The Archaeological Journal.

SEPTEMBER, 1859.

ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF CUMBERLAND.[1]

BY JOHN HODGSON HINDE, ESQ.,
Vice-President of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle.

In the sketch, which I offer to the members of the Archæological Institute, of the early history of Cumberland, it is not my intention to dwell at any length upon the Ante-Roman and Roman periods. Of the former we know almost nothing, and although the memorials of the latter are both numerous and interesting, they belong rather to the antiquarian than the historical section of our inquiries.

There can be little doubt that Cumberland formed a portion of the territory of the Brigantes, the largest and most powerful of the native states of Britain, for although seven at least out of the nine cities or towns assigned to them by Ptolemy lay on the east of the chain of hills which intersects this district of the island, we are expressly told by the same authority, that the possessions of the Brigantes extended from sea to sea. Of the two remaining towns, one has been allocated in Lancashire, the other in Westmoreland; in both cases indeed on very imperfect evidence, but no case whatever can be made out for placing either of them within the limits of this county.

Under the Romans the most important military stations in Cumberland were those on the line of the great mural barrier,—at Burdoswald, Walton, Stanwix, Burgh-upon-Sands, Drumburgh, and Bowness; but of these the ancient name of the first only, Amboglanna, has been ascertained

[1] This memoir was communicated to the Historical Section, at the meeting of the Institute in Carlisle, July, 1859.

with certainty; the testimony of inscribed stones, which has enabled our antiquarians to identify all the mural stations in Northumberland, entirely failing us after our first step on Cumbrian ground.

On the sea-coast we find the stations of Ellenborough and Moresby, the former amongst the noblest monuments of the imperial sway in Britain, and inferior to few in its treasures of inscribed and sculptured stones; but nothing has yet been found to lead to the absolute identification of either with any of the names in the *Notitia Imperii.* The same remark applies to the numerous stations of which traces are yet to be seen in the interior of the county. The remains of several Roman roads, more or less perfect, exist in Cumberland; but of these one only occurs in the Itinerary of Antoninus, forming the Western route from York and the South of Britain to the extremity of the Province. The stations indicated in the Itinerary were not necessarily military posts, and it is very doubtful whether Carlisle, which lies in this route, and is described as Luguvallium, was one. It certainly had no garrison when the *Notitia* was compiled, towards the close of the imperial government, but relied for its defence on the Wall to the north and the adjacent station at Stanwix. The vestiges of Roman occupation undoubtedly bespeak a town of considerable magnitude and importance, occupying as it did the same position on the great western thoroughfare which Corbridge did on the eastern. The remains at Corbridge, as they are described to us previous to their disturbance by King John, in a vain search for hidden treasure, were at least as extensive as at Carlisle; but Corbridge was not a *Notitia* station, nor, as far as we know, a fortified post. Its shape was irregular, more nearly circular than rectangular, lying like Carlisle within the Wall, but somewhat more distant and less directly connected with a mural station. Both places, although unoccupied by a stationary military force, were doubtless the regular halting-places of the Legions on the occasion of an expedition against the Caledonians. At each, it is probable, commissariat magazines were established for storing the produce of the fertile country around; and thus we may account for the existence of a large population at both places, although neither of them seems to have been a British town, and neither is described as a Roman garrison.

For the gradual enlargement of their territories in Britain, the Romans were indebted not less to diplomacy than to arms. On the invasion of the island in the reign of Claudius, the powerful tribe of the Iceni was deluded into a false security by a treaty of amity, until the neighbouring states were subdued ; and when at last they were roused to resistance by the encroachments of the invaders, they found themselves isolated from their compatriots, and unable alone to offer an effectual opposition to the imperial legions.

A similar compact was entered into by the Brigantes, with the same ultimate result, although their subjugation was much longer deferred. Seven years after the invasion, Ostorius Scapula, the successor of Aulus Plautius, the first governor, was recalled from an expedition against the Cangi, whose territories extended towards the shores of the Irish Channel, by intelligence of disturbances amongst the Brigantes, which he hastened to put down. The terms of the alliance, which must have been arranged previous to this date (A. D. 50), seem to have been submission on one side and protection on the other, and the consequences which followed are exactly paralleled by those which we have so often seen under the treaties of the British Government of our own day and the native princes of the protected states of India.

Cartismandua, Queen of the Brigantes, having by her disreputable and vicious conduct alienated the affections of her subjects, was driven from her throne, and claimed the aid of the Romans which was due by treaty, and which she had further earned by the betrayal of Caractacus, King of the Silures, the heroic defender of his country, who after his defeat had sought an asylum at her court. The Silures made common cause with the Brigantes under Venusius, the repudiated husband of Cartismandua ; the struggle was long and obstinate. "At first," says Tacitus, "the result was doubtful, but the termination was satisfactory." It is doubtful whether Cartismandua lived to reap the benefit of the success of her allies, for the war with the Brigantes extended almost, if not quite, to the government of Agricola, which commenced A. D. 78. Two years later that illustrious general marched through the Brigantian territory to gather fresh laurels in his campaigns against the Caledonians. Whether he took the eastern or western route can only be matter for

conjecture, but it is not improbable that both lines of communication were now for the first time made available, and the basis of operations extended over Cumberland as well as Northumberland.

As late as the reign of Antoninus Pius the Brigantes still enjoyed the semblance of a domestic government, but half of their territory was taken from them by that emperor, as a punishment for their temerity in invading the country of the Gadeni, a tribe who like themselves were placed under the protection of the Roman government, and paid it tribute. The Gadeni, or, as they are called by Pausanias, to whom we are indebted for the above information, Genuini, lay to the north of the Brigantes, beyond the Wall of Hadrian, but within the barrier erected by Lollius Urbicus, the lieutenant of Antoninus, between the Forth and the Clyde. It was therefore in all probability in the latter reign that they first became tributary. The territory thus annexed seems to have included the city of York, which in the reign of Severus became the seat of the imperial court, as it was afterwards under Constantius and his son Constantine. How long the northern section, which necessarily included Cumberland, continued under the administration of its own princes is uncertain, but all real power must have been in the hands of the Romans at all events from the time of Hadrian, whose Wall and stations gave him the complete command of the adjacent country. Of the presence of his troops, as well as of those of Severus and his successors, we have abundant memorials in the inscriptions which have been discovered throughout the district. That the garrisons on the Wall were maintained to the latest period of the Roman dominion is clear from the Notitia, nor is it quite certain that they were even then withdrawn. We know, indeed, that the Legions were recalled, but these garrisons, which were composed of auxiliary forces drawn from all quarters of the empire, as well in Europe as in Africa, had for a long series of years been stationary in the same locality, often in the same fort, and it is not improbable that they ultimately remained amongst a people with whom they must already have become to a great extent amalgamated. The effect on the population of the intermarriage of these foreign troops has been the subject of much discussion, and its influence on the national character perhaps a little exaggerated ; but whatever

its extent, there can be no doubt, from the number of garrisons in this district, that it operated here in as great a degree as in any part of the island.

The earliest Saxon settlement in Britain is generally assigned to the year 449, about 40 years after the departure of the last Roman Legion, and this date I am disposed to consider historical, notwithstanding the confident opinions to the contrary which have been put forward of late years. Towards the close of the fifth century a settlement was effected on the shores of the Frith of Forth, and about the middle of the sixth Ida laid the foundation of a kingdom, which ultimately included the vast district which extends from the Humber and the Mersey on the south, to the Forth and Clyde on the north. Until the reign of his grandson, Ethelfrith, the Saxon conquests in this quarter appear to have been confined to the east coast; but under this monarch operations were conducted, as we learn from Beda, on a much larger scale. "He conquered," we are told, "more territory from the Britons than any other king or tribune; of this he colonised a portion with his followers, the remainder he left in the hands of its native possessors, on payment of tribute." The tributary states appear to have extended over the whole of the western portion of the kingdom of Northumberland, from the Clyde to the Mersey, for within this district we find traces of British nationality at a much later period. To the north, the Britons of Strathclyde frequently occur in history, sometimes in rebellion against their conquerors, at others, engaged in wars under their own kings against the neighbouring states. To the south, we have evidence of a kindred population in Lancashire, in a charter of Ecgfrid, King of Northumberland, to the church of Lindisfarne, in which he grants to St. Cuthbert, Cartmel, in that county, "*with all its Britons.*"

These northern Britons are called by historians "*Cumbri,*" a designation we first meet with in the chronicle of Ethelwerd, who applies it to the Britons of Strathclyde, in describing their sufferings from the invasion of the Danish Halfdene, A.D. 875. Joceline, of Furness, in his life of Kentigern, speaks of Strathclyde as Regnum Cambrense, Regnum Cambrinum, and Cambria, but he is unsupported by the authority of any earlier or more authentic writer. Cumbria was never applied as a territorial distinction to any portion of the land

of the Cumbri, until a more extended kingdom was formed under this name, by the union of Strathclyde with Galloway and modern Cumberland, to which we shall hereafter have occasion to refer. Ecgfrid, who reigned over Northumberland from 670 to 685, seems to have destroyed the last semblance of a domestic government in all the petty states of the Cumbri, with the exception of Strathclyde. Besides the grant of Cartmel already referred to, he bestowed on St. Cuthbert Carlisle and the surrounding district, whilst Galloway was after his time erected into a distinct see, and is described by Beda as an integral portion of Bernicia.

Cuthbert turned the munificence of his sovereign to good account by founding a nunnery and a school at Carlisle, the former of which was presided over by the sister of Queen Eormenburga, who was herself an inmate within its walls at the time of her husband's fatal expedition against the Picts. A monastery also existed here, but whether it was of St. Cuthbert's foundation is uncertain. At the time of the Danish invasion in 875, in which so many of the northern monasteries were destroyed, Eadred was abbot of Carlisle. This holy man, who was surnamed Lulisc, from Luel the ancient name of his city, was consulted by Eardulf, Bishop of Lindisfarne, as to the best course to be pursued under the circumstances of peril in which the monastery of the latter was placed. The result of their consultations was a resolution that the monks should seek safety in flight, carrying with them the body of their patron saint, and other relics belonging to their house. The wanderings of these pious enthusiasts during a period of seven years have furnished employment for the pen of more than one historian. During the whole time Eadred Lulisc shared their toils and dangers, and afterwards took a prominent part in the establishment of Guthred, a Christian king, on the throne of Northumberland, and the transfer of the bishopric, which had twice suffered from the sacrilegious violence of the Danes, from Lindisfarne to a less exposed site at Chester-le-Street.

No effort was made to restore the religious and educational establishments at Carlisle, which were suffered to remain in ruins till a period long subsequent to the Norman conquest. Guthred's dominions were confined to the district south of the Tyne, which had been divided among the followers of Halfdene, and contained a numerous Danish population;

whilst to the north of that river a petty Saxon state continued to exist under the government of its native princes, at first dignified with the title of kings, but afterwards described as dukes, whose capital was at Bamburgh. Carlisle, with the adjacent district, was not included in either of these governments, although it had formed part of Northumberland previous to its dismemberment. When next heard of, it was incorporated with Galloway and Strathclyde, under the name of Cumbria. This new kingdom was from the first intimately connected with Scotland, and although it is frequently mentioned by our own historians, the only circumstantial account of its origin is found in the Scottish Chronicle of Fordun. At the time of the Danish ravages, which were not confined to the eastern district of Northumberland and the vicinity of Carlisle, but extended to Galloway and Strathclyde, the throne of Scotland was occupied by Gregory, a man of great vigour and enterprise, who not only maintained his authority within his own dominions, but had considerably extended their limits, whilst his powerful contemporary the English Alfred had been compelled to make large concessions of territory to the invaders. To this monarch it is not unnatural that the Cumbrian members of the kingdom of Northumberland should turn for support, when they found their late superiors not only unable to maintain their sway, but to protect either themselves or their dependents. That such was actually the case we learn from Fordun, who informs us that "the indigenous inhabitants of certain provinces voluntarily submitted themselves to Gregory, with their lands and possessions, offering to him an oath of fealty and homage, thinking it preferable to be subject to the Scots, who, although enemies, were Christians, than to infidel pagans." Some authorities represent Gregory not as King of Scotland, but merely as the guardian of Eocha, the son of Kun, King of Strathclyde; and nephew and heir of Constantine II., King of Scotland, but whether he held the sceptre in his own right, or exercised a vicarial sway, there is no reason to doubt that he was the virtual ruler of his country, and had distinguished himself for his martial exploits. We have indeed some exaggerated accounts of his conquests, one chronicler asserting that he subdued all Ireland and great part of England; but these very exaggerations, although incredible to their full extent, would

hardly have been propagated of any one, who had not really distinguished himself by his warlike exploits.

On the death or expulsion of Gregory in 893, he was succeeded on the Scottish throne by Donal IV., contemporary with whom was another Donal, King of Strathclyde. Donal of Scotland died in 904, and was succeeded by Constantine III., who again, on the death of Donal, King of Strathclyde, procured the election of his own brother Donal to the vacant throne. This Donal, as well as his predecessor, is described as "King of the Britons," but never specifically as King of Cumberland. Eugenius, however, the son and successor of the second Donal, is invariably so designated, as well by Fordun as by the English historians. This prince appears somewhat prominently in the transactions of this period, in conjunction with his uncle, Constantine. When Guthred, son of Sitric the Danish King of Northumberland, was expelled by Athelstan, he took refuge at the Scottish court, and Eugenius, as well as Constantine, seems to have been implicated in his escape. Both were summoned by Athelstan to surrender the fugitive, and hostilities were threatened in case of refusal. Unprepared for resistance against such an antagonist, they promised compliance, and hastened to meet their imperious neighbour, who had already entered Cumberland, at Dacre. In the meantime, however, Guthred again escaped, but Constantine and his nephew succeeded in making their own peace. The Scottish king was again in arms against the Anglo-Saxon monarch in 933—34, but compelled to yield to the superior power of his antagonist. Three years later a grand confederacy was formed between the Danes, as well of Northumberland as of Ireland, and Constantine; and great preparations were made both by sea and land to humble the power of Athelstan. Eugenius was a party to this league, which resulted in the total defeat of the confederates at the battle of Brunanburgh, in which they are said to have lost five kings and six earls with countless multitudes of their followers. Eugenius was probably amongst the slain, as his name does not afterwards occur. In 945, Dunmail, who then occupied the throne of Cumberland, had by some means incurred the displeasure of Edmund, the successor of Athelstan, who, in the words of the Saxon chronicle, "wasted all Cumberland and gave it to Malcolm, King of Scots, on the condition that he should be

his ally by land and sea." To this statement Wendover adds, that, having by the aid of Leoline, King of South Wales, plundered that province of its wealth, he deprived the two sons of Dunmail of sight. The decisive combat between the forces of Edmund and the Cumbrians is said by tradition to have taken place near a well-known site, which still preserves the name of Dunmail Raise; and it is further added that Dunmail fell on this occasion, in confirmation of which a cairn is pointed out which is said to have been erected to his memory. The tradition receives no confirmation from Wendover, and on other grounds it is probable that Dunmail escaped. Thirty years afterwards a notice occurs in the Cambrian Annals of a British Prince, called Dunwallen, who having gone on a pilgrimage died at Rome. He is there described as Prince of Strathclyde, the term still applied in these annals to Cumberland after the annexation of Galloway and Carlisle. Now Donal, Dunmail, and Dunwallen are all different forms of the same name, and it is difficult to find a place for this Dunwallen in the Cumbrian dynasty, unless we identify him with Dunmail, whose kingdom was seized and his sons mutilated in 945.

In giving Cumberland to Malcolm, Edmund merely restored to Scotland a dependency which had belonged to it in the reign of Gregory, Edward the Elder, indeed, and afterwards Athelstan, had compelled the Cumbrian prince to acknowledge the supremacy of the English crown, but this was only what, by the right of the stronger, they had insisted on from Scotland also. As a component part of Northumberland, whose king, Eanred, admitted the superiority of Egbert, Cumbria might owe a nominal subjection, but no Anglo-Saxon king had ever exercised any substantial act of authority within its limits.

From this period Cumberland continued in the possession of the royal line of Scotland, sometimes retained by the king himself, at others by a member of his family; usually, if we may credit the national historians, by the proximate heir. The only circumstance which is recorded of it for many years is its total devastation by Ethelred, King of England, A.D. 1000, at which time it is represented as the chief rendezvous of the Danes in Britain. This is the only mention of a Danish colonisation of Cumberland by any historian, but their occupation has not passed away without leaving traces

behind, both in the language of the people, and in the nomenclature of the district. This, however, is a subject on which it is unnecessary to enlarge, as it has already received the attention of a native of the county, well qualified both by his intelligence and application to illustrate a theme of so much local and general interest. Fordun gives a different account of Ethelred's expedition, which he represents as directed not against the Danes but the native Cumbrians, as a punishment for their refusal to contribute to a fund raised for the inglorious purpose of purchasing the forbearance of the common enemy. Such a fund is indeed said to have been raised about this time, under the name of Danegeld ; and if it was really applied to buying off the enemy instead of providing means to repel them, resistance to such an impost would have been highly honourable to the Cumbrians ; but unfortunately the whole story, unsupported as it is by any other testimony, rests on very questionable authority.

Fifty years before the time of which we are speaking, the kingdom of Northumberland had ceased to exist, and the government of the province was committed by the kings of England to a succession of earls, of whom perhaps the most distinguished was Siward, the hero of many a romantic legend, and immortalised by Shakespeare in the tragedy of Macbeth. Siward was appointed to the earldom in 1041, and was sent by Edward the Confessor on his memorable expedition into Scotland in 1054. Malcolm, the son of the murdered Duncan, the predecessor of Macbeth, was at that time King of Cumberland, and Siward, having defeated and slain Macbeth, placed either Malcolm himself or a son of the same name, for historians differ on this point, upon the throne of Scotland. This was the celebrated Malcolm Caenmore, who during his long reign retained Cumberland as well as Scotland in his own hands. Under his government, however, the district of Carlisle, which contained all the Cumbrian territory south of the Solway, was severed from the rest of the kingdom, and formed into an earldom dependent on the crown of England. An authentic document is in existence which sets forth the exact limits of the kingdom of Cumberland previous to the dismemberment. When Edward I. put forth his claim to a paramount superiority over the realm of Scotland, he directed the various religious houses throughout the kingdom to furnish him with

all the information, historical or documentary, bearing upon the ancient relations between England and Scotland, which they had in their possession. Amongst the returns from the monastery of Carlisle is the following important statement as to the boundaries of Cumberland at the period in question :—"That district was called Cumbria, which is now included in the bishoprics of Carlisle, Glasgow, and Whitherne, together with the country lying between the bishopric of Carlisle and the river Duddon." At an earlier period it is probable that the southern limit included Furness and Amounderness, nearly the whole of which is recorded in Doomsday to have been in the possession of Tosti, Earl of Northumberland, and which were probably acquired by his predecessor, Earl Eadulf, whose rapacity and cruelty towards the British population formed the principal feature of his government.

Nothing can be more discordant than the statements of historians as to the condition of the southern portion of Cumberland during the reign of William the Conqueror, or more uncertain than the date of its transference from Scotland to England. The last notice of the Scottish king's supremacy over the entire province occurs in the chronicle attributed to Symeon of Durham, which, however, so far as it is not a mere copy of Florence of Worcester, is of very doubtful authority.

In the year 1070, we are told, "a countless multitude of Scots, under King Malcolm, marched through Cumberland, and turning eastward, ravaged Teesdale and the neighbouring country . . . . Whilst the Scots were engaged in these devastations, Earl Gospatric, having collected a considerable force, made a furious incursion into Cumberland, spreading slaughter and conflagration on all sides. . . . . Cumberland at this time was under the dominion of Malcolm, not as a rightful possession, but subjugated by force."

Twenty-two years later, A.D. 1092, in the reign of William Rufus, we read in the Saxon Chronicle, that "the King went northward with a large army, to Carlisle, when he repaired the city and built the castle. He drove out Dolphin, who had previously governed the country, and having placed a garrison in the castle, he returned south, and sent a great number of English husbandmen thither, with horses and cattle, that they might settle there and

cultivate the land." To this Florence of Worcester adds, "This city, like most others in that quarter, had been laid in ruins by the northern Danes, two hundred years before, and had been uninhabited up to this time." This account is adopted by all our historians, and amongst others by Matthew of Westminster; and yet that writer has admitted into his chronicle the following paragraph under the date A.D. 1072, twenty years earlier, which is utterly irreconcileable with it:

"King William, returning from Scotland through Cumberland, beholding so royal a town, took it from Earl Ranulph, and gave him instead of it the earldom of Chester. The King also ordered Carlisle to be fortified with the strongest towers and ramparts."

Besides the inconsistency between this paragraph and those quoted above from the Saxon Chronicle and Florence, it contains other anachronisms which will be pointed out hereafter; but we must at present recur to the proceedings of William Rufus in 1092. There is no reason to doubt the literal correctness of the particulars recorded, but it is by no means clear that the lordship of Carlisle passed for the first time into the hands of the English at this date, although the statement is conclusive that the city was not rebuilt at an earlier period. Dolphin, it appears, was at this time the Governor, and although several persons of this name occur in the north of England during this and the preceding reigns, it is probable that the individual in question was the son of Gospatric, Earl of Northumberland, mentioned above, whose descendants were connected with Cumberland by large territorial possessions. Gospatric held his earldom under the English crown, and, if we are to credit the authority cited above, was engaged in bitter hostilities with the Scottish king in 1070; but two years later he was expelled from Northumberland and a refugee at Malcolm's court, who, forgetting all former animosities, conferred on him large possessions in Lothian, which were long held by his descendants, the Earls of Dunbar. The question arises whether Dolphin had been appointed governor of a portion of the district which his father overran, by the English monarch in 1070, or whether he had received it from Malcolm after Gospatric's exile in 1072. The incidents recorded by Matthew of West-

minster, under the latter date, may be passed over as inconsistent with either supposition, but we look in vain for any more reliable authority to help us to a solution of the difficulty.

The statement of Matthew of Westminster, that the lordship of Carlisle was given to Ranulph de Micenis by William the Conqueror, is adopted by the writer of a brief chronicle formerly preserved in the monastery of Wetheral, and printed by Dugdale in the Monasticon, under the title of Chronicon Cumbriæ. The latter does not indeed adopt the monstrous assertion that Ranulph was promoted to the earldom of Chester in 1072, in the face of the notorious fact that he did not attain to that dignity until the death by shipwreck of the previous earl, his cousin, in 1118; but other particulars not less startling are recorded,—as, for instance, that this same Earl Ranulph, who survived till 1129, had been an efficient auxiliary of the Conqueror at the battle of Hastings.

The information which we have from the Saxon Chronicle, that the county of Cumberland was in the immediate possession of the Crown in 1092, and not yet bestowed as a territorial grant on a subject, is confirmed by a charter of William Rufus, by which he founds the monastery of Armathwaite, and endows it with various possessions within the county. The earliest period from which the grant to Micenis can date is the latter part of this reign, but it is nearly certain that it was not earlier than the commencement of that of Henry I. In the foundation charter of Wetherel Priory, Ranulph expresses that the endowment is for the welfare, in addition to the members of his own family, of the soul of King Henry; but not a word is said of William, who would scarcely have been omitted, if the grantor had owed his own ample possessions to the latter.

We have some materials for a pedigree of the Micenis family in the Liber Vitæ of the church of Durham, in which we find his own name, "Ranulphus de Mesch," with those of his father Ranulphus, his mother Mahald, his elder brother Richard, and his wife Lucia. The elder Ranulph is styled by Ordericus Vitalis "De Brichsard," and was a viscount or sheriff of Bayeux. A viscount of Bayeux of the same christian name is mentioned by William of Poitiers amongst the Norman nobles who conspired against William the

Conqueror on his accession to the duchy. Lucia had previously been the wife of Roger de Romara, and seems to have been the daughter of Yvo Tailboise, though the Peterborough Annals and the compilation ascribed to Ingulf represent him as her first husband. We know from the Pipe Roll of the 31st of Henry I., that she had livery of certain estates in Lincolnshire, which are described as her husband's lands. To these lands her son William de Romara was heir, and the latter appears from the Testa de Nevil to have been in possession of various manors, which were formerly enjoyed by Yvo Tailboise, but which are described in Doomsday as having been before his time in the hands of separate proprietors. If all were held by Lucia in right of her father, that father could only have been Yvo. A more glaring misstatement makes her the daughter of Algar, Earl of Mercia, and the sister of the Earls Edwine and Morcar, whose vast estates she is said to have inherited. Now we know from Ordericus that Algar had but one daughter, who was called, not Lucia, but Aldith, and that she was successively the wife of Griffin, Prince of Wales, and of Earl Harold; and further, it is matter of notoriety that the estates of Edwine and Morcar did not pass to any individual, but were divided amongst a large number of grantees. I dismiss the subject of these misstatements thus briefly, but fuller details will be found in the preface to the Cumberland Pipe Rolls, published by the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle.

Ranulph is referred to in a valuable return of the time of King John, which is preserved in the Testa de Nevil, as formerly Lord of Cumberland, but his proper title was Lord or Earl of Carlisle, which was till late in the reign of Henry II. the name by which the surrounding territory, as well as the city, was distinguished. It is not till the 23rd year of that king that Cumberland appears in the Pipe Rolls as the title of the county instead of Carleolium. The earldom of Carlisle, however, was not confined to the present county of Cumberland, but comprised, besides, the barony of Appleby, which now forms part of the county of Westmoreland. Its precise limits are ascertained by a reference to the boundaries of the adjacent districts in Doomsday Book, for the two great earldoms of Northumberland and Cumberland, in the revenues of which the Crown had no interest, are not included in that survey. A small portion also of the present

county of Cumberland, including the lordship of Millum, appears to have been excepted from the grant to Ranulph; although it lies to the north of the Duddon, and is included in the kingdom of Cumbria, as set forth in the return of the monastery of Carlisle to Edward I.

In the year 1118, Richard, Earl of Chester, perished by shipwreck, in company with William, the only legitimate son of King Henry, and several of the principal nobility of the realm. His earldom was bestowed on Ranulph de Micenis, not, as has been alleged, in virtue of his hereditary right through his mother Matilda, daughter of Richard and sister of Hugh, successively Earls of Chester, and aunt of the late earl, but in exchange for other possessions of which the lordship of Carlisle was the chief. He gave up, besides, his wife's estates, to the detriment of her son and heir William de Romara, who resented the injury so keenly that two years afterwards he took up arms against his sovereign; nor, as we are informed by Ordericus Vitalis, did he return to his allegiance until the king gave him competent satisfaction, and yielded him a large part of his claim. Besides the lands given in exchange, Ranulph was charged with a very heavy fine in respect of this transaction, of which 1000*l.* remained due at his death, and is debited against his son and successor in the Pipe Roll of 31st of Henry I. as "for the land of Earl Hugh." Yvo Tailboise was in possession of the barony of Kendal, which is included with that of Appleby in the present county of Westmoreland, as appears from a grant of the churches within it to the Abbey of St. Mary at York, under Stephen its first abbot, between 1088 and 1112. His title must have been derived from a grant subsequent to the compilation of Doomsday, in which this barony is described as a part of Amounderness, the whole of which was then in the hands of the Crown. No doubt he owed this valuable possession to the favour of William Rufus, whose cause he espoused in opposition to his elder brother Robert, as we gather from the fact that when Ralph Flambard, Bishop of Durham, who was a partizan of the Duke of Normandy, was for a time deprived of his bishopric, Yvo was one of the custodians of the temporalities. Whether Kendal descended to Lucia, and was in Ranulf's possession at the time of the exchange, is uncertain; but, if so, it was never restored to William de Romara, but

remained with Cumberland and the other barony of Westmoreland in the hands of the Crown during the remainder of this reign.

The isolated Pipe Roll of the 31st of Henry I. includes, with the sheriff's accounts of other counties, those of Cumberland and Westmoreland; but Cumberland and apparently Westmoreland were given up by Stephen to David, King of Scotland, as the price of his acquiescence in Stephen's usurpation of the crown of England. Westmoreland, at all events, is included with Cumberland and Northumberland in the claims made by succeeding kings of Scotland for the restoration of the provinces enjoyed by David and his family.

In the 3rd of Henry II., Cumberland, as well as Northumberland, was finally annexed to the crown of England, though not without many efforts on the part of the Scotch, both by arms and diplomacy, to recover so valuable a possession. At length, the claims of Scotland were compromised under the mediation of Cardinal Otho, the Papal Legate, A.D. 1242. For some years the Scottish kings had held the lordship of Tyndale, in Northumberland, and they now had awarded to them in addition the manors of Penrith, Sowerby, Longwathby, Salkeld, Carlatton, and Scotby, being all the crown demesnes in Cumberland, with the exception of the city of Carlisle.

The portion of ancient Cumberland which lies to the north of the Solway, including Strathclyde and Galloway, had continued to be held as a dependency of the Scottish crown, being at this time under the king's immediate government. David I., however, had held it before he ascended the throne, with the title of earl, and a very remarkable document of that period is extant, the "Inquisitio Davidis," being a return of the ancient possessions of the see of Glasgow within this principality, which is described as "Regio Cumbrensis." These are spread over all parts of the district between the Clyde and the Solway, but none occur to the south of the latter river. Mr. Chalmers, whose general accuracy is as remarkable as his laborious research, has hence been led into the error of assuming not only that the Solway was the limit of David's principality, which was undoubtedly the case, but that it had always been the boundary of the *Regio Cumbrensis*. Hence he infers that from an early period two

separate states had existed, the Regio Cumbrensis including the country between the Clyde and the Solway, and the kingdom of Cumbria comprising the present county of Cumberland. Further than this, he would identify the Regnum Cambrense of Joceline with the Regio Cumbrensis, making it include Galloway as well as Strathclyde.

Now, there can be no doubt that the Regio Cumbrensis and the kingdom of Cumbria were identical, and that they included the Cumbrian territory on both sides of the Solway, and this is evident from a passage of this very Inquisitio, which has escaped the notice of the author of the Caledonia, in which it is expressly said that "David at that time did not rule over the whole of the Cumbrian region," referring unquestionably to the dismemberment of the earldom of Carlisle. Whilst the Regio Cumbrensis extended on both sides of the Solway, there was of course no space for the separate existence of a kingdom of Cumbria to the south, the identity of the two being indisputable. But ever after the severance of the earldom of Carlisle, we have shown that that district was never by itself called Cumberland till a late period of the reign of Henry II., and long after the death of David.

Lastly, the so-called Regnum Cambrense was not identical with the Regio Cumbrensis. As the latter was not limited to the country north of the Solway, the former did not extend to that river, and so include Galloway as well as Strathclyde, and this is demonstrable from Joceline himself, who, in coining a new name for the latter kingdom, had no intention to mislead. He tells us that Kentigern's bishopric was co-extensive with the Regnum Cambrense ; and again, in describing the missionary labours of the Saint in Galloway, he expressly states that that province was not within the boundaries of his diocese.

The high reputation of Chalmers has rendered this digression necessary ; and I may be allowed, in a few words, to recapitulate what I believe to be a correct statement of the facts which he has misapprehended.

I. The kingdom of Strathclyde existed as a separate state from the sixth century, when it is described as *Regnum Cambrense*, till near the close of the ninth.

II. In the ninth century the kingdom of Cumbria was formed by the union of Strathclyde, Galloway, and Carliol.

III. Towards the end of the eleventh century the lordship of Carliol was severed from Cumbria, then or shortly afterwards known as the Regio Cumbrensis.

IV. The county of Cumberland, being a portion of the lordship of Carlisle, first occurs under its present name in the 23rd of Henry II.

I have had occasion more than once to point out the inaccuracy, not to use a harsher term, of the authorities which have hitherto been relied on, in tracing the general history of Cumberland. It is foreign to the design of this essay to enter into local details, or I should have to expose errors and misstatements at every step; but it may not be out of place to give a few instances, by way of showing how much caution is necessary in sifting the received statements of our Cumbrian topographers.

The narrative of the foundation of the Priory of Lanercost is familiar to us all, repeated as it has been by one writer after another, and yet the whole story is a fiction. We are told that that religious house had its origin in the remorse of Robert de Vaux for the treacherous murder of Gils Beuth, the former owner of Gilsland, of which his father, Hubert de Vaux, had obtained a grant from Ranulf de Micenis. Now it happens that an enrolment of the charter, by which Hubert became possessed of Gilsland, is preserved amongst the Cartæ Antiquæ in the Tower, from which it plainly appears that Gils Beuth was already dead before Hubert had any connection with Gilsland; and we further learn as well from this charter, as from the Testa de Nevil, that the title of the latter was derived from Henry II., and not from Ranulf, whose interest in Cumberland ceased before the close of the reign of Henry I.

A fundamental error of the Chronicon Cumbriæ is the deduction of the titles of all the estates in Cumberland from Ranulf de Micenis, whereas this is the case with two only. The bulk of the remainder were granted directly by the Crown in the reign of Henry I., Gilsland, as we have seen, and two or three others, by Henry II., and the remainder to one individual by Richard I.

Another mistake is the identification of Hugh de Morville, lord of the barony of Burgh, with his more notorious namesake, the murderer of Thomas à Becket. Hugh was a common name in the Morville family, as appears by various

documents in which we meet with the name of Hugh de Morville, at dates and under circumstances which show that it could be neither of the above. Hugh de Morville, of Burgh, was the grandson of Simon de Morville, who was probably the brother, and certainly the contemporary, of Becket's assassin. The former survived to the reign of John; whereas the latter is stated by all the biographers of the saint to have died at Jerusalem, whither he had gone on a pilgrimage in expiation of his offence, and to have been buried in front of the Temple, within three years of the murder. He was lord of Westmoreland, and of Knaresburgh in Yorkshire, at the same time that Burgh was possessed by Simon, the grandfather of his namesake.

It would be easy to multiply instances of misstatements, if it were necessary. Many of them originate with the Chronicon Cumbriæ, but these are amplified and augmented by succeeding compilers, especially by two persons of the name of Denton, whose manuscript collections have been the main source from whence the modern historians of the county have derived their information as to the early descent of property, and the genealogy of its possessors.

The contents of these storehouses of error must be discarded by the future topographer, or used only to compare with more authentic documents. The foundation of his labours must rest on an Inquisition of the reign of King John, preserved in the Testa de Nevil, aided by the early Pipe Rolls, and illustrated by such contemporary charters as are preserved among the Cartæ Antiquæ and elsewhere. Such, however, as occur in the Monasticon, valuable as many of them are, must be used with extreme caution, and tested not less by their own internal evidence than by comparison with the records in our national repositories.