The episcopate of Richard De Kellawe, Bishop of Durham 1311-16

Foss, D. B.

THE EPISCOPATE OF RICHARD DE KELLAWE, BISHOP OF DURHAM 1311-16

In 1311, Richard de Kellawe became Bishop of Durham, the last Benedictine monk to ascend the episcopal throne. He emerged from a decade or more of bitter strife between the convent and Bishop Bek, the choice of the monks, to an episcopate under constant strain from the depradations of the Scots. This was the time of Robert Bruce and Bannockburn. Kellawe against Bruce seemed weak and helpless; hence his episcopate has been viewed as that of a pious and incompetent ecclesiastic, unfitted for the ways of the world. The present study, firmly based on the Bishop's Register, attempts to show how this is untrue; how in fact Kellawe coped as well as could be expected with the Scottish depradations, and maintained a well-ordered diocese, was a capable administrator, and conducted relations with the King so that the rights and privileges of the regalian franchise of Durham were in no way compromised or impaired.

It attempts to interpret Kellawe's position in terms of wider currents, especially in the light of recent work on the episcopate of his predecessors; his relationship to the convent in the background of his part in the struggle against Bek, his ability to become Bishop in relation to many factors, not least the character of Edward II and the distraction from a serious royal canditature for the bishopric caused by the Ordinances.

It sees Kellawe as a worthy holder of the see, in spiritualia and temporalia, capable in his dealings, sincere in his wishes, realistic in his actions. It attempts to show too how his ultimate failure was not the result of his own deficiencies, but came about because the problems confronting him were too great for him to solve, and because his position was becoming increasingly incompatible with current tendencies.

THE EPISCOPATE OF RICHARD DE KELLAWE, BISHOP OF DURHAM 1311-1316

D. B. FOSS

CONTENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I ORIGINAL SOURCES-PRINTED

The Register of Richard de Kellawe, Lord Palatine and Bishop of Durham (Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense, ed. Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy, 4 vols. Rolls Series, 1873-78)

The Register of William Greenfield, Archbishop of York 1306-15 (ed. W. Brown and A.H. Thompson, Surtees Society, 5 vols. 1931-38)

The Register of John de Halton, Bishop of Carlisle 1292-1324 (transcribed W.N. Thompson, Canterbury and York Society, 2 vols. 1913)

Letters and Papers from the Northern Registers (ed. J. Raine, Rolls Series, 1873)

The Greenwell Deeds (Calendar, ed. J. Watson)

The Chronicle of Robert de Graystanes (Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres, ed. J. Raine, with Appendix, Surtees Society no. 9, 1839)

"Gesta Dunelmensia, AD $m^{o}ccc^{o}$" (ed. J.K. Richardson, Camden Miscellany XIII, 3rd Series, 1924)

Chronicle of Walter de Guisborough (ed. H.Rothwell, Camden Series, Vol. 89, 1957)

Chronicon de Lanercost, 1201-1346 (Edinburgh, 1839)

John of Fordun-Scotichronicon (Historians of Scotland, Vol. IV, ed. W. F. Skene, Edinburgh, 1872)

Testamenta Eboracensa (Surtees Society no. IV, 1836)

Calendar of Papal Letters (Vol. II 1305-42, ed. W.H. Bliss, 1895)

Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward II (ed. H. C. Maxwell-Lyte, Public Records Office, 1898)

Calendar of Close Rolls, do. (do. 1892-93)

Calendar of Fine Rolls, do. (do. 1912)

Taxatio Ecclesiastica Angliae et Walliae auctoritate Papae Nicholae IV, 1291-92 (Record Commission, 1802)

Thomas Rymer-Foedera, Conventiones, Literae et Cuiuscunque Generis Acta Publica, etc. (Vol. III, London 1727)

Rotuli Scotiae in Turri Londiniensi et in Domo Capitulari Westmonasteriensi Asservati (Vol. I, Record Commission 1814)

II ORIGINAL SOURCES-MANUSCRIPT

MUNIMENTS OF THE DEAN AND CHAPTER OF DURHAM

Locelli VI 9(a-k) (ten documents concerning the election of Bishop Kellawe, 1311); VII 7, 24, 45; XXVII 2, 30, 31.

Miscellaneous Charters 4265, 5055, 5523, 5823, 5985.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE PUBLIC LIBRARY

Greenwell Deeds, D. 39

III SECONDARY SOURCES

R. Surtees-History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham (4 vols., 1816-40)

W. Hutchinson-History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham (3 vols., 1785)

W.Fordyce-History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham (2 vols., 1857)

Victoria County History of Durham, ed. W. Page (3 vols., esp. Vol. II, 1907)

Northumberland County History (15 vols., 1893-1940)

G. T. Lapsley-The County Palatine of Durham (1900)

C. M. Fraser-The Life of Antony Bek, Bishop of Durham 1283-1311 (Durham Ph.D. thesis, 1951)

C. M. Fraser-A history of Antony Bek (1957)

C. M. Fraser-Edward I of England and the Regalian Franchise of Durham (Speculum, Vol. 31, 1956)

G. V. Scammell-Hugh du Puiset (1956)

R. L. Storey-Thomas Langley and the Bishopric of Durham, 1406-37 (1961)

F. Barlow-Durham Jurisdictional Peculiars (1950)

G. W. S. Barrow-Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland (1965)

J. Scammell-Robert I and the North of England (English Historical Review, July 1958)

W. A. Pantin-The Church in the Fourteenth Century

K. L. Wood-Legh-Church Life under Edward III (1934)

I. Churchill-Canterbury Administration (2vols., 1933)

R. M. Haines-The Administration of the Diocese of Worcester in the first half of the Fourteenth Century (1965)

R. Brentano-York Metropolitan Jurisdiction (1959)

W. E. Lunt-Financial Relations of England with the Papacy to 1327 (1939)

C. R. Cheney-Episcopal Visitation of Monasteries in the Thirteenth Century (1931)

J. Conway Davies-The Baronial Opposition to Edward II (1918)

M. McKisack-The Fourteenth Century

IV WORKS OF REFERENCE

Fasti Dunelmenses, ed. D. S. Boutflower (Surtees Society NO. 139, 1926)

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN REFERENCES

Reg.	Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense (followed by volume and page no., e.g. Reg. I 175)
S.T.	Chronicle of Robert de Graystanes in Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres
Lan.	Chronicon de Lanercost
CPL	Calendar of Papal Letters
CPR	Calendar of Patent Rolls
CCR	Calendar of Close Rolls
Taxatio	Taxatio Nicholae IV
Rymer	Rymer's Foedera (1727 ed.)
Rot. Scot.	Rotuli Scotiae in Turri Londiniensi
Loc.	Durham Locelli (followed by no., e.g. Loc. VI 9)
M.C.	Miscellaneous Charters (do., e.g. M.C.4265)

Fraser (1951) C. M. Fraser-The Life of Antony Bek, Bishop of Durham 1283-1311 (Durham Ph.D. thesis, 1951)

Fraser (1957) C. M. Fraser-A history of Antony Bek (1957)

NCH	Northumberland County History (followed by volume and page No.)
VCH	Victoria County History of Durham (do.)

Lapsley	G. T. Lapsley-The County Palatine of Durham
DJP	F. Barlow-Durham Jurisdictional Peculiars
Scammell	J. Scammell-Robert I and the North of England (E.H.R. 1958)
Storey	R. L. Storey-Thomas Langley and the Bishopric of Durham
Haines	R. M. Haines-The Administration of the Diocese of Worcester in the first half of the Fourteenth Century
Lunt	W. E. Lunt-Financial Relations of England with the Papacy to 1327

INTRODUCTION

It is perhaps surprising that no systematic study of the episcopate of Richard de Kellawe has been undertaken before. It may well be argued that his episcopate was short, superficially unimportant, definitely untypical; that his completely local orientation renders him a small and unrewarding study; and that he was a monk, the general impression of whom is the personification of goodness and meekness, ineffectual in the harsh conditions of his time, and therefore uninteresting. The growing interest in administrative development can afford him little new concern, for it cannot be pretended that his episcopate was of major significance in either the growth or decline of palatine authority and jurisdiction. It is of mild interest to the ecclesiastical historian that he was the last monk ever to occupy the episcopal throne of Durham (and how he was able to gain it bears relation to the history of England as a whole, in the difficulties of Edward II). It is perhaps of more general interest that he held this important see at a time when the Scottish leader Robert Bruce was conducting his war against England by the expedient of a series of devastating raids into the northern extremity of the kingdom, at first suffering little resistance because of the

paralysis of the King of England in constitutional strife at home, later inflicting at Bannockburn the greatest ever defeat of an English army at the hands of the Scots.

Yet Kellawe means much more than this, as only a very little study of his episcopate will reveal. It will show him to be a capable and realistic bishop, combining the sincerity of the religious with the practical necessities of spiritual jurisdiction and temporal administration. It gives a clearer insight into the pattern of Durham history if taken with what went before and what came after. It will show above all that Kellawe's episcopate was certainly not a "negative" one.

But the overwhelming reason for studying Kellawe's episcopate is the survival of his episcopal register; this is the first of the very few Durham registers extant, and although by no means complete, forms a solid basis for a detailed study of the episcopate. A valid criticism of Kellawe's episcopate is its untypicality-a monk-bishop, whose sole concern was the Church in a limited area, who was constantly resident in or near his diocese, a bishop whose earlier career had consisted largely in leading a struggle against his predecessor, a bishop with no previous connection with the King or with royal service-

all this makes Kellawe appear an archaic survival in the fourteenth century. But this does not detract from the value of the register (nor indeed from the episcopate), as a source of information concerning the workings of administrative machinery and ecclesiastical procedure. It has proved a valuable source to those who have made use of it as a mean of comparison in establishing the nature of these procedures in other episcopates and in other dioceses. Yet no composite picture has been formed of this episcopate, better documented than any other Durham episcopate before Hatfield's. A more substantial criticism of it as untypical is that what it reveals are the workings of an episcopate under stress, diocesan organisation stretched to its limits by the destruction of the Scots. True enough-but does this not engender greater interest, and afford greater credit to the bishop who, in the face of such troubles, strove to maintain his spiritual and temporal jurisdiction, and in a measure succeeded?

Rather, the true nature of the episcopate has hitherto been misunderstood by historians of a previous generation and a different standard of criticism, affected by over-reliance on naturally coloured chronicle sources, with a tinge too of misplaced piety. The material we possess, none of it

written after the beginning of the twentieth century, consists of short sections in compendia of all the bishops of Durham, wherein Kellawe is but an interlude bounded on either side by bishops of stronger-and generally more nefarious-character. Such works are Hutchinson's, Surtees and Fordyce's histories (all called "History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham", of 1785, 1816 and 1857 respectively), and the Victoria County History of Durham, begun in 1900. The fault common to all is an assumption that because Kellawe was a monk, holiness was his predominant characteristic, and that he was detached from the ways of the world, and frankly incompetent. Nothing could be farther from the truth. It is perhaps understandable that such an impression should arise from the Scottish devastation of his diocese, though the question should arise of how far he could have prevented this -and as we shall see, there is evidence that he tried to do what he could in this situation.[1] Though it would be wrong to condemn out of hand all previous views of Kellawe, it must be recorded that his true nature seems to have been oversimplified to the point of inaccuracy.

Thus we read in Fordyce of "the bishop, who, unlike his predecessor, knew only the arts of peace"; and "as a prelate,

1 Cap. II

Bishop Kellow's character was irreproachable. He was humble, unostentatious, peaceable and just."[2] Surtees' history is a great work, and it would be unfair to smite him too severely, but we must consider carefully before accepting, "Richard Kellow carried with him to the Palatine throne the piety and humility of the cloister"; and "yet from the Palatine throne Kellow might often look back with regret on the tranquillity of the Convent"[3]-Surtees has but a limited appreciation of the state of the Convent under Bek, and the nature of the feelings that produced Kellawe. Hutchinson faithfully records the story as told by Graystanes, with little pronouncement; but the Victoria County History, firmly based on Hutchinson, nevertheless concludes that "the episcopate of Richard Kellawe, Bek'ssuccessor, was one of the most disastrous in the annals of Durham. Owing to the supineness of the central authority, the men of the bishopric were left to a large extent to their own devices in dealing with the Scottish inroads....The meek and pious Kellawe was not the man to grapple effectively with the difficulties of the military situation, accented as they were by the defeat of Bannockburn, and the condition of the Palatinate, when famine aggravated the evils of war."[4] It will be shown in

2 Fordyce, op. cit., Vol. I p. 49
3 Surtees, op. cit., Vol. I p. xxxv-xxxvi
4 VCH II 156

due course that this judgement is completely untrue. Even Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy, the editor of the Rolls Series edition of Kellawe's register, while displaying a greater appreciation of the material he had at hand, took pains above all to point out how the documents show that Kellawe had a gentle, kindly and forgiving nature, and showed his worth by encouraging learning among the clergy, and punishing incontinence among the laity, even to the highest in the liberty.[5] Without denying that all this is true-though recognising that it is overstressed, and such qualities were by no means confined to Kellawe-it is suggested here that there was much more to the bishop than his previous biographers have been led to realise, and there is a need for a fresh and perhaps more mature assessment of his episcopate.

With careful reference to the sources which are available, both in print and in manuscript, foremost among them the register itself and the chronicle of Robert de Graystanes-a Durham monk, himself elected bishop, though unsuccessfully, in 1333-such a reappraisal can reasonably be attempted. It is this which the following chapters seek

5 Reg. III civ-cx, cxviii-cxxxi

to offer. They constitute an attempt to discover what sort of man Kellawe really was, how important, in himself and in what he represented, and how capable he showed himself to be in dealing with the problems which beset his episcopate. They will seek to establish the nature and extent of his relations with and his position vis-à-vis the convent and commonalty of Durham, the King, the Pope and the Archbishop of York, and how important or unimportant these relations were in the wider history of the bishopric of Durham. They will consider what can be learned from the episcopate of administration of the franchise, and the nature of the Church and religious life at local level, in the parishes and the religious houses, and amongst the laity, and what interest in and effect upon this life the Bishop had. They will discuss the effect on the episcopate of the Scottish inroads, how far Kellawe was able to cope with them, and how far they both prevented the functioning of a strong episcopate, and paradoxically demonstrated that one existed. It is hoped that these pages will prove an addition of some small value to the work done on other medieval bishops of Durham in the last few years. But their main purpose will be to transfer Richard de Kellawe from his

pedestal of saintly weakness to his true position of strength and worldly reality-to show that here was no mere monkish interlude, but an episcopate worthy to succeed that of Bek.

I KELLAWE-THE MAN AND HIS INHERITANCE

Antony Bek, Patriarch of Jerusalem and Bishop of Durham, died on 3 March 1311, and was buried inside Durham Cathedral, the first to be so honoured since St. Cuthbert.[1] His death brought to an end a full and fascinating episcopate. It was a time of dispute, with the King, the Pope, the Archbishops of York, and the prior and convent and commonalty of Durham, which resulted largely from Bek's policy of wide-scale augmentation of his franchise.[2] In this venture, he had enjoyed success, and he had also suffered setback. His greatest achievement was to create "in the north of England from an antique franchise, a highly centralised liberty on the royal model of the greatest strategic value".[3] Yet posthumously he was defeated. His greatest battle was with his own convent., a battle personified in bitter and lasting hatred of its prior, Richard de Hoton, who had fought Bek on all possible occasions, and thwarted his designs on many.[4] Hoton died in 1308; but a man who appears to have been his close colleague,

1 Fraser (1957) p.228; S.T. p.91
2 Fraser (1957) p.231, et.passim.
3 Fraser (1951) Cap. X
4 See Fraser (1951, 1957)

brother Richard de Kellawe, succeeded Bek as bishop of Durham in 1311.

Prior Hoton's part in the long struggle was by far the most important and the most conspicuous. The most spectacular stage of the contest began in 1300, when Hoton refused to admit Bek as visitor unless Bek came alone; when Bek retaliated by besieging the convent, Hoton resisted this siege, until at length two rebel monks dragged him from his stall, and he was imprisoned and his office usurped by Henry de Luceby, prior of Holy Island. Hoton was twice suspended from his office, and twice restored, after prosecuting his case at the Curia. News of his second restoration was immediately succeeded by news of his death on 9 January 1308, worn out by long years of struggle, litigation and intrigue. These are the salient facts of a long and complex issue involving questions of custom and canon law.[5]

Less easy to establish, however, is the part played in the struggle by Hoton's chief colleagues, foremost among them Richard de Kellawe. Yet enough evidence may be gathered

5 As the work of Hoton has constituted a large part of Dr. Fraser's work on Bek, it would be improper to reproduce much of it here.

to believe that Kellawe was closely associated with Hoton in all he did. When Kellawe entered the convent, or how old he was, we do not know. In 1300, however, he became third prior, and in 1302 subprior.[6] After the siege of 1300, when Luceby had been successfully intruded, Bek sought to resume his visitation; the convent, however, under Kellawe's leadership, repudiated the validity of the Evenwood agreement on the grounds that Bek himself had not observed it, and appealed to York and Rome-the opposition being so fierce that Bek withdrew.[7] A process was brought against both Hoton and Kellawe by the intruded prior Luceby, but this was successfully contested and quashed by papal letters.[8] On 19 March 1301, Kellawe appeared as the convent's proctor "en la pleine Curt le Esueke en la sale des pletz a Doream", and before the Bishop's justices and others of his council requested that various injustices committed by the Bishop and his officers against the prior and convent should be redressed, and that the protection afforded them by the King should be observed-though the justices refused to admit the King's writ.[9] In 1302, when news was received that Hoton was

6 S.T. p.79; Loc. VII 7. In "Gesta Dunelmensia A.D. m°ccc°, he occurs as subprior in 1300, in which office he had long arguments with Bek during the visitation. This is certainly wrong.

7 Fraser (1957) p.145; Gesta Dunelmensia pp.34, 39-43; Loc. VII 24; MC 5823 (Loc. XXVII 2)

8 Fraser (1951)

9 Fraser (1957) pp.84, 155; Loc. VII 45

to be restored, Luceby lost all control over the monks. Excitement ran high when on April 14, Kellawe publicly read the text of the mandate authorizing the restoration, having previously safeguarded the rights of the papal executors, who alone might enforce it; Luceby slunk from the convent (accompaniedby Henry de Stanford, the almoner, another adherent of Bek), leaving the monks, with Kellawe at their head, victorious.[10] At this time, Kellawe acted as Hoton's vicar-general, in which capacity he made presentations to churches of which the convent held the advowson-presentations which were frequently contested.[11]

One fact possibly detracts from the picture of Kellawe as an avid supporter of Hoton. When C. M. Fraser was doing research into the episcopate of Bek, she discovered a letter of 1302 sent by Hoton, who was then at the Curia, to the convent.[12] This condemns the lack of support which the prior was receiving from his monks, and seems to belie the impression of a convent under Kellawe eager in active participation in their prior's struggle. It may possibly, however, be fairly interpreted as a cry of despair from a man

10 Fraser (1957) p.158
11 Fraser (1951)
12 Fraser (1951) Appendix

beset with difficulties who perhaps did not realise the problems encountered by those he had left behind, labouring under an intruded prior, the vehicle of their enemy. The letter ends with a command to Kellawe, the subprior, to remove the new prior of Holy Island (unnamed, but obviously a supporter of Bek, and quite probably intruded, like Luceby, whom he succeeded); if Hugh de Monte Alto, previously prior, and a supporter of Hoton, might not be restored, some other adherent was to be put in his place. The immediate result of this command is not apparent; but by 26 April 1305, Kellawe himself was prior of Holy Island.[13]

After Hoton's death, a free election of a new prior was prevented by Bek's success in postulating William de Tanfield, former monk of St. Mary's York, and lately prior of Wetheral in Cumberland,[14] a procedure aided by Hoton's death in the proximity of the Curia. It may fairly be conjectured that had an election taken place, Kellawe might well have been the convent's choice as Hoton's successor, as three years later they chose him as Bek's successor (though equally the choice could have gone to Geoffrey de

13 Loc. VII 7
14 Fraser (1957) p.169; S.T. p.85

Burdon, more extreme than Kellawe and nearer Hoton's outlook, who would have less chance in 1311 as Kellawe would be the more respectable candidate). Rather, Kellawe was probably removed from what office he held. We do not know when he ceased to be prior of Holy Island, but in the election document of 1311, Stephen de Howden appears in this capacity[15] -if Kellawe was removed, it was possibly now, as Burdon was removed from the priorship of Finchale.[16] The lack of organized resistance during the visitation of 3 February 1309 suggests that Hoton's friends had lost their power, though this might reflect merely that the monks were disheartened and submissive, in view of the fact that after long years of struggle, the Bishop and his nominees were more firmly in control than ever, because of the unjust participation of death in the contest, and too because the strain of constant litigation had imposed a grinding debt upon the convent. From this point on, Kellawe is less conspicuous. It might be that as a realistic man, as more moderate than the extremist Burdon, he knew that the struggle was lost, and he knew when to yield as well as when to fight. Certainly

15 Loc. VI 9a
16 Fraser (1957) p.169

Kellawe suffered nothing of,the fate of Burdon. On 15 May 1310, Bek sent his commissaries to the convent. Thirty-five monks appeared, including Kellawe and Burdon, humbly petitioning to be removed from sentences of excommunication passed on them at the visitations of 1300 and 1309. Their request was granted on 24 May, except to Burdon.[17] On 13 December, Bek sent a mandate from London to the prior, subprior and joint third priors to examine and alter sentences passed by his commissaries and decide penances, saving only that Burdon was to be removed to Coldingham, the cell whither it seems to have been customary to despatch all troublesome monks. He was to be deprived of all office, and to be denied both fellowship with the other monks and a voice in chapter for ten years. He was further forbidden communication with the outside world, awarded a meagre diet, and directed to say psalms for the soul of Antony Bek.[18] This individual treatment of Burdon-the modern word "victimisation" might be a better description-could not have been successful for long. Burdon returned to Durham to play an active part in the election of Kellawe as bishop three months later, and

17 Fraser (1957) p.173
18 Fraser (1957) p.174

thereafter appears as subprior of Durham, in place of Henry de Stanford, (a supporter of Bek, who became prior of Finchale -was this a deliberate concentration of the victorious party in the mother house, and an expulsion of Bek's party?; if so, it follows the policy of both Hoton and Bek), rising after Tanfield's retirement to the priorship itself.[19] The fact that Kellawe did not suffer Burdon's fate does not make him any the less an avid supporter of Hoton. Had he not been so, or even had he compromised himself from his previous support more than was necessary after Hoton's death, it is unlikely that he would have been elected bishop by a convent of which the majority had been solidly behind Hoton. If this is certain, then the very fact of Kellawe's election belies the traditional view of Kellawe's episcopate as a victory of all that was meek and pious and good, of Kellawe himself as detached from the world and its wiles, and indeed as the epitome of saintly incompetence. If the present reading of Kellawe before his elevation to the episcopal throne is more realistic, then he must have been a determined and able man, with qualities of leadership. Without such qualities, he would not have been Hoton's lieutenant, nor

19 See below, and Cap. IV

would he have been likely to have been chosen as bishop when such qualities were a dire necessity. That much of his episcopate was a time of trouble is an indication of the magnitude of his problems rather than a reflection on his character.

The election of 1311 was not, however, straightforward. Once again, some of the leading monks, including both prior and subprior, were under sentence of excommunication -imposed this time by William Greenfield, Archbishop of York. It is difficult to determine exactly what Greenfield's justification for this act was. The question of rights of administration of Durham "sede vacante" had been presumed to have been settled by the aggreement of 2 November 1286, which had ended the Bek-Romeyn struggle.[20] By this agreement, York ceded its claims of "jurisdiction as metropolitan during a vacancy, accepting the position only of diocesan. Greenfield nevertheless saw fit to excommunicate all concerned when the prior and chapter ventured to appoint officers to administer the diocese during the vacancy.[21] When

20 Fraser (1957) p.48; S.T. App. pp.xciv-xcvi; R. Brentano, York Metropolitan Jurisdiction, pp. 78, 144

21 S.T. p.92

the day of election-31 March, the Wednesday after the Annunciation before Palm Sunday[22] drew near, There was great anxiety in the convent regarding what should be done. It was obvious, as Graystanes states, that the Archbishop would never accept the result of an election performed by those under ecclesiastical censure.[23] At the same time, much harm would accrue if the convent did not proceed to an election. If the monks did not elect, they would have no chance at all of procuring their own nominee as bishop, and would find it difficult to do so in the future. At length, it was agreed that those under excommunication should absent themselves from the election, leaving the responsibility to those of their brethren who were free to proceed.[24] In this way all would be legitimate, and the right of election could not be denied.

This is borne out by the public notary's declaration of the election.[25] Brother Henry de Castro, one of the "compromissarii", requires "omnes suspensos, excommunicatos, et interdictos" to retire from the chapter, because it was neither their "intentio vel voluntas cum talibus procedere".[26]

22 Loc. VI 9a
23 S.T. p.93
24 Ibid.
25 Loc. VI 9a
26 Ibid.; see Appendix A

The list of monks able to elect comprises fifty-seven names, plus the eleven "compromissarii", beginning with Reginald de Barneby, third prior, confirming that both the prior and subprior, and possibly a third prior, if there were still joint third priors, were absent.[27] Other holders of offices were similarly absent: the list includes a succentor, but no precentor. A number of interesting names do appear on this document, however, foremost among them Geoffrey de Burdon, Hugh de Monte Alto, almoner, and Geoffrey de Haxeby, all of them among the eleven "compromissarii". In fact, an interesting situation seems to have arisen. In the convent's previous struggles with the Bishop, it was the "left wing" element-Hoton's, Kellawe's and Burdon's party-who suffered ecclesiastical censure, rather than the "right wing", if the convenient political anachronism be allowed, and not understood to apply too rigidly; though it is interesting to note that Tanfield had to be absolved with the rest of his convent in 1310.[28] The element which clashed with the Archbishop was, however, the "right wing". It was Tanfield, Bek's prior, who sought to take control during the vacancy, in accordance with Bek's struggle against York, and it was

27 Loc. VI 9a
28 Fraser (1957) p.175

Tanfield's party which was excommunicated by Greenfield for so doing, leaving the "left wing", notably Burdon, Monte Alto, a previous supporter of Hoton and a close confidante of Bishop Kellawe,[29] and Haxeby, also close to Kellawe,[30] to proceed to the election. The monks excommunicated for assuming administration during the vacancy, would be concentrated in the mother house. In this circumstance, the monks of outlying cells might possibly have constituted a majority, or at least a largef element than would be usual. The effect of this is, however, difficult to assess. On the one hand, it was to these cells that the troublemakers were sent, and here adherence to the ideas of Hoton should have been strongest. On the other, when Hoton had been prior, he tried as far as possible to expel the "right wing" to the peripheral cells, leaving a hard core of,his own supporters at Durham[31] (though possibly he liked these cells to have a"left wing" prior, to check any stirrings of revolt-hence the wish for Monte Alto's return to Holy Island, followed by Kellawe's transfer there; unless of course Hoton was dissatisfied with Kellawe's work while Hoton himself had been at the Curia, though this is

29 See Cap. V
30 Reg. I 45
31 Fraser

unlikely). It is possible that during the reactionary period after Hoton's death, this process was reversed-the "left wing" sent to outlying cells, the "right wing" brought back to Durham, the "left wing" head of the cell of Holy Island replaced. Certainly Burdon was sent to Coldingham, the most apparent place of exile for the recalcitrant; but Holy Island may have served the same purpose, and Kellawe had been to Holy Island, which may be a significant element in his election. With the "right wing" concentrted in Durham, and disabled, the influx ofa"left wing" hard core from the outlying cells may have been a vital factor.

Kellawe himself was not among the fifty-seven monks who elected, nor the eleven "compromissarii". This may suggest that he too was excommunicate, though if what has been suggested about the "left-right" split is true, when Tanfield assumed administration during the vacancy, he would have no place in his administration for one of Hoton's chief colleagues. For this reason, Kellawe may not have been excommunicate. There is the question too whether a man under sentence of excommunication could canonically be elected. It is very doubtful whether he would be considered "ydoneus"; canon law stressed legitimacy, and elections were very formal proceedings. In any case, canon law apart, the convent had been at pains to

purge the proceeding of any element which would or could be seized upon to cast the validity of the election into doubt; it is unlikely that they would compromise all this by choosing a man whose election could thus be contested. Kellawe's absence is more probably to be explained by the likelihood that he would be elected, especially by a hard core "left wing" accentuated by Tanfield's and others' disability. This possibility is borne out by the mention in Graystanes of those absenting themselves along with the excommunicate "de quibus erat spes quod eligerentur".[32] Though not a holder of office, Kellawe was certainly one of the senior monks, had held high office, and had displayed his worth and his qualities. At the same time, the very fact of election by compromise rather than by inspiration would suggest that Kellawe was not an absolutely certain choice; if he was a unanimous choice, it was only of the "left".

There is a note of irony in all this-that Bek should have devoted so much effort to crushing the "left wing" in the convent, and buiding up his own party, which, when he died, clashed with York, another of Bek's causes, as a result of which the "left wing" was left free to elect Bek's successor.

32 S.T. p.93

But all this is relative. It is impossible to say how deep the division was. Would there have been in 1311 as bitter feelings as there would have been in the days of the siege of 1300? The decline in anti-episcopal agitation in 1309-11 may indicate that to some extent Hoton's party had died with him. Bek's might similarly have lost vitality. There was not again bitterness on the surface in any way approximating that of Hoton's day. Kellawe as bishop in 1311 and Burdon as prior in 1313[33] are, it is suggested, definite and deliberate choices of men of the old "left". Yet when Kellawe was bishop, Prior Tanfield suffered no heartfelt opposition, in the way that the convent under Kellawe's leadership had made execution of his office all but impossible for the intruded prior Luceby in 1300-02; and when Kellawe died, the convent's choice for his successor was not a "left wing" man at all, but Henry de Stanford, a firm adherent of Bek and colleague of Luceby.[34] Even so, it would be an underestimation to think of this rift as anything less than important-Kellawe was the definite result of years of opposition. The existence of a split is not belied by the co-operation of "left" and "right"

33 See Cap. IV
34 Fraser (1957) p.158

in the election of Kellawe-the"right" by preserving its validity. It was in the interests of all that the election should proceed, for all, whatever their sympathies, were first monks of Durham, and many had probably been faced with a choice of sides which they did not wish to make, and were glad to abandon. Whether for all or none of the suggested reasons, on 31 March 1311, brother Richard de Kellawe was solemnly elected to be the new bishop of Durham. It remained now whether that election would be able to stand.

Edward II had granted the monks the congé d'élire on 20 March 1311, after two of the brethren, Richard de Kellawe himself and Hughde Monte Alto, had brought news of the vacancy to him at Berwick.[35] However, before the election took place, he sent Gilbert de Clare, earl of Gloucester and Hereford, then King's lieutenant in England,[36] to cause the monks to elect as their new bishop the King's kinsman Antolin de Pisana[37]-an obscure figure, whom a search through Patent and Close Rolls and Papal Letters has failed to identify. This, according to Graystanes, they could not bring themselves to

35 CPR p.334
36 CPR p.337
37 S.T. p.93

do, because he was unknown to them, he was a foreigner, and also under canonical age.[38] They were also promised large sums of money by Piers Gaveston, the King's favourite, if they would procure him the bishopric, but this they could not do because they feared God. They elected a monk because this would bring greater benefit than any favours of kings, in this world as well as in the world to come. Apparently the King did not mind this; when excuses were offered for not complying with his wishes, the King himself added that still worse was the fact that his kinsman was an Augustinian friar and apostate.[39] The royal assent was given to Kellawe's election at Berwick on 11 April. On 20 May, Henry de Percy, keeper of the bishopric of Durham and lands pertaining to it during the vacancy, was instructed to restore the temporalities of the see to the new bishop.[40] Kellawe had previously professed obedience to the Archbishop of York, examined by him at Hexham, and confirmed by him on 13 May;[41] he was consecreted at St. Peter's York on 31 May, and enthroned in Durham on 4 September, St. Cuthbert's day.[42]

Why was this election allowed to stand? Basically,

38 S. T. p.93
39 Ibid.
40 Reg. I 1; CPR p.349
41 Reg. I 1-3
42 S.T. p. 92

Graystanes is right-the King was either unable or unwilling to overturn it. 1311 was the year of the Ordinances, and the long drawn-out conflict with the Lords Ordainers, which paralysed much royal and governmental activity at this time -one reason why the north of England suffered so badly from Scottish aggression-may have so preoccupied Edward II that he was unable to devote the thought, will, and to have the time and energy necessary to interpose a candidate, so allowing the monks victory by default; a possibility borne out at least by the chronology of the baronial programme. Certainly it could make the difference between an election being upheld in 1311 and overturned in 1316. Yet there was a royal candidate in 1311, in the person of the mysterious Pisana, albeit a weaker one than in 1316. There are too other factors. Graystanes tells us that in 1316, Edward was unwilling to overturn the election of Henry de Stanford, doing so only when his Queen begged it of him as a personal favour.[43] If this is true-and it might be just an attempt to deny further Beaumont's right to the bishopric-there might well have been equal unwillingness on the King's part to reverse the election of 1311; Pisana might have been able to exert sufficient pressure upon the King for his election to be requested, but not enough to force him

43 S.T. p.98

to secure it when the monks failed to comply. The enigmatic character of Edward II might be as important a factor as the exigencies of the political situation. The historian can point to other facts: the precedent of monk-bishops like Robert de Stichill and Robert de Insula; the fact that Bek had been the monks' choice in 1283[44] (though admittedly one that the King might be expected to favour), and that no episcopal election to the see of Durham had been overturned for some considerable time. He may point to other dioceses like Worcester, where a monk of the convent became bishop as late as 1339; where, of the nine bishops consecrated in the first half of the fourteenth century, Gainsburgh was Franciscan, Hemenhale and Bransford Benedictine.[45] (In fact, there were only five elections: three were superseded, one -of a royal nominee-was ignored because the bishop-elect preferred to await papal provision, and only Bransford was freely elected by the chapter, and that was at the second attempt.[46]) A monk-bishop might properly be regarded as a survival from a previous era, or as a return to a tradition only recently broken; the old and the new overlapped at this time, and the monk-bishop was not entirely a thing of the past.

44 Fraser (1957) p.34
45 Haines p.76
46 Haines p.294

In Durham, nevertheless, Kellawe represented a last manifestation of the old order. Special considerations may have weighed in Kellawe's case-Edward II might have remembered the protection his father gave the convent against Bishop Bek-though this is unlikely. It remains a mystery why, in such a geographically and strategically critical see, a monk was allowed to be elected bishop with but a faint offering of royal opposition, one of the few elections to pass so successfully. Kellawe might have seemed a suitable choice in the circumstances-the royal alternative was not a worthy candidate (if anything, probably less worthy than Beaumont in 1316, and lacking the support that he enjoyed). If it is surprising that there was not keener-and worthier-competition for this wealthy see, the answer might be found in the Scottish troubles, which had rendered the bishopric considerably less attractive; for even in a time of domestic political upheaval, a candidate should have appeared. In the event, however, it might be questionable whether the intrusion of another unpopular royal servant might have proved more advantageous than the restoration of internal peace which might accrue from the elevation of a local man. The question arises whether feudal society was yet sufficiently weakened in the

bishopric for the identity of its head-the bishop-no longer to matter. Probably it had not-the expreience of Bek had not been entirely happy, and this was a time of war, when there should be a drawing together rather than a breaking apart. The disadvantages of another bishop like Bek might have proved too pernicious at this point. In addition, in view of Durham's importance at this time, it might be suggested that however pressing his troubles, the King would never allow a bad choice on the monks' part to pass uncontested, that if Kellawe's election by the convent suggests that he was a strong man and a worthy choice, then his acceptance by the King reinforces that suggestion. But in the last analysis, the Ordainers were probably the critical factor, which alone of the intangibles could affect the balance. It is probable that Richard de Kellawe became bishop of Durham because Edward II could find no satisfactory alternative in the situation as it then existed.

Who was this Richard de Kellawe, this monk so elevated by ecclesiastical strife and warfare to the pinnacle of episcopal power? His parentage is less easy to trace than that of a royal servant like Bek. Most probably, however,

he was a member of the large local family, of gentle stock and moderate landed wealth, which took its name from Kelloe, some seven miles from Durham, descending from Luke de Kellawe (1167). It is unfortunate that in the Greenwell deeds, in which the Kellawe family is very prominent, that Richard would nowhere appear as being granted land, nor his parentage stated. The numerous Kellawes who surrounded him after his elevation to the bishopric can, however, be identified, notably Patrick (though the other prominent member of the family, mr. William, cannot be identified with certainty, as the name is so common). The most significant document is the charter of 27 July 1315 whereby Patrick de Kellawe confirmed to John de Carlisle, clerk, the manor of "Herebarus"-which appears to have been in Chester ward, though it has not proved possible to locate it-which Patrick held of his brother, Bishop Richard. ("Sciant presentes et futuri quod ego, Patricius de Kellawe, dedi concessi et hac presenti carta mea confirmavi Johanni de Carliolo capellano totum manerium de Herebarus cum pertinentiis. Videlicet quicquid huius(?) de dono et feoffamento venerabilis patris domini Ricardi Dunelmensi episcopi fratris mei, de bosco et vasto quae vacabantur Herebarus in Cestr'...."[47]) In no other place, in the Greenwell

47 Greenwell Deeds, D.39

deeds or in the Bishop's charters, is the relationship with any other member of the Kellawe family so precisely stated. It is the more unfortunate, therefore, that nowhere is Patrick's parentage stated. In his introduction to the Calendar of the Greenwell deeds, A. H. Thompson speaks rightly of "the somewhat difficult ramifications of the family which took its name from Kelloe", and "the prolific house of Kellawe". It is at least certain that Bishop Richard was one of that family.

This lengthy resumé of the events before 1311, in particular Kellawe's part in them, and their connection with the conduct of the election, has been necessary because the significance of Kellawe's elevation to the episcopate cannot be appreciated apart from them. Nor can the character of the Bishop himself. 1311 is to be seen as a time of defeat for all that had gone before, a time when the previous opposition proved victorious. Kellawe is to be seen as the personification of this opposition. He emerges after years of strife to begin a new order-and probably the greatest blow to those to whom he represented success was his death after only five and a half years. The part of the King in all this is enigmatic, and yet of critical importance. With royal initiative lacking,

Richard de Kellawe was made lord of the palatine franchise of Durham, and left to rule it, in one of the most difficult periods it experienced.

To what did Kellawe succeed? A tradition of strife in Durham, but yet at the same time a bishopric better ordered and administered. A tradition of local separation, strengthened rather than weakened by the episcopate of a royal servant, despite reverse and setback, by Bek's realisation of firm palatine status. An ordered and disciplined diocese, but one soon to be cast into disarray by border warfare. Of all this, a Durham monk was once again lord.

But what was the new Bishop going to be like? He had resisted Bek in Durham, and from this viewpoint, would be unlike Bek in every respect. Bek was a royal servant, for whom the Church must inevitably have been a secondary consideration-though it was recognised that his churchmanship was beyond reproach, and probably, in his own terms, he was a very good churchman. Kellawe was a monk, to whom the Church was a whole way of life-even to the depths of ecclesiastical politics. Bek was at times both loved and hated by the King. Kellawe was neither. Bek was in constant dissension with the convent and at odds with the commonalty. Kellawe enjoyed

good relations with the convent, and tried to weld the commonalty into an active organism under his headship.[48] Bek was an administrator and a franchise builder. Kellawe was a religious, and either not inclined, or not able to expand the jurisdiction of the Palatinate. Bek's interest was the kingdom as a whole, and he was constantly away from his diocese. Durham was the centre of Kellawe's life, and he was reluctant to leave his diocese, or at least the southern extremity of it,[49] even on the rare occasions on which he was obliged to do so. Bek was arrogant and mighty, and from this many of his problems derived. Kellawe was by no means the humble self-abnegating religious he has been painted, but he could exert himself without overriding, without bringing upon his head the concerted opposition of all those upon whom he exercised authority. This-as far as Durham was concerned-was the main difference between his episcopate and that of Bek. The accession of Kellawe promised a reign of internal peace, and that promise was fulfilled. At the same time, the two men were not completely opposite in character. Both were strong, determined, and able. The subprior had shown himself to be quite capable of resisting the bishop, yet knowing as well when it was time to yield. The monk-bishop was to show an ability as an admin-

48 See Cap. IV
49 See Itinerary, Appendix B

istrator which compared well with that of his predecessor; an ability to co-operate with the King's will when advantage accrued, or resist it when prejudicial; an ability to keep some order in his diocese when troubles beset it. For Kellawe's episcopate could not be a time of peace. The new threat was from without, for 1311 marked the beginning of the zenith of Scottish advance and the nadir of English initiative. The relationship of Edward II and Robert Bruce in Kellawe's time was far different from that of Edward I and John Balliol in Bek's. These were the years of tribute money, "Scavengers", ultimately Bannockburn. The Scottish war discoloured the whole of Kellawe's episcopate, and has proved responsible for much of the subsequent misconception concerning the character of the Bishop. His true character, his ability and his work were hidden by the crisis. Because of this, his could never be a great episcopate, but neither, as the following pages will seek to show, was it a time of incompetence and ineptitude. It was rather a time when moderate strength and ability proved insufficient to withstand problems which were too great to be resolved, and which probably have proved too much for any in similar circumstances to control. If the episcopate of the last monk-bishop was a time of distress

and failure, the main responsibility for this rests with the Scottish threat. To this threat, therefore, we must now turn our attention.

II THE EPISCOPATE UNDER STRESS-KELLAWE AND ROBERT BRUCE

Itis well realised that the coincidence of perhaps the most active ever period of Scottish ascendancy, under a determined and aggressive leader, and the almost complete paralysis of any English initiative in the war, brought about by a combination of the character and circumstance of a weak and vacillating king, must have had rep ercussions upon the north of England. It is probably not so well realised how serious these repercussions were, and how far-reaching their consequences on the administration of the bishopric of Durham. The episcopate of Kellawe cannot be understood apart from this strain, for some half the entries in his Register are either the result of these troubles, or are in some way coloured by them. It would be less than accurate to attempt to examine any aspect of Kellawe's episcopate without first making some serious consideration of the Scottish troubles and all that they entailed.

By 1311, Scottish policy consisted in taking advantage of England's domestic political struggles by a series of devastating raids in the northern counties, with the purpose of weakening English resources proportionately to replenish-

ing their own. Despite the fact of being bought off by a number of locally-negotiated truces[1]-which the Scots fairly observed- the destruction wrought by the Scots on these raids was both widespread and severe. Record after record tells the same story -churches burnt, cattle driven away, hostages taken, property destroyed. In October 1311, Robert de Pykewell, perpetual vicar of Haltwhistle, was given licence to farm the fruits of his vicarage for one year to pay the cost of his redemption from the Scots.[2] A year later, Haltwhistle no longer had any fruits to farm-the Bishop's return to the royal writ of 11 December 1312 touching the collection of the moiety granted to the King's father by the clergy reveals that "de bonis personae ecclesiae de Ovingham, aut vicarii de Norham, vicarii de Hautwisel' et vicarii de Hildreton', nihil invenimus sequestrandum aut levandum; quod omnia bona ipsorum per incursum et incendium Scottorum fuerunt et sunt, combusta, et omnino destructa."[3] Returns to further royal attempts to collect the same moiety show that devastated churches remained destroyed throughout the episcopate. The reply to the writ of 12 February 1315 tells again how of the churches of Ovingham and Haltwhistle "omnia sunt destructa per Scottos et malefactores in illis partibus commorantes."[4]

1 See below

2 Reg. I 95

3 Reg. II 899. The story is only too common: see also ibid. 851, 880, 925, 943, 1023. The unfortunate rector of

The use of the word "malafactores", and in other instances "inimicos", indicating a class of marauders apart from the Scots, is revealing, and refers probably to the "Shavaldi", the border jackals who took advantage of the Scottish incursions to rob and pillage their own fellow-countrymen.[5] The "Shavaldi" are mentioned by name in relation to the church of Whickham: "De bonis personae de Quicham sequestratis ad valentiam c. s., nihil levare possumus, quia in sequestro nostro asportabantur per fures et Shavaldos."[6] Alnham and Bywell St. Peter at some time suffered a similar fate to Ovingham and Haltwhistle, and for these churches and Washington, Stanhope and in other cases, the Bishop took it upon himself to supersede the King's writs.[7] Concerning Ovingham and Haltwhistle, a further return, in May 1315, discloses that now no official dared even to go near these churches: "Ad ecclesias vero de Ovingham et Hautwysel' non audet aliquis ministrorum nostrum nostrum accedere, ad aliquam jurisdictionem exercendam, propter metum Scottorum, nec sunt ibidem parochi-

Ovingham and vicar of Haltwhistle were excommunicated in 1314 because they were unable to pay (ibid. 966)

4 Reg. II 1054

5 Reg. II 1023, 1040; and see below

6 Reg. II 943

7 Reg. II 851, 880, 899, 925, 966

ani aliqui degentes."[8] The same picture occurs in many other parishes: there were no goods left which could be sequestered; if there were, no-one could be found to buy them "propter turbationem et guerram partium illarum" or "propter metum Scottorum";[9] sometimes it was too dangerous to attempt to go near, as in the case of Ford, "situata in Marchia Scotiae".[10] In any event, when subsidies were levied, seldom were they to the value demanded by the King.[11] The destruction is also to be seen in the answers to inquisitions into the defects of the church of Longhorseley, whose land had long lain uncultivated because of the frequent descents of the Scots, and Ford, whose "manerium....erat combustum per ingressum Scottorum, quod reparari non potest pro cc. l."[12] Perhaps for the most consistent evidence of decline, one has only to compare the values of benefices given in the "Nova Taxatio" with those of the 1291-92 taxation of Nicholas IV.[13]

Northumberland, of course, situated next to the Scottish border, suffered far worse than did Durham. No religious house

8 Reg. II 1084
9 Reg. II 1040, 943
10 Reg. II 1038
11 In connection with the foregoing instances of returns to royal writs, it should be noted that many of them were not executed, for reasons including (i) they were too late (e.g. Reg. II 940); (ii) the collectors were dead (ibid. 846); (iii) they involved too many people and too far-away places (ibid. 982).
12 Reg. II 721,723
13 Reg. III, Taxatio; and see below, Appendix D

in Durham experienced the depradation of Hexham (in the Archbishop of York's franchise), which was burned in 1312, ravaged again in 1314 and dispersed in 1315.[14] No religious house in Durham suffered either the "status miserabilis" of the nunnery of Holystone, or yet the impoverished state of Newminster, whose abbot was entered in 1315 as having no ecclesiastical property, and whose livestock had to be driven south to protect it; or Alnwick, whose depleted resources had to be replenished by the appropriation of the churches of Wooler and Fenton.[15] The threat was not so great: the Convent of Durham was called upon to pay only £4 10s. 10d. for protection of its Durham churches in 1314-15, but £45 6s. 8d. for its fewer churches in Northumberland.[16] At the beginning of his episcopate, the Bishop was unable to carry out his projected visitation of the archdeaconry of Northumberland, after that of Durham, because of the Scottish incursions.[17] But the threat was certainly there. In October 1314, Thomas de Clifford, dean of Auckland, was given a dispensation for non-residence because of the danger presented by the Scots[18]-though it is very probable, of course, that they provided merely a conven-

14 NCH III p.146; Lam. p.219; Reg. Greenfield II 82b
15 Reg. I 353, 444, 731; II 963; CPR 8 Ed. II p.163
16 Scammell p. 388; Durham Bursar's Roll 1314-15
17 Reg. I 75
18 Reg. I 619

ient excuse for such absence. Graystanes tells how the Scots invaded the prior of Durham's retreat at Bearpark in 1315, capturing the appurtenances of the prior's chapel, a large amount of silver, altar-cloths and trappings, sixty horses, one hundred and eighty cows with calves, some of the prior's family and very nearly the prior himself.[19] In 1312, while the Bishop was in London, the town of Durham itself was invaded and burned and pillaged by the Scots.[20] This, according to the Lanercost chronicler, was done by a part of the following which had come with Bruce against Hexham and Corbridge about the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin (15 August 1312), and entered Durham on market day and carried off all movable goods, burning much of the town and cruelly killing all those who opposed them, though naturally making little attempt on the castle or cathedral priory. They were stopped only by a truce-put by the chronicler at the over-high figure of £2000 against Graystanes' 1000 marks-which they accepted only if they were allowed free passage through the bishopric on their way to attack parts of England further south.[21]

19 S.T. p.96
20 S.T. p.94; Scotichronicon p.338
21 Lan. p.220

Kellawe was attending parliament in London in 1312 on the only occasion on which Durham itself was dangerously threatened by the Scots; but this was one of the only two periods during which he was away from the immediate area of his liberty for any length of time-the other was in 1314, during which he was probably also present at parliament. Normally the Scottish trouble was so severe that his permanent residence in or near Durham was obligatory-and as his itinerary shows, "near" Durham generally meant the perhaps safer area of the Bishop's Yorkshire franchise. He could not attend the general council of Clement V at Vienne in 1312-though here again the Scots might have afforded merely a convenient excuse for the non-discharge of a tedious and unpleasant duty-because, he explained to the Pope, as temporal as well as spiritual ruler of his people, he was responsible for their safety and defence as well as for their spiritual well-being, and Robert Bruce, claiming he was king of Scotland ("se regem Scotiae asserens"), with his "accomplices" and "confederates" (another reference to the "Shavaldi"?), had invaded and pillaged, and there was spilling of Christian blood, tyranny, cruelty, destruction of property, confusion and danger. He therefore begged the Pope to

accept as his representative his ubiquitous proctor, mr. John de Snaynton.[22] This could not have been entirely untrue; it was supported by the King, who wrote to the Pope in the same terms, at the same time sending other northern bishops, Greenfield archbishop of York and Halton bishop of Carlisle with safeconduct to the council "on the King's buisness."[23] For the same reason-"Sire Robert de Brus, vostre enemye, et de tute vostre terre, ad jeu faite assembler son hoste por entrer en vostre terre d'Engleterre"[24] -Kellawe could not attend the parliaments to which he was summoned, save the two at which he was probably present in 1312 and 1314, sending instead Snaynton and other proctors, such as William de Rasen, William de Ayremynne and Geoffrey de Edenham.[25] He thereby possibly missed important opportunities for co-ordinating the local resistance-such as it was-with the English war-effort as a whole,especially when the wording of the writ of summons intimated that an expedition to Scotland was particularly to be discussed.[26] One may be forgiven the suspicion that Kellawe used the permanent imminence of Scottish attack to escape performance of his duty in parlia-

22 Reg. I 92
23 Reg. I 73; Rymer p. 283; CPR 5 Ed. II p.378-79
24 Reg. I 386 (1 July 1313); see also ibid. II 912 (20 Feb. 1313)
25 Reg. I 384
26 Reg. II 935

ment, for his interests and inclinations were essentially Durham-centred, and bishops who lived and worked permanently in their dioceses were becoming increasingly rare. But this is perhaps belied by a similar request for dispensation from attending parliament by John de Halton, bishop of Carlisle, on 4 April 1314[27]; and, more significantly, by the express royal order of 20 February 1313 that the Bishop was "not to leave those parts, notwithstanding the King's late order to be with him on the third Sunday in Lent at Westminster, to take counsel concerning the affairs of the realm, but he is to send thither a proctor with power to assent to what shall then be ordained, as the King desires him to stay in those parts for the security of the same against the Scots."[28] (Halton received a similar injunction.)

It is probably fair to suggest that Kellawe was genuinely concerned for the safety and well-being of his franchise. The Scottish problem presented a devastating and apparently insuperable challenge thereto. Kellawe, as ruler of the franchise, however divorced he might be from a world of diplomacy and military expedition, was called upon to face this threat.

27 Reg. Halton F. 36b (also printed in Raine, Northern Registers, p.219)

28 CCR 6 Ed. II p.568

The Scottish problem, however, serious as it was, was not all. It was the progenitor of two other agents of destruction, the "Shavaldi" and the famine. The "Shavaldi"(or "Scavangers") are a somewhat mysterious body, for they are mentioned by name only once in the Register, though their existence is probably implied in other instances.[29] Yet according to Graystanes, Kellawe faced them as a threat in no uncertain way. "He dealt boldly with the "Shavaldi" rebels; some were hanged, some were chased out of the bishopric"; and he incurred the King's anger when "quidam qui portabat robas Episcopi"-almost certainly his brother Patrick, presumably at the Bishop's command-defeated and killed a brigand leader, John de Wardal, a kinsman of the King, on Holy Island. Edward, recorded Graystanes, was angered by the fact that this was done without his knowledge or command, and wrote to the Pope to have the Bishop removed, and to imprison his brother and put him to death, though in fact nothing was done.[30] Graystanes also mentions later Sir Gilbert de Middleton, who abducted Bishop Louis de Beaumont; the Lanercost chronicle records his eventual deserved fate of quartering.[31] But only a general picture of the "Shavaldi" can be formed-a picture of freebooters, the border jackals who flourish in war, "Scottish when they will and English

29 See above

at their pleasure."[32] This is sufficiently clear to show too, as J. Scammell points out, that the north of England was "a no-man's land, through which any armed force could pass at will."[33] But the fate of the "Shavaldi" on Holy Island shows also that Kellawe was prepared and able to strike at the threats to his bishopric in a decisive way which belies the impression of a man of weak character.[34]

But the destruction had taken its toll. The huge acreage of land destroyed by the Scots, or left uncultivated through fear of them, the plundering of cattle, the constant attacks with no hope of recovery or survival, had had their effects, especiallyin Northumberland. The populace had fled, and the land had become desolate. The Royal Escheator for

30 S.T. p.94. Even for Edward II, this attitude seems unreasonable. Possibly he was spiting the Bishop because the latter had refused to allow Gaveston, the hated royal favourite refuge in the Palatinate (ibid.; see Cap. VI); or just possibly, Graystanes is here confused, extending the royal anger for the one offence to the other also.

31 S.T. p.100-01; Lan. p.234

32Scammell p.388

33 Scammell p.396

34 See below

Northumberland, Cumberland and Westmorland recorded at Michaelmas 1315 that all the eight holdings from which rents were due were in ruins; a year later, only one yielded rent. Hexham accounts show that in 1316, a mere two or three people remained on each manor; the Archbishop of York's manor at Hexham showed a loss in assised rents of 98.4 percent. (This of course was the most wealthy part of the Tyne valley, and therefore the most prone to ravaging in the area most prone to ravaging; the Scots would come from the Balliol lordship of Tynedale, via Haltwhistle to Hexham, thence in a line to Corbridge, Bywell and Ovingham-all of which are prominent in the Register for their misfortunes-stopping short of Newcastle, possibly venturing over the river into Durham, occasionally as far as the twenty or so miles to Durham itself.) Even in Durham, where more stayed, tallage in 1316 was worth 34.7 percent less than in 1311.[35] To this destruction was added

35 These figures are quoted from Scammell, but one would hesitate to adopt entirely her conclusions that the poor tenantry completely disappeared, and that "neither people or animals remained"-especially as at the beginning of the article, she states that the buying of truces "maintained the semblance of normal life for many of the English." (p.385)

the natural disaster of the floods of 1315,which, beginning on St. Swithun's day, quickly surpassed their normal levels, and submerged the crops and the grass, washed away the mills, flooded houses and drowned men, women and children. This, coupled with disease which spread among the cattle, brought famine-famine so severe that the price of a quarter of corn reached forty shillings, and people died in the fields, on the pathways, among the crops and in the towns, "so many thousands of men" asserts Graystanes, "that they could scarcely be buried."[36] Special arrangements for the sale of corn had to be made to alleviate the famine.[37] The backcloth of Kellawe's episcopate, then, was one of war, destruction, desolation and famine. It is in the light of such a picture that his administration must be judged.

Of necessity, the Scottish situation demanded a dual approach. Immediately, the Scots had to be bought off by a series of locally-negotiated truces, to prevent further destruction. Over a longer period, they would have to be met and defeated, for this blackmail could not continue indefinitely. This would entail a merging of Durham resistance with that of the rest of

36 S.T. p.97
37 Reg. II 1119

the country-when at length the King and the barons stopped squabbling sufficiently to realise that neither could control some one-fifth of their kingdom until they did something about it. In November 1315, the King strongly condemned local truces, and forbade the contracting of any more[38]-but what else could be done as long as the north of England was left alone to face an enemy which it could not possibly restrain?

The Scots made many truces with individuals, but those with which we are concerned were those negotiated with the Scots by Durham itself, by a loose association of bishop, prior and convent and leading laymen.[39] Five such major truces were contracted during Kellawe's episcopate. The first, of 1311, was later extended to the spring of 1312. The third stretched from the autumn of 1312 to June1313, the fourth from the following autumn to September 1314, and the last ended at Christmas 1315. The extension of the first truce was negotiated by the prior of Durham himself, when Kellawe was away in London, at a cost said to be 1000 marks, and which allowed the Scots free passage through the bishopric.[40]

38 Reg. II 1100-01; Rymer p.540; Rot. Scot. p.151a

39 This raises the question of whether there was a "communitas episcopatus", which is discussed in Cap. IV. Some of the following information on truces derives from Scammell, and is not otherwise acknowledged.

40 Reg. I 191; MC 4265; S.T. p.94; Lan. p.220

It is evident that this was done with the Bishop's approval, for in November 1312, he wrote to Guy de Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, complaining that his tenants at Barnard Castle were not contributing to the truce made by common assent, while enjoying its advantages; and in any case, the prior had been one of the vicars-general appointed to administer the diocese while the Bishop was away.[41] In August 1312, Richard Marmeduke, steward of the bishopric of Durham, in company with William de Denum, the Bishop's secular chancellor, Gilbert Gategang and John de Alainsheles, who had been deputed by the commonalty for that purpose, met Robert Bruce himself at Hexham, and negotiated peace for "les gentz de la communalte del eveche de Deresme" until the following Nativity of St. John Baptist (24 June 1313) for a sum of money, of which the first instalment was to be paid on the feast of St. Michael then following (29 September-barely six weeks away).[42] The wide-scale organisation and integrity of this "truce-warfare" by the Scots is perhaps no better demonstrated than by the provision in this document for the punishment of any Scot who violated this agreement. (It is also interesting for being the first English record to admit Robert Bruce as "by the

41R eg. I 191; S.T. p.cxi, App. xcii
42 Reg. I 204

grace of God King of Scotland".) In October 1314, the Earl of Moray was actually at Durham when he promised the prior that the bishopric should enjoy peace until the following February for 800 marks, 400 within six weeks, and the balance seven weeks later.[43] In June 1315, Bruce was at Chester-le-Street and James Douglas at Hartlepool when they were offered a further 800 marks for immunity until Christmas-immunity from which Hartlepool-part of the Bruce fee-was exempted because some of its inhabitants had captured a ship taking armour and food to the Scots.[44] The completeness of the Scottish hold, their ability to ravage where they would without restraint, reveals that the only defence for the bishopric of Durham consisted in buying off its enemies for as long as it could.

This tribute money had to be collected speedily-often 400 marks in six weeks-and came essentially from three sources: graded levies on ecclesiastical benefices (at the same rate as ecclesiastical taxation), roughly assessed levies on manors (affecting those of bishop and convent as well as lay estates), and arbitrary seizures. The collectors included local incumbents who described themselves as appointed by

43 S.T. p.cxiii, App.xciv; Reg. Sec. Prioris et Conv. Dunelm 47b (Raine, Northern Registers p.227)

44 S.T. p.96

the Bishop, or by the clergy and people of the archdeaconry; in 1313, the collectors were William Graystoke, rector of St. Mary the less, Durham, and Robert, vicar of St. Oswald's, Durham.[45] In 1314, the bursar of Durham paid £4 10s. 10d. for the Convent's churches in the archdeaconry of Durham, and £9 4s. 0d. "pro temporalitatibus", "in contribucione facta Roberto Brus."[46] Finchale paid £1 16s. 8d. in 1314, and half this sum in the following year.[47] The prior and convent of Durham often made up deficiencies in the amounts collected, and stored the collections in the priory until they could be handed over.[48] The subordinate collectors, like William de Kellawe-whose service is probably indicative of the Bishop's consent to the proceedings-passed their amounts to the leading laymen to assemble and deliver. These men, Richard Marmeduke, Robert Neville and William de Denum, secular chancellor, were responsible for delivering the money to the Scots. This involved difficult journeys through the wastes of Northumberland into enemy territory-Hulme Cultram in 1312, Jedburgh in 1314, or Marmeduke's unspecified destination.[49] One interesting

45 MC 5055
46 Durham Bursar's Roll 1314-15
47 Priory of Finchale, ed. J. Raine, Surtees Soc.
48 Loc. XXVII 31; MC 5055
49 Reg. I 204; S.T. p.cxiii, App.xciv; Loc. XXVII 31

helper was Robert Dichburn, a monk of Durham, who after being censured at the visitation of 1314, was probably removed to Coldingham, whence even too he might have been expelled; he seems to have had "friends and well-wishers in those parts" and "a taste for uncanonical wanderings", and eventually disappeared in Scotland in 1318.[50] The fact that the Marmedukes were tenants of Robert Bruce, and that the Nevilles were on bad terms with the Bishop-Ralph was made to do penance for incest[51]-together with certain extant receipts, suggests to J. Scammell that the integrity of thesemen was not beyond doubt, that some of the tribute-money was diverted into their hands, and that they were possibly even in league with the "Scavengers".[52] At best the buying of truces could be but a temporary expedient. Alleviation of the Scottish stranglehold demanded much sterner resistance.

One defence lay in prayer. On 4 September 1312, William Greenfield, archbishop of York, issued a mandate to his suffragans-Durham, Carlisle and Whithorn-to pray for the King and

50 Scammell p.395; Loc. XXVII 31, 30
51 S.T. p.94
52 Scammell p.399-401

Queen and the peace of the kingdom.[53] On 29 May 1314, he requested the prayers of all in the diocese of Durham for the success of the King and his army, on their way to punish the Scots for the atrocities they had committed, and encouraged the supplication by the grant of forty days' indulgence.[54] On 5 June, Kellawe accordingly commended to the Convent this request for the offering of prayers for peace, and for the King's success in the war against Robert Bruce, who had taken up arms against the King, and had burned and shed blood, and had violated holy places, wherefore they who served not with spear and sword should serve with prayer.[55] It seemed to the Lanercost chronicler that the subsequent defeat of Edward's "splendid and numerous army, if only they had had the Lord as their ally", at Bannockburn on 24 June 1314 proved that God was on the side of the Scots; this happened because the Scots had prayed to Him, whereas Edward II had forsaken his father's practice of praying at shrines and bestowing gifts on monasteries as he travelled north.[56]

The provision of money to pay the cost of fighting the

53 Reg. Greenfield I 314

54 Reg. I 558; Reg. Greenfield II 211-12 (also in Raine, Northern Registers p.220)

55 Reg. I 556; Reg. Secundum Prior. et Conv. Dunelm. 46a.b. (Raine, op. cit. p.222)

56 Lan. p.224-25

war was another important necessity. Yet one of the earliest entries in Kellawe's Register is the letter to the King of Whitmonday 1311 from the Archbishop of York and his suffragans refusing the King's request for a subsidy of a thirteenth to enable him to carry on his affairs in Scotland.[57] In these days when Edward was locked in conflict with the Ordainers, it might have been felt that the money would not have been well spent. The returns to royal writs levying subsidies,[58] and the difficulty of collecting papal taxation, particularly the procurations of Cardinal Arnald,[59] suggest that it was no easy matter to raise ordinary taxation, quite apart from extra impositions to meet the Scottish threat. The Scots, after all, were destroying the churches that were to be called upon to contribute extra subsidies to defeat them. Consequently, the King, to raise money for the war, had to resort to dubious methods, such as procuring for himself the sexennial tenth for a crusade to the Holy Land, that Clement V had imposed at the Council of Vienne, to begin on 1 October 1313, with the bishops acting as collectors in their dioceses, first by claiming that the late Pope had granted him this money for the

57 Reg. I 6
58 See above
59 Reg. I 396 et seq.; Lunt pp.562-64

Scots war, later by forcing loans from the collections, which the bishops eventually had to reimburse from clerical subsidies of 1314-15.[60] Yet a real attempt was made by the bishopric of Durham to provide money to meet the Scots. In 1311, the rural dean of Durham and John de Pollowe were commissioned to receive in the Galilee Chapel a subsidy of tenpence in the pound from ecclesiastical benefices, raised for protection against the Scots.[61] On 16 November 1314, William de Burdon, perpetual vicar of Newcastle, was commissioned to levy eightpence in the mark on ecclesiastical benefices in the archdeaconry of Northumberland, which the Archbishop of York had granted to the King to aid him against the Scots at the provincial convocation, and William de Graystoke, rector of St. Mary the less, Durham, to raise sixpence in the pound in the archdeaconry of Durham for the same purpose.[62] At the same time, the prior of Durham was instructed that there was to be a subsidy of one shilling in every mark (i.e. a thirteenth) in the archdeaconry against the Scots, and four days later, the rural dean of Durham and the rector of St. Mary were ordered to levy sixpence in the pound in the parishes of the rural

60 Reg. I 373-83, 441, 456, 550; II 1009-10; Lunt pp.395-401, esp. 401

61 Reg. I 97

62 Reg. I 636-37

deanery for their defence.[63] There is unfortunately no record in the Register as to how much, if any, of this money was ever collected. In addition, Convocation of York discussed aids to the King in 1314 and 1316.[64]

Money for fighting the Scots could also be raised from "personatae ecclesiastici ac mulieres" in lieu of military service. Accordingly, on 13 April 1314, Robert de Pickering, dean of St. Peter's York, and Stephen de Mauley, archdeacon of Cleveland, were commissioned by the King to receive the fine of 20 marks for each knight's fee in the counties of York, Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmorland and Lancaster.[65] The bishop of Durham, however much he held royal power in his franchise, was still a feudal tenant of the Crown, and at York, on the morrow of Trinity Sunday 1314, Kellawe admitted to the commissioners that he owed to the King a service of nine Knights' fees, or a fine of £120.[66] On 23 December 1313, Edward had ordered the Bishop to assemble his whole service due to the King, with horses and arms, at Berwick-on-Tweed the next Monday after St. Barnabas' day, to proceed against the Scots rebels,

63 Reg. I 641-42
64 Reg. I 577; II 802-05
65 Reg. I 561
66 Reg. I 555

who "in terra nostra Scotiae, ac aliis terris nostris adjac- invaserunt et occuparunt, homicidia, depraedationes, incendia, sacrilegia, et alia innumera facinora, inhumaniter perpetrando."[67] As the service was not forthcoming, on 27 June 1314 (three days after Bannockburn), he was directed instead to pay the fine of £120.[68] On 20 February 1315, Kellawe was again ordered to assemble his military service, this time at Newcastle-upon-Tyne on the quinzaine of the Nativity of St. John Baptist, though this date was later altered to the feast of St. Laurence.[69]

More important were the forces voluntarily supplied by the Bishop at the King's request. Bek had experienced conflict

67 Reg. II 986

68 Reg. II 1010. There is no return to the writ, as the matter was being discussed in the Bishop's council. G. T. Lapsley, in his "County Palatine of Durham", appears to think that Kellawe was fined £120-in the modern sense of punishment for crime-for failing to provide the service (pp.153, 301). He also alleges that Kellawe "did not neglect to make a profit out of the defence of the border" (p.304n.), and that the burden of buying truces from the Scots fell on the commonalty because of "Kellawe's long absences for reasons connected with the King's dislike of him" (p.121). Such statements are unfortunate blemishes on what is otherwise a very important work.

69 Reg. II 1113, 1122

with the commonalty over this, but Kellawe too, realising the seriousness of the Scottish menace, was presumably prepared to disregard any notion of a special immunity from military service for the "Haliwerkfolk", and provide troops when called upon to do so. As early as 20 May 1311, the King requested, with the Bishop's good-will and consent, a levy of one foot-soldier from every vill within his liberty to be at Roxburgh on the Nativity of St. John Baptist (June 24), to join the expedition to Scotland.[70] On 7 March 1314, the King requested the raising by the Bishop's officers of 1000 foot-soldiers, equipped with bows and arrows and other arms, to be at Newcastle-upon-Tyne on Palm Sunday; the Bishop passed the writ to his secular chancellor to be executed.[71] On 27 May, he asked for the levy to be speeded up (if this was the same levy -for the number of troops had increased to 1500; the Palatine troops who were to fight at Bannockburn).[72] In 1315, the King adopted the new expedient of sending part of his army, with a mandate to the Bishop to allow the royal officers-Henry de Beaumont and Adam de Swynburn-to raise men in the franchise,

70 Reg. I 16; Rot. Scot. 4 Ed. II m.3d
71 Reg. II 989
72 Reg. II 1003

asking the Bishop to work with them, and not make any more private truces.[73]

The Bishop was an important factor by virtue of his palatine status in a critical area. No troops from Durham could be levied without his consent. His aid and advice was necessary to theexecution of their office by the wardens of the marches.[74] More important still, the strategic strong-point of Norham castle was in the Bishop's northern franchise. At the King's request, Norham was loaned to him in May 1314 for three years, but on the definite understanding that this was done of the Bishop's volition for the safety of the realm. It was to be looked upon, not as a cession to the King of any palatine rights, but as a voluntary and temporary suspension of them in extreme circumstances:-"Apres le terme de susditz treiz annez, le dit chastel retourne a nous at a noz successours, et a nostre eglise de Duresme, a toutz jours"; and "volentes ipsius episcopi, et ecclesiae suae Sancti Cuthberti Dunolmensis indemnitati, in hac parte, providere, concessimus ei, pro nobis et haeredibus nostris, quod concessio et liberatio dicti castri, in forma praedicta, nobis facta,

73 Reg. II 1100; Rymer p.540; Rot. Scot. p.151a
74 Reg. II 1034

eidem episcopo aut successoribus suis, episcopis Dunelmensibus, vel ecclesiae suae praedictae, praejudicium in futuro non afferat quoque modo".[75] Norham does not seem to have afforded the King all the service he would have wished-though it was to be one of the few "exceptionally strong castles" in which "English morale remained high"[76]-for at the end of July 1314, only three months later, the castle was restored to the Bishop, though he granted custody to the same Constable.[77] Nevertheless, this was a significant occurrence, for it would seem to indicate that Kellawe was no less jealous of his palatinate rights than Bek had been. It

75 Reg. I 547; II 1108; see also Rymer p.541 (23 November 1315)

76 G. W. S. Barrow, Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland, p.336

77 CPR 8 Ed. II p.163; Reg. I 585-89. A confused sequence of events. On 2 August, the King restored the castle to the Bishop, and ordered William Rydel, the constable, to deliver it. On 5th, the Bishop granted custody to William de Denum, Geoffrey de Edenham and Roger de Sokepeth, yet on the same day ordered them to deliver custody of the castle to Rydel. On 16th, he commissioned Denum, Edenham and Sokepeth to receive the castle from Rydel, and on the same day granted Rydel custody. Possibly this roundabout method was adopted to show that Rydel was Constable by the Bishop's express command-that the castle was again his, and palatinate rights had been fully restored.

is of importance in assessing Kellawe's character and the decline of the Palatinate.

The Scottish troubles were the critical factor of the whole of Kellawe's episcopate, and by them any analysis of the man and his work must be shaped. They affected every aspect of his episcopate. He was unable to carry out visitation for fear of the Scots. The religious houses, in any case, even if they had been visited, could hardly be expected to maintain a high standard under constant threat of destruction; only Durham was visited, but the fact that Kellawe was prepared to chasten his own former house-if only lightly-indicates the sort of standards for which he would look.[78] His dealings with the parish churches and their incumbents were also hindered by Scottish destruction. This was a great loss, for the indications are that Kellawe did expect a high standard of religious life and work, and was concerned when incumbents were failing to carry out their pastoral responsibilities-as he was when he ordered inquisitions into the state of health of the vicars of Corbridge and Brancepeth.[79] Unlike the political appointees to epis-

78 Reg. I 639-46; and see below, Cap. IV
79 Reg. I 560, 570; 567, 572

copal thrones, Kellawe was a religious by vocation, and almost permanently resident in his diocese; his concern one would imagine to have been-and does seem to thave been-with the Church rather than the world. Because of this,and the desparate state of the bishopric as a result of the war, former historians of Durham who have transitorily dealt with the years 1311-16 while passing to greater triumphs, have assumed that Kellawe was but a weak and impotent ecclesiastic. "The episcopate of Richard Kellawe, Bek's successor, was one of the most disastrous in the annals of Durham. Owing to the supineness of the central authority, the men of the bishopric were left to a large extent to their own devices in dealing with the Scottish inroads....The meek and pious Kellawe was not the man to grapple effectively with the difficulties of the military situation, accented as they were by the defeat of Bannockburn, and the condition of the Palatinate, when famine aggravated the evils of war."[80]

The facts and their implications do not vindicate this sort of conclusion. As has been shown above, the Bishop's hand was definitely visible in dealing with the Scots; but

80 VCH II p.156; see also Introduction

as temporal head of the franchise, particularly in such matters as buying truces, which went directly against the interests of the King and the country as a whole, was it possible that the Bishop should be anything less than subtle? Is it indeed conceivable that in those critical and troubled years, the convent would have elected as its bishop such a meek and inefficient nonentity, rather than one of its number upon whom it could rely to safeguard its interests against all threats?[81] The type of man that Kellawe was is surely not to be found in what the Scots did, such as the destruction of Haltwhistle or the plundering of Bearpark, for probably no bishop, not even the mighty Bek, could have prevented those, nor were the other bishops confronted by the powerful Robert Bruce on the one hand and the hapless Edward II on the other-except Louis de Beaumont, and by his time at least, Edward was not so impotent as he had been in Kellawe's early years. The fact that the Scots were too strong for him does not necessarily mean that Kellawe was weak. Rather he is to be seen in what he himself did-in his positive blow against the "Shavaldi", in his levying of

81 See also Cap. I

resources to meet the Scottish threat, or in the safeguarding of his palatine rights with respect to Norham castle.

Any analysis of what the Palatinate was is difficult because it so largely depended upon what each individual bishop was able to make it. The essential conditions were the strength of character of the bishop, and the extent to which the King was prepared to allow him to exercise his regalian franchise. Any wide-scale freedom would be permitted only as long as the King's interests and the bishop's interests coincided, for then royal interests were being maintained without any effort on the King's part. This is why the high-water mark of the Palatinate was reached in the time of Bek. The character of Bek caused him to envisage the exercise of a vast independent franchise on the borders of England and Scotland, and this franchise was able to expand throughout the early years of the episcopate because he and Edward I were very close; but when their interests diverged, this growth was severely checked by confiscation of the franchise. By the fifteenth century, conditions were much the same as they had been during Bek's early years-the bishop was a royal councillor-like Langley, on good terms with the

King, exercising a regalian authority which bore a marked resemblance to royal authority in manner and outlook-at least until the conflict of Lancastrian and Yorkist loyalties resulted in Edward IV's confiscation of Laurence Bothe's temporalities. But by now the conception and the reality of the Palatinate had definitely and seriously declined. No later royal bishop exercised anything like the authority of Bek, nor probably had the inclination to do so. Bek's pontificate was the highest point which the Palatinate reached; Kellawe's the beginning of the downward path.

But why? Although warnings had been sounded by the confiscation of Bek's franchise on two occasions, Kellawe's episcopate rather should have tended to the aggrandisement than to the diminution of this "kingdom within a kingdom". Kellawe was a Durham man, with Durham-centred interests, and unusual as a bishop in desiring no further advancement, thereby obviating continued dependence on royal favour. This was the type of man to rule the Palatinate. His background and his local concerns would suggest that he would allow no royal infiltration of his prerogative. Nor would he. He protested violently when the royal escheator seized the manor of Hetton in the Norhamshire franchise, "ou bref le

roy ne courte mye", as a forfeiture of war, on the double claim that such forfeitures belonged of right to the bishop (recalling Bek's struggle with the King over the Bruce-Balliol lands), and in any case, no royal official had any authority in the franchise, completely restored to Kellawe after his consecration:-"Le rey dut ausi pleynement aver rendu lez terres del eveschee, come eles fussent seisies en sa meyn apres la mort le dit Antoyne, et que les forfetures de guerre appendent al evesque deynz sa fraunchise reale, piert par le evidence ci encloses; et coment que soit, al eschetour ne a autre ministre e roy ne apent a nul office faire deynz la dite fraunchise, fors sulement al evesque, qi est ministre le roy, saunz meen, et a cws ministres, et par euse deit le roy estre servy en memes celle fraunchise et par nul autres".[82] In the same way, he contested the seizure of the manor of Hart and Hartness, and Barnard Castle and the manor of Gainford-Balliol and Bruce forfeitures-reciting Henry III's charter to the "Haliwerkfolk", ensuring the liberty of the bishopric of Durham.[83] The conditions imposed upon the grant of Norham castle to the King, even in

82 Reg. I 77
83 Reg. I 77; III 1-9

a critical situation, show that Kellawe was in no way prepared to yield his franchise.

Yet there was a decline in palatinate authority, and it is in the abnormal situation that the answer is to be found. The Scots were the critical factor. It was they who compelled Edward II's concern with and presence in the north of England, when the immediate defence of the kingdom and the Palatinate were rendered a common necessity. It was they who cramped Kellawe's administration, making it impossible to expand or even maintain the Palatinate as it had been under Bek. Kellawe may not have been the visionary of a vast independent franchise, like Bek; but he was certainly not the antithesis, a weak-souled creature who would stand back and allow his franchise to be absorbed by the King. It cannot be altogether imagined what would have happened had times been more pacific, and Kellawe had enjoyed an episcopate with an absence of Scottish troubles. Certainly, however, a stronger, more powerful bishop would visibly have emerged than the one whose bishopric suffered badly from the Scottish depradations. The important point is that Kellawe should not appear, as has been thought, as necessarily a weak man. Both before and after he became bishop, he showed that he had a strong will

and an able mind, and that he did not fear, but could deal with conflict. But the Scots were stronger, and this is why the episcopate of Kellawe was not a success. The decline in the status of the Palatinate was not a result of the weakness of Richard de Kellawe; it was the result of the strength of Robert Bruce.

III SOME ASPECTS OF KELLAWE'S ADMINISTRATION

The meaning of the word "administration" has been taken in a general sense to include the nature and organisation of the Bishop of Durham's franchise, the identity and function of its officers, both secular and ecclesiastical (though with the emphasis on the former), including the members of his Council, its revenues and financial organisation, and the administration of its law. It is not, however, within the scope of the present study to examine the general nature and organisation of this administration, for this has already been admirably and adequately undertaken in modern studies of other bishops of Durham, whose work in the administrative field was of much greater consequence than was that of Kellawe.[1] It is not the intention to reproduce here a detailed survey of what the franchise was and how it came to be, nor to trace the development of the administrative organisation, the Household, Chancery, Bishop's Council, consistory court, etc., and the place therein of the Vicar-General, secular Chancellor, Receiver-General, and the other officials, except in so far as this may be necessary to understand a particular application of their authority, or where the Register may shed some important light on the function or exercise of

1 Fraser (1957) Cap. V,VI; Storey Cap. II.

any individual office. The administrative structure was still very tentative, for the sophisticated separation of function and department, characteristic of the administration of the later royal Chancery bishops, was a process which did not gather momentum until the reign of the great administrator Bury (1333-1345). Kellawe inherited the administrative structure of Bek's episcopate, and no important change took place in the position of the officials during his short episcopate (except possibly in the Yorkshire franchise[2]). There are signs of the coming definitive separation of the secular from the ecclesiastical -the writs of "Richard by the grace of God Bishop of Durham to Richard by the same grace Bishop of Durham"[3]-but in general, the interest of Kellawe's officers is not what they did, but who they were; of the Northumberland and Yorkshire peculiars, not how they were governed, but what of interest took place in them, irregular rather than regular; of financial organisation, not what revenues in general were, but particular measures taken during Kellawe's episcopate; of the law, not how the various courts worked, but particular cases with which they were concerned. The following pages will seek to establish what type

2 See below, p.71

3 e.g. Reg. I

of men staffed the administration of Kellawe, and particular actions they took; who were members of his Council, with some consideration of what it did; what of interest and significance happened in the peculiars; what irregularities there were in finance (occasioned laggely by the Scottish depradations); and the administration of the law in Kellawe's episcopate, showing particularly the impingement of the ecclesiastical upon the secular. Any more detailed survey of administrative development than this is the function of a more general work, or of a study of a bishop whose reign was more significant than Kellawe's in this field- who was himself primarily an administrator rather than an ecclesiastic.

It would be in order, however, to be reminded in very general terms of the extent of the Bishop's secular administration, unique among English prelates by virtue of his dual status as both spiritual and temporal head of his franchise. The ecclesiastical historian of Durham is obliged to be in part a constitutional, political and economic historian as well. If he does not consider these other aspects, he cannot appreciate in its entirety the position of the bishops, particularly when the distinction between their ecclesiastical and secular functions was not yet as clear as it was later to become; and his history would be at best unbalanced, and at worst positively untrue. To correct this bal-

ance, we need only look briefly at the statement of their privileges, made (in almost the same words) by two important bishops, Bek in 1292, and Langley in 1433, when these privileges were being questioned: "between Tyne and Tees....and in the lordship of Norham and manor of Bedlington, he and all his predecessors had the "liberty" of a county palatine, with their own Chancery, Exchequer, and courtwhere all pleas and assizes were taken, their own justices, sheriffs, coroners, escheators, and other ministers such as the Kings of Englandhad been wont to employ whenever need arose, or for the execution of parliamentary statutes; the bishops of Durham issued their own original and judicial writs, held acounty court, possessed their private mint, and were accustomed to grant their peace to subjects who submitted after being outlawed."4 As well as regalian powers of justice, he possessed regalian prerogatives, such as wardship and wreck. The franchise extended south into Yorkshire, into Allertonshire, centred on Northallerton in the north, and Howdenshire in the south, though here the franchise was not regalian, except in the Bishop's manor of Crayke. The Bishop of Durham was also an extensive landholder in Lincolnshire, as the list of Kellawe's tenants in that county

4 Quoted from Storey, p. 57. Norham includes Norhamshire and Islandshire.

shows.[5] In1292, it was admitted that "the Bishop of Durham has a double status, namely the status of bishop as to his spiritualities, and earl palatine as to his temporal holdings."[6] In 1311, the last Benedictine monk to become Bishop of Durham, was made lord of this franchise, at a time which, because of the ravages of exterior forces, was probably the worst ever in the history of Durham. It is the purpose of this chapter to examine the consequence of this fact upon the administrative structure of the bishopric of Durham.

Of the leading officers of Bishop Bek, two-Peter de Thoresby, former temporal Chancellor, justice and Receiver-General, and Stephen de Mauley, Steward, Vicar-General, Archdeacon of Cleveland and Dean of Auckland, andbrother of Edmund de Mauley, the Steward of Edward II's Household[7]-had fallen into disrepute in Kellawe's episcopate. The former was removed from the Wardenship of Kepier Hospital for embezzlement, the latter excommunicated for "inobedientia, rebellione et contumacia."[8] Another-Roger de Waltham, Bek's Chancellor-continued in favour.9 Yet these were

5 Reg.I 262

6 Fraser (1957) p.95, q.v. for the circumstances of this judgement (Bek-Romeyn case.)

7 Fraser (1957) p.101; (AA)

8 See Cap. V, p.39; Reg.I 214

the type of men to whom Kellawe continued to entrust his administration. His temporal Chancellor was William de Denum, clerk, who amongst his other responsibilities had to negotiate with Robert Bruce, and receive Norham back from the King.[10] Denum was an episcopal clerk of the same type as those who had served Bek. The Steward, or Seneschal, whom Kellawe appointed as Custodian of Durham and Sadberge on 26 December 1314, was Richard Marmeduke, not a clerk at all, but a leading member of the commonalty. The Seneschal was the leading official in the Bishop's secular administration. In his economic capacity, he represented the Bishop as landlord, managing his business, farming boroughs, renting land, holding manorial courts; in his political capacity, he represented the Bishop as head of the civil government.[11] Accordingly, Marmeduke was appointed with "potestatem plenariam populum dictae libertatis, pro salvatione propria quotiens opportunum videritis, convocandi, et convenire compellendi, collectas imponendi et levandi, rebelles, si qui fuerint, contra ordinata pro communi utilitate, seu contradictores, coercendi, suspectos contra pacem notabiliter de dicta libertate amovendiinferioribus ballivis nostris in hiis quae

10 See Cap. II, p.53

11 Lapsley, p.78

ad dictam custodiam pertinent praecepta, et mandata faciendi, et omnia alia exercendi quae custodes ejusdem facere consueverunt, et etiam exercere."[12] This was an indication of Kellawe's realisation of the importance of including such men in his administration-at the beginning of his episcopate, Marmeduke and Robert Neville were appointed to be on the Bishop's Council;[13] and there was none of the animosity between Bishop and commonalty which was a marked feature of Bek's pontificate.[14]

Apart from the Sheriff and Escheator, Adam de Bowes,[15] another important official was Kellawe's Sequestrator-General, Constable, Receiver and Official of Durham, master William de Kellawe.[16] His appointment to these offices is demonstrative of Kellawe's nepotism, a marked feature of his episcopate, though more in the way of grants and wardships than appointments (viz. the grants of wasteland to Patrick de Kellawe, and the wardships to Cecilia and Alicia de Kellawe[17]).

Another feature, as to be expected, was the elevation of monks to positions of responsibility. These, however, were

12 Reg.II 686. (Lapsley gives "patriae" for "propria", p.II4n.)
13 Reg.I 9-10; seebelow, p.
14 Fraser
15 Reg.I222; II 688.
16 Reg.I 44 II6, 275, 329.
17 Reg.II II27, I295; I303, I309.

generally offices of a spiritual nature, rather than the leading secular positions of Seneschal and Chancellor (as Greystanes suggests[18]), though brother William de Guisborough was made Commissary-General, and brother John of Barnard Castle Commissary, though in companionship with William de Whickham, dean of Lanchester.[19] This latter became Official in 1313, and then Vicar-General in 1315.[20] As Official, he succeeded John de Insula, former King's clerk and bishop's clerk under Bek,[21] who had been appointed to this office by Kellawe in 1311.[22] This is indicative of Kellawe's policy of appointing to positions of responsibility the episcopal clerks, the class of administrators nurtured by Bek. Appointments of monks or members of his family, however much he would have liked to have favoured them-and the indications are that he would -would not be permitted to the prejudice of the health of the administrative machinery. Kellawe's continuance of the professionalism that had held sway under Bek is yet further proof that his administration was responsible, realistic and efficient, and further contradiction of the traditional view of Kellawe's episcopate as a disastrous and incompetent interlude.

18 S.T. p.95; and see below and Cap. V
19 Reg. I 10, 21
20 Reg. I 450; II 707
21 Fraser (1951), Appendix
22 Reg. I 20

The same considerations doubtless influenced Kellaw e's appointments to offices in the Northumberland and Yorkshire parts of his franchise. Norhamshire took on special significance by virtue of its situation on the Scottish border; Kellawe insisted that the loan of its castle to the King in 1314 was not to be to the prejudice of him or of his successors.[23] A particularly important official therefore, was William Rydel, Constable of the Castle and Bailiff, appointed by the Bishop on 5 June 1311.[24] He was succeeded by Walter de Gosewyk on 9 October 1314, though Gosewyk had held custody of the castle and county until 1314, when he was obliged to deliver it to Sir Robert de Coleville.[25] A memorandum of the appointment of Robert de Sokepeth as Receiver of Norham in 1313, appears in the Register just before the granting of Norham Castle tot he King in May 1314, though he is seen to be performing this function as early as 4 April 1312, when Patrick de Kellawe, the Bishop's brother, arrived in Norham[26] (prior to his expedition to Holy Island against the Shavaldi, which Grayatanes tells us took place in 1312, and for which Norham Castle, the heart of the Bishop'S northern franchise, only some fifteen miles from Holy Island, would have been the obvious base[27]).

23 See Cap. II, p.[52]
24 Reg. I 19
25 Reg. I 614; 544. Gosewyk occurs as Constable as early as 16 Nov. 1312 (Reg. II 1177).
26 Reg. I 547; 174
27 See Cap. II, p.[37]

The Bailiff and Receiver of Allerton was Matthew Dauney.[28] He was also Steward and Bailiff of Howden; Hugh de Lokington, the Receiver there (also Master of Gateshead Hospital and first vicar of Wooler[29]), was directed to pay him the receipts of Howden for the Bishop's use, on 6 February 1314.[30] Lokington succeeded Stephen Cecile as Receiver of Howden,[31] and Dauney succeeded Alexander de Bergh (appointed by Kellawe on 4 June 1311) as Steward and Bailiff in October 1312, himself being succeeded by Sir John de Doncaster in January 1316.[32] In Allertonshire as a whole, the Custodian of Spiritualities was Robert de Brompton, whose return on the inquisition into the defects of the church of Leek was found to be inaccurate, and had to be done again; his "locum tenens" knew more about the true position than did he, because he himself was absent at the time.[33]

Brompton was also Chancellor and Receiver of Durham;[34] as Keeper of Spiritualities in Allertonshire, he succeeded mr. Henry de Allerton, whom in turn Kellawe had appointed in July 1311 to succeed mr. Thomas de Levesham.[35] Brompton was himself replaced in 1314, after only a year, by mas-

28 Reg. I 502
29 Reg. I 595; II 706
30 Reg. I 505
31 Reg. I 503
32 Reg. I 19, 203; II 772
33 Reg. I 354
34 Reg. I 454, 468 et passim.
35 Reg. I 56

ter William de Allerton.[36] It is significant that Kellawe's R representatives were not deans (as in the twelth and thirteenth centuries), but officials on the archiepiscopal model.[37] They are referred to in the Register variously as "custos spiritualitatis" and "custos jurisdictionis";[38] and in 1314, master William de Allerton is specifically made Official and Keeper of the jurisdiction ("te in officialem nostrum, et custodem praefatae jurisdictionis, praeficimus et creamus"[39]). It is impossible without a detailed study of the later history of the jurisdiction, to appraise the significance of this development, but it does show again that Kellawe's administration represented not a retrogression from that of Bek, but rather an advance. There are still references to a dean, which suggest that a rural dean was an important person besides the Keeper. The Convent, however, had no rural dean in its wider area of jurisdiction; but the Bishop appointed members of the "familia" rather than local clergy, and the additional services of a dean, with ecclesiastical rather than administrative responsibilities, may have been required.[40]

36 Reg. I 581
37 Barlow, DJP, p.40-50
38 Reg. I 187, 305, 353, 390; II 729
39 Reg. I581
40 Barlow, DJP, p.40-50

Even so, the Keeper does not seem to have been omnicompetent, for it was felt necessary to appoint special commissioners for various actions. In July 1312, the Keeper was reinforced by the master of the hospital of Lasingby in the matter of the dispute between the prioress and nuns of St. Stephen and the prebendaries of the church of Osmotherley.[41] The same church occasioned the commission, on 1 September 1315, of mr. Richard de Eryum, professor of civil law, and rector of St. Nicholas, Durham, to decide the dispute between Peter and Matthew Dauney, and Peter Gikel, which involved also Henry Gikel, chaplain (and appears from the number of names involved, to have been a most complex matter), over the tithes of the prebend of Peter de Vylers in Osmotherley; to inquire also into the holding and value of the prebends of John de Berwick and mr. Thomas de Logor, to proceed against those who detained them, punish where necessary, and do anything else which might require attention.[42] On 6 October 1315, Eryum was directed also to carry out a visitation in Allertonshire, presumably including it while he was attending to the other matter; Kellawe had notified the Keeper of Spiritualit-

41 Reg. I 187
42 Reg. II 737

ies on September 23 that a visitation was to take place.[43] One result of Eryum's visitation was the excommunication for contumacy of master William de Hamerton, Rector of Cousby; his absolution in June 1316, necessitated yet another special commission, to master Peter de Fishburn, Perpetual Vicar of Northallerton.[44] Despite this, the office of Keeper of Spiritualities seems to have been an important appointment in the Bishop's Yorkshire franchise, one in which Kellawe's episcopate was of particular significance, and which vindicates further the maturity of his administration. Possibly indeed, the administration of Allertonshire was too advanced, and too efficient-in November 1314, the Bishop's subjects there were afforded an opportunity to complain against the injustices of the Bishop's bailiffs and ministers, which the Bishop undertook to discuss with his Council.[45]

As has been shown, Kellawe's administrative officials were professional men, rather than promoted monks or members of his family, though these had their place. The only member of his family, it has been pointed out, to procure such office

43 Reg. II 739,729
44 Reg. II 808
45 Reg. I 634

was William de Kellawe, variously Sequestrator-General, Constable, Receiver and Official of Durham,[46] and other men soon appear in these offices, John de Pollowe as Sequestrator-General, William de Whickham as Official, Robert de Brompton as Receiver.[47] William was probably appointed as the member of the family most likely to succeed in office; possibly he did not fulfil expectations. It seems that Kellawe tried nepotistic appointments and found they did not work. Patrick, who did such good work against the "Shavaldi",[48] was a military leader, not an administrator. The monks too, where appointed, regulated matters of spiritual concern rather than temporal.[49] But these men were nevertheless close to Kellawe, and would probably have found places on his Council.

The Register tells us little about the Council. We know of only two definite appointments to it-of the two leading representatives of the laity, Richard de Marmeduke and Robert de Neville.[50] In addition the Prior of Durham would have been on it, and certainly some of the senior monks, in particular men like Hugh de Monte Alto, who takes on the appearence of the Bishop's trusted

46 Reg. I 44,116, 275, 329

47 Reg. I152, 450, 468

48 See Cap. II,p.37

49 See above, p.69 ; & Cap.IV, p.88

50 Reg. I 9-10; II1169; The indenture of the Bishop with Ralph Fitzwilliam, to which Lapsley draws attention, may suggest his membership of the Council, but advice was not a stipulated duty, as in the other cases. (Reg. II 1181; Lapsley p.145)

companion, or Geoffrey de Haxeby, doctor of theology, whose academic distinction the Bishop admired, and who later became Sub-Prior of Durham.[51] It is hardly possible either that the two leading members of the Kellawe family, William and Patrick, would not have been members of the Council. Lapsley seeks to identify more by the names of witnesses to Kellawe's charters, though over-reliance on this method would certainly be misleading; certainly however, the two professors of civil law, Richard de Eryum and John de Insula, both at some time Official of the Bishop, would have been among his advisers.[52]

The Register does, however, reveal something of the Council's nature and function. Its members were paid-Marmeduke was to receive 20 marks of silver per annum, Neville £10 of silver. Their responsibility was "bien et loialment counsaillra et eydra le dite evesque en tutes chose touchaunz lui et sa eglise de Duresme, et la pees denz la fraunchise de Duresme entre les ewes de Tyne et de Tese, bien et loialment eydra de meintenir, garder et governer; et de mesfesours denz la dite fraunchise eydra, soloinces lai de terre, refrenir et justiser, tutes les fiez que a ce faire soit requis ou mande."[53] The Council may have

51 Reg. I 100, II784; I 20, 110, &.
52 Lapsley p. 145-46
53 Reg. I 9-10

taken on special significance in the difficult time of the Scots War; Kellawe's recruitment of lay, military and legal support shows, as do his appointments to administrative offices, that he was nothing if not capable and realistic.

Such qualities were also of prime importance in the matter of finance. Though figures are unfortunately lacking, it is clear that the Scottish incursions destroyed much landed wealth, on the Bishop's estates as on those of others, and the reduction in tithes was probably tremendous. The disaster of the Scots was aggravated by the natural disaster of 1315, when the floods, amongst other evils, washed away the Bishop's mills-which as later records show, represented some fifteen percent of his gross income.[54] Revenues accrued from taxation of the clergy (the tenth of the ecclesiastical benefices for one year of 1311, which yielded £854 17s. -¼d., and the similar grant of 1313[55]), and the laity (the Bishop's Steward was given power to impose "collectae"56); and from profits of justice.[57] But these were insufficient. On 19 October 1311, master John de Snaynton was appointed the Bishop's special proctor to contract a loan from the merchants of the Peruchi of Florence, in the Bishop's name, and

54 ST p.97; See Cap. II, p.40;
55 Reg. I 486-88; ST App.lxxxvii p.
56 Reg. II 686
57 Lapsley, p.290

on the security of the manors of Allerton and Howden.[58] £216 13s. 4d. of this was repaid out of the moneys in the possession of the abbot of St. Mary's York, to John Juncti in March 1314 (in a peculiar sequence of events).[59] At the end of March, the Bishop undertook to sell wool to the Society of the Peruchi; and a bond of 9 May 1314, of £135 6s. 8d. to the Bardi of Florence, suggests similar transactions with that Society.[60]

Entries in Kellawe's Register shed light also on the workings of the episcopal exchequer. Accounts were audited at Michaelmas-hence the acquittance of the account of Walter de Gosewyk, Receiver of Norham, in 1312,[61] though the issue of special commissions to audit the accounts of the Bishop's ministers, like those to John de Insula, Hugh de Monte Alto and Robert de Brempton on 3 December 1312, and to the latter two and Geoffrey de Edenham on 19 October 1313,[62] suggest that the process was not yet completely automatic, or even (remembering Peter de Thoresby at Kepier[63]) that some revenues were being misappropriated. By Langley's time, however, audit had become a regular function of the Council.[64]

58 Reg. I 69, 87
59 Reg. I 514-16
60 Reg. I 540, 543
61 Reg. I 251
62 Reg. I 261, 451
63 See below, Cap. V
64 Storey, Langley, p. 103

The Register is, of course, an invaluable source for the student of Durham fourteenth century legal history, but it is the intention here to select only one or two important or interesting points. The administration of his own justice was, of course, a matter of prime importance to the Bishop in his liberty, and something of the effect of this upon his subjects will be discussed when we consider Kellawe as diocesan;[65] as will be shown there, the confusion (or perhaps more correctly the lack as yet of separation) of his spiritual and temporal functions could lead to ecclesiastical censure for crimes which even in this age of liberal interpretation of spiritual offences, would be designated as secular. Of the English sees, only Durham could possess a Bishop's Register which would instruct the Sheriff to deliver a man from gaol who had been imprisoned for the death of another, or a direction to the justices not to allow an excommunicated man plead before them,[66] as a matter of ordinary diocesan buisness. This interlocking of ecclesiastical with secular is emphasised by the fact that the Chief Justice of the liberty, Lambert de Trikingham, was also Master of the Hospital of St. Mary Magdalene, Sherburn.[67]

65 See Cap. V, p.128
66 Reg. I 560, 399
67 Reg. II 868, 885, 1224

The nature of the Bishop's courts, the structure of the judicial system and the administration of justice in the Palatinate, has been closely studied in those works already mentioned,[68] whose writers have rightly drawn freely on Kellawe's Register (as on other sources just outside their period-viz. C. M. Fraser's excellent analtsis of the assize roll of 1279-80, the nearest in date to the pontificate of Bek[69]), and whose findings have been set down in far greater detail than could be attempted here. Little purpose would be served in reproducing this work, and it is in any case of little special significance in gaining an understanding of Kellawe, except in one point which has not been stressed. This is the closeness all the time of the Bishop's authority as spiritual and temporal head, this confusion of substance of the ecclesiastical and the secular. This may be especially characteristic of Kellawe's episcopate, deriving from his religious rather than his judicial background, and from his permanent residence in his diocese. These facts might have influenced the administration of justice, as they influenced most aspects of the episcopate; certainly one gains the impression in reading Kellawe's Register that retribution

68 Lapsley, Fraser, Storey

69 Fraser (1957) p. 85

for sin is at hand for those who fall short. Even from the most worldly of religious men, one would expect a type of justice tempered by religious influence. This impression may be completely inaccurate, but it would explain the lesser presence of this element in the legal administration of Bek and Langley; and it is this deficiency in the consideration of the nature of episcopal justice, and its effects upon those who were subject to it, that these few thoughts on Kellawe's law, here and in Chapter V, have sought to supplement.

Even so, it would be wrong to press any difference too far. Professionalism in administration was, as we have seen, as much a mark of Kellawe's administration as of the Chancery bishops'. Episcopal clerks and members of the commonalty (in the latter respect, Kellawe went further than Bek) staffed the leading offices. The small religious and nepotistic elements which were infused (possibly in the form of an initial flirtation, soon abandoned), were of no lasting significance. Of greater significance, indeed, was the opposite process going on in the Yorkshire franchise. The revealing and important

point about Kellawe's administration was not how dissimilar it was from that of the Chancery bishops, but how similar. In this field at least, his episcopate does not represent a retrogression, a last echo of the old order, but a positive contribution to the emergence of the new. It is such facts as these which show the stuff of which the last monk-bishop was really made.

IV KELLAWE AND DURHAM-CONVENT AND "COMMUNITAS"

The convent and the "communitas" are two distinct entities, but go conveniently together as the two elements with which the bishop was immediately concerned in the city that housed his episcopal throne, and was the focal point of his diocese and his work, and indeed, in Kellawe's case, of his whole life. The greatest church in the diocese was the cathedral priory of Durham, the nearest laymen those leading members of the "communitas" influential in Durham. In fact, the two elements were not so separate as they should normally have appeared, because the crisis of the Scottish war had bound all the men of Durham, monks and "milites", in a common concern. This does not, as might be expected, distort the question. On the contrary, it clarifies it, for it is in the extent of co-operation in the face of this threat that the degree of communal feeling can be seen.

Was there a well-organized community? The impression that there was might arise from the existence of some degree of common action to meet a common foe, as there was some element of concerted opposition to Bishop Bek, and some concerted

effort to meet the obligation of buying truces from the Scots. Here though, the lack of such an element becomes apparent. The truces were negotiated by haphazard groups of men, acting ad hoc on their own initiative. On one occasion a truce might be negotiated by the prior, on another by the Bishop's secular chancellor, on another by a layman of the Marmeduke-Neville stamp. Indeed, the very need to buy truces without offering resistance testifies to a lack of concerted opposition-though the question whether anything else could be done in the prevailing conditions has already been posed. All the time, however, such small groups took the initiative. There were no sanctions which could be imposed if certain members of the "communitas" proved unwilling to co-operate in the buying of truces-such as Warwick's tenants at Barnard Castle.[1] The prior of Durham's additional contribution of £100 to supplement deficiencies in the blackmail collections is the clearest evidence of the individual nature of the transactions.[2] Very often, action was taken entirely by the Bishop, attempting to push the reluctant "communitas". He harangued those at Barnard Castle, he authorised dealings with the Scots, and

1 Reg. I 191
2 Loc. XXVII 31

the one military vistory of the episcopate, against the traitorous "Shavaldi", was the personal triumph of the Bishop)s family. Kellawe nevertheless tried to make a reality of episcopal-lay co-operation. Marmeduke and Neville, the leading representatives of the "communitas", were members of his Council. Whether because of his local sympathies, or through the dictates of plain commonsense, there needed to be none of the animosity towards Kellawe that had existed between the "communitas" and Bishop Bek. At the beginning of his episcopate, he acceded to the request of the "communitas" to prevent the royal justices exercising jurisdiction in the bishopric, which he did at great cost to himself, because the promised reimbursement never materialised.[3] The failure was not Kellawe's. It resulted because even at a time of such great crisis, there was no common feeling strong enough to make itself a vital factor. The "communitas" had hereditary leaders-Marmeduke's and Neville's fathers had led the lay tenantry in the struggle for a charter of liberties from Bishop Bek-but its rank and file had melted away when the time came to face a greater foe. "Despite....occasional references to the 'community of the county', the negotiations with the Scots were clearly the work

3 S.T. p.93

of a small group of local gentry and magnates whose authority rested on the intangibles on personal prestige and character. Apart from a possible coincidence with an archidiaconal chapter on one occasion, the very presence of the Scots would prevent any assembly to authorize their placation. More important, the time factor would ensure that the initiative would have to be taken quickly, and consequently by a small body of people. The references to the "community" were made only by people seeking to spread responsibility, at more realistic levels it was disregarded if not unknown."[4]

This, however, is probably an overstatement of the case. "Communitas episcopatus" was an intangible reality, if admittedly elusive-more elusive, if that were possible, than "communitas regni". It showed itself as distinct from the bishop only when it was at odds with him-as it was with Bek. In normal times, the bishop was its natural head, as the biggest and most powerful lord in the franchise. Kellawe would appreciate the tradition; he would have been schooled in it, and probably recognized and utilised it when he procured the services of its leading representatives as councillors. Hence with him rather than against him, there was less occasion for it actively to appear on the surface. The "communitas" had,

4 Scammell p.398

however, afforded glimpses of itself in the past. William of St. Barbe's effective control over the bishopric was thought contemporarily to have been secured only by the support of local lay feeling. In 1208, the knights of the bishopric purchased a charter from King John, in order that royal legal procedures might be used in the bishopric, raising some hundreds of pounds to do so. In the same way, when money was raised to buy off the Scots, though it cannot be seen to have been raised, somehow it was raised. If the Bishop and Marmeduke and Neville seem to be commanders without an army, this is not necessarily proof that no army existed. Certainly, the conditions conspiring to such a "communitas", the presence in the franchise of no great lord (except Warwick), but rather a number of small magnates with interests concentrated in this small area, were beginning to break down; feudal society in 1300 was considerably less close-knit than it had been a hundred or even fifty years before. But it would probably be a mistake to assume as a result that the concept was wholly unreal. Among the bishops, Kellawe was the best able to recognize whether on not such a "communitas" existed. He did his best to work with it; Bek fell foul of it. We should accept

his judgement. The "communitas" may have been loose, intangible, failing sometimes to exert itself when it should have done; but it was probably there.

The convent of St. Cuthbert Durham was a "community" of a very different sort. It has always been assumed by historians of Durham that Kellawe necessarily enjoyed good relations with his convent because he was himself a monk. "Between him and the convent the greatest cordiality subsisted. He took much pleasure in the society of the monks, and was almost invariably accompanied by one or more of them; his chancellor, seneschal and confessor were chosen from among their number."[5] His confessor, certainly; but we have seen above[6] how this latter assertion, based on Graystanes, is probably untrue, and how in fact the monks played very little part in Kellawe's administration. In any case, this is specious reasoning. The convent's relations with previous monk-bishops, Robert de Stichill and Robert de Insula, had not been at all happy. In Kellawe's case, relations probably were good. The significance of his position vis-á-vis the convent was that it had just

5 VCH II p.96
6 See Cap. III

emerged from a long period of particularly bitter conflict with its bishop, conflict in which Kellawe had been one of its leaders. He had been Hoton's subprior and Vicar-General, and he was the choice of the majority of the monks for bishop. His election in 1311 was a posthumous defeat for Bek. Kellawe as bishop was their final triumph.

Because of this, the prior's leadership of the convent was no longer of such prime importance. The animosity between the "left wing" and the "right wing" died down. Prior Tanfield enjoyed a period of office at the head of the convent much more tranquil than one would have thought possible for a nominee of Bek. When he wished to resign his office, in June 1313, there is no justification for supposing that it was for any other reason than the one he gave: he had become unfit for the office through age and infirmity.[7] This was confirmed by the dispensation for him to eat meat during Advent on this ground.[8] The usual provision for a retiring prior was made for him, a cell at Jarrow and a pension of £10 per annum.[9] The identity of his successor, however, revived echoes of the struggle with Bek. Geoffrey de Burdon may have been elected prior

7 Reg. I 361
8 Reg. I 476
9 Reg. I 362-65

simply because he was a senior monk, an able man, and had served as Tanfield's subprior; but he had also been active with Hoton and Kellawe against Bek, and was the only one excepted from Bek's general absolution in 1310.[10] Perhaps too he was chosen by the same type of "compromissarii" as those who chose Kellawe-his election was by compromise.[11] Though the struggle was no more, the new prior was very marked as a man of the old "left". This was not of such importance now that Kellawe was bishop, though it would have been of considerable consequence had Bek been succeeded by another bishop of the same stamp. It was more a confirmation that things were now back to normal, where a free choice of prior would be allowed and confirmed by the bishop. Petition to the Bishop for congé d'élire was made on 13 June 1313, and granted on 15th. Geoffrey de Burdon was proclaimed prior on 6 July, and confirmed by the Bishop on 14 July.[12] Like the episcopal visitation,[13] the mark of Kellawe's relations with his convent is the ease and smoothness with which they were conducted, in such great contrast to those of Bek. The

10 Fraser (1951) pp.173-74
11 S.T. p.95
12 Reg. I 355-56, 392-94
13 See below

new subprior was Geoffrey de Haxeby, doctor of theology, also one of the senior monks at the time of Kellawe's election, whose academic distinction Kellawe admired.[14]

The free election of Burdon was far removed from such gross episcopal violation of privilege as the intrusion of Luceby and the postulation of Tanfield. To prevent the recurrence of such high-handed action, Kellawe had "in the first year of his consecration, revoked by his decree what Antony had done concerning the vacancy of the priorship, and renewed the old privilege, that during a vacancy of the priorship, none should usurp for himself the priorship in temporalities or in spiritualities, except the subprior and the chapter, and that the bishop should name as guardian of the priorship one clerk with three knights and three servants, seeking nothing further, nor entering into the goods of the house."[15] It should engender no surprise to learn that when the vacancy occurred, Kellawe nominated as guardian mr, William de Kellawe.[16]

Nevertheless, this charter was an important concession

14 Reg. I 45
15 S.T. p.95
16 Reg. I 356

to the convent, whose urgency was emphasized by its early date-12 November 1311.[17] Its preamble condemns Bishop Antony's unjust removal of the monks from their offices and deprivation of their ancient rights, and gives assurance "ut quotienscunque prioratum ipsum de caetero vacare contigerit, supprior, cum consilio monachorum, in spiritualibus et temporalibus de personis et rebus infra monasterium et extra, ad ipsum prioratum quomodolibet spectantibus, libere administret, ordinet et disponat, prout ad commodum et utilitatem dicti prioratus videbit amplius expedire".

Of less significance was Kellawe's charter of 6 January 1312, smoothing out certain obscurities in "Le Convenit" of 1228, dealing principally with the convent's right of jurisdiction over its tenants.[18] Kellawe's favour towards his convent is however evident from the charters which he granted to it:-nine in all, as against eight to other religious houses combined, eleven to the hospitals, suggesting particular concern for their work, and nine to members of the Kellawe family. These charters included the grant of wasteland in the vill of Wolsingham, with the wood of "Wastrophead", an extension

17 Reg. II 1125-27
18 Reg. II 1147

to the prior's retreat of Bearpark, wasteland in Middlewood near Sacristanhaugh to augment the office of Sacrist (modern Sacriston), a fishery on the Wear from Elvet bridge to the old bridge below Durham castle, land in South Street, Durham, granted by William Ludworth and Matilda his wife; and two licences for alienation in mortmain of land to the convent, to William, son of John Fitzpeter of Bruntoft, to grant land and a mill in Bruntoft, and to Adam Bett, chaplain, to grant one messuage of land.[19] The bishop would have conferred much more upon the convent, thinks Graystanes, had not death claimed him before he could complete what he intended.[20]

The showing of favour to the convent could extend only so far, however, and the Bishop was able to afford little help to the convent in its dispute with the archdeacon of Durham, Thomas de Goldesburgh, over the prior's archidiaconal jurisdiction in those churches appropriated to the prior and convent. This was a long-standing dispute, of which the worst part-the prior's assumption of these archidiaconal duties himself-occurred in 1319, slightly outside our period. Thomas

19 Reg. II 1139, 1141, 1148, 1188, 1289, 1230, 1298
20 S.T. p.95

de Goldesburgh was unusually active in,his archdeaconry, and a large proportion of the writs concerned with matters of archidiaconal jurisdiction in Durham are addressed to him personally rather than to his official. It was probably for this reason that the dispute reopened when he became archdeacon in 1308.

The convent's franchise was now a long-standing reality.[21] Comparative peace had reigned since Bishop le Poore's "Convenit" of 1228, though the convent was unable to recover the episcopalia it had then lost. Kellawe's Register, the first extant, shows sequestration of the convent's churches and inquisition and induction performed by the archdeacons under episcopal mandate. Even so, the bishops respected the convent's rights. The immunity of appropriate churches from episcopal visitation fees was probably maintained. Kellawe's visits were unaccompanied by protest-though Kellawe, of course, should have been the last to violate the convent's rights. There were no procurations from such churches, and since the number of appropriate churches had grown since "Le Convenit" the convent's franchise had extended at the

21 Much of the following information derives from F. Barlow, Durham Jurisdictional Peculiars, pp.40-50, not otherwise acknowledged.

bishop's expense. (R. M. Haines has shown in his study of the diocese of Worcester that the loss of episcopal rights and revenues was a reason for episcopal opposition to new appropriation.[22] There was no attempt at fresh appropriation by Durham in Kellawe's time, but he did oppose the appropriation of Whittingham by the Augustinian canons of Carlisle.[23]) In 1320, Bishop Beaumont questioned these rights, but they were vindicated by the bishop's commissaries.[24] In Northumberland, the position was less urgent. There no franchise existed, nor was one claimed, nor was there an agreement (or a disagreement) with the archdeacon. The number of appropriate churches in the archdeaconry was increasing, however, and eventually the convent was moved to exert its rights, though the matter was still in dispute well on in the fourteenth century.[25]

Goldesburgh's attempt to expand his authority upset the composition of 1271, by which Robert of St. Agatha, then archdeacon of Durham, acknowledged the prior as archdeacon in the churches appropriated to the convent between Tyne and Tees, though in fact the archdeacon exercised jurisdiction in

22 Haines pp.247-48
23 See Cap. V
24 Book of Richard de Bury, pp.181-82
25 S.T. p.108

the prior's name, and paid the prior an annual pension. Bishop Stichill pronounced for the prior, and Bishop de Insula-both, like Kellawe, monks of Durham-confirmed this in 1276. It was this vicarial position which Goldesburgh refused to accept, thus ushering in the fresh period of dispute and litigation which culminated in the prior's personal assumption of his archidiaconal functions.

On 5 October 1312, Kellawe cited the prior and convent and the archdeacon to appear before him concerning this issue.[26] On 22 November, he instructed that Thomas de Heppeswell, Goldesburgh's proctor, should be excommunicated for contumacy in the Bishop's presence touching the matter[27]- unfortunately, we do not know what this "contumacy" was. On 30 December, he instructed his Official to cite the parties again to appear before him in the Galilee Chapel on 18 February 1313.[28] The process took place before the Bishop in the chapel of his manor at Stockton on 27 October, the convent represented by the senior monk, Brother John de Laton, the archdeacon by the unfortunate Heppeswell,[29] but no

26 Reg. I 203
27 Reg. I 253
28 Reg. I 266
29 Reg. I 471-75; II 693

composition was reached before the end of Kellawe's episcopate.

Something of the prior's archidiaconal authority is witnessed by the fact that he sat with the archdeacons in time of vacancy, but something too of the archdeacon's position is shown by the Bishop's declaration, according to the custom of the diocese (and probably much against his personal inclinations) of the archdeacon's right against the subprior and convent to install the new prior.[30] Developments during Kellawe's episcopate were an important stage in this long struggle between archdeacon and convent, which was repeated in dioceses other than Durham.[31]

The bishop, however possessed one right over the convent which the archdeacon did not share. This was visitation of the convent itself. On 17 October 1314, Kellawe cited the prior and convent to attend visitation on 7 November following.[32] There is no record that any protest accompanied his visit (how unlike previous attempts by Bek and Archbishop

30 Reg. I 579
31 Haines p.25
32 Reg. I 630-31

Wickwaine!), but it was defenitely carried out, and would have been conducted in accordance with the bull "Debent" and the Evenwood agreement, by which the bishop could not enter the convent with a large retinue, but accompanied by only three or four clerks, one a Benedictine monk, and a public notary. That it was carried out legitimately may be the reason why so little mention is made of it, none at all by Graystanes. The monks doubtless resented it, even at the hands of a bishop who was one of themselves-whose insistence on holding a visitation is indicative of his worth; they had no grounds on which to contest it , and so preferred as little as possible to be made of it, less successful visitation become a sound precendent against them. (It might, however, have caused a degree of disaffection from the old "left" party; it possibly contributed to the election, as Kellawe's successor, of Henry de Stanford, previously an adherent of Bek.)

On 18 November, Kellawe commissioned Brother Hugh de Monte Alto, a senior monk and master of Kepier, and mr. John de Insula, professor of civil law, and mr. John de Snaynton, canons of Darlington, "ad procedendum, cognoscendum, corrigendum, reformandum, statuendum, discutiendum, et diffiniendum

super articulis in nostra visitatione....cum coercionis canonicae potestate....assumptis et associatis vobiscum, domino priore ecclesiae dictae Dunolmensis, ac fratribus Henrico de Tesedale, Roberto de Boghes, Thoma de Wynestowe, Ricardo de Aslagby, Willilmo de Couton' et Johanne de Seton', ejusdem ecclesiae monachis, ad cognitionem et correctionem, reformationem, et omnia praemissa faciendum et exercendum, cum eorum consilio, procedatis".[33] On the same day, the prior and convent were notified that correction was to be received at their hands. Eight days later, Kellawe ordered the prior and convent, under pain of greater excommunication, to submit to correction on those matters contained in a "schedule" sent with the letter.[34] Thus there were abuses to be reformed; it is unfortunate, however that the schedule would be unlikely to survive. At the same time, a mandate was sent to the prior to summon certain erring monks before the Bishop or his commissaries.[35] These were Richard de Tynedale, Robert de Dichburn, Henry Wild, Robert de Birtley and John de Barneby. Of these, Dichburn at least may have been

33 Reg. I 639-40
34 Reg. I 644
35 Reg. I 645

removed from Durham to Coldingham, and thence he turns up delivering blackmail money to the Scots, disappearing, probably in Scotland, in 1318.[36] Also on 26 November, the purgation directed on two monks, William de Gretham and Thomas de Hessewell, was respited. Gretham at least did undergo purgation, as is testified on 29 August 1315, imposed, we learn, because he gave a negative answer to everything put to him.[37] (Greatham is named in June 1313 as prior of Coldingham, giving added justification for viewing this cell as a place of exile for the unworthy, and an effective depository for recalcitrant monks; though on this occasion Greatham was entrusted with procuring a licence from the Bishop for the election of a new prior.[38] Were the priors of outlying cells as degenerate or troublesome as those who were sent there to dispose of them? Hoton attached much importance to the priorship of Holy Island, held at different times by Hugh de Monte Alto, Henry de Luceby and Richard de Kellawe. Was the headship an important and responsible position? The nature of the outlying cells is a fascinating question, but a problem

36 See Cap. II

37 Reg. II 717

38 Reg. I 354

with many imponderables.)

The visitation of the convent of November 1314 was the quietest and probably most beneficial for many years. This might have been resented; but this apart, the episcopate of Kellawe was a period of excellent relations between bishop and convent. His death in 1316, after only five and a half years, was a great blow to the convent, particularly when the overthrow of Henry de Stanford's election in favour of Louis de Beaumont meant that never again would a Benedictine monk become bishop of Durham. Kellawe's short episcopate has often been viewed as a negative one. If one element that was lacking was constant dispute between bishop and convent, that was no bad thing.

V KELLAWE AND HIS DIOCESE-PARISHES, LAITY AND RELIGIOUS ORDERS

The survival of Kellawe's Register has resulted in a wealth of information about the state of the church at local level in the years 1311-16, unparalled before the mid fourteenth century. His records of presentations and collations, institutions and inductions, inquisitions and mandates, licences and dispensations, and excommunications and interdicts, make it possible to build up for the first time a detailed picture of the parishes and their clergy. His penances and his legal records help to indicate too the position of the laity. Hardly less valuable are the entries in the Register concerned with religious houses, particularly those remoter houses of Premonstratensians, Cistercians and nuns, which have not left the detailed records that Durham yields, though here the information is regrettably much less prolific. It is the more unfortunate, therefore, that these years were untypical, for the Scottish war, with its plundering raids, im many cases destroyed or severely damaged both parishes and religious houses. There is a danger of forming a distorted view, particularly with regard to what was happening in Northumberland. Nevertheless, the material available is

valuable and far-reaching, and of prime importance in assessing Kellawe's episcopate.

Chapter II described how many parish churches, such as Ovingham and Haltwhistle, were destroyed and damaged by the Scots, and remained so throughout the period. Despite this, and the inability of the Bishop's officers to penetrate the troubled areas, parochial organization and responsibilities remained intact. "Nihil invenimus levandum vel sequestrandum" -yet Haltwhistle's deficient property was sequestrated for non-payment of ecclesiastical taxation, except when its rector, the abbot of Aberbrothok, gained its release by payment of arrears in November 1313.[1] In 1315, "omnia sunt destructa", "nec sunt ibidem parochiani aliqui degentes"-yet just over a year later, the benefice was collated to a new vicar, in the person of David de Harreys, in September 1316.[2] While occasionally licences for non-residence were granted because of the Scottish threat, on 9 September 1316, William de Comyn, rector of Ovingham, was by contrast ordered to reside in his parish, and to minister the Sacrament and attend to the needs of his

1 Reg. II 899; I 467, 479
2 Reg. II 1054, 1084; 830

flock.[3] This order was given despite the fact that Ovingham was very near to Hexham and Corbridge, where Scottish incursions were frequent, and that its own revenues had been destroyed.[4] This would suggest either that the Scottish troubles were not so severe that all parochial life broke down, especially in the latter part of the episcopate when sterner English resistance was offered; or, complementary to this, the Bishop was determined that despite the conflagration, the parochial structure and its responsibilities must be maintained. This is one of a number of instances where a closer reading of the documents concerned indicates a greater control of the situation by the Bishop, than the more spectacular information sent to the King, in the way of excuses for not attending parliament and the like, failure to collect ecclesiastical subsidies would seem to intimate; in common form a good reason had to be given, in the course of which truth might suffer.

Though the Scots may not completely have destroyed the parochial system, its resources were severely reduced. Ecclesiastical taxation could not be met. Edward II sent seventeen

3 Reg. II 824
4 Reg. II 899, et passim; see Cap. II

writs to the Bishop, demanding the collection of the moiety granted by the clergy to his father, and five concerning the fifteenth granted to him by the clergy at the Northampton parliament.[5] The returns to seventeen of these twenty-two writs show that, as a result of the Scottish incursions, the Bishop had been able to levy the full amount in only a few cases; in most others, he had been able to sequestrate goods to a lower value; some churches have no goods left at all because of Scottish pillaging; in other cases he had taken it upon himself to supersede the writs.[6] (The remaining five writs have no return.) A detailed quotation of figures to illustrate the difference between the amounts demanded by the King and those returned by the Bishop would be tedious, but the wide variety may be seen from the following few examples from the return to the writ of 7 February 1312:-[7]

5 Reg. II 835, 847, 859 (Return 868), 862, 875 (Return 879), 895, 922, 940, 963, 981, 994, 1005, 1021, 1038, 1052, 1082, 1092; 845, 938-40, 960, 969 (Return 984), 975.

6 See also Cap. II for examples of charches yielding no subsidies at all; and note on reasons offered for non-execution of writs.

7 Reg. II 847-851

BENEFICE	KING'S DEMAND £ s d	BISHOP'S RETURN £ s d
Rector of Sedgefield	6 13 4	6 13 4
Rector of Wolsingham	6 13 4	1 - -
Rector of Stanhope	13 6 8	2 - -
Portion of Louis de Beaumont in the church of Norton	2 - -	1 - -
Vicar of Newburn	5 10 6	1 - -
Vicar of Bywell St. Peter	1 11 10	- 6 8
Rector of Ovingham	32 1 7	5 - -

ETC.

The burden was not made lighter by the incidence of episcopal and papal taxation. In 1311, a tenth of ecclesiastical benefices for one year was granted to the Bishop, and a total of £854 17s. -¼d. collected; in 1313, there was a similar grant.[8] Papal taxation will be more fully considered when Kellawe's relations with the Pope are discussed,[9] but the excommunication, suspension and interdict

8 Reg. I 486-88; S.T. App. lxxxvii, p.cv

9 See Cap. VI

of a number of ecclesiastical persons for non-payment of Cardinal Arnald's procurations-they were absolved in August 1313[10]-possibly suggests that these extra demands were pressing heavily on benefices whose value was steadily decreasing; though, of course, papal procurations were generally very unpopular, and where they were not forthcoming, the bishop had to go through the form of canonical censure, lest the papal agents laid the condemnation on him. The bishopric of Durham yielded nothing like its full quota of clerical subsidies to King, or taxation to Pope, in these years; a much greater amount went to Scotland. J. Scammell estimates that whereas during this series of raids, Edward II was able to raise only £2622 from Northumberland and Durham in four ecclesiastical tenths, the Scots took twice as much from Durham alone.[11] In 1291, for the purposes of the taxation of Pope Nicholas IV, values of parishes in England and Wales were assessed, and taxation calculated at a rate of one mark in forty. For the northern dioceses, there is a Nova Taxatio, of uncertain date in the first half of the fourteenth century (the date 1318 has been given, but this seems rather early,

10 Reg. I 415
11 Scammell p.402

and it is unlikely that the assessment would have been made before the Scottish troubles had subsided; it is much more likely to have been produced during the episcopate of Richard de Bury) in which greatly reduced values of benefices are determined (e.g. the taxable assessment of the rectory of Sedgefield was reduced from £113 6s 8d. to £51; that of Newburn from £62 to £3 6s. 8d.) Though this reassessment is by no means complete-few revised values are given for the archdeaconry of Northumberland, suggesting an earlier rather than a later date-by a detailed comparison of these two sets of values, such as has been given in Appendix D, the overall decline in wealth of the parishes in the bishopric of Durham can perhaps best be seen.

Hardship caused by the Scottish depradations is the particular reason given for appropriation of parish churches to religious houses in this period. There was only one new appropriation of rectories in Kellawe's episcopate-Wooler and Fenton to the Premonstratensian canons of Alnwick-but in addition, the nuns of Holystone were inducted into the vicarage of Harbottle[12] (unusual for a vicarage), regulation was made concerning Felton, appropriated to the Austin canons

12 Reg. I 137; II 1152-54

of Brinkburn, and Whittingham was confirmed to the Augustinian cathedral priory of Carlisle.

In September 1313, the abbot and convent of Alnwick appointed John de Otteley, one of their number, as a proctor to plead for licence to appropriate Wooler and Fenton (of which they were patrons), because they were hard-pressed by the Scots. A satisfactory case was obviously made out, for on 3 October, the Bishop granted the application, allowing the abbot and convent to appropriate the revenues of Wooler and Fenton to themselves, saving only 16 marks of silver to the perpetual vicar which they were obliged to appoint, and an annual 4 marks pension to the bishop and church of Durham. This, as was usual, was to take effect when the rectory next became vacant, which might not have occurred for a number of years; the resignation of the rector, mr. Robert de Eryum, only six days later, therefore suggests an arrangement of some kind, by which he would cede his benefice. The abbot and convent were duly inducted as rector, and Hugh de Lokington was presented as vicar in March 1314.[13]

The prior and convent of Brinkburn had enjoyed the

13 Reg. I 443-50, 595

fruits of the church of Felton since 1260, but now William de Glanton, the (secular) perpetual vicar, complained that insufficient provision existed to support the incumbent in the execution of his duties. On 19 May 1313, Kellawe commissioned mr. William de Whickham, dean of Lanchester, and Richard de Morpeth, rector of Graystoke, to try the petition. The result was obviously that the Bishop decided to allow the canons to staff the parish with one of their own number, for on 26 December 1313, he directed mr. Richard de Eryum, prebendary of Lanchester, to institute one of the canons into the vicarage. This was accordingly done-at some time brother John de Doxford became vicar, resigning in May 1315, and being succeeded by brother William de Bewick.[14]

The prior and convent of Carlisle had appropriated Whittingham in 1307, but Kellawe was contesting the appropriation. It was eventually decided that it was to be allowed, and brother William de Hurworth, canon of Carlisle, was inducted as vicar, saving to the church of Durham 12 marks of silver per year.[15]

The number of new appropriations was minimal, and in the circumstances, this was probably beneficial. The fruits

14 Reg. I 335-37, 489; II703
15 Reg. II 862; I267-68; II 1218-24

of the benefices would provide succour to the struggling religious houses, especially when the parish could be staffed by one of their own brethren; or(as R. L. Storey suggests for the fifteenth century)[16] the benefit might accrue the other way, for the vicar might gain a fixed stipend greater than that which could be collected by the appropriators of a despoiled benefice-though the vicar of Felton apparently did not prosper like this. Additionally, when troubled circumstances might cause some secular priests to neglect their responsibilities for thoughts of their own safety (which may have been the motivation of the rector of Ovingham17), an incumbent who as a member of the religious order which had appropriated the parish was under a vow of obedience to that order, might be a positive advantage. On the other hand, Kellawe's process against the prior and convent of Carlisle, despite the fact that he was a religious himself and could be expected to view their case favourably, suggests that he regarded over-free extension of appropriation with some concern-though the fact that Carlisle was not in his diocese may have influenced his course of action. Possibly too many churches had already been appropriated.

16 R. L. Storey, Thomas Langley and the Bishopric of Durham, p. 177

17 See above.

Corbridge and St. Nicholas Newcastle (confirmed with Whittingham) belonged to Carlisle, either to bishop or convent. The convent of Durham had Monkwearmouth, Pittington, Dalton, Hesleden, Billingham, Middleham, Merrington, St. Oswald, Durham, Whitworth, Heighington and Aycliffe in Durham, and Bedlington in the bishop's Northumberland franchise, as well as portions in Jarrow and Castle Eden. The prior of Guisborough held Hart with Hartlepool, and Stranton, with a portion in Castle Eden; the prior of Tynemouth, Tynemouth, Woodhorn and Horton, with portions in Hart with Hartlepool, Stranton, St. Nicholas, Newcastle, Ovingham and Wooler; Hexham, Stanfordham; St. Oswald's, Nostell, Bamburgh; and so on.[18] R. L. Storey records of Northumberland that in the fifteenth century, some twenty-five percent of the churches were served by members of religious orders, a higher proportion, he thinks, than in other counties in England.[19]

The customary inquisitions were held to establish the right of these religious houses to the patronage of their parish churches when they fell vacant-Corbridge (prior and convent of Carlisle), Bywell St. Peter (prior and convent

18 Surtees, Hist. and Antiq; NCH; Taxatio. See Appendix D
19 Storey, op. cit. p.177

of Durham), Bywell St. Andrew (abbot and convent of Blanchland-the vacancy occurred when the vicar became abbot), Meldon (prior and convent of Durham), and others.[20] The inquisitions into lay patronage included those into the presentation of Simon de Baldreston to Hurworth by Lucas de Tailboys, the presentation of Henry le Waleys to Longhorseley by Ralph, son of William, and that which established that John Prat was patron of Knaresdale[21]-of which more in a moment. The lack of great lordships in the diocese concentrated patronage in the hands of the bishop and the prior and convent of Durham, especially in the Patrimony of St. Cuthbert itself. In Northumberland, it was more heterogeneous, though the prior and convent of Durham was still the most considerable patron; in addition the patrons included other religious houses, the bishops of Durham and Carlisle, and some nine or ten lay patrons.

More interesting-and more acrimonious-were those inquisitions which involved the King's right of presentation. It might be two to three years before the King heard that a vacancy had occurred in a benefice at the same time as the bishopric had been void, to which benefice therefore he had

20 Reg. II 758; I 306; II 725, 755
21 Reg. II 712-13; I 439-40

the right to present; alternatively (as seems to have been a common custom) the King might demand a benefice as a reward after a consecration. Only in the single case of Coniscliffe was a contested royal presentation successfully reversed, and this benefice in any case appertained to the abbot of St. Albans. In the cases of Whitburn and Knaresdale, the sitting incumbent was displaced to allow the royal nominee to be admitted, and at Hartburn, one royal nominee was ejected to accomodate another. Whitburn was the one example of an attempted papal provision, overturned by royal right. The case of Simonburn involved the vexed question of forfeit lordships. These were the interesting inquisitions, and it would perhaps be in order briefly to discuss each in turn.

On 13 June 1312, Kellawe ordered an inquisition into the King's presentation of William de Ayremynne, a royal clerk, to the rectory of Whitburn.[22] Ayremynne also became variously rector of Wearmouth, rector of Kirklevington in the diocese of Carlisle, prebendary of Auckland, prebendary of Oxgate in St. Paul's, prebendary of Boyden St. Mary in Lincoln, custodian of the House of the Conversi in London, and later Keeper of the Great Seal.23 He did useful service for Kellawe as a proctor

22 Reg. I 181-84

23 Reg. II 807; CPR 5 Ed. II p.399, 8 Ed. II p.165, 298, 10 Ed. II p.534

to parliament, and in other ways.[24] The presentation to Whitburn belonged to the bishop "sede plena", but devolved to the King "sede vacante". The inquisitors established that the benefice had become vacant by the resignation of William de Bordis, bishop-elect of Letour, on 13 April 1311. This was two days after the royal consent was given to Kellawe's election as bishop of Durham, but a good month before the restoration of his temporalities and his consecration,[25] so that the see was still effectually vacant. Bordis, the retiring rector, had been provided by the Pope because his predecessor, Adam de Driffield, had died in the region of the Curia. On the same day as Bordis' resignation took effect, Clement V made provision to the rectory of Berald de Fargiis, who held benefices in the dioceses of Orleans and Argen, and who was soon to become rector of Bredon in the diocese of Worcester, and Orpington in the diocese of Rochester.[26] On 30 June, Kellawe summoned Fargiis or his representative (who in fact was John de Pollowe, Kellawe's sequestrator-general[27]) to show why he should not be removed.[28] Accordingly Ayremynne did become rector, and

24 Reg. I 301, et passim.
25 See Cap. I
26 CPL .pp.82, 87
27 Reg. I 152
28 Reg. I 184

in November 1312, Kellawe wrote apologetically to the bishop of Poitiers on the matter, excusing himself because he could not resist royal authority.[29]

Hartburn, on the other hand, presented the spectacle of two royal clerks fighting to gain admission. There was an inquisition into the royal presentation of Hugh de Sapy to the vicarage in May 1311, which was obviously proved to be legitimate, on behalf of the Archbishop of York.[30] The King presented Geoffrey de Edenham in April 1312, and mr. John de Percy on 14 January 1313, but he had also presented mr. William de Wyrkesal, who was the resident incumbent, and who had to be removed for Percy to be admitted.[31] By 1316, however, the benefice had devolved to the bishop-Kellawe collated the vicarage to Robert de Tymparon on 4 July 1316.[32]

The one success-Coniscliffe-was not essentially Kellawe's, for the abbot and convent of St. Albans held the advowson. They had appropriated the church in the thirteenth century, but this was contested by the descendant of the lord of the manor (Graystoke), and there ensued a three cornered contest of King, bishop and abbey of St. Albans. The King presented

29 Reg. I 184, 199
30 Reg. I 4-6; CPR 4 Ed. II p.385
31 Reg. I 282, 286-86; CPR 5Ed. II p.452, 6 Ed. II p.520
32 Reg. II 810

John de Croft to Coniscliffe by reason of the voidance of the abbacy by the death of Abbot Roger in his father's reign. There were proceedings in the court of York, the King revoked his presentation on 25 September 1315, issued writs in favour of the abbey's possession of the advowsom, and granted the abbot and convent licence to alienate the advowson in mortmain to the bishop of Durham. The right of presentation had meanwhile lapsed to the Bishop, under the decree of the Lateran Council, and he had collated the rectory to Geoffrey de Edenham on 9 March 1315; Richard Pigeon appears as vicar on 19 October 1315.[33] This appears as if Kellawe smartly exploited the old appropriation to his own advantage, probably through an agreement with Edenham, appropriating the fruits of the benefice to his own use-henceforth Coniscliffe was a vicarage.

Knaresdale was an apparent failure. Kellawe had previously, in September 1313, ordered an inquiry into the patronage of this benefice, and found that the patron was one John Prat, who had accordingly presented Hugh de Swinburn as rector when the church fell vacant. On 1 November

33 CPR 8 Ed. II p.257, 9 Ed. II p.353; Reg. II 689, 696-98, 704, 745, 817, 834, 1042-44, 1051, 1060, 1072

1315, however, the King presented John de Crossby. On 10 June 1316, the Bishop wrote to the court of York on the matter, and on 2 July the incumbent was cited to appear, but the matter was obviously still in dispute when Kellawe died.[34]

The most complex question, however, was that of Simonburn. In 1294, the advowson was granted to Bek by John Balliol, then King of Scotland, and the grant was confirmed by Edward I. Bek obtained a papal licence to appropriate the living to his household expenses, making provision for the parish. In 1296, Balliol's lands were seized by Edward I, who accused Bek of obtaining the grant of Simonburn after Balliol's deposition. Bek was out of England, and so judgement was given against him.[35] There was to be long dispute over this, of which one part was Kellawe's commission to the archdeacon of Northumberland, after the royal presentation of John de Pelham to the living in April 1312, on the grounds of the late vacancy of the see, to inquire diligently "an dicta ecclesia vacat, et a quo tempore vacat, et qualiter; quis est verus patronus ejusdem; quis ad eam tempore pacis

34 Reg. I 439-40; CPR 9 Ed. II p.364; Reg. II 789, 811
35 NCH XV p.167; Reg. III 10, 23, 540

ultimo presentaverit; quis sit in possessione presentandi; quantum valeat per annum; an sit pensionaria, et cui, et in quantum; an sit litigosa, et inter quos, et qua occasione; de conditionibus etiam presentati ad eandem, an sit idoneus, et in quibus ordinibus constitutus; an sit alibi beneficiatus, de uno vel de pluribus beneficiis ecclesiasticis, cum cura vel sine; et aliis articulis in casu consimili debitis et consuetis".[36] The Register provides no answer to the inquisition, but the King provided one in that on 1 October 1314, John de Sandale, King's clerk and chancellor, bishop of Winchester from 1316, appears as rector, and appointed Robert de Aketon, monk of Newminster, "to do those things which appertain to the custody of that church and of the possession of the Chancellor....the King, to do the Chancellor a favour, has taken into his protection for one year the said Robert de Aketon and the Chancellor's men, lands, possessions, rents, and other goods that are in his custody."[37]

The lack of Kellawe's success in contesting royal presentations may have been a harmful result of his divorce from the court and dependence on the King. The strength of the palatinate

36 Reg. I 172
37 CPR 8 Ed. II p.184

was not sufficient to override those interests of the King which could be upheld, when it did not enjoy the present support of his positive good favour. Few bishops, though, did enjoy much success in this field-generally not even so much as at Coniscliffe.

The parish clergy, of course, varied greatly in wealth, position, learning and ministration. On the one hand were the great pluralists like William de Ayremynne, or Geoffrey de Edenham, who was variously prebendary of Auckland, rector of Coniscliffe, vicar of Hartburn, rector of Meldon and vicar of Woodhorn;[38] or John de Insula, the Bishop's Official, prebendary of Auckland and Darlington, rector of Boldon and rector of Bolam.[39] On the other were the humble vicar, the poor parish chaplain, or the religious administering the parish for the benefit of his order.[40] Kellawe does appear to have been anxious that parochial responsibilities should be carried out. He summoned the holders of pluralities having cure of souls to show their dispensations, probably with this motive.[41] He ordered inquisitions into the conduct

38 Reg. II 696, 756; CPR 5 Ed. II p.452; Fasti Dun.
39 Reg. I 20, 246-48
40 See above
41 Reg. I 65-67

of the parochial ministry of Corbridge and Branxton, when the state of health of the vicars of those parishes, Walter de Warwick of Corbridge and Roger de Milburn of Branxton, gave cause for alarm, and in both parishes appointed administrators, Simon de Fresingfield to the former and William de Espeley to the latter; Espeley later succeeded Milburn as vicar of Branxton.[42] He ordered inquisitions into the defects of Hartburn, St. Nicholas, Durham, Ford, the collegiate church of Auckland, and other churches and chapels.[43] There were also visitations.

In October 1311, Roger de Saxton, rector of Aberford, and John de Pollowe were directed to visit all churches, collegiate and parochial, in the archdeaconry of Durham, inquiring into defects and imposing punishments.[44] On 1 November 1311, brother Hugh de Monte Alto and brother William de Guisborough, monks of Durham, and mr. Henry de Luceby, rector of Wooler, and Peter de Fishburn, clerks, were commissioned to carry out a visitation.[45] The visitation of Northumberland, after that of Durham, had to be delayed because of the Scottish incursions, though notice had been given to the rector and parishioners of Corbridge, but on

42 Reg. I 560, 570; 567, 572, 584
43 Reg. I 72, 144, 106; II 723; et passim.
44 Reg. I 91
45 Reg. I 76

8 January 1312, mr. Richard de Eryum, Official of Durham, and mr. Henry de Luceby, rector of Wooler, were commissioned to visit the archdeaconry and correct excesses.[46] A week later, John de Pollowe was appointed to levy and collect the fines and amercements imposed as a result of the findings of the visitation, with the power of ecclesiastical censure.[47] Kellawe certainly intended a primary visitation of his diocese, even if circumstances prevented its complete accomplishment.

It is easy to read too much into records simply because they exist. It might be a mistake to apply generally what was done in any particular instance. But it does seem fair to suppose that despite the threat imposed on his bishopric by external forces, Kellawe did maintain a high standard of discipline amongst his clergy. In March 1312, ten sentences of excommunication and interdict of clerical persons were relaxed, though these were mainly for failing to pay subsidies;[48] but disregarding the decline in revenues, this dislike of non-fulfilment of obligation gives some indication of what was expected. While permitting benefices to be regarded as property, and rewards for important officials like

46 Reg. I 75; 62-63; 115
47 Reg. I 75, 120
48 Reg. I 167-69

Geoffrey de Edenham, where there was a cure of souls, Kellawe insisted that this should be done. Obstacles like deficiency of parentage-Clement V's dispensation for Peter Roger de Beaulieu[49]-or bondage-Kellawe's grant of freedom and holy orders to Walter de Heighington, scholar of Merton Hall, Oxford[50]-need not prevent a man becoming a priest. The acquisition of learning, however, was the one major exception to Kellawe's insistence on the carrying out of parochial duties. The pluralists, of course, were absentees, engaged on the Bishop's or the King's business, and occasional licences to be absent for various reasons were granted-to John de Orreby, rector of Wearmouth, to prosecute his own affairs; to James de Ispania, rector of Rothbury, to be with the King; or to the dean of Auckland, ostensibly for fear of the Scots.[51] Some obtained papal dispensations for non-residence, such as Bernard de Kirkby, vicar of Norton.[52] On the other hand, William de Comyn, rector of Ovingham, was ordered in September 1316 to reside in his parish and attend to its needs, despite the destruction of the rectory and the possibility of further attack.[53] But Kellawe, though no scholar himself,

49 Reg. I 208-10
50 Reg. I 197
51 Reg. I 154, 455, 619
52 Reg. I 269
53 Reg. II 824

stressed learning (he commended to the convent of Durham the learning of Geoffrey de Haxeby, the only one of its number to have achieved the distinction of a doctorate in theology[54]), or at least demanded a minimum standard of literacy which he expected his clerks to attain. For either reason, seventeen licences for the purpose of study , involving a degree of non-residence, were granted to some ten individuals, including Richard de Eryum, rector of St. Nicholas, Durham (to study civil law, though not neglect cure of souls), Robert de Eryum, rector of Wooler, Roger de Nassington, rector of Ford, Elias de Cochill, rector of Seaham, William de Beresford, rector of Morpeth, and the rector of Stanhope.[55] These again might occasionally have been used merely as an excuse for non-residence; but Kellawe not only expected a high standard of dedication- he wanted a high standard of knowledge and competence as well.

Without wishing to exaggerate the picture, therefore, Kellawe seems to have been sincerely concerned for the maintenance of the parochial ministry. The depradations of the Scots should disrupt it as little as possible, and the clergy should be fit men, able to perform their responsibilities and

54 Reg. I 45

55 Reg. I 102, 114, 139, 155, 196, 288, 294, 305, 442, 476, 498, 521, 540, 611; II 823, 824, 831. See also the elaborate provision for the study of the archdeacon of Rheims, I 531-40

learned whenever possible. He intended, in summo, that there should be no decline in Christian witness in his bishopric.

It is improbable, therefore, that there was any reduction in the number of clergy ordained, and perhaps there was even an increase, though unfortunately there do not survive for Kellawe's episcopate long lists of ordinations comparable to those of Bury's.[56] Kellawe certainly performed the spiritual functions which fell to him. Most of the entries in the Register concerned with their fulfilment, however, are the commissions to Kellawe from Archbishop Greenfield, or from the dean and chapter of York after Greenfield's death, to perform these functions in the diocese of York. In February 1315, Greenfield directed Kellawe to ordain in the first week in Lent in any church in the diocese of York, beneficed clerks and members of religious orders of the dioceses of York, Durham and Carlisle, accepting too others presented by the chapters of York, Beverley, Southwell, Ripon and Howden.[57] A few weeks before, he had been similarly commissioned to confer orders, dedicate a chapel altar, confer the first tonsure, confirm magnates, nobles and other worthy persons,

56 See Reg. III
57 Reg. II 685

adults and children, consecrate portable altars, patens and chalices, bless ecclesiastical ornaments, and perform other such services.[58] A few weeks later, he was to reconsecrate the churchyard at Drax, which had been polluted by the shedding of blood, and consecrate chrism and holy oil in Selby Abbey.[59] These commissions became more numerous after Greenfield's death.[60] In the same way, Kellawe twice deputed Thomas bishop of Whithorn to confer orders in Durham, in February 1312 and November 1313.[61] By the diocesan bishop or by one he had delegated, the spiritual functions of ordination, confirmation and consecration were carried out; in this context it is perhaps significant to note that there is no trace in Kellawe's episcopate of a suffragan bishop, the friar or the holder of a titular see in Ireland or "in partibus infidelium", frequently employed by absentee bishops to perform the responsibilities which only a bishop could. This is indication that none was necessary, if, as seems likely, Kellawe took these spiritual functions upon himself. The episcopal obligation of visitation, too, was, as we have seen, carried out as far as circumstances would

58 Reg. II 680-83
59 Reg. II 687, 694
60 See Reg. II 702, 764-69, 789
61 Reg. I 140, 455

allow.[62]

Subordinate to the bishop in the administration of the parishes were the two archdeacons, of Durham and Northumberland, and below them the rural deans, of Durham, Darlington, Bamburgh, Corbridge, Newcastle and Alnwick (or as D. S. Boutflower has it, Northumberland this side Coquet and other side Coquet[63]). Robert de Pickering, the archdeacon of Northumberland, was also dean and canon of St. Peter, York; he played little part in the affairs of his archdeaconry, appointing William and Richard de Pickering (obviously members of his family) as his proctors immediately upon being made archdeacon.[64] With one accord, the commissions touching functions incumbent upon his office-inquisition, induction and the like-are addressed to his official.[65] Thomas de Goldesborough, archdeacon of Durham (also Vicar-General and prebendary of Chester-le-Street[66]) appears to have played a much bigger part in the ecclesiastical administration, for many writs concerning the execution of his office are addressed to him in person, but the main interest concerning him

62 See above
63 Reg. I 13; Fasti Dun.
64 Reg. I 152, 156
65 E.g. Reg. I 177, 208, etc.
66 Reg. I 13, 60

derives from his dispute with the prior of Durham over archidiaconal jurisdiction in those parishes annexed to the prior and convent of Durham, which we have already discussed in some detail.[67] This attempt to vindicate and even enhance his rights stems probably from his unusual degree of activity in his archdeaconry, a rare occurrence among archdeacons at this time. Even so, little particular interest attaches either to the archdeacons or to the rural deans with regard to parochial administration. There is no significant indication of either advance or decline in their office in the five years of Kellawe's episcopate, and for this reason, no detailed survey of them or their work has been undertaken.

The standards insisted on among the clergy appear to have extended equally to their flocks. The laity were to be made to observe a certain discipline by rewarding them when they were good and punishing them when they were bad. For the good, there were indulgences; for the bad, excommunication and penance; though as sincerely as conventional and precisely defined institutions would allow. The indulgences were granted mainly for praying for the souls of the faithful departed, or

67 See Cap. IV

for good works in the shape of contributions for the rebuilding of burned-down churches and wrecked bridges, though there were also those for hearing sermons-a form of good requiring deeper understanding, scarcely obtainable to the majority of the hearers, even from the popular preaching of the friars. The excommunications were the consequence of both moral sins, such as incest, and crimes, such as robbing and violating churches and property. The system of indulgences and penances could not be but clumsy, assessing as it did good and evil in practical terms and positive units of time; but as far as holiness could accrue from this system, Kellawe endeavoured to extract it. Therefore he chose as Penitentiary-General a Franciscan friar, brother Roger de Bothal, though a good number of monks were made penitentiaries, among the earliest being Robert de Insula and Reginald de Barneby; though too in January 1316, four monks of Durham, Thomas de Winestowe, John de Laton, William de Couton and Henry de Castro, were appointed Penitentiaries-General.[68] Indicative of this sincerity too, is that such an eminent member of the commonalty as Ralph Neville might find himself doing penance for incest.[69]

Of the indulgences offered by Kellawe, some three or four

68 Reg. I 195; 135, 153; II 772
69 Reg. I 450; S.T. p.96; and see below.

were granted for praying for the King and the tranquillity of the realm; this is a much smaller number than one would expect in such troubled times, and includes the one offered to all parishioners immediately after his consecration, for praying also for the faithful departed.[70] There were about seventy for praying for particular souls, or for the health of various individuals while they were alive, and for their souls after their death; these included those for Thomas and Agnes de Kellawe (possibly the Bishop's parents?) and William their son, brother Simon de Otteley, abbot of St. Mary's, York, and Hugh de Evesham, abbot of St. Albans; they included one too for twenty-one days, the only exception to the customary indulgence of forty days.[71] There were also about a dozen for contributions to the building or fabric of churches, religious houses and bridges, including the church of Guisborough, which had been destroyed by fire, the fabric of St. Peter's, York, and a bridge over the Wear at Auckland;[72] but only three for the more spiritually exacting experience of hearing the Gospel preached, by mr. Robert de Wigley (Quigheley), doctor of theology, by the monks in Durham

70 Reg. I 42 et passim.
71 Reg. I 265, 591, 192; II 687
72 Reg. I 57, 201, 525

Cathedral preaching on the mercies of God, and by William de Lincoln, an Austin friar-[73] in all some one hundred indulgences.

Of the excommunications, a number were of a general nature against despoilers of property: those who intruded in parks, those who violated the fruits of the church of Whickham, those who interfered with the fair at Darlington, or drove those seeking sanctuary from the church of the Carmelite friars in Newcastle, or violated the rights and liberties of the church in any way, following such violation at Barnard Castle; or else those who invaded the liberties of Farne, and the "satellites of Satan", the unknown persons who invaded the church and priory of Holy Island, carrying off windows, tables and other goods.[74] These last might have been the "Shavaldi",[75] and were to be whipped on three Sundays, publicly excommunicated, made to carry candles at solemn mass, and to remain excommunicate until full restitution had been made. As they were unknown, their punishment could hardly have been imposed, but the similar penances enjoined on individuals who raised their hands against the

73 Reg. I 195, 250; II778
74 Reg. I 161, 177, 222, 252, 428; II 734, 744
75 See Cap. II

Church, or who were found to be guilty of moral turpitude, were of comparable severity. Nicholas le Porter, who violated sanctuary at the church of the Carmelite friars in Newcastle, was absolved from excommunication by the papal nuncio, on penance of public declaration of his offence, and chastisement at both St. Mary and St. Nicholas, Newcastle, every Sunday, with additional whippings at Durham in Holy Week.[76] John de Kaldmarton, for assaulting a priest, was to be beaten three times round the parish church of Wooler.[77] John de Alwent, who committed adultery with five women, was sentenced to be flogged in public six times in Gainford parish church on Sundays, and six times in Darlington market place on Mondays, for each offence-a total of sixty floggings.[78] John de Amundeville was excommunicated and chastised during mass at Durham Cathedral for adultery and incest, while his wife's sister, Isabella de Merley, the object of his illicit affection, was to be whipped six times round Durham market-place and round the parish church of Auckland-this was the punishment for mortal sin, and if it was not carried out, she would revert to the former sentence of excommunication.[79] The two sisters, Anastasia

76 Reg. I 313
77 Reg. I 328
78 Reg. I 417
79 Reg. I 582; II694

de Falconberg and Mary de Neville committed adultery with John Lilford, for which Anastasia had to undergo the penance of holding a candle at mass in the Galilee Chapel and in Staindrop parish church, for six days at each, undressed.[80] The Neville family seems to have been particularly unchaste, for Anastasia had further committed adultery and incest with her father Ralph, for which Ralph was duly excommunicated and purged.[81]

Kellawe's authority over the laity much exceeded that of most bishops-though theirs too was far-reaching-and derived from his dual status as secular as well as ecclesiastical head of the franchise. The two functions-temporal and spiritual-continued to be intertwined because the palatine administration had not yet reached the sophisticated departmentalism which it was to acquire in the later episcopates of the royal chancery bishops, though it was well on the way to this.[82] The bishop's lay courts and ecclesiastical courts were sharply distinguished, and Richard Bishop of Durham as spiritual head informed Richard Bishop of Durham as secular head that in a certain case the spiritual arm could do no more, and would the secular arm take responsibility;

80 Reg. I 432
81 Reg. I 461, 484
82 See Cap. III

Richard Bishop of Durham as secular head would order the sheriff to arrest the man concerned. When the obdurate excommunicate made his peace with Richard Bishop of Durham as spiritual head, he then requested Richard Bishop of Durham as secular head to deliver him from gaol. Such a process seems odd, but is very real evidence of the distinction that was felt between the functions. Spiritual punishments for secular crimes-a fact which would probably become much more patent if the offences of those laymen excommunicated for "contumacy", like Hughtred Wrowe,[83] were stipulated with greater precision-was perhaps to be expected, but in this Durham was not peculiar: all fourteenth century bishops used excommunication against crimes other than spiritual. Because of the dual nature of the bishop of Durham's headship, though, Kellawe's Register is a markedly heterogeneous document: enrollments of wills, like that of William le Vavascour, inventories of goods like that of Sir John Marmeduke's, inquisitions post mortem like that concerning Roger de Esshe, because of the land in the franchise held by service to the bishop, even the need to certify that William le Lorimer was born without a left ear, and had not lost it as a punishment for

83 Reg. I 165

felony,[84] and many other legal matters, are interspersed in the Register with all the entries concerning ecclesiastical regulation. Such matters as the injunction to the parishioners of Norton, Billingham and Grendon to repair the bridges and causeway linking their parishes[85] was as much a concern of the bishop as ecclesiastical censure of the incumbents of those parishes would have been. Other examples of the apparent intrusion of the secular upon the religious are manifold, but over-strict differentiation between them would be both anachronistic and inappropriate. The laity in the Palatinate were as subject to the bishop as their parish clergy; their well-being, correction and legal regulation was as much the bishop's responsibility as the care of their souls; and the variety of entries in the Register touching these secular matters is perhaps indication that this responsibility was felt and was exercised.

Cure of souls was not, of course, the responsibility of all secular clergy. An important class of the clergy was that of the episcopal clerks who served in the bishop's administration. Bek had exclusively secular clerks as his officers, and

84 Reg. I 331; II 674; I 256-59; I 346
85 Reg. II 683

though, as was to be expected, Kellawe appointed a number of monks to positions of executive responsibility, particularly in the spiritual field, there was a continuity of personnel to a surprising degree.[86] These men required wealthy benefices, but the fact that Durham was a monastic cathedral denied them lucrative canonries in the cathedral itself; affording alternative accommodation for them was an important function of the five collegiate churches.

Of the collegiate churches, Lanchester and Chester-le-Street were founded by Bek early in his episcopate, probably to fulfil this very purpose, and Auckland was reconstituted in 1292.[87] The dean or vicar was concerned with the work of the parish, but the prebendaries (twelve at Auckland, eight at Norton, four at Darlington, and seven each at Bek's foundations[88]) generally had only to provide a vicar to replace them at divine service. The portions, varying in value from £5 to £20 at Auckland, and from £6 13s. 4d. to £20 at Bek's collegiate churches (1291-92 values), well compensated for the deficiency of rewards caused by the existence of the monastic cathedral. Holders of prebends

86 See Cap. III
87 VCH II p.126
88 Taxatio; Fasti Dun.

included Geoffrey de Edenham, Richard de Eryum, John de Snaynton, Roger de Waltham, John de Insula, Louis de Beaumont and William de Ayremynne (the last after Kellawe's death) at Auckland, John de Percy and Roger de Waltham at Chester-le-Street, Waltham, de Insula and Snaynton again at Darlington, Richard de Eryum and Louis de Beaumont at Lanchester, and Beaumont yet again at Norton.[89] A number of others held prebends in more than one church, and often one or more parishes as well (e.g. Roger de Waltham was rector of Egglescliffe and rector of Longnewton, holding a dispensation granted to him by Antony Bek, Patriarch of Jerusalem and Bishop of Durham; Robert de Tymparon was prebendary of Bedburn in Auckland, rector of Meldon and vicar of Hartburn; and the benefices of Geoffrey de Edenham, John de Insula and William de Ayremynne have already been noted[90]).

This practice was only slightly modified by Kellawe, though in an important way, when in 1315 he founded the prebend of Kepier in Auckland. The prebend was endowed with newly cultivated land, and appropriated to the hospital of

89 Reg., Fasti Dun. & other sources; see Appendix D
90 Reg. I 526-30; I 338, II 754-58, 810; and see above.

Kepier. The master was to provide a subdeacon for the church, and two additional chaplains in the hospital, making eight in all, who were to celebrate mass for the souls of the bishops of Durham, Kellawe's anniversary was to be kept, and ten additional paupers were to be relieved. The master was to be exempt from further obligations in attending chapters or visitations as a result of his new office, and was to reside in the hospital.[91] This was something of a departure, but it succeeded another grant of newly cultivated land, at Gateshead and Brownside, to Kepier,[92] which the hospital sorely needed, having been burnt by the Scots three years before, and it is probably significant that the master of Kepier was brother Hugh de Monte Alto, monk and almoner of St. Cuthbert's, one of the senior monks who elected Kellawe, and a close colleague of the Bishop in his administration.[93] There is, however, no intimation that the institution of a monk as a prebendary in a collegiate church of secular clergy occasioned any alarm; Monte Alto was also a canon of Auckland, and there were other instances of this, for example the prior of Hexham's stall in York.

Kellawe showed great concern for the well-being of Kepier.

91 Reg. II 1272-78
92 Reg. I 190; II 1164
93 See Cap. I

Early in his episcopate, he had cause to summon Peter de Thoresby, then master, since "sane ex clamosa et frequenti insinuatione fidedignorum accepimus quod dominus Petrus de Thoresby....bona ejusdem hospitalis, tam immobilia quam mobilia....alienavit, dilapidavit temere et consumpsit, et alia gravia dispendia in subversionem status dicti hospitalis, diminutionem divini cultus, subtractionem sustentationis Christi pauperum et aliorum caritatis operum, quae ibidem vigere solebant, multipliciter perpetravit, in animae suae periculum et scandalum manifestum".[94] Thoresby was probably removed for his embezzlement, as Monte Alto, an able and reliable man, a senior monk, certainly appointed by Kellawe to resuscitate the hospital after the blow it had received, appears as master by July 1312.[95] In addition, in October 1311, Kellawe commissioned mr. Henry de Luceby, rector of Wooler, and mr, William de Kellawe, clerk, to visit the hospital and reform abuses, in the head and in the mem bers, in persons and in things, in spiritualities and in temporalities.[96] If Kellawe was genuinely a man of compassion and bēnevolence, it was with regard to Kepier that he most demonstrated these

94 Reg. I 34
95 Reg. I 190
96 Reg. I 92

qualities.

He was generous too with Gretham Hospital. In 1313, he granted it seventeen acres of waste land in Weardale forest, with pasture for sixty cows, at an annual rent of two shillings.[97] The quality of the accommodation at Gretham is indicated by the Bishop's confirmation, on 23 September 1315, of the grant by John de Botheby, the master of Gretham, to Matthew Lardener, of allowance for himself and his servant, receiving daily two loaves of bread, one brown, one white, a flagon of ale, food from the kitchen, fodder for his horse and a gown a year;[98] this is probably one of those less worthy corrodies, a sometimes undue diversion of charitable resources to those well able to fend for themselves, though of course Lardener had paid for his corrody (the Register does not say how much), and the money was probably very welcome to the hospital at the time. But it is doubtful whether the paupers received anything like such ample provision.

With Sherburn, the third of the three major hospitals, Kellawe appears to have been less beneficent. He reduced the

97 Reg. II 1225

98 Reg. II 727-29; see also the corrody granted by Hugh du Puiset to Reginald de Camera, keeper of the door of lepers at Sherburn, confirmed by Kellawe, Reg. II 1299-1301

pittance granted to the inmates by Martin of St. Cross, sometime master, from ten shillings to five shillings and fivepence.[99] But he did confirm and enlarge the constitutions, built a new chapel dedicated to the Virgin Mary, and provided a fourth priest, who sang mass somewhat later every day than the usual service, for the benefit of the infirm; and he made a grant of fifty acres of land to Lambert de Trikingham, the master, on 1 August 1313.[100]

Of the other hospitals in the diocese, there is little mention, save their collation to new masters; John de Eryum became master of Friarside, near Derwent, on 22 October 1312; Peter de Ponte of St. Stephen, Pelaw, on 3 December 1313; and Hugh de Lockington of the hospital of St. Edmund, King and Martyr, Gateshead, on 9 June 1315.[101]

With regard to collations, even hermits were subject to patronage: on 28 September 1312, the hermitage of St. Cuthbert on Tyne was collated to John called Godsman; but this was probably a peculiar case by virtue of its proximity to the bishop's park.[102]

99 VCH II p.115. I have been unable to substantiate this from the Register, or from other original sources.
100 VCH II p.115; Reg. II 1224
101 Reg. I 248, 476; II 706
102 Reg. I 197

Of the two great religious houses in the bishopric, one was the Benedictine priory of St. Cuthbert's, Durham, with which we are not concerned here.[103] The other was the priory of Austin canons of St. Andrew, Hexham, which was a peculiar in the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of York, and therefore not within the sphere of the bishop of Durham, though it is interesting to note in passing that the only religious house to be dispersed in Kellawe's troubled episcopate was the only one with which he had no connection whatever, though this is not significant, for Hexham was the major centre along the Tyne valley, along which the marauding Scots customarily came, so that Hexham was more prone to attack than any other house.[104] The most important aspect of the religious orders is Kellawe's dealings with Durham itself, but in the context of the diocese as a whole, it is only right to point out what light the Register throws on the other religious houses.

Of these houses, five-Finchale, Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, Holy Island and Farne-were cells of Durham itself. (Coldingham in Berwickshire was also a cell of Durham.) Tynemouth priory

103 See Cap. IV
104 See Cap. II

was a cell of St. Albans, Alnwick and its poor cousin Blanchland were houses of Premonstratensian canons, Newminster was Cistercian, and Brinkburn a house of Austin canons. There were four houses of nuns, at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Holystone in Redesdale, Lambley on the south Tyne, and Neasham in Durham. The Franciscan, Dominican, Austin and Carmelite friars each had a house at Newcastle, and the Franciscans a second at Hartlepool.

There is little in the Register about the cells of Durham. Of Jarrow, we know only that provision of a cell there was made for prior Tanfield when he retired;[105] of Monkwearmouth, there is not even one entry. Regarding Finchale, there is nothing of significance: a charter of Kellawe conferring land near the Wear, a confirmation of a charter of Hugh du Puiset, three commissions to the prior, and a dispute over parish boundaries; though Finchale itself has left good records.[106] Of Lindisfarne and Farne, the only information given is about the difficulties these cells were experiencing: the prior of Holy Island was unable to pay the pension due to the convent of Durham because of a

105 See Cap. IV

106 Reg. II 1145, 1296; I 407, 573, 582-83, 628; and see Surtees Society, Vol. VI, 1837.

grinding burden of debt, aggravated by the increase in mortality amongst the fishermen, and "other troubles"- which we may take from Graystanes to be connected with the "Shavaldi"; and the liberties of the Farne Islands and Holy Island were being invaded, and the church of Holy Island ravaged, by "certain satellites of Satan",[107] Since none of these cells was visited, the state in which they were living cannot be established, but the need for correction of the mother house after visitation suggests that all might not have been well, especially in those cells more remote and more subject to depradation.

More is told of Tynemouth. On 1 July 1311, a new prior was presented to the Bishop by the abbot of St. Albans in the person of Simon de Taunton; he was admitted on July 21. This presentation is followed in the Register by a recital of the composition between the abbey of St. Albans and Nicholas de Farnham, Bishop of Durham, of 1247, underlining the fact that the Bishop had little opportunity for interference, the presentation to him being mere courtesy.[108] In March 1314, Richard de Tewing became prior,[109] though the

107 Reg. I 96; II 735, 745

108 Reg. I 79-84

109 Reg. II 696, 699

Patent Roll of 25 November 1313 offers protection for one year to one Robert de Norton, prior of Tynemouth.[110] Tewing ruled well, and the priory was one of the safe refuges against the "Shavaldi"-he is supposed to have retained eighty armed men for its protection.[111] Kellawe showed favour to the priory in 1311 by directing that the sequestration of its fruits should not be vigorously enforced.[112]

Of the non-Benedictine houses, the entries in the Register are of three kinds: a testimony to the hard-pressed state of the house as a consequence of invasion and depradation, sometimes resulting in the appropriation of one or more parish churches to supplement its shattered resources; a directive to the house to take back an erring brother or sister; or the elevation of a new superior. Attention has already been drawn to the devastation of Alnwick, Holystone, Newminster and Neasham, and the consequent annexation of the churches of Wooler and Fenton by the first, and Harbottle by the second, and also to the appropriation by Brinkburn of the church of Felton.[113] To the erring members of the religious orders, breaking the cloister seeme to have given

110 CPR 7 Ed. II p.42
111 NCH VIII p.86
112 Reg. I 44
113 See above and Cap. II

way to an adventurous life. Walter de Wytton, a monk of Newminster, had worn secular habit, for which he had been imprisoned in chains in the abbey; he escaped from his incarceration, and had wandered for ten years, in the course of which he had contracted marriage. Now the abbot-not surprisingly-had to be compelled to take him back.[114] Kellawe himself ordered that the prioress and convent of Neasham were to reinstate Agnes de Campion, which they had refused to do, even though she was prepared to undergo punishment.[115] In 1314, the official of the archdeacon of Northumberland was directed to supersede the punishment of a nun of Holystone for a lapse into worldly sin.[116] (Even St. Cuthbert's Durham had an erring priest for whom Kellawe made entreaties.[117]) This concern for unhappy individuals is perhaps further evidence of Kellawe's compassion. The only other entries in the Register concern the presentation of new superiors: of Tynemouth (already noted), and of the presentation of William de Norton as abbot of Blanchland (from being vicar of the abbey's appropriate church of Bywell St. Andrew).[118] Durham represents the only election

114 Reg. I 13-16
115 Reg. I 33
116 Reg. I 551
117 Reg. I 46
118 Reg. II 722, 725-26

to a priorship,[119] and there was unfortunately no election by a house of nuns of a prioress-such elections have a certain fascination because of the confusion which often resulted therefrom.

The Register affords scarcely any information on the mendicant orders. It records only the violation of sanctuary at the Carmelites' house, the appointment of a Minorite as Penitentiary-General, and the indulgence of forty days to those who heard the preaching of William de Lincoln, an Austin friar.[120] Even so, these few facts indicate that the friars had made some impact on the religious life of the time, though their spiritual works would find little place in an essentially administrative record.

Little is heard, either, of the suppressed order of Templars. Proceedings against the Templars were still going on, and Kellawe was summoned to the provincial council to be held on the matter at York in July 1311,[121] though there is no record that he attended it. His status could naturally not even approximate that of Bek, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, in this sordid business. There is

119 See Cap. IV
120 Reg. I 571, 195; II 778
121 Reg. I 35-37

in the Register a royal writ to the Bishop touching the holdings of the Templars in Durham, directing the Bishop to pay without delay to Robert de Fawdon, sheriff of Northumberland and keeper of the Templars' lands in that county, the £10 18s. 3d. due to the King from those holdings, by virtue of the lands of the Templars in England being in his hands. The Bishop replied that these holdings did not appertain to the King, as his predecessor Antony had died seised of them, they had been taken into the King's hands with the franchise on his death, and had been returned "plene et integre" to the present bishop;[122] another indication of Kellawe's jealousy of his palatine rights. The only other mention of the Templars results from the King's mandate to the Bishop to sequestrate the property in his liberty of Guichard de Charroun, late sheriff of Northumberland, who had died, owing the King £140 3s. 1d., and £39 9s. 9d. from the Templar lands. To this writ there is no return.[123] For information concerning the proceedings against the Templars in the northern province, one would look not to the Register of Kellawe, but rather to that of the metropolitan, Greenfield, in whose court these proceedings were

122 Reg. II 857-58
123 Reg. II 1077

being executed. Kellawe played scarcely any part in this odious spoliation. By the bull of Clement V, the Templar lands were to be handed over to the Hospitallers.[124] An inquisition was held into the latters' lands, at the direction of Arnald, Cardinal priest of St. Prisca; Kellawe replied that in his diocese, the Hospitallers held only the house of Chipburn in the archdeaconry of Northumberland, worth £10 per annum.[125]

This chapter has attempted to survey a wide spectrum of religious life, with great diversity in standards of observance. It is therefore perhaps an impossibility to give adequate conclusions, except to point out that things were by no means static, and that the guiding hand of the Bishop is plainly visible, with encouragement here, direction there, discipline in a third case. There is no indication that the diocese suffered from the pastorship of the last monk-bishop; rather it enjoyed positive good therefrom.

124 CPL 7 Clement V p.95; CCR 7 Ed. II p.89
125 Reg. I 387-89

VI KELLAWE'S RELATIONS WITH KING, POPE AND ARCHBISHOP

As we have seen, Kellawe's interests and attentions were essentially Durham-centred. He came from a Durham family, entered the convent of St. Cuthbert, Durham, rose to be its subprior, became prior of its cell at Holy Island, and for the last five and a half years of his life was its bishop. Before 1311, he does not seem to have left the bishopric-Durham and Northumberland-at all; he was not one of the proctors, for example, who pleaded the convent's case before the Pope. Even when he became bishop, he spent nearly all his time in Durham or in his Yorkshire franchise. He went twice to London, albeit unwillingly, but never ventured out of England; the disordered state of his diocese both necessitated his stay, and provided a convenient excuse for it. In this respect of almost permanent residence, Kellawe was unusual among prelates, and of all the contrasts of his episcopate with his predecessor's, this is probably the greatest. It is probably unfortunate that his episcopate occured at a time when a bishop with wider horizons might have been advantageous, in view of Durham's critical situation near the Scottish border. Bek would certainly have been better able to deal

with this age of Bannockburn than his successor, so unlike him, and yet with much in common-for as we have seen, Kellawe's handling of the situation demonstrated a fair degree of capability and efficiency. Kellawe was thrust into wider horizons by the Scottish threat. Edward II was compelled to go to Scotland as his father had gone voluntarily. Kellawe co-operated as far as he could, though he yielded not an inch-viz. Norham; and on occasion-viz. Gaveston-gave the King cause actively to dislike him. In general, however, there was not the animosity which existed between Edward I and Bek, but neither was there the close and lifelong friendship. There was nothing of such turbulence as Edward I's confiscation of Bek's franchise. Edward II's policies were not so strong as those of his father, nor were Kellawe's as strong as Bek's. Kellawe sought to maintain, not to extend. Similarly, in Kellawe's relationship with the Archbishop of York, there was nothing like the struggle between Bek and Romeyn, nor the collaboration of Bek with Greenfield in the distasteful business of the Templar proceedings. Kellawe would recognise his subordination to York as York's suffragan, rather than stressing his temporal superiority (and of course, he had no patriarchate of Jerusalem), and would

fulfil his spiritual functions in this respect. Neither did Kellawe have Bek's need for papal support against the convent, for Kellawe had no quarrel with the convent. The tranquillity of Kellawe's relationships with these, indeed may be one reason for the previously overstressed impression of Kellawe's meekness, following Bek's thirty years of bluster, might and grandeur. Certainly his relationships with Archbishop and Pope do not warrant much attention. The relationship with the King, however, though in no way as profound as Bek's, was definitely important, and shows more than any other aspect of his episcopate, the strength of the man with whom we are dealing. To Kellawe's relationship with Edward II, therefore, we must now turn our attention.

A number of significant facts has already emerged in treating other aspects of Kellawe's episcopate. Dr. Fraser has told us how the convent, of which Kellawe was a leading member, enjoyed Edward II's support in its struggle with Bishop Bek, because the King disliked Bek's invitation of papal interference in English affairs.[1] We have seen too how

1 Fraser (1951)(1957)

the convent's choice of Kellawe to succeed Bek depended for its realisation on a suitable admixture of royal character and circumstance; it was suggested that Edward II's unwillingness to overturn the election of Henry de Stanford in 1316 is perhaps indicative of equal readiness to accept Kellawe in 1311.[2] Other factors have to be taken into account: whether a meek monk would cause the King less trouble than Bek had his father; how much weight should be attached to the precedent of the thirteenth century monk-bishops, Stichill and de Insula (probably none at all), from which pattern Bek was a departure, rather than Kellawe an exception to the line of chancery bishops, which, even with Bek as a prototype, had not yet really come into being; whether the King would be sufficiently bold to overturn an episcopal election (and he probably would-he did in 1316), which had not been done in Durham since 1208 (in the struggle of 1237-40, the monks compromised by electing Nicholas de Farnham, a royal servant whom the King might well have chosen anyway, but the convent preserved in theory its right of election[3])-the intrusion of Richard Marsh, therefore was a precedent of a century before. It is highly unlikely, of course, that such thoughts would

2 See Cap. I

3 VCH II pp.93-94

have crossed Edward II's mind. We cannot know in the last analysis why Kellawe's election was allowed to stand when those of Stanford in 1316 and Graystanes in 1333 were not; we may but surmise that the truth is to be found in an inability on the King's part either to grasp the situation, or having grasped it, to exploit it, particularly if he was in deadlock with the Lords Ordainers-probably the critical factor-and absorbed in a doubtful relationship with Piers Gaveston.

The Gaveston incident was important, because it was the one time that the struggle of Edward II with the Ordainers affected Durham at all, and the one time that the normally indifferent relationship between Edward and Kellawe deteriorated into open hostility. Doubtless it is of little value to speculate on the probably insignificant fact that in 1316, when Edward was under the influence of his Queen, the election of Henry de Stanford was overturned, whereas in 1311, when thoughts of Gaveston dictated the King's actions, that of Richard de Kellawe was allowed to stand. It would be nonsense to suggest that Kellawe owed his elevation to the bishopric to Gaveston. Even so, from Graystanes' account, it appears that Edward

expected Kellawe to demonstrate suitable gratitude by "favouring the King in all things"[4]-meaning, in practical terms, affording the royal favourite refuge from those who sought his life, in the Palatinate, where the King-and therefore the Ordainers-had no authority. Even if such a demonstration of gratitude was incumbent upon Kellawe, none was forthcoming. Perhaps, as Graystanes would like to believe, "the Bishop was moved by his conscience to the contrary position", but more probably Graystanes' alternative answer is more correct, that he was too shrewd to involve himself in the matter-"it was a serious matter to go against the community of the realm."[5] It would indeed have been unwise to incur the hostility of such men as Guy de Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, who held Barnard Castle (and whose aid Kellawe was later to solicit in buying truces from the Scots[6]). Kellawe was no Winchelsea, but neither was he a royal creature; by his very position, he enjoyed greater independence from the King than any other bishop. He would not take issue with the full force of the English baronage, who regarded the return of Gaveston in 1312 as a declaration of war by the King. According to M. McKisack,[7]

4 S.T. p.94
5 S.T. p.94
6 See Cap.II
7 M. McKisack, The Fourteenth Century, pp.24-26

the whole of England was to be barred to Gaveston by the confederation of barons, of whom Robert Clifford and Henry Percy were to cut off escape via the northern border. London, the south and the east, the west and north Wales, were all closed, and Edward and Gaveston, at Newcastle on 4 May, learned that Thomas, earl of Lancaster, was marching on the town with a large force. If any request was made to the Bishop for refuge in the Palatinate, it would have been now; but we know nothing of Kellawe at this time, because ten folios, covering the period April-June 1312, are missing from the Register at this juncture (they might have told us where Kellawe was, even though nothing concerning this incident would probably have been recorded). Even so, it seems probable that such an appeal was made, and a negative response given. With all other avenues closed, Edward and Gaveston were obliged to escape to Tynemouth, and thence take ship to Scarborough. Soon after this, Gaveston was taken by Pembroke and Warenne, and then captured by Warwick, the only great lord with holdings in the Palatinate, and the man most responsible for the favourite's murder, though he personally did not attend the execution. If all this is true, Kellawe must shoulder some of the responsibility for Gaveston's death. Certainly EdwardII

held him responsible, for otherwise it is impossible to explain the King's completely unjustified show of spite when Patrick de Kellawe killed a leader of the "Shavaldi"-though admittedly he was described as a "kinsman" of the King-on Holy Island, on the grounds that this was done without his consent (which should not after all have been necessary, for Holy Island was part of the Bishop's franchise of Norhamshire), and therefore the Bishop should be removed, and his brother put to death.[8] According to Graystanes, Edward and Kellawe were not reconciled before Bannockburn, when the Bishop "went to the King's aid"-presumably meaning his levy of 1500troops; by this time, Edward takes on a greater stature and a greater responsibility, and was at last able to offer some defence of the northern extremity of his kingdom against the ravages from Scotland. It is very probable, as Graystanes claims, that the antagonism between King and Bishop, caused by the Gaveston incident, was mellowed only by necessity for co-operation against a common foe.

But how far, in fact, was there co-operation? Kellawe would not unnecessarily antagonize the King, but neither would he allow encroachment upon his prerogative, nor accede to

8 S.T. p.94; See Cap. II

royal requests unless some benefit would accrue from this to himself or to Durham, as in the loan of Norham and the raising of troops for defence against the Scots.[9] We have already considered the returns to royal writs, and the plain fact which emerges is that Kellawe would go only so far as he was prepared to go, notably in the matter of clerical subsidies; he would not accede if to do so would be difficult or inconvenient.[10] This was partly tempered by the very real problem of Scottish depradations in the bishopric, without which Kellawe might have been more prepared to co-operate; though alternatively, in a stronger position, he might have been even less ready to obey the royal bidding. Which possibility is correct cannot definitely be decided, but it seems as though Kellawe's nature was a defensive one; he recognised his position, and though he would conceive no grandiose and forward schemes for extending his authority, neither would he allow any avoidable diminution of it. He was as remote from the King as Bek and the later bishops were near. He could not possibly have enjoyed the royal support necessary for an extension of his franchise, nor had he the background of royal service

9 See Cap. II
10 See Caps. II & V

which would tend to blunt the insistence on regalian prerogative. This factor, coupled with the stress on and the shortness of the episcopate, would tend to make the royal-episcopal relationship neither amicable nor hostile, and the position of the Bishop vis-å-vis the King a static one; though if anything, as has been pointed out, the Scots were the critical factor whose existence pointed to a diminution of palatine authority rather than an augmentation of it.[11] Kellawe's position with regard to the King, however, was in no way as weak as has been thought. Certainly his strength did not approach that of Bek, but he had to deal with Edward II, not Edward I. The decline in stature of both men from their predecessors was probably approximately equal. In Kellawe's episcopate, the independence of the bishop from the King was beginning to decline from the high-water mark of Bek's pontificate, but it still had far to go before the Palatinate ceased to be a reality.

Similarly, the Pope could exert no more power in Durham than that to which he had a right. We have seen how the one attempted papal provision to a benefice in Kellawe's episcopate proved unsuccessful.[12] The patronage in Durham was so

11 See Cap. II

12 See Cap. V

tightly held, that it was very difficult for a papal provisee to be intruded at any time. This, however, should have been an ideal time for the Pope, if any was to be ideal. A monk had become Bishop of Durham at the close of years of litigation, during which both bishop and monks had had to solicit papal support. The inability of the Pope to derive any advantage from this, is indicative of the remoteness of Durham from Rome (or Avignon), and is no reflection on the character of Clement V, or those who administered the apostolic see during the vacancy before the elevation of Pope John XXII, which coincided with the last two years of Kellawe's episcopate. Very little opportunity existed for papal intrusion into the affairs of Durham.

The temporal status of the Bishop of Durham gave him no superiority in spiritual matters, however; he was as subject to papal authority as other English bishops. It was a matter of gravity not to attend the Council of Vienne, to excuse which absence, both the disordered state of the diocese and royal support were necessary; as proctor in his place, Kellawe appointed the able mr. John de Snaynton, who was soon commissioned to bear a gift of 2000 florins to the Pope.[13] A number

13 Reg. I 92, 73, 67

of papal dispensations for non-residence and plurality was given, and penances and absolutions authorised by the papal penitentiary, and several bulls are recited at length in the Register for one reason or another.[14] There was also the matter of papal taxation.

W. E. Lunt, in his study "The Financial Relations of the Papacy with England to 1327", finds Kellawe's Register a most valuable source in establishing the nature and extent of papal taxation in England in these years. The Register records the bull of Clement V, levying the sexennial tenth for the Crusade at the Council of Vienne, beginning on 1 October 1313.[15] Only one year's tenth was in fact collected, because the apostolic see fell vacant in 1314. The Register records acquittances to the collectors, notably the prior and convent of Durham, for 203 marks, £60 and £700.[16] The King, however, determined to divert the money to his own use, and directed the bishops to ensure payment of the levy, even though the Pope had died, insisting that Clement had granted him the money for the Scots war;[17] he later contented himself merely with loans from the

14 CPL p.91; Reg. I 269-74; 210-12; 223-42 (the lengthy business of Walter de Maydenstene, dio. Canterbury); et passim.

15 Reg. I 373-83

16 Reg. I 441, 456, 550

17 Reg. II 1009-10

collection.[18]

Another character prominent in the Register in the matter of papal taxation was Arnald, Cardinal priest of St. Prisca. He was appointed with Arnald, bishop of Poitiers, to attempt to reconcile Edward and his barons, though the Cardinal alone was given power to levy procurations, payment of which might be compelled by ecclesiastical censure. These procurations were fixed at 12 marks each from ecclesiastical persons with incomes of over £200 (heads of religious houses were to pay separately if they enjoyed a separate income of over £200), and threepence in the mark on the value of revenues under £200, exempting benefices worth less than six marks, and poor houses and hospitals.[19] There is a spate of entries in the Register concerned with the levy and collection of Cardinal Arnald's procurations:-injunctions from the court of York, the Bishop of Durham and Cardinal Arnald himself; the absolution and dispensation of those excommunicated for failing to pay the procurations, including Thomas, vicar of Kelloe; and the appointment in October 1313 of the papal collector and nuncio in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales, William de Balaeto, to

18 Lunt pp.400-01
19 Lunt pp.562-64

authority in this matter.[20] The previous August, he had excommunicated and put under interdict the prior and convent of Durham, as sub-collectors of the tenth imposed by Pope Nicholas IV in 1292, for failing to provide it-the money was to be paid in St. Paul's by All Saints' Day (1 November). He also demanded the arrears of the procurations of Bishop Antony due to the Cardinal bishops of Albano and Palestrina.[21] Taxarion was the major aspect of papal authority to loom large in Durham under Kellawe.

Kellawe's dealings with York need detain us hardly at all. They consist essentially in the commissions of Archbishop Greenfield, and of the dean and chapter of York after his death in 1315, to Kellawe to perform spiritual functions in the diocese of York; we have already considered these in detail.[22] There is no dispute over jurisdiction, rights of visitation, or any of the bitterness that previously existed between metropolitan and suffragan. The great age of Durham-York litigation had passed. Bishop and Archbishop were no longer determined to range themselves one against the other.

20 Reg. I 340-45, 396-99, 402-06, 413-15, 418-20, 431, 457-61, 479, 521

21 Reg. I 420-23

22 See Cap. V

In any case, if we accept the view of Robert Brentano, the cause of bishop against archbishop was not the stuff of the struggle at all. The issue was primarily the custody of the spirituality during a vacancy of the bishopric, which was therefore the concern of the prior and convent of Durham, not the bishop. The unique position of Durham regarding temporalities-which were in the King's hands during a vacancy-was not important, and served only to inflate Durham pride; this, "supported by tradition and wealth, and inflamed by the demagogues of the cloister, was at the heart of Durham's resistance to York".[23] The Bek-Romeyn struggle, while conspicuous, was irrelevant tot he issue. Whatever concern Kellawe had in the matter as a member of the Convent, he had none as Bishop.

It was hardly to be expected that Bishop.Kellawe, a promoted monk who was scarcely concerned with matters outside Durham at all, would have cause for either outstandingly good or excessively bad relations with the King, the Pope and the Archbishop. For all, he would fulfil his bounden duty, neither resisting it, nor giving more than he was obliged. In his

23 R. Brentano, York Metropolitan Jurisdiction, p.173

position, this was without doubt the wisest course to follow. His dealings with the King were more important and of more interest than those with his ecclesiastical superiors, but all show the type of man he was-an able guardian of the bishopric, neither forthright nor incompetent, neither a great protagonist nor a disaster. The five and a half years of Kellawe's episcopate were a time of sensible mediocrity; to a bishop such as he, succeeding a man like Bek, emerging from the cloister and having thrust upon him the charge of an important regality, situated near the border of a country at war, with responsibilities both temporal and spiritual, such a judgement is perhaps the greatest tribute which could be paid.

VII KELLAWE-THE MAN AND HIS LEGACY

Richard de Kellawe died in the lesser chamber of his residence of Middleham shortly after midnight on the morning of the feast of St. Paulinus the Bishop, in the sixth year of his consecration.[1] His will was dated the Sunday after the feast of St. Michael the Archangel, less than a fortnight before, which suggests that he knew his end was near. By the terms of his will, he bequeathed his two palfreys to the convent, 100 marks to the poor, £60 to provide sixty candles for his funeral, and the rest of his goods, after satisfaction had beem made to his debtors, to his executors, his kinsman (germanus) Patrick de Kellawe, Thomas de Hessewell, rector of Sedgefield, Robert de Brompton, prebendary of Auckland, and Roger de Saxton, rector of Aberford, "pro salutem animae meae disposuerint".[2] The provision for the convent was surprisingly poor, especially in view of Graystanes' assertion that Kellawe had frequently mentioned during his lifetime that he would bequeath to the convent his chapel, library (on the strength

1 Reg. II 834. Graystanes gives the day of St. Dionysius (Oct. 9). The exact time on the night of October 9-10 is therefore uncertain.

2 Testamenta Eboracensa (Surtees Soc. No. IV, 1836) pp.1-2

word alone he has been made out to have been a man of literature[3]), and a large amount of money; but concerned with his illness, thinks Graystanes, he hastily appointed executors, who in their own interests misused the goods of the late bishop to curry favour with his successor and the King. "Dederat enim uni consanguineo suo ecclesiam de Seggefeld, et ipse, timens privari ea, fecit sibi amicos de Rege et suis, de succedente Episcopo et suis, cum mammona iniquitatis de bonis defuncti, nec creditoribus ejus satisfaciens, nec aliis. Episcopus, enim, infirmitate praeoccupatus, totam dispositionem rerum suarum et illi consanguineo suo et aliis committebat."[4]

Other wishes of Kellawe were, however, complied with. He was buried in the Chapter house of Durham Cathedral, above the steps under a marble stone near the bishop's chair. The tomb lay undisturbed until the close of the eighteenth century, when "the beautiful Chapter house in which Kellawe was laid, was mutilated by Wyatt, the so-called architect." The apsidal portion was removed, and the space became part of the dean's garden. In what appeared to Canon Raine to be Kellawe's grave,

3 Fordyce, History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham, Vol. I

4 S.T. p.97

there were found bones which indicated a man of short stature, a piece of a wooden pastoral staff, and pieces of clothing material, which indicated that "the bishop had evidently been buried after the simple and touching fashion of his time, in the garb which had been familiar to him from his earliest years, the cowl and habit of a Benedictine monk."[5]

After Kellawe's death, the battle for the episcopal throne started afresh. Edward II granted the licence to elect on 19 October, news of the vacancy having been brought by brothers Henry de Stanford and William de Couton. The election of 1316 occasioned much greater intrigue and attempted bribery than did that of 1311-there was not the distraction of internal crisis this time, the Scottish troubles, though still severe, had subsided sufficiently to render the bishopric a more attractive proposition than it appeared in 1311, and-most important of all-the King was better able to take an interest in theproceeding. This time, there was to be no monk-bishop by default, no second Kellawe-though naturally the monks would do their best to repeat the triumph of last time. The Earl of Lancaster, Graystanes tells us,[6] urged the case of

5 Preface to Reg. III, pp.cxv-cxvi
6 S.T. pp.98-99

his clerk, John de Kynardsley, promising the convent in return protection against the Scots-and against the King's wrath at such an act. Humphrey de Bohun, earl of Hereford and Essex, put forward his clerk, John Walwayn. The King requested the election of Thomas de Carleton, Keeper of the Privy Seal-to whom he might well have afforded little more support that Antolin de Pisana enjoyed on the last occasion. There was a stronger royal candidate-the Queen so wanted the elevation of her kinsman, Louis de Beaumont, Treasurer of Salisbury and also prebendary of Auckland, as to canvass each monk individually. The result of the election was awaited in person by the earls of Lancaster, Hereford and Pembroke, and other nobles, and by Henry de Beaumont and others on behalf of his brother, and who-Graystanes asserts-had let it be known that if another monk was elected, they would cut off his head. It was only to be expected that the monks would try to repeat their triumph of 1311, and news came to the assembled nobles that election had solemnly and canonically been made of Henry de Stanford, prior of Finchale. Equally it was to be expected that in the teeth of such opposition, particularly that of the Queen, such a decision would be untenable. According to Graystanes, the King was prepared

to agree to Stanford's election, as he had agreed to Kellawe's in 1311, but the Queen impressed Beaumont's case upon him apparently by the expedient of baring her knees ("nudatis genibus"). Be that as it may, Pope John XXII was persuaded to set aside the election, despite Stanford's strong prosecution of his own case at Avignon-evidence that the convent did not intend to yield lightly. The episcopate of Louis de Beaumont suffered an inauspicious start, when the bishop-elect, on his way to his diocese with two cardinals on a mission to Scotland for the Pope, was set upon and despoiled by Gilbert de Middleton, leader of the "Shavaldi", who, while letting the cardinals go free, took Beaumont off to his castle at Mitford, near Morpeth.[7] This is a very difficult action to assess. If Middleton was acting on his own initiative, it was an act of folly, setting him on the road to the gallows. But may there not have been other agents behind it? It would be fascinating, though probably quite impossible, to associate the convent with this incident; on them , at the cardinals' instigation fell the burden of paying for Beaumont's redemption. But Graystanes shows how the monks wished to impede Beaumont's consecration, for Stanford was still fighting, as

7 S.T. pp.100-01

when the prior sent a message to Beaumont at Darlington, telling him to turn back, for the "Shavaldi" were at hand- and they were. How did the prior know? Graystanes tells also how the cardinals were moved against the monks when Middleton came to Durham, and mass was celebrated in his presence. Graystanes urges that they did not know that it was he, and that if they had known, they could have offered no resistance? It is unlikely that they could not have known. Surely it is not too cynical to suggest that waylaying a bishop of whom they did not approve in 1317 is not too far removed from resisting a bishop by siege in 1300, and an archbishop by force of arms in 1283-though the consequences would have been very grave, and it might be too much to attack cardinals, even for the monks of Durham. But the episcopate of Kellawe was the type of episcopate they wanted, and for this they were prepared to fight. In 1333, they elected the chronicler Robert de Graystanes himself, subprior and doctor of theology (and among the compromisarii, still fighting for the convent, was the former prior Geoffrey de Burdon. Graystanes was even consecrated by William de Melton, Archbishop of York.[8] But never again were the monks to enjoy success. 1311 was a great

8 S.T. pp.120-21. A fascinating matter, but unfortunately beyond the scope of the present study.

triumph, but in the long run proved to be but a fleeting victory. The old order had passed. The new age of the royal servant, foreshadowed in Bek, had superseded the old age of the monk, whose last expression was Kellawe.

In this respect, Kellawe's episcopate was not a success. He represented the hopes and aims of Durham, of the monks that the throne of St. Cuthbert should be occupied by one of themselves, of the commonalty that the bishop should be a man of local interests and concerns, and in his temporal capacity, a true head of the "communitas"-as Bek could never be. But this was never again to be so. The franchise itself suffered no great decline under Kellawe's administration, though its peak had passed; he showed himself to be a capable administrator and an avid defender of his palatine authority, even if his concern and circumstances did not conspire towards an active extension of it. He showed himself to be a good pastor of his flock, determined to maintain order in his diocese despite the ravages from without. A reappraisal of Kellawe away from the emphatic judgements of historians of a previous generation acquits him well for his work on both counts, temporal and spiritual. Kellawe was a good bishop,

not in their sense of commendable but misplaced piety and other-worldliness, for he was firmly implanted in the processes and machinations of his time and place. Rather, he was a good bishop in that he combined these spiritual values with the strength, ability and appreciation necessary in a bishop of Durham produced by years of internal turmoil to face military crisis and civil and ecclesiastical disorder. As we have seen, Kellawe was far from being incapable and unrealistic. And yet he failed. He failed because the immediate problems were too great for him, and because in the long run, the forces that produced him were becoming incapable of producing another like him. Kellawe was an interlude, a last vestige of something that had passed- this is inescapable. Exactly how he was produced is not even now entirely clear.; possibly initial conflicts with the new order which had not yet realised its true purpose made it possible for a reaction to come about for a short time, but would not permit the old to become again a permanent and definite feature. Yet the pity of Kellawe is that at this last irrecoverable hour, he was probably all that a monk-bishop should have been. If we can see below the surface,

if we can look beyond the Scots, the burned churches, and the outward manifestations of a time of despair and disintegration, we can see a well-ordered diocese, free from internal dissension, under a bishop who knew from long association and hard experience what was desired and what was necessary, who could combine spiritual devotion and authority with good temporal administration, the search for the world to come with the needs of the world here and now. The loss to the convent of the ability to produce another monk-bishop was irrecoverable. The tragedy of Kellawe is that he showed all the advantages and potentialities of the old way when it had been abandoned. Just as the monks never received the rich bequests which were promised at his death, so Kellawe promised a fine legacy which could never be enjoyed.

APPENDIX A-THE ELECTION OF KELLAWE (FROM LOC. VI 9a)

(See Cap. I)

(i) A LIST OF THE MONKS FREE TO ELECT

(Those under sentence of excommunication, including both prior and subprior, absented themselves from the election, as did some others of their brethren.)

Reginald de Barneby
(third prior)

Osbert de York
(Infirmarius)

Robert de Bowes

Thomas de Castra

Walter de Eaglescliffe

John de Jarrow

Robert de Stanlawe

Geoffrey de Lincoln

John de Barnard Castle

William de Haxeby

John de Laton

Roger de Greatham

John de Allerton
(Master of the Galilee Chapel)

Alan de Marton
(Celerarius)

William de Durham
(Librarius)

John de Seaton
(Camerarius)

Alexander de Lamesley

John de Harneby

William de Hexham

Richard de Neasham

William de Killingworth

John de Bermeton

William de Guisborough

Ralph de Twisle (?)

Thomas de Haldanby

Roger de Stanhope

Michael de Chilton
(Granerarius)

William de Eaglescliffe

Thomas de Bamburgh
(Master of Farne)

Thomas de Athelingfleet

Simon de Grimsby

Stephen de Howden
(Prior of Holy Island)

Robert de Stanford

John de Wolviston

Adam de Pontefract
(Prior of Coldingham)

Thomas de Allerton

Gilbert de Stanford

Richard de Cotsmoor
(Refectorarius)

Thomas de Rillington

William de Couton

William de York

John de Haxeby

John de Durham

William de Ripon
(Lectairius)

Peter de Hilton

Emery de Lomely

Richard de Whitworth

John Luterell
(Hostilarius)

William de Levingthorp

Nicholas de Throckrington
(Succentor)

Nicholas de Louthbery

Robert de Bamburgh

John de Buttrelbyr (?)

John de Barneby

Walter de Scarisbek

William de Insula

THE "COMPROMISSARII"

Henry de Teesdale

Nicholas de Rothbury

Thomas de Wivestowe

Thomas de Aldewood

Geoffrey de Haxeby (doctor of theology)

Geoffrey de Burdon (prior of Lytham)

John de Birden

Thomas de Hessewell (Terrarius)

Hugh de Monte Alto (Elemosinarius)

Henry de Castro

Gilbert de Ellewybyr (?)

(ii) EXTRACTS FROM LOC. VI 9a

(a) Henry de Castro is to require those under suspension to retire from the election, so that its validity may be incontestable.

In dei nomine, Amen. Cum vacante ecclesia Dunelmensa die tertio mensis martii Anno domini millesimo trecentissimo decimo per mortem bonae memoriae domini Antonii nuper episcopi ecclesiae praedictae, petita licentia ab excellentissimo principe et domino Edwardo dei gratia Rege Angliae illustri eligendi episcopum dictae ecclesiae vacanti pariter et optenta vocatisque omnibus et singlis qui de jure et consuetudine ecclesiae praedictae pro electione huius celebranda fuerint evocandi ac assignato ad hoc termino videlicet isto die mercurii proximo post festum Annunciationis beatae Mariae Virginis Anno domini $m^{o}ccc^{o}$ undecimo. Nos .. Capitulum .. priores, cellerarius ac omnes et singuli monachi ecclesiae Dunolmensi qui debemus volumus et possimus electioni huiusmodi interesse in capitulo nostro pro electione huius celebranda favente domino congregati volentes ut vite etsecurem in dicto negotio procedatur damus plenam et specialem potestatem dilecto commonacho nostro fratri Henrico de Castro monendi

et requirendi omnes suspensos, excommunicatos et interdictos si qui presentes fuerint, et omnes alios qui de iure non debent electioni huius interesse quod ab isto loco et capitulo recedant, et nos qui debemus volumus et possimus interesse libere eligere permittant pretestantes quod non est nostra vel alicuius nostrum intentio vel voluntas cum talibus procedere seu vocibus ipsorum invita in negotio memorato minimo volumus quod voces illorum si qui tales inveniantur in posterea nulli praestent suffragium nec alicui afferant documentum pro nostro receptas et non habitis habeantur. In cuius rei testimonium sigillum commune capituli nostri praesentibus est appensum.

(b) Election is made by compromise of brother Richard de Kellawe.

Qui quidem compromissarii compromissionem praedictam acceptantes et in eodem capitulo in partem secedentes et super electionem praedictam facienda de futuro episcopo et pastore ad in vicem conferentes et tractantes post diligentem et magnum tractatum super hoc habitum inter ipsos, in religiosem virum fratrem Ricardum de Kellawe commonachum et confratrem suum licet absentem virtute compromissionis et veritatis(?) suae praedictae ipsorum

nominem ac omnium et singlorum aliorum praedictorum de dicto capitulo monachorum ibidem praesentium direxerunt unanimiter et concorditer vota sua ipsum quae fratrem Ricardum in episcopum et pastorem dictae ecclesiae Dunelmensis eligendum fore concorditer consenserunt et frater Henricus de Tesedale eorum compromisarii et college ad eligendum eundem fratrem Ricardum de Kellawe in episcopum et pastorem dictae ecclesiae dederunt in scriptis hac forma....

(c) The "compromissarii" give reasons for their choice

In dei nomine, Amen. Nos, Henricus de Tesedale, Nicholaus de Rothbyr', Thom' de Aldewod', Galfridus de Haxeby, doctor sacrae theologie, Galfrid' de Burdon', prior de Lytham', Johannes de Birden', Thom' de Hessewell' terrarius, Hugo de Monte Alto, elemosinarius, Henricus de Castro et Gilbertus de Ellwyb', fratres et commonachi ecclesiae Dunelmensis, electi a capitulo eiusdem ecclesiae et in nos ab eis speciali potestate collata, etper nos vercundia acceptata vice sua et nostra eligendi ydoneam personam in episcopum ecclesiae supradictae, et de ipsa persona eidem ecclesiae providendi, prout in litteris coram nobis inde confectis plenius continetur secedentes in partem invocita Spiritu Sancti gratia de diversis personis procedente utilitate

et deliberatione per habita diligenti ecclesiae nostrae utilitate pensata et personarum variarum meritis ponderatis, deum prae oculis habentes, vice nostra et vice omnium et singlorum de capitulo Dunolmense pro electione huius facienda in dicto capitulo praesentium in certum personam videlicet in fratrum Ricardum deKellawe confratrem et commonachum nostrum processum presbytrum virum utique providem et discretum in elate praedictum vita et moribus commendatum in spiritualibus et temporalibus circumspectum et aliis diversis virtutum actibus insignitum nostra concorditer....consentum in ecclesiae Dunolmensis episcopum electum. Quocirca nos....compromissario nostro specialiter mandamus et potestatem in hiis scriptis damus et committimus specialem ut cum vice sua et nostra et vice omnium et singlorum de capitulo praedicto pro electione huius celebrandi praesentium dictum fratrem Ricardum in episcopum dictae ecclesiae Dunelmensis eligas et electionem de eo factam publices in communi.

APPENDIX B-KELLAWE'S ITINERARY

(This is derived from the date and place of entries in the Bishop's Register. This may tend to be inaccurate -the clerk composing the entry need not necessarily have been in constant attendance upon the bishop-but the method is more reliable for the itinerary of a bishop than for that of the King, and is probably even more reliable in the case of Kellawe, in view of his relative immobility throughout his episcopate.

The most striking fact that emerges is that Kellawe preferred to spend much of his time in Yorkshire-at Riccall, or on his regalian manor of Crayke. He does not, however, seem to have resided at Wheel Hall, which he founded.

Dates and places in parenthesis are those given by the Register which may not indicate the Bishop's presence: an isolated location far from where he was currently residing; or, in the case of Durham, caused probably by the continued functioning of the Bishop's Chancery in his absence.)

1311

May 11	Ripon (consecration)
" 13	~~Woodhorn~~ Woodham (Ayeliffe)
" 25	Crayke
Jun 5	Stockton
" 14	Wolsingham
" 20	Darlington
" 25	Riccall
" 29	Howden
Jul 8	Stockton
" 10	Riccall
" 20	Northallerton
" 21	Crayke
" 26	Stockton
(10folios missing from Register here.)	
Sep 24-Oct 6	Middleham
(Oct 4	Durham)
" 21	Greatham
" 22	Stockton
Nov 1	Middleham
" 17-Dec 22	Auckland
Dec 25	Middleham
" 26-28	Durham
" 29-Jan 8	Auckland
Jan 10-12 1312	Darlington
(" 11	Northallerton)
" 12-23	Stockton
" 24	Auckland
" 28-Mar 5	Durham
Mar 10-20	Kepier
" 21	Middleham
" 23 -Apr 6	Stockton
Apr 15	Gateshead
" 16	Lumley
(10 folios missing from Register here.)	
Jun 16	Darlington
" 20-Jul 6	Crayke
Jul 9-17	Riccall
(1 folio missing from Register here.)	
Aug 23	Ware, Mddx.
" 25	Tottenham

Sep 6	Riccall
" 7	Crayke
" 16	Stockton
" 17-28	Auckland
" 30-Oct 1	Middleham
Oct 3-Nov 2	Stockton
Nov 8-18	Middleham
" 19	Crayke
" 21-24	Stockton
" 26	Northallerton
" 28-Dec 3	Crayke
Dec 14-Jan 21 1313	Riccall
Jan 27-Feb 5	Crayke
Feb 10-28	Middleham
(" 14	Kepier)
Mar 2-Apr 11	Stockton
Apr 22-23	Evenwood
" 28-Jun 2	Auckland
(May 19	Wolsingham)
Jun 6-Jul 2	Middleham
Jul 6	Auckland
" 14	Durham
" 25-Aug 7	Stockton

Aug 18-19	Crayke
" 23	Riccall
" 25-29	Howden
Sep 2-23	Riccall
(" 12	Wheel Hall)
Oct 1-13	Evenwood
" 17-Nov 2	Middleham
(" 27	Stockton)
Nov 9-30	Wolsingham
Dec 2-23	Evenwood
" 26	Auckland
" 28-Jan 7 1314	Stockton
Jan 12	Crayke
" 27-Feb 9	Riccall
Feb 26	Tottenham
" 27	Kilpesham(?)
" 27-Mar 4	Stepney (Stebbenhyth)
Mar 5	Dartford
" 8-10	Greenwich
" 12	London
" 15	Alreford(?)
" 17-25	Walworth

Apr 7	Offingtom
" 22	Northallerton
" 23	Middleham
May 1- 9	Crayke
" 15-16	Middleham
(" 25	Durham)
" 25-31	Stockton
Jun 5- 6	Riccall
" 8 -20	Evenwood)
(" 13	Durham
" 24	Crayke
" 25-Sep 10	Riccall
(" 27	Durham)
Sep 20-Oct 9	Naburn
Oct 10-17	Riccall
" 25-Nov 2	Stockton
Nov 12-14	Kepier
" 15-16	Durham
" 16	Kepier
" 18	Middleham
" 20-26	Stockton
Dec 5	Crayke
" 26	Riccall

1315	
Feb 21-Apr 20	Riccall
May 25	Stockton
(" 31	Durham)
Jun 6	Stockton
" 11-Aug 7	Ricca ll
Aug 21	Northallertom
" 25	Haughton-le-Skerne
" 26	Wardley
" 29	Middleham
" 31-Sep 23	Stockton
Sep 25	Middleham
Oct 6-25	Stockton
" 27	Northallerton
" 31-Nov 23	Riccall
Dec 4	Wheel Hall
(" 4	Auckland)
" 6 -Jan 18 1316	Ricca ll
(Jan 4	Howden)
Feb 14-22	Carleton Paynel (?)
(4 folios missing here.)	
May 21-Aug 3	Riccall
Aug 18-21	Naburn
Sep 6	Northallertom
" 9-15	Stockton
" 20-Oct 10 (died)	Middleham

APPENDIX C-SELECT LIST OF KELLAWE'S OFFICIALS (See Cap. III)

SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL

OFFICE	HOLDER	DATES OF OCCURENCE	REFERENCE IN REGISTER
Vicar-General	William de Tanfield, Prior of Durham Thomas de Clifford, Dean of Auckland (jointly)	app 26 Nov 1312	I 279
	William de Whickham, Dean Lanchester	app 19 Jun 1315	II 707
Official	mr. John de Insula, prof. civil law (King's clerk and Bp's clerk under Bek)	app 19 Jun 1311	I 21
	mr. Richard de Eryum, prof. civil law	occ 8 Jan 1312	I 115
	William de Whickham, Dean Lanchester	app 13 Oct 1313	I 450
Steward	Richard de Marmeduke	app 26 Dec 1314	II 686
Temporal Chancellor	William de Denum	occ 28 Nov 1312	I 257
Receiver-General	mr. William de Kellawe	app 12 Jan 1312	I 116
Chancellor and Receiver of Durham	Robert de Brompton	occ 20 Apr 1314 et al.	I 520

Receiver of Consistory	John de Easington	app 6 Feb 1312	I 137
Sequestrator-General	mr. William de Kellawe	app 6 Jun 1311	I 44
	John de Pollowe	app 27 Feb 1312	I 152
Sheriff and Escheator of Durham and Sadberge	Adam de Bowes	app 19 Oct 1312	I 222
Constable of Durham	mr. William de Kellawe	app 12 Jan 1312	I 116
Chief Justice	Lambert de Trikingham (also Royal Justice, Master of Sherburn Hospital)	occ 1312	II 885
Warden of Forests, Chases, Parks, Woods, Mines	Gilbert de Scaresbek	app 31 May 1314	I 552

Constable of Norham	William Rydel	app 5 Jun 1311; occ until 1314	I 19 I 598 et al
	Walter de Gosewyk	app 9 Oct 1314; occ 16 Nov 1312	I 614 II 1177
Receiver of Norham	Robert de Sokepeth	app 1313; occ 4 Apr 1312	I 174 I 547
Custodian of Spiritualities in Allertonshire	mr. Thomas de Levesham	bef 19 Jul 1311	I 56
	mr. Henry de Allerton	occ 19 Jul 1311	I 56
	Robert de Brompton	occ 11 Jun 1313	I 353
	mr. William de Allerton	occ 25 May 1314	I 581
Bailiff and Receiver of Allerton	Matthew Dauney	occ 11 Nov 1313	I 502
Steward and Bailiff of Howden	Alexander de Bergh	app 4 Jun 1311	I 19
	Matthew Dauney	app 3 Oct 1312	I 203
	John de Doncaster	app 4 Jan 1316	II 772
Receiver of Howden	Stephen de Cecile	bef 9 Feb 1314	I 505
	Hugh de Lokington	app 6 Feb 1314	I 505

APPENDIX D-BENEFICES (HOLDERS, PATRONS etc., VALUES)

(See Cap. V)

(Material based upon:-

Holders-Fasti Dunelmenses, ed. D. S. Boutflower

Advowsons, Presentations, Rectors, Appropriations
-R. Surtees, History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham
-Northumberland County History

(considerably supplemented and corrected from the Register and other original sources)

Values-Taxatio Papae Nicholae IV
-Register Vol. III)

I) COLLEGIATE CHURCHES

(a) AUCKLAND-Dean and 12 Canons

DEAN	Stephen de Mauley	1311	Thomas de Clifford	1311
CANONS	William de Bliburgh	1312	Richard de Morpeth	1312-15
	Roger de Ely	1311	Philip de Kilkenni	1312
	Robert de Wycombe	1311	John de Berwick	1312
	Gilbert de Sandale	1312	Thomas de New Hay	1312
	Geoffrey de Puccini	1312	John de Snaynton	1312
	Stephen de Mauley	1312	John de Insula	1312
	Geoffrey de Edenham	1312	Richard de Tymparon	1313
	Richard de Eryum	1313	Roger de Waltham	1312
	Hugh de Monte Alto	1312		

Gilbert de Rothbury	by 1316
Geoffrey de Stokes	1314
Robert de Lincoln	1314
Gilbert de Wygton	1315
Louis de Beaumont	1315-16
Robert de Brompton	1316
Gilbert de Stapleton	1316
William de Ayremynne	1316

VALUES-1291

Dean		40	-	-
Portions	(i)	46	13	4
	(ii)	26	13	4
	(iii)	20	-	-
	(iv)	20	-	-
	(v)	20	-	-
	(vi)	16	13	4
	(vii)	16	-	-
	(viii)	16	-	-
	(ix)	10	-	-
	(x)	10	-	-
	(xi)	6	13	4
	(xii)	5	-	-

VALUES-NOVA TAXATIO

	26	13	4
Robert de Woodhouse	21	-	-
(Philip de Kilkenni?)	16	-	-
Stephen de Mauley	12	-	-
Gilbert de Wygton	12	-	-
Hugh de Sapy	11	13	4
Robert de Brompton	10	-	-
Laurence de St. Marus	11	-	-
Roger de Waltham	10	5	-
Geoffrey de Stokes	5	-	-
William de Ayremynne	1	10	-
Alan de Kirkham	1	10	-
Gilbert de Rothbury	1	6	4

(b) CHESTER-LE-STREET-Dean and 7 Canons

(founded by Bek 1286. Presentation vested in Bishop)

DEAN	William de Marclan	1311
	Robert de Keighley (doctor of theology)	1316
CANONS	Thomas de Goldesborough	1311
	Robert de Baldock	1311
	Ralph de Holbeche	1311
	John de Percy	1311
	Reginald de Brandon	1314
	Roger de Waltham	1314

VALUE-1291			
Dean	33	6	8
Portions (i)	20	-	-
(ii)	20	-	-
(iii)	17	6	8
(iv)	16	-	-
(v)	13	6	8
(vi)	13	6	8
(vii)	13	6	8

VALUE-NOVA TAXATIO			
Dean	14	-	-
James de Ispania	11	13	4
John de Percy	11	6	8
John de Denton	5	6	8
Roger de Waltham	6	13	4
William de Rotney	8	-	-
Ralph de Holbeche	4	13	4
Robert de Baldock	3	6	8

(c) DARLINGTON-4 Masters and Vicar

VICAR Richard de Hadyngton 1312

CANONS Roger de Waltham 1311
Elias de Sordiche 1311
Roger de Witham 1311
William de Ewell 1311
Adam de Middleton 1312
John de Insula 1312
John de Brabant 1312
John de Snaynton 1312
Ralph de Brandon 1313
Peter de Ciresy 1313

VALUE-1291

Vicar 6 13 4
4 portions, each 16 13 4

VALUE-NOVA TAXATIO

Vicar 1 4 -
4 portions, each 9 - -

(d) LANCHESTER-Dean and 7 Canons

(founded by Bek 1283. Presentation vested in Bishop.)

DEAN William de Whickham 1311

CANONS Thomas de New Hay 1311
Giles de Aldenaro 1311
Gerard de Aldenaro 1311
Richard de Eryum 1311
Peter de Insula 1311
Michael de Harcla 1311
John de Longford 1313
Pontius de Montmartin 1311
Oliver Daincourt 1312
John de Roma 1313
Roger de Stockton 1315
Robert de Brompton 1315
Louis de Beaumont 1316
Adam de Osgodby 1315-16
Gilbert de Sandale 1316
(after Kellawe's death)

VALUE-1291		VALUE-NOVA TAXATIO	
Dean	23 6 8	Dean	3 2 -
Portions (i)	16 13 4	John de Roma	3 - -
(ii)	13 6 8	Oliver Dayncourt	8 13 4
(iii)	10 13 4	Robert de Brompton	1 4 -
(iv)	6 13 4		
(v)	6 13 4		
(vi)	6 13 4	Michael de Harcla	- 2 -
(vii)	6 13 4	Richard de Eryum	- 1 -

(e) NORTON-Vicar and 8 portioners

VICAR[x]	Ralph de Dalton	Incumbent, displaced 1311
	Hugh de Sapy	Presented by King 1311
	Bernard de Kirkeby	Presented by King 1311

x-See Cap. V

PORTIONERS	Louis de Beaumont 1286-1313	James de Avisio	1314
	John de Brabant 1305-13	John Vanne	1314
	Roger de Insula 1310-13	John de Norton	1315
	Robert de Levisham 1310	Maunfred de Bargiis	1315
	Gerard de Aldenaro 1313	Roger de Savage	1315
		Roger de Saxton	1316

VALUE-1291		VALUE-NOVA TAXATIO	
Vicar	20 - -	Vicar	13 - -
8 portions, each	6 - -	8 portions, each	4 - -

II PARISHES

BENEFICE	INCUMBENT	DATE(S)	RECTOR/APPROPRIATOR PATRON/PRESENTED BY	VALUE 1291	VALUE NOVA TAXATIO
ARCHDEACONRY OF DURHAM					
DEANERY OF DURHAM					
Billingham-Vicar	Walter de Offington	1312	Prior Conv. Durham	20 - -	13 6 8
				V[x] 5 - -	V 1 3 -
Boldon-Rector	Thomas de Brompton	ante 1313	Bp. Durham	40 - -	16 13 4
	John de Insula	1311			
Brancepeth-Rector				53 6 8	
Castle Eden			Prior Conv. Durham		3 6 8
			Portion, Prior Durham	5 - -	
			" , " Guisborough	5 - -	
			x-Vicar's portion		xxx

Dalton-le-Dale -Vicar	William de Dalton	1312	Prior Conv. Durham	22 13 4	13 6 8
DURHAM					
St. Mary, North Bailey-Vicar	William de Graystoke	1312	Prior Conv. Durham	Exempt from tenths	
St. Mary, South Bailey-Rector	Henry de Donyngton	1312, 1316	Earls of Westmorland	Exempt from tenths	
St. Nicholas-Rector	Peter de Chartres Richard de Eryum	1308 1312	Hospital of St. Giles, Kepier	13 6 8	5 10 -
St. Oswald-Vicar	Nicholas de Crossgat	1312	Prior Conv. Durham	20 - -	12 - -
Easington-Rector	Archdeacon of Durham			120 - -	53 - -
Edmundbyers				6 13 4	
Elwick-Rector	Adam de Dalton	1313	Bp. Durham	26 13 4	16 13 4

Gateshead-Rector	John de Valle John de Haverings	1311 1312	Bp. Durham	13	6	8	6	13	4
Gretham-Vicar	Adam de Bedale	1312	Hospital of Gretham	23	6	8	12	6	8
Hart (with Hartlepool) -Vicar	Stephen de Cotum	1314	Prior Conv. Guisborough	40	-	-	26	13	4
			Hartlepool:	26	13	4	17	6	8
			Portion, Prior Tynemouth	10	-	-			
Hesleden-Vicar	Hugh de Ilderton	1312	Prior Conv. Durham	20	-	-	14	-	-
Houghton-le-Spring -Rector	Stephen de Mauley	1311	Bp. Durham	86	13	4	50	-	-
Jarrow				40	-	-	26	13	4
			Portion, Prior Durham	20	-	-			
Kelloe-Vicar	Thomas de Canterbury	1314	Master Sherburn Hospital	5	-	-	1	6	8

Merrington-Vicar	(?)Thomas de Skirkenbeck	1317	Prior Conv. Durham	20 - -	14 13 4
				V 5 - -	V - 18 -
Middleham-Vicar	Nicholas de Bishopton	1311	Prior Conv. Durham	36 13 4	18 13 4
				V 6 - -	V - 13 4
Pittington-Vicar	John de Pittington	1314	Prior Conv. Durham	26 13 4	16 13 4
				V 6 13 4	V 1 - -
Ryton-Vicar	John de Botheby	1312	Bp. Durham	40 - -	1 10 -
Seaham-Rector	Elias de Cochill	1311	Hadham and Yeland (lords of manor) alternately (Surtees)	30 - -	16 - -
	John	1312			
Sedgefield-Rector	Peter de Kellawe	1311	Bp. Durham	113 6 8	51 - -
	Thomas de Hessewell (Master of Sherburn)	1313			
Stanhope-Rector	Guilelimo de Frescobaldi	1311	King	40 - -	2 - -
	Henry de Botheby	1311, 1316			

xxxx

Stranton-Vicar	Richard de Topcliffe	1312	Prior Conv. Guisborough	40 - -	24 10 -
				V 6 13 4	V 4 - -
			Portion, Prior Tynemouth	6 13 4	
Trimdon			Prior Conv. Guisborough	12 - -	6 13 4
Monkwearmouth				23 6 8	13 6 8
			Portion, Prior Durham	12 - -	
Bishopwearmouth	John de Orreby	1312	Bp. Durham	100 - -	52 13 4
-Rector of Wearmouth	William de Ayremynne	1314			
Washington-Recror	William de Hameldon	c. 1313	Bp. Durham	33 6 8	22 10 -
	Aymo de Savoy	1314			
Whickham-Rector	Richard de Leicester	1311	Bp. Durham	20 - -	1 - -
	Robert de Baldock	1313			

x

Whitburn-Rector[x]	Berald de Fargiis	incumbent, 1311	Pope	40 - -	26 13 4	
	William de Ayremynne	1312, res. 1316	King			
	John de Snaynton	claimant	Bp. Durham			
	Nicholas de Welburn	1316	King			
x-See Cap. V						
Whitworth			Prior Conv. Durham	8 - -	4 10 -	
Wolsingham-Rector				40 - -	2 - -	
DEANERY OF DARLINGTON						
Aycliffe-Vicar	Robert de Wolverton	1312	Prior Conv. Durham	43 6 8	27 - -	
	Richard de Hoton	1312				
Cockfield-Rector	Hugh	1311		5 - -	3 3 4	

x

Coniscliffe[x] -Rector	Walter de Clifford	1313	Abbot Conv. St. Albans	26	13	4	21	5	-
- "	John de Croft	presented & removed 1315	King						
- "	Geoffrey de Edenham	1315	Bp. Durham						
-Vicar	Walter Pigeon	1315	"						
x-See Cap. V									
Dinsdale-Rector	Thomas de Normanton	1312	Prior Conv. Durham (?)	4	13	4	3	-	-
Eggescliffe-Rector	Roger de Waltham	1312	Bp. Durham	40	-	-	20	15	-
Elton-Rector	William de Elwick William de Hoo	1311	Gower/Bowes (Surtees)	4	6	8	2	-	-
Gainford-Rector	William de Pickering	1312, 1314	Abbot Conv. St. Mary, York	R[z]100	-	-	R 40	18	-
				V 10	-	-	V 1	-	-

z-Rector's portion

Haughton-le-Skerne -Rector			Bp. Durham	113	6	8	54	1	8
Heighington-Vicar	William de Burdon	1311	Prior Conv. Durham	46	13	4	26	13	8
				V 5	-	-	V 1	6	8
Hurworth-Rector	Simon de Baldreston	1315	Lucas de Tailboys & Robert de Heppe-hale	54	-	-	30	6	8
Longnewton-Rector	Roger de Waltham	1314		20	-	-	14	-	-
Middleton-in-Teesdale -Rector	John Fitzhenry	1294, 1313	Abbot Conv. St. Mary, York	20	-	-	3	6	8
Middleton St. George -two Rectors, one a sinecure	John de Cambe (incumbent Rector)	1312	John de Cambe	a. 9	6	8	a.4	13	4
				b. 4	-	-	b.2	6	8
	William de London (sinecure Rector)	1312	Ralph Bart						

Redmarshall-Rector	John de Bohoun – Thomas de Salcock	1311 1316	Bp. Durham	26 13 4	13 6 8
Sockburn-Vicar	Rabanus de Jarrow	1313	Master of Sherburn Hospital	4 13 4	2 13 4
Staindrop-Rector	Thomas de Salcock	1316	Nicholas de Staindrop & his wife Isabella (recovered by Bp. Beaumont, 1319)	93 6 8	60 10 4
Stainton-le-Street -Rector	John de Akeley Peter le Vavascour	1311 1313	Abbot Conv. St. Mary, York	10 – –	3 6 8
Winston-Rector	Robert de la Rye	1312	Bp. Durham	16 – –	10 13 4

ARCHDEACONRY OF NORTHUMBERLAND

DEANERY OF NEWCASTLE

Bedlington-Vicar	Simon de Darlington	1315	Prior Conv. Durham	40	-	-	
	Gilbert de Burdon	1315		V12	14	6	
Benton (Longbenton) -Rector				31	6	6	1 - -
Bolam-Rector	John de Insula	1312	Bp. Durham(?)	28	8	5	
Bothal-Rector	Roger Bertram	1312		37	-	-	
	Robert	1316	Portion, Prior Tynemouth				1 - -
Hartburn-Vicar[x]	William de Errington	1311	Appropriated to	67	18	8	
			Prior Conv. Tyne-	V37	4	-	
			mouth (Taxatio)	Portions from Vicar;			
	William de Wirkeshale	1311	King	Abbot St. Albans			
	Hugh de Sapy	1311	"				2 6 8
	Geoffrey de Edenham	1312	"	Prior Tynemouth			
	John de Percy	1313	"				8 - -
	Robert de Tymparon	1316	Bp. Durham				

x-See Cap. V

Heddon-on-the-Wall -Vicar	Thomas de Stockton	1312	Abbot Conv. Blanchland	25	-	8		
				V 6	5	8		
Horton	(Rectory merged with Woodhorn)		Prior Conv. Tynemouth	75	1	8		
Longhorseley	John de Horbiry	1314		R33	6	8		
-Rector of Horseley	Henry le Waleys	1315	Ralph son of William	V 7	5	-½		
- Perpetual Vicar	Thomas	1315						
Mitford-Vicar	Nicholas de Massam	1312		R42	1	8		
Morpeth-Rector	William de Beresford	1311		44	14	11		
Newburn-Vicar	Gilbert de Darlington	1311	Bp. Carlisle	62	6	-	3	6 8
				V 11	1	2		

xiv

Newcastle-upon-Tyne (St. Nicholas) -Vicar	William de Burdon	1303, 1314	Bp. & Prior Conv. Carlisle	20 5 -	10 - -
			Portions	1291	Nova Taxatio
			Bp. Carlisle	38 13 4	5 - -
			Prior Carlisle	38 13 4	5 - -
			Prior Tynemouth	8 - -	2 - -
Ponteland-Incumbent Vicar & 2 Portioners	John de Pickering	1312	Merton College, Oxford	R30 1 -	
			Prebendaries:	22 - -	
				20 10 -	
Tynemouth-Vicar	(?)John de Bamburgh	c.1308	Prior Conv. Tynemouth	71 12 10	
				V 6 1 2	
Woodhorn-Vicar	Robert de Littlebiry	1310 -15	Prior Conv. Tynemouth	75 1 8	
				V50 - -	
	Geoffrey de Edenham	1315	Portion, Prior Tynemouth	4 18 3	

DEANERY OF CORBRIDGE

Alston-Rector	(?)William de Poynton	1308		8	-	-
	Robert (degraded by Abp. Greenfield)	1313	Portion, Prior Hexham	-	6	8
Bywell, St. Andrew -Vicar	Bro. William de Norton[x]	1315	Abbot Conv. Blanch-	27	14	4
	Robert de Warkworth	1315	land	V 6	-	6
Bywell, St. Peter -Vicar	Walter de Jarrow	1312	Prior Conv. Durham	42	15	4
	Walter de Sherburn	1313		V 9	11	4
	Gilbert de Heley	1315				
Chollerton-Vicar	William	1316	Prior Conv. Hexham	77	17	6
				V 9	-	-
Corbridge-Vicar	Walter de Warthewyk	1315	Prior Conv. Car-	75	-	-
	William de Glasgow	1315	lisle	V 9	16	-
Corsenside(?)			Nunnery of Holystone (No vicarage ordained, 1312)	16	17	8

x-became Abbot of Blanchland 1315

Denton-in-Gilles-land(?)				5 1 -
			Portion, Prior Lanercost	- 10 -
Elsdon-Rector	John de Heddalem	claimant, 1312		90 16 5
			Portions	6 13 4
				5 - -
Haltwhistle-Vicar	Robert de Pykewell	1311	Abbot of Aber-brothok(?)	61 6 8
	Robert le Avener	1315		V21 1 -
	David de Harreys	1316		
Kirkharle-Vicar	John	1313		10 14 -
				V 5 9 6
Kirkhaugh-Vicar	Roger	1316		4 16 10
Kirkwhelpington -Rector of Whelpington	Hugh de Whelpington	1315	Appropriated to Abbot Newminster (Taxatio)(?)	45 18 -
	William	1316		

Knaresdale-Rector	John de Rydale	1313		10 - -
	Hugh de Swinburn	1313	John Prat	
	John de Crosseby[x]	1315	King	
	x-displaced Swinburn on King's presentation			
Ovingham-Rector	William de Comyn	1293-1316	Lord of barony of Prudhoe	96 4 10¼
			Portion, Prior Tynemouth	3 10 -
Simonburn-Rector	John de Pelham	1312	King	136 4 2
	John de Sandale	1314	King	
	Gilbert de Sandale	1316	King	
Slaley-Vicar	Canons of Hexham		Prior Conv. Hexham	
Stanfordham-Vicar	Thomas de Harum (Canon of Hexham)	1311	Prior Conv. Hexham	89 8 6
			Portion, Prior Hexham	25 8 8
Warden-Vicar				54 2 5
				V 6 2 -
Whitfield-Rector	Thomas	1312		

DEANERY OF BAMBURGH

Bamburgh-Master	Henry de Dermor	1311	Prior Conv. St. Oswald, Nostell	230 9 4
			Portion, St. Sixtus	33 6 8
Branxton-Vicar	Roger de Milburn	1293-1314	Prior Conv. Durham	10 13 4
				V 4 - -
			Portion, Prior Kirkham	- 4 -
Chatton-Vicar	Henry de Herdslawe	1311	Abbot Conv. Alnwick;	100 - -
	Adam	1315	collation by Bp. Durham	V50 - -
C hillingham-Vicar	Robert	1316	Abbot Conv. Alnwick	13 6 8
				V 6 13 4
Ellingham-Vicar	Richard de Roubiry	1311	Prior Conv. Durham	50 - -
				V 6 13 4

Fenton-Rector (merged with Wooler, 1313)			Abbot Conv. Alnwick (after 1313)	6	13	4
Ford-Rector	Roger de Northburgh Roger de Nassington	1314 1316		86	13	4
Holy Island			Prior Conv. Holy Island	230	15	-
Ilderton-Vicar	Roger de Wetwang Robert de Norham (brothers of Kirkham)	1315 1315	Prior Conv. Kirkham	20 V10	- -	- -
Kirknewton (Newton-in-Glendale) -Vicar	Philip	1316	Prior Conv. Kirkham	90 V20	- -	- -
Norham-Vicar	Gilbert de Werington. William de Elwick	1311 1315	Prior Conv. Durham	133 V13	6 6	8 8

Wooler			Abbot Conv. Alnwick	20 - -
-Rector	Henry de Luceby	1307-12	Bp. Durham	Portion, Prior Tynemouth 4 - -
	Robert de Emeldon	1312	Abbot Conv. Alnwick	
	Robert de Eryum	1313		
-Vicar	Hugh de Lokington	1314	Appropriated to Abbot Conv. Alnwick (with rectory of Fenton)	
	Thomas Harpyn	1315		
DEANERY OF ALNWICK				
Alnham-Vicar	Walter de Alnham[x]	1311	Abbot Conv. Alnwick	31 - -
	Thomas	1316		V 6 13 4
	x-later Abbot of Alnwick			
Alwinton-Rector	Richard de Cotes	1316-40	Umfraville lords of Redesdale	66 13 4
			Portion, Nunnery Holystone	20 - -

Angerham(?)				53 6 8
Edlingham-Vicar	Robert de Raynington	1311	Prior Conv. Durham	74 6 8
	Robert de Esshenden	1316		V26 13 4
Eglingham-Vicar	John de Couton	1311	Abbot Conv. St. Albans	30 - -
				V 6 13 4
Embleton-Rector	Peter de Dene	1307-21	Thomas earl of Lancaster	120 - -
Felton-Vicar	William de Glanton	1310	Prior Conv. Brinkburn	
	Bro. John de Doxford	1315		40 - -
	Bro. William de Bewick (Canons of Brinkburn)	1315		
Holystone-Rector)			Nunnery Holystone	8 - -
Harbottle-Vicar)				

Howick			Annexed to Archdeacon of Northumberland	16	-	-
Lesbury-Vicar	Robert de Emeldon	1311	Abbot Conv. Alnwick	70	-	-
				V 6	13	4
Rothbury-Rector	James de Ispania	1313	Bp. Carlisle; presented by King	133	6	8
Shilbottle-Vicar	William Bernardi	1312	Abbot Conv. Alnwick	12	2	-
				V 5	-	-
Warkworth-Vicar	Roger de Stanhope	1311	Bp. & Prior Conv. Carlisle	80	-	-
				V20	-	-
Whittingham-Vicar	Adam de Softlaw	1311	Prior Conv. Carlisle	50	-	-
	Bro. William de Hurworth	1313		V10	-	-

III-HEADSHIPS OF RELIGIOUS HOUSES &HOSPITALS

(a)RELIGIOUS HOUSES

HOUSE	ORDER	HEADSHIP	HEAD	VALUE
DURHAM	BENEDICTINE			
-St. Cuthbert		Prior	William de Tanfield, 1308-13 Geoffrey de Burdon, 1313	620 - -
-Monkwearmouth				
-Jarrow				
-Holy Island		Prior	Stephen de Howden, 1311	
-Farne		Master	Thomas de Bamburgh, 1311	
-Coldingham (Berwickshire)		Prior	Adam de Pontefract, 1311	

Tynemouth	Benedictine (cell of St. Albans)	Prior	Simon de Taunton, 1311 Robert de Norton, 1313 Richard de Tewing, 1314	200	-	-
Hexham[x]	Austin canons	Prior	Thomas de Fenwick, until 1313 Robert de Whelpington, 1313 Priory dispersed 1315	164	-	-
x-Hexhamshire franchise of Archbishops of York.						
Brinkburn	Austin canons	Prior		31	5	7
Newminster	Cistercian	Abbot		220	-	-
Alnwick	Premonstratensian	Abbot		30	-	-
Blanchland	Premonstratensian	Abbot	William de Norton, 1315	9	-	-

HOUSES OF NUNS

Newcastle-upon-Tyne	Prioress	17	10	7
Holystone	Prioress	24	6	-
Lambley	Prioress	8	10	-
Neasham	Prioress	19	-	-

MENDICANT ORDERS

ORDER	HOUSES
Franciscan	Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Hartlepool
Dominican	Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Austin	Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Carmelite	Newcastle-upon-Tyne

(b) HOSPITALS

HOSPITAL	MASTER	EXPENSES	NOVA TAXATIO
Kepier	Peter de Thoresby, removed 1311 Bro. Hugh de Monte Alto (monk of Durham), 1311		
Gretham	John de Botheby, 1315	6 13 4	3 6 8
Sherburn	Lambert de Trikingham, 1313	57 6 8	21 6 8
Gateshead (St. Edmund, King and Martyr)	Hugh de Lokington, 1315	18 - -	3 6 8
Friarside (near Derwent)	John de Eryum, 1312		
Pelaw (St. Stephen)	Peter de Ponte, 1313		