

Some Social Relations of 'Castles and Fortresses'

The testimony of the documents is, then, very far from the confident declarations of what constituted a castle (more usually 'the castle') which are the opening ritual of innumerable castle-books.²³² What the less numerous 'fortification' books gain by breadth they lose by an even greater obsession with 'defence'. To contemporaries what mattered was clearly not this type of thinking at all. Of the array of technical words of modern castellology, derived mostly from the seventeenth century and later gunpowder era and celebrated in countless 'glossaries of terms', there is scant sign (see Index, 'Terminology'). Place-styles, moreover, had as much to do with rank as with structures as such. 'Fortification' was always an architectural 'manner', seldom if ever purely utilitarian.²³³ It was a major genre in what is becoming known as 'the architecture of power'. Actual medieval buildings defy arbitrary classifications invented to sustain ideological positions. Knepp (Sussex), for instance, declassified by David King ('a low platform with counter-scarp bank; some remains of masonry; always very much of a hunting-lodge, and seldom called a castle') nevertheless was a castle in fact as well as in name and had fortress-character as late as 1368. The unimpressionable compilers of the inquisition on John de Mowbray mention, 'Knappe: . . . includes a messuage *ad modum forceletti*, a park with deer . . .', etc.²³⁴ With little exaggeration, the Irish city of Waterford, a mere seven acres in extent, was described in 1375 as 'like a little castle' by burgesses hoping for royal support and commercial privileges. The image here

is of the beleaguered outpost of Englishry, 'little' by self-deprecating humility.²³⁵ The militant concept to which they appealed was universal but requires careful handling—it does not translate into modern strategy-speak. Architectural features had their own rules. When John de Sutton of Holderness was arraigned in 1352 for building a castle at Swine (Yorks., *alias* Branceholme), an occasion notable for being virtually the sole case to be found of officious or jealous interference, he not only denied that his 'houses' there, 'strengthened with tiles and mortar', were any such 'castle, crenellated and battlemented' as had been alleged, but (as though to show criteria were venal as well as subjective) forthwith and without difficulty obtained a licence to crenellate, and a pardon for good measure.²³⁶ He was denying undue social pretension while also covering himself in case of future local jealousy.

It is because a far broader and looser sense of the 'castle' operated in the medieval sphere, whether the period be early, middle, or late, that the social interactions of fortresses were so diffuse and pervasive. These elusive connotations, corrections, and resonances are explored in this chapter. It is done with no little resignation. Although as a tool of analysis, even as a hypothesis, the modern construct of 'the castle' carries with it too many false associations to continue to be useful, its dominance of the modern popular mind is not likely to change. The 'battering-rams and boiling-oil' view of the middle ages will continue to slander the period. It satisfies psychological need and will not easily be replaced.²³⁷ Scholarship has not modified the popular image of 'feudal' (of *féodal* still less, perhaps) or even of 'medieval', words both still current in virtually the Enlightenment sense of 'barbaric'.²³⁸ But conversely, the rediscovery of what castles were to medieval people is all the more important as a result. Castles are probably, with 'knights', the dominant popular impression of the period. That Tussauds, of Chamber of Horrors fame, for a time took over Warwick castle is the problem (but also the opportunity) in a nutshell. Perhaps Disney World is a sign of hope that a more authentic romanticism may become acceptable. If chivalry rather than Snow White can dethrone war, truth will benefit. Without this possibility the present task would scarcely be worth attempting. As it is, the records and the archaeology allow no option—and modern French usage is quite sympathetic.²³⁹

²³² Expanded to an assertive manifesto by D. King, *The Castle*, 1–14: castles cannot be 'corporate habitations' and must be 'seriously fortified', although many were far from grand, etc. He defends the 'military' approach against 'the contemporary fashion to dwell on the castle's peaceful functions, which is a healthy reaction against the totally military view. Nevertheless castles need to be considered in military terms . . . war is what they were meant for' (p. 5). Cf. Watson, 'Expression of Power', 59–77.

²³³ e.g. Tibbers, co. Dumfries (Cruden, *Scottish Castle*, 72, 75), despite the stresses of 1298–1302, was both 'castle' and 'house'; Selkirk, Lochmaben, and Linlithgow were alternatively 'peel', 'fortress', and 'castle': *CDScotland* ii. 257, 291, 327–8, 331–2, 340, 396, 468, 483 (1302–6). Conversely, castle features such as crenellation, moats, drawbridges, gatehouses, etc. were ubiquitous at 'manors', including large royal ones: e.g. *CLiBR* ii. 218; iii. 244–5, 248, 332, 372 (Woodstock, 1244, 1249, 1251; Kingscliffe, 1249; Havering, 1251).

²³⁴ *CIPM* xii. 385. The jurors reported this at Steyning nearby. For the castellated manor-houses at Shenley (Bucks.), Conington (Hants), Mulbarton, Brundall, and Ketteringham (Norfolk), see *CIPM* x. 385 (1359); xii. 58–9 (1365); 337–8 (1370).

²³⁵ *CPR*, 1374–77, 145; on bourgeois hyperbole see Coulson, 'Battlements and the Bourgeoisie', *passim*; *CDIreland*, i. 226–7 (1227); Bradley, *Walled Towns in Ireland*, 12–14.

²³⁶ *CPR*, 1350–54, 218; Coulson, 'Freedom to Crenellate', *passim*.

²³⁷ Popular imagery (often sadistic) is particularly clear in cartoons, e.g. Gary Larson, *The Far Side Gallery* 2, 15, 26, 34, 38, 57, 63, 65, 76, 98. Animal fat was used, e.g. to burn the props in the mine under the NE angle of Rochester keep in 1215; *R Litt Claus* i. 238b. Burning oil was dropped to destroy wooden siege-works, but not from the spyholes (conventionally *meutrières*) in gate-passage vaults, where it would harm the defenders more. For mineral oil thrown by trebuchets and mangonels see Partington, *Greek Fire*, esp. 1–43; Bradbury, *Medieval Siege*, index 'Greek Fire', etc.; Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire de l'architecture*, art. 'Siège'. Alleged use of molten lead is one of many typical projections of modern psychosis (e.g. *Sunday Telegraph*, 18 July 1999, pp. 22–3).

²³⁸ e.g. Mackrell, 'Feudalism' in *Eighteenth Century France*, 1–16, etc. Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals*, 3–13, etc.

²³⁹ The breadth of even late-medieval nomenclature is reflected throughout by Contamine, *Guerre*,

1. *Earthwork and Ashlar: Policing, Hierarchy, and Aesthetics*

The historical text particularly relied upon to support the Anglocentric view of aboriginal castles as primarily (or even exclusively) quite small ('private') works of earth and timber, is the famous clause 4 of the 1091 *Consuetudines et Justicie*.²⁴⁰ Taking their tone from ecclesiastical denunciations of castles used against the Church, historians have supposed that the dukes of Normandy, and the kings of England, restrictively licensed castle-building on a systematic basis.²⁴¹ Clause 4 seemed to justify this view, as it sets out a definition of what minimum standard constituted a fortification. Precision rarely attempted—acts of violence and illicit armed assembly were the real problem. For structures of earth and timber with few diagnostic features definition was especially difficult, but their existence was incontrovertible. Disorder in the duchy after the Conqueror's death highlighted the need to distinguish the by-no-means trivial but entirely normal fenced ditches and boundary banks of farmsteads from works so built and located as to facilitate use by armed men to disrupt the peace, by deterring all but resolute counter-measures on the part of the ruler, including the baronial authorities. It was also important to define serious intrusions upon the tenurial and jurisdictional map (before they usurped permanent status) in such a way as to set them apart from established castles sanctioned by long-user, law, and custom, most of which in Normandy also consisted of crude earth and timber. The occupants of extempore lairs could just as well usurp lordship, collect revenues, and acquire 'rights'. Those which relied not on works at all but on mere inaccessibility and on natural defensibility, needing no artifice to make them troublesome centres for armed forays, would have to be covered as well. It is these provisions which are most revealing. Clause 4 was, then, the (abortive) solution devised during a pause in their civil war by the sons of William the Conqueror, to pacify the duchy of Normandy after four turbulent years of lawlessness following their father's death.²⁴² William Rufus, king of England, and Duke Robert of Normandy, his ineffective elder brother, looked back to the harsh order of William the Bastard's later years to declare what had then been, as they alleged, the practice in a wide range of local-government matters. Fortifying was but one out of fourteen clauses (by modern paragraphing) devoted to it:

état et société, but p. 5 and n. 14 tend to interpret late wartime restrictions (1416, 1426, 1437, 1444) on public subvention for fortress-defence as universal structural criteria of what was de facto a *forteresse*. The aim was to limit aid to places best capable of protecting refugees. The *moustier fort*, some abbeys, and other forts might be militarily unsatisfactory in such extreme conditions.

²⁴⁰ Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, 282 (4); nn. 22, 130 above. Conventional view: Dunbabin, *France in the Making*, 199–201 (p. 200).

²⁴¹ e.g. Thompson, *Military Architecture*, 89–90, 102, as 'an edict of the council of Lillebonne' of 1080; redated Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, 277–8, to July 1091, 'the only year in the July of which (Robert and Rufus) were in Normandy and in friendly relations', partitioning the duchy (provisionally). Consequences of redating not assessed by Pounds, *The Medieval Castle*, 26–9. Cf. Eales, 'Royal Power and Castles', 71–3; Coulson, 'Rendability and Castellation', 59; also 'Freedom to Crenellate', 93, 101–2, and 'Castles of the Anarchy', 72–3; also 'French Matrix', 74.

²⁴² But Haskins, *Norman Institutions*, 277–81, and D. Bates, *Normandy Before 1066*, 162–6, accord the whole document general and impartial authority as a retrospective declaration of Norman laws.

Nobody in Normandy was permitted to make earth-works (*fossatum*) in the *terra plana* unless such that the dug spoil could be thrown directly up from the bottom [onto the bank] without standing on any kind of step (*scabellum*). And nobody was allowed to erect a palisade there, unless it formed a single line (*una regula*) and that without projections and parapet-walks (*sine propugnaculis et alatoris*). Nor might anyone make a stronghold (*fortitudo*) upon any promontory or island (*rupe vel insula*), or create a new castle-lordship (*castellum*) in Normandy. Nobody in Normandy was permitted to deny [use of] the fortress of his castellary (*fortitudinem castelli sui vetare*) to the lord duke of Normandy, if he desired to have it in his hand.²⁴³

The passage forms one brief section of a comprehensive statement of the 'most necessary' of the rights, once claimed in Normandy by the Conqueror, which Rufus and Robert, but not their younger brother Count Henry, sought to reassert. The last sentence refers (in standard form) to existing and lawful fortresses, distinguished as *castella*, which the duke was entitled to requisition whenever necessary under the familiar governmental power of *rendability* vested in the direct overlord throughout the provinces of France, inherited in the duchy as elsewhere from Carolingian times. *Reddibilitas* and the sanctioning of fortresses were part of early medieval civilization.²⁴⁴

Like Orderic Vitalis' excuse for the English defeat, that 'what the Gauls call castles were very few in England', the 1091 *Consuetudines* item appeared to chime so exactly with the British experience of 'Norman castles' that it was taken to be an exact specification of 'the castle'. By that simplistic reasoning the seemingly redundant prohibition of new 'castles' should have made the rest superfluous. Ella Armitage thought the document dated to 1080 (Council of Lillebonne, to whose record the manuscript became collated), giving it the authority of the Conqueror.²⁴⁵ Redated (by C. H. Haskins) to during the civil war in the duchy, and regarded, as we have done, as directed against the sort of 'very nasty fortlets' (*munitiunculas pessimas*) complained of as a symptom of disorder in England during Stephen's reign (1135–54);²⁴⁶ and seen not as a 'ban' declaring general principle but as a reassurance offered to established baronial and sub-baronial jurisdictions by whose consent any new lordship (castellar or otherwise) had normally

²⁴³ *Terra plana* may mean 'land without fortresses' (as e.g. *Layettes*, i, 105, of 1175) or simply 'plain', in distinction to the *rupis vel insula*. Here *propugnaculum* must mean a timber brattice (*bretaschia*) or projection (cf. n. 263 below); elsewhere 'outworks' when associated with *fossa* (*Recueil Charles III*, 205, of 917) but vaguer when with *turris*: Brussel, *Nouvel Examen*, i, 313–14, of 1080–96. It is vague in literary use, e.g. Chibnall, 'Orderic on Castles', 54. Castellary for *castrum/castellum* in both occurrences makes best sense here. *Fortitudo* (twice) is figurative as well as physical, but 'fortress-proper' is a usual sense, in this context.

²⁴⁴ Part II, below. Coulson, 'National Requisitioning', for overview. Haskins (*Norman Institutions*, 278) was unaware of the generality of this frequently used ducal right. Background to 1091 in Poole, *Domesday Book to Magna Carta*, 104–8; also Yver, 'Les Châteaux-forts en Normandie', 60–5. Yver implies ducal licensing of castle-building but without explicit statement or evidence (pp. 50, 53, 55, 60–1, 76, 80–1, 101, 105). He tends to deny *ex hypothesi* that franchisal *châtellenies* (and *avoueries*) could exist in Normandy (p. 76).

²⁴⁵ Armitage, *Early Norman Castles*, 377–8. She also misconceived the c.1115 *Leges Henrici Primi* allusion to *castellacio trium scanmorum* (Coulson, 'Freedom to Crenellate', 100–2).

²⁴⁶ *Gervase of Canterbury*, i, 160; Coulson, 'Castles of the Anarchy', 60 *et passim*.

to be created, the *Consuetudines* clause makes contemporary sense. Contemporary 'bans' were not prohibitions as such but were intended to submit major new castles to local consent. Such documents used terms such as *turris* (stone or timber 'donjons' enmotted or free-standing) as well as the cover-all *castrum/castellum*.²⁴⁷ In the *Consuetudines*, *castellum* is used distinctively of 'proper castles', naturally as an afterthought. Notably this receives less prominence than is given to the more important principle which is recalled of the rendering of established forts. The structural prescription in Clause 4 permitted low ring-works. It defined neither what a 'castle' was (post-Conquest castles in Britain fell below as well as above these criteria) nor some cut-off point of official interest, but attempted simply to strike at the visible symptoms of lawlessness, namely the upstart occupation of natural fastnesses and erecting irregular field-works. The 'incastellation' of churches, often mentioned by chroniclers such as Orderic,²⁴⁸ may have been regarded as covered but was probably left out deliberately, so as not to intrude upon episcopal jurisdiction. Clearing up the debris of discord was (as we shall see) a normal feature of pacifications (ineffective in 1091). The vagueness of *castrum/castellum* created difficulties.

Writing of the 'small, circular enclosures' of Normandy, Michel de Bouïard typically considered that they came below the 'one-throw-of-earth-from-ditch-to-bank' rule, restricting profiles to a height of 10 feet or less. 'Such excavations', he deduced, 'were not considered to be military', but were classed with those surrounding most *maisons rurales*, to protect them against *les animaux carnassiers et les rôdeurs*.²⁴⁹ Wolves and robbers may not have been so finely discriminating. Much depended on the unspecified height and character of the palisade, and much more always depended on manning. The weakest link in the argument that 'military' works were structurally distinct is the vast grey area disclosed by archaeology.²⁵⁰ Small castles were 'knightly' (just as the *burh* was thegnly in pre-Conquest England), and still smaller establishments belonged to a lower class: but all were in various ways demonstrative, their character depending upon the size of the labour force which could be coerced to build them—and so on the rank and means of their possessor.²⁵¹ Manorial curtilages acting as property boundaries, as fences protecting man and

²⁴⁷ e.g. *Recueil Philippe I*, 315–17 (1092), regarding a (stone) *turris* (destroyed by mining) and *munitiones* which had encroached on Compiègne abbey (*dép.* Oise). Philip put under ban (i.e. created a licensing franchise, as the gloss confirms) any intrusive *turrim aut munitionem sive domum defensabilem*. In 1080–96 the count of Blois, to protect his lordship, forbade any *turris vel propugnacula* (perhaps 'battlements') at the bishop's palace, Brussel, *Nouvel Examen*, I, 313–14. See Coulson, 'Seigniorial Fortresses', App. C. 'Regional and Particular Bans on Fortification in France'.

²⁴⁸ Chibnall, 'Orderic Vitalis on Castles', 48, 52–3, *et passim* on warfare in Normandy c.1087–1108, 1138–42.

²⁴⁹ de Bouïard, 'Les Petites enceintes circulaires', 21–35; conventional treatment of the *Consuetudines et Justicie*, 32; map-diagram of 27 sites of enclosures of internal diameter of 65–163 feet.

²⁵⁰ e.g. Brown, *English Castles*, 48–9: arguing from the truism that 'there is a difference between one's garden fence and the walls of Caernarvon castle', betrays the underlying absurdity of this position (Eales, 'Royal Power and Castles', 52–3).

²⁵¹ As in pre-Conquest England, Williams, 'A Bell-House and a Burh-Geat', 225. A social-rank explanation proposed also (Normandy) by Fixot, 'Les Fortifications de terre'. On Poitevin castellaries

beast from wolves and casual human marauders, were everywhere. The demarcation of territory (parks especially) was often by substantial earthen banks, akin to early linear 'dykes', hedged or palisaded along the top. Even when elementary defences to gentry-seats and farmsteads could be dispensed with, still the symbolic separateness of ditch, bank, and moat, setting apart the manor and dependent buildings from the great open fields, was retained. Numerous manorial 'extents' (descriptive valuations) and dower and co-heiress partitions show that the manor-place, or (more grandly) the 'capital messuage', consisted of the 'houses within the moat', severed in dignity from the *basse cour*, often a mere farmyard.²⁵² Irreducibly, virtually all were farm-houses, grand or small. In France especially, inner and outer courts might be adorned by turrets, seigniorial dovecote, gatehouse, and show of castellation; but these features were just richer versions of the primitive *gentilhomme*.²⁵³ Their overt militancy might vary with period, rank, and place but their symbolism did not. In the more sophisticated thirteenth century, as late as 1268 in the county of Nevers in north-central France, any palisaded earthwork was still regarded as legally constituting a fortification.²⁵⁴ And in Normandy, possession of a *mota* similarly conferred rights on its lord to the labour services of his peasantry for the repair of a type of fortress and noble seat never socially outmoded.²⁵⁵ Although the opportunities for expressive architecture were greatly enlarged by building in masonry, they were once equally exploited especially by the timber *donjons* of the eleventh and earlier twelfth century. One such 'tower-house' (*domus lignea turris*) at La Cour-Marigny (*dép.* Loiret), built by Aubry, a leading noble *castri Castellionis* (i.e. of the resort of Châtillon-sur-Loing), had an upper-floor dwelling and dormitory floored with wood-blocks, and a cellar below for storage of provisions.²⁵⁶

see Hajdu, 'Castles, Castellans in Poitou'; socio-military as well as political, the analysis is backed by detailed appendices. The psychological-symbolic also matters, e.g. Samson, 'Knowledge, Constraint and Power'.

²⁵² n. 129 above. Major English examples of the very numerous but underrated castles of 'manorial type' are Bampton (licensed 1315, Oxon.) of Aymer de Valence, Coulson, 'Specimens of Freedom', 8–9, and Somerton (licensed 1281, Lincs.) of Anthony Bek.

²⁵³ e.g. Binney, 'Château d'Olhain', 174–8; a late and refined example. Others, preserved by rural conservatism, are Cherveux, Toury, Pontivy, La Brède: Énaud, *Les Châteaux-forts*, 30, 59, 86, 100. Coulson, 'Castellation in Champagne', 349–56.

²⁵⁴ *Les Olim*, I, 719–20. By virtue of having an ancient 'palacium a giant, quod est fortalitium secundum usum et consuetudines patrie', the prior of La Charité-sur-Loire (*dép.* Nièvre) was upheld by the parlement in the right to fortify anew at Aubigny-sur-Loire in the same lordship; inaccurately calendared in *Actes du Parlement*, ser. I, I, 113. Du Cange, *Glossarium*, under *glandis*. *Les Plessis* names and those with *Mote* are diagnostic: Laurent, *L'Atlas des châteaux-forts* is selective.

²⁵⁵ *Jugements de l'Échiquier*, Delisle (ed.), 256 (1210), xx, ii, 238–432: viz. 'judicatum est quod homines Rogeri Caperon, qui manent in feodo suo lorice, debent reparare motam suam apud Bonam Villetam.' Conversely, his hauberk-fief status obliged them to make him a *mota* if he lacked one (*et facere de novo nisi aliqua esset, or si aliqua ibi non esset*). Other similar verdicts, *ibid.* 324 (1223), 392 (1240); on water-mill rights, *ibid.* 283–4. As late as 1469, a *Belle Mote* near Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire (*dép.* Loiret) justified licence by Louis XI to re-fortify, granted to Baudes Meurin, his secretary: *Ordonnances*, xvii, 219 (quoted Part III, Ch. 1, sec. 4 below).

²⁵⁶ Brown, *English Castles*, 36, Armitage, *Early Norman Castles*, 89–90, translate *in extenso* Lambert of Ardres's description of c.1117 of Arnold of Ardres's timber tower-house; summarized Thompson, *Military Architecture*, p.256; text, Mortet, *Recueil*, I, 181–2 ('c.1060'). Lambert of Ardres, 160–1. Other valuable passages on building are pp. 59, 74, 106–7, 111–12, 115–16, 117, 142.

For dignity and authority as well as durability, stonework was of course supreme.²⁵⁷ In prosperous parts of France great patrons enjoyed it very early on. In the south, on the Mediterranean, the eleventh-century bishops of Maguelone (dép. Hérault) 'caused their cathedral and precinct to be grandly (*solemniter*) adorned with towers, walls and all necessary offices and other fortifications (*fort-alitia*)'.²⁵⁸ Similarly the works of Hugh de Noyers, bishop of Auxerre (1183–1206) in north-central France, are celebrated with relish, particularly their eloquent fortifications, which always proclaimed lordship, ancient authority, and temporal power.²⁵⁹ Bishop Hugh's buildings were the noble castle of Varzy (dép. Nièvre), his palace at Sainte-Eugénie with 'solid walls, towers and outworks' (*propugnaculis*), whose inner keep (*presidium*) boasted 'towers, fortifications and advanced defences of impregnable strength', surrounded by wide, spring-filled ditches.²⁶⁰ These moats were not only 'no small augmentation of the fortifications', but, 'by reason of the multitude of fish they provided, by the mills the bishop built there, and other profitable assets, they greatly improved the entire establishment (*totique municipio*)'. This aesthetic of embattled comfort, a taste beloved by an aristocracy glorying in its own splendour, was not so much 'military' or 'religious' as seignorial, emblematic, and hierarchical.²⁶¹ We need a new or recalibrated vocabulary to grasp it. Architecturally its style could not be more different from the 'civilian' Roman, early Carolingian, or, for that matter, from the early modern classical revival mansion—and yet the evocative spirit was much the same. Architectural nobility took its militant form directly from the warlike manner of life of noble patrons²⁶²—just as did the ostentatiously pacific 'Palladian' classical style from its different ethos. Power of old had tended to assume a façade of architectural bellicosity, overt or restrained as taste dictated. Bishop Hugh of Auxerre built only palaces (*domus episcopales*) at his seats (*domus*) of Toucy and Cosne (both *castra episcopalia*), but at 'his patrimonial noble castle of Noyers' (dép.

²⁵⁷ Admired in England, even in Northumbria, since the time of Bede (d. 735) as 'in the Roman manner', Clapham, *English Romanesque Architecture*, i. 41, 60. Only in 15th-century England did brick become more fashionable: Thompson, *Decline of the Castle*, ch. 5 ('A Martial Face'). Prestwich, 'Castle-Building', 28–61.

²⁵⁸ Mortet, *Recueil*, i. 87–91 (p. 90), paid for out of pious donations; text dated '1030–1063/90'.

²⁵⁹ Mortet, *Recueil*, i. 96–101. Ailred (1110–66), abbot of Rievaulx (Yorks.), significantly allegorized the elements of keep, ditch, and wall, typical of contemporary castles, in a sermon on the Assumption of the Virgin; quoted Thompson, *Rise of the Castle*, 181. Müller, *Bishop's Palace*.

²⁶⁰ On the standard literary formulae see van Emden, 'The Castle in French Literature', esp. 4–5; on *chastel* for 'small town' (p. 2); literary 'impregnability', tunnels, food reserves (pp. 6–7, 20–2); siege allusions (pp. 8–11); references to large exterior windows (p. 12); postern gates 'treachery' stories (pp. 14–20). These are the important genre context.

²⁶¹ Gerald of Wales's description (later-12th-cent.) of his family's castle of Manorbier (Pembs.) and Iolo Goch's eulogy (14th. cent.) of Criccieth (Caerns.) are notable Welsh examples: quoted Brown, *English Castles*, 201, 203; Johns, *Criccieth Castle* guide, 4, 35, n. 1; Part II, n. 139 below.

²⁶² e.g. the *nobilitas* 'without defect' of rebuilt Dover castle which Henry III in 1247 instructed to be 'shown off' to the count of Saint-Pol. Even 'undefended' houses had turrets, or at least crenellated screen-parapets, seldom (unless low-class 'vernacular') no castellated element whatever: Wood, *English Medieval House*, chs. 11, 12, *et passim*; Thompson, *Decline of the Castle*, ch. 4; Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire de l'architecture*, arts. 'Maison', 'Palais', 'Crénau', etc.; for Brittany and north-west France see nn. 21 (Introduction), 126 above.

Yonne) he spared no effort to improve the *munitio municipii*, be it on walling the lower *burgus*,²⁶³ or on ditching the already 'impregnably sited' *castrum* and adding higher and thicker walls around the hilltop keep (*presidium* and *turris*). His precautions nominally against missile 'engines',²⁶⁴ and to ensure that 'enemies be shut off from the keep by multiple obstacles and barriers', indicate (as very commonly) an inventive ingenuity, suggested perhaps (if the eulogy is not fanciful) by Frontinus' *Strategemata* or Vegetius' *De re militari*. Such learning (and its display) was as fashionable as skill in warfare or practical poliorcetics.²⁶⁵ The one merged constantly into the other. For everyday living at Noyers, Bishop Hugh had built outside the verge (*septa*) of the chief keep (*presidii principalis*) a *palatium magne nobilitatis*, 'which to it was no slight fortification' (*sic*). He lived magnificently as his rank required, ingeniously constructing several 'underground tunnels from the wine cellar beneath the chief keep into the lower palace' for their secret provisioning, together with a piped water-supply and also piped wine, both facilities meant, we are told, 'for defence in the greatest security'.²⁶⁶ This revelling in defensive parade is very characteristic. Guard-chambers stocked with weapons and lodgings for knights were also provided, not in constant expectation of attack but to ensure that the bishop was nobly attended, and that only those people the lord wished to see could reach him. The regulation of access to the lord's presence transcends period and is a constant feature of 'domestic' planning. Places of common and public resort, such as the Baptistery, were outside the upper enclosure. All these works, we are assured by the panegyrist, were much admired and served both the 'utility' of the Church and 'the needs of the poor'. Aristocratic ethos, not only to modern eyes, frequently clashed with ideals of Apostolic poverty.²⁶⁷

²⁶³ '[Projecting] from its wall [-top] he fixed robust *propugnacula*' (i.e. hours: Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire de l'architecture*, art. 'Hourd') 'made from very solid timbers'; Mortet, *Recueil*, i. 109–11 (p. 99 quoted).

²⁶⁴ The *situm machinis erigendis accommodum . . . in cacumine montis* he countered by thickening and raising the new existing wall, building another within *in capite ejus turrim*, with deeper exterior ditches with *artemuralia* (counterscarp fencing), and by constructing 'from immense beams' a covering to ward off 'whatever missiles the enemy might hurl down with engines' (*tormenta jaculatoria*): see Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire de l'architecture*, art. 'Engin'. For modern trials see Payne-Gallwey, *The Crossbow*, pt. 4. D. King, 'The Trébuchet', 457–70.

²⁶⁵ e.g. consulted (allegedly) by Geoffrey of Anjou (1149/51) before assaulting Montreuil Bellay castle; Mortet, *Recueil*, i. 96–8, nn. 7, 3, 1; ii. 80–3. Numerous editions and MSS show the fashion for Vegetius. Alexander Neckham (1157–1217), while condemning architectural quasi-military extravagance, offered detailed advice on how to build and besiege: Mortet *Recueil*, ii. 179–82. Saphet, in Syria, as rebuilt by the Templars (1240–60), was magnificent as well as strong, with fertile environs 'blessed by God with the fat of the land', with 12 mills, etc.: *ibid.* 261–4 (detailed).

²⁶⁶ Mackenzie, *Castles of England*, retails many anecdotes of 'secret' tunnels. This troglodytic fascination deserves extended treatment. Lord Hastings's upgraded Ashby (Leics., 1462–80) had a tunnel 50 feet long, linking the Lord's Tower to the kitchen: Jones, *Ashby de la Zouche Castle* guide, end-plan.

²⁶⁷ e.g. Dixon, 'Control of Access to the Lord', 47–57. Mortet, *Recueil*, i. 100–1. Peter the Cantor (1187–97) inveighed against lofty, turretted palaces, with *propugnacula*, as due to 'lust for building . . . out of the tears and plundering of the poor . . . granges castellated as an eternal witness of avarice', etc.; invective in the style of St Bernard (cf. the deterministic militarism of Berman, 'Fortified Monastic Granges'). Ostentation was the target e.g. of Hugh de Fouilloi, c.1153, condemning those who 'convert to other lordship monasteries which are, as it were, the castles of God' (*quasi castra Domini*): Mortet, *Recueil*, ii. 91–4.

Such typical adulatory descriptions reveal fortifications in a truer light. Facile modern distinctions between 'functional' and 'decorative', 'serious fortification' and 'sham', and so on, serve only the demarcations of modern specialisms. 'Weak' castellation still conspicuously affirmed noble status; and thoroughly defensible buildings did so too, the reality of their strength and cost showing their lord's power and wealth, in addition to deterring any physical confrontation. French ecclesiastical precincts, as in England (but often more grandly), were walled, ditched, and towered as befitted their dignity and renown.²⁶⁸ The intrusions of other lords, lay nobles particularly, were polemically denounced: such as 'the most nefarious tower', built near the priory of Celle-en-Brie (*dép.* Seine-et-Marne) which the mother-house of Marmoutier (near Tours) first bought out and then 'caused to be destroyed, the whole thing, in wood and in stone'.²⁶⁹ From clerical invective against such intrusions castles have derived most of their bad publicity and sinister reputation.²⁷⁰ Occasionally, in a severe prophetic spirit, ecclesiastics might denounce the extravagances of castle-building, as by Alexander Neckam of St Albans deploring 'man's vain ostentation in superfluous architectural ornament'. In his late-twelfth-century treatise *De naturis rerum* he inveighs (in an age of many English stone towers to both churches and castles) against 'towers erected to threaten the stars, overtopping the peaks of Parnassus, but to no use'.²⁷¹ No explicit defence was offered to such accusations—but surviving buildings and pictures are very eloquent. One text, less puritan and more typical, is the rhapsody on a tower once by the sea near the major port-town of La Rochelle (*dép.* Charente-Maritime). It was written not later than 1130 by Richard de Poitiers:

And to thee, O maritime tower, built strongly upwards with projections (*propugnaculis*), the sons of the stranger will come; but covered with shame and ignominy one and all, they shall flee to their own land! You shall have no fear of their threats (*minas*) but shall boldly

²⁶⁸ Andres abbey, by Boulogne, c.1164, had its churchyard (*cimiterium*) walled in stone; but the main sanction against encroachment was the abbatial anathema. Saint-Hubert-d'Ardenne abbey (Luxembourg) received an enclosure 'in honour of the church of St Giles' (c.1065–70), comprising 'a stone wall and crown (*corona*) of eight towers'; Mortet, *Recueil*, i. 191–3, 387–94 (p. 389). Also Coulson, 'Hierarchism in Conventual Crenellation', on 58 English religious houses with licences to crenellate and their context.

²⁶⁹ Mortet, *Recueil*, i. 324–6 (1177–87), after recital of the 'improvement' (1104–24) of Marmoutier itself (*dép.* Indre-et-Loire) and its 'munitioning with walls round about'. The common label 'fortified church' is misleading.

²⁷⁰ Coulson, 'Freedom to Crenellate', 86–90, 98–9, 110 on castle-phobia; also 'Fortress-Policy', 16–20, 'Castles of the Anarchy', 75–8, 88, 90–2, and 'French Matrix', 66, 69, 72, 75–6, 81, 85–6, on doctrine and details. Peace of God and related decretals often pilloried castle-building, incastellation of churches, and activities based upon *castra/castella*, e.g. Mortet, *Recueil*, i. 113–15 (1041), 115–16 (c.1065), 116–17 (1042/3), 152–3 (1054), 250–1 (1080), 364 (1123).

²⁷¹ nn. 265, 267 above; cf. Girouard, *Victorian Country House*, 157–8, uncharacteristically astray on Peckforton (Cheshire, 1844–50): 'Salvin realized that genuine castles were intended primarily for use, not effect . . . no higher than . . . defence made necessary . . . long, low, sober and businesslike'; contrast e.g. Meiss, *Painting in the Time of Jean de Berry*, pl. 16, 18, 19, 171, 183, 185–8, 194, 197, 419–25, etc.

hold up your countenance to the North. Stand on your guard-duty and take your stance upon your fortification (*munitionem*) summoning, if need be, your allies coadjutory (*conlaterales*) to come to your aid with their forces! ²⁷²

A canon of Châlons (*dép.* Marne), Gui de Bazoches, allowed himself a more personal pleasure: pride in having a castle in the family (structurally obsolescent though it was) and noble *Champenois* connections belonging. He lovingly refers (c.1172) to his dynastic stronghold as 'rising, girded with ramparts set with timber towers, hanging on the smoothly swelling hill tending towards the South, at whose foot, clothed with verdure and woods on both sides, flows the River Aube'.²⁷³ It is an idyllic picture long anticipating the landscape art of Claude Le Lorrain (1600–82). Gerald of Wales's Manorbier castle (Pemb.), in his almost caressing late-twelfth-century description, is bathed in the same calm and peaceful light.

Lambert of Ardres's account (1181) of the round stone *domus* built by Count Baldwin II of Guines at his comital seat near Boulogne (*dép.* Pas-de-Calais) shows a more technical and less scenic appreciation; but one still emphatically aesthetic.²⁷⁴ Upon the motte (*dunjo*), in superior 'squared' stone (i.e. ashlar, not rubble), 'he built and suspended it high in the atmosphere' (*aere*). Lambert makes its flat timber leaded roof with 'pinnacles' and superb view sound a wonder of delight. It was a Daedalus' maze within of passages and chambers, 'with a chapel like Solomon's' (i.e. circular) at the entry, and around the building (*oppidum*) a *firmitas* of a stone wall. The gateways Baldwin 'strengthened and decorated' with 'warlike towers and devices' (*machinamentis*). Elsewhere, at Tournehem, Baldwin possessed an old *turris*, also filled with 'labyrinthine' apartments, whose 'rough workmanship' he had improved conformably to late-twelfth-century taste. Having noted that the (ground-floor) entry-passage was defended by a portcullis (*cataractas*), Lambert, less soberly, then plunges into a lurid story of 'terrible prisons for keeping (and to speak more truly, for despoiling) wretched beings, in the bowels of the earth, dragging out a terrified existence . . . [eating] the bread of affliction'. Nineteenth-century novelists (and historians) took great note: such purple passages are the part of the genre of particularly clerical invective whose understanding presents considerable difficulties.²⁷⁵ To insist that imprisonment

²⁷² Mortet, *Recueil*, i. 387. In similar vein, as late as 1603–10, is *Macbeth*'s 'Our castle's strength will laugh a siege to scorn' (V. v); cf. Duncan's and Banquo's contrasting praise of Dunsinane, also typical (I. vi). Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire de l'architecture*, art. 'Pinnacle'.

²⁷³ Mortet, *Recueil*, i. 126–7; 'topographically accurate' on Rumigny (*dép.* Ardennes, *arr.* Rocroi), which belonged to Gui's uncle (c.1172), archdeacon of Laon. See Coulson, 'Castellation in Champagne', for tenorial context. Styled *castellum/castrum* in 1204/5, when 'jurable and rendable'; but only 'liege for the castle and appurtenances of the new fief', in c.1200/1 (Coulson, 'Seignorial Fortresses', App. A, 3a, b, c). Cf. Manorbier, Part II, n. 139 and text.

²⁷⁴ Arts Council Catalogue, *The Art of Claude Lorrain*, pls. 4, 5, 7, 10, 14, 20, 21, 29, 32, 36. Mortet, *Recueil*, ii. 141–4. Jean de Colmieu's famous description of Merckem motte, Flanders, equivocally styled *munitio quedam quam castrum vel municipium dicere possumus* (also *arx*, and *villa*), views it as an example of a local aristocratic style (*ante* 1130): Mortet, *Recueil*, i. 312–14; *Lambert of Ardres*, 111, 112.

²⁷⁵ Preface, n. 11 and n. 270 above. The Peterborough E manuscript of the *Anglo Saxon Chronicle* for 1137, 'but written in the 1150s', probably an elaboration of William of Malmesbury's diatribe against

was not a normal medieval punishment (unlike execution or even mutilation), but only detention preparatory to trial, and that individuals incarcerated in the long term were generally of higher rank, kept for ransom or to avoid political problems (like Robert of Normandy, 1105–34), who were expected to be treated honourably, can do little to deflect the craving (medieval as well as modern) for atrocity. Yet cells for keeping prisoners pending trial (and in episcopal castles to impose clerical discipline) were common and necessary in castles as an aspect of their normal role as court-houses. By English eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century standards (to look no further), surviving ground-floor (seldom basement) chambers, with outward-opening, heavily barred doors, ventilation and light apertures (exteriorly mere slits, as for storerooms and cellars), provided not uncommonly with latrines, were relatively humane. The *oubliettes*, as a means of slow execution, expected by readers of Mrs Radcliffe, Byron, Dickens, and Edgar Allan Poe, among modern horror-romantics, and ineradicably embedded in popular mythology, are very hard to find; but popular dungeon-mentality still continues to dominate the presentation of monuments.²⁷⁶ 'Market forces' make history conform to public prejudice even on clearer issues than this. Not wholly false but basically morbid, even sadistic, in motivation, the whole 'dungeon'-fixation has its place (however marginal) in authentic contemporary perception, as Lambert of Ardres on Tournehem demonstrates. But the tower-complex he goes on to describe was also apparently a sports-centre and fish-farm.

Returning to the open air, Lambert mentions some compounds outside the 'tower' of Tournehem for boxing matches and athletics, mentioning Baldwin's *propugnacula* (here 'outworks') and 'very strong ditches', and his walling of the adjacent town. Lambert then expatiates on that frequent and lucrative accompaniment of mansions, a large fish-pond made by damming the river 'full of great fishes'. Moats offer a revealing insight into the ambivalence of 'fortification': fish-farming and scenic quality chiefly motivated what incidentally looked 'strong' and might be defensive in the event of attack, especially by mine tunnels. Conveying power allied with comfort was the focus uniting this ambivalent double-purpose. Many motives coalesced in castle-building, and moats more obviously than other elements in castellated architecture combined them.²⁷⁷ They establish a link, moreover, with 'water-features' as an element in the later

Bishop Roger's motte castle put into Malmesbury abbey precincts, E. King, Introduction, *Anarchy of King Stephen*, 1 (abbreviated translation). But see *William of Malmesbury: Historia Novella*, King (ed.), p. xcvi. For overview see R. Pugh, *Imprisonment in Medieval England*.

²⁷⁶ e.g. Pounds, *The Medieval Castle*, 99–100, 202; Toy, *Castles*, 254, mentions prisons at Skenfrith, Conway, Warwick, Warkworth, Dalhousie, and Crichton. Episcopal Llawhaden had a 'considerable permanent prison' (King, *The Castle*, 5) partly for clergy discipline. Pevensey, *caput* of its rape, had 'basement' (not subterranean) cells in the gatehouse. Bellamy, *Crime and Public Order*, 162–98. Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire de l'architecture*, arts. 'Oubliettes', 'Prison'. Brown, 'English Castles, 1154–1216', 238–43, and n. 6 above.

²⁷⁷ Coulson, 'Some Analysis of Bodiam', 55, fig. 2, 83–9, 103. Summary note, Leslie, 'English Landscape Garden', 3–15. Recognized as an enduring type in Germany, e.g. Mummenhof, *Wasserburgen in Westfalen*; Wildeman, *Rheinische Wasserburgen*. C. Taylor, 'Medieval Ornamental Landscapes', 38–55, assembles known English cases at castles (including Caerfilly, p. 53).

landscape-architecture of the country-house. Bodiam castle (Sussex: 1385–92) and many earlier mansions are now recognized as having had them. When (which is seldom) moats are deep and defensibly dammed, their 'strength' is more than visual (e.g. Kenilworth, War.; Caerfilly, Glam.), adding a military dimension to the economic and scenic qualities of lakes (e.g. Leeds, Kent, with corn-mill) and of demarcating water-filled ditches, of fish-stews and preserves. These, like attached parks, church, town, dovecot, and the rest were, above all, attributes of aristocracy.²⁷⁸ In the 'Deeds of the Bishops of Auxerre' (prelates badly infected with what Peter the Cantor called 'building mania') we are told that Bishop William (1207–20), lacking 'only a sufficient residence' at Meung-sur-Loire (*dép. Loiret*), built there 'an episcopal castle of great nobility, a palace with towers and *propugnacula*' (here 'pinnacles?'). Two bridges across the Loire and the rebuilding of his cathedral were no less works of self-advertisement combined with piety of the sort praised by contemporaries less censorious than St Bernard of Clairvaux.²⁷⁹ Bishop Gui, who enjoyed another facilitatingly long 'pontificate' (1247–69), was able to embellish the palace hall at Auxerre with 'crystal-clear glass windows', a two-storey chapel, and a more prosaic 'double chamber' (latrine block) serving both storeys of the hall, adorned with visually pleasing 'turrets'. Where the palace had previously been open and unenclosed, by the riverside of the Yonne, Gui built 'new and strong walls, with a gateway and battlements (*propugnaculis*) of costly workmanship most beautiful to behold'.²⁸⁰

Flatulent literary texts of this kind and self-indulgent building are not peculiarly ecclesiastical.²⁸¹ Lay nobles acquired equally refined tastes. It may be difficult to see relatively crude earthworks in this same cultural light (masonry ruins are also often deceptively crude and brutal), but elaborate towers crowning mottes, turrets (*bretasches*) to the crenellated palisading, and much ornamental carpentry, presented originally a far less sombre and utilitarian appearance. By reinstating in the mind's eye the whole vanished timber component, which excavation has

²⁷⁸ Salvaing, *De l'Usage des Fiefs*, ch. 63, 'Des Etangs': frontier Dauphiné law had few restrictions, unlike Anjou and Touraine. Fresh fish was needed for the late-medieval 146 'jours maigres' a year and for noble consumption: Dyer, 'Consumption of Freshwater Fish'. On noble dovecots, Salvaing, ch. 43; Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire de l'architecture*, art. 'Colombier'; Pounds, *The Medieval Castle*, 105–6, appreciates the domesticity but denies the castle quality of 'moated sites' (n. 129 above).

²⁷⁹ n. 267 above: *libido aedificandi* and *morbus aedificandi*: Mortet, *Recueil*, ii. 202–9. The early Cistercian statutes forbade even stone bell-towers (1157), rules against *nimis grandia et sumptuosa aedificia* being renewed in 1240. But 'strong and secure prisons' were ordered (1229) both for discipline and exercise of jurisdictional franchises: *Thesaurus Novus*, iv. cols. 1350–1 (3); 1246–51 (16); 1371–4 (3, 4). The violent resistance in 1212 to the abbot of Cluny by the monks of La Charité-sur-Loire, with complicity of the count of Nevers, shows the potential of such towered precincts: *Recueil Cluny*, vi. 5–9.

²⁸⁰ Mortet, *Recueil*, ii. 206; 'camera dupplicis . . . cum jucunde visionis turricula decenti situatas' [sic]. The earlier *turris* ('great-tower or 'keep' begins to be differentiated by *turriculum* (mural) tower, or turret. By this date *propugnaculum* may be more confidently translated 'battlements'.

²⁸¹ e.g. Count William of Nevers's celebration of his sumptuous refounding of St Stephen's abbey (*dép. Nièvre*) with 'a high and strong' *muri clausura*, three 'beautiful and conspicuous towers', etc., and corresponding endowment with lordly powers, in 1097: *Recueil Cluny*, v. 67–74. Ecclesiastical documents have naturally survived best.

facilitated at Hen Domen, by Montgomery (Salop), the artistic-defensive detail as well as the gigantism still visible of great English mottes (e.g. Thetford, and Haughley, Suffolk), of towers, and of bailey enclosures, at the greatest magnatial (and royal) castles, can be properly evaluated. Close parallels are provided by the cathedrals and great churches. To do so it is necessary to revise perceptions of 'early castles' in the light of the still-evident artistic sophistication of the twelfth-century castle-palaces such as Old Sarum, Farnham, Newark, and Winchester (Wolvesey). Surviving ornate early 'keeps' correctively help, notably the White Tower, London; Colchester and Hedingham, Essex; Castle Rising and Norwich, Norfolk; Canterbury and Rochester, Kent, by showing what rich and ambitious patrons could achieve when time and money were plentiful. These stupendous residences show the same aesthetic of powerful grandeur as later ones. Very tellingly, they and others were very evidently meant to be imposing, not to be defended. Extended, gently rising, processional ramped entrances with bypass access for menial attendants, large windows, complete absence of defensive bow-loops (all still true of Dover 'keep', 1176-89), and many other features show that oppressive but peaceable power was their message to an abject population. Making people labour on castle-works (anciently *burh-bot*), especially in the towns, rubbed in the new rulers' power as well as displaying their enormous ambition.²⁸²

2. Architectural Eulogy and Noble Ambition

The works celebrated among the 'Deeds of the Bishops of Auxerre' echo the spirit and tone of English architecture and panegyric even during the 'anarchy' of Stephen's reign. How castles were regarded by Bishop Roger of Salisbury (1102-39) and his clan coincided with the view of the biographer of Bishop Hugh (1183-1206), or of Bishop Gui.²⁸³ Prelates as magnates revelled in ostentatious power. Scientifically up-to-date, artistically, technologically, and also militarily vying with their peers, abbots, priors, bishops, and lay patrons built ever-higher ceiling vaults, loftier towers, and ever-larger traceried windows in the great churches and palaces with great halls, kitchens, and noble suites of apartments. The drive for 'more height, more light' in churches was relatively simple, visible, and uncomplicated: not so the various types of castellated building which expressed the more plainly materialistic realities of power and wealth. Whether

²⁸² References etc. in Coulson, 'Peaceable Power'; Kenyon, *Medieval Fortifications*, analyses recent British excavations (with bibliography); also Higham, Barker, *Timber Castles*, e.g. 144-6 for Iolo Goch's poem on Sycherth (c.1390). Prior Lawrence's poetic description (II. 143 above) of earthwork Durham castle is a rare survival: Armitage, *Early Norman Castles*, 148, conjecturing that its tower's 'galleries' were hours; cf. Brown, *English Castles*, 34, 35-6, 226 (53) and 'The Architecture', Stenton (ed.), *The Bayeux Tapestry*, 76-87. Borgund is an exemplar: Ahrens, 'An English Origin for Norwegian Stave Churches?', fig. I.

²⁸³ T. Heslop, 'Orford'; also *Norwich Castle Keep*; Coulson, 'Castles of the Anarchy', 81-6, and 'Cultural Realities'. Stalley, 'Buildings Erected by Roger, Bishop of Salisbury', 1-27, 317-19. E. King, *Anarchy of King Stephen*, 16-17, on Roger and his nephews, Alexander of Lincoln (builder of Newark) and Nigel of Ely.

symbolism came out on top (as more consistently occurred in the later middle ages), leaving sometimes a mere semblance of physical defensibility—or was subordinate, so that utilitarian resistance seemingly prevailed (as in borderlands, and contested territory), so that a barely adorned self-evident strength of structure predominated, with an 'active defence' by crenels, loops, machicolation, and so on, did not alter the architectural programme—all such different permutations of ingredients were noble-style 'fortification'. The labels 'serious' and 'sham' are travesty, not analysis. Real 'strength' and allusive defence possessed equal prestige, and were scarcely differentiated. Thus when Bishop Gui of Auxerre at Régenne (dép. Yonne) 'constructed' (here 'rebuilt') 'a very noble small dwelling (*habitaculum*)' it still had the due panoply of *muros, fortericiam, fossata, propugnacula*, and *turres*. Next to the entry 'a tower of hewn stone most strong and of exceptional size, which they call "the portal", contained numerous dwellings within and in the thickness of its walls'.²⁸⁴ Within the walls of the fortress (*fortaricie*) were stables, the improved episcopal hall, and a two-storey chamber-block adjacent to it. The residence of Régenne had been upgraded. As much pride was taken in making the domestic apartments 'more beautiful than customary' as in providing 'on the other hand (*ex alio vero parte*)' the accoutrements of 'defence' which were the alter ego of noble architecture. At Régenne they included 'the necessary covered-ways (*appendicia*) for the manning (*munitio*) of the walls'. The place satisfied the contemporary noble criterion of powerful outward militancy which denoted a castle; whereas, by contrast, Beaufort (a place with much fish in connected ponds), though not devoid of seignorialia, was styled *receptaculum*.²⁸⁵ The episcopal castle of Varzy, magnificently rebuilt by Bishop Hugh, Gui restored after a serious fire, making 'the walls and *propugnacula*, better than before', as well as their roofs and skyline, enhancing the place with dwellings and fortifications alike. At Villechaud on the Loire, Bishop Gui had vindicated in the king's court his right to build a castle against objections by the count of Nevers. It stood low but was suitably conspicuous from afar. The *fortericia*, contentious symbol of higher lordship and for that reason resented by Nevers, was less important in this case to the chronicler than the 'double hall and chapel of exquisite nobility, fit for a king's habitation'; less noted than the wine-cellars, so excavated in the rock below as to remain cool even in high summer; or the stables and 'masonry barn of immense capacity', themselves enclosed by lesser outer walls. The 'vineyard of choice vines' planted nearby is also proudly mentioned.²⁸⁶

²⁸⁴ Mortet, *Recueil* II, 207-9. This 'château . . . maison de plaisance des évêques d'Auxerre, fut démolie pendant la Révolution' (ed.). 'Keep' towers often reflect this evidently admired 'cellular' construction of chambers within exaggeratedly 'thick' walls, e.g. Dover (1180-9).

²⁸⁵ But *receptaculum* and *receptum* were also synonyms for 'fortress'; e.g. in the 1095 Peace of God decretals for Touraine, *receptacula vel munitiones* were mostly towns: *Thesaurus Novus*, IV, cols. 121-4 (12). The two *receptacula idonea* in Poitou awarded by the 1174 treaty of Henry II, after the Young King's revolt, to Richard were guaranteed innocuous like fortresses and in the popular version called *castella*: text, *Recueil Henri II*, II, 19, 21. In Saintonge in 1201 the *receptum de Bruolic* was specifically defined as the castle *de barbacanis* (outworks) *infra*: *Layettes*, v. 110, 131.

²⁸⁶ Mortet, *Recueil*, II, 207-9; 208, n. 4, states that Gui made good his right to fortify in the king's

Rarely in such architectural eulogies is any mechanism or motive suggested other than the glorification of the patron and of his standing—which is normal²⁸⁷ (Cowering in fear was ignoble; outfacing danger had 'style'. In fact dangers (actual or potential), let alone the counter-measures geared to developments in siegecraft such as preoccupy the 'strategy-speak' of modern analysis, are seldom even implied. Likewise, such motives as are cautiously inferable from over 500 English licences to crenellate (1200–c.1578) strikingly coincide with those of post-medieval mansion-building; the more so when the licence was associated more or less closely with building projects. Appeals to danger were standard and can, in the vast majority of cases, be shown to be mere parading of pretended public service. Towns, especially, hid behind this screen. The actual occasions for building were almost universal.²⁸⁸ We are wrong to set 'castles' apart. Lip-service to defence as a public good perfunctorily cloaked motives of aggrandizement. Explicit avowal is not to be expected, but the 'Celebration of the Province of Tours' (c.1210) comes quite close. Having reviewed the rivers and towns of the archdiocese, 'which give increase of honour, beauty, decorum, and strength (*fortitudinis*) to the metropolitan city' (Tours, *dép.* Indre-et-Loire), the eulogy descants upon the city itself in flowery language which tempts sympathetic imitation. Its site is 'incomparable, warding off the approach of enemies'; its bridges are 'of great breadth and solidity (*firmitatis*)'. Châteauneuf town is portrayed likewise, with houses so grand that 'almost all are turreted, with sky-scraping pinnacles (*propugnacula*)'. Tours cathedral had been thrice burned, we are told, once by the (tenth-century) Normans, 'with the entire city (*cum toto castro; una cum castro*)'. In 1175 'the whole castle' was again burned, but the shrine-church of St Martin of Tours was unharmed. Presumably these (and other early) burnings are mentioned as testimony to the city's resilient majesty, alluding incidentally to its seaward vulnerability on the Loire, a situation not at all difficult of enemy access. Poetic licence, in all these texts, is the price of conceptual truth and of spiritual accuracy. Consequently such panegyrics deserve great weight. Much of our blinded sight is due to preferring historical 'models' (especially of conflict) insensitive to the insights of art history—and to the surviving architectural record.²⁸⁹

court issues discussed in Coulson, 'Sanctioning of Fortresses in France'. The text typically emphasizes wall-tops ('muros et propugnacula munitiones castri in suis cacuminibus pro majori parte dirupta vel collapsa egregie reparavit'), here implying hourding or bratticing. For *propugnacula* and great 'unmilitary' exposed roofs see Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire de l'architecture, arts 'Charpente', 'Couverture'*.

²⁸⁷ e.g. the terms of Edward I's licence for Lichfield cathedral close (Staffs., 1299) and the king's defence of Walter Langton's building, writing to Boniface VIII in 1303: *CPR, 1292-1301*, 409; *CCR, 1302-7*, 81-2; *Foedera* i. ii, p. 956; Coulson, 'Hierarchism in Conventual Crenellation', 77-9. Important summary, Cherry, 'Imago Castelli', 83-90.

²⁸⁸ e.g. inheriting, dynastic ambition, political prominence, position in local affairs, wealth, etc.; Girouard, *Victorian Country House*, esp. 393-427, over 30 case-studies; Coulson, 'Freedom to Crenellate', *passim*; to be discussed in my *Castles and Crenellating*.

²⁸⁹ Territoriality offers better explanations than the conflict model. Mortet, *Recueil*, ii, 211-13. See Bachrach, 'Early Medieval Fortifications', 547; table of 13 lesser *urbes* (Poitiers 104 acres, down to Périgueux 12 acres), 569, fig. 11 (plan-diagram). On urban panegyric in Italy, Zancani, 'Lombardy in the Middle Ages', 219-24.

To turn back from southern and central France to Britain makes a contrast that is more apparent than real. The sometimes obsessive English and north-west French preoccupation with earthworks as castles par excellence is not due to a different original 'military' culture but to historical accident. Peculiar Conquest and late-Carolingian historical experiences, slanted by technological and political fixations, have produced a view of castles which is not the rounded perception of contemporaries. It is also geographically unbalanced, biased towards the North, unrepresentative even of France as a whole. The published *Colloques* of the Société Française d'Archéologie are corrective. Bernard Bachrach's compilation of data of names and site-details for Anjou, Touraine, Poitou, Limousin, Aquitaine, Périgord, and beyond is a valuable succinct demonstration of these provinces' comparatively rich late-Roman and early medieval patrimony of *castra/castella*. Most English-Continental comparisons are made with relatively upstart and deprived Normandy.²⁹⁰ Great masonry complexes (justly '*agglomérations castrales*') were normal in France south of the Loire, in the Midi as well as in the south-west. Their sheer number, wealth, antiquity, and size correct the Anglo-Norman perspective.²⁹¹ Those styled *castrum* by Adémar de Chabannes (988-1034) in his *Chronicon*, Bachrach reckons as totalling twenty-six. Under a seemingly personal purism which led him to shun the chroniclers' vogue for what H. W. Fowler called 'elegant variation', Adémar chose to distinguish *castra* from *castella*, *burgi*, *munitiones*, and even from *firmitates*. In principle they are late-Roman, 'Gallo-Roman', and early-medieval walled towns, many with tenth- and eleventh-century stone great-towers as citadels, sometimes divided into *vieux château* and *neuf château*. Others, like Montignac and Gençay, were major comital centres. Few at this period (especially in idiosyncratic Languedoc) were at all compatible in the size and type of their populations with the modern idea of 'the castle'.²⁹² Direct and indirect evidence of towers of masonry (prestigious but only comparatively fire-resistant) is plentiful. Very many are earlier than the well-known 'keeps' of Fulk Nerra of Anjou (987-1040), some sites having been abandoned early and few excavated. Anglocentric notions that 'castles' were invented in Normandy (Doué-la-Fontaine is a favourite) or in the provinces of the north-west (or even refined during the very Norman settlement of England), or that

²⁹⁰ Bachrach, 'Early Medieval Fortifications', *passim*; endowing Adémar de Chabannes's 'terminology' with archaeological precision seems forced (pp. 531-4; n. 99 above); Debord, '*Castrum et Castellum* chez A. de Chabannes', 97-113. But criticisms of Jean Richard's modernistic classification ('Châteaux, châtelains et vassaux', 433-47), echoing Héliot, are justified. Richard, like Gardelles (*Les Châteaux du sud-ouest*, 7-9, 13), neglects original vocabulary. Cf. Yver, 'Les Châteaux forts en Normandie', esp. 33-42, 'Avant Guillaume le Conquérant'. Baudry, *Fortifications des Plantagenêts en Poitou*, provides an impressive alternative comparison, no less relevant to England.

²⁹¹ Bachrach, 'Early Medieval Fortifications', 536-49; Aubenas, 'Les Châteaux-forts', 548-86. Post-Roman continuity was a reality in the south especially, in the north-west much less, in England almost legendary: Dunbabin, *France in the Making*, e.g. 169-79 (Toulouse, Aquitaine).

²⁹² Bachrach, 'Early Medieval Fortifications', 549-59; the case of Blois (p. 554) highlights the difficulty of making name coincide with site-type. Others vary greatly viz. Loudun, Argenton-sur-Creuse, Melle, Brosse, Blaye (p. 554; a late-Roman *castellum* called *castrum* by Adémar). For Gençay in the 1022-8 *Conventum*, see Coulson, 'French Matrix', 77-80.

they evolved in some nebulous fashion with 'feudalism', however defined and dated, confront a reality in the French provinces of the south-west and south (and elsewhere) going back to Charlemagne and before, whether they be styled *castra*, *castella*, or otherwise in Adémar's *Chronicon* and in other early-medieval narrative sources.²⁹³

Both of these aspects, the later-twelfth- and earlier-thirteenth-century literary image and the buildings of the sub-Roman or 'Gallo-roman' era, ('Romanesque' in art is now more narrowly defined), help to clarify what the castle was to medieval people and delineate its full scope.²⁹⁴ A wider chronological and political range of reference will now help to draw these various strands together for the whole of the period until the early fifteenth century which is 'covered' by this book.

Returning to the minimalist earthwork-type castle, we find that they aroused lordly interest, as in the Norman *Consuetudines et Justicie* (and in the Anglo-Norman *Leges Henrici Primi* of c.1115), for example, also in Champagne. Their legal status was enshrined in the custom of the Nivernais (1268). That intrusive castles must not challenge the establishment was the rule. His wariness of competition from the Capetian magnate, Count Robert of Dreux, brother of Louis VII (1137-80), led Count Palatine Henri le Libéral of Champagne-Brie to restrict Robert's ditching of the *domus* of Savigny. In Champagne Robert was a vassal and had to behave with due subordination, whatever his wealth and lineage. In 1160/1 he and Count Henri agreed that the rampart of Savigny, begun with 'a ditch of two casts', should be completed with a submissive single cast of earth from ditch-bottom to bank-top, and there was to be no palisade (*briteschia*) along the crest. Humble as this was (more so than the Norman 1091 criteria which allowed palisading), Count Henri insured further against Robert's pretensions by making the place (*domus* still) rendable to him in case of war: it must be handed over to Henri on demand; averting any conceivable hostile use of course, but primarily to make acknowledgement on demand that the fief was held from Champagne. Constant provision for war can be deceptive. Robert's rank, however, was recognized in that Henri expressly and reciprocally promised to respect while in his hands 'in good faith, the said house, fish-ponds (*stagna*) and corn-mills', and to return them as soon as war ended 'stocked (*munita*) as they had been when handed over'. This obligation was usually taken for granted. Perhaps to avoid awkwardness, the fief of Savigny was transferred in 1167 to the lordship of the bishop of Beauvais, by agreement.²⁹⁵

²⁹³ Attempts, here and elsewhere, to antedate 'castle' ('private fortified residence') to fit early 'terminology' and to make it coincide with 'la naissance de la féodalité' are unconvincing: Bachrach, 'Early Medieval Fortifications', 559-60, 565-9: five of the *castra* were later 9th-century, built (as refuges) against the Vikings. Neither Doué-la-Fontaine (Brown, *English Castles*, 23-5), nor Langeais, nor even Mayenne (*Castle Studies Group Newsletter*, 10, p. 41; Fernie, *Architecture of Norman England*, 55) has any claim to be 'the earliest castle in W. Europe'.

²⁹⁴ Even in England, the normal image was administrative, as in Edward I's post-1274 inquiry (e.g. Cambridgeshire 1278-9) into tenures in *omnibus aliis will[is] et hamelettis ut in castris, forcelettis, feod[is] militum, terris*, etc.: text, *Rot. Hund.*, ii. 356a; also similarly 430b, 497b, 514a, 517a.

²⁹⁵ Brussel, *Nouvel Examen*, i. 381, n. a, 382, n. b. In 1176 Count Henri similarly limited a *domus firma*

The question has been considered elsewhere, and is throughout this book, how the conventions and practice of sanctioning new and rebuilt fortresses and of handing them over, or 'rendering' them on the lord's requisition, affirmed tenurial bonds, even when strained, and made fortresses accountable to the superior and ruler. Their originally clericalist anti-social image, despite these rules, and the reasons for rejecting it are the concern of Part II. Castles and fortresses were truly 'for all the folk', and their public profile reflected it. Neglect of rendability (since Du Cange in 1668) is itself in large part due to ignoring that fact.

Pacts for fortifying, whether treaties as at Savigny or formal grants of licence *de haut en bas*, are a rich vein of information about the conspicuous, symbolic and significant recognition-features of fortification.²⁹⁶ Status-acknowledgement and conformity to rank in the local hierarchy by due genuflexion on the part of the subordinate feudatory, and watchful concern by the dominant lord against any fragmentation of his territory and infringement of his authority by the creation of any new castle and castellary without his consent and conditions (frequently rendability in 'war' and on demand), were safeguards implemented normally by due legal process, according to familiar custom, without force or violence.²⁹⁷ Force could not establish legitimacy. At the visceral level of conflict-avoiding symbolic acts, dominance-recognition, and territorial marking, lordly relationships generally obeyed a formal code which conditioned and complemented their fortresses' seigniorial display. Demonstrations of brute architectural strength were rare, not merely because turning fortification towards full attack-deterrence was highly expensive.²⁹⁸ Throughout the period, lords and their vassals, particularly if of lower rank, tended to be more interested in the symbols of strength. Any more would take them out of their class and usually beyond their means. Metaphysics matter deeply.²⁹⁹ Too fundamentalist an approach leads to the crude and subjective categorizing of fortifications into artificial grades between 'strong', 'seriously fortified', and 'sham'; in truth, as has been argued, no fortification, however decorative, was spurious. Contemporaries were naturally more discerning.³⁰⁰ With

in Marsangis town (*dép.* Marne) to a house *planam et absque muro, cum fosseo unius jacture*: Jubainville, *Histoire de Champagne*, iii. 465-6. A Dreux-Champagne pact in 1206-7 allowed La Fère-en-Tardenois (*dép.* Aisne: Héliot, 'Châteaux de plan polygonal', 52-3) to be built in return for a ban at Torcy and in the border: Brussel, *Nouvel Examen*, i. 386-7. Many Champagne licences 1160-1262 were of this type: Coulson, 'Seigniorial Fortresses', App. B (4).

²⁹⁶ Coulson, 'Structural Symbolism', *passim*; also 'Castellation in Champagne', 357-8, and 'Freedom to Crenellate', 96-7, etc.; and 'Seigniorial Fortresses', Index, 'Criteria of Fortification', for refs.

²⁹⁷ Fully discussed Coulson, 'Sanctioning of Fortresses', *passim*. Background, Martindale, 'His Special Friend', 21-57.

²⁹⁸ e.g. the stupendous octagonal late-14th-century *donjon* of Largöet-à-Elven (Brittany, *dép.* Morbihan), taller even than vanished Coucy (177 feet), at 185 feet from its ditch: Enaud, *Les Châteaux-forts*, 87, 104, both exemplary triumphs of *orgueil* and of high-rise dwelling.

²⁹⁹ e.g. Coulson, 'Hierarchism in Conventual Crenellation', and 'Some Analysis of Bodiam', *passim*; Dixon and Lott, 'Courtyard and Tower', 93-101; (English) bibliography in Coulson, 'Cultural Realities', 204-7.

³⁰⁰ Some 'military' features (e.g. arrow- and crossbow-loops, battlements, machicolation, drawbridges), nominally 'anti-personnel' in function, achieved visual impact at less cost than massive elements: cf. discussion by Mesqui and Ribéra-Pervillé of 'Les Châteaux de Louis d'Orléans', esp.

earthwork, the volume of spoil laboriously moved to create large ramparts, tall mottes, and extensive baileys spoke unambiguously for itself of large resources of authority, subject manpower, and money, although the timber-works now vanished were doubtless no less eloquent. Masonry gave durability and greater artistic scope to such detailed features as the cut stone permitted, elegant mouldings and enhanced battlements. Ashlar was best, not rubble masonry, and always had greatest prestige, in England since Bede's day, and when resources permitted it came to dominate earth and timber when in combination. Craftsmen cost even more than massed gangs, which in England became less available as exemptions from *operationes castellorum* multiplied.³⁰¹ Bernard Bachrach has shown, with permissible speculation, how great an outlay of all kinds of resources the construction of the hall-*donjon* of Langeais (992-4) in Anjou must represent.³⁰² Ditches, moats, and banks, of course, were never superseded, but notably in the English royal licences to crenellate (England and Gascony) from King John's reign onwards, recognition-features concentrated on masonry elements such as mural towers, stone mortared walls, and on battlements ('crenels') constantly, sometimes mentioning drawbridges, but archery loops and moats very seldom. In England, crenellation was adopted as the diagnostic symbol of fortification from the later thirteenth century. These elements are ambivalent in that their cost and practicality depended on their massiveness. Battlements ranged from the solid to the low and flimsy. How 'strong' they were was entirely at the builder's discretion. Licence covered major fortification on the same basis as the normal embellishment of manor-houses.³⁰³ Licences and, in France, pacts for fortification generally ignore defensibility. Their unconcern emphasizes that it is quite mistaken to select 'military architecture' as 'genuine fortification'. In totality, the social functions of fortresses in everyday operation vastly outweigh the much exaggerated military role of the few in emergencies. Nor was the licensing of fortification in England other than perfunctory. Anyone with Court access who paid the nominal 'writ of course' fee was licensed. In France it was lordly in essence and not reluctant in normal circumstances. An overlord with the right to give permission was generally very ready to demonstrate his right by doing so, whereas his vassal

321-3, denying that they (and others) belong truly to 'Architecture militaire' but rather to 'Architecture civile'. This pursues classification unduly far.

³⁰¹ Edwards, 'Edward I's Castle-Building in Wales', 15-81, esp. tabular analyses, 55-6. In general, Salzman, *Building in England*, esp. ch. 4, 'Wages'; Knoop and Jones, *Medieval Mason*, chs. 4, 5; and pp. 235-9, 'Statistics of masons' wages and of prices'.

³⁰² Bachrach, 'The Tower at Langeais'. This tends to technological assimilation (occasionally extreme), a strong trait of the historiographical reaction against earlier romanticism (n. 44 above). The cost-benefit analysis, summarized on pp. 53-4, is perhaps unduly narrow: cf. Gimpel, *The Medieval Machine*, esp. 237-52, for an explicit thesis of medieval-modern parallelism. On the palatial character of early 'keeps' see Coulson, 'Cultural Realities' (in general), 'Peaceable Power' (detail).

³⁰³ Summary, Emery, *Greater Medieval Houses*, i, 174-80. A significant extreme is the 1292 licence of William de Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, to 'build and crenellate a wall of stone and lime around a garden' (*viridarium*), within the *mansum* or castle of Hanslope (Castletorpe, Bucks.): *CPR*, 1281-92, 497; Parker, *Domestic Architecture*, iii, 403. In France, a garden wall with seigniorially pretentious turrets at Couilly, near Meaux, caused friction in 1253: *Layettes*, iii, 192 (below).

was no less eager to receive the accolade of nobility conferred thereby on his family residence. A charter or letter patent itself conferred recognition and legitimacy.

Many manor-places in England were styled 'castle', by their owners or by popular acclaim, after being licensed, irrespective of the sort of 'crenellation' consequently added: sometimes, indeed, when no building at all seems to have been done. But there was no rule about it. A licence did not of itself confer the title 'castle', even informally. In 1338 William Heron obtained licence '... to crenellate his dwelling-place of his manor of Ford, Co. Northumberland'. Not satisfied, he applied for and got a formal charter in 1340 in unique terms granting 'that he may hold his manor-house of Forde, which is enclosed with a high embattled wall, by the name of a castle ... without impediment ... for the defence of those parts against the attacks of the Scots'. It evidently conformed to the castle image in both respects. Heron's grant was by charter, not patent, since a parcel of lordly rights, also seigniorially expressive but lucrative as well, came with it. It is one of a significant group of mainly charter licences, beginning with Kirkoswald (Cumb.) in 1201. Although the danger from the Scots at Ford was more than justificatory verbiage, the enhancement of Heron's status among his local peers was the object of the exercise.³⁰⁴ The factors involved were sociological, variously expressed from the great magnate, who less often had to prove his status, down to mere gentry who eagerly did so, and town oligarchs likewise.

In 1261 permission was obtained from Henry III for the addition of a palisade to the earthwork at Old Basing in Hampshire. Many licences, both English and French, were issued for works militarily so insignificant that prestige and perhaps repressing neighbours' jealousy are the chief plausible reasons.³⁰⁵ Even in closely governed England, 'enforcement' in any form was non-existent. That a measure of military affectation, and a modicum of actual defensibility, were considered appropriate to a gentleman's residence is apparent in this order sent to his seneschal of Gascony and to all concerned by Edward I in 1281:

Touching what Amanieu de Loubens, donzel (*domicellus*), has told us about his intention to construct a house or manor for his residence, without any major or undue fortification (*sine magno et indebito fortalicio*), in the lands which he holds of us directly in our provosty of la Réole [*dép.* Gironde]—we gather that he has been unjustifiably hindered from doing so by you, our seneschal, and by your deputies; so we have accordingly ordained that the place where the work has been commenced shall be inspected to find out what kind of fortification (*cujusmodi fortalitium*) he wishes to make there and if and how it might affect our interests or those of others, now or in the future ... And we have, in the meantime, granted permission to Amanieu that he may complete the house with its dependencies as now begun in timber (*domum ligneam erectam cum suis appendiciis*) so far as relates to the enclosure (*clausura*) of earth or timbers and to the roofing with tiles, together with other intramural operations, but not involving any further curtilage, palisading, or

³⁰⁴ *CPR*, 1338-40, 114; 1343-5, 409; *CChR* iv, 468-9.

³⁰⁵ *CPR*, 1258-66, 172: in general see Coulson, 'Freedom to Crenellate' and 'Battlements and the Bourgeoisie', for demand-led licensing.

defensive devices, such as a drawbridge (*palis et ingenio et ponte levadicio*), rather greater ditches or other works characteristic of major fortification.³⁰⁶

Amanieu had to build according to his rank if the jealousies of his fellows and superiors were not to be aroused. Greater lords, barons especially, fortified and issued their own licences in the duchy as elsewhere. A 'donzel' was truly a 'lordling'—but one whom his duke would wish to encourage as his own vassal and supporter.

3. Some Incidentals of the Castle Image

The progressive elaboration of 'defences' was naturally matched by the terminology of licences. Their precise formulae, in Britain and France, chart a lengthening vocabulary of features but add little in principle to the examples already mentioned. The aim was to include all that was most expressive of lordship, not omitting new fashions. But a castle was defined by the use made of it as well as by the structural features it incorporated. In this final section we accordingly illustrate some of the implications of this fact. Foremost, castles were economic units. Thus, in 1222 Count Henry V of Grandpré acknowledged that his overlord Thibaut IV, count Palatine of Champagne and Brie, 'has handed over to me Château-Porcien [*dép.* Ardennes], namely the fortress and the revenues'.³⁰⁷ When a grantor wished to sever the almost indissoluble bond between fortress and castellary it had to be done very explicitly. Count Raymond V of Toulouse in 1177 sanctioned all the future landed acquisitions (in 'mortmain') throughout his wide dominions by the knightly Order of St John of Jerusalem, but excluded 'the capital places of castellaries (*capitibus castellorum*) which I decree reserved to myself'.³⁰⁸ By this expression towns (usually walled) were included. So far towns have been mentioned only incidentally, but examples are numerous and specific, both early and late, of these 'castles of communities', in Hamilton Thompson's apt phrase, being in all respects 'proper castles'.³⁰⁹ The early Cistercian monks avoided sites for their monasteries located 'in cities, fortified places (*castris*), or towns'. Essentially the walling of towns and of religious establishments performed the basic function of setting apart a distinct 'peculiar' and jurisdictional area—separating and, if need arose, protecting the permanent inhabitants, and those

³⁰⁶ Viz. *augmentacione fossatorum et aliis operibus magni fortalicii: Rôles Gascons*, ii. 125. For a slightly less ostentatiously militant but comparable English dwelling of c.1180–1236, see G. Beresford, 'The Medieval Manor of Penhallam', 90–145, esp. figs. 25–7, 35; also Martin, 'Glottenham'. The 'lawlessness' rationale prevails, in both discussions.

³⁰⁷ *Layettes*, i. 54–8: *forteressiam scilicet et proventus cum omnibus pertinentiis ejusdem castri*.

³⁰⁸ *Ibid.* 113. Raymond also reserved *justiciis et expeditionis vel exercitus gratia mandamento*, i.e. judicial and military rights attached to the castle-territories.

³⁰⁹ Thompson used it apologetically, *Military Architecture*, p. viii. Comparison of texts with sites is often necessary (e.g. Mesqui, 'Crécy-en-Brie', 17–23, 'Le Château'). Early instances of textual clarity in Mortet, *Recueil*, i. are 113, Amboise (1040–60); 111–12; Vendôme (post-1040–post-1060); 250, on Normandy *ecclesie in civitatibus, vel castellis, vel burgis* (1080); 351–2, La Roche Canillac (1114); 375–7, Bruges (1127). Others collated Coulson, 'Seignorial Fortresses', Index 'Terminology'.

who took refuge within their walls on occasion. It was much the same as with the fortified lordly establishment whose population in peacetime might also be quite large if the lord was in residence. Towns were frequently employed as major administrative centres for the receipt of revenues and the holding of courts,³¹⁰ but this governmental role primarily belonged to the lord's personal seat, his town citadel, or to his estate centres in the country where the community of his household and his fiscal and secretarial personnel were housed, and where his tenantry periodically assembled at the great church feasts and on judicial and fiscal occasions. The 'banquets' of popular romance were but one of the uses of the great hall. This was the daily life of the fortress—the scratching of quill pens on parchment in the great hall and in the chancery behind the screen in the chapel, was much more commonly to be heard than the tramp of armed men on the battlements.

Of all the physical elements, the 'great tower', 'donjon', or (in newspeak) the 'keep' most symbolized dominion, lordship, and seignorial authority and lasted the longest, in France especially but also in Spain. Late in the year 1203, and shortly before he lost the duchy of Normandy to the victorious King Philip Auguste, John of England made a routine grant of 100 acres of land in return for due service and 'for delivering to us annually at our tower of Rouen, fifty capons (*capones*) in full satisfaction therefor' (or, presumably, their cash equivalent). The ancient 'great tower' of Rouen castle was deliberately destroyed and replaced by one of his own typical cylindrical towers after the conquest by King Philip, in order to supplant an object of Norman loyalties. The result is that it is now pictorially known only from its representations in the Bayeux 'Tapestry', late in the Conqueror's reign. This 'tower' was the capital centre or nexus of all the tenures of Normandy.³¹¹ It was always desirable to have such a focus for a host of non-military reasons. The lack of a proper *caput* in Quercy, in 1290 recently regained by Edward I from Philip IV of France by treaty, in right of the Plantagenet duchy of Gascony, caused Edward to write to his seneschal in those parts to remedy the deficiency:

As we have learned for certain that we have no possessions of our own (*proprietales*), or hardly any, in our land of Quercy . . . especially at places suitable for our seneschals and bailiffs to hold judicial sessions (*assisas*) as is right and fitting (*ut deceret*) and to exercise other rights of justice, capital and minor (*altam et bassam*)—we order and instruct you to set about buying a good castle or fortress (*castellare seu fortalicium*), by the advice of our

³¹⁰ Knowles, *Monastic Order*, 314, as 'cities, fortified places or villages'. Urban *banlieues* were jurisdictional castellaries e.g. Carpentras (*dép.* Vaucluse, 1155) *Layettes*, i. 74–5; 1155; Corbie (*dép.* Somme, 1180), *Ordonnances*, xi. 216–30; and in the county of Ponthieu (*dép.* Somme), viz. Abbeville (1184), Crécy (1194), Noyelles-sur-Mer (1195), Waben, Marquenterre (1199), Ponthoile (1201), Doullens (1202), etc: *ibid.* iv. 53–9; *Recueil Ponthieu*, 198–200, 202–4, 227–9, 230–2, 236–40, 433–5.

³¹¹ Round, *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, 334–6; built by Duke Richard I (942–96); Brown, *Bayeux Tapestry* (ed. Stenton), p. 81; *Rot Chart*, 113b, 11 Nov. 1203; next day, a land-grant for an annual cash payment *ad turrim Rothomagensis* (*ibid.* 113a). Philip II habitually and certainly deliberately built circular *donjons* in his conquests and elsewhere, characteristically French as to Ritter, *Châteaux, donjons et places fortes*, 55–7 (Louvre, Paris; Dourdan, Chinon, Gisors, Rouen, Falaise, Vernon, Laon, etc.).

special clerk, Master Stephen de Lafitte, together with a site suitable for a new town (*bastide*) to be founded nearby...³¹²

A court-house customarily had a gaol. The form in which a common medieval word for the castle 'keep', its *donjo*, has come down to us shows the notoriety of its use as a prison. Gaols often used castle-sites (e.g. Cambridge, Hertford, Canterbury). Originally such a hall as the Salle de L'Echiquier at Caen, or the great halls surviving in the castles of Winchester and Oakham (Rutland) and Westminster Palace were also court-houses and, on occasion, dormitories. Norman Pounds has surveyed the English castles which were the offices, treasuries, and gaols of county sheriffs, many of them always unsuited to any other purpose.³¹³ 'Unfortified' halls might suffice (and often did), but lacked the lordly atmosphere particularly desirable in frontier Quercy. Fortification, like the *fasces* of the Roman lictors, being a mark of judicial franchise denoted penal power. Some castles had little else to boast. Lincoln castle in the later middle ages is one of many instances. In 1344 the government of Edward III ordered a report to be made on its condition, the reason given in the king's writ being that 'the buildings there are at the present time so much out of repair that there is great reason to fear the escape of prisoners from the gaol'.³¹⁴ Franchisal prisons were necessarily not much less numerous than castles where courts were held. Their administrative role, not any 'strength', was the chief reason. They were, in fact, often insecure to judge from the frequency of references to escapes in the Chancery Rolls. Dilapidation is often blamed, but the actual cause was probably as much the normal scanty skeleton staff of resident officials (caretakers not 'guards') in all but a few castles, except when the lord was in residence (and the greater his rank the longer his absences as a rule), combined with an undoubted element of collusion and corruption.

Significantly, castles were burgled no less it seems than 'manor-houses' in England.³¹⁵ They were not police stations, although their association with the law

³¹² *Rôles Gascons*, ii. 554. For the Gascon forms *castel*, *castellare*, *castéra*, *castet* see Gardelles *Les Châteaux du sud-ouest*, Index; *castillon/châtillon* is universal. On economic-seignorial penetration in the SW by new *bastides* see Coulson, 'Community and Fortress-Politics in France', 92-3, 103-7; and Part III, Ch. 2, sec. 3 below.

³¹³ M. de Botiard, 'La Salle dite de l'Echiquier, au château de Caen', attempting to assimilate it to the upper-hall pattern; C.J. Blair, 'Hall and Chamber'; Brown *et al.*, *King's Works*, ii. 856-61; Pounds, *The Medieval Castle*, 91-6: 'the banqueting halls' of popular imagery. Sheriffs' seals featured castles: Cherry, 'Imago Castellii', 87.

³¹⁴ *CPR*, 1343-5, 388. Competition in prestige with the cathedral complex left the comital seat in the shade: *CCR*, 1330-3, 255; Coulson, 'Hierarchism in Conventual Crenellation', 76-7, 98 (22), Part IV; cf. King, *The Castle*, 29: same military preoccupation in Brown *et al.*, *King's Works*, ii. 766-7, recognizing that Odiham (Hants) was built by King John as a park hunting-lodge ('por lui deporter') and as 'a convenient resting-place on the way from Windsor to Winchester', but emphasizing the (fortuitous) 'military value' of its (slightly fragile) octagonal keep (*ibid.* i. 76), 'demonstrated in 1216' by 'its garrison of 3 knights and 10 sergeants' refusing to surrender to Louis le Lion for over a week. Often-cited Civil War sieges (e.g. Basing, Corfe, Donnington) are still less conclusive, given variable extraneous circumstances.

³¹⁵ e.g. Somerton (Lincs.), stocked with wine to receive the captive Jean le Bon, in 1359; Clinton's Maxstoke (War.) in 1357, and Kiriell's Westenhanger (Kent) in 1382: *CPR*, 1354-8, 651; 1358-61, 221; 1381-5, 133, 319.

in their role as centres of jurisdiction, royal or franchisal, lasted a very long time. In England, many castellated Victorian county prisons and court-rooms descended directly from the county-town castle (often in the same building, as at Lincoln and Lancaster). Many more were built in castle-style. Sitting in judgement was so attached to seignory that if there was no castle, the place where the courts of the lordship were held, even if no more than under a tree, like many Hundred courts, or in a field plot, was the substitute. Thus in 1433, in the frontier French province of the Dauphiné, the officials of the Dauphin 'king of Bourges' Charles VII, going around the capital sites of the *honor* of Clermont to take ceremonial possession before accepting the heir, finding at Le Passage 'no sort of castle (*alicujus castri*) or house appurtenant to the lordship of that place', made do with the court-site, 'where also forfeited goods are sold by auction', situated near the churchyard. The *maison forte* built there by 1344 had already disappeared, but not its associations. On that plot they planted, 'on a long pole, a banner painted with the Delphinal arms'. The idea was to show that judicial power had briefly reverted: similarly, under rendability the ceremony of placing the lord's banner (and of shouting his war-cry) was normally performed at the summit of the chief tower of the capital castle.³¹⁶

Court-houses, assembly-rooms, prisons, noble residences, estate offices—the peaceful functions of castles outweighed all others. They were not barracks (compare Roman forts with parade grounds nearby) nor drill-halls. Justice could only be done to everything that went on in them by drawing extensively on literary and narrative sources, in addition to records in the narrow sense. For all purposes of lordship, fortification was a customary (but not invariable) accessory of fashion. Even as safe-deposits for valuables, fortresses were rather less often used than religious houses, which regularly had treasuries and strongrooms for devotional gold- and silverware, seldom unattended. Where there was a regular need it might be otherwise: in south-west England, in 1263, Henry III ordered a special castle to be set up to protect the valuable metals extracted from the royal tin-mines in Devon.³¹⁷ This was to be 'a good and strong building, with a tower (*turris*) of stone in which the treasure, metals, and tools for the workings of the mine may be deposited, and our mine-workers be able to dwell'. In addition, the custodians of the mine were expressly told 'to wall and fortify' this 'house' or *domus*. The word *domus* is a significantly ambivalent term constantly encountered especially in France (e.g. Champagne fief rolls), which often denoted what was a lesser fortress. Burglary was a real danger, so Henry III's 'convenience and

³¹⁶ Salvaing, *De l'Usage des Fiefs*, 83-8; for Le Passage, see Andru, Colardelle, Moyne, Verdell. 'Les Châteaux de Clermont', 33. As performed elsewhere, e.g. at five Astarac county castles (*dép.* Gers, 1244); at two Turenne viscounty castles (*dép.* Lot, 1263): *Layette*, ii. 543-4, 539-40; *Foedera*, i, i, 425-6.

³¹⁷ *Close Rolls*, 1261-4, 227-8; Jolliffe, 'The Chamber and the Castle Treasures Under King John', 117-12; Brown, 'English Castles, 1154-1216', 209-32, also on prisons, 233-43. Parker, *Domestic Architecture*, ii. 193 and plates, of late-13th-century treasury of Merton College, Oxford. St Lawrence Hospital, Westminster, had a (licensed) jewel tower: *CPR*, 1377-81, 325; 1385-9, 215 (description). In 1340 20,000 sacks of Edward III's tax-in-kind wool were divided between Sleaford castle (bishop of Lincoln), Caythorpe castle (lady de Burgh), and St Katharines priory, Lincoln: *CCR*, 1339-41, 531-2.

security' were seriously at risk, countered by this appropriately turriform royal lordly outpost, which was works' depot, lodging, and safe-deposit all rolled into one.³¹⁸ Similarly in 1204, the castle of Dublin was rebuilt by order of King John expressly to be a treasury and administrative centre for his outlying dominion of Ireland, in which he took particular interest. Dublin castle needed all the attributes of a power-advertising fortress to assert the king's new title of *Dominus Hibernie*. Emphatic features were indicated, including 'good ditches and strong walls', a donjon (*turris*) which was to be built before the *castellum et baluum* (*sic*) and dependencies (*percunctoria*). There was, as usual, more to this mandate than the mailed fist. David King, a convinced militarist, truly declared that 'neither for housing the upper class nor for local administration and estate management were the defences of a castle remotely necessary'. It is indeed most significant that, in his words, it was 'only in the feudal ages that it . . . was thought worthwhile to employ them in such civilian connections'. Throughout the period, in fact, it is almost impossible to find any purely 'civilian' (noble and non-vernacular) residence without some 'fortified' allusion, however faint—for example, courtyards, curtilage-gateways, parapets, moats, or tower-elements. In France this leitmotif is very eloquent of the unique fortified manner of architecture in medieval society.³¹⁹ In the case of Dublin, the castle-constable, like the constable of Bordeaux, capital of Gascony, was the treasurer of 'the land'. Probably the initiative to build had come from the justiciar (viceroys) pleading the lack of somewhere adequate to keep the king's treasure (not cash only, but vital administrative rolls and memoranda as well). In fact there was already a castle there, but King John, perhaps to assert his power as Normandy slipped from his grasp, agreed that a *fortelicia* 'would be very useful to us, for this as for many other purposes'. Dublin deserved the dignity of a *castellum* and one which was to be *quam fortissimum poteritis* and to be located, in fortress-style, where the justiciar judged best 'for the governance of the city, and for defending it should the need arise'.³²⁰ Because the citizens of Dublin were legally obliged, as was normal, to maintain their walls and ditches, the king in an afterthought next day (doubtless also prompted) sent an order to them 'to fortify their town'. It was all part of the manifestation of royal power in Ireland for local administrative reasons, though it was done at a moment of grave

³¹⁸ Saunders, 'Lydford Castle, Devon', 123–86; excavation revealed 'a purpose-built gaol', rebuilt 'towards the middle of the 13th. century'. A mound was (atavistically) piled up around the base to enmotte the tower which also had a bailey. As the Stannaries prison it was in use until the 18th century.

³¹⁹ *Rot Litt Claus* i, 6b, 45b. King, *Castellarium Arglicanum*, i, p.xvi. Pounds, 'Lostwithiel', 203–17, and pl. 53–4, shows how this initially late-13th-century Stannary gaol, courthouse, tin-foundry, etc., showed its rank chiefly by size (especially of the hall), not by castellation (1734 Buck engraving, pl. 53a). Parker, *Glossary*, 5th. edn., pp. 67–8, acknowledged the 'ornamental' use of 'battlements' (but denied it in France). Frankl, *Gothic Architecture*, 246, remarks: 'There is, as yet, no terminology for the styles of military architecture, and this is a subject to which more thought could profitably be devoted.' As he sees it, 'some forms are taken as adornment from military architecture, especially battlements'.

³²⁰ *Ad urbem iusticandam et si opus fuerit defendendam* (only once seriously threatened, by Edward Bruce in 1316). Dublin castle's Storehouse Tower may have been the keep. The SE tower is large (diam. 56 feet), also cylindrical with very thick walls: Leask, *Irish Castles*, 53–4. Manning, 'Dublin Castle', 119–22.

(but remote) political crisis in the 'Angevin Empire'. Such mandates are seldom transparent: the order may well have been asked for to strengthen the justiciar's leverage with the citizens.

The stress put on the way in which fortifications manifested lordly power does not detract from the fact that force was its ultimate sanction and that fortresses might facilitate, if need be, resistance to forcible challenge. The castle was the embodiment and instrument of the territorial lord's power: but so also were his mill (*moulin banal*), his church, barns, and gallows, all of which might be allusively 'fortified'. When a tenant died his *caput* figured crucially when his feudal superior took back his land before the heir did homage and received his inheritance. In England the (royal) escheator's procedure was both formal and thorough. Only afterwards, when his subordination had been signalized, was the heir ceremonially invested with his fiefs by the overlord. The *caput* of the fief in England was treated merely as the chief site of the property. In France, however, very usually if the *caput* was a fortress (by name, repute, or style of building) it was specially and ceremonially taken back into the superior's possession to demonstrate his unique control, namely (as often expressed) *in signum reddibilitatis, dominiue directi et superioritatis*. This is how it was phrased in the detailed record of 1433, relating to the Dauphiné in eastern France adjoining alpine Savoy.³²¹

On behalf of King Charles VII, the governor of the province delegated to the Castellan of La Tour-du-Pin the task of visiting each chief place of the component fiefs making up the *honor* of the lately deceased Viscount Aymer of Clermont. He was directed 'to implant and to affix at each place and castle, namely on the donjons (*in Donjonis*) and on the higher and more conspicuous (*magis apparenti*) points thereof 'the royal dauphin's banner, which was there to remain for three days in signification of his 'repossession (*reddibilitas*), overlordship, and superiority'. The Castellan went accordingly to the first castle, that of Virieu (*dép. Isère*), dating possibly from 1034 and *chef-lieu de châteltenie* since at least 1107, and 'put a banner on its donjon, namely on the great round tower on the east side of the castle', and caused the act to be officially witnessed and recorded by a notary. The same day he did likewise at Paladru, also recorded in 1107 and still styled 'castle', although the lordship seat had long been transferred to Montferrat. There he fixed a banner 'atop a certain tower over the gateway on the west side', indicating that it had no proper 'keep'. Given the present ruinous state of these castles, these details are archaeologically valuable. The same day he went to the castle of Montferrat, successor by the early fourteenth century to Paladru, and there he placed another banner with due solemnity 'on the summit of the donjon on the west side of the castle'. His next call was to Le Passage where, as noted, there was

³²¹ Salvaing, *De L'Usage des Fiefs*, 83–8, printed *extenso* in Andru *et al.*, 'Les Châteaux de Clermont', 28–31, 33, etc. For rendering *pro bono dominio* see Coulson, 'Seigniorial Fortresses', Index 'Recognitory Rendering'. Banner-placing, handing over of keys, actual evacuation by the castellan, and entry by the lord's men 'in great force or small' were some of the features (at 'castles' and towns almost indifferently). An overall survey of rendability, jurability and cognate fortress-customs is projected.

no surviving castle or seignorial building, but the functions of lordship were still attached to the place where they were exercised, in the field by the churchyard. Castles were quite often 'ghosts' in this way, spiritually outlasting their material 'bodies': or, to be more exact, institutionally still alive but structurally decrepit.

Despite thrice-repeated and loudly proclaimed summons at the next *caput*, this time a fortress with dependent *bastide*, now La Bâtie-Divisin (in 1433 *castrum*; *maison forte* in a homage of 1317), the Castellan of La Tour-du-Pin found the gate shut, the custodian refusing him 'the opening up of the castle' because he said he held it for the heir of Jean de Clermont. He denied, moreover, that the fief of *Castrum Bastidae* was held from the late viscount, directly or in sub-fief, claiming it as a direct rendable tenure (*per se de feudo reddibili et directo*) from the king-dauphin. On this account, the custodian 'would not permit any pennons or delphinal banners to be placed'—being, as he argued, a separate fief in its own right. No threat of a fine could procure access to place a banner atop the 'great tower'; procedure was punctilious: refusal of entry was a necessary legal step, not a violent discourtesy, ceremoniously performed so as not to prejudice the stance. It was five days later that the castellan-commissioner concluded his task by visiting the town of La Tour-du-Pin at Hauterive and entering the last of the castles of the viscounty (*videlicet ad castrum dicti loci*). There, the record from the delphinal archives at Grenoble relates, he placed a banner 'on the summit of the great square tower on the east' to be displayed there for the customary three days. Thus the feudal proprieties were duly observed, and the overlord's rights ceremoniously demonstrated with their draconian principle that all land came from the lord and that all castles were peculiarly his.³²² With typical late-medieval punctilio the proceedings, embodied in memoranda (*notas*) by those who had perambulated the Barony of Clermont, were engrossed (written out in full) by public notary and deposited in the treasury at Grenoble.

Ceremony tended to grow more elaborate over time, but all this was characteristic of the permanent principle. At the very centres of seignorial pride, the gesture of humble submission and surrender emphasized that fortresses were not only, like ordinary property, conditionally held from a superior who stood for the wider demands of the public interest, but were subject also to fortress-customs which put special constraints upon construction, tenure, and succession. Fiefs were the overlord's to give and, in certain restricted circumstances, to take back. Fortresses were lawfully his to use when he had need of them, and the vassal could not gainsay his right. Aimeri de Thouars, lord of Luçon (*dép. Vendée*) in Poitou, under severe French pressure at the time, expressed this convention in 1230 to Henry III of England. Their relationship was understood by both as a permanent one of mutual duty, activated by, but not conditional upon, warlike emergency. When the young Louis IX had withdrawn, Luçon

³²² The liege homage allegedly done to Charles VII as dauphin by the late lord could not be impugned, 'on which account, the custodian *nullos penuncellos sive bannerias delphinales . . . supra ipsum castrum apponi permittet*'. To have allowed it would have derogated his master's status of tenant-in-chief and created a precedent—fears constantly present in medieval legalism.

castle was left 'totally destroyed by the enemy', with much damage to Aimeri's lands. Expecting further French attack, he requested King Henry, as a vassal ready faithfully to serve his lord to his power, 'to afford to me and to my castles, being yours also, such subvention as may redound to my advantage and be mutually to our honour, yours and mine'. The fortresses of the lands of Luçon were lawfully and properly as fully at the lord king of England's disposal as Aimeri himself: as he put it, expecting help as of right from his lord, 'ego vester sum, et dicta castra mea vestro servitio sunt parata'.³²³ Feudal custom, not *force majeure* or *raison d'état*, made this understanding, however it may have been observed, a matter of honour.

4. Conclusions: Part I—Castles 'For All The Folk'

How nobles, not moderns, saw castles is the heart of the matters dealt with in this chapter and whole first half of this book. Because all propertied classes were imbued with the chivalric ethos, which might be described as noble without necessarily being altruistic or considerate to non-nobles, not only the lay aristocracy (Part III, chs. 1, 2 below) and women (Part IV) but also the higher clergy were affected, as also were the *bourgeoisie* to a lesser extent. The peasant community was differently touched (Part III, ch. 3). Each was a part of the whole social body of the medieval castle. Castles were 'for all the folk', as very much more than occasional refuges.³²⁴ The verdict of the archaeology is as clear as is that of the representative documents. If what they reveal might seem here to 'have little to do with castles' as hitherto familiar, especially to English readers, it is not due to any pursuit of mere originality (desirable though that might be in this subject). Rather, it follows from seeing what a balanced sample of the mainstream evidence has to say. The aim of this and the following Part is to do the preliminary job of clearing away some of the remaining obstructions, especially those due to historical constructs and to anachronistic militarism, while introducing the authentic language and some of the spirit and historical context of the early-medieval reception and modification of its inheritance of fortresses.

The attractive but delusive simplicities of the war-gaming view of fortresses the author began to discard, by reluctant and progressive reappraisal, over thirty years ago. Since then more than twenty academic articles have sought to put in its place a comprehensive set of alternative vignettes. On a lighter note, as a companion to the fieldwork of examining and photographing castles in England, Wales, and France, a large-scale model of 'the ideal (military) castle', was started at that time. Since then it has changed, evolving in the 'non-military' aspects

³²³ *Royal Letters*, W. Shirley (ed.), i. 386. Phrases like 'total destruction', even when not special pleading, often mean no more than laying land waste. See also *ibid.* 25-6, 49-50, 93, 125-6, 155-6, 185-6, 231, 302-3, 383-4, 386-7, 388 for similar appeals in 1219-31; see Part II, Ch. 3, sec. 1, etc. below. Baudry, *Fortifications des Plantagenêts en Poitou*, 307-8.

³²⁴ n. 118 above. Misused to support the facile 'communal' (Anglo-Saxon)/'private' (Norman) anti-thesis of historiographical convention.

which constitute advanced castle-study. The process of architectural research this model has required has given innumerable insights and lines of enquiry. These and other investigations, and the articles publishing their results, are the foundation of this book.

PART II

Castles and the Public Interest