XII.—*The Castles of the Conquest.* By J. H. ROUND, Esq., M.A.

Read 23rd January, 1902.

By way of introduction to the subject I have the honour of bringing before you I will trace as briefly as possible the controversy as to the origin of those remarkable strongholds, found throughout the three kingdoms, of which the essential feature is a moated flat-topped mound. This was the “motte” of mediæval French, the “mota” of mediæval Latin.

The story begins with the well-known theory which “the great master of military architecture,” as Mr. G. T. Clark was styled by Professor Freeman, was, he claimed, “the first to set forth,” and which he applied throughout the two volumes of his *Medieval Military Architecture*, a work published, at Mr. Freeman’s suggestion, in 1884. This theory, as I hope to show you, has met with extraordinary acceptance; it has been widely and influentially adopted as established beyond dispute. These moated mounds, according to Mr. Clark, are all subsequent to the coming of the English to this country in the fifth century, and they are none of them later, as the other limit, than the first half of the tenth century. Whether he had formed any clear idea as to when, or by whom, within those limits, these mounds were actually raised seems extremely doubtful. In his preface, indeed, we find them styled “the moated mounds of the ninth century,” and he usually assigned them to the period of the Danish invasions; but owing to his using the term “Northmen” for the first English settlers as well as for the later Danes, his meaning is often obscure. Yet he held, at least, that in the sixth century Wihtgar “probably threw up the work which bore his name,” now “known as Carisbroke,”^b and that “when the English lord took up his

^a *Medieval Military Architecture*, i. vii.

^b *Op. cit.* i. 15.

abode within a Roman camp or station," he "threw up his bank in one corner," as at Pevensey, Leicester, Cambridge, and several other places where these mounds are found;^a and in the closing words of his paper devoted to "the shell keep," he styled these mounds "the early residences of the adventurous Northmen who laid the foundations of the English people."^b

In spite, however, of these expressions, Mr. Clark assigned, I think, these moated mounds, in the main, to the long struggle of the Danish invasions in the latter part of the ninth century and the early part of the tenth. And his reason for doing so was this. He found in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, throughout the course of that struggle, frequent mention of a *burh* being "wrought" as a defensive work. "Of the fifty *burhs* mentioned in the chronicle, about forty-one," he wrote, "have been identified," and at "twenty-two are moated mounds, mostly with base-courts also moated."^c From this Mr. Clark jumped to the following essential propositions:

What then is a burh? A burh is a moated mound with a table top, and a base court, also moated, either appended to one side of it or within which it stands. But the burhs, the dates of which are on record, and which are thus described, are but a very few of those found all over England, in the lowlands of Scotland, and on the marches bordering on Wales, which, from their precise similarity in character to those actually identified, must be assumed to be of like date and origin, and may therefore safely be attributed to the ninth and tenth and possibly to the eighth centuries, and to the English people, that is to the Northern settlers generally, as distinguished from the Britons and the Romans.^d

I have been careful to give you here Mr. Clark's own words, because, overlooking their confusion, which does not concern us here, of the first English settlers with the later Danish invaders, they show clearly his two propositions: first, that the *burh* was a moated mound; second, that all the *burhs*, that is the moated mounds, were raised at one period, which closed in the tenth century.

The first proposition, that the *burh* of the Chronicle was always a moated mound, was accepted without hesitation by Professor Freeman and Mr. Green. I need only cite the case of Warwick, where Æthelfleda wrought a *burh* in 914. Of this we read in Mr. Freeman's work:

The Lady wrought between the town and the river one of those vast artificial mounds which played so important a part in the early history of fortification The mound

^a *Medieval Military Architecture*, i. 18.

^b *Ibid.* 22.

^c *Ibid.* 145.

^d *Ibid.* 23.

itself still remains, a monument of the wisdom and energy of the mighty daughter of Ælfred, while the keep of William has so utterly perished that its very site can only now be guessed at.^a

And again :

At Warwick the mound of the Lady of the Mercians still stands ; for the castle of the Conqueror we seek in vain.^b

Mr. Green was every whit as positive that the *burh* of the Chronicle was a mound. Almost in Mr. Freeman's words he wrote of Æthelfleda that

she reared between town and river one of those mounds which marked the defensive warfare of the time, and which stripped as it is of every trace of the fortress with which she crowned it . . . still remains to witness to the energy of the lady of Mercia (p. 202).

From his *Conquest of England* published in 1883 I hasten to three important works all published, by a strange coincidence, in 1898, and all eager in adoption of Mr. Clark's theory on the mounds. In *Early Fortifications in Scotland*, Dr. Christison, secretary of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, asserted that moated mounds or "motes were the fortresses of England during the Saxon period," and referred to Mr. Clark as his authority. Sir James Ramsay, in the most recent of the detailed histories of this country in the early middle ages, cited Mr. Clark throughout on the *burhs* and followed him most absolutely.^c Lastly Professor Oman, who is actually supposed to be our greatest authority on

^a *Norman Conquest*, iv. 191.

^b *Ibid.* v. 648. The first of the above quotations continues thus : "Most likely it stood in the void space between the mound, the gateway, and the later castle." It is thus abundantly clear that, at Warwick, Mr. Freeman considered the castle of the Conqueror to have been something quite distinct and apart from the old English mound. On the other hand, at Wallingford, we find him writing : "One of the vast mounds which speak of later days of English victory under Eadward the Unconquered stood ready to become at William's bidding the kernel of a stronghold from which the new invader might hold Englishmen in bondage" (iii. [1875], 543). And, lastly, at Chester, under the heading "Restoration by Æthelfæd 907," he writes without hesitation of "the mound on which the Norman castle was now to supplant her earlier stronghold" (iv. [1871] 313). Comparing this with the passage on Warwick quoted in the text from the same volume, we see, I think, clearly that he had not thought out the subject, and that his vague language leaves it in doubt what he really believed as to those mounds and their treatment by the Normans, if indeed he had then any definite belief on the subject.

^c *The Foundations of England*, i. 272, 452 ; ii. 152.

mediæval warfare, ardently adopted Mr. Clark's theories in his *Art of War in the Middle Ages*.^a You will see then that these theories practically hold the field and that their overthrow would affect several standard works.

And now from the *burhs* of the Danish wars I pass to the castles of the Conquest. Here I speak of the Norman Conquest, as did Professor Freeman, in the sense of a process which began with Normans who settled in England under the Confessor, and which was going on for many years after the landing of William. The old crude conception of the castles raised at this period is seen very clearly in Professor Freeman's work; but the peculiar horror with which he viewed them was part of his well-known *ῥθος*, of a cast of mind which accurately reflected the middle-class Liberalism of the period of the great Exhibition. Primogeniture he detested; feudalism he loathed; castles were for him always filled with "devils and evil men." I will read you the Professor's words:

The hateful castle was wholly new. The stern square tower, perched on its height, . . . was before all things the badge of the Conquest, the sign of the dominion of the stranger. It was the castles which sheltered the devils and evil men. . . . It was the castles which contained those dens of torment where men pined as no martyrs had pined in the days of old. . . . The castle was the badge of the great change, social and political, to which the Norman Conquest had put the finishing stroke.^b

And he ends by referring to the feelings of our "forefathers" at "the un-English importation of Eadward's foreign favourites . . . when Richard the son of Scrob raised the first castle on English ground,"^c that is, Richard's Castle.

I want you to observe Mr. Freeman's insistence on the fact that the castles of the Conquest were something, in English eyes, absolutely strange and new. In describing the building of Richard's Castle, if Richard's Castle it was, which I doubt, in 1052 he was moved to write as follows:

The building of castles is something of which the English writers of this age frequently speak, and speak always with a special kind of horror. Both the name and the thing were new. . . . For such a structure the English language had hitherto contained no name. But now the tall, square, massive donjon of the Normans, a class of buildings whose grandest type is to be seen in the Conqueror's own Tower of London and in the more enriched keep of Rochester, began . . . to rear itself over the dwellings of Englishmen. . . . Such

^a See below.

^b *Norman Conquest* (1876), v. 648.

^c *Ibid.* 649.

strongholds, strange to English eyes, bore no English name, but retained their French designation of *castles*.^a

So long as it was possible to maintain this old crude view, Mr. Clark's theory of the *burgh* would arouse no difficulty. Mr. Freeman argued, plausibly enough, that as the word "castel" was a new introduction, it must evidently have denoted something "quite distinct from the familiar *burgh* of earlier times."^b And

^a *Ibid.* (1870), ii. 136. Compare the remarkable passage on the destruction of the castles at York by the English rebels in September, 1069: "Wherever a Norman castle had been reared it was the object of the bitterest of all hatred, as the living embodiment of the foreign yoke. We now look on those massive square keeps, wherever they are left to us, as among the most venerable and precious of the antiquities of our land. . . . But when those towers were still newly built, when their square stones were still in their freshness, when the arches of their doors and windows were still sharp and newly cut, they were to our fathers the objects of a horror deeper even than that with which France in the moment of her uprising looked on the Bastille of her ancient kings. They were the very homes of the Conquest; within their impregnable walls the foe was sheltered. . . . In the eyes of the men of those days the castle was an accursed thing, to be swept away from the earth by the stroke of righteous vengeance, as when liberated Syracuse swept away the citadel from which her Tyrants had held her in thralldom. On the very day on which the army reached York the two castles were broken down. We are not to suppose that the whole of the massive walls of two Norman keeps could be razed to the ground in the afternoon of a day of battle. But they were doubtless dismantled, wrecked, and left in a ruined state, so that they could not, for some while at least, be again used as places of defence" (*Ibid.* [1871], iv. 270). Yet of one of these "square Norman keeps," with their "massive walls," the writer himself had asserted, some pages back (p. 241), that it "must have been a hasty structure of wood or of the roughest kind of masonry. For we read that it was built during the king's sojourn of eight days" earlier in the year.

Compare with Mr. Freeman's dreams the plain words of Mr. Clark on the subject of these York castles. On the later of the two he wrote (*op. cit.* i. 86, ii. 545): "The other mound, the Bayle Hill, south of the river, was also fortified by William, but in haste and with timber only, which does not appear ever to have been replaced with masonry." "That this was a mere stockade is clear from the fact that it was completed in eight days, before he left the city. . . . The defences were familiar to the English, and would not strike them with the same terror as the stony and lofty keeps which the Normans had lately begun to build in Normandy, and which William had commenced in London." Here I may incidentally observe that, according to Mr. Clark himself, the Tower of London was not commenced till some ten years later (i. 138; ii. 205), and that even this date is earlier than can be proved. But keeping to York, we find Mr. Clark pressing, very properly, the evidence as to its castles (i. 42-3), and concluding thus: "It is clear, from the time occupied by the whole sequence of events, that these castles were not of masonry. Moreover, the masonry of the present York keep contains nothing that can be attributed to the eleventh century, but much that is far too early to have replaced a really substantial keep or curtain of Norman date had such been built. Upon the great and artificial mound of Bayle Hill, the site of the second castle, there is neither trace nor tradition of any masonry at all."

^b *Ibid.* 605.

if it denoted a rectangular keep, this of course was so. But unfortunately it did not; and that is where the trouble begins. Any archæologist could tell you to-day not only that Richard's Castle never had a square keep, but that this type, so far as we can find, was not even introduced into England till five-and-twenty or thirty years after the Normans had raised their Herefordshire "castel" in 1052. And the land had been covered with castles meanwhile by their countrymen.

Fig. 1. Plan of Richard's Castle, from the Ordnance Survey.^a

^a The above plan has been kindly prepared by Mr. W. H. St. John Hope from the 25-inch Ordnance Map, and it may therefore be relied on as accurate. It differs seriously from the plan given in Mr. Clark's work, but his own description there facing it proves that the plan is erroneous.

When correctly depicted, as here, Richard's Castle presents the normal features of these fortresses, and may be taken as a type of the Conquest castle described in this paper. The appended base-court or bailey is "semi-lunar" in form, a shape produced in these strongholds by placing the moated mound with its proper ditch astride on the *enceinte*. The same arrangement will be observed in the plan of Pleshey below.

Mr. Clark observed that 'Richard's Castle is one of a series of works common on the Welsh

What then were the castles of the Conquest? Mr. Clark set himself to answer this question in the third chapter of his work. He observed that in their existing remains there is hardly ever a trace of masonry that can safely be assigned to the period, and he forcibly argued that, speaking generally, "Those castles which belong to the Norman period are too late to be the work of the Conqueror or his personal followers, and too early to allow of any preceding work in Norman masonry (which was usually sound and solid) having been constructed and swept away."^a What then, he asked, was the solution? He was forced to the conclusion that the shortness of time, of material, of skilled labour, drove them to adopt and repair the *mottes* or castle mounds which, according to him, were already plentiful before ever a Norman came here. In his own words, where there was a mound, "they seem to have been content to repair the existing works, usually of timber only, and to have postponed the replacing of them with a regular shell till a more convenient season, which in many cases did not occur for a century."^b And there were not, he even held, half a dozen instances in which they did not select an existing mound as their castle.^c Thus we discover that, after all, the castle introduced by the Normans, that new, that strange, that terrible thing, was only the old palisaded mound standing where it stood before. Mr. Clark even suggests that it may have been the Conqueror's policy to place his followers in strongholds with which the English were so familiar.^d

Observe into what contradiction Mr. Clark's theory had led him. As a dutiful follower of Professor Freeman he was bound to hold that Richard's Castle was something new and fearful. "The English," he wrote, "who were aware what engines of local tyranny were the Norman castles, could not but have regarded with dismay the lofty walls and towers, which made impregnable a place already strong, and converted a well-known *burh* into a castle such as they

border and the Middle Marches. Such were . . . Kilpeck and Ewias Harold" (ii. 401). And of Ewias Harold he wrote that "on the western margin is placed a conical table mound . . . which necessarily . . . reduces the eastern side to an open crescent-shaped platform" (ii. 40). This platform corresponds, it will be seen, with the base-courts of Richard's Castle and of Pleshey.

The immediate proximity of Richard's Castle to the churchyard is another feature of common occurrence, and points to such castles having been used as the seats of local lords (*mottes seigneuriales*).

^a *Op. cit.* 41.

^b *Ibid.* 42.

^c *Ibid.* 44.

^d *Ibid.* 44-45.

had heard of with dread, but had not before seen" (ii. 402).^a Yet he hastened, in the very next sentence, to admit that "it is difficult to say" what Richard really built, and that "lofty walls and towers" had no foundation but a guess.

Indeed, when writing of Kilpeck Castle, in the same county and of the same type, Mr. Clark suggested that "the early Norman lords contented themselves with a residence and defences of timber, and did not build for a century or so after their occupation, when the shell keep was constructed. It is not probable that this was preceded by any earlier work in masonry, as Norman buildings were substantial and durable" (ii. 165). And at the opening of his chapter on the shell keep he maintained that it was usually later in date than the rectangular type for the reason that the early Norman lords had found the English palisade crowning the English mound a sufficient defence for their purpose.^b

I cannot find that Mr. Freeman ever really faced the question; but vague as his language is, he cannot have liked a theory which threatened to rob him of his castles.^c When you are clamouring for stone donjons "filled with devils and evil men," it is annoying to be offered only the harmless necessary *burgh*. The word "castel," he insisted, meant "something quite distinct from the familiar *burgh* of

^a So too he wrote, in another place, of Richard's Castle that "as this castle was a great cause of offence, it probably was something different from the fortified timber houses of the English thanes, and may well have been of stone, after the rising Norman fashion" (i. 393).

^b "A tolerably close examination has failed to discover, either at Arundel or elsewhere in England or in Normandy, any masonry of very early character, probably none that can safely be attributed to the eleventh century. The fact seems to be that the early timber structures, which are known to have been erected originally on the moated mounds, were found to be very defensible, and so were retained by the Norman lords until they were able to replace the timber by masonry" (i. 139). So too, "it may safely be said that, save a fragment of wall at Corfe, no military masonry older than that event (the Conquest) has as yet been discovered" (i. 37). This covers the remains of masonry at Richard's Castle, which he admitted looked later than 1052 (ii. 402). Indeed he elsewhere definitely stated that it has "no masonry of the age of the Confessor, nor is it probable that the keep was constructed before the age of Stephen, if so early" (i. 102).

^c "I have already spoken of the extreme rarity of castles in England before the Norman Conquest, and of the general indignation which was awakened by the building of a single castle in Herefordshire by a single Norman adventurer. . . . But now the age of castle-building fairly set in. It was William's policy to keep the conquered land in check by commanding every town and every important point by one of these fortresses. . . . And, as we follow his steps, we shall see that at every stage of the Conquest, the building of a castle in a conquered town was ever the first work of the Conqueror's foresight" (*Norman Conquest* [1871], iv. 66). And again he speaks of the houses overthrown "to make way for the building of the castles which were in English eyes the special homes of wrong and badges of bondage" (*Ibid.* [1876], v. 40).

earlier times"; and he urged, as against Mr. Clark, that "stone fortresses" were well known in the eleventh century.^a But the evidence he adduced was amazing. It consisted of a passage in which, he wrote, the stone fortress is "pointedly distinguished" from the wooden tower. In the year 1025 Count Odo of Chartres "turrem ligneam miræ altitudinis super domgionem ipsius castri erexit." On this Mr. Freeman comments: "The donjon itself was surely of stone." You will observe the word "surely." Why, the writer cannot even have known what a donjon was. Yet a chronicler whom he had studied, namely Lambert of Ardres, wrote of "motam altissimam, sive dunjonem eminentem, in munitionis signum firmavit et in aggerem coacervavit."^b The "donjon" was the *mota* or moated mound, and is the name given it in later days by Leland at Southampton and elsewhere and by Dugdale at Warwick. Mr. Freeman, "surely," was thinking of "the mysteries of Udolpho."

But if Mr. Freeman had his doubts about Mr. Clark's theory, it has made at least, as I shall show you, one illustrious convert.

Our chief specialist on the Art of War as practised in the Middle Ages, who is now acting at Oxford as Chichele Professor of History, I mean Mr. Charles Oman, is apt to change his views somewhat suddenly and often. Those who will do me the honour to read my paper on "Anglo-Norman Warfare" will find that he has in turn produced four different theories on the so-called palisade at the battle of Hastings, each of them absolutely trustworthy and all of them mutually destructive.^c It is the same, as I have shown, with the battle of Bannockburn.^d

And so with the castles of the Conquest. So late as 1894 we find Mr. Oman writing that the Conqueror was induced "not only to erect stone castles himself, but to encourage his great tenants to follow his example . . . that William and his great barons generally built in stone is attested by the remains that are

^a *Ibid.* [1870], ii. 605-7.

^b Mr. Freeman, indeed, could not mistake the significance of the word as used by Lambert. We find him writing: "As the Lady of the Mercians had done a few years before, he raised a mighty mound—'dunio,' 'firmissimus munitionis agger'—and girt it about with a twofold ditch. These words bring home to us that *dunio*, *donjon*, meant, first of all, the *mota*, the artificial *dune* or *down*, so characteristic of the earlier stage of fortification The *dunio*, as we shall presently see, was primarily meant to carry only wooden buildings; at the outside it would never carry more than the shell-keep of Cardiff or Lincoln." (*Historical Essays*, 4th S. 171.)

^c See my *Commune of London*, 43-8.

^d *Ibid.* 299-301.

with us to this day.”^a But four years later we find Mr. Oman writing of “the palisaded *burhs* . . . of Edward the Elder,”^b and explaining that

Hillocks or artificial mounds were trenched and palisaded. *Motte* (mound) seems to have been the general name for these structures among the Romance-speaking races; the English called them *burhs*. . . . Such undoubtedly were the *burhs* of the English thegnhood which William the Conqueror found in existence when England submitted to him . . . the greater part of William’s castles were merely adaptations and additions to the old English strongholds. The masonry was added half a century later.

Mr. Oman goes on to assert that “undoubtedly the large majority of William’s strongholds must have been palisaded *burhs* in the old English style,” and acknowledges his “deep indebtedness to Mr. Clark’s third chapter” (pp. 518-521).

In spite, however, of the ardour of the neophyte, you will see for yourselves that there is something wrong. If the normal castle of the Conquest was but the familiar *burh*, why was there no word for it in English? Why was it something new and terrible? Why did it excite horror and dismay, as even Mr. Clark admits that it did in the case of Richard’s Castle? I have sometimes found in the course of my researches, as in the problem of the introduction of knight-service into England, that a theory, however influentially upheld, needs only to be clearly stated to break down of its own weight. And so when you strip from Mr. Clark’s theory the vague language in which it was expressed, you find that it breaks down from its own inherent contradictions.

Let me remind you that this theory, the theory that the castles of the Conquest were but the English strongholds occupied and repaired by the Normans, rests on two propositions. The first is that the *burh* was essentially a moated mound, and that therefore some of the existing mounds were the actual *burhs* mentioned as constructed in the ninth and tenth centuries. The second and far more startling proposition is that every moated mound must, as a consequence of this,

^a *Social England*, i. 328. Precisely the same view is taken by another writer in the same volume: “Conquered England was held down by dozens of castles, square keeps with walls of enormous thickness built of solid stone, and often relying solely on their own strength without being surrounded by any outworks. The English, in their revolts, could never storm one of the new castles. . . . In the eleventh century the art of defence had quite outgrown the art of attack” (p. 301).

^b *Art of War in the Middle Ages*, i. 517.

belong to that period. With the first of these propositions others, I shall show, have dealt; with the second I dealt myself in the *Quarterly Review* article which sounded, Mr. Hope tells me, the first note of opposition to the accepted theory on the subject. It is really difficult to say which is the more surprising, that Mr. Clark should ever have advanced, or that anyone else should have accepted, a proposition not only so baseless, but so wildly at variance with all our evidence on the subject as that these mounds were never erected after the earlier years of the tenth century. Mr. Freeman rightly cited against him the definite witness of

Fig. 2. The building of Hastings castle. From the Bayeux Tapestry.
(From *Vetusta Monumenta*, vol. vi.)

William of Jumièges that even in the days of the Conqueror's youth his nobles threw up mounds, "erexerunt aggeres," as their castles. The priceless witness of the Bayeux tapestry (fig. 2) shows us that he himself did so as soon as he landed in England; ^a and, to hasten on, I showed in my article, that more than a

^a The legend on the tapestry is "jussit ut foderetur castellum at Hestengaceastra." The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle has: "Hi . . . worhton castel æt Hæstinga port." Its phrase for the Herefordshire castle of 1052 is "gewroht ænne castel on Herefordscire."

century later, the Anglo-Normans in Ireland were still raising, as their castles, *mottes* or moated mounds.

I know of no more amazing example of the determination to sweep aside all facts and all testimony conflicting with a theory which itself is absolutely without foundation than is seen in Mr. Clark's treatment of the castles of the Conquest. We see the castle-mound rising on the Bayeux tapestry (fig. 2); we read in the chroniclers how William, at every stage of the Conquest "condidit," "firmavit," "stabilivit," "locavit," "construxit," his castles; we turn to Domesday and there we read how William or one of his barons made (*fecit*) a castle. And at these very places mentioned by these witnesses we normally find *mounds*. Mr. Clark, of course, was aware of this, but he swept aside the language of Domesday and the chroniclers alike, and insisted in paper after paper that these mounds were English. In vain does Orderic observe, in an often-quoted passage, "Muniones (quas Castella Galli nuncupant) Anglicis provinciis paucissimæ fuerant," with the result, he adds, that the bravery of the English did not enable them to offer an effective resistance to the Conquest. All a mistake, Mr. Clark replies, "England, in this respect was exceedingly well provided—quite as well provided as Normandy" (i. 35); the country was "covered with strong places, which were, no doubt defended, and well defended with palisades If at the Conquest no English stronghold held out it was not that such places were less capable of defence than those in Normandy, but that England was broken up into parties The conquest of England was made possible, not by the absence of strong places, but by the want of organisation for their defence" (i. 38-9).

It was thus that Mr. Clark disposed of unwelcome evidence; he either ignored it, or waived it aside. On the other hand his own evidence needs careful sifting, for it not only proves at times to be little else than assumption, but even takes the form of assertions contradicting one another. For instance, under Richard's Castle we read that Harold, in 1056, entered the Marches against the Welsh, and that at that time "his probable godson, Harold, the son of Ralph, held the Castle of Ewias Harold, the earthworks of which were constructed on the type of those of Richard's Castle" (ii. 402). But on turning back to Ewias Harold (ii. 42), we there read that (as was the fact) Harold the son of Ralph "was a mere child" at the time (1055), and had nothing to do, moreover, with Ewias castle till many years later. And yet we have only to turn back further to an earlier page of Mr. Clark's work (i. 108) to read of Ewias, that "The Harold

from whom it derives its distinctive name was an English proprietor before the Conquest," an assertion which would favour Mr. Clark's theory if it rested, as of course it does not, on fact.

I desire to call special attention to the words employed by the chroniclers and by Domesday. There is one instance in which we find the word "restaurarent" used by a chronicler; Orderic speaks of the men left by William at York "qui restaurarent in urbe castella." But this word is applied to the castles which William himself is recorded to have there constructed,^a and which the rebels had broken down. This is exceedingly strong evidence that when the chroniclers applied such words as "firmavit" and "condidit" to the castles founded by William, the mound for instance that we see being raised on the Bayeux Tapestry, they did not mean, as Mr. Clark imagined, the mere occupation or even restoration of an existing English fortress. And Domesday Book supplies precisely the same evidence. To its normal word, the word "fecit," there is one striking exception. We read of the castle of Ewias Harold, "castellum Ewias" as Domesday terms it (fo. 186), that William Fitz Osbern "hoc castellum *refirmaverat*." Why? Because it stood in the very district where the Normans had begun building castles even under Edward the Confessor, and was, I have urged in my *Feudal England* (p. 324), the actual castle of Osbern Pentecost mentioned in the English Chronicle. Thus the one exception to the rule in Domesday Book proves that, as with the chroniclers, it used its words with care, and that when it said "fecit," it meant what it said, and did not mean "restored" or "adapted."

When we turn to later evidence, evidence of the days of Stephen, we find in the language employed striking confirmation of my view. Thus, for instance, in the second charter of the Empress Maud to Geoffrey de Mandeville (1142) we read:

Concedo etiam eidem Gaufredo quod novum castellum quod *firmavit* super Luiam stet et remaneat ad efforciandum ad voluntatem suam. Concedo etiam ei quod *firmet* unum castellum ubicunque voluerit in terra sua . . . et quod stet et remaneat.^b

It is quite clear that the verb *firmare* is used here of the raising of a new castle, not of the repair of an old one. For strengthening the defences of a castle

^a Orderic had said of the first castle, "in urbe ipsa munitionem firmavit," and of the second "alterum præsidium condidit."

^b See my *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, 168. Compare the use of "firmavit" by Lambert of Ardres in the passage quoted above.

after it is raised the word used here is “efforciandum.” So, too, in her earlier charter the Empress had granted to Geoffrey :

ut castella sua que habet stent ei et remaneant *ad inforciandum* ad voluntatem suam.^a

But Stephen used, like her, the word *firmare* when it was a question of a fresh castle :

firmiter ei concessi ut possit *firmare* quoddam castellum ubicunque voluerit in terra sua, et quod stare possit.^b

Again, when Henry, son of the Empress, granted a charter to Robert FitzHarding in or about the year 1153, it contained this remarkable clause relating to Berkeley :

pepigi ei *firmare* ibi castellum secundum voluntatem ipsius Roberti.^c

So, too, we read of Hayles (Glos.) that Ralf of Worcester founded there a castle to the disgust of the monks of Winchcombe :

Tempore Regis Stephani, domino Simone presidente ecclesie Wigornensis, cum hostilitas vehementer ingrueret [1140-1150] quidam prepotens, Radulfus de Wirecestre, in Hailes castrum *firavit*.^d

Lastly, in the same reign, the very remarkable treaty between the earls of Leicester and of Chester contains the following clause :

Nec comes Cestriæ, nec comes Leecestrie debent *firmare* castrum aliquid novum inter Hinchelai et Coventre, nec inter Hinchelai et Hardredeshellam, etc. etc. nisi communi assensu utriusque. Et si aliquis in prædictis locis vel infra prædictos terminos *firaret* castrum, uterque alteri erit auxilio sine male ingenio donec castrum diruatur.^e

^a *Ibid.* 91.

^b *Ibid.* 175.

^c *Berkeley Charters and Muniments*, 2.

^d *Registrum monasterii de Winchecumba*, 65. Ralf, we read, founded there, at the same time, a church, and now “the meadow adjoining the church contains the earthworks of Ralf’s castle” (*Bristol and Gloucester Archæological Transactions*, xxiii. 9). Mr. W. H. St. John Hope tells me that these are slight, so that the castle was probably destroyed as “adulterine” under Henry II., not being licensed to “stand and remain.” The proximity of church and castle should here again be observed.

^e *Vincent’s Discovery of Brooke’s Errors*, 302-3. It is strongly suggested by the second clause that the castles contemplated would be rapidly raised and could not, therefore, be of masonry.

Sufficient evidence has now been given to show that the phrase *firmare castrum* meant to erect a castle on a new site.

And now, if we try to arrive at a conclusion, what form will it take? On the one hand Mr. Clark may be said to have proved, as against Mr. Freeman, that the castles of the Conquest were moated mounds, crowned with a palisade, and not the rectangular keeps, the "donjons" of solid stone, of which Mr. Freeman dreamed. On the other, these Norman castles appear to have been something new. Allowing for great exaggeration in Mr. Freeman's language on the subject, admitting that the horror they aroused is by no means clearly proved,^a the fact remains that the word *castel* appears, as he says, to have been used to denote something "quite distinct from the familiar *burh* of earlier times." And if what it denoted was Richard's castle, as Mr. Freeman and Mr. Clark agreed it was, it follows that this stronghold and the many others like it were something "evidently" in Mr. Freeman's words, "quite distinct from the familiar *burh* of earlier times." I am anxious not to press the argument an inch further than is fair, but you see clearly what it involves, namely, that the moated mound crowned with its palisades, an object, according to Mr. Clark's theory, long familiar to English eyes, was an object, on the contrary, so strange to them, that their language had no word for it.^b

At this point I may speak of those who have followed up my attack. A well-known Scottish antiquary, Mr. George Neilson of Glasgow, contributed to the *Scottish Review* three years ago^c a paper on "The Motes in Norman Scotland," in which he accepted my conclusions and boldly challenged Mr. Clark's fundamental axiom that a *burh* was a moated mound. Analysing all the facts connected with the Scottish motes, he came to the conclusion that these mounds were raised as the *capita* of fiefs after feudal institutions had been introduced into Scotland. A further advance is marked by the paper of Mrs. Armitage read before the Scottish Society of Antiquaries a year and a half ago.^d In this very remarkable

^a A careful examination of the passage in the Chronicle, under 1051, will show that the grievance was the "harne and bismere" wrought to the king's men by the strangers rather than their raising "æenne castel." And what Godwine demanded was not the destruction of the castle, but the handing over of the Frenchmen themselves.

^b The argument based on the introduction (or, more strictly, the fresh introduction) of the word "castel" is strengthened, I think, by the similar introduction of the word *Tur* into the Chronicle, under 1097, to denote a rectangular keep, the Tower of London.

^c October, 1898 (lxiv. 209-238).

^d *Proceedings*, xxxiv. 260-288.

study the accomplished writer argued that on the one hand the *burhs* mentioned in the Chronicle are never found to have a *motte* unless the Normans have had a castle there, and that on the other the *motte* is almost universal in castles of early Norman foundation. There are details, with which I need not trouble you, on which questions might arise;^a but in the main her paper presents a case for the Norman origin of all the *mottes* which it would not be easy to answer.

Her conclusions are well supported by my own county of Essex. In Essex the English Chronicle mentions two *burhs*, those of Colchester and Witham; and at neither of these places are there traces of a moated mound. On the other hand we have at Rayleigh a typical moated mound, and Domesday tells us that Suain of Essex "in hoc manerio fecit suum castellum." This then was a castle of the Conqueror's reign. But what is, I think, even more interesting is that Suain's father, Robert Fitz Wimarc, had held the great manor of Clavering, at the other end of the county, under Edward the Confessor, and that there also we find one of these moated mounds. Now when the Normans fled from London, on the triumph of Godwine's party, in 1052, some rode, in Mr. Freeman's words, "towards a castle in the north, belonging to the Norman Staller, Robert the son of Wymarc."^b Mr. Freeman could not find this castle, but I suggest that it was Clavering, which virtually lies north of London. If so we have at Clavering, as in Herefordshire, a Norman *motte* of Edward's days. One point more. Of the noble stronghold of Pleshey there is no mention in Domesday; but Pleshey is virtually surrounded by two great parishes, High Easter and Great Waltham, belonging to Geoffrey de Mandeville. Now in Great Waltham there was, as at Rayleigh, a new and extensive vineyard. This, I have argued in a paper on the subject, points to the residence of a Norman magnate.^c Cross into Hertfordshire and you find it so at Ware; penetrate even into North Suffolk, and there too a baron at Ixworth is engaged in the perilous adventure of growing his own wine. I claim, therefore, the Waltham vineyard as evidence that there was already a Mandeville stronghold near; and I hold that this was Pleshey, which for ages was the seat of the Mandevilles and their heirs.

^a Mrs. Armitage, it seems, was not aware that the "castle of Wareham" was Corfe; and her inclusion of Berkeley, Hastings, Montgomery, Rochester, and Winchester among castles of the *motte* type known to have been built in the reigns of William I. or William II. is open to question. Nor is the destruction of houses in a town absolute proof in itself of the construction of a *motte* as she insists. It might well, conceivably, be due to the extension of a fortified area.

^b "Some north to Rodbertes castele," in the Chronicle.

^c *Transactions of the Essex Archæological Society* (N. S.), vii. 250.

And now if I have not detained you too long already, there are a few new points that I should like to bring before you. First, as to the name of Richard's Castle in Domesday. There is no question, of course, as to this. Mr. Clark spoke of it as

[Fig. 3. Plan of Pleshey Castle.^a

^a The above plan was prepared by Mr. I. C. Gould, to whom the Society is indebted for the loan of the block. It illustrates the addition to the moated mound and appended base-court, which were (as at Richard's Castle) the essential features of the type, of outer courts or baileys, which is not uncommon in the case of important strongholds.

“Richard’s Castle, the Auretone of Domesday” (i. 102), and Mr. Eyton, in his well-known study of the district, dealt with it as “Richard’s Castle formerly Auretone.”^a Mr. Freeman, however, in his list of the “castles mentioned in Domesday” entered the Domesday name as “Averton,” and strangely called attention to the fact that “Richard’s Castle, the earliest, and in some sort the most historically important of all, is not mentioned.”^b As the Domesday name, so far as I know, has never yet been explained, let us ascertain exactly what Domesday actually says. In one place it tells us that Osbern, the son of Richard Scrupe, “has 23 men in the castle of Avretone” (fo. 186b); in another we read that “Robert Gernon holds lands in the castlery of Avretone” (fo. 185). The “v” of course, stands for “u,” which brings us to “Auretone”; but what was “Auretone”? Why, it was simply Orleton, of which, though in another Hundred, the church is less than two miles to the south of Richard’s Castle. The place itself is “Alretune” in Domesday, for “u” and “l” were then treated as interchangeable, as in “Aubigny” and “Albini.”^c You see then that it is incorrect to speak of Richard’s Castle as “formerly Auretone.” It was called, from a neighbouring village, “the castle of Auretone” (Orleton), because it had no name of its own unless men spoke of it simply as “Richard’s Castle.”

Now this principle of nomenclature has a very considerable importance. Take, for instance, Domesday’s mention of the Conqueror making “Castellum de Warham” (fo. 78b). Mr. Clark and Mr. Freeman both assumed that this castle was at Wareham itself, and therefore sought at Wareham for William’s work.^d But Mr. Eyton in his *Dorset Survey* (pp. 43, 111, 112), and Mr. Bond subsequently in his monograph on Corfe Castle (pp. 88-91), explained that the Domesday entry referred, not to Wareham, but to Corfe Castle itself, some four miles away. Mr. Freeman, however, did not like to have his assumptions questioned; the great “accuracy” fetish was already nodding on its throne. He therefore asserted anew his belief that Wareham was meant, in a passage which showed that he had not discovered the difference between the parish of Corfe Castle and the far distant Corfe Mullen.^e And the state of the “accuracy” fetish became more parlous than ever.

^a *Shropshire*, v. 225.

^b *History of the Norman Conquest*, v. 808.

^c In Domesday, for instance, the “Alre” of four entries in Devonshire becomes “Avra” in a fifth, just as with “Alretune” and “Avretone.”

^d *Medieval Military Architecture*, i. 38, ii. 516; *History of the Norman Conquest*, v. 807.

^e “Corfe appears in Domesday as the former holding of two Englishmen . . . and as the

Let us turn to Pontefract Castle, as another instance of the practice of naming a castle from a place some distance away. I agree with Mr. Freeman that the name was taken from that passage of the Aire, which Orderic speaks of as "Fractus pons,"^a and from which Pontefract Castle is some three miles distant. But this derivation has been disputed,^b and the name does not occur in Domesday. The same remark applies to another Yorkshire castle, the great mound at Tickhill. This fortress, as is well known, was often called the castle of "Blythe," which, says Mr. Ellis, "is unaccountable, as at that manor there are no remains or traditions of a castle."^c But this is simply another case of a castle built on a site with no recognised name, being sometimes named from a manor, in this case belonging to its lord, a few miles away.

Let us then apply this practice to a far more famous castle, that of Windsor. This castle stands, as you know, between Clewer and Old Windsor, but a mile from Clewer, roughly speaking, and two miles from Old Windsor. Old Windsor is entered in Domesday as a great royal manor, with two serjeants of the king's court among those who dwelt thereon (fo. 56b). But "the castle of Windsor" ("castellum de Windesores") is entered under Clewer (fo. 62b), which was then in the hands of a small tenant-in-capite. Out of its five hides there had been taken half a hide for this "castle of Windsor," which stood about as far from Old Windsor as Richard's Castle from Orleton, just as from the Abbess of Shaftesbury's manor of Kingston (Abbess), with its sixteen hides, the king had taken, says Domesday, "1 hide in which he made the castle of War(e)ham," that is, Corfe. This passage creates a presumption that Windsor Castle was new and its great moated mound thrown up by William. And this presumption is strangely confirmed by a statement in the Abingdon Chronicle that at Wallingford, Oxford, and Windsor, under William, "castella pro regno servando compacta,"^d and that the abbey was called upon to provide knights to guard the one at Windsor.

But if Windsor was new, what of Arundel, which, as Mr. Clark observed, present possession of Robert son of Gerold. From this a local antiquary of high authority (Mr. Bond) has argued that the Domesday of Wareham Castle really refers to Corfe" (*English Towns and Districts*, 153). I need scarcely say that Mr. Bond's careful arguments were, of course, not based on an error which he would have known to be such. He specially explained that the "Corfe" of Domesday, held by Robert Fitz-Gerold, was not Corfe Castle, but Corfe Mullen (p. 90).

^a *History of the Norman Conquest* (1871), iv. 284-5.

^b See *Medieval Military Architecture*, ii. 376-7.

^c *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, iv. 142.

^d Vol. ii. 3. The authority is recognised as a good one for that period, and it also represents local knowledge, for Abingdon was about half way between Oxford and Wallingford.

resembles it closely in plan? That Domesday speaks of Arundel Castle as existing in the time of the Confessor is a point on which historians and antiquaries have all, I believe, been agreed, and it is held to be the only castle of which Domesday makes that statement. Sir Henry Ellis,^a Professor Freeman,^b Mr. Clark,^c and others all take it for granted. Even Mrs. Armitage herself found in Arundel Castle, "which Domesday Book," she writes, "speaks of as a *castrum* in the reign of Edward the Confessor" (p. 274), the only difficulty in the way of her view that the *mota* was first introduced into England by the Normans.^d

But when we turn to the manuscript of Domesday, we find the words "Castrum Harundel" written in capitals and rubricated to show that they were the name of the place, while "Castrum" begins with an enormous "C" of the same size as the initials used for Chichester, Pevensey, and Lewes. Moreover, in the often-quoted passage we read that "Castrum Harundel" rendered certain dues in the days of the Confessor, which dues had greatly increased at the time of the Survey, the Conquest having brought prosperity to the river ports of Sussex. In all this we are clearly reading, not of the mere earthwork on the hill, but of Arundel as a whole with its water-mill and its port. So when we speak of Newcastle to-day we mean thereby the whole town and not the mere castle itself. It is common in Norman chronicles and charters to find "castrum" or "castellum" employed in this sense; but, for our purpose, it is more important to observe that Domesday itself indulges in the same practice. Monmouth, to take but a single instance, is entered as "Castellum Monemude" (p. 180b), and its survey begins by stating that in it the king has four carucates and that he draws from what he holds in the "castle" five pounds a year. We then read of ploughs at work there, ploughs many in number, and so we gather what was meant by Domesday's "Castellum Monemude," words, which, as with the name of Arundel, are given in capital letters.^e I hold therefore that "Castrum Harundel" simply means Arundel itself, which was so named at the time of the Survey from the

^a *Introduction to Domesday*, i. 212, 223.

^b *History of the Norman Conquest* (1871), iv. 66, 493; and *William Rufus* (1882), i. 58, ii. 43.

^c *Medieval Military Architecture*, i. 71, 195.

^d It is on this account, doubtless, that Mrs. Armitage, I observe, has run her pen, in the copy I possess, through the perfectly sound observation that "It is certainly remarkable that Dover Castle, the only castle which has any claim to have been built by an Anglo-Saxon, has no motte" (p. 284).

^e "Castellum Ewias" is similarly valued at £10 a year, and we read that 5 carucates of land were there (*ibidem*), and ploughs at work on them (fo. 186).

mighty castle that earl Roger had erected on the hill above. Domesday Book compares its issues before and after the Conquest, but does not, I confidently assert, imply the existence of the earthwork, a matter of supreme indifference in itself to those who made the Survey, in the days of Edward the Confessor.

This conclusion is of much importance, for if Arundel may have been the work of that mighty lord Roger de Montgomery, at whose Norman home, St. Germain-de-Montgomery, earthworks are found, Carisbrooke, of which the plan is similar, might well be assigned to William Fitz Osbern, that potent warrior-earl and ruler of the Isle of Wight.^a

For the present, however, I prefer to retain a cautious attitude, and to assert only that William and his barons threw up *mottes* as their castles. I am not prepared to go to the length of saying that, because these moated mounds can be proved in many cases to have been thrown up by the Normans, none of them is earlier in date, say the work of Danes. This would be the opposite error to that into which Mr. Clark fell.^b But I hope that if it can be proved that some of them were raised by Danes, some one will put together and produce the evidence that they *were*; and in the meanwhile I suggest that we deal with each example on its merits. That at least the bulk of them are Norman I feel no doubt. And that they equate, as alleged, the Anglo-Saxon *burh* Mrs. Armitage in her powerful paper has, I think, decisively disproved. There are cases, no doubt, in which we find these moated mounds, with their appendant courts, at places where the Normans never had, so far as we know, a castle. Such are Laughton-en-le-Morthen and Barwick-in-Elmet, Yorks, Great Canfield, Essex, and Towcester, Northants. But we must remember that, as was done by William himself at Hastings, a castle mound would be thrown up at once for defence against a hostile population by the new Norman lord, and might afterwards be abandoned by him for another site. Ilbert de Lacy, for instance, may, I think, have abandoned Barwick for Pontefract.^c And it is thus also that I

^a Similarly the great moated mound with its surrounding courts at Castle Acre was a stronghold of William de Warenne, at the *caput* of whose Norman fief, Bellencombe, there is still to be seen "Château du xi^e siècle, sur une motte énorme entourée de fossés."

^b It is but fair to remember that the words of Orderic as to "castella" being "paucissima" in England before the Normans came are, though directly opposed to Mr. Clark's theory, antagonistic also to the view that they were previously quite unknown. These "castella," however, need not have comprised mounds. It is admitted, for instance, that Dover Castle was without one.

^c Mr. W. H. St. John Hope has drawn my attention to the striking case of Old and New Buckenham, in Norfolk. A priory was founded at Old Buckenham by William d'Albini, earl of

should explain such types as Bramber and Oxford, where the mounds seem to have been first thrown up, and a rectangular tower built as the keep subsequently in another part of the enclosure.^a Lastly, if *mottes* were still being raised by the Anglo-Normans in Ireland under Henry II., and in Scotland, as Mr. Neilson's researches imply, in at least the twelfth century, they may well have been among that swarm of castles which were thrown up on every side in the struggles of Stephen's reign. This might account for some that we could not otherwise explain.^b

I may remind you in conclusion that the whole tendency of modern research on the subject has been to assign to rectangular keeps dates later in most cases than the early part of the twelfth century. What, then, was the normal type of castle for half a century after the Conquest? Must it not have been the moated mound with its timber palisade, and its moated and palisaded court or courts? And if in the eyes of the English its sight was strange and fearful, if they had to use for it a foreign word, was not the thing itself as new and as foreign as its name?

My paper originally terminated here; but I am tempted to add an argument derived from the nature and object of the moated mound as a defensive work. It is essentially calculated to enable small bodies of men, planted in the midst of a hostile population, to hold their own against a sudden rising, even when greatly outnumbered. Being thus adapted exactly to the needs of the Norman Conquerors, it possessed for them the further merits of being (1) quickly raised; (2) composed of materials available on the spot; (3) requiring no skilled labour.

But when we are invited to believe that, in the Danish wars, it was the type of fortress adopted by the English, we must ask ourselves whether it was well suited for a purpose wholly different from that of the Norman lords. It was not to protect detachments of their followers against a hostile townsfolk but to protect their own loyal townsfolk against the assaults of Danes that Edward

Chichester, not earlier than 1146, for Austin canons, to whom the founder gave *inter alia* "*infra parcum cum bosco et plano cum sede castelli lxxx. acras, et castellum diruendum*" (Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, vi. 419). The earl then built himself another castle at New Buckenham, where its great earthworks still remain. See the plan in H. Harrod's *Gleanings among the Castles and Convents of Norfolk* (Norwich, 1857), 215.

^a There is some reason to suppose that this may have been the case at Hastings also.

^b See the cases of Hayles, etc. quoted above.

and Æthelflæd wrought. For this purpose the moated mound, it appears to me, would be useless. Its summit could hold but a few defenders, and their missiles could at most reach the base of the mound itself. Beyond that limit they had no power to afford protection.^a A town, lying at their feet, might be sacked and burnt before their eyes. For protecting a town against attack what was needed was a wall or rampart of some kind round it. That towns were so defended we know from the evidence of Domesday, which alludes to the walls of Chester, Oxford, Colchester, Leicester, and Hereford; and as these allusions are only incidental they cannot be at all exhaustive. Indeed, the Chronicle speaks of the wall which Edward built round Towcester, and of that which subsequently girdled Exeter.

The tale of the assaults on Exeter and their fate is one which bears directly on the meaning of the word *burh*. And I think it further illustrates the confusion which inevitably follows the adoption of Mr. Clark's theory. There is really no need to assail it; we have only to watch Mr. Freeman and Mr. Clark plunging into hopeless contradiction when they attempt to apply it. Mr. Freeman's monograph^b did not appear till 1887, and it shows stronger traces of Mr. Clark's influence than are found in *The Norman Conquest*.

The first mention of Exeter, Mr. Freeman observes, is in 876, when Alfred pursued a Danish force making for that city, but in vain; for "they had reached the fastness before him."^c The Professor's comment ran as follows:

we gain two main points. Exeter was in Alfred's day a fastness, or strong place. The Roman walls of Isca were doubtless still standing, perhaps not carefully repaired or strengthened under either British or West-Saxon occupation. And the word *burh*, so familiar in the military history of the next generation, is not used at this stage. This looks as if the hill which had formed the British stronghold and the Roman citadel did not just now hold that place in the attack and defence of Exeter which it did in after times. Still the walls alone would form a fastness, as the empty walls of forsaken Deva did a few years later.^d

^a A base court, if added, would have to depend on its own defences. The mound itself could not protect it.

^b *Exeter* (Historic Town Series).

^c *Exeter*, 21. This follows the words of the Chronicle, which here speaks of "þam fæstene" (I. 166-7). In Florence of Worcester its words are rendered, "quia civitatem jam intraverat, illam assequi non poterat."

^d *Ibid.* 21.

This allusion to the similar episode in 894 at Chester is of much interest. Of that episode Mr. Freeman wrote in another place :

In 894 the Danish army pursued by the English took refuge within the ruined site of Chester "priusquam Regis Ælfredi et Ætheredi subreguli exercitus, qui illos insequutus (*sic*) est, assequi poterant, intrant." The fugitives were able to defend the "geweorc," as the Roman walls are called, very successfully.^a

The admission that "geweorc" was used for a walled enclosure should be observed. It is in the same year, 894, that Exeter again appears in history; and the language of the Chronicle on this occasion deserves to be carefully studied. In it we read that the Danes "ymb-sæton Exancester," and again that "se here þa burg beseten hæfde" (I., 166-8). This, surely, makes it clear that the "burg" which they beset was Exeter itself; and so Florence understood the words. Alfred, he wrote, heard "illos Exanceastram . . . non modica manu obsedissee." But Mr. Freeman, reading the passage through Mr. Clark's spectacles, comments on it as follows :

But now that special word is used which was not used in the earlier story. It was now a *burh* which the besiegers beset. It may be that, at some time between the first and the second appearance of the Danes before Exeter, the city had been strengthened according to the highest standard of the time. The guardian care of Alfred had turned the mere fastness into something stronger. The English forerunner of the Norman castle was now to arise within its walls. At the north-eastern corner the neglected hill, the natural acropolis, was again strengthened. Exeter had not yet a castle; that, name and thing, was everywhere the hated work of later invaders. But the natural stronghold of the city was again fortified; Exeter had now a *burh*, and she had just proved the value of her new defences.^b

Thus pleasantly, on the wings of fancy, we pass from a guess to statements of fact. But when we strip the passage of its plumes we find that what it asserts is that the Danes beset, not Exeter, but only a *burh* "within its walls." Of this improbable hypothesis the best criticism is found in the words of the Chronicle itself, which states that, in later days, William the Chronicler "besæt þa burh Exancester xviii dagas" (I. 340). Mr. Freeman duly quoted these words from "the short but weighty account" in the Chronicle; ^c but how did he understand

^a *Norman Conquest* (1871), iv. 313, note. The Latin of "insequutus" is Mr. Freeman's.

^b *Exeter*, 22.

^c *Norman Conquest*, iv. 151-2.

the word *burh*? In exactly the opposite sense to this which we have just seen him assign to it. It now becomes the whole area of the walled city:

The walls which Æthelstan had reared, and which Swend had at least partly overthrown, had been repaired or rebuilt, and the city was again strongly fortified. . . . But it should be noted that we hear only of the defences of the city itself; Exeter did not as yet contain a castle.^a . . . The new invader found the city as well prepared for defence as ever it had been against the earlier enemy. The gates were shut, and the whole range of walls and towers was thick with defenders.^b . . . The siege began, and was carried on with vigour on both sides for eighteen days. The besiegers kept up a constant attack on the walls. . . . It was by undermining the walls that William at last gained possession of the city.^c

We shall have to return to the dealings of William with the Exeter defences, and I only introduce them here to illustrate the use of the word *burh*.

Between these two periods Exeter was again attacked in 1001 and 1003, unsuccessfully on the former, successfully on the latter occasion. Of Pallig's attack in 1001 we read that the Danes entered the Exe and "eodon þa up to ðære byrig and ðær fæstlice feohtende wæron" (I. 250-251). Florence's version of this episode runs, "Dum murum illius destruere moliretur, a civibus urbem viriliter defendentibus repellitur [Paganorum exercitus]." Mr. Freeman, in his *Norman Conquest*, cited these passages and summarised their contents thus:

The Danes now attacked Exeter, just as they had attacked London; but the citizens of the western capital fought with as good a will and with as complete success as their brethren of the east. King Æthelstan's wall stood them in good stead, and the attack of the barbarians was altogether fruitless.^d

Here the attack is represented as repulsed by the walls alone, the walls which, as I observed above, were the natural and only effective protection for a town. But when we turn to Mr. Freeman's *Exeter* (1887) we again find that Mr. Clark's theory has effectually coloured his view:

A few years before the wall of London, defended by the citizens of London, had proved too strong for two kings of the north. And now the *burh* of Alfred, the wall of Æthelstan—both are specially spoken of—were guarded by men no less valiant and did their work no less well. The heathen were beaten back, and the city could breathe again.^e

^a *Norman Conquest*, iv. 139.

^b *Ibid.* 154.

^c *Ibid.* 156. In his *Exeter*, 36-8, Mr. Freeman adopted precisely the same view.

^d Vol. i. 309.

^e *Exeter*, 26.

It should be scarcely needful to say that of a "*burh* of Alfred" there is no mention, or explain that the "*byrig*" of the Chronicle refers, on the contrary, here to the walled town itself, the *urbs* of Florence. The next episode is the capture of Exeter by the Danes in 1003. "*Her wæs Exacester tobrocen*," says the Chronicle, and Florence tells us that the Danish king "*civitatem Exanceastram infregit, spoliavit, murum ab orientali usque ad occidentalem portam destruxit*." Mr. Freeman observed that "this does not imply the complete destruction of the city, but Henry of Huntingdon says, '*urbem totam funditus destruxerunt*,' which is doubtless an exaggeration"^a The Professor had evidently overlooked the words of his own supreme authority, the Chronicle itself, which goes on to tell us that "*se here ƿa ƿa buruh mid ealle fordyde*." So Henry merely gave a rendering of the Chronicle's words, and we see that for him as for Florence the *burh* was the town itself.

We may now return to 1068, when William besieged Exeter,^b the *burh* of the Chronicle on that occasion being, as we have seen, for Mr. Freeman, the whole walled town. Both in his earlier and in his later work he assigns to the "*Rougemont*" mount no part in the defence. But he could not wholly escape the question, what did William find on that mount, and what did he add to it? In the *Norman Conquest* he seems to have held that William found nothing, for he assigned to the Conqueror, as a "first step, the building of a castle"; on Rougemont "William laid the foundations of the famous castle of Exeter."^c Next year we read of "the fortress which had grown up on the Red Mount of Exeter," and are told that "the men of Devonshire . . . appeared in arms beneath the walls of Rougemont."^d But in his later work (1887) he had been influenced enough by Mr. Clark's theory to take a less positive view and to hold that William merely adapted a fortress already in existence, in fact the *burh* he had now been led to attribute to Alfred.

The Red Mount of Exeter had been the stronghold of Briton, Roman, and Englishman; but the military art had advanced in Norman hands, and the defences which satisfied Alfred did not satisfy William.

The conquered city had to be secured by the building of a castle. But both nature and

^a *Norman Conquest*, i. 315-6, note.

^b See my paper on "The Conqueror at Exeter," in *Feudal England*, 431 *et seq.*

^c *Ibid.* iv. 161. "To the right of the gate," we read, on his arrival, "there rose the high ground which William's keen eye would at the first glance mark as the site of the future castle" (p. 154).

^d *Ibid.* iv. 272-3.

the men of earlier times had done so much that the Norman engineers had less to do than usual. The hill-side was ready scarped, the ditch was ready dug; on such a site the massive square keep was hardly needed, and the top of the hill was already turned into something not unlike a shell-keep. But a stone wall supplanted the rampart of earth which had hitherto been its defence, and towers were added Within the next year, the new defences of the Red Mount were put to the test.^a

This, it will be seen, whittles down the construction of the Norman castle to the adaptation of an English one, and is thus in agreement with Mr. Clark's theory. But when we reject vague generalities and grapple with the plain question, what did William do? we find that Mr. Clark effectually disposes of Mr. Freeman's answer. "The earliest masonry," we read, to be seen is that of the gatehouse,^b and Mr. Clark was doubtful whether this was the work of Baldwin (de Meules) "or his successor," while in his chapter on the shell-keeps, he questioned the existence in any such keep of masonry that can safely be attributed to the eleventh century, and asserted that "the shells of masonry were of later date than the solid towers"^c (*i.e.* the rectangular keeps).

Here then we are brought back once more to the same, the inevitable difficulty. If, as Mr. Clark's theory involves, the castles of the Conquest were simply those of the English taken over by the Normans, how was it that the castle, "name and thing, was everywhere the hated work of the invaders."^d Mr. Freeman seems, in the case of Exeter, to have gone so far, we see, as to admit that the Normans may only have strengthened an English stronghold by replacing earth by masonry. But this concession was of no avail, for Mr. Clark declined, rightly it would seem, to admit that the castles of the Conquest were castles of masonry at all. What then, we can imagine Mr. Freeman asking him, did the Normans really do? Where was the great innovation? What were the castles which the chroniclers describe them as founding, as constructing?^e The answer, of course, is quite simple. We shake ourselves free of Mr. Clark's assumptions and see that what the Normans raised were moated and palisaded mounds.

NOTE.—I have selected, as explained above, the case of Exeter for study

^a *Exeter*, 39.

^b *Medieval Military Architecture*, ii. 45.

^c *Ibid.* i. 139.

^d *Exeter*, 22.

^e Orderic states that William, at Exeter, "locum intra mœnia ad exstruendum castellum delegit." This implies a new construction.

because its history “bears directly on the meaning of the word *burh*,” and shows how Mr. Freeman was led by Mr. Clark’s theory to detect an imaginary “*burh* of Alfred” within its walls. But Rougemont, it must be remembered, was a castle of a quite exceptional type, owing to the configuration of the ground. Its elevation made it a natural citadel, and in such cases the Normans seem (as Mr. W. H. St. John Hope has shown was done at the Castle of the Peak) to have simply fenced in the summit without troubling to erect a mound as the keep. Rougemont thus eventually assumed the form of a walled enclosure about 100 yards square.