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R.L.STOREY.
Apart from one recent exception, no individual study has been made of any aspect of the career of Thomas Langley. He has attracted attention because a notice of his life had to be given in some series; as one in the line of Bishops of Durham or Chancellors of England; as a supposed graduate of Cambridge and even as a worthy of the parish of Eccles in Lancashire. The historians of Durham added little to the sixteenth century account of Chambre, which is hardly more than a record of building and benefactions by Langley. Bare outlines of his career appear in all these works. Lord Campbell added some contemptuous comments and Baines the most extraordinary adulation: both writers were somewhat prone to let imagination be a substitute for information. Other biographical notices appear in the Dictionary of National Biography and in Wylie's History of England under Henry the Fourth. These accounts are the most informative, but based upon printed sources only and at times inaccurate.

The most valuable contribution to an appreciation of Langley's life is an article by the late Professor Hamilton Thompson. The writer's attention was confined to Langley's episcopate, however, and relied upon the Bishop's Register for information on this subject and for an outline of his itinerary. This source is not adequate for either purpose: the records of the Prior and Convent of Durham offer an important supplement.

to the Register and the rolls of the royal chancery provide more details of Langley's movements. The account given in this article therefore requires some amendment.

The present study of Langley's career is based primarily on manuscript material. The usual printed sources have been consulted, but reliance upon them alone would have produced a very uneven result. The records in two depositories have yielded most material. The first objective in the Public Record Office was to trace Langley's early life in the records of the Duchy and County of Lancaster and of various branches of the royal household: these proved disappointing. Then the records of those parts of the national administration in which Langley served were examined, and also the archives of the Palatinate of Durham. At Durham itself the material for the chapter on Langley's episcopate was found, and invaluable additional evidence for the study of the County Palatine. Both here and in a number of other repositories were found records giving some information about other aspects of Langley's life.

It has been considered undesirable to present the large amount of material found in a strictly chronological arrangement. Langley's career as a royal minister and councillor is given in this order, but the Palatinate and Diocese of Durham, and the history of the Scottish Border are considered in separate chapters. The first chapters - those arranged chronologically - have their narrative form broken from time to time so that some study might be made of administrative organs with which Langley was closely concerned. At the same time, an attempt is made to present some account of contemporary events so that the life of this man may be viewed in relation to his political environment. This method of division into topics is felt to be necessary but also somewhat unrealistic: Langley was a man of several parts and he played them all simultaneously.
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ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are employed:

(1) Prefixing references to manuscript sources.

B.M. ...... British Museum.
D. ...... Durham Dean and Chapter.

No prefix is given in respect of sources in the Public Record Office.

(2) Other abbreviations.

C.& P.S. ..... Treasury of Receipt: Council and Privy Seal.
(Numbers of the file only follow.)

C.C.R. ...... Calendar of Close Rolls.
C.F.R. ...... Calendar of Fine Rolls.

C.P.L. ...... Calendar of Papal Letters.
C.P.R. ...... Calendar of Patent Rolls.
C.W. .... Chancery: Warrants for the Great Seal.
(Numbers of the bundle follow, then, after a stroke, the number of the piece.)

E.H.R. ...... English Historical Revue.
E.C.P. ...... Chancery: Early Chancery Proceedings. (Numbers of the bundle follow, then, after a stroke, the number of the piece.)

(Numbers of the box follow, and, after a stroke, the number of the piece.)

Fed. ...... Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae, etc. Ed. T.Rymer. 1704, etc.

P.S.Bill ..... Chancery: Warrants for the Great Seal: Bills of Privy Seal.
R.C. ......... Record Commission.
R.S. .......... Rolls Series.

(Continued)

1. In Chapters II and IV the numbers of the files of warrants under the Privy Seal have not been given: the individual pieces are numbered consecutively. Warrants of Henry IV Nos.2873-5134, referred to in Chapter II, are contained in Files 611-634, as follows:- Nos.2873-2900 in File 611; Nos.2901-3000 in File 612; and thereafter one hundred to each file. Warrants of Henry V, referred to in Chapter IV:- Nos.845-900 in File 666; Nos.901-1000 in File 667; Nos.1001-1100 in File 668; and Nos.1101-1205 in File 669.
(ABBREVIATIONS continued.)

Reg. . . . . . . Durham Dean and Chapter MSS: Register of Bishop Langley.
Rot. . . . . . . (Public Record Office) Palatinate of Durham: Chancery Records: Cursitor's Records: Rolls of Bishop Langley. (The distinguishing letter follows: see notes 2-5 of p.165 infra.)
Rot.Parl. . . . . Rotuli Parliamentorum. 1783.
S.S. . . . . . . Surtees Society.
Scr.Tres App. . Appendix of Scriptores Tres. (References to pages are given in arabic numerals although roman numerals are used in this part of the publication.)
V.C.H. . . . . . Victoria County History.
CHAPTER I: LANCASHIRE BACKGROUND.

The few references to Thomas Langley\(^1\) in fourteenth century records offer no more than a sketch of the environment in which he spent nearly the first forty years of his life. He was born soon after 1360, for in 1433 he described himself as a septuagenarian\(^2\). His later benefactions to the parish of Middleton, six miles north of Manchester, indicate his birthplace. In the north-west corner of the parish is Langley, from which a family of some standing had taken its name. In 1394, one Roger de Longley died seised of the manors of Pendlebury and Prestwich, and other lands in the same district\(^3\). He was presumably the head of the family to which Thomas belonged, but was not his father\(^4\). The manor of Middleton was held by the Bartons, but the manor of Langley belonged to a branch of the family of Langley until 1466, when it is said to have been sold to James Radcliffe of Radcliffe\(^5\). The mullet on Thomas Langley's arms\(^6\) indicates that he belonged to a junior branch of the family. His origin, therefore, if humble, was not obscure: he came from the same class as his contemporaries, Archbishops Chichele of Canterbury and Kemp of York.

The nature of Thomas Langley's education is uncertain. There is a tradition that he went to Cambridge\(^7\), but proof

---

1. In contemporary records, the surname is spelt "Longley" at least as often as "Langley". The first form is the more common in records of the royal administration, but at Durham the balance favours the second form, which was almost exclusively preferred in the last years of his life. Since he is chiefly remembered for his connection with Durham, the form that has been traditional there since about 1420 is observed throughout this work. 2. Reg.f.201. 3. D.K.R.\(^3\)(Lancashire Inq., P.M.) 541. 4. His father's name was William (C.P.R. 1413-1416, p.206). 5. Francis Gastrell: Notitia Castriensis (Chetham Soc.1849), Vol.II,p.99,note 2. 6. Paly arg. & vert, with a mullet for difference. 7. The earliest authority I have found for this information is Wharton (Anglia Sacra, (1691) p.775), who is followed by the historians of Durham, including (Con.on p.2)
of this cannot be found. If he did ever attend an university, it is certain that he did not take a degree; not a single instance of his being styled "master" has been seen. The obvious career for the younger son of a "gentle" family was as a clerk. He could have expected the patronage of influential friends to assist his advancement in the Church. It is most likely that Langley's career began in the household of a local family of some note, where he would have served in a clerical capacity. His later connections with the family of Radcliffe.

(Note 7, p.1, continued) Surtees (County Palatine of Durham (1816-1840) Vol.I, p.1v). This is presumably the authority of the D.N.B. and Venn (J.& J.A.Venn: Alumni Cantabrigienses, Part I (1924), Vol.III, p.45), who give no contemporary warrant. Baines (History of the County of Lancashire (1889-1890), Vol. III, p.298) says not only that Langley was educated at Cambridge but previously in a Norfolk monastery. He also states that "According to the testimony of Pits, he ranked with the first poets of his time". This curious rigmarole is due to Baines' confusion of Bishop Langley with a contemporary monk, also named Thomas Langley, of St. Benet's Hulme. Pits, to whom Baines refers, gives the name of this monk, with his works. (Relationes Historica de Rebus Anglicis (Paris 1619), p.622) He got his information from Bale, whose account is the same. ("Index Britanniae Scriptorum", ed. R.L. Poole, in Anecdota Oxoniensia, 1902, p.441). Leland does not mention him in his Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis (ed. J.A. Hall, 1709).

1. George Radcliffe, D. Canon Law, was attached to Langley's household. The Bishop ordained him accolite at Pontefract in 1408 (Reg. f.18d). He witnessed transactions in the London hostel in 1411 & 1415 (ibid 45d, 69d). He received a number of Durham benefices. Eventually, in 1436, he exchanged the Rectory of Sedgefield and Gateshead Hospital for the Treasurership of Lichfield (ibid 225d). He acted as sequestrator-general in the Archdeaconry of Durham 1424-1425 (ibid 117, 122, 127 & 128). He was appointed to a number of commissions, including the penitentiary, 1419-1435 (ibid 139d, 152, 157d, 175, 185d, 199, 218).

John Radcliffe, son of the "noble" Robert Radcliffe, was granted a dispensation for his illegitimacy by Langley in 1417 (ibid 97). He was treasurer of the Bishop's household in 1456 (Scr. Tres App. 244). William Radcliffe, collated Canon of Auckland in 1412 (Reg. f.59d). Dispensations for marriage in the prohibited degrees were granted by Langley to Thomas Radcliffe in 1411, and to Robert in 1416 (ibid 47, 47d). Like the dispensation for John, these were granted in accordance with facilities granted by Alexander V to Langley (ibid 45; C.P.L. VI, pp.151,152).
suggest that he was at some time attached to their house, where he made personal links that endured throughout his life. The Hadcliffes were one of the most important families in Lancashire, and a clerk in their household, of such outstanding talents as Langley's later career shows him to have possessed, would have been able to attract the notice of some leading official of the County Palatine, even of the Duke himself.

The Palatine records offer no indication of the time when Langley entered the service of John of Gaunt. In 1407, Langley was said to have served Gaunt and Henry IV from the days of his youth, but no trace has been found of his activities before he reached the age of thirty. It is clear, however, that by 1394, he was in the Duke's confidence. In that year, he was sent to speak to Richard II, then in Wales, regarding certain of the Duke's affairs. The nature of the business is not ascertainable. As the relations between Gaunt and the King were then amicable, Langley would have been favourably received. In the following year, on 23 July, Langley's estate as a prebendary of the royal free chapel of St. Martin-le-Grand was ratified, and on 12 February 1396, he was given the Rectory of St. Alphege.

London, a benefice in the gift of the Dean of that chapel. It is a fair inference that the King was responsible for Langley's presentation: he wished to please the Duke and reward his trusted clerk. On 15 February 1397, Langley exchanged the Church of St. Alphege for a Canonry in St. Asaph Cathedral, with the prebend of Myvold. A month later, on 17 March, he was ordained priest in Coventry Cathedral, with this prebend as his title. Gaunt presented him to the Church of Castleford, in the Honour of Pontefract, and he was admitted on 28 September 1398. On the same day, he was granted the Archbishop's licence for non-residence for three years. A further indication of Langley's standing is that Gaunt appointed him one of the executors of his will.

Langley's connection with the Duchy and County of Lancaster had considerable significance in his later career. Firstly, of course, it accounts for his later rise, his selection for high office by Henry IV. His loyalty to the House of Lancaster, so marked throughout his life, arose from the same cause. He remained on terms of friendship with other old servants of the Duchy who became royal ministers at the same time. Of more particular significance was the fact that he had lived for the first half of his life in the territories and service of the Duchy. The liberties of the Duke of Lancaster were most extensive. He was authorised by royal charters to have his own chancery in the County, where he could issue writs under his own seal. He had also his own exchequer exercising in the County the jurisdiction enjoyed elsewhere by the royal Exchequer. The Duke could

appoint his own justices to hold crown and all other pleas. He enjoyed, in fact, all the liberties and *iuera regalia* pertaining to a county palatine. It was under this form of administration that Langley had lived, and his important position in the Duke's service would have enabled him to become experienced in its machinery. When he became Bishop of Durham, he became lord of a franchise with almost identical privileges. His earlier experience made it easy for him to enter into the position of a count palatine. Being already acquainted with the organisation necessary for the government of a private regality, he would have been able, from the very beginning of his episcopate, to provide for the smooth operation of the administrative machinery of Durham. He would, moreover, have been fully aware of the extent of his rights and jealous for their preservation and for their full recognition.

There is no doubt that Bishop Langley appreciated this resemblance, for when he chose men to assist him in the administration of Durham, he frequently selected fellow Lancastrians. A noticeable number of the men collated to benefices in his gift were described as clerks "of the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield", the diocese in which lay Lancashire. John Newton, his receiver-general, probably came from the place of that name outside Manchester. Nicholas Hulme, John Radcliffe's predecessor as treasurer of the household, belonged to a Manchester family. William Mablethorp, who acted as one of the Bishop's auditors, held a similar office under the Duchy. John Thoralby, who had been a clerk in the Duchy chancery and became a master in the royal Chancery, often accompanied Langley as he travelled about the country and his diocese. Mr. Thomas Lyes became Langley's vicar-general. Thomas Holden, a member of Langley's household

2. See note 1, p. 2 supra.
before he became Bishop, was later Steward of Durham. Two members of the family of Strangways held important offices: Robert was chief forester of Weardale, and James, later Chief Justice of the County of Lancaster, was one of the Bishop's justices. Langley was not merely favouring old friends and associates by bestowing offices and benefices upon them, but securing the services of men he knew and could trust, men, like himself, experienced in palatine administration.

Further connection with the Duchy was maintained by duties arising from the execution of John of Gaunt's will. As the most junior of the executors, and as one of the two clerks in the body of distinguished persons appointed, a great amount of routine business would have become Langley's responsibility. The settlement of the vast estate, the collection and payment of debts, probably occupied the whole of his time from Gaunt's death until he became Keeper of the Privy Seal nearly three years later. Arrangements had to be made to carry out Gaunt's wishes for the establishment of chantries. It was not until 1403 that royal licences were obtained for the foundation of chantries in St. Paul's, London, and in the collegiate Church of St. Mary, Newark, by Leicester. Langley's interest in these foundations is evidenced by entries in his episcopal register. These concern the appropriation of the Church of Preston, Lancashire, to St. Mary's, Newark, and presentations of priests to the chantries by himself and other executors. The last presentation recorded, on 1 February 1436, was made by Langley alone: all the other executors were then dead.

The endowment of chantries was a common practice in Langley's day. It had become almost a tradition for men who

---

rose to greatness in both Church and State to erect these foundations in the places of their birth, for reasons mainly pious, no doubt, but also as memorials to their fame in their native parishes. Just as Chichele at Higham Ferrers, Kemp at Wye, and Skirlaw at Swine, so did Langley at Middleton have endowed a religious foundation at his birthplace. The church there was apparently in a ruinous condition before he had it entirely rebuilt. On 22 August 1422, the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield licensed Langley to consecrate the new church, the high altar and two additional altars, one of them dedicated to St. Thomas. After his death, his executors erected a chantry dedicated to the Virgin Mary and St. Cuthbert at this altar, for one priest to celebrate masses for the souls of the Kings of England, Langley and his ancestors. As in his Galilee foundation at Durham — where, incidentally, his parents were commemorated — the incumbent had also "to teach one grammar school for poor children." Nothing remains of Langley's church at Middleton, except the tower, the remainder having been rebuilt. The school, however, survived the Reformation, and was re-founded, with an additional endowment, in the reign of Elizabeth I.

Another instance of Langley's later activities in Lancashire was his participation in the foundation of the collegiate Church of Manchester. The founder was Thomas, Lord la Warre and Rector of Manchester. He enfeoffed Langley and other trustees in lands which they subsequently granted to the College. The royal licence for the foundation was granted on 22 May 1421. In the following August, despite
the fact that Langley must then have been much occupied by his duties as Chancellor of England, he went through Lancashire on his way to Durham. He was in Manchester on 8 and 9 August, obviously attending to business relating to the foundation.

The Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, in licensing the erection of the College, authorised Bishop Langley and Thomas la Warre to make its statutes. The foundation was of a warden, eight priests to be fellows of the College, and a number of other ministers and servants. The first warden was installed in 1428. In confirming the local bishop's licence, the Pope authorised Langley to make new statutes and amend or abolish those already existing as he saw fit. Langley's experience of collegiate churches in his diocese would have been most valuable in framing the ordinances for Manchester, and it is apparent that they were designed to prevent the common abuse of non-residence. The warden's salary had to be sufficient to support his dignity, but the stipends of the fellows were such as to make it necessary for them to stay in residence: each priest had £4 p.a., but an allowance of 16d. a week was made for commons. That these small stipends were due to policy and not necessity is shown by the fact that after all deductions had been made from the endowment of £260 p.a., a surplus of some £56 was left for charity, repairs and other requirements. The regulations were apparently successful in preventing non-residence, for in 1545 it

was reported that the warden, fellows and other ministers were resident "at this daye", keeping hospitality together according to their statutes\textsuperscript{1}.

Thus Langley retained an interest in Lancashire until the end of his life: in his will, he bequeathed books to the College of Manchester\textsuperscript{2}. He clearly had a deep affection for his native county, and took pleasure in the company of fellow Lancastrians. Above all, he had gained experience in palatine government that was to stand him in good stead throughout his pontificate in Durham.

\textsuperscript{1}\textit{Lancashire Chantries}, pp.7-10. \textsuperscript{2}\textit{Scr. Tres App.}, p.245.
CHAPTER II: THE KING'S CLERK, 1399-1407.

John of Gaunt died on 3 February 1399. His son and heir, Henry of Derby, was in exile, and his estates were seized by the King. Richard II permitted Gaunt's executors to collect all sums of money due at the time of his death, so that his will could be executed. Piety and gratitude required no less, but Richard clearly intended never again to have so powerful a subject as his late uncle. The might of the House of Lancaster was apparently destroyed, and its servants must have felt uncertain of their future. Whether or not the King had formed plans for the disposition of the Lancastrian estates, however, he was not to have the opportunity to carry them out. Henry of Derby returned to England about 1 July, and soon received such widespread and extensive support that he was able to gain the crown of England.

It is very doubtful if the country benefitted by the change of rulers. Indeed, the rebellions and disturbances of Henry IV's early years, and the opposition to financial concessions shown by his parliaments, indicate that the new King was even less popular than his predecessor. To certain persons, however, Henry's usurpation was only advantageous. These were the Duchy servants, the officers and retainers of John of Gaunt and the members of Henry's household: "the Lancastrians looked well after their own". Henry had good reason to rely upon his family's supporters. The magnates whose aid had put him on the throne attempted to keep him in a state of subjection to themselves. They insisted that the King should rule only by their advice and consent.

1.C.P.R.1399-1399,p.502. 2.Langley received ratification of his estate in his prebend at St. Asaph and his church of Castleford, on 3 Apr. 1399 (ibid 380). He was an attorney of Edward, Duke of Albemarle, when the latter crossed with the King to Ireland (ibid 519). It thus appears that Langley did not follow Henry into exile. 3.E.F.Jacob in Introduction to Reg. Chichele I p.xxv. 4.T.F.T. Plucknett: "The Place of the Council" etc., in T.R.H.S. Series IV, Vol. I, p.165.
Henry for his part strove to maintain the prerogatives of the crown. He opposed the baronial restraint on his powers and sought to rule by the counsel of men chosen by himself. He placed his confidence in men like John Pelham and Thomas Erpingham, knights who had served his family for many years. His resolution was helped by divisions among the magnates.

Thomas Langley was another Lancastrian official who passed into royal service after the revolution. In the first two years of the new reign his position was obscure: his name is not to be found amongst the ministers of the royal administration or household, nor of the Duchy. That the King placed considerable value on Langley's services is attested by the number and value of the benefices he received. He was described as "the King's clerk" within a fortnight of Henry's accession.

On 29 October, he became Archdeacon of Norfolk. In 1401, he was given prebends in York Minster and the royal free chapel at Bridgenorth. On 1 July 1401, he was granted the Deanery of York, the leading ecclesiastical dignity below episcopal

---

1. K.B. McFarlane in *C. Med. H.* Vol. VIII, p. 363. 2. On 11 Oct. 1399, he had recently resigned his church of Castleford (C.P.R. 1399-1401, p. 178). 3. J. le Neve: *Fasti Ecclesiae Angliae*, ed. T. D. Hardy, Vol. II, p. 484; F. Blomefield: *History of the County of Norfolk* (1805-1810), Vol. III, p. 644. 4. On 4 Mar. Held until Aug. 1406 (Le Neve III 205). 5. On 11 Apr. (C.P.R. 1399-1401, p. 470). 6. Langley had some difficulty in establishing his title to the Deanery. The royal grant of 1 July (C.P.R. 1399-1401, p. 506) was followed by the confirmation of the Archbishop of York on 20 January 1402. Five days later, Langley was installed by proxy (York Archiepiscopal Registers: Reg. Scrope, pp. 9-12; Le Neve III 124). The Pope, however, had already provided Cardinal Angelo to the Deanery: he claimed the right to present because the vacancy was caused by the (non-effective) provision of the previous Dean, Richard Clifford, to the Bishopric of Bath and Wells. On 4 Mar. 1403, Langley was given the King's licence to obtain papal provision to the Deanery. At the same time, Cardinal Angelo was permitted to receive the Archdeaconry of Exeter (Foed. VIII 291; C.P.R. 1401-1405, p. 212). Apparently, there had been negotiations, and this was the bargain struck. On 11 June 1403, Langley was granted papal absolution for entering the Deanery and other benefices reserved to the Pope (C.P.L.V, p. 537). Finally, continued...
rank and a benefice usually held only by "great clerks". Langley received the Pope's licence for non-residence at York\(^1\), a dispensation of which he took full avail. Later, he was given a second prebend at York\(^2\), and others at Lincoln\(^3\) and Salisbury\(^4\).

On 3 November 1401, Langley was appointed Keeper of the Privy Seal\(^5\). His elevation to this office of state, the third in rank in the royal administration, is further reason for presupposing Henry's confidence in him. Despite the absence of any record, it may be assumed that he had spent the two previous years in attendance upon the King. From this date, the obscurity that surrounds Langley's early career is lifted. Until the days of his death, his movements may be fully traced, with only spasmodic exceptions, almost from week to week, sometimes from day to day.

(i) The Privy Seal Office under Henry IV, and its relations with the King and Council.

The political revolution of 1399 did not cause any innovations in administrative practice. The existing machinery of government continued to function without change\(^6\). The Privy Seal Office, for instance, made no alteration in even the form of its writs, apart from the change in the name of the monarch\(^7\). This office was now generally recognised as the third department of state, a position to which it had risen by the end of the fourteenth century. It is not true, however, as Tout put it, (Note 5, p.11, continued) on 8 Aug., following, he was again installed, this time in person (Le Neve loc. cit.).

that the Privy Seal had finally "gone out of court"\(^1\). The Keeper did have his own hostel, and the clerks of his office apparently lived there with him\(^2\). He was paid 20s. a day as his wages. In the warrant for payment to Langley, "the time-honoured phrase threatening a revival of residence at court"\(^3\) was still used. Although Langley received his full wages for all the time he was Keeper\(^5\), he was often a member of Henry IV's household as it travelled about the country, and had a room reserved for his use in at least one royal manor house\(^6\). Taking into account the revenues of his benefices, he must have commanded a considerable income. Unless a Keeper had his own house in London, it was the practice to rent the hostel of a bishop who did not reside in the capital\(^7\). Langley was living in the hostel of the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield on 15 July 1403\(^8\). There were about ten clerks of the Privy Seal Office\(^9\). Amongst the clerks of Langley's period in the Office was Robert Rolleston, later Keeper of the Wardrobe and Archdeacon of Durham\(^10\).

\(^1\) Tout: Chapters V 50-54. \(^2\) Ibid V 69-72. \(^3\) Ibid V 54. \(^4\) Appendix A(xv) p.282. \(^5\) An instrument by which Langley appointed proctors to take possession of the Deanery of York was drawn up at Eltham Manor on 27 Dec. 1401 in quadam camera domini Thome Longley. The two witnesses, John Wisbeach clerk and Thomas Holden, Esq., later served him when he became Bishop of Durham. (York: Reg. Scrope pp.10-11). \(^6\) Conclusive evidence of full payment has not been traced but an entry on Issue Roll 6 Hen.IV Easter, under 23 May 1405 (No.582 m.4) suggests this was made. It is there stated that Langley was paid for his wages as Keeper the sum of £436 7s.8d. for the 527 days from 1 Oct. 1403 to 1 March 1405. £21, part of the outstanding balance, was then paid. Earlier payments traced are £100 in Michaelmas 3 Hen.IV (Roll No.571 m.12) and £100 in Mic.6 Hen.IV (No.580 m.7). The last was not included in the total of 23 May 1405. \(^7\) Tout: Chapters V 71. \(^8\) Ancient Petition 1082 (given in H.C. Maxwell-Lyte: Historical Notes on the Use of the Great Seal of England (1926)p.198). \(^9\) C. & P.S. File 9 contains a petition of 9 clerks for their wages, in 1401. \(^10\) Collated 14 Aug. 1425 (Reg. f.127d). Appointed one of Langley's proxies in Parliament Jan. 1436 (Ibid 238d).
Another was the poet Thomas Hoccleve, who has left on record his complaints against the drudgery of his work and his regrets of the riotous course of his life.

Maitland described the Chancellor of the late medieval period as the "head of the whole secretarial establishment, (as we now might say) the Secretary of State for all departments. While the high dignity of the Chancellor's office does merit the first description, even that he was, in effect, the King's "prime minister", the term "Secretary of State for all departments" is more appropriate to the contemporary Keeper of the Privy Seal. His was the central position in the royal administration: warrants were sent from his office to every department, commanding and authorising their different activities. His operations were untrammelled by routine or tradition, as were Chancery and the Exchequer. The Privy Seal was an instrument readily adaptable to new requirements, yet it had an established authority and was widely known as an instrument authenticating the commands of government.

Most attention has been paid to the relations of the Privy Seal and Chancery. The Privy Seal Office did not enrol its letters, so that resort has to be made to the original copies. Its warrants to Chancery were kept there, and are very numerous. For the three years and four months that Langley was Keeper, thirteen hundred and forty warrants survive in the Chancery files. These authorised the issue

1. Hoccleve's Works ed. F. J. Furnivall (Early English Text Society, 1892-1897), Vol. III, pp. 36-37. He wrote that none of the Privy Seal clerks sat up drinking as late as himself, or overslept so long the next day, although Prentice and Arundel "hir bed loven so wel" that they did not rise till Prime (ibid Vol. I, p. 35). The John Arundel collated by Langley to a prebend at Auckland in 1410 (Reg. f. 32) may have been the same as Hoccleve's colleague. 2. Constitutional History (1951) p. 202. 3. ibid 202. 4. C. W. 2876-4215.
of letters under the Great Seal, which would be dated under the same day and place as the warrant, according to the usual practice. Thus a warrant authorising the grant of the custody of some lands to John Blount, dated from Hertford on 4 November 1401 was followed by the issue of letters patent under the same place-dating. Again, a warrant in respect of the appropriation of the church of Horncastle by the Bishop of Carlisle led to the grant of letters patent of the same date, 4 December 1402. Bills of Privy Seal, less formal letters commencing *Fiat proteccio*, authorised the grant of letters of protection under the Great Seal. The writ *de procedendo* was another form of communication with Chancery, touching the "Latin side" of its jurisdiction. When the King was involved in a suit, it was suspended until his licence to proceed was obtained. In the case of suits in other courts, this licence was generally issued by Chancery, but when the suit was in Chancery, a writ of Privy Seal had to be sued. A Privy Seal writ *de procedendo* was sent to the Chancellor concerning a suit between John Mondeville as plaintiff, and Mary Stapleton and Richard Goldsmith. The latter claimed the King's protection since he had granted them the messuage in dispute. The Chancellor was now ordered to continue his hearing of the suit, but not to give judgement without first consulting the King.

It was not essential that the King should authorise letters under the Great Seal by Privy Seal warrants. He could employ his signet for this purpose if he chose. He

1. Lyte: Great Seal p. 247.  2. C.W. 2878.  3. C.P.R. 1401-1405, p. 64.  4. C.W. 3528.  5. C.P.R. 1401-1405, p. 185.  6. Some 360 of these "fiats" were issued during Langley's Keepership (C.W. Files 1091-1099).  7. Appendix A(x) p. 277. An instance of the use of this writ in another suit in the "Latin side" of Chancery is shown in C.C.R. 1405-1409, pp. 205-207.
was unable, however, to use this instrument for his commands to the Treasurer and Chamberlains of the Exchequer. Pursuant to the Walton Ordinances of 1338, the Exchequer could not make extraordinary payments without a warrant under the Privy Seal: for routine payments, that is, of pensions and salaries, Chancery writs of liberate were sufficient. For all payments not "of course" - ambassadors' expenses, wages of soldiers and servants, rewards and gifts, arrears of pensions, repayment of loans, and numerous other items - the Exchequer had first to receive authorisation from the Privy Seal. On one occasion at least, Henry IV ordered payment by a signet warrant. The Treasurer and Chamberlains refused to honour it, so that a second warrant, this time of Privy Seal, was sent.

Other departments of the administration received their instructions from the Keeper's Office. The accounts of the Keeper of the Privy Wardrobe in the Tower show that arms, "gunnepoudre" and other military stores were issued in accordance with writs of Privy Seal. The Privy Seal Formulary attributed to Langley's contemporary Hoccleve indicates the wide extent of the Privy Seal's influence. This shows that the Privy Seal Office sent instructions to royal ministers of all ranks and in all parts of the country, to officers in Chester and Wales, collectors of customs in the ports, sheriffs, bailiffs, escheators, clerks of works, captains of castles and other military officers, stewards, receivers, farmers and auditors. Justices were ordered to suspend proceedings and to see that right was done speedily; or informed of the King's protection of
certain persons or his pardon of fines\(^1\). Orders were sent to equivalent officers in the Duchy of Guienne\(^2\). Letters patent were also issued\(^3\). One recorded the settlement of an heraldic dispute during one of Henry IV's Welsh campaigns\(^4\). The draft of a letter patent of the Privy Seal has been found elsewhere; this ordered all royal ministers to give assistance to two of the King's servants transporting certain of his goods\(^5\).

The Formulary also gives instances of various letters to individuals\(^6\). It is clear that the scope of the Privy Seal in this respect was unlimited. The most important examples of this class of missives were the writs of personal summons to a Great Council. On 14 January 1402, writs of Privy Seal were sent to Prince Henry; both Archbishops, twelve bishops, six earls and twenty four other secular magnates, bidding them attend a Council to be held instead of the Parliament called for 6 February\(^7\). On one occasion, Henry IV had letters of Privy Seal sent to various prelates to order a Convocation\(^8\), although the usual method of calling this assembly was by letters under the Great Seal to the Archbishop. Hoccleve also noted a number of letters *pur monnoie apprester*, calling persons to the King to lend him money\(^9\).

A considerable proportion of the Formulary is devoted to diplomatic correspondence\(^10\). The Privy Seal played a major part in the King's relations with foreign powers. Its lack of formality made it highly suitable for carrying out this business. Secret instructions and memoranda for

---

\(^{1}\) Additional 24,062 ff.815-884. See also Appendix A (iv) p.275: \(^{2}\) Additional 24,062 ff.115-126. See also Appendix A (iv) p.274. \(^{3}\) Additional 24,062 ff.103-106. \(^{4}\) Ibid 4. \(^{5}\) Appendix A (iv) p.274. \(^{6}\) Addl.24,062 ff.120a-136d. \(^{7}\) C.& P.S.11. (Given in "Parliamentary Documents from Formularies", ed. H.C.Richardson & G.O.Sayles, in Bulletin of I.H.R. XI,p.159. \(^{8}\) See p.31 infra. \(^{9}\) Addl.24,062 ff.137-138d. \(^{10}\) Ibid 139d -149.
ambassadors, and private letters to foreign rulers could be
drawn up in the Privy Seal Office. Chancery, on the other hand,
could not adapt its solemn forms for these purposes. Drafts
of diplomatic instructions are quite common among the records
of the Privy Seal, but instances of letters actually
despached are naturally rare. A letter of Privy Seal of
20 May 1403 to the Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights is
preserved in the records of the Hanse. The letter complained
of hostile acts by ships of Danzig against vessels from
Calais. An indication of the Keeper's concern in diplomacy
is afforded by a letter to Langley from Nicholas Rishton, one
of an English embassy sent to confer with Flemish represen-
tatives. Rishton reported that the two sides were unable to
agree on a rendezvous. He therefore asked Langley to consult
the King and then send new instructions in haste. Rishton
also informed Langley of the progress made in negotiations
with French envoys.

The extensive range of the business conducted through
the Privy Seal made the question of the control of this
instrument one of great significance, as it had been through-
out the fourteenth century. The Keeper could use the seal on
his own initiative for certain purposes, but for most of the

1. E. Perroy, in Introduction to The Diplomatic Correspondence
xi-xii. 2. Die Recesse und Andere Akten der Hansetage von
warrant was made for the payment of a herald who had delivered
letters of Privy Seal to various German rulers (Appendix A
Henry IV (R.S.) Vol. I, pp. 429-431; La Cotton Manuscrit Galba
B.1, ed. Gilliotits van Severen (1896), pp. 63-65. 4. "Like the
Chancellor of England, the Keeper of the Privy Seal seems to
have authority to issue certain warrants as a matter of
course," without troubling his royal master", e.g., the warrant
for certificate of homage (Lyte: Great Seal 87). Hoccleve
complained that the clerks of the Privy Seal Office were
sometimes deprived of their fees for the issue of letters
by lords' servants who had been sent to sue for these
letters (Works III 55-56).
business of his Office he required instructions from a higher authority. It was the King, of course, who usually directed the Keeper's activities. In the later years of the reign of Henry IV, the government was for some time conducted by a small, continual Council not of the King's choice. In the earlier period, however, Henry was able to exercise his prerogative to select his own advisers. The "King's Council" was a small body, including in its number the Chancellor, Treasurer, Keeper of the Privy Seal and some other persons. The latter might have included some bishops and secular magnates, but although the Council's records for the first years of the reign are scanty, it appears that Henry chose for his Councillors men of no great standing, who were retained with pensions. Thus when Langley became Keeper there was no conflict between the King and his Council. The function of the second was not to guide royal policy, but to assist in details of administration.  

No particular political importance need be attached to the replacement of Richard Clifford by Thomas Langley as Keeper of the Privy Seal. Clifford had recently been provided to the See of Worcester. As the Keepership was considered beneath the episcopal dignity, the new Bishop would have been anxious to resign the office. The change was made immediately after the King's return to London from an unsuccessful campaign against the Welsh rebels. There was some significance in Langley's appointment, however. Previously, Henry IV had selected for the offices of Chancellor, Treasurer and Privy Seal men who had served under Richard II without being too closely associated with the more

unpopular acts of the late King. Henry's policy had been to seek support by conciliatory measures, and he thus found it expedient to choose ministers for their practical experience of administration rather than for their political leanings. Langley, on the other hand, was obviously a Lancastrian partisan. It may well have been that Henry had been influenced by his powerful supporters in making the earlier appointments. Richard Clifford was connected with the barons of Westmorland. Langley's appointment may therefore indicate that the King was gaining more freedom in the selection of his ministers. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that, three months later, his half-brother, Henry Beaufort, then Bishop of Lincoln, became Chancellor in the place of Edmund Stafford, Bishop of Exeter, another of Richard II's ministers who was also a member of a leading baronial family.

It may therefore be assumed that the relations between Henry and Langley were harmonious. Communication between them was mostly direct and personal. Langley was frequently in attendance on the King, not only at Westminster, but also on several of the King's journeys in the country. It would have been most convenient for Henry to have his Privy Seal close at hand. He would thus not be obliged to rely on his personal seal, the signet, to express his commands. It was the practice for a king separated from his Privy Seal to send directions under the signet to the Keeper to make letters under the more influential instrument. This course might delay occasion, which, during a military campaign, might prove dangerous. The attendance of the Keeper thus made for efficiency.

The nature of the contact between Henry and Langley is best instanced by the procedure adopted for dealing with many of the petitions addressed to the King. It would appear that after Henry had seen a bill and given his consent, of which a note was made, it was handed to the Keeper, who then had a letter prepared and sent to instruct the appropriate branch of the administration to attend to the matter. A petition from William Glym, for instance, requesting the royal licence to obtain papal provision to a benefice, was granted by the King. A warrant of Privy Seal was sent to the Chancellor to issue letters patent. It was noted on the petition that this warrant was made at Westminster on 12 May 1404, and the subsequent licence from Chancery bore the same date. Requests were often made for payments, in which case, if the bill was granted, a warrant was sent to the Exchequer. Sometimes a request was made for the remedy of some wrong, such as the petition of Thomas Scrivener, who complained of his allegedly wrongful imprisonment. In this case, a writ of Privy Seal was sent to his captor to release him, under security so that he should come to the King to answer the charge against him.

Although the King could instruct the Keeper verbally, this was not always possible. If letters of Privy Seal were then required, the Keeper was directed by signet letter. The number of surviving signet warrants for the Privy Seal is small. About a score of signet warrants to Langley survive. It is noticeable that most of these were written by the King when he was outside London, away from Langley. Several ordered warrants for the Great Seal. Others asked for

1. Appendix A(iii) p. 273. (Bill and draft of warrant) 2. C.P.R. 1401-1405, p. 397. 3. For an example, see Appendix A(v) p. 274. 4. Appendix A(vi) p. 275. 5. Privy Seal Office: Warrants for the P.S., Series I, File I nos. 31A-53A; File 2 nos. 1-6. 6. Sometimes such signet warrants "by-passed" the Privy Seal, going direct to Chancery, where they were acted upon. For an example, see Lyte: Great Seal, p. 87. It occurred in Dec. 1403.
letters to be sent to various officials. The Treasurer and Barons of the Exchequer were to be told to stop an action against the Earl of Somerset. The Keeper of Sherwood Forest was to give wood to a royal servant. The Keeper of the Great Wardrobe was to be instructed to give some royal valets their clothing. The King occasionally sent petitions he had granted to the Keeper under cover of signet letters with orders for the issue of warrants. The King could, and often did, communicate with Chancery under his signet, even when the Keeper was at hand. The proportion of signet warrants to those of Privy Seal in the Chancery files indicates that Henry did not make it his usual practice to circumvent the Privy Seal.

The King delegated a certain amount of business to his Council. The Keeper was doubly concerned in Council business, firstly as a member, and secondly through it often being left to him to ensure that the Council's decisions were put into effect. A number of Privy Seal warrants bear the words "By assent of the Council". In the first two years that Langley was Keeper, this expression did not often appear. A warrant to Chancery for a minor appointment, and two warrants to the Exchequer, all in November 1401, bear these words. Until early in 1404, there is no indication that the Council enjoyed the authority to make extensive use of the Privy Seal. Sometimes Henry IV, absent from London, wrote to the Councillors he had left there to make certain arrangements on his behalf. On 10 July 1403, he wrote from Higham Ferrers to the Council, asking it to see that money was sent to Prince

Henry. Later in the same year, on 29 December, he wrote to the Chancellor, Treasurer and Keeper, instructing them to arrange for money to be sent to the Earl of Warwick, and also a letter of Privy Seal "for the greater comfort of him and all of his company".

After 1404, the Council had a more important place in the direction of government. In the Parliament that met on 14 January, strong dissatisfaction was expressed at the weakness and inefficiency of the King's Council. Henry was in serious financial difficulties, and was unable to resist the united opposition of lords and commons. He assented to their demand to name the members of his Council. None of those named was new to the Council: Henry was not under pressure to accept councillors nominated by the opposition. The object of this move was apparently to impress on the Council a sense of its responsibility to Parliament. This responsibility was to be exercised in financial business in particular. After much criticism of the extravagance of the royal household, an extraordinary tax on land was granted. This was to be paid to four "war treasurers" appointed by Parliament, who were to control its expenditure under the Council's supervision. The treasurers were to make payments on receipt of warrants of Privy Seal made by authority of the Great Council. Despite the King's concessions, the grant

1. Nic.I 206-207. 2. From Abingdon, which shows the year to have been 1403 (Wylie:Henry IV Vol.IV, p.292). 3. Appendix A(ii) p.272. 4. Rot. Parl. III 530; Baldwin:King's Council, pp.153-155; C. Med. H. VIII 369. 5. C. F. R. XII 251-254; C. Med. H. VIII 370. It is probable that "Great Council" here meant the large King's Council recently named. The large assemblies of magnates usually termed "Great Councils" were not suitable for the conduct of routine administration over a long period. In fact, the "Great Council" that authorised the issue of warrants for payment on 23 Apr. 1404 comprised only persons appointed to the King's Council (Nic.I 220-222).
was not sufficient for his needs\textsuperscript{1}. On 5 July, the payment of annuities was stopped\textsuperscript{2}. The second Parliament of 1404 was opened at Coventry on 6 October. It was called there so that it might be more amenable to the King's wishes\textsuperscript{3}. The "war treasurers" were replaced by two royal servants, and a substantial grant was conceded to the King. Amongst the measures enacted was a provision for the repayment of loans to the King by remission of taxes: the Exchequer or "war treasurers" were to be notified by letters of Privy Seal\textsuperscript{4}.

Although Henry had been successful in obtaining the grant of subsidies without having to make any concessions, even to name his councillors, the Council was markedly more active from April 1404\textsuperscript{5}. It took a far greater concern in all matters involving financial expenditure: from this time, the phrase "by assent of the Council" commonly appears in Privy Seal warrants to the Exchequer. Many petitions for payment were discussed by the Council. A bill from William Banaster, late sheriff of Shropshire, for instance, was endorsed with a statement that on 21 May 1404, the Council, in which were present the Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishops of Winchester (Chancellor), Bangor and Bath, Duke of York, Earl of Somerset, Treasurer and Keeper of the Privy Seal, had agreed that the suppliant should be paid £20\textsuperscript{6}. A warrant of Privy Seal was sent to the Exchequer accordingly\textsuperscript{7}. Plans were made for the payment of the expenses of royal officials. On 16 January, the Council, then comprising only the

\textsuperscript{1}Rot.Parl.III 545. Warrants of P.S. had been sent to the war treasurers on 2 September, for payment of some military expenses. The Council had assented to the payments, but the treasurers did not honour the warrant, presumably because they lacked the means to do so (Appendix A(xvii) p.283).  
\textsuperscript{2}C.Me%H.VIII 370.  
\textsuperscript{3}ibid 370.  
\textsuperscript{4}Rot.Parl.III 546.  
\textsuperscript{5}The fact that the records of the Council's proceedings for the period Apr.1404-July 1405 (C.& P.S.Files 12-22) are much more than usually full is not in itself sufficient proof of increased activity: their survival is due to an accident.  
\textsuperscript{6}C.& P.S.12.  
\textsuperscript{7}E.I.W. 19/438.
Chancellor, Treasurer, Privy Seal, and Sir Hugh Waterton, decided that ten marks should be paid to Nicholas Lobard, who was about to depart to Germany to deliver letters of Privy Seal to certain princes. Another small Council drew up a Privy Seal warrant to the Exchequer for the payment of Prince John, Warden of the East March. Richard Redman, sheriff of Yorkshire, asked that his debt to the Exchequer might be pardoned; on 31 October 1404, the Council agreed to forgive the greater part. On 7 May 1404, the Council granted that John Hende should receive payment for goods sold to Richard II. Many other petitions were submitted to the Council, such as those for licences to grant lands in mortmain and for the custody of the Abbey of Wilton to be enjoyed by the Convent whenever there was a vacancy.

Despite the amount of business transacted by the Council, Henry IV continued to bear an active part in his government. Many petitions still show that he alone had granted them, and commanded Langley to issue letters of Privy Seal. Even in matters of a financial nature, he gave his instructions without requiring the Council's assent. Certain bills show that the assent of both King and Council had been given. That of Thomas Swinburn, captain of Hammes Castle, asking for money to pay his troops, bears two additional notes, one that the King had granted the request and ordered the Keeper to make a warrant, and the second that the King and his Council had agreed that a warrant should be made. It is likely that

a bill with an endorsement that the Council had given its assent had already been agreed to in principle by the King, who then passed the petition to his councillors to consider the measures necessary for the performance of his wishes. The outcome of such deliberations was almost invariably the despatch of a letter of Privy Seal. The Council had no seal of its own and used the Privy Seal to give effect to its decisions. The Keeper's association with the Council was thus particularly close. Not only was he one of its permanent members, but his Office carried out all the Council's secretarial work. One of his clerks usually acted as clerk of the Council. The connection of the Privy Seal with the Council reached its most complete stage during the minority of Henry VI. When Langley was Keeper, however, he was firstly the King's minister. His career shows the extent to which Henry IV relied upon him.

(ii) Thomas Langley as Keeper of the Privy Seal, 1401-1405.

The first year of office passed comparatively quietly. Langley spent most of his time in the capital, leaving it only occasionally to visit royal residences in its neighbourhood. On the day after his appointment, 3 November, he was at Hertford, and left for Westminster on 5 November. He was back at Hertford from 11 to 14 November. Christmas and most of the following fortnight were spent at Eltham, Henry's favourite manor. Langley returned to Westminster on 7 January 1402.

1. The Chronicle of Meaux shows the procedure followed with a petition from the Abbey. After this had been accepted by Henry IV, it was sent to the Council. The Abbey's request for a charter exempting it from taxation on flooded lands was refused, but it was agreed to grant allowance for the same lands for the years 5 & 6 Hen. IV. A writ of P.S. to this effect was sent to the Exchequer on 28 Oct. 1406 (Chron. de Meaux, R.S.) III 299-303). 2. Lyte: Great Seal 86. 3. C.W. 2876-2902; E.I.W. 17/261. 4. C.W. 2903-2911. 5. ibid 3016, 3017, 3023-3025, 3029. 6. C.W. 3026.
He was again at Eltham on 25 and 27 March\textsuperscript{1}, and on 3 April, when he was a witness to the contraction of marriage by proxy of the Duchess of Brittany to Henry IV\textsuperscript{2}. On 24 June, Langley was at Berkhamstead\textsuperscript{3}. His only other recorded absence from London in 1402 was a visit to Windsor on 27 December\textsuperscript{4}.

The government's chief preoccupation in this year had been Welsh affairs. The rebellion of Owen Glyndwr had reached alarming proportions, and strong military arrangements had to be made in an endeavour to suppress it. The King left it to the Council to organise the details of the defence of Welsh castles\textsuperscript{5}. He spent the summer in the North Midlands making preparations for a campaign against the rebels\textsuperscript{6}. It is probable that he discussed his plans with Langley on the occasion of the latter's visit to Berkhamstead. On the day following, 25 June, he wrote from there to the Council, instructing it to arrange for the despatch of letters of Privy Seal to his retainers so that they should assemble at Lichfield for the campaign. The Council was also to arrange for the summons of the forces of certain counties for the same purpose. Similar measures were to be taken for the defence of the Scottish border and the coasts\textsuperscript{7}. An invasion by the Scots was expected, and the Council was ordered to make dispositions to repulse it\textsuperscript{8}. The anticipated attack was made in August, and defeated at Homildon Hill. The King's Welsh campaign failed completely\textsuperscript{9}.

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] C.W. 3159 & 3159. 2. Nic. I 188-189, citing Breton chronicles.
\end{itemize}
Langley was at Westminster for most of the first half of 1403. On 20 January he attended the Council when the heads of certain alien priories appeared to show their charters. The King had already departed for Winchester, where he was to meet Joan of Brittany. Langley followed, and was at Winchester on 24 January. After the royal marriage on 7 February, the court returned to Westminster, for Queen Joan's coronation. Henry then stayed at Eltham for several weeks, where Langley visited him on 5 March and on 15 and 16 April. He was at Windsor on the eve of the Feast of the Garter, and again on 11 June. On 17 June, he was one of the small Council that decided that English ambassadors should meet the Flemish representatives at Calais on 1 July. He was again present at the Council on 23 and 27 June.

About this time, the King decided to go north to assist the Percies against the Scots. He left London on 4 July. On the 10th, he wrote to the Council from Higham Ferrers, asking it to provide Prince Henry with money. In

1, 2 Jan. to 16 July, apart from given exceptions (C.W.3555-3761). 2. Nic.1 190-192. Wylie supposed that Lord Lovell was then Keeper of the Privy Seal, as custode privati sigilli appears after his name, superficially in parenthesis. Wylie believed that Lovell had been appointed in Langley's place as a consequence of proceedings in the last Parliament (Henry IV Vol.I 301). This view is quite wrong; there is no evidence that Langley was not Keeper at any time between 3 Nov.1401 and 1 Mar.1405. The Keeper's name was not usually given in Council minutes. (The original MS, B.M. Cotton MS Cleopatra P.III,f.30d, has been consulted on this point.) 3. Wylie: Henry IV Vol.I 310:IV 290. 4. P.S.Bill (C.W.) 1993/39. Other warrants from Winchester 26 Jan.-8 Feb. are C.W.3577,3580,3581 & 3583;and E.I.W.18/285. 5. Wylie: op.cit.I 310:IV 290. Langley was back at Westminster on 12 Feb.(C.W.3584). 6. Wylie: loc.cit. 7. C.W.3620. 8. ibid 3676;E.I.W.18/311. 9. 22 April, C.W.3865. 10. E.I.W.18/561. 11. Parliamentary Proceedings (Chancery) File 13, no.9. 12. Select Cases before the King's Council (Selden Society Vol. XXXV,1918) pp.91-92. 13. Ramsay: Lancaster and York I 57.
a postscript, he told the councillors that they could trust the bearer to communicate other matters\(^1\). Amongst these verbal commands must have been an order that Langley was to join Henry. A week later, the King had learnt that Henry Percy was in open rebellion. He wrote to the Council from Burton-on-Trent on 17 July, bidding its members join him. Langley met the bearer of this letter on the next day, and opened and read it. He added a note to this effect, and also that since letters of Privy Seal were required to inform various lords of the King's plans, the Chancellor should arrange this. The clerks of the Privy Seal Office would prepare the letters for the seal, which Langley would send as soon as he could\(^2\). In the meanwhile, the King had moved to Lichfield, whence he issued summonses for more reinforcements\(^3\). Langley probably joined him there on 19 July, before his departure for Shrewsbury\(^4\). The royal army would have passed through Stafford, whence letters of Privy Seal were sent to various sheriffs\(^4\), no doubt giving orders to assist the King's military operations.

The King reached Shrewsbury on 20 July, thus putting himself in the way of Henry Percy's march from Cheshire to join Owen Glyndwr. The next day, both armies were drawn up for battle. In order to prevent bloodshed, the King first

---

\(^1\) Nic.I 206-207. \(^2\) ibid 207-209. Nicolas attributed the added note to the Chancellor (p.xxii) as it concludes with _Monsieur le Chancellor_. This is clearly not a signature, however, but a direction. The Chancellor was in Westminster from 15 to 19 July (Chancellor's presentations in C.P.R.1401-1409 p.250). On the other hand, the last recorded day that Langley was in Westminster was 16 July. (C.W.3761). As he was at Shrewsbury on the 21st., he could hardly have left London any later. The attribution of the note to Langley is borne out by its purport. The _mes autres compagnons_ who were to make letters ready for the Privy Seal were obviously the clerks of his Office. \(^3\) C.P.R. p.297; Feed.VIII 313. \(^4\) Account of Keeper of Wardrobe of Household 4 Hen.IV,f.51. Langley was again at Stafford on 24 July (C.W.3764) so that the letters may have been sent then.
attempted to negotiate a settlement. He sent the Abbot of Shrewsbury and Langley\(^1\) to Henry Percy, to offer him peace and a pardon. Percy was apparently impressed by the King's terms, and sent his uncle, Thomas Percy, Earl of Worcester, to explain the causes of the rising. The Earl was a hostile emissary, however, and is reported to have accused Henry IV of unjustly seizing the crown. Although the King seems to have shown a conciliatory spirit, the Earl was not impressed, and gave an unfavourable report to his nephew. In consequence, the armies joined battle, and the Percies were totally defeated. The King stayed at Shrewsbury until 23 July, when the Earl of Worcester was executed\(^2\).

Henry had acted with remarkable speed and resolution to prevent a junction of his enemies in Wales. He showed equal energy in preparing to meet further dangers. There was much disaffection in the North\(^3\), where the Earl of Northumberland was still at large. The Earl of Westmorland had kept him from joining his son\(^4\), but the King had to enforce his submission. In addition, there was still a threat of invasion from Scotland. The King therefore advanced to York, Langley accompanying him all the time. On 25 July, the Keeper wrote from Lichfield to the Exchequer: the King had learnt that a Scottish attack was imminent, and required arms to be bought and sent to Pontefract in all possible haste\(^5\). Henry and Langley stopped at Nottingham on 29 and 30 July\(^6\), and reached York on 8 August\(^7\). Langley took the opportunity to be personally installed in his Deanery\(^8\), and officiated in the Minster when the Archbishop celebrated mass for the King\(^9\).

\(^6\)Wylie IV 291;C.W.3770,3772.  \(^7\)Wylie:loc.cit;C.W.3774.  
The main object of the King's visit to York was to receive the surrender of the Earl of Northumberland, which was made on 11 August. Henry then returned to Pontefract, where he arranged for the custody of the Earl's castles by his own officers. Afterwards, he travelled south to Woodstock, where he passed the last days of August. Langley had parted from him at Leicester on 21 August and went on to Westminster. He was there from the 23rd. to the 27th., but then departed to rejoin Henry at Worcester on 3 September.

It had been the King's intention before the outbreak of the recent revolt to join his son in Wales in order to put an end to the rebellion there. The English position had deteriorated since the end of 1402, when Edmund Mortimer had joined the rebels. In the spring and summer of 1403, Glyndwr had spread his depredations to South Wales and the English border counties. Henry reached Worcester on 2 September, but delayed there as he was again short of funds. A council of the magnates present at Worcester was asked for assistance, and a number of bishops made loans to finance the campaign. Privy Seal letters were sent to various prelates to hold a Convocation in London, which granted a half-tenth, whereby the loans were repaid. Having obtained this financial aid, the King left Worcester, on 10 September, for Hereford, where he stayed until the 15th. Then he advanced as far as Carmarthen, where he made dispositions for its better defence. Langley was with him throughout the campaign. Henry had apparently

exhausted his funds before he left Carmarthen, for Langley had to lend him ten marks for the payment of the garrison's wages. Henry was back at Hereford on 3 October, where Langley left him. While he went on to Bristol, at no great speed, his Keeper of the Privy Seal hastened to Westminster. Langley arrived there on 11 October.

The reason for his hurried return was probably that the King wished him to inform the Council of the position in South Wales, and to ask for money for the garrisons left there. This matter was undoubtedly discussed by the Council soon after Langley's return. On 21 October, letters of Privy Seal were sent to a number of knights and other laymen asking for loans for this purpose. Langley departed from London on 26 October to join the King at Cirencester, and was back again on 8 November. The object of this visit to the King is fairly clear. Henry had received a considerable number of petitions with which he had not yet dealt, and desired the assistance of the Keeper in arranging for the grant of the many favours sought. Welsh affairs were still disturbing him: he wrote to the Council from Cirencester on 8 November to make the usual request for the payment of his soldiers. The danger to the south coast from hostile foreign ships was equally grave. A French fleet under the Count of St.Pol was known to be in the Channel. The Council issued commissions of array for counties in south-east England in November. When it met on 28 November, some sailors were called to give

---
advice on defence against the hostile navy. Their proposals were worthy of the ancestors of Brake; instead of waiting for the enemy, they recommended an attack on the French ports, and especially at the mouth of the Seine. The Council, however, preferred discretion to valour. At the same meeting, it proposed that there should be two admirals, one for the north, another for the south, thus aiming at greater efficiency by a division of command. Thomas Beaufort, who was recommended for the northern parts, was appointed on the same day. Other points discussed were negotiations with Flanders, appointments to offices, the government of South Wales and the reinforcement of Calais, which was also threatened with attack. The Council's precautions did not prevent the Count of St. Pol from landing on the Isle of Wight on 6 December, but its hasty measures forced his withdrawal four days later.

The King probably now thought the danger of invasion past. He left London to spend Christmas at Abingdon, where Langley joined him for a few days. The position at sea was still far from satisfactory, however, as was shown by a letter from Henry to the Council, written at Abingdon on 2 January 1404: he asked for further measures against perils threatening the navy in western parts. In Wales also, the situation had worsened. Glyndwr, now receiving French aid, soon threw off the restraint imposed by the King's recent campaign. Henry had survived a most serious threat to his throne when he defeated the Percies, but had achieved little other success in 1403, while he had utterly exhausted his treasury. When a critical Parliament met on 14 January, he

1. C.P.R. 1401-1405, p. 318. The warrant for the appointment shows that the King was present. 2. C. & P. S. 12. 3. Wylie I, p. 395; Oman 185. 4. After his return from Cirencester, Langley was at Westminster 8 Nov-21 Dec; Abingdon 26-28 Dec; Westminster from 3 Jan. (C.W. 3837-3895; E.I.W. 19/286). 5. C. & P. S. 12. 6. Oman 185; Ramsay I, 75-76.
was in no position to oppose its demands. He was now
obliged to be much more dependent on the advice of his
Council. The Council is recorded to have been holding
frequent sessions at Westminster from the end of April until
the second week of June. Apart from the three chief ministers,
only Bishop Bowet of Bath and the Lancastrian gentlemen, Hugh
Waterton, John Doreward, Arnold Savage and John Curson, were
regular in their attendance.

Leaving his Council in the capital, the King set out
for the north. The transfer of the Earl of Northumberland's
castles into the hands of royal officers had not yet been
effected, and it was Henry's purpose to bring this about.
Langley stayed in London until 20 June before following the
King, presumably in the company of the Chancellor and others
of the Council. The Earl had been called to Pontefract, and on 9 July made an agreement with the King and Council to
surrender his Border castles in return for lands of equal
value. At Pontefract, plans were also made for the defence
of the Marches and a truce concluded with Scotland. Henry
then retired to his Duchy estates in the north Midlands.
Langley went back to London, but for a few days only. He
soon rejoined the King, accompanying him as he travelled
from manor to manor. Henry's object was doubtless to
economise by living on his estates, but he probably also
wished to avoid the restraint of ruling with his Council.

---

1. See p.23 supra. 2. C.& P.S.12; C.W. (Council) 1542/2:E.I.W. 18/264; Nic.I 222. 3. Wylie IV 292. 4. Langley was in
He was at Pontefract 26 June-9 July (C.W. 4034-4043; C.& P.S.
p.408. 8. Langley's itinerary: Westminster 21-26 July;
Leicester 30 July-5 Aug; Oakham (Rutland) 6 Aug; Rockingham
(Northants.) 7 Aug; Drayton (Northants.) 8 & 9 Aug; Pipewell
11 Aug; Leicester 14-16 Aug; Tutbury (Staffs.) 18 Aug; Lichfield
For itinerary of Henry IV, see Wylie IV 293.
The petitions granted in the summer of 1404 show that he had regained full control, as he dealt with them all himself, whereas earlier in the year the Council had been attending to a number of bills. He had not dispensed with the assistance of the Keeper of the Privy Seal.

A Council, however, met at Lichfield in the last week of August. The King was desperately short of money. It was decided to call Parliament again and to stop the payment of annuities from the Exchequer. The situation in Wales was serious: a fleet was assembling at Harfleur to carry French soldiers to reinforce Glyndwr; Carmarthen was again in peril; and the English border counties were threatened with further ravages. The Council decided that Henry should remain at Tutbury, a good strategic position, and that various other measures should be taken to strengthen the English position in Wales. Henry consequently resided at Tutbury throughout September, apart from a short visit to the manor of Ravensdale, near Derby. At the end of the month he went to Maxstoke, and then to Coventry, for the opening of Parliament there on 8 October. Langley was still in his company. A Council met at Tutbury on 14 September, when an order was made limiting the prices of food at Coventry. Langley went to Coventry the following day, doubtless to make arrangements.
for the Parliament. Petitions attended to in September show that the King was still dealing with them without the Council's participation.

Langley had now been Keeper of the Privy Seal for nearly three years: it was time for him to receive the usual reward for his services, a bishopric. Robert Braybrook, Bishop of London, had died on 27 August. The royal licence for an election was issued on 10 September. The Chapter elected Langley on 10 October. The King informed the Pope of his wish for Langley's provision to London. The Archbishop of Canterbury had already written to the Pope on behalf of Robert Hallum, Chancellor of Oxford. Learning of the King's intentions, however, he wrote again to Innocent VII, now recommending Langley, whom he praised for his virtues as well as for his long service to both John of Gaunt and Henry IV. The Archbishop referred to Langley as his "dear friend". Innocent ignored Langley's nomination, and provided Roger Walden, the former Archbishop of Canterbury.

Meanwhile, at Coventry, the Council's activities were

1. C.& P.S.13 & 15. 2. C.P.R.1401-1405,p.422. 3. F. Godwin: De Praesulibus Angliae (1743) 186. 4. Amicum meum sincere dilectum. Royal Letters, Henry IV Vol.1 415-416. The name of the writer is not given but it is difficult to conceive whom else besides the Archbishop would have ventured to propose a candidate for a bishopric to the Pope. Henry Beaufort, the Chancellor, might possibly have done so, but he would have been more likely to recommend Langley or some other "great clerk". 5. On 10 Dec.1404 (C.P.L.VI 6). Archbishop Arundel has been held responsible for Walden being preferred to Langley (Godwin 187; Wylie I 483). This is not easy to credit. Apart from my remarks in the last note, it does not bear with Arundel's general record. Walden had supplanted him at Canterbury, when he was exiled by Richard II. The relentless campaign the Archbishop waged against the Lollards hardly gives grounds for supposing that he had a forgiving nature. Walden's provision may be attributed to the Pope's desire to restore the former Archbishop to the episcopal rank and dignity. (For the conclusion of this episode, see p.46 infra)
resumed as Parliament assembled. Henry may have wished to make it appear that he was ruling with the assent of his councillors. The presence of Parliament would also have increased his activities. Moreover, Archbishop Arundel and the Duke of York, who had come to attend Parliament, would have insisted on taking their places at the Council. The official members and Lancastrian esquires, together with the Earl of Somerset, who was Henry's half-brother and Chamberlain, and Bishop Bowet, once a minister of John of Gaunt, were also regular in attendance. The Council met at Maxstoke on 3 October, and thereafter at Coventry. The bills it dealt with probably represented only a fraction of its business\(^1\). The "Unlearned Parliament" was dismissed on 14 November. The King had good cause for satisfaction with its proceedings\(^2\).

The Council resumed its sessions at Westminster. It is again the endorsements of petitions that provide most evidence of its activities, but graver matters were also given its attention. Plans had to be made to repel the French invasion of Guienne\(^3\). The position in Wales was improving, but such routine measures as the provision of garrisons and their payment were still necessary. The King continued to bear an active part in his administration. On 5 December, he ordered Langley to draw up an indenture for the Earl of Arundel, who was to guard Oswestry\(^4\). On 24 January 1405, he instructed the Keeper to send a letter of Privy Seal to Peronat de Puches, to encourage him in his defence of the Castle of Chales against French attacks; and on the next day, to write to the Archbishop of Bordeaux to ask him to send aid to

\(^{1}\text{C.& P.S.15.} \quad ^{2}\text{See p. 24 supra.} \quad ^{3}\text{Nic.I 242-243.} \quad ^{4}\text{C.& P.S.16.}\)
Peronat. As usual, Henry granted a number of petitions, and commanded Langley to make letters under the Privy Seal so that the plaintiffs might have what they sought.

The records suggest that the King was sharing business fairly with his Council. There is every reason to suppose that their relations were harmonious, for in the winter of 1404-1405, the only councillors to attend regularly were the high officials and the Lancastrian retainers. A magnate might occasionally appear, as did the Earl of Northumberland on 28 November and 1 December. There were rarely more than six councillors at a meeting, and sometimes less. Only four were present, for instance, when a warrant of Privy Seal for the payment of Prince John was authorised on 22 January. At the beginning of 1405, Henry IV might have well have felt content with his position: his most dangerous enemies had apparently been crushed; the threat of invasion had abated; the Welsh war was turning in his favour; his last Parliament had been liberal; his authority was not disputed. If he was at times obliged to delegate certain business of government, he could do so to men dependent on himself. The events of the coming year, however, despite his apparent success against his enemies, were to lead to a diminution of his personal authority.

1. Appendix A(ix) p.277. 2. C.& P.S.files 16 and 17. 3. Ibid 15-17; Miscellaneous Inquisitions (Chancery) 283/1. 4. Appendix A(viii) p.276.

Langley was appointed Chancellor on 2 March 1405. The previous Chancellor, Henry Beaufort, had recently been translated from Lincoln to Winchester. He had doubtless resigned the Great Seal in order to be free to attend to the affairs of his new diocese, possibly to hold his primary visitation. Langley's appointment thus need not be supposed to have reflected any change of policy. He had now attained to the highest position in the royal administration. The rapidity of his promotion since 1399 is remarkable. His character alone can account for his preference before all other old Duchy officials. The King was obviously aware that Langley possessed administrative ability of the highest order, and that his loyalty was unimpeachable.

As Chancellor, Langley had great and numerous responsibilities. He was firstly the King's chief minister and as such held a permanent and influential position in the Council. He had to ensure that the administrative machinery of Chancery functioned efficiently. Chancery was still the principal organ of government, although its adaptability to new demands

1. The first warrant of Privy Seal to Chancery addressed to "Thomas Longeley" is dated 1 Mar. 1405 (C.W. 4217). He was, however, paid his wages as Keeper of the Privy Seal up to and including 1 March (Issue 6 Hen. IV Easter (No. 582) m.4.). His successor as Keeper, Nicholas Bubwith, was appointed on 2 March (E.I.W. 21/351). T.D. Hardy gives between 27 February and 1 March for Langley's appointment (Catalogue of the Lords Chancellors (1843) p. 47), and The Handbook of British Chronology (ed. F.M. Powicke (1939) 69) circa 28 Feb. A petition to the King for a warrant of P.S. to be sent to the Chief Butler bears the note *Lettre ent faite a Wycombe par commandement du Roy par report du sieur Thomas Longeley Chancellor le xiiiij jour de Fevrier lan etc sisme* (C. & P.S. 18). This note must have been written after the date given.
was restricted by its traditions and by the routine
developed over three centuries. Letters under the Great
Seal were the most solemn expression of the King's
commands, and of his licence for numerous activities on
the part of his subjects. By the issue of writs, the
Chancellor held an important position in the operations
of the courts of Common Law. In addition, he was himself
able to exercise jurisdictions in both Common Law and
equity. As was appropriate to the dignity of his office,
Langley lived in considerable state. Apart from the
clerks of Chancery, his Household included laymen of
gentle birth. On one occasion at least, the King was
his guest.

Attendance of the King's Council accounted for a
considerable proportion of Langley's time. In the month

1. It is hardly necessary to give a sketch here of the
organisation and activities of Chancery, since by the
fifteenth century these had already been developed to
an almost rigid routine. A consideration of the
chancellor's equitable jurisdiction has been deferred to
a later stage (pp.128-134 infra), when Langley was again
Chancellor, from 1417 to 1424, as the amount of
evidence for his legal activities in that period is
vastly more considerable than for the years 1405-1407.
Nor is it proposed to make more than passing mention of
the "Latin side" of the chancellor's jurisdiction,
partly because this also was well-defined by 1405, and
also because few records of Langley's exercise of the
common law jurisdiction have been found. A number of cases
of Placita in Cancellaria may be noted. All arose from
disputes about the possession of lands, etc. The plaintiffs
generally complained that they had enjoyed seisin until
they were dispossessed by other persons by virtue of
letters patent or some other act of the government. After
the parties had appeared in Chancery and put their cases,
the matter was usually sent to King's Bench as a jury was
required, or a special inquisition was ordered. (Chancery
Miscellanea: Placita in Cancellaria (County Series) File 22,
nos.16-19 & 21; Devon Bundle nos.45 & 46.)  2. John Curteys,
Esq., living with "Thomas Longele", the Chancellor, is
mentioned in a private grant of 20 Jan. 1406 (Ancient Deeds
following his appointment, the Council met frequently, possibly daily, at Westminster, while the King was absent from London. The Chancellor, Treasurer and Keeper of the Privy Seal attended every meeting, being only occasionally joined by other councillors; the Bishop of Bath on 6 March; the Earl of Somerset on 9 and 10 March; John Cheyne on 6 and 10 March; Lord Grey and John Norbury on 10 March; and Sir Hugh Waterton on 18, 24, 26 and 28 March. On 21, 22, 23, 27, and 29 March, only the three high officials were present. The absence of the Archbishop of Canterbury may be explained by the fact that he had fallen under suspicion of complicity in the plot of Lady Despenser to abduct the two Mortimer children from Windsor Castle. This was carried out on 17 February, but the Mortimers were soon recovered. The Duke of York was also implicated, and was temporarily imprisoned. The greater safety of the young Mortimers was discussed by the Council on 1 March. Welsh affairs still required the Council’s attention. On 6 March, a new indenture for Prince Henry’s service was drawn up. On 13 March, the King instructed the Council to have proclamation made in London of a recent success against the rebels. Besides giving its assent to the inevitable petitions, the Council prepared drafts of letters on Gascon affairs and to the rulers of Florence on behalf of English merchants residing there. It also examined some signet warrants for the Privy Seal, giving assent to them.

On 1 April, a Great Council was held at St. Albans. Henry was again in need of financial assistance, which was refused.

As the King intended to lead an expedition into Wales, commissions of array were authorised. Langley was in St. Albans from 1 to 6 April, but instead of returning to London after the dismissal of the Council, went on to Norfolk to hold a visitation of his Archdeaconry. On 7 April he was at Baldock, and the 8th, at Babraham, and at Shouldham, near King’s Lynn, on the 11th. He thence crossed Norfolk to Corton, a few miles south of Great Yarmouth. On 22 April he was at Thetford, and reached Babraham on the same day. He was back at Westminster on the 30th. This visitation, for such it clearly was, was a remarkable event. A visitation by an archdeacon in person was an extremely rare occurrence in the later Middle Ages, and by an archdeacon who was also Chancellor of England probably unprecedented. An archdeaconry was then regarded as a sinecure: the duties were performed by an official, while the income was enjoyed by the absentee archdeacon. Langley’s contemporaries who were like himself archdeacons and high government officials obtained papal licences to hold visitations by deputy. It would be cynical to suppose that Langley’s motive was to make an impression of his suitability for episcopal rank that the Pope would bear in mind next time he was nominated to a

1. C.C.R. 1402-1405, p. 503. 2. C.P.R. XII p. 266; C.C.R. 500; C.P.R. 1401-1405 p. 461. It is possible to construct a chancellor’s itinerary from the place-dating of letters issued on his own authority, which show no warrant. 3. C.C.R. 505. 4. Ibid 508. 5. Ibid 505. 6. Ibid 442. 7. Ibid 505. 8. Ibid 490. 9. C.& P.S. 20; Warrants for Privy Seal file 2 no. 90. 9.e.g. Indults for William Raucombe, Archdeacon of Worcester, and Nicholas Bubwith, Archdeacon of Dorset, in 1401. (C.P.L.V 408)
bishopric. Langley had never obtained an indul to visit by deputy. When he was Keeper of the Privy Seal, he was too occupied by secular affairs to hold any visitation but his interest in his archdeaconry is evidenced by his obtaining, on 29 December 1402, the King's licence to certify direct to Chancery the names of all persons excommunicated in the archdeaconry. This suggests that there was some friction between Langley and the Bishop of Norwich, Henry Despenser, but there are indications that their relations were not unfriendly. On one occasion, Despenser asked Langley to use his influence with the King on his behalf, and although Langley was not as successful as Despenser would have liked, he offered to undertake other commissions. On 1 October 1404, the Bishop appointed Langley one of his proxies in Parliament.

That the Chancellor should have been able to pass the Easter vacation away from the capital, the King and the Council, indicates that the government felt its position comparatively secure: there were no matters of urgency sufficient to require Langley's residence in London. After his return, the Council resumed its sessions. On 30 April, only the three senior ministers, with the Bishops of Winchester and Bath, were present. From 10 May until the end of the month, the Council was at practically full strength, with the regular attendance of the Bishop of Worcester, Lords Roos and Lovell, Sir John Pelham, and the four esquires, Savage, Doreward, Curson and Cheyne. Archbishop Arundel is

shown to have attended on 9 and 10 May only. The payment of officials and petitions of subjects again received their attention. A signet warrant from the King to the Chancellor, ordering writs under the Great Seal, was brought before the Council, where it was agreed that the writs could be issued. As this was a financial matter, Langley presumably thought it wiser to receive the Council's assent. Instructions were sent, at the King's requirement, to ambassadors who had gone to negotiate with French envoys at Calais. The King wrote to the Council from Worcester on 8 May to ask for money for his campaign against the Welsh, as the war treasurers had failed to provide any. In reply, the Council wrote to inform Henry of the arrangements it had made for the payment of himself and his sons Henry and Thomas, who were also engaged in military operations. The Council had also made dispositions for the garrisons of Guienne and South Wales, and for the government of Jersey and Guernsey. It had learnt that Lord Bardolf had gone to the north of England, although he was under orders to join the King in Wales; in case he had any treasonable designs, Lord Roos and Sir William Gascoigne, the Chief Justice, had been sent after him.

Bardolf had gone to join the Earl of Northumberland in a new rising. The Earl Marshall also went northwards to join the King's enemies. These magnates were doubtless the leaders of the rebellion, but Archbishop Scrope of

---

York put himself forward as its figurehead, and published a manifesto against Henry's administration. The King received news of the rising when he was at Hereford, on 22 May, where he issued orders for the assembly of the shire levies of the midland counties. He hastened to the scene of the rising. On 28 May, he wrote to the Council from Derby, informing it of the rebellion: he asked his councillors to join him at Pontefract with such forces as they could raise.

Before Henry had reached Yorkshire, the main part of the rebellion had been crushed by the politic treachery of the Earl of Westmorland, who, by feigning to parley, had captured the Archbishop and the Earl Marshall. Northumberland and Bardolf, too late to help their fellow-conspirators, retired further north.

The Council, meanwhile, had been prompt to obey Henry's summons. Although it had met at Westminster on 30 May, Langley, at least, reached Nottingham the next day, where the King was waiting. On 6 June, Langley and Bubwith, the Keeper of the Privy Seal, were at Bishopthorpe, the Archbishop's manor, where Henry had set up his headquarters. Langley was thus close at hand on 8 June when Archbishop Scrope was hastily given a form of trial and executed immediately.

1. The King had learnt of this manifesto, or, at least, of hostile propaganda, when he was at Worcester, on 9 May. He then ordered proclamations in the city and county of York, and counties of Lincoln, Nottingham and Derby, bidding subjects pay no heed to lying rumours but arrest their fabricators, as he was aware that certain persons were trying to raise the people against him. On 15 May, the Council ordered this proclamation to be made in every county (C.C.R.1402-1405 p.515).

afterwards, despite the Archbishop of Canterbury's intercession. According to one account of Scrope's death, the King was reluctant to have him executed, but the royal councillors insisted on this extreme measure. As Henry's first councillor, Langley must be suspect of complicity, but a second account indicates that it was the secular members of the Council, certain knights, who pressed for the capital sentence. These accounts are mere excuses for the King, however: he had to explain his action to Archbishop Arundel, and ecclesiastics generally, as well as he could, and put the blame on his advisers. His position had been gravely endangered by Scrope's treason, and he was well acquainted with the dictum *necessitas non habet legem*. Scrope was not the first prelate or priest to suffer death by Henry's command.

The Archbishopric of York was thus vacant. On 17 June, the King's licence for the election of an Archbishop was given. Langley, the Dean, was clearly the King's nominee. On 8 August, Henry gave his assent to Langley's election. The Pope was notified, and asked to give his confirmation. The question of Langley's promotion to London could now be set aside. The King had not yet accepted the provision of Roger Walden, so the Bishopric was still vacant while negotiations were presumably in progress between the King and the Roman Curia. There was no need to continue the dispute after Langley's promotion to York had been decided. On 24 June, therefore, licence was given for Walden to enter into possession: his provision was allowed.

---

2. Incerti Scriptoris Chronicon Angliae, ed. J.A. Giles (p. 45).
4. He had added these words to a warrant to Chancery in 1401 (Lyte: Great Seal 130).
5. Wylie I 428.
6. C.P.R. 1405-1408, p. 22.
7. Ibid. 48; Ford, VIII 406.
8. C.P.R. 1405-1408, p. 22.
King's surrender was presumably intended to placate the Pope. Innocent VII, however, refused to countenance Langley's election to York. He naturally regarded the execution of Scrope as an affront to the Church, and the nomination of the King's Chancellor as his successor to have been an additional insult. Nor had it been particularly creditable for Langley to have accepted promotion in the circumstances: it is possible that the delay of six weeks between Scrope's execution and the issue of the licence for an election was due to Langley's reluctance to fill Scrope's place.

The Pope issued a bull excommunicating all who had taken part in the execution: it was not published in England. Henry sent envoys to excuse his actions, but no settlement was made until Innocent had been succeeded by Gregory XII. Langley was then appointed, on 12 April 1408, one of the papal mandatories to absolve those guilty of Scrope's death. Meanwhile, Innocent had provided Robert Hallum to York. The King would not accept this provision, so the Archbishopric remained vacant until after Langley's promotion to Durham. At York, Scrope's memory was the object of popular veneration, and miracles were alleged to have been performed at his tomb. In the year of his death, on 3 December, Archbishop Arundel and Dean Langley wrote to the Chapter of York to discourage these superstitions. They also drew up articles on the same subject, which the King commanded the Chapter to observe.

With the death of Scrope, the most serious part of the rebellion had been brought to an end. Northumberland and Bardolf were still at large. The King set out to pursue them on 16 June, went on to reduce the Earl's castles in Northumberland and did not return to Pontefract until 24 July\(^1\). The Council had left him as he began this campaign. Langley was at Stamford on 20 June, en route for Westminster\(^2\). In July, the Council resumed its normal activities. Throughout the month, Langley, Bubwith, Cheyne and Pelham were the only members to attend regularly\(^3\). The King wrote to them from Warkworth on 2 July, reporting that he had taken all the Earl's castles except Alnwick\(^4\). The Council arranged for the provisioning of Henry's army. On 8 July, it gave orders for the purveyance and despatch of supplies to Newcastle-upon-Tyne\(^5\). Reports had been received that Wales was about to be invaded by a French army. In the King's absence, the Council made plans to repel the expected attack. On 2 July, it issued commissions of array\(^6\). Attacks on Calais and other English possessions in France were also anticipated; plans for sending provisions to the garrisons were made by the Council\(^7\).

The French army landed at Milford Haven\(^8\), and it was probably the news of the invasion that caused Langley and the other councillors to rejoin the King.

---

3. C.& P.S. 22: records of meetings on 6, 7, 10, 16, 22, 24 and 27 July. Warrants for P.S., nos. 156 and 162, show sessions on 9 & 16 July. After this month, the records are meagre.
8. Wylie II 296-297; Oman 199.
On 2 August, Langley reached Leicester, and would have met the King at Nottingham the next day. It was decided that Henry should go to Wales. The shire levies were ordered to meet him at Hereford. Henry and his ministers departed from Pontefract on 14 August. They waited a few days at Leicester before going on to Worcester. They reached Hereford at the beginning of September, where there was a further delay. The reason for this was that Henry was once more without a sufficient supply of money. His revenues and the first part of the grants of the last Parliament had been exhausted by the exceptional demands of the past months. The second instalment of the subsidies was not due until Martinmas. On 4 September, commissions were issued by authority of the King and Council for the early collection of these taxes. Apart from the requirements of the Welsh campaign, provision had to be made for the defence of Guienne. Henry then made a brief incursion into South Wales, where all he accomplished was the relief of Coity Castle. In his absence, Langley went to Coventry, probably to raise a loan. Both he and Henry were back at Worcester on 29

1. C.P.R.1405-1408, p.54. 2. Wylie's itinerary of Henry IV is at fault for the first fortnight of August 1405. He gives the following: Doncaster 4 Aug; Nottingham 7-14 Aug; Leicester 15-19 Aug, (Henry IV Vol.IV 294). In fact, the King's movements were thus: Pontefract 1 Aug. (C.P.R.36); Nottingham 3 Aug. (ibid 39); Pontefract 4-12 Aug. (ibid 35); C.C.R.1402-1405, pp.458, 460, 464, 466 & 514). From after 14 Aug., Wylie's itinerary is again dependable. Langley was at Pontefract 6-14 Aug. (C.P.R.1 & 14; C.C.R. 513, 524 & 525). 3. Ibid 527-528. 4. Wylie: loc.cit. Langley was at Leicester 17-19 Aug. (C.P.R.64, 45), and at Worcester 24-28 Aug. (ibid 17, 37; C.C.R.529). 5. Wylie: Henry IV Vol.III 304; IV 294. 6. C.P.R. XII 317-319. 7. Wylie II 305-308; Oman 199-200. 8. He was at Hereford 8-10 Sept., and at Coventry on 12 Sept. (C.C.R.525; C.P.R. pp.36 & 58).
September. An assembly of the clergy was held there, but the King was unable to persuade it to relieve his financial difficulties. No further military operations were possible that year, so the King retired to the Home Counties. Fortunately the French were equally unable to stay in Wales, and deserted their ally Glyndwr in November.

The King's Council met at Westminster during the Michaelmas term. It appointed commissioners to summon the local forces to defend Cornwall against an expected French attack. The Duke of York was released from prison, and his lands restored by the Council's warrant. The most pressing preoccupation of the government was the state of its finances. No resort was left to the King save to call Parliament. The choice of place where it was to assemble was the subject of much discussion. Apparently Henry wished to repeat his successful manoeuvre of calling Parliament to Coventry, where he could again expect to find it as amenable as it had been there in 1404. On 21 December, writs were sent out for a meeting at Coventry on 15 February. Then there was a change of opinion: it was decided that Parliament should meet at Northampton. On 1 January, however, Henry was

1. Wylie: Henry IV Vol. IV p. 295; C.C.R.1402-1405, p. 525. A meeting of the Council at Worcester on 4 October was attended by the Archbishop of Canterbury; the Bishops of Winchester, Worcester, Bath and Hereford; the Chancellor (Langley); the Earl of Arundel; Lords Hoos and Furnival (the Treasurer); the Keeper of the Privy Seal (Bubwith); and Arnold Savage (Ancient Correspondence Vol. XLIII, no. 65).
2. Stubbs: Constitutional History III 53;
4. Oman 200; Ramsay: loc. cit.
5. Sessions of which there is some record were held on 10, 16, 17 & 20 Oct. (C.C.R.1405-1409, pp. 66-68);
6 & 24 Nov. (Warrants for P.S. File 4 no. 206; C.R. R.1405-1408, p. 149); 1, 2, 6, 14, 15 & 17 Dec. (ibid. 107 & 164; C.C.R. 6, 7, 14-16, 20).
6. C.P.R. 149.
7. C.C.R. 14-16.
again in favour of Coventry, but two days later, he had determined on Northampton. He wrote to Langley ordering new writs of summons. It had been agreed by the King and Council on 27 December that the Great Council should be hastily called. Henry expressed his displeasure that the letters calling it had not yet been sent, and asked Langley to see that the appropriate letters of Privy Seal were issued. A further change of plan soon followed. As the King intended to join Prince Henry in a campaign against the Welsh rebels, Parliament was called to Gloucester. The writs were dated 1 January 1406, but it is clear that they were deliberately antedated. On 3 February, men were appointed to arrange for the conveyance of the rolls of Chancery. The rolls were actually taken to Gloucester, but soon had to be sent back: on 9 February, writs were issued for a Parliament at Westminster on 1 March. It has been suggested that Henry was constrained to adopt this final arrangement by pressure from certain of his councillors and prominent citizens of London. Possibly the Great Council had urged the change, but the motive behind the alteration, whoever pressed for it, was most likely that given in the writs rather than a desire to avoid a repetition of the Coventry Parliament of 1404. The reason given in the writs was that hostile French ships were blockading the mouth of the Thames, so that the country would have been exposed to worse dangers if the King and

When Parliament met on 1 March 1406, Langley, as Chancellor, formally opened it with the usual address. He placed particular emphasis on the King's desire for counsel. This was obviously a conciliatory move, but the matters on which advice was sought were named and thus, by implication, limited. Langley said that the King was anxious for the good governance of his people, who were much troubled in various ways, but in particular by the Welsh rebels. Henry also desired counsel regarding the defence of his subjects in Guienne, Calais, Ireland and on the Scottish Marches. If the government had hoped that Parliament would confine its attention to questions of national defence, it was to be disappointed. The Commons were highly critical of the administration's failure to deal adequately with the attacks of foreign enemies: "good governance" began at home, and only an efficient government could deal with the dangers threatening the country. The opposition therefore went to the root of the problem in pressing for reforms in the administration. There seemed little point in granting more taxes unless it could be felt that they would be put to good use. The Commons thought that the King had already wasted enough of their money, and that he should "live of his own". Because of their refusal to make any grant until putative reforms had been enacted, the "Long Parliament" of 1406 lasted until Christmas.

One of the first subjects to be considered by Parliament was piracy. On 3 March, Langley made a

statement to the lords on the recent negotiations with
the Teutonic Knights of Prussia and the Hanseatic League:
it had been agreed that English subjects who had robbed
ships of the German powers should pay compensation. The
lords ratified that a proclamation to this effect should
be made. The Council had already shown concern at the
illegal exploits of English seamen. On 29 January 1406,
a commission was appointed to recover goods stolen from
some merchants of Hamburg. After March, its interest in
this problem increased. On 4 March, it ordered action in
the case of a Spanish ship captured in the Channel. On
8 March, on information given by the ambassadors returned
from Prussia, the arrest of certain seamen was ordered:
you were to be brought before the King and Council. Proclamations
were issued according to the treaty with
the Hanse and Teutonic Knights, ordering not only the
making of amends by offenders but the lodging of
complaints by English merchants with grievances against
German pirates, and a commission was appointed, on 4 June,
to examine inquisitions and receive complaints. This
commission apparently sat for several weeks, as on 26
July, the Council ordered the arrest of men charged before
it. Parliament was not satisfied with the government's
activities: while the Council might be able to take
measures to punish English pirates, it had not shown
itself competent to provide protection for law-abiding
English merchants. A plan was prepared by the Commons
whereby the responsibility of sea-keeping was entrusted
to a number of English merchants. The government accepted
this scheme on 3 April. Although this arrangement was a

failure, its enactment represented a vote of "No confidence" in the royal administration.

This unorthodox plan for sea-keeping was the main achievement of the Parliament in its first month. As Easter was approaching, and no grant had been made, it was prorogued on 3 April for three weeks. Langley again spent the vacation in visiting his Archdeaconry of Norfolk. On 12 April, he was at Corton, and travelled slowly westwards through Norwich to King's Lynn, where he arrived on 18 April. As he went, he issued some writs touching local matters of a legal nature. On 20 April, he took a recognisance at West Dereham. Then he returned to London. Parliament was due to reassemble on 25 April, but the King was unable to be present. On the 28th, he wrote to the Council that he was too ill to leave Windsor. The Council was therefore instructed to conduct business in Parliament, as well as to make arrangements for the defence of Guienne and the despatch of his daughter Philippa, who was to marry Prince Eric of Denmark. Parliament thus did not recommence its sessions until 30 April. It was no less critical of the government, and the councillors must have found it difficult, particularly since the King was incapacitated, to resist its demands. This weakness accounts in part for the increased pressure by Parliament for reforms, and the concessions made to it.

The King's Council was again the object of Parliament's attention. Following the precedent of 1404, the King was asked to name his councillors. On 22 May, he gave way and named seventeen councillors. "None of these men were new..."
to the Council, and all of them were the king's friends.\(^1\) The importance of the Council was so increased by the ordinances of Parliament that it has been remarked that little of the King's prerogative was left to him,\(^2\) in theory, at least. It had been realised that Henry had contrived to avoid being completely dependent despite his concessions in 1404. The additional measures of 1406, which attempted to make it impossible for the King to act without his Council's consent, thus marked an advance in Parliament's constructive ideas. On 19 June, there was a further defeat of the government when Henry had to agree that the accounts of the war treasurers appointed in the last Parliament should be submitted to auditors chosen by the Commons.\(^3\) On the same day, Parliament was again prorogued.\(^4\)

During the recess, the Council was engaged on business made necessary by Parliament. No subsidies had yet been granted, although on 13 June tunnage and poundage had been renewed for one year.\(^5\) In the meanwhile, money had to be found for the government's immediate requirements. On 28 June, commissioners were appointed in each county to borrow money.\(^6\) Considerable sums were raised, but mostly from a few wealthy individuals.\(^7\) Parliament had instructed the Council to make enquiries into the grants by the King of manors and other properties, to see whether these grants had been made at a loss.\(^8\) The King and Council issued warrants for this purpose on 28 June.\(^9\) Langley was appointed to both commissions for Norfolk. Another of Parliament's enactments had been directed against aliens living in the country: they were to leave the realm or

make fine to the King. The Council met on 1 July to approve the form of licence to be given to foreigners who paid a fine to the Treasurer. The size and composition of this Council show that Henry was observing his concessions to Parliament.

During the summer, Langley at last attained to the episcopal dignity. Walter Skirlawe, Bishop of Durham, had died on 24 March. On 30 March, the temporalities were committed to the custody of Prince John, Warden of the East March, and on the same day, two monks of Durham were appointed keepers of the spiritualities by the Prior and Convent, as the Archbishopric of York was then also vacant. The royal licence for an election was issued on 25 April. Innocent VII had already been asked to provide Langley to Durham. This time, no objection was raised. The bull of provision was issued on 14 May. Although Langley was styled "Elect of Durham" in the bull, the Prior and Chapter did not assemble for the purpose of electing a bishop until 17 May. Langley was elected by an overwhelming majority. Obviously, the King had instructed the monks to vote for Langley. The fact of his election shows that his provision was not made at the Pope's initiative, but on the King's nomination: the bull would have been received in London in the first week of June. On 8 June, Langley received licence for the payment of the first-fruit of Durham to Rome.

On 1 July, after he had paid £600 into the royal Chamber, the temporalities were granted to his agents. He was consecrated on 8 August 1406, in St. Paul's London, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, as York was still vacant. The Pope had granted Langley the privilege of choosing two or three bishops to assist at the ceremony. The two Bishops he chose were Henry Beaufort of Winchester and Richard Clifford of Worcester. The Archbishop received the new Bishop's oath of loyalty to the Pope, which included an undertaking to have no dealings with the party of Robert of Geneva, damnate memorie, that is, with the Avignonese party in the Great Schism. On the following day, the King officially restored the temporalities of Durham. Langley's first act as ordinary was to appoint the Prior of Durham and Thomas Weston, Archdeacon of Durham, his vicars-general in spiritualibus. His seal for the Archdeaconry of Norfolk was used to authenticate the instrument, as his episcopal seal had not yet been made. William Chancellor, whom the King had appointed Constable of Durham on 7 August, was left in office.

The new Bishop did not hasten to visit his diocese. The King would have been most unwilling to part with his Chancellor at that particular time. Langley had presumably become well-acquainted with the leading elements in the "Long Parliament", and understood their attitude to the government. Chancery was always closely associated with Parliament. As a further session was imminent, Henry would have wished to retain the minister who was best informed on the subject. Moreover, if Langley were to resign the Great Seal then, whatever his motive, his replacement might have appeared an as indication

of weakness on the King's part in that he had dismissed the chief minister of his much criticised administration. Langley therefore stayed in office for a further six months.

At the end of August he went to Leicester, where the King was staying, and returned with him to London. They had presumably discussed the business of the coming session of Parliament. This was opened on 13 October. While it was sitting, the Council also met. On 29 October, issues from the manor of Wantage were granted to John Cornwall, in return for a loan and other services to the King. The subsequent letters patent were warranted by the Privy Seal, showing that the Council was employing this instrument. Parliament desired a further enhancement of the Council's authority. On 27 November, the King again submitted the names of his councillors. They met again on 8 December to make arrangements for a more economical regulation of the royal household, one of the objects of Parliament's criticism. Finally, on 22 December, the councillors each took an oath in Parliament to observe thirty one articles drawn up by the Commons for the reform of the government. On the same day, subsidies were granted and Langley informed the Commons that they were dismissed.

The main burden of the Parliament's complaints had been directed against the inefficiency of the administration and in particular against the government's failure to defend the country against its enemies. This criticism...
may have been the reason for Langley's resignation of the Great Seal on 30 January 1407\(^1\): so much indeed may be inferred from Stubbs' view that this was "one result of the parliamentary action of 1407"\(^2\). As the first minister of the administration, Langley might have been held responsible for the criticisms made against it. This explanation of his resignation cannot be accepted: incompetence would have been the last charge made against Langley. Apart from the record of his government, both spiritual and temporal, in Durham, the mere fact that so discerning and exacting a master as Henry V employed him as Chancellor for five years, at a time when the responsibilities of his office were greatly increased on account of the King's absence abroad, is sufficient warrant to exonerate Langley from the accusation of inefficiency, is, indeed, good reason for supposing him to have been one of the most able administrators of his day. In any case, the parliamentary criticism of 1406 was less than just: the chief cause of the crown's weakness was the inadequacy of its financial resources\(^3\).

A further reason for rejecting any suggestion that Langley had suffered in reputation is the fact that on the same day as he resigned the Great Seal, he was appointed a member of the King's Council, with an annual salary of two hundred marks\(^4\). Later in the year, on 5 May, the King granted a charter confirming the franchises of the Bishopric of Durham, and gave as one of the causes moving him the special affection he had for Langley\(^5\). His

Resignation may have been due to a wish to be free to visit his diocese, but this is not likely, as he did not go to Durham for another six months. The cause of Langley's resignation must be sought in the changed political situation of the latter years of the reign of Henry IV, when two factions struggled for control of the government. Just as the development of this partisan conflict marked a new stage in the reign, so did the surrender of the Great Seal signify the end of a chapter in Langley's life. He was no longer merely the "King's clerk", owing his position in the state to the office the King conferred upon him. He now stood as a public figure in his own right, for as Bishop of Durham, he was both a high ecclesiastic and a powerful secular magnate. His position, as well as the incomparable experience and knowledge he had acquired of the details of government, his record of loyal service in times of crisis and the fact that he was still in the prime of life, ensured his future prominence as a statesman of the first rank.
CHAPTER III: COUNCILLOR AND DIPLOMAT, 1407-1417.

In the ten years that followed his resignation of the Great Seal, Bishop Langley held no office of state, although it might be said that he remained a "cabinet minister". He served on a number of embassies and appears to have had some special responsibility in the conduct of diplomacy. In 1409, he was a delegate to the Council of the Church at Pisa. As Bishop of Durham, he was inevitably concerned in the affairs of the Scottish Marches. Sometimes his various duties tended to overlap. It was, for instance, surely more than a coincidence that he should have spent six months in the north of England, partly in holding his only visitation of the diocese, immediately after the defeat of the Earl of Northumberland's last rising. Langley's career was thus complicated by the fact that he had several places to fill; these must be considered separately.

(i) The King's Council: 1407-1413.

Ten days after Archbishop Arundel replaced Langley as Chancellor, the King confirmed Richard II's act legitimising the Beauforts. It has been customary for historians to draw attention to the addition of the words *excepta dignitate regali* as an indication of the influence, of Arundel, who certainly had no wish for one of these children of John of Gaunt to ascend the throne. No immediate breach followed, but the protagonists in the coming conflict had emerged. On the one side was the Archbishop, on the other Henry Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester. When Prince Henry had finally crushed the Welsh rebellion and returned to London to seek

1. For this reason, relations with Scotland will be dealt with in a later chapter, so that the importance of the Palatinate of Durham in this respect can be more fully emphasised (See p.205 et seq.). 2.Stubbs III 61; Ramsay I pp.106-107; C.Med.H.VIII 374; K.H.Vickers: England in the Later Middle Ages (Fifth Edition, 1930) p.333.
the leading position in the government, his chief supporter was his uncle. The King, estranged from his half-brother and alarmed at his son's ambitions, gave his full support to the Archbishop. Control of the Privy Council was the goal of both parties.

Langley's part in this struggle was somewhat equivocal. There was good reason for his being attached to Henry Beaufort. Beaufort was Langley's junior by some fifteen years. He would have first encountered Langley when the latter was in the service of his father Gaunt. It was significant that Langley should have chosen Beaufort to be one of the Bishops to assist at his consecration. Their relations may have been a cause of Langley's surrender of the Great Seal. That it should have been Arundel who succeeded him suggests that he was temporarily involved in the disfavour under which the Beauforts had fallen. The high position to which Langley attained under Henry V also lends support to the view that he had been a partisan of the Prince in Henry IV's reign. Yet Langley never forfeited the old King's confidence. He remained a member of the Council until the end of the reign. He was appointed an executor of the King's will, while Beaufort was not, despite his close kinship. It is clear then that Langley never became a strong partisan of either faction, while his standing was such that both parties trusted him and sought his counsel.

Langley was appointed a member of the Council on 30 January 1407, with a salary in accordance with the

1. See p. 57 supra. 2. CLL, Kingsford regarded Langley as "an adherent of the Beaufort party" (Henry V (1923) p. 63, note). 3. Appendix B(i) P. 285. 4. These payments to Langley have been noted:
   - 24 Oct. 1408: £133 6s. 8d. (Iss. 10 Hen. IV Mic. m. 4).
   - 8 Nov. 1409: £66 13s. 4d. (Iss. 11 Hen. IV Mic. m. 4).
   - 23 Feb. 1412: £33 6s. 8d. (Iss. 13 Hen. IV Mic. m. 11).
   - 6 Feb. 1413: £33 6s. 8d. (Iss. 14 Hen. IV Mic. m. 13).
   - 28 Feb. 1413: £200 0s. 0d. (ibid m. 15).
ordinances of the last Parliament. He remained in London until early July. He was one of the members of the Council who interceded with the mayor and citizens of London on behalf of some fishermen whom the Council had found guilty of certain offences, on 19 February. On 17 June, he lent the King one hundred marks for the payment of the garrison of Calais, and joined with other councillors in underwriting both his own loan and those by other persons for the same purpose. His connection with the Beauforts was evidenced by his being granted, together with the Bishop of Winchester and others, licence to enfeoff John Beaufort, Earl of Somerset, in certain lands. On 16 July, Langley was at Wheel Hall, his episcopal manor near York. He spent the summer in his diocese, being enthroned at Durham on 4 September.

The seventh Parliament of the reign was opened at Gloucester on 24 October. Henry's desire for a removal of restraints on his prerogative was shown in the speech of Chancellor Arundel, whose choice of text was "Honour the King". The Speaker, Thomas Chaucer, a kinsman of the Beauforsts, referred to the grant of subsidies by the last Parliament and the appointment of a Council. In reply, Arundel told the Commons that the councillors had performed their duties without receiving any thanks and had been obliged to make loans to assist the government. He asked that the councillors should be excused from the oath they had taken in 1406. Henry granted this request. He had again placed Parliament at a disadvantage by making it meet away from

---

London, and this helped to prevent it from interfering with his position by any fresh enactments concerning the Council. Langley attended the Parliament. He was the first-named of the triers of Gascon petitions. He was one of the councillors whom the Speaker asked the King to send to speak to the Commons, on 14 November. After Parliament had been dismissed, Langley returned north, to spend Christmas at Auckland.

He was in London when the Earl of Northumberland and Lord Bardolf made their final attempt against the King. They came from Scotland, where they had received little encouragement. An army was raised, mostly in the Percy estates in North Yorkshire, but it was defeated by the local forces at Bramham Moor, on 19 February 1408. The Earl was killed in the battle. The King went to Yorkshire to restore order. It seems that Langley accompanied him. The advice of the Bishop of Durham would have been valuable in the work of pacifying the North of England. While the King stayed at Wheel Hall, Langley was at Howden, another episcopal manor nearby. When the King turned south again, Langley remained: in May, he went to his manor of Northallerton, which was in the centre of the disaffected area. He spent the whole summer in his diocese, conducting visitations of the Convent and Archdeaconry of Durham. He did not depart until the end of September. It may be presumed that he attended meetings

of the Council at Westminster during the Michaelmas term, although none of its records survive.\(^1\)

In December, Langley attended Convocation at York\(^2\) and paid a brief visit to Wheel Hall\(^3\). His stay in the North was doubtless cut short by his receiving news of the King's grave illness\(^4\). On 21 January 1409, Henry's will was drawn up at Greenwich, where he lay sick, apparently dying. The witnesses to the will would have been those persons in whom he placed most confidence. His three chief ministers and chamberlain were there, and also the Duke of York and Langley, with three other faithful old Duchy servants, Thomas Erpingham, Robert Waterton and John Norbury\(^5\). This was not Henry's last will, for he recovered, although he remained convalescent until the summer\(^6\). His incapacity led to the Council undertaking a greater responsibility in the business of government. At the same time, Prince Henry was free to attend. With the recapture of Harlech, Glyndwr's rebellion was no longer dangerous. The Prince was thus able to take his place in the Council\(^7\). He was present at a meeting of the Council on 2 March 1409. Langley was also there\(^8\). The King continued to take some part, however: he sealed writs granting the Cstle of Queenborough to Archbishop Arundel on 10 March. He was still at Greenwich. Langley and the Treasurer, John Tiptoft, were the only members of the Council present, although Thomas Beaufort was there\(^9\). This incident is of interest, for it again suggests that Langley was not committed to the Beaufort faction. As the most senior councillor in attendance on the sick King, he had presumably been consulted on the subject of this grant to Arundel. At the end of March, Langley set out to attend the Council of Pisa, and did not

---

While Langley was abroad, the rivalry between Prince Henry and the Beauforts on the one side, and Archbishop Arundel, backed by the King, on the other, developed to a crisis. While his father was ill, the Prince was willing to curb his ambitions in the expectation of his own early succession, but with the King's recovery, he was less inclined to be patient. Before his party had succeeded in its bid to gain control of the Government, Langley returned to London, but did not remain long. He departed for the North at the end of November, and stayed there until late in the following January. He was therefore absent from the capital when Arundel surrendered the Great Seal, on 21 December, and Thomas Beaufort was appointed in his place, on 21 January 1410. At the same time, John Tipoft was dismissed from the office of Treasurer. He was succeeded by Henry Scrope of Masham, one of Prince Henry's followers.

Parliament met at Westminster on 27 January. Langley, who was a trier of petitions, was in London during the greater part of its session. On 2 May, the Commons asked the King to name the members of his Council. Henry replied that certain lords had been excused from attendance. He had appointed Prince Henry, the Bishops of Winchester, Durham and Bath and Wells, the Earls of Arundel and Westmoreland, and Lord Burnell to be his councillors, all of whom, except

1. The last day he is known to have been in England was 26 March, when he was in London (Reg.f.29). 2. C. Med. H. VIII p.375. 3. London 23 Oct; Wheel Hall 3-5 Dec; Northallerton 9 Dec. (Reg. ff. 28d & 30). He spent Christmas at Auckland (D. Bursar 1409-1410, m. 39), and was there 1-6 Jan. and at Durham 9 Jan. (Reg.f.30). On 21 Jan. he went to Chester-le-Street to stand godfather to Thomas Lumley (Reg. II (Inq. P.M.) f.258d). He could thus hardly have reached London before 13 Feb., the first day he is known to have been there (Reg.f.32). 4. C.C.R.1409-1413 p.115. 5. C. Med. H. VIII 376; Ramsay I 123. 6. Rot. Parl. III 622-623. 7. He was in London from 13 Feb. to 19 June (Reg.ff.32 & 46d; Nic.I 331-338).
the Prince, then swore to serve loyally. The success of the Prince's party was thus ratified. This aristocratic Council, small in comparison with the Councils named in previous Parliaments of the reign, was presumably nominated by Prince Henry. It was thus largely a partisan body, although the inclusion of Langley and Bubith, the Bishop of Bath, seems to have been due to a desire to give the Council a broader basis by retaining these two experienced curialists. On 9 May, the Prince told the Commons that Langley and Westmorland would be unable to attend the Council continually, on account of their responsibilities on the Scottish Border. The Earl of Warwick and Henry Chichele, Bishop of St. David's, were therefore appointed councillors. Langley attended meetings of the Council on 16, 18 and 19 June. Soon afterwards, he left the capital for his diocese, where he passed the summer.

Langley returned to London in October. On 12 November, he was at Leicester, where the King was staying. At that time, the Council was sitting at Westminster. It apparently joined Henry IV at Leicester on 26 November, but stayed there for only a few days. Thus during a fortnight when the King was separated from the Council, Langley was in attendance on
Henry IV, and remained at Leicester until 1 December. He left soon afterwards, to again spend Christmas at Auckland. He was back in London early in March 1411\(^1\), and attended meetings of the Great Council at Lambeth on 19 March\(^2\). A month later, he was at Howden. He remained in the North until the beginning of September\(^3\), continuing his interrupted visitation of the Archdeaconry of Durham\(^4\).

Langley's long absences from London are rather significant. In the sixteen months after his appointment to the Council of the Prince's partisans, he had spent, at the most, four months in London. His last visit may have been made for the sole purpose of attending the Great Council. It is thus likely that since November 1410, when he was at Leicester with the King, he had ceased to be an active member of the Privy Council. Its records are admittedly too scanty for this time to support this view, but it may be noted that Langley received no payments for attendance while Prince Henry was in power\(^5\). Langley's responsibilities in northern England had been recognised, but there were no Scottish attacks in the summer of 1411. He had been appointed, on 23 May, to a commission to treat with Scottish envoys, yet there is no indication that he took any part in these negotiations\(^6\). On the other hand, the Pope was told that Langley was at this time too valued by the King for his counsel to be allowed to leave the kingdom, but as this was also said of Bishop Hallum\(^7\), who was not a member of the Council, this may have been no more than an excuse. That Langley was not out

---

1. Leicester 1 Dec; Wheel Hall 7 Dec; Auckland 25 Dec-14 Jan. 1411; Howden 20 Jan; Auckland 24 & 25 Jan; Crayke 29 Jan; Sheriff Hutton (a castle of the Earl of Westmorland) 30 & 31 Jan; Howden 1 Feb; London 9 Mar. (Reg.—ff. 37-40, 45, 46d & 47). 2. Nic. II 6-7. 3. London 20 Mar; Howden 27 & 28 Apr; Auckland 7 June -2 July; Sherburn 6 July; Auckland 31 July; Stockton 8 Aug; Auckland 24 Aug-1 Sept; Northallerton 3 Sept; Stockton (Reg.—ff. 40-45, 47 & 497). See pp. 238-239 infra. 5. See p. 82, note 4, supra. 6. See pp. 210-211 infra. 7. Appendix B(iii) p. 286.
of favour is shown by the grant to him and Prince Humphrey of the custody of the alien Priory of Tickford, on 4 August. That he had not severed his connection with the Council is testified by his joining it in underwriting a government liability.

There is thus some reason to suspect that Langley had been somewhat estranged from the Prince and his supporters. The cause is obvious. The King was feeling resentful at the extent to which the conduct of affairs had been taken from his hands. He even suspected that his son intended to supplant him on the throne: the Beauforts were believed to have suggested that he should abdicate. In the autumn of 1411, the Prince's ascendancy was on the wane. The King, with Arundel constantly at his side, was now waiting for the occasion to regain full control of the government. Langley's loyalty to the King accounts for his attitude, which he had presumably taken up in November 1410.

Parliament met at Westminster on 3 November 1411. On 30 November, the King thanked his councillors for their services, and dismissed them. Shortly afterwards, Thomas Beaufort was replaced by Arundel and Henry Scrope by John Pelham as Chancellor and Treasurer respectively. No new Council was appointed in Parliament, but Prince Henry and the Beauforts were excluded for the remainder of the reign. Prince Thomas took the place of his elder brother. Langley was one of the members of the former Council whose services were retained. His visits to Durham were now shorter.

After the close of Parliament, he went to his diocese. In

February 1412, he was back in London. He spent Easter in the Bishopric, but returned to the capital in May. He was at Rotherhithe on 5 July when Thomas Beaufort was created Earl of Dorset, and on 9 July, when Prince Thomas was made Duke of Clarence. Meetings of the Council were also held there, on 8, 9 and 10 July. Their composition shows that Henry was relying on the counsel of veteran ministers, namely Archbishop Bowet of York and Bishop Bubwith, in addition to Arundel and Langley. Langley was at the same time again on good terms with Prince Henry. The Prince had been estranged from his father for some time. He attempted to effect a reconciliation. On 30 June, he came to London with a large company, and stayed at Langley's inn until 11 July. As Langley was then residing in London, he would have been the Prince's host.

Langley's visit to the North that summer was brief in comparison with those of the two previous years. He was in London during the autumn. He attended meetings of the Council on 20 and 21 October, where the members were the same who had been present at the sessions in July. In accordance with his usual practice, Langley spent Christmas in his diocese. He was back in London on 3 February 1413.

Henry IV died on 20 March. His will does not survive. Henry V, with whom he had recently been reconciled, and
Archbishop Arundel were the supervisors, and Archbishop Bowet, Bishop Langley, John Pelham, Robert Waterton and John Leventhorp, all Lancastrians, were his executors. Their task was onerous: Henry IV had died so heavily in debt that the executors were at first unwilling to undertake the duty. It was granted in Parliament in 1413 that they should be given the sum of 25,000 marks in composition for the goods that Henry V had inherited in order to settle the late King's obligations. The greater part of this sum was not paid until after Henry V's death, and the executors of Henry IV received their final acquittance from the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1423.


The marriage of Richard II to Isabella of France in 1396, and the conclusion of a truce for twenty eight years, marked the close of the first stage of the Hundred Years War. Had Richard remained King for another thirty years, the relations of the two countries might well have improved with the passage of time, but his overthrow and death led to the reopening of the strife. The government of Charles VI was inevitably shocked by the fate of his son-in-law. Henry IV was regarded as an usurper, his title was not recognised. Once Isabella had been restored to her parents, French hostility became increasingly open. France was not strong enough to invade England, but was able to commit many acts of an hostile nature: Guienne was attacked and partly overrun; Calais was threatened; a treaty of alliance was made with Owen Glyndwr; there were constant clashes between English and French ships. In this unofficial warfare at sea, English sailors were no less aggressive than the French: plundering

3. Ramsay I 23 & 41.
expeditions landed on both sides of the Channel. Nominally, there was a truce at sea, and in Normandy and Picardy. Even though it was honoured more in the breach than the observance, ambassadors occasionally met to discuss ways of correcting infringements. Between 1401 and 1405, these meetings were the only form of diplomatic relation existing between the two countries.

The defeat of the rebellion of Archbishop Scrope in 1405 made it clear that the House of Lancaster had secured a strong hold on the throne of England. The rapid collapse of the rising before Henry's ruthless and energetic counter-measures would have shown the French government that he was no longer a mere usurper barely holding his own; he was obviously King de facto. At the same time, France's internal position had deteriorated. After the death of Philip le Hardi, Duke of Burgundy, on 26 April 1404, his son and heir, Jean sans Peur, soon quarrelled with Charles' brother, Louis, Duke of Orleans. Each sought for himself the power to direct the government of the mad King. In the autumn of 1405, they took up arms. Jean sans Peur entered Paris and took charge of the government. This was England's opportunity for a settlement. At the end of March 1406, a commission headed by Bishop Beaufort was sent to France with powers to conclude peace and arrange a marriage between Prince Henry and a daughter of Charles VI. On 5 October, a second embassy was appointed for the same purpose; one of its members was Mr. Henry Chichele. Burgundy and Orleans were now "reconciled", however, and in consequence, hostilities against England were renewed. Orleans' invasion of Guienne was abandoned in January 1407. After a second breach

with Burgundy, there was another "reconciliation". A further English Delegation to France was appointed on 11 June, but its members, Sir Thomas Erpingham, Mr. John Catricic and Hugh Mortimer, were only empowered to treat for "repairs" and an extension of the existing local truce. It was now proposed to send a French embassy to England. On 27 September, safe-conducts were granted to the Bishop of St. Flour and other envoys.

Before their arrival in England, civil war in France was made inevitable by the murder of Orleans, at Burgundy's admitted instigation, on 23 November. The government now passed into the cautious hands of Charles' uncle, the Duke of Berry.

Early in December, the French embassy arrived at Gloucester. Bishop Langley, who was there to attend the Parliament, was appointed, on 1 December, to lead the English representatives. The other members of the commission were Erpingham, Catrick and Mortimer. Prince Thomas was associated with the commission, but apparently took no part in the negotiations. Langley and the others were empowered to treat for a perpetual peace; discuss any questions the French wished to raise concerning matters with which Charles was at issue with Henry; consider their suggestions for the means whereby peace was to be realised, including the possibility of marriage alliances; or to conclude general or local truces. In the event, it was agreed, on 7 December, that there should be a truce in Guienne from 15 January to 15 April 1408, so that it should be possible for further negotiations to be conducted in a more friendly atmosphere. This result was meagre in comparison with the terms of the English commission, but the treaty was of some importance.

1. Foed VIII 484-485. 2. Ibid 499. 3. Coville: op. cit 331-332. 4. See p. 64 supra. 5. Foed. VIII 504-507. 6. Ibid 507-509. For the possible relation of these negotiations to the diplomatic prelude to the Council of Pisa, see pp. 85-86 infra.
in that it marked a resumption of better relations between England and France. The two countries still regarded each other as enemies, but they were now prepared to settle their differences by diplomacy.

French ambassadors were again in England in 1408. On 15 April, at Pontefract, it was agreed that the truce for Guienne should be extended until 30 September. The English representatives were Robert Waterton and Mr. Robert Holme. Langley must have taken some part in these negotiations. He was then staying at Howden, less than twenty miles from Pontefract. Holme, moreover, was his spiritual chancellor and constant companion. The truce was later extended to 1 May 1409. While these temporary cessations of hostilities were being arranged, discussions for a final peace were being continued. It was decided at a meeting of English and French representatives that Henry IV should send an embassy of one archbishop or bishop, a baron, a knight, a clerk and an esquire to Paris, to meet a French Commission, on 3 February 1409. The King hoped that a peace might then be concluded, probably with the marriage of Prince Henry to Katherine of France or one of her sisters. In November 1408, he appointed Bishop Langley, Lord Scrope, Sir Arnold Savage, Mr. John Catrick and Hugh Mortimer to go to France. For some reason, the English embassy was not sent as agreed, but Catrick went to France early in March 1409 to declare that Henry was still anxious for these negotiations to take place, and to arrange a new date for the meeting. It had been the King's

1. *Foot.* VIII 513-517. 2. See p. 64 *supra.* 3. See Appendix E(G). p. 501. Holme was with Langley at Howden on 15 April, the day of the treaty (Reg.I.14d). 4. *Foot.* VIII 551-553. 5. Their commission is not extant. On 22 Nov. warrants to the Exchequer for an advance payment towards their expenses were issued. (E.I.W. 24/235-237, 239 & 240). Scrope, Savage, Catrick & Mortimer were members of Beaufort's embassy (See p. 75 *seg.*). 6. *Foot.* VIII 571; E.I.W. 24/298.
intention to employ Langley in these negotiations, he had delayed his departure for the Council of Pisa. On 20 March, however, the King had decided that Langley was to set out for Pisa immediately.

While Langley was in Italy, the talks were continued. An embassy of the stipulated composition, headed by Bishop Beaufort, was appointed on 15 May. On 16 September, there was a further meeting at Leulingen, where the truce was extended. On 21 June 1410, an embassy led by Henry Chichele, now Bishop of St. David's, met French representatives at the same place. It was empowered to treat for peace, but again only the truce was prorogued. English relations with France now took a new turn. In the past four years, attempts had been made to conclude a treaty of peace. It is doubtful whether these had been wholly sincere: Henry still styled himself King of France, and may have had no intention of abandoning his dubious claims to that throne. On the other hand, the commission to his ambassadors, while not empowering them in any way to renounce his title, did not require them to make any demands for French territory, as Henry V was to do.

France was now divided into two camps. The Orleanist party was joined by the royal princes, and, more important, by the Count of Armagnac, in its quest for vengeance against the Duke of Burgundy. Civil war broke out, but neither side was sufficiently strong to destroy its rival. In 1411, both Burgundians and Armagnacs turned to England for assistance. Prince Henry was now in control of the Privy Council; he was not the man to neglect an opportunity for military glory. Although the King did not wish to abandon his policy of

seeking peace with France, the Prince concluded an alliance with Burgundy and sent soldiers to aid him. The prospect of a closer alliance was entertained. On 1 September, Prince Henry was authorised to marry one of the Duke's daughters, and an embassy was sent to negotiate for this marriage. A Burgundian embassy was sent to England in February 1412. Langley was appointed to lead the English commission, which was empowered to discuss the marriage and other forms of alliance.

It has already been suggested that, in this period, Langley was holding aloof from the Prince and Council: he was in his diocese in September, when the embassy was sent to Burgundy. His appointment to the commission on 10 February would appear to conflict with this view. The King was again in charge of the government, however. He was still unenthusiastic about the Burgundian alliance. At the same time as the Burgundian envoys were in London, representatives of the opposing French party arrived. They outbid Burgundy, promising to restore Aequitaine to England. Henry IV was thus enticed to take up the Armagnac cause. Eventually, on 18 May, he concluded an alliance, and sent Prince Thomas to lead a contingent against the Burgundians.

Langley's part is thus more explicable. He was appointed by the King, not by the Prince. His task was to protract the talks with Burgundy and secure promises of concessions that would cause the Armagnac faction to increase its offers for English aid. The King soon learnt of the ill-success of his intervention in French affairs. On 15 July, the hostile parties were again "reconciled" and the English expedition was bought off.

A resumption of the Burgundian alliance was to be expected after the death of Henry IV. In fact, negotiations with both French parties were continued during the next two years. Henry V's diplomatic objectives were to keep Burgundy and the other French princes apart, and to cause the former such anxiety by apparently coming to terms with the latter that he would join forces with England. In addition, Henry wished to make a great show of seeking a peaceful settlement, so that, when negotiations broke down, France should appear guilty of rejecting his overtures: he could thus make France appear as the aggressor, so that public opinion in England in particular, but also in the rest of Europe, would be in his favour. His demands on France were so outrageously high as to be unacceptable, yet he maintained a pose of seeking only his just rights. Doubtless he was sincere: he seems to have been one of those men who see only one side to a question, their own. Henry was devout in his religious beliefs, even a bigot. Clearly, to his mind, he was in the right, and he would call on Heaven to witness the righteousness of his cause. He could be as ruthless as his father, yet was more patient and methodical. Before such an adversary, divided France was unable to offer any steadfast resistance.

At first, Henry V did not press any claims against France. The existing truce was extended until 1 June 1414. It was apparently also arranged that a French embassy should come to England. On 19 December 1413, French ambassadors arrived in London and lodged in the Bishop of Durham's inn. Their object was to treat for peace. Langley, then in London, the Earl of Warwick and Mr. Henry Ware were appointed to confer with them. On 24 January 1414, a general truce, to last from 1 February for one year, was concluded. During these talks,

the prospects of peace had been favourably discussed, but the French lacked authority to conclude a treaty. On 28 January, therefore, the King appointed an embassy to Charles VI to show his desire for peace. The question of Henry's marriage had also been discussed, and the King undertook not to enter into a contract of marriage with any woman other than Princess Katherine before 1 May. At the same time, however, Henry was also negotiating with Burgundy. An embassy from the Duke was received at Leicester in May, while French representatives were also there.

Proposals for a Burgundian bride for Henry were considered, but when Jean sans Peur was later pressed to admit English claims to French territory, he demurred, so that the talks were broken off.

On 31 May, Henry appointed his first great embassy to France. Bishops Langley of Durham and Courtenay of Norwich, the Earl of Salisbury and Lord Grey were its leaders. On 28 June, they were granted allowances towards their costs. Letters of protection were issued on 7 July. On 10 July, the ambassadors set out from London. They sailed from Winchelsea to Dieppe. They were met at St. Denis, on 8 August, by various French prelates, lords and members of the Parliament of Paris. The embassy was estimated to be five hundred strong. Certainly, its size was impressive. Langley alone had eighty eight men in his company. Charles VI was then at the siege of Arras, the final stage of his campaign against the Duke of Burgundy. The ambassadors were magnificently received by the Duke of Berry, who gave them handsome apartments in royal

residences and entertained them sumptuously. Courtenay acted as spokesman. He sought peace and a marriage alliance, but, in addition, demanded vast territorial concessions to the King of England, to be held free of homage or fealty: this was the "way of Justice", whereby Henry desired to settle his claims to the French throne. Berry replied that he had no powers to treat with the embassy. Since Charles and his Council did not return while the ambassadors were in Paris, they returned to England. While they were in Paris, the Bishops had attended to another requirement. Henry was desirous of founding a house of the Celestine Order in England. The Celestine House in Paris was visited: while Courtenay talked with the Prior in the garden and tasted his fruit, Langley examined the constitutions of the House, comparing them with the Rule of St. Benedict. The greater part of the embassy returned by way of Calais and was back in London on 3 October, but Courtenay and the Earl of Salisbury had gone ahead, by way of Harfleur and Portsmouth, to report to Henry at Shene.

The embassy had achieved nothing. Parliament met on 19 November. Grants were made for war, but the Great Council asked that hostilities should not be opened until it was clear that negotiations would produce no result. Henry had already decided to send another embassy. On 3 November, payments were made to Langley and other ambassadors about to depart for France. On 5 December, he was appointed, with Courtenay, the Earl of Dorset and Lord Grey, to again demand what Henry termed the restitution of his just rights. They departed from London on 14 December. They travelled to

Southampton, with the intention of taking ship there. High seas prevented their sailing, so the party rode to Dover, whence they crossed to Calais. The English ambassadors again greatly impressed the Parisians with their splendour and their company of six hundred horsemen. Charles VI entertained them lavishly. Many French princes were assembled. Feasts and tournaments were held to honour Henry V's ambassadors. The Bishop of Norwich again acted as the embassy's spokesman. Henry's demands were rejected as excessive, but the French undertook to send an embassy to England. The chroniclers give a picture of great festivity and cordiality. When the English dined with Charles, he said that they should take back a portrait of Princess Katherine. Yet the French did not doubt that Henry would attempt to enforce his claims by war. Soon after the departure of the ambassadors, aids were levied to defend France against the expected invasion.

The embassy soon achieved one of its objects, the extension of the truce concluded at Westminster on 24 January 1414, that was due to expire on 1 February 1415. On 24 January 1415, in Paris, it was decided that this truce should continue until 1 May following. The ambassadors were also empowered to engage Henry to Katherine, and to conclude peace "by the ways of justice and family bonds." They firstly demanded the crown of France for Henry. After this claim was

1. For.Accts. 2 Hen.V,§(dorse). Langley & the Earl of Dorset are stated to have been present at a meeting of the Council in London some time in February (Nic. II 145). This was clearly impossible; the Foreign Accounts make no mention of their making a visit to England during the course of the negotiations in Paris. It would appear that the date of the Council record is wrong. 2. Chron.St.Denis V 408; J.Juvenal 285-286; J.de Waurin:Recueil des Chroniques (R.S.) II 164; J.le Fèvre:Chronique, ed.F.Morand (Soc.de l'Hist.de F,1876,1881) 211-212; Enguerrand de Monstrelet:Chronicles, trans.T.Johnes(1810) Vol.XIII 99-100. 3. Fusoris 272-273. 4. Baye II 212. 5. Feed.IX 183. 6. ibid 197-200. 7. Per vias Justiciae et Parentalas (ibid 186-187).
rejected, as had been anticipated, a series of concessions were sought as an alternative: the ambassadors would not renounce Henry's title to the French throne, but said that these lesser requirements were made so that peace might be concluded. They demanded the cession, in full sovereignty, of Normandy, Touraine, Anjou and Maine, the parts of Acquitaine held by France, and the remaining lands ceded to England under the Treaty of Bretigny: the suzerainty over Brittany and Flanders; half Provence, with the lordships of Nogent and Beaufort; payment of the balance of King John's ransom; and the hand of Princess Katherine, with a dowry. The Duke of Berry replied: Charles would yield various lands in Acquitaine and give his daughter in marriage, with a dowry of 600,000 écus. The ambassadors again reduced their demands, to the Bretigny frontier, half Provence with Nogent and Beaufort, and the remainder of the ransom. Despite their insistence, the French would not yield until the question of the marriage had been discussed. To this request the English gave way, in the alleged hope that bloodshed would thus be avoided, and that if the marriage were decided upon, the other claims might then be admitted. Henry wanted a dowry of 2,000,000 écus, but his ambassadors offered to reduce this to 1,500,000 écus if Katherine was provided with robes and jewels. Finally, since it was time they returned to England, they made their last concession: if two sons were begotten by the marriage, Henry would give the second his possessions in Ponthieu and Montreuil. These terms were set down in writing on 13 March. The next day, the French reply was given: Henry was offered various lordships in south-west France and a dowry of 800,000 écus, and her trousseau with Katherine. The English embassy was not empowered to reduce its terms to this extent, so no conclusion was reached. Charles promised, however, to send an embassy to Henry.

Henry certainly thought his demands reasonable. On 12 January 1416, he had the report of the negotiations published.
as if to show that he had made every possible concession to preserve peace. He had allowed his ambassadors considerable scope: they had enormously reduced his demands. The French still felt that even these final terms would have led to the dismemberment of their country. It is surprising that they agreed to yield so much. On 23 February, another reconciliation with Burgundy was effected in Paris. The French attitude might have been expected to harden in consequence. In all probability, they thought they could play off Henry against Jean sans Peur and lull him into neutrality in their internal quarrel; just as the same French princes had deceived Henry IV by their offer to restore Acquitaine. War might be expected after the negotiations had failed, but the French had no reason to fear the outcome. They were able to put a far larger army into the field, and no doubt believed that he would receive little support from the shifty Duke of Burgundy.

The Bishops of Durham and Norwich returned to London on 29 March. The news of their failure was made public. The King and his military supporters were indignant. Preparations for war were already being made. The promised French embassy came to Winchester, where it was met outside the town on 30 June by Langley and Courtenay. It achieved nothing, and Henry angrily dismissed it. On 7 August, his fleet sailed for France. The second stage of the Hundred Years War had begun. The King had observed the magnates' wish to seek firstly his claims by diplomacy. There had been little chance that the negotiations would prove fruitful, but their failure was of immense value to Henry as propaganda.

The employment of Langley in these negotiations calls for some explanation, in view of the somewhat equivocal part he had played in the final years of Henry IV. Henry V showed no affection for his father's closest supporters, yet he retained Langley, not only as a councillor, but as his minister in the most responsible positions. Chichele had been most to the fore in embassies abroad towards the end of the last reign, but Langley now took his place. Chichele's promotion to Canterbury did, of course, tend to preclude his being sent out of the country. Langley was not as prominent in the negotiations as Courtenay, who was the member of both embassies to Paris appointed to formally declare their purpose. Even in the visit to the House of the Celestines, Courtenay appears as the courtier, Langley as the man given the less agreeable task of comparing rules of religious orders. This incident is most suggestive: it indicates the nature of his work in the negotiations. It was essential that there should be in each embassy a member who was fully acquainted with the details of previous diplomatic exchanges, who had a close knowledge of treaties and understood the exact meaning of their phraseology. Langley had been prominent in the course of Henry IV's attempts to make peace with France: he was therefore well informed on not only the course of those negotiations but also with the way and personalities of French diplomacy. Probably Henry V thought that by employing the man who had been so closely associated with his foreign policy he would give an earnest of his own allegedly peaceful designs; but in any case, he could not afford to act without so experienced a diplomat as Langley. In the commission of 31 May 1414, Langley alone of the English ambassadors was styled "our councillor". Bishop Courtenay may well have most impressed the French in a part in which his noble birth and education naturally placed him,

but there need be little doubt that Langley was the real leader of the English embassies, even though his prominence only became apparent at the conference table.


When Thomas Langley was consecrated Bishop of Durham and took an oath of loyalty to Pope Innocent VII, the Great Schism in the Western Church had lasted for nearly thirty years. Since 1378, when the College of Cardinals had abandoned Urban VI, declared his recent election void and elected Robert of Geneva, who took the title of Clement VII, Europe had known two rival obediences. Political divisions had deepened and perpetuated the cleavage. Clement, who established his court at Avignon, was supported by France and the Spanish kingdoms. The Urbanist party could count England, Germany and Hungary among its allies. It was almost inevitable that England should take up a position opposing that of France, equally so that Scotland should join its French ally in adopting the Avignonesse cause. The Schism was a scandal to Christendom, and was admitted to be such by many of the clergy and laity. France was the first to attempt to end the situation. The withdrawal of obedience in 1398 failed in its effect because of internal political conflict, but France, and in particular the University of Paris, still held the intellectual leadership in a slowly mounting movement to reunite the Catholic Church. England showed less enthusiasm. Although serious concern was felt in certain academic circles, the government was slow to take any active measures. In 1402, Parliament was told that

Henry IV had corresponded with the King of the Romans on this subject. The Commons asked the King to make efforts to end the Schism, but without incurring any expense that might fall on his subjects. Meanwhile, it was still believed that reunion could be effected by "the way of cession", namely that both Popes should resign. Hope in such a solution was strong in 1407. As a result of French pressure, it had been arranged that Gregory XII, the Urbanist Pope, and the Avignonese, Benedict XIII, should meet at Savona in September. This project came to nothing, owing to the reluctance of Gregory to carry out his part. At the same time, Benedict was equally intransigent. He appeared all the more anxious for a meeting when he knew that his rival was unlikely to come to Savona. The failure of this scheme led to a change of opinion among the French reformers. "The way of cession" was now considered impracticable, and in its stead, support for the idea of conciliar action grew. On 23 November, the murder of the Duke of Orleans deprived Benedict of his chief supporter.

The English government had shown interest in the abortive project. At the same time, however, a letter of Robert Young, Bishop of Rochester, voiced distrust of French motives. It was at this stage that diplomatic relations between England and France were resumed. The ostensible purpose of the negotiations at Gloucester in December 1407, in which Langley took part, was to arrange peace with France. The preamble to the commission of the English representatives, however, stated that the negotiations were to be entered into with the object of promoting means to end the Schism.

An understanding with France was to be the prelude to this greater objective. Even if no concerted action was planned, the representatives were able to exchange views. The French would have been anxious to show that English suspicion of their intentions was unjustified. When the truce was extended at Pontefract in April 1408, Langley was again at hand. He would thus have had a further opportunity to learn of the latest French moves to end the Schism.

A council of the French Church had decided, on 12 January, that there should be a second withdrawal of obedience from Benedict XIII if reunion had not been accomplished before 24 May. Consequently, on 25 May, the neutrality of France was declared. In England, official action was at last taken. Richard Dereham, Chancellor of Cambridge, who had assisted in negotiations with Gregory XII in 1407, returned to England. He brought letters from the Cardinals of both obediences, who had joined forces at Pisa. Henry IV had been displeased by the creation of new Cardinals by Gregory. In July, the Convocation of Canterbury met to decide whether England should withdraw obedience. It confirmed the King's decision to withhold the payment of taxes to Gregory. On 14 July, the Cardinals issued invitations to attend a General Council of the Church at Pisa on 29 May 1409. Early in November, Cardinal Uguccione, Archbishop of Bordeaux, came to London and preached a sermon condemning both Popes and urging support for the Cardinals' proposal of the Council. His intervention was decisive: Henry was now determined that England should be represented at Pisa.

Langley was in London at the time of Uguccione's visit. As a member of the royal Council, he would have joined in its

deliberations regarding the General Council. The Convocation of York had already met to consider the ending of the Schism, but Langley had not attended. He was present when Convocation met again in December, and was appointed leader of its delegation to the General Council. His selection was inevitable: neither Archbishop Bowet nor Strickland of Carlisle were figures of the same high standing in the state. His part in recent negotiations with France, as has been suggested, was a further commendation. There was, in addition, a peculiar reason why the Bishop of Durham should have been the most appropriate choice, namely that his position, both temporal and ecclesiastical, on the Scottish Marches, had brought him into contact with Avignonese partisans. Scotland had followed France into that camp. This added to the trials experienced by Coldingham Priory, the cell of Durham in Berwickshire, and thus in the schismatic diocese of St. Andrews. In 1390, the Urbanist Pope, Boniface IX, granted Walter Skirlawe, then Bishop of Durham, full episcopal jurisdiction in Berwick-on-Tweed, Roxburghshire and all parts of the diocese of St. Andrews that might be conquered by the King of England. When Langley succeeded Skirlawe, he also inherited this jurisdiction. He had thus gained experience of one of the most pernicious consequences of the Schism.

Langley's departure for Pisa was delayed so that he did not accompany the delegates of the Southern Province. The King had required him to remain behind so that he could take part in further negotiations with France. On 20 March, Henry decided, par certaines causes, that Langley should set out at once. He was permitted to export £1,000, take an hundred

persons in his train, and was granted letters of protection and of friendship addressed to other princes. A chronicler made note of the large company Langley took with him. He arrived in Pisa on 7 May 1409.

The first session had been held on 25 March. Little progress was made in the first month, as delegations were slow in arriving. Thus the fifth session was not held until 24 April. Robert Hallum, Bishop of Salisbury, arrived on that day. At the next session, on 30 April, he addressed the Council, urging it to take united action. He announced that he had full powers to act for the King and realm of England. On 10 May, he spoke during a debate on the union of the two Colleges of Cardinals. Hallum was thus the spokesman of the English delegation. There is only one notice of Langley's activities, namely that he celebrated mass before the Council on 13 June. His influence must have been considerable, because he held powers of attorney from fourteen bishops and one hundred and three abbots and priors. After the two rival Popes had been declared deposed, Alexander V was elected, on 26 June. It may well have been that the grant by Alexander to Langley of various privileges was made in

1. Appendix B(ii) p. 265; Foed. VIII 579; C.C.R. 1409-1409, p. 440 & 1409-1413, p. 444. 2. Cum magno apparatu. (Continuatio Bulgar. p. 414. 3. Mansi: Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio (1759-1798), Vol. XXVII, col. 348. It is also stated there that Hallum & the other English delegates arrived on the same day. This is incorrect, as Hallum was at Pisa on 30 Apr. (ibid XXVI, col. 1139). 7 May can be accepted as the date of Langley's arrival. As he left London soon after 20 March, his journey had taken six weeks. Professor Jacob estimated that it would take an Englishman "fully five (weeks) and probably more, to reach the mouth of the Arno" (Essays 44). 4. Creighton I 237-245; Mansi XXVI cols. 1139, 1140; J. Lefrant: Histoire du Concile de Pise (1724) Vol. 1 269, 272-273. 5. Vatican Library No. 12610: Th. Troteti Manuale Concilii Pisan. f. 64d. 6. Mansi XXVII cols. 348-350. 7. ibid 1146-1151; Creighton I 246-250. 8. On 7 July 1409, Langley was permitted to collate to 24 benefices in the gift of himself and the Prior & Convent of Durham (C.P.L. VI 154-155). This peculiar privilege was probably due to a misapprehension /continued on p. 89.
recognition of the part he had taken in the Council\(^1\). The last session was held on 7 August\(^2\). Langley then returned to England in leisurely fashion. He was probably back in London by 17 October\(^3\) when Henry IV recognised Alexander V\(^4\).

There were now three Popes. Benedict and Gregory still had supporters. Alexander died in 1410 and was succeeded by John XXIII. The new Pope was less suited to the pontifical role than to that of a condotierre. He was able and energetic, and engaged himself in the task of strengthening his

(Note8, p.88,continued) of Alexander that the Papacy normally made provision to these benefices. No mention is made of this faculty in Langley's Register: he had no need of it, and would hardly have petitioned for such a superfluous "privilege". This makes it the more likely that the grant was a spontaneous one from the Pope. On 18 July, five further faculties were granted to Langley: he may have asked for these instead of the useless grant of 7 July. These permitted him to grant dispensations to 12 persons under canonical age to receive all orders; to 12 men & 12 women related in the third & fourth degrees to marry; and to 12 scholars of illegitimate birth (C.P.L.VI 151-152). The other two faculties, recorded only in his Register, allowed him to choose his own confessor, and to create 12 notaries.

Langley did not expend these privileges hastily. Three folios of his Register - the last of a gathering - were set aside for entering dispensations as they were made. Most were granted to inhabitants of his diocese, but some were made for friends (e.g. the Radcliffes - see note 1,p.2 supra) and to influential connections. Dispensations for marriage were granted to Henry Lord Scrope & Lady Willoughby, and to Richard Despenser and Eleanor Neville; and for ordination, although under canonical age, to Mr. Robert fitz Hugh (Reg.f.45-47d).

1.It has been suggested to me by Professor Jacob that Langley may have helped to promote the election of Alexander, whose choice would probably have been welcome to the English party on account of his early connection with this country. (He had taken the degree of B.Theol.at Oxford - Gascoigne: Loci e Libro Veritatis, ed. J.E.T. Rogers (1881) 161). 2.Creighton I 252. 3.The earliest date for his return would have been late September. He cannot have been back more than a week before 3 October, as John Newton, whom he had empowered to collate to benefices during his absence, was still using this power then (Reg.f.29d). Langley was certainly in London by 23 Oct. (ibid. 28d). 4.Wylie: Henry IV, Vol.III 387.
territorial position in Italy. He was aware of the need of diplomatic support from other European powers, against both his Italian enemies and the rival Popes. It was for this purpose that he created, on 6 June 1411, fourteen Cardinals to fill existing vacancies in the College. The new Cardinals were chosen from the most distinguished ecclesiastics of several countries, including such eminent churchmen as Pierre d'Ailly, Filastre and Zabarella. From England, he selected the two Bishops who had been at Pisa, Langley and Hallum.

The creation of the two English Cardinals did not meet with the approval of the King's Council. News of their election reached England before the Pope sent official notification. A letter was sent to the Pope excusing Hallum and Langley from accepting their election: the honour to the country was appreciated, but the counsel of both men was too valuable for them to be permitted to take up continual residence at Rome. This letter is known from a copy in the letter-book of John Prophet, then Keeper of the Privy Seal. Since correspondence with the Papacy was conducted under the Privy Seal, and as the Keeper was a member of the royal council, this letter would have been written on instructions of the Privy Council, then under the control of Prince Henry and his friends. As Langley was in his diocese throughout the summer of 1411, it is unlikely that he was consulted before the letter was sent.

There is no parallel between the case of Langley and Hallum in 1411, and that of Henry Beaufort in 1417. Beaufort, besides being created a Cardinal, was also appointed legatus a latere. Henry V forbade acceptance of the Cardinalate because he was aware that it would have been dangerous to allow Beaufort so great an accession of authority. The

Archbishop of Canterbury regarded Beaufort's legatine commission with the utmost misgiving\(^1\). The only similarity between the two events is that Henry V was probably responsible for Langley and Hallum not receiving their Cardinalates, as he certainly was in Beaufort's case. No legatine commission was granted to either Langley or Hallum; they were both expected to go to Italy and become resident members of the Sacred College. No doubt these two Lancashire men would have justified their election on their own merits, and would have given good service to the Papacy. Their eminence in their own country, however, of Hallum as the leading exponent of conciliar thought and ecclesiastical reform, and of Langley as a statesman, made the King's Council unwilling to lose their services. An additional cause of its reluctance may have been that it was disinclined to be enthusiastic in its recognition of the Pope who was soon to be deposed by the Council of Constance. The election of Langley and Hallum still stands in the Atti Consistoriali, but neither adopted the style of Cardinal or was ever addressed as such by their contemporaries\(^2\).


The reign of Henry V commenced on 21 March 1413. That same day, he took the Great Seal from Archbishop Arundel and gave it to Bishop Beaufort, and dismissed Sir John Pelham from the office of Treasurer, appointing the Earl of Arundel in his stead\(^3\). These changes were inevitable in view of the party conflict of the last years of Henry IV. There was less alteration in the composition of the Privy Council. Its membership can be adduced from the Charter Rolls: the witnesses to a royal charter were not necessarily present on

---

2. Langley's "Cardinalate" has, of course, been awarded posthumous recognition, notably by Durham's local historians.
the date of issue, but all had presumably indicated their assent to its grant, and may therefore be considered as members of the Council. In the first year of Henry V, the councillors were Archbishop Arundel; Bishops Beaufort, Langley, Bubwith and Chichele; the Earls of Warwick and Arundel; Henry fitz Hugh, the Chamberlain; Thomas Erpingham, the Steward; and John Prophet, Keeper of the Privy Seal. The Duke of York and Bishop Clifford of London appeared less frequently. That Henry's authority was more secure than that of his father had been is evidenced by the fact that he was never called upon to name his Council in Parliament. Only in the first years of his reign did any members receive payment for their attendance. Yet despite the strength of his position, Henry V did not attempt to dispense with the principle of ruling with the assent of the Council.

Archbishop Arundel died on 19 February 1414. The King chose Henry Chichele as his successor. Chichele was translated to Canterbury on 27 April 1414. There were possible candidates who possessed greater experience in statecraft, namely Bishops Clifford, Bubwith and Stafford of Exeter, but all three were becoming too old for wider responsibilities. Henry no doubt thought his uncle Henry Beaufort too ambitious to be entrusted with an enhancement of authority. Hallum of Salisbury was firstly a churchman, and too aged. The strongest candidate was Langley. Apart from his great experience as an administrator and diplomat, he had made sufficient impression at the Council of Pisa to attract the favour of Alexander V and John XXIII. Moreover, he had been a bishop for over seven years, and had far from neglected

1. Thus Langley is shown as a witness on 21 July, 12 August and 25 & 26 September, 1414, when he was in France (Charter 2 Hen. V, pt. I, mm. 40, 1, 7 & 40). 2. Chart. 1 Hen. V, Pts. 1, 2 & 3. 3. Baldwin: King's Council 165. 4. C.P.I.VI 454.
his diocese; his position in the government had required him to spend most of his time in London, but he had visited Durham whenever he was free. Chichele's record was far less distinguished. He had held no office of state, and had been Bishop of St. Davids' since 1408. His political experience was mostly confined to diplomatic affairs, and it may be doubted whether he had much concerned himself with the affairs of his Welsh diocese. He had one advantage over Langley, however: he was an Oxford graduate. This factor told with Henry V, for he was genuinely anxious for the good government of the English Church. Chichele had also been at Pisa, and could be expected to take an active part in the promotion of interest in future conciliar activity. Langley could still have been a greater Archbishop, but there was another consideration which Henry presumably found decisive. The Bishop of Durham could not be regarded solely as an ecclesiastic. He was also the temporal ruler of a compact bloc of land on the Scottish Marches. Each time a new Bishop of Durham was appointed, there were necessarily some adjustments in the government of the Palatinate. Before Langley's day, apart from a single exception, no Bishop of Durham had ever been translated to another see. It was obviously desirable that the Palatinate should have as long a continuity of government as the span of human life permitted. As Henry was about to embark on war with France, and thus inevitably rouse hostilities on the Northern Border, this was the worst of times to remove from Durham a Bishop who had already made himself familiar with the administration and established personal relations with the inhabitants of the Palatinate,

1. For his early career, see Introduction (by E. F. Jacob) to the Register of Henry Chichele, Vol. I, pp. xvi-xxxiii.
2. John Fordham, translated to Ely in 1388, because he was politically obnoxious to the Lords Appellant (Tout: Chapters Vol. III 436).
and to put in his place a man who would have to enter upon his new responsibilities at a time when the Bishopric was subject to the threat of Scottish invasion.

Most of the information available for Langley's activities in the first two years of the reign concern his employment in the embassies to France. He would have taken the traditional place of the Bishop of Durham in Henry's coronation on 9 April. He was a trier of petitions in the first Parliament, which was opened at Westminster on 15 May. On 10 July, he attended a meeting of the Council, when the defence of the Scottish Marches was the most important item discussed. He was in his diocese in August and September, and returned to London in October. He was detained there over Christmas 1413 to negotiate with a French embassy. He remained in London until 22 March 1414, then went to spend Easter at Auckland. Parliament assembled at Leicester on 30 April, when Langley was again appointed to try petitions. He was still in Leicester on 3 June, but in London on the 17th.

Before his departure to France on 10 July, he received two marks of the royal favour. The Parliament had legislated that all alien priories, with the exception of those granted to other persons, were to remain in the King's hand until peace was made with France. On 9 July, Langley was granted a general pardon for any illegal acts committed by him in his occupation of alien priories or other lands. On the previous day, royal letters patent were issued in respect of the foundation of the Galilee Chantry, in the endowment of which the King's co-operation was given. Langley returned to London in October. He was again

a trier of petitions in the second Parliament of that year, which was opened on 19 November, at Westminster. His second departure for France was again preceded by a royal grant to him, this time of an assignment of two manors in Essex.

The return of the embassy late in March 1415 was followed by increased preparations for war. On 12 April, the Council met in London. Further messages to France were discussed. Langley prepared drafts of these letters, which were to be shown to the King. On 16, 17 and 18 April, the Great Council met at Westminster. Fifteen prelates, including Langley, and twenty eight secular lords were present. Arrangements were made for the King's expedition to France and for the defence of the country in his absence. While Henry was abroad, the Duke of Bedford was to be Lieutenant of the Realm, and rule with the advice of a small Council of lords spiritual and temporal, of whom Langley was one. Despite the volume of business before the Council, Langley visited his diocese during May. A Scottish invasion was expected; only so urgent a matter could have permitted his absence from London at that time. He was back at Westminster to attend a meeting of the Council on 19 June. The King and his court now went to Winchester, to meet the French embassy. Langley was with the party that met it on 30 June, but appears to have taken no part in the abortive negotiations. Henry then went to Southampton. On 22 July, Langley lent him one thousand marks, in pledge for which, as well as for loans by the Archbishop of York, the Prior and Convent of Durham, and others, he was given a golden tabernacle. On the same day, Henry granted a great part of

---

campaign. On the 25th, Langley was with the Council when it made arrangements for the defence of the recently captured French port of Harfleur. He was again dealing with diplomatic business on 27 November, when documents relating to truces with Brittany were taken from the Exchequer and given to him and other councillors. He was able to revert to his earlier practice of passing Christmas in his diocese.

Langley was back in London on 4 February 1416. He was at a meeting of the Council on 25 February. The main preoccupation of the government this year was in diplomatic affairs, in arranging a number of alliances that were to isolate France from outside support. The Emperor Sigismund visited the country with the object of making peace between England and France, in order to ensure the success of the Council of Constance. Negotiations with France were resumed, but while they were in progress, the Count of Armagnac led an attack on Harfleur. He failed, but his operations appeared as an act of bad faith. Any prospect of peace was thus dashed, and Sigismund realised that his intervention had been fruitless.

On 15 August, at Canterbury, he concluded a treaty of alliance with Henry V. Langley was in London for the greater part of the time that the Emperor was in England, although he spent July in his diocese. He may have reached Canterbury by the day the treaty was made. Henry, preceded by Sigismund, then

1. Nic. II 184-185. 2. Ancient Kalendars of the Exchequer, ed. Sir F. Palgrave (R.C. 1836) II 92-93. 3. Auckland 18 Dec-24 Jan. (Reg. ff. 75-80). 4. Ibid. 60d. 5. Nic. II 191. 6. Jacob: Henry V 114-120; Wylie & Waugh III 9-19; Ramsay I 234-235. 7. London 4 Feb-13 June; Stockton 7-26 July; Wheel Hall 29 July (Reg. ff. 80-84, & 47d). According to Wylie (Henry V III 13), Langley sat "at high table" with the King, Emperor, Bishop Beaufort and other princes, at the feast at Windsor following Sigismund's installation as a Knight of the Garter, on 24 May. Wylie derived this information through reading Develyn and Dyvelyn as Dunelm. Now, the former names are variants on the Latin form for Dublin, but as the prelate was shown to be a bishop, not an archbishop. The Archbishop of Dublin was hardly a man of sufficient standing to be so honoured. It is continued on p. 98.
crossed over to Calais. Langley was with Bishop Beaufort when the latter delivered the Great Seal to a messenger, who was to take it to the Master of the Rolls, in Beaufort's lodging at Sandwich, on 4 September\(^1\). Langley was among the distinguished company that sailed to Calais with the King\(^2\). Henry stayed there for some weeks, while negotiations with France, Burgundy and other powers were being conducted. Talks for a truce with France were continued by a commission headed by Archbishop Chichele\(^3\). The Duke of Burgundy came to Calais to offer fealty and enter into an alliance with Henry\(^4\). Langley's duties were apparently just advisory to the King. He was still in Calais on 11 October, when he appointed his proxies to the Council of Constance\(^5\).

He was back in London in November, no doubt earlier, to attend the Parliament that was opened on 19 October\(^6\). He was among the lords who guaranteed repayment of loans made to the King\(^7\). On 8 December, he was appointed to a commission that was to negotiate with Scottish representatives concerning the proposed release of their king from captivity in England\(^8\).

(Note 7, page 97, continued) hard to believe that English chroniclers would have failed to put Dunelm if Durham was intended. Again, it is questionable if Langley would be asked to attend the Feast. In all probability, the bishop present was a German prelate, a member of Sigismund's entourage.

Langley set out for the North immediately, and remained in that part of the country until March 1417. At the same time, he was engaged in negotiations for the release of other royal prisoners, the Duke of Bourbon and the Sieur de Gaucourt, who had been captured in France in 1415. Early in January 1417, Langley, with the Earls of Westmorland and Northumberland, and Henry fitz Hugh, wrote to the King to report talks they had had with the French prisoners. The King was considering a plan to release Bourbon and Gaucourt in order to employ them in negotiations with Charles VI. Langley and the other English lords were sent to the French prisoners to arrange for the making of bonds and similar pledges to ensure their return to England after their mission had been attempted. Henry had already come to some conclusion on the question of bonds, but the English lords made some suggestions of their own. The King's further commands were therefore sought. It was pointed out that Langley would be at Pontefract, where the prisoners were in custody, on the following Saturday (16 January).

Langley received Henry's instructions at Pontefract on 17 January. The King acknowledged the earlier letter from Langley. He replied to Henry on 18 January: he had spoken to the Dukes of Orleans and Bourbon for a bond conditional upon Gaucourt's return from France. The Dukes, with Marshal Boucicaut and the Sieur d'Estoutenville, had accordingly bound themselves in 40,000 écus by two letters and an instrument which Langley had enclosed. Langley also talked to the Duke of Bourbon about his pledges, but no conclusion was reached as the King had not decided how long he should stay in France.

The Duke had been asked to write to the King "with his awen hond how he contynuth his wil and entent in the matire secret". Langley also thanked the King for sending him news of current negotiations with the Duke of Holland. He proposed to go to York that evening, to meet the Earl of Westmorland, so that on the following day (19 January) they should seek a loan for the King. Langley then intended to go to Durham "to sumwhat ordeyn for my litell and symple governance". He was back at Pontefract on the following Thursday, however, when he replied to a letter from the King concerning the gold tabernacle pledged to him. He wrote that he had ordered that it was not to be moved from Durham Cathedral until he had spoken to the Prior.

As a result of these negotiations with the prisoners, Gaucourt was granted leave, on 25 January, to cross to France in order to attempt to arrange peace between England and France. On the same day, Henry wrote to Sir John Tiptoft, his ambassador to his ally, the Emperor Sigismund was to be informed of the talks with the prisoners. Henry had asked them to recognise him as King of France. They had refused, but later, the Duke of Bourbon told Henry that he and his fellow-prisoners now admitted certain of his claims. Bourbon offered to go to France to advise Charles VI to surrender Henry the lands granted to England by the Treaty of Bretigny, together with Normandy. If Charles refused, the Duke would recognise Henry as King of France, and give him all possible support. The other prisoners were willing that Bourbon should undertake the mission, and would give securities for him. Henry had found this offer so reasonable that he had agreed

1. Appendix B(iv) p.287. 2. See p.95 supra. 3. Original Letters ed. Sir H. Ellis, Series II (1827), Vol.I, p.51. I have assigned this letter to Thursday 21 Jan. 1417, since Langley was at Pontefract on the previous Monday. He had received Henry's letter on a Monday. No other business is mentioned in Langley's reply, but he referred to "myn othir letteres I send you by the berer of thes".
that Bourbon should depart as soon as the bonds had been made. In the meanwhile, the matter was to be kept a close secret, so that Bourbon's safety should not be imperilled when he went to France. This business was so confidential that Henry wrote this letter by his own hand: only he and Langley knew of it. The Duke of Bourbon's mission did not take place, nor did that of Gaucourt achieve any result. The major part borne by Langley in these highly secret negotiations is a further indication that Henry V placed the utmost confidence in his discretion and diplomatic skill.

The King was preparing for a second expedition to France when Langley returned to London at the end of March. On 2 May, he went to the King at Mortlake to receive his approval of various arrangements suggested by the Council. Later that month, he was at Reading, when the Great Council met, and, according to Adam of Usk, approved of a scheme whereby the King would extort money from his wealthier subjects. Certainly Henry received extensive loans that year. On 12 June, Langley lent him five hundred marks. The King and Council then moved to the neighbourhood of Southampton, where the fleet and army were assembling. On 10 June, Langley was one of the Council when it met at Titchfield to discuss relations with Flanders.

1. , Henry wrote that none knew of the matter save Derham and I. It might be thought that "Derham" was Mr. Richard Dereham, Master of the College of the King's Scholars at Cambridge, who had seen some diplomatic service. That "Durham" was meant cannot be doubted, however, in view of Langley's part in the discussions. Bourbon's proposal was the matter secret referred to in Langley's letter of 18 Jan. (Durham was not uncommonly spelt "Derham" or "Dereham").
Prior to sailing to France, various magnates enfeoffed trustees in their estates. Langley was one of the feoffees of the Duke of Gloucester, and of the Earl of Salisbury: the first took this measure so that his debts should be paid, the second in order to raise money for his service with the King and for the maintainance of his dowerless mother. On 21 July, Henry drew up his second will, in which he asked his feoffees in the Duchy lands, of whom Langley was again one, to carry out the provisions of his will and to re-enfeoff his heir after his debts had been paid. Then, on 23 July, at Southwick Priory, near Portsmouth, Bishop Beaufort resigned the Great Seal, which was immediately afterwards entrusted to the Bishop of Durham. Langley took it to Wickham, where he was presumably lodged, and sealed various writs. Two days later, the Duke of Bedford was appointed Keeper of the Realm in the King's absence. On 30 July, the English fleet put to sea.

It has been suggested that the replacement of Beaufort by Langley was due to a breach between the King and his uncle, probably for financial reasons. It does seem, however, that Beaufort had resigned voluntarily in order to be free to seek a higher prize, the triple crown of the Papacy. He went to Constance and arrived there when proposals were being mooted for the election of a Pope. He was not able to secure his own election, even if he pressed for it in earnest, but proved so influential towards the election of Martin V that he was offered a Cardinalate. Then he carried out his intention of visiting the Holy Land.

Langley was the obvious choice for Beaufort's successor as Chancellor. He was the only man apart from Beaufort who had had any experience in the office. Henry had frequently employed Langley since his succession, and so had good reason to know that he could rely on the loyalty and ability of his new Chancellor. The King intended to wage a regular campaign of conquest, and thus anticipated being absent from England for long periods. It was therefore essential that he should leave a reliable man in charge of the administration: Langley was undoubtedly the most suitable person for this high duty. The sequel will show to how considerable an extent Henry depended on Langley alone for the well-being of the government of England.
CHAPTER IV: GOVERNMENT IN THE KING'S ABSENCE, 1417-1422.

It has been said - perhaps with some exaggeration - that "At no time, probably, did the practical authority of the Crown stand higher than it did between 1415 and 1422". From August 1417 until his death five years later, Henry V was continually in France, apart from a visit of several months in 1421. His absence by no means caused an abatement of the strength of his control over the government of England. England was his arsenal, his source of revenue and his recruiting ground. That he should have been able to prosecute the war in France, methodically, over several years, is the mark of the respect paid to his authority at home. His orders to his ministers in London were obeyed. They faithfully observed his wishes in attending to the operation of the administration and in supplying him with his military requirements. Yet much had to be left to their discretion: the King could not provide for every detail, could not be consulted on every emergency. Henry's successes abroad owed much to the work of his ministers at home.

(i) The English Administration.

A few days before the departure of the English fleet, the Duke of Bedford was appointed Lieutenant of the Realm. His task was to perform the official duties of the monarchy, such as to preside in Parliament and act as supreme military commander in the Kingdom. His authority was curtailed by the King's order that he should be ruled by the advice of the Council. The number of letters made under the Great Seal on the warrants of the Lieutenants is very small. Some petitions were addressed to him, but were submitted to the Council for its approval.

consent. He attended the Council, when he would have "taken the chair". His presence was not essential, however: business was transacted when he was absent, not an infrequent occurrence. The King sometimes wrote to the Lieutenant to order him to take certain action. He wrote to Bedford concerning breaches of the truce with Brittany and negotiations with Flanders. Bedford was also directed to restore the temporalities of Salisbury to John Chandler, but the Chancellor was sent a similar warrant. On 17 March 1418, Henry told Bedford to join Langley in discussing repairs to the property of the Bishopric of St. David's with Benedict Nicholl, who had just been provided to the See. Langley seems to have performed this task, however. On 2 May, Nicholl made bonds in Chancery not to sue his predecessor's executors for repairs. Langley reported this to the King on 4 May. The Duke of Gloucester, who succeeded Bedford as Lieutenant, was informed that the King wished Parliament to meet on 2 December 1421. The small number of such orders surviving by Henry to his Lieutenants tends to suggest that theirs was an anomalous position: they did not hold the rank of vicegerent.

The real executive authority in England, under the King, was exercised by the Privy Council. From the time Henry sailed for France in 1417 until his return at the beginning of 1421, attendance at the Council, as indicated by its surviving records, was usually quite small. In the fourteen sessions for which the names of those present are noted, the Lieutenant was present on eight occasions, Archbishop Chichele six times, Bishop Beaufort and John Pelham three times, and the Duke of Exeter, the Earl of Westmorland, and the Bishop of Bath and

Wells once. The Keeper of the Privy Seal attended in the autumn of 1417, before he joined the King. The only two regular members were Langley, who was absent only once, and William Kinwolmarsh, the Treasurer's deputy. In 1421, when the King was in England, and up to 15 July, a larger number of councillors attended, namely the three ministers, Archbishop Chichele, and the Bishops of Winchester, Worcester, and Bath and Wells. In the last year of the reign, at four known meetings, the average number of members to sit was five. On a few occasions, a number of judges were called in, when only the Chancellor and Treasurer's deputy, of the regular councillors, usually attended. It happened at some times, therefore, that only two or three members constituted the Council. On 1 March 1419, Langley and Kinwolmarsh drew up instructions for commissioners who had been appointed to confer with Genoese ambassadors. On 31 August following, these two ministers, joined by Chichele, transacted further business. A few letters, of which drafts remain in the "Council and Privy Seal" files, were said to have been drawn up by command of the Chancellor alone. An order to officials in Wales to take the tithes of a certain church was thus marked. It was prepared at Langley's manor of Old Ford on 14 July 1420. An order to the Mayor of Dartmouth and orders, on behalf of Venetian merchants, was made on 1 May 1421, by command of the King and by the advice of the Chancellor.

Various orders from the King to Langley illustrate the wide responsibilities held by the Chancellor. In 1417, Henry told Langley to arrange for the Duke of Exeter to join him in

France in the event of a truce being made with Scotland. The King wrote more than once to urge Langley to see that the Duke of Orleans was closely guarded. Henry wrote about this on 1 October 1419, asking Langley to find out whether Robert Waterton was careless in keeping this prisoner. Then on 1 November, he again wrote: "And furthermore we wol and also charge you that ye ordeyne yt that be effectually doon in dede that we wrote unto you as touching the Duc of Orliens, as our trust is to you, for the cas is so grete that ye couthe not ymagyn hit gretter." In consequence, the Council arranged that Orleans should be transferred to the custody of Sir Nicholas Montgomery. An important prisoner was sent from France to Langley, who was to receive his oath to observe the Treaty of Troyes. Langley had written to the King to report the progress of negotiations with Genoa and Flanders. Henry's reply gave further directions for the English commissioners.

On 12 February 1419, Henry informed Langley that he had learnt that the King of Castile was planning to invade England. The Chancellor was ordered to make measures in haste, by the advice of Bedford, and others as he say fit, to protect English ships at Southampton and elsewhere. On 5 March, the Council appointed commissions for defence against this expected attack. Langley was told, by a letter of 4 June 1418, to provide ships to convey the Prior of Kilmainham and his troops to France, speedily. This matter was also submitted to the Council. It decided that ships should be commandeered in Bristol to go to Waterford for the soldiers. Later, on 27 October, the Council ordered that other ships

should take the troops to France from Southampton. In 1420, Langley was directed to have indentures drawn up for Richard Neville to serve as Warden of the West March. This was to be done with the advice of the Council.

This correspondence arose from Langley's position as first councillor. Apparently, Henry rarely wrote to the Council itself. Only three letters to the Council have been noted: one instructed it to receive an embassy from the Duke of Bavaria; a second reported the conclusion of the Treaty of Troyes; and the third asked the Council to make restitution of her goods to Queen Joan. The letters from the King to Langley were, however, generally laid before the Council. Langley would not take sole responsibility for arranging the means whereby the King's orders were to be executed: in fact, the Chancellor's authority would not have been considered sufficient for the measures taken, for instance, to meet the anticipated Spanish invasion. He would have required the advice of his colleagues on the means to be adopted, but more important, he needed the warrant of the Council for putting them into effect. The authority of the Privy Council would have carried more weight than that of a single minister, no matter how small this body might have been, or who were its members.

The importance of Langley's standing is further emphasised by letters to him from persons other than the King. Bishop Beaufort wrote to him on behalf of Genoese merchants, and again for the Treasurer of Calais. The Duke of Exeter wrote to ask Langley to arrange for the release of a Breton ship seized by seamen of Bristol. Sir Thomas Erpingham informed Langley

of the likelihood of a serious breach of the peace in Suffolk. He asked that the Council should take measures to prevent the riot. In consequence, letters of Privy Seal were sent to the unruly parties, to warn them against violence. The absence of the King had led, perhaps inevitably, to a popular enhancement of respect for the Chancellor. This presumably accounts for the large number of petitions addressed to him. Some bills, however, did not seek judicial action in Chancery. John Mosdale, for instance, wrote to ask Langley for letters of the Privy Seal to be sent to the Exchequer to pay him his wages as Keeper of Scarborough Castle. The Prior of St. John asked Langley to send writs of Privy Seal to certain Florentine merchants to order them to treat with the plaintiff for the restitution to him of £1,000.

Langley was, in fact, the real head of the English administration. He rarely, as it has been shown, took major decisions on his own initiative, that is, by virtue of his office of Chancellor. It was presumably understood that orders from the King addressed to Langley should be put before the Council. In this body, however, Langley's influence was, no doubt, usually predominant. In the small Council of those five years, his high office and great experience would naturally have given him the leadership, which his possession of the King's confidence made certain. The only other regular member, William Kinwolmarsh, looked upon him as a patron. The work of the Council during Henry's absence cannot, therefore, be regarded as apart from Langley's own achievement. Its efficiency was largely his responsibility. He was not, however, "prime minister", in that he determined matters of policy: the King

1. Nic.II 272-274. 2. See pp.132-134 infra. 3. C.& P.S.35. 4. ibid. 5. Langley collated him to a prebend at Auckland in 1415 (Reg.f.63d). Kinwolmarsh appointed Langley supervisor of his will, on 14 March 1421 (Reg.Chichele II 236).
still exercised the supreme direction.

In addition to the orders for various forms of administrative action, this direction by the King was made manifest to Langley, as Chancellor, in the warrants sent to him to employ the Great Seal. Henry used both the Privy Seal and his signet for this purpose. An interesting feature of the signet warrants of Henry V is that those addressed to his first Chancellor, Bishop Beaufort, were written in French, while all those to Langley are in English. Apart from warrants for the Great Seal, other letters remain in the files of signet warrants. Some of the orders to Langley, already mentioned, are there. Petitions that the King had granted form part of this correspondence. Some called for letters under the Great Seal. A charter of pardon for William and Marjory Holland, to which the King had given his assent, at Lisieux on 27 May 1418, was issued from Chancery on 12 June.

The Convent of Shene complained that the Exchequer would not excuse it from clerical taxation, as had been granted by the King. Henry sent this petition to Langley, with a letter dated at Caen on 20 May 1418, ordering him to see that the Convent was given a discharge at the Exchequer. Other letters from the King required Langley to show favour to suitors and to see that right was done. Such commands touching the Chancellor's jurisdiction will be considered in their proper context, but two points may be observed. In the first place, Henry was clearly still receiving petitions from subjects; and secondly, he was anxious that these petitions should receive full consideration. Despite his great preoccupations in France, Henry could still attend to the grievances of his humblest subjects.

1. C.W. Files 1364-1366. 2. C.W. 1364/56; C.P.R. 168. 3. C.W. 1364/55. 4. See p.133 infra, for such letters from the King to Langley.
Warrants to Chancery under both Privy Seal and signet continued to cover a great range of topics. A signet letter of 19 May 1418, from Caen, presented two clerks to benefices. Letters patent followed on 1 June. On 2 June, a letter from Barnay expressed the King's wish that "oon that hyght Colchestre" might be appointed his master mason. Letters patent were accordingly issued on 6 July. The Chancery practice of giving the time and place-dating of a warrant was not observed in these cases, nor in others noticed. The letters of Great Seal were dated from Westminster, presumably on the days of their issue. This departure offers an indication of the time taken for the passage of letters from France to England. Henry's assent to the provision of William Barrow to the See of Carlisle was given at Caen on 15 May 1418. On 5 June, Chancery ordered the livery of the Bishop's temporalities. One warrant, ordering the presentation of Robert Fry to the church of Loughborough, was dated at Mantes on 1 November 1419. On 10 November, letters patent were sealed at Westminster. This was quite quick, a shorter time than it usually took Langley to travel from London to Durham. It would appear that an efficient messenger service had been arranged. The King's ability to direct the English administration depended primarily on his personal authority, but the speed with which he could communicate with the home government was an important factor.

The Privy Seal was still the most important authority for "moving" the Great Seal. The number of surviving Chancery warrants is comparatively small. For the last five years of Henry's reign, only 459 Privy Seal warrants are extant.

1. C.W. 1364/54; C.P.R. 154, 168. 2. C.W. 1364/58; C.P.R. 170. 3. C.W. 1364/52; C.P.R. 167. 4. C.W. 1365/12; C.P.R. 249. 5. C.W. (P.S.) Files 666-669, nos. 845 (23 July 1417) to 1203 (21 July 1422).
Until 19 April 1418, these warrants were dated from Westminster, showing that the Privy Seal was being employed by the Council\(^1\). From 24 May, the warrants were dated from France. A warrant dated from Rouen on 19 December 1419 ordered the Chancellor to issue a commission appointing the Duke of Gloucester Lieutenant of England. This order was expressed in general terms: Gloucester was to be given such powers as the commission of 1417 had allowed Bedford. Feeling that this warrant might have been insufficient, the King added a postscript: the commission should be issued despite this inadequacy, and Langley should make a more full warrant, if he thought it necessary. This warrant was to be sent to the King, who would have it sealed with the Privy Seal and returned to the Chancellor\(^2\). The warrant of 19 December was deemed sufficient, however, and Gloucester's appointment by letters patent was made on 30 December\(^3\).

Now this warrant suggests that the King alone had access to the Privy Seal. In fact, warrants of Privy Seal were dated from both England and France throughout the years of the King's absence. It is apparent that there were two Privy Seals, one with the King, the other held by the Council. Warrants for issues from the Exchequer uphold this theory. The majority were dated at Westminster, and include the phrase "by the assent of our Council"\(^4\). One of these is particularly revealing. This was a warrant made under the Privy Seal by the Council, on 27 October 1418, for payment to a clerk of the Privy Seal Office who was going to France to join the Keeper of the Privy Seal\(^5\). The Privy Seal had long been used by the Council. There would have been considerable difficulty

---

if the Council in England had been deprived of this instrument to warrant its orders. The provision of a special "Council Seal" would not have answered the problem: a new seal would not have commanded sufficient respect, and at the Exchequer, warrants of Privy Seal alone could authorise the issue of extraordinary payments. Hence this curious dichotomy of the Privy Seal in the last four years of Henry V. While the Keeper had charge of the seal with the King, the custodian of the duplicate in England is unknown. Its natural guardian would have been the clerk of the Council, who was one of the clerks of the Privy Seal Office.

The subordination of the Council to the King is evidenced by its execution of his commands. From time to time, memoranda were submitted to Henry. Thus a number of proposals for the government of Calais were sent to him; his approval of the Council's suggestions was indicated by the writing of fiat, or similar words, against each article. The Council was far from being completely dependent on the King, however: the administration would have been seriously hampered and Henry would have been overtaxed with business had his assent to be given before any action could be taken. A clear instance of independent activity by the Council is afforded by the counter-measures taken when the country was threatened by invasion from Scotland in the summer of 1417. The danger was only realised by the Warden of the East March on 31 July. As the English fleet had then set sail for France, his messenger would have reported to the Council. It immediately despatched letters of Privy Seal to men to bid them join the Lieutenant in meeting the attack. The councillors who ordered

1.C.& P.S.35. 2.See p.214 infra. The Warden's letter was written at Berwick-on-Tweed. The letters of Privy Seal were dated at Southampton on 14 and 24 August. It would have taken nearly a fortnight to make the journey.
the issue of these letters were probably the same who had met on 10 August, when only Chichele, Langley, Kinwolmarsh and Henry Ware, Keeper of the Privy Seal, were present.

The amount of business transacted by the Council was enormous, it would be impossible to list briefly the variety of matters that received its attention. The Chancery rolls show that a great number of letters were issued under the Great Seal on the Council's warrants. Its action in preparing to defend the country have already been mentioned. It saw that castles were garrisoned and that the seas were guarded. It appointed admirals. In 1419, it made plans for the interception of French ships going to Scotland. One of the Council's great undertakings was the reform of the coinage. Its warrants to the Exchequer show its attention to numerous small matters. Petitions were received and appropriate action taken. On 11 October 1421, the three senior ministers granted the request of an Exchequer clerk for payment. A warrant of Privy Seal was therefore sent to the Exchequer. The warrant for Eleanor Dagworth, sent to the Exchequer on 14 July 1420, was made by the order of the Chancellor alone, given at Old Ford on the previous day: the warrant was said to have been made by the Council.

The supply of the King formed a major part of the Council's work. It ordered food and military stores to be sent to the royal army. Ships were pressed for national service. The raising of troops was another requirement. Lord Willoughby came before the Council and promised to serve the King with a certain number of soldiers. On 7 February 1422, the Council made indentures for the King.

with the Duke of Bedford, and on 6 April, appointed the Bishops of Winchester and Durham to supervise his musters. A knight who had broken his contract to serve abroad was summoned to the Council. On one occasion, the Council ordered a payment of £2,000 to Henry's war treasurer.

A supply of money to the King was of the first importance. Henry's chief advantage in the war "lay in the fact that while his opponents were financially embarrassed most of the time, he had a sufficiency of money." Taxation voted by Parliament was not the sole source, but a considerable amount of money was thus provided. While the war was popular, little difficulty was to be expected in inducing the Commons to grant supplies. Public enthusiasm had to be maintained if the recruitment of soldiers was to be adequate. It was a duty of the Council to encourage support for the war. A particular responsibility lay upon Langley. Parliament gave the government its best opportunity for the dissemination of propaganda. The Chancellor was its spokesman. The ideas expressed in his sermons would be carried to all parts of the country by the members when they returned to their localities.

Langley made it the object of his Parliamentary sermons to foster support for the war and loyalty to the King. He stressed that the war had not been undertaken wilfully, but to recover the King's just rights, after negotiations had failed. Henry's virtues, his wisdom and courage, were praised. The English victories were recalled to stir the patriotism of the members. The Chancellor's words in Parliament in 1417 were heard by the chronicler Thomas Elmham, who was impressed by the call for vigorous effort, coupled with the expression of satisfaction at the

country's position: it must have been a stirring speech, designed to bring encouragement to its hearers. Langley's sermons departed from the traditional form. After 1417, he did not preface them the usual rehearsal of the Coronation Oath.


The preservation of order in England was a major, perhaps the greatest, responsibility of the Council. It has been a fallacy popular with historians to regard the years of Henry V's French campaigns as a time of quiet at home. One of the reasons for renewing the Hundred Years' War, it was thought, was the King's desire to remove England's more troublesome inhabitants by offering them scope for licensed violence and prospects of enrichment. Had such an idea been in Henry's mind, it was not realised. Many unruly subjects remained at home. In 1417, the chief danger suspected was of Lollard conspiracy, which was linked with plots to assist a Scottish invasion and to release French prisoners. Even after the capture and execution of Sir John Oldcastle at the end of the year, there was still cause for anxiety. His adherents were still suspected for some years afterwards. Some were brought to Chancery to undertake to cease to maintain heretical opinions and to take part in conspiracies. As late as 1421, two men were thus bound over and also to appear before the Council. With the suppression of the Lollard conspiracy, however, the most serious threat of treason had passed.

A more general cause of alarm to the government was the

---

widespread lack of respect for the law. Several incidents of particular violence were reported. Clerical taxgatherers, for instance, complained that their servants were killed and robbed. Bishop Bubwith reported that he was afraid to detain certain offenders in his prison "nollenggre consideryng the condicions of men at this daies". Langley, in writing to his receiver-general for money, ordered that it should be sent as secretly as possible and under a strong escort because the roads were more dangerous than they had ever been. The law itself offered many opportunities for abuse. False indictments were the subject of petitions in Parliament. Local officers, when a party in disputes, were prone to use their influence to the subversion of justice. The King was aware of this danger, and directed the Lieutenant to see that when sheriffs, justices of the peace "and such officers as shul be maad be suche persones as ben able and worthy therto, and that ben no troublers in thaire countrees, and that they be chose withoute brocage or favour of persones of any other unleeual meenes". Local officials who attempted to carry out their duties were sometimes opposed. One justice of the peace in Wiltshire told Langley that when he went to arrest those who had seized a manor by armed force, he was threatened with drawn bows. The condition of the north of England was worst, inevitably, but the south-west and Welsh Marches were little better, nor indeed were the counties near London free from occasional disorders.

The Council took various measures to deal with the problem. It appointed commissions of oyer et terminer to try cases of notorious violence. Two reports of disturbances in Devon were followed by two such commissions being sent. Commissions to

enquire into treasons and felonies were sent to Cornwall and Northamptonshire¹. The second was followed by a commission of *over et terminer*²: the county of Northampton contained many suspected Lollards. Similar commissions were sent to South Wales and the counties of Wessex³. A hint of the state of Devon is given by the unusual step of having the prisoners brought from the county gaol to King's Bench⁴. Perhaps the county was too disturbed to permit the visitation of a commission of gaol delivery. Another unconventional measure was the appointing of commissions to arrest evildoers. A lawless band roaming in the North Riding was to be put in gaol until securities for good behaviour were given⁵. Other commissions were instructed to arrest men in various counties⁶. The reason for the Council not leaving this work to the sheriffs was presumably that these offenders were known to be wandering from county to county.

A common method of attempting to prevent disorder was to have men bound over to keep the peace, especially towards named persons. The Council sent the Bishop of Winchester to see that Sir John Arundel was bound in £1,000 to do no harm to Sir John Arundel of Trerice⁷. Upon the Council's receipt of a warning of an expected breach of the peace in Suffolk, the parties were ordered to refrain from violence⁸. It may be doubted if this method was always successful. It was unwise of the government to pardon Sir John Pelham for his disregard of such an undertaking⁹. The Council tried to enforce respect for the local officers. Richard Cheddar was fined £200 for his contempt of the justices of the peace in Somerset¹⁰. Sometimes, the Council removed men from the commission of the peace, doubtless because they had abused their position¹¹. This

certainly was the reason for the dismissal of Nicholas Turpin from the office of coroner in Northumberland. He had been suspected of complicity in a murder, a suspicion borne out by the fact that he was later bound over to do no hurt to the dead man’s widow 1.

The authority of the Council as a judicial body was already well-established. Henry V’s Council was most active in the exercise of this function. There are numerous instances of undertakings made in Chancery for persons to appear before the Council, on a stated day or upon summons. Sometimes, the contracting party was at the same time bound over not to harm a named person 2. On 30 March 1422, a total of thirty seven men, all of Waltham, were bound over to come before the Council when called and to keep the peace in the meantime 3. Commissioners were sent to arrest people and bring them to the Council 4. The Council also committed men to prison 5. The more common method of calling persons before the Council was by writ, generally of sub poena. An action might be initiated by the Council itself, or by the bill of a plaintiff. After the parties had been caused to appear, pleadings were heard and written evidence seen. Parties could be examined on oath. Common law judges were generally called in to give their counsel 6.

It has been held that the Chancellor’s jurisdiction in equity was delegated to him by the Council 7. This opinion has recently been challenged: it has been shown that, on the contrary, the equitable jurisdiction of the Chancellor had been exercised many years before the Privy Council began its judicial activities 8. It is unnecessary to enter into this

controversy here or to examine the origins of these juridical powers. Both were established well before the reign of Henry V. There was considerable similarity, but a certain distinction was drawn between the spheres of Council and Chancery. Petitions addressed to the Chancellor were occasionally delegated to the Council, as touching matters of too serious a nature for trial in Chancery.

Af few bills addressed to Langley came from foreign merchants who alleged piracy by English seamen. Guillaume Guyhomar, a Breton, complained that his ship had been seized during the truce. The bill was laid before the Council, which appointed a commission to summon the offenders and cause him to make restitution. On hearing another bill to the Chancellor, the Council ordered that the defendant should come before it, and that the wine on the captured vessel should be guarded until the dispute was settled. Piracy was one of the subjects appertaining to the Council's jurisdiction. It was rampant at that time. The Council appointed a number of commissions to enquire into the reported seizure of foreign ships, to cause restitution to be made and sometimes to have the alleged offenders haled before it. The arrest of suspected pirates was ordered, so that they should answer before the Council. Henry Morgan and others undertook to come to the Council, and it is apparent that satisfaction was given, for their accusers declared themselves contented of the price of the stolen cargo. There are other cases of foreign merchants undertaking to prosecute their suits no further, presumably because they had been recompensed. Nor did the Council concern itself solely with the misdeeds of English

subjects. Complaints against foreign pirates were also heard. It ordered the seizure of Breton and Dutch ships so that injured English merchants might be compensated\(^1\). Claims were made before the Council for sums to repay losses caused by Genoese\(^2\). Foreign pirates sheltering in English ports were called before the Council, under arrest\(^3\).

Piracy was obviously too serious a matter to be left to the Chancellor. In addition, other bills directed to him concerned subjects of a peculiar nature, for which the greater authority of the Council was required to provide remedies. Complaints of the theft of crops, expulsion from dower lands, unjust distraint, and of the forcible release of an arrested person were put to the Council because these offences had been committed in the liberties of the Duchy of Lancaster and South Wales\(^4\). Two bills to the Chancellor alleging illegal resort to the Roman Court were brought to the Council. The Abbot and Convent of Humberstone alleged that the local vicar and parishioners plotted to appeal to Rome to dispossess them of the tithes of the church. The Council directed that the defendants should be called before it to answer the Abbot\(^5\). Gilbert Hallum complained that William Langbroke tried to expel him from his prebend at Salisbury by virtue of a papal bull of provision. It was agreed that the Chancellor should call the parties before him. Langley had Langbroice bound in £1,000 to abstain from making any suit at Rome\(^6\). Complaints of an incorrect return of an inquisition, the detention of charters, a conspiracy against the King and plaintiff, a case of illegal arrest followed by threats of violence, an attack on a tax-gatherer and unjust distraint were also referred to the Council\(^7\). The pitiful case of Marjory Day was first brought to Langley's notice, by the King, in

---

1421, but two years elapsed before, on her petition, the case was referred to the Council. She had been imprisoned on a suit of debt, and though her misfortunes were grievous, it would have been difficult to have provided a remedy without overriding the common law. This seems to have been one of the considerations that caused Langley to refer petitions to the Council.

Both Council and Chancellor heard pleas concerning possession of lands. In matters of this nature there seems to have been little clear distinction between the two courts. Generally, the Council heard suits where the parties were men of some importance and who might have resorted to violence unless the cause of their quarrel was firmly settled. Disputes regarding landed property were numerous. Some two hundred bills to the Chancellor allege disseisin, nor is this the total of such petitions. The reason for this subject being brought to the Chancellor and Council was that the common law remedy by assize of *novel disseisin* was no longer available. Before departing for France in 1417, Henry V had an ordinance made in the Council suspending the taking of all assizes. The reason for this measure was to protect men serving in his army from the risk of losing their lands by means of assizes. Chancery did, in fact, continue to issue writs for assizes of *novel disseisin* until November of that year. Two writs were issued in the following year but none at all in the next two years. Now, in the first four years of the reign, a total of one hundred and five such writs were sued from Chancery. If this figure gives a fair indication of the

1.C.W.1366/30; E.C.P.5/113. 2. References to bills not among E.C.P. are given in C.P.R.320,330,422,446-447; C.C.R.II 24,73 & 168. 3. Rot.Perl.IV 147. 4. Originalia 5 Hen.V,mm.37-41. 5. ibid 6 Hen.V,mm.33,36. 6. ibid 7 & 8 Hen.V. 7. ibid 1 Hen.V,mm.70-72 (27 writs); 2 Hen.V,mm.40,41,49,50,53 (35 writs); 3 Hen.V,mm.52,53,57,58 (23 writs); and 4 Hen.V,mm.39, 40,42 & 44 (20 writs).
average annual number of assizes, it was a measure of doubtful wisdom to abolish the assize temporarily. In fact, the number of bills to the Chancellor shows an increase in the cases calling for assizes of *novel disseisin*.

That injured parties should have made resort to the Chancellor for remedy is due to Chancery being regarded as the court for suitors who were unable to find a remedy at common law. Some of the bills alleging disseisin do, in fact, mention that no normal remedy was available. Since all kinds of assize were suspended, the inconvenience caused must have been very general. There is an instance of a bill complaining of the erection of a chimney, in Norwich, that caused annoyance to the plaintiffs. They had no remedy at common law, however, as they were unable to obtain an assize of nuisance. This peculiar situation inevitably gave a considerable amount of additional work to Langley, and, to a lesser degree, to the Council.

Before considering how the problem was tackled, it would be well to examine the subject in its wider significance as evidence of the condition of English society in the years 1417-1421. It has been contended that the remarkable degree of resemblance in the phraseology of bills is suspicious: the offences alleged were made to appear as heinous as possible. There certainly is a considerable amount of common form. Acts of disseisin were said to have been committed *ove force et armes*, the expression common to all allegations of trespass: the bills frequently go on, after naming the chief defendants, to say that these were accompanied by a multitude of unknown malefactors, sometimes enumerated, occasionally said to have

---

been armed with an unvarying assortment of weapons. This common form, however, was doubtless due to bills being drafted by professional scribes. The geographical distribution of alleged offences is most instructive. The counties where the number of the cases of *disseisin* was comparatively most high were Cornwall¹, Devon², Somerset³, Gloucester⁴ and Yorkshire⁵. These are just those districts known to have been most disturbed. Nearer London, the incidence was lower. A distributive map would suggest that the further a man travelled from the capital, the more hazardous would his journey have become. It may therefore be presumed that these bills give a true reflection of the condition of England.

The axiom guiding the Chancellor and Council in their attitude to such litigation was derived from the principle underlying the assize of *novel disseisin*. The purpose of the assize was not to determine a true title to disputed lands, but to find which party had *seisin* at a given time. The term set for *seisin* in this period dated from the last passage of the King to Normandy, that is, the end of July, 1417. The party found to have had *seisin* then was awarded possession. This was understood by plaintiffs, for every suitor to the Chancellor made a point of claiming to have had *seisin* at the time Henry crossed the sea. This might entail some injustice, as did the assize. For instance, an inquest found that tenants had been expelled from a property by the landlord, because they had failed to observe an undertaking to keep the gutter of the house in good repair. Nevertheless, the tenants were restored to possession⁶. It was not the
government's object to dispense justice in such cases, but
to maintain order. The term for *seisin* was to be enforced
in order to prevent breaches of the peace.

Evidence of action by the Council is found on the
Chancery rolls. It ordered that disputed lands should be held
for the Crown, by commissioners who were to receive the issues
and restore them to the party to whom it should be found they
belonged¹. In 1419, the sheriff of Cambridgeshire was told to
take the assizes of bread, ale and wine, and supervision of
weights and measures, in a market claimed by the University
and by the Corporation of London². The object behind these
committals was to prevent attempts by parties to take the law
into their own hands. The Council also gave its warrant for
the restoration of lands to disseised persons³. These latter
orders, and also committals, were made by the Council in
respect of a number of pleas that were actually heard in
Chancery. Instances of Council proceedings are rare.
Before 1421, there are only two recorded cases. Sir John
Cokayn, alleged to have expelled John Fynderne from two
manors in Derby and Leicestershire, was examined before the
Council, on oath. He denied taking the issues from one of the
manors, and laid claim to the second. Despite this plea, the
Council, with the assent of judges and other lawyers present,
granted recovery to Fynderne⁴. As a result of another suit
before the Council, Sir Humphrey Stafford was restored to the
possession of a manor in Shropshire⁵.

The great majority of pleas concerning *seisin* were
attended to by the Chancellor. Following the receipt in
Chancery of a bill, the defendant was called there by force of
a writ of *sub pena*. The parties were examined on oath. The

defendants sometimes admitted the charges of violent expulsion, or that they had not enjoyed seisin at the time of the King's passage. After the advice of judges and other lawyers had been heard, the Chancellor, or the Council, gave orders for recovery. One defendant failed to appear, and judgement was given against him. Petitions from three unconnected plaintiffs, alleging their expulsion by Nicholas Walweyn, were apparently all heard on the same day. The defendant came into Chancery, but withdrew without leave. The court therefore found against him. One suit, initiated by bill and followed by a committal of the lands, was terminated by the defendant's quitclaim to the plaintiffs of the disputed manor.

It was not always possible, however, to confine the proceedings to trial in Chancery. After the plaintiff's bill had been read, the defendant might make a rejoinder, setting out his claims to remain in possession. He would state his readiness to verify his contentions. A surrejoinder by the plaintiff would follow, and the parties would seek a sworn inquest. The Chancellor then appointed a commission, usually headed by a common law judge, to enquire whether or not the plaintiff had seisin at the time of the King's passage to Normandy. After the return had been received in Chancery, judgement would be awarded by the court, advised by men learned in the common law. Then the Chancellor, if necessary, would make an order for the restitution of the plaintiff. The record of such a case, of John Hals and others v. John Hincley, survives, as does the original bill addressed to Langley. A commission of enquiry was appointed.

and judgement given for the plaintiffs. The procedure followed was that of the "Latin side" of Chancery. In view of the exceptional nature of suits in Chancery concerning cases of novel disseisin, it is unwise to argue from the record of this case that "there was no distinction, such as was afterwards recognised, between the ordinary or common law and the extraordinary or equitable jurisdiction of the court of Chancery." Novel disseisin was a common law matter. Nearly twenty similar commissions of enquiry were appointed between 1419 and 1421. Langley gave orders to restore plaintiffs to possession when the inquests had found in their favour. One such restitution was apparently resisted, and he ordered that those so doing should be arrested.

After Henry's return to England in 1421, Parliament petitioned that assizes should again be permitted. The King assented. Special provision was made for the protection of his soldiers. The Council was empowered to suspend assizes brought against them. The Council twice used these powers. The Chancery rolls indicate that extraordinary measures to deal with disseisin were less necessary after 1421. Only four commissions of enquiry were appointed before the end of the reign. One of them concerned the disseisin of a

---

1. C.P.R. 272; C.C.R.II 74; J.L.O. Pike, in Introduction to Hear Book 12-13 Edward III (R.S.), p. cx. The case of Hals and others v. Hincley is given in pp. cviii-cx. 3. C.P.R. 271-272, 272 (Eleanor Beauchamp, 5/82); 272(4/113; 5/130; Early Chancery Proceedings (Wm. Salt Soc, New Series VII), pp. 242, 243; 272; 320 (J. Cook & Wm. Beche); 320 (J. Hede, 5/140); 321 (5/36); 324 (Sibyl Malby, 4/30 & 31); 324 (J. Andrew); 325 (5/103); 326-327 (5/16 & 17); 327 (5/20); 328 (J. Chabber, 5/148); 328 (Ellen Knyvet, 5/7 & 18); 330 (Nic. Sherwin, 4/41, 5/190); 330 (J. Wynne, 5/150 & 151); 330 (T. Alcester); C.C.R.II 73. (Figures in brackets give relevant E.C.P. Names of plaintiffs given when more than one commission on a page of C.P.R.) 4. C.C.R.II 29, 73, 144-145, 169. 5. ibid 97-101. 6. Rot. Parl. IV 147. 7. C.C.R.II 488, 247-248. 8. C.P.R. 421 (E.C.P. 4/192); 422; & 446 (E.C.P. 5/13).
soldier. One committed of lands is recorded. It arose from a dispute before the Council, and was made because the Council was too busy to attend to the suit. The return to normal conditions is evidenced by a second suit before the Council, when the parties agreed to seek a remedy at common law. After the restoration of the assizes, only five writs for assizes of novel disseisin were purchased in the last five months of 1421. In the first seven months of 1422, fifty seven writs were issued. Only three of these can be connected with acts of disseisin reported to Langley by bill. None of the writs purchased in the first two years of Henry VI can be so linked. The totals then were fifty six and fifty respectively. That these figures are not due to an accumulation caused by the temporary suspension is indicated by the fact that in the next five years, the average number of writs for the assize issued annually was forty five. It would therefore appear that the measures adopted by the Chancellor and Council for dealing with cases of disseisin between 1417 and 1421 had been most successful, and had given public satisfaction. The suspension had caused inconvenience, but the government had given the problem such attention that dispossessed persons were given comparatively speedy recovery.

Of the four hundred surviving petitions addressed to Langley, half concerned cases of alleged disseisin. In view of the suspension of the assizes, the subject fell into the third of the three main categories embraced by the Chancellor's equitable jurisdiction. These categories, as defined by Holdsworth, were of cases outside the common

1. C.P.R. 418, 419. 2. ibid. 414; Nic. II 321. 3. ibid 333. 4. Originalis 9 Hen. V, mm. 59, 63 & 64; 10 Hen. V, mm. 38-41, 50, 71-78. 5. ibid 1 Hen. VI, mm. 46-50; 2 Hen. VI, mm. 38-41, 50. 6. ibid 3 Hen. VI, mm. 29, 30, 33, 34 (46 writs); 4 Hen. VI, mm. 34-36 (59 writs); 5 Hen. VI, mm. 50-52, 55 (59 writs); 6 Hen. VI, mm. 53, 54, 59, 60 (49 writs); & 7 Hen. VI, mm. 43-46 (34 writs).
law; cases where the common law gave a remedy, but was not able to do so because of the disturbed condition of the country; and cases with which the common law could not deal.

The first class embraced matters concerning alien merchants, and maritime and ecclesiastical law. As has already been shown, Langley sent some bills complaining of piracy or recourse to the Roman Curia to be dealt with by the Council. Two bills from English merchants state that judgement had wrongly been given against them, against one in favour of a "Ducheman", in Admiralty courts: they asked that their cases should be heard in Chancery. There were several ecclesiastical cases. One plaintiff complained of being defrauded in an projected exchange of benefices. The defendant, John Boure, "chopchirch", undertook to appear in Chancery. He did so, and was dismissed sine die. Richard Ogan was said to be still drawing the tithes of a church granted to John Frank after the King had recovered the advowsons. Ogan was bound to answer in Chancery.

The enforcement of testamentary dispositions gave rise to a certain amount of litigation. One bill, for instance, complained that a trustee did not give a fourth part of an estate, as he was obliged by the will of Thomas Kays, to one of Kays' daughters, who was a nun of the house of Stratford.

Three testator executors who had quarrelled submitted to Langley's ruling on the conduct of their administration. One complaint, which surely should have been made to the ordinary of the diocese, was lodged by a woman against her husband: she said that he was living in adultery at a place close to Langley's manor of Old Ford.

---

The second type of cases were those due to the troubled state of society. Some plaintiffs alleged that they were unable to get remedies at common law owing to the "maintainance" of their adversaries. A Bristol merchant said that he was denied justice as the defendant was allied to many of the local jurors. One accused person was said to be a justice of the peace and "has fees and robes from many great lords and ladies". Nicholas Heron was described as a notorious extortioner and oppressor of the people (in Northumberland), so that his victim could not get justice. The "great power" of the Prior of St. Frideswide's, Oxford, prevented John Carlton from getting a remedy at common law. Robbery, violent assault, murder, abductions of heiresses, wrongful imprisonment and contempt of the courts of common law were reported to Langley. Threats of violence were alleged in nearly a score of bills. Sometimes, the parties came into Chancery and made bonds to do each other no hurt. In one case, the defendant was bound to do no harm to John Shipley, and a commission was sent to find what persons had attacked Shipley in Ipswich, as his petition had alleged.

Thirdly were the cases for which the common law was not competent. The practice of making feoffments in trust had become very common. One man would enfeoff another under certain conditions, such as to re-enfeoff the grantor later, or to employ the estate in fulfilling the terms of his will. The deed of conveyance was no proof in a court of common law if the grantor, or his heirs or executors, were to claim that the conditions of the grant had not been fulfilled: since these terms were not expressed in the deed, the common
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law took no cognisance of them. Consequently, an injured party appealed to the Chancellor, so that, in the name of equity and good conscience, he would rule that the grantor's intention should be accomplished. "This branch of equitable jurisdiction was from the first, and has continued to be, its most important branch." Many of the petitions to Langley concerned uses. Another subject of an equitable nature concerned certain bonds: it was said that their conditions had been fulfilled, but because these terms were not stated in the deeds, execution was being sought. Complaints were also made of bonds made under duress of by fraud. In this respect also, the provision for remedy at common law was inadequate.

Apart from the cases of novel disseisin, there is very little evidence of how any of these suits progressed. A defendant was usually summoned to Chancery by means of a writ of sub pena. Most bills concluded by asking for this writ, and some stipulated the amount of the monetary pain. It was the obligation of the plaintiff to serve the writ: this was sometimes a most hazardous undertaking. Langley occasionally ordered the arrest of persons to be brought to Chancery. There are several instances of mainprises to ensure that men would appear in Chancery on a certain date or when called. Sometimes it was laid down that a person was to appear from day to day until dismissed. It is likely, however, that some of these instances are not related to any suit. A few suggest the cause of summons, such as an additional undertaking not to

harm other people\textsuperscript{1}, and, in one instance, to abstain from fishing in certain waters\textsuperscript{2}. A defendant who left the court without leave could be attached\textsuperscript{3}. In one case, of two defendants, one was committed to prison, the second undertook to appear daily, under paid of £200\textsuperscript{4}. The plaintiff in each suit gave the names of two men as his pledges to prosecute. One woman stated her readiness to find such sureties as Langley required, and promised to pay the costs of the defendant if her bill was found untrue\textsuperscript{5}. Some bills were clearly delivered into Chancery by the plaintiffs in person\textsuperscript{6}.

Of actual proceedings, there are no records for this period. A judgement in what appears to have been an equitable case is shown on a close roll. A man was ordered by Langley, in the presence of two judges, to give the belongings of a deceased priest to his brother and a second person, probably the executors\textsuperscript{7}. John Egerton lodged a bill against Richard Cholmondeley, alleging that he had abducted an heiress and married her to his son Hugh\textsuperscript{8}. Hugh undertook to do no injury to Egerton, and to appear in Chancery, which he did twice\textsuperscript{9}. The case was then sent for arbitration by friends of the disputants, but as no settlement was made, Hugh came again into Chancery\textsuperscript{10}. Another case was submitted to arbitration: it concerned the partition of lands between two married heiresses. It was said that the defendant retained all the relevant charters and deeds, refusing the plaintiff, John Drax, access to them\textsuperscript{11}.

It is disappointing that there is no direct means of determining how successful Langley was as a dispenser of equity. That Chancery was given much employment as a court in his time is apparent. Parliament petitioned in 1421
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and 1422 against the practice of calling common law cases into the Council and Chancery by means of writs enjoining penalties. Such complaints, which had for long been "nearly annual", now ceased. This suggests an acceptance of the Chancery jurisdiction. There is no doubt that Chancery was becoming popular: it was known as a court where redress could be sought in cases where the common law gave no remedy. The increase in the number of bills bears this out. In the class of "Early Chancery Proceedings", the first two bundle contains a few, and the third consists of, bills addressed to various Chancellors in the reigns of Richard II and Henry IV. The number of separate bills is greatly exceeded by those addressed to Langley, who received at least four hundred in a period of seven years. From his time of office onward, the volume grew greater.

One major cause of this growing tendency to make resort to the Chancellor is to be attributed to the long absences of the King from England. Bills were still sent to him, but he was not free to attend to them. He despatched a number to Langley. In a letter of 22 May 1421, he told Langley that he could not hear a suit because of his hasty departure from England. He had sent for the parties to appear before the Chancellor, who was to hear the dispute. The petition of the Rector of Street was sent by Henry to Langley, with a letter directing him to call the parties and "that ye do unto hem both right and equite, and in especiale that ye see that the porer partye suffre no wrong". The dispensation of equity was a royal prerogative, but the growing number of applications for it, besides the King's preoccupation in other matters, led to its delegation to the

Chancellor. It was natural, in these circumstances, that suitors should avoid delay by making application direct to the Chancellor. In the minority of Henry VI, conditions continued to favour the development of Chancery's equitable jurisdiction.

A second factor in this development would have been the suspension of the assizes. Resort to the Chancellor was the only means of redress. Thus the idea of sending bills to him in all cases where a common law remedy was not available gained wider currency. Again, the vigour with which Langley and the Council addressed themselves to dealing with this temporary problem would have enhanced Chancery's prestige and given grounds for trust in its efficiency. It is not known whether Langley enjoyed any reputation for justice, but Henry V was so highly esteemed for this quality, even among the French, that it is inconceivable that he would have chosen as his first minister a man deficient in this respect. Should this assumption be correct, it would seem that Langley's personal prestige attracted many suitors. Certainly, the poor woman of London did not think her suit too humble for his notice.

Note on Langley's Movements.

The records of the Chancellor's itinerary in the years 1417-1422 give further evidence of his close application to government business. He passed most of these five years either in London or at his manor of Old Ford, then in the country, a few miles distant. He paid a visit to his diocese in the summer of 1418, when he sought relaxation in hunting. He was in the North again in August and September of 1420. He was in Durham for

---


(Continued on p.135)
Easter 1421. The presence of the King in England had presumably made it possible for him to be absent from London. He later joined Henry at York, and entertained him at Howden in the second week of April. Langley was probably with the King when the news of the defeat and death of the Duke of Clarence at Beaugé was received, causing Henry and his party to return hastily to London. Langley's visit to the North was longer in the summer of that year: he went to Durham by way of Manchester, doubtless on business concerned with the erection of the collegiate church. In 1422, he was again in his diocese during the summer. These visits to Durham were probably actuated by a desire to order measures for the defence of the Bishop's Marches and for the Bishop's secular government. At the same time, he attended to some ecclesiastical matters, the reform of the Hospital of West Spital in Newcastle and St. Nicholas' Hospital, York. Langley left London on some other occasions, twice for Canterbury, in March 1419, and again in June 1421, when he was accompanying the King to Dover on Henry's last departure from England. In April of the following year, Langley was with the Council in and near Southampton, attending to the despatch of reinforcements to France. For the rest of the time, he was in the capital.

(Note 5, p. 134, continued) 20 Aug; Auckland 4-10 Sept; York 12 Sept; Stockton 20 Sept; York 26 Sept; Howden 30 Sept. (Reg.f.274; Originalia 8 Hen.V,m.46; C.F.R.XIV 336).

Even when Langley was away from London, he continued to carry on his duties as Chancellor. He always took the Great Seal with him, and probably some of the Chancery clerks. In the summer of 1421, for instance, he was in the North for nearly three months. He went from London by way of Daventry where, on 2 August, he issued an order for the seizure of the lands of a deceased royal tenant. On 7 August, at Macclesfield, he made a presentation to a rectory. At Manchester, on 9 August, and at Skipton-in-Craven, on the 13th, he gave the royal assent to the elections of heads of religious houses. Writs de recordari were granted to suitors at Manchester. On 1 September, at Durham, he issued commissions of the peace for Cumberland and Westmorland. On the 2nd, at Gateshead, Sir Henry Percy of Athel made a bond to William Mitford. Mitford had sent a bill to Langley complaining that Percy had expelled him from his lands. The bond was doubtless made at Langley's direction, as a means of preserving the peace. He was clearly also instrumental in the making of bonds between Marmaduke Lumley and Sir Richard Neville at his manor of Auckland, on 5 September, and had probably mediated to produce the agreement between them. Three commissions were dated from the same place, on 6, 9 and 14 September. The

(Note 12, p.135, continued) that Langley was in France in November 1418 (Wylie & Waugh: Henry V, Vol. III, 156). He was in London (16 Oct, 15 Nov, 3 & 17 Dec. - Reg. ff. 100, 102d & 103; Select Cases before the King's Council, p. 95). The error is due to reliance on the Chronicle of Jean le Fèvre. This states that (at the time of the siege of Rouen) the English ambassadors taking part in certain negotiations included le chancelier d'Angleterre (op. cit. Vol. I, p. 348). In fact, the commission for these talks, appointed on 30 Nov. 1418, makes no mention of Langley, but included Philip Morgan, Chancellor of Normandy (Foed. IX 653-654). Clearly, Le Fèvre confused the two Chancellors.

Chancellor's return to London was marked by the issue of orders to escheators from Crayke, York and Wheel Hall on 19, 20 and 24 September respectively\(^1\). At the last place, on 27 September, a writ of debt was sealed\(^2\). In the previous year, the Lieutenant, Gloucester, sent his warrant to Langley for the issue of letters patent to confirm the election of a prior. Gloucester wrote from Lichfield, on 30 August 1420. Five days later, the letters patent were issued from Auckland\(^3\): the warrant had obviously been sent there direct from Lichfield, showing that Gloucester knew that Langley was at Auckland and that the Great Seal was in his possession.

---

\(^1\) C.F.R. XIV 406, 378.  
\(^2\) Originalia 9 Hen. V, m. 63.  
\(^3\) C.W. 1537/6; C.P.R. 312; Lyte: Great Seal 176.
During the lifetime of Henry V, even when he was abroad, the government of England had been firmly directed by him alone. He delegated responsibilities, yet continued to rule in fact as well as in name. There were separate administrations for France and England, but the King exercised control over both. After his death, this personal unification came to an end. The direction of French affairs became the charge of the Duke of Bedford, who did, indeed, receive considerable respect in England, but whose effective authority there was relatively slight. The right to exercise the power of the monarchy in England became the object of contention between the Duke of Gloucester and a number of magnates, led by Henry Beaufort. This group was able to maintain the principle of rule by the Council. Gloucester refused to accept this view, and made sporadic attempts to gain control over the English government. As his personal quarrel with his uncle Henry Beaufort developed, so did the constitutional conflict become increasingly bitter. This unhappy situation persisted throughout the last years of the life of Bishop Langley, for it was not until a few days before his death that the minority of Henry VI was officially brought to a close.

It was Gloucester's wish to exercise the prerogative powers of the monarchy in the name of his infant nephew. As the only brother of the late King then resident in England, and until then Lieutenant of the Realm, he claimed that this viceregal authority legally appertained to himself. Such arguments, weakened by the absence of any apposite law or clear precedents, were heard without

---

1. The minority ended on 12 Nov. 1437. Langley died on 20 Nov.
sympathy. The royal minority "provided the lords with their
golden opportunity of taking over the reins of government". The uncertainty of the legal position gave the magnates an opening to assume control and also to enjoy all the opportunities of profit that this would put into their hands. Their party doubtless furnished itself with constitutional theories to justify their attitude, but its motive was private gain. Bishop Beaufort put himself at the head of this group, giving it a leader both in opposition to Gloucester and in the pursuit of riches.

The contention must have begun almost as soon as the news of Henry V's death at Vincennes, on 31 August, reached England. Gloucester seems to have laid claim immediately that he should be, "as for the next of blood, Lieutenant then of England and regent". Beaufort and the lords denied his claim, and appear to have won the first round before 28 September. On that day, Langley, just arrived from the north of England, surrendered the Great Seal to Henry VI at Windsor. This was a fiction, of course, but it indicated that Gloucester had been debarred from acting as vicegerent. He was present, however, as were a number of prelates, including Chichele and Beaufort, and other magnates and ministers, who had apparently constituted themselves the councillors of the infant King. On 30 September, an assembly of lords decided that Parliament should be called, and the writs were warranted "by the King and Council." This body met to transact business in the period before Parliament assembled. One of its ordinances arranged for the

On 5 November, an assembly of prelates and magnates agreed on the form of commission to empower Duke Humphrey to act for the King in Parliament, including the proviso that these powers were to be exercised with the concurrence of the Council. He objected to these words as prejudicial to his position, but the lords, of whom Langley was one, refused to allow any amendment. Parliament met on 9 November. There being no Chancellor, Archbishop Chichele gave the sermon, calling for the provision of a royal council. The arrangements made for the government of the realm confirmed the success of the magnates. The Duke of Bedford was appointed to be Protector whenever he was in England; otherwise, Gloucester was to hold this office. The amount of patronage at the Protector's disposal was severely curtailed. The Council was named: it consisted of five prelates and eleven secular lords. It was granted patronage of all crown offices save those previously reserved, and the disposal of feudal incidents. The great officers of state had already been appointed, on 16 November. It was said that in view of the known wisdom of Henry V, who had chosen ministers of tried ability, the Bishop of Durham, William Kinwolmarsh and John Stafford should resume their offices of Chancellor, Treasurer and Keeper of the Privy Seal. The appointments were confirmed by letters patent.

One of the Council's major tasks was to see that various intentions of the late King were respected, and it fell to

---

Langley, as Chancellor, to implement this policy. It had been granted in Parliament that all charters and other grants would be confirmed by Chancery, on application, without fine. Chancery seems to have ignored this concession. The Privy Seal Office, which acted as the Council's secretariat, issued some two hundred warrants to Chancery between 15 and 20 December, mostly ordering confirmations of letters patent or writs of liberate pursuant to earlier grants. The will of Henry V had to be executed. Parliament had added the Dukes of Gloucester and Exeter, and Bishops of Winchester and Durham to the number of supervisors appointed by the late King. Langley, already well-experienced in testamentary matters, was much occupied with this will. It was in his possession for some time. He surrendered it to the Council on 12 March 1426. In addition, he was one of the feoffees in the Lancastrian estates. The alienation of these lands from the Crown, made to perform the terms of Henry V's will, remained in force until 1442. Expensive loans were made to the government from this source. Langley had also been appointed one of Henry V's trustees for the foundation of the nunnery of Sion. The trustees had been enfeoffed in 1416, but the endowment was not made until 1424 nor completed until 1431. Parliament confirmed the foundation in 1423.

Apart from these duties on behalf of his late master,

Langley continued to be heavily engaged in government business. He was unable to leave London at Christmas. In 1423, the Council met regularly from mid-January until shortly before Easter. The Dukes of Gloucester and Exeter, Archbishop Chichele, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Norwich and Worcester, Ralph Cromwell, John Tiptoft and the Earls of March, Northumberland and Warwick, with the three officers of state, attended almost daily. They considered measures for the defence of the northern Border and Guienne, the appointment of officials, payments from the Exchequer, petitions of subjects and various other matters. Langley left London in March. On Good Friday (2 April), he was in Durham. He soon returned to the capital. The composition of the Council remained unchanged in the sessions extending until July. On 22 May, however, a smaller gathering met in Langley's manor of Old Ford, when only he, the Bishop of Worcester, the Treasurer and Privy Seal were present. He set out for the North late in July.

On 10 July, Langley had been appointed to lead a legation to confer with a Scottish embassy. The talks, concerning the release of James I from captivity in England, took place at York in September. According to his usual practice, Langley had the Great Seal of England in his possession. The acknowledgement of certain indentures before him were said to have been made in Chancery at York, on 10 September. Some letters under the Great Seal were issued from York on 11, 12

and 16 September. After the negotiations had been adjourned, Langley went to Auckland, whence royal letters were issued on 18 and 22 September.

The second Parliament of Henry VI met at Westminster on 20 October. Langley delivered it a simple homily on the text: "Fear God, honour the King". He said that the cause of summons was the desire of the lords of the Council for Parliament's advice. He later gave the Commons an account of the recent negotiations with the Scots: the members considered that the progress made was satisfactory, and asked for the conclusion of a treaty. The discussions for James' release were resumed in London early in December, but Langley was not one of the English commissioners. On 17 December, he announced to the Commons the prorogation of Parliament until 14 January following. Presumably the Commons had been restive. No supplies had been granted. The names of the councillors were again requested, and given: no substantial change in the composition of the Council appeared. Its members were not sworn, but rules of procedure were declared. Their object was to ensure that the approval of the whole Council, or a stipulated quorum, should be given to matters before it. Members assenting to bills were to sign them. Finally, on 28 February, the Commons granted subsidies.

Langley must have found the Commons' unwillingness to grant supplies most irksome. He was again obliged to stay in London over Christmas, and in February 1424, he was anxious to depart for the North, in order to take part in the final negotiations for James' release. As he had to await the

dismissal of Parliament, he could not set out until 1 March, ten days after his fellow-commissioner, Bishop Kemp of London. Langley reached Durham by 20 March, where the treaty was concluded on 28 March. He remained in the diocese during April. He was back at Westminster to attend meetings of the Council between 28 May and 15 July. Fewer members attended in this period. In addition to Gloucester and the three ministers, these were Archbishop Chichele, the Bishops of Winchester, London and Worcester, the Earl of Warwick, Lords Cromwell and Scrope, and Sir Walter Hungerford. On 16 July, at Hertford, where he had received the Privy Seal from Henry IV over twenty two years previously, Langley surrendered the Great Seal for the last time. It was given to Bishop Beaufort.

The resignation of the office of Chancellor by Thomas Langley marked a term in not only his own life but also the political history of his day. Admittedly, the change does not appear to have been due to any political development. No other ministers were replaced. His resignation must have been made by his own wish. He had held office for seven years, and was now over sixty years of age. He had been extremely busy throughout his term of office: the absence of Henry V had added to his cares, and, more recently, his participation in the Anglo-Scottish negotiations had increased his work. He must have felt in sore need of relaxation. By remaining in office after the death of Henry V, he had ensured the undisturbed continuity of the administration. Obviously, he had been a minister acceptable to the ruling class. While he was Chancellor, the relations of the two most influential men in the country, Duke Humphrey and Bishop Beaufort, had

remained calm. With Beaufort's appointment to the office of Chancellor, a more bitter stage in the party conflict opened. Its development was delayed for several months, as Gloucester soon afterwards departed for Hainault to pursue his fortunes there. Perhaps he had consented to the aggrandisement of his rival in return for Beaufort's acquiescence in his scheme which endangered Anglo-Burgundian relations. In the Duke's absence, the direction of English affairs was assumed by Beaufort. Gloucester's return to England was to be followed by the outbreak of party strife.

From Hertford, Langley travelled northwards. He was at Long Sutton, in Lincolnshire, on 21 July. It has been suggested that he had reached this place after visiting the shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham, having made a pilgrimage there to give thanks for his release from the duties of Chancellor. Such an explanation is not impossible, although there is no indication that Langley had any particular veneration for this shrine. A more mundane—and likely—explanation offers itself. Langley was a feoffee, by the grant of Henry V, in the manor of Long Sutton. It had recently been involved in litigation between the Bishop of Ely and one of its tenants. Langley may well have decided to make a short detour while on his way north, in order to enquire personally into the dispute. He went on to his diocese, where he remained until early October.

Langley attended the Council at Westminster during November, although not appointed a member. He came to the

north for Christmas. He stopped at Auckland until mid-April 1425. Apart from this long stay, there are other indications that he had been ill. His suffragan was required to confer orders at a service in the chapel of Auckland manor on 3 March. On 6 March, the resignation of a rector was received by the Bishop in the parlour of the same house, instead of in the hall. These departures from the usual practice suggest some indisposition which was not serious enough to prevent Langley from attending to business.

He was able to attend the Parliament that was opened on 30 April 1425, where he was a trier of petitions. He was also present at the sessions of the Council in May. He was still in London at the beginning of July, but reached Howden before the end of the month. He went on to Berwick, where he arrived on 20 August, to join in conversations with Scottish representatives. He was back at Auckland on 27 September, and remained in the diocese until November. On 4 December, he was in London. Since his resignation of the Great Seal, he had only been in London to attend the Council in November 1424 and his last visit was due to the sitting of Parliament. He had probably decided to withdraw from political life. His advanced age justified such a course. He was not officially a member of the Council. Yet at the beginning of winter, he had left his diocese, where he preferred to reside at that time of year. The cause of his departure was the gravity of the political situation.

Duke Humphrey had returned to England in April, after

---

1. He stopped at St. Mary's, York, on 11 Dec. (Reg.f.119).
the failure of his Flemish adventure. From this time, his struggle with Beaufort "passed from the stage of political rivalry to that of personal competition". Gloucester was supported by the citizens of London. On 29 October, there was an ugly incident on London Bridge, when some of Beaufort's servants attempted to enter the city. Further violence was prevented by the mediation of Archbishop Chichele and the Prince of Portugal. Two days later, Beaufort wrote to the Duke of Bedford, calling him to England. Bishop Kemp told William Swan that the quarrel had caused Beaufort to leave London on 31 October, with the result that the Council had ceased to do any business. This news must have reached Langley on 20 November, when he was at Raby. He received Richard Neville's oath as an executor of the first Earl of Westmorland. Langley may have been personally called to London, but in that case he would surely have received a message, and departed, earlier than three weeks after the disturbance. It is most likely that he heard of the outbreak from Richard Neville, who was Beaufort's nephew, and decided, or was persuaded by Neville, to go to the capital to intercede in the dispute.

There were many reasons why Langley should have tended to side with Bishop Beaufort, arising from their long association, which presumably began in the household of John of Gaunt, and also from the relations of the Bishop of Durham with Beaufort's kinsmen, the Nevilles. Yet on the occasions that Beaufort was attacked, or his partisans openly opposed

---

3. B.M. Cottonian MS Cleopatra C.IV f.159. Letter dated 1 Dec. (1425), is signed Scribeus est vobis notus, but relating to the writer's translation, i.e. Kemp's translation from London to York. 
4. Reg. f.297d.  
Gloucester, Langley did not emerge as one of his supporters(1). Both Gloucester and Beaufort were depicted in the St. Cuthbert Window that Langley gave to York Minster^2. The indications are, then, that Langley took up a neutral position. As in the disputes of the later years of Henry IV, he regarded himself as primarily the King's servant.

When Bedford arrived in London on 10 January 1426^3, he and his duchess were lodged in Langley's inn^4. On 7 January, Parliament was called to meet at Leicester on 18 February^5. Gloucester was absent from the Council and was reluctant to attend Parliament. The Council, meeting at St. Albans on 29 January, appointed certain of its members to persuade him to go to Leicester^6. When Parliament had assembled, the Commons requested that the division between certain lords should be healed. On 7 March, both Gloucester and Beaufort agreed to submit to the mediation of certain arbitrators, of whom Langley was one. Consequently, a formal reconciliation was effected on 12 March. On the following day, Beaufort surrendered the Great Seal, which was given to Bishop Kemp on 14 March^7. Four days later, Bishop Stafford was removed from the office of Treasurer, and his place was taken by Sir Walter Hungerford. The new ministers were by no means friends of Gloucester, as their dismissal in 1432 testifies^8. Beaufort's wish to go on a pilgrimage was acceded to by the Council on 14 May^9. He was not present at any meeting of the Council in May, June or July^10.

His withdrawal marked a victory for Gloucester.

Langley had been regular in his attendance of the Council while it was at Leicester. He had been appointed a member by the Council in Parliament. On 1 June, however, he asked to be excused: while he lived he would always be ready to serve the King, he said, but he was now old and enfeebled. Moreover, it was his duty to attend to the affairs of his diocese, which his political responsibilities had caused him to neglect. He dared not continue in this neglect for he would thus imperil his eu-soul\(^1\). It is clear that his request was refused. He continued to sit with the Council when it moved to London, up to 26 July\(^2\). His sincerity cannot be doubted: he had apparently wished to leave political life after 1424. On the other hand, his services were to highly esteemed for the government to dispense with him; his experience and counsel were too valuable, especially in the present condition of national politics. His retention as a councillor suggests that he was welcome to Gloucester.

After leaving London, Langley went to York to take his place in Convocation, the second occasion on which he attended this assembly\(^3\). He presided on 12 August and on the following day. Friar Thomas Richmond was then accused of preaching heretical doctrines. These were that a priest lost his sacred office by the commission of mortal sin, and that the secular arm might punish sins that appertained to the church courts. Richmond denied the charges, although he admitted the article concerning a priest in mortal sin. He produced three fellow-friars "to help him, as it seemed, in defending the said articles"\(^4\). After these witnesses had been examined by Langley, however, they said that they had no

\(1\) Nic.III 197-198. 2.ibid 196-208; C. & P. S. 47. 3.He had attended in Dec. 1408 (See p. 87 supra). 4.In subsidium, ut videbatur, defensionis articulorum praescriptorum. (Records of the Northern Convocation, p. 151)
wish to defend Richmond. Clearly, the Bishop Of Durham, with his past experience as Chancellor, was well able to deal with witnesses, and had used his skill to undermine Richmond's defence. The friar then fully admitted all the charges, renounced his privileges and submitted to the Archbishop. Langley accepted this statement, ordering Richmond to appear before the Archbishop at a later date.

On 16 August, the Convocation's spokesman asked for its dissolution, but Langley refused this request. The prayer was repeated on the next day, but Langley again said that the assembly could not be dismissed without the Archbishop's licence. Royal commissioners then entered to ask for the grant of a subsidy. After their withdrawal, Langley tried to persuade Convocation to make this grant. The clergy excused themselves: they alleged that they must first know the amount of tithes the present harvest would yield them. Langley then appointed his proctors and presumably departed from York. They had no better success, so that Convocation was prorogued for several weeks. Langley probably spent the next weeks in Durham. He returned for Convocation's next session. The clergy had met on 5 October, but adjourned until the following Monday (7 Oct.) as the Bishop of Durham was expected. Three days passed in which he tried to persuade the clergy to make a grant for the defence of the realm. He refused to dissolve the assembly, but was obliged to announce its adjournment on 9 October.

Langley was in London a month later. On 24 November, he attended the Council at Reading, when a list of articles for its direction was approved. Bedford was still in England, and Beaufort was again attending the Council. As Gloucester was also taking part in its deliberations, it would appear that,

1. Records of the Northern Convocation, pp. 146-160.
2. Nic. III 221.
under the influence of his elder brother, the dispute with
his uncle had been allayed for the time being. Langley is
shown to have sat in the Council at Westminster on 6, 7, and
8 December only, although it was then meeting almost daily.1
He probably went to Durham for Christmas, remaining there
until February 1427, but there is no record of his movements
until 6 March. He was then present in the Council. He
apparently did not go to Canterbury with the councillors on
8 March, when they accompanied Bedford on the first stage of
his journey to France. They remained there for a week, after
which Bedford departed. Beaufort, who was going on his papal
mission to Bohemia, went with him. On 25 March, he received
the Cardinalate. Gloucester was left at the head of the
government in England, but Bedford and the Council had
attempted to restrict his actions by securing his promise to
be ruled by the advice of the latter.2

After visiting his diocese for Easter, Langley returned
to London, attending the Council in May, June and July. Then
he probably spent the summer in the North, though there is
again no trace of his activities. He was in London from
8 November, probably from 13 October, when Parliament was
opened by the King, not by Gloucester. Langley was not among
those appointed to try petitions, nor does his name appear
in the records of Council proceedings in the following weeks. He
remained in London until 6 December; he had business
arising from his office as an executor of Henry IV to

1.C.& P.S.48. 2.Two folios of his Register, nos.130 & 131,
are missing. The last entry on f.129d is unfinished. Apart
from items dated 30 Mar.1426 (Reg.f.292d); 14 Apr. (ibid 136)
and 27 June 1427 (ibid 295), there is a gap in the series of
acts from 31 Jan.1426 (ibid 129) to 8 Nov.1427 (ibid 132).
transact in Parliament\textsuperscript{1}. On 15 December, he was at Howden, on his way to Auckland\textsuperscript{2}. On 21 January 1428, he appointed his proxies for the second session of Parliament, excusing himself from personal attendance on the grounds of ill health\textsuperscript{3}. He remained in the diocese until 22 May\textsuperscript{4}. Ten days later, on 1 June, he was present when the Council appointed the earl of Warwick tutor to the young King, and drew up rules for his direction\textsuperscript{5}. That Langley was sufficiently concerned with Henry's education to travel to London is confirmed by a later, even longer, journey to take part in a discussion of the same subject\textsuperscript{6}. He stayed in London, attending the Council, until 11 July\textsuperscript{7}.

He returned to the diocese in August, and did not leave it for seven months\textsuperscript{8}. He was therefore absent from London when Cardinal Beaufort returned to England after the fiasco of his campaign against the Hussites. He had come to recruit men for a new crusade. On 11 November, a protest against his legatine commission as contrary to national custom was lodged in the name of the King, at the instance of Gloucester and others of the Council\textsuperscript{9}. The Cardinal was permitted to make preparations for his crusade, however, and to travel to the Border to confer with the King of Scotland. When he went north for this purpose he was apparently met by Langley at Crayke about 16 January 1429, when commissions for the proclamation of the crusade in the diocese of Durham were issued by the Bishop. At the same time, Langley was appointed to meet Scottish ambassadors\textsuperscript{10}. After Easter, he went to Westminster to take his place in the Great Council. Its chief business was to consider Bedford's proposal to

\textsuperscript{1} Rot.Parl.IV 323. \textsuperscript{2} Reg.ff,134d-135. \textsuperscript{3} Ibid 137. \textsuperscript{4} Ibid 135d-141d. \textsuperscript{5} Nic.III 296-300. \textsuperscript{6} See p.159 infra. \textsuperscript{7} Rot.Parl.IV 534;C.& P.S.50;B.M.Stowe MS 145;C.P.R.519; Reg.f,141d. \textsuperscript{8} Ibid 143d-159d. \textsuperscript{9} Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum et Fugiendarum ed.E.Brown (1690) pp.618-619. \textsuperscript{10} See pp.220-221 infra.
have Henry VI crowned in France. On 17 April, the same assembly decided that Cardinal Beaufort should not take his customary part as Bishop of Winchester at the coming Feast of the Garter, as his new rank caused misgiving. All the magnates present, Langley included, had been asked singly for their opinion, and this was their conclusion. Langley was again present on 3 May, when it was agreed that his friend Richard Neville should assume the title of Earl of Salisbury. Langley's signature appears on a Privy Council warrant of 8 May. Otherwise, it appears that his sole motive in visiting London was his duty as a peer of the Great Council.

He was again engaged on a diplomatic mission soon afterwards, and was at Norham Castle on 13 July. He was back at Durham on 19 July, and thereafter mostly at Stockton. On 12 September, he was at Howden, when he appointed his proctors for the Parliament that met ten days later. He alleged old age and feebleness for his excuses. Nevertheless, he was back in London by 10 October. New rules for the royal Council had been approved in Parliament, and the councillors sworn to observe them. Langley was not named a member of the Council, yet he continued to be present at its sessions. The major reason for his coming, however, was the coronation of Henry VI on 6 November, when he performed the traditional role of the Bishops of Durham for the second time. Preparations for the King's coronation in France were now advanced. Gloucester had ceased to be Protector, but was appointed Lieutenant of the Realm on 21 April 1430. Two days later, Henry left

---

England, taking Beaufort and other councillors with him. Langley took no part in these arrangements. He had reached Auckland by 20 December and was there for four months. He was employed in negotiations with the Scots in 1430, which seems to have been otherwise uneventful. Apart from a short visit to York in August, he remained in the diocese until the autumn. On 6 November, he was back at Westminster, attending a much depleted Privy Council. He had doubtless gone to attend its discussions on relations with Scotland. On 15 November, he was appointed to a further embassy. Then he went north. He dined in the Convent of Durham on the Feast of the Epiphany. Many magnates and "foreigners", possibly fellow-ambassadors, were also present. On 2 January 1431, he appointed proctors for Parliament, giving the usual excuse for his absence. He was able to visit Howden, however, where he stayed for nearly eight weeks. Then he came back to Auckland. From 17 April until 13 October, Langley was mostly at Stockton, save on 24 and 25 May. He was then in Newcastle, where he and the Earl of Northumberland had gone to persuade two Northumberland families to submit their feud to mediation.

1. Vickers: Duke Humphrey 219. 2. See p. 222 infra. 3. Reg. f. 171d. Convocation was not sitting then. 4. 20 Dec. 1429-23 Sept. 1430 (Reg. ff. 162d-172d). 5. Nic. IV 70. 6. See p. 222 infra. 7. Northallerton 30 Nov. & 11 Dec; Auckland 14 Dec-2 Jan. 1431 (Reg. ff. 173d-174). 8. Durham Acct. Rolls Vol. I, 61. 9. Reg. f. 174. 10. Howden 8 Jan; York 11 Jan; Howden 14 Jan-18 Feb; Auckland from 24 Feb. (ibid. 174d-175d). 11. ibid. 177d-182. 12. D. Locellus 5 no. 45. Wm. Heron had been killed at Etal by servants of John Maners, after riding into that place from Norham with a number of men who discharged arrows, etc. This had happened over four years previously. Heron's family was supported by Sir Robert Umfraville, and Cardinal Beaufort took an interest in the quarrel. Prior Wessington was one of the arbitrators. Since 1427 at the latest, there had been conferences to decide what compensation Maners should pay, how many masses for Heron he should provide, etc. The parties do not appear to have made resort to Common Law. (Locellus 5, nos. 45-53, are records of negotiations and projected settlements made between 1427 & 1431).
There were meetings of the Great Council in November (1431), which Langley attended. Gloucester was now trying to ensure Beaufort's exclusion from the government. On 6 November, lawyers showed that two former Archbishops of Canterbury had lost their Archbishops when raised to the Cardinalate. Gloucester hoped that Beaufort would be deprived of his diocese. The prelates and magnates present, however, would not allow any further proceedings to be taken until the Cardinal could appear before them, save that the records should be searched. Marmaduke Lumley, Bishop of Carlisle, was the only peer who held that nothing at all should be done until Beaufort returned. On 28 November, a writ of praemunire against Beaufort was sealed, but its execution was deferred. On the same day, a proposal to increase Duke Humphrey's salary was debated. Langley went with the majority in assenting, and thus separated himself from Beaufort's partisans, Archbishop Kemp, Bishop Lumley and four secular lords, who at first opposed the motion. Langley attended the Privy Council on 29 November, signing two bills. Then he departed for Auckland.

Gloucester had been taking measures against his rival's imminent return to England. The King came back on 9 February 1432. There followed a practically complete change in the leading ministers of the administration. The Cardinal's supporters, Archbishop Kemp and Lord Hungerford, were replaced by Bishop Stafford and Lord Scrope, a friend of Gloucester, as Chancellor and Treasurer. The chief officers of the royal household were dismissed, and their places given to men presumably agreeable to Gloucester. Langley had

been at Auckland all this time. It is possible that he had not intended to leave his diocese again and had therefore withdrawn his vicar-general's commission. On 12 April, he issued a new commission to Mr. Thomas Lyes. Soon afterwards, he set out to attend the Parliament that met on 12 May, in which he was a trier of petitions. He did not return to his diocese until August, but does not appear to have attended the Council in the intervening period. He may have felt that the political struggle had reached such a stage that his intervention might prove useful; he may even have been called in by one of the parties. Cardinal Beaufort was now back in England and was trying to reinstate himself. He had been exonerated from all charges arising from his acceptance of the Red Hat, and received a general pardon in Parliament. The dispute developing in the Palatinate of Durham might also have been a cause of the Bishop's long stay in London. He would have wished to seek advice and also make sure of influential support should it be necessary. In any case, Parliament was not dismissed until 17 July. Langley still had some prestige as a diplomat. On 14 August, the Council ordered a warrant, predated 18 July, to be sent to him to order him to surrender various documents, including the Treaty of Troyes, and charters of Richard I and Edward I concerning Anglo-Scottish relations.

From August, Langley passed the remainder of 1432 in the north of England. In October, he was at York to attend Convocation. It had been summoned to consider the peace of

the whole Church. In other words, the latest developments in the Conciliar Movement were to be considered. Langley's interest in the subject thus persisted. On 23 February 1433, he appointed the members of the English delegation his proctors at the Council of Basle. It was on this occasion that he described himself as a septuagenarian. As his years demanded, he was now living most of the time in his favourite Durham manor of Auckland. In the past five years, his visits to London had been infrequent and usually short, his business there generally being to attend Parliament or the Great Council. He had been giving closer attention to the affairs of his diocese in these years. He had, in fact, abandoned his place at the centre of political life. A crisis in the affairs of his Palatinate was to make him resume his position in the governing circle of England.

On 1 April, an inquisition was taken in his franchise by royal commissioners. Langley's response to this challenge was to go to London, where he arrived by 8 May, his object clearly being to seek counsel and assistance from his powerful acquaintances. On 24 May, he joined Gloucester, Chichele, the Earl of Warwick, Chancellor, Treasurer and three other councillors in guaranteeing repayment of a loan to the King by Cardinal Beaufort. He was again one of the Privy Council on 20 June, when it heard a legal cause. When Parliament met on 8 July, Langley was named a trier of petitions. He continued to attend the Council while Parliament was sitting. The Duke of Bedford was now back in England. His visit led to

a diminution of Gloucester's influence and the enhancement of that of Beaufort. A transaction more important to Langley, though possibly related, was the success of his petition in Parliament, whereby the franchises of the Bishopric of Durham were confirmed.

Langley was at Stockton during September, but was back for the second session of Parliament. On 3 November, he was one of a number of lords who followed the Duke of Bedford in swearing that they would not shelter or "maintain" robbers and evil-doers. He was present at the Privy Council on 22 November and 15 December. At the end of the Parliamentary session, on 21 December, he was excused from further attendance of the Council on account of his age. He attended a meeting on 1 February 1434, however, when the Council prepared instructions for envoys being sent to Scotland. Langley would have been called in as an expert on the subject of Border conditions. He had stayed in London after Parliament's dismissal for reasons touching his Palatinate.

He returned to the North after 24 February and remained there until the autumn. His major achievement that year was his new statute for Sherburn Hospital, although at the same time he must have been much occupied with the condition of his County Palatine. On 1 May, he was appointed, together with the Earl of Westmorland and the two knights of the shire, to administer to the leading men of Northumberland.

the oath of non-maintainance ordered in the last Parliament. Langley received the royal letters on 12 August. On 17 August, he instructed the sheriff of Northumberland to have it proclaimed that the persons listed were to take the oath at Newcastle on 18 September. Later, on 23 August, Langley went to the session of the county court at Newcastle to have the royal letters announced there, and received the oaths of nine persons. He had been on the commission of the peace for Northumberland since 1433, and was clearly taking this responsibility seriously.

Langley was at Crayke, on his way south once more, on 2 October. He attended meetings of the Privy Council at Westminster on 6 and 8 November, when he signed bills laid before it. Then he travelled by way of Abingdon to Cirencester, where there was a full meeting of the Privy Council on 12 November. It discussed the young King's conduct, and advised him to respect the decisions of his councillors. Langley then returned to Auckland. His interest in the education of Henry VI was apparently still so close as to occasion long journeys: he was not one of the King's guardians, but it is possible that Henry V had asked him to take an interest in the upbringing of his son. Langley's interest generally is evidenced by his foundations at Durham and Middleton. From December 1434 until September 1435, he resided continuously in his diocese. Parliament met on 10 October, and he went to attend it. He still had a place in the Privy Council: he signed bills on 26 October and 8 November. On the latter day, he surrendered in

Parliament Henry V's will of 1417 touching the Duchy of Lancaster enfeoffment. He remained in London during November, but departed some days before the adjournment of Parliament. It was his last visit to the capital.

With Langley's final departure from the political scene, the government of Henry VI's minority lost its most disinterested statesman. His services in these thirteen years had been considerable although not on the same extensive scale as earlier. In Chancery and the Privy Council, as also in the affairs of the Border, he had continued to serve the House of Lancaster into its fourth generation. What distinguished him from his contemporaries in the royal Council was that he did not follow them in turning their advantageous position to personal profit. In 1424, the members of the King's Council decided to allow themselves salaries on a scale according to their rank. Langley qualified for two hundred marks a year: in fact, he did not take a penny. The part he took in negotiations with Scotland likewise cost the government nothing. This unselfish service fully warranted the tribute paid to him when his petition was granted in Parliament in 1433.

1. Rot. Parl. IV 486. 2. CPP, R. 1. 2. London 9-26 Nov; York and Grayke 16 Dec. (Reg. ff. 222d-223). Parliament was dissolved on 23 Dec. (Rot. Parl. IV 486). 3. Baldwin: King's Council 174-175. 4. The Issue Rolls and Exchequer Issue Warrants 3-15 Henry VI show payments to every councillor except Langley. 5. On the other hand, the Bishop of Carlisle received payment for his expenses (e.g. Iss. 7 Hen. VI Easter m. 5.). 6. Rot. Parl. IV 431.
CHAPTER VI: THE COUNTY PALATINE OF DURHAM

The Palatinate of Durham comprised the whole of the modern county of Durham, and Norhamshire, Bedlingtonshire and Island in Northumberland. The Bishop of Durham, feudal overlord of all lands in these districts, ruled over them with regalian powers. His writ, not the King's, "ran" there. The common law of England was observed, but it was administered by the Bishop's justices. It was possible to appeal from the Bishop's courts to King's Bench by means of a writ of error. Instances of such an appeal were few: only one has been noticed during the time of Langley's rule. Again, if the subject of the Bishop holding land by royal letters patent or in possession of royal letters of protection was involved in a suit touching that land, he could claim aid of the King. The royal licence would then have to be obtained before the case could be continued in Durham.

The "acid test" of Palatine privilege lay in the question of the disposal of lands of traitors against the crown. It had been established in 1327 that the Bishop of Durham could take all forfeitures in his liberty. Even this decision was based upon a precedent of 1267. The Statute of Treasons of 1351 had made no provision for the exemption of forfeitures due to the lords of liberties. Langley obtained from Henry IV and Henry V confirmations of the liberties of his Palatinate, including that of forfeitures. When the judgement against the Earl of Cambridge, Henry Lord Scrope and Thomas Grey, for their treason, was confirmed by Parliament in 1415, a proviso was made for those claiming forfeitures in their liberties.

Langley consequently seized the lands in his franchise that had been held by Grey and made a grant of the custody of Scrope's lands in Durham.

There were a number of infringements of the liberties of Durham when Langley was Bishop. The advowsons of churches were among the temporalities of the Bishopric. Although the crown had no right to present to any church in Durham when the See was occupied, it did so on a few occasions. On 5 March 1409, the King presented John Legburn to the Church of Sedgefield. Langley did not contest the nomination: in any case, Legburn was an old friend. Even so, the presentation was undesirable in principle, and four days after it had been made, Langley, who was then in London, obtained an exemplification of the judgement of Edward I by which Anthony Bek was restored his regalian privileges in the Bishopric of Durham. This was a quid pro quo: Langley had submitted to the royal presentation, but had secured recognition of his liberties from Henry IV. This swift reaction to a petty infringement indicates Langley's jealousy for the preservation of the franchises of his Church. The much graver attack on these liberties made in 1433 will be considered separately.

Statutes enacted in Parliament were obeyed in Durham, although the County did not send any knights to Westminster. Durham did not pay lay subsidies granted by Parliament. This was the rule up to 1435, when a graduated tax on lands was granted to the King. On 29 January 1436, Langley was

---

1. Sheriffs' Accounts (Norham) 1421-1422, m.1; Appendix F(viii) pp.316-317. 2. Rot. H. m. 12d. 3. C.P.R. 1408-1412, p. 54. 4. Legburn's collation is not noted in Langley's Register, but he held the church until 1424 (Reg. ff. 119d-120d). 5. Legburn, a chamberlain of the Exchequer, was another of Gaunt's executors. Langley was at his house in Westminster on 13 Oct. 1413 (ibid 45d). 6. See p. 65 supra. 7. C.P.R. 54-55; Poed. VIII 572-575. 8. See pp. 190-198 infra. 9. Rot. Parl. 7B. 446.
ordered to arrange for the assessment and collection of this tax in his liberty. He appointed a commission for this purpose on 6 March. On 29 May, however, the crown appointed a second commission. No doubt there had been opposition to the subsidy in Durham, that had led to delay in its collection. Eventually, instead of paying the subsidy, the tenants of the Palatinate paid the King a fine which was said to have exceeded the sum the subsidy would have yielded. The principle of immunity from Parliamentary taxation was thus upheld.

Parliament had sought in 1433 that commissions should be appointed in every county to take from every man of substance an oath not to "maintain" robbers and other lawless men. The crown appointed these commissions on 1 May 1434, and lists were given of the men of each county who were to take the oath. In view of the Bishop of Durham's franchise, he was merely told to attend to the administration of the oath in his county, to such men as he saw fit. It seems that he did not receive this instruction until 12 August. He then gave orders that certain persons were to come before him in Durham Cathedral on 23 September to take the oath. The list was much longer than those for other counties. In addition to five knights and fifty one esquires, eighteen other persons, including the mayors of Hartlepool and Stockton and some forest officials, were called. This incident is of interest in that it illustrates that, while the Bishop of Durham was expected to obey Parliamentary enactments, it was left to him to put them into effect. The franchise of Durham was respected, but at the same time it

was understood that the Palatinate was part of the realm of England and subject to its laws.

(i) The Bishop's Secular Government.

It was inevitable that the pattern of government in Durham should have been a replica in minature of the royal administration. Langley was the fifth successive Bishop who had been Keeper of the Privy Seal. Even earlier, from the time of William II's minister Flambard, the Bishopric had been ruled by men well versed in the practices of the King's administration, and who applied its methods to their temporal government. The administrative system of Durham underwent a significant change under the rule of Richard de Bury (1333-1345). He separated the temporal administration from that of the diocese. Before 1343, the records of both Palatinate and diocese were kept together in one series of registers, with the exception of recognitions in the Palatine chancery, and only one seal was employed. From that date, episcopal acta were recorded in registers, but the records of the temporal government were enrolled. For the diocese, the oval Ad causas seal of one matrix was used; for the Palatinate, the round seal of majesty, showing the Bishop enthroned on the obverse, and as a mounted secular baron on the reverse.

The great seal and rolls were kept in the chancery of the Palatinate. This had its permanent situation in Durham Castle, although it was occasionally said to have been else-where. The office of chancellor was associated with that of constable of Durham Castle throughout Langley's episcopate, when both offices were held by William Chancellor, a layman. He had been appointed constable by the King on 7 May 1406. As he held office until Langley's death, it may be presumed that the appointment was made with Langley's consent.

1. Thus on 26 Feb. 1437, bonds were made before the Bishop in chancery at Auckland (Rot. D.m. 15d.). 2. C.P.R. 1405-1408, p. 175.
probably at his suggestion. There was an office of clerk of
chancery and keeper of its rolls. In 1437, this office was
granted to William Raket for life. An improvement in the method
of enrolment was introduced in Langley's first year. Previous
bishops had kept only one set of rolls. For nine years, two
rolls were used, one for letters patent, the second for letters
close. Then a reversion was made to the earlier practice, but
after 1430, two rolls were again kept. This practice was
continued under subsequent bishops.

The rolls show the warrants for the issue of letters under
the great seal. The most common notices are per breve de privato
sigillo and per ipsum Episcopum. The number of surviving privy
seal warrants is very small. They indicate that the clerks of
the Durham chancery were careless in the way they recorded
warrants. A warrant under the Bishop's privy seal, dated 1 July
1431, ordered the issue to Robert Eure of a licence to fortify
his house at Bradley. The licence was issued on 20 January
1432, and the enrolment shows no warrant. No warrant is given
for the issue of the licence for the election of a Prior of
Durham in 1416, although a copy of the warrant is entered in
the episcopal register. The copy of a licence for the
acquisition of lands is noted per ipsum Episcopum, when the
warrant was one of privy seal. Inevitably, the resemblance
between the diplomatic of royal and Durham letters of privy
seal is very close. The Durham chancery did not follow that of
the King in giving their letters the dates of their warrants.

1.Rot.C.m.13. 2.Rot.A. is headed Rotulus patens de anno primo
domini Thome episcopi (Dunelmensis). 3.Rot.B. : Rotulus Claus
de anno primo, etc. 4.Rot.B.mm.7-20 & dorse; Rot.E., headed
Achue Rotulus Cancellarie Dunelmensis de Anno Domini Episcopi
quintodecimo. 5.Rot.C & D., patent & close respectively.
6.Appendix F(i) p.306. 7.Rot.C.m.5. 8.Rot.B.m.11.
12.Compare Appendix F(ii) p.306 with Appendix A(ii) p.279,
examples of warrants for the great seal. Also Appendix F(iii)
p.307 with Appendix A(x) p.277, writs de procedendo.
No signet warrant survives. There are a few direct references to this seal in notices of warrants. Presumably *per ipsum Episcopum* usually indicated the signet, just as *per ipsum Regem* indicated the King's signet in his chancery. On the other hand, the use of this formula cannot be taken as a clear reference to the Bishop's signet in view of the notice just given, of this term being used when the privy seal was intended. Langley certainly had a signet; he was the first Bishop of Durham known to have used one. *Per ipsum Episcopum* did not always mean that a written warrant had been received in the chancery. For instance, on 21 September 1407, the custody of some lands was granted on the Bishop's authority, as announced by the steward. No doubt many other letters were so warranted; many were issued when the Bishop was so close at hand as to have been able to authorise letters verbally.

The Bishop's council was also able to authorise letters of the great seal. Many matters were inevitably left to the chancellor's own discretion. The feudal aspects of the Bishop's government — the seizure of land after the death of a tenant, the inquisition *post mortem* and livery to the heir — lay, for the most part, in the chancellor's sphere. No warrants were necessary and none were mentioned. Outside this field, however, one cannot regard the noting or absence of warrants as offering the key to the limits of the chancellor's authority. As it has been shown before, there was much laxity in the recording of warrants. In all probability, few of the letters enrolled, except those concerning the descent of landed property, were issued without the Bishop's personal order. Judicial writs were also issued without the Bishop being consulted, as was

---

1. *e.g. per billam de signeto, per litteram domini de signeto*, in 1432 (Rot. C. m. 6).
3. See p. 177 infra.
the practice in the royal chancery. Suitors had to pay for these writs.

The justices were mostly inhabitants of County Durham. Appointments were made very infrequently. Langley's first commission was issued on 14 September 1406, the next not until 4 April 1422. The following year, a third commission was issued to add Thomas Holden, the new steward. The other justices then were Sir William Eure, William Chancellor and Robert Wycliffe, clerk; and James Strangeways, the only "foreigner" and a professional lawyer who eventually became chief justice in the Duchy of Lancaster. These justices were appointed to hold assizes and try all pleas according to the custom of the realm. Sessions were held at Durham for the County, and at Sadberg for the Wapentake. Amercements, which were paid to the Bishop, do not seem to have added much to his revenues. The account of the sheriff, who collected fines, shows a total of £7 3s.10d. for one year. Sessions in Durham in September 1416 and September 1422 had to be adjourned for several months because of outbreaks of plague. Commissions of the peace were issued more frequently — there were six in Langley's time — and had more members. The number of J.P.s tended to increase as the years passed. In addition to the justices of assize, steward and sheriff, there were a few local magnates, such as the Earl of Westmorland, and one or two other ministers, like Richard Bukley, the receiver-general. A separate commission was appointed in the Wapentake of Sadberg.

A certain amount of litigation took place in the Bishop's

---

1. A number of payments for writs are recorded on Rot.B. m.1.  
2. Rot.A. m.1.  3. Rot. E. m.7.  4. Rot. E. m.8.  5. See Appendix E (i) p.301.  6. Sheriffs' Accounts 2. A list of fines before the justices of assize and labourers in 15-17 Langley appears on the dorse of the roll of the graniter of the Convent for the year 1341.  7. Rot.B.m.10; E.m.8d.  8. In 1410, 10 members (Rot. A. m.7); in 1422, 11 (E.m.8); in 1423, 12 (ibid); in 1427, 15 (E.m.16); in 1433 & 1436, 16 (C.m.m.7 & 11).  9. Rot.B.m.12.
chancery. The increased number of records on this subject suggests a development in the chancery's activities. Langley had good cause to appreciate the potentialities of chancery as a court of law. Some reports of proceedings were enrolled in the chancery, but these do not represent the sum of cases heard there. The suit of John Binehester against the Bishop gives the pattern of these proceedings. His plea was heard in chancery on 27 April 1424. An inquest had found in 1418 that Donald Hesilrig had granted certain lands in East Rainton to Prior Hemmingburgh without the Bishop's licence. The lands were therefore seized by the Bishop. Binehester claimed that Hesilrig had granted him all his (Hesilrig's) lands in East Rainton, and that he (Binehester) had held the lands until he was expelled by reason of the inquisition. This he was ready to verify, and he sought the Bishop's hand might be removed. Then John Aslakby, the Bishop's attorney, said that he was ready to prove that Prior Hemmingburgh had acquired the lands in question. It was then decided by the court that the matter should be sent before the justices of assize, to be tried by a jury. The sheriff was therefore instructed to call twenty four men of East Rainton to appear before the justices at Durham on 19 December. On that day, the chancellor gave the record of the plea to the justices. Some of the jurors failed to appear, so the case was adjourned to 12 April 1425. The jury then swore that Hesilrig had given the land to Binehester, to whom it was then restored.

The other cases are very similar. Lands held by John Heron, a tenant of the Bishop, were entered after his death by Richard Lestrang and others, by virtue of a deed made to them by Heron. The lands were seized by the Bishop, for whom it was alleged that the deed was without value. An inquisition taken after the death of the Earl of Westmorland led to the seizure of some of

1. Rot. E. m. 11; D. Cartulary IV, f. 112d. 2. Cart. IV, f. 193. 3. ibid 112d. 4. ibid 193. 5. Rot. E. m. 13.
his lands as it had been found that they had been held of the Bishop. The Abbot of Blanchland claimed that the lands were his by right of his church. William Rome, a chantry chaplain in Durham City, claimed that certain lands seized by the Bishop had been granted to him personally, while it was contended against him that the lands had been granted to the chantry in mortmain, without the Bishop's licence. Three men were called into chancery to give reasons why they should not forfeit a bond made to the Bishop, with the condition that it should be held void while they kept the peace. It was shown against them that one of their number had made a disturbance at Sadberg and attacked a man. In defence, it was said that the injuries were inflicted in self-defence. In all these cases, the issue was not settled in the chancery, but was sent for determination by a jury. Each dispute was narrowed to a simple question of fact which could be verified or not by jurors.

A somewhat more complicated case of which fuller details than usual are extant merits some attention. Sir William Blaykeston, a tenant of the Bishop, died about 1 June 1418. On 18 August, the inquisition was held at Auckland and the Bishop's escheator seized the lands. The heir, Nicholas Blaykeston, although a minor, was granted custody of the lands at an annual rent of forty marks, on 26 September. Subsequently, Thomas Langton complained that he had held some lands at Blakestone, by the feoffment of William Hoton, which same lands had now been seized and granted to the custody of Nicholas. On Langton's petition, a commission was appointed to hold an inquisition into his claims. The inquisition, held on 20 April 1419, found that Langton had indeed been disseised from his lawful tenements. He therefore sought that the Bishop's letters

1. Rot. E.m. 15. 2. Rot. E.m. 15. 3. Rot. D.m. 12. 4. Writ of diem clausit extremum on 4 June 1418 (Rot. E.m. 14d). 5. D. Locellus 5 no. 11. 6. Rot. B.m. 18. 7. Rot. B.m. 17d.
patent granting custody to Nicholas Blaykeston should be revoked. The latter was therefore summoned, by the sheriff, to appear in chancery on 2 January 1420 to give cause, if he could, why the letters patent should not be revoked. On that day, Blaykeston appeared, presumably by attorney, and showed royal letters of protection to himself, to have force for one year from the day of issue, 6 December 1419\(^1\). Langton was unable to continue his suit until the letters of protection had expired and Blaykeston was back in England. On 8 April 1422, Blaykeston appeared in the Durham chancery, as summoned. On his claim that he need not answer without the Bishop’s aid because of the letters patent granting custody, the hearing was adjourned until 21 September, and then again until 21 December. Langton had in the meantime applied to the Bishop for licence to proceed. On 2 December, Langley sent to the chancellor his writ of privy seal, ordering him to proceed despite Blaykeston’s plea, but not to give judgement without first consulting the Bishop\(^2\). This writ was read in chancery. Blaykeston then said that the letters patent should stand because his father had died seized of the lands which Langton claimed. Langton denied this, and both parties said they were prepared to have their case decided by a jury. The proceedings in chancery were then concluded, and the record handed over to the justices of assize on 8 January 1423\(^3\).

These accounts of proceedings in chancery have all one feature in common: in each case the Bishop was involved, either directly as a party or indirectly through his aid being called upon by a party citing his letters patent in defence. This litigation is therefore comparable with that of the "Latin" or common law side of the royal chancery. The Bishop could no more be impleaded in his own courts than the King. Claims against alleged injustice by the Bishop or his ministers could

---

3. D. Locallus 5. no. 11.
only be heard in his chancery. His licence had to be obtained before his letters patent could be challenged in chancery, or, indeed, before any suit against him or one of his ministers could be tried in one of his courts. His claim to this prerogative was challenged in 1433. There is no doubt that it was popularly resented, although it was clearly an attribute of his regalian liberties. The similarity with proceedings in the "Latin side" of the King's Chancery was more than one of principle; it extended into methods of procedure. The course of the pleadings to the eventual passing of the record to the justices was the same as that in the royal court.

The chancery and judiciary of the Palatinate have now been reviewed. The third central department of the Bishop's government was his exchequer at Durham. Unlike the chancery, the exchequer retained a place in the administration of the diocese. The pensions paid to the Bishop from various churches in Northumberland, collected by his sequestrator-general in that Archdeaconry, were paid into the exchequer. That this diocesan officer was required to render his accounts in September, like the ministers of the secular government, also indicates his connection with the latter. Fees were paid to the Official and to the Bishop's suffragan from the exchequer. The receiver-general was the chief financial minister in Durham. He paid out money at the Bishop's requirement and on his warrant, and received the issues from local ministers. A sheriff's account for 1409-1410, made at the annual audit, gives details of various sums collected, for fines imposed by justices of assize and of the peace, waifs and strays, wreck and escheats. The coroner was primarily a financial officer. He did carry out the traditional duties of his office, but it was his

responsibility to collect all farms and rents due to the Bishop in his ward. The accounts of a coroner in Chester ward illustrates his duties as a collector of rents. The Bishop's forests also had ministers who were required to make account at the exchequer. Auditors were appointed from time to time to inspect the accounts of the receiver-general and other ministers. There were usually five auditors, including the steward, chancellor and receiver-general.

Unfortunately, it has not been possible to ascertain the revenue Langley received as Bishop, nor how he employed it. In 1292, the temporalities of the See were assessed at £2,666 13s. 4d. per annum. In one year (1384-1385), Bishop Fordham received £3,405 9s. 14d. from all sources. According to the Valor Ecclesiasticus of 1535, the bishop's annual receipts totalled £3,128 17s. 8d. Langley paid Henry IV £600 for livery of his temporalities and 2,500 marks to the Pope for first-fruits. It may therefore be assumed that Langley enjoyed a revenue of £5,000 per annum or more. The greater part of this revenue came from land. Langley was anxious to derive the best value from his estates. A survey of his lands was made in 1418, which was recorded as on 15 August. At the same time, abstracts were made of the returns of inquisitions post mortem, the earliest being from the second quarter of the previous century. Later inquisitions were recorded in this volume.

1. Exchequer Accounts Various 514/1. 2. 1408 (Rot.A.m.3d); 1416 (Rot.B.m.11); in 1419, Richard Buckley only (Rot.B.m.11); & 1428 (Rot.E.m.17). For a warrant of privy seal to the auditors, see Appendix F(v) p.309. 3. Taxatio Ecclesiastica (R.C.1802), p.318. 4. D.Hev.-gen.4 Fordham, m.4. 5. Valor (R.C.1810 etc.) Vol.V, pp.299-300. 6. C.P.R.1405-1408, p.208. 7. C.C.R.1405-1409, p.40. 8. Of the total of £3,405 9s. 14d in 1384-1385, £2,212 8s. 2½d. came from the wards of Darlington, Chester & Basington; £517 7s. 10d. from Stockton ward; and £42 7s. 1d. from Sadberg (Reg.-gen.4 Fordham). 9. P.R.O. Rentals & Surveys 21(29). 10. P.R.O. Durham "Register II". Up to f.189d. all the folios are of paper, most having one of two watermarks: all are written after a similar pattern & in an uniform hand. This series continues up to continued on p.173.
Under subsequent bishops, this practice of recording abstracts was continued. The Bishop had to meet many expenses out of his revenue, including the payment of his minister's salaries, but even so, Langley was able to spend considerable sums on building and to make large loans to the King.

The control exercised by Langley over his secular administration was strong, even if often remote. It has already been suggested that few letters, save writs "of course", were issued from the chancery without his warrant. His long and frequent absences made little difference; he continued to direct his officers from London. Even when he left the realm, on embassies to France and to attend the Council of Pisa, he did not appoint a vicegerent. When Richard de Bury went to France on an embassy in 1338, he appointed two keepers of the temporalities of Durham, with full powers. That Langley never took this measure is a clear indication of the trust he placed in his ministers. The efficiency of his administration must have been impaired, however: for instance, in 1409, when he was in Italy, not one letter patent was issued. The extent of his supervision over his ministers is well illustrated by a few letters he wrote to his receiver-general, John Newton. On 24 December 1419, Langley wrote to acknowledge a letter and memorandum written to him by Newton on 14 December.

The memorandum was answered by a list of articles. It had been advised that William Alwent be appointed coroner of Darlington ward: Langley assented, and said that he had sent his warrant of privy seal to the chancellor (here called the constable), in the accustomed form. The Bishop was pleased with

(Note 10, p. 172, continued) 26 Aug. 1418, which gives a term for the compilation. The remaining folios (190-3136) are of parchment and the hands vary considerably. The first entry is of an inquisition on 6 Mar. 1420. The series was continued chronologically up to 11 Dec. 4 Neville (1441).

the agreement made with the coroner in Chester ward, no doubt for payment of issues in the ward. He had made drafts of writs concerning the late sheriff. William Chancellor was to attend to the measurement of keels at Newcastle. A commission and writ touching William Lambton were enclosed, which Langley wished the chancellor to seal. Other matters included the livery of robes to two esquires. Finally, Langley sent a list of names of those who were to be given his hay. The former sheriff, Sir William Claxton, wrote to Langley to explain how illness prevented him from collecting sums due to the Bishop. He asked that the Bishop would grant him respite in rendering his account, "considerant gracious lord that I am affere to be demyt be yor stowarde (and) auditours in yor forsaid counte in yor absence be cause yor stoward I suppose will be to me noght evyn but malicious". This letter was sent to the auditors with a note to them from Langley that Claxton had been told to make his account, but if it was found to be in arrears, he could give security for the remainder and go free. On another occasion, Langley wrote from London to Newton to ask how much money he had in hand, and also to tell him to go to Auckland to inspect his beds and cloth, making repairs if necessary. This correspondence shows that Langley, although then Chancellor of England, gave his attention to all aspects, to the most minute details, of his own secular government.

The Bishop's household, wherever he was, thus remained the real centre of his administration, not only of the Palatinate but also of the diocese. The diocesan side was represented by the spiritual chancellor and a registrar. Their services may well have been required in certain secular business. Clerks in the household would have written letters for the Bishop acting in both of his capacities. The Bishop's privy seal and signet were carried with him, as was the Ad causas for the diocese.

Langley used all three in business concerning the election of a Prior of Durham when he was at Calais, on 6 October 1416. Possibly a single officer was entrusted with the custody of the privy seal, but the signet was a personal seal. It was once used by Langley to seal a letter which, for the sake of secrecy, he had written by his own hand. Both seals were used on warrants to chancery and letters to officers. The privy seal was of greater authority, being used for warrants like that of de procedendo to the chancery or to the auditors for to make allowances. An example of a letter under the signet to the sheriff shows the Bishop ordering this minister to abstain from casting the mayor of Hartlepool into prison. There was a treasurer of the household, a dean and chaplains of the Bishop's chapel, esquires, valets, pages and grooms. Langley's household must have been large, in accordance with the magnificent style traditionally maintained by the Bishops of Durham. When he went abroad for the King and took nearly an hundred men with him, most of them were his own retainers.

The subject of the Bishop's council is complicated by his having had two "estates". The men who witnessed ecclesiastic acta in his presence, the iurisperiti, were obviously clerks. Yet sometimes a layman was amongst those present when certain diocesan business was transacted. Thomas Holden, the chamberlain, was often present, as when Langley appointed proctors for the Council of Constance; when John Newton made a protest touching his position as Recor of Houghton-le-Spring; and when a spiritual chancellor was appointed. At the licencing of a notary in 1412, Sir Ralph Eure, the steward, and Sir Thomas Surteys were present. Sir Robert Umfraville saw the master of West Spital Hospital resign his benefice to the Bishop. It

was natural that laymen should have been present when the Bishop committed the administration of the will of the Earl of Westmorland to his executors, but the names of those present, on 14 November 1425, at Auckland, suggest that this business was done before the Bishop's council. The witnesses included William Chancellor; Robert Eure, the sheriff; Christopher Boynton, one of the Bishop's justices; and John Aslakby, Langley's attorney in his temporal chancery. It is easier to speak of the Bishop's councillors than of his council, or councils, if he really persistently distinguished the nature of the business to be transacted. The laymen were obviously included for their counsel on secular affairs, but some of the leading positions in the secular administration were held by clerks.

It is possible to make some distinction between the secular and ecclesiastical councillors, however, for the former, apart from Thomas Holden, mostly had other duties that kept them in the Palatinate, while the leading members of the latter, in particular the spiritual chancellor, generally accompanied the Bishop. The secular council was therefore resident in Durham, and presumably met to discuss aspects of administration when the Bishop was absent. It probably acted in the same manner as the King's Council early in the reign of Henry IV, discussing business and drawing up lists of recommendations that would be submitted to the Bishop for approval, as John Newton had done. Bishop Kellawe (1311-1316) had retained local magnates as members of his council. No similar indentures with Langley have been traced. Thus only those who were councillors ex officio can be enumerated. The steward, chief forester, chancellor, sheriff, receiver-general and justices of assize would have been members of the council. In addition, mention may be made of John Thoralby, a master in the royal chancery, and William Mablethorp, an auditor of the Duchy of

---

Lancaster, who occasionally served Langley in Durham, in those branches of his government where their expert knowledge would have proved most valuable.

Rare notices of the activities of the council of the Palatinate exist. In 1432, Prior Wessington excused himself from attendance at the Black Monks' Chapter for the reason that he had been requested by the sheriff and others of the Bishop's council to be present in person when an attempt was to be made to bring to an end certain disputes then prevailing between leading men of the County. A warrant of privy seal shows that Langley had conferred with his council regarding the Prior's claim to half the fines imposed on his tenants in the Bishop's courts. Some of the letters on the chancery rolls were warranted per consilium, namely the appointment of a receiver for Norham in 1406; licences to widows of tenants of the Bishop to re-marry, in 1406 and 1424; the grant of the custody of a ward of the Bishop for three years, in 1425; and the grant of livery of certain lands. This last was said to have been made with the assent of James Strangways, Christopher Boynton and others of the council, in chancery, on 10 April 1432; although according to the Bishop's rental the tenant should have paid an annual rent of 8s., while the inquisition had returned the sum as 4s.4d. The tenant had shown a charter to confirm the inquisition's findings. Obviously, this livery was only granted after some litigation in chancery: both Strangways and Boynton were justices of assize in Durham. A bond that a certain man should be brought before the council, in 1431, also indicates that, like the King's Council, it was exercising some judicial powers. This may well have been a

recent development, due to Langley's experience in the King's Council. The other examples of operations by his council are not as significant: it was not a council of regency. Langley allowed it certain powers with respect to his feudal relations with his tenants, but, like Henry V, kept the real direction of the administration in his hands.

(ii) Bishop Langley and his Subjects.

The ceremonial commencement of Langley's rule in Durham came a year after his consecration, when on 4 September 1407, he was enthroned by the Prior in Durham Cathedral. The day had been chosen out of respect for local sentiment, for it was the Feast of the Translation of St. Cuthbert. There was a large and distinguished assembly present. Prince John, the Warden of the East March; the Bishop of Carlisle; and the Abbots of Alnwick, Blanchland, Jervaulx and Egglestone were there. The majority were the Bishop's tenants-in-chief - Ralph Neville, Earl of Westmorland, his son John, Lords Mauley and Dacre, Baron Hilton, Gilbert and Robert Umfraville, John and Wramaduke Lumley, Thomas Grey of Heton, Ralph Eure, Robert Ogle and seven other knights. They had come not only to attend the ceremony, but doubtless also to offer the Bishop homage as their temporal lord.

The good order of the Palatinate rested upon the personal relations of the Bishop and his more powerful tenants. Foremost among his subjects was the Earl of Westmorland, the most formidable magnate in the north of England. The family of Neville had lived in County Durham for centuries, but in recent years had risen to prominence and acquired lands in many parts of the country. Its main power was concentrated in south Durham and north Yorkshire, round its castles of Brancepeth, Raby, Middleham and Sheriff Hutton. Ralph was created first Earl of Westmorland by Richard II, but he had married Joan Beaufort, a daughter of John of Gaunt. Thus he supported
Henry IV from the time of his invasion in 1399\textsuperscript{1}. The importance of the Neville family in Durham is illustrated by a letter written to the Pope by Henry VI after Langley's death. The King recommended that Robert Neville, Bishop of Salisbury, a younger son of the first Earl, be translated to Durham. It was pointed out that Robert was a member of the most illustrious family in that county, and his translation would therefore be of great benefit to Durham\textsuperscript{2}. That Langley should be on good terms with the Nevilles was expedient from a local point of view, but the connection had wider implications. Countess Joan was the sister of Henry, Bishop of Winchester. It has been indicated previously that Langley's relations with Henry Beaufort were not unfriendly\textsuperscript{3}, but, clearly, Langley could not afford to quarrel with him for fear of repercussions in his County Palatine.

In the lifetime of the first Earl, Langley's connection with the Nevilles was free from complications, and their relations were harmonious. Ralph and Langley would have been acquainted for some years before 1406, as co-executors of John of Gaunt and members of the King's Council. The Earl headed the commission of the peace in County Durham\textsuperscript{4}. His conventional piety, evidenced by his foundation of Staindrop College\textsuperscript{5}, would have influenced his attitude towards the Bishop. He had decided upon a career in the Church for his son Robert, to whom the Pope had granted a dispensation to hold benefices although only seven years old, in 1411\textsuperscript{6}. Three years later, Langley collated Robert to a prebend at Auckland\textsuperscript{7}. When Ralph drew up his will in 1424, his choice of supervisors emphasised the triple relationship between himself, the Beauforts and Langley, for the three supervisors he named were the Bishops of Winchester and Durham.

and the Duke of Exeter. He died on 21 October 1425. His eldest son, John, had died in 1420, leaving a son, Ralph. Thus the heir to the Earl was a minor, who became the King's ward. His lands in Durham were taken into the Bishop's custody.

The first Earl had married twice. Margaret Stafford, his first wife, had predeceased him by some thirty years. The second, Joan Beaufort, lived until 1440. Margaret had given him nine children, Joan fourteen. The children of the first marriage had been found wives and husbands from the families of north-east England; those of the second made splendid matches, as befitted the kinsmen of the royal house, so that the power of the family was spread throughout the kingdom. Joan's eldest son, Richard Neville, married the sole heiress of the Earl of Salisbury, to whose lands and title he succeeded in 1429. Younger sons became magnates by right of their wives. The daughters married the greatest peers of the realm, the youngest, Cicely, making the most momentous match of all. She married Richard, Duke of York, and was the mother of King Edward IV. Although the younger branch of the first Earl's family had been well provided for, Joan and her children were not satisfied. The ancestral lands were the lawful inheritance of young Ralph. Joan endeavoured to extend her dower lands at his expense. Most of her husband's lands in North Yorkshire had been granted to her in jointure. It was her ambition to pass these on to Richard, whose estates as Earl of Salisbury were not very valuable.

Ralph proved his age and received livery of his lands outside Durham in 1429. A separate inquisition to prove his

---

age was required in the Bishopric: it was taken in 1432, and livery of his lands in the County was then granted. Ralph now began to try to recover what he, not unjustly, regarded as his rightful property, in litigation against Countess Joan and the Earl of Salisbury. The dispute was brought before the King's Council and Parliament. This litigation was carried on for many years, but the parties eventually took to the field. Finally, the two branches of the family were ranged against each other in the Wars of the Roses, which their quarrel had done so much to bring about.

In Langley's day, the breach was already open. There is no doubt which side he favoured. His long connection with the Beauforts made him a partisan of Countess Joan and her children. Langley was one of Richard Neville's feoffees in 1431, when the latter was preparing to accompany the King to France. Richard was first appointed to the commission of the peace for Durham in 1422 and became its leader in 1427. In 1433, he was joined by his brothers William, Lord Latimer, and George, Lord Fauconberg. All three were re-appointed in 1436. The Earl of Westmorland, however, was never appointed to any commission by Langley. The only hint of any dispute between Langley and Prior Wessington was occasioned by the Neville quarrel. On 20 September 1434, Langley write to the Prior in anger: he had learnt that an earlier will of the first Earl of Westmorland had been delivered to Prior Hemmingburgh in 1400. Countess Joan and the Earl of Salisbury told Langley that Wessington had refused to give it to them, the first Earl's executors. The Prior was threatened with ecclesiastical censures if he continued to refuse to surrender the will to the Countess and Salisbury. Finally, Langley appointed the Earl of

Salisbury was one of the executors of his will. When probate was granted at the Earl's castle of Middleham in 1439, he was one of the few executors who undertook the administration. It is apparent that there had been affection on both sides.

While the most powerful northern family engaged in quarrels to the point of open warfare, it is small wonder that lesser men were no less turbulent. Lancastrian England was generally unruly, but in no part of the country was more notorious for its lawlessness than the North. It was alleged in Parliament that murders and other disorders were common occurrences in Northumberland, where no justices would venture and where the franchises of Redesdale, Hexhamshire and Tynedale offered asylum to the evil-doers. In 1409, Sir Robert Ogle had seized Bothal Castle from his brother, John Bertram, by force, with the aid of two hundred men-at-arms, some of them Scots. In Durham, the situation was little better. Pardons for murder are not infrequent on the rolls of the Bishop's chancery. In some cases, the circumstances are described: there would be a quarrel, and as most men went armed, death ensued. On two occasions, death was caused by arrows: the murderers must have laid in wait for their victims. The offenders in these cases were generally described as yeomen or labourers.

The landed class was no less violent. On 6 May 1411, Sir Robert Hilton rode into Sunderland with a considerable following, in warlike manner, and insulted John Duckett.

1. Scr. Tres. App. P. 247. 2. Rot. Parl. III 662; IV 21. 3. Ibid. III 629. 4. One pardon records the words of a dispute. Wm. Cowherd was guarding Bearpark Moor for his father, its keeper. He saw John Forster, a skinner, carrying a sack full of nuts. Cowherd: "Where did you get those nuts?". Forster: "What business is that of yours?" (Quid ad te). Cowherd: "I think you gathered them in this park, which is in my care, so I will have either them or your pledge". Forster refused to give either. A quarrel ensued, in the course of which Cowherd struck Forster with a knife, fatally wounding him (Rot. C. m. 6). 5. Rot. A. m. 8; E. m. 13. Other weapons mentioned were a staff (Rot. E. A. m. 8); a hatchet (Una secure vocata hachet) (Rot. E. m. 14); a mablynex (Rot. A. m. 11); and, twice, a earlalax (Rot. A. m. 4; C. m. 8).
On Hilton's order, one of his servants fired an arrow into Duckett's throat, and when he lay dying, a second servant struck him with the pommel of a sword. A few days later, Sir William Hilton and others made bonds to the Bishop in 1,000 marks that neither he nor his retainers would do any harm to certain men of Sunderland. A similar bond was made for Robert Hilton. These pledges were presumably honoured, and this good faith was rewarded by a pardon for Duckett's murder, granted in 1412. Bonds were commonly employed in order to restrain certain men from attacking others. Thus in 1422, Sir William and Ralph Eure undertook, under pain of 1,000 marks each, to keep the peace towards Sir William Claxton. Sir William Elmeden was bound over, in 1432, to do no harm to the Rector of Sedgefield. The making of bonds was often too late, and followed riotous behaviour. There was a feud between the families of Marley and Cooper, both of which lived at Langton. On 1 September 1408, the Marleys killed Henry Cooper. Three weeks later, bonds were made in chancery that the Marleys would not harm William and John Cooper. These recognisances were renewed two years later. The Marleys were pardoned for the murder on 24 December 1410. There is no further evidence about this quarrel, so presumably the two families had been reconciled. A grave commentary on the prevailing attitude to the law is given in a letter from a monk of Durham to the Prior, in which he recommended highway robbery in order to prevent a servant of Robert Stanton from delivering papal bulls to his master.

The immunity enjoyed by those who had killed their enemies indicates the powerlessness of the Bishop's government. The maintenance of order in England had always depended upon co-operation between the central government and the landed
classes. In Durham, as in the rest of the country, this partnership was dissolving. There was no professional police body to take its place. Offenders could be bound over not to pursue a vendetta further, but there was no means of preventing crime, and the administration was often unable to call an evil-doer to account in order to punish him. Thus there was no sufficient deterrent of crime. Langley's method of tackling the problem is intriguing. He turned to the spiritual arm to remedy the weakness of his secular government. When a crime had been committed, and its perpetrator had escaped undetected, a monition threatening major excommunication was issued against him and all who had aided, favoured and concealed him, unless he made amends within a limited period, of usually two or three weeks.

The use of this threat was quite in order in the cases of thefts from the hospitals of Sherburn and Gateshead, and perhaps even against those sons of iniquity who had poached in the fishpond of the Rector of Sedgefield and took the wine from his cellar. The practice of taking arms into the church of Lanchester was obviously undesirable. Thefts of charters, a seal, cattle, and chests from an inn in Durham were held equally reprehensible. A degree of absurdity was reached when excommunication was threatened against the persons who had set dogs on a cow in calf to worry it to death, and also, it was gravely added, her unborn calf. This extraordinary method of combatting crime received papal sanction. William Orde obtained a bull from Martin V directing Langley to issue a monition against those who had broken into Orde's house and stolen goods and charters. Parliament also regarded the practice with favour: in 1433, it petitioned that, in view of the prevalence of crime in the counties of Hereford, Salop,
York, Nottingham, and Derby and Sussex, the local bishops should be required to threaten the transgressors with excommunication, "so that those who do not do fear the justice of human law might dread divine vengeance".

The best instance of resort being made to the spiritual arm after failure by the administration occurred in 1432. A ship of the Hanse, with which England was on terms of amity, was wrecked on the coast of the County, near Hartlepool. Its goods were seized by the local inhabitants. The merchants petitioned the Bishop for the restitution of their cargo. Robert Jackson, the coroner of Easington ward, was therefore sent an order from the secular chancery to arrest all the goods he could find, no matter into whose hands they had fallen. The merchants, or their attorneys, would identify the goods, which were then to be restored to them. Compensation was to be paid for the trouble taken by persons who had rescued the goods, but anyone who refused to surrender them was to come to chancery to give his reason for their retention. This order was made on 26 July. Jackson met considerable opposition. On 21 August, a monition threatened the excommunication of the unknown persons still holding the goods, unless they were restored to the German merchants of Jackson within fifteen days. This threat did not suffice. On 4 October, Langley wrote from York to his vicar-general, empowering him to excommunicate the defiant persons who had ignored the monition. On 8 October, the vicar-general issued the sentence of excommunication. Four days later, the merchants appointed Jackson their attorney in Durham, in all pleas there, and to receive their goods. They had, in fact, left Durham, despairing to recover their goods.

Several of the monitions concern offences against

Langley himself; the destruction of his mills at West Auckland, Wideopen and Evenwood\(^1\); of his trees at Ryton\(^2\); and of the fences of his park at Darlington and the theft of building-material and tools from his manor-house there\(^3\). In 1435, a savage attack was made upon one of his servants by armed men who had disguised themselves and blackened their faces for their fell purpose\(^4\). The Bishop was particularly troubled by poaching in his forests, which he regarded as an attack upon the franchises of St. Cuthbert and therefore a damnable offence. A monition was issued, in 1408, against those who had unlawfully set fire to bracken in the Bishop's forest of Weardale\(^5\). In 1436, Langley ordered that two men who had been poaching in Evenwood should be cited to answer for their offence, before him. The Vicar of Gainford reported that he dared not serve the citation on William Pudsay for fear of death. The Bishop's apparitor was then instructed to cite Pudsay\(^6\). Nicholas Clerionet and others unknown stole some of the Bishop's cattle at Gainford, and were summoned to appear in the Consistory Court\(^7\). On 23 January 1437, the clergy of Gainford were instructed to announce a monition against unknown persons who had poached in Evenwood on the night of 18 January\(^8\). On 15 February, Langley ordered that the poachers should be denounced as excommunicated as ten days had passed without any sign of repentance\(^9\). It is difficult to understand how offenders, if unknown, could be debarred from communion. Possibly some people who knew the identity of miscreants may have been stirred to give evidence, as they too were comprehended in monitions. The employment of these measures only emphasises the failure of the Bishop's secular administration to cope with the lawlessness of his subjects.

\(^{1}\)Reg.f.159. \(^{2}\)f.188. \(^{3}\)f.188d. \(^{4}\)f.216d. \(^{5}\)f.18. \(^{6}\)f.224. \(^{7}\)f.236d. \(^{8}\)f.240. \(^{9}\)f.241.
It is against this background of spasmodic disorder and unruly tempers that the great crisis of Langley's pontificate is to be viewed. The inquisitions taken by royal commissioners at Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Hartlepool, in the Bishop's liberty, in April 1433, challenged the legality of his royal franchise. Lapsley regarded these inquisitions as "an unusually flagrant case of royal encroachment," but his opinion was based on only the account of subsequent pleadings in Parliament. A totally different interpretation is made possible by evidence supplied by the records of the Prior and Convent of Durham. The inquisitions were brought about by the agency of certain of the Bishop's subjects. In so far as their party had a leader, he was Sir William Eure. An account of his relations with Langley will show that he had ample cause to regard the Bishop with the utmost hostility.

The family of Eure had served the bishops of Durham for generations. William's father, Sir Ralph, had been appointed steward of Durham by Bishop Skirlawe. He continued to hold this office under Langley. He was a man of some note in the north of England and was prominent in military operations in the reign of Henry IV. Ralph Eure was, indeed, considered by the King's Council as a suitable candidate for the office of steward of the royal household, in 1405. In 1410, he obtained the Bishop's licence to crenellate his house at Witton-le-Wear. His lands in that district, held of the Bishop, mostly by military service, were worth nearly £100 per annum. He died on 10 March 1422. His heir, William, was then some twenty six years of age. William had married Matilda, daughter of Henry fitz Hugh, later Treasurer of England, in 1411. The marriage

had given him a powerful connection. William was probably disappointed when his father's office of steward was given by Langley to Thomas Holden, but Eure served the Bishop in other duties. He was appointed a justice of assize on 4 April 1422, and of the peace in the same year. In 1424, he was granted a nine years lease of mines previously demised to his father, at an annual rent of £212 13s.4d. In 1427, he was again appointed to the commission of the peace. The custody of the Earl of Westmorland's lands was granted to him and two others for one year. Two years later, he was one of those appointed to make an enquiry into the state of Sherburn Hospital.

Thus far his relations with Langley had been amicable; in return for his services, he had been rewarded with some favour. After 1431, however, an estrangement set in. Its first cause was a lawsuit of no great significance. Eure had sought to recover two cattle seized by Thomas Ferry. When the case was brought before the justices on 22 March 1431, Ferry said that he had taken the beasts in a tenement of the Bishop, whose minister he was. Eure contended that the ground was common pasture, in which he was lawfully entitled to graze his cattle. Ferry, however, pleaded that he should not be prosecuted further without recourse being made to the Bishop. Eure therefore had to procure a writ of de procedendo directed to the justices. Another suit was opened in 1432. A writ of scire facias was issued against Eure on 14 August. It had been found that when he was granted livery of his father's lands on 14 September 1422, he had been allowed, owing to a mistake on the part of the chancery, to enter into possession of the manor of Langley and other lands which had been acquired without the Bishop's licence. He was summoned to show cause why the Bishop should not seize the lands and recover the issues from

1.Rot.E.m.7. 2.ibid 8. 3.ibid 20d. 4.ibid 15d. 5.ibid 16 6.ibid 19. 7.Appendix F(viii) pp.319-320.
the day of livery. Consequently, Eure's attorney came into chancery on 11 September, and also William Raket, the Bishop's attorney. The hearing was adjourned until 17 December. In the interval, a further move was made against Eure. He had fallen into arrears with the payment of rent due for his lease of the Bishop's mines. On 8 December, the sheriff was instructed to distress Eure's goods to the extent of £365 9s. 5d., nearly two years' rent. The money was to be paid into the exchequer by 20 December. This measure seems to have been a deliberate attempt to cripple Eure. No doubt, the real cause of the dispute with the Bishop went even deeper than the legal issues suggest. On 16 December, it was agreed that the disagreement should be settled by arbitration. Eure and Thomas Holden, obviously acting for Langley, made bonds to each other in 1,000 marks, on the undertaking that Langley and Eure would accept the arbitration of Richard, Earl of Salisbury, regarding the arrears of rent, the suit in chancery, an assize pending before the Bishop's justices, and other matters. The award was to be made before 20 January next (1433). That Langley should have taken the unprecedented step of submitting his dispute with a subject to mediation does suggest that he was anxious for a settlement. There is no indication, however, that Earl Richard ever made his award.

In view of the pending arbitration, the hearing in chancery, when the parties met again there on 17 December, was once more adjourned, to 2 April, 1433. The failure of the attempt at mediation was indicated by a fresh order for distress against Eure on 14 March, this time for £298 16s., which was to be received by 3 April. Eure had thus paid about £110 in the

1. Rot.D.m.5. 2. ibid 9-10. 3. ibid 6d. 4. Touching the impounded cattle? 5. Rot.D.mm.5d,6d. 6. ibid 10. 7. ibid 7.
past three months. It is likely that Eure considered his case hopeless. The defence he later made could not be substantiated. The suit, moreover, was being brought against him by the Bishop in the Bishop's chancery. In addition, the distraint for the arrears of rent was impending. He might well have felt himself threatened with ruin. There was at hand, however, the means not only of retaliation, but of possibly bringing about the complete overthrow of the Bishop's power. Could this have been achieved, Eure would have been safe from further prosecution.

On 12 February 1433, the crown had appointed a commission to make enquiries into subtractions of royal rights in the counties of Northumberland, Cumberland and Westmorland. On 1 April, four members of this commission came to Hartlepool at the instigation, Langley later alleged, of persons bearing ill-will against him. Now, Hartlepool lay in the Wapentake of Sadberg, once part of Northumberland, but purchased from the crown in 1190 and incorporated into the Palatinate of Durham, although it was always regarded as apart from the County. This offered the commission a pretext to enter the Bishop's liberty. Durham was not included in its terms of reference, but Northumberland was, and in the inquest's report, Hartlepool was said to be in that county. The senior member of the commission to sit at Hartlepool was Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland. That he should have been induced to take part in this invasion of the Bishop's franchise may be explained by Langley's part in the quarrel in the Neville family. The Earl of Westmorland

had married Percy's sister. Percy doubtless thought this a good opportunity to strike a blow against the supporter of his brother-in-law's enemies. Another commissioner, Sir William Tempest, had a grievance against Langley.

There were fifteen jurors. Four of them, Sir Robert Hilton, John Hedworth, Thomas Billingham and Robert Merlay, had each at some time disturbed the peace of the County. Hedworth and another juror, William Alwent, both had complaints to make against the Bishop. William Eure was not one of the jury. The amount of information supplied at the inquest about his affairs, however, makes it apparent that he was present. Twenty three articles were presented. Three of these dealt with the points at issue between Langley and Eure: the account of his attempt to recover his beasts from Thomas Ferry; the distraint arising from his arrears of rent and the suit in chancery. Touching the distraint, accurate details to the last penny, were given of the lease to Eure, and the writ of scire facias of 8 December 1432 was quoted in full. The plea in chancery was the subject of an article. The dates of livery to Eure and of the writ of scire facias were given correctly. In fact, it seems that the second writ was also produced at the inquest, for the report at this stage reads like a paraphrase of it. Two other articles concern William's brother Robert, that he had been appointed the Bishop's sheriff and had been given a licence to crenellate his house at Bradley.

---

1. Complete Peerage. 2. Appendix F(viii) p.315. 3. See pp.182-183 supra. 4. He had been bound over not to harm the Prior and Convent in 1419 (Rot.B.m.18). See also F(viii) pp.323 & p.208 infra. 5. He had attacked some monks & servants of the Convent in 1419 (Locellus 21,no.11). 6. See p.185 supra. 7. F(viii) p.324. 8. pp.319-320. 9. pp.320-321. 10. pp.322-323. 11. p.314. 12. p.318. 13. Robert was said to have been made sheriff on 30 Sept.1419. In fact, the date was 2 Jan.1420 (Rot.B.m.10). The licence to crenellate Bradley was not given on 20 Sept.1421 but on 20 Jan.1432 (Rot.C.m.5; see also Appendix F(i) p.306).
The articles concerning the judicial activities of the Bishop's chancery are the most interesting as they probably indicate the real cause of discontent. Eure's case has already been mentioned. A writ directed to John Hedworth, one of the jurors, was given in full: the Bishop had learnt that he held six men against their will. He was ordered, on 6 December 1432, to appear in the Durham chancery two days later, with his prisoners, to explain to the Bishop and his council why he had seized the men. The jurors alleged that Langley used such writs to compel his subjects to answer him in matters concerning himself. This was, in fact, a writ of corpus cum causa, and the jurors were scarcely well-advised in presenting it. What they probably had in mind, however, was the fact that the writ ended with the words et hoc nullatenus omittas sub periculo quod incumbit, and that it was with such a threat that subjects were summoned to chancery. Another form of writ that the jurors resented was that of de procedendo. Eure's plea against Thomas Ferry was given as an example. This article concluded with the generalisation that the Bishop obliged all his subjects to sue for this writ in all pleadings against himself.

Apart from an article dealing with licences to fortify houses, and the escape of convicted clerics from the Bishop's diocesan prison reported in two other articles in accordance with the terms of the royal commission, the remaining charges are of a feudal nature. Four articles related to the seizure of lands after the deaths of their tenants. In one case, the heirs entered into possession without first following the normal procedure of suing livery from the Bishop, of whom the deceased tenant had held in chief. The Bishop consequently caused the lands to be seized, and did not release them until the heirs had paid a fine. Then it was said that heirs were not granted livery until they had obtained the Bishop's writs.

of de terris liberandis. Even though they met this requirement, because of some defect in the form of livery, they might be summoned to chancery to give what reasons they could why the Bishop should not seize the lands so entered. If they could not justify their actions, the lands were seized and held until fresh writs of livery were obtained\(^1\). The two other instances were of Langley having seized the lands of deceased tenants-in-chief together with the lands they had held of intermediate lords\(^2\). Another article showed that the Bishop seized lands alienated to other persons by his tenants, without his licence, and held them until charters of pardon were purchased from his chancery\(^3\). Bishop Langley was also said to grant licences for the foundation and endowment of chantries\(^4\). He had refused to permit tenants to make fines in lieu of suit of court, contrary to the Statute of Merton\(^5\). His auditors had imprisoned a bailiff who was in arrears with his account, and although this man died in prison, his lands were subsequently put under distraint until the debt was settled\(^6\). It was alleged that the Bishop had compelled two tenants, one of them William Alwent, a juror, to pay rents for certain lands that they did not occupy\(^7\). These articles may have proved that the Bishop's administration was efficient and exacting, even when sometimes at fault, but they do not represent usurpations of royal rights, as the jury alleged.

Despite the strong undercurrent of private resentment against Langley betrayed in these articles, there was a certain element of constitutional principle in the quarrel. The charter of King John to the "Haliwerfolk", the men of the franchise of St. Cuthbert, was quoted as a preface to the articles of the inquest. This charter granted to the men of Durham certain legal safeguards against the bishop\(^8\). With the development of the

\(1\) Appendix F(viii) pp.321-322. \(2\) pp.315-316. \(3\) p.313. 
\(4\) pp.318-319. \(5\) pp.314-315. \(6\) p.324. \(7\) p.324. \(8\) pp.312-313. As in Rotuli Chartarum 1199-1216 (R.C.1837) p.182. There is a copy of this charter in D.Cartulary I, f.194.
Palatinate, some of these privileges had been lost. That this ancient charter should have been recalled, however, reveals the existence of a belief that the liberties of Durham did not mean only the regalian franchise of the Bishopric, but also certain undefined rights of its subjects. A manifestation of this popular idea was seen in 1436, when the men of Durham made fine with the King rather than pay a subsidy, in order to preserve the principle of their immunity from parliamentary taxation. It was also later alleged against Langley that he was planning "to have opteigned certayne thinges agains the fraunehises of Goddes kyrk and Seint Cuthbert of Duresme". Thus the men of the Palatinate could take up the position of defending its liberties against the Bishop. The dispute against Langley was thus raised to one of principle. The holding of the inquisition at Hartlepool may be described as a constitutional rebellion. The jurors knew quite well that Sadberg was part of the County Palatine of Durham; that Langley was exercising no more regalian liberties than his predecessors had done; that the Bishop's title to these liberties was well-founded, had been maintained as lawful against earlier challenges and repeatedly confirmed by the crown; and that the inquisition itself was therefore unlawful.

Those responsible for this seditious act may have spent some thought on the traditional liberties of the "Haliwerfolk", but more immediate preoccupations brought about their revolt. They felt that Langley's administration was unduly severe, and were aware that they had no lawful means of protection against it. The fact that the Bishop claimed the same privilege as the King in his courts of law, namely that he could not be compelled to defend himself

1. C.R.P.1436-1441,p.43. See p.163 supra. 2. Appendix F(ix) p.326. 3. Henry VIII's Act for resuming liberties to the crown was a cause of participation of men of Durham in the Pilgrimage of Grace (Reid: King's Council in the North 129-130).
without his consent was resented. Again, when the Bishop did become a party, the suit was heard in his own courts. In such a plea in the Bishop's chancery, there was no jury. The discontented party therefore felt that the Bishop's position at law was so advantageous that redress of grievances would be sought in vain. Yet, in view of his regalian privileges, the Bishop was fully in his rights to claim these advantages. There could be no parity as long as he was in possession of his franchise. The destruction of this franchise therefore became the objective of his enemies. The appointment of the royal commission to make enquiries in Northumberland offered the malcontents a wonderful opportunity. Some of the commissioners were persuaded to hold an inquisition into the status of the Bishopric. Then it was presented that the whole fabric of the Palatinate, every facet of its administration, were unlawful; the acts of Langley's government were illegal, for he was exercising privileges that belonged to the King alone. Such was the case put against the Bishop by his enemies. The commission then sent its report to the royal chancery.

The chronology of events also makes clear William Eure's responsibility in the attack on the Bishop. The inquisition was taken on the day immediately before that appointed for the resumed hearing of the Bishop's suit against him in chancery. In the circumstances, the proceedings had to be adjourned, this time to 17 September, when the attorneys appeared on 2 April. Eure's defence had already been prepared - it is partly given in one of the inquest's articles - but Langley's government had to prepare to defend itself. Prior Wessington assisted the Bishop by having drawn up a justification of the liberties of the Church of Durham, based upon chronicles and (forged) charters. His loyalty in this crisis was the reward for Langley's persistent policy of friendship towards the Convent.

Langley, although an old man and living in semi-retirement, set out for London on 15 April. He remained there until August, when he returned to the diocese. He knew that he could rely on the aid of his friends in the King's Council in defending his franchise. To this favour he must have owed his appointment, on 16 May, for the first time, to the commission of the peace in Northumberland. The new position must have been of some value to him. Parliament met on 8 July. Langley introduced a petition, protesting against inquisitions at Newcastle as well as Hartlepool, which, he said, had been brought about by the machinations of his enemies. He asked that the record of the inquests should be removed from Chancery and destroyed. He gave an account of the liberties of the Bishopric, and cited the judgement given in favour of Anthony Bek and later royal confirmations in justification.

William Eure now came into the open as the leader of the Durham malcontents. He presented in Parliament a petition to counter that of Langley. He spoke, he claimed, as much for the King as on his own behalf. He made two main points: that the liberties claimed by the Bishop had not been enjoyed from beyond the time of legal memory and had to a large extent been lost to the crown through the lies of Bek; and secondly that Sadberg was in Northumberland. Nothing was said about Langley's administration in particular, but Eure concluded with the prayer that the King would give justice to his subjects. Both the petitions were then examined: after much discussion and scrutiny of charters, it was concluded that Hartlepool and other places mentioned by the inquest lay in the Bishop's franchises, where the King's writ did not run. This was the judgement made in Parliament, but another factor was considered by the Council: Langley's long and faithful services to Henry VI and his forbears were recalled.

1.Heg.ff.204-206. See also pp.157-158 supra. 2.C.P.R.1429-1436, p.622. 3.Hot.Parl.IV 419. 4.ibid 427-429. 5.Tam pro Domino Hege quam pro se ipso, ut asseruit (ibid 429).
when the King granted his petition. The inquests' reports were therefore cancelled in Parliament and placed among its petitions.

At Langley's request, an exemplification of these transactions under the Great Seal was made on 16 August 1433.

Although the liberties of the Palatinate had been preserved, the dispute was not yet settled. Langley returned to London for the autumn session of Parliament. While it was sitting, some knights went to the Earl of Warwick to ask him to persuade Langley to submit his quarrel with Eure to arbitration. Consequently, Langley chose the Archbishop of York, and the Earls of Warwick, Salisbury and Northumberland, while Eure named the Bishops of London and Carlisle, to mediate between them. The disputants were to give the arbitrator articles in writing by Easter, failing and the decree was to be given a fortnight later; failing which, an umpire was to be chosen who was to give his verdict before 19 June. This information was given by Langley in a letter he wrote to Prior Wessington on 4 January 1434. At the same time, he told the Prior that he had learnt that certain men had obtained a copy of a petition Langley was supposed to have delivered in Parliament in order to obtain some things contrary to the privileges of the Church of Durham. They had met at St. Nicholas Church in Durham and decided to meet again on 2 January when they would determine that some of their number should be sent to the King's Council to oppose the petition. Langley would await their coming until 28 January. In fact, he remained in London until 24 February, but there is no indication in the records of the Council of any...

2. There is a copy in Reg. III ff. 157d-172d.
4. Percy's nomination is inexplicable (see pp. 190-191). One can only presume that he and Langley had been reconciled. Warwick was named one of his executors & a bequest was made to Kemp in his will (Scr. Tres App. pp. 245, 247). For his relations with Salisbury see pp. 181-182 supra. These three were clearly his friends.
5. Robert fitz Hugh, Eure's brother-in-law.
6. Marmaduke Lumley, a member of the Durham family.
7. Appendix
litigation concerning affairs of the County Palatine.

The petition referred to in the letter cannot have been Langley's plea against the inquisitions. It could hardly be described as contrary to the liberties of Durham, and, moreover, had been granted some four or five months previously. There is no record of this second petition being presented in Parliament. Two copies exist of a petition that would merit the description, and which, from the content, obviously relates to the dispute between Langley and his subjects. Both copies are described as a "Petition of the lord Thomas Langley, Bishop of Durham, that he and his successors might have causes and matters concerning the rights and liberties of the Bishop of Durham tried outside the County of Durham; but the petition was not granted".

In the preamble, it is brought to the King's notice that on several occasions in the past the Escheator in Northumberland and other persons, bearing ill-will against the bishops of Durham and seeking to diminish their power, had taken inquisitions in the County and Liberty of Durham, or in Northumberland, on matters concerning the said Liberty: this had been done on the supposition that Durham was part of the County of Northumberland, whereas it was in fact a County in itself, and all the bishops of Durham had appointed their own justices, sheriffs, etc., and had enjoyed various other liberties. Certain persons who resented that Langley possessed such privileges, and that they should be subject to his rule, had begun to hold assemblies and to form associations with the purpose of destroying his liberties. They were planning to promote legal actions, and in specie Regem (sic) partem faciendam, intended to hold trials of the Bishop's liberties. They supposed that any matter touching the Bishop or his government coming into dispute should be tried by a jury of men of the Liberty of Durham. It was obvious that their intention was to destroy the Bishop's franchise. The circumstances outlined indicate that this

1. Appendix F(x) p.327.
petition was related to the same dispute between Langley and his subjects that led to the inquisition at Hartlepool. Indeed, the reference to the taking of inquisitions in Durham was presumably intended to draw attention to the illegality of the recent inquest. The conclusion that this was held as the result of a conspiracy of certain subjects of the Bishop is borne out. Further, the statement that the malcontents were claiming to be acting on the King’s behalf tallied with William Eure’s assertion that his petition in Parliament was made *tam pro Domino Rege quam pro se ipso.*

The substance of this petition of Langley’s was that he, in order to thwart the plots of his hostile subjects, sought that new arrangements should be made for the trial of two classes of cases. Firstly, he asked that any issue touching the Bishop within his Liberty of Durham, and that also concerned the King, that was triable according to common law in the Bishop’s court before a Durham jury, if it was neither treason or felony, should be sent by the Bishop’s justices to the King’s justices. The case was then to be tried in King’s Bench or Common Pleas, or in another court where a royal justice was sitting, before a jury of men of the County of York, *sufficienter et minus suspectos.* After trial, the case was to be sent back to the Bishop’s justices for judgment and termination of the plea. On the other hand, the whole business could be conducted in Durham in the Bishop’s court before his justices, in the manner accustomed, if the Bishop so chose. In the second place, Langley requested that if any matter touching the Bishop that also concerned the King was brought into a royal court, as to whether a place lay between Tyne or Tees, that is, in the Bishopric of Durham, or in the County of Northumberland (an obvious allusion to Sadberg) that should be tried by a Durham jury, then it should instead be tried by a jury from Yorkshire or Northumberland; or if a matter arose from some dispute in the Liberty of Durham, it might be tried by a Durham jury in a royal court,
the choice again lying with the Bishop 1.

Langley was apparently offering to surrender a part of his prerogatives in allowing a case to be taken for trial in the King's courts. This then could have been the petition against which it was said that he was seeking a diminution of the liberties of St. Cuthbert, but the liberties in question were again not those of the Bishop, but those claimed by his subjects; for in reality, Langley was not giving anything away: he reserved to himself, his executors and his successors, the right to choose whether they would take this unprecedented step. His concern was to avoid submitting his affairs to the verdict of a jury composed of possibly hostile subjects. His opponents were planning, as he said in the preamble, to associate the King with themselves in suits to be brought against the Bishop. It was only for cases of this sort that the petition requested provision. If such pleas were raised, then the Bishop could choose to have them taken before a jury of whose partiality he would have less reason to be anxious. No mention was made of suits between the Bishop and his subjects: they would still be tried in his courts, most likely in the chancery at Durham. Had the petition been granted, the Bishop's position would have been fortified by having available the facilities to avoid the sort of emergency contemplated. The reason for the rejection of the petition was possibly that the privileges sought were considered excessive: it would have been a dangerous precedent to have allowed the lord of a great liberty the right to choose from which county a jury should be drawn for any suit in which the crown was a party.

The legal position thus remained the same as it had been

1. Appendix F(x) p.327. See also note 1 on p.204 infra.
Before April 1433. The dispute with Eure, however, went on. The pleadings in the Bishop's chancery had been resumed on 17 September 1433. Eure's defence was then submitted. His attorney stated that Eure did not in fact occupy most of the lands in question. As for the remainder, they should not be seized by the Bishop: it was an ancient custom in Durham that if anyone acquired lands held of the Bishop without his licence, a fine was made to him and his pardon was granted. It was alleged that Langley had refused to take a fine, but had pardoned Eure the acquisition by word of mouth on account of his good services. At the request of the Bishop's attorney, the suit was then adjourned to 18 December¹.

Langley's breach with Eure and his desire for more support locally was evident in the commission of the peace appointed on 1 December: Eure's name was omitted, and Lords Latimer and Fauconberg, Thomas Lumley and Sir Robert Ogle were brought in². On 18 December, Langley's reply to Eure was given: the contention that the Bishop held any of the lands in dispute was denied, and as for the supposed oral licence, "the Bishop need not nor by the law of the land could he be compelled to answer to that plea in the manner and form aforesaid"³.

As the Court was not prepared to give its sentence, the 23rd March 1434 was given. From then and until 12 August 1435, there was a series of sixteen adjournments, made for the same reason⁴. In the meanwhile, there were some attempts at mediation. The arbitrators appointed at the instance of Parliament in 1433 apparently achieved nothing. Prior Wessington interceded with Langley on behalf of Eure and his party. A letter from Eure and Sir William Elmeden, the year of which cannot be ascertained, reveals that Langley

¹ Rot. D. m. 10. ² Rot. C. m. 7. ³ Idem Episcopus ad placitum illud modo et forma predictis necesse non habet nec per legem terre tenetur respondere. ⁴ Rot. D. mm. 10-11.
regarded not only Eure, but also "us and our frendes", with displeasure. On 12 August 1435, judgement was given in chancery by the advice of the Bishop's justices and other lawyers: the Bishop could take the manor of Langley into his hands, with the issues from 14 September 1422, but Eure could remain in his possession of the other lands. This sentence was thus, to some extent, a compromise, but not a very satisfactory one for Eure. He therefore obtained a writ of error from the royal chancery on 1 February 1436, and the case was sent to King's Bench on 12 May. Even then, the quarrel became more bitter, for in 1437, Langley feared that Eure was planning to kill him. It would appear that after having tried every peaceful means, legal and quasi-legal, in his dispute with Langley, Eure had eventually contemplated the final resort of his period, violence. Langley was then confined to his manor of Auckland, dying, and so the conflict of six years came to an end. A few years after Langley's death, Eure received a pardon from Bishop Neville for his acquisition of the various lands.

(iv) Other Features of Langley's Pontificate.

Apart from the accounts already given of the disordered state of society in Durham, of Langley's successful defence of the franchises of the Bishopric and his quarrel with Sir William Eure, little remains to be related of the history of Langley's long rule over Durham. That he introduced a number of new practices into his administration and fully realised the legal implications of his regalian prerogatives in his relations with his subjects may stand as his most notable achievements in the sphere of Palatine government. The Survey

---

of 1418 and the subsequent legal proceedings to determine the titles to various lands show him to have been anxious to maintain his rights as a landowner. In 1417, after litigation in Parliament and the royal chancery for seven years, he recovered for the Bishopric a third part of the Tyne Bridge, lost to Newcastle by Bishop Fordham over thirty years ago. Throughout his pontificate, he was an energetic builder. In Durham, he built a new gaol, added a tower to the Castle and strengthened the City's defences by the erection of gates on both of its bridges. The school of his vaileale foundation showed his concern for other needs of the people of the City. Langley "left his mark upon Durham".

1. This topic has already received the notice of the historians of Durham (Surtees I lvi; Hutchinson I 407). For a summary of the proceedings, see Early Newcastle Deeds (S.S.1924) pp.64-65. During the pleadings in Chancery on 28 Dec. 1413, it was contended for the Bishop by his attorney, John Thoralby, that the issue should be tried by a jury from Yorkshire: as Gateshead was in Durham a jury could not be called from there. The Mayor of Newcastle said that Northumberland was nearer, giving measurements. On 22 Apr. 1414, the Chancellor decreed, by authority of Parliament, that a jury from Cumberland & Westmorland should be empanelled, a compromise. (Placita in Cancellaria file 24, no. 7). The Bishop's objection to a Durham jury must be linked with his attitude to the subject in 1413. 2. Scr. Tres (Chambre) p. 146. 3. Hutchinson I 406 (Notes from account of receiver-general 1415-1416). 4. Durham Account Rolls Vol. II (S.S. 1898) 304; Vol. III (S.S. 1900) 621. 5. V.C.H. Durham Vol. III, p. 25, where a fuller account is given of building by Langley in Durham City.
CHAPTER VII: THE BORDER.

Before Edward III created great "liberties" for members of his family, the Kings of England had not permitted the growth of such privileged temporal lordships except on the borders of the realm. The Marcher Lords had special powers as it was their duty to contain the Welsh. Likewise in the North of England, the Bishopric of Durham was a major part of the defences against Scotland, and it is probable that William II had a similar purpose in mind when he created the short-lived "Honour of Carlisle", that it should be to the Western March what Durham was to the Eastern. Between Cumberland and Durham lay the liberties of Tynedale and Redesdale, and the Archbishop of York's franchise of Hexhamshire. The extensive privileges of Durham were tolerated because they gave stability and strength to an important frontier district. The military responsibilities of the Bishop were expressed by Edward II, when he recommended Louis Beaumont to be Bishop, for "he would be a wall of brass between the King and his Scottish enemies". Likewise, when Henry VI wrote to the Chapter of Durham in 1437, to bid it elect Robert Neville to the see, he said that he was particularly concerned for the diocese "As wel for it is one of the greatest and moost notable churche of our patronnage within this our Royaume as for hit is nygh unto the marches of Scotlande, for the whiche cause namely hit is right necessary and expedient both for the wele of that countrey and for the said Church to set and povey of suche a notable and myghty personne to be heed and Bishop thereof, as am and may puissantly kepe thayme best to the honour of god and defence of this our Royaume".

The outlying parts of the Palatinate, Norhamshire and Islandshire, lay on the south side of the Tweed, for ten miles

westwards from its mouth\(^1\). Its government was largely separate from that of County Durham: the chancery at Durham was still its administrative headquarters, but it had its own sheriff and escheator, justices of the peace\(^2\) and gaol delivery\(^3\), and receiver-general\(^4\). Norham Castle was the local centre of government. It was also the largest English castle on the south bank of the Tweed, and thus held an important place in the defences of the Border. It was greatly strengthened by Langley, who had its west gate rebuilt, a new tower erected and great iron-bound gates put in\(^5\). The constable of Norham Castle usually also held the offices of steward, sheriff and escheator of Norhamshire and Islandshire. In 1436, Langley took the unprecedented step of leasing all four offices to Sir Robert Ogle for twenty years\(^6\). This was done, at a critical time\(^7\), because the Bishop preferred that the responsibility for the upkeep and defence of the castle should be undertaken by a resident commander. The accounts of the sheriff were previously rendered annually at Durham. Apart from the more usual items, the Bishop's share in the ransom of Scottish prisoners\(^8\) emphasises the peculiar position of these territories. Being so close to Scotland, the district was exposed to Scottish raiders. The value of lands was adversely affected\(^9\). The revenues drawn by the Convent from its estates in Islandshire revealed the same tale of destruction\(^10\). The sessions of the justices had to be postponed occasionally\(^11\), the cause presumably being that Scottish raids prevented their being held in safety.

Owing to Scotland's adherence to the Avignonese party in

\(^{1}\) J. Raine: North Durham (1852), pp. 15-16.  
\(^{2}\) Rot. A.m. 3d; E.m. 5; C.m. 12.  
\(^{3}\) Rot. A.m. 6d; E.m. 7.  
\(^{4}\) Rot. A.mm. 1 & 9.  
\(^{5}\) Raine p. 287.  
\(^{7}\) See pp. 224-225 infra.  
\(^{8}\) Sheriff's Accounts (Norham) 1421/22; 1426/27.  
\(^{9}\) Reg. II (Inq. P.M.) f. 173d.  
\(^{10}\) See p. 251 infra.  
\(^{11}\) See p. 223 infra.
the Great Schism, the Bishop was also involved as ordinary in
the politics of the Border. The English town of Berwick-on-Tweed
and the Durham cell of Coldingham lay in the diocese of
St. Andrews, and thus under the jurisdiction of a supporter of
the "anti-Pope". In 1390, Boniface IX granted to Skirlawe powers
of episcopal jurisdiction in Berwick, Roxburgh (then held by
England), and whatever other parts of the diocese of St. Andrews
the English King might conquer. Langley exercised the same
powers by virtue of this bull. He mediated in a dispute between
the Prior of Coldingham and Vicar of Holy Trinity, Berwick, in
1408, and in 1411 ordered the restoration to their benefices at
Berwick of two priests who had been expelled on a pretext given
by the Schism. He exercised this jurisdiction until 1423. The
position of Coldingham was most unfortunate: it was subject to
attacks by both Scots and English. Its monks fled to Durham and
the Scottish house of Dunfermline appointed a Prior.

The diocese of Durham entered into the pattern of Border
defence. The payment of captains was occasionally made by
assignment on the clerical subsidies of Durham. In 1419, £100
collected by the Prior of Durham as part of a clerical tenth
was paid to Sir John Bertram, Keeper of Roxburgh Castle. The
Prior paid £60 to Bertram in 1420. Part of the Bishop's
contribution to a clerical subsidy was paid to the Wardens of
the Marches in 1436. In 1412, Langley and William Chancellor
paid Sir Robert Umfraville 100 marks for the repair of the
walls of Berwick. Langley also sent money to Roxburgh. In
1418, he lent 100 marks for the repair of the castle. For some
years, payments were made to the captain of Roxburgh "by the
hands" of "Thomas Houden", once described as receiver of the

---

3. Ibid. 44. 4. Ibid. 279d (Undated, but recorded between entries
Bishopric of Durham. This would have been Langley's Steward Thomas Holden, which suggests that the Bishop had undertaken to advance money for the costs of Roxburgh, being reimbursed later. Apart from its contributions to the expenses of Border defence, the clergy of Durham were at times arrayed for a more active part. The record of a muster of the clergy in 1400 shows the share each beneficed clerk had to provide. The Rector of Sedgefield, apparently the wealthiest church, brought five "lances", i.e. men-at-arms, and ten archers; the Dean of Auckland four "lances" and ten bowmen; and the remainder smaller contributions. A Vicar of Gainford who died in 1412 bequeathed his bows and plate-armour to his chamberlain. The laymen of the Palatinate were called out more frequently than the clergy, on orders from the Bishop.

Throughout the years of Langley's rule at Durham, the history of the Border was one of constant raids, threats of invasion and frequent exchanges of embassies to arrange short truces. Langley had an important part in Anglo-Scottish diplomacy. Being so closely concerned in Border relations, the Bishop of Durham was inevitably called upon from time to time to join in negotiations for their amelioration. There was no question of his taking an independent part in view of his Palatinate, as some of his predecessors had done. He was, however, responsible for the observation of truces by his subjects. In 1434, John Bedworth, who had been impeached in the court of the Warden of the East March for breaches of the existing truce, was bound over to answer to the Bishop or his ministers for this offence.

In the year that Langley became Bishop, good fortune gave England a valuable prisoner, James, the son of the King of

---

3. Reg. f. 57; Wills and Inventories (S. S. 1635), p. 35.
5. Rot. D. m. 8d.
Scotland. The captive succeeded to the throne that same year. The government of Scotland was taken over by James' uncle, the Duke of Albany. Albany's title to the regency was asserted by himself, not prescriptive. He was not anxious for the release of his nephew, preferring to enjoy his _de facto_ position as ruler. Nor did he wish to be troubled by English attacks, as he was sufficiently occupied in maintaining his hold on Scotland. The prospects for some understanding between the two governments was thus fair. The current truce was due to expire at Easter 1407. It was at this stage that Langley began to take part in Anglo-Scottish diplomacy. Henry IV was in some doubt about Albany's title to the regency: he was not sure of the Duke's correct style of address. The Bishops of Durham and London were consulted, and advised that two forms of commission should be prepared for the English representatives in the coming talks, one to empower them to treat for a truce with the ambassadors of the Duke of Albany Governor of Scotland; the second to treat with the commissioners for Scotland. Archbishop Arundel wrote to Henry IV about this time, saying that he believed that the copy of the previous truce with Scotland was in the hands of Langley and others of the Council.

Truces were frequently made and renewed for short terms. Nevertheless, the hostility and predatory instincts of the inhabitants of the Marches prevented any real state of peace from being restored. The Earl of Northumberland found shelter in Scotland until he departed early in 1408, to meet his death at Bramham Moor. Langley spent the spring and summer of that year in the North. On 28 June, he was at Norham Castle, his business seems to have been private: he wished to see his

2. Reg. f. 19. The west gate was being rebuilt then (Haine p. 287).
Border castle and lands. In the autumn, there was a fear of Scottish attack. Commissions of array were issued in Durham on 16 September\(^1\). It was apparently a false alarm. The condition of affairs on the Border is well-illustrated by certain events in 1410. Patrick of Dunbar captured that fort of Fascastle. Its former English commander, Thomas Holden\(^2\), had raided the neighbourhood, by sea as well as by land, before his capture\(^3\). In the same year, Sir Robert Umfraville made attacks on Scottish shipping and on the people of Jedworth Forest\(^4\).

Negotiations were generally conducted for England by men holding no outstanding positions. North-country gentlemen and clerks were usually employed. Richard Holme, Langley's spiritual chancellor, was often appointed to these diplomatic commissions\(^5\). On 4 April 1411, Prince John and the Earl of Westmorland, the Wardens of the Marches, were instructed to negotiate for a truce. A more powerful commission was appointed soon afterwards, on 23 May. It included the Bishops of Durham and Bath and Wells, and the Earls of Warwick and Westmorland\(^6\). Their instructions were to conclude a truce for two or three years, with limitations of the frontier zones round every town and castle. If the Scots would not agree to the fixing of these bounds, the English Commissioners had to report back to the King before concluding any truce\(^7\). The duration of the truce sought was longer than usual. The King's Council, then directed by Prince Henry, wished for peace in the North in order to be free to pursue an aggressive policy in France. There is no trace of the movements of this embassy. Hawden-stank was the place appointed for its meeting with the Scottish ambassadors, who were granted safe-conducts up to

---

1 July. Langley took no part in these negotiations. He passed the summer in County Durham, continuing his episcopal visitation. If the meeting did indeed take place, it achieved little or nothing, for a smaller commission was appointed to treat for truces on 24 September following. On 1 November, a truce until Easter 1418 was arranged.

This truce, however, was not to take effect. Henry V's Council, meeting on 29 June 1413, advised that the Wardens should be reinforced. It was decided on 10 July that these additional forces should be engaged. Apart from the usual negotiations for short truces, exchanges were also made concerning the release of notable prisoners. In 1413, Scottish embassies were permitted to come to treat for the release of James I. On 5 August 1415, an English commission, appointed to treat for truces, was also empowered to discuss the exchange of Murdoch, the Duke of Albany's son, with Henry Percy, grand-son of the Earl of Northumberland. The fact that Henry V was about to invade France made him less anxious to release the King of Scotland. The last commission appointed before his departure from Southampton had more desirable objects. A truce was particularly necessary. Henry could well expect Scottish attacks as a consequence of his own invasion of France. Such a contingency had, indeed, been anticipated. There was an Elizabethan tradition that, when the royal Council was debating the proposed invasion, the Earl of Westmorland opposed it, pointing out the likely repercussions on the northern frontier. In April, the Council had made arrangements for its defence. Commissions of array were appointed. Langley went to Durham.

after seeing the English fleet sail for France\(^1\), in order to be at hand during the expected emergency. There was some activity on the West March\(^2\), but no major Scottish attack.

Plans were made for the exchange of Murdoch and Henry Percy. The King wanted Percy to be released so that he could employ him in the defence of the Marches. The family of Percy was traditionally bound to the office of Warden of the East March. Its popularity in Northumberland made the King desirous of using Percy's services. The Duke of Albany was equally anxious to recover his son, who had been a captive in England since Hamildon Hill. On 21 May 1415, John Hull and William Chancellor\(^3\) were instructed to take Murdoch to Newcastle, whence he was to be conducted to Berwick when the time of Percy's arrival there was learnt\(^4\). Nothing came of these plans, but a second English commission was appointed on 11 December to continue the discussions. Its composition was entirely of Durham men - Sir Ralph Eure, Sir William Claxton, Richard Holme and John Huntman, Dean of Auckland\(^5\). The Bishop was at Auckland from 18 December to 24 January 1416\(^6\): it is possible that he had some part in the negotiations. The exchange was effected, Percy came to Parliament to make his homage to the King and was created Earl of Northumberland\(^7\). In the next year, on 11 April 1417, he was appointed Warden of the East March\(^8\).

Further negotiations for the release of James I were carried on in 1416. Safe-conducts were issued for Scottish embassies on 26 April and 8 December. On the second date, Langley and the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland were commissioned to hold discussions regarding bonds and hostages offered by James in an indenture for his release, and to

---

determine whether these were adequate. They later wrote to Henry V that James wished to go to the North of England to await the Scottish commissioners. Henry agreed that the Bishop and Earls should take James to Raby Castle where he might remain until Easter 1417, if necessary. On 12 March, the Earl of Westmorland was empowered to grant safe-conducts to Scottish ambassadors coming to Raby. Langley had been in the North since December 1416 but returned to London in March. This diplomatic activity proved fruitless. Henry wanted the Scots to admit his sovereignty as a condition of James' release, and this they would not do. The subject was again considered in 1421, but while Henry V lived, James remained his prisoner.

The danger to the country was more serious in 1417, when Henry began the conquest of Normandy. The Duke of Albany had received French envoys and was planning to send Scottish soldiers to France. Henry is said to have prevented the early departure of this expedition by feigning to attack Scotland. The Scots remained at home to await this nebulous invasion while the English army crossed the Channel. The hostility of the Scottish government was certainly apparent. In addition, there was disaffection in England. In March, commissions had been sent out to enquire into treasons in Northumberland, Yorkshire, Cumberland and Westmorland. The Lollard, Sir John Oldcastle, was still at large, and was supposed to have conspired with the Scots, urging them to invade England and bring with them the "mammet", alias "King Richard". How serious the danger of treason was is shown by an account of the capture of Oldcastle's confederate, Thomas Payn. He was taken
outside Windsor Castle on the night he had planned to enter it to rescue James of Scotland. A copy of the itinerary by which James was to have been taken to Edinburgh was said to have been found in Payn's possession.

One day after Henry had sailed for France, the Earl of Northumberland learnt, on 31 July, that the Duke of Albany proposed to attack Berwick by land and sea. On 3 August, Sir Robert Umfraville heard that Albany, with sixty thousand men, would lay siege to Berwick within twenty days. The Council issued letters of Privy Seal on 14 and 24 August, to order various men to join the Lieutenant, the Duke of Bedford, at Leicester. He intended to go further north if necessary.

Bedford was apparently too late to take part in the repulse of the Scots. The Duke of Exeter was then in the North, visiting the shrines of St. John of Beverley and St. Cuthbert. He gathered an army of northcountrymen, of whose fighting qualities he formed a very high opinion. The Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland also collected forces, and the Archbishop of York called out his clergy. The combined force is said to have been one hundred thousand strong. This figure, like that of the Scots, is fantastic, but it does indicate that the numbers involved were a great deal larger than was usual in Border warfare. As the English force advanced, the Scots learnt of its approach. The Earl of Douglas, who was besieging Roxburgh Castle, hastily broke camp. Albany likewise abandoned the siege of Berwick, burning the town of Norham as he retreated.

Apparently, Henry V hoped that the Border would be more peaceful after the repulse of the Scots, for on 25 September

---

1417, he wrote to Langley to bid him arrange for the Duke of Exeter to join him in France. The King was soon of a different opinion. Early in 1418, he wrote to Exeter to ask him to confer with Bedford, Langley and the northern Earls "to set a gode ordinance for my North Marches". Henry was anxious about his French prisoners. He had learnt that a servant of the Duke of Orleans had been in Scotland to talk to Albany, so that in the following summer, the Scots should again take hostile action. There was a plan to rescue King James, Orleans and other Frenchmen. On 2 March, Exeter passed the King's instructions on to Langley. Exeter, however, went to France in May. There was another invasion scare that year. Commissions of array for the defence of the realm were issued in April. In Durham, arrays were ordered in July, and in August, the clergy were called out. The danger does not seem to have materialised, and the Wardens were empowered to treat for short truces. In 1419, there was a typical Border "incident". Wark Castle was taken by some Scots. Langley's sheriff of Norhamshire, Sir Robert Ogle, shortly afterwards retook it and massacred the enemy garrison.

Negotiations for the release of James were resumed after the death of Henry V. Scots were permitted to visit James at Pontefract early in 1423, where he had gone to meet them. An English commission, led by the Bishops of Durham and Worcester, and the Wardens of the Marches, was appointed on 10 July. The Bishop of Worcester travelled to Pontefract with James. The Scottish embassy was not appointed until 19 August. The talks were conducted at York in the second week.
of September. The English representatives had been given their instructions on 6 July. Firstly, they were to make difficulties if the Scots wished to see James before Langley's arrival, but not to refuse if pressed. Then a treaty of release was to be made if the credentials of the Scots were sufficient. The sum of £40,000 was to be demanded to repay James' expenses in captivity, but this might be reduced to £36,000. Securities for payment were to be obtained. Whether or not the Scots asked for a treaty of peace or truce, the English were to seek for peace. If it could not be concluded, then truces were to be made in order that time could be given to make a peace. Every method was to be used to persuade the Scots to recall their men from France. Should the Scots suggest the marriage of their King to an English lady, the point was to be developed, but the English representatives were not to raise the matter. The Scottish embassy, on the other hand, was only empowered to negotiate for James' release. On 10 September, articles were agreed to by Bishops Langley and Morgan, the Earl of Northumberland and Mr. John Woodham on one side, and by the Scottish embassy on the other. The Scots agreed to pay £40,000 in six years after James' return to Scotland. They had not been instructed as to the names of hostages to be given as security for payment, so it was agreed that on 1 March next, James should go to Brancepeth or Durham to treat with his subjects on this point. It was agreed that a marriage was desirable: a further embassy would be sent to the English Council before 20 October to settle the matter.

The Scottish embassy did not arrive in London until December. The English representatives were led by the Bishop of Worcester: neither Langley nor the Wardens were appointed.

On 4 December, a further set of articles was agreed upon. They were more detailed than those made at York, but not really different in substance. James was to reach Durham or Brancepeth by 10 February, not 1 March. The hostages and bonds were to be handed over in Durham Cathedral on 1 March, or before 31 March at the latest. The Scottish embassy had also discussed the matter of James' marriage. Before he left London, he married Joan Beaufort, niece of the Bishop of Winchester and Duke of Exeter. Accordingly, as had been agreed at York, 10,000 marks were remitted from the ransom. The treaty of peace which the English Council was so anxious to obtain had not yet been made, nor had its desire for the recall of Scottish soldiers from France been realised. The Scottish embassies had not been authorised to discuss either topic, nor even the conclusion of truces. On 14 February, a third English commission was appointed. The Bishops of London and Durham, the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland, the Keeper of the Privy Seal, and four northcountry magnates were empowered to treat with James himself or with his representatives for a final peace or truces.

There was again a slight delay in the proceedings. James did not arrive at Brancepeth until 1 March. He spent most of the month there. Bishop Kemp of London set out for Durham on 18 February, but Langley was still in London on 28 February. He reached Durham by 20 March. On 28 March, at Durham, James gave his bond for £40,000, and made an indenture with the English representatives by which he gave over to them hostages and bonds in security. On the same day, a second indenture testified to the conclusion of a truce, to last

1. Feod. X 302-305; Rot. Scot. II 241-243. 2. Feod. X 322-323; Rot. Scot. II 246. 3. Ibid 246. 4. E. W. M. Balfour-Melville: James I, King of Scots (1936) 102. 5. B. M. Cottonian MS Cleopatra C IV, f.156. Kemp was mounting his horse when he received a letter from Wm. Swan. 6. Nic. III 146; Reg. f. 115d. For the cause of Langley's delay, see pp. 143-144 supra.
for seven years from 1 May following. James then departed for Scotland. As had been agreed on 4 December, he made letters under his great seal confirming these agreements, on his entry into his kingdom. He also took an oath, at Melrose on 5 April, to observe all these agreements. Sir William Bowes, Mr. William Doncaster and William Park had been appointed, on 29 March, to receive this oath. Their commission was issued under the Great Seal, which Langley, as Chancellor, had with him at Durham.

After eighteen years of captivity, James had been released. The reason for his release being made so soon after Henry V's death was the desire of the English councillors for peace with Scotland. They were disappointed in this object, but had secured a long truce. As for their second aim, the recall of Scottish troops from France, they again did not obtain their wishes in full, but James promised to send no more military aid. As the Scottish soldiers were mostly killed at Verneuil five months later, the problem was no longer serious.

The presence of King James in Durham gave Prior Wessington a good opportunity to seek his favour for Coldingham. The interest taken by the Convent in the negotiations is attested by a copy made in the Prior's Register of the treaty of truce. In 1409, the Duke of Albany had ordered that the English monks should leave Coldingham, following the appointment of a Prior by the Abbot of Dunfermline. This was in the time of the Schism, however, and Scotland had now fallen into line with the rest of Christendom: Langley had just recently abandoned his claim

to episcopal jurisdiction in the diocese of St. Andrews.  

After James had returned to Scotland, the claims of Durham and Dunfermline were heard in a parliament at Perth, on 26 May. William Drax, the Prior of Coldingham appointed by Durham, was found to be in lawful possession. As the Priory was in ruins, said to have been caused by the English, Drax was ordered to repair it and maintain divine services. This affirmation of the Convent of Durham's rights was apparently referred to in a commission of Henry VI to Langley on 26 February 1425. James had sought that the English King would show the same favour to Scottish houses deprived of their property in England. Langley was appointed to hear their claims and report to the Council. Whether he did hear such claims cannot be ascertained, but he supported a like requirement by the Convent of Durham. He wrote to James on 10 March to ask that certain lands taken from the Prior of Coldingham should be restored to him. Coldingham's position continued to be an unhappy one: Henry VI took the cell into his protection in 1438, as it was still suffering from the depredations of both Scots and English.

After the Treaty of Durham, and as he gradually withdrew from his place in the King's Council, Langley became increasingly engaged in Anglo-Scottish relations. Indeed, in the seven years after his resignation of the Great Seal, his participation in Border diplomacy was his chief part in national affairs. On 14 July 1425, he was the first named of an embassy to discuss breaches of the truce and reparations. All those with complaints were told to come before the English commission at Berwick on 16 August. Langley visited

Holy Island on 12 August and Norham on 14 August. He was in Berwick for the negotiations. He was staying in the manse of the Rector of Berwick on 20 August, when he granted an indulgence for a Scottish chapel. He returned with John, Lord Scrope and William Alnwick. They wrote to the Council from Warkworth, on 23 August, complaining of the obstructive tactics of the Scottish representatives, who had refused to come to any conclusion without consulting their King. The English side of the dispute, concerning the bounds of the foraging areas of the garrisons of Roxburgh and Berwick had been presented, and Sir Robert Umfraville was sent to James for the same purpose: the result of this mission is unknown.

Cardinal Beaufort planned to meet King James to recruit Scottish aid for his Bohemian venture. On 1 December 1428, James was granted a safe-conduct to come to Durham or Newcastle before 1 May next. Actually, Beaufort met James at Coldingham early in 1429. He had visited the Prior of Durham, and, it would seem, Langley also. On 16 January, the Bishop appointed commission's to proclaim Beaufort's Crusade. He was then at Craik, where he had gone, presumably, to meet Beaufort. On 10 February, the Council granted the Cardinal its licence to meet James, to speak on affairs of the realm as well as those of the Church. On 15 February, however, a separate commission, again headed by Langley, was appointed to treat with James regarding the unpaid balance of his ransom, his hostages, breaches of the truce and also the prospects for its extension. Of these talks as well as of those between James and Beaufort, no record remains. In the same year, on 15 June, further embassies were appointed. One commission, of the Bishops of Durham and Carlisle, the Earls of Salisbury

and Northumberland, and six others, was to treat regarding
the ransom and hostages. In addition, a treaty of final peace,
possibly with a marriage alliance, or further truces, were to
be sought. The second delegation was smaller, but all its
members belonged to the larger mission. Langley was not a
member. Its object was the less important one of discussing
breaches of the truce. The Prior of Durham had excused
himself from attendance at the Black Monks' Chapter as he
wished to speak to this embassy, probably on behalf of
Coldingham. On 12 July, it met the Scottish representatives
at Hawdenstank. Articles for the better observation of the
truce, and reparations, were agreed upon. Langley was at
Norham on 13 July, but his mission was fruitless.

The English Council was becoming alarmed at the Scottish
situation. The "auld alliance" with France had been renewed
in 1428, and the truce was due to expire in 1431. The marriage
the Council had in mind as a means of securing peace was that
of Henry VI to a Scottish princess. An envoy from James had
informed the Council of his own desire for peace. Langley
and others received two commissions on 24 January 1430, both
similar to those of 15 June 1429. Their instructions referred
to the message of James' envoy to the Council. They were to
listen to the Scottish proposals for peace, but if none were
made, the English desire for a settlement was to be declared
in general terms. If the Scots wished for the marriage of
Henry to a Scottish princess, this would be agreeable, but
must not be determined upon until a treaty of peace was made,
although their offers for the marriage were to be heard. The

f. 159d. 5. Nic. IV 347-348. 6. Ibid. 19; C. Macrae: "The English
non-fulfilment of the conditions of James' release was to be broached, but deferment of the balance of the ransom might be allowed if this made the conclusion of a truce more likely. On 5 April, the English embassy wrote to James. His reply was brought to the Earl of Northumberland at Warkworth on 21 April. The Earl would not open the letter in the absence of his colleagues. The Scottish messenger then hastily retired. The Earl wrote to Langley to suggest that the commissioners should meet in Newcastle on 1 May. Langley, who was then at Lumley Castle, passed this message on to the Earl of Salisbury on 25 April. The meeting took place on 28 April, however, when a letter was sent to James to protest at the precipitate retreat of his envoy, which had prevented the arrangement of a meeting of representatives.

Despite this fiasco, the Council continued to press for peace. A further commission, Langley being one of the first member, was appointed on 15 November 1430, to negotiate on the same subjects as previously except for the marriage, of which no mention was made. Two of the embassy, Lord Scrope and Mr. John Stokes, went to Edinburgh, where a truce was agreed upon, on 15 December. It was to last for five years from the expiry of the current truce. Langley's participation in Border diplomacy now became more and more nominal. On 14 August 1432, he was asked by the Council to surrender various documents in his possession, including the Treaty of Troyes, but mostly relating to Border affairs. He was empowered to grant safe-conducts to Scots coming to England, on 7 June 1434. He was not one of the commission appointed

1. Nic. IV 18-27. 2. Macrae, in E.H.R. 1939, p. 418. Two letters printed in his "Appendix" (Nos. II & III, on pp. 423-424) were obviously written by Langley, although the writer's name is not given. They are dated 25 & 26 April, at Lumley Castle. Their tone indicates that the writer was one of the leaders of the embassy, and their content that he was neither of the Earls. Elimination leaves Langley. He was at Lumley Castle on 26 Apr. (Reg. f. 167d). 3. Foed. X 482-487. 4. Nic. IV 127-128. 5. Scot. II 287.
to treat for peace and on other subjects, in the same year. On 20 July 1435, he was appointed to an embassy to discuss the fulfilment of James' agreements at Durham in 1424, as well as to treat for an extension of the truce. Langley did not move from Stockton, leaving the business to his younger colleagues. When another embassy was appointed on 5 February 1436, he was not one of the stipulated quorum. Once more, he did not stir from his diocese.

During these last years, the Marches were still in a troubled state. Inhabitants continued to raid each other. Instructions by the Council to English commanders failed in their object, the preservation of the truce. Large bodies of Scots had plundered around Berwick and in Glendale during July 1435. The sessions of the Bishop's justices at Norham had to be adjourned in April 1432, April and September 1433 and March 1434. The greater part of Alnwick was burnt by the Scots. On 28 May 1435, commissions of array were issued in Durham. Although it was believed that the Scots were planning to invade in force, the orders were ignored and had to be repeated on 16 September. The lack of any feeling of urgency on the part of either the Bishop of his subjects suggests that this was a false alarm. In 1436, the situation was much more grave. The truce expired, and James' daughter was married to the Dauphin, despite the despatch of an English herald to dissuade him. James had decided to support France openly and assist his ally by invading England.

The sheriffs of the northern counties were told to call out the local forces to join the Wardens in resisting the Scots, on 27 June. A similar order was sent to the Bishop of

Durham: he did not appear to be very alarmed, for he waited for some six weeks after receiving this command before he issued his summons. The Archbishop of York, Bishops of Durham and Carlisle and Earl of Northumberland were at Durham on 25 July. The mayor of Berwick came to them to report the danger to the town, due to its being abandoned by its garrison. The Earl of Northumberland had recently been discharged from his captainship and the soldiers did not know who would pay them. The mayor was therefore charged to return to Berwick in all haste in order to bargain with the soldiers to stay, which he managed to do, at his own expense. That the mayor should have come to Durham to confer with this small body of notables suggests that they were known to be acting as a branch of the King's Council for the defence of the Marches; in fact, as a forerunner, presumably ad hoc only, of the Council of the North. On 6 August, these three prelates, with the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland, and four other northcountry magnates, were appointed to lead the men of northern England, including the Bishopric, against the Scots.

Fortunately, King James did not attack Berwick, where there was such "simple kepyng of the waethes", but Roxburgh. The lay members of the commission of defence were ordered, on 10 August, to defend Roxburgh. On 15 August, Langley's sheriff was told to proclaim that the men of Durham were to prepare to set out whenever required by these magnates. James was said to have led an enormous army against Roxburgh: the lowest contemporary estimate was one hundred thousand, the largest over double that figure. He had called out all men of military age. Their attacks were resisted by the

small garrison of Roxburgh, under the command of Sir Ralph Grey. The relieving army was led by the Earl of Northumberland. At its approach, the Scots fled, abandoning their artillery. There was unrest in their camp; in fact, the disaffection against James that led to his murder in the following year was the chief cause of England's bloodless defensive victory.\(^1\)

The Bishop of Durham was said to have been one of the leaders of the English army. His movements between 12 August and 10 September\(^2\), in which time Roxburgh was relieved, cannot be traced, but it is unlikely that a prelate of his extreme age would have taken part in military operations. The references to him no doubt indicate rather that his subjects formed part of the English army. The captain of Roxburgh, incidentally, was also his tenant. Throughout the years of his rule over Durham, the subjects of the Bishopric had been prominent in Border warfare. In two years when Henry V was engaged in the conquest of Normandy, Sir Robert Umfraville harried the Scottish March.

"And none helpe had but of his Countre men,
Of the bishopryke and of Northumberlande then."\(^3\)

Langley had been the leading diplomat in Anglo-Scottish relations for many years. The achievements of this English diplomacy had not been very satisfactory, a tale of making and ineffectively attempting to preserve truces. Langley's work in strengthening Norham Castle was, in effect, his most permanent contribution to the defence of the Marches.

---

CHAPTER VIII: THE DIOCESE OF DURHAM.

When Thomas Langley became Bishop of Durham, he was about forty-five years of age. He had held a number of benefices, but his interest in them was mostly financial. As Archdeacon of Norfolk, however, he had undertaken some of the responsibilities of ecclesiastical office: he conducted visitations of his archdeaconry, whereas his contemporaries preferred to have this done by deputy. Otherwise, his knowledge of Church affairs would have been confined to such matters as were brought to his notice in the course of his public duties, especially as Chancellor. He had not studied at an university, so that his knowledge of canon law would not have been extensive, although he would have become familiar with its functions. The practical ability that had taken Langley to the office of Chancellor and his experience of the ways of mankind were not spiritual qualities, but sure to have been of value in the supervision of a diocese.

(1) Diocesan Administration.

The Lancastrian episcopacy was notorious for its absenteeism, neglecting spiritual duties for secular business. Such is the character given to it by the censorious Thomas Gascoigne. Langley was thus no worse than his contemporaries in that he spent the greater part of his time in London, or elsewhere, on affairs of state. He was not, however, as constantly non-resident as some of his fellow-bishops. In only one year, 1419, did he fail to visit the diocese. He usually contrived to come on two occasions annually, in the summer and for Christmas. His longest period of absence was from October 1418 to August 1420, but it was exceptional. In the last ten years of his life, his absences were less frequent and generally shorter.

The routine of diocesan administration had by this time become sufficiently developed to function of its own accord. The long absences of a bishop gave rise to abuses, but as long as he made sure that the various administrative and judicial offices were held by men of ability and sound canonical training, he could feel certain that the machinery would operate without much danger of a breakdown. A second feature of ecclesiastical government, leading from the first, was that there was a class of clerks who specialised in administrative work. They formed, in fact, the Church's "permanent civil service". Some of these men found employment in episcopal households, but others resided and worked in the dioceses. They remained and continued to be given employment under succeeding bishops. Thus Langley's first two officials had both been ministers of his predecessor. The interesting career of Mr. William Doncaster was begun as an advocate in the Durham Consistory Court. He was also a notary-public. He was employed by the Prior of Durham, by the two archdeacons of the diocese and eventually by the Bishop; nor did any of these masters ever have a monopoly of his services. Men like Doncaster could only hope to pursue such a career when the system of administration was stabilised, but they in turn gave to the system its continuity.

The bishop's government was two-fold. Close at hand, in his household, was his secretariat, and, whenever he chose to constitute it, his court. Secondly, there were the local ministers in the diocese. Many of the duties of

---

an absentee bishop were delegated to his vicar-general in spiritualibus, but for the sacerdotal functions of the episcopal office, a suffragan bishop was employed. Archdeacons were no longer, by virtue of their office, ministers of the bishop, but they exercised a theoretically subordinate jurisdiction. The small diocese of Durham had two archdeacons, one for each of its counties of Durham and Northumberland. In addition, there were a number of jurisdictional peculiars. Hexhamshire lay directly under the Archbishop of York. The Prior of Durham claimed, and in Langley's day fully enjoyed, the position of archdeacon in all churches appropriated to his Convent in both counties. The archdeacons continued to contest these claims, but without avail. It is also apparent that the authority of the archdeacons was excluded from the churches in the gift of the Bishop of Durham, all of which lay in his temporal franchise. This exclusion was of recent origin, effected in the last decades of the fourteenth century, and it must be associated with the contemporary development of the office of sequestrator-general.

The bishop's secretariat, the office through which he exercised his control over the affairs of the diocese, was part of his household. The principal officer was the spiritual chancellor. Langley's chancellors were men of distinction. The first, Mr. Richard Holme, had served in the Papal Curia and in the households of bishops Waltham of Salisbury and Skirlawe of Durham. He was frequently engaged, even when in Langley's service, in embassies of Henry IV and Henry V to Scotland and France. His successor was Thomas Hebbeden, a man of knightly birth and a doctor of law. Finally, John Bonour was a doctor of canon law of the

---

To the spiritual chancellor was entrusted the bishop's seal *ad causas*. This was the instrument used for the sealing of all episcopal letters, copies of which were written in the bishop's register. The responsibility for keeping the register, however, rested with a registrar. There were two registrars in the diocese simultaneously: one was a permanent officer of the Consistory Court, the other resident in the bishop's household. Both registrars were notaries. The bishop needed to have at hand a clerk who could draw up properly attested instruments.

The register itself was the record of the official acta of the bishop. It could be referred to to ascertain earlier transactions, not only on the bishop's behalf, but also for other interested parties. It was intended to be a final record, to be preserved for all time, together with the registers of past bishops of the same diocese. It was therefore essential that the greatest care should be taken in its compilation, and this was why a notary was employed for this purpose. Unlike some contemporary registers, such as that of Archbishop Bowet of York, Langley's Register was not compiled with any regard for subject: the entries were not made under separate heads of subjects or archdeaconries, but all were entered in chronological order. There were some

---

1. John Bonour took this degree on 1 Sept. 1428 (R. J. Mitchell: "English Law Students at Bologna in the Fifteenth Century", in *R. H. R.* 1936, p. 271). References to J. Bonour in Reg. Langley before this date show him as a bachelor, and subsequently as a doctor (ff. 134, 158).

2. Only the former registrars have their appointments recorded in the Register (see p. 231, note 6, infra), but the household notaries are occasionally described as registrars, e.g. Thomas Jobur, who served in this capacity between 1427 & 1437 (Appendix H(iv) p. 335; Reg. ff. 134, 225d, 231d, 248d & 254).

3. Langley certified to having seen the registers of Bishops Bek (1284-1311), Fordham (1382-1388) and Skirlawe (1388-1406). (None of these survive). He was at Auckland on all occasions (Appendix H(iii) p. 333; Reg. ff. 41, 25).

4. Langley cited having seen the registers of Bishops Bek (1284-1311), Fordham (1382-1388) and Skirlawe (1388-1406). (None of these survive). He was at Auckland on all occasions (Appendix H(iii) p. 333; Reg. ff. 41, 25).
exceptions to this rule: five ordination services by his suffragan, held between 19 December 1410 and 6 June 1411, were recorded in the Register after the acta up to 13 November 1411. There was a similar delay in entering records of ordinations between 19 December 1411 and 24 September 1412. The delays are to be accounted for by the Bishop's absences from the diocese. He carried the Register with him. All Langley's episcopal acta were not recorded, and entries that did not concern him as ordinary, but were rather of personal interest, were made, as were some items concerning him as Chancellor. Most of his Register, as of that kept by his vicar-general, Thamas Lyes, was written in a "Privy Seal hand".

A few reports of legal proceedings before the Bishop are recorded in the Register. These are instances of the exercise by the Bishop of his "gracious" jurisdiction. The "court" for this purpose seems to have been somewhat informal. These

proceedings took place in that one of his manors in which the Bishop happened to be residing, that is, in his diocese. He delegated this judicial power to his vicar-general while absent. Most of the cases shown were of matrimonial disputes. Langley occasionally delegated such cases to commissions. More purely ecclesiastical matters were also brought to his notice. On 5 February 1433, at Auckland, he gave judgement concerning the fraudulent resignation of a benefice. A suit regarding the carrying of consecrated water in the parish of Lanchester was entrusted to a commission. Once, Langley had before him a Carmelite friar accused of heresy, heard his confession and received his submission. On these occasions there were always a number of *jurisperiti* at hand. These were the ecclesiastical lawyers, of whom there seems to have been a fair number in Durham. Although they did not all hold office under the Bishop, they were given the richest benefices in his gift, generally resided in the diocese, and were appointed to penitentiary commissions. In so far as Langley had a council for diocesan affairs, they were its members.

The local organisation of the diocese centred on the Consistory Court, which, in Durham, was held in the Galilee Chapel of the Cathedral. Here sat the official-principal, to dispense justice according canon law. The registrar of the

1. Reg. ff. 39, 56 & 71. 2. Ibid 200. 3. Ibid 102. 4. Ibid 119; printed in Depositions and Ecclesiastical Proceedings (S.S. 1845) pp. 21-23. 5. E.g. A penitentiary commission for the Archdeaconry of Durham, 8 Mar. 1435, was composed of Stephen Howden, Subprior of Durham; Richard Barton, monk of Durham; T. Lyes, B. Dec., R. of Wearmouth (Vicar-general); T. Hebbeden, LL. D., Dean of Auckland (spiritual chancellor); George Radcliffe, D. Can. L., R. of Sedgefield; Wm. Doncaster, LL. B., Official; Ric. Penymaister, B. Theol., R. of Haughton-le-Skerne; Wm. Blackburn, LL. B., R. of Stanhope; and J. Lythom, LL. B., R. of Gateshead (sequestrator in Durham) (Reg. f. 218). B. Robert Berall, appointed 11 Apr. 1408 (Appendix H(i) p. 33.) was described by the Official as *scribam nostrum in eadem (curia)*, in 1419 (D. 1. 3. Pontificales 8; Cartulary III f. 281; Scr. Temp. App. pp. 209-209) The Bishop's attendant registrar at the time of Berall's appointment was T. Lyes, so described on 26 June 1408 (Reg. f. 13d).
court attended to supervise the making of its records, which the court itself kept. It was thus only when the Official had to appeal to the Bishop that any traces of the court's activities made their way into the episcopal register. For instance, the Bishop had to cite Margaret Merley to appear in the Consistory Court: she had been suspended from attendance at church for ignoring a summons by the Official. On another occasion, the Official informed Langley that John Rat of Newcastle had been excommunicated, yet refused to submit. Langley therefore wrote to the King to invoke the secular arm. The position of the episcopal courts with regard to the inhabitants of the County of Durham was much stronger. The Bishop, as ordinary, had merely to write to himself, as secular ruler, to command the sheriff to seize an excommunicated person. Action could thus be taken quickly. Thus ten days after the sheriff had been ordered to arrest Marion Story, it was reported that she had submitted, and the Bishop was therefore asked to release her from prison.

The best evidence for the activity of the Consistory Court is to be found in the records of the Prior and Convent. On 23 July 1415, the Official gave judgement in their favour against Thomas de Blakston, in a suit they had brought for non-payment of tithes of coal. Sentence was given for the Convent on 10 January 1419, in a suit against a parishioner of Bywell St. Andrew, who was shown to have refused to pay tithes on two hundred sheep. The defendant gave notice of appeal to York, but failed to lodge it in the term given.

1. Reg.f.14/4. 2.ibid III; Chancery Significations of Excommunication,File 199,no.11. 3. D.Reg.III, f.80. For an invocation of the secular arm of the Palatinate by the Archbishop of York, see Reg.Langley f.70. 4. D.Cartuariium Evidenciarum Communarii,f.51. 5. D.Cartulary IV,ff.33d-34.
Fees were paid for litigation. In 1419-1420, the sacrist of the Convent paid 3s.4d. for a sentence against the Abbot of Blanchland. In 1436-1437, the almoner paid 2s. to William Berhalgh, the registrar of the Court, for making an instrument for the recovery of tithes of coal at Fulforth, and 2s. to William Doncaster, the Official, for attaching his seal to the instrument. 2s. was paid to the Official in 1414-1415 for a letter of excommunication. At the instance of the Prior, the Official issued a monition, on 4 March 1432, against unknown persons who had stolen goods from the Master of Parne. At times the Official might be asked to have a copy made of a document. Thus an exemplification of the (fraudulent) charter of Bishop William I was made in the Court on 12 February 1419, to which the Official attached his seal in testimony, and on which William Doncaster, then an advocate of the Court, and Robert Berall, the registrar, made their notarial marks.

The Official's commission empowered him to act in proceedings brought about by the exercise of his office, or at the instance of parties. According to canon law, the bishop should have held a visitation of his diocese every three years. This rule was no longer observed, but a major object of visitations, investigations into misdemeanours by clergy and people, was adequately catered for by the system of church courts. The Consistory Court was the centre to which various local ministers sent reports of crima et excessus. Rural deans and incumbents would inform the Official of alleged offences. It was also open to individuals to denounce suspected persons. An example of this activity is afforded by a notarial instrument of 6 March 1431. On that day, four

---

chaplains and three male and two female parishioners met in Gateshead Church, to make charges against John Bolton, lately curate of that church. He was accused of incontinence, spending the night in taverns and abusing the confessional office. The notary examined the parishioners and recorded their evidence. This report was presumably sent to the Official.

The operations of the sequestrator-general also ensured that a close watch was kept over the behaviour of the clergy and people of the diocese. A sequestrator was appointed for each archdeaconry. Duties arising from sequestrations accounted for only a fraction of his activities. He was also given powers to grant probate of wills and exercise other testamentary jurisdiction in respect of all persons except nobles and knights, and their wives and widows. Further, he had to collect all pensions due to the bishop from churches of the archdeaconry. The sequestrator made account for his receipts annually, at Michaelmas. It is worthy of note that sequestrators were usually appointed about this time.

The similarity with the terms of service of sheriff is accounted for by the fact that the pensions from churches were paid to the Receiver-General of the Palatinate, whose year of account ended at Michaelmas. The account rendered by a sequestrator

1. Loelesius, 19, no. 18. 2. Appendix
3. Recorded appointments of sequestrators:
   (i) Archdeaconry of Durham:
      21 Sept. 1408 - William Tert (Reg.f. 25d).
      3 Sept. 1411 - Ralph Steel, L.L.B. (ibid 49).
      6 Feb. 1417 - Robert More (ibid 91).
   (ii) Archdeaconry of Northumberland:
      18 Sept. 1410 - John Brigg (ibid 34d).
      31 Mar. 1435 - John Burn (Appendix K[i], p. 14).

The deaths of sequestrators account for appointments of their successors at times other than about Michaelmas.

4. D. Rec.-General 4 Bordham, mm 3 & 4d. For the confusion of episcopal and Palatine finance, see p. 171 supra.
for Northumberland during the vacancy of the see, from 25 April to 24 August, shows the extent of his operations. He accounted for the receipt of probate charges and fines for incontinence by laymen. In his four months of office, the sequestrator had made six circuits of the whole county and two of Newcastle. The sequestrator's duties were certainly onerous. In addition, he was frequently required to perform other tasks, such as holding inquests into delapidations of churches, inducting new incumbents and supervising the purgation of diffamed persons.

The operations of the sequestrators must have made considerable inroads into the sphere of archidiaconal jurisdiction. They were, moreover, ministers of the bishop, and would thus have been in a strong position against the Archdeacons. The Archdeacons of Durham and Northumberland were generally absentee, leaving their responsibilities to officials. At one time, the ubiquitous William Doncaster was the official of both Archdeacons. The only notice of any judicial activity by either of these Archdeacons in the Bishop's Register is an inhibition to the official of the Archdeacon of Northumberland, who was prosecuting a woman for an offence of which she had purged herself in the presence of the Bishop's Official. Occasionally, Langley would direct certain commissions to an Archdeacon, or his official, but there is little trace of their operations. There is more evidence of the activity of the Prior of Durham, as archdeacon in the appropriated churches. Visitations were made by his commissioners, of the Convent's churches in Northumberland in 1409, 1417 and 1422, and in Durham in 1433 and 1434. Two monks of Durham visited Billingham in 1418 or 1419. No

doubt, archidiaconal visitations were made fairly regularly. The court of the Prior, as archdeacon, was held in the church of St. Oswald's, Durham. An official was employed for this work: William Doncaster once numbered this office among his occupations. A record of the court's proceedings from 1435 to 1456 survives.

As Langley spent so much of his time outside the diocese, his vicars-general were almost constantly active. The vicars kept their own records. The first entries in the first of the Registra Parva of the Priors of Durham record some of the acta of Prior John Hemmingburgh as Langley's vicar-general. For the first eight years of Langley's episcopate, most of the vicars' records are missing, but those from 1414 onwards survive; they have been bound together with the Bishop's own Register. One of Langley's vicars-general, Thomas Lyes, Dean of Auckland, held this office for nearly twenty years. He was first commissioned to act with a colleague on 8 October 1416, but three years later, when this partner was dead, he continued to act, alone. Although Langley resided in the diocese a score of times during Lyes' period of office, only one further commission is recorded, in April 1432. It would appear that a new commission was not necessary for every time the bishop was absent: Lyes' activities as vicar ceased when Langley was in the diocese and recommenced after he departed. The range of the vicar-general's work covered almost the whole field of episcopal activities.

Langley also had a suffragan bishop continually in his employment. The first was Oswald, styled Bishop of

---

Whithorn, a see in partibus infidelium during the Schism. The other three were bishops of Irish sees. One of them, Robert Foston, Bishop of Elphin, a minorite friar, was deprived by the Pope for non-residence, but was permitted to adopt the style of "bishop in the universal church". Both he and Oswald obtained papal dispensations to hold benefices, obviously necessary for their support, and these they received in Durham. The task of the suffragan was to carry out the bishop's sacerdotal duties, principally in the ordination of clergy, but also to bestow the episcopal benediction on the newly elected heads of religious houses, to consecrate churches, graveyards, and the like. The inferior position held by the suffragan may be illustrated from the case of the benediction of a new Abbot of Alnwick in 1437. A canon of the house came to Langley at Auckland, to explain that for various reasons, including the dangers of the road owing to Scottish raids, the Abbot could not come to receive Langley's blessing. So it was sought that the Bishop of Dromore should be sent to Alnwick, to give his benediction there. Langley agreed, and sent his unfortunate suffragan to brave the attacks of the enemy.

(ii) Langley as Bishop.

While the Bishop of Durham had under him a well-knit system for the supervision of his diocese, much still depended upon him alone for the well-being of its religious

1. Appointed 3 Nov. 1406. He had been Skirlaw's suffragan. (Reg. ff. 16 & 25).
3. He was probably the same as the Robert Foston who was a member of the minorite house at Hartlepool in 1408 (ibid 10d). 4. Ibid 172; C.P.L.VIII 175. 5. Oswald held the Hospital of Friarside, near Consett (Reg. f. 99d). Foston was Rector of Kimblesworth from 3 Sept. 1430 (ibid 172). For payments by the Receiver-General to both suffragans, see Hutchinson: History of Durham Vol. I, pp. 332 & 335. 6. Reg. f. 247.
life. In no way could his influence be brought to bear more closely than through the method of personal visitation. Thus only could he see for himself how matters stood in the various parishes of his diocese. Langley's record in this respect is not good. Presumably he relied almost entirely upon his local ministers to watch over the people in his charge. In this, he was no worse than most contemporary bishops. Even in visitations, he often delegated his responsibilities to commissions. Their appointment, however, shows that he was aware of the need for reform in certain quarters, and wished to remedy abuses. Records of visitations, whether by Langley or his deputies, are regrettably scanty. Such as do remain show that measures were taken to correct the defects that were discovered.

On 28 June 1408, Langley sent to the Archdeacon of Durham his citation of visitation. Certificates of acknowledgment were to be laid before him by 24 July. On 23 July, he visited the Convent of Durham. Shortly afterwards, the visitation of the Archdeaconry was commenced. He was at Auckland on 23 and 27 July, Stanhope on 10 August, Darlington on 14 August and 20 September, and back at Auckland on 22 and 23 September, before his return to London. Much was found to be amiss, for many fines were imposed: they were to be paid into the building funds of the Cathedral and other churches. Many of the fines had not been paid by the end of the year, when a commission was appointed for their collection. While at Norton, Langley observed the ruinous condition of the chancel, and ordered each canon to pay 40s. to its repair. The visitation was not completed, but was continued three years later. The citation was issued on 22 June, the returns ordered for 4 July. Langley went to

Sherburn on 6 July, was at Auckland on 31 July, Stockton on 8 August and again at Auckland on 24 August. By 3 September, he was on his way to London. He found cause for complaint at Sedgefield and Staindrop, where markets were held on Sundays. On 16 April 1412, he issued monitions against this practice. The people of Sedgefield were unaffected by the censure: the monition was repeated in 1430. Indeed, this was an offence of long standing: Bishop de Bury forbade Sunday markets at Sedgefield in 1344. The amount of time spent by Langley in this visitation of his County Palatine—four months—indicates that he was conscientious: other prelates were more hasty. This was his only full-scale visitation, although he did appoint a commission, on 8 September 1435, to make enquiries into the behaviour of the clergy of the diocese.

The only other visitation Langley is recorded as making in person was of the nunnery of Neasham. A commission was appointed for this purpose, but the injunctions show that Langley as well as his commissioners had made the visitation, on 12 October 1436. These injunctions showed that all the canonical hours were not being observed; the house lacked a suitable confessor; there was scandal-mongering and ill feeling among the nuns; secular persons were permitted to pass the night in the convent; nuns slept outside the dormitory and ate outside the refectory; the prioress and nuns did not spend their spare time profitably; and some of the buildings needed repair. The injunctions were not fully obeyed. Consequently, a second commission to visit Neasham was appointed. As a result, the prioress

resigned on 10 August 1437. On 10 November, two nuns, as proctors of the convent, appeared before Langley, at Auckland. A third nun, whom the others had postulated as their new prioress, also came. Langley asked her if she was willing to undertake the office. She consented, whereon the Bishop told his spiritual chancellor to make her a dispensation for incontinence, to which she had confessed.

There are indications of Langley making informal visitations while travelling through the diocese. Thus when he went to Berwick to meet Scottish ambassadors in 1425, he visited Holy Island on his way there. He issued monitions against the unknown thieves of animals belonging to two of its parishioners. On his return, he granted an indulgence for a chapel at Belford, which he had possibly found ruinous. When at Norham four years later, he noticed that the church of Carham needed repair, which he ordered. In 1432, he issued a citation for the visitation of Gainford, where he was so much troubled by the poaching of his game. Langley later proposed to visit the collegiate church and parish of Darlington, on 31 May 1434. As he was at Auckland that day and at Stockton from 4 June, it is likely that he carried out the visitation, as he would have passed through Darlington.

Other local visitations were conducted by commissions. In 1415, a commission was appointed to visit Newcastle and the Hospital of West Spital on 14 September. One of its acts was the suspension for one year of a priest. The master of the hospital was not in residence, which the commissioners ordered him to resume. The master, William Carlisle, was an unsatisfactory person. He had been excommunicated by Bishop

---

1. Reg.ff. 254-255. 2. ibid. 127. 3. ibid 128d. 4. ibid 159d. 5. ibid 187d. 6. See p.186 supra. 7. Reg.f. 210d. 8. ibid 210d, 211. 9. ibid 73d. 10. ibid 78d. 11. ibid 73d.
Mi Skirlawe in 1398. He had been elected in 1412, when there was only one other canon. His administration was badly regulated. A fresh commission was appointed to visit the hospital, and it was sequestrated. A week after the second visitation, on 25 February 1417, Carlisle "freely resigned" his office. Langley brought in a canon of Newburgh to succeed him. A similar result followed from visitations of the hospital at Gateshead. A commission visited it in 1421, and a second was appointed for 27 March 1431. The master, John Walkington, was removed from his position and a successor collated on 29 January 1432. On 13 May, Langley wrote to William Swan, who was in Rome. He explained that Walkington had failed to repair the buildings, while his way of life was incorrigible. The Bishop's commissioners had expelled him and sequestrated the hospital. A new master had been appointed. It was rumoured that Walkington had gone to Rome, but Langley did not know whether he had lodged an appeal. He asked Swan to find out whether Walkington intended to bring a suit against the Bishop or his ministers. Swan was finally asked to take such measures as he thought expedient. Swan consequently obtained a bull appointing the Prior of Durham and the Treasurer of York to find out why Walkington had not made his appeal within one year of his deprivation. Here the matter ended: the new incumbent remained in possession until he exchanged the hospital for another benefice in 1436.

The visitation of Kepler Hospital by commission in 1436 ended more happily: the master received a full acquittance for his administration. The visitation of the church of

Iglingham, a church appropriated to the Convent, in 1430(1), was followed by protracted litigation. Shortly after the visitation, some parishioners brought a suit against the vicar in the Consistory Court, alleging that he refused to pay the stipend of a curate who should have been maintained in the chapel at Brandon, in the parish. Judgement was given against the vicar, William Bamburgh, who then appealed to Rome. Langley wrote to William Swan about this on 14 January 1432. He had learnt that Swan was approrctor of the parishioners, whose cause he commended. Swan was asked to try to have the case delegated to the Archbishop or another person in the diocese of York. The Pope then referred the appeal to the Prior of Durham. The cause was heard in the Cathedral on 9 January 1433. The vicar was present, but refused to accept the Prior as judge. He was called to appear again on 16 January, when he made many derisory remarks against the Prior. He again withdrew, and was excommunicated. Bamburgh had already, on 12 April 1432, been ordered to resume residence in his vicarage. Despite this warning, he remained absent and farmed the issues. On 28 February 1436, Langley ordered the issue of a formal monition that he was to return. Here the story seems to end. It is remarkable that Bamburgh had not been deprived earlier, for his contumacy as well as his non-residence.

The activities of the Bishop and his ministers would have been of little avail had not the churches been provided

1. By the Bishop's commission. Reg.f.167. 2. Cleop.C.IV,p.161. 3. Bull dated 4 July 1432.D.1.3.Papales 5;Cartulary III,f.195. 4. The account of these proceedings (D.Misc.Charter 2613) is one of the more amusing medieval records I have seen. The vicar was rather a cantankerous person. He had with him one William Kerby notarium suum....qui in veritate, ut dicitur, notarius non existit, whom he dragged away with him, the first time he left the court. The second time, Bamburgh's name was called two or three times ante voluit respondere, quavis non longe asset et audiret satis bene, tandem alune stans et vix appropinquare dedignans, vociferando quasi derisoria,dixit:"Quid vultis ?" 5. Reg.f.189. 6. Ibid 224d & 228d.
with suitable incumbents. The Bishop was the most
considerable patron in the Palatinate. He had in his gift
over a score of rich benefices, deaneries of collegiate
churches, custodianships of hospitals and rectories. In
addition, there was double that number of prebends in the five
churches of Auckland, Lanchester, Chester-le-Street, Norton
and Darlington. Langley's first charge was to reward his
ministers of both the diocese and secular administration.
King's clerks, men whom Langley had under him or had met while
in royal service, together with a few relatives of Langley's
influential acquaintances, also received his patronage. There
was no instance of a papal provision during his episcopate.
Henry V claimed to present to the Archdeaconry of Durham when
he nominated Robert Gilbert: Langley ordered an inquest. Its
report is not recorded, but as Gilbert remained Archdeacon
until 1425, the King's title was admitted. The previous
Archdeacons had been Thomas Weston, who had served Skirlawe
and Langley; John Hovingham, prothonotary of Chancery, but
who had also performed some duties in the diocese; John
Kemp, subsequently Chancellor and Archbishop; and, after
Gilbert, Robert Rolleston, Keeper of the Great Wardrobe. The
Archdeaconry of Northumberland was similarly disposed.

1. For examples, see Appendix E passim, p.299. 2. William
Kinwolmarsh. See p.109 supra. 3.e.g. Robert Neville. See
p.179 supra. 4.Reg.f.106. Presented 24 Mar.1419. (Also
shown in Catalogue des Rolles Gascons, etc., ed.T.Carte(1753),
Vol.II,p.397). The King had to send Langley two "reminders"
before the inquisition was ordered. 5.Reg.f.127d. Gilbert
became Bishop of London. 6.Appendix D, p.211. 7.Appointed
1409 (Reg.f.28). He enquired into and received the resignation
of the prioress of a convent in Newcastle in 1413; was one of
the visitors of West Spital in 1417; and was appointed to
the penitentiary commission in that year (ibid.55d,65d,5bld & 94d).
9.ibid 97. Also canon of Norton (ibid 99). 10.127d.He had
been in the Privy Seal Office under Langley (see p.13 supra).
The only other notable patron was the Prior and Convent of Durham. Most of its benefices had been appropriated, so that few of its churches could be regarded as valuable to their incumbents. The remaining churches of the diocese were mostly appropriated to other religious houses, but there were still a few rectories. Most were in the gift of laymen and several lay in northern Northumberland. In most churches, the duties were performed by deputies, vicars in the case of appropriated churches or curates on behalf of rectors. Langley's ministers were employed locally, but their offices prevented them from giving their full time to their churches. The class of clergy exercising the cure of souls was thus one of stipendiary priests. On the whole, none of them had received any university education, and most were local men, ordained in the diocese. There is little indication of clergy coming into the diocese to accept vicarages, curacies or chantries. The North of England, exposed as it was to Scottish raids, was not attractive to southerners. The supply of ordinands in the diocese of Durham was therefore of prime importance. It has been observed that large numbers of priests were ordained during this period, so that there was no difficulty in filling any vacancies. This was not the case in Durham, where the average number of secular priests ordained annually was only ten. At times, it was necessary to compel chaplains to serve in certain churches.

1. A. Hamilton Thompson: The English Clergy, p. 143. 2. Langley's Register shows a total of 463 priests ordained during his episcopate, of whom 190 were members of religious orders, the remaining 273 being secular clergy. Allowing for 25 ordinations that are not recorded (only 130 out of a possible 155 -i.e. 5 p.a. in 31 years - are shown), a total of 320 secular priests is obtained. 3. Priests were pressed to serve at Auckland in 1416 (Reg. 79d); Lanchester 1417 (ibid 283d); Wearmouth 1417 (ibid 287d); Darlington 1425 (ibid 128d); Whitburn 1431 (ibid 179); Gateshead 1432 (ibid 193); and Auckland 1432 (ibid 199d).
in Parliament in 1402, 1414 and 1419, showing that the scale of stipends fixed by the statute of 36 Edward III was not being observed, indicate that the shortage of priests was more general.

The absenteeism of beneficed clergy was a common abuse. Apart from the Vicar of Eglingham, only three cases occur in Langley's Register. In 1411, the Rector of Boldon was ordered to reside: the Bishop had learnt that he was going on a pilgrimage and had farmed his revenues. John Burgeys, Dean of Chester-le-Street, was a notorious offender. Bishop Skirlawe had warned him to resume residence in 1404. He had, however, obtained a papal licence to be absent for the duration of his life, in 1405. On 22 March 1414, Langley issued a monition, threatening to sequestrate the Deanery unless Burgeys returned to it. Burgeys appealed to the Court of York, but as he did not appear on the appointed day, 13 June, his appeal was dismissed, and an order inhibiting the sequestration was annulled. Langley promptly ordered the sequestration. Burgeys proposed to appeal to Rome, but Langley forestalled him and had the indulg for non-residence revoked. This final measure had not time to take effect, for Burgeys died three months later. Another absentee Dean, William Pelleson, of Lancaster, was ordered to reside by the vicar-general, on 18 November 1417. Pelleson had anticipated trouble, however, and made his escape by a

2. Reg.f.44d.  
3. D.Locellus 17, no.3. Skirlawe had removed Burgeys from his office of master of Sherburn Hospital on account of his bad administration (C.P.R.1401-1405, p.475). He had been Bishop Fordham's treasurer of the household (Rec.Gen.4 Fordham m.5d). Perhaps he had followed his master to Ely.  
4. C.P.L.V 555.  
5. Reg.f.67.  
6. ibid 259.  
8. Probate of his will was granted on 24 Apr.1415 (Reg.f.70).
timely exchange with the rector of a church in York. He had doubtless been impressed by Langley's success against Burgeys, but the effect on the practice of non-residence generally was only temporary. In 1438, it was reported to the keeper of the spiritualities that eighteen rectors and vicars of the diocese were absent from their benefices.

Langley showed particular concern for the three greater collegiate churches of County Durham, Auckland, Lanchester, and Chester-le-Street. The canons were mostly absenteeees, and failed to provide suitable, if any, deputies. In 1410, the three deans were ordered to warn the canons to remedy this state of affairs. In the course of his visitation, Langley had learnt that the founder's statutes for Lanchester were not being observed. Consequently, at the request of the Dean, ministers and parishioners, he commanded that if any absent canond failed to maintain a vicar, the revenues that should have been devoted to this purpose were to be paid, half to the fabric of the church, half amongst the other ministers.

In 1429, the Bishop had learnt that four farmers of prebends were ignoring this ordinance, and they were called to the Consistory Court to answer for their neglect. Five years later, the Dean of Lanchester and the Sequestrator were authorised to admonish any absentee canons, or their farmers, who did not keep vicars, and also disobeyed Langley's decree. They were empowered to sequestrate the prebends whenever necessary, and cause offenders to appear in a church court.

The prebends of Chester-le-Street had been sequestrated in 1408, as their buildings had become ruinous. No impression

---

was made on the canons, who received a further monition in April 1415. The warning was ignored. Two months later, Langley wrote that he had learnt and seen for himself that no canon of Chester was in residence, divine service was neglected and no hospitality given. The prebends were therefore sequestrated for a second time.

The condition of collegiate churches received criticism from Thomas Gascoigne. He suggested that founders should have decreed that if any member of a foundation accepted a licence to absent himself, he should be deprived. Langley had already come to a similar conclusion. While at Lanchester and Chester-le-Street, he had tried to enforce the existing statutes, with the promulgation of an additional ordinance at the first, he reformed the College of Auckland. One of the causes of abuse there was that the original values of the prebends had altered, so that some were too poor to afford adequate salaries for vicars. On 20 March 1428, Langley ordered an inquisition into the annual values of the prebends. Then on 20 September following, the gave the college its new statutes. The richer prebends were divided, the poorer merged. Vicars' stipends were prescribed and the Dean authorized to sequestrate the prebend of any canon who failed to pay his vicar. Langley's experience with collegiate churches bore fruit when he drew up the statutes for the new college of Manchester. These were so framed that the fellows were obliged to reside continuously. Langley was successful in this object, for the Master and fellows were residing there at the time of the Reformation.

The condition of hospitals during this period was...
generally unsatisfactory. It was the subject of complaints in Parliament in 1414 and 1416. The King replied that the bishops had undertaken to provide remedies. Langley's proceedings against the masters of the hospitals of West Spital and Gateshead were taken after these petitions had been presented. Sherburn Hospital, a twelfth century foundation, was held for sixteen years by John Newton, one of Langley's most trusted ministers. In 1429, a commission was appointed to enquire into reported delapidations, grants of corrodiés and similar wastage of the Hospital's revenues during the time that Newton was Master. In fact, Newton was not the first to abuse his trust. His predecessor, Alan Newark, had in 1409 leased some of the Hospital's lands for a period of forty seven years, and the previous Master had been removed for maladministration. Langley received the Pope's licence to make new statutes. The depletion of the revenues made this necessary. Bishop Pudsey provided for sixty five lepers; Langley for only two lepers and thirteen poor men. This reduction was made possible by the great fall in the incidence of leprosy in the later Middle Ages. Langley also made rules for the government of the Hospital and the observance of divine services. This statute, dated 22 July 1134, remained in force until the nineteenth century.

Commissions to enquire into reports of delapidations were all too common. Sometimes Langley ordered repairs under paid of suspension, as in 1429, when the parishioners of Pittington were told to repair their belfry. The Pope had been told of the wastage of the property of the Archdeaconry of Durham by the negligence of Robert Gilbert. The chantry.

---

of "Le Close," at Heddon-on-the-Wall was utterly wasted by its patron. Mr. William Brown, Dean of Lanchester, complained to the Bishop of the deterioration of the Deanery's property in the time of his three predecessors. An inquest was taken, when it was estimated that £44 would hardly suffice to make good the damage done to the Dean's house and other buildings held by his tenants. It is probable that some new incumbents sought an inquisition for defects as a matter of course, to safeguard themselves. Thomas Hebbeden, who became Dean of Auckland on 29 December 1431, alleged that there were dilapidations dating from the time of his predecessor, Thomas Lyes. The ensuing inquisition, taken on 16 April 1432, fully exonerated Lyes. There were some trifling defects in a few buildings, but it was estimated that he had spent £229 5s. 2d. on repairs to the Deanery and £100 in food for workmen. The manse of the chapel of St. Helen could have been repaired for a little cost, yet he had it wholly rebuilt. It was shown that Lyes had been Dean for sixteen years, and had given hospitality there continuously.

Thus if some churches had been allowed to become ruinous, there were also some new building. Langley himself set a magnificent example in Durham, and his vicar-general Lyes had seconded him. Not only the Deanery of Auckland, but also the collegiate church had been extensively repaired, the latter by Langley. A number surprisingly large, of new foundations testifies to the strength of conventional religious feeling in Langley's day. The Bishop founded a chantry in the Galilee Chapel, the two chaplains of which were to teach grammar and song to poor children free of charge. This foundation was the origin of the present Durham School. Ralph Neville, Earl of

Westmorland, erected the church of Staindrop into a college for decayed gentlemen, in 1412. A Newcastle merchant, Roger Thornton, founded an hospital there in the same year. Chantries were established in the churches of St. Nicholas and St. Mary in the North Bailey, Durham; in Sir Robert Umfraville's manor of Fernacres; and in churches in Newcastle and Gateshead. Lands were granted to existing chantries at Sedgefield, Auckland and Durham. Some of Langley's secular ministers founded the Guild of Corpus Christi in St. Nicholas, Durham.

On the other hand, only one case of heresy is recorded, and its nature was not very serious. The most common abuses in Langley's diocese were absenteeism and neglect by a number of the clergy, and he took considerable care to attempt to remedy them, especially in the hospitals and collegiate churches. Despite his long absences, Langley was a vigorous, conscientious Bishop, and the ministers he chose were of like...

1. Langley's licence to found the college and for it to be a corporate body was granted on 1 Nov., 1408 and confirmed by the King on 28 Nov. (C.P.R. 1408-1413, p. 35; Monasticon VI 1401). The appropriation of the church to the college was made on 18 Apr., 1412 (Reg. f. 55). 2. C.P.R. 1408-1413, p. 412. 3. In 1408, by John Cokyn, Dean of Lanchester (Rot. A. mm. 2 & 3; D. Reg. III f. 150). 4. By John Belasyse, Esq., in 1418 (Rot. B. m. 15). The jurors at Hartlepool took exception to this foundation, and wrongly said that the Bishop's licence was given in 1424 (See p. 194 supra). 5. The royal licence for Umfraville to grant Langley the title to present to the future chantry was given in 1427 (C.P.R. 1422-1429, p. 454). The Bishop's licence for the foundation was given on 20 Mar., 1429 (Rot. E. m. 18). The advowsons were given to Langley on 7 Sept. (C.C.R. 1429-1435, p. 27). Confirmation of this was made in 1437 (C.P.R. 1436-1441, p. 53). The statutes of the chantry are given). 6. By a number of citizens, in 1406 (C.P.R. 1405-1408, p. 262). 7. By John Dolfanby, a native of Gateshead, in 1421 (Rot. E. m. 6a). 8. By Wm. Hoton of Herdwick, Steward of the Prior, in 1435 (Rot. C. m. 9.). 9. By Wm. Doncaster, then Dean, in 1437 (ibid 13). 10. By Wm. Holylobe, chaplain, and Wm. Raket (keeper of the rolls in the temporal chancery), in 1428 (Rot. E. m. 18). 11. By Wm. Chancellor, Ric. Bakley, T. Tange, Robert Jackson & Wm. Raket, in 1436 (Rot. C. m. 11). 12. A Carmelite friar of Newcastle, Wm. Boston, had preached against the making of gifts of candles in parish churches at Purification (Reg. ff. 111 & 119).
calibre. By his reforms, especially at Auckland and Sherburn, he left his influence, just as in the Galilee Chapel he left his memorial, in the diocese he ruled for 31 Years.

(iii) The Priors and Convent of Durham.

The Prior stood in a twofold relationship to the Bishop of Durham: firstly, he was one of the foremost magnates of the Palatinate; and secondly, he was the head of the largest religious house in the diocese. The Lollard scheme for the disendowment of bishoprics and convents mooted in the Parliament of 1410, put the annual value of the lands of the Bishop and Prior of Durham at 20,000 marks. This was, of course, a gross exaggeration, yet it does reflect a contemporary opinion of the wealth of Durham. The Convent's revenues were not as great as they had been. The rents received from its lands had fallen seriously since the reign of Edward I. Receipts from this source in 1293 had been nearly £1,500. After 1350, and until 1430, the average annual receipts were only £400. The revenues from Coldingham and churches in Scotland were lost, and those from lands in northern Northumberland cut to a fraction, by reason of the wars with Scotland. Even in County Durham, rents had fallen by half: one of the causes was that lands were being converted to pasture. In 1436, the total had fallen to £353. As not all the Yorkshire estates were included in this figure, nor other, spiritual, sources, the total is not complete. Yet that the Convent had suffered grave impoverishment is obvious. In 1372, it was said that the total number of monks had fallen by one third, to fifty six.

Even so, the Convent could still be considered prosperous in Langley's time. Its income was now steady.

This was reflected in the number of monks. Fifty six monks were present at Langley's election in 1406. Ten years later, the figure was sixty nine. On 27 January 1438, when the full Chapter met to elect Langley's successor, fifty three monks were present, eleven represented by proxy and nine absent in the cells of the Convent, a total of seventy three. In the thirty years that John Wessington was Prior, a total of £6,123 8s.7d. was spent on repairs of the Cathedral, the buildings of the Convent and its other property. In the same period, the Convent sacrificed any additional revenue it might have gained by the appropriation of its church at Hemmingburgh, in Howdenshire, by its erection, in 1426, into a college for a warden, three canons, six vicars and six clerks. The warden was to receive £40 p.a., and each canon ten marks. That the Convent felt able to deny itself this potential income is a sign that it had few misgivings about the state of its finances.

The Bishop, as ordinary, was concerned with the general condition of life in the Convent. On 11 June 1408, Langley sent the Prior his citation to announce that he was going to conduct a visitation on 23 July. On 16 June, the Prior, John Hemmingburgh, wrote to the Prior of Finchale, and presumably to the priors of other cells, warning him of the visitation and ordering him to attend. The Prior of Durham acknowledged the Bishop's citation on 12 July, stating that he had summoned all members of cells, save those who had to remain in order to administer services. He appended a list of the names of fifty eight monks. On the appointed day, the visitation was carried out in the established manner. Langley brought with him, as assessors, John lent, a monk of St. Mary's, York; Mr. Richard Holme, the spiritual chancellor; Mr. Alan Newark, canon of Lanchester; and Mr. Thomas Lyes, a...

---

notary and Langley's attendant registrar. A bull of Boniface IX, of 1397, had confirmed the custom at Durham, that in visitations, the bishop should have with him, as assessors, two or three clerks, one a notary, and a monk of Durham. Langley broke this rule, but no protest was made.

The Prior and monks came before the Bishop. The Prior presented his acknowledgment of the citation, and took an oath of obedience to Langley. Then John Wessington, on behalf of the Convent, asked that this oath might be recorded in a notarial instrument. This was done by Thomas Lytes. All the monks then left the Chapter House, except for the Prior, who was then examined by Langley and his assessors. The visitation articles, sixty-six in number, were most comprehensive, covering all aspects of monastic life and the administration of the Convent's property. After the Prior, the monks were examined singly by the assessors. No record of any detecta survives. There had been some apprehension as to the Bishop's course of action. The Prior had written to a lawyer of York, on 2 July, asking that he should be present at the visitation. The Prior did not know whether Langley intended to inflict any punishments or do anything prejudicial to the privileges of the Convent, although he did not expect him to. Thomas Lythe, the third prior, had anticipated the Bishop's censure: on 21 July, he had made an appeal to Rome. In 1439, one of Langley's injunctions was still remembered. He had decreed that the Convent was not to grant any office for term of life. Langley later visited some of the Convent's appropriated churches. Procurations were paid to him at Pittington and Aycliffe. This again was a breach of custom. Bishop Beaumont had

conceded, in 1328, that procurations should not be paid by the Convent in respect of its appropriated churches. This grant was confirmed by succeeding Bishops, though not by Langley. Apparently, no protest was made, a clear indication that the visitation had passed comfortably.

This was Langley's only visitation of the Convent of Durham. Other visitations were made during his period by visitors appointed by the Chapters of Black Monks. Once more, no detailed information has been left. There is sufficient evidence elsewhere, however, that monastic life at Durham was not without its scandals. At the time of Wessington's election, it was reported that John Boner could not be allowed to have any part in it on account of his infamous behaviour and disobedience. Two other monks, John Fishwick and Adam Durham, had run away and therefore been excommunicated. Adam had cast off his monk's garb many years earlier, and had roamed abroad as a layman. In 1407, the Prior had learnt that he was being sheltered at Burton, in Lindsey. He asked for the Bishop's aid in obtaining a royal writ for Adam's capture.

In 1422, a third monk, John Marlay, abandoned the Convent. It was later learnt that he had gone into Hexhamshire. A letter from the Duke of Bedford probably referred to Marlay: Bedford had recently been told "that one of the monks of your convent was not longe a go proved and founde gylte of the horrible synne of sodomye". He had been imprisoned, but had escaped and apostatised. Bedford was concerned for the honour of the Convent, "sithen that we be brothir therof", and charged the Prior to seek the monk and punish him "sharply". In 1435, Thomas Nesbit successfully maintained

---

his innocence against a charge of adultery, and was purged by the oaths of twelve brother-monks. Violence was perhaps inevitable in those times. In 1407, Thomas Esh, in the course of a quarrel with a second monk, Richard Stockton, struck and wounded him with a knife. They were reconciled. The Prior gave Esh licence to go to Rome to seek absolution, but he met a papal nuncio in London, who absolved him then and there, as he was too old and feeble for the journey. Both monks were fairly senior; Stockton had died by 1416, but Esh was then Master of Farne. In 1420, one monk actually killed another. John Tynemouth was indicted before the Bishop's justices for the murder of William Warner. He confessed, and was put in prison. Langley felt it indecent that a monk should be shut up with common robbers, and gave Esh into the Prior's custody, observing that this transfer was not to be held as a precedent.

The Prior and Convent were frequently engaged in litigation. There was a dispute with John Rikinghall, Archdeacon of Northumberland, concerning the Prior's claim to archidiaconal jurisdiction. This had been established for many years, but on a doubtful title, and challenges continued to be made. In 1410, the Prior warned the clergy of his churches in Northumberland not to admit Rikinghall, who had apparently proposed to visit them. The case was first heard at York, where John Wessington was the Convent's attorney. The issue was not settled there, however, for on 28 February 1413, Rikinghall and Wessington came to Langley, in London, and swore to accept his arbitration. Wessington prepared a formidable list of twenty eight articles for Langley's edification. The whole story of the Convent's

privileges, from the foundation of a community of monks by
King Oswald in 635 A.D. right up to the present time, with
numerous confirmations by popes, kings and archbishops of
Durham, testified to the justice of the Convent’s claim, as
well as to Wessington’s skill as a legal antiquary. One may
presume that the Convent’s case was proved in full. In the
Archdeaconry of Durham, John Hovingham contested the Prior’s
title, but agreed, on 22 September 1411, to cease taking legal
action. He also promised to accept the award made by Langley,
as arbitrator, who had inspected the Convent’s records on this
subject. At the same time, Hovingham was retained as legal
counsel by the Prior and Convent. Langley had obviously
settled the dispute during his recent visitation of the diocese.

At the same time, the Prior and Convent were engaged in
a suit with Archbishop Bowet of York. Bowet had held
visitations of Howdenshire in July 1409 and of Allertonshire
in July 1410. He found that the Prior of Durham took pensions
from certain churches in those districts without, as Bowet
said, any canonical title, and also disputed his right to hold
visitations there. On 26 July 1410, he commissioned his
chancellor, Mr. Richard Pittes, Canon of York, to conduct
legal proceedings in this matter. The case was heard before
Pittes on 28 July. The Convent’s attorneys established that
it had legally appropriated the churches of Northallerton,
Eastrington and Giggleswick; that the churches of Roddington,
Bossall and Fishlake were legally appropriated to Durham
College, Oxford; and that the Convent had a clear title to
the pensions it drew from ten other churches. In addition,
the Prior’s claims to hold visitations and levy procurations,
administer wills and enjoy other privileges in Howdenshire
and Allertonshire were upheld. Pittes admitted the claims.

1. D. 1. 1. Archidiaconales Dunelm. 8 & 9; Cartulary I, ff. 144-147d.
2. Cart. I, f. 132d.
4. ibid. 273d; D. 3. 2. Archiepiscopales Ebor. 3.
and granted a demise. A confirmation of this sentence was obtained from Pope John XXIII, on 7 December 1412. The Convent's expenses had been heavy. The Archbishop's demise cost £20, and the papal bull £4 8s. 10d. As early as 6 July 1410, the Prior had written to a friend for financial assistance: he had already spent large sums and lacked the means to continue in the suit.

The relations between Langley and the Priors of Durham were amicable throughout his episcopate, and afforded a remarkable contrast to the history of Durham a century earlier, when the enmity shown to each other by bishops and priors was most bitter. Prior Hemmingburgh was Langley's vicar-general for ten years. He was occasionally the Bishop's guest. He spent Christmas with Langley at Auckland in 1409, and again in 1412. In 1407, he told Langley that neither he nor the Convent, although summoned, could attend Parliament, and asked that if there were any unfortunate repercussions, Langley would make excuses for the monks. Hemmingburgh again sought Langley's aid in 1412. He had been appointed collector of a clerical half-tenth, but had been unable to collect it in full as he had not had sufficient time. A royal writ had ordered the sheriff of Yorkshire to distrain the Prior's goods in that county. Langley was asked, while with the King, to use his influence to persuade the Exchequer to grant a longer term for collection and cancel the order of distraint.

Hemmingburgh died on 15 September 1416. Langley was then abroad, at Calais. The Subprior and Chapter met to consider how to procure a licence to elect a prior. It was pointed out that, according to the canonist, "the Archdeacon", a licence
could be obtained from the Bishop's vicar-general. There was some doubt about this, so it was decided to avoid any risks and send a messenger to Langley. It would, in fact, have been an error to have sought a licence from the vicar-general. The words of "the Archdeacon" had been wrongly interpreted: he had not referred to a vicar in spiritualibus but to the vicegerent a temporal ruler would appoint on leaving his domains. Langley had not appointed any vicegerent. This incident is of interest in that it shows that there was still some confusion between the Bishop of Durham as ruler of his Palatinate and as ordinary of the diocese. The monks sent Thomas Ryhale, a notary, to Calais, to speak to Langley. On 6 October, Langley sent a letter under his signet to the Chapter, exhorting the monks to choose a worthy prior. On the same day, he sent his warrant of privy seal to his temporal chancellor for a licence under the great seal of the Palatinate. He also appointed John Newton guardian of the Priory during the vacancy. The licence for the election was issued on 17 October. The election was held on 5 November, and John Wessington, the sacrist and chancellor, was chosen unanimously. On 26 November, the Bishop appointed Thomas Lyes to examine the election proceedings. The examination was mere form, however, for Langley had already told the Archbishop of York that he approved of the Convent's choice. Bowet answered a letter from Langley to this effect on 24 November, when he gave his own consent. Lyes sent Langley his report on 14 December, but Langley had already, as temporal ruler, given his assent.

1.D.2.6.Pont.9;Cart.III,ff.298d-299. 2."Archidiaconus"(Guido de Bayso):Rosarium super Decreto (Venice,1495),Dist.LXIII,c.16. 3.Bursar 1416-1417,m.5d;Durham Acct.Rolls III 614. 4.Loc.25, no.167,Reg.f.84d;Cart.III,f.297;Scr.Treas App. pp.205-206. 5.Reg.f.84d. 6.Under the seal Ad'cauaas. 7.D.1.6.Pont.10;Rot.B.m.11;Reg.f.84d;Cart.I,f.88. 8.Reg.f.86d. 9.ibid 88d. 10.ibid 89. 11.ibid 86d. 12.On 7 December. 2.6.Pont.3;Rot.B.m.11;Cart.I,f.88d.
As ordinary, he confirmed the election on the 23rd. Lyes was instructed to induct Wessington. This was done on 24 December.

Langley was on as friendly terms with Wessington as he had been with his predecessor. The Prior, as he once wrote, often went to the Bishop for advice, and was always treated with kindness: he had liberty of access to Langley as often as he wished, nor did he fail to obtain the counsel he sought. In 1418, he sent a monk to Langley to explain the grave financial state of the Convent's cells, particularly Wearmouth and Jarrow. When the central tower of the Cathedral was seriously damaged by fire, Wessington lost no time in sending Langley a report of the disaster. Langley spent large sums in completing the new cloisters. Once, he had Wessington hunting with him in his park. The Prior, for his part, made some return for Langley's favour. He provided Langley's suffragan, Bishop Pecston, and spiritual chancellor, Thomas Hebbeden, with benefices. In the critical events of 1433, he stood by the Bishop. Whether Langley's cordial association with the Priors arose from political design, a sense of episcopal duty or mere human feeling, the fruit it bore in 1433 was invaluable. A Prior in the days of Bek or Beaumont would have sought to extract the utmost advantage from the Bishop's embarrassment. Wessington gave Langley cause for displeasure in 1434, but the quarrel was short-lived. A year later, Langley gave the Prior a mitre, as a gift. In his will, he left money to the Prior and monks so that they should pray for his soul, books to their library and that of Durham College, and jewels, ornaments and vestments.

CHAPTER IX: CONCLUSION.

Langley departed from London, where he had attended Parliament, early in December 1435. Apart from short visits to Durham City in February, he spent the first five months of 1436 at Auckland. Convocation was called to meet at York on 11 June, and it is apparent that Langley attended. In that summer, there was imminent danger of invasion from Scotland, and Langley naturally took part in concerting measures for the defence of the Border. In August and September, he stayed at Stockton. Then, after holding a visitation of the nunnery at Neasham on 12 October, he retired to Auckland. He never again left that manor, his especial favourite. His will was drawn up there on 21 December. Some clergy were ordained in the chapel of the manor on the next day, and there were four other such services there in 1437. All were conducted by the suffragan. Langley was presumably not strong enough to act himself, yet, owing to feelings of piety and duty, anxious to be present. It is possible that he had suffered a stroke, or, a less disputable assumption, that he was merely worn out. When he excused himself from attendance of Parliament on 10 January, he said that he was broken by old age and his frame stricken by illness. A further indication of his feebleness is given by grants of certain offices for life, despite his previously expressed dislike of such appointments. At this same time, he was disturbed by the hostility of some of his subjects, even to the point of fearing physical violence. He was not completely incapacitated, however, for on 20 November 1437, he was able

to examine the Prioress of Neasaham\(^1\). It was the last act of his episcopate. He died ten days later, as the last entry of his Register records, in the third hour of the morning, and in his inner chamber at Auckland\(^2\).

Langley had outlived nearly all of his notable contemporaries. Chichele and Henry Beaufort were still alive; the others had predeceased him. All those former servants of the Duchy of Lancaster who had followed Henry IV into royal service were dead. Langley was the last surviving executor of John of Gaunt\(^3\). He had also been the most successful of the old Lancastrians. None had risen as high as he in the service of the State, nor to such prominence in the Church. The fundamental reason for his long career of public service, as of his longevity - he was nearly eighty when he died\(^4\) - was the strength of his physique. Of his appearance nothing is known save that he was bearded\(^5\), but he was possessed of extraordinary energy. His numerous visits to Durham, usually taken in the few weeks between the law terms; the fact that he chose so vigorous a form of relaxation as hunting when his official duties in the last years of the reign of Henry V must have been sufficiently exhausting\(^6\), all testify to the tireless vigour of his constitution.

This must have been a quality that commended him to Henry IV, himself a man of the utmost energy\(^7\). He required, especially as his Keeper of the Privy Seal, one who could accompany him as he went about the country. Langley often travelled with him, often in haste, as the King went to suppress a rebellion or to campaign against the Welsh\(^8\). When Henry granted a charter confirming the

\(^{1}\) See p.240 supra.  \(^{2}\) Reg.f.257.  \(^{3}\) ibid 223.  \(^{4}\) ibid 201.  
liberties of the Bishopric of Durham, he put on record, among his reasons for making the grant, the special affection he had for Langley, "who had, from the days of his youth, laudably served our dear father, John, late Duke of Lancaster, now deceased, and ourself, in our affairs and those of our realm, and has been, and still is, towards us, tirelessly dutiful". This characteristic, Langley's tireless application to duties of great responsibility, was most in evidence in the years 1417-1424. They were difficult years for a Chancellor. The absence of Henry V, putting greater burdens on the Council, of which Langley was the leading member, and, at the same time, a great increase in judicial work in Chancery; then subsequently, the difficult transition to a new order of government in the minority of Henry VI, put the utmost demands on Langley's strength. He was able to remain in office for seven years, a longer period than any Chancellor since John Langton, under Edward I, had held that position.

That Langley's administrative ability was of the first order is evidenced by the same long tenure of office. His work, under Henry V in particular, entitle him to be ranked with the greatest of the medieval Chancellors of England. Together with this quality went an insistence on the observance of established rights. The monks of Meaux grumbled at Langley's reluctance to make them a charter, but his attitude was due to unwillingness that the crown should lose any revenue. These two features are most noticeable in Langley's administration in Durham. As Chancellor of England, he became fully acquainted with the

extent of regalian prerogatives, and also, as an old Duchy servant, knew how far these could be applied in the government of a palatinate. Thus he carried into Durham a fully developed sense of the nature of his authority. He applied to its administration the experience he had gained in royal service. In the matter of suits at law against himself by his subjects, in particular, he insisted that he should have the same consideration in the Bishopric as the King had in England. His subjects were resentful to the point of sedition, but he maintained his position. His success in this respect, as also in his recovery of part of the Tyne Bridge, gave to his successor a stronger position than he had inherited from Bishop Skirlawe. Into his episcopal duties, Langley carried the same desire to enforce respect for established rules. His measures against absentee canons, his reforms at Lanchester and in the hospitals, and, above all, the new statutes for Auckland College and Sherburn Hospital show him as a reformer. The success of the ordinances for the College at Manchester also attests to his awareness for making provision against the current abuse of clerical absenteeism. He was, of course, often an absentee himself, but never neglectful of the affairs of his diocese.

Langley had all the qualities to make an admirable public servant, but of genius there is no trace. He was no innovator: he certainly introduced new practices into the government of the Bishopric, but they were in imitation of the usages of the royal administration. His lengthy will shows that, even on his death-bed, he still paid the closest attention to numerous small details. As a true civil

servant, he liked to have everything in its due order. The subjects of his County Palatine were obliged to respect his regalian prerogatives, and the clergy the rules of their foundations. Sound, firm government was his object. Yet he was not without initiative: the Council of Henry V, of which Langley was the foremost minister, had to meet several emergencies. Its measures, notably the provision for remedy in cases of novel disseisin, where Langley was particularly responsible, did not betray any lack of ingenuity. The idea of duplicating the Privy Seal was probably his: as a former Keeper, he would have appreciated the need of the Council for this instrument.

Langley was not an unjust man. Sometimes, when the title to certain lands was at issue between himself and subjects, he committed their keeping to the latter. The charges laid against him in 1433 suggest that his government was felt to be too severe, too pressing in its just demands. There is, indeed, some cause for supposing that Langley, when Henry V's Chancellor, enjoyed a certain reputation for justice. That his integrity was widely respected is shown by the considerable number of occasions on which he was appointed to act as supervisor or executor of wills. In the affairs of both diocese and Palatinate, Langley appeared reluctant to take severe measures in haste. The custodians of the hospitals of West Spital and Gateshead were not dismissed until after second visitations of their houses. The same restraint was shown towards the Prioress of Neasham. The offenders were given an opportunity to mend their ways, but their failure to

comply with the Bishop's injunctions was punished. Likewise in the dispute with Sir William Eure, Langley let the suit in his chancery be protracted unduly so that an opportunity for a more amicable settlement might be found; his anxiety for such a solution was sufficient to make him abandon his regalian prerogatives, in that he submitted his quarrel to arbitration

Langley's conduct in Convocation in 1426 reveals his patience and skill in dealing with men: he caused the heretical friar's brothers to abandon him and Richmond himself to confess. Langley was unable to persuade the clergy to make a grant, but it was not for want of repeated solicitations on his part. Here he showed those qualities that gave him so much employment in diplomatic affairs. These, with an equally essential characteristic, discretion, are well evidenced by his part in the negotiations with the French prisoners early in 1417, when the object was to persuade them to assist their captors. The utmost secrecy was required: Henry V wrote that Langley was the only other to know of Bourbon's proposals. Even earlier, when Langley was a clerk of the Duchy, his diplomatic qualities had given him access to John of Gaunt's confidence. Thus for many years, Langley seems to have been "the secretary of state for foreign affairs" of both Henry IV and Henry V. His tact - and his generosity - also won him the valuable friendship of the Priors of Durham: their good relations were a remarkable contrast to the bitter enmity between the Convent and previous Bishops of Durham.

Of Langley's other qualities, those not so prominent in tenure of high office, the most apparent was his great

---

capacity for compassion. His concern for the errant Vicar of Eglingham has already received comment. His grief at the sad condition of his old friend, John Thoralby, is noticeable in even an official instrument. He had placed in the Galilee Chapel a font where, by papal licence, the children of excommunicated parents could be baptised. Langley's Register contains many grants of indulgences for the benefit of people who had suffered severe losses; for prisoners taken by enemies or local men whose homes had been destroyed by fire. The most notable instance of Langley's deep sympathy for the helpless appears in his ordinance for Sherburn Hospital. The clause concerning the thirteen poor men on the foundation decreed that they were to say their hours. Those who were feeble, however, were to sit up in bed at the times of the canonical hours and masses, and say their hours there. "And those who are weaker still, so that they cannot even sit up, may lie in peace and say what they can."

That Langley was pious and conscientious in his episcopal duties, particularly in his latter years, is clear. Earlier still, when Archdeacon of Norfolk, he showed a sense of responsibility for his ecclesiastical charge unparalleled by his contemporaries. He was not a learned man, but his will shows that he possessed a library, consisting mainly of theological works, but also including the Corpus Iuris Civilis and some histories. The record of his having gone hunting with Prior Wessington, and his monitions against those who had poached his game, testify to his love of outdoor sport. Langley's mission to the rebel camp at Shrewsbury shows that he did not lack courage. A gallant - and patriotic - temper.

is also to be discerned in his sermon to Parliament in 1417. There is some indication that he possessed a certain sense of humour. The "atte last he is condescendit" in his letter to Henry V, relating to the Duke of Bourbon, suggests this quality; as does the punning allusion of Robert Ariston to the arrogance of the Aragonese: he surely expected Langley, the recipient of his letter, to appreciate the jest. Another human characteristic was Langley's fondness for the company of men from his own county of Lancashire. In his will, he showed consideration for each member of his large household. The opinion may be hazarded that Langley did not recall the Council's refusal of his Cardinalate and exile to Rome with unrelieved regret. There is no scandal recorded against him in Gascoigne's censorious pages.

A love of pomp was natural to the Prince Bishops of Durham. Walsingham described Langley and Courtenay as viri magnifici. Langley's tomb in the Galilee Chapel, blocking the great west door of the Cathedral, is an impressive structure. There were other memorials, buildings in various parts of the Bishopric. As Holinshead wrote of Langley, "like unto the philosopher Anaxagoras, (he) supposed that there was not any more earthlie felicitie, than to erect sumptuous palaces, wherby after their death the memorie of the founders might have continuance." This also accounts for the Bishop's displeasure against those who neglected buildings in their care. Langley's two religious foundations, however, had a more valuable purpose than the perpetuation of his memory. At both Durham and Middleton, schools were attached to his chantries, where education was to be given free to poor

---

children. "Though many afterwards followed his example, I know of very few instances before his time of a bold liberality such as his, which offered the priceless pearl of knowledge, without payment, to the children ...... of the 'rude county' of Lancaster."

Throughout his long career of public service, Langley was constant in his loyalty to the House of Lancaster. He has left a memorial to his devotion in the St. Cuthbert Window he gave to York Minster. In the lowest panes appear figures representing the donor and the four generations of the House he had served. The presence there of depictions of Humphrey of Gloucester and Cardinal Beaufort is a record of Langley's neutrality is their deplorable quarrel. He was no time-server: he had stood beside Henry IV in the King's last years and did not desert him in order to make sure of favour in the next reign, obviously not far distant as Henry's health declined. Nor did Henry V hold this loyalty to his father against Langley. He was well aware of the high nature of Langley's character and abilities. He took Langley into his confidence from the beginning of his reign, and received invaluable service. In the minority of Henry VI, Langley's devotion was primarily to the person of the infant King. Despite his reluctance to continue as a member of the Council and desire to devote himself to his diocese, he came to give his counsel when the strife of Beaufort and Gloucester came to a crisis or when the young King's education was to be considered. This service was given freely: other councillors took salaries, a charge the country could ill afford, but Langley did not take anything.

It was a bitter irony that, in the North, he had given his friendship and support to one so prominent among those who were to overthrow the House to which Langley had been so devoted: Richard Neville, Earl of Salisbury, was the father of Warwick "the Kingmaker" and uncle of Edward IV.

Langley's epitaph may best be taken from the tribute paid to him when his petition against the attack of his franchise of Durham was granted in Parliament in 1433. One of the considerations said to have moved Henry VI to show favour to Langley were "the countless magnificent and fruitful services, profitable to himself and all his realm of England, diligently and faithfully shown and given by the said Bishop, in the time of the said lord our King as well as in that of his noble forebears, without stint of toil, costs or expenses, nor without grievous bodily hurt".

---

APPENDICES.

Note In the following transcriptions of manuscript sources, a number of departures have been made from the original records. The letter y has been substituted for u when the sense clearly calls for the former. In records in English, th is given in the place of y in conformity with modern usage. Liberties have also been taken with respect to capital letters and punctuation. The long transcription from the Durham Register III (given on pp. 312-325) has been broken down into paragraphs.
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APPENDIX A: RECORDS RELATING TO LANGLEY'S CAREER 1401-1406, AND TO THE OFFICE OF THE PRIVY SEAL.

(i) Petition of Thomas Swinburn, granted by the King and Council, 22 November 1403. (See p.25)
(Treasury of Receipt: Council and Privy Seal, File 12)

A nostre tresredoute tressoverein et tresexcellent seigneur le Roy. Supplie vostre simple Bacheler Thomas Swynbourne, Capitain de vostre Chastell de Hammes en la Marche de Picardie, que come le dys et noefisme iour de Decembre lan de vostre regne primer y pluist a vostre hautesse par voz lettres de Prive Seal doner en mandement al dit Thomas de rescuyver en le dit Chastell, pur la greindre sauvacion dicell, dys hommes darmes et dys archers, dont deux hommes darmes et deux archers as chivalx, outre le nombre des autres gentz darmes et archers queux le dit Thomas avoit demeurant sur la sauve garde du dit Chastell en temps de pees, par force dune endenture entre vous, tressoverein seigneur le Roy, et le dit Thomas pur la sauve garde du dit Chastell fait, preignant chascun des ditz dys hommesarmes et dys archers as tieux gages et regardz come prendroyent les autres soudeurs de leur estatz demurantz deinz le dit Chastell. Les quelles dys hommesarmes et dys archers outre le nombre des autres gentz estoient rescueuz par le dit suppliant par force du dicte lettre, et demeurerent sur la sauve garde du mesme le Chastell tanque al iour de Seint Pier ad Vincula lan susdit et depuis mesme le iour de Seint Pier ad. Que le dit suppliant tanque encea huz et tenuz, et ad et tient uncore cynk hommes darmes et cynk archers, dont deux hommes darmes et deux archers al chival, outre le nombre des gentz darmes et archers queux il ad demeurantz sur la sauve garde du dit Chastell par force du dicte endenture, Que vous plese de vostre treshabundant grace comander le Gardein de vostre Prive Seal de fere garantz suffisantz a Robert Thorley, Tresorer de Calays, pur acompter ovesque le dit suppliant, et a ly fere paiement pur les dyes cynk hommes darmes et cinq archers, dont deux hommes darmes et deux archers a chival, queux il ad heuz et continuelement ad demeuranzt sur la sauve garde de vostre dit Chastell par virtue de voz dictes lettres de Prive Seal, outre le nombre de gentz darmes et archers lymitees en le dit endenture, de as teiuix gages et regardes come autres de leur estatz deinz le dit Marche de vous preignont, cestassavoir del darrein iour de Fevrier lan de vostre reigne quart tanque a le vyntisme iour de Novembre lan de vostre regne quynt, et ensi de temps en temps tanque vous estes autrement avisez de donner au dit suppliant mandement par vostre lettre de Prive Seal en contr.
contrarie. Pur dieux et en oevere de charite.

Le xxij jour de Novembre lan etc quint, a
Loundres, le Roy granta ceste peticion et
comanda le Gardein du Prive Seal deu faire
garrant, et sur ce lettre feut faire a
Westmoustier mesme le iour.

(Dorse) Le xxij iour de Noverabre lan etc quint, deinz
loustel:monsieur Thomas Erpyngham, Chamberlain du Roy; en
Loundres. Accordez est par le Roy et son Counsail,
presentz messieurs les Chancellor, Tresorer, Gardein du
Prive Seal et monsieur Johan Cheyne et monsieur Arnaud
Savage, que garant soit fait selonc la contenue de ceste
peticion.

(ii) Letter from Henry IV to the Chancellor; Treasurer and
Keeper of the Privy Seal, 29 December (1403). (See p.23)
(C.& P.S.File 12)

Depar le Roy.

Reverent pere en dieu nostre tresame frere, et nos
treschiers et foiaulx. Nousconsiderans les peril et
dommages que avenir pourroient a noz Chastel, ville et
seigneurie de Breghenok, et aussi a les parties
par le departir dilloeques de nostre treschier et foial
cousin le Conte de Warrewyk, qui est en propos de la
faire sicomme entendu avons; escrivons a mesme le Conte
par les forme et maniere comme il est contenue en la
cedule close dedeins cestes. Si volons et vous prions
enchargeantz que ycelle cedule par vous veue et entendue,
facez ordeiner par les causes comprises en mesme la cedule,
que le dit Conte ait refresshemont de monnoye pour lui et
ses gens en toute haste possible, par un quartier ou
autrement selon ce que mieulz vous semblera, et au moins
par un mois. Ainsi que dommage naveigne a noz ditz chastel,
ville et seigneurie, ne au pays environ en nostre default,
que dieu ne vuille, en nous certifiant en tout haste
possible de vostre fact en ceste parture, et au dit Conte
de noz volontee et entencion sur ce, par noz lettres
dessoubz nostre prive seal, a greindre confort de lui et
de tous ceux de sa compagnie. Et que en ce nart point
default sicomme nostre entiere affiance est en vous et
sicomme vous desirez la bonne governance et salvacion de
noz Chastell, ville, seigneurie et pays avanditz. Donne
soubz nostre signet a Abyndon le xxixme. Jour de
Decembre.

(Dorse) A noz Chancellor, Tresorer et Gardein de nostre
prive seal.
(iii) Petition of William Glym, granted by Henry IV, 12 May 1404, together with a draft of a warrant of Privy Seal.
(C.& P.S. File 12) (See p.21)

(a) Le Roy ad grante toute la bille.

Please au vostre tressoverain seigneur le Roy graunter de vostre grace especiale a vostre paure orateur William Glym, Clerc, licence de pursuer a nostre seint piere le Pape pour avoir grace destre expectant a quecunque benefice en leeglise Cathedrale Nostre Dame de Novell Sarum et mesme la grace executor selonc leffect et force del grante quale nostre dit seint piere luy plerra graunter et en tiele benefice possession prendre et le enioier, nient contrestesteantz ascunz estatuitz ou ordinaunces a lencontre faitz, et cea pur Dieu en oevre de charite. Et sur ceo graunter vos lettres patentz desouths vostre grant seel.

Le Conte de Somerset. Lettre ent feut faire a Westmoustier le xij Jour de May lan etc quint selonc lacedule a ceste annexee.

(b) Cum nos de gracia nostra speciali concesserimus et licenciam dederimus dilecto Clerico nostro Willielmo Glym, quod ipse canonicatus prebendum officia et dignitates in ecclesia cathedralis Sarum eciam maiora post pontificalem vacatura a domino summo Pontifice in Curia Romana impetrare et ea per se et procuratores suos acceptare et corporalem possessionem inde prosequi et capere, ac els gaudere. Idemque Willielmus, executores, subexecutores, Nocarii et alii de consilio suo processum et processus de provisionibus et graciis eidem Willielmo per dictum summum Pontificem in hac parte faciendis facere, ac huiusmodi provisiones et gracias sibi sic faciendas, nee non processum et processus inde similiter faciendos in Curie Christianitatis et alibi ubi sibi placuerit prosequi, ac plenie execucioni iuxta tenorem eorumdem demandare valeant, ut modo et forma supradictis, absque impetacione, molestacione, actione vel impedimento nostrorum seu heredum nostrum seu ministrorum quorumcumque, statuto de provisionibus, Anno regni Regis Ricardi Secundi post conquestum tercio edito decimo edito, aut alis statutis seu ordinacionibus incontrarium factis non obstantibus nobis etc.
Henri etc. A touz Viscontes, Maires, Baillifs, Conestables et autres noz officers et ministres, sibien deinz franchisez come dehors, qi cestes noz lettres verront ou errront, saluz. Come noz bien amez Escuiers Nicholas Talbot et Johan Hull de presens esteants deinz nostre Chastel de Wyndesore en se doient transporter de nostre commandement pardeids nous es parties de North owc certains noz biens et harnois ce chargiez leur avons de faire carier ovesas eux. Vous mandens ce as ditz Nicholas et Johan en venantz ensi devers vous parmy voz, voz offices et Baillies, purvoit et facez purvoit tant de chivaux parheurge, ce monsure come de cairie et dautres leur necessaires a leur dispenses reasonables quant et si souvent come vous serrez depay aux dueant requis. En testomigne de quelle chese nous avons fait faire cestes noz lettres patentes sealies desouz nostre privy seal. Donne a Westmoustier le xx iour de May lan de nostre regne quint.

(v) A petition of Thomas More, Treasurer of the King's Household, granted 23 August 1404. (See pp. 21 & 25) (C.& P.S. File 13)

Pleez a nostre tresredoute seigneur le Hoy comanduer al Gardein de vostre privy seal a faire lettres de garraunt a Thomas More Tresourer de vostre honourable houstiell de xix li. xviiij s. xjd. par luy paiez de vostre comandement pur les despenes de monsieur Pierre Ambassour de Danmores estant a vostre despenes et coustages a Loundres et a Saint Albans le dirrein moys daverill, sicome piert par les parcelles ent faites par Johan Peraunt, un de voz Sergeantz dawmes.

Item de xviij li. vj s. vij d. ob. q. a. paiez pur les despenes de les Ambassours del Duchesse de Holand et del Count de Cliff, estant a vostre coustages a Notyngham et Donyton en le moys de May dirrein, sicome piert par les parcelles en faites par Johan Feriby, Clerc.

Item de xcviiij li. xviij s. viij d. ob. pur les despenes des Escotes estant a vostre despenes et coustages a Pountfreyt le moys de Juyll dirrein, sicome piert par les parcelles en faites par le dit Johan Feriby, Clerc.

Item de CC li. pur destrubucion a vost poveres par vost maynes proprios le Jour de la Benoite Vendresdy.

Lettre ent feut faite a Lichefeld par commandement du Hoy, le xxiiijme. Jour daugst lan etc quint.
(vi) Petition of Thomas Scrivener, granted by the King, 8 September 1404. 
(C. & P.S. File 13) 

A Roy nostre souverain seigneur.

Supplie treshumblement vostre pour et humble liege Thomas Skrevener de Scarburgh. Que comme le dit suppliant de haigne et envie empechez par Alan Edenham de Scalby de ce qu'il euse dispersione vostre treshaulte seigneurie en certeines paroles, les quelles le dit Adam ore renoiet les avoir dit et celx ne vult maintenir, commise el garde de sieur David Rocliffe el Chastiel de Pikeryng. Pleise a vostre trespuissante et tresgracieuse seigneurie denvoyer voz honourables lettres de Prive Seal da prendre soufficeant suertee de dit suppliant destre devant la personne, et a le iour, lieu et heure par vous ent assigne a sa responce. Pour Dieu et en ovre de charite.

Le viij iour de Septembre lan etc quint a le Chastiel de Tuttebury, lettre estit faite par commandement du Roy, a sieur David Roucliffe susdit de suffrer le suppliant aler hors de la garde sur suffissant seurtee destre devant le Roy lundy prochein aprés la Seint Michel prochein quel part qe le Roy lors serroit deinz le Roiamme.

(vii) Instruction for making letter of Privy Seal. 
(C. & P.S. File 15) 

Soit faite unes lettres dessoubz le prive seal a monsieur William Gascoigne et a ses compaignons Justices en le Banc du Roy, lour chargeant quils surseent de proces faire en mesme le Banc envers Johan Prophete, nadjairs Dean de Hereford, par force du brief du Roy.de Scire facias issant hors de mesme le Bank a la suyt du Roy touchant les issues et proifits du manoir de Ansty en Countee de Warrewyk, Jusques a la quinzeine de Seint Hiller prochein venant, puisque le dit Johan tant est occupiez en la service du Roy qu'il ne pourra bonnement vaquer entour la defense de mesme le proces.

Une lettre ent feut faite a Maxstoke par commandement du Roy, le quart iour doctobre lan etc sisme.
(viii) Draft of warrant to Exchequer, made by the Council, 22 January 1403. (See pp. 25 & 38) (C. & P. S. File 17)

Henri etc. As Tresorer et Barons de nostre Eschequer, Saluz. Come par endenture faite le treszisme iour daugst nostre regne quart parentre nous dune part et nostre treschier filz Johan dautre part, mesme celui Johan feusse demorez devers nous Gardein de noz Chastel et ville de Berewyk et de tout la Estmarche vers Escoce, a avoir etc., sicome en lendenture insy purra plus pleinement appaorir. Volons de layvs de nostre Conseil et vous mandons que vous accountez duement ovec nostre dit filz, ou ovec aucun autre persone convenable pur lui en son noun person serement, sibien de la nombre des gentz darmes et archers quil ad ensi sune par force de la dicte endenture du dit treszisme iour daugst sur la sauve garde de les Chastel, ville et marche susditz, et de les gages et regardz dicelx gentz darmes et archers, come de touz les deniers par lui receuz par celle cause par assignementz et autrement par force sibien de noz lettres desouz nostre prive seal faites sur la dite endenture et directes as Tresorer et Chamberleins de nostre Eschequer, come par force dautres noz severalz lettres desouz nostre dit seal directes a nostre ame Clerc Johan Oudeby et a noz bien amez Johan Haddeley, Thomas Knolles et Richard Merlawe, madgairs assignez Tresorers pur noz guerres en nostre darrein parlement tenuz a Westmoustier, fesant a lui due allouance en celle partie dutieux gages et regardz pur les susditz gentz darmes et archers come il ad este acustemez destre paiez et allouez a autres de leur estatz par semblable manere en celles parties avant ces heures, et selonc le pourport de lendenture susdite. Nientcontrestant et que nous navons uncore assignez nully de prendre les moustres de les gentz et archers susditz. Et de ce que par le dit aconte lui serra trovez raisonnement duz du dit treszisme iour daugst lan de nostre regne quart tanque ale douzisime iour de Novembre darrein passez, facez Bien et seurement certifier a nostre Conseil susdit. Donne etc. a Westmoustier le xxij iour de Januer lan etc. sisme.

Par le Conseil, presens Messieurs les Chancellor, Tresorer, Gardein du Prive Seal et le Sire de Grey, Chamberlain.
(ix) Letter to the Archbishop of Bordeaux, 24 January (1406).
(C.& P.S. File 17) (See p.17)

De par le Roy.

Tresreverent pere en Dieu et nostre treschier et tresbien ame, Nous vous savons souvent, vous esmerciyant daffectueus cuer de la grande diligence que vous mettez de iour en autre entour la bone governance ale nostre pais de Guyenne en nous signifiant de temps en temps lestat dycelle ensemblement avec vostre bon et sage avys a la conservacion de nostre honneur et de lestat de nostre dicte pais. Et pour ce que tant par lettres de nostre treschier et bien ame Peronat de Puche Capitain de nostre Chastel de Chales, come par relacion daucuns dignes de fay, nous avons entenduz lestat en quoy il est et le peril que avenir pourra a nostre dit Chastel si de bon et hastif secours ne y soit purveu; Nous considerans yce mesme et auxi semble peril de nostre pais susdit dont escrit vous avez ore tard aussi come plusieurs autres nous ont escrit; Si avons ordonnez de y envoyer tiel aide et refreshement, come certifiez nous avons par autres noz lettres desoubz nostre prive seal a present, tant a vous come a les estatz de mesme nostre pais; Si vous prions, tresreverent pere en Dieu, que puis que vous savez coment le dit Capitain sa porte bien et loialraent envers nous et lestat de nostre Corone, et coment le susdit Chastel est assiz en la fronture de noz enemys, vuillez par voz lettres et autrement donnez a lavantdit Capitain tout le comfort que vous purrez, jusques atant que nostre ordennance touchant la general secour de nostre susdicte pais purra estre mys en execucion que sera bien brief, Dieu devant. Sachant que par noz lettres quelles nous lui envoienu a present avant la retour de nostre chier et bien ame Hopkin Holme, qui nous apporta la tard ses lettres pour nous signifier lestat de lui et du pais lui environs. Nous lui certifions de celle ordennance par nous facte en lui comfortant de moi temps a mieulx que nous pourrons, dont nous espoirons quill serra recomfortez pour le temps. Tresreverent pere en Dieu, nostre Seigneur vous veulle tous iours garder. Donne sous nostre Prive Seal a nostre palois de Westmoustier le xxiiij de Januer.

A tresreverent pere en Dieu lerevesque de Burdeux.

Par le Roi de son commandement.

(x) Privy Seal Writ de procedendo to Chancery, 1 Feb.1402
(Chancery Warrants, file 613, no.3072) (See p.15)

Henricus dei gracia Rex Anglie et Francie et Dominus Hibernie, Venerabili in Christo patri Consanguineo nostro carissimo
Episcopo Exoniensis Cancellario nostro, salutem. Cum per inquisitionem coram Willielmo de Louthir, nuper Escaetore domini Ricardi nuper Regis Anglie secundi post conquestum, de mandato ipsius nuper Regis captam, et in Cancellarium suam retornatum, fuisset compertum quod quidam Johannes de Capella senior dedit et legavit, per testamentum suum conditum apud Karliol die sabbati proximo post festum sancti valentini Anno domini millesimo trecentesimo nono, unum mesuagium cum pertinenciis iuxta Cimiterium sancti Cuthberti infra Civitatem Karliol, quod se extendit in longitudine a via regia, quae est iuxta Cimiterium sancti Cuthberti, usque fontem, et continet in longitudune quater viginti et quinque pedes, et iacet inter placeam terre que fuit dicti Johannis de Capella ex parte una, et terram sancti Cuthberti ex altera, et continet in latitudine triginta et quinque pedes, luminari beate Marie in ecclesia sancti Cuthberti Karliol, licencia regie super hoc non optenta, quodque predictus Johannes de Capella tempore capcionis inquisitionis predicte non habuit aliquem heredem. Posteaque Johannes Mondeville nobis graviter conquerendo monstraverit quod licet Thomas Sadeler de Penreth, nuper seisitus in dominico suo ut de feodó de mesuagio predicto, idem mesuagium cum pertinenciis in Civitate Karliol eidem Johanni per cartam suam dederit et concesserit, habendum eodem Johanni, heredibus et assignatis suis, per servicia inde debita et de iure consueta. Idemque Johannes, pretextu doni et concessionis predictorum, in plena et pacifica possessione eiusdem mesuagii extitisset, et possessionem huiusmodi continuasset pacifico et quiete quousque ipse a possessione sue dicti mesuagii, tam colore inquisitionis predicte, quam litterarum nostrarum patenelum per quas, vicessimo primo die Februarii Anno regni nostri primo, de gracia nostra speciali concessimus dilectis nobis Marie de Stapilton et Ricardo Orfeour mesuagium predictum cum pertinenciis, habendum sibi et heredibus suis sub certa forma in dictis litteris contenta, amotus fuit et expulsus minus iuste, in ipsius Johannis damnum non medicum et gravamen, absque hoc quod idem Johannes de Capella dedit et legavit mesuagium predictum luminari beate Marie in ecclesia predicta, prout per dictum inquisitionem supponitur. Unde nobis supplicavit ut litteras nostras predictas prefatis Marie et Ricardo sic factas revocari, ipsumque Johannis ad possessionem suam eiusdem mesuagii, una cum exitibus inde a predicto die Februarii perceptis, restituui iubere vellemus. Et nos, volentes in hac parte fieri quod est iustum, preceperimus vicecomiti nostro Cumberland quod scire facteret prefatis Marie et Ricardo quod essent coram nobis in Cancellaria nostra in Crastino sancti Johannis Baptistae Anno regni nostri primó, ubicumque tunc foret, ad ostendendum, si quid pro nobis aut pro seipsis haberent vel dicere scirent quare littere nostre sibi de mesuagio predicto sic facte revocari, idemque Johannes ad possessionem suam
mesuagii predicti cum pertinenciis, una cum exitibus inde a 
predicto vicesimo primo die Februarii perceptis, restitui 
non deberent, et ad faciendum ulterius et recipiendum quod 
Curia nostra consideraret in hac parte. Ad quem diem tam 
predicti Maria et Ricardus, iuxta premunicionem eis is hac 
parte factam, per Johannem Asplion Attornatum suum, quam 
suprascriptus Johannes Mondeville, per Thomam Smyth 
Attornatum suum, in Cancellaria predicta comparatorunt. Et 
prefati Maria et Ricardus allegarunt ipsos mesuagium 
supradictum ex concessione nostra sibi et heredibus suis 
tenere, ipsosque ea occasione sine nobis respondere non 
debere, petendo auxilium de nobis, quod eis concessum fuit. 
Quare sicut accepmus absque nostro speciali mandato in 
placito coram vobis in Cancellaria nostra inde pendente 
uterius procedere noluitis. Volumus igitur, consideratione 
justicie, quod dicto auxilio vel allegacione non obstantibus, 
in dicto placito debite procedatis ulterius iusticiam 
partibus facientes, In tamen quod ad iudicium in ea parte 
reddendum nobis inconsultis minime procedatis. Datum sub 
private sigillo nostro apud Westmonasterium primo die 
Februarii Anno regni nostri tercio.

(xi) Privy Seal Warrant to Chancery, 4 June 1402. 
(C.W. 615/3290) (See p.22)

Henri par la grace de Dieu Roy d'Angleterre et de France et 
Seignur d'Irlande. A Lonurable Piere en Dieu nostre treschier 
Cousin Levesque dexcestre nostre Chanceller, saluz. Nous 
vous envoions close deinz cestes une supplicacion a nous 
baillee par nostre treschier et foial Hugh de Watertoun, et 
envoie au Gardein de nostre prive seal en une lettre desouth 
notre signet a lui adresse. Par la quelle supplicacion le 
dit Hugh nous ad suppliez de lui granter de novel la garde 
de les deux parties de tout les terres et tenementz queux 
feurent a Richard Talbot, et que le dit Hugh eit due 
allowance et deduction dan en an en la paiement de sa ferme 
des ditz terres et tenementz (et) de certaines annuities, et 
qu'il eit auxi due allowance en la paiement de mesme la ferme 
de les sommes des deniers entour la reparacion du Chastel de 
Goderich necessairement despenduz, sicome par la dite 
supplicacion, la quelle nous avons grantez, vous purra plus 
pleinement appaire. Si vous mandons que sur la contenue de 
de la dite supplicacion facez avoir au dit Hugh noz lettres 
patentes desoubz nostre grand seal en due forme. Donne souz 
nostre prive seal a Westmoustier le quart iour de Juyn lan 
de nostre regne tierz.
(xii) Signet Warrant for the Great Seal, 5 May 1405.  
(C.W.1398/38)  
(See p.44)

Depar le Roy

Treschier et bien ame. Nous volons et vous mandons que sur la contenance de noz lettres patentes par lesquelles nous avons grantez a nostre chier et foial Chivaler Nichol Ryvenys et Anne sa Compaigne Cent livres a prendre durantes leur ties de nostre grant Custume en port de nostre Citee de Londres par les mayns des cuillours dycelle pour le temps esteantz, sicomme en noz lettres patentes desusdites il est contens plus au plein, vous facez avoir a messmes ceux Nichol et Anne noz briefs de libere et allocate desoubz nostre grant seal en due forme pour les termes de seynt michel et de Pasques darrein passez, aucun ordennance ou proclamacion faite au contraire nient contreestante, et ce a cause que mesmoe nostre Chivaler est a aler en nostre compaignie en cest mostre voiage vers les parties de Galas ou quel voiage luy comendra faire grandes coustages lesquelles il ne pourra sustenir sanz ce qu'il soit paiez du dite annuitee pur les termes avantditz. Donne soubz nostre signet a nostre Citee de Wircestre le quint Jour de May.

(Dorse) A nostre treschier clerc Thomas Longley nostre Chancellor.

Le x iour de May, lan etc sisme, presentz en le Counsail Messieurs lercevesque de Cantirbirs, les Evesques de Wyncestre, Wircestre et Beath, les Chanceller, Tresor er et Gardein de Prive Seal, les Sires de Roos et de Louvel, Monsieur Arnaud Savage et Johan Doreward, accordez est, que messieurs Nichol Ryvenyssh et Arnaut Savage, et Johan que fuist la femme de Robert Morice, nommez en les troiz lettres du signet cy annexees, eient du doun du Roy, a tant de somme come leur est aderere de leur annuitées pur les termes especifiez en mesmes les lettres, en rebetant autiele somme de leur annuitées susdites, et que briefs ent soient faizt, descuz le grant seal, tieles come appartient en due forme.

(xiii) Signet Warrant for the Great Seal, 3 January 1406.  
(C.W.1360/2)  
(See p.51)

Depar le Roy

Treschier et bien ame. Nous vous salvons souwent. Et combien que nous vous escrisiasmes ja tarde par noz lettres dessoubz nostre signet a vous apporzzees par nostre Tresor er de nostre Houstell, que nostre vouloir estoit pour certeines causes lors a ce nous meevantes que vous deussiez faire faizt noz briefs, en manere accustome,
pour faire nostre parlement estre tenuz a nostre Citee de Coventre. Nientmains, pour autres chargeantes causes dont nous sumes moevez au present, nous volons que nostre dit parlement soit tenuz a nostre ville de Northampton par maniere comme nous estiens primerement assentuz. Si vous prions enchargeant que sur ce facez faire noz briefs scoubz nostre grand seal en due forme en manere accustumee. Treschier et bien ame, savoir vous faisons en outre que nous merveillons grandement, que puis que nous estiens pleinement accordez avec vous et autres de nostre Conseil, par oyt iours passez, quen nostre grant Conseil se tiendra en hast, et que sur ce noz lettres deussent avoir este faitz, le plus en hast que faire purra, nest pas riens fait en celle partie. Considerez niefement que nous semble quen nostre garnissement ent fait, se deust souffrire au plein, pour laccomplissement de nostre desir. Si vous mandons que vous facez estre faitz sur cest nostre vouloir noz lettres scoubz nostre Privé Seal en due forme, solon ce que nous estiens accordez, et ce sanz delay ou difficultee queconque. Et ce en nulle manere ne lessez. Et nostre Seigneur vous ait en sa seinte garde. Donne scoubz nostre signet a nostre Manoir de Altham le tierz jour de Janyuer.

(Dorse) A nostre treschier et bien ame clercl Thomas Longley nostre Chaunceller.

(The words underlined were inserted)

(xiv) Signet Warrant for the Great Seal, 6 January 1406. (C.W. 1360/36) (See p.40)

Depar le Roy

Treschier et bien ame, Nous volons et vous mandons que sur la contenue de la supplieacion a nous nadgairs baillée par nostre ame Escuier Roger de Thornton, Maire de nostre ville de Novel Chastel sur Tyne, par la quelle il nous a suppliez de luy pardonner ce quil a porcheaze le manoir de Wytton et certains autres terrez et tenementz en le Comtée de Northumberland, sicone en mesme la supplieacion,la quelle nous vous ballasmes au temps de nostre darrein demoeur avec vous deinz vostre hostel, dont nous vous merclions grandement, il est contenz au plein, vous facez avoir a mesme nostre Escuier noz lettres patentes desoubz nostre grand seal en due forme sanz luy mettre en aucume delay en este partie. Donne scoubz nostre signet a nostre Citee de Londres le vj jour de Fevrier.

(Dorse) A nostre treschier clercl Thomas Longley nostre Chancler.
Henricus dei gracia Rex Anglie et Francie et Dominus Hibernie Thesaurario et Camerariis suis salutem. Quia dilectus clericus noster Thomas Longeley, tercio die Novembris proximo preterito, custodiam privati sigilli nostrti de mandato nostro susceptit, vobis mandamus quod eidem Thome pro singulis diebus ab eodem tercio die Novembris usque ad diem consecutionis presencium et extunc quandiu ipse steterit in officio predicto, quosque de ipso ad continuam moram in hospicio nostro faciendam ordinatum fuerit, tantam summana quanta aliis Custodibus privati sigilli nostri et domini Edwardi nuper Regis Anglie Avi nostri solvi et allocari consuevit solvi et allocari facite. Teste me ipso apud Westmonasterium primo die Decembris Anno regni nostri tercio.

Per consilium.

Henri par la grace de Dieu Roy Dengleterre et de France et Seignur Dirlande, As Tresorer et Chamberleins de nostre Eschequier, saluz. Combien que nadjaires par noz lettres dusouz nostre signet vous eussions chargez de paiier a nostre ame serviteur Johan Merssh, sur les dismes et quinzismes nadjaires a nous grantezs, deux Centz livres, en partie de paiement dune greindre somme a lui due pour vyn de lui achatez a nostre oeps. Nientmains nostre dit serviteur par force de noz dites lettres ne poe avoir paiement de la dite somme, a ce quiel nous ad donez a entendre. Par quoy vous mandons que a nostre dit serviteur facez paiier de nostre tresor les dites deux Centz livres sanz delay ou difficultee queconque. Donne souz nostre prive seal a Westmoustier le xxx iour de Januer, lan de nostre regne tierz.

Henri par la grace de Dieu Roy Dengleterre et de France et Seignur Dirlande, As Tresorer et Chamberleins de nostre Eschequier, saluz. Come nostre treschier Clerc Thomas Longley nous eit apprestez dys marcs, et les eit baillez a nostre oeps a Johan Morehay, cler, demorant ovesque le reverent piere en Dieu levesque de Bathe, a paiier sur les gages de certein nombre de gens darmes et archers qui
demorèrent en la compagnie du dit Évesque et de nostre tresame frère le Conte de Somerset, sur la sauve garde de nostre ville de Kermerdyn et du pays la environ pur un mois, sicome par une endenture faite parentre les ditz Thomas et Johan pleinement poet apparoir, et nostre treschier Esquier Johan Norbury nous eit aussi par la dicte cause apprestez Cent marcs. Volons et vous mandons que, sibien au dit Thomas de les dictes dys marcs, come au dit Johan Norbury de les dictes Cent marcs, facez prest paiement ou suffisant assignement es lieux ou ils agréer se veullent. Donne souz nostre prive seal a nostre ville de Kermerdyn le xxviiij jour de Septembre, lan de nostre regne quart.

(xviii) Privy Seal Warrant for Issue, 19 December 1404.  
(See p.32)

Henri par la grace de Dieu Roy Dengleterre et de France et Seignur Dirlande, As Tresorers et Chamberleins de nostre Eschequer, saluz. Come le second jour de Septembre darrein passez, par noz autres lettres desouz nostre prive seal, donames en mandement a nostre ame Clerc Johan Oudeby, et a noz bien amez Johan Haddeley, Thomas Knolles et Richard Merlawe, lors noz Tresorers assignez pur noz guerrés, pur avoir paiez a nostre treschier Esquier Johan Norbury certaines sommes de deniers par lui a nous apprestez pur noz guerrés. Cestassavoir premierement a nostre Chastelle de Wyndesore quarante marcs, et depus a nostre servitour Spreng, pur noz Canons, vynt livres, et a nostre Chastel de Tuttebury cynthauate livres, queles feurent deliverez de lavis de nostre Conseil a nostre chier et foial Chivaler Thomas Burton, pur la sauve garde de nostre Chastel de Llampadervaure. Lesqueux nadgairs Tresorers nont my paiez a nostre dit Esquier les sommes susditz, ne aucune dicelles, et partant ove restitutz en loffice de nostre prive seal noz lettres susdites. Si volons de lassent de nostre grand Conseil par la cause susdite et vous mandons que au dit Johan Norbury, facez avoir paiement de les sommes susditz. Donne souz nostre prive seal a Westmoustier le xix jour de Decembre, lan de nostre regne sisme.

(xix) Privy Seal Warrant for Issue, 15 January 1405.  
(See p.18)

Henri par la grace de Dieu Roy Dengleterre et de France et Seignur Dirlande, As Tresorer et Chamberleins de nostre Eschequer, saluz. Nous volons de lassent de nostre Counsil et vous mandons que a Nicholás Lobard, nostre Heraud, facez paiez dys mars pur les coustages et despenses en alant de nostre comandement en nostre message vers les parties Dalemaigne ovesque certaines
lettres descend nostre prive seal adresses as certains Princes, Contes et Seignurs celles parties. Donne souz nostre prive seal a Westmoustier le xv iour de Januer lan de nostre regne sisme.

(xx) Signet Warrant for the Privy Seal, 27 January.
(Privy Seal Office: Warrants for the Privy Seal, Series I, File 1, No.4QA) (See pp.21-22)

Dpar le Roy.

Treschier et bien ame. Nous volons et vous mandoms que, par noz lettres sous nostre prive seal, vous donnez en mandement depar nous a le Gardein de nostre Forest de Shirwode ou a souz lieutenant illoeqes pour deliverer a nostre ame servitour Philippe Cranbourn, un de noz vallectz herbergers, quatre cheisnes covenables pour maresme en nostre boys de Lyndehirst, deins mesme nostre Forest, a avoir de nostre doun pour amender aucuns ses maisons. Donne sous nostre signet a nostre Manoir de Eltham le xxvij jour de Januer.

(Dorse) A (nostre) treschier clerc Thomas Langley, Gardein de nostre prive seal.
APPENDIX B: RECORDS OF LANGLEY’S CAREER, 1407-1417.

(i) Warrant to the Exchequer, 15 February 1408.  
(E.I.W. 23/264)  
(See p.62)

Henri par la grace de dieu Roy Dengleterre et de France et Seignour Dirlande, As Tresorer et Chamberleins de nostre Eschequier, saluz. Come le trentisme iour de Januer lan de nostre regne oytisme, Hussions ordenez et assignez lonurable piere en dieu Thomas Evesque de Duresme destre un de nostre Counsail, et par celle cause lui eussions limitez et assignez la somme de deux Cents marcs, a prendre chacun an par voye de regard de nostre Tresor du dit trentisme iour de Januer enavant tancombe il ensi serroit un de nostre Counsail. Volons et vous mandons que ce qest aderere au dit Evesque des dictes deux Centz marcs par an du dit trentisme iour de Januer enca, lui facez avoir paientment de nostre Tresor, et ainsi desore enavant de temps en temps selon lafferant de mesme les deux Centz marcs par an, tancombe il serra ensi un de nostre Counsail. Donne souz nostre prive seal a Westmoustier le xv iour de Feverer lan de nostre regne noeisme.

(ii) Warrant to the Chancellor, 20 March (1409).  
(C.W.1362/44)  
(See pp.74-75,87-88)

Depar le Roy  
Tresreverent pere en dieu et nostre treschier et tresame cousin. Nous vous saluons tresouent. Et pour ce que le Reverent pere en dieu et nostre tresbiename Thomas Langley, Evesque de Duresme, nagairs par les prelatz et la clergie de la province Deverwik en leure darreine convocacion ordenez estoit daler au conseil general a Pise en les parties de Touscanie, com'dien que pour le fait du traettie dentre nous et ceux de France, nous luy eons fait uncore demourer pardeca. Nientmains par certeines causes nous a ce moevantes, avons de present ordenez le dit Evesque de soy transporter en toute bonne haste pardeverf mesme le conseil. Et vous raandons pout taut que siblen noz briefs de faire son eschange de mil livres de nostre monnoie ovec la Compagnie des Albertyns, et noz briefs de passage en quelque port lui plerra, comme noz lettres de familiarite pour lui et cent personnes en sa compaignie, de quelque estat ou condicion quils soient, et aussi comme a cellui qui demoert en nostre service es parties de Touscanie et aillours par dela la mer pour la fait de lunion de leglise nostre mere, noz lettres de proteceion ovec clausula volumus adureres par un an, facez faire au dit Evesque dessoubz nostre grand seal en due forme. Donng soubz nostre signet a nostre manoir de Eltham le xx8 jour de Mars.

(Dorse) A Tresreverent pere en dieu et nostre treschier et
Beatissime, pater, humillima filiali recommendacione premissa. Non apostolice sedis apicibus sed relatibus aliquorum qui de sanctissima vestra Curia iam pridem ad nostram presenciam sunt reversi didicimus qualiter ipsa sanctitas vestra venerabiles patres Dunolmensis et Saresburiensis ecclesiarum Antistites ad apicem Cardinalatus assumpserat. Quod utique factum esse tenemus ut talium personarum non tam scienciarum fecunditate quam virtutum claritate fulgenceum prudencia circumspecta, quo spiritu ducta nescimus. Verutamens opinari poterimus ecclesie sanctissime vestre providenciam hoc fecisse tam notabiles tamque sapientes viros in Sancti vestri Collegii numerum aggregando non solum ut status ecclesie Romane felicius (et) propensiur exaltet ut convenit, atque nobis et Regno nostro forsor honor et complacencia tribuantur. Unde si factum apostolicum in hac parte opinioni nostro reddeat proftci dignum duximus apostolice beatudini graciarum acciones impendere quas valimus. Nos itaque nichilominus duplurentes in merito attendentes quam grave foret eciam et molestu pariter et damno nobis et Regno nostro dictorum assistitum quovismodo destitui vel carere presencia necnon et ipsorum eximio et prudenti non frui consilio cum optet. Attendentes quoque propterea quod iidem Episcopi nostris assistendo lateribus multo magis proficere poterunt ad Romane ecclesie vestrique status utilitati ut expedit, assidue procurandam quam si personaliter et continue residerent in Curia. Igitur apostolice sanctitati filiali susasione consulimus humillime supplicantes eidem quatenus debite consideratis omnibus et singulis que contra premissa prudenter, hiis presertim temporibus, sunt merito ponderando quam dictos Episcopos ac status huius Cardinalatus oblati quantumcumque honorifici susceptione eciam nostrorum contemplacione precaminum excusatos habere dignetur apostolica celatudo. Cuius tribuat altissimus cum dierum longitudunem, prosperitatem et pacem, ad universalis ecclesie fulcimentum pariter et augmentum.
Sovereign Lord, with all meek and entier hert as I kan or may, I recomand me to youre royale maistie. To ye whiche please it to wite that in your Castel of the Pontfreit, Sunday the xviij day of this monythe of Januer, I have recyvet certeins articles enseelet undir youre signet of the egle, makyng mencion the said articles that ye have receyvet and seen the articles that I last sent ye touching the goyng of the Duc of Burbon and of Gaucourt yn to France. In the whiche matter it has liket yow to write me youre uttermost entent that if the Frensh lords, that is to say, the Ducs of Orliens and of Burbon, wollen of thaire owne fre wil plegge the said Gaucourt for the somme of xl scutz for to be trewly paied to yow the first day of May next commyng if Gaucourt entre not his body to you the last day of March now next followyng or with inne, and als so that the forsaid Gaucourt make to yow gooode assurance or he depart that he shal take noon advantage ne colour of withdrawyng hym over his day by the forsaid pleggyng nor by no nother thyng, but that he shal trewly with owten fraude or mal aegyne entre his body to yowe the forsaid last day of March or afore. And so ye wol accorde his goyng.

As touching this article please it to youre soverain lорorship to wite that communyng had with the said Ducs that have bunden hem to yow in the somme of xl scutz in manere as is before desyret. And over that to fulfille in partie youre desire that byfore this tyme ye have had that alle the lordes shuld plegge the said Gaucourt etc, the forsaid Ducs, Mareschal Bouciquaut and Stoutville by thaire lettres haven plegget the same Gaucourt as in two several lettres and an instrument ther on made it is more playnyly contenet. And so the said Gaucourt cometh to yow atte this tyme and with hym a Clerc of the Duc of Burbon, as it has list yow to comand. And the said lettres and instrument I sende yow by the berer of this lettre. And as touching the assurance that Gaucourt shuld make in his persone, he may make it best now whenne cometh to youre presence.

As touching the goyng of the said Duc of Burbon, it hath liket yow to write that ye wol that he go so that be the last day of March next commyng he lay to yow en hostage on thaire lyves his two soens and othir especifiet in his last lettres to yow written the whiche with alle the tother lettres of the Frenshmen that ye sent me last I sende yow now egyn be the berer of this lettre. And over that, that the said Duc of Burbon fynd seuttie of
marchantz respondentz of the somme of CCxl\textsuperscript{m} scutz of the which two scutz alway shall be worth a noble of Yngland.

Plsee it yow to wite, sovernein lord, that the mateire of this article hath been diligently communet with the said Duc and atte last he is condescendit to lay and fynd the the forsaid hostaiges and seurte en manere and forme as he writet to yow atte his tyme, in Frengsh and in Latyn aftir the translacion of his awen cler. the whiche Clerc with Gaucourt he hath ordeynet to make redy the forsaid hostaiges and seurte. And as touchyng the tyme that the said Duc shuld abide in Pance, for as much as ye have not written therof youre wille, it semeth goode that the appointement therof abide til he come to your presence. Over this I have remembred the said Duc of Burbon that he write to yow with his awen hond how he contynuth his wille and entent in the mateire secret.

Soverein lord, that ymong youre grete bysynesse it hath liket yow to sent me the copie of the credence to yow sent from the Duc of Holand and the copie of the unsware therto, I me suffir not for to thank yow but I pray to God that he recompense yow. And as of thythyngs in this youre cuntre, y blessit toe God, here is goode rest and quiete. This same Monday at nyght, with Goddes grace, I shal mete my lord of Westmerland et York, and there abide al Tyseday to solicite the chevance that ye have commanct us, And from thennes atte first, I go to Durem ward, with youre gracious leve, to sumwhat ordeyn for my litell and symple governance. More I kan not write atte this tyme, but soverneinlord, I pray to the Holy Trinite to kepe yow body and sawle. Writen this same Monday.

Youre symple Chapellein  
T. de Duresme.
A treshonoure, tresgracious et tresreverent Pier en Dieu, levesqe de Duresme, Chaunceler dengleterre.

Suppliant humblement Guillaume Piedru, burgeys de la ville de Nantes, et Guillaume Madok, demorant en Apoueldaux en Bretaigne, qe come, gracious seignur, lez ditz suppliantz avoient chargez en la dit ville de Nantes une Nief appelle nostre dame de Pouldauy, dount estoit Maister le dit Gillaume Madok, ovesqe xlv tonelx de vyne sibien de blank come de rouge deux amener marchaundement a la ville destaples en Picardie, ou en la Port de Flaundrez; le quell Neif (sic) pur pour de eux de Crotye ariva devant la ville de Harflieu, al entencion de descharger le dit Nief et de vender les vinez suisditz as marchaundez du dit ville de Harflieu; par quelle temps un homme appelle Guy Buss h de Caleys, en compaigne de plusieurs autrez, ariva le jour de seint George darrein passe devant la dit ville de Harflieu, et prist le dit Nief ovesqe toutz lez gentz et marchaundisez qe estoient dedains, et les amesnoint iesques la Havene de Sandewych, et illoqes lessa xiiij tonelx dez ditz vinez et la remainant il ad amesne iesques a Caleys et ensy detient, en tresgraund greef et damagez dez ditz suppliauntz. Qe please a vostre tresgracious paternite considerer le trewe pendaunt parentre nostre tressoveraigne seignur le Roy et le Duc de Bretaigne, et sur ceo graciouslyement graunter as ditz suppliantz vous graciussez lettres directez as governours des ditz Havenez de Sandewych et Caleys, eux chargeantz de fair restitution as ditz suppliantz sibien du dit Nief come de toutz les biens et marchaundisez en icelle prisez. Et ceo pur dieu et en oevre de charite.

(Dorse) Soit brief fait a le partie defendant pour comparer devant le Roy et souv Conseil a Cantirbirs lundy qe sera a deux semaignes, pour respondre a ce qe li sera declare a sa venue; et soit autre brief fait pur mettre les vins prises en gard tanqe il soit discussez a qi ils de droit appartiegnent.

Assentuz est par le Counsell come cy desus est declarez, a Westmoustier le xxix jour de May, lan etc. ix.
(ii) Petition of Elizabeth Montagu.  
(E.C.P. 4/116).  
(See p.129)

A soun tresgracious seignur et reverent pier en dieu, levesqe de Duresme, Chaunceler dengleterre.

Supplie treshumblement vostre povere oratrice Elizabeth femme a Thomas Mountagu de Loudrez, qe come le dit Thomas de long temps ad continue sa vie ovesqe une Margarete Fapyour en adulterie, et ensi ad dispanduz et degaste toutz sez biens, parount ele est devenuz en si graund dette qele est en point de iour en autre destre arestuz et en prisonez; et au present le dit Thomas gist ove la dite Margarete a Stratford atte Bowe, pres a vostre mancior de Oldeford, ensi continuant sa vie en adulterie, a graund peryll de sa alme et destruccioun du dite suppliaunt. Pleez a vostre gracious seignurie, al honour de dieu et pur emendement del vie du dit Thomas, defaire venir le dit Thomas devant vous au fyn qe par vostre gracious seignurie il purra lesser et refuser sa mals governance. Pur dieu et en oeuvre de charite.

(iii) Petition of Robert Seynham (1420).  
(E.C.P. 5/129)  
(See pp.123, 126 & 132).

A tresgracious et tresreverent pierre en dieu, restituatur. Levesqe de Duresme, Chaunceller Dengleterre.

Supplie humblement Robert Beynham, qe come il fuist peisblement seisez de quatre mees, cent acrez de terre (et) xl acrez de pre, ove lourz appurtenancez en la ville de Newent en le Countee de Gloucestre, au temps et puis le darrein passage nostre soveraigne seignur le Roy en les parties de Normandie, tanqe un Nicholas Walweyn et William Wynter de Oxenhale, le Marsdy prochein apres le feste del Purificacion de nostre dame darrein passe, le dit suppliant des mees, terres et prees suiisditz, ove force et armez, ove graunde nombre dez gentz desconuz, ousterount et les ensy occupiount, en pleyn disherytesoun de dit suppliant sil neit vostre tresgracious eide celle partie. Que please a vostre tresgracious seignurie de considerer la matier suiisdicte, et sur cee degrauntier severalx briefs directy as ditz Nicholas et William destre devant vous en la Chauncellarie nostre dit soveraigne seignur le Roy, a certain iour et sur certain peine par vous alimiter, destre examine sur les premisses et encotre defaire restitution a dit suppliant des mees, terrez et prees suiisditz, ensemble ove lez issuez en le mesme temps resceux. Pur dieu et en oeuvre de charite.

Plegii de prosequendo (Given).

(Dorse) Super quo infrascriptus dominus Cancellarius fieri
fecit quoddam breve domini Regis infrascriptis Nicholo et Willielmo directum ad comparendum coram domino Rge in Cancellaria sua a die Pasche in unum mensem, sub certa pena in eodem brevi continetur; ad quem diem predictus Nicholas in Cancellaria predicta comparuit, et ab eadem recessit absque licencia; per quod concessum est quod infrascriptus Robertus restituatur ad possessionem suam terre et tenementorum infrascriptorum, et quod prefatus Nicholas attachietur etc.

(iv) Warrant of Privy Seal to the Chancellor, 19 December 1419. (Chancery Warrants, File 667, No. 910) (See p. 112)

Henri par la grace de dieu, Roy de France et d'Angleterre et Seigneur Dirlande, au Reverent pere en dieu, Levesqe de Duresme, nostre Chanceller, saluz. Pource que nous avons ordonnez, deputez et assignez nostre tresame frere Humfrey, Duc de Gloucestre, destre nostre Lieutennant et Gardein en nostre Royaume d'Angleterre, vous mandons que a mesme nostre frere facez faire noz lettres de Commission de Lieutennancie desouz nostre grand seal, pour estre nostre Lieutennant et gardein de nostre dicte terre par manere et selonge les fourme et teneure de noz autres lettres de Commission de Lieutennancie madgairs faites a nostre treschier frere Johan, Duc de Bedeford; et facez aussi adresser brief dessouz nostre dit seal en due fourme a mesme nostre frere Johan, Duc de Bedeford, qui de nostre commandement et vouletern se transporter devers nostre presence, pur lui descharger de la Lieutennancie et garde de nostre Royaume suisdit. Donne souz nostre prive seal a nostre Citee de Rouen, le xix jour de Decembre, lan de nostre regne septisme.

Et si vous semble que cestes noz lettres ne soient pas suffissantes pur vostre garrant en ceste partie, uncore ce nonobstant, facez faire et deliverer noz dictes lettres de Commission de Lieutennancie et brief de descharge baillables et suffissantes en ce cas, et facez conceivre et escrire autiel garrant come vous semblez que serra pour vous souffissant pour celle cause, et icel garrant escrit et devers nous envoe, nous le vous renvoierons ensealle desouz nostre de priveseal suisdit. Donne come dessus.

J. Hethe.

(v) Warrant of Privy Seal to the Exchequer, 27 October 1418. (Exchequer Issue Warrants, Box 34, No. 198) (See p. 112).

Henri par la grace de dieu, Roy Dangleterre et de France et Seignur Dirlande, as Tresourer et Chamberlains de nostre
Eschequier, saluz. Nous volons de lassent de nostre
Counsail et vous mandons qe a nostre ame Clerc Richard
Priour, de loffice de nostre prive seal, facez paier Cent
souldz de regard pur ses coustages et expenses alant de
nostre commandement devers nous en nostre Duchee de
Normandie, pur y estre entendant a nostre treschier Clerc
Mestre Johan Kemp, Gardien de nostre prive seal. Donne souz
nostre prive seal a Westmostier le xxvij iour doctobre, lan
de nostre regne sisme.

(vi) Letter of Henry V (to Langley), 12 February (1419).
(Ancient Correspondence, Vol. XLIII, No. 162) (See p. 107)

Worshipful fader in god, right trusti and welbeloved, we
grete you wel. And witeth that we been enformed that the kyng
of Castel maketh a grete armee of vesselx whiche shuld be
redy in short tyme, as is sayde, for to doo the harme against
us and ourues that thay may, whiche god defend, and in
especiale that thaire purpos is to doo thaire powaire for to
brynne and destrue oure shippes and the navie of oure lande
and namely oure shippes at Hampton. And also thaire
ordinance is to lande in oure Reaume for to doo thannoye
that thay may. Wherefore we wol and charge you that by thavys
of oure brothre of Bedford and of other suche as semeth to
your discrecion, ye ordenne in alle haste for the
governance of oure lande, and for the saufwarde of
seurkepyng of oure saide vesselx at Hampton and in other
places where as evre thay bee. And that thay of the portes
of the see coost al wowte be warned here of in alle haste,
and charged to be wel waytyng and redy at al tymes if any
suche thyng happen. Geven under oure signet in oure Castal
of Rouen, the xij day of Feverer.
APPENDIX D: THE ELECTION OF THOMAS LANGLEY TO THE
BISHOPRIC OF DURHAM, 17 MAY 1406.

In the later Middle Ages, English bishops were usually
appointed by papal bull of provision after nomination by the
king. The formal election by the cathedral chapter "was
simply an act of consent to the king's choice." Some interest
attaches to Langley's election, however, because it was not
by unanimous consent. Of the 57 monks who met, 47 voted for
him, led by the Prior, Subprior, Masters of five of the cells
and of Durham College, and nearly all the obedientiaries.
Walter Teasdale, Master of Jarrow, voted for Henry Bowet,
Bishop of Bath and Wells. Nine others voted for Thomas Weston,
Archdeacon of Durham: these were John Hutton, Master of
Wearmouth; John Barton, the chamberlain; Thomas Lythe, the
precentor; and six monks, for one of whom Lythe was proxy.

That nine monks should have voted for Weston when it was
known that Langley was the King's nominee indicates that the
Archdeacon, unlike many of his predecessors in that office,
was a popular figure to the Chapter of Durham. His career
had not been undistinguished. Richard II had employed him in
negotiations with France. He was a member of the household
of Bishop Skirlawe, his spiritual chancellor, and latterly
executor of his will. A letter written soon after Skirlawe's
death throws some light on Weston's candidature for the
Bishopric. There can be no doubt that Weston was the writer.

The letter is addressed to Thomas Rose and William
Barry, the two monks employed by the Chapter as its agents.

1. A. Hamilton Thompson: The English Clergy, p.17. 2. Reg. III,
   ff. 22-25. 3. In 1401, the Prior presented him to a prebend
   7. A transcript is printed at the end of this note.
to the King in the business of the election. The writer had learnt that Prince John, Warden of the East March and keeper of the temporalities of the Bishopric, had written to the King asking for his licence for the Prior and Chapter to elect a bishop freely. Prince John had written another letter to his esquire, William Massy, which the writer (Weston) had seen, in which John wrote that it was the intention of the Prior and Convent to elect him (Weston), on account of his many past services to them and for his many alleged virtues, and that it was the wish of all the nobles and lords of those parts that he should be elected. John wrote to Massy that he should press the King and Council to promote the writer. Rome and Barry were asked to communicate with the Chancellor (Langley) and Massy, and make an arrangement with the former whereby the writer should be recommended to the King and Council. He (Weston) would not press his suit, however, without Langley's agreement, as he was himself prepared to do all he could to aid Langley's promotion. If it should be that Langley was seeking promotion to York, and neither he nor Bubwith was standing for election to Durham, then the writer would do all he could, sparing no expense, to bring about his own election, although this would tend to exclude the Bishop of Bath. The writer felt that nothing could be done until Langley returned to London, where he was expected a few days before 25 April. Before then, the writer would send his servant Strech to London to inform Langley of his intentions.

This is a most revealing letter. It would appear that

---

1. On 2 April they were sent to sue the royal licence to elect (Misc. Charter 5723, f.3). 2. Nicholas Bubwith, Keeper of the Privy Seal, who was provided to London the same day as Langley was to Durham, viz. 14 May 1406 (C.P.L.VI 82). 3. This refers to Langley's absence while he was in Norfolk (See p.54 supra). 4. John Strech was one of the executors of Weston's will (Wills & Inventories, p.45).
after Skirlawe's death, the Chapter first considered the Bishop of Bath as a possible successor; this accounts for the solitary vote cast for him. Then the monks decided on Weston. There is no suggestion that Weston had himself urged his election, but rather that he was so highly esteemed that the Chapter favoured him of its own accord; indeed, he wrote that he knew nothing of his candidature before he saw Prince John's letter. John was then asked, and undertook, to use his good offices in obtaining for the Chapter the royal licence to elect its candidate. Weston, however, was aware that the King probably intended that either his Chancellor or Keeper of the Privy Seal, preferably the former, should have the Bishopric. Langley had apparently not yet given up hope of obtaining provision to York. Weston understood that Langley was the strongest candidate for Durham, and had no wish to oppose him. It was certainly unwise to oppose the royal nominee, but it seems that there were other reasons for Weston's attitude.

The nine monks who voted for Weston were men of independent mind. The smallness of their party was not the major cause of their failure. The Pope had provided Langley to Durham three days before the formal election. Although the election was held in secret, Langley would have learnt from Weston himself of the latter's hopes. After he became Bishop, he showed no ill-will against his unsuccessful rival. He appointed him one of his vicars-general. Weston did not remain long in the diocese, but went to Rome to seek advancement, no doubt, as a clerk of the Papal Curia. He was appointed one of Langley's attorneys there. He died at Pistoia, near Florence, on 29 August, 1408. In his will, he asked Langley to act as

---

supervisor, and bequeathed him a pair of gilt candlesticks. Their relations had thus remained friendly. Previously, they had had a common friend in Walter Skirlawe. The episode of the election of 1406, when Weston was reluctant to oppose Langley, and afterwards, when the Bishop retained the services of the Archdeacon, showing his continued confidence in him, tend to permit a favourable interpretation of the characters of both men.

"Weston's Letter": D. & C. Durham, Locellus 6, No.2.

Reverendi domini, confratres et amici confidentissimi. Post mei debitam recommendacionem, scire dignemini quod in die veneris preterita die, videlicet parascevende mane, varias serenissimi Principis domini Johannis filii domini nostri Regis litteras domino Regi predicto, et eam uni speciali scutifero suo Willielmo Massy, ad instanciam dominorum meorum Prioris et Capituli Dunelmensis, pro mei promocione directas recepi, quas licet in vestri absencia emanaverunt, non dubito originales procuratas ad instanciam Reverenciarum vestrarum, que mei personam licet immemitam dignate sunt dominis meis confratribus vestris adeo commendare. Pro quo eisdem Reverenciis omnes quas valeo graciarium refero acciones. Et quia in litteris huiusmodi quedam alia negocia prefati domini Johannis continentur, earum presentationem saltem dicto Willielmo Massy differre non audebam, qui ut spero usque ad vestri adventum, et reditum domini mei Cancellarii Anglie, omnem in hac materia differet prosecutionem quia expediencius reputo istud negocium per vos tractari quam per eum. Nam in quantum ego concepi, prefatus magnificus Princeps scribit patri suo pro libertate eleccionis ut Priori et Capitulo licenciam concedere dignetur libere elegendi quem voluerint, pro qua vos omnino instare oportet. Scribit tamen scutifero suo, quomodo Prior et Capitulum sunt michi pre ceteris affeccionati propter obsequia impensa, et impendenda, et propter virtutes per eos et si nulle subsint multipliciter allegatas.

1. Wills & Inventories, p.45. 2. Skirlawe appointed Langley one of his proxies in the Parliaments of 1402 and 1404 (Parl.Proxies,41/2012 & 42/2053 & 2088). He appointed Langley an executor and made him some bequests (Testamenta Ebor. I.315,325). In 1414, Langley named Skirlawe as one of those for whose souls masses were to be sung in the Galilee Chantry (C.P.R.1413-1416,p.206).
quidque omnes et singuli domini et Nobiles harum parcium mei promocionem desiderant. Et ideo scribit sibi ut domino nostro Regi et aliis dominis de consilio amicis suis ex parte sua pro mei promocione instanciam faciat. Vestras igitur Reverencias exoro attentius, quatinus cum domino meo Cancellario, et cum prefato Willielmo Messy, super hac materia secundum quod eisdem Reverenciis vestris consulcius videbitur communicare dignemini, et secundum ordinacionem domini mei Cancellarii, et vestram, ordinetur ut tam dominus noster Rex quam alii domini de consilio de recommendacione persone mee per litteras predictas, et eciam de sincera affecione quam vos ac domini mei Prior et confratres vestri ad mei persona geritis pro mei honore diligenter informentur, quia licet commendacio et affeccio huiusmodi non possint proficere ad id de quo nunc agitur. Verisimiliter tamen proderunt in aliiis, si que me prosequi contigerit in futurum. Sciatis tamen pro constanti quod nichil vellem in hac materia attemptari, nisi secundum ordinacionem et voluntatem domini mei Cancellarii, cuius promocionem paratus ero prosequi iuxta posses, eciam si mei promocio verisimiliter immiuneret. Si tamen contigerit laborare pro Eboracense et nec ipsum nec Bubbewith instare pro eleccione Dunolmensi, tunc ad exclusionem postulacionis Episcopi Bathloniensis faciam omnem instanciam possibilem pro eleccione, non pariendo laboribus nec expensis, eciam saepe excessivis. Et si videatur domino meo Cancellario et vobis quod per litteras et recommendacionem huiusmodi, benevolencia regia capta(r1) poterit ad aliquam mei promocionem ad aliquod aliud beneficium iam per promocionem alicuius vacaturum, seu ad aliquem aliam ecclesiam cathedralem vacaturam, ordinetur ad hoc media per dominos meos Cancellarium et Bubbewith, et vos, secundum quod consulcius videbitur. Sciatis eciam indubie quod littere predicte absque aliqua mei instancia emanarunt, me omnino inscio et penitus inobservato, et revera usque ad earum receptionem de ipsis seu contentis in eis nichil penitus suspicabile, quod vobis affirmo vinculo iuramenti. Si tamen videatur domino meo Cancellario et vobis, quod expediat prosequi pro mei promocione ad ecclesiam Dunolmensis, sciatis indubie quod in illum eventum laboribus non parcam nec expensis notabiliter excessivis. Intellexi per Strech quod Cancellarius Anglie veniet London vel vta vel vjta feria ante quindecim pasche, citra quod tempus mittam Strech London de intencione mea plenius informatum. Omnipotens vestras Reverencias diu conservare dignetur in prosperis. Scriptas apud Hoveden die Pasche (11 April 1406).

(Dorsa) Honorabilibus et religiosis viris dominis Thome Rome et Willielmo Barry, monachis Dunolmensis et confratribus suis precarissimis,
APPENDIX E: NOTES ON SOME OF LANGLEY'S MINISTERS.

(i) Lancastrians.

John Newton (clerk, Coventry and Lichfield). Receiver-General of Palatinate of Durham, probably from 1406. One of the Bishop's auditors 1408,1416 & 1421, and Justices of the Peace 1422 & 1423 (Rot.A.3d;B.11;E.2 & 8). For correspondence with Langley, showing amount of business in his hands, see pp. 173-174 supra. Appointed by Bishop to collate to benefices in his gift while he was absent at Pisa (Reg.f.29d). A "trustee" in foundation of Galilee Chantry (C.P.R.1413-1416, pp.206-207). First benefice from Langley was Gateshead Hospital, 13 Sept. 1407 (Reg.f.10). Never appears as witness in Langley's London household. Died 1427, possessed of R. of Houghton-le-Spring, Sherburn Hospital, and canonries, with prebends, at Chester-le-Street and Darlington (ibid 133-134d). For his wastage of Sherburn Hospital, see p.248 supra. Will dated 9 Nov, 1427, appointing Langley supervisor. Probate 28 Jan, 1428. (Reg.f.137; Wills and Inventories 77).


John Radcliffe, treasurer of Langley's household in 1436. (See p. 2, note 1, supra).

look after Thoralby's four Durham benefices as well as his
prebend at St. Teath, Cornwall, as he was afflicted with
bodily infirmities and mente et memoria alienatus. The Bishop
was gravi cordis dolore in hac parte concussi at this news
(Reg. f. 207). Thoralby died in 1434 (ibid 213d). He held no
office in the Palatinate of Durham but was, while still
serving in the royal Chancery, attached to Langley's
household and may be considered one of his councillors. The
last quotation suggests the Bishop's affection for him,
which must have been of very long standing.

Thomas Lyes (priest, Coventry and Lichfield; B. Dec: notary).
Described as clericum nostrum by Langley, when he drew up
an instrument for the Bishop on 10 Aug. 1406, in London
(Reg. f. 4d). From then and until 5 Dec. 1412, constantly with
Bishop as his registrar (ibid 11-53d passim). Dean of
Auckland 17 May 1415 (ibid 70d). For his good record of
nearly 20 years residence there and his building, see p. 249
supra. Vicar-General jointly with John Huntman, 8 Oct. 1416
(Reg. f. 65), and alone after 1419 and until 1435. His
register is Reg. Langley ff. 282-286d, 266-280d & 289-304d,
(in chronological order). R. of Wearmouth 3 Dec. 1431 (ibid
182). Bequeathed Langley's best chalice and appointed an
executor (Scr. Tres App. pp. 245 & 247). For other details of
his career, see Visitations of Religious Houses in the
Diocese of Lincoln 1420-1449, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson (Cant.

George Radcliffe, D. Dec., R. of Sedgefield, Sequestrator
General in Archdeaconry of Durham 1424-1425 (See p. 2, note
1, supra).

James Oculshagh (clerk, Coventry and Lichfield). Ordained
subdeacon at Durham by suffragan, with Church of West
Thorney, Sussex, as title, 23 Dec. 1424 (Reg. f. 291d). R. of
Long Newton, 4 Oct. 1425 (ibid 127). Resigned, and collated
25 Dec. 1428, and priest 18 Feb. 1429, on both occasions by
Bishop, at Auckland (ibid 149, 158d). Witness to transactions
before Langley at Auckland 1431; London 1433; Auckland 1435;
Stockton 1436; & Auckland 1437 (ibid 175d, 204d, 216d, 232d, 241d,
250d). Bequeathed a Gloss on Epistles of St. Matthew and
St. Mark by Langley (Scr. Tres App. p. 247). Apparently a clerk
of Bishop's household.

Richard Rishton (clerk, Coventry and Lichfield). Educated
Winchester and New College, where fellow 1408-1409 (Reg.
Chichele II p. 674). Witness at Auckland 1410 and 1425 (Reg.
Langley ff. 46 & 122d). Will drawn up in room of Langley's
London hostel, 18 July 1425. Asked to be buried next to
John Streche, quondam domicelli domini mei Dunelmensis.
Executors John Bury and John Merland, valets of Bishop of
Durham. Supervisor John Radcliffe (q. v. supra) meum amicum
precarrassimum amicum. The notary who drew up the will
was Laurence Stafford, Langley's attendant registrar (Reg. 
Chichele II pp.329-330). Presumably a relative of Nicholas 
Rishton; the diplomat, who claimed kinship with Langley 
(Royal Letters, Henry IV (R.S.) I pp.429-431).

Thomas Holden (layman, from Holden, near Whalley, Lancs.). 
Attached to Langley by 27 Dec.1401 (York: Reg. Scrope f.5d). 
Witness at Selby 7 Jan.1408 (Reg. Langley f.11). Possibly 
captain of Fascastle in 1410 (see p.210 supra). Granted 
lease for life of manor of Ludworth, Co.Durham, by Alice 
Menville, 24 Jan.1411 (Rot.A.6). Licence to fortify his 
house there, 6 Aug.1422 (Rot.E.13d). In Durham commission of 
oyer et terminer 1412 (Rot.A.9d). Witness at Auckland 1411; 
Newcastle 1413; Calais 1416; and London & Auckland 1418 (Reg. 
ff.42,65d,85d,99d & 102d). Witness to later business before 
Bishop, but always in diocese. Appointed Steward of Durham, 
Justice of Assize and of the Peace, Mar.1423 (Rot.E.8), and 
auditor 1428 (ibid m.17). Bishop's proctor in Parliament 1437, 
when described by Langley as camerarium meum (Reg.f.236d), an 
office he had doubtless held since 1406. Bequeathed plate and 
appointed executor by Langley (Scr.Tres App.pp.245 & 247). 
Had also been given Langley's manor of Old Ford, London. Died 

James Strangways, of Yorkshire family (although name shows 
Lancashire origin). Sergeant 1411; King's Sergeant 1415; 
Justice of Common Pleas 1426; second Justice in Lancashire 
1429 and Chief Justice 1436 (Foss: Judges IV 361; Somerville 
op.cit.451). In Durham commission of oyer et terminer 1412 
(Rot.A.9d). Bishop's Justice of Assize; and reappointed 1423 & 1424 (Rot.A.11; E.7 & 8). Justice of Peace in Durham 1425, 
1427, 1433 and 1436 (Rot.E.8 & 16; C.7 & 11). Sent Langley 
information of seditious gathering in Durham, apparently in 
Dec.1433 (Appendix F(ix) p.316). Appointed one of Langley's 
executors (Scr.Tres App.p.247).

Robert Strangways. Chief Forester in Weardale, 1 Apr.1410, 
and presumably until 1436 (Rot.A.5; C.11).

(ii) Richard Holme.

Holme's life is of interest in that he combined duties 
as an ambassador for the King with service in Langley's 
household. His career prior to 1406 may be mentioned briefly. 
He was a Yorkshireman; a scholar of King's Hall, Cambridge; 
took the degree of Bachelor in Both laws; Canon of York 
from 1391; abbreviator of letters at the Papal Curia; 
chancellor to John Waltham, Bishop of Salisbury; royal 
clerk and diplomat; and latterly, had been in the service 
of Bishop Skirlawe, from whom he received the Rectory of 
Wearmouth (Reg.Chichele II 659; Anglo-Norman Letters and 
Petitions, ed. M.D.Legge, pp.95-96; Testamenta Ebor.1 pp. 
306-325. This last gives Skirlawe's will, showing Holme's 
attendance over two years).
Like others of Skirlawe's ministers, Holme presumably entered Langley's service when the latter became Bishop of Durham. The first notice of his employment was as a commissary for Langley, then Chancellor, in a dispute in the royal free chapel of St. Martin-le-Grand, London (C.P.R. 1405-1408, pp. 313-314). Holme was Langley's spiritual chancellor, apparently from 1406 until 1422. He was a witness in the Bishop's presence at London on 2 July 1407; attended his enthronement at Durham on 4 Sept.; and attended transactions by Langley at Selby on 7 Jan. and London on 31 Jan. 1408 (Reg. ff. 8d, 11-12d; D. Cartulary I f. 119). He was appointed, with Robert Waterton, to treat with French ambassadors for a prolongation of the truce made by Langley in the previous December, on 8 Apr. 1408. Holme was then called "nostre Conseller" by Henry IV (Foed. VIII 513). The extension was agreed upon at Pontefract, on 15 April. On the same day, Holme was with Langley at Howden (See p. 74 supra).

Following the perpetration of offences in the Forest of Weardale, the Bishop issued a monition against the offenders, on 11 June 1408: they were to appear before Holme the Chancellor, and the Official. An instrument setting out the Bishop's sentence in a dispute concerning Coldingham was witnessed by Holme at Durham on 26 June. A month later, he attended Langley at the visitation of the Convent, and was one of the Bishop's assessors. On 6 August, he was appointed one of Langley's proctors in Convocation. He witnessed a resignation in London on 15 Feb. 1409 (Reg. ff. 18, 20, 23 & 28). He accompanied Langley to Pisa, having been, like the Bishop, appointed a representative of the Northern Convocation at the General Council (York: Reg. Bowet, I f. 291d). On his return, he was appointed, on 20 November, to confer with Scottish representatives in order to make a truce (Foed. VIII 609; Rot. Scot. II 192). He took part in the following negotiations at Kelso, on 27 Jan. 1410 (E. I. W. 25/198). On 4 April, Holme was again sent to meet a Scottish commission (Foed. VIII 630-631; Rot. Scot. II 192). He left London for Scotland on the next day, and was back on 5 May (Foreign Accounts 10 Hen. IV, B.). During these absences from the Bishop's household, routine episcopal business was still transacted (Reg. ff. 30-32d). Holme did not take with him the AD CAUSA'S seal that, as spiritual chancellor, was entrusted to his keeping (See p. 229 supra).

In the following years, Holme was a constant witness to acta in Langley's presence. Wherever the Bishop went, Holme was with him. From 24 Aug. 1410 to 1 Feb. 1412, he is shown to have been present on eight occasions. On 23 Feb. 1411, he was appointed to a general commission of correction in the Diocese (Reg. ff. 34d-35d, 38, 39d, 41d-42, & 46d). It is thus surprising that on 12 Feb. 1412, Henry IV should have called Holme "our secretary". There is no other indication that he
served the King in this capacity, and his duties under Langley lead one to doubt the meaning of this term. It was employed in the commission appointing Holme to a commission, of which Langley was the first named, to confer with a Burgundian embassy (Foed. VIII 720–721; see p. 76 supra). On 10 and 17 May following, Holme acted for the Bishop in receiving the resignation of a benefice and making collation to it; and in effecting an exchange of livings. From then until 16 July 1413, he was present in Langley’s household at Auckland, Howden and London, on eight separate recorded occasions. On the last day, he again acted for Langley in the resignation of, and collation to, a benefice (Reg.ff.46d, 47d, 50d, 51, 58, 61d & 62; D.Cartulary I f. 144).

Holme and another clerk were appointed by the King to hold an enquiry into a Gascon affair, on 16 July 1413 (Foed. IX 41). In September, he was in France with an embassy led by Bishop Chichele (ibid 56–58), but in March and June 1414, he was at Auckland and London respectively, still with Langley (Reg.ff.66d, 67 & 68d). He was not one of the first great embassy to France in 1414, but appointed to the second, on 5 Dec. (Foed.IX 132, 186). He set out from London with Langley on 14 Dec., but returned twelve days earlier, on 17 Mar. 1415 (Foreign Accounts 3 Hen.V,B; see also pp. 80–82 supra).

Holme was with Langley in London on 15 April, and again, at Darlington, on 17 May (Reg.ff.69d & 70d). He was appointed to treat with Scots for a truce, on 5 Aug. (Foed.IX 302; Rot.Scot. II 214). On 7 Sept., he was one of the commission appointed by Langley to visit the Hospital of West Spital. The commissioners’ citation to the Master to reside was issued from the Hospital on 14 Sept. On 15 Oct., Holme was at Wheel Hall, and on 13 Nov., in London (Reg.ff.73d, 75). He was appointed to an embassy to treat with the Scots for a truce and the exchange of Henry Percy and Murdoch of Fife, on 11 Dec. 1415 (Foed.IX 323; Rot.Scot. II 215; see p. 212 supra).

This was Holme’s last diplomatic commission. His reward for these services came on 3 Oct. 1417, when he was appointed Warden of his old college at Cambridge (C.P.R.1416–1422 p. 123). His duties of the chancellor of the Diocese of Durham now formed his chief occupation. Acting as the Bishop’s commissary, he read the sentence dissolving a marriage, at Auckland on 13 Jan. 1416. He accompanied Langley to Calais in October (See p. 98 supra). On 12 Feb. 1417, he was again sent to visit West Spital (See pp. 240–241 supra). He saw Langley commence his duties as Chancellor of England at Whickham on 23 July (C.C.R.1413–1419, p. 135). On 24 Sept. 1418, he was one of the Bishop’s commission that sat at Durham to hear an ecclesiastical suit. Holme witnessed the drawing up of an instrument concerning Anglo-French negotiations in 1412, at Old Ford, on 14 Jan. 1419 (Foed.IX 669). He acted for the Bishop in effecting an exchange of benefices, at Durham, on
19 Mar., 1421. Holme's last recorded appearance in Langley's household was on 4 Jan., 1422, at Old Ford. On the same day, his successor as chancellor, Thomas Hebedden, made his first known appearance (Reg. ff. 46d, 79d, 80, 81, 85d, 91d, 92, 96d, 97, 99d, 100, 102d, 105, 107 & 109d). Holme presumably retired to Cambridge soon afterwards. His will was drawn up there on 18 April 1424. He died within a few days (Probate on 22 May).

Holme's will is quite remarkable. The preamble shows him as a man of education but of little conventional piety. He did not make a bequest to a single religious order, nor for the provision of masses. The poor of his parish of Wearmouth, his relatives and friends, were remembered, but none of his colleagues in the Bishop's service, nor even Langley himself; the mention of an inventory, however, indicated bequests not covered by the will. (Reg. Chichele II pp. 385-390; Testamenta Ebor. I 405-407). It is indeed strange that a man who had spent most of his life in ecclesiastical affairs should have remained untouched by religious sentiment. It is not surprising that his Rectory of Wearmouth had been allowed to fall into such disrepair that its sequestration was deemed necessary, on 14 Jan., 1425 (Reg. Langley f. 122). Yet Holme had, it must be presumed, given Langley good service for some sixteen years. He had also inspired Henry IV to show some mark of confidence. Holme's dual career is not unworthy of note.

(iii) William Doncaster

This sketch is of the career of an ecclesiastical civil servant par excellence. Doncaster was a clerk of the Diocese of York, a Bachelor of Laws and a notary-public. From 1414, he was retained by the Prior and Convent of Durham with an annual pension of 73s. 4d. (Bursar 1414-1415, m. 2d., et seq.). Witness to various transactions in Chapter House, Galilae Chapel, etc., 1416-1419. Described as an advocate of the Consistory Court on the last occasion (Reg. ff. 88 & 284d; D. Cartulary I f. 112; Scr. Tres. App. p. 208). Presented by Prior, and admitted, V. of Bedlington, V. of Aycliffe and V. of St. Oswald's Durham, consecutively, 1418-1420 (Reg. ff. 268d, 272 & 274). Official of Archdeacon of Durham 1419-1423, and of Archdeacon of Northumberland 1419-1423 (ibid. 268d, 270d, 275d & 279). After his visit to Melrose to receive the oath of King James (see p. 218 supra), Doncaster entered the Bishop's service: he continued to serve the Prior, but not, it would seem, either Archdeacon. In Bishop's penitentiary commission for Archdeaconry of Durham 22 Feb. 1425, and then throughout Langley's lifetime (Reg. ff. 121, 138d, 158, 167, 175, 218 & 223d). Witness to acta before Bishop at Auckland 1425 and London 1427 (ibid. 297 & 133). First notice of Doncaster as Sequestrator-General in Archdeaconry of Durham on 28 Nov.
1427. Held this office until 8 Sept. 1435 (Reg. f. 222). Given various additional duties because of this office, viz., to induct to certain churches in the Bishop's gift (ibid 134, 205d & 140); enquire into reported dilapidations of churches (ibid 140d, 152, 177d & 199); enquire into advowsons of churches at Warkworth, Middleton-in-Teesdale and Rothbury, and chantries at Gateshead and Wooler (ibid 145, 197, 202d, 184 & 194). On 9 Feb. 1433, appointed Sequestrator in Northumberland also, until another clerk could be found to hold this office. The next Sequestrator appointed 31 March following (ibid 200 & 203d).

At the same time, he was also Official of the Diocese. First mentioned as "commissary of Durham" on 28 Apr. 1428 (ibid 140). Still holding office at Langley's death. In commissions to visit Church of Eglingham 1430; Gateshead Hospital 1431; and Newcastle 1436 (ibid 167, 176 & 221d). Also in general commission of enquiry and correction 1435 (ibid 235d). In this period, his name often appears as a witness to Langley's acta. Collated by Bishop to Canonry at Chester-le-Street 1434, and Deanery of Auckland 30 June 1435. Resigned V. of St. Oswald's on 5 July following (ibid 211d & 219d). Granted lands to Chantry of Blessed Mary in Auckland Collegiate Church, for prayers for Bishop Langley and himself, 1437 (Rot. C.13) Reg. II (Inq. P. M.) f. 278). Rather strangely, not a beneficiary by Langley's will, indicating that although the Bishop valued, and had rewarded, his services, he had no particular liking for him.

Simultaneously, Doncaster continued to serve the Convent. Acted for Prior at installation of Archbishop Kemp, 1428 (Durham Account Rolls II 304). Official of Prior as archdeacon from 12 Sept. 1431 to 12 Sept. 1435 (Reg. Parvum I ff. 50 & 87). Engaged at York on business of Prior, 1431 (ibid 49). In commissions to visit churches of Convent in Yorkshire 1431, 1432 and 1433, and in Co. Durham 1433 (ibid 50d, 58d, 74d & 73d); and to audit accounts of the Collegiate Church of Hemmingburgh 1433 and 1437 (ibid 71 & 96). On 12 Nov. 1435, Prior refused to grant next vacant prebend in Howden or Hemmingburgh Churches to a nominee of Bishop of Salisbury, as he wished to give it to Doncaster, for the services he had given bene et laudabili ter in the last twenty two years (ibid 89). On 4 Jan. 1437, a papal licence granted to Doncaster, Dean of Auckland, to hold another benefice (C. P. L. VIII 594). Presented by Prior to R. of Meldon, and admitted 23 Apr. 1437 (Reg. Langley f. 244). Dead by 1440 (D. Locellus 25 no. 7, a letter of Countess Joan of Westmorland, dated 22 May ----, nominating to prebend at Howden vacant by death of Doncaster. She died 13 Nov. 1440 -Reg. II (Inq. P. M.) f. 308d).
(i) Bishop's warrant of privy seal to his temporal chancellor, 1 July 1431. (See p.165)
(P.R.O. Durham Chancery Records: Warrants & Grants, File 1,d.)

Thomas dei gracia Episcopus Dunelmensis dilecto nobis Willelmo Chaunceler, Constabularion nostro Dunelmensis, salutem. Cum nos de gracia nostra, concesserimus et licenciam dederimus pro nobis et successoribus nostris quantum in nobis est dilecto Armigero nostro Roberto Eure quod ipse Manerium suum de Bradley in Comitatu Dunelmensis muro de petra et calce firmare, kernellare, batillare et turrillare, et Manerium illud sic firmatum, kernellatum, batillatum et turrillatum tenere possit sibi et heredibus suis de nobis et successoribus nostris imperpetuum sine occasione vel impedimento nostri vel successorum nostrorum, Justiciorum, Escaetorium, Vicecomitum aut aliorum Ballivorum seu Ministrorum nostrorum vel successorum nostrorum quorumcumque. Ideo vobis mandamus quod litteras nostras patentee sub sigillo nostro in custodia vestra existenti predicto Roberto facias in forma predicta, alisque fine et feedo magni sigilli nostri ad opus nostrum inde capiendo. Datum sub privato sigillo nostro in manerio nostro de Stokton, primo die mensis Julii Anno Consecrationis nostre vicesimo quinto.

(ii) A similar warrant, 23 October 1411.
(ibid File 1, f.)

Thomas par la grace de dieu Evesque de Duresme, A nostre treschier et biename William Chancellor, nostre Conestable de Duresme, saluz. Come de nostre grace especiale eons pardoniez a William Maynesford de Elvet en nostre Cite de Duresme la trespasse et offense que envers nous il est encurruz de ce quil, sanz nostre congie, a purchassez a lui et a ses heirs de Johan Herryson de Maynesforth, milner, un mees et sessante acres de terre, ove les appurtenances, que de nous sont tenuz en chef en Maynesforth; Vous mandons que sur ce facez faire a lavantdit William noz lettres de pardon desoubz nostre grant seel en due forme, quites del fie de nostre dit seel que a nous appertient. Donne soubz nostre prive seel a nostre houstiel en Londres, le xxiiij iour doctobre lan de nostre Consecration sisme.
(iii) Bishop's writ of privy seal de procedendo to his temporal chancellor, 2 December 1422. (See pp.169-170) (Durham D. & C.; Locellus 5, no.11, extract from.)

Thomas dei gracia Episcopus Dunelmensis dilecto sibi (sic) Willielmo Chaunceller, Cancellario nostro Dunelmensis, salutem. Monstravit nobis Thomas Langton de Wynnyard quod cum nos, vicesimo sexto die Septembris anno pontificatus nostri terciodecimo, per litteras nostras patentes commiserimus Nicholo filio Willielmi filii Willielmi de Blaykeston Militis custodiam omnium terrarum et tenementorum que fuerunt predicti Willielmi Blaykeston Chivaler quæ de nobis tenuit in capite, et que per mortem eiusdem Willielmi Blaykeston Chivaler et racione minoris etatis eiusdem Nicholi in manus nostras seisita fuerunt, habendum a tempore mortis predicti Willielmi Blaykeston Chivaler quandiu in manibus nostris contigerint remanere, reddendo inde nobis per annum quandam certam summam, prout in litteris predictis plenius continetur; ac postmodum compertum fuisset per quandam inquisitionem coram Radulpho de Eure Chivaler, Ricardo de Norton et Jacobo Strangways, die Jovis in septimana Pasche anno predicto, virtute Commissionis nostre eiusdem Radulpho, Ricardo et Jacobo directe, captam et in Cancellariam nostram retornatam, quod predictus Thomas nuper seisitus fuit in domino suo ut de feodo de uno mesuagio, duobus cotagis et una carucata terre cum pertinentiis in Blaykeston, vocatis Chamberland, virtute cuiusdam feoffamenti sibi inde per Willielmum Hoton, per nomen omnium terrarum et tenementorum que predictus Willielmus de Hoton habuit in villa de Blaykeston, facti, habendum et tenendum eisdem Thome, hereditibus et assignatis suis imperpetuum, et possessionem suam virtute feoffamenti predicti continuavit usque ad decimum octavum diem Augusti tunc proximum preteritum quod predictus Thomas de predictis mesuagio, cotagis et terra per Willielmum Claxton, nuper Escaetorem nostrum in Comitatu Dunelmensis, colore cuiusdam inquisitionis coram prefato nuper Escaetore apud Aukland, dicto decimo octavo die, virtute cuiusdam brevis de diem clausit extremum, capte, per quam compertum fuit quod predictus Willielmus de Blaykeston Chivaler, qui de nobis tenuit in capite, die quo obiit fuit seisitus de quinquaginta et tribus acris terre et tribus acris prati cum pertinentiis in Carleton, et de uno mesuagio et certis acris terre in Blaykeston vocatis Chamberland, set de quo statu vel de quibus tenebantur juratores dicte inquisitionis coram prefato Escaetore captæ ignorabant, a possessione sua expulsus fuit; ac postmodum pro eo quod predicta mesuagium, cotagia et carucatam terre in dicta inquisitione coram prefatis Commissionarii capta contenta fuerunt parcella dictorum terrarum et tenementorum prefato Nicholo per litteras nostras predictas concessorum, per breve nostrum preceptimus vicecomiti nostro Dunelmensis quod scire faceret prefato
Nicholo quod esset coram nobis in Cancellaria nostra predicta die mercuris proximo post dominicam in Ramis Palmarum ultimo preterito, ad ostendendum si quid pro nobis aut pro se ipse habeat vel dicere sciat quare litterae nostre patentes sibi facte revocari et adnullari, et manus nostre de predictis mesuagio, cotagiiis et carucata terre ammoveri, et predictus Thomas ad possessionem suam dictorum mesuagii, cotagiorum et carucate terre, una cum exitibus inde medio tempore perceptis, restitui non debeant; ad quem diem partibus predictis coram nobis in Cancellaria nostra predicta comparentibus, predictus Nicholus (sic) pertulit in Curia litteras nostre patentes per quas concessimus ei custodiam mesuagii, cotagiorum et carucate terre, per nomen omnium terrarum et tenementorum que fuerunt Willielmi Blaykeston Chivaler, qui de nobis tenuit in capite, et quae per mortem eiusdem Willielmi Blaykeston Chivaler et racione minoris etatis eiusdem Nicholi in manus nostra seisita fuerunt, habendum et tenendum eadem Nicholo quamdiu in manus nostris contigerint remanere, unde non intendebat quod nos in placito illo ulterius procedere vellemus, petendo ea de causa de nobis auxilium, quod sibi existit concessum, ut dicturus, quo pretextu nos in placito illo ulterius ul distulistis et ad hac defertis, in ipsius Thome dispendium non modicum ac exheredacionis periculum manifestum; unde nobis supplicavit sibi per nos remedium adhiberi. Nos volentes eadem Thome iusticiam differri in hac parte, vobis mandamus quod, si in placito illo taliter sit processum et allegatum, tunc in placito illo cum ea celeritate, quae de iure et secundum legem et consuetudinem regni Anglie et nostre regie libertatis Dunelmensis poteritis, procedatis, allegacione predicta non obstante, dum tamen ad iudicium in hac parte reddendum nobis inconcussitis nullatenus procedatis. Datum sub private sigillo nostro apud London, secundo die Decembris anno pontificatus nostri decimo septimo.

(iv) Langley's reply to a memorandum sent to him by his ministers in Durham, (24 December 1419). (See pp.173-174) (D, Additional Document 107)

Articuli responsivi ad certos articulos per J(ohannem Neuton) et R(icardum) Bukley missos Dunelmensis Episcopo per manus Ricardi Burton.

In primis, quantum ad articulum facientem mentionem de ordinacione Willielmi Allewent in Coronatorem de Derlyngton etc. Episcopus bene contentatur et fieri fecit sub privato sigillo suo litteras Constabulario ut inde faciat prefato Willielmo litteras patentes in forma debita.

Item, de apunctamento facto cum Coronatore de Chestre. Episcopus bene contentatur.

Item, quantum ad tercium articulum concernentem factum domini Willielmi Claxton nuper vicecomitis Dunelmensis etc. Inde factura sunt brevia prout predictus Burton referre poterit.
Item, pro mensuracione kelarum apud Novum Castrum. Willielmus Chaunceller reportabit remedium.


Item, quantum ad breve de mandamus post mortem J. Haukeswell, et breve de Ravysement de garde. Dictus Episcopus mittit dicta brevia facta de avisiamento Johannis Thoralby.

Item, quantum ad Henricum Gartesheed. Jacobus Strangways faciet diligenciam.

Item, quantum ad reparacionem Majjarii de Insula quod domina Comitissa de Suffolk tenuit in dedit supportandam. Reparacionem et alia onera faciant executores dicte domine seu terram tenentes tempore suo, reparacionem necessariam ad quam dicta domina tenebatur.

Item, quantum ad litteras de Waranto Constabulario dirigendas pro R. Bukley. Littere ille facte sunt et sigillate et predicto Ricardo Burton tradite.

Item, quantum ad pannum pro robis pro domino Thoma Surtese et Johanne Hoton. Pro dictis robis est provisum, prout referre potest dictus Ricardus.

Nomina eorum quibus liberari debet fenum.

In primis, apud Aukland liberetur decano fenum sibi necessarium.

Item, de remanente dicti fenii, liberetur pauperibus tenentibus domini in partibus illis aliqua porcio secundum discretionem J. Neuton et R. Bukley. Ita quod pars dicti fenii remaneat in grangia apud Aukland pro adventu domini.

Item, de feno apud Midelham, liberetur Priori Dunelmensis x carrecte, Suffraganeo iij carrecte, Thome Holden iij carrecte, et totum residuum fenii, excepta notabili parte tradendo Ratulpho de Eure, liberetur pauperibus tenentibus domini in partibus illis.

Item, de meliori feno apud Stokton, reservetur in grangia pars competens pro equis domini, et residuum liberetur pauperibus tenentibus domini in Stokton, Hertburn, Carleton, Norton, Eseyntong, et alibi in partibus.

(v) Bishop's warrant of privy seal to his auditors, 26 September 1432. (See p.175) (D.1411-Pont.-12; Cartulary III, f.333)

Thomas par la grace de dieu Evesque de Duresme, As Auditors dez Accomptez de noz Ministrez en nostre Countee de Duresme qi ore scount ou pur le temps serrount, salutz. Come par autrez noz lettres donez a nostre Manoir daukland le xxj'er iour da Septembre lan du nostre Consecracion quinte, eions
Treschier et tresbiename. Nous vous savons tressovent, en vous signifiant que l'onurable dame Elizabeth Dame de Clifford nous a en formez par ses lettres et messages que vous vous proposez de prendre et mettre en prison le Maire de Mertilpole, pour y demourer sans lui mettre a mainprise ou en baile; de la quelle matiere nous avons communiquerez une délibération avec nostre biename William Chanceller nostre Conestable de Duresme, qui en vous fera report de nostre entencion en ceste matiere; et pource nous volons et vous prions que en le noien temps ne faisoit nauthrement molester le suisdit Maire; et apres ce que le dit nostre Conestable en avera vous enforme de nostre avys, ce veuillez mettre en execution en nous signifiant voz desire. Et nostresieur vous ait en sa garde. Escrit a Londres le xxvij Jour de May

(D'orse) A treschier et tresbiename monsieur William Claxton, nostre Viconte de Duresme.

(He was sheriff from 1416 to Jan.1420 - Rot.B.mm.17 & 19).
Thomas etc. dilecto filio Thome Leys, Rectori ecclesie parochialis de Weremouth nostre diocese, Vicario nostro in spiritualibus generali, salutem. Licet nos nuper, per quasdam litteras nostras dilectis filiis Rectoribus, Vicariis, capellanis parochialibus et alii in ecclesiis parochialibus et capellis de Esyngton, Hert, Stranton, Monkehesilden, Castleden, Dalton et Hertilpole, nostre diocese, divina celebrantibus, et eorum singulis directas, ac nos per easdem litteras nostras monuerimus, primo et secundo et peremptorie, palam et publice, temporibus et locis congruis, moneri mandaverimus in genere omnes et singulos dictarum ecclesiarum et capelliarum parochianos qui de bonis Henrici Hope et aliorum sociorum mercatorum Hanze Theutonice in Allemania, de amicia Domini nostri Regis, nuper circa partes maritimas de Hertilpole predicto, prope locum vocatum le Blakhalle, in mari, diversis et vi ventorum et maris ad partes propinquas villarum predictarum impulsis et agitatis, quicquam rapuerunt, abstulerunt et depredarunt ea, ve detinuerunt seu concealerunt, quatinus ipsi, sub pena excommunicacionis maioris, quam in ipsos omnes et singulos si monicionibus nostris huiusmodi non paruerunt, cum effectu comminabemur solempniter fulminare infra quindecim dierum spaciunm post huiusmodi monicionem nostram eis sic factam et intimatam, quorum quindecim pro primo, v. pro secundo, et v. pro terto et peremptorio termino, premissa huiusmodi moniconie nostra, eis assignavimus omnia et singula bona sic per eos, ut prefertur, rapta, ablata, detenta et concealerunt, predictis mercatoribus suo saltem Roberto Jakson, commissario nostro ad colligenda huiusmodi bona sufficienter et legitime deputato, restituerent seu restitui facerent, ut tenentur, vel alteri satisfacerent debite pro eisdem. Ac licet, ut accepimus, prefate littere nostre per prefatos mandataries nostros debite fuerint execucion demandata, nonnulli subditi nostri, tunc dictarum villarum incole et parochiani, predictas moniconionem et comminacionem nostros contemnentes, ut videtur, qui in alio predicitur, bonam dictorum mercatorum per eos, ut predictur, rapta et ablata, adhuc penes se detinent, concealer et occultant, in animarum suarum grave pericum dictorumque mercatorum non medicum detrimentum et jurisdiccionis ecclesiasticie contemptum manifestum. Vobis igitur tenore presentium committiamus et mandamus quatinus prefatam excommunicacionis maioris sanctiambam contra omnes et singulos monicionibus nostris predictis eis debitis factis et intimatis non parentes, per nos, ut prefertur, comminatis, debite execucioni demandari faciatis, eosque omnes et singulos qui contra moniconionem nostram huiusmodi quicquam de bonis dictorum mercatorum adhuc penes se detinent, concealer vel occultant, si qui tales fuerint in prefatam excommunicacionis
sentenciam incidisse, et ipsos excommunicatos fuisse et esse, palam et publice ac solenniter, temporibus et locis congruis, auctoritate nostra denunciari faciatis. Quorum omnium absolutionem nobis specialiter reservamus. Datum Eboraco sub sigillo nostro, quarto die Mensis Octobris Anno domini etc., ut supra, et Consecracionis xxvij°.

(viii) Report of the Inquisition at Hartlepool, 1 April 1433. (D. Register III, ff. 159-164d) (See pp. 190-194)


Qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod Johannes nuper Rex Anglie, progenitor domini Regis nunc, per litteras suas patentes, quorum datum est apud Kirkeby in Kendale xx° primo die Augusti anno regni sui decimo, concessit liberis tenentibus Episcopatus Dunelmensis, per nomen militum et liberorum tenencium de Halierwolk, quod si ponantur in placitum de liberis tenementis suis, possint se defendere secundum communem et rectam assisam regni sui Anglie. Et siquis eorum velit rectum suum petere secundum communem et rectam assisam per brevia originalia, capiantur in curia domini Regis. Et si ipsi vel heredes sui implacitentur de aliqua re in curia Episcopi Dunelmensis, quod possint se defendere secundum communem et rectam assisam regni. Et quod non implacitentur de liberis tenementis suis nisi per breve Regis et heredum suorum, seu capitalis Justiciarii domini Regis, sicut fieri consuevit toto tempore Regis Henrici, patris predicti Johannis nuper Regis. Et cum in forisfacturam Episcoporum inciderint, deducerentur per amoeriametis secundum assisam eiusdem Episcopi. Et quod si Episcopus Dunelmensis ceperit averia eorum et tenuerint contra vadium et plegia, vicecomes Northumberland faciet eis illa replegiari et eis inde iuste deduci. Et quod ipsi et heredes sui habeant de cetero libertates et asiamenta in foresta Episcopi Dunelmensis qui ipsi et antecessores sui habuerunt temporibus Henrici, patris predicti Johannis, et tempore
Johannis, predecessoris predicti Episcopi. Et dicunt quod predicti liberi tenentes libertates predictas habere debent virtute litterarum predictarum dicti domini Regis Johannis patencium.

Dicunt eciam dicti iuratores quod Thomas, Episcopus Dunelmensis nunc, ut in iure ecclesie sue Dunelmensis et predecessoris (sic) suj ab antiquo usi fuerunt libertatibus subscriptis, videlicet, habere cognicionem omnium placitorum coram Justiciariis ipsius Episcopi apud Dunelm. emergencium infra libertatem Dunelmensis, ac eciam cognicionem omnium placitorum emergencium infra wapentagium Sadberg in predicto Comitatu Northumberland, coram Justiciariis ipsius Episcopi apud Sadberg, a tempore Regis Henrici terci post conquestum usque nunc.

Et dicunt quod idem Episcopus, colore libertatum predictarum, de iniuria sua proprius usurpavit super dictum dominum Regem nunc, et super Henricum quartum avum ipsius Regis, ac Henricum quintum patrem suum, nuper Reges Anglie, utendo libertatibus et franchesis subscriptis infra libertatem et wapentagium predicta, videlicet, quod ubi quidam Nicholus de Lyndeley perquisivit sibi et hereditibus suis unum mesuagium et CXL acras terre cum pertinenciis in Shirburn, infra dictam libertatem Dunelmensis, de quodam Percivallo de Lyndeley, Armigerou, quod quidam mesuagium et terre tenentur a dicto Episcopo in capite, et valent per annum ultra 30 represis C solidos, predictus Episcopus dicta mesuagium et terras cum suis pertinenciis, post perquisicionem predictam, videlicet, vicesimo die Maii anno Regis Henrici quarti xij , per ministros suos in manus suas seisivit dicta mesuagium et terram, et inde exitus et proficua a dicto vicesimo die usque diem Jovis proximum post festum Sancti Mathel Archangeli anno regni Regis Henrici quinti primo percepit, pro eo quod dictus Nicholus dicta mesuagium et terras licencia dicti Episcopi inde non obtenta perquisivit, quo usque dicto die Jovis, dictus Nicholus cum dicto Episcopo finem pro deliberacione mesuagii et terre predictorum de manibus dicti Episcopi habenda, occasione trangressionis predicte facte, per Centum solidos cum eodem Episcopo fecit, et eodem centum solidos eadem Episcopo in cancellaria sua apud Dunelm persolvit. Et quod dictus Episcopus fecit seisire in manus suas diversa terre et tenementa per diverses homines sic perquisita infra libertatem et wapentagium predicta, temporeis eorumdem Regum, et inde percepit exitus et proficua ad valenciam centum librarum, quousque tenentes terrarum et tenementorum illorum graves fines cum dicto Episcopo in forma predicta (f.160) ad voluntatem suam fecerint, in domini Regis contemptum et populi sui in hac parte dampnum non modicum et gravamen.

Item: dicunt dicti Juratores quod dictus Episcopus, per litteras suas patentes sub sigillo suo signatas, quarum datum est apud Dunelm die lune proximo post festum Sancti Mathel Apostolii anno Regis nunc undecimo, assignavit et constituit

Item: dicunt quod predictus Episcopus, per litteras suas patentes per xx annos proximos iam elapsos, ad libitum suum fecit et constituit unum vicecomitem et unum escaetorem in libertatem et wapentagium predicta, ad exercendum et faciendum omne quod ad officia vicecomitis et escaetoris domini Regis alibi in Anglia pertinebat faciendum. Et dicunt quod dictus Episcopus sic assignavit et constituit per litteras suas patentes Robertum de Eure vicecomitem et escaetorem suum in libertate et wapentagio predictis, in crastino Sancti Michaelis Archangeli anno regni domini Henrici nuper Regis Anglie, patris domini Regis nunc, septimo; qui quidam Robertus, virtute litterarum predictarum et per mandatum ipsius Episcopi, officia illa continue a predicto crastino hucusque fecit et occupavat, et adhuc facit et occupat, in libertate et wapentagio predictis, in enervacione corone domini Regis et in contrarium statutorum domini Regis de vicecomites et escaetores faciendos editorum, et in contemptum domini Regis. Et quod idem Episcopus, a dicto crastino Sancti Michaelis hucusque, aliquem vicecomitem seu escaetorem domini Regis in dicto comitatu Northumberland officium pro proficuo Regis in libertate Dunelmensis et wapentagio predictis facere non permisit, sed eos ad hoc faciendam omnino per idem tempus impedivit. 

Dicunt eciam dicti juratores quod cum in statuto apud Merton quondam edito provisum sit quod quilibet liber homo qui debet
sectam ad Comitatums, Thrythyrngum, hundredum et wapentagium,
vel ad curiam domini sui, libere facere possit attornatum
suum ad sectam illam pro se faciendam. Quidam Henricus
Ravenesworth qui sectam nuper debuit ad curiam dicti
Episcopi, quum idem Episcopus Cominatu Dunelmensis numcupare
facit de quindena in quindenam apud Dunelm, tenendum pro uno
mesuagio et centum acris terre cum pertinenciis que idem
Henricus tenet de dicto Episcopo in Gatesheved, pro huiusmodi
secta, vicesimo quarto die Novembris Anno domini Regis nunc
undecimo, apud (f.160d) Dunelm in cancellaria dicti Episcopi,
pecit de eodem Episcopo breve suum pro attornato suo
recipiendio ad sectam predictam pro eo faciendum, quod quidem
breve idem Episcopus adtunc ibidem idem Henrico omnino
negavit, et ipsum tunc ibidem ad finem quadragesimai denariorum
cum ipso Episcopo pro secta predicta facienda compulsit. Et
dicunt quod idem Episcopus in huiusmodi casu per spaciunm xx
annorum iam proximorum elapsorum diversi tenentibus suis
infra libertatem Dunelmensis et wapentagium predictum
huiusmodi brevia negavit, et tenentes suos per idem tempus
compellebat facere sectam vel finem ad voluntatem ipsius
Episcopi pro huiusmodi sectis suis faciendis, statuto
predicto non obstante, in domini Regis contemptum et ligeorum
domini Regis grave damnum ac formam statuti predicti.
Item: dicunt dicti Juratores quod ubi Johannes Gilleford
armiger iam defunctus fuit sesitus in domino suo ut de
feodo die que obit de tribus mesuagis et Centum acris terre
cum pertinenciis in Gatesheved, et quod Johannes Gilleford
filius et heres eiusdem Johannis Gilleford Armigeri tempore
mortis eiusdem Johannis, videlicet, primo die Septembris Anno
regni domini Regis nunc sexto, fuit plenus etatis, scilicet
triginta annorum et amplius, et quod dicta mesuagia et terre
tenebantur de dicto Episcopo in capite per servicium militare;
et quod idem Johannes Gilleford Armiger obiit sesitus de uno
mesuagio et decem acris terre in eadem villa que tenentur de
Willielmo Tempest chivaler; que quidam terre et tenementa in
Gatesheved valent per annum centum solidos; que quidam terre
et tenementa, tam illa que de dicto Episcopo quam de dicto
Willielmo Tempeste sic tenentur, per Robertum Bare
Escaetorem dicti Episcopi infra libertatem et wapentagium
predicta, primo die Octobris Anno regni dicti domini Regis
nunc septimo, sesita fuerunt in manus eiusdem Episcopi; et
quod idem Episcopus exitus et proficua inde percepit a dicto
primo die Octobris usque ad festum Sancti Michaelis Anno
octavo regni eiusdem domini Regis, quo festa, apud Dunelm,
predicts Johannes Gilleford fecit finem cum ipso pro quattor
libris pro deliberacione predictarum terrarum et tenementorum
predictorum de manibus eiusdem Episcopi habenda. Et dicunt
quod dictus Episcopus in omnibus huiusmodi casibus seisire
facere solet in manus suas omnia terre et tenementa post
mortem tenencium suorum infra libertatem et wapentagium
predicta, et inde exitus et proficua percepit quousque haberet
huiusmodi tenencium breve de diem clausit extremum et brevia de liberacione terrarum et tenementorum huiusmodi extra manus eiusdem Episcopi habenda prossequatur, et exitus et proficia illa inde ad valorem mille librarum ad usum suum proprium de diversis tenentibus suis, diversis temporibus per spaciun viginti annorum proximorum elapsorum, percepit infra libertatem et wapentagium predicta, in magnam depauperacionem eorum tenencium.

Item: dicunt Juratores predicti quod quidam Johannes Lombeley chiavaler nuper seisisatus fuit die quo obiit, videlecet, in vigilia Pasche Anno Regni domini Regis Henrici, patris domini Regis nunc, octavo, in dominico suo ut de feodo de uno mesuagio et centum acris terre in Setoncarrowe infra wapentagium Sadberg, et dicta terras et tenementa tenuit de dicto Episcopo in capite per serviciun militare; que quidem terras et tenementa, occasione mortis predicti Johannis et racione minoris etatis Thome filii et heredis eiusdem Johannis, seisita fuerunt in manus dicti Episcopi; et postea, videlecet, die martis proximo ante festum Sancti Gregorii Pape Anno regni dicti domini Regis nunc sexto, compertum fuit per quandam inquisitionem, coram Roberto Eure tunc Escatoris dicti Episcopi in wapentagio Sadberg, apud Sadberg captam, quod dictus Johannes Lombeley obiit seisisatus in dominico suo ut de feodo de Manerio de Stranton cum pertinentiis in wapentagio predicto, quod tenebatur de domino Clifford, et valuit per annum ultra represis centum marcas; quod quidam manerium, virtute inquisitionis illius, seisisum (f.161) fuit in manus dicti Episcopi, eodem Episcopo usurpando et clamando prerogativam dicti domini Regis nunc sibi pertinere in hac parte, eo quod idem Episcopus clamavit custodiam dicti manerii quod de alio sic tenetur sibi pertinere, pro eo quod alia terre et tenementa in Seton predicta in quibus idem Johannis seisisus fuit, fuerunt in custodia dicti Episcopi racione minoris etatis dicti Thome Lombeley in eodem wapentagio, quod manifeste sonatur contra dignitatem domini Regis nunc et iura corone sue in hac parte, tam ex causa predicta quam pro eo quod idem Thomas, racione minoris etatis sui, fuit in custodia domini Regis, pro eo quod dictus pater suus alibi tenuit de domino Rege in capite per serviciun militare die quo obiit. Et quod predictus Episcopus, toto tempore domini Regis nunc, usurpavit super dictum dominum Regem nunc, et utitur in wapentagio et libertate predictis omnibus prerogatibilis, avantageis et privilegiis que ad dictum dominum Regem nunc et in iure corone et dignitatis derogacionem et detrimentum corone domini Regis predicti et dignitatis sue, et populi dicti Regis ibidem oppressiis et exheredacionem manifestam, qua auctoritate ignorant.

Item: dicunt dicti Juratores quod Thomas Grey Chivaler quonquam fuit seisisus in dominico suo ut de feodo talliato de manerio et villa de Consete infra dictam libertatem Dunelmensis, que valent per annum ultra represis decem
marcas; qui quidam Thomas Grey postea, videlicet, primo die Augusti Anno regni Henrici quinti post conquestum Anglie tercie, commisit altam prodicionem erga dictum Regem Henricum quintum, patrem domini Regis nunc, unde quinto die Augusti eodem anno convictus est, et morti adiudicatus fuit, prout in curia ipsius nuper Regis liquet de Recordo. Et postea, coram dicto Roberto Bare Escaetore dicti Episcopi Dunelmensis infra dictam libertatem Dunelmensis, primo die Novembris anno dicti domini Regis patris eiusdem domini Regis nunc octavo, apud Dunelm, per inquisitionem coram eodem Escaetore captam, compertum fuit quod dictus Thomas Grey fecit prodicionem erga dictum Regem Henricum quintum in forma predicta, tempore prodicionis cuius facte idem Thomas seisitus fuit de manerio et villa predictis in dominico suo ut de feodo; colore cuius inquisitionis dictus Episcopus seisivit terras et tenementa predicta in manus dicti Episcopi, ut terras et tenementa eodem Episcopo et successoribus suis occasione prodicionis predicte forisfacta; ac idem Episcopus, iniuste clamando forisfacturam illam, inde exitus et proficua, a tempore inquisitionis predicte usque diem Veneris proximum post festum Sancti Martini in hieme Anno regni dicti domini Regis nunc quinto, quo die quidam Radulphus Grey filius dicti Thomas Grey, clamando dictum manerium et villam de Consete virtute cuiusdam scripti talliati facti cuiusdem Thome Grey militi, patri predicti Thome Grey chivaler, et heredibus de corpore suo procreateis, ut consanguineus et heres dicti Thome Grey militis, per formam donacionis predicte, videlicet, filio dicti Thome Grey chivaler, filii predicti Thome Grey militis, venit coram dicto Episcopo in Cancellaria sua apud Dunelm, et peciit manerium et villam predicta virtute tallii predicti sibi liberari; qui quidem Episcopus, post petitionem predicti Radulphi Grey eodem Episcopo sic factam, per litteras suas patentes apud Dunelm fecit inquiri de titulo ipsius Radulphi in petitione predicte contento, per quam quidam inquisitionem in cancellaria dicti Episcopi retornatam, dictus titulus pro eodem Radulpho compertus fuit, ac idem Episcopus manerium et villam predicta dicto Radulpho, cum pertinenciam, habendum et tenendum sibi, secundum formam tallii et donacionis predicte, extra manus suas liberavit, reservando eodem et successoribus suis quod si contingat dictum Thomam Grey militem sine herede de corpore suo exeunti obire, quod tunc (f.161v) dictum manerium et villam cum pertinenciam dicto Episcopo et Successoribus suis revererent imperpetuum, prout in Cancellaria dicti Episcopi liquet (de Recordo) manifeste, in domini Regis nunc et corone sue damnum non medicum et exheredacionem manifestam. Et dicunt quod dictus Episcopus eodem modo clamat et usitat super dominum Regem nunc habere sibi et successoribus suis forisfacturas, tam terrarum et tenementorum quam bonorum et cattallorum, omnium tenencium in libertate et wapentaggio predictis prodicionem erga dominum Regem faciencium de quibus convicti fuerint, in exheredacionem dicti domini Regis nunc et heredum suorum.
Item: dicunt dicti Juratores quod idem Episcopus compellit omnes tenentes suos de eo tenentes per homagium infra libertatem Dunelmensis et wapentagium Sadberg predicta facere sibi homagium regale per hec verba: Je deveigne vostre homme de vie et de membres et de terrayn, honour, etc., sub eadem forma que homagium domino Regi per ligeos suos fieri deberet.

Item: dicunt quod dominus Episcopus infra libertatem Dunelmensis et wapentagium Sadberg predicta usurpavit super dictum dominum Regem nunc et progenitores suos, videlicet, super predictum dominum Henricum avum suum et dominum Henricum patrem suum, dando et concedendo cuicumque de popolo domini Regis qui castra seu forcelletta edificare voluerint infra libertatem Dunelmensis et wapentagium Sadberg predicta, licencias per litteras suas patentes ad edificanda, batellanda et machicollanda faccellet, castra, muros et alia domos et edificia defensibilia infra libertatem et wapentagium predicta. Et quod idem Episcopus, die sabbati vicesimo die Septembris anno regni Henrici quinti nunc, apud Aukeland, concessit Roberto Eure per litteras suas patentes quod ipse posset apud Bradley infra libertatem Dunelmensis predictam, quoddam castrum batellare, edificare et machicollare, in derogacionem dicti domini Regis et corone suae.

Item: dicunt dicti Juratores quod Willielmus Stower de Norton, in libertate Dunelmensis laborer, nuper coram Justiciariis dicti Episcopi apud Dunelm legaler indicatnus fuit, de eo quod ipse apud Norton felonice furatus fuit unum bovem, preci decem solidorum, de bonis et catallis Johanni Osbern, prout in dicto indicatnus satis liquet, postea, videlicet, die mercuris proximo post festum Sanctae Lucie Virginis Anno regni domini Regis nunc sexto, apud Dunelm, coram dictis Justiciariis, idem Willielmus de feloniea predicta in forma iuris arectatus fuit, et per iuramentum patrie tunc ibidem convictus, postea, eisdem die et Anno, ibidem idem Willielmus, coram dictis Justiciariis, peciat privilegium clericale, et pro eo quod idem Willielmus, coram eisdem Justiciariis, examinatus legebat ut clericus, idem Willielmus per eodem Justiciarios tunc ibidem dicto domino Episcopo, ut loci illius ordinario, commissus fuit ad salvo custodiendum sub periculo incumbenti. Postea, videlicet, primo die Maij Anno regni dicti domini Regis nunc septimo, predictus Willielmus ex prisonam dicti Episcopi apud Dunelm, pro defectu bone custodie et in defectu predicti nunc Episcopi, evasit, et ad largum ivit.

Item: dicunt dicti Juratores quod dominus Episcopo, decimo die Octobris Anno regni Regis (Henrici) sexti post conquestum tercio, apud Dunelm, per litteras suas patentes, iniuste et sine titulo, assumando super se potestatem Regalem et prerogativam domini Regis, pro fine xl (solidorum ?) eadem Episcopo in Cancellaria sua predicta soluta, concessit et licenciam dedit Johanni Bellacyse, quod ipse, secundum avisiamentum, dispositionem et ordinacionem suam, quandam
Cantariam unius Capellani ad altare Beate Marie in ecclesia Sancte Marie Dunelm divina imperpetuum pro anima dicti Johannis et animabus (sic) omnium fidelium defunctorum celebraturi de novo creare fundare et stabilire possit; et quod idem Johannes dicto capellano et successoribus suis, capellaniis cantarie predicte, terras et tenementa in libertate Dunelmensis predictae, ad valenciam decem librarum per annum dare et concedere possit, et quod idem capellanus eadem (f.162) terras et tenementa ab ipso Johanne Bellacyse recipere, habere et gaudere possit, habendum et tenendum sibi et successoribus suis, capellaniis cantarie predicte, imperpetuum; qui quidam Johannes, vicesimo die Januarii proximi tunc sequentis, cantariam predictam apud Dunelm de novo creavit, fundavit et stabilivit, et Johannem Stilyngton capellanum cantarie predicte constituit et ordinavit, ac eodem capellano, virtute dictarum litterarum patenciarum, decem mesuagia et centum acras terre cum pertinenciis in Dunelm, que valent per annum demarcas, dedit et concessit, habendum et tenendum eodem capellano et successoribus, capellaniis cantarie predictis, imperpetuum; virtute quorum doni et concessionis idem Johannes Stilyngton inde seisitus fuit, et adhuc existit, colore iuris cantarie sue predicte, Statutis domini Regis in contrarium factis non obstantibus, in contemptu domini Regis et corone sue lesionem manifestam.

Item: dicti Juratores dixerunt quod cum Willielmus Eure Chivaler nuper in Cancellaria dicti nunc Episcopi apud Dunelm quoddam breve de replegiarum de averiis suis iniuste captis, videlicet, de duobus bosibus in uno loco vocato Southmorden, in villa de Shaldeford infra libertatem Dunelmensis, versus Thomam Fery de Shaldeforth, apud Dunelm prosecutus fuisset, retornabile coram Justiciariis ipsius Episcopi die Jovis proximo ante diem Dominicam in Ramispalmarum Anno Regni domini Regis nunc nono. Et idem Thomas, coram eisdem Justiciariis tunc ibidem cognovit capcionem averiorum predictorum, et dixit quod locum in quo supponebatur capcionem predictam fieri fuit solum et liberum tenementum predicti Episcopi ut de iure ecclesie sue Sancti Cuthberti Dunelmensis, et dixit quod ipse fuit ballivus ipsius Episcopi, et quod inventit boves predictos herbam ipsius Episcopi depascentes et ipse eos cepit et imparcavit, prout se bene licuit. Et predictus Willielmus dixit quod ipse seisitus fuit tempore capcionis predicte de uno mesuagio et decem acris terre cum pertinenciis in Shaldeford, in dominico suo ut de feodo, et quod ipse et omnes alii quorum statum ipse tunc habuit in tenemento predicto habuerunt communem pasturam cum omnimodis averiis suis omni tempore anni in loco predicto, a tempore quo non extat memoria, tanguam pertinenciis ad eadem tenementa, et quod ipse boves predictos in eodem loco posuit, prout ei bene licuit. Et predictus Thomas dixit quod ipse non potuit ulteriorius inde sine dicto Episcopo respondere, et peciti inde auxilium de dicto Episcopo. Et super hoc dies datus fuit partibus predictis coram prefatis Justiciariis ipsius Episcopi apud Dunelm, usque in
crastinum Sancti Laurencii tunc proximi sequentis, et dictum fuit prefato Willielmo quod interim sequetur erga dominum Episcopum si sibi videret expedire; et sic predictus Willielmus per eundem Episcopum in curia sua compulsus fuit ad prosequendum breve predicti Episcopi de procedente prefatis Justiciariis suis directum, ubi talem prerogativam nullus habere potest nisi dominus Rex. Et dicunt quod dominus Episcopus infra predictus compulsit diversos residentes et tenentes infra libertatem et wapentagium predicta in huiusmodi casibus esse, prosequi brevia de prosequendo et peticiens prout domino Regi in curia sua prosequi debet, in maximum derogacionem iuris domini Regis et in contemptum dicti domini Regis, et populi sui demum manifestum.

Item: dicunt dicti Juratores quod ubi Johannes Breyser et Walterus Whitewain, die Jovis proximo post festum Sancte Lucie Virginis Anno regni Henrici quinti secundo, apud Dunelm, coram Justiciariis ipsius Episcopi nunc, arrestati fuerunt pro certis feloniiis sibi impositis, unde indictati fuerunt. De quibus quidam feloniiis idem Johannes et Walterus, coram eisdem Justiciariis tunc ibidem, de bono et malo posuerunt se inde in exitum patrie, per quem triati in forma iuris tunc ibidem conviciti fuerunt, et pro eo quod idem Johannes et Walterus, coram eisdem Justiciariis tunc, clamaverunt privilegium clericale, et per ordinarium examinati, legerunt, per iudicis Justiciarios dicto Episcopi nunc, ut ordinarium loci illius, tunc ibidem commissi fuerunt, salvo et secure custodiendum sub periculo incumbenti; qui quidam Johannes et Walterus postea, seclsect, decimo die Octobris Anno regni dicti Domini Henrici nuper Regis quinti post conquestum quarto, apud Dunelm, ob defectum bone custodie, a prionsa eiusdem Episcopi, et in eius defectu, evaserunt, et sui iuris, ad largum iverunt, in contemptum dicti domini Regis.

Item: dicunt Juratores predicti quod cum per quandam indenturam inter prefatum Episcopum, ex parte una, et Willielmus Eure militem, ex parte altera, apud Dunelm vicesimo die Aprilis Anno regni Henrici sexti post conquestum secundo factam, idem Episcopus dimiserit prefato Willielmo minerias suas carbonum in Raby et in Baronia de Evenwod, habendum usque ad fines novem Anorum extunc proximorum sequencium, reddendum inde de Episcopo annuatim durante termino predicto Cxij libras xiiij solidos iiiij denarios; predictus Episcopus pro CCCIx et v libras novem solidos et quinque denarios quos sibi a retro fore supponuntur de firma predicta, misit breve suam clausum de fieri facias vicecomiti suo Dunelmensis in hec verba: Thomas dei graci Episcopus Dunelmensis, vicecomiti Dunelmensis, salutem, Preceperimus tibi quod de bonis et cattallis Willielmi Eure Chivaler in balliva tua fieri facias CCCIx et v libras novem solidos et quinque denarios quos nobis debet de firma minerarum nostrarum carbonum et ferri subitus eodem carbones in Raby, Caldhieste, Hertekeld, Hathereclogh alies vocato Tollelawe, et Wollawes, et in Baronia de Evenwod, quas quidem minerias idem Willielmus de nobis tenet ex firmam per Cxij
libras xiiij solidos et quatuor denarios per annum, prout
nobis constat per inspeccionem rotulorum Cancellarie nostre.
Ita quod denarios illos habeas ad scaccarium nostrum Dunelm
vicesimo die Decembris nobis solvendum. Et si forte bona et
catalla ipsius Willielmi in ballya tua non sufficiant ad
solucionem debiti predicti, tunc pro eo quod inde defuerit
capias in manum nostram omnia terras et tenementa ipsius
Willielmi in ballya tua, et ea salvo et secure ad opus nostrum
custodies. Ita quod de exitus eorumdem nobis respondes
quousque nobis de debito predicto plenarie fuerit satisfactum.
Et quid feceris in premisis nobis ad dictum scaccarium
nostrum ad dictos diem et locum distincte et aperte constare
faceas, et habeas tunc ibi hoc breve. Teste Willielmo
Chaunceller, Cancellario nostro, octavo die Decembris Anno
pontificatus nostri vicesimo septimo. Absque alio processu
inde versus predictum Willielmum in hac parte facto, ad grave
damnum ipsius Willielmi, contra legem terre et in
derogacionem domini Regis.
Dicunt eciam quod ubi dominus Thomas Hatfeld, quondam
Episcopus Dunelmensis predecessor predicti nunc Episcopi,
tempore domini Edwardi nuper Regis Anglie terci post
conquestum, fieri fecisset sibi quoddam magnum sigillum
clausum ad similitudinem sigilli regii in Cancellaria sua
usitati, et quod dictus Episcopus nunc toto tempore suo habuit
et usus fuit huiusmodi sigillo, et cum eo brevia sua sigillari
facit, et in brevibus de transgressione utitur huiusmodi
temini, contra pacem ipsius Episcopi, et in brevibus ut
recordis suis de appellis in curia sua prosecutis utitur
talibus terminis, contra coronam et dignitatem ipsius
Episcopi, in exheredacionem domini Regis et corone sue.
lesionem manifestam. Et dicit quod omnes usurpaciones
predictas, libertates, franchesias predictas usurpatas sunt
et fuerunt per dictum Episcopum nunc et predecessores suos,
tempore predicti Regis Edwardi terci et deinceps, infra
libertatem et wapentagium predicta, in magnam oppressionem
populi domini Regis in hac parte ac exheredacionem corone sue.
Item: dicit dicti Juratores quod idem Episcopus deliberacionem
fecerit tenentibus suis post mortem antecessorum suorum de
terris et tenementis suis in manibus ipsius Episcopi saltem
per breviam sua de terris liberandis, idem Episcopus postmodum
per breviam de Scire facias prosequitur et sepius
prosequeretur versus eodem tenentes ad ostendendum et
respondendum dicto Episcopo in Cancellaria sua predicta quare
dicta terras et tenementa de manibus suis sic deliberatur (sic)
in manus suas reseisire et de exitus eorumdem respondere non
debeant, (3.163) pro defectu forme et aliis omissionibus et
mesprisionibus per ministros suos proprios in huiusmodi
brevibus de liberacione et inquisicionibus coram Escaetore suo
super brevibus ad diem clausit extremum factis et habitis. Et
per eadem brevia de Scire facias dicta terras et tenementa
reseisiri fecit et exitus et proficua in de percepit a tempore
liberacionis predicte quousque huiusmodi tenentes suos de novo
liberacionem extra manus dicti Episcopi de terris et tenementis illis prosecuti fuerint, et sic extorcionaliter compellit dictos tenentes suos de novo prosecui deliberacionem de terris et tenementis huiusmodi, non obstante dicta prima deliberacione. Et istam prerogativam dictus Episcopus nunc usurpavit super dictum dominum Regem et super tenentes suos infra libertatem et wapentagium predicta ubi nullus predecessorum ipsius Episcopi ante ipsum illam prerogativam unquam habuit nec clamavit. Dicunt eiam dicti Juratores quod cum, coram Escaetori eiusdem Episcopi in libertate et wapentagio predictis, compertum fuerit quod si aliquis tenens perquisivit aliqua terras et tenementa de ipso Episcopo tenta in capite infra libertatem et wapentagium predicta licet idem perquisitor optuleret eodem Episcopo racionabilem finem pro transgressionibus illis sic factis, et pecierit litteras patentes dicti Episcopi de perdonacione sibi in hac parte faciendas, illam perdonacionem idem Episcopus facere recusat. Et postea perquisitores huiusmodi de exitus terrarum et tenementorum sic perquisitorum sibi respondere et eos prosequi perdonacionem huiusmodi, et finem pro eisdem facere compellit, in derogacionem populi domini Regis in hac parte. Et ulterius dicunt quod Radulphus Eure Chivaler perquisivit sibi habere et assignatis suis manerium et villam de Langley, ac diversa terras et tenementa cum pertineniciis in Newerland cum Ladley Parke, et Faweleyes in Wolsyngham cum pertineniciis, que tenentur de dito Episcopo in capite per servicium militare; postquam per inquisitionem idem Episcopus ore tenus apud Dunelm perdonavit dicto Radulpho transgressionem factam in hac parte et finem sibi in hac parte contingentem et pertinentem eisdem Radulpho in vita sua; ac prefato Willielmo Eure, filio et herede dicti Radulphi, post mortem eiusdem Radulphi, separatim dedit et concessit, ac ipsos inde separatim plenarie exoneravit, iodi idem Episcopus; post mortem dicti Radulphi et postquam, idem Episcopus quartodecimo die Septembris Anno pontificatus sui xviij, ceperit homagium et fidelitatem predicti Willielmi Eure Chivaler, filii et heredis predicti Radulphi Eure Chivaler defuncti, pro omnibus terris et tenementis que idem Radulphus de ipso Episcopo tenuit die quo obit. Et predicto quartodecimo die Septembris, per breve suum, omnia terras et tenementa illa prefato Willielmo reddiderit, et ei iinde plenarie liberationem fecerit; quoddam breve de Scire facias vicecomite Dunelmensis directum, cuius datum est vicejimo quarto die Augusti Anno pontificatus dicti Episcopi vicesimo septimo, retornabile soram ipso Episcopo in Cancellaria sua Dunelmensis die Jovis proximo post festum Nativitatis Beate Marie tuno proximum sequentem, versus ipsum Willielumm prosecutum fuit, ad premunendum ipsum Willielmum ad ostendendum siquid pro se habeat vel dicere sciat quare predicta manerium et villa de Langley, aeras, terre et tenementa cum pertinenciis in Newland cum Ladley Parke et Faweleyes in Wolsyngham cum pertinenciis, parcellass dictorum terrarum et tenementorum unde idem Episcopus predictam
liberacionem prefato Willielmo fecerat, occasione perquisicionis ac non solutionis et satisfaccionis finis predicte, in manus suas resumi et reseisiri non deberent, idem que Willielmus Eure de exitibus inde medio tempore perceptis eidem Episcopo respondere et satisfacere non deberet, prout in eodem brevi plenius continetur. Virtute cuie brevis, Robertus Eure tunc vicecomes Dunelmensis retoravat super breve illud quod ipse scire fecit prefato Willielmo quod esset in dicta Cancellaria ad diem illum, ad faciendum et reci piendum quod breve illud in se exigit, et requirit per Willielum Melote, Johannem Spence, Hugonem Foster et Willielmum Mordon; per quod predictus Willielmus Eure ad comparendum ad diem illum in Cancellaria predicta (f.163d) cum eodem Episcopo super breve illud placitare, iustate et contra legem terre, compulsus fuit, quod quidem placitum adhuc ibidem inter eos pendet indiscussum.

Item: dicti Juratores dicunt quod dictus Episcopus, assumendum super se et usurpandum prerogativam que ad coronam et dignitatem domini Regis pertinet, die Lune proximo post festum Sancti Martini ultimum preteritum, mandavit Johanni Hedworth armigero, per Robertum Dalton coronatorem ipsius Episcopi infra libertatem Dunelmensis, breve ipsius Episcopi clausum quod ipse compararet coram prefato Episcopo in Cancellaria sua apud Dunelm, certo die in dicto breve limitato, ad respondendum dicto Episcopo de hiis que tunc sibi ex parte dicti Episcopi obijcerentur, et ad recipiendum et faciendum quod in curia predicta consideraret in hac parte, cuizs brevis tenor sequitur in hcc verba: Thomas dei graeia Episcopus Dunelmensis, dilecto sibi Johanni Hedworth armigero, salutem. Quia datum est nobis intelligi quod tu Robertum Richardson, Willielmum Leman, Georgium Scott, Henricum de Ogle, Johannem Forman et Willielmum Correx cepisti et quae causa racionabili sub custodia tua iniuste detenuisti et adhuc detines, quibusdam certis de causis nos specialiter moventibus, tibi precimus firritere iniungentes quod sis coram nobis in Cancellaria nostra Dunelmensis, die Lune proximo futuro, tecum ducendum predictos Robertum, Willielmum, Georgium, Henricum, Johannem Forman et Willielmum; id ad faciendum ulterius et recipiendum quod curia nostra consideraverit in hac parte; et hoc nulla-tenus omittas, sub periculo quod incumbit. Et habes ibi hoc breve. Datum die Lune per manus Willielmi Chaunceller, cancellarii nostri, sexto die Decembris Anno Pontificatus dicti Episcopi vicesimo septimo, per ipsum Episcopum. Quod quidam breve eadem Johanni Hedworth, eodem die Lune apud Chestre in le Street, deliberatum fuit; et dicunt quod idem Episcopus ligeos domini Regis infra libertatem et wapentagium predicta commorantem ad libitum suum compellit per huiusmodi brevia respondere dicto Episcopo in Cancellaria sua predicta, de materiis que socia ipsius Episcopi concernunt, ad libitum ipsius Episcopi, licet materie ille ad determinacionem legis communis terre pertinent, in contemptum domini Regis, dignitatis sue derogacionem et preiudicum manifestum, quo titulo predicti Juratores ignorant.
Item: dicunt quod predictus nunc Episcopus, toto tempore ex quo ipse in Episcopum Dunelmensis creatus fuit, omnes et singulas prerogativas domini Regis, tam scriptas quam non scriptas, iniuuste usurpavit et eas super se assumpsit et usurpat et usus fuit, colore libertatis sue Dunelmensis, infra libertatem et wapentagium predicta, tam toto tempore domini Regis nunc quam toto tempore domini Henriici nuper Regis Anglie patris sui et tempore domini Henrici nuper Regis avi sui, preterquam quod idem Episcopus non tenet parlamentum suum ibidem, in magnum prejudicium et derogationem domini Regis et corone sue et populi sui dampnum non modicum et gravamen, quo titulo dicti Juratores ignorant.

Item: dicunt dicti Juratores quod Willielmus Alwente et Johannes de Morton habent et tenent villam de Morton sibi et hereditibus suis imperpetuum, exceptis quadraginta sex acris terre que sunt dicti Episcopi de iure ecclesie sue Dunelmensis in eadem villa, et iacent in deasu in manibus dicti Episcopi et iacuerunt per sex annos ultimos elapsos; idem Episcopus extensive per eosdem sex annos compulsit dictos Willielmum et Johannem, contra suam voluntatem, per duricam districcionis, solvere annuatim ibidem dicto Episcopo quadraginta solidos pro ipsis quadraginta sex acris terre, ubi dicte quadraginta sex acre terre non valuerunt xx ss. per annum, ad grave dampnum ipsorum Willieli et Johannis. (P.164)

Item: dicunt dicti Juratores quod dictus Episcopus, decimo die Novembris Anno regni Henrici quinti patris domini Regis nunc none, apud Dunelm, assignavit Willielmum Chaunceller, Willielmum Malberthorp et Robertum Freend Auditores ad audiendum compotum Thome Ferrour de tempore que idem Thomas fuit bailivus et receptor denariorum ipsius Episcopi apud Derlyngton; coram quibus idem Thomas adtunc et ibidem computavit de balliva et recepcione predictis, super quo compoto idem Thomas inventus fuit et remansit in arregiis dicto Episcopo in Centum marcas; pro quibus arregiis dictus Thomas Ferrour per Auditores predictos,secundum formam statuti in huiusmodi casu provisi, per agreamentum et preceptum dicti Episcopi, gaole ipsius Episcopi Castro Dunelmensis commissus et Roberto Eure, custodi eiusdem gaole, liberatus fuit, ibidem custodiendum in executionem pro debito predicto, quousque idem Thomas debitum illud eodem Episcopo plenarie persolvisset; in qua gaola idem Thomas sic in executionem existens obiit; post cuius mortem dictus Episcopus diversa terras et tenementa, videlicet, decem messuagia et CC acras terre cum pertinentiis in Consecliffe et Derlyngton, que fuerunt ipsius Thome tempore mortis sue pro eodem debito, decimo die Aprilis Anno regni domini Regis nunc primo, iniuuste et extensive seisivit, et illa extunc in manibus suis tenuit, et exitus et proficua inde percepit quousque ipse dictas Centum marcas de eisdem terris et tenementis plene levavit et percepit, dicta execucione corporis ipsius Thome pro eodem debito non obstante.

Item: dicunt dicti Juratores quod cum quedam Isabella
Claxton, sexto die Decembris Anno regni Henrici quinti post conquestum nono, obiit seissita de viginti mesuagis, quingentis acris terre, centum acris prati et mille acris pasture cum pertinencis, in Lumbelley, Morelawe et Hetton infra dictam libertatem Dunelmensis, que valent per annum xx libras, et que tenentur de Episcopo Dunelmensis per s'erviciu militare; post cuius mortem quidam Petrus Tillioll miles et Elizabeth uxor eius, etatis quadraginta annorum et amplius, in predicta terras et tenementa cum pertinencis intraverunt, ut in iure ipsius Elizabethe, fille et heredis Isabelle; que quidam terras et tenementa predictus Episcopus, decimo die Marcii Anno regni dicti Regis Henrici nono, in manus suas, racione ingressus predicti, seisiere fecit, et illa sic seissita in manibus suis tenuit et omnia exitus et proficua inde percepit, scilicet, a dicto decimo die Marcii usque ad ultimum diem Aprilis Anno decimo eiusdem Regis Henrici quinti; que die dictus Petrus, antequam deliberacionem inde extra manus dicti Episcopi habere poterit, finem cum dicto Episcopo pro deliberacione illa habenda in Cancellaria sua apud Dunelm pro xxv libris fecit, et ad eadem viginti et quinque libras dicto Episcopo adtunc et ibidem persolvendum. Post quam quidam deliberacionem et solucionem dictarum viginti et quinque librarum, predictus Episcopus, scrutatis rotulis Cancellarie sue, inventit dictum Petrum eodem Episcopo in quadam recognicionem de predictis xxv libris ex causa predicta sibi in dicta Cancellaria obligatum, ac idem Episcopus predicta terras et tenementa, causa recognicionis et transgressionis predictarum, non obstante (sic) liberacione et solucione predictis, in manus suas de novo reseisire fecit, videlicet, quarto die Maii Anno regni domini Regis nunc secundo, absque aliquo processu versus dictum Petrum ea de causa facienda, et ea sic seissita in manibus suis extunc tenuit et exitus et proficua inde percepit, quousque predictus Petrus de novo cum ipso Episcopo pro ingressu et recognicione predictis, antequam deliberacionem inde extra manus suas habere poterit, finem pro xxxv libris pro deliberacione illa habenda fecit, et easdem xxxv libras idem Episcopus per ministros suos (f.164d) opus suum, tercio die Decembris Anno regni eiusdem domini Regis nunc quarto ibidem extorsive fecit levari, in magnum detrimentum ipsius Petri.

In cuius re testimonium, tam sigilla predictorum Juratorium, per quos facta fuit hec inquisicio, etc.
Worshipfull and right dear brother in Criste, I grete yow wel with entier hert, thanking yow of your good affecion the whiche alway ye have to me. And for somoche that sithe I departed from yow I have diverses tymes written to my Conestable of Duresme, to Sir Richard Bukley my Receyvor theer, and to other myn Officiers, to enforce yow and my trewe brethern of my Chapitre of my good speed that, by goddes grace, I have and shal have in my matiers, praiyng yow that ye wol have me alwey recommended to your good prayers. And now late I have understonde that certain persones have geten a copy of abyll, the whiche thai pretende that I shuld have gyfen inne to the parlement to have opteigned certayne things agins the fraunchises of goddes kyrk and seint Cuthbert of Duresme; to the whiche persones, as hit is said, my good frend James Strangways, Justice of the Comune Place, haas declared the matier of myn entent of the forsaid byll, and as hit semed hym, thai, enformed of my said entent, kowthe wel suffre hit for my dayes; the whiche declaracion of the sayd James wherof ye have knowlage as I trowe shall be founde trewe. And yet that nat withstonding, the Saterday next after the departing of the said James, thai have assembled hem at syant Nicholas kyrk in Duresme, and theer comuned of matiers conteyned in the forsaid bille pretended, and therupon among hem concluded that on the Seterday the second day of Januer thai shuld theer meete agayn, and theer sette for a conclusion that summe of hem fro thens should come to the kynges Counsaill to London, wheer, with goddes grace, I shal abyde hem if thei come byfore the xv of saint Hillary next. And more over, wol ye wite that atte instance of certains knyghtes of the parlement, my lord of Warrewyk haas so spoken to me of tretee bitwix Sir William Bure and me, that I have for me chosen my Lord Archebissop of York, my Lord of Warrewyk, my lords of Sarum and Northumberland, and for the said Sir William was named my Lord of London and my lord of Karlell; that thees sex, or atte lest four of thees, shuld discerne and arbitre bitwix the said Sir William and me, of alle articles the whiche in writyng shuld bee gyfen to hem byfore the fest of Pask next coming; soo that the same decre and arbitrement bee gyfen before the xv of Pask beforesaid, or elles that the said parties shuld stonde to thordeignance and decre of a nounpier to bee chosen by the sayd arbitrours, so that he make his decre and arbitrement before the xv of the Nativite of seint John next. Wherfore worshipfull and right dear brother, lykefa yow to suche as yow semes necessare, and in especiall to myn officiers at Duresme and to Sir Nichol Hulme, gyfe informacion of this my lettre that I write yow, letyng hem wite that als soon as I may goodly after the forsaid xv of saynt Hillary, I dispose me for to see yow. And therfore I write nomore to yow at this tym, but
pray to Almighty God to have yow in his keping. Writen at London, the iiiij day of Januer.

T. Bishop of Duresme.

(Dorse) To the Worshipfull and my Right dear brother in Cryste, the Pryour of my kyrrk of Duresme.

(x) Copy of a petition of Langley to the King in Parliament, (1433). (See pp.199-200) (D.Locellus 21, No.21. No.21a is another copy of the same)

Placet suppremo domino nostro Regi animadvertere qualiter diversis retroactis temporibus Escaetor in Comitatu Northumberland, et alie persone tales, qui aliquociens fuerint minus benivol Episcopis Dunelmensis pro temporibus existentibus, et qui statagerunt dilatare fines suos, potestatem et auctoritatem inquirendi et inquisitiones capiendi infra eundem Comitatum, venerunt infra Comitatum et libertatem Dunelmensis inter aquas de Tyne et Tese, et ceperunt ibidem inquisitiones; et alii ceperunt inquisitiones infra dictum Comitatum Northumberland et inquisiverunt de diversis rebus et articulis infra dictum Comitatum Dunelmensis suppositis, intrence sua supponendo eodem Comitatum et libertatem Dunelmensis fuisse et esse infra dictum Comitatum Northumberland et parcella eiusdem. Vero in rei veritate, isdem Comitatum et Libertas Dunelmensis inter aquas predictas sunt et, a tempore quo non extat memoria, fuerunt Comitatus et libertas Dunelmensis per se ingrosso, et omnes Episcopi Dunelmensis pro suis temporibus existentes Cancellarium, Justiciarios, Vicecomitem, Coronatores, Ballivos et alios officiorios suos, et diversas Franchesias et libertates, habuerunt, et ex eis ussi fuerunt in eisdem, absque eo quod fuerunt infra dictum Comitatum Northumberland seu parcella eiusdem, seu eodem Comitatu Northumberland aut aliqui minister eiusdem in aliquo intendebant. Et similiter considerare quomodo diversi et quam plures gentes dicti Comitatus Dunelmensis et libertatis, indigne ferentes humilimum oratorem ipsius Regis, Thomam, nunc Episcopum Dunelmensis, et ecclesiam suae sancti Cuthberti, tantis Franchesiis, privilegiis et libertatibus dotatos esse, aut ipsius Episcopi regimini subdi se, invicem in conventiculuis congregare ceperunt, congregarunt et eem indies congregant, consilia ineunt, et ligaciones inter se faciant ad libertates et franchesiis illas, pro posse et intencione suis, adnullandas, finaliter destruendas et ad movendas acciones, querelas et debatas, ac callidas materias, responiones et
placita invenienda, machinanda et ministranda, et in specie Regem partem faciendam versus dictum Episcopum, intencione triandi inter eos dictas libertates et franchesias, a diu valde continuatas; imaginando et supponendo, pro posse suo, quod si aliqua materia tangens prefatum Episcopum vel suas libertates aut franchesias eveniret indebata, variacione, exitu patrie vel transverso, qui, que vel quod triari deberet per gentes Comitatus seu libertatis Dunelmensis, illa vel illud versus dictum Episcopum et intencionem suam omnino triaretur, licet debite vel iniuste, in adnullacionem et destructicionem status ipsius Episcopi et libertatum et franchesiarum suarum, et iuris et dignitatis predicte ecclesie manifestas. Et super hoc, ex habundanti gracia Regia, que more nobilium inclite recordacionis progenitorum suorum in ecclesiis in eis arum necessitatibus pie subvenire non omittit, in supportacionem iurum predicte ecclesie sancti Cuthberti semper hucusque habitorum, satisfacere et ordinare, auctoritate presentis parliamenti, quod si contingat aliquam debatam vel variacionem, aliquem exitum patrie vel aliquod transversum, tangentem vel tangens predictum Episcopum vel executores testamenti sui, aut libertates vel franchesias ipsius Episcopi vel successorum suorum predictorum suorum in ecclesiis in eis arum necessitatibus, super aliqua materia emergente vel re supposita, infra Comitatum seu libertatem Dunelmensis, evenire in aliqua curia ipsius Episcopi vel successorum, licet tangat ipsum Regem vel heredes suos, vel talis aut tale iam eveniret, qui, que vel quod per communem cursum Legis Anglie est seu esset triabilis seu triabile per dictos gentes dicti Comitatus seu libertatis Dunelmensis; tunc datur dies per Justiciarios vel officiarios seu officiarii Episcopi vel successorum suorum, coram quibus vel quo deducta fuerit loquela sive causa inde, si eadem loquela vel causa prodicioem vel feloniam sapierit coram Rege, et si eadem loquela nec prodicionem nec feloniam sapierit coram Justiciariis domini Regis de Banco, secundum quod recordum et processus inde per dictos Justiciarios, officiarios vel officiarii, prout eadem exposat, loquela vel causa coram Rege vel coram Justiciariis de Banco mittatur, et extunc trietur eadem debata, idem exitus vel dictum transversum coram Rege vel eiusdem Justiciariis de Banco, secundum quod recordum et processus inde coram eo vel eis missa fuerint, aut Justiciariis aut Assissas, aut uno Justiciario specialiter assignato per breve de nisi prius, per gentes de Comitatu Eboracensis, predictum Comitatum Dunelmensis proximus adiacens, sufficienter et minus suspectos; et aliter, ultimo die inde habito coram Rege vel in Banco, detur dies coram eisdem Justiciariis, officiarii vel officiario ipsius Episcopi, coram quibus vel quo deducta fuerit loquela vel causa inde in dicto comitatu Dunelmensis, seu aliis vel alio in loco ipsorum vel ipsius existentibus vel existenti, parti pro qua comportum fuerit veridictum inde et coram eisdem
Justiciariis, Officiariis vel officiario remittantur recordum et processus eiusdem loquela vel cause, et ibi ulteriorus inde reddatur judicium et placitum, et totum factum inde terminetur; vel quod, ommisissus huius adiornamento et missione coram Rege vel Justiciariis de Banco, remanentibus eidem loquela vel causa coram prefatis Justiciariis, officiariis vel officiario ipsius Episcopi et successorum suorum, et trietut inde debata, variacio, exitus patrie vel transversum, et ulteriorus inde terminetur placitum et negocium in Curia ipsius Episcopi et successorum suorum, more prius debito et consueto, ad electionem ipsius Episcopi et successorum et executorum testamenti eiusdem Episcopi. Et si contingat aliquam materiam debetam seu variacionem, aliquem exitum patrie seu aliquod transversum, tangentem vel tangens predictum Episcopum vel successores suas, aut libertates vel franchesias suas, vel executores testamenti eiusdem Episcopi, in posterum evenire in aliqua curia domini Regis nunc vel heredum suorum, licet tangat ipsum Regem vel heredes suos, qui, que vel quod per communem cursum legis Anglie triari debeat per gentes de Comitatu vel libertate Dunelmensis, aut eius recte cius triari debeat vel debeat, utrum aliqua villa aut aliquis hameletus vel locus inter predictas aquas de Tyne et Tese sit vel fuerit, in vel de dicto Comitatu Northumberland vel non; triacio illa fiat integre per sufficientes gentes dicti Comitatus Eboracensis, qui est contiguus et adiacens dicto Comitatu Dunelmensis; vel fiat triacio de materia debata, variacione, exitu patrie seu transverso, sic emergente in Comitatu seu libertate Dunelmensis, in curia Regis integre per gentes de eisdem Comitatu et libertate Dunelmensis, et triacio utrum aliqua villa, aliquis hameletus vel locus inter aquas predictas sit vel fuerit, in vel de dicto Comitatu Northumberland vel non, integr eller gentes de dicto Comitatu Northumberland, ad voluntatem et electionem predicti Episcopi et successorum suorum et executorum testamenti ipsius Episcopi predictorum.

(Dorse, on both copies) Supplieacio Domini Thome Langley, Episcopi Dunelmensis, quod ipse et successores sue possent triare causas et materias iura et libertates Episcopi Dunelmensis et aliiis concernentibus extra Comitatum Dunelmensis; sed supplicacio non fuerat optenta.
APPENDIX G: WARRANT TO THE EXCHEQUER, 14 NOVEMBER 1436.
(See p. 214)

Henri bi the grace of god kyng of Englande and of Fraunc and lorde of Irlande. To the Tresorer and Chamberleins of oure Eschequier gretyng, Shewed hath unto us and to oure Counsell our trewe liegeman, Thomas Elwyk, late Maire of oure toune of Berewik, hou he at the Feste of Saint James last passed, opened and declared unto the right worshipful and worshipful fadris in god tharchebishop of York, the Bisshoppis of Duresme and of Karliel, and unto oure right trusty and welbeloved Cousin therle of Northumberland, thes beyng at Duresme, the grete peril and gipardie that our saide toune of Berewik stode in at that tyme for many and diverse causes, and hou our souledeours there noght knowyng whoo shulde pay hem thaire wagis, consideryng that our saide Cousin stode thanne discharged of the Capteynship therof, withdrew hem and went away in grete nombre. The which right worshipful and worshipful fadres in god and our right trusty and welbeloved Cousin, conceyvyng the grete myscheefe and peril that myght of liklyhode growe therupon yif right hasty provision were nought made therefore, charged the saide Thomas to ride in all haste possible to oure saide toune of Berewyk to thentente for to trete the saide souledeours that were last therinne to abide and to acquite thaim soo namly in that article of nede as thei myght deserve thanke of us, for a tyme til that thei myght be better ordened fore. The which Thomas after that he hadde soo doon, conceyvyng the grete scarsite of peple at that tyme left in oure saide toune, and also the simple kepyng of the wacthes there ynne, hired wacthes for viij days and viij nyghtes, and paied thaim of his owne raonay. The which his paiementes aforesaide, with other costis that he alsoo made for the sure kepyng therof, drewe fully to the somme of x marc. Whereof he hath besoughte us of gepaiement, and we, considering the good and trewe acquifeaille of the said Thomas in this partie, wol by thavis of oure Conseil and charge you that of oure Tresore ye make paiement unto the saide Thomas of x marc for his repaiement of the x marc soo by hym paied as above. Geven under oure prive seal at Westminster the xiiij day of Novembre, the yere of oure regne the xv'.
(i) Appointment of a Registrar, 11 April (1408).

(Reg.Langley, f.14d) (See pp.231-232)

T.etc. dilecto filio Roberto Berall, clerico nostre diocese, apostolica auctoritate notario publico, salutem etc. Ad scribenda et fideliter regestranda quoscumque processus et acta in omnibus et singulis causis, sive ex officio vel ad instanciam parcium, in curia nostra Dunolmensis motis aut movendis; acciacam facienda et exercenda omnia et singula que ad Regestratorem curie nostre predicte tenore presencium constitui, facimus et creamus presentibus pro nostro beneplacito duraturo. Datum apud manerium nostrum de Hoveden, die xj mensis Aprilis, Anno domini ut supra.

(ii) Commission to visit Gateshead Hospital, 20 March 1431.

(ibid 176) (See p.241)

Thomas etc. Dilectis filiis magistris Thome Leys Decano ecclesie nostre Collegiate de Aukland in decretis, et Willielmo Doncastre' in legibus, Bacalleris, ac Willielmo Tart Rectori ecclesie parochialis de Quykham nostre diocese, salutem etc. Licet olim in quadam visitacione nostra in Capella sive hospital! Sanctorum Edmundi Confessoris et Cuthberti ville de Gatesheved per vos, magistros Thomam Lyes et Willielmum Tart,ac Ricardum Burgh nuper Officialem nostrum Dunelmensis, Comissarios nostros ad tunc per quasdam Comissionis nostre litteras, quam datum est apud Manerium nostrum de Stokton xix die mensis Septembris Anno domini M° CCCGxxj°, sufficienter et legitime deputatos, auctoritate nostra actualiter exercata, super compertis et detectis coram vobis contra dominum Johannera Walkyngton, magistrum seu Custodem dicte Capelle sive hospitalis se dicentem, legitime procedentes, eidem Johanni quedam monita salubria et iniuncta, anime sue saluti et Capelle sive hospitalis predicto comodo et utilitati multum necessaria, iniuncti faceritis et imponi, prout in actis (f,176d) super hoc confectis plenius continetur. Dictus tamen Johannes Walkyngton, ut accepius, monitis et iniunctis vestris, quin verius nostris, huiusmodi obedire, et ea effectualiter perimplere hucusque, non curavit, sed distulit et differt adhuc in presenti, in anime sue grave periculum dicteque Capelle sive hospitalis ac bonorum eiusdem dispendium et finalem destruccionem verismiliter futuram infra brevem, si non cicius in hac parte remedium
per nos debitum apponatur. Quocirca nos, premisiis sollicita-
mente pensatis, cercius super eisdem ac super statu et
regimine ipsius Capelle sive hospitalis informari cupientes,
ipsum hospitale tam in capite quam in membribis denuo duximus
visitandum. Ac super hoc prefato domino Johanni Walkyngton,
magistrum seu Custodem dicte Capelle sive hospitalis se adhuc
dicenti, diem martis xxviiii diem instantis mensis Marci pro
termine peremptorio prexiximus et assignavimus, ac per
ipsum, ceteros presbiteros et ministros aliasque personas
quascumque in Capella sive hospitali predicto degentes seu
habentes interesse quolibet in eodem, ad eundem diem citari
et premuniri mandavimus ad comparendum coram nobis vel
commissariis nostris in Capella sive hospitali predicto,
visitacionem nostram ordinariam eis in forma canonica
impendendam suscepturos et actualiter subituros. Nos vero,
variis arduis negociis aliunde occupati quominus in dicte
visitationis negocio personaliter interesse possimus pro
presenti, de vestra circumspecta prudencia et fidelitate
sincera in domino plurimi confidentes, ad visitandum
Capellam sive hospitale predictum, prefaturnque Johanne
Walkyngton, magistrum seu Custodem eiusdem se dicentem, ac
ceteros presbiteros et ministros et alias personas
quascumque in ipsa Capella sive hospitali predicto
degentes seu interesse quolibet habentes in eodem, edificiaque et
ornamenta ecclesiastica ac alia bona quescumque eisdem
Capelle sive hospitali pertinencia; necon de et super
statu, administrationes et regimine ipsius hospitalis, ac
vita, conversacione et et moribus prefati Johannis ac
ceterorum presbiterorum, ministrorum et personarum
predictorum, et specialiter si idem Johannes monita et
iniuncta sibi alias, ut prefertur, auctoritate nostra facta
et imposita, ut deputit, perimpevit; inquirenda crimina,
excessus et defectus sive fuerint, tam in personis quam in
bonis predictis, reformanda et punitenda; ac ut titulum
incumbencie sue in capella sive hospitale predicto,
composivumque, calculum et raciocinium de et super quibusdam
bonis dicte capelle sive hospitalis per ipsum toto tempore
suo receptis, et administratione eorumdem, ac plenum et
fidele Inventarium de quibuscumque bonis mobilibus et
immobilibus Capelle sive hospitalis, et munimenta quescumque
ipsius hospitalis sique habeat, prefatus Johannes reddat,
exhibeat et ostendat, ipsum canonice compellendum, et bona
quescumque dicte Capelle sive hospitalis ante vel post dictam
visitacionem nostram aliam, ut prefertur, factam alienata
indebite, revocanda et in statum debitum reducenda.
Ceteraque omnia et singula facienda et expeclienda que
visitacionis huiusmodi officium egxit et requirit, vobis
comiter et divisim committimus vices nostras cum cuiuslibet
cohercionis canonice potestate. Detecta tunc sive tali
fuerint coram vobis que privacionem vel amacionem exigant
personarum nobis specialiter reservantes. Datum sub sigillo
nistro in Manerio nostrro de Aukland, xx die dicti mensis
Marcii, Anno domini Millesimo CCCXXX. Et nostre
Consecracionis xxvto.

(iii) Commission for Lanchester Collegiate Church, 1 May 1434.
(209d) (See p.246)

Thomas, etc. Dilectis in Christo filiis Decano ecclesie
nostre Collegiate Langcestre, nostrarum collacionis et
diocese, et Sequestratori nostro in Archidiaconatu
Dunelmensis, salutem etc. Olim nos, visitacionem nostram
ordinarium in ecclesiis, tam collegiatis quam parochialibus,
et alii piis locis nostre iurisdictioni subjectis,
actualiter exercentes, et ad ecclesiam nostram Collegiatam
Langcestre predictam personaliter accedentes, eramus
certitudinaliter informati quod, licet bone memorie Antonius
quondam Episcopus Dunelmensis pie et salubriter ordinasset
quod in predicta ecclesia Collegiata septem essent canonici
prebendati, quorum tres canonici tres primas prebendas
obtinentes vicarios pro se capellanos, et reliqui quatuor
Canonici vicarios pro se ydones in sacris ordinibus
constitutos, suis sumptibus propriis exhiberent, qui, iuxta
dispositionem decani ipsius ecclesie pro tempore existentis,
in habitu decente et honesto, vice dictorum Canonicorum
ministrarent continve in divinis; iisdem tamen Canonici
vicarios huiusmodi seu ministros ydones, pro se in dicta
ecclesia Collegiata pro cultu divino sustentando,
multociens non habeant nec exhibere (f.210) curabant, et
sic salaria et stipendia, que in ministris huiusmodi
expendere debuissernt, in usus proprios convertebant,
ecclesiam ipsam quatenus in eas erat inofficiatam reliquendo,
in animarum suarum grave periculum, cultusque divini in
ecclesia predicta detrimentum, ad ordinacionis memorate
enervacionem manifestam; quam quidem ordiinacionem prefati
predecessoris nostri in ipsius registro luculentem eciam
invenimus contineri. Quocirca nos, ad instantem
requisicionem tam decani et ministerum quam reliquor
parochianorum eiusdem ecclesie Collegiati tunc pulsati ut
remedium in hac parte congruum adhibere curaremus, ne officia
divina ibidem nostris temporibus plus solito subtrahentur et
subtractores ipsi de culpa sua seu fraudem vel
commodum reportarent, decrevimus et ordinavimus quod
quocienscumque vicarii huiusmodi sive capellani sive alii
inferiores per prefates canonicos seu eorum aliquem non
essent ibidem pro officiis divinis exhibiti ut deberent,
tunc salaria et stipendia, que ipsis vicariis sic
absentibus solvi debuisissent, vicariis illis, qui tunc
presentes essent et in divinis ministrentur, nonen
fabrice Campanilis ibidem, ae reparacione et emendacioni
librorum et ornamenrorum ipsius ecclesie, devolverentur,
ac integre et plenarie solverentur inter prefatos vicarios, sic presents seu yconomos predicte ecclesie ad opus eiusdem, ut prefertur, distribuenda et equis posfracionibus dividenda. Sed quia parum vel nichil prodest statuta aliqua iura vel ordinaciones concedere nisi sint eiam qui ipsa condita exequi debeant et tueri; nos volentes quantum in nobis est statuta et ordinaciones huiusmodi, tam prefati predecessoris nostri quam nostra in hac parte ut prefertur, in hac parte facta execucioni debite facere demandari; vobis coniunctim et divisim tenere prescensium committimus firmiter inluungentes quatinus quocienscumque contigerit vicarios aliquos dictae ecclesiae abesse et iuxta formam ordinacionis prefati predecessoris nostri ibidem exhibitos et inventos non esse, vos canonicals huiusmodi sic in exhibicione vicariorum suorum delinquentes et deficientes, seu eorum procuratores aut firmarios, congrue moneatis, seu moneri faciatis, moneat ve seu moneri faciat alter vestrum, quod citra tempus limitum per vos eis assignandum, vicarios pro se ydoneos in ecclesia predicta ministratures habeant, et eis salaria et stipendia debita subministrent; vel quod salaria et stipendia que vicariis sic absentibus solvi debere si exhibiti et inventi fuissent, vicariis illis presentibus et in divinis ministrantibus, necon propositis et yconomis antedictis, iuxta nostram ordinacionem huiusmodi solvant realiter cum effectu. Alioquin, lapso huiusmodi termino per vos aut vestrum alterum eis assignato et prefixo, vos fructus, redditus et presentus dictorum Canonicorum sic, ut prefertur, in exhibicione dictorum vicariorum suorum deficiencium, in quoruncumque manibus existant, per rata stipendiorum seu salariorum et in singulis vacacionibus vicariorum huiusmodi debitorum, tociens quociens oportuerit, authoritate nostra, sequestretis ac sub arto et tuto sequestro custodiatis, ac sub arte et tuto sequestro custodiatis (sic), seu custodiari faciatis, sequestret ve custodiat seu custodiri faciat alter vestrum, quasque pro tempore vacacionum huiusmodi prefatis vicariis presentibus ac propositi et yconomis de eisdem stipendiis et salariis fuerit congrue satisfactum. Contradictoresque et rebelles in hac parte, si quos forte inveneritis seu invenerit alter vestrum, citetis seu citari faciatis peremptorie, tociens quociens opus erit, seu sic citet seu citari faciat alter vestrum, quod compareant coram nobis vel Officiale nostro Dunelmensis, aliquibus certis die et loco per vos seu alterum vestrum eis assignandis, causam racionabilem, si quem pro se habeant, quare ad exhibicionem vicariorum huiusmodi, vel ad solucionem dictorum salariorum et stipendiorum pro vacacionibus huiusmodi debitorum, ut prefertur, per censuras ecclesiasticas compelli non debeant, et artari dicturi et ostensuri, facturique ulterior et recepturi in ea parte quod iusticia suadebit. Certificantes nos seu Officialem nostrum predictum de citacionibus vestris in hac parte factis, necon de
nominibus et cognominibus citatorum, ac de die et loco per vos eisdem assignatis, aut personaliter vel per litteras vestras, harum nostrarum litterarum mentionem expressam facientes, sigillo auctentio consignatas. Datum sub sigillo nostro in Manerio nostro de Aukland, primo die mensis Maij, Anno Domini Millesimo CCCXXXIII. Et nostre Consecracionis xxvij.

(iv) Appointment of a Spiritual Chancellor, 7 February (1433).
(ibid 200) (See p.229)

Septimo die mensis Februarii, Anno domini superdicto, dominus in camera sua interiori Manerii sui de Aukland, constituit magistrum Johannes Bonour, decretorem doctorem, Rectorem ecclesie parochialis de Gateshead sue dioecese, Cancellarium suum, et, recepto ab eodem magistro Johanne promisso sufficienti de bene et fideliter se gerendo in ipso officio, sigillum suum ad causas ad illud officium pertinens eider liberavit. Presentibus magistro Thoma Leys Rectore ecclesie parochialis de Weremouth, Thoma Holden Armigero, et me Thoma Jobur Notario Publico et domini Dunelmensis Scriba et Registratore.

(v) Papal Commission to the Prior of Durham and Others, 24 July 1432.
(D. 1-3-Papales-2.)

Eugenius episcopus servus servorum dei, Dilectis filiis Priori Dunelmensis et Thesaurario Eboracensis ecclesiarum, Salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Sua nobis venerabilis frater nostro, Thomas Episcopus Dunelmensis, peticione monstravit quod olim fama divulgante publica ad eiusdem Episcopi notitiam deducta quod Johannes Walkyngton, olim Magister sive Custos Capelle sive hospitalis sanctorum Edmundi et Cuthberti in villa de Gateshead Dunelmensis dioecese, structures et edificia Capelle sive hospitalis eiusdem, ad quorum reparationem et conservacionem tenebatur, ipsius culpa et negligentia collabi et ad evidentis desolationis opprobium reduci permissaret, ac huiusmodi reparationi necnon conservacioni etiam desuper legitime requisitum intender non curarat, et ad regimen Capelle sive hospitalis huiusmodi prorsus mutulis erat, excessuus quoque et crimina plura commiserat. Idem Episcopus contra prefatum Johannem, quem propter ea ad suam presentiam evocari fecit, super premisis ex officio ad inquisitionem descendit, et quia per illum dictum Johannem super hiis culpabilem repperit, eum per suam diffinitivam sententiam Capella sive hospitali huiusmodi auctoritate ordinaria privavit, et de ea sive illo realiter amovit; a quaquidem sententia dictus Johannes, illam iniquam fore falsa asserens, ad sedem apostolicam appellavit;
sed, ut asseritur, impedimento cessante legito
appellationem huiusmodi etiam a tempore interpositionis
eiusdem Anno dudum effluxo prosequi non curavit, et
properea appellatio huiusmodi deserta est censenda.
Quocircum discretioni vestre per apostolica scripta
mandamus quatinus, vocatis Johanne predicto necnon alis
qui fuerint evocandi, causa appellationis si non deserta
non sit aliquo desertionis huiusmodi audiatis debitoque
fine decidatis, facientes quod decreveritis per censuram
ecclesiasticam firmiter observari. Testes autem qui
fuerint nominati, si se gratia, odio vel timore
subtraxerint, censura similis appellatione cessante
compellatis veritatis testimonium perhibere. Quod sisnon
ambo hiis exsequendis potueritis interesse alii vestrum
eae nichilominus exequatur. Datum Rome apud Sanctumpetrum,
Anno Incarnationis domini Millesimoquadringentesimo
-tricesimosecundo, viij kalendis Augusti, Pontificatus
nostri Anno Secundo.

pro W. Swan.
G. de Callio.

(Dorse) Bulla Eugenii iiiijti contra Magistrum Johannem
Walkyngton, Magistrum Hospitalis sanctorum Edmundi et
Cuthberti in Gaytisheved, etc.

(vi) Indenture between Bishop Langley and the Prior and
Convent of Durham, 27 September 1420. (See p.255)
(D. Lociellus 27, No.3)

Hec indentura facta inter Reverendum patrem dominu
Thomam permissione divina Danelmensis Episcopum ex una,
Prioramque et Conventum ecclesie Danelmensis parte ex
altera, testatur quod licet frater Johannes Tynmouth,
Monachus dicte ecclesie Danelmensis, coram Ministris
temporalibus dicti Reverendi indiciatus et impetitus
fuerit pro morte fratris Willielmi Warner, Commonachi sui
dicte ecclesie, per ipsum felonice interficti, et crimen
huiusmodi coram eiusdem Ministris prefatus frater Johannes
iudicaliter confessus fuerit, et properea sit carceribus
prefati domini Episcopi mancipatus. Idem tamen dominus
Episcopus, considerans vituperosum et inhonestum fore
Monachum dicti Prioratus inter latrones et alios
criminosos in publicis suis carceribus detineri, vult, de
consensa dictorum Prioris et Conventus, et concedit quod
dictus frater Johannes, Monachus ut premissitur
incarceratus, liberetur et tradatur ad carceres et
custodiam dictorum Prioris et Conventus ibidem perpetuo
conservandum. Vult insuper idem dominus Episcopus quod
si dictus frater Johannes, Monachus, custodiam et carceres
dictorum Prioris et Conventus aliquo casu evaserit, dicti

(Language's AD CAUSAS Seal.)

(vii) Letter of Prior Wessington to Langley, (undated).
(D.Registrum Parvum I,f.29) (See p.259)

Reverendissime patri et domino, humillima recommendacione premissa cum omni subieccioni et obedientia filiali; pro vestris magnificis solaciis et benevolentis paternalibus mihi a vestra paternitate reverendissima nuper Landon, et antea multipliciter cumulatis quasquaque sufficio graciaram intimas refero acciones, et specialissime pro vestro predietissimo et sanissimo consilio in meis ad vestram venerabili presenciam, accessu pariter et recessu ab eandem paternaliter mihi datis, memorie mee tanquam consilio suanissimo patris ad filium merito inferendo, Reverendissimo pater, quia Ricardus H(emmingburgh), lator presencium et consanguineus nuper Johannis H(emmingburgh) patris mei Prioris defuncti, habet certa negocia expedita penes vestram reverendissimam paternitatem contra Jacobum S(trangways) et alios, ut dicit, infeoffatos domini Ricardi le Scrope, domini de Bolton defuncti, pro quodam annuo reddito xl s. sibi ad terminum vite per dictum dominum R. le S. concesso, eo quod per eundem dominum et suos in ecclesia Cathedrali Eboracensis fuerat vulneratus, sicut idem R. H. vestram reverendissimam paternitatem noverit apercius informare. Vestre reverendissime paternitas, supplico pro voto quatinus prefato R. H. tanquam necessitate pacienti per vestrum promptissimum consilium dignemini subvenire, et eo favorabilius quo patris mei ultimi Prioris defuncti sanguinis propinquitas et precum mearam exitas intervenient pro eodem. Ad consolacionem pauperum et ecclesie Catholice fulcimentum, altissimus vobis multiplicit veros dies.
APPENDIX I: INDUCTIONS TO BENEFICES IN THE GIFT OF THE BISHOP OF DURHAM.

During the episcopate of Thomas Hatfield (1345-1381), the archdeacons were instructed to induct to every benefice in the diocese. Two exceptions have been noted. The Dean of Chester-le-Street had to induct a canon of the Collegiate Church, and the Vicar of Norton one of his prebendaries. Otherwise, even canons of collegiate churches were inducted by the Archdeacon of Durham, or his official. He was responsible for inductions of incumbents of the Rectories of Wolsingham and Stanhope, the Vicarage of Norton, the Deanery of Auckland and Greatham Hospital, all of which lay in the Bishop's gift.

By Langley's time, all this had changed. From the beginning of his episcopate, and throughout its duration, neither Archdeacon was instructed to induct to a single benefice in the Bishop's patronage. The earliest collation noted in Langley's Register was of John de Stafford to the Church of St. Nicholas, Durham, on 1 Jan., 1407. The Official of the diocese was told to induct him. Later inductions to this church were entrusted to John Newton, the receiver-general of the Palatinate, and to the Sequestrator-General in the Archdeaconry of Durham. No particular minister was given this duty: at collegiate churches, the dean or vicar, the Sequestrator, the Official or parish priest were instructed to induct prebendaries. The Prior of Durham, as archdeacon, inducted vicars to churches appropriated to the Convent. This rule obtained

1. Reg. Hatfield f.79. 2. ibid 121. 3. Chester-le-Street: ibid 84,144d,164; Auckland: ibid 118,152, etc.
4. ibid 77,138,166,121 & 188, respectively.
in both Archdeaconries. Archdeacons inducted only to
churches in the gift of patrons other than the Bishop or
the Prior and Convent.

The Archdeacons had thus been excluded from any part
in inductions to a considerable number of benefices, and,
of course, had lost any perquisites appertaining to this
duty. It cannot be stated with certainty that they no
longer exercised any jurisdiction in these parishes, but
it seems likely. The smallness of the number of
commissions directed to them suggests that the Archdeacons
had suffered a grave diminution in their powers. Yet there
is no indication of any protest against their exclusion
from the Bishop's churches. This curtailment of
archidiaconal rights had obviously taken place in the
period between the death of Hatfield and the accession of
Langley: the circumstances in which it occurred have yet
to be discovered.
APPENDIX K: THE OFFICE OF SEQUESTRATOR-GENERAL.

The importance of this office in the diocese of Durham in Langley's time has already been shown. No mention is made of a sequestrator-general in the late Professor Hamilton Thompson's "English Clergy", and there is only one instance of an appointment in Miss Churchill's "Canterbury Administration". It therefore seems that a few notes on the subject would be useful, although this study is far from being exhaustive.

The duties of the sequestrator were already well established in Durham by 1311, when William de Kellawe was appointed Sequestrator-General in the City and Diocese: he was authorised to carry out sequestrations, administer and grant probate of wills, and do all other things known to pertain to his office. A commission of 1312 is even more general. The example from Canterbury is of the appointment of a Sequestrator for the Diocese and dependent deaneries, in 1325, with unspecified general powers but also, unlike the Durham commission of 1311, instructions to enquire into crimes and punish offenders, and report the names of non-resident clergy and of vicarages being farmed. In Coventry and Lichfield, the terms of the appointments again varied: commissions issued in 1359 and 1360 instructed the Sequestrators-General of the Diocese to correct and punish crimes, appoint rural deans and apparitors, and receive canonical obedience due to the Bishop. At the same time, in 1360, and again in 1361 and 1364, commissions from Bishop Hatfield appointing successive Sequestrators for the whole of the Diocese of Durham indicate the nature of the duties to have been

so well known that it was unnecessary to mention them.  

Hitherto, appointments had been made of a single sequestrator-general for a whole diocese. In 1367, Bishop Wykeham of Winchester appointed Sequestrators in each of the Archdeaconries of the Diocese: they had powers of enquiry, to sequestrate and over the wills of all save knights and ladies. The final development of the office in Durham is marked by a commission from Hatfield, in 1378, to Mr. William Alman. He was appointed Sequestrator in the Archdeaconry of Northumberland only. He had powers of administration of the wills of all subjects except nobles, knights, etc., and powers to sequestrate, and enquire into and punish crimes, save those reserved to the Bishop or his Official. This authority is more extensive than that noted in any previous commission, and was not less than that granted by Langley to his sequestrators. The final emergence of this office must be related to the diminution of the authority of the Archdeacons of Durham and Northumberland.

(i) Appointment of a Sequestrator-General for the Archdeaconry of Northumberland, 31 March 1433.  
(Reg. Langley f.203d)

Thomas etc. Dilecto in Christo filio domino Johanni Burn, Vicario perpetuo ecclesie parochialis de Hautwesyll nostre diocese, salutem etc. De tuis circumspeccione et industria ac consciencie puritate plurimi in domino confidentes, Ad corrigenda, punienda et debite reformanda crimina, excessus et errores quorumcumque subditorum nostrorum Archidiaconatus Northumberland, et eis pro criminiibus, excessibus et erroribus huiusmodi penitencias canonicas infligendas; necnon insinuaciones testamentorum ipsorum


(ii) Acquittance of Sequestrator, 11 September 1421.

Pateat universis per presentes, nos Thomam, permissione (divina) Dunelmensis Episcopum, recepisse et admississe compotum Ricardi Burgh, Sequestratoris nostri in Archidiaconatu Dunelmensis, a festo sancti Michaelis Archangeli Anno domini MCCCC vicesimo usque festum anno revoluto, et quia invenimus eundem magistrum Ricardum de receptis in officio suo huiusmodi fidelem compotum reddidisse et de eisdem receptis nobis integre respondisse. Idecirco eundem magistrum Ricardum ab ulteriori compoto pro dicto anno reddendo eum absolvimus et acquietamus per presentes. Volumus tamen que pensiones ecclesiarum, si que infra archidiaconatum predictum nobis debeantur, exigat et colligat iuxta posse et nobis respondat de receptis. Datum sub sigillo nostro in Manerio nostro de Aukland, xj die mensis Septembris, Anno domini Millesimo Quadringentesimo vicesimoprimo. Et nostre Consecracionis xvj.
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