was John, the future bishop, who was a custodian of a fair, along with others, in 1236: by our estimates he would have been too young for the job, CPR 1232-47, 196. Similarly, in 1251 one John Breton, whose wife was Basilia, was detained for murder in a prison of York. This John was most likely a namesake, Close Rolls 1247-51, 488.
111. CPR 1247-58, 368, 472, 551, 586; CPR 1258-66, 45, 191; Close Rolls 1261-64, 3.
not the crown but the barons, however, he was pardoned by Henry in 1266.\textsuperscript{112} John may have felt in 1261-66 that the king valued neither his, nor his father’s services to the extent that it was due: the overall amount of gifts and favours received by them over the decades appears to have been negligible. From 1266 to 1269 John had acted as a royal justice on a great variety of matters. He seems to have been extremely busy: in 1267 no less than eleven murder cases were assigned to him for investigation, apart from other tasks - hardly the best training for a future spiritual vocation.\textsuperscript{113}

Although Henry came to be troubled by an election controversy during 1270-72, after weathering the barons’ war he probably felt confident enough to never doubt the outcome of the matter. Archbishop Boniface had died in his native Savoy in July 1270 and the king consequently appointed a guardian to the archbishopric by August; the granting of the election licence, however, appears to have been withheld.\textsuperscript{114} Nevertheless, on 9 September 1270 the monks advanced the prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, Adam of Chillenden, whom Henry refused to accept.\textsuperscript{115}

Adam had become head of its house in April 1264, and although as a prior he was moderately involved in wider affairs, and even favoured by the crown to some extent, he was not the right candidate for the archbishopric.\textsuperscript{116} When the king had visited Canterbury at the end of October-early November 1265 he acknowledged Adam’s loyalty to him during the times of baronial disturbances which may have been responsible for the damages inflicted on the priory by the insurgents.\textsuperscript{117} Henry was

\textsuperscript{112} CPR 1258-66, 559; CPR 1266-72, 319.

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., 35, 49, 89, 103, 117, 134, 145, 152, 154, 158, 164.

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., 457; For Boniface’s last years, Cox, Eagles of Savoy, 382-92.

\textsuperscript{115} Dunstable, 252; Worcester, 459; Fasti, vol. II, 7.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 12; CPR 1258-66, 344, 369.

\textsuperscript{117} Already on 28 August 1265 - a little over three weeks after the battle of Evesham - the king ordered the prior and other heads of religious houses in Canterbury to assist in the arrest of some of de Montfort’s French followers that had found refuge in the city, \textit{Ibid.}, 445, 496-97.
not only mindful of the financial predicament of the priory and thus requesting its tenants to relieve the situation, he compelled them to supply Adam with a "good palfrey" which had been customarily due to every new prior.\textsuperscript{118} This, and various other royal favours to the prior and convent in 1264-70, indicated that the relationship between Henry and Adam was reasonably good in the period.\textsuperscript{119} Even in 1271 - by the time the election dispute had been in progress - the prior and convent received a grant from Henry, however, seemingly insignificant, and when in the same year a question arose to fill the stewardship of the priory, Adam made no objection to the person of the king's sergeant.\textsuperscript{120} During 1270-72, Henry well exploited his prerogative arising from the vacancy and presented well over a dozen of his men to benefices in Canterbury.\textsuperscript{121} The king's right naturally could not be disputed even if the numbers seemed perhaps excessive, yet there were no opposing voices to be heard.

What Adam probably did not understand at this stage was that all this was not enough for him to be accepted to such a cardinal post as the archbishopric. He turned to Gregory X and to prove his credentials his proctors presented the pope with what probably was the letter 'patent' dated 1 November 1265 at Canterbury, in which the king had admitted the prior's fidelity to the crown.\textsuperscript{122} Whether intentionally or not, the date of the original letter became mixed up, and Henry writing to Gregory X on 24 July 1272 informed him that he had no knowledge of such a document 'dated' 2 November 1270.\textsuperscript{123} In the same passage the king also assured the pope that he had not been to Canterbury "for four years before and after that date", i.e. 2 November 1270 - an

\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 496-97.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid., 383, 452; Close Rolls 1264-68, 137, 248; CPR 1266-72, 498.
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., 523, 528, 532, 577.
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., 458, 460, 468, 500, 523, 535, 538, 550, 575, 603, 607, 610, 614, 616, 617, 672, 680, 682, 710.
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., 704; CPR 1258-66, 496-97.
\textsuperscript{123} CPR 1266-72, 704.
obvious contradiction in 1272.124 Henry’s very last visit to Canterbury had occurred in October-November 1265; and it is most likely that the king used the whole misunderstanding as an excuse, if he did not create it. Henry rightly thought, however, that after Boniface, Adam was simply no match, no matter how loyal.

The king died on 16 November 1272 at Westminster, his mind free from the Canterbury election dispute: Adam had resigned his claim two months earlier.125
CONCLUSION
In at least two of its aspects the reign of Henry III was extraordinary. The king ruled England for fifty-six years, a period unchallenged for its length by any English monarch until George III. In the space of forty-six years, from 1226 to 1272, Henry came to witness the promotion, or attempted promotion of nearly seventy men of various background and capacity to the English episcopacy, no doubt a record number in any comparison.

Archbishops and bishops were of special importance in the fabric of Medieval society and thus naturally for a secular ruler to give direction to the composition of the episcopal body was always high on the agenda. Paradoxically, it was the Christian church to blame: it had sought to better Man, and in the process it became entangled in institutional secular affairs which in turn constantly stimulated lay attempts to meddle in ecclesiastical matters. In theory, at least, such a state of affairs could have been averted. The possibility to create a more introvert and spiritually orientated church would have been there in the West, had there been a decisive emphasis placed on inner contemplation rather than outward conformity in Christian doctrine. The secularisation of thirteenth century society too indicated that in the long term the intertwining of church and state was as futile as it was unsustainable. St Francis better than anyone else, perhaps, sensed the quintessential danger in mingling the spiritual and intellectual realms that was the very reason of decay in the church and which he had endeavoured with his followers to reverse.

In thirteenth-century England the involvement of the episcopal body in the affairs of the monarchy was, on the whole, considerable, although there were, as we have seen, individual exceptions to the rule as well. Henry III, taking in his hands the reigns of power in 1227 already had a clear idea of the type of men he had wished to see in episcopal or archiepiscopal positions, although by 1235 two major misjudgements were made with the promotion of Edmund of Abingdon and Robert Grosseteste. For the king an ideal bishop would have been, apart from his religious qualities, a man of loyalty, versed in the affairs of the court, but also in those of foreign kingdoms and of
Rome. Such an ecclesiastic would be used as an ambassador to France or on occasion to the papal curia, to negotiate a marriage or a peace treaty and support royal demands for taxation, be it for a Gascon campaign or for a crusade. And ideally, he would lend support to the crown in matters dealt with in the royal council. Edmund of Abingdon and Robert Grosseteste were far from being such prelates. On the contrary, while Edmund took an active role in contributing to the dismissal of the current favourites, the Poitevins, in 1234 - Henry's first major rebuff from the church - Robert adopted a critical, and at times hostile attitude towards the king.

The men who were advanced in 1226-35 to the highest positions in the ecclesiastical hierarchy in England were a mixed lot, reflecting yet the uncertainties of the times after the long minority of Henry and the flexibility of the line that had existed between the power of the crown and that of the church in respect of episcopal promotions. Quite naturally Henry had preferred candidates whom he knew well and could therefore trust and presume that they generally would adopt a pro-royal platform. Often such men emerged from the group of courtiers, but this was not always the case, and as the example of William Raleigh had vividly illustrated even the most important of curiales could face serious royal opposition at times. Up until the promotion of Hugh of Northwold - who was the first, and one of the two monastic candidates to gain episcopal advancement through royal goodwill - Henry's successes lay in rejecting unwanted candidates such as William Scot and Walter de Eynesham. Arguably, in both cases the king's excuses not to accept their advancement were reasonable. There were minor setbacks too, for Luke would have seemed like a good choice for Durham in 1226, although as it later turned out, his loyalty to the crown was diminished by his attachment to the fallen justiciar, de Burgh. More vexing for Henry was perhaps Gregory IX's decision to translate Richard Poore from Salisbury to Durham, not because of the person of Richard, but because he had not been consulted beforehand by the pope. The king may have been afraid that Gregory IX would create a precedent to interfere in episcopal matters in such a way, but these fears proved to be unfounded,
although in the Canterbury dispute the pope's role in Edmund's appointment amounted, in practical terms, to an intervention. Gregory IX, on the whole, showed not a great deal of cooperation towards Henry in matters of episcopal promotion: he had annulled the appointment of an unwanted candidate Walter de Eynesham, but for an excessive price from Henry; provided Richard Grant to Canterbury at the request of the king's proctors, but rejected the candidacy of two curiales, Ralph Neville and John Blund.

That the king was quite prepared to accept unknown candidates to the episcopacy became already clear in 1227-29 with the elevation of Henry Sandford, Robert Bingham and Roger Niger and this was a principle that was generally true of all of the reign, although it had been put aside at times as a result of various other considerations. Robert and Roger, however, already highlighted the dangers associated with bishops of such a background: they had no special loyalty to the crown forged by the years and Henry naturally could not be sure as to how accommodating they would be later. With Hugh of Northwold, the king was on a much firmer ground: the bishop of Ely had been, in fact, the first episcopal candidate to whose early career Henry could personally relate. Hugh proved to be very much an exception, for no later monastic candidate had had such a good relationship with the king prior to his election and for that reason the monk-bishop was a rarity during much of the thirteenth-century in England. Nevertheless, by the end of 1235 it must had dawned on Henry, and especially following the fall of the Poitevins, that more effort was needed to influence the composition of the episcopate. The situation was far from being favourable: in the archiepiscopacy of Canterbury Edmund of Abindgon was hardly an ally; the bishop of Winchester had left England after his dismissal from court, and in fact, none of the men who had been advanced to episcopal positions after 1226 had been drawn from the court. Henry's latent designs naturally gained new impetus with his marriage in January 1236 and the arrival of Savoyards in England, but even though the king's attempts to intrude William Raleigh to Norwich in 1236-39 were quite discreet. This was somewhat of an irony, not so much because Henry had really refrained from such interference
during the preceding decade, but because his methods in 1226 to have Luke promoted were not really circumspect.

The year of 1236 had initiated, however, a period of confidence on the part of the king in episcopal promotions which was to last essentially until the decisive action of the barons in 1258. A clear majority of the men advanced to the episcopacy in these twenty-two years had been connected to the court; as we have seen the fact that so many curiales had been promoted was not so much a result of direct royal intervention, but rather a consequence of recurring expedient elections. Henry was successful in the late 1230's in the rejection of two unwanted candidates: Simon of Elmham and Thomas Melsonby. The case of the Norwich dispute is of special interest, in as much as it had represented the coming together of various factors, but it is notable that it was not Henry who had initiated opposition to the elect, although he later made good use of certain defects in Simon's character. As far as Thomas Melsonby was concerned, it is likely that the king was still being too mindful about the possibility of a Scottish threat on the northern borders, although Alexander II had renounced his claim to the disputed counties in 1237 - in the same year the prior was elected. In any case, to allow the promotion of a man to Durham, who was cooperative, or potentially cooperative towards the Scottish monarch, hardly made any political sense for the English crown. Thus Simon's and Thomas' major shortcomings were not primarily related to their monastic background and, arguably, had they had adequate earlier ties with Henry, matters would have turned out differently for them.

In retrospect, the much celebrated Winchester dispute of 1238-44 was no coincidence, since by that time all the necessary elements had been in place. The king had a genuine affection for his Savoyard [and Poitevin] relatives and this was a factor which would have explained in itself the royal efforts to gain them episcopal rank in England. Winchester was a special see, as it was by far the wealthiest in England, and
Henry's personal connection to it was also matter of importance. Considering the Norwich and Durham disputes, and the fact that in Worcester a curialis had been advanced in 1237 [the first one since 1226, in fact] the Winchester monks' proposal to elevate two very important servants of the crown - William Raleigh and then Ralph Neville - was an expedient decision. Over these curiales, however, William of Savoy had one decisive advantage apart from the king's personal attachment towards him: the Savoyard's background played a pivotal part in the crown's broader Continental ambitions, a qualification which could not be matched by any of the high ranking English courtiers. Henry had wanted to reward William Raleigh with a bishopric for his services, but with Norwich and not Winchester. And although no Savoyard gained ultimately Winchester the king did not end up on the losing side. William of Savoy had died prematurely, and this was doubtless a cause of great grief to Henry, but Boniface became consecrated as archbishop of Canterbury in 1245 - arguably one of the greatest successes of royal ecclesiastical policy over the years. With the Savoyard as head of the English church, the king's Continental ambitions, theoretically at least, gained a much more realistic tone.

The repercussions of the controversies of 1236-44, but particularly that of Winchester was evident from the conservative and timid mood of the electors for many years to come. The elevation of royal servants to the episcopacy appeared to have been unstoppable. Hugh Pattishall, Nicholas Farnham, Fulk Basset, William of York, Silvester Everdon, Lawrence of St Martin and William of Kilkenny were some of the examples. Henry was also successful in elevating another Savoyard, Peter d'Aigueblanche, in 1240 - whom he may have regarded as a kind of substitute for William of Savoy - and his half-brother, Aymer de Valence, to the sensitive see of Winchester. Although these two promotions appeared to have been, and undoubtedly were advantageous to the crown's interests, in the long term the benefits had been

1. Stacey, Politics, 221.
diminished, since Peter and Aymer provoked, within the ranks of the barons and the church in general, considerable irritation. Yet even in this relatively conservative period not all went well, for the elevation of Richard Wich and Roger Weseham demonstrated two disturbing exceptions: nominees could be advanced on occasion without royal approval, or even knowledge, provided there existed a cooperation between 'English' ecclesiastics and Rome. That Boniface, a royal relative, should act against royal prerogative was a clear sign that even the loyalty of the closest allies could not be taken for granted at times. Boniface may not have realised that his unprecedented action and Richard's earlier association with Edmund of Abingdon was a formula that was highly unattractive to the crown.

Apart from the fact that the archbishopric of Canterbury was ruled by Boniface, one tangible accomplishment of the two decades that had preceded the era of baronial disturbances was that by the end of 1258 there were about a dozen bishops, who had been formerly Henry's courties, ruling in England. The fact that the episcopal body, on the whole, had supported the movement of reform in 1258-65 should not blind us to the significance of this achievement, for matters would have undoubtedly turned out much worse for the crown had it faced a situation in 1258 similar to that of in 1236, when Henry had not had such men in episcopal or archiepiscopal positions. Nevertheless, the baronial movement of 1258-65 had brought about the third distinctive phase in the chronology of episcopal appointments, a period in which the king's power to influence the elections, to all intents and purposes, was lost. Actually, the electors were not entirely unsympathetic in these years to royal interests as the examples of Henry of Wingham and Richard Talbot indicated, and it was only too unfortunate for Henry that both the bishop of London and his proposed successor died prematurely. More importantly, prior to their advancement, Richard Gravesend, Henry of Sandwich and Walter de la Wyle had only weak ties with the crown, while the bishop of Chichester seems to have had none at all. Not surprisingly, they came to support the baronial side during the years of upheavals. And in the context of the 1240's and the 1250's the
elevation of Godfrey Ludham to York, Richard Gravesend to Lincoln, Robert Stichill to Durham, John Gervais to Winchester would have likely provoked opposition of some extent from Henry III. Henry of Sandwich may have too belonged to this category. The fact that such ultimately adverse candidates had gained episcopal rank was one highly unfavourable outcome of the crown’s diminished control over domestic politics, for the episcopacy that was hostile, or even just passive to the king’s interest naturally lent considerable strength to the cause of the barons. The loss of political influence on the part of the king and the advancement of nominees who would eventually turn against Henry were elements that tended to reinforce each other in the power play initiated by the reforming barons, and quite understandably so, but naturally it needed to have come to a halt at some point of time.

In retrospect, it came to an end even before the battle of Evesham with the elevation of Walter Giffard whose family tradition made loyalty to the king unavoidable. Although his election should probably be seen independent of the wider political background as a result of strong local influence, it led the list of those courtier-bishops whose promotion went hand-in-hand with the development of royal consolidation after Evesham. In the final phase of Henry’s reign, i.e. in 1265-72, the majority of those advanced to the English episcopacy had been of tested loyalty: Godfrey Giffard, Nicholas of Ely, Roger Skerning, John Breton. William of Bitton II arguably also belonged to this group primarily as a result of his family background. Finally, the case of Adam of Chillenden, the only explicit example in fact, demonstrated the king’s bias against monastic candidates: Adam had been on reasonably good terms with Henry prior to his election yet assent to the proposed elevation was not given. No obvious cause stood out - the king, after his long association with Boniface, may have simply held the standards too high for Adam to pass.

Ironically, despite the fact that in the king’s Continental ambitions the Savoyards had played such a key role, considering the timespan of Henry’s rule and the corresponding large number of men gaining episcopal or archiepiscopal positions, their
numerical representation in the English church was almost of no consequence. Henry's whole European strategy had centred on his possessions, lost and real, in France and the king's ultimate objective could not be but to recreate an empire on the Continent. In southern France, Henry's aims to counter the expansion of Louis IX had coincided with the interests of the family of Provence-Savoy wishing to control the Western Alps and Provence, independent of all powers. It was a mutually beneficial alliance at the time, since for Henry the Savoyards had constituted the only realistic pillar of support in Europe, apart from the papacy, while English cooperation and presence on the Continent was contributing to the eventual creation of a transalpine principality. And although the Poitevins had not played such a prominent part in these schemes, seen in this light, Henry's efforts to install his relatives into those English sees that were of primary importance - Winchester, Canterbury, and York made perfect sense. Arguably, the king had shown a great deal of moderation as well, since as we have seen, there had been no attempts made to overfill the English episcopacy with relatives from France. For Henry to obtain episcopal rank even in those 'secondary sees' for his relatives, or as in a case of Peter d'Aigueblanche, a Savoyard favourite, was never worth the effort if the electors were ready to admit a curialis anyway. The king had intended to advance Peter d'Aigueblanche, or Boniface of Savoy to Durham, but ended up approving Nicholas Farnham; in London, Henry had accepted Fulk Basset, despite his plans to translate d'Aigueblanche from Hereford and a similar scenario arose in Lincoln before the consecration of Henry Lexington; in Durham again, Walter Kirkham was elevated, although the royal nominee had been Aymer de Valence. Since Boniface's promotion to Canterbury was relatively easily achieved by the crown, theoretically a potentially prolonged dispute could only develop in Winchester and York.

In Winchester the controversy of 1238-44 would have been much more easily solved [and probably in favour of the crown] had the electors decided to advance not

high standing courtiers, but someone relatively less important. Following the death of Raleigh, the king had made certain that there emerged no 'second best' contenders in form of trusted royal servants for the see of Winchester, and thus the election of Aymer was procured. During the baronial disturbances Henry could not have hoped to keep the bishopric in the hands of a relative, and had to be 'content' with John Gervais at the end, although he probably would have preferred the original choice of the monks, Henry of Wingham. The outcome of the second Winchester controversy ultimately turned sour for the king because John Gervais had become a supporter of the barons, but this could not have been predicted by Henry; by the time the see became vacant again the period of active Savoyard [and Poitevin] engagement in English affairs was coming to an end and the crown accepted an easy-going curialis to this sensitive bishopric.3

In York, the first vacancy had occurred only in 1255, but by that time the king had been involved in the Sicilian business with the papacy, and it is quite likely that for that reason he had no desire to go against the decision of Alexander IV to advance Sewal de Bovill, although the matter concerned an all-time royal favourite, Aymer de Valence. Thus Henry's initial enthusiasm to obtain the archbishopric for his half-brother, and quite possibly to install a relative, or a royal servant to Winchester was very short-lived - after the Winchester controversy the king would not be drawn into prolonged disputes with Rome. The influencing of the York election of 1258 had been lost to Henry, although he most likely would have liked very much to have his say after the death of Sewal. And as in the case of Winchester, after the baronial movement York went to a well trusted curialis.

In the last resort, while the Savoyard and Poitevin ecclesiastics could not really turn away from the king, if for no other reason than that they had had no roots of their own in England, this was not the case with the English courtiers. William Raleigh not unnaturally felt himself confident enough to be obstinate in the matter of the
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Winchester election; Walter Cantilupe and John Gervais had a standing of their own and when they came to support de Montfort they did not view the king as their sole benefactor whom they disappointed. The courtier-bishops comprised a reliable group for the English monarchy despite occasional ‘desertations’ or quarrels, as it happened in the parliament of 1253. More often than not, their work in the service of the crown had spanned decades prior to episcopal elevation, and as a rule they left behind the highest of positions at court for a change in career. Nicholas Farnham was a royal physician and confessor and had already been on good terms with Henry for fourteen years prior to his advancement; William of York was a valued itinerant judge with a career of some twenty years behind him; Silvester Everdon’s association with the crown also went back for about two decades, and he in due course became royal chancellor; Walter Kirkham was advanced to Durham in 1249, but he had been connected to the wardrobe as early as 1224. Apart from Silvester Everdon four other successive chancellors of Henry had gained episcopal appointment after 1247: William of Kilkenny, Henry of Wingham, Nicholas of Ely and Godfrey Giffard. And while Ralph Neville had been prevented from becoming a metropolitan in 1231, Walter Giffard, chancellor in 1265, became translated to York in 1266. There were also those who became promoted to the episcopacy not solely on their own merits but those of members of their family - generally fathers or elder brothers. The father of Walter Cantilupe had been a steward of the household for nearly twenty years; Hugh Pattishall’s father had worked as a justice during the reign of king John, while the father of Fulk Basset had been a friend of John and his brother became a royal counsellor. And similar advantages were also enjoyed by Henry Lexington, the Giffard brothers and John Breton, not to mention the royal relative, Roger Longespee. In contrast, curiales like William of York and Silvester Everdon appear to have started their careers from a much lower social standing. Episcopal/archiepiscopal rank was the highest of rewards for a courtier, and along the way, success in a career was measured not only by one’s office, or situation at court, but also by the volume of royal gifts, grants and ecclesiastical presentations received. The
ability to direct royal orders through letters 'patent' and 'close' was, as we have seen, an unequivocal sign of the confidence of the king in his servant, and as such, it signalled a peak of a secular career.

While the electors in England understandably would not nominate a Savoyard, or a Poitevin as their pastor on their own accord, their attitude to the curiales could not be so negative. From the chapters' point of view, the voluntary election of a courtier was a realistic compromise for it worked - even in Winchester in 1238-44 - in preventing less wanted candidates gaining promotion. It was a question of degree rather than of choice between black and white. As far as Henry was concerned, he had seldom made special efforts to procure an election of his servant to a particular see. The real significance of royal intrusions resulting, for example, in the election of William Raleigh to Norwich and Silvester Everdon to Carlisle lay not so much in the actual outcome for it was in a numerical sense negligible, but in the fact that these, together with attempts to intrude a relative, and even with abortive attempts, e.g. the case of Robert Passelewe, were responsible for the systematic occurrence of expedient elections. In the final analysis, the fact that out of the fifty-odd men who gained episcopal, or archiépiscopal rank during Henry III's reign about a third gained promotion through an expedient election speaks for itself.

When it came to episcopal advancement, the diocesan and cathedral clergy had been in a far less advantageous situation than royal relatives or even curiales. Their election - mostly canonical - was subject to royal approval; Henry not unnaturally had no special interest in promoting their cause over those of his relatives or courtiers. The king did not generally object, however, to contenders from the secular clergy, for it was relatively rare that he had his own nominees for normal bishoprics, and even then there were instances of withdrawal. Henry had preferred known candidates to unknown ones, but the fact that the majority of those who were advanced belonged to the first category was primarily a reflection of the extent of the connection between the crown and the cathedral clergy, rather than a result of indirect royal intervention. The numerical
representation of former clergymen in the episcopacy was considerable: it had equalled to about a half, i.e. roughly as big a proportion as that of the curiales, in the total of all those promoted in 1226-72.

Interestingly, in almost all instances the elevation of unknown, or lesser known candidates appears to have been helped by a special circumstance of one kind or another. Henry Sandford, Robert Bingham and Roger Niger had undoubtedly benefited from the fact that the king, in the years immediately after the declaration of his majority, was not yet in a position to pursue a vigorous policy of his own to influence elections. At any rate, in Rochester, Henry's actual control was even less than in other sees - an element which cannot be ignored not only when looking at Henry Sandford's promotion, but also that of Richard Wendene in 1238. Three of the elects - Roger of Salisbury, John Climping and Stephen Bersted partly owed their advancement to the king's engagement in French affairs at the time. Similarly, the consecration of Walter Suffield may have to some extent mirrored the king's desire to put an end to the long period of uncertainty in Norwich beginning with the election of Simon of Elmham, while Richard Blund's consecration in 1245 is more easily understood in the context of Henry's relative lack of interest in Exeter in 1234-45 and his recent troubles in ecclesiastical matters. It is also of interest that local influences served little or unknown men from the clergy [apart from the curialis Walter Giffard] to gain episcopal promotion. It was clear that the courtiers, but even the cathedral clergy in general were able to manage without such help in the process of climbing the steps of the ecclesiastical hierarchy by the virtue of their importance and position. The extent of lay or ecclesiastical local pressure had been minimal, however, in 1226-72: such forces had only contributed to the election of William of Bitton I, his nephew, and indirectly helped Thomas Vipont.

Deans, precentors, chancellors, treasurers, archdeacons and other dignitaries of the church, theoretically, at least, had the option to keep their involvement in the affairs of the crown to a minimum. That a few managed was an indication that ecclesiastical
office did not automatically bring secular engagement in one form or another. This argument, however, seems all too forced, since the clergy, by a large majority had no desire to be involved and certainly not for the reason to gain episcopal advancement later. Only a very few, such as Ralph Maidstone and Giles of Brideport had been on sufficiently good terms with the crown to receive gifts or favours of various sort. And although the king had known, or at least could relate to the family background of the large majority of those who eventually ended up in episcopal or archiepiscopal positions, in most of the cases his relationship to them was official and small scale. In any rate, the line that existed between occasional official contact and that which had also brought material benefits was quite thin considering the extent of favours that curiales or royal relatives generally received. While Henry would take no active part in the promotion of clergymen to the episcopacy, they in turn hardly ever showed sympathy with particular designs to elevate a royal favourite. One exception was Walter Bronescombe who as an archdeacon of Surrey helped the crown in its attempts to have Aymer elected to Winchester, a course of action that would severely have rattled the bones in the graves of such men as Edmund of Abingdon.

Monastic candidates had been, on the whole, in an almost disadvantageous position during Henry III's reign to obtain episcopal promotion. The point can hardly be illustrated better than by the fact that in 1226-72 only four nominees of such background - out of nearly seventy candidates - gained eventually bishoprics: Hugh of Northwold, Hugh Balsham, Robert Stichill and Roger Skerning. It is important to note that out of these four, only Hugh of Northwold had had a really good relationship with the crown, hence the reason of his acceptance. But the king also had a cogent motive not to reject the others: Hugh Balsham was consecrated by Alexander IV and it would not have made political sense to challenge the papal decision during negotiations concerning the kingdom of Sicily; similarly Robert Stichill's consecration was essentially due to the general political circumstances of the time, unfavourable to the crown, while in contrast, Roger Skerning's loyalty during the years of baronial upheavals secured him
the bishopric of Norwich. It would be wrong, however, to attribute the monks' such low representation to Henry III's unfavourable personal attitude alone throughout the years. Although out of the total of seventeen sees in England, monastic cathedrals had existed in eight, the cause of the monks in Canterbury and Winchester was quite simply hopeless after 1236 as a result of wider considerations. At Rochester, matters were very much under the influence of the archbishop of Canterbury, and the fact that Boniface was tied to royal interests most probably contributed, albeit indirectly, to the election of a curialis, Lawrence of St Martin. As mentioned, Durham, but also Carlisle, lay on a strategic borderland with Scotland, a fact of primary importance for Henry III when considering candidates for those sees, whatever the momentary relationship with the northern kingdom may have been. Elsewhere, in Ely, Norwich and Worcester, the monks had not been immune from wider trends and thus a few expedient elections were made to save possible future trouble; the secular cathedral chapters, needless to say, would not chose a monastic candidate.

Apart from specific considerations the king's implicit excuse against monastic nominees appeared to have been that they had no experience in worldly matters thus were unfit to carry out, for example, the manifold administrative tasks of a bishop. This charge, as it had been demonstrated, was not merely formal but rather real. Indeed, in some ways, it seems extraordinary that apart from Hugh of Northwold no other monastic candidate had much business to do with the crown prior to his attempted promotion. The finding certainly smacks at the notion of too much worldly involvement on the part of thirteenth-century monastic communities in England. Like the dignitaries of the secular church, the priors and abbots had also had a choice, either to be engaged in wider affairs or remain immersed in their original pursuits. True to their vocation they chose the latter option and bore the result by being implicitly, or
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explicitly denied positions of real authority in the church, but it would be much too easy, and indeed mistaken, to claim that Henry's prejudice alone was responsible for what was a wider social development.

That the king had a bias against nominees from the cathedral monasteries is clear: although he at times had accepted unknown men from the clergy to the episcopacy this was not the case with monastic candidates. And even when a relatively well known and appreciated nominee, such as Adam of Chillenden, emerged the crown would refuse to give in. But since Henry's preference for episcopal candidates after 1236 had followed a strict logic, from which monastic contenders were not exempt, it would not have made sense to allow too much room for compromise.

Henry III's ecclesiastical policy in respect of episcopal elections had been a realistic combination of family and foreign policy considerations, and when it came to vacancies in the more critical of the English sees the reaction was almost predictable. Far from being an oppressor of the church the king engaged in a 'game' of manipulation to obtain the desired result and played his part with considerable skill. And, arguably, Henry's confidence in the 1240's and 1250's was well demonstrated by his attempts to have d'Aigueblanche translated from Hereford to more central bishoprics, for it was no doubt believed by the king that in the event of a transfer, Hereford, being also a sensitive see as a result of its close proximity to Wales, could go only to a thoroughly trusted man. The relative 'value' of a particular archbishopric or bishopric for the crown, as we have seen, turned out to be a factor of primary importance at times - a consideration essentially ignored by the study of Marion Gibbs.6

For the king, however, not all family ties were of equal importance, and of this Roger Longespee was doubtless clearly aware. Even in this regard Continental ambitions had their decisive say. Judged against his own foreign policy objectives,

6. Another shortcoming of the author's work is connected to its basic disregard of a wider political background both in terms of Henry's general foreign policy and the events of 1258-65.
Henry's policy in respect of episcopal candidates ultimately was a failure, for neither the Savoyards nor the Poitevins were able to secure tangible long-term advantages on the Continent for the English crown. In retrospect, no Continental ally of the king could have obtained such benefits, since they would have run against a most potent socio-political trend ultimately resulting in the emergence of national monarchies. Seen in this light, Henry, essentially was a realist: he most likely did the best he could with the Savoyards and his own relatives. And if the English monarchy was to remain a viable European power the church's support of the crown via the curialis-bishops was indispensable. During the reign of Henry III a considerable number of courtiers gained episcopal promotion without provoking any serious opposition - another implicit, but nevertheless important legacy for the future Edward I.
APPENDIX I

Episcopal and archiepiscopal candidates in England, 1226-72

Chronological List

The dates refer to the time of consecration, unless otherwise indicated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>proposed 1226 Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>William Scot [alias of Stichill]</td>
<td>elected 1226 Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Richard Poore</td>
<td>translated 1228 Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Henry Sandford</td>
<td>1227 Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Walter de Eynesham</td>
<td>elected 1228 Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Richard Grant</td>
<td>provided 1229 Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Robert Bingham</td>
<td>1229 Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Roger Niger</td>
<td>1229 London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hugh of Northwold</td>
<td>1229 Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ralph Neville</td>
<td>postulated 1231 Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>John of Sittingbourne</td>
<td>elected 1232 Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>John Blund</td>
<td>elected 1232 Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Edmund of Abingdon</td>
<td>1234 Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ralph Maidstone</td>
<td>1234 Hereford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Robert Grosseteste</td>
<td>1235 Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Simon of Elmham</td>
<td>elected 1236 Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Walter Cantilupe</td>
<td>1237 Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Thomas Melsonby</td>
<td>elected 1237 Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Richard Wendene</td>
<td>1238 Rochester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Winchester Dispute, 1238-44

20. William of Savoy [royal nominee never elected]
21. William Raleigh proposed 1238, elected 1240, temporalities 1244
22. Ralph Neville postulated 1238

William Raleigh elected to Coventry and Lichfield in 1239, but declined in favour of Norwich the same year; elected to Norwich in 1239, consecrated bishop of Norwich 1239, but translated to Winchester September 1243.

23. Hugh Pattishall 1240 Coventry and Lichfield
24. Nicholas Farnham 1241 Durham
25. Peter d’Aigueblanche 1240 Hereford
26. Roger of Salisbury 1244 Bath and Wells
27. Fulk Basset 1244 London
28. Robert Passelewe elected 1244 Chichester
29. Boniface of Savoy 1245 Canterbury
30. Walter Suffield 1245 Norwich
31. Richard Wich 1245 Chichester
32. William of Montpellier elected 1245 Coventry and Lichfield
33. Roger Weseham 1245 Coventry and Lichfield
34. Richard Blund 1245 Exeter
35. William of York 1247 Salisbury
36. Silvester Everdon 1247 Carlisle
37. William of Bitton I 1248 Bath and Wells
38. Walter Kirkham 1249 Durham
39. Aymer de Valence elected 1250 Winchester
40. Lawrence of St Martin 1251 Rochester
41. John Climping 1254 Chichester
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Diocese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Henry Lexington</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Thomas Vipont</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>William of Kilkenny</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Sewal de Bovill</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Giles of Bridport</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Hugh Balsham</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>Ely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Roger Longespee</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>Coventry and Lichfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Simon Walton</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Walter Bronescombe</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Robert de Chaury</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Godfrey Ludham</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Richard Gravesend</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Henry of Wingham</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Robert Stichill</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>John Gervais</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Stephen Bersted</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Richard Talbot</td>
<td>elected</td>
<td>1262 London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Henry of Sandwich</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Walter de la Wyle</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>William Langton</td>
<td>elected</td>
<td>1265 York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Walter Giffard</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>Bath and Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1266 York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Godfrey Giffard</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Nicholas of Ely</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1268 Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Roger Skerning</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>William of Bitton II</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>Bath and Wells</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
67. John Breton 1269 Hereford
68. Adam of Chillenden elected 1270 Canterbury
## APPENDIX II

Diocesans during the reign of Henry III, with references to episcopal and archiepiscopal candidates

The dates refer to tenure of office, unless otherwise indicated

### Bath

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocesan</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jocelin of Wells</td>
<td>1206-42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bath and Wells

'Bath and Wells' became episcopal title in 1245

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocesan</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roger of Salisbury</td>
<td>1244-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of Bitton I</td>
<td>1248-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Giffard</td>
<td>1265-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of Bitton II</td>
<td>1267-74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Canterbury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocesan</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Langton</td>
<td>1213-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter de Eynesham</td>
<td>elected 1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Grant</td>
<td>1229-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Neville</td>
<td>postulated 1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John of Sittingbourne</td>
<td>elected 1232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Blund</td>
<td>elected 1232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund of Abingdon</td>
<td>1234-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boniface of Savoy</td>
<td>1245-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam of Chillenden</td>
<td>elected 1270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Carlisle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocesan</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter Mauclerc</td>
<td>1223-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvester Everdon</td>
<td>1247-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Vipont</td>
<td>1255-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert de Chaury</td>
<td>1258-78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chichester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocesan</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Neville</td>
<td>1224-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Passelewe</td>
<td>elected 1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Wich</td>
<td>1245-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Climping</td>
<td>1254-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Bersted</td>
<td>1262-87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coventry

see Lichfield and Coventry

Durham

Richard Marsh 1217-26
Richard Poore 1228-37
Thomas Melsonby elected 1237
Nicholas Farnham 1241-49
Walter Kirkham 1249-60
Robert Stichill 1261-74

Ely

Geoffrey de Burgo 1225-28
Hugh of Northwold 1229-54
William of Kilkenny 1255-56
Hugh Balsham 1258-86

Exeter

William Briwere 1224-44
Richard Blund 1245-57
Walter Bronescombe 1258-80

Hereford

Hugh Foliot 1219-34
Ralph Maidstone 1234-39
Peter d'Aigueblanche 1240-68
John Breton 1269-75

Lichfield and Coventry*

Coventry

Alexander Stavensby 1224-38

* See Handbook of British Chronology, 253.
Coventry and Lichfield
[recognised as the bishop’s sees in 1228]

- William Raleigh: elected 1239
- Nicholas Farnham: elected 1239
- Hugh Pattishall: 1240-41
- William of Montpellier: elected 1245
- Roger Weseham: 1245-56
- Roger Longespee: 1258-95

Lincoln

- Hugh of Wells: 1209-35
- Robert Grosseteste: 1235-53
- Henry Lexington: 1254-58
- Richard Gravesend: 1258-79

London

- Eustace of Fauconberg: 1221-28
- Roger Niger: 1229-41
- Fulk Basset: 1244-59
- Henry of Wingham: 1260-62
- Richard Talbot: elected 1262
- Henry of Sandwich: 1263-73

Norwich

- Thomas Blundeville: 1226-36
- Simon of Elmham: elected 1236
- William Raleigh: 1239-43
- Walter Suffield: 1245-57
- Simon Walton: 1258-66
- Roger Skerning: 1266-78

Rochester

- Benedict of Sawston: 1215-26
- Henry Sandford: 1227-35
- Richard Wendene: 1238-50
- Lawrence of St Martin: 1251-74
### Salisbury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bishop</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Poore</td>
<td>1217-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bingham</td>
<td>1229-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William of York</td>
<td>1247-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles of Bridport</td>
<td>1257-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter de la Wyle</td>
<td>1263-71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Winchester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bishop</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter des Roches</td>
<td>1205-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Neville</td>
<td>postulated 1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Raleigh</td>
<td>1243-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aymer de Valence</td>
<td>elected 1250, consecrated 1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry of Wingham</td>
<td>elected 1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew London</td>
<td>elected 1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Taunton</td>
<td>elected 1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gervais</td>
<td>1262-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas of Ely</td>
<td>1268-80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Worcester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bishop</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William de Blois</td>
<td>1218-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Cantilupe</td>
<td>1237-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas of Ely</td>
<td>1266-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey Giffard</td>
<td>1268-1302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bishop</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter de Gray</td>
<td>1215-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewal de Bovill</td>
<td>1256-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey Ludham</td>
<td>1258-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Langton</td>
<td>elected 1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Giffard</td>
<td>1266-79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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