

THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

NO. LXXV.—JULY 1904

The Early Norman Castles of England

PART II.

31. **PONTEFRACT.**—This castle is not spoken of in Domesday Book by its French name, but there can be hardly any doubt that it is 'the castle of Ilbert,' which is twice mentioned and several times alluded to in the *clamores*, or disputed claims, which are enrolled at the end of the list of lands in Yorkshire belonging to the tenants in chief.¹ The existence of Ilbert's castle at Pontefract in the eleventh century is made certain by a charter (only an early copy of which is now extant) in the archives of the duchy of Lancaster, in which William Rufus at his accession regrants to Ilbert de Lacy 'the custom of the castelry of his castle, as he had in the Conqueror's days and in those of the bishop of Bayeux.'² As Mr. Holmes remarks, this carries us back to four years before the compilation of Domesday Book, since Odo, bishop of Bayeux, whom William had left as regent during his absence in Normandy, was arrested and imprisoned in 1082. Another charter, which is a confirmation by the second Ilbert de Lacy of the ecclesiastical gifts of Ilbert I and Robert, his son, states that the chapel of St. Clement in the castle of Pontefract was founded by Ilbert I in the reign of William II.³

Pontefract is called Kirkby in some of the earlier charters, and this was evidently the English (or rather the Danish) name of the place. It lay within the manor of Tateshall, which is supposed to

¹ D. B. i. 373 b.

² Cited in Holmes's *History of Pontefract*, p. 62.

³ *Monast. Angl.* v. 128.

be the same as Tanshelf, a name still preserved in the neighbourhood of, but not exactly at, Pontefract. Tanshelf claims to be the Taddenescyfl mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, where Edgar received the submission of the Yorkshire Danes in 947.⁴ There is no proof that the hill at Kirkby was fortified before the Conquest, but it would be equally difficult to prove that it was not. It was a steep headland rising out of the plain of the Aire, and needing only to be scarped by art and to have a ditch cut across its neck to be almost impregnable. It lay scarcely a mile east of the Roman road from Doncaster to Castleford and the north. Kirkby is not mentioned in the Survey, but Tateshall was a rather large manor, having soke in seven other places and over some odd carucates in three other places. It had belonged to King Edward.

It is no part of our task to trace the fortunes of this famous castle, which was considered in the middle ages to be the key of Yorkshire.⁵ In spite of the labels affixed to the walls we venture to assert with some confidence that none of the masonry now visible belongs to Norman times, except the remains of the chapel of St. Clement's. The structural history of the castle was probably this: Ilbert de Lacy, one of the greatest of the Norman tenants in chief in Yorkshire,⁶ built in this naturally defensive situation a castle of earth and wood, like other Norman castles, exceptional only in having a motte at each end. Whether he found the place already defended by earthen banks, and by a ditch cut across the headland, we do not attempt to decide, but analogy makes it almost certain that the mottes were his work, and were crowned by wooden towers. The western motte, which was at least partially scraped out of the soft sandstone rock, is now disguised by the remarkable keep which has been built up round it. This keep consists at present of two enormous round towers and the ruins of a third; but, as a fourth side is vacant, it may reasonably be conjectured that there was a fourth roundel.⁷ If the plan was a quatrefoil it exactly resembled that of the keep of York, which is now ascertained to belong to the reign of Henry III; and the very little detail that is left, or has been preserved by drawings, confirms this view. Probably the keep at Pontefract was copied from the royal experiment at York, though it differed from it in

⁴ It is not necessary to discuss the meaning of the name Pontefract, since, for whatever reason it was given, it was clearly bestowed by the Norman settlers.

⁵ 'Castrum de Pontefracto est quasi clavis in comitatu Ebor.' (Letter of Ralph Nevill to Henry III, *Foedera*, i. 429, cited by Holmes, *Pontefract*, p. 194.)

⁶ The Conqueror had given him more than two hundred manors in Yorkshire (*Yorks. Arch. Journal*, xiv. 17).

⁷ Four roundels are indicated in the plate given in Fox's *History of Pontefract*, 'from a drawing in the possession of the Society of Antiquaries.' But the drawing is so incorrect in some points that it can hardly be relied upon for others. There were only three round towers in Leland's time, but one of them may have been masked by constructions on the platform.

that it actually revetted the motte itself. There is no ditch now round the motte, but we venture to think that the ditch is indicated by the position of the postern in Piper's Tower, which seems to mark its outlet. It appears to have been partly filled up during the great siege of Pontefract in 1648;⁸ but it must have been partially obliterated by the formation of the platform from which the motte now rises, which was probably no part of the original work. Excavation only can decide this question.

The eastern motte has not even been noticed by the many writers on Pontefract Castle; yet it seems evident that the hill now at the east end is not made up entirely of the ruins of John of Gaunt's magnificent building there, by which the motte was probably as completely revetted as its western fellow had been at an earlier period. Even a vestige of the ditch probably remains in the deep sallyport on the north side.

These two mottes are probably alluded to in an inquisition of 1361 copied by Dodsworth, which says that 'the foresaid castell within the wall is worth nothing yearly, because it needs much reparation of the walls, houses, and motes.'⁹ If 'mote' here represents the Latin *mota*, we have to remark that *mota* in medieval documents always means a motte, and never a ditch, for which *fossatum* is the invariable word. The learned Muratori has some sharp criticism of Spelman for translating *mota* as *moat* in his *Glossary*.¹⁰

It is generally said that the area of Pontefract Castle is seven acres, but the measurements of the bailey given by Holmes work out to about three. Probably the measurement of seven acres includes the barbican or Main Guard, and an outer bailey which once covered the approach on the south side. The shape of the main bailey is an irregular oval, determined by the hill on which it stands.

The value of the manor of Tateshall had fallen at the time of the Survey from 20*l.* to 15*l.*, an unusual circumstance in the case of a manor which has become the site of an important castle; but the number of ploughs in the manor had decreased by half, and we may infer that Tateshall had not recovered from the great devastation of Yorkshire in 1068.

32. RAYLEIGH.—'In this manor Sweyn has made his castle.'¹¹ Sweyn was the son of Robert Fitz Wymarc, one of the Norman favourites of Edward the Confessor. Robert was sheriff of Essex under Edward and William, and Sweyn appears to have succeeded

⁸ Drake's account of the siege says that there was a hollow place betwixt Piper's Tower and the Round Tower, all the way down to the well; the gentlemen and soldiers all fell to carrying earth and rubbish, and so filled up the place in a little space (quoted in Holmes's *Manual of Pontefract Castle*).

⁹ 'Notes on the Wapentake of Osgoldcross' (*Yorks. Arch. Journ.* xxxviii. 262).

¹⁰ *Antiquitates Italicae*, ii. 504.

¹¹ "In hoc manerio fecit Suenus suum castellum" (D. B. ii. 48 b).

his father in this office.¹² Sweyn built his castle on land which had not belonged to his father, so Rayleigh cannot be the Robert's castle of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, to which some of the Norman adventurers fled on the triumph of Earl Godwin. There is a fine motte at Rayleigh, and a semicircular bailey attached; the ditch round the whole is still well marked. There is not a vestige of masonry, and it is probable that there was never anything there but a wooden castle. But the castle is mentioned as late as the reign of Henry II.¹³ The whole area of the castle, including the ditches and banks, is about 9½ acres. The value of the manor had risen since the Conquest. It was only a small manor, with no soke.

33. RHUDDLAN.—The whole passage about Rhuddlan in Domesday Book is worth quoting.

Earl Hugh [of Chester] holds Roelent of the king. Englefield lay there in the time of King Edward, and it was entirely waste. Earl Edwin held it. When Earl Hugh received it it was still waste. Now he has in demesne half the castle which is called Roelent, and is the *caput* of this estate. Robert of Roelent holds of Earl Hugh half of the same castle and of the borough, in which Robert has ten burghers' houses and half of the church. . . . There is a new borough there and eighteen burghers' houses. . . . In this manor of Roelent a castle has lately been built, which is also called Roelent.¹⁴

Rhuddlan of course is in Flintshire, but the victorious campaign of Earl Harold in 1063 had added a considerable part of North Wales to the dominion of England, and what is now Flintshire is reckoned in the Survey as part of Cheshire. As such it had formed part of the earldom of Edwin. King Griffith, who made himself master of all Wales towards the end of Edward the Confessor's reign, had a 'palace' at Rhuddlan, probably a wooden hall, which was burnt by Harold in 1063.¹⁵ After this Rhuddlan remained waste or uninhabited till William's days, as Domesday Book very clearly tells us.¹⁶ Though the name Englefield seems to show that there

¹² Freeman, *N. C.* ii. 329, and iv. note H.

¹³ Pipe Rolls, xiii. 134, xix. 23; and in 27 Henry II.

¹⁴ 'Hugo comes tenet de rege Roelent. Ibi T. R. E. iacebat Englefield, et tota erat wasta. Edwinus comes tenebat. Quando Hugo comes recepit similiter erat wasta. Modo habet in dominio medietatem castelli quod Roelent vocatur, et caput est huius terrae. . . . Robertus de Roelent tenet de Hugone comite medietatem eiusdem castelli et burgi, in quo habet ipse Robertus 10 burgenses et medietatem ecclesie. . . . Ibi est novus burgus et in eo 18 burgenses. . . . In ipso manerio est factum noviter castellum similiter Roeland appellatum' (D. B. i. 269 a, 1).

¹⁵ A. S. C. 1063. See also Freeman, *N. C.* ii. 683.

¹⁶ Domesday says that Robert de Roelent held Nortwales under the king, and also Ros and Rewenion; the last two districts roughly correspond to the modern shire of Denbigh. The line of Anglo-Norman advance in North Wales is indicated by the mottes of Rhuddlan, Hawarden, Mold, Basingwerk, Caergwrle, Wrexham, Yale, and Dernion, and those of Aberlleinog, Conway, Aber, Bangor (?), and Carnarvon, where Hugh Lupus, the Norman earl of Chester, is said to have built castles. Some of these

was some English settlement in the district, it is plain that there was no fortification at Rhuddlan before the 'castle newly erected' by Earl Hugh and his vassal Robert de Roelent.¹⁷ The motte of this castle still stands, to the south of the magnificent castle of Edward I, together furnishing a notable proof of the progress made between the eleventh century and the thirteenth century. In Gough's time the motte was still 'surrounded with a very deep ditch, including the abbey, and falling into that of the castle.' Nothing can be seen of this ditch now, except on the south side of the motte, where a deep ravine enters from the river. It is, therefore, impossible to recover the area or shape of the bailey. The motte is now called Abbot Hill, and not Tut Hill,¹⁸ as it was called in Gough's time. As from Gough's description it was within the precincts of the priory of Black Friars, founded in the thirteenth century, it is extremely probable that Edward I gave the site of the old castle to the Dominicans when he built his new one.¹⁹ The fact that the work in the Edwardian castle is all of one date suggests that it was built on a new site.

The value of the manor and berewicks of Rhuddlan, of which there were a great many, for Rhuddlan was the centre of a large district, had risen from nothing to 23*l.* 13*s.*

The mention of the *novus burgus* by the Survey calls for a few words. Our older antiquaries, finding that the word *burgenses* was commonly used in Domesday Book in connexion with a site where a castle existed, formed the mistaken idea that a *burgus* necessarily implied a castle. But a *burgus* was the same thing as a *burh*, that is, a *borough* or fortified town. It may have existed long before the castle, or it may have sprung up after the castle

mottes may be of the time of Henry II, as Basingwerk probably is. Dernion Castle is mentioned in the Pipe Rolls of Henry II (ii. 26), and is possibly Rug, at the head of the valley of Edeyrnion, where there is a motte. Domesday Book says that Rainald, a man of Earl Roger's (probably Rainald de Bailleul, the builder of Oswestry Castle), has two *finēs* in Wales, Chenlei and Derniov (i. 255 a, 1). Yale Castle was undoubtedly on the motte Tomen y Roddwy, which Leland noticed halfway between Vale Crucis and Ruthin. It is commonly attributed to Owen Gwynedd in the twelfth century, because he occupied it then. For Ros and Rewenion see Mr. W. H. Stephenson's map of England before the Norman Conquest, in Poole's *Historical Atlas*.

¹⁷ Ordericus refers as follows to the building of Rhuddlan Castle: 'Decreto regis oppidum contra Guallos apud Rodalentem constructum est, et Roberto, ut ipse pro defensione Anglici regni barbaris opponeretur, datum est.'

¹⁸ Tut or toot hill means 'look-out' hill, and is not unfrequently given to abandoned mottes. The word is still used in mining works. Cf. Christison's *Early Fortifications in Scotland*, p. 16.

¹⁹ Such presentations of old castle sites, and of old wooden castles, to the church were not uncommon. We have seen how the site of Montacute Castle was given to

Cluniac monks (*ante*, p. 288). Thicket Priory, in Yorkshire, occupied the site of the castle of Wheldrake; and William de Albini gave the site and materials of the old castle of Buckenham, in Norfolk, to the priory which he founded there. The materials, but not the site, of the wooden castle of Montferrand were given in Stephen's reign to Meaux Abbey, and served to build some of the monastic offices.

was built. The latter case was very common, for a nobleman who built a castle would almost certainly build a *burgus* near it, because it was to his advantage to do so. In exchange for the protection offered by the borough wall or bank he could demand *gablum*, or rent, from the burghers; he could compel them to grind their corn at his mill and bake their bread in his oven; he could exact tolls on all commodities entering the borough, and if there was a market he would receive a certain percentage on all sales. The borough was, therefore, to him an important source of revenue. The immediate establishment of a borough at Rhuddlan, as soon as the castle was built on the deserted banks of the Clwydd, is a very interesting fact. In some places a 'new borough' is clearly a new suburb, doubtless having its own fortifications, built specially for the protection of the Norman settlers, as at Norwich and Nottingham. This cannot have been the case at a place so entirely waste (*tota wasta*) as Rhuddlan.

34. RICHARD'S CASTLE.—There can be little doubt that this is the castle referred to in Domesday Book under the name of Avreton.²⁰ Richard's Castle is not far from Overton (Avreton), on the northern border of Hereford. It is mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as the castle of Richard Scrob, one of Edward the Confessor's Norman favourites and his sister's son. At the time of the survey Richard was dead, and the castle was held by his son Osbern, and it is noted that he pays 10s., but the castle is worth 20s. to its owner. Its value was the same as in King Edward's time, a fact worth noting, as it coincides with the assumption that this was a pre-Conquest castle. There is a motte at Richard's Castle, and a small bailey which is roughly square with rounded corners. The fragments of masonry which remain on the motte are later than the eleventh century.²¹ The whole area of the castle is about three acres. Avreton was not the centre of a soke, but appears to have lain in the manor of Ludeford.

35. RICHMOND.—As in the case of Pontefract, this other great Yorkshire castle is not mentioned by name in Domesday Book, nor is there any allusion to it except a casual mention in the Recapitulation that Earl Alan has 199 manors in his castlery, and that besides the castlery he has forty-three manors.²² The castle, however, must have been built at the date of the Survey, which was completed only a year before William I's death; for during William's lifetime Earl Alan, the first holder of the fief, gave *the*

²⁰ 'Isdem Osbernus habet 28 homines in castello Avreton et reddit 10 solidos. Valet ei castellum hoc 20 solidos' (D. B. i. 186 b).

²¹ Clark, *Medieval Military Architecture*, ii. 402.

²² 'Comes Alanus habet in sua castellata 199 maneria. . . . Praeter castellariam habet 43 maneria' (D. B. i. 381 a, 2).

chapel in the castle of Richmond to the abbey of St. Mary at York, which he had founded.²³ The name of course is French, and it seems impossible now to discover what English vill name it has displaced.²⁴ It is certainly a case in which the Norman castle was not placed in the seat of the former Saxon proprietor, but in the site which seemed most defensible to the Norman owner. The lands of Earl Alan in the wapentake of Gilling had belonged to the Saxon Earl Edwin, and thus cannot have fallen to Alan's share before Edwin's death in 1071. The *Genealogia* published by Dods-worth in the *Monasticon* (from a manuscript compiled in the reign of Edward III) says that Earl Alan first built Richmond Castle, near his chief manor of Gilling, to defend his people against the attacks of the disinherited English and Danes.²⁵ The passage has been modified by Camden, who says that Alan 'thought himself not safe enough in Gilling;' and this has been interpreted to mean that Alan originally built his castle at Gilling, and removed it to Richmond; but it does not really bear this meaning.²⁶

Richmond Castle differs from most of the castles in our Domes-day list in that it has no motte. Yet it would be rash to assert that it never had one. The ground plan, indeed, is exactly that of a motte and bailey castle. At the apex of the large triangular bailey may be seen in old maps a smaller roundish enclosure, just large enough to be the base of a motte. This ward, in the middle ages, formed the barbican to the castle; it can now only just be traced. We have already seen that at Chepstow and Gloucester the mottes were transformed into barbicans. But we shall not venture to insist that there was once a motte at Richmond; the proof is insufficient. It is possible that the powerful earl who founded the castle designed from the first to have a stone keep, though the design was not carried out for some eighty years. The present keep is attributed by the *Genealogia* cited above to Earl Conan,

²³ This is stated in a charter of Henry II, which carefully recapitulates the gifts of the different benefactors to St. Mary's (*Mon. Angl.* iii. 548). It is curious that the charter of William II, the first part of which is an inspeimus of a charter of William I, does not mention this chapel in the castle.

²⁴ Mr. Skaife, the editor of the *Yorkshire Domesday*, thinks that it was at Hinderlag, but without giving his reasons. But Hinderlag, at the time of the Survey, was in the hands of an under-tenant (*Yorks. Arch. Journ.* pt. lii. pp. 527, 530).

²⁵ 'Hic Alanus primo incepit facere castrum et munitionem iuxta manerium suum capitale de Gilling pro tuitione suorum contra infestationes Anglorum tunc ubique exhaeredatorum, similiter et Danorum, et nominavit dictum castrum Richmond suo ydiomate Gallico, quod sonat Latine divitem montem, in editiori et fortiori loco sui territorii situatum' (*Mon. Angl.* v. 574).

²⁶ There are no remains of fortification at Gilling, but about a mile and a half away there is, or was (nothing could be heard of it on a recent visit), an oval enclosure called Castle Hill, of which a plan is given in McLaughlan's paper, *Archæol. Journal*, vol. vi. It had no motte. Mr. Clark says, 'The mound at Gilling has been removed;' it probably never existed except in his imagination.

who reigned from 1148 to 1171.²⁷ Some entries in the Pipe Rolls make it probable that it was finished by Henry II, who kept the castle in his own hands after the death of Conan.²⁸ There are some indications at Richmond that the first castle was of stone and not of earth and wood. The walls do not stand on earthen banks; the Norman curtain can still be traced on two sides of the castle, and on the west side it seems of early construction, containing a great deal of herring-bone work, and might possibly be the work of Earl Alan.

According to the measurements given in the old plan published by Clarkson²⁹ the whole area of the castle contained only about three and a half acres, including the annexe known as the Cockpit. Other authorities give the area as five acres. The Cockpit was enclosed in Norman times, for it has a Norman gateway in its wall.

As we do not know the name of the site of Richmond before the Conquest, and as the name of Richmond is not mentioned in Domesday, we cannot tell whether the value had risen or fallen. But no part of Yorkshire was more flourishing at the time of the Survey than this wapentake of Gilling, which belonged to Earl Alan; in no district, except in the immediate neighbourhood of York, are there so many places where the value has risen. Yet the greater part of it was let out to under-tenants.

36. ROCHESTER.—Under the heading of Aylsford, Kent, the Survey tells us that 'the bishop of Rochester holds as much of this land as is worth 17s. 4d. in exchange for the land in which the castle sits.'³⁰ Rochester was a Roman castrum, and portions of its Roman wall have recently been found.³¹ The fact that various old charters speak of the *castellum* of Rochester has led some authorities to believe that there was a castle there in Saxon times, but the context of these charters shows plainly that the words *castellum Roffense* were equivalent to *castrum Roffense* or Hrofesceastre.³² Otherwise there is not a particle of evidence for the existence of a castle at Rochester in pre-Norman times, and the passage in Domesday Book quoted above shows that William's castle was a new erection, built on land obtained by exchange from the church.

²⁷ The Genealogia in the *Monasticon* (v. 574) says from 1166 to 1170; the chronicles given at the beginning of Morice's *Bretagne* give the dates as above.

²⁸ Henry spent 51l. 11s. 8d. in 1171 on 'operationes domorum et turris,' and 80l. 6s. in 1174 on 'operationes castelli et domorum.'

²⁹ Clarkson's *History of Richmond*.

³⁰ D. B. i. 2 b: 'Episcopus de Rouceastre, pro excambio terrae in qua castellum sedet, tantum de hac terra tenet quod 17 sol. et 4 den. valet.'

³¹ See Mr. George Payne's paper on 'Roman Rochester,' in *Archaeologia Cantiana*, vol. xxi. Mr. Hope tells me that parts of all the four sides are left.

³² Thus Egbert of Kent, 765, gives 'terram intra castelli moenia supranominati, id est Hrofescestri, unum viculum cum duobus jugeribus' (Kemble, i. 188); and Offa speaks of the 'episcopum castelli quod nominatur Hrofescester' (Earle, *Land Charters*, p. 60).

Outside the line of the Roman wall, to the south of the city, and west of the south gate, there is a district called Boley or Bullie Hill, which at one time was included in the fortifications of the castle. It is a continuation of the ridge on which the castle stands, and has been separated from it by an artificial ditch of Roman date. This ditch once entirely surrounded it, and though it was partly filled up in the eighteenth century its line can still be traced. The area enclosed by this ditch was about three acres; the form appears to have been oblong. In the grounds of Satis House, one of the villas which have been built on this site, there still remains a conical artificial mound, much reduced in size, as it has been converted into a pleasure ground with winding walks, but the retaining walls of these walks are composed of old materials, and towards the river-side there are still vestiges of a wall.³³ We venture to think that it cannot reasonably be doubted that this Boley Hill and its motte formed the original site of the (probably) wooden castle of William the Conqueror. Its nature, position, and size correspond to what we have already observed as characteristic of the first castles of the Conquest. It stands on land which originally belonged to the church of St. Andrew, as Domesday Book tells us William's castle did.³⁴ The very name may be interpreted in favour of this theory.³⁵ And that there was no Roman or Saxon fortification on the spot is proved by excavations, which have shown that both a Roman and a Saxon cemetery occupied portions of the area.³⁶

It is well known that between the years 1087 and 1089³⁷ the celebrated architect Gundulf, bishop of Rochester, built a new *stone* castle for William Rufus 'in the best part of the city of Rochester.'³⁸ This castle, of course, was on the same site as the

³³ See an extremely valuable paper on 'Medieval Rochester,' by the Rev. Greville M. Livett, in *Archaeologia Cantiana*, vol. xxi.

³⁴ See the charter of Coenulf, king of Mercia, giving to Bishop Beornmod three ploughlands on the southern shore of the city of Rochester, from the highway on the east to the Medway on the west (*Textus Roffensis*, p. 96).

³⁵ The name Boley may very probably represent the Norman French Beaulieu, a favourite Norman name for a castle or residence. Professor Hales suggested that Boley Hill was derived from Bailey Hill (cited in Mr. Gomme's paper on 'Boley Hill,' *Archaeologia Cantiana*, vol. xvii.). The oldest form of the name is Bullie Hill, as in Edward IV's charter, cited below, p. 427.

³⁶ Roman urns and lachrymatories were found in the Boley Hill when it was partially levelled in the eighteenth century to fill up the castle ditch (*History of Rochester*, p. 281). At the part now called Watts's Avenue Mr. George Payne found 'the lag end of an Anglo-Saxon cemetery:' *Archaeologia Cantiana*, vol. xxi.

³⁷ Mr. Round remarks that the building of Rochester Castle is fixed, by the conjunction of William II and Lanfranc in its history, to some date between September 1087 and March 1089 (*Geoffrey de Mandeville*, p. 339). Possibly, therefore, it was in this new castle that Bishop Odo began his rebellion against Rufus in 1088. Ordericus says that 'cum quingentis militibus intra Rofensem urbem se conclusit.'

³⁸ 'In pulchriore parte civitatis Hroucestre' (*Textus Roffensis*, p. 145). Mr. Freeman and others have remarked that the special mention of a stone castle makes it probable that the first castle was of wood.

present one, though the splendid keep was not built till the next reign.³⁹ But if what we have maintained above be correct the castle of Gundulf was built on a different site from that of the castle of William. Nor are we without evidence in support of this. What remains of the original Norman wall of Gundulf's castle (and enough remains to show that the circuit was complete in Norman times) does not stand on earthen banks; and this, though not an absolute proof, is a strong suggestion that there was no earthen bank belonging to some previous castle, when Gundulf began his building.⁴⁰ But, further, Mr. Livett has shown in his paper on *Medieval Rochester* ⁴¹ that in order to form a level plateau for the court of the castle the ground had to be artificially made up on the north and east sides, and in these places the wall rests on a foundation of gravel, which has been forcibly rammed to make it solid, and which goes through the artificial soil to the natural chalk below. Now what can this rammed gravel mean but an expedient to avoid the danger of building on freshly heaped soil? Had the artificial platform been in existence ever since the Conquest, it would have been solid enough to build upon without this expense. It is therefore at least probable that Bishop Gundulf's castle was built on an entirely new site.

It seems also to be clear that the Boley Hill was included as an outwork in Bishop Gundulf's plan, for the castle ditch is cut through the Roman wall near the south gate of the city.⁴² Mr. Livett remarks that King John appears to have used the hill as a point of vantage when he attacked the city in 1215, and thinks this was probably the reason why Henry III's engineers enclosed it with a stone wall when they restored the walls of the city.⁴³ Henry III's wall has been traced all round the city, and at the second south gate it turns at right angles, or nearly so, to enclose Boley Hill.⁴⁴ It is not improbable, as Mr. Livett suggests, that

³⁹ It is now attributed to Archbishop William of Corbeuil, to whom Henry I gave the custody of the castle in the twenty-seventh year of his reign, with permission to make within it a defence or tower such as he liked (Continuator of Florence). Gervase of Canterbury says 'idem episcopus turrim egregiam aedificavit.' Both passages are cited by Hartshorne, *Arch. Journ.* xx. 211. Gundulf's castle cost about 60l., and can scarcely have been more than an enclosing wall with perhaps one mural tower. See Mr. Round's *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, p. 340, and Mr. Livett's paper, *Archaeologia Cantiana*, vol. xxi.

⁴⁰ Two common friends of Rufus and Gundulf advised the king that in return for the grant of the manor of Hedenham and the remission of certain moneys 'episcopus Gundulfus, quia in opere caementario plurimum sciens et efficax erat, castrum sibi Hrofense lapideum de suo construeret' (*Textus Roffensis*, p. 146).

⁴¹ *Archaeologia Cantiana*, vol. xxi.

⁴² See Mr. Livett's paper, as above, p. 49.

⁴³ There are several entries in the Close Rolls relating to this wall of Henry III in the year 1225.

⁴⁴ Mr. Beale Poste says that the ancient boundary wall of this addition appears to have been met with some years since in digging the foundations of the Rev. Mr. Conway's house, standing parallel to the present brick walls and about two feet within them ('Ancient Rochester as a Roman Station,' *Arch. Cant.* ii. 71). The

the drawbridge and *bretasche*, or wooden tower, ordered in 1226 for the southern side of Rochester Castle⁴⁵ were intended to connect the Boley Hill court with the main castle. In 1722 the owner of the castle (which had then fallen into private hands) conveyed to one Philip Brooke 'that part of the castle ditch and ground, as it then lay unenclosed, on Bully Hill, being the whole breadth of the hill, and ditch without the walls of the castle, extending from thence to the river Medway.'⁴⁶

The general opinion about the Boley Hill is that it is a Danish earthwork, thrown up by the Danes when they besieged the city in King Alfred's reign. But the words in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 'They beset the chester and wrought another fastness *around themselves*,'⁴⁷ give no countenance to this view, but suggest that the earthwork constructed by the Danes on this occasion was a simple circumvallation, such as they are known to have made at Bamfleet, Shobury, and Milton.⁴⁸ There is not a particle of evidence that the Danes in England ever threw up mounts of the class we are considering, and the 'traditions' which in some places connect these earthworks with the Danes are probably mere echoes of the fancies of bygone antiquaries. Moreover at Rochester the Danes would have had to pass under the bridge (which is known to have existed both in Roman and Saxon times) in order to get to the Boley Hill; and even if their ships were small enough to do this they would hardly have been so foolish as to leave a bridge in their possible line of retreat. It is, therefore, far more likely that their 'fastness' was somewhere to the north of the city.⁴⁹

It is a remarkable thing that until very recently the Boley Hill had a special jurisdiction of its own, under an officer called the baron of the Bully, appointed by the recorder of the city. This appears to date from a charter of Edward IV in 1460, which confirms the former liberties of the citizens of Rochester, and ordains that they should keep two courts leet and a court of pie-powder annually on the Bullie Hill. The anonymous historian of Rochester remarks that it was thought that the baron represented the first officer under the governor of the castle before the court leet was instituted, and is supposed to be the person to whose care the security of it (the Bullie Hill) was entrusted under the governor of

continuator of Gervase of Canterbury says (ii. 235) that at the siege of Rochester in 1264 Simon de Montfort captured the outer castle up to the keep ('forinsecum castellum usque ad turrin'), and Mr. Livett thinks this outer castle must have been the Boley Hill.

⁴⁵ Close Rolls, ii. 98 b.

⁴⁶ Hasted's *Kent*, iv. 163.

⁴⁷ 'Ymbesetan tha ceastre and worhton oðer fæsten ymb hie selfe' (A.-S. C. anno 885).

⁴⁸ See Mr. Spurrell's paper on 'Early Sites and Embankments' in *Arch. Journ.* vol. xlii., and Mr. St. John Hope's paper on 'English Fortresses,' *ibid.* lx. 72.

⁴⁹ See *ante*, p. 211. Mr. Hope suggests the east side, as the north was a marsh.

the castle.⁵⁰ This is probably much nearer the truth than the theory which would assign such thoroughly feudal courts as those of court leet and pie-powder to an imaginary community of Danes residing on the Boley Hill. When we compare the case of the Boley Hill with the somewhat similar cases of Chester and Norwich Castles we shall see that what took place in Edward IV's reign was probably this: the separate jurisdiction which had once belonged to an abandoned castle site was transferred to the citizens of Rochester, but, with the usual conservatism of medieval legislation, it was not absorbed in the jurisdiction of the city.

The value of Rochester at the time of the Survey had risen from 100*s.* to 20*l.* The increase in trade, arising from the security of traffic which was provided by William's castles on this important route, no doubt accounts in great measure for this remarkable rise in value.

37. ROCKINGHAM.—Here also the castle was clearly new in William's reign, as the manor was uninhabited (*wasta*) until a castle was built there by his orders, in consequence of which it produced a small revenue at the time of the Survey.⁵¹ The motte, now in great part destroyed, was a large one, being about 100 feet in diameter at the top; attached to it is a bailey court of irregular but rectilateral shape (determined by the ground), covering about 8½ acres. It is divided into three wards on different levels,⁵² which may not be all original. The first castle would undoubtedly be of wood, and it is probable that John was the first builder of the 'exceeding fair and strong' keep which stood on the motte in Leland's time,⁵³ as there is an entry in the Pipe Roll of the thirteenth year of his reign for 126*l.* 18*s.* 6*d.* for the work of the new keep.⁵⁴ This keep, if Mr. Clark is correct, was a polygonal shell keep, with a timber stockade surrounding it.⁵⁵

Rockingham was only a small manor of one hide in Saxon times, though its Saxon owner had *sac* and *soke*. It stands in a forest district, not near any of the great ancient lines of road, and was probably built for a hunting seat.

38. SHREWSBURY.—The passage in Domesday Book relating to this town has been called by Mr. Round one of the most important

⁵⁰ *History of Rochester* (published by Fisher, 1772), p. 285.

⁵¹ 'Wasta erat quando Rex W. iussit ibi castellum fieri. Modo valet 86 solidos' (D. B. i. 220).

⁵² Clark, *M. M. A.* ii. 426.

⁵³ 'I markid that there is a stronge Tower in the Area of the Castell, and from it over the Dungeon Dike is a Drawbridge to the Dungeon Toure' (*Itin.* i. 14).

⁵⁴ 'In operat. nove turris et nove camere in cast. 126 l. 18 s. 6 d.'

⁵⁵ Mr. Clark admits that there is no masonry of the Conqueror's time, though he thinks that the curtain which now runs up the motte may be late Norman. He afterwards says that there is probably no masonry of the twelfth century; what there is is of Henry III's or Edward I's time (*M. M. A.* ii. 426, 428).

in the Survey, and it is of special importance for our present purpose. 'The English burghers of Shrewsbury say that it is very grievous to them that they have to pay all the geld which they paid in King Edward's time, although the castle of the earl occupies [the site of] 51 houses, and another 50 are uninhabited.'⁵⁶ It is incomprehensible how, in the face of such a clear statement as this, that the new castle occupied the ground of 51 former houses, any one should be found gravely to maintain that the motte at Shrewsbury Castle was an English work; for if the motte stood there before, what was the clearance of the houses made for? The only answer could be, to enlarge the bailey court. But this is exactly what the Norman would not wish to do; he would want only a small area for the small force at his disposal to defend. Shrewsbury was doubtless a *burh* (that is, a fortified town) in Saxon times; probably it was one of the towns fortified by Ethelfleda, though it is not mentioned by name in the list of those towns furnished by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.⁵⁷ These ancient walls were certainly only of earth and wood, for a writ of 1281 says that the old stockade and the old bretasche of the old ditch of the town of Shrewsbury are to be granted to the burghers for strengthening the new ditch.⁵⁸

The castle of Shrewsbury was built on the neck of the peninsula on which the town stands, and on the line of the town walls. The oval motte, which still remains, stands, as usual, on the line of the castle banks, and slopes steeply down to the Severn on one side. Its proximity to the river made it liable to damage by floods. Thus we find Henry II spending 5*l.* on the repair of the motte,⁵⁹ and in Edward I's reign the abbot's mill is accused of having caused damage to the extent of 60 marks to the motte. But the men of the hundred exonerate the mill, and from another passage the blame appears to lie on the fall of a great wooden tower.⁶⁰

⁵⁶ 'Dicunt Angligeni burgenses de Sciropesberie multum grave sibi esse quod ipsi reddunt totum geldum sicut reddebant T. R. E., quamvis castellum comitis occupaverit 51 masuras et aliae 50 masurae sunt vastae' (D. B. i. 252).

⁵⁷ Ethelfleda is said to have founded the church of St. Alkmund in Shrewsbury.

⁵⁸ 'Mandatum est vicecomiti Salopie quod veterem palum et veterem bretaschiam de vetere fossato ville Salopie faciat habere probis hominibus ville Salopie ad novum fossatum eiusdem ville, quod fieri fecerant, efforcandum et emendandum' (Close Rolls, 1281, p. 508). The honest men of the city are also to have 'palum et closturam' from the king's wood of Lichewood, 'ad hirucones circa villam Salopie faciendas ad ipsam villam claudendam' (*ibid.*). 'Hirucones' are probably the same as 'heritones,' or 'hericias,' a defence of stakes, generally on the counterscarp of the ditch.

⁵⁹ Pipe Rolls, 19 Henry II, p. 108: 'In op. castelli de Salopp in mota 5*l.*'

⁶⁰ Hundred Rolls, ii. 80: 'Dampnum mote castri Salopp ad valenciam 60 marcarum, sed non recolligunt totum evenisse per molendinum abbatis Salopp, quia 30 annis elapsis mota castri fuit fere deteriorata sicut nunc est.' 'Dicunt quod unus magnus turris ligneus (sic) qui edificatur in castro Salopp corrui in terram tempore domini Uriani de Sancto Petro tunc vicecomitis, et meremium eius turris tempore suo et temporibus aliorum vicecomitum postea ita consumatur et destruitur quod

This can hardly have been other than the wooden keep on the motte, and thus we learn the interesting fact that as late as Edward I's reign the castle of Shrewsbury had only a wooden keep. The present tower on the motte is the work of Telford.

The bailey of Shrewsbury Castle is rectilinear, and according to Hulbert's plan is roughly octagonal in outline. The walls stand on banks, which show that the first wall was of timber. The Norman entrance arch seems to render it probable that it was in Henry II's reign that stone walls were first substituted for a wooden stockade, and the Pipe Rolls contain several entries of sums spent by Henry on this castle.⁶¹ But the first mention of stone in connexion with the castle is in the reign of Henry III.⁶² In the reign of Edward I a *jarola*, or wooden wall, which had been raised above the outer ditch in the time of the barons' war, was replaced by a stone wall.⁶³ But this probably refers to the second bailey, now destroyed, which lay to the south of the castle. In the time of Charles I the castle still had a wooden palisade on the counterscarp of the ditch.⁶⁴ The two large drum towers on the walls, and the building between them, now converted into a modern house, belong to a much later period than the walls. The area of the present castle, including the motte, is perhaps somewhat under three acres.

The value of the town of Shrewsbury had risen since the Conquest.⁶⁵

39. STAFFORD.—The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle says that Ethelfleda of Mercia built the *burh* of Stafford in 913, and consequently we find that both in King Edward's and in King William's time Stafford was a *burgus*, or fortified town. Florence of Worcester, who is considered to have used a superior copy of the Chronicle as the foundation of his work, says that Ethelfleda built an *arx* on the north bank of the Sowe in 914. *Arx*, in the earlier chronicles, is often only a bombastic expression for a walled town, as, for example,

nihil de illo remansit, in magnum damnum domini Regis et deteriorationem eiusdem castri' (p. 105).

⁶¹ Pipe Rolls, 11 Henry II, p. 89; 12 Henry II, p. 59; 20 Henry II, p. 108. There is a payment of 18*l.* 12*s.* 4*d.* in 'custamento murorum de Salopesbiria', which may refer to the castle.

⁶² Payment to those who dig stone for the castle of Shrewsbury (Close Rolls, i. 622 b). This is in 1224. There is also a payment of 50*l.* for works in the castle in 1223 (*ibid.* 533 b).

⁶³ A *jarola* had been made at the castle in the time of the great war, above the outer ditch ('super forinsecum fossatum'), at the expense of the men of the town; this the burghers sold for 40*s.*, which they added to the king's money coming from the ferry, by the king's brief, to build a stone wall there (Hundred Rolls, ii. 80). A *jarola* or *garuillum* is a stockade; apparently derived from a Celtic word for *oak*.

⁶⁴ Owen and Blakeway's *History of Shrewsbury*, i. 450.

⁶⁵ D. B. i. 152, 1a: 'Inter totum reddebat civitas ista per annum 30*l.* Duas partes habebat rex et vicecomes tertiam. Precedenti anno huius descriptionis reddidit 40 *l.* comiti Rogerio.'

when Ethelwerd says that Ethelfleda's body was buried in St. Peter's porch in the *arx* of Gloucester. But the statement led many later writers, such as Camden, to imagine that Ethelfleda built a *tower* in the town of Stafford; and these imaginings have created such a tangled skein of mistake that we must bespeak our readers' patience while we attempt to unravel it.

Domesday Book only mentions Stafford Castle under the manor of Chebsey, a possession of Henry de Ferrers. Its words are, 'To this manor *belonged* the land of Stafford, in which the king commanded a castle to be built, which now is destroyed.'⁶⁶ Ordericus also says that the king placed a castle at Stafford, on his return from his third visit to the north, in 1070.⁶⁷ Now the language of Domesday appears to us to say very plainly that in the manorial rearrangement which followed the Conquest some land was taken out of the manor of Chebsey, which lies immediately to the south of the borough of Stafford, to furnish a site for a royal castle.⁶⁸ It is exactly in this position that we now find a large oblong motte, similar to the other mottes of the Conquest, and having had the usual bailey court attached to it.⁶⁹ It lies about a mile and a half south-west of the town, near the main road leading into Shropshire. The position was an important one, as the castles of Staffordshire formed a second line of defence against the North Welsh, as well as a check to the great palatinate earls of Shropshire.⁷⁰ The motte itself stood on high ground, commanding a view of twenty or thirty miles round, and both Tutbury and Caus Castles could be seen from it. Between it and the town lies a stretch of flat ground which has no doubt been formerly a swamp, and which accounts for the distance of the castle from the town; while the fact that it lies to the south of the Sowe proves that it has no connexion with Ethelfleda's earthwork. There is no dispute that this motte was the site of the later *baronial* castle of Stafford, the castle besieged and taken in the wars of Charles I's reign; the point we have to prove is that it was also the castle of Domesday Book.⁷¹

⁶⁶ 'Ipse Henricus tenet Cebbesio. Ad hoc manerium pertinuit terra de Stadford, in qua rex precepit fieri castellum, quod modo est destructum' (D. B. i. 249 a).

⁶⁷ 'Apud Estafort alteram [munitionem] locavit' (Ord. Vit. p. 199).

⁶⁸ It should be said that Mr. Eyton interprets the passage differently, and takes it to mean that the castle was built on land in the borough of Stafford belonging to the manor of Chebsey. But he himself says that 'the site of Stafford Castle, within the liberties, though not within the burgh of Stafford, would suggest a royal foundation;' and he believes this castle (the one on the motte) to have been that garrisoned by Henry I and made a residence by Henry II (*Domesday Studies*, p. 21).

⁶⁹ This bailey was still discernible in Stukeley's time, and was 'fenced with a deep ditch' (*Itin.* ii. note 3). There is now a modern building on the motte.

⁷⁰ *Salt Archaeological Society*, vol. viii., 'The Manor of Caste or Stafford,' by Mazzinghi, a paper abounding with valuable information, to which the present writer is greatly indebted.

⁷¹ In the 'Addenda' to Mr. Eyton's *Domesday of Staffordshire* (p. 135) the learned editor says that there are two Stafford castles mentioned in Domesday, in two

If the first castle of Stafford was of earth and wood, like most of William's castles, there would be nothing wonderful in its having many destructions and many resurrections. This castle was clearly a royal castle, from the language of Domesday. As a royal castle it was probably committed to the custody of the sheriff, who appears to have been Robert de Stafford,⁷² ancestor of the later barons of Stafford, and brother of Ralph de Toesny or Toden, one of the great nobles of the Conquest. Ralph de Toesny joined the party of Robert Curthose against Henry I in 1101, and it is conjectured that his brother Robert was involved in the same rebellion, and thus lost the shrievalty of Staffordshire, for in that year we find the castle held for the king by William Pantolf, a trusty companion of the Conqueror.⁷³ It is very unlikely that this second castle of Stafford was on a different site from the former; and an ingenious conjecture of Mr. Mazzinghi's helps us to identify it with the castle on the motte. In that castle, when it again emerges into light in the reign of Henry II, we find a chapel dedicated to St. Nicholas, which Robert de Stafford gives to the abbey of Stone,⁷⁴ and the king confirms the gift. The worship of St. Nicholas came greatly into fashion after the translation of his remains from Asia Minor to Bari, in Italy, in 1087. William Pantolf visited the shrine at Bari, got possession of some of the relics of St. Nicholas, and with great reverence deposited them in his own church of Noron, in Normandy.⁷⁵ It is, therefore, extremely probable that William Pantolf founded the chapel of St. Nicholas in the castle of Stafford during the time that the castle was in his custody.⁷⁶ But about the situation of the chapel of St. Nicholas there is no doubt, as its history is traceable down to the sixteenth century. It stood in the bailey of the castle outside the town. This castle was, therefore, certainly identical with that of Henry II, and most probably with that of Henry I and William I.

So far, as we have seen, Stafford Castle was a royal castle. It is true that in the reign of Henry II's predecessor, Stephen, we find the castle again in the hands of a Robert de Stafford, who speaks of it as 'castellum meum.'⁷⁷ Apparently the troubles of Stephen's reign afforded an opportunity to the family of the first Norman different hundreds. We have carefully searched through the whole Staffordshire account, and, except at Burton and Tutbury, there is no other castle mentioned in Staffordshire except this one in Chebsey.

⁷² Dugdale conjectured that Robert was sheriff of Staffordshire. He had large estates round the town of Stafford (*ibid.* p. 61).

⁷³ Mazzinghi, *Salt Arch. Soc. Trans.* viii. 6; Eyton, *Domesday Studies*, p. 20.

⁷⁴ *Monasticon*, vi. 223: 'Ecclesiam S. Nicolai in castello de Stafford.'

⁷⁵ Ordericus, vii. 12. See also vii. 13, p. 220 (ed. Le Prévost).

⁷⁶ Mazzinghi, *Salt Arch. Soc. Trans.* viii. 22.

⁷⁷ In a charter to Stone Abbey, *Salt Collections*, vol. ii. That the castle he speaks of was the one outside the town is proved by his references to land 'extra burgum.'

sheriff to get the castle again into their hands. But under the stronger rule of Henry II the crown recovered its rights in Stafford Castle, and the gift of the chapel in the castle evidently cannot be made without the consent of the king. The gaol which Henry II caused to be made in Stafford was doubtless in the castle of Stafford.⁷⁸ John repaired the castle,⁷⁹ and ordered bretasches, or wooden towers, to be made and finished in the forest of Arundel, and taken to Stafford,⁸⁰ a statement which gives us an insight into the nature of the castle in John's reign. But it was the tendency of sheriffdoms to become hereditary, and in many cases they did so, as Dr. Stubbs has pointed out.⁸¹ This seems to have been the case at Stafford. In the reign of Edward I a local jury decided that Nicholas, baron of Stafford, held the castle of Stafford from the king *in capite*, by the service of three and a half knights' fees;⁸² and in 1348 Ralph, baron of Stafford, obtained a license from Edward III 'to fortify and crenellate his manes of Stafford and Madlee with a wall of stone and lime, and to make castles thereof.'⁸³ The indenture made with the mason a year previously is still extant, and states that the castle is to be built upon the *moële* in the manor, whereby the motte is evidently meant.⁸⁴ Besides, the deed is dated 'at the chastel of Stafford,' showing that the new castle in stone and lime was on the site of an already existing castle.

We might spin out further evidence of the identity of the site of William's castle with that of the present one from the name of the manor of Castel, which grew up around it, displacing the equally suggestive name of Montville, which we find in Domesday Book.⁸⁵ Against the existence of a castle in the town we have the silence of Speed and Leland, who only mention the present castle,⁸⁶ and the statement of Plot, who wrote about the end of the seventeenth century that 'he could not hear any footsteps remaining' of a castle in Stafford.⁸⁷ We may, therefore, safely conclude that it was only due to the fancy of some Elizabethan antiquary that in an old map of that time a spot to the north of the town is marked with the

⁷⁸ The Pipe Rolls contain several entries relating to this gaol at Stafford. It is clear from several of the documents given by Mr. Mazzinghi that the king's gaol of Stafford and the king's gaol of the castle of Stafford are equivalent expressions.

⁷⁹ Pipe Rolls, 2 John.

⁸⁰ Close Rolls, i. 69.

⁸¹ *Constitutional History*, i. 272.

⁸² Cited in *Salt Arch. Soc. Trans.* vi. pt. i. p. 258.

⁸³ Patent Rolls, 22 Edward III, cited by Mazzinghi, p. 80.

⁸⁴ *Salt Arch. Soc. Trans.* viii. 122. It was undoubtedly at this time that the oblong stone keep on the motte, which is described in an escheat of Henry VIII's reign (see below, n. 87), was built.

⁸⁵ *Salt Arch. Coll.* viii. 14.

⁸⁶ Speed's *Theatre of Britain*; Leland, *Itin.* vii. 26.

⁸⁷ The Stafford escheat of Henry VIII's reign, which describes the town, also makes no mention of any castle in the town (Mazzinghi, p. 105).

inscription, 'The old castle, built by Edward the Elder, and in memorie fortified with reel walls.'⁸⁸

The value of Stafford town had risen at the time of the Survey, as the king had 7*l.* for his share, which would make the whole revenue to king and earl 10*l.* 10*s.*, as against 9*l.* before the Conquest.⁸⁹ The property of the canons of Stafford had risen from twenty shillings to sixty shillings.

40. STAMFORD.—This was one of the boroughs fortified by Edward the Elder, and consequently we find it a royal burgus at the time of the Survey. But Edward's *burh*, the Chronicle tells us, was on the south side of the Welland; the northern *burh*, on the other side, may have been the work of the Danes, as Stamford was one of the towns of the Danish confederacy of the Five Boroughs. The Norman castle and its motte are on the north side, and five *mansiones* were destroyed for the site.⁹⁰ There is at present no appearance of masonry on the motte, which is partly cut away, and what remains of the castle wall is of the thirteenth century. It is, therefore, probable, though not certain (certainty can only be obtained by excavation), that the *turris*, or keep, which surrendered to Henry II in 1158, was of wood.⁹¹ Henry gave the castle to Richard Humet, constable of Normandy, in 1155.⁹² It was a very exceptional thing that Henry should thus alienate a royal castle, and special circumstances must have moved him to this act. The castle was destroyed in Richard III's time and the materials given to the convent of the Carmelite friars. It appears to have been within the walls, but with a bailey reaching down to the river. The shape of the bailey is quadrangular; the area may be guessed as from two to three acres.

It is curious that the burh of Edward the Elder, on the south side of the river, continues to the present day to be a distinct liberty and parish from the town on the north side.⁹³

Stamford had risen enormously in value since the Conquest. 'In King Edward's time it paid 15*l.*; now it pays for feorm 50*l.*, and for the king's other dues 28*l.*'⁹⁴

⁸⁸ *Salt Arch. Soc. Trans.* viii. 231.

⁸⁹ There must be an error in the first statement of the Stafford revenue in Domesday, which says that the king and earl have only 7*l.* between them, as it is contradicted by the later statement, as above (D. B. 246 a and 247 b, 2).

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 336 b, 2. There were 141 'mansiones' T. R. E. 'et modo totidem sunt praeter 5 quae propter operationem castelli sunt wastae.' From a passage in the Domesday of Nottingham it would seem that a 'mansio' was a group of houses.

⁹¹ Gervase of Canterbury, i. 156 (Rolls Series).

⁹² Peck's *Antiquarian Annals of Stamford*; he gives the charter, p. 17.

⁹³ *Beauties of England and Wales; Lincolnshire.*

⁹⁴ D. B. 336 b, 2: 'T. R. E. dabat Stanford 15*l.*; modo dat ad firmam 50*l.* De omni consuetudine regis modo dat 28*l.*'

41. STANTON (Stanton Long, in Shropshire).—At the time of the Survey the Norman Helgot was lord of Corve Dale, and had his castle at Stanton.⁹⁵ A slight rise had taken place in the value, perhaps due to the erection of the castle on a site which was previously waste. The castle was afterwards known as Helgod's Castle, or (by corruption) Castle Holdgate. The motte still exists; quite separate from it is a circular tower, which now forms part of a farmhouse. The Ordnance map indicates a part of the earthworks of the bailey, but not enough to calculate its size; but it was evidently only a small castle. The manor of Stanton was an agglomeration of four small manors which had been held by different proprietors in Saxon times, so it was not the centre of a soke.

42. TREMATON.—‘The count [of Mortain] has a castle there and a market rendering 101 shillings.’⁹⁶ Two Cornish castles are mentioned in Domesday, and both of them are only on the border of that wild Celtic country; but while Launceston is inland Trematon guards an inlet on the south coast. The position of Trematon Castle is exceedingly strong naturally. The bailey is a sort of rounded triangle, and covers rather more than an acre of ground.⁹⁷ The motte is inside it, and now carries an oval keep of the thirteenth century.⁹⁸ The rest of the masonry is of the same period. In spite of the establishment of a castle and a market the value of the manor of Trematon had gone down at the time of the Survey, which may be accounted for by the fact that there were only ten ploughs where there ought to have been twenty-four. It was only a small manor and not a *burgus*.

43. TUTBURY.—The first castle here appears to have been built by Hugh d'Avranches, the first Norman earl of Chester, for Ordericus says that in 1070 William gave to Henry Gualchelin de Ferrers the castle of Tutbury, which Hugh d'Avranches had formerly had.⁹⁹ The Survey simply states that Henry de Ferrers has the castle of Tutbury, and that there are forty-two men living by their merchandise alone in the borough round the castle.¹⁰⁰ There is no statement in Domesday as to the value of the manor T. R. E., but T. R. W. it was 4*l.* 10*s.* Henry de Ferrers mentions this castle in his charter to the priory of Tutbury, in which he states

⁹⁵ ‘Ibi habet Helgot castellum, et 2 carucas in dominio, et 4 servos, et 8 villanos, et 8 bordarios et 1 Francigenam cum 8½ carucis. Ibi ecclesia et presbyter. T. R. E. valebat 18 solidos: modo 25 sol. Wastam invenit’ (D. B. i. 258 b).

⁹⁶ ‘Ibi habet comes unum castrum et mercatum, reddentes 101 solidos’ (D. B. i. 122).

⁹⁷ *Beauties of England and Wales*.

⁹⁸ Murray's *Guide to Cornwall*. Mackenzie states that the keep is Norman, and a shell keep.

⁹⁹ Ordericus, p. 522.

¹⁰⁰ ‘Henricus de Ferrers habet castellum de Toteberie. In burgo circa castellum sunt 42 homines de mercato suo tantum viventes’ (D. B. i. 248 b).

that he and his wife built the church of St. Mary at Tutbury from the foundations.¹⁰¹ We have already observed that we generally find near a Norman castle a church which bears traces of Norman foundation or restoration.

At Tutbury the keep was placed on an artificial motte, which itself stood on a hill of natural rock.¹⁰² There were two baileys attached; the motte was placed so as to command the town. The general shape of the bailey is roughly triangular; with the motte it covers about 3½ acres. There is now a sham ruin on the motte, where there formerly stood a stone keep, which was ruinous in Queen Elizabeth's reign.¹⁰³ A description of that reign seems to show that it was a shell keep, as it says: 'The castle is situated upon a round hill, and is circumvired with a strong wall of astiler [ashlar?] stone. . . . The king's lodging therein is fair and strong, bounded and knit to the wall. And a fair stage hall of timber, of a great length. Four chambers of timber, and other houses well upholden, within the walls of the castle.'¹⁰⁴ Extensive restorations were made by John of Gaunt, and Clark says that the masonry extant is chiefly his work. The account above cited shows how many of the buildings were still of timber in Elizabeth's reign.

Tutbury was the centre of an honour in Norman times, and the castle was an important one throughout the middle ages. But in Saxon times it does not seem to have been even a manor, and there is no mention of ploughs. The borough was probably the creation of the castellan.

44. WALLINGFORD.—There is good reason to suppose that in the vallum of the town of Wallingford we have an interesting relic of Saxon times. It is one of the *burhs* enumerated in the 'Burghal Hidage'; it was undoubtedly a fortified town at the time of the Conquest,¹⁰⁵ and is called a *burgus* in Domesday Book; but there appears to be no evidence to connect it with Roman times, except the discovery of a number of Roman coins in the town and its neighbourhood. But no Roman buildings or pavements have ever been found.¹⁰⁶ The Saxon borough was built on the model of a Roman chester, a square with rounded corners. The rampart, which still exists in great part, is entirely of earth, and must have been surmounted with a wooden wall, such as was still existing at Portsmouth in Leland's time.¹⁰⁷ The accounts of Wallingford in

¹⁰¹ *Mon. Angl.* iii. 393.

¹⁰² Clark, *M. M. A.* i. 17-81.

¹⁰³ Shaw's *History of Staffordshire*, i. 49.

¹⁰⁴ Quoted in *Beauties of England and Wales; Staffordshire*, p. 1129.

¹⁰⁵ William of Poitiers calls it an 'oppidum,' p. 141.

¹⁰⁶ Hedges, *History of Wallingford*.

¹⁰⁷ 'The Towne of Portsmouth is murid from the Est Tower a forowgh lenght with a Mudde Waulle armid with Tymbre' (*Itin.* iii. 118).

the great Survey are very full and important. 'King Edward had eight virgates in the borough of Wallingford, and in these there were 276 haughs paying 11*l.* of rent. Eight have been destroyed for the castle.'¹⁰⁸ This Norman castle was placed in the N.E. corner of the borough. At present its precincts cover thirty acres,¹⁰⁹ but this includes garden grounds, and no doubt represents later enclosures. No ancient plan of the castle has been preserved, but from Leland's description there appear to have been three wards, each defended with banks and ditches.¹¹⁰ The inner ward, which was doubtless the original one, is rudely oblong in shape. Leland says: 'All the goodly buildings, with the towers and dungeon, be within the third dyke.' The motte, which still exists, was on the south-eastern edge of this ward—that is, it was so placed as to overlook both the borough and the ford over the Thames.¹¹¹ It was ditched around, and is said to have had a stone keep on the top; but no foundations were found when it was recently excavated. It was found to rest on a foundation of solid masonry several feet thick, sloping upwards towards the outside, so that it must have stood in a kind of stone saucer.¹¹² The masonry which remains in other parts of the castle is evidently none of it of the early Norman period, unless we except a fragment of wall which contains courses of tiles. Numerous buildings were added in Henry III's reign; the wall and battlements were repaired, and the *hurdicium*, which had been blown down by a high wind, was renewed.¹¹³ But the motte and the high earthen banks show clearly that the first Norman castle was of wood.

The value of the royal borough of Wallingford had considerably risen since the Conquest.

45. WARWICK.—Here again we have a castle built on land which the Conqueror obtained from a Saxon convent, and which consequently cannot have been the site of a castle previously.

¹⁰⁸ 'In burgo de Walingeford habuit rex Edwardus 8 virgatas terrae; et in his erant 276 hage reddentes 11 libras de gablo. . . . Pro castello sunt 8 destructae' (D. B. i. 56).

¹⁰⁹ Hedges, *History of Wallingford*, i. 139.

¹¹⁰ Leland's *Itinerary*.

¹¹¹ Camden speaks of the motte as being in the middle of the castle, but in reality it is on the edge of the inner ward.

¹¹² Hedges, *History of Wallingford*, i. 189. It is to be inferred that the fragment of a round building which stands on the top of the motte must be modern; it is thick enough to be ancient.

¹¹³ Close Rolls, i. 1223. *Hurdicium* is from the same root as 'hoarding,' and probably refers to the wooden galleries placed on the highest part of towers and walls to defend the base.

Note.—If we divide the 276 haughs mentioned in D. B. between the 114 acres enclosed by the rampart, we shall find it gives them an average of about 1 rood 26 perches; multiply this by 8 (the number destroyed for the castle), and we get an area of 8 acres, which is just about the average area of an early Norman castle.

Only a small number of houses was destroyed for the castle,¹¹⁴ and this points to the probability, which is supported by some other circumstances, that the castle was built outside the town; it has already been remarked that houses outside the walls had to pay geld along with those in the town, and were thus reckoned as being in the town.¹¹⁵ Warwick of course was one of the boroughs fortified by Ethelfleda, and it was doubtless erected to protect the Roman road from Bath to Lincoln, the Foss way, which passes near it. Domesday Book, after mentioning that the king's barons have 112 houses in the borough, and the abbot of Coventry 36, goes on to say that these houses belong to the lands which the barons hold outside the city, and are rated there.¹¹⁶ This is one of the passages from which Professor Maitland has concluded that the boroughs planted by Ethelfleda and her brother were organised on a system of military defence, whereby the magnates in the country were bound to keep houses in the towns.¹¹⁷ Ordericus, after the well-known passage in which he states that the lack of castles in England was one great cause of its easy conquest by the Normans, says: 'The king *therefore* founded a castle at Warwick, and gave it in custody to Henry, son of Roger de Beaumont.'¹¹⁸ Putting these various facts together, we may fairly assert that the motte which still forms part of the castle at Warwick was the work of the Conqueror, and not, as Mr. Freeman believed, 'a monument of the wisdom and energy of the mighty daughter of Alfred.'¹¹⁹ Dugdale, who also asserted the motte to be Ethelfleda's work, was only copying Rous, a very imaginative writer of the fifteenth century.

The motte of Warwick is mentioned several times in the Pipe Roll of Henry II; it then carried wooden structures on its top.¹²⁰ In Leland's time there were still standing on this motte the ruins of a keep, which he calls by its Norman name of the Dungeon. It appears to have been of fourteenth-century work.¹²¹ There is not a scrap of masonry of Norman date about the castle. The motte, and the earthen bank which still runs along one side of the

¹¹⁴ 'Abbas de Couentreu habet 36 masuras, et 4 sunt wastae propter situm castelli' (D. B. i. 238 a, 1).

¹¹⁵ See *ante*, p. 233, under Huntingdon. There are many instances in Domesday Book.

¹¹⁶ 'Hae masurae pertinent ad terras quas ipsi barones tenent extra burgum, et ibi appreciatae sunt' (D. B. i. 238).

¹¹⁷ Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 189.

¹¹⁸ Ordericus, p. 184: 'Rex itaque castellum apud Guarevicum condidit, et Henrico Rogerii de Bello Monte filio ad servandum tradidit.' Mr. Freeman remarks that no authentic records connect Thurkil of Warwick with Warwick Castle (N. C. iv. 781).

¹¹⁹ N. C. iv. 190.

¹²⁰ 'In operatione unius domus in mota de Warewich et unius bretaschie, 5 l. 7 s. 11 d.' (Pipe Rolls, 20 Henry II.)

¹²¹ Parker, *Domestic Architecture of the Middle Ages*.

court, show that the first castle was a wooden one. The bailey is oblong in shape, the motte being outside it; its area is about $2\frac{3}{4}$ acres.

The value of Warwick had risen since the Conquest from 30*l.* to 60*l.*

46. *WIGMORE*.—It has been usual to identify this place with the *Wigingamere* of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, though the slightest attention to the narrative of the Chronicle is sufficient to show how absurd this identification is. Edward the Elder had pushed his conquests into the eastern Danelagh until he had received the submission of the Danes in Essex, Herts, Beds, and Northants, and a peace was concluded in 915.¹²² Edward utilised the three years of quiet which followed in fortifying the boroughs of Bedford, Maldon, Towcester, and Wigingamere. But the building of these last two boroughs appears to have aroused the suspicions of the Danes that further conquests were intended. To forestall any such plans, they broke the peace; those of Northampton and Leicester vainly attacked Towcester, and at a later period in the same year those of East Anglia and Essex made an equally unsuccessful assault on Wigingamere. Towcester is on Watling Street, and its fortification might well have boded an advance to the north-west; but, as Wigingamere appears to have specially drawn upon itself the wrath of East Anglia and Essex, it should probably be looked for on or near the Icknield Way, at some point near its junction with the Ermine Street.

But, to return to Wigmore, in Herefordshire, which it is not likely that Edward ever visited, for in fact it was out of his beat, as Western Mercia was under the management of his sister Ethelfleda, we have the strongest indication that the Norman castle at Wigmore was a new erection, since Domesday Book tells us that William Fitz Osbern built it on waste land called Mereston.¹²³ This express statement disposes of the fable in the 'Foundationis Historia' of Wigmore that the castle of Wigmore had belonged to Edric the Wild, and was rebuilt by Ralph Mortimer.¹²⁴ Wigmore had only been a small manor of two taxable hides in Saxon times. Whereas it had been then unproductive, at the date of the Survey there were two ploughs in the demesne, and the borough attached to the castle yielded 7*l.*

The bailey of Wigmore Castle is an amorphous half-moon; its area, including the motte, does not much exceed two acres. Traces

¹²² We follow the chronology of Florence of Worcester, who is generally believed to have used a more accurate copy of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle than any now extant.

¹²³ 'Willelmus comes fecit illud castellum in wasta terra quae vocatur Mereston.' 'Burgum quod ibi est reddit 7 l.' (D.B. i. 183). This is another instance of the building of a borough close to a castle, and the revenue which was thus obtained.

¹²⁴ *Mon. Angl.* vi. 349.

remain of a second and a third bailey. On the motte are foundations of a circular or polygonal keep,¹²⁵ certainly not of the early Norman period.

47. WINCHESTER.—We include Winchester among the castles mentioned or alluded to in Domesday Book, because we think it can be proved that the *domus regis* mentioned under Alton and Clere is the castle built by William on the site outside the west gate of the city, where the present county hall is the only remaining relic of any castle at all.¹²⁶ Under the head of Aulton we are told that the abbot of Hyde had unjustly gotten the manor in exchange for the king's house, because by the testimony of the jurors it was already the king's house.¹²⁷ That *excambio domus regis* should read *excambio terrae domus regis* is clear from the corresponding entry under Clere, where the words are *pro excambio terrae in qua domus regis est in civitate*.¹²⁸ The matter is put beyond a doubt by the confirmatory charter of Henry I to Hyde Abbey,¹²⁹ where the king states that his father gave Alton and Clere to Hyde Abbey in exchange for the land on which he built his hall in the city of Winchester. Where then was this hall, which was clearly new, since fresh land was obtained for it, and which must not therefore be sought on the site of the palace of the Saxon kings? The 'Liber Winton,' a roll of Henry I's time, which gives a sort of inventory of the city of Winchester, says that twelve burgesses' houses had been destroyed and the land was now occupied by the king's house.¹³⁰ Another passage says that a whole street *outside the west gate* was destroyed when the king made his ditch.¹³¹ These passages justify the conclusion of Mr. Smirke that the king's house at Winchester was neither more nor less than the castle which existed in medieval times outside the west gate.¹³² Probably the

¹²⁵ Clark, *M. M. A.* ii. 531.

¹²⁶ Ordericus says: 'Intra moenia Guentae, opibus et munimine nobilis urbis et mari contiguae, validam arcem construxit, ibique Willelmum Osberni filium in exercitu suo preelpuum reliquit' (ii. 166). The *intra moenia* is not to be taken literally, any more than the *mari contigua*. It is strange that Mr. Freeman should have mistaken Guenta for Norwich, since under 1067 Ordericus translates the Winchester of the A.-S. C. by Guenta.

¹²⁷ 'De isto manerio testatur comitatus quod iniuste accepit [abbas] pro excambio domus regis, quia domus erat regis:' D. B. i. 43 a, 1.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.* i. 43 a, 2.

¹²⁹ *Mon. Angl.* ii. 444: 'Sicut rex Willielmus pater meus ei dedit in excambium pro terra illa in qua aedificavit aulam suam in urbe Winton.'

¹³⁰ 'Pars erat in dominio et pars de dominio abbatis; hoc totum est post occupatum in domo regis' (p. 584). This passage throws light on the fraud of the abbot of Hyde, referred to above.

¹³¹ 'Extra portam de Vuest . . . ibi iuxta fuit quidam vicus; fuit diffactus quando rex fecit facere suum fossatum' (p. 535).

¹³² *Archaeol. Inst.*, Winchester volume, p. 51.

reason why it is spoken of so frequently in the earliest documents as the king's house or hall, instead of the castle, is that in this important city, the ancient capital of Wessex, where the king 'wore his crown' once a year, William built, besides the usual wooden tower on the motte, a hall suitable to the royal greatness, and that the splendid hall of Henry III, which is still standing, had its precursor in the earliest Norman times. The palace of the Saxon kings stood, where we might expect to find the palace of native princes, in the middle of the city; according to Milner it was on the site of the present Square.¹³³ William may have repaired this palace, but that he constructed two royal houses, a palace and a castle, is highly improbable. The castle became the residence of the Norman kings, and the Saxon palace appears to have been neglected.¹³⁴

We see with what caution the Conqueror placed his castle at the royal city of Wessex outside the walls. Milner tells us that there was no access to it from the city without passing through the west gate.¹³⁵ The motte of the castle appears to have been standing in his time, as he speaks of the artificial mount on which the keep stands.¹³⁶ It is frequently mentioned in medieval documents as the *beumont* or *beau mont*. It was placed in the north-east corner of the bailey—that is, so as to overlook the city—and was surrounded with its own ditch.¹³⁷ The bailey was triangular in shape. With its ditches and outer banks it covered six acres, according to the commissioners who reported on it in Elizabeth's reign; but the inner area cannot have been much more than three acres. When masonry was substituted for woodwork may be inferred from the sums spent on this castle by Henry II. The Pipe Rolls show entries to the amount of 1,150*l.* during the course of his reign; the work of the walls is frequently specified, and stone is mentioned.

Domesday Book does not inform us whether the value of Winchester had risen or fallen since the Conquest.

48. WINDSOR.—Here we have another of the interesting cases in which the geld due from the tenant of a manor is lessened on account of a castle having occupied a portion of the land.¹³⁸ The

¹³³ *History of Winchester*, ii. 194.

¹³⁴ Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester and brother of King Stephen, pulled down the royal palace close to the cathedral, which presumably was the old Saxon palace, and used the materials to build Wolvesey Castle. See Giraldus Cambrensis, vii. 46. He could hardly have dared to do this if the palace had been still used by the Norman kings.

¹³⁵ *History of Winchester*, ii. 210.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.* p. 195.

¹³⁷ In the Liberate Roll, 85 Henry III (quoted in Turner's *Domestic Architecture*, i. 231), is an order for the repair of the ditch between the great tower and the bailey.

¹³⁸ 'Radulfus filius Seifrid tenet de rege Clivor. Heraldus comes tenuit. Tunc se defendebat pro 6 hidis, modo pro 4½ hidis, et castellum de Windesores est in dimidia

Survey tells us that the castle of Windsor sits in half a hide belonging to the manor of Clewer, which had become royal property as part of the spoils of Harold. It was now held of the king by a Norman tenant-in-chief, but whereas it was formerly rated as five hides it was *now* (that is, probably, since the castle was built) rated as four and a half hides. Of course we are not to suppose that the castle occupied the whole half-hide, which might be some sixty acres; but it extinguished the liability of that portion. At Windsor, however, we have no occasion to press this argument as a proof that the castle was new, since it is well established that the palace of the Saxon kings at Windsor was at least two miles from the present castle and town, in the village long known as Old Windsor, which fell into decay as the town of New Windsor sprang up under the Norman castle.¹³⁹ The manor of Windsor was given by Edward the Confessor to the convent of Westminster, but recovered by William the Conqueror.¹⁴⁰ But, as the Survey shows us, he did not build his castle in the manor of Windsor, but in that of Clewer. He built it for a hunting seat,¹⁴¹ and it may have been for the purpose of recovering forest rights that he resumed possession of Old Windsor; but he placed his castle in the situation which he thought best for defence. For even a hunting seat in Norman times was virtually a castle, as many other instances show.

It is needless to state that there is no masonry at Windsor of the time of the Conqueror, or even of the time of his son Henry I, in spite of the statement of Stowe that Henry 'new builded the castle of Windsor.' This statement may perhaps be founded on a passage in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle which says that Henry held his court for the first time in the New Windsor in 1110, where the reference must be to the castle.¹⁴² But it is probable that the first stone castle at Windsor was built by Henry II, who spent 1,670*l.* on it in the course of his reign. One of his first acts after his

hida' (D. B. i. 62 b). The Abingdon history also mentions the foundation of Windsor Castle, and gives some interesting details about castle guard. 'Tunc Walingaforde et Oxenforde et Wildesore, caeterisque locis, castella pro regno servando compacta. Unde huic abbatiæ militum excubias apud ipsum Wildesore oppidum habendas regio imperio iussum' (ii. 3, R. S.)

¹³⁹ Leland, iv. i. 47. See also Tighe's *Annals of Windsor*, pp. 1-6. Until recently there was a farmhouse surrounded with a moat at Old Windsor, which was considered to mark the site of Edward's *regia domus*.

¹⁴⁰ Edward's grant of Windsor to Westminster is in *Cod. Dipl.* iv. 227. Domesday does not mention the rights of the church, but says the manor of Windsor was held of the crown T. R. E. and T. R. W. Camden professes to give William's charter of exchange with the convent of Westminster (*Brit.* i. 151).

¹⁴¹ The charter given by Camden states that this was one of the reasons for the exchange of land.

¹⁴² An entry in the Pipe Roll of Henry I seems to show that he was the first to enclose the *burgus* of Windsor. 'In 1 virgata terrae quam Willelmus fil. Walteri habet in escambio pro terra sua quae capta est ad burgum' (p. 127).

accession was an exchange of land at Windsor, which seems to have been for the purpose of a vineyard, possibly the origin of the second bailey.¹⁴³ At present the position of the motte is central to the rest of the castle, but this is so unusual that it suggests the idea that the upper ward is the oldest, and that the motte stood on its outer edge. Henry II surrounded the castle with a wall, at a cost of about 140*l*.¹⁴⁴ The other entries in the Pipe Rolls probably refer to the first stone shell keep on the motte, and there is little doubt that the present Round Tower, though its height has been raised in modern times, and its masonry re-dressed and re-pointed so as to destroy all appearance of antiquity, is in the main of Henry II's building.¹⁴⁵ The frequent payments for stone show the nature of Henry's work.

Although so much masonry was put up in Henry II's reign, the greater part of what is now visible is not older than the time of Henry III. The lower bailey seems to have been enlarged in his reign, as the castle ditch was extended towards the town, and compensation given for houses taken down.¹⁴⁶ The upper and possibly ancient ward is rectangular in shape, and with the motte and its ditch covers about seven acres.¹⁴⁷ The state apartments, a chapel, and the Hall of St. George are in the upper ward, showing that this was the site of the original hall and chapel of the castle. The charter of agreement between Stephen and Henry in 1153 speaks of the *motte* of Windsor as equivalent to the castle.¹⁴⁸ Repairs of the motte are mentioned in the Pipe Rolls of Henry II.¹⁴⁹

The value of the manor of Clewer had fallen since the Conquest; that of Windsor, which was worth 15*l*. T. R. E., but after the Conquest fell to 7*l*., was again worth 15*l*. at the date of the Survey.¹⁵⁰

49. York.—William the Conqueror built two castles at York,

¹⁴³ *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, which contains an abstract of the missing Pipe Roll of 1 Henry II, has an entry of 12*s*. paid to Richard de Clifwar for the exchange of his land, and regular payments are made later. There was, however, another enlargement of the bailey in Henry III's reign (Tighe, p. 21).

¹⁴⁴ 'In operat. muri circa castellum 11*l*. 10*s*. 4*d*. Summa denar. quos idem Ricardus [de Luci] misit in operatione predicta de predicta ballia 128*l*. 9*s*.' (Pipe Roll, 20 Henry II, p. 116.)

¹⁴⁵ Mr. St. John Hope, whose forthcoming *History of Windsor Castle*, written by the King's command, is eagerly expected, has kindly read over the proofs of this paper, and has supplied me with several valuable corrections.

¹⁴⁶ Tighe's *Annals of Windsor*, p. 21.

¹⁴⁷ There is a singular entry in the Pipe Roll of 7 Richard I, 'pro fossato proster-nando quod fuit inter motam et domos regis,' clearly the ditch between the motte and the bailey. Mr. Hope informs me that this can only refer to the northern part of the ditch, as the eastern portion was only filled up in 1824. Mr. Hope thinks that the castle area has always included the lower bailey.

¹⁴⁸ *Foedera*, vol. i.

¹⁴⁹ Pipe Rolls, 30 Henry II.

¹⁵⁰ D. B. i. 62 b, 2; 56 b, 2.

and the mottes of both these castles remain, one underneath the keep of York Castle (known as Clifford's Tower), the other, on the south side of the Ouse, still bearing the Norman name of the Baile Hill, or the Old Baile.¹⁵¹ The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle implies, though it does not directly state, that both these castles were built in 1068, on the occasion of William's first visit to York. The more detailed narrative of Ordericus shows that one was built in 1068, and the other at the beginning of 1069 on William's second visit.¹⁵² Both were destroyed in September 1069, when the English and Danes captured York, and both were rebuilt before Christmas of the same year, when William held his triumphal Christmas feast in York.

This speedy erection, destruction, and re-erection would be sufficient to suggest that the castles of William in York were, like most other Norman castles, hills of earth with buildings and stockades of wood, especially when we find these hills of earth still remaining on the known sites of the castles. And we may be quite sure that the Norman masonry, which Mr. Freeman pictures as so eagerly destroyed by the English, never existed.¹⁵³ But the obstinate tendency of the human mind to make things out older than they are has led to these earthen hills being assigned to Britons, Romans, Saxons, Danes, anything rather than Normans. A single passage of William of Malmesbury, in which he refers to the *castrum* which the Danes had built at York in the reign of Athelstan, is the sole vestige of basis for the theory that the motte of Clifford's Tower is of Danish origin.¹⁵⁴ The other theories have absolutely no foundation but conjecture. If Malmesbury was quoting from some older source which is now lost, it is extremely probable that the word *castrum*, which he copied, did not mean a castle in our sense of the word at all, but was a translation of the word *burh*, which almost certainly referred to a vallum or wall constructed round the Danish suburb outside the walls of York. Such a suburb there was, for there in 1055 stood the Danish church of St. Olave, in which Earl Siward was buried, and the suburb was long known as the Earlsburgh or Earl's Burh, probably because it was the residence of the Danish earls of Northumbria.¹⁵⁵ But this suburb was not anywhere near Clifford's

¹⁵¹ It is needless to remark that *baile* is the Norman word for an enclosure or courtyard; Low Latin *ballium* or *ballia*.

¹⁵² Ordericus, ii. 188 (ed. Le Prévost).

¹⁵³ *Norman Conquest*, iv. 270. Mr. Freeman has worked out the course of events connected with the building and destruction of the castles with his usual lucidity. But he never grasped the real origin of mottes, though he emphatically maintained that the native English did not build castles.

¹⁵⁴ 'Ethelstanus castrum quod olim Dani in Eboraco obfirmaverant ad solum diruit, ne esset quo se tutari perfidia posset' (*Gesta Regum*, ii. 134).

¹⁵⁵ Widdrington, *Analecta Eboracensia*, p. 120. It was this suburb which Alan, earl of Richmond, gave to the abbey of St. Mary at York, which he founded.

Tower, but in quite a different part of the city. To prove that both the mottes were on entirely new sites, we have the assurance of Domesday Book that out of the seven shires or wards into which the city was divided one was laid waste for the castles; ¹⁵⁶ so that there was clearly a great destruction of houses to make room for the new castles.

What has been assumed above receives striking confirmation from excavations made recently (1903) in the motte of Clifford's Tower. At a depth of thirteen feet were found remains of a wooden structure, surmounted by a quantity of charred wood. ¹⁵⁷ Now the accounts of the destruction of the castles in 1069 do not tell us that they were burnt, but thrown down and broken to pieces. ¹⁵⁸ But the keep which was restored by William, and on the repair of which Henry II spent 15*l.* in 1172, ¹⁵⁹ was burnt down in the frightful massacre of the Jews at York Castle in 1191. ¹⁶⁰ The excavations disclosed the interesting fact that this castle stood on a lower motte than the present one, and that when the burnt keep was replaced by a new one the motte was raised to its present height, 'an outer crust of firmer and more clayey material being made round the older summit, and a lighter material placed inside this crater to bring it up to the necessary level.' This restoration must have taken place in the third year of Richard I, when 28*l.* was spent 'on the work of the castle.' ¹⁶¹ This small sum shows that the

'Ecclesiam Sancti Olavii in qua caput abbatis in honorem Sanctae Mariae melius constitutum est, et burghum in quo ecclesia sita est' (*Mon. Angl.* iii. 547). For the addition of new boroughs to old ones see *ante*, p. 240, under 'Norwich.' Although Athelstan destroyed the fortifications of this burh, they were evidently renewed when the Danish earls took up their residence there, for when Earl Alan persuaded the monks from Whitby to settle there one inducement which he offered was the fortification of the site, 'loci munitionem' (*Mon. Angl.* iii. 545).

¹⁵⁶ 'In Eburaco civitate T.R.E. praeter scyram archiepiscopi fuerunt 6 scyrae; una ex his est waste in castellis' (D. B. i. 298).

¹⁵⁷ *Notes on Clifford's Tower*, by George Benson and H. Platnauer, published by the York Philosophical Society.

¹⁵⁸ 'Thone castel tobræcon and towurpan' (A.-S. C. See Freeman, *N. C.* iv. 270.)

¹⁵⁹ 'In operatione turris de Euerwich 15*l.* 7*s.* 8*d.*' (Pipe Roll, 19 Henry II, vol. xix. 2.) We assume that the second keep of William lasted till Henry's reign.

¹⁶⁰ Benedict of Peterborough, ii. 107.

¹⁶¹ 'In operatione castri 28*l.* 18*s.* 9*d.*' (Pipe Roll, 3 Richard I.) Under the year 1193, after relating the tragedy of the Jews at York Castle, Hoveden says: 'Deinde idem cancellarius [William de Longchamp] tradidit Osberto de Luncamp, fratri suo, comitatum Eboracensem in custodia, et precepit firmari castellum in veteri castellario quod rex Willelmus Rufus ibi construxerat' (iii. 84). The expression *vetus castellarium* would lead us to think of the Old Baile, which certainly had this name from an early period; and Hoveden, being a Yorkshireman as well as a very accurate writer, was probably aware of the difference between the two castles. But if he meant the Old Baile, then both the castles were restored at about the same time. 'Rufus' must be a slip, unless there was some rebuilding in Rufus's reign of which we do not know.

new keep also was of wood; and remains of timber work were in fact found on the top of the motte during the excavations, though unfortunately they were not sufficiently followed up to determine whether they belonged to a wooden tower or to a platform intended to consolidate the motte.¹⁶³ It is extremely likely that this third keep was blown down by the high wind of 1228, when two shillings was paid 'for collecting the timber of York Castle blown down by the wind.'¹⁶³ In its place arose the present keep, one of the most remarkable achievements of the reign of Henry III.¹⁶⁴ The old ground plan of the square Norman keep was now abandoned, and replaced by a quatrefoil. The work occupied thirteen years, from the 30th to the 43rd Henry III, and the total sum expended was 1,927*l.* 8*s.* 7*d.*, equal to about 40,000*l.* of our money. This remarkable fact has slumbered in the unpublished Pipe Rolls for nearly 700 years, never having been unearthed by any of the numerous historians of York.

The keep was probably the first work in stone at York Castle, and for a long time it was probably the only defensive masonry. The banks had certainly only a wooden stockade in the early part of Henry III's reign, as timber from the forest of Galtres was ordered for the repair of the breaches in the *palicium* in 1225.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶³ Messrs. Benson and Platnauer are of the former opinion. 'The existence of a second layer of timber work seems to show that the fortification destroyed was rebuilt in wood' (*Notes on Clifford's Tower*, p. 2).

¹⁶⁴ 'Pro mairemio castri Ebor. prostrato per ventum colligendo, 2 s.' (Pipe Roll, 19 Henry III). It is, of course, a conjecture that this accident happened to the keep; but the keep would be the most exposed to the wind, and the scattering of the timber, so that it had to be collected, is just what would happen if a timber structure were blown off a motte.

¹⁶⁵ As this is the first time that this statement has been published, it will be well to give the evidence on which it rests. The keep of York is clearly Early English in style, and of an early phase of the style. It is, however, evident to any one who has carefully compared our dated keeps that castle architecture always lags behind church architecture in development, and must therefore be judged by different standards. We should, therefore, be prepared to find this and most other keeps to be of later date than their architecture would suggest. Moreover, the expenditure entered to York Castle in the reigns of Henry II, Richard I, and John is quite insufficient to cover the cost of a stone keep. The Pipe Rolls of Henry III's reign decide the matter, as they show the sums which he expended annually on this castle. It is true they never mention the *turris*, but always the *castrum*; we must also admit that the *turris* and *castrum* of York are often sharply distinguished in the writs, even as late as Edward III's reign (*Close Rolls*, 1334). On the other hand extensive acquaintance with the Pipe Rolls proves that though the medieval scribe may have an occasional fit of accuracy he is generally very loose in his use of words, and his distinctions must never be pressed. Take, for instance, the case of Orford, where the word used in the Pipe Rolls is always *castellum*, but it certainly refers to the keep, for there are no other buildings at Orford. Other instances might be given in which the word *castellum* clearly applies to the keep. It should be mentioned that in 1204 John gave an order for stone for the castle (*Close Rolls*, i. 4 b), but the amounts which follow the bill for it in the Pipe Rolls show that it was not used for any extensive building operations.

¹⁶⁶ 'Mandatum est Galfredo de Cumpton forestario de Gaunteris quod ad pontem et domos castri Eboraci et breccas palicii eiusdem castri reparandos et emendandos

As late as Edward II's reign there was a *pelum*, or stockade, round the keep, on the top of a *murus*, which was undoubtedly an earthen bank.¹⁶⁶ At present the keep occupies the whole top of the motte except a small *chemin de ronde*, but the fact so frequently alluded to in the writs, that a stockade ran round the keep, proves that a small courtyard existed there formerly, as was usually the case with important keeps. Another writ of Edward II's reign shows that the motte was liable to injury from the floods of the river Foss.

It is difficult to say what the original area of York Castle was; it was certainly not large, as the present court, which covers about four acres, represents a modern enlargement in 1825. This enlargement has altered the ground plan of the bailey, which appears from an ancient drawing to have been of that common amorphous outline of which it is difficult to say whether it is a flattened circle or a rounded square. The motte was placed considerably outside the Roman walls of York, but on the line of what is believed to have been the Anglo-Saxon rampart; it is so placed as to overlook the city. The bailey was entirely outside the city rampart.

The value of the city of York, in spite of the sieges and sacks which it had undergone, and in spite of there being 540 houses 'so empty that they render nothing at all,' had risen at the date of the Survey from 53*l.* in King Edward's time to 100*l.* in King William's.¹⁶⁷ This extraordinary rise in value can only be attributed to increased trade and increased exactions, the former being promoted by the greater security given to the roads by the castles, the latter due to the tolls on the highroads and waterways, which belonged to the king,¹⁶⁸ and the various 'customs' belonging to castles, which, though new, were henceforth equally part of his rights.

50. THE BAILE HILL, YORK.—There can be no doubt whatever that this still existing motte was the site of William's second castle at York. It bore the name of the Old Baile at least as early as the fourteenth century, perhaps even in the twelfth.¹⁶⁹ In 1326 a dispute arose between the citizens of York and Archbishop William de Melton as to which of them ought to repair the wall around the Old Baile. The mayor alleged that the district was under the express jurisdiction of the archbishop, exempt from that of the city; the archbishop pleaded that it stood within the ditches of the city.¹⁷⁰ The meaning of this dispute can only be under-

Vicecomitem Eborac. maeremium habere faciat in foresta de Gaunteris per visum,' &c. (Close Rolls, ii. 61 b.)

¹⁶⁶ Order to expend up to 6 marks in repairing the wooden peel about the tower of York Castle, which peel is now fallen down (*Cal. of Close Rolls*, 17 Edward II, p. 25).

¹⁶⁷ D. B. i. 298 a.

¹⁶⁸ D. B. i. 298 b.

¹⁶⁹ See the passage from Hoveden already quoted, *ante*, p. 446, note 161.

¹⁷⁰ Drake's *Eboracum*, app. xlv.

stood in the light of facts which have recently been unearthed by the industry and observation of Mr. T. P. Cooper, of York.¹⁷¹ The Old Baile, like so many of William's castles, originally stood outside the ramparts of the city. The original Roman walls of York (it is believed) enclosed only a small space on the eastern shore of the Ouse, and before the Norman Conquest the city had far outgrown these bounds, especially to the east and south, and a new vallum had been made, enclosing an area at least double the size of the Roman castrum, on the western bank of the Ouse. This was the Micklegate suburb, in which lay 'the shire of the archbishop.' This vallum was of earth, with a stockade on top, and it continued to be so till at least the reign of Henry III, if not later.¹⁷²

The evidence of the actual remains renders it more than probable that this rampart turned towards the river at a point 500 feet short of its present angle, leaving the old castle and its bailey entirely outside.¹⁷³ This is exactly how we should expect to find a castle of William the Norman's in relation to one of the most turbulent cities in the realm; and, as we have seen, the other castle at York was similarly placed. By the time of Archbishop Melton the city was already enclosed in the new stone walls built in the thirteenth century, and these walls had been carried along the west and south banks of the Old Baile, so as to enclose that castle within the city. The archbishop, therefore, had a good pretext for trying to lay upon the citizens the duty of maintaining the Old Baile. The cause appears to have gone against him, but he stipulated that whatever he did in the way of fortification was of his own option, and was not to be accounted a precedent. A contemporary chronicler says that he enclosed the Old Baile first with stout planks, eighteen feet long, afterwards with a stone wall,¹⁷⁴ an interesting proof that wooden fortifications were still used in the reign of Edward III.

Though the base court of the Old Baile is now built over, its area and ditches were visible in Leland's time,¹⁷⁵ and can still be

¹⁷¹ Mr. Cooper's forthcoming work on the *Walls of York* will contain a mass of new material from documentary sources, which will shed a quite unexpected light on the history of the York fortifications. I am indebted to Mr. Cooper for some of the extracts from the Close Rolls given or referred to above relating to York Castle.

¹⁷² 1161. was spent by the sheriff in fortifying the walls of York in the 6th year of Henry III. After this there are repeated grants for murage in the same and the following reign. There are some Early English buttresses in the walls, but the majority are later. No part of the walls contains Norman work.

¹⁷³ The details of this evidence, which consist mainly in (1) a structural difference in the extended rampart, (2) a subsidence in the ground marking the old line of the city ditch, will be found in the forthcoming work of Mr. Cooper.

¹⁷⁴ 'Locum in Eboraco qui dicitur Vetus Ballium, primo spissis et longis 18 pedum tabulis, secundo lapideo muro fortiter includebat' (T. Stubbs, in *Raine's Historians of the Church of York*, ii. 417, B. 8.)

¹⁷⁵ 'The plote of this castelle is now caullid the Olde Baile, and the area and diches of it do manifestley appere' (*Itin.* i. 60).

guessed at by the subsidence of the houses built on the line of the city moat and of the present wall where it crosses the site of this moat.¹⁷⁶ The area of the bailey must have been about $4\frac{1}{2}$ acres, and its shape nearly square. This measurement includes the motte, which was placed in the south-west corner on the line of the banks; it thus overlooked the river as well as the city.

We have now examined in detail the fifty castles mentioned in Domesday Book. But besides these we know on good authority of at least thirty-seven castles which were existing in the latter part of the eleventh century. For convenience sake we have thrown these castles along with those mentioned in Domesday into one table, so that the result of the inquiry may be seen at a glance. We have in this table a list of eighty-seven castles, which, though it probably contains only a small portion of the whole number of castles founded at the epoch of the Conquest, at least gives us a number which is sufficiently representative to form a basis for general inferences.¹⁷⁷

Omitting Burton Castle, of which nothing is known, we find that out of eighty-six castles no less than seventy-seven are of the motte and bailey type. The exceptions are the Tower of London and Colchester, where stone keeps were built by the Conqueror himself, and where the motte is absent simply because a stone keep could not be built on a new earthwork; Carlisle, Peak, Pembroke, Richmond, Tynemouth, and Wisbeach, the two latter being now almost entirely destroyed, so that nothing can be asserted about their original type. Exeter is a doubtful case, but if, as there is some evidence for believing, it formerly had a bailey at a lower level, it would answer entirely to the motte and bailey plan.¹⁷⁸ Pembroke was originally a turf castle, and it is doubtful whether the present castle occupies the site of the one built by Arnolf of Montgomery.¹⁷⁹ There is conclusive evidence that mottes formerly existed at Bristol, Gloucester, Hereford, Monmouth, Newcastle, Nottingham, Winchester, and Worcester, while the motte and bailey plan is clearly traceable at Chepstow and Montgomery. Even if we do not count Exeter we find that more than 88 per cent. of the list are castles of this type.

About thirty-eight of these castles are attached to towns. Of these ten are placed inside the Roman walls or the Saxon earthworks of the towns, while twenty-six are either wholly or partly

¹⁷⁶ From Mr. Cooper's information.

¹⁷⁷ Some Welsh castles whose identification is uncertain are omitted.

¹⁷⁸ Norden, whose plan of Exeter was published in 1619, indicates the lands below the ditch of the castle, inside the town walls, as belonging to the castle. The *Gesta Stephani*, describing the siege of 1135 says that Stephen took the *pro-murale*, which was fortified with a high bank (p. 28).

outside the enclosures.¹⁸⁰ This circumstance is important, because the position outside the town indicates the mistrust of an invader, not the confidence of a native prince. In the only two cases where we know anything of the position of the residence of the Saxon kings we find it in the middle of the city.¹⁸¹ Even when the castle is inside the town walls it is almost invariably close to the walls, so that an escape into the country might always be possible.¹⁸² Of the towns in which these castles were situated Domesday Book gives us the value in King Edward's and King William's time in twenty-four instances. In all cases but three (Hastings, Huntingdon, and Quatford) the value has risen. In the case of the country castles the same law holds good, since out of forty-seven manors with castles the value has risen in twenty-three cases, fallen in eight, while in the remaining cases it is either stationary or we have no information. Evidently something has caused a great increase of prosperity in these cases, and it can hardly be anything else than the impetus given to trade by the security afforded by a Norman castle.

The table proves that Mr. Clark's favourite theory, that the moated mounds were the centres of large and important estates in Saxon times, was a dream. Out of forty-one mottes in country districts thirty-six are found in places which were quite insignificant in King Edward's day, and only five can be said to occupy the centres of important Saxon manors.¹⁸³

Without claiming absolute accuracy for the figures given for the size of the baileys, which are in most cases roughly calculated from the six-inch Ordnance map, they are sufficiently trustworthy to prove that these early Norman castles were very small in area, suitable only for the personal defence of a chieftain who has only a small force at his disposal, and absolutely unsuited for people in the tribal stage of development, like the ancient Britons, or for the scheme of national defence inaugurated by Alfred and Edward.

¹⁷⁹ 'Primus hoc castrum Arnulfus de Mungumeri sub Anglorum rege Henrico primo' (really before 1092) 'ex virgis et cespite, tenue satis et exile construxit' (Giraldus Cambr. *Itin. Wall.* p. 89). The 'Brut y Tywysogion,' in 1105, says that Gerald, seneschal of Pembroke, built a second time the castle of Pembroke in a place called Little Cengarth. The first castle was evidently of the usual Norman type.

¹⁸⁰ It is not always possible to be certain whether a castle was placed in a town or in the country, because we have no information as to the existence of a town at that date; this is especially the case with the Welsh castles. Information as to the position of the castle is wanting in the cases of Lewes and Quatford.

¹⁸¹ At Winchester and Exeter. For Winchester see Milner, ii. 194; for Exeter, Shortt's *Sylva Antiqua Iscama*, p. vii.

¹⁸² Colchester is the only exception to this rule, as the castle there is in the middle of the town; but even this is only an apparent exception, as the second bailey extended to the town wall on the north, and had been royal demesne land even before he Conquest. See Round's *History of Colchester*, p. 186.

¹⁸³ Of these Pontefract is a doubtful case.

The table also shows that in not a single case is any masonry which is certainly early Norman to be found on one of these mottes; where the date can be ascertained the stone work is invariably later than the eleventh century.

Nearly half the number of castles mentioned in this table are placed at ports on the coast, or on the great navigable rivers. Others stand on or near the great lines of Roman road. But any generalisations as to the reasons of their situations would be premature until an accurate list of mottes throughout the kingdom has been drawn up. We have some hints in Domesday Book and the Chronicle that the castles erected were built by royal order or permission.¹⁸⁴ What unwritten law there was on the subject we do not know; it is not till the time of Henry I that we find castle-building mentioned in law-books.¹⁸⁵ All that we can say *a priori* is that so able a ruler as William would certainly check the building of private castles as far as possible, while on the other hand he had to face the dilemma that no Norman landholder would be safe in his usurped estates without the shelter of a castle.¹⁸⁶ In this situation we have the elements of the civil strife which burst forth in Stephen's reign, and which was ended by what we may call the anti-castle policy of Henry II.

ELLA S. ARMITAGE.

NOTE.—Professor Tout has kindly sent a correction to the note 85 on p. 226 about Clitheroe Castle, pointing out that the passage cited from Hulton's *Documents relating to the Priory of Penwortham* concerns the barony of Penwortham, and has no reference to Clitheroe, although both are in Blackburn hundred. The charter published in W. Farrer's *Lancashire Pipe Rolls*, p. 885, shows that the castle of Clitheroe was in the hands of Robert de Lacy in 1102: it must have come to him with the Bowland estates, which were granted to him in the same year to hold of the king, but which he had previously held of Roger the Poitevin: *ibid.*, p. 882. It may be added that a second visit to Clitheroe has convinced the writer that the date given by Dugdale for the building of the castle applies correctly to the present keep. Dugdale says it was built by Robert de Lacy II between 1187 and 1194: *Baronage*, i. 99.

¹⁸⁴ Thus Domesday Book shows us that William Fitz Osbern built several castles in Herefordshire which he did not hold, and the Chronicle ascribes extensive castle-building to him and to Bishop Odo, whom William left behind him as regent during his first absence in Normandy.

¹⁸⁵ *Leges Henrici Primi*, x. § 1. The 'castellatio trium scannorum' is declared to be a right of the king. *Scannorum* means *scannorum*, banks. It is noteworthy that a motte and bailey castle is actually a fortification with three banks, one round the top of the motte, one round the edge of the bailey, one on the counterscarp of the ditch. See Mr. Hope's paper on 'English Fortresses,' *Arch. Journ.*, lx., for some valuable observations on the position of castles.

¹⁸⁶ He does not seem to have been able to do in England as he did in Normandy keep garrisons of his own in the castles of his nobles. See *Ord. Vit.* iii. 262.

452 EARLY NORMAN CASTLES OF ENGLAND July

No	Name of Castle	Type ¹	Probable Date of Stone Keep ²	Town or Manor T. R. E.	Caput of Dis- trict(?) T. R. E.
1	Aberlleinog . . .	M.	Thirteenth c.; on motte	(Wales)	No
2	Arundel . . .	M. & B.	Henry II: shell, on motte	Town: castle outside	
3	Bamborough . . .	K. & B.	William II, according to W. St. John Hope	Saxon burh at first, castle inside	
4	Barnstaple . . .	M. & B.	Not early; tower, on motte	Town: castle inside	
5	Belvoir . . .	M. & B.	Shell, on motte; licence to crenellate 1266	In Woolsthorpe manor	No
6	Berkley (Nesse) . . .	M. & B.	Henry II: shell, enclosing motte	Manor	Yes
7	Berkhamstead . . .	M. & B.	Henry II (?) v. Pipe Rolls: shell, on motte	Manor	Yes
8	Bishop Stortford . . .	M. & B.	Flint walling, possibly not ancient	Manor	No
9	Bourne . . .	M. & B.	Tower, destroyed: on motte	Manor	Yes
10	Bramber . . .	M. & B.	No keep: early stone gatehouse	In manor of Washington (Wales)	No
11	Brecon . . .	M. & B.	(?) Shell, on motte	Town: castle outside	
12	Bristol . . .	M. & B. destroyed	Henry I: tower, on motte		
13	Burton (?) . . .				
14	Caerleon . . .	M. & B.	No keep: motte outside castrum	Manor: formerly Roman castrum, castle outside	No
15	Cambridge . . .	M. & B.	Fourteenth c., destroyed: on motte	Town: castle outside	
16	Canterbury . . .	M. & B. ³	The Dane John: no masonry	Town (Roman): first castle outside	
17	Cardiff . . .	M. & B.	Thirteenth c.: shell, on motte	Roman castrum: castle inside	
18	Carisbrook (Alwineston) . . .	M. & B.	Henry I: shell, on motte	Manor	No
19	Carlisle . . .	K. & B.	David I, 1124-58: tower	Roman castrum: castle outside	
20	Castle Acre . . .	M. & B.	Late Norman: shell and tower on motte	Manor	No
21	Chester . . .	M. & B.	Foundations of late Norman tower on motte	Roman castrum: castle outside	
22	Chespatow (Estrigoe) . . .	M. & B. plan	No keep on former motte	Manor	No
23	Clifford . . .	M. & B.	Thirteenth c.: on motte	In Blackburn manor	No
24	Clithore . . .	M. & B.	Henry I (?): on motte	Town: Roman castrum; castle inside	No
25	Colchester . . .	K. & B.	William I	In Kingston manor	
26	Corfe (Warham) . . .	M. & B.	Henry I: on motte		No
27	Deganwy . . .	2 Ms. & B.	John: on natural motte	(Wales)	
28	Dover . . .	M. & B.	Henry II: on motte	Castle built inside a Saxon or Roman castrum, outside port	
29	Dudley . . .	M. & B.	Henry III: on motte	Manor	No
30	Dunster (Torre) . . .	M. & B.	No keep now	Manor	No
31	Durham . . .	M. & B.	Edward III: shell, on motte	Town: castle outside	
32	Ewias . . .	M. & B.	Foundation trench of thirteenth-c. keep on motte	Manor	(?)
33	Exeter . . .	M. & B. (?)	No keep: eleventh-c. gatehouse	Town: Roman castrum; castle inside	
34	Eye . . .	M. & B.	No keep now	Manor	No
35	Gloucester . . .	M. & B. both destroyed	Henry I (?): not on motte	Town: castle outside	
36	Hastings . . .	M. & B.	No keep on motte	Town: castle outside	
37	Hereford . . .	M. & B.	Tower keep, on motte, both destroyed	Town: castle inside	
38	Huntingdon . . .	M. & B.	No keep now	Town: castle outside	
39	Launceston (Dunheved) . . .	M. & B.	Henry III (?): tower on motte	Manor	No
40	Lewes (DeLaquis) . . .	2 Ms. & B.	Edward III (?): shell on motte	Town	
41	Lincoln . . .	2 Ms. & B.	Stephen: shell on motte	Roman town: castle inside	

¹ In this column 'B.', 'K.', and 'M.' stand for 'Bailey', 'Keep', and 'Motte'.
² In this column 'c.' stands for 'century'.

³ The Dane John.

Area of Bailey *	Shape of Bailey	Value of Town or Manor	Authority for Existence in Eleventh Century	No.
(?)	(?)	Not in D. B.	'Brut y Tywysogion,' 1096	1
Whole area not quite 5 a.	Oblong	Risen	Domesday; Florence of Worcester, 1088	2
Whole area 8 a.; castle proper 8 or 4	Follows ground	Not in D. B.	A.-S. C., 1095	3
Half an a.	Circular	Not given T. R. E.	<i>Mon. Angl.</i> v. 197 ^a	4
(?)	(?)	Risen	<i>Mon. Angl.</i> iii. 288.	5
C. 1½ a.	Nearly square	Risen	Domesday, 163 a, 2	6
C. 3 a.	Roughly square	Fallen	<i>Mon. Angl.</i> vii. 1090	7
C. 5 a. (?)	Oblong (?)	Fallen	William I's charter, Dugdale's <i>St. Paul's</i> , p. 804	8
C. 8 a., including motte	Roughly square	Risen	<i>Mon. Angl.</i> vi. 86	9
C. 8½ a., including motte	Pear-shaped	Risen	Domesday, i. 23 a, 1	10
2½ a. (?)	Oval	Not in D. B.	<i>Mon. Angl.</i> iii. 252; Ord. Vit. iii. 43	11
8½ a.	(?)	Not given T. R. E.	A.-S. C. 1088 ^c	12
(?)	(?)	Not given T. R. E.	No trace of any castle at Burton	13
		Risen	Domesday, i. 185 b, 1	14
C. 6 a. (?)	Rectangular	Risen (?)	Domesday, i. 189	15
8 a.	Triangular	Risen	Domesday, i. 2 a, 1	16
Norman bailey about 1½ a.	Rectangular	Not in D. B.	'Brut y Tywysogion,' 1080	17
First bailey 1½ a.	Square	Risen	Domesday, i. 52 b, 1	18
Not quite 8 a.	Triangular	Not in D. B.	A.-S. C., 1092; Bower's <i>Scottish Chronicle</i> , v. xlii.	19
(?)	Horse-shoe	Risen	<i>Mon. Angl.</i> v. 49	20
First ward not quite 1 a.	Polygonal	Risen	Ord. Vit. ii. 199	21
1½ a.	Oblong	Risen	Domesday, i. 162	22
8½ a. (?)	Rectangular	Risen	Domesday, i. 182 a, 2	23
Inner ward c. 2 a., including keep	(?)	Blackburn fallen	Domesday, i. 882 a, 1 bis	24
Nearly 5 a., including second bailey	Roughly square	Risen	Charter of Henry I, in Round's <i>Colchester</i>	25
Whole area c. 8 a.	Rectangular	Risen	Domesday, i. 78 b, 2	26
Inner castle with motte c. 6 a.	Follows ground	Not in D. B.	Ord. Vit. iii. 284	27
	Square with loop to enclose church, &c.	Risen	Wm. of Poitiers, p. 140	28
C. 2 a.	Rectangular	Fallen	Domesday, i. 177	29
C. 2 a.	Roughly oval	Risen	Domesday, i. 95 b	30
Twice enlarged; c. 4 a. now	Rectilateral	Not in D. B.	Simeon of Durham, 1072	31
Whole area c. 5 a.	Half-moon	Not given T. R. E.	Domesday, i. 186 a	32
C. 2 a. inside walls	No bailey now	(?)	Ord. Vit. ii. 181	33
2½ a.	Oval	Risen	Domesday, ii. 179	34
(?)	(?)	Risen	Domesday, i. 162	35
C. 8 a.	Triangular	Fallen	Tapestry: Domesday, i. 18 a, 2	36
C. 4 a.	Rectangular	Not given T. R. E.	A.-S. C. 1048, 1052; for motte, Grose, ii. 18	37
C. 2 a.	Roughly square	Stationary	Domesday, i. 203	38
8½ a.	Pentagonal	Fallen	Domesday, i. 121 b	39
C. 5 a.	Oval (?)	Risen	Domesday, ii. 157, 163, 172, &c.	40
C. 5½ a.	Roughly square	Risen	Domesday, 886 b, 2	41

* In this column 'c.' stands for 'about' and a. for 'acres.'

* For motte, Seyer's *Bristol*, ii. 201.

* D. B. says, '23 domus vastatae.'

No.	Name of Castle	Type ¹	Probable Date of Stone Keep ²	Town or Manor T. R. E.	Head of District T. R. E.
42	Monmouth . .	M. & B.	Round tower, on motte: thirteenth c.	Manor	No
43	Montacute . .	M. & B.	No keep now	Manor	No
44	Montgomery . .	M. & B. plan	Henry III: shell, on motte	Waste land	No
45	Newcastle . .	M. & B.: both destroyed	Henry II: not on motte	Roman castrum: castle outside (?)	(?)
46	Norham . .	M. & B.	John? tower, on motte	Town: motte outside	
47	Norwich . .	M. & B.	Henry I: tower, on motte	Town: castle probably outside	
48	Nottingham . .	M. & B.	John: tower, on motte, destroyed	Manor	No
49	Okhampton . .	M. & B.	(?) Tower, on motte	Manor	No
50	Oswestry (Luvre)	M. & B.	Twelfth c. (?): shell, on motte	Manor	No
51	Oxford . .	M. & B.	Decagonal foundations found: probably Henry II	Town: motte outside	
52	Peak . .	K. & B.	Henry II	Manor	No
53	Penwortham (Peneverdant)	M. & B.	No keep now	Manor	No
54	Pembroke . .	K. & B.	Thirteenth c.	(Wales)	
55	Peterborough . .	M.		Attached to abbey	
56	Pewsey . .	M. & B.	Thirteenth c.: on motte	Roman castrum: castle inside	Pro- bably
57	Pontefract . .	2 Ms. & B.	Henry III: built round motte	Manor	No
58	Preston Capes . .	M. & B.	No keep now	Manor	
59	Quatford . .	M. & B.	No keep now	A burgus: in manor of Ardinton	No
60	Rayleigh . .	M. & B.	No keep now	Manor	Yes
61	Rhuddlan . .	M. & B. ³	No keep now	Manor	
62	Richard's Castle (Avreton)	M. & B.	Fragments on motte: date later than Conquest (Clark)	In manor of Ludford	No
63	Richmond . .	K. & B.	Henry II	Name of manor unknown	No
64	Rochester . .	M. & B.: the Boley Hill	Henry I (in Gundulf's castle)	Town: first castle outside	
65	Rockingham . .	M. & B.	John: shell, on motte	Manor	No
66	Old Sarum . .	M. & B.	Henry II (?): tower, on motte	Manor of 50 hides	No
67	Shrewsbury . .	M. & B.	Only modern work now on motte	Town: castle outside	
68	Skipson . .	M. & B.	Only fragment of wall on motte	In manor of Cleeton	No
69	Stafford . .	M. & B.	Edward III: rebuilt now	Town: castle outside	
70	Stamford . .	M. & B.	No keep now	Town: castle inside	
71	Stanton (Holgate)	M. & B.	No keep now	Manor	No
72	Tickhill . .	M. & B.	Henry II (?): foundations of decagonal tower, on motte	In Dadeley manor	No
73	Totnes . .	M. & B.	Henry I (?): shell, on motte	Town: castle outside	
74	Tower of London	K. & B.	William I: tower	On line of city wall	
75	Trematon . .	M. & B.	Thirteenth c.: shell, on motte	Manor	No
76	Tonbridge . .	M. & B.	Late shell, on motte	In Haslow Manor	No
77	Tutbury . .	M. & B.	shell, now destroyed	(?)	No
78	Tynemouth . .	(?)	No keep or motte now	(?)	
79	Wallingford . .	M. & B.	No keep on motte now	Town: castle inside	
80	Warwick . .	M. & B.	Fourteenth c.: on motte	Town: castle outside	
81	Wigmore . .	M. & B.	Foundations, on motte, of tower: thirteenth c.	Manor	No
82	Winchester . .	M. & B. destroyed	Probably Henry II: on motte	Town: castle outside	
83	Windsor . .	M. & B.	Shell, on motte: Henry II	In manor of Clewer	No
84	Wisbeach . .	Destroyed: no plan	A Juliet or round tower	Manor	No
85	Worcester . .	M. & B. destroyed	(?)	Town: castle outside	
86	York . .	M. & B.	Henry III: on motte	Town: motte on line of wall	
87	York (Baila Hill)	M. & B.	No keep now	Outside former	

¹ In this column 'B.', 'K.', and 'M.' stand for 'Bailey', 'Keep', and 'Motte.' ² In this column 'c.' stands for 'century.'

Area of Bailey *	Shape of Bailey	Value of Town or Manor	Authority for Existence in Eleventh Century	No.
Inner ward c. 1½ a. (?)	Oblong (?)	Not given T. R. E.	Domesday, i. 180 b; for motte, Speed	42
C. 2½ a.	Rectilateral	Not given T. R. E.	Domesday, i. 93 a, 1	43
Whole area 3 a.	Roughly oblong	Not given	Domesday, i. 254	44
		Not in D. B.	Simeon, 1080; for motte, Brand, i. 173	45
C. 8 a.	Quadrant	Not in D. B.	Simeon of Durham, 1088	46
8 or 4 a.	Half-moon	Risen	Domesday, ii. 116	47
C. 3 a. including motte	Half-moon	Risen	A.-S. C. 1068; for motte, Misc. Roll, 1212, and Pipe Roll, 6 & 7, Ric. I	48
Scarcely 2 a.	Oval	Risen	Domesday, i. 105	49
(?)	(?)	Risen	Domesday, i. 258	50
(?)	Octagonal	Risen	Mon. Angl. vi. 251; Abingdon and Osney Chronicles, 1072	51
1½ a.	Quadrant	Risen	Domesday, i. 276	52
Less than 3 a.	Roughly square	Risen	Domesday, i. 270	53
Nearly 4 a.		Not in D. B.	'Brut y Tywysogion,' 1091; M. A. iv. 820	54
(?)	(?)	Stationary	Hugh Candidus, Sparke, p. 68	55
Not quite 2 a.	Oblong	Risen	Ord. Vit. ii. 145; Wm. Gemm., vii. 84	56
C. 8 a.	Roughly oval	Fallen	Domesday, i. 878 b	57
(?)	(?)	Risen	Mon. Angl. iv. 178, 183	58
C. half an a. (?)	Roughly half-moon	Fallen	Ord. Vit. iv. 82	59
C. 3½ a.	Half-moon	Risen	Domesday, ii. 43 b	60
(?)	(?)	Risen	Domesday, i. 269 a, 1	61
C. 3 a.	Roughly square	Stationary	Domesday, i. 186 b	62
First ward 8½ a.	Triangular	(?)	Domesday, i. 381 a, 2	63
3 a.	Oblong	Risen	Domesday, i. 2 b	64
3½ a.	Rectilateral	Risen	Domesday, i. 220	65
(?)	(?)	Stationary	Mon. Angl. vi. 1394	66
Under 3 a., including motte	Octagonal	Risen	Domesday, i. 252	67
(?)	(?)	Fallen	Chronicon de Malma, i. 90	68
(?)	(?)	Risen	Domesday, i. 249 a	69
2 to 3 a.	Quadrangular	Risen	Domesday, i. 386 b, 2	70
(?)	(?)	Risen	Domesday, i. 258 b	71
C. 2 a.	Roughly oval	Risen	Ord. Vit. iv. 83, 171	72
Slightly over 1 a.	Pear-shaped	Risen	Mon. Angl. iv.	73
Keep originally on edge of bailey	(?)	London not in D. B.	Ord. Vit. ii. 175; cf. iv. 109	74
Less than 2 a.	Rounded triangle	Fallen	Domesday, i. 122	75
2½ a., including motte	Roughly oval	Stationary	A.-S. C. 1068	76
C. 3½ a.	Triangular	Not given T. R. E.	Domesday, i. 248 b	77
C. 6 a.	Peninsula	Not in D. B.	Simeon, B. S. ii. 846; A.-S. C. 1095	78
3 a. (?)	Roughly oblong	Risen	Domesday, i. 56	79
2½ a.	Oblong	Risen	Domesday, i. 238 a, 1	80
Under 3 a., including motte	Roughly semilunar	Risen	Domesday, i. 183	81
Inner area c. 3 a.	Triangular	(?)	Domesday, i. 43 a, 1; Ord. Vit. ii. 166; Mon. Angl. ii. 444	82
Not quite 2 a. (upper ward)	Rectangular	Clewer fallen	Domesday, i. 62 b	83
4 a.	(?)	Fallen	Mon. Angl. ii.	84
(?)	(?)	Risen	A.-S. C. 1088; Malma. G. P. p. 253; for motte, Rot. Pat. 1 Hen. III	85
less than 4 a.	Amorphous	Risen	A.-S. C. 1068; Domesday, i. 298	86
C. 4½ a., incl. motte	Square		As above, and Ord. Vit. ii. 188	87

* Abbot's Hill.

* In this column 'c.' stands for 'about' and 'a.' for 'acres.'