

ART. VIII.—*Marmaduke Lumley, bishop of Carlisle, 1430-1450.* By R. L. STOREY, B.A., Ph.D.

Read at Carlisle, September 13th, 1955.

A BRIEF survey of the careers of the bishops of Carlisle in the later middle ages reveals a pattern markedly different from the general character of the English episcopate in those times. The working agreement reached between king and pope in the 14th century gave to the crown an almost complete control of the disposition of the English sees. The form of election by the cathedral chapter was still observed, but the promotion of royal nominees was really made effective by papal bulls of provision. Thus the king was able to advance his most trusted clerks to the highest ecclesiastical preferments. The personnel of his administration were mostly ordained clergy; they could be rewarded by the grant of crown livings and benefices in cathedral and collegiate churches, while those who attained to the highest offices in the secular administration could be advanced to the chief dignities in the Church. Sons of great magnates who embarked on an ecclesiastical career achieved similar promotion. The archbishoprics of Canterbury and York and the wealthy sees of Durham, Lincoln and Winchester were rarely ruled by a prelate not drawn from one of these two classes. The other bishoprics were usually held by the same kinds of men, administrators, diplomats and younger sons of peers. There were bishops distinguished for their piety or their learning, but these qualifications were not generally required of a candidate for the episcopal office.

Carlisle was an exception. For two centuries, no bishop rose to such eminence in the state as Walter Maucclerc (1225-1246), who was once treasurer of England

and prominent in the council of Henry III. His successors were lesser figures: some were scholars, others members of religious orders, while most were natives of the diocese. The reason for the difference between Carlisle's bishops and those of other sees was the poverty of this diocese, a poverty greatly increased by the ravages of Scottish raiders. This poor see was no reward for a royal clerk, no more than were the bishoprics of Wales and Ireland. In this Carlisle may have been fortunate, for it was ruled by men chosen for their suitability for spiritual office; who generally resided in the diocese, and had, from before the outset of their administrations, personal knowledge of the district placed in their charge. The episcopate of Thomas Merks (1397-1399), the loyal chaplain of Richard II and presumably an absentee from his diocese, was a departure from the rule, but there was a reversion to the usual type of bishop with William Strickland (1400-1419), member of a notable Westmorland family; Roger Whelpdale (1420-1423), a distinguished scholar with local associations; and William Barrow (1424-1429), a professional ecclesiastical minister.¹ The succession of Marmaduke Lumley was thus a remarkable exception to the established pattern, for, although he was a scholar, he came of a noble family not resident in the diocese, was a courtier, and became a prominent figure in the national politics of his day.

The family of Lumley took its name from its manor in county Durham. The Lumleys had been among the fore-

¹ He had been vicar-general to the bishop of London (CPR. 1416-1422, 215).

These abbreviations will be used:—

- | | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| CPS. | — | P.R.O. Exchequer of Receipt: Council and Privy Seal (with the number of the file following). |
| CCR. | — | <i>Calendar of Close Rolls.</i> |
| CFR. | — | <i>Calendar of Fine Rolls.</i> |
| CPL. | — | <i>Calendar of Papal Letters.</i> |
| CPR. | — | <i>Calendar of Patent Rolls.</i> |
| EW. | — | P.R.O. Exchequer of Receipt: Warrants for Issues (with the numbers of the box and piece following). |
| Nic. | — | <i>Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England</i>
Ed. Sir N. H. Nicolas (Record Commission, 1834-1837). |
| D.D. & C. | — | Durham, Dean & Chapter) to prefix references to |
| P.R.O. | — | Public Record Office) manuscript sources. |

most tenants of the bishops of Durham for many years and held lands of them to the considerable value of nearly £250 p.a. The fortunes of the family had been enhanced by the marriage of Robert Lumley to Isabella Thweng, whose share, as one of four co-heirs, in the extensive lands of her family included an eighth part of the barony of Kendal.² Their grandson Ralph was thus a considerable magnate, with estates in Yorkshire, Lancashire, Northumberland and Westmorland, in addition to those in the Bishopric. He was the first of the Lumleys to be summoned to parliament, in 1384, the year after he had come of age. When Henry IV seized the crown, Lord Lumley joined those who swore to maintain him on the throne, but soon repented of his decision. A few months later, in January 1400, he joined the plot of the earls of Kent, Huntingdon and Salisbury to capture Henry and restore Richard II. He was killed when the townsmen of Cirencester rose against the conspirators. He was attainted and his lands confiscated. His widow was left with twelve children, for whose support the king granted an annuity of £100.³

Marmaduke Lumley was one of this large family. He was some ten years old at the time of his father's death.⁴ Despite the ruin of his family, it had such powerful connections that its restoration was only a matter of time. His mother was the sister of Ralph Neville, earl of Westmorland. The earl's second wife was Joan Beaufort, sister of Henry Beaufort, the future bishop of Winchester and "Cardinal of England", and half-sister of Henry IV. The Nevilles appear to have taken the Lumleys under their wing, for the eldest son, at least, seems to have been educated in their household.⁵ This son, John Lumley, received his father's lands in 1405.⁶

² CCR. 1381-1385, 336-337; P.R.O. Chancery: Inquisitions post mortem, Henry IV, file 49.

³ *Complete Peerage*, VIII, 266-270.

⁴ CPL. X, 57.

⁵ *Wills and Inventories*, I (Surtees Society II, 1834), 62.

⁶ CPR. 1405-1408, 7.

His brother Marmaduke was thus not wanting influential patronage to advance his career in the church. He was to owe most to Bishop Beaufort, not only for direct support but also for the further connections he made for the ambitious and talented young clerk. Thomas Langley, bishop of Durham, a close friend of the earl of Westmorland, also assisted the Lumleys. He was the godfather of John's son, Thomas, and gave ecclesiastical preferment to Marmaduke. Richard, Lord Scrope of Bolton, was another relative. In 1420, he appointed his cousin Marmaduke one of the executors of his will and granted to him certain of his lands.⁷

The patronage available to Marmaduke was a major cause of his rise to prominence in the Church, but he was not undeserving of his good fortune, for he was an able scholar; this was doubtless the reason why his guardians decided upon an ecclesiastical career for him. He was sent to Cambridge, where he proceeded to the degree of bachelor of laws. He eventually became master of Trinity Hall and was chancellor of the university in 1427.⁸ He was now a prosperous ecclesiastic, for his patrons had seen to it that he was well provided with benefices. His first known preferment was the deanery of the collegiate church of Lanchester, in Durham, granted to him by Bishop Langley on 1 March 1417. On 20 May following, he exchanged this benefice for the rectory of Anderby, in Lincolnshire.⁹ In 1420, he received the family living of Warton, north Lancashire, which he exchanged for the rich church of Charing, Kent, in the next year.¹⁰ Bishop Langley collated him to the archdeaconry of Northumberland on 27 March 1422,¹¹ when he resigned the church of Anderby.¹² In 1424, Lumley exchanged Charing for

⁷ *Testamenta Eboracensia* IV (Surtees Society LIII, 1868), 2-3.

⁸ CPR. 1422-1429, 560.

⁹ D.D. & C. Register of Thomas Langley, fo. 96.

¹⁰ *Testamenta Ebor.* IV, 2; *Yorkshire Archæological Journal*, XXX, 26 and 68; *Register of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury* (Canterbury and York Society, 1937-1947), I. 217.

¹¹ Reg. Langley, fo. 112.

¹² CPR. 1416-1422, 436.

the rectory of Hawarden, Flintshire, and a prebend in the collegiate church of Howden, Yorkshire;¹³ which last he soon exchanged for the office of master of Bootham Hospital, York.¹⁴ The king's council, of which Bishop Beaufort was a leading member, gave him the precentorship of Lincoln Cathedral on 16 July 1425.¹⁵ His career as a "chopchurch" reached its apogee in November 1427, when he exchanged the precentorship for the rectory of Stepney, London, and the archdeaconry for the church of Burmarsh, Kent.¹⁶ In the same year, the prior and convent of Durham gave him the first stall in their newly erected collegiate church of Hemingbrough, Yorkshire.¹⁷ He resigned Burmarsh in 1428,¹⁸ but in the following year his cousin Lady Mauley presented him to the church of Bainton, in Yorkshire.¹⁹ When Lumley became bishop of Carlisle, he was a canon of Chichester, rector of Stepney, master of Bootham Hospital and a prebendary of Osmotherley, Yorkshire, another gift of Bishop Langley.²⁰ He probably still held the churches of Bainton and Hawarden, and the prebend at Hemingbrough.

It is by no means likely that Lumley performed the duties attached to any of these benefices in person. He had been granted a licence, on 12 June 1422, to absent himself from the church of Charing for two years so that he might study at a university.²¹ In this and his other livings he would have placed curates to carry out the necessary duties, while he drew the bulk of the revenues. His interest in them was financial, and he must have gained an income at least as considerable as that he was

¹³ *Reg. Chichele* I, 217.

¹⁴ *Testamenta Ebor.* IV, 2.

¹⁵ *CPR. 1422-1429*, 264.

¹⁶ *Reg. Langley* fo. 132 v.; *Reg. Chichele* I, 248; *Visitations of Religious Houses in the Diocese of Lincoln* (Canterbury and York Society, 1915-1927), I, 174.

¹⁷ D.D. & C. Register III, fo. 126.

¹⁸ *Reg. Chichele* I, 250.

¹⁹ YORK, St. Anthony's Hall: Register of Archbishop Kemp, fo. 7 v.

²⁰ *CPR. 1429-1436*, 56; G. Hennessy: *Novum Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense* (1898), 410; *VCH. Yorkshire*, III, 346; *Reg. Langley* fo. 171 v.

²¹ *Reg. Chichele* IV, 240.

to receive as bishop of Carlisle. His studies and duties at Cambridge would have commanded much of his time, but they were not his sole occupation. He also held some position in the household of Queen Katherine, the widow of Henry V. When he was chancellor of Cambridge, she wrote to the prior and chapter of Durham to request their promotion of her "dear clerk and friend" Master Marmaduke Lumley.²² With his noble birth and academic distinction, he was well fitted for employment in a royal household. His introduction to the queen was doubtless brought about by his kinsman Beaufort.

Lumley was still associated with the university as late as 24 November 1429, when he was reappointed to the commission of the peace in the town of Cambridge.²³ The time had come, however, for his promotion to a higher sphere. The see of Carlisle had fallen vacant, by the death of Bishop Barrow, in the previous month.²⁴ The prior and chapter of Carlisle, presumably in compliance with orders from the royal council, had elected Lumley as his successor. The letter reporting his election was received by the council on 3 December. The majority of the lords agreed that the royal assent should be given, but Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, and his supporter John, Lord Scrope of Masham, were in opposition.²⁵ Their attitude was due to the enmity between Humphrey and his uncle Beaufort, which arose from their struggle to win control of the government of the young king. The duke saw in Lumley an adherent of his rival, whose hand would be strengthened by the addition of Lumley to the peers of the great council. His distrust of Lumley was to be justified. He had failed to prevent Lumley's promotion, however, which was now carried out in the usual way. The pope was informed of the royal assent to the election,²⁶ and the bull of provision was issued on

²² D.D. & C. Locellus 25, no. 103.

²³ CPR. 1429-1436, 614.

²⁴ CFR. 1422-1430, 280.

²⁵ Nic. IV, 8.

²⁶ CPR. 1429-1436, 32.

27 January 1430. The bishop-elect was consecrated by Archbishop Kemp of York, in the chapel of St. Thomas the Martyr, on the east bridge of Canterbury, on 16 April.²⁷ The temporalities of the see were then delivered to him.²⁸

The new bishop owed his advancement to political considerations, and his course may thus seem to have been marked out. It would have been by no means unusual if he had chosen to reside in London for most of his time, so that he could take his place in the government, while the administration of his diocese was committed to his ministers. He must have paid a visit to Carlisle in the summer of 1430, for he was at Durham in August.²⁹ When parliament met on 12 January 1431, he was one of the triers of petitions from Gascony.³⁰ On 21 February, he was one of the lords sent by the council to persuade the convocation of Canterbury to grant the government a subsidy.³¹ Both these assignments were an indication of his standing in official circles, but he was not appointed a member of the small, permanent council. On 2 August, Archbishop Kemp ordered the archdeacon of York, to whom the duty pertained, to enthrone Lumley at Carlisle.³² The bishop made his primary visitation, but was back in London in November for a meeting of the great council, the occasional assembly of prelates and secular lords. Duke Humphrey was preparing a great blow against his enemy. He proposed that, in view of Beaufort's election as cardinal, he should be deprived of the see of Winchester. The lords would not allow so drastic a measure, but agreed that the records should be searched for precedents. Lumley alone opposed this decision: he said that nothing should be done until the cardinal had returned to England. Later, he voted with

²⁷ Reg. Kemp, fo. 17.

²⁸ CPR. 1429-1436, 53.

²⁹ Durham Account Rolls I (Surtees Society XCIX, 1898), 61.

³⁰ Rotuli Parliamentorum (1783), IV, 368.

³¹ Reg. Chichele III, 220-221.

³² Reg. Kemp, fo. 20.

Kemp and four secular peers in opposing a motion to increase the duke's salary.³³ Beaufort survived the attack, but Lumley was less fortunate. His strong partisanship had ruined his political career.

Records of Lumley's movements are scanty for the next fifteen years, until the end of 1446. As a peer, he would have attended sessions of parliament and of the great council, but he is not shown to have attended one meeting of the privy council, nor was he even appointed a trier of petitions in this period. After his appearance at the great council of November 1431, he is next known to have been in Carlisle on 1 May and 26 June 1432, and at Appleby on 1 December.³⁴ In May 1433, he was preparing to attend the general council of the Church at Basel,³⁵ but his employment on the Border in the summer shows that he never left England.³⁶ He was present in parliament to take the oath against the maintenance of evil-doers on 3 November³⁷ and was appointed by Sir William Eure as an arbitrator in his dispute with Bishop Langley.³⁸ On 25 July 1436, Lumley was at Durham and probably came before the council in November.³⁹ In 1437, he attended meetings of the great council in April, and was ordered to be at Norwich on 1 May to see that the election of a mayor was conducted without disturbance.⁴⁰ He was in London on 14 January 1438.⁴¹ He was nominated as a delegate to the Council of Ferrara in that year,⁴² but it is clear that he did not attend,⁴³ for he was again fully occupied in the marches. He paid

³³ *Nic.* IV, 100-101, 104.

³⁴ P.R.O. Chancery: Significations of Excommunication, file 197, nos. 1 and 2; *Reg. Langley*, fo. 197.

³⁵ *Nic.* IV, 161; *Foedera*, X, 549-550.

³⁶ P. 123 below.

³⁷ *Rot. Parl.* IV, 422.

³⁸ D.D. & C. Locellus 25, no. 28.

³⁹ P. 125 below.

⁴⁰ *Nic.* V, 6-13; *CPR. 1436-1441*, 86.

⁴¹ *CCR. 1461-1468*, 192.

⁴² *Nic.* V, 92.

⁴³ The English delegates were given payment at the Exchequer for their expenses: no warrant to pay Lumley, as delegate to either Basel or Ferrara, has been discovered.

another visit to London on 11 June 1439, and is next known to have been at Rose Castle on 1 October 1441.⁴⁴ The only notice of his movements in the five years following is of his attendance at meetings of the great council in May and July 1443, and of the privy council on 5 June.⁴⁵ This scanty itinerary makes it clear that the promise of an active life in national politics, that was already being realised in 1431, had not been fulfilled. The government, even when Cardinal Beaufort was supreme, felt little confidence in Lumley. It was not that he was lacking in ability; this was not the reason for his rejection, but rather that his support for the cardinal had been so warm that it was found an embarrassment. Lumley was therefore exiled from the centre of public affairs, to the "ferre cuntree" where he had other responsibilities to give him occupation.

Of these charges, his diocese was the first. The most serious problem facing the bishop of Carlisle was the impoverishment of his diocese. His revenues, as well as those of the religious houses and clergy, had suffered from more than a century of incessant raids by the Scots. Practically all the sources of clerical income were derived from the land, either directly, by cultivating or leasing Church estates, or indirectly, from the tithes of farm produce and the offerings of a people almost solely engaged in agriculture. The effect of continuous Scottish incursions, the plunder of cattle and destruction of crops and buildings, was to reduce all these forms of revenue; for while the profits of cultivation were diminished, and tithes thus made smaller, the rental value of land also fell. The clergy were further burdened with the need to repair churches and other buildings destroyed by the enemy. Allowance had been made for these repairs in the grants of subsidies by the convocation of York; but after 1420, following heavy losses by raids in the previous year, the whole diocese was exempted from payment,

⁴⁴ Significations of Excommunication, file 197, nos. 3 and 4.

⁴⁵ *Nic.* V, 269, 275, 276, 278, 285, and 298.

and remained free of this burden throughout Lumley's episcopate.⁴⁶ A positive measure that he considered was the appropriation of churches in his patronage. By the conversion of a rectory into a vicarage, the greater part of the revenues of a church could be secured for another purpose; after a small, fixed stipend had been apportioned for the maintainance of the incumbent. In 1438, Lumley obtained the king's licence to grant the advowsons of the church of Kirkland to the convent of Carlisle, so that its revenues might be augmented.⁴⁷ He received another such licence in 1443, to permit him to appropriate the churches of Caldbeck and Rothbury in order to supplement his episcopal income.⁴⁸ This appropriation was not effected. Lumley must have realised that this project would have worsened another problem.

The richer benefices at a bishop's disposal were reserved for the support of clerks who could fill important offices in his administration. Bishops, particularly those often absent from their sees, depended to a great extent on the services of trained lawyers, into whose hands the government of the diocese was entrusted. Bishop Strickland's appropriation of the church of Horncastle⁴⁹ had reduced the kind of patronage that would attract men with these qualifications; for the small salary allowed to a vicarage would not tempt a graduate. Lumley could not afford to diminish this patronage, particularly when the comparative impoverishment of the wealthier benefices meant that one of these livings was not thought sufficient for the support of a trusted minister. On 1 December 1432, Lumley presented Master Alexander Cok, bachelor in canon law, to the church of Rothbury. Cok was already archdeacon of Carlisle and vicar of Torpenhow.⁵⁰ He had been Bishop Barrow's vicar-general and served

⁴⁶ *CFR*. 1413-1422, 324-325, 1430-1437, 23-24, 180-181, 309-310, 1437-1445, 8-9, 192-3, 257-259, and 1445-1452, 7-8.

⁴⁷ *CPR*. 1436-1441, 185.

⁴⁸ *CPR*. 1441-1446, 183.

⁴⁹ *CPR*. 1401-1405, 185.

⁵⁰ Reg. Langley, fo. 197.

Lumley in the same office.⁵¹ He was probably also the official of the diocese, a position he was certainly holding under Bishop Close in 1452, when he was still rector of Rothbury.⁵² Cok belonged to the class among the clergy of permanent ecclesiastical ministers, who continued in service under successive bishops of the same diocese. Another of the bishop's officers, John Whelpdale, the receiver-general of the see of Carlisle, held the church of Thursby.⁵³

The small amount of patronage at Lumley's disposal—Cok is the only canon lawyer he is known regularly to have employed—made it necessary for him to rely upon the occasional offices of the heads of religious houses. Both the prior of Carlisle and the abbot of Holme Cultram served as his vicars-general.⁵⁴ It can be supposed, therefore, that it was Lumley's policy to form friendly relations with his subordinate clergy. The grant to the convent of Carlisle of the church of Kirkland and other grants obtained from the king also point to this feature of Lumley's episcopate. The loss of his register forbids a longer account of his administration. He is known to have conducted at least one visitation of the diocese, and to have sat in judgement in suits between the college of Greystoke and the parishioners of Threlkeld, and between the abbey of Fountains and the vicar of its church of Crosthwaite.⁵⁵ The contemporary Durham register shows a number of regular clergy, canons of Carlisle and Shap; and monks of Holme Cultram, going to that diocese to receive ordination.⁵⁶ This suggests that Lumley failed to provide the required number of annual services. He was presumably unable to secure the services of a suffragan and was himself often too much engaged on other matters.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 159, 203, 219 and 246.

⁵² *CPL.* X, 119.

⁵³ *Ibid.* 42.

⁵⁴ Reg. Kemp, fo. 36r; Reg. Langley, ff. 186, 203 and 212.

⁵⁵ *VCH. Cumberland* II, 206; *CPL.* VIII, 177, 352-353.

⁵⁶ Reg. Langley, ff. 192 v, 201 v, 203 and 246.

The bishop of Carlisle, as a peer of the realm, had secular responsibilities in Cumberland and Westmorland. His name headed the commissions of the peace for both counties. Other commissions were occasionally sent to him. Lumley, together with other persons, had to see that the oath against maintenance was administered in Cumberland⁵⁷ and to enquire into the complaints of Elizabeth Crackenthorp.⁵⁸ The most important of these secular duties was his part in the diplomacy of the Border. It was customary for the two northern bishops, if they were resident, to be appointed to commissions to meet Scottish representatives, either to make truces or discuss the observation of truces already in being. Lumley's first appointment came on 14 August 1433. A truce to last for five years from 1 May 1431 was then in force.⁵⁹ Lumley, the earl of Salisbury and the other commissioners were required to discuss breaches of this truce in the west march.⁶⁰ There was a more important commission in 1434. Lumley and two others were appointed to treat for various objects, including a treaty of peace with Scotland. This object was not secured, and the next two commissions, of which Lumley was a member, were required to seek only further truces and the observation of the truce still current.⁶¹

This truce expired on 1 May 1436. James I of Scotland did not wish for its renewal. He had decided openly to support his ally of France by the invasion of England. This attack was believed to be imminent on 27 June, when the sheriffs of the northern counties were ordered to call out the local forces.⁶² James, having summoned to his standard all men of military age, laid siege to Roxburgh Castle. The English headquarters was at Durham. Lumley was there on 25 July, with Archbishop Kemp,

⁵⁷ CPR. 1429-1436, 383.

⁵⁸ CW2 LIII, 76.

⁵⁹ Foedera, X, 482-487.

⁶⁰ Rotuli Scotiae (Record Commission, 1814-1819), II, 282.

⁶¹ Ibid. 288, 291 and 294.

⁶² CCR. 1435-1441, 66.

Bishop Langley and the earl of Northumberland. The situation was serious, for the term of office of the earls of Huntingdon and Northumberland as wardens of the east march had expired on that day. No plans had been made to retain them or to appoint other wardens, so that the soldiers guarding Berwick-upon-Tweed, not knowing who would pay them, were deserting.⁶³ The lack of a warden to lead the English forces was remedied on 6 August. Kemp, Langley, Lumley, the earl of Northumberland and a number of other secular lords were ordered to command the defending army. On 10 August, the lay members were directed to relieve Roxburgh.⁶⁴ The siege was raised. There was dissension in the Scottish camp, which hastily broke up when the English forces approached. The state of war continued. There was still no warden of the east march, and the two earls ceased to act in the west when their term there expired on 12 September.⁶⁵

From about 1390, a warden of the marches was engaged by a special form of contract. He made an indenture with the king, by which he was bound to serve for a fixed period at certain rates of payment, from which he had to pay the soldiers he had engaged to carry out his duties. The rates of payment in the west march, whose warden had also to defend the castle and city of Carlisle, had been £2,500 p.a. in times of war, and £1,250 p.a. in peace or truce, since 1411. The rates for Berwick-upon-Tweed and the east march were double, for that part of England was more exposed to attack. These sums were a considerable burden on the Exchequer, which was often unable to meet them. Payments fell into arrears, with the result that a warden had himself to find money to pay his soldiers. The earl of Salisbury, warden of the west march since 1420, asked that he should be relieved of his office, early in 1435, as he was unable

⁶³ EW. 51/350, 53/131.

⁶⁴ *Rot. Scotiae*, II, 294 and 295.

⁶⁵ EW. 51/351.

to bear its costs any longer.⁶⁶ The failure of the English government to find wardens to act from the times Northumberland and Huntingdon's terms ended in 1436 was clearly due to a general lack of confidence in its ability to fulfil its part of the contract.

This was Bishop Lumley's opportunity to widen the field of his activities. On 22 November, he made an indenture with the king whereby he became warden of Carlisle and the west march for seven years from 12 December. This was an unusually long term, but he secured it by offering to accept a lower rate of payment. This was to be £1,050 p.a. in all circumstances. He drove a shrewd bargain, for he tried to ensure that this money would be paid to him in full. The issues of various lands were assigned for the payment of his salary.⁶⁷ This also was an unusual measure. The practice of making assignments on certain crown revenues was commonly practised, but they were not made until the payments fell due at the Exchequer. The sources sometimes proved inadequate, or other royal creditors had a prior claim, with the consequence that the tallies of assignment proved valueless. New tallies would then be sought, with perhaps no better success. A creditor might wait for years before being paid. Lumley showed a good grasp of the crown's financial situation by stipulating for these assignments in advance, but his plan miscarried in part: he received "bad tallies" to the value of £1,663.⁶⁸

The duties of the wardenship were two-fold. The warden was bound to defend Carlisle at his peril, and to do his utmost to protect the march. He had also to enforce the observation of truces. The war did not end until 1 May 1438, when a period of nine years' truce began.⁶⁹ It is hardly likely that the bishop himself took the field to direct operations: the nature of Border warfare, rather than questions of propriety, would have

⁶⁶ *Nic.* IV, 295-296.

⁶⁷ CPS. 58; EW. 53/148; *Rot. Scotiae*, II. 296-298.

⁶⁸ A. Steel: *The Receipt of the Exchequer 1377-1485* (1954), 253.

⁶⁹ *Foedera*, X, 688-695.

caused him to leave this work to his lieutenants. A number of men were associated with him in his formal commission as warden, three of them members of his own family.⁷⁰ They would have carried out the military duties. The government soon repented of its contract and realised that Lumley was an unsuitable choice for warden. Early in 1438, "my Lord of Salesbury was spoken to for to be cappitain of the marches towards Scotland".⁷¹ The earl was equally anxious to recover the wardenship. Although it was undertaken at a risk that full payment might not be received, it is probable that the office generally yielded a profit. In a long period of truce, the warden would employ only sufficient men to prevent the capture of Carlisle by surprise or treachery. It was left to the warden's discretion to decide the size of the garrison. He might well have a considerable balance in hand from his annual salary after the soldiers had been paid. There was a further attraction. These soldiers were engaged by the warden, they were his retainers; he could recruit them from among his friends and tenants. The value of a private standing army, existing for a legal purpose and paid from the royal treasury, was an attraction in the wardenship not lightly to be ignored in an age when a man's standing in terms of both social prestige and political power depended to a considerable degree upon the size of his retinue and the extent of his patronage.

Salisbury wanted to resume office without delay, and for a long period. He followed Lumley's example by offering to take a salary of £1,000 p.a., less than the bishop by £50. He would take over the custody of Carlisle and the march when Lumley's term expired, or earlier, if the bishop wished to resign his office. The earl offered to repair "the dungeon of the said castle" within four years, if he were allowed £50 p.a. for this purpose, for "the said dungeon" was in danger of falling

⁷⁰ *Rot. Scotiae*, II, 297-298.

⁷¹ *Nic.* V, 92.

down. This petition was granted by the king on 18 December 1439, but the council cut Salisbury's fee by a further hundred marks. He was engaged on that day to be warden for ten years from 12 December 1443, at an annual salary of £983. 6s. 8d. from the Exchequer.⁷² Lumley was not induced to surrender his office before the end of his term of seven years. He must have found the salary a valuable supplement to his episcopal revenues, for it was not until 1443, when he was about to lose this source of income, that he proposed to appropriate the churches of Rothbury and Caldbeck.⁷³

The wardenship of the west march thus again passed into the control of the Neville family. Its grip was given a further extension in 1446, when Salisbury and his son the earl of Warwick were retained as wardens for twenty years, in survivorship, from the end of the former's term of ten years, at the same rate of payment.⁷⁴ Lumley's term of office thus had had the effect of lowering the cost of the wardenship. The state of truce continued until 22 September 1448, although it must have been frequently broken, for the clergy of Carlisle were still exempted from the payment of subsidies.⁷⁵ Then war broke out, to last until 11 August 1449.⁷⁶ The lords of northern England were excused from attendance of parliament so that they could defend the marches, for, as the king wrote to them,

"It nedeth not to remembre you sith open experience sheweth of what evelwylle, malice and untoward disposicion the Scotts ben of towards us, this our reaume and subgitts, which dayly by alle the wayes and meenes they can and may practyse enforceth thaim to the noysaunce and hurte thereof, and namely of our marches towards thaim."⁷⁷

The bishop of Carlisle was not among these lords: he was now an absentee from his troubled diocese.

Since Lumley's political aspirations had been dashed in 1431, a new figure had risen to prominence in the

⁷² CPS. 63; EW. 60/108.

⁷³ P. 121 above.

⁷⁴ CPR. 1446-1452, 184.

⁷⁵ P. 120 above.

⁷⁶ EW. 71/2/51.

⁷⁷ CPS. 78.

English government. As old age compelled Cardinal Beaufort to withdraw from politics, the leadership of his party was taken over by William de la Pole, earl of Suffolk, who had married the daughter of Beaufort's cousin, Thomas Chaucer. In 1444, Suffolk had arranged the marriage of Henry VI to Margaret of Anjou. He now became supreme in the royal council. It was his programme to bring the fighting in France to an end, but this policy was unpopular since it would not succeed unless the king abandoned his claim to the crown of France. The "war party" was still led by Beaufort's old enemy, Humphrey of Gloucester, whose prestige had greatly declined in the past years. Suffolk's position was insecure, however, for his rise was regarded with disfavour by certain of Beaufort's adherents. He looked around for new allies and found one in Bishop Lumley. He could rely on Lumley's support in his plans finally to ruin Duke Humphrey. The feelings rising from personal associations, and his ambitions, would have drawn Lumley to Suffolk, but he must be credited with a similar outlook on foreign policy: his experience as bishop of Carlisle and warden had taught him what the Hundred Years War had done to northern England. As long as England was at war with France, there could be no peace with her Scottish ally.

Lumley began to attend the king's council regularly from 14 December 1446.⁷⁸ On the 18th, he was appointed treasurer of England.⁷⁹ The condition of the royal finances at this time must have caused him great misgivings in accepting the office, for the charges to be met had for many years exceeded the receipts. Lumley had already shown, however, when he was appointed warden of the west march, that he understood the state of the Exchequer. He began office with an attempt to remedy certain defects in the financial machinery. The powers granted to him in the following January were not customarily given to

⁷⁸ CPS. 77.

⁷⁹ CPR. 1446-1452, 28.

a treasurer upon appointment and therefore indicate Lumley's determination to improve the collection of revenue. It was conceded that no collectors of customs could be appointed without his assent, nor could they permit shipments of wool unless they were profitable to the king. The treasurer was empowered to enforce all payments ordered from the customs, none of which were to be made without his agreement. On 2 July, all feudal dues pertaining to the crown were granted to five commissioners, all royal ministers, for five years. No issues were to be made from these revenues without the advice and assent of the treasurer. Later in the year, the incomes of the households of the king and queen were limited. The treasurer was to receive half this money from the staple of Calais and distribute it at his discretion.⁸⁰

These measures reveal the energy and ability Lumley applied to his office. He was also regular in his attendance at the council, for which he received a salary in addition to his fee as treasurer.⁸¹ On 23 June 1447, he was granted a further £600 in consideration of his good service to the king, for coming to the council "fro ferre cuntree", for "the greet charge and laboriouse bysynes" he had sustained as warden and for his constant application to his duties as treasurer.⁸² He was a trier of petitions in the parliament at Bury St. Edmund's, where Duke Humphrey died under arrest; and again in February 1449, in the protracted parliament that met at Westminster and was prorogued to Winchester.⁸³ Suffolk sought to reward him with the bishopric of London. Although the king had previously requested the pope to provide Thomas Kemp to this see when it fell vacant, he wrote, at Suffolk's instigation, to commend Lumley. His recommendation was too late. The pope provided Kemp to

⁸⁰ *CPR. 1446-1452*, 28, 61, 114 and 123.

⁸¹ *EW.* 63/23.

⁸² *EW.* 57/279; *CPS.* 77-79; *Nic.* VI, 74 and 75.

⁸³ *Rot. Parl.* V, 129 and 141.

London on 21 August 1448.⁸⁴ He rebuked the king for his inconstancy, but promised to provide Lumley to the next vacant bishopric. The pope also wrote to Suffolk, to say that if Lumley was a worthy and virtuous man, as he believed him to be, this was the less reason for him seeking his own advancement.⁸⁵ This rebuff was not well received: Kemp was not admitted to the see of London until Lumley had received his promotion.⁸⁶

The cession of Maine to the French in 1448 had made Suffolk widely unpopular. The renewal of the war and loss of Rouen made his fall imminent. Lumley took alarm and deserted his leader. A new treasurer was appointed on 22 September 1449: he rapidly incurred general hatred. When parliament met on 6 November, Lumley was not one of the triers of petitions.⁸⁷ Three days later, Bishop Moleyns of Chichester resigned the privy seal: he was regarded as Suffolk's chief accomplice in the surrender of Maine.⁸⁸ Suffolk was charged with treason and sent to the Tower. On 31 January 1450, Lumley was present in the council chamber when the chancellor resigned his office, which was committed to Suffolk's opponent, Archbishop Kemp.⁸⁹ Suffolk was banished. He suffered the same fate as Bishop Moleyns in being murdered as he was leaving the country. There were risings in southern England; other royal favourites to be slain were the treasurer and the bishop of Salisbury. Lumley was extraordinarily fortunate; for he had not only escaped the fate of his former colleagues, but also received his delayed advancement. He was translated to the see of Lincoln on 28 January. He made his profession of obedience to the archbishop of Canterbury on 14 March⁹⁰ and was given livery of his temporalities on the same day.⁹¹

⁸⁴ *CPL*. X, 387-388.

⁸⁵ *Correspondence of Thomas Bekyngton* (Rolls Series, 1872), I, 155-159.

⁸⁶ *CPR*. 1446-1452, 307, 308.

⁸⁷ *Rot. Parl.* V, 210.

⁸⁸ J. H. Ramsay: *Lancaster and York* (1892), II, 112.

⁸⁹ *CCR*. 1447-1454, 194.

⁹⁰ Lambeth Palace: Register of Archbishop Stafford, fo. 34.

⁹¹ *CPR*. 1446-1452, 322-323.

Lumley had expected to be detained in the capital on the king's affairs and thus be unable to visit his new diocese. In fact, there is no record of his attending the council after he became bishop of Lincoln. He was then sixty years of age⁹² and his health may have been failing; but the fact that he died without making a will indicates that his death was sudden. It seems more probable that the chancellor had caused the exclusion from the council of his nephew's rival for the see of London. Lumley had again fallen from favour. His disgrace was short-lived, for he died before 5 December 1450.⁹³ His memorial at Carlisle was a light in the cathedral.⁹⁴ It is probable that he had not visited the diocese since his appointment as treasurer, but he remained mindful of its needs, using his influence with the king to obtain grants for the convent.⁹⁵ His episcopate had been a long one, and it is unfortunate that a dearth of evidence makes it impossible to make any conclusions on his work as diocesan. The suggestion that "He may well have been the ablest of the 15th century bishops of this see"⁹⁶ is amply justified by his record as treasurer. His political career was blighted, however, and the fault was his own: he was too zealous a partisan. Lumley would certainly have been translated to a richer see than Carlisle, several years earlier, had he not fallen from favour. When his opportunity came in 1446, it was too late. He became involved in the bitterness of a party strife that was drawing the country into civil war. He was not the statesman to stand between the parties, and, at the last, failed to show sufficient courage to stand by his falling leader.

⁹² *CPL*, X, 57.

⁹³ *CPR*, 1446-1452, 407. It is easy to suspect foul play, in view of the fate of other royal councillors in this year and because Lumley died intestate, but there is no evidence that his death was due to other than natural causes.

⁹⁴ *Valor Ecclesiasticus* (Record Commission, 1810-1834), V, 276.

⁹⁵ *CPR*, 1446-1452, 228-229; *Calendar of Charter Rolls 1427-1516*, 91.

⁹⁶ *Prelates & People*, 116.