

## THE PARLIAMENTS OF CARLISLE.<sup>1</sup>

It can scarcely have escaped the recollection of the historical inquirer, if he has devoted any attention to the rise of our representative system, that it was in the 23rd year of the reign of Edward I. that boroughs were first regularly summoned with knights of the shire to take part in the councils of the realm. Two years later the exigencies of the monarch compelled him to attempt obtaining large grants from his people by irregular and arbitrary means, and so far had their discontent proceeded in consequence, that he was obliged to confirm the charter of liberties granted by John and that of the forest of Henry III. He was also under the necessity of conceding, by a celebrated statute, "De tallagio non concedendo," that no aid should be levied by the king or his heirs without the will and assent of the nobility, bishops, knights, burgesses, and other men of the kingdom. This was a most important advancement in popular liberty, as it rendered the consent of the subject necessary to the imposition of all taxes. It may therefore be perceived that in the year 1297 the powers of legislation had very nearly approached their present form, and accordingly, when Edward summoned his Parliament to meet him at Carlisle, in the 26th, or following year to the one last mentioned, he found himself constrained to adopt wary and discreet measures, so as to ensure the maintenance of the royal authority. He was equally embarrassed by the state of his affairs in France and in Scotland. In the latter kingdom the pressure was extremely dangerous. Unable to enforce the collection of pecuniary aids upon his people without the consent of Parliament, and having had to sustain wars with Wales, France, and Scotland, his exchequer had become entirely drained. In consequence of the difficulties to which he was

<sup>1</sup> Communicated to the Historical Section, at the Meeting of the Institute in Carlisle, July, 1859.

thus reduced, both of raising money and of prosecuting the contest with the latter kingdom, he issued writs from Stanwix in September, in the 26th year of his reign (1298), to the different sheriffs throughout England, informing them of his intention of being at Carlisle on June 6th, in the next year, for the purpose of punishing the malice and rebellion of the Scotch, as well as to place his lieges in seisin and possession of the lands he had either already or in expectancy granted them for their services against his enemies. But a few days previously he had been victorious in the battle of Falkirk, and the hope conveyed in the royal summons could not fail of being an additional inducement to the men-at-arms, who were ordered to muster here in 1299, on Whitsun eve. The king, however, departed from his camp at Stanwix about a week afterwards, and no public business appears to have been transacted. Out of the eleven earls and a hundred and six barons who were summoned to attend under such agreeable mandates, we do not discover that the hopes of more than one individual were gratified, and from his name not being amongst those to whom the writs were addressed, it is more than doubtful whether the king should have shown him any preference.

Edward did not return to Carlisle till the last week of June, in the 28th year of his reign. In the previous month of December writs of military summons had been addressed to all the magnates, ecclesiastics, and sheriffs of the kingdom, ordering them to prepare for the defence of the crown and kingdom, and to prevent the damages, affronts, and dangers arising from the rebellion of the Scottish enemy. They were commanded to meet the king here on the feast of St. John the Baptist then next, or the 24th of June, 1300, prepared and ready, and in addition to the services that were due from them, to assemble with their utmost power, in order that he might deliver himself from the troubles and anxieties occasioned by this rebellion of his perfidious enemies. Edward, fired with the entire resolution of subduing the hostile forces of Scotland, did not permit the recent birth of his son, Thomas de Brotherton, so named from the place where his young Queen Margaret was confined on the 1st of June, to retard his journey to join the hosts he had gathered to meet him at Carlisle. It is curious to trace his movements. After the Queen's

accouchement, on the 1st of June, he remained with her at Brotherton and Pontefract till the 12th of the month, when he left her to join his army in the capital of Cumberland. On the 23rd he was at Brougham, the 24th at Skelton, on the 28th in this city. He staid here till the 7th of July, having had in these nine or ten days' interval the means of consulting for his future movements with his brother Edmund, Earl of Cornwall, his son, Prince Edward, his nephew, Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, and of gaining the probably weightier counsel that emanated from Beauchamp, and Bigod, and Bohun, de Montalto, de Multun, Mortimer, Pembroke, Percy, de Vere, names among the greatest that chivalry and noble blood can boast of, worthy indeed of descent from those still nobler men who in a better cause wrested the rights of their nation from Edward's vicious ancestor on the plains of Runnymede.

Here, then, where these glittering hosts were arrayed for an expedition, romantic and memorable for all ages, the king held a council of war. If he is more commonly known to the world as a soldier, as the conqueror of Wales, the terror of infidels, or the scourge of Scotland, it must also be remembered how needful it was that he should punish aggression, and enforce obedience by the sword. Therefore, in now speaking of him as a warrior, it is because his actions, no less than the irresistible current of events, the spirit of the age, and the course of his illustrious destiny thus present him to notice at this particular time. Undoubtedly Edward I. was, for courage and military skill, a warrior whose actions have rarely been equalled, never surpassed. Yet, in speaking of his martial virtues it must not be forgotten that he stands still higher as a legislator, and the numerous acts of his judicial life show how fully he has deserved the title of the English Justinian. Not merely do his statutes evince a wide spirit of justice towards all his subjects, but he endeavours in one of them to ensure its more speedy administration, "Celerius," says he, "apponi decrevimus remedium," and to him belongs the highest merit of desiring that all unnecessary delays should be prevented.

It was decided by the council, that the royal forces should lay siege to Carlaverock. A poem, composed by Walter de Exeter, an ecclesiastic of the period, furnishes us with very full particulars of the enterprise. Whilst the poet's verses

are replete with the quaint beauty peculiar to the compositions of the age, and picturesquely describe the armorial bearings, surcoats, and pennons of the assailants, the richness of their caparisons embroidered on silk and satin, their banners chequered with gold and azure, it is a production of equal value to the herald, the antiquary, or the historian. The poet says that as many as eighty-eight of the most distinguished peers of the realm and 3000 men-at-arms went forth on this adventurous expedition. Edward remained at Carlisle till the 6th of July, when he left the city by way of Dumfries to join his army. He continued before Carlaverock until the 15th, and in the interval this celebrated castle fell before the King's army. The little garrison vigorously resisted, for some time, the assault of the four royal squadrons, but at length, overpowered by the number, and determination of the English host, its small body of sixty men surrounded the shield-shaped fortress, and cast themselves on the clemency of the king. Edward paid it a flying visit on the four last days of August. In the months of September and October his time was chiefly passed at Holme Cultram, La Rose, Dumfries, and Carlisle, leaving this place on the 15th of November, 1300, for the south.

For a considerable time the relations subsisting betwixt Boniface VIII. and the King of England had been growing less amicable in proportion as the demands of the Papal See became more imperious and exacting. The pope had boldly asserted his claims to the kingdom of Scotland as a fief of Rome. He had forbidden Edward to persecute the Scots, and enjoined him to sue and plead before the Latin consistory for the rights he enjoyed in that kingdom. The monarch met this assumption with the dignified reply that it was a matter which concerned no less himself than the right of the kingdom of England, and he could give no other answer till he had consulted his people. Yet such an unexpected claim induced the king to call a parliament together for the purpose of giving it their consideration. When Boniface preferred this insolent demand, Edward was residing at Rose Castle, and from hence he issued on the 24th of September those writs which have for ever associated the place, and more especially the name of the monarch, with a defence of religious freedom that time will not obliterate.

In pursuance of the mandates, a general parliament

assembled at Lincoln in the month of January, 1301, which gave that unanimous reply to the pope's usurpation which effectually prevented the royal rights being called in question afterwards.

Having on a previous occasion fully examined the proceedings of this important parliament, it is now needless to enlarge on the subject. Before, however, pursuing the history of those military, or parliamentary assemblies that were called together at Carlisle, it may not be irrelevant to mention a few miscellaneous facts in their illustration.

From the Wardrobe account of the 28th year of Edward I., it is seen that the whole of the royal expenditure during this period amounted to £64,105 0s. 5*d.*, and of this sum about one half, or £31,773 19s. 8*d.*, was required for victualling the king's household and army, payments to knights, wages of archers, engineers, &c. It is difficult to separate the various entries with nicety, but £31,773 may be set down as the gross amount of expenses incurred for military purposes against the Scots and others in the year 1300. Now, taking what has been usually adopted as the means of knowing the comparative value of money, if a shilling, according to Bishop Fleetwood's calculation, would in 1700 buy fifteen times as much as it would exactly 500 years previously, the expenses of the Scottish and other wars in 1300 would amount to about £476,600 sterling; and measuring by the same ratio, in round figures, Edward I. was now spending little short of half a million in military operations yearly, and about £90,000 (£89,265) more than the receipts of his exchequer.

In the year 1297, or three years before, we have the account of Walter de Amondesham, confined exclusively to the expenses of the Scottish war, and these, pursuing the same method of multiplying by fifteen, amounted for that year to £160,950. These are approximate estimates for two different years relating to Scotland, and it is interesting to see how they stand in comparison with the cost of the Welsh wars. The returns of William de Luda on the Pipe Roll up to the 10th year of the reign, when Edward had scarcely passed Conway in his career of conquest, amounted to £122,113 0s. 9*d.*, as received to sustain the contest, or in a modern equivalent calculation to £1,681,695. Nor do the contests between the Scotch and the Welsh comprise

all that was expended in this king's wars, for he had disputes going on in Flanders and Burgundy simultaneously, and his expedition to the Holy Land, where he fought for two years, must have added a considerable weight to the national burdens.

Can it then be wondered at that the people took the first opportunity of controlling the power of the crown, and of enforcing the custom that no tax or imposition of aid should be levied upon them by the royal authority alone. Than this, no privilege they have inherited from these early struggles can be more highly valued, or indeed ought to be more constantly brought to the recollection of their representatives in Parliament. The knowledge of possessing such a check upon the national expenditure, if a correct judgment may be formed from a recurring increase of taxation in our own day, is, however, but very slowly diffusing itself. It is only during periods of great excitement, distress, or misrule, that men acknowledge the inconvenience of heavy contributions to the state, passively considering them both as their natural burden and the changeless security of England's protection.

There remains to be noticed another parliament, convened at Carlisle; its proceedings were of a more purely legislative kind than those hitherto mentioned. We last parted with Edward I. when he held his general parliament at Lincoln, in 1301. Let us pass over the interval till he again issued writs, the third time, for a national gathering of his nobility, knights, and burgesses at Carlisle. The war with Scotland was being continued with its former vigour. The pretensions of the Papal See had not become moderated, and it was evidently in consequence of this untoward and unchangeable aspect of affairs that the king resolved upon taking here the advice of his parliament. From Lanercost, on the 3rd November, 1306, writs were issued for its assembling in the Octaves of St. Hilary in the following year. It was ostensibly set forth to the nobles that the meeting was called to consider the Scottish difficulty, the treason of Robert Bruce, as well as other pressing business; but the bishops, ecclesiastics, and burgesses received no intimation at all as to the real reason of their being summoned. The king was detained at Lanercost in infirm health, but he sent the bishop of Lichfield and Henry de Lacy, earl

of Lincoln, to address the parliament in his name. On the first day, being Friday, only a few prelates had appeared, business was therefore adjourned till Sunday, when numbers being still absent, the proceedings were deferred till the following Wednesday. When, however, the parliament at length entered on the business of its sitting, it enacted what still remains (unrepealed) in the authorised collection of Statutes of the Realm, the Statute of Carlisle. This statute seems to have been made in pursuance of a proceeding at Westminster two years before, prohibiting the payment by any abbot, prior, or religious person, of any tax imposed by the superior of their respective houses. It enforces the execution of this provision, and forbids any money assessed amongst themselves, or any rent, tallage, or imposition, being sent out of the kingdom. Moreover, that religious orders should hereafter possess a common seal, so that the abbot or prior should be able to establish nothing of themselves.

The Statute of Carlisle was evidently directed against the exactions of the Pope. The encroachments of the Roman See have already been adverted to, and if any proof were wanting to show how oppressive they had become, it will be found in the numerous petitions from the clergy and people of England that are entered on the roll of this parliament. These causes of complaint are set forth at great length, and undoubtedly were the motives which impelled the Parliament to enact the Statute of Carlisle.

About a hundred petitions in Latin or French, besides pleas, were subjects of consideration. Many of them are private, and many abound in local interest, relating to the regality of Tindal, Carlisle, Cockermouth, Penrith, &c. One petition, however, is of sufficiently general interest, even at the present day, to be brought before notice. The earl of Lincoln comes to the parliament of Carlisle to seek redress about the restricted channel and condition of the river Thames. The course of the water, he states, formerly ran under Holborn and Fleet bridges to the river; it used to be so large, and broad, and deep, that ten or a dozen ships could come up laden with merchandise and pass under Holborn bridge; but now its course is so obstructed by filth, and the refuse from tan-yards, and by various disturbances of the water, chiefly by raising a quay and diverting

the water for the use of the mills belonging to the new Temple beyond Castle Baignard, that ships can by no means enter as they were accustomed ; wherefore the earl prays that the mayor and sheriffs, and discreet aldermen of London may inspect the river, and restore it to its former condition. To this petition it was replied, that all the impediments should be removed and its course maintained in the way it had from antiquity been accustomed to follow.

It is hence observable, that whilst this parliament of King Edward's reign entertained private claims, it also really addressed itself to the general business of the country, and under this head the state of the Thames was considered a matter of such vital importance that even five centuries ago it arrested the attention of the legislature when it held its memorable meeting in this city. Whatever superficial enquirers may think of the inutility of making researches into the habits and civil economy of the middle ages, it must be allowed that our ancestors preceded us in taking a salutary as well as a sanitary view of this most important subject, and, had the mandate of Edward and his two successors to the throne been constantly enforced, had the prohibition of Edward III. received continual attention, that neither refuse of slaughter-houses, ordure, or the common nuisances, should be cast into the Thames (44 Edward III.), the huge metropolitan evil would never have assumed its present magnitude, nor perhaps have existed.

Without, however, attempting unduly to exalt the transactions of a bygone age and the study of our early constitutional history, or on the other hand, without aiming to enlarge the ideas of those who by depreciating these researches into the records of antiquity below the actual value they have in illustrating the social system ordained by the Divine Governor of the world, without reasoning with a class of sciolists who thus evince themselves incapable of extracting sound knowledge from these pure fountains of historic truth, it may be still further remarked on taking a review of the events of Edward's reign, that the foundation of most of the political privileges we enjoy were obtained during his life. Obtained not by violence and at once, but after full discussion and by degrees, indeed in many respects they were the necessary result of circumstances. Every aid and every act of extravagance of the crown produced some

advantage for the community, whilst the barons in their turn by uniting against its tyranny became the friends of the people. The king, the nobility, and the clergy were in reality indifferent to the condition of each other. They were friends or enemies just as it served their purpose. Yet with this anomalous relationship they were mutually, unconsciously laying a sound and expansive foundation of English liberty.

In our present state of domestic security, we are happily able to look back with calmness upon the long train of disastrous events that by war or civil strife have purchased these precious advantages. Yet we must not forget that out of national calamity and evil, even from the crimes of potentates, and the vices of rulers, have sprung those laws which have rendered England a free country. Therefore, if we are animated by the remembrance of any noble struggle that has been made in our land to destroy oppression or avert slavery, if a feeling of grateful homage arises in the mind when we think of patriots, such as the Montforts, the Hotspurs, and the Russells, who bled on the field, or who laid their heads on the block to secure their country's independence, if we are inspired with holy admiration and piety when the memory recalls the dying constancy of those martyrs who sealed the testament of religious freedom at the stake,—if the heart is touched by these affecting and sacred memories of the past, we shall transmit their fruits still more extended and matured as the very dearest inheritance that can be bequeathed by us to posterity.

---

#### SUPPLEMENTARY OBSERVATIONS.

It was in the twentieth year of of his reign, October 8th, 1292, that Edward first visited Carlisle, on his road from Skipton by Appleby (where he was October 3rd) to Berwick-upon-Tweed. On the 8th of September, 1298, we find him again at Carlisle, where he remained for upwards of a fortnight. There can be no doubt that during his stay here he resided in the castle.

Though this ancient place of royal residence and defence against the Scots has become much injured by the hostile incursions of this nation, by natural dilapidation, and injudicious repairs, it still exhibits in the keep and in the inclosing walls characteristic marks of its origin and its architectural history.

It was no doubt planned by William II., when he visited Carlisle in 1092, and it is more than probable that at this time he erected the curious castle of Appleby.

In 14 Henry II., 1168, notice of its existence occurs on the Pipe Roll, "pro removenda Porta Castelli de Cardel 40 sol. per breve Regis," which shows that the castle was erected before 1156, or the second year of Henry II., as there is not any intervening notice relating to it, this being the earliest account of the sheriff that has been preserved. Had the castle not been built before 1156, there would have appeared some entry respecting it, before the expense just alluded to, for removing the gate. In 1173 it withstood a siege against William the Lion, Robert de Vallibus receiving twenty pounds for the maintenance of soldiers within its walls on this occasion. It is evident that this assault of the Scottish king injured it, as there occurs a charge for reparation the following year, under the direction of Wulfricus, the engineer, besides works upon the fosse, and its victualling. No further outlay occurs till the thirty-second year, 1186, when the castle bridge was repaired. In 1187, larger works were carried on in the king's chamber, in the small tower, and in removing the materials and scaffolding from the great tower. In 1192, further works occur on the sheriff's accounts. In 1197 the gate of the castle was repaired at a cost of one hundred shillings. In 1198, a chapel in the castle and a small bridge within the walls were repaired. In 1199 other repairs on the internal buildings were effected.

In the 1st, 5th, and 6th of John, minor works are mentioned on the sheriff's accounts, but after this reign the expenses are entered on a different class of official documents, and we must look to the Close Rolls and the Liberate Rolls for architectural information regarding these military possessions of the crown. More correctly speaking, it may be said that in the Close Rolls during the reigns of King John and Henry III., and in the Liberate Rolls of Edward I. and II. the information is more usually and appropriately recorded.

It would be needless to pursue those entries very fully, and I will therefore give but a few extracts, sufficient to show the manner in which the royal writs ran, and the way the charges are set down. "The King, &c., to R. de Veteri Ponti. We command you to pay to the Constable of Chester 60 marcs, for fortifying our castle of Carlisle. Teste me ipso, apud Lutegarsal, 28th Nov." (Rot. Lit. Claus. 6 John, 1204.) This is followed on the 12th April, 1205, by a writ to Hugh de Nevill, ordering him to let the Constable of Chester have such wood as he has need of in the Forest of Carlisle, for the reparation of the castle there. Now, referring to the Pipe Roll of 6th of John, a verification of these orders is enrolled thus: "In reparacione Castelli de Carduill. c. & xvi. li. xij. s. & vi. d." Whilst the Patent Rolls give the writ the same year, addressed to Robt. de Curtenay, informing him that Robt. de Lascy, Constable of Chester, was appointed to the custody of Carlisle.

These writs, addressed to the Constable of Chester and Hugh de Nevill, are thus remarkably illustrated by the account returned by the Sheriff of Cumberland to the Exchequer, and they prove upon what a very accurate system the royal expenditure was directed as well as recorded.

Other repairs were done in 1223. In the following year the keep was repaired and joisted, as well as some of the houses within the walls. But the operations were inefficiently carried out, since it is stated on the public accounts three years later (1226) repairs to what had been done, as well as leading to the keep, were ordered immediately.

During the reign of Henry III. there does not seem that any large or

continuous outlay was made on the Castle of Carlisle. It had sustained a heavy siege by William the Lion, who was repulsed by a small garrison. It was repaired by Henry II., by Richard I., by King John, who was driven out of it by Alexander of Scotland. It was repaired whilst the Scottish king held its possession, who was subsequently obliged to restore it. Walter de Gray received it for the English monarch in 1256, when it was found to be in a very dilapidated state. The whole history, in fact, is one of decay and ruin, so constantly requiring an outlay that it can scarcely be said that it was at any time in a sound state.

When Edward I. ascended the throne it naturally engaged his early attention. In the eleventh year of his reign (1283) its custody was deputed to Robert Brus, Earl of Carrik, but such was the constant restlessness of the Scots, that it did not appear prudent to entrust it very long to one belonging to that nation. In the 25th year the king selected a prelate to take charge of the castle, who was in every way fitted for so important a trust. Whatever was done in this fortress, in the cathedral, at Rose Castle, where he undoubtedly erected the existing gatehouse with the walls to its right and left, as well as the picturesque tower, standing as it were isolated as the eastern limb of the bishop's palace, or whatever was done in the diocese on the ecclesiastical architecture, must be attributed to the superior mind and energy of John de Halton, Bishop of Carlisle. His abilities fitted him for the prominent position in which the sagacity of the king placed him. If Bishop Burnel, a man so eminent and stirring, so wise also as to be capable of directing the legislative enactments of Edward, was the adviser of the crown in everything relating to the Welsh, John de Halton, bishop of Carlisle, occupied scarcely an inferior place as the king's counsellor in the affairs of Scotland. The bishop comes singularly before notice in the royal writ addressed to him in the year 1297, at which time Robert Brus was ordered to give up the castle with all its appurtenances, victuals, and arms, and by a concurrent letter, John de Halton was to guard them at his peril during the king's pleasure.

Two entries taken from the Liberate Roll will be sufficient to show the nature of the various outlays that were made on the castle during this reign. A great deal of this and the previous expenditure went for nothing, as it had to be repeated after every fresh incursion of the Scots.

In 27 Edward I. Michael de Harcla, late Sheriff of Cumberland, was allowed 7*l.* 6*s.* 3*d.* for the carriage of timber taken in Inglewood Forest in the 24th and 25th years to Carlisle, to construct four large engines there; and 143*l.* 11*s.* 3*d.* expended in iron, steel, brass, canvass, and coals, bought for those engines, and 40*l.* 10*s.* 7*d.* in expenses of carriers carrying stores for the engines, and of men making cables for them. And 152*l.* 2*s.* 8½*d.* expended in wages and expenses of smiths' working the iron, and other small necessaries for the engines. (Rot. Lib.) The expenses for bringing the stores for the engines is a very curious and unusual entry.

In 29 Edward I. John de Halton, Bishop of Carlisle, farmer of the castle and lordships of Carlisle, was allowed 10*l.* 14*s.* 1*d.* for timber bought for the repair of the houses beyond the gate of the castle, and of the brewhouse; 5*l.* 5*s.* for timber bought to make anew the stockades (bretachias) round the castle, wages of carpenters, carriage of the timber and nails; 3*l.* 15*s.* 8*d.* for timber to make new the three bridges of the castle (this proves the existence of three distinct fosses on the south side), carriage of timber and wages of carpenters; 1*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.* for glass windows

bought for the king's chamber and chapel in the castle ; 2*l.* 1*s.* 2*d.* for repair of the great hall, great chamber, wardrobe, large kitchen, small kitchen and stable, &c. ; 18*s.* for repairs of stone walls round the castle and scouring the ditch inside and outside the castle ; 6*l.* 10*s.* 8*d.* wages of four foot cross-bowmen for the fortification and defence of the castle against the army of Scots besieging the city, to wit, twenty-eight days, 4*d.* per day each ; 22*l.* 3*s.* 4*d.* wages of ninety-five footmen in the castle, twenty-eight days, 2*d.* per day ; 2*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* wages of ten cross-bowmen in the castle, fourteen days, 4*d.* per day ; 3*l.* 10*s.* for wages of thirty footmen, fourteen days at 2*d.* a day each. (Rot. Lib.) All these expenses were incurred for the defence of the castle against the Scotch army in the 25th and 26th years of Edward I.

Another extract from the Liberate Roll of 32 Edward I. will close the view these documents give of the state of the building.

The Bishop of Carlisle, farmer of the castle, &c., is allowed 12*l.* 1*s.* 11*d.* for repairs in the 29th year ; 8*l.* 2*s.* 9½*d.* for repairs of houses and walls in the 30th year ; 2*l.* 3*s.* 11*d.* for the construction of new stockades and posts and repair of one "Springall" in the said castle in the 31st year.

John de Halton, Bishop of Carlisle, presided over the see from the year 1292 to 1325, retaining his military command until the death of Edward I. We now get the following succession of governors :—

3 Edw. ii. John de Castre.	4 Edw. iii. Ralph Dacre.
5    "    Andrew de Harcla.	13    "    John, Bishop of Car-
"    Peter de Gaveston.	lisle.
6    "    Andrew de Harcla.	19    "    Hugh de Moriceby.
12   "    Anthony de Lucy.	24 Richard de Denton.
"    Andrew de Harcla.	30 Thomas de Lucy.
17   "    Anthony de Lucy.	51 Robert de Clifford.

During the reign of Edward III., the repairs were as extensive as under the preceding king. The following are the chief entries. In the 7th Edward III., the sheriff was ordered to effect repairs to the amount of 20*l.* In the 20th, Robert de Nevill was commissioned to inspect the castle and carry out all that was requisite ; and in the 39th year, the sheriff was enjoined to lay out upon it 63*l.* from the issues of the castle and its demesnes.

During this reign violent dissensions arose betwixt the citizens of Carlisle and the vassals of the Bishop, so that several of the former were slain.

Upon examining the existing buildings there is abundant evidence in the ages of its various kinds of masonry to show what numerous changes it has gone through. There are, in fact, very few feet of walling together that belong to the same period. The general figure of the keep and of the encircling walls are probably identical with those planned by Rufus. Very little, however, can be assigned to his period, a part of the keep on the west side is original, and the main portion of the foundations, which bear marks of having been taken from the Roman wall, or some other Roman work in the neighbourhood. All the other parts are so continually mixed up with the masonry of successive ages, that it would be difficult to describe on paper where one commences and the other ends.

There can be no doubt that when the English monarchs were at Carlisle

they took up their residence in the castle, and that here Edward I. held his Parliaments.

A few facts must still be added regarding the historical events of which the Castle of Carlisle has been the scene. David, King of Scotland, took possession of it in 1135, and died here in 1153. In 1173 it was besieged by William the Lion; visited by Henry II. in 1186; surrendered to Alexander of Scotland in 1216; retaken by the English the following year, and has since continued in the hands of the English crown. Edward I. made it his residence when he assembled his Parliaments to Carlisle, and here his son received the homage of the nobility immediately after his father's death. The Chronicle of Lanercost gives a minute account of the siege it sustained by Robert Brus, which, with other interesting particulars, both of this and a later period, has been so fully given in Jefferson's History of Carlisle, that it is unnecessary to repeat them here.

In the preceding notice I have deviated from my hitherto invariable practice of giving the particular authority for every statement, a custom that no writer's historical reputation for accuracy exempts him from complying with. All readers have the indisputable right to claim, however slight they may appear, the references for the author's assertions, and if he does not condescend, or take the trouble to give them, they are justified in withholding their reliance upon any of his statements. In fact it is as much the duty of a reader to look to the notes for the author's proofs, as it is the first obligation of the writer to set forth the reasons for demanding any confidence. My own excuse for the present deviation is simply, as will be seen from their titles, that the authorities are very few, namely, in the Parliaments of Carlisle, the Rolls and Writs of Parliament, Report on the Dignity of the Peerage, the Wardrobe Account, 28 Edward I., &c., and in the Supplemental Notes, the Pipe Rolls, Liberate, Clause and Patent Rolls, of the respective years, with the commonly received facts of Hoveden, Henry of Huntingdon, William of Newbury, &c. Whilst these authorities are inconsiderable in number, the references to them would be so numerous as to make a dry statement perplexing, if not unintelligible.

CHARLES HENRY HARTSHORNE