II.

ANGLO-SAXON BURHS AND EARLY NORMAN CASTLES. By Mrs E. S. ARMITAGE. *Communicated by* Professor BALDWIN BROWN, F.S.A. Scot.

I am not aware that any serious attempt has ever yet been made to ascertain what the nature of an Anglo-Saxon fortification was. One of our best archæologists observes that "whatever amount of difficulty may attend our inquiry respecting the domestic buildings of the Saxons, the character of their military edifices is involved in far greater obscurity."[1] It is possible that this ignorance is mainly due to not making use of the materials which exist in a scattered and fragmentary condition, and which have never been pieced together. But it cannot be denied that the general absence of interest in questions of English archæology has led to a complete lack of accumulated observations on the subject; and the difficulty of getting information, even about existing remains, can only be appreciated by those who have attempted an inquiry of the kind.

What is worse is that this lack of interest has left the ground open to assumptions, which are accepted as facts, because no one cares to dispute them. It seems strange that in the nineteenth century any archæologist of reputation should still follow the method of the archæologists of a hundred or two hundred years ago, who first guessed at things, and then said they *were* so. Yet this is certainly the method followed by the late Mr G. T. Clark in his otherwise valuable work on *Mediæval and Military Architecture*. Finding that in several places where the Anglo-Saxon records tell of *burhs* or strongholds erected by our forefathers, there are still existing round hillocks of earth, surrounded with ditches, he jumped to the conclusion that a *burh* was a moated hillock, and then proceeded to assert that it was so, without any further inquiry into the literary history of the word. The evidence which he adduced in support of his assumption was chiefly this:—1st,

[1] Hudson Turner, *History of Domestic Architecture in England*, vol. i. p. 18.

that of the fifty *burhs* mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, there are twenty-two still existing where moated mounds of the kind in question are to be found; 2nd, many of these works are known to have been the centre or caput of great estates in Saxon times.[1] Strange to say, this very scanty and disputable evidence has been accepted without question even by such writers as Freeman and Green, and is adopted by most of the antiquarian books and papers written during the last twenty years.

With the theory that these moated hillocks mark the centre of a private estate in Saxon times, this paper will not attempt to deal, as it can be left in the far more competent hands of Mr J. H. Round, who has clearly expressed his dissent from it.[2] The philological and historical evidence, and the evidence drawn from the actual remains, will be sufficient for the purpose of this paper. What first led the writer to doubt the truth of Mr Clark's contention that a *burh* was a conical earthwork, was that on looking through the illustrated Anglo-Saxon MSS. in the British Museum to find a picture of a *burh*, it was seen that the Anglo-Saxon idea of a *burh*, as represented by those pictures, was an enclosure with walls and towers of stone—in other words, a walled town.[3] Not long afterwards, an article on English castles in the *Quarterly Review* for July 1894, now known to have been written by Mr J. H. Round, led to the conviction that Mr Clark's theory of *burhs* was simply an archæological delusion. Mr Round's words are: "We hold it proved that

[1] *Mediæval and Military Architecture*, pp. 22, 23.

[2] *Essex Archæological Society's Transactions*, vol. iii. part ii. "The more deeply I have studied the theories of 'Castle Clark,' the more reason have I seen to doubt his view that these strongholds were intended for the centre and defence of a private estate, for the accommodation of the lord and his household, and for the dwelling of the English lord who succeeded the Roman provincial." In his *Feudal England*, Mr Round shows that most of the Norman fiefs were wholly new creations, constructed from scattered fragments of Anglo-Saxon estates, p. 260.

[3] On p. 29 of the MS. of Prudentius (Cleopatra C. viii.) there is an excellent drawing of a four-sided enclosure, with towers at the angles, and *battlemented* walls of masonry. The title of the picture is "Virtutes urbem ingrediuntur"; and *urbem* is rendered in the A.S. gloss as *burh*.

these fortified mottes were, at least in some cases, erected in the Conqueror's days, and if this is proved of some, it becomes probable of many. Indeed, so far as what we may term private castles are concerned, there is actually, we think, a presumption in favour of this late origin." It is proposed in this paper to carry this contention even further, and to maintain that while the *burhs* of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle are almost always walled towns, the moated hillocks scattered so thickly over England and south-western Scotland are the remains of castles built by Normans.

The philological evidence is of considerable importance in this contention. There is not the smallest reason to suppose that the word *burh* ever meant a hillock, for the history of the word can be clearly traced. Mr Clark had not the advantage of consulting the *New English Dictionary*, which had not appeared when he wrote, but had he looked into *Schmid's Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, he would have learned that a *burh*, which is derived from the same root as the verb *bergian*, to shelter, meant originally a wall of some kind, whether of earth, wood or stone, built for protection. As in the case of the words *tun*, *yard* or *garth*, and *worth* or *ward*, the sense of the word became extended from the protecting bulwark to the thing protected. In this sense of a *fortified enclosure*, the word was naturally applied by the Anglo-Saxons to the prehistoric and British "camps" which they found in Britain, such as Cissbury, or to similar forts which they constructed themselves, such as Bebbanburh (Bamborough). Sometimes the *burh* was probably nothing more than a palisade or hedge round a great man's house, if we may judge from the innumerable places whose names end in bury or borough,[1] from which every vestige of bulwark has totally disappeared.

The laws of Ethelbert of Kent, Ine of Wessex, and Alfred, speak respectively of the king's and earl's *tun*, *huse*, and *healla*, and special

[1] The dative form *byrig* is the origin of the names ending in bury. "To say nothing of hamlets, we have full 250 parishes whose names end in burgh, bury, or borough, and in many cases we see no sign in them of an ancient camp or of an exceptionally dense population." Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 184.

punishments are ordained for crimes committed within their precincts.[1] It is possible that in two instances in the later laws, the *king's burh* is used in the same sense.[2] But from the time of the laws of Athelstan the word *burh* far more commonly means a city or town. Thus he ordains that there shall be a mint in every *burh*.[3] And it appears that already the town has its *gemot* or meeting.[4] In the laws of Edgar's time and later, the *burh* has not only its *burh-gemot*, but its *burh-gerefa* or town-reeve, and its *burh-waru* or townsmen.[5] Burh is contrasted with wapentake as town with country.[6] And in this sense it has descended to our own day as a *borough*, though because the word *borough* has so long meant a chartered town or a town with parliamentary representation, we have forgotten its older meaning of a fortified town.

If we turn to Anglo-Saxon literature, we get the same answer. Alfred in his Orosius translates city by *burh*.[7] The Anglo-Saxon translation of the Gospels (circa A.D. 1000) uses the same word for the *civitatem* of the Latin version.[8] In the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the words *geweorc* or *faesten* are generally used for a fortress hastily thrown up, and *burh* is reserved for fortified towns. The word *burh*, indeed, is seldom used in the Chronicle until we come to the time of Edward the Elder. It is conclusive as to the general meaning of the word that

[1] V. Schmid's *Gesteze der Angelsachsen*, Ethelbert, 5, Ine. p. 22, Alfred, p. 74.

[2] Thus Edmund (ii. 2) speaks of *mine burh* as an asylum, the violation of which brings its special punishment (Schmid, p. 176), and Ethelred (iii. 4) ordains that every compurgation and every ordeal shall take place on *thaes kyninges byrig.* (Schmid, p. 214). A charter of Alfred's time speaks of the hedge of the king's burh. Birch's *Cartularium*, ii. 305. The word burh does not occur in the laws of Edward the Elder.

[3] Athelstan, ii. 2. Schmid, p. 140.

[4] Professor Maitland says: "In Athelstan's day it seems to be supposed by the legislator that a *moot* will usually be held in a *burh*. If a man neglect three summonses to a moot, the oldest men of the *burh* are to ride to his place and seize his goods." *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 185.

[5] Edgar, iii. 5. Ethelred, ii. 6. Athelstan speaks of the reeves of every *burh*. I. Preface.

[6] Oððe on burge, oððe on wæpengetaece, Edgar, iv. 2.

[7] *New English Dictionary*, Borough.

[8] Ib. Matt. xxi. 17.

Florence of Worcester, one of the most accurate of our early annalists, in his account of Edward's reign, regularly translates the *burh* of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle by *urbs*.[1]

But though we may now feel certain that the general sense of the word *burh* was a town, its more special sense as an enclosing bulwark does not appear to have been forgotten in Anglo-Saxon times. Thus Athelstan orders that all *burhs* shall be repaired fourteen days after Rogations;[2] and Cnut, when making a similar provision, expressly defines it as *civitatum emendatio*.[3] Here the word for town is used for the town wall. The same sense appears as late as the reign of William Rufus, in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (1092); when relating the restoration of Carlisle by that King, it says:—"He repaired the *burh*, and ordered the *castell* to be built."[4] And finally, a remarkable charter of Ethelred of Mercia and Ethelfleda his wife states that they have commanded the *burh* at Worcester to be built as a protection to all the people.[5] Ethelred and his wife were not building a new town, for Worcester already had its churches and its bishop, and possibly the remains of its Roman walls, but they were building or rebuilding a town wall or embankment to protect the city from the Danes.

It is equally clear that a *burh* was not a castle, in the sense in which we commonly use that word. The word *castellum* is occasionally used in Anglo-Saxon charters, but when it is used it clearly means a town.[6]

[1] Florence of Worcester lived at the end of the eleventh century and beginning of the twelfth, when Anglo-Saxon was still a living language.

[2] Athelstan, ii. 13. Schmid, p. 138.

[3] Cnut, ii. 10. Schmid, p. 276.

[4] A passage, by the way, which is fatal to Mr Clark's theory that a burh meant a moated hillock, for there is no such hillock at Carlisle.

[5] Hehtan bewyrcean tha burh at Weogernaceastre eallum tham folce to gebeorge. Birch's *Cartularium*, ii. 222.

[6] Thus a charter of Egbert of Kent, 765, says: "Trado terram intra castelli moenia supranominati, id est Hrofescestri, unum viculum cum duobus jugeribus, adjacentem plateæ quæ terminus a meridie hujus terræ," etc. *Codex Diplomaticus*, i. 138. In two charters of Ethelwulf, *Hrofi castellum* is used as an equivalent for Hrofecestre or Rochester. Birch's *Cartularium*, ii. 48 and 86. In this sense, no doubt, we must interpret Asser's "castellum quod dicitur Werham." Vita Elfredi, 478.

The word *castell* first makes its appearance in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the days of Edward the Confessor, the last of the old line of Saxon Kings. His mother was a Norman lady, and in his days Norman favourites received grants of land in England, and built castles for their personal defence. Thus we hear of Richard's castle, Robert's castle, and Pentecost's castle; of which more anon. There can be no question that the thing as well as the word was new in England.[1] The hall of the Saxon ealdorman or of the thane, even when enclosed in an earthwork or stockade, was a very different thing from the castle of the Norman noble. For a castle is built by a man who lives among enemies, who distrusts his nearest neighbours as much as any foe from a distance. The Anglo-Saxon great man had no reason to distrust his neighbours, and to fortify himself against them. The charter in which Elswith endows the Nunnanminster at Winchester speaks of "the hedge of the king's burh";[2] and if the royal palace in the chief city of the realm had no better defence than a hedge, possibly on an embankment, we can well believe that the halls of the nobles, when they were situated in towns, had no better protection, but took their chance with the wooden huts of the burghers within the walls of the town.[3]

[1] Mr Freeman says: "In the 11th century, the word *castel* was introduced into our language to mark something which was evidently quite distinct from the familiar *burh* of ancient times. . . . Ordericus speaks of the thing and its name as something distinctly French; 'munitiones, quas castella Galli nuncupant.' The castles which were now introduced into England seem to have been new inventions in Normandy itself. William of Jumièges distinctly makes the building of castles to have been one of the main signs and causes of the general disorder of the days of William's minority, and he seems to speak of the practice as something new." *Norman Conquest*, ii. 606.

[2] Cyninges burg hege. Birch's *Cartularium*, ii. 305.

[3] Later historians, who were familiar with the state of things in Norman times, tell us frequently of castles in the Saxon period; but it can generally be proved that they misunderstood their authorities. Henry of Huntingdon probably meant a town when he says that Edward the Elder built at Hertford "Castrum non immensum sed pulcherrimum." He generally translates the *burh* of the Chronicle by *burgus*; and he shows that he had a correct idea of Edward's work when he says that at Buckingham, Edward "fecit *vallum* ex utraque parte aquæ"—where *vallum* is a translation of *burh*.

It has been necessary, at the risk of tediousness, to spend some time on the history of the word *burh*, because it is the key to the historical and archæological evidence, to which we must now turn. We must first inquire what models the Anglo-Saxons were likely to follow in fortress-building. From the first days of their coming to Britain, they had before their eyes the remains of the cities and camps fortified by the Romans. The numerous terminations of place names in *chester*, *cester*, and *caster*, show how plentifully the island was furnished with Roman towns, each with its four-sided bulwark of stone or earth.[1] It has been maintained that the Saxons, after laying the Roman towns in ruins, avoided rebuilding them from superstition or some other feeling, and made their own settlements on other sites. This was certainly true in some cases, as, for example, when the Saxon town of Rotherham arose at the distance of about a mile from the Roman station of Templeborough. But the great Roman towns, such as Canterbury, London, Winchester, and York, were evidently occupied by the English from the first, and probably they kept the walls in repair. And it may have been the invasion of the Danes which led Alfred to repair and occupy many *chesters*, as the Saxons called them, which had until then been unoccupied and ruinous.[2] In 886 the Chronicle tells us that Alfred repaired "Londonburh," and committed it to the keeping of Ethelred the ealdorman, the same Ethelred who restored, as we have already seen, the burh of Worchester. William of Malmesbury tells us that the city of Shaftesbury was built by Alfred; and it is evident that the old Roman castrum at Lymne was being repaired by Alfred's orders, when the workmen who were repairing it were attacked by the Danes.[3] The repair of the city of Chester—the

The square or parallelogram was certainly the Roman ideal, but the nature of the ground often led them to vary this form, so that many Roman towns are polygonal. See the plan of Compiègne in Cohausen's *Befestigungen der Vorzeit* (fig. 99).

[2] Dr Christison thinks the Saxons sometimes gave the name of *chester* to their own fortifications, even when they had no Roman origin. *Early Fortifications in Scotland*, p. 105. It would be interesting to know whether Roman remains have been found at all the *chesters* in Britain.

[3] *A.S. Chronicle*, 893.

"waste chester in Wirrall"—after it had been possessed and ruined by the Danes, was another of the good works of Ethelred of Mercia, in Alfred's reign.[1] A charter of Edward the Elder's reign shows that he secured the old Roman city of Porchester, by exchanging some other lands for it with the Bishop of Winchester, to whom it belonged. We cannot doubt that he did this in order to make it one of the defences of his kingdom.[2]

What was done at Porchester was doubtless done at many other places. Sometimes the fortification to be restored or the new one to be raised would be a stone wall; sometimes it would be an earthen bank with a stockade or hedge or wattle-work fence on top, such as Ida reared at Bamborough; sometimes it would be a *Thelwall* or timber palisade such as Edward put up on the shores of the Mersey.[3] No nation is unacquainted with these simpler forms of fortification; but if we are to judge from the illuminated manuscripts, the Anglo-Saxon ideal of fortification was formed from Roman models, just as their other architecture was, and the solid stone wall with towers and battlements, forming either a polygonal or a square enclosure, was what they preferred when time and money permitted.

But of whatever material the Saxon *geweorc* or *burh* of the 9th and 10th centuries was constructed, we may be sure of one thing: that the burh enclosed a much larger area than the ordinary Norman castle. The works constructed by Alfred and Edward and Ethelfleda were not

[1] *A.S. Chronicle*, 907.

[2] The charter of Edward speaks only of some *cassati* of land at Porchester, but a later charter of Edgar, which recounts this transfer of land, says expressly that it was the *oppidum* of Porchester which Edward acquired by this exchange. It is interesting to find that Mr Clark and Mr Smirke both remark that the masonry at Porchester does not at a first glance suggest Roman work. Possibly an expert might be able to separate the repairs of Edward the Elder from the original Roman work in the outer walls of Porchester, as well as from the later additions of the Norman and Plantagenet kings.

[3] Camden was the first to point out this etymology, which he professes to quote from Florence of Worchester; but it is not to be found in Florence. *Britannia*, iii. 44.

castles, built for the personal defence of some great man and his family; they were not forts, intended to be held by a choice body of troops, for there was no standing army from which to draw such a force;[1] they were *boroughs*, that is, towns, in which people were expected to live and do their daily work, as well as to repair and defend their town walls, while at the same time these walls were to be ample enough to serve as a place of refuge for the whole country side at the time of a Danish inroad. The people of England would no longer be at the mercy of their barbarian foe if they could take refuge behind stout bulwarks while the Dane harried the country. And perhaps from these bulwarks they could sally forth to cut off his retreat, even if they had not had the courage to oppose his advance. But as Professor Maitland has observed, the origin of the boroughs was largely military, and in all probability the burghers were, of all men in the realm, the most professionally warlike.[2]

Before we turn to the existing remains of the *burhs* or boroughs founded in the 9th and 10th century, it may be well to say a few words on the type of castle which Mr Clark supposed to be peculiarly Anglo-Saxon, or, as he sometimes more vaguely expressed it, Northern, in its origin. The type is a very marked one, and consists of a round or oval hillock (there are a few cases in which the hillock is square), truncated at the top so as to form a platform, which is sometimes large enough to sustain extensive buildings, as at Tamworth, sometimes so small that it cannot have carried anything larger than a watch-tower, as at Bradfield and Mexborough, Yorkshire. This hillock is generally surrounded by a ditch with a bank on the counterscarp, and has attached to it a court-yard which is also ditched, and has evidently had banks both on the scarp and counterscarp. The courtyard is usually higher than the surrounding land.

[1] I will not go so far as to assert that they never constructed anything small enough to be called a fort. But if it were intended for permanent occupation, it must have been maintained on the same system as the boroughs were: by laying on the magnates of the shire the duty of keeping *haws* in the borough, and burgesses in those *haws*. See Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 189.

[2] *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 190.

In very many cases, the ground plan of these earthworks resembles a figure of 8, in which the upper limb is very much smaller than the lower. But though the court is frequently circular or semilunar in form, this is by no means invariably the case; and it will be seen from the table given in this paper (p. 279) that rectangular forms predominate in the castles built by William the Conqueror. The banks of these courts were, of course, crowned by stout palisades, and there can be no doubt that these enclosures contained the stables, kitchens, workshops, and other necessary appurtenances of a castle. The hillock carried on its summit the lord's residence, a wooden tower, which served as a citadel in the last resort, as well as a look-out station from which to watch the foe. The hillock is generally artificial, though, as might be expected, in cases where a natural hill or rock offered itself, it has been utilised to form the base or even the entire citadel. But the situation of these fortresses differs entirely from that of the more ancient prehistoric camps, where natural strongholds were chosen by preference. The moated hillocks are almost always found in towns or villages, on the level of the arable country.

The wooden castles which crowned these hillocks had a special name in Norman French; they were called *bretasches*.[1] The hillock also had its name in the same language; it was called a *motte*, Latinised as *mota*. The courtyard was known as the *bayle* or *bailey*, in Low Latin *ballium*. As these are the proper Norman names, and there are no others, I shall henceforth speak of this type of castle as the motte-and-bailey type. The word *motte* is, of course, the same as the *mote* which we so frequently find in the south-west of Scotland, and in other parts of Great Britain, and which is also found in some old English records, with the sense of an artificial hill. Thus a document of the year 1585, cited by Grose, says that Prudhoe Castle is built "on a high moate of earth."[2] Dr Christison, in his *Early Fortifications of Scotland*, remarks that there is the same confusion between *moat* in the sense of a ditch, and *mote* or

[1] See Ducange, Bretaschia, Mota, and Ballium.

[2] Grose's *Antiquities*, iv. p. 5 of Addenda.

motte in the sense of an artificial hill, as there is between *dyke* and *ditch*. Both are derived from the old French *motte*, a clod.

When or where this type of fortification originated is not as yet certainly known, but it is more common in Normandy than anywhere else, except perhaps in England. It is not unfrequent, however, in other parts of France, and in Belgium, and is to be found, though less frequently, in Italy, Germany,[1] and Denmark. It does not occur in Sweden or Norway,[2] but it is found in certain parts of Scotland and Ireland, particularly in those parts which were colonised or conquered by the Normans in the 11th and 12th centuries.

It is clear that the facts of name and distribution suggest a Norman origin for these mottes. Let us now consider whether the existing remains bear out the same conclusion, or whether they support Mr Clark's contention that the *burhs* of the 9th and 10th centuries were mottes. The first thing to do is to tabulate the *burhs* which the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* states to have been erected by Edward the Elder or Ethelfleda during the great fortress-building epoch, when more *burhs* are recorded to have been built than at any other period of Anglo-Saxon history. The weak point of Mr Clark's argument was that when he found a motte on a site which had once been Saxon, he did not stop to inquire what any subsequent builders might have done there, but at once assumed that the motte was Saxon. The following table (which is arranged chronologically) will show that we never find a motte on the site of one of the *burhs* in question unless a Norman castle-builder has been at work there subsequently.

We have here a list of thirty *burhs* built by Edward the Elder or his sister Ethelfleda. Of these, twenty-six can be identified, nearly all with certainty, the only doubtful one being Cyricbyrig, about which I have ventured to adopt the conjecture of Dugdale, who identifies it with

[1] Cohausen denies that there are any castles built on artificial mottes in Germany. *Befestigungsweisen der Vorzeit*, p. 28. But Essenwein asserts that many mottes are to be found there. *Handbuch der Architektur, Kriegsbaukunst.*

[2] I make this statement on the authority of a communication from Professor Montelius. Dr Christison quotes a similar statement from Hildebrand.

Monk's Kirby on the borders of Warwickshire. In only ten of these twenty-six places is a motte to be found, and in every case there is evidence tending to show that the motte was connected with a subsequent Norman castle.[1]

BURHS OF ETHELFLEDA.

Worcester,	873–899.	A motte and a Norman castle.
Chester,	907.	A motte and a Norman castle.
Bremesburh,	911.	Unidentified.
Scærgate,	913.	Unidentified.
Bridgenorth,	913.	No motte, but a Norman stone keep.
Tamworth,	914.	A motte and a Norman castle.
Stafford, N. of Sowe,	914.	No motte and no Norman castle.
Eddisbury,	915.	No motte and no Norman castle.
Warwick,	915.	A motte and a Norman castle.
Cyricbyrig (Monk's Kirby),	916.	No motte and no Norman castle.
Weardbyrig,	916.	Unidentified.
Runcorn,	916.	No motte; a mediæval castle (?).

BURHS OF EDWARD THE ELDER.

Hertford, N. of Lea,	913.	No motte and no Norman castle.
Hertford, S. of Lea,	913.	A motte and a Norman castle.
Witham,	914.	No motte and no Norman castle.
Buckingham, S. of Ouse,	915.	No motte and no Norman castle
Buckingham, N. of Ouse,	915.	A motte and a Norman castle.
Bedford, S. of Ouse,	916.	No motte and no Norman castle.
Maldon,	917.	No motte and no Norman castle.
Towcester,	918.	A motte and bailey.
Wigingamere,	918.	Unidentified.
Huntingdon,	918.	A motte and a Norman castle.
Colchester,	918.	No motte, but an early Norman keep.
Cledemuthan,	918.	Unidentified.[2]
Stamford, S. of Welland,		No motte and no Norman castle.
Nottingham, N. of Trent,	919.	A motte and a Norman castle.
Thelwall,	920.	No motte and no Norman castle.
Manchester,	920.	No motte; a mediæval castle.
Nottingham, S. of Trent,	921.	No motte and no Norman castle.
Bakewell, (near to)	921.	A motte and bailey at Bakewell.

Out of this list, fourteen are ancient boroughs, that is to say more than half the names in the list, which must be reduced to twenty-seven if the

[1] See Appendix A.

[2] Possibly Cley in Norfolk. If so, this is another case where there is no motte and no Norman castle.

burhs on both sides of the river at Hertford, Buckingham, and Nottingham are counted as one. I have counted them as two in my list, because the very precise indications given in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* show that each *burh* was a separate construction. If, therefore, a *burh* was the same thing as a motte, we ought to find mottes on each side the river at Hertford, Buckingham, and Nottingham. But as a matter of fact, in all these three cases we only find mottes on that side of the river where a Norman castle was subsequently built, and they always form part of the works of these castles.

Regarding it, then, as proved that a *burh* is a wholly different thing from a motte, and that it meant generally the vallum or wall of an Anglo-Saxon town, we must now consider the evidence which exists to prove that the mottes were the work of the Normans. *A priori*, we can see that such castles would be extremely advantageous to the Normans in England, because they could be so quickly built. They were exactly the castles which were needed by an invader who was intending to settle among the people whom he was conquering. He needed not only an intrenchment which could be thrown up quickly, but he needed one which could be defended by a small force, for he had only a few men with him whom he could trust.[1] He needed also a look-out station from which his sentinels could watch the disaffected town or village which had fallen to his share. It was said of Roger de Montgomeri's castle at Shrewsbury (which was originally a motte and bailey) that not a bird could fly in the streets of Shrewsbury without being observed from it.[2]

But we are not confined to arguing that the Normans would be likely to build castles of this type; we can show by positive evidence that they did build such castles. We can point to the innumerable mottes which still exist in Normandy, some in their primitive condition of simple earthworks, having lost their wooden stockades and bretasches; others transformed into mediæval castles by the addition of walls and

[1] See article on English Castles in *Quarterly Review* for July 1894.
[2] Leland's *Itinerary*.

towers of stone.[1] And we have also direct testimony that the Normans did throw up castles of this kind in England. In that most trustworthy contemporary record of the Norman Conquest, the Bayeux Tapestry, there is a picture of William's troops, after the battle of Hastings, engaged in throwing up a motte at Hastings, and the inscription above the picture says, "He commands that they dig a castle" ("Jussit ut foderetur castellum"). And the same authority bears witness to the fact that this type of castle was the recognised type in Normandy and its borders, in the picture which it gives of the castles of Bayeux, Rennes, Dol, and Dinant. In the picture of the siege of the castle of Dinant, we see not only the motte delineated, but the wooden bretasche on the top of the motte; the assailants are endeavouring to set fire to it, while the defenders are trying to frustrate this purpose by pushing down the torches as fast as they are applied.

Now not only Normandy, but England also, bristles with castles of the motte-and-bailey type. The more obscure of them remain as simple earthworks; the greater ones have for the most part been transformed by the work of successive ages, which has covered them with walls and towers of masonry; yet there is hardly a castle whose origin is known to date from the Norman period, in which the motte-and-bailey plan cannot still be traced. Had these mottes been Saxon works, as Mr Clark supposed, England at the time of the Conquest would have been amply supplied with the means of defence. But we have the express testimony of the historian Ordericus Vitalis, who was himself born in that part of England where mottes are most abundant (the Marches of Wales), that there were hardly any castles to be found in England at the time of the Conquest.[2] The few castles which did exist were the work of the Norman favourites of Edward the Confessor, with the

[1] De Caumont mentions fifty-four mottes within a radius of 60 miles from Caen.

[2] Munitiones enim, quas castella Galli nuncupant, Anglicis provinciis paucissimae fuerant; et ob hoc Angli, licet bellicosi fuerint et audaces, ad resistendum inimicis exstiterunt debiliores. *Hist. Ecc.*, p. 184. Edition Prevost. Wace's testimony is to the same effect, but as he wrote a hundred years after the Conquest, I do not quote him as an authority. See Freeman, *N.C.*, iii. 535.

single exception of Dover Castle, which was built by Harold,[1] and perhaps Arundel, which *Domesday Book* speaks of as a *castrum* in the reign of Edward the Confessor.

The motte-and-bailey castles are scattered very thickly over England, though as no complete list has ever been made of them, it is impossible to say what their numbers are. But their distribution in Wales, Scotland, and Ireland is one of the most important links in the chain of argument for their Norman origin. In South Wales it is impossible to claim these mottes as the work of a former English proprietor; and they certainly were not the native Welsh fashion of fortification, for the Welsh were still in the tribal stage, and the *gaers* which they built were intended to accommodate large numbers of people. Harold had a great campaign in Wales, but it is plain that the only part which he retained as a conquest was the vale of Clwyd, Radnor, and that part of Monmouthshire which lies between Wye and Usk.[2] But the Normans before the end of the 11th century had conquered the whole of South Wales, and the building of castles is expressly recorded as the method by which they fixed their hold on the land.[3] The sites of these castles still remain, as well as the tradition of their Norman founders, and though it has been impossible to obtain particulars of all of them, at least 30 can be enumerated where mottes are yet to be seen. Several of these castles are mentioned as Norman castles in the *Brut y Tywysogion*. Grose expresses his surprise that the castles in the marches of Wales are so often said to have been burnt to the ground, and six months afterwards are mentioned as standing and making a defence. But this is easily explained if we suppose them to be wooden castles on earthworks, the earthworks remaining when the wooden walls and buildings were destroyed.

In Scotland, also, these mottes are to be found, and they have been

[1] William of Jumièges.

[2] See Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vol. ii.

[3] "About the Calends of July, the French came into Dyfed and Ceridigion, which they have still retained, and fortified castles, and seized upon all the land of the Britons." *Brut y Tywysogion*, 1091.

the subject of a more careful investigation than they have received in England. As Dr Christison's work on *Early Fortifications in Scotland* confines its attention to those mottes which have had no additions in masonry, and takes no notice of those which have been transformed into stone castles, it is impossible to say with absolute certainty where the motte type is most abundant in Scotland; but it would appear to be in the south-western Lowlands. A steady immigration of Normans into Scotland took place from the time of the Norman Conquest to the 13th century. These immigrants were highly favoured by the Scottish kings, and by a silent and strange revolution all the principal fiefs of the Lowlands passed into their hands. Balliol, Bruce, Soulis, Mowbray, Saintcler, Heyes, Giffard, Ramsey, Boyce, Colville, Fraser, Graeme, Gurley, all these were Norman adventurers, who became the ancestors of the nobility of Scotland. It is so difficult to find out from books alone whether a castle has been of the motte-and-bailey type, that I am unable to trace the connection between the castles of these immigrants and the mottes which still survive in Scotland, except in the case of the mote of Erroll, which was the seat of the Hays before they established themselves in Buchan.[1] The splendid work by Messrs MacGibbon and Ross on the castellated architecture of Scotland takes little notice of earthworks; and I am only able to note the following castles which appear to be on the motte-and-bailey plan: Tarbert Castle, Loch Fyne; Duffus, Elgin; Redcastle, Forfar; Dunolly, Argyle; Duchal, Renfrew; Dunure, Ayrshire (in these three last instances the motte is of natural rock). The same authors remark on the strange absence of any castles showing architecture of the 12th century; but this is easily accounted for if the Norman immigrants built the same earthen and wooden castles which their fathers had built in England. The name *mote*, which is still given to these hillocks in south-western Scotland, witnesses plainly to the race with whom these works originated. Dr Christison reckons that there are about 180 earthworks in Scotland bearing this name, a name which can only be interpreted from Norman sources, while

[1] Innes, *Scotland in the Middle Ages*, xxii.

the earthworks themselves correspond precisely to the Norman type.[1]

From Ireland we obtain evidence of the same kind. The motte-and-bailey castle is to be found in Ireland, but only in the English pale, that is, in the part of the country conquered by the Normans in the 12th century.[2] The era of stone keeps had then begun in England, but the existence of these castles in Ireland shows that where the same circumstances prevailed as at the time of William's conquest of England—need of haste and limitation of men and resources—the old type of castle was resorted to.[3] There can be no doubt that the Normans were the builders of mottes in Ireland, for in the Anglo-Norman poem on the Conquest of Ireland, edited by Michel and Wright, the erection of mottes by the Norman conquerors is mentioned more than once.[4] Richard Fleming, on receiving the Barony of Slane,

Un mot fit jeter
Pur ces ennemis grever.

And when Tirel was forced to abandon the castle he had raised at Trim, the Irish

La mot firent tut de geter,
Desque a la terre tut verser,

[1] Dr Christison states that there are many mottes which have no vestige of bailey. But it is much easier to fill up a ditch with its own vallum than to level a motte; and the farmers of the Lowlands are notoriously industrious.

[2] See Wright's *Louthiana*, where plans are given of many of these mottes. The small size of the area they enclose is remarkable; it points to the smallness of the force at the disposal of the builder. Two of them which have square baileys (Castletown and Mount Killaney) do not cover as much as an acre.

[3] Mottes with wooden *bretasches* were undoubtedly built in the 12th century in England, when circumstances compelled. Very probably Ralph Flambard's original castle at Norham was of this character, as the ground plan is certainly that of the motte and bailey, and the earthworks and general treatment of the position are what Mr Clark calls "thoroughly English"; so of course he introduces a previous Saxon occupation, though Simeon of Durham expressly states that there had been no fortress there before, to resist the incursions of the Scots. (Simeon, 1072.)

[4] Quoted by Mr Round in the article on English Castles, *Quarterly Review* for July 1894, already referred to. Mr Round remarks that the description of the levelling of the motte after burning the buildings is conclusive as to the character of the fortress.

after they had set fire to the wooden buildings which stood on it.

I have already remarked that the word *mote* is used for these fortresses in Scotland. In Ireland also, as we are informed by Dr Joyce, large high mounds are often called *mota*.[1] Wales also retains the same Norman word in at least one district. "Moat in the Englishry of Pembroke," says Fenton,[2] "is often used for castle, when there is one of the flat-headed *tumuli* with a ditch round it." The word *mota* is of course the Low Latin for *motte*, and it was in common use in early mediæval times for castles of this construction. Thus the agreement between Henry II. and Stephen speaks of the Mota of Windsor and the Mota of Oxford;[3] at both places there are mottes. And one of the Close Rolls of Henry III.'s reign orders all those who have *mottes* (motas) in the valley of Montgomery to strengthen their mottes with good *bretasches* without delay.[4]

We will now turn to the evidence which we get from the castles which are known from our early records to have been built in the reign of William I. or William Rufus. And as, in drawing an inference from a multitude of facts, there is no method so clear as that of tabulating them, a list is subjoined of all the castles which good contemporary authority states to have been built in the period indicated, that is, before the close of the 11th century.[5] The first table (p. 271) has already shown that the motte is not found on the sites of the *burhs* of Edward and Ethelfleda, except in cases where a Norman castle has been built there

[1] Quoted by Dr Christison, p. 11.

[2] *Historical Tour in Pembrokeshire*, 1811.

[3] Rymer's *Fœdera*, vol. i.

[4] "Precipimus tibi quod ex parte nostra firmiter precipias omnibus illis qui motas habent in valle de Muntgumery quod sine dilatione motas suas bonis bretaschiis firmari faciant ad securitatem et defensionem suam et partium illarum."—Rot. Claus. 9, Henry III., quoted by Clark, i. 106.

[5] William of Malmesbury and Ordericus Vitalis, whose authority I take in one or two cases, may not be strictly called contemporary, but they were both born before the end of the 11th century, and their authority is so good that they are among our best sources for the history of that period.

afterwards. The second table (p. 279) shows that the motte is almost universal in castles of early Norman foundation, and that where it does not occur there was some special reason which rendered it unnecessary. The list is not exhaustive as regards the enormous number of castles which were probably built at the epoch of the Conquest; and it might have been made much longer if it had included all the castles which are *mentioned* in Domesday, or those which traditions preserved in county histories attribute to the Conqueror or his companions. It does not even include those of which Domesday says "and there sits his castle," because these words do not directly assert that the castle was new, though they may imply it. But I take it that when Domesday says *fecit*, it means *fecit*, just as when it says *refirmavit* it means *refirmavit*. I also assume that when Domesday tells us that houses were destroyed for the site of a castle, the castle was new. The table is therefore confined to those castles which Domesday, or the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, or some of our most trustworthy chroniclers either expressly or by implication state to have been the work of William or his followers; and I think that for these the list will be found to be exhaustive. Some particulars as to the size of the area and the shape of the bailey-courts have been added, as being not without importance for a thorough grasp of this subject.[1]

We have here a list of forty-three castles built in the reign of the Conqueror, or of his son Rufus, and all but three have or had mottes. Of these three exceptions, the first, Exeter, is possibly a case of a natural motte, whose character has been altered by subsequent constructions; the second, Carlisle, appears never to have had a motte, though its present keep was not built till the 12th century; the third, the Tower of London, had a stone keep before the end of the Conqueror's reign. All these castles, without exception, when in towns, are placed, not in the middle of the town, but on the line of the walls; frequently even, and that in the case of some of the most important cities of the kingdom, *outside* the walls, which means that they were built by men who did not trust themselves

[1] See Appendix B.

LIST OF CASTLES BUILT IN THE REIGN OF WILLIAM I. OR WILLIAM II.

Castle.	Authority.	Type.	Area.	Shape of Bailey.
Aberlleinog	Brut y Tywysogion	Motte		Square
Berkeley	Domesday	Motte	About 1 acre	Roughly rectangular
Cambridge	Domesday, Ordericus	Motte		Rectangular
Canterbury	Domesday, William of Poitiers	Motte	3 acres	Triangular
Carisbrook	Domesday	Motte	1½ acres	Oblong, corners rounded
Cardiff	Brut y Tywysogion	Motte	Original ward about 4 acres	Rectangular
Carlisle	Anglo-Saxon Chronicle	Stone Keep	3 acres	Triangular
Chepstow	Domesday	Motte-and-bailey plan	3 acres	Oblong
Chester	Ordericus	Motte	Original ward 2 acres?	Rectangular?
Clifford	Domesday	Motte	2¼ acres	Roughly rectangular
Durham	Simeon of Durham	Motte		Rectangular
Exeter	Ordericus		2 acres?	Rectangular
Eye	Domesday	Motte	5 acres?	Oval
Gloucester	Domesday	Motte—destroyed		
Hastings	Bayeux Tapestry, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Chron. De Bello	Motte	3 acres	Triangular
Huntingdon	Domesday, Ordericus	Motte	6 acres	Square, corners rounded
Lincoln	Domesday, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle	Motte	6 or 7 acres	Roughly square
Montacute	Domesday	Motte of natural rock		
Montgomery	Domesday	Motte of natural rock	2 acres?	Rectangular
Newcastle	Simeon of Durham	Motte—destroyed		
Norwich	Domesday, William of Poitiers, Ordericus	Motte	Original ward about 3 acres	A half-moon
Nottingham	Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Ordericus	Motte-and-bailey plan	3 acres?	A half-moon
Oswestry	Domesday	Motte		
Oxford	Abingdon History	Motte		Octagonal
Penwortham	Domesday	Motte	3 acres?	Follows ground
Pevensey	William of Jumièges, Guy of Amiens, Ordericus	Motte	1¼ acre	Quadrangular
Rayleigh	Domesday	Motte		Oval
Rhuddlan	Domesday	Motte		
Rochester	Domesday	Motte	Original ward 2 or 3 acres	Oblong
Rockingham	Domesday	Motte	3½ acres	Rhomboidal
Shrewsbury	Domesday	Motte		
Stafford	Domesday, Ordericus	Motte		
Stamford	Domesday	Motte		
Tower of London	William of Poitiers	Stone keep	Inner ward about 3 acres	Rudely square
Wallingford	Domesday, William of Poitiers	Motte	Original ward 3 acres	Roughly oblong
Wareham	Domesday	Motte		
Warwick	Domesday, Ordericus	Motte	2¾ acres?	Oblong
Wigmore	Domesday	Motte	About 1 acre	Oval
Winchester	Liber Winton, Charter of Henry I.	Motte	6 acres including ditches and banks	Triangular
Windsor	Abingdon History	Motte		Quadrangular
Worcester	William of Malmesbury	Motte—destroyed		
York	Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Domesday	Motte	About 4 acres	A quadrant
York, Bayle Hill	"	Motte	2 acres?	Quadrangular

in the midst of the townsmen with whom they had to live. This fact alone speaks strongly against the theory of a Saxon origin for these castles. In not one single case is the keep now on the motte of early Norman date; a circumstance which certainly supports the assumption that the early Norman castles were usually of timber. There is no masonry to be found on mottes which is earlier than the reign of Henry I.

It is quite impossible that the clearance of houses in towns mentioned in *Domesday Book* as done for the site of a castle, can refer to the adding of a bailey-court to an already existing motte. To suppose that mottes existed without baileys is to misunderstand the type of fortification under consideration. The motte and bailey formed a unit, and of its two parts the bailey was the more essential, for the great man for whom the fortress was built could not do without lodgings for his followers, stables, storehouses, and all the various buildings necessary to a castle, which we must remember was a self-sufficing establishment, carrying on a number of arts and crafts besides those relating to war. The motte was chiefly necessary because the lord was obliged to keep a sharp eye on his townsfolk or villagers. I do not believe that there is a single instance of a motte erected for defence which can be proved never to have had a bailey attached to it, unless it were some advanced outpost in a frontier district. But a few such exceptions would not invalidate the general statement that a motte with its *bretasche* was in fact the keep of a castle, and was as little likely to be without a bailey as a stone keep. In fact, one of the names commonly given to the motte in old records is the *dungeon hill*, and the word dungeon or donjon (which Skeat derives from the low Latin *domnium*) means the lord's residence.

The eminent Danish antiquary, Dr Sophus Müller, in treating of some specimens of the motte-and-bailey which are found in Denmark, makes the luminous remark that these are evidently personal fortifications, built not for the shelter of a tribe or a clan, but for some one great man and his immediate following.[1] They are in fact the fortifications of feudalism, and they cannot have arisen before the age of feudalism.

[1] *Vor Oldtid*, chap. xii.

We know that the 10th century was the time at which feudalism became established in Europe, if we can fix any date as precise as a century for a change which was so gradual in its working. It was then, according to M. de Caumont,[1] that the face of the country was changed in France by the building of castles everywhere. These castles, he infers, were earthworks defended with palisades. He traces the motte to an imitation of the Roman prætorium, the tower where the Roman general lived in the midst of his castrum. Whether there was any such imitation, and not rather an invention arising out of necessity, I venture to doubt. The proper place of the Roman prætorium was in the centre of the camp, but the motte, though occasionally placed in the centre of the bailey, is far more often found on the edge of the court. I am inclined to believe that the motte-and-bailey took its origin in the early years of William the Bastard, when the Barons of Normandy were resisting his authority, and when we are told by historians that they fortified castles against him.[2] This indeed is conjecture, but what is certain is that the first actual information we get of the existence of mottes is from the Bayeux tapestry, where we find (from the pictures of Dol, Dinant, Rennes, Bayeux, and Hastings) that they were in use in the years referred to. The description of a motte which De Caumont quotes from John of Colomedia, Archdeacon of Terouenne, was written at the end of the 11th century.[3] The only motte to which M. de Caumont was able to assign an exact date was the castle of Vieux Conches, built by Roger de Toesny early in the 11th century, and abandoned about 1040.[4] We are not, therefore, without some historical

[1] *Architectures Militaires*, p. 58.

[2] *Malmesbury Gesta Regum*, 218; *Wil. Gem.*, vii. 1. "Sub ejus ineunte aetate, Normannorum plurimi aberrantes ab ejus fidelitate, plura per loca aggeres erexerunt et tutissimas sibi munitiones construxerunt." Mr Freeman remarks that the language of William of Jumièges would lead us to suppose that the practice of castle-building was new.

[3] Acta Sanctorum, 27th January. The passage is cited by De Caumont, *Abécédaire d'Archæologie*, p. 300, and from him by Clark, *Military Architecture*, i. 33.

[4] *De Caumont*, p. 303. See also dates of Ducange's quotations, article *Mota*. Vieux Conches is a nearly round enclosure, with two mottes, and no remains of masonry.

basis for the assumption that the motte-and-bailey first appeared on the continent in the 11th century.

But when did it cross the Channel into England? That, speaking generally, it came with William the Norman, can hardly be doubted. But it is very likely that under the half-Norman Edward the Confessor, some of his Norman favourites may have brought this new thing, the Norman castle, into England, and that Richard's castle, Robert's castle, and Pentecost's castle,[1] may have been earthen mottes and baileys like those of Normandy. Richard's castle, near Ludlow, built by Richard Scrob, one of these Normans, still exists, and is a fine specimen of the motte-and-bailey type; its scanty remains of masonry belong, according to Mr Clark, to a later date than the early Norman, so we may infer that it was at first a wooden castle resting on earthworks.

The point on which I wish to insist, that these castles were essentially the fortifications of feudalism, is one of special importance in the light of recent studies. The researches of Mr Round and Professor Maitland and others are tending to the conclusion that while a state of things prevailed under the Confessor which had many of the outward aspects of feudalism, the rigidity and definiteness which were the essence of feudalism did not exist in England; and that thus the statement of our older historians, that William the Conqueror introduced the feudal system into England, is not so wide of the mark as it is assumed to be by the school of Mr Freeman.[2] But if, as Mr Round supposes, William the Conqueror granted out lands in England just as Henry II. is known to have granted out lands in Ireland, to be held as fiefs by the service of a round number of knights, what is more likely than that these peculiarly feudal fortifications, the mottes and baileys which we find scattered all over England, were the castles by which these military tenants defended their new acquisitions? Not that we are to suppose that these castles

[1] *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 1052.

[2] Mr Round holds that "the military service of the Anglo-Norman tenant-in-chief was in no way derived or developed from that of the Anglo-Saxons, but was arbitrarily fixed by the king, from whom he received his fief, irrespectively both of its size and of all pre-existing arrangements." *Feudal England*, p. 261.

were erected without royal consent, when they were on the property of the tenants. The Carlovingian kings, in many capitularies, claimed the right of fortification as a royal prerogative, and forbade their nobles to erect such works;[1] and there can be little doubt that William, who had had so much experience in his youth of the way in which his nobles could use their castles against himself, would only allow of castle building as part of a general scheme of defence for the conquering settlers.[2] The chroniclers all tell us that it was by the order of William that castles were built throughout the land;[3] and that the castles in the marches of Wales were built by order of William Rufus. It was not till the anarchy of Stephen's reign that the nobles assumed to themselves the right of castle building, a right which Henry II. was careful to take away from them.

It is to the absence of a rigid feudal system in Anglo-Saxon times that we should ascribe the absence of castles, to which the chroniclers testify. The difference between Norman and English history during the reign of Edward the Confessor, amply confirms these express statements of the chroniclers. The great feature of the rebellion of the Norman barons during William's youth is that they fortified castles against him, and the struggle revolves principally around these castles. In England we never hear of the house of Godwin fortifying castles against Edward; and with

[1] Cohausen, *Befestigungen der Vorzeit*, p. 137.

[2] There are expressions in *Domesday* which suggest that the building of a castle obtained for the owner at whose cost it had been built a remission of the *geld* to which he was otherwise liable. Carisbrook; (Alwinestone) Donnus tenuit pro duabus hidis et dimidio; modo pro duabus hidis, quia castellum sedet in una virgata. *Domesday*, 52 b. Clivore (Clewer) Heraldus comes tenuit. Tunc se defendebat pro 5 hidis, modo pro 4 hidis et dimidio, et castellum de Windesores est in dimidio hida. *Ib.*, i. 626. But I only speak under correction on a subject so sacred to experts as the inner mysteries of *Domesday* finance.

[3] "Bishop Odo and William the Earl (William's regents) built castles wide throughout the nation, and distressed the poor." *A.S.C.*, 1066. "He forthwith caused castles to be built on the marches." *Ib.*, 1079. "The King, guided by the wisdom which marked all his acts of government, visited with extreme care the least fortified parts of his kingdom, had very strong castles constructed in all the positions suitable for repulsing the attacks of enemies, and set there chosen knights, giving them all sorts of provisions and good pay." *William of Jumièges*, p. 237. Guizot's Transl.

the single exception of Dover Castle, which Norman accounts state was built by Harold, the only castles mentioned are those built by Edward's Norman favourites. It is certainly remarkable that Dover Castle, the only castle which has any claim to have been built by an Anglo-Saxon, has no motte.[1]

I am, of course, assuming that the first castles of the Conquest were, for the most part, earthworks with wooden superstructures. The time and means at William's disposal seldom admitted of costly constructions in stone. The White Tower, Colchester, and Malling probably exhaust the list. But the great weakness of wooden castles was their liability to fire, and therefore at a later period stone walls were built upon the earthen curtains, and stone towers or shell keeps arose upon the mottes.[2] Some few of these keeps may have been built in the reign of William II.; but a greater number probably belong to the reign of Henry I., who is said to have repaired almost all the fortresses built by his predecessors.[3] The splendid keeps of Henry II.'s time, such as Dover, Canterbury, and Scarborough, are generally built on the natural soil, and not on mottes.

I will conclude this argument by referring to the archæological evidence bearing on the origin of mottes, a reference which must necessarily be brief, as the evidence of this kind is so scanty. The most scientific investigation of a motte that has come to my knowledge is that of General Pitt-Rivers at the earthwork known as Cæsar's camp above Folkestone. The plan of this earthwork was that of a motte with two baileys, and amongst the objects found was some green-glazed pottery, of a kind which is known to have been not earlier than Norman times. Another object found seemed to point to the 12th century.[4] The motte

[1] William of Jumièges says that Harold in his captivity promised to give William this castle, "studio atque sumptu suo communitum."

[2] I am informed by a practical engineer that so quickly does artificial soil settle down under the rains of England that in 10 years an artificial motte would be capable of sustaining the weight of a stone keep.

[3] *Will. Gemet.*, viii. 31. William further says that he kept in his own hands the castles of some of his barons, and sometimes caused them *to be surrounded with walls and furnished with towers*, as though they were his own.

[4] *Archæologia*, vol. xlvii.

at Penwortham in Lancashire, which was excavated in 1856, surpassed all others in interest, inasmuch as it contained the foundations and what we may perhaps call the cellar of the original Norman *bretasche*.[1] An iron prick spur, found in the ruins, is evidently Norman, being of exactly the same type as the one on the effigy of Geoffrey de Mandeville in the Temple Church.[2] The top of the motte had been defended by an outer wall of wattles. The *bretasche* appears to have been round, the broken stumps of uprights taking that form. A motte at Hallaton in Leicestershire, and the motte at Almondbury, near Huddersfield, have also yielded objects which point to the Norman period.

These are the only cases that I know of in which the excavation of mottes has produced any results worth mentioning. I need not say that the mere finding of Roman or Saxon coins in an excavated motte is no evidence that it was thrown up in Roman or Saxon times, for these objects may have been lying in the soil out of which the motte was dug. Ancient barrows have probably sometimes been utilised to form the nucleus of mottes, as cases are recorded in both England and France in which burials have been found in the heart of these mounds. But this very circumstance points to a late origin for the mottes, as a grave would never have been utilised for a castle except by a generation which had forgotten the use of these *tumuli*.

To sum up: There is no evidence that the Anglo-Saxons built mottes; there is strong evidence that the *burhs* they built during the Danish wars were large enclosures, generally town walls or banks; there is certain evidence that the Normans built mottes both in Normandy, England, Wales, and Ireland; the name of the motte is Norman; the type belongs to the age of feudalism, and answers precisely to the needs of the Normans during the first period of their conquests; mottes are found in connection with almost all English castles known to be of Norman

[1] *Transactions of Lancashire and Cheshire Historic Society*, vol. ix., 1856-7. Unfortunately the article is so loosely written that many important questions are unanswered.

[2] Saxon spurs were much shorter.

origin; and the evidence of excavations, scanty as it is, supports the theory that they are Norman work. If we weigh these facts carefully, we can hardly avoid the conclusion that these mottes and baileys so thickly scattered over England are the footprints of the Norman Conqueror, and an important part of the organisation by which he held England down. Alfred and his House, on the other hand, did not build little castles of wood and earth for their own personal defence: they saved England by defending, and thus developing, the English town.

APPENDIX A.

The fortification of *Worcester* is not mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, but only in the very interesting charter already referred to in the text. (Birch, *Cartularium*, ii. 222.) *Chester* is not called a *burh* in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, but is spoken of under the year 894 as "a waste chester in Wirral." *Stafford* has a motte which was once crowned by a Norman castle, but as it is on the South bank of the Sowe, it is clearly not the work of Ethelfleda. *Runcorn* at the beginning of this century had still the remains of an earthwork enclosing the headland known as the Castle Rock, but its very small area makes it improbable that it can have been the *burh* spoken of by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*; more likely it was a small castle erected by the Norman baron of Halton to protect the ferry which started from that point. Ethelfleda's *burh* would certainly have included the church, which she is traditionally said to have founded. At *Bedford* the motte which was the site of the Norman Castle is on the N. side of the Ouse, whereas Edward's burh was on the S. side. *Stamford* is a precisely similar case. *Worcester*, *Chester*, *Colchester*, and *Manchester* were, of course, Roman *castra*, which were only rebuilt by Edward or his sister; *Tamworth* also had been fortified before Ethelfleda's restoration (Florence says *urbem restauravit*), as it was the ancient seat of the Mercian Kings. At *Maldon*, *Witham* and *Eddisbury* there are still remains of the ancient earthworks which enclosed the Saxon burh; the area of which in these three cases is from 22 to 25 acres. *Eddisbury* is extremely interesting, as it is almost in its original condition, except for the building of a hunting lodge, now in ruins, in the reign of Edward III.

There are two cases in the list where the evidence for the existence of a Norman castle may not be thought conclusive: Towcester and Bakewell. I have not hitherto been able to find any evidence of the existence of a castle at Towcester except the fact that there was a lord's oven in or near the precincts of the present intrenchments, to which the citizens owed soke, as they commonly did to the ovens of castles. King John stayed in the town in 1207, and there must have been some residence fit to receive him. But Towcester is a case in which there can be no doubt whatever what the work of Edward was, as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* tells us expressly that "he wrought the burh at Towcester with a stone wall." At Bakewell we have not only the name Castle Hill,

but such names as Castle Field, Warden Field, and Court Yard testify to the existence of a castle. It was the seat of jurisdiction for the High Peak Hundred in mediæval times. The *Chronicle* says that Edward "commanded a burh to be built and manned *in the neighbourhood* of Bakewell." I am tempted to look for this burh on the top of Carlton Hill, where the first Ordnance Survey marks an intrenchment. But no intrenchment can be seen there now.

APPENDIX B.

In eleven of the cases mentioned in the list, Domesday records the clearance of houses to make room for the site of the Castle. (Cambridge, Gloucester, Huntingdon, Lincoln, Norwich, Shrewsbury, Stamford, Wallingford, Warwick, Winchester, York.) The Castles of *Clifford*, *Rockingham*, and *Wigmore* are expressly said to have been built on waste or uninhabited ground. *Wigmore* has been absurdly identified with the *burh* of Wigingamere built by Edward the Elder, but a careful study of Edward's campaigns will show what a mistake this is. At *Chepstow* and *Nottingham* it can be seen at a glance that the original castle has been on the motte-and-bailey plan, though in neither case is there an artificial motte at present. At *Montgomery* and *Montacute* the motte is of natural rock. *Hastings* is particularly interesting as the only case in which we have actual documentary evidence, in the Bayeux tapestry, that the motte was built by the Normans. *Pevensey* was a Roman castrum which the Normans utilised by putting a motte and bailey in one corner of it, just as they did at Porchester and Burgh Castle, and at the probably Saxon *burhs* of *Wareham* and *Wallingford*. At Cambridge, Carlisle, Chepstow, Durham, Hastings, Montacute-Rochester, Stafford, London, Oxford, Winchester, York, and probably at Canterbury, the Norman castle was placed outside the town. There can be no doubt that the Dane John at Canterbury was the motte of the original Norman castle, as the name Dane John can be proved to be only a corruption of Dungeon. (See Somner's *Antiquities of Canterbury*, p. 144.) And if the theory of this paper be correct, there can be equally little doubt that the Boley Hill was the motte of the original Norman castle of *Rochester*, the present castle belonging to two later periods. At *Canterbury*, *Rochester*, *Montacute*, *Wareham*, and *Winchester*, Domesday records that the site of the castles was obtained from the church by an exchange of lands, a clear proof that no castle existed there before, as we never hear of Saxon prelates thus entrenching themselves, though Norman bishops frequently did. *Stafford* is a case of peculiar difficulty, owing to the apparent evidence for the existence of two castles, one in the town, the other on the motte which still exists about a mile south-west of the town. Yet after carefully studying the arguments in the 8th volume of the Salt Archæological Society, I cannot help thinking that the existence of a castle *in the town* is due to the fancy of antiquaries of the 17th century, (1) because all the evidence adduced turns on the interpretation of the word *villa*, which appears to me to be used not of the town itself, which was properly called a *burgus*, but of its liberty or banlieu ; (2) in the long series of records concerning the castle outside the town, it is invariably called the Castle of Stafford, without any expression to distinguish it from any castle in the town. I believe, therefore, that the motte outside the town was the site of a wooden castle built by William I., and was the same of which Domesday says "Ad hoc manerium (Chebsey)

pertinet terra de Stadford in qua rex precepit fieri castellum quod modo est destructum"; and that this castle was restored by his son Henry I.

The figures given of the acreage of these castles must only be regarded as approximate; in many cases it has been impossible to find out whether the authorities were speaking of the whole area of the castle, motte, ditches, banks and bailey included, or of the bailey court alone. But the repeated recurrence of low figures shows that the original area of Norman castles was generally very small; and that when we meet with such large areas as 12 or 20 acres, we must ascribe it to the addition of other courts in later times.