ART. III.—*Brougham Castle and early communications in the Eden Valley*. By P. A. WILSON.

Read at Grange-over-Sands, July 9th, 1976.

BROUGHAM CASTLE has been the subject of many notices in *Transactions*. In an article printed in 1882 (CW1 vi 25) G. T. Clark, author of *Medieval Military Architecture* (1884), basing himself on the structural evidence, assigned the keep to the time of Robert de Veteripont, "very early in the thirteenth century". A later student of our military architecture, relying in part on literary as well as structural evidence, reached the same conclusion (M. W. Taylor, *Old Manorial Halls* (1892), 36). But this view has at no time won general acceptance.

Chancellor Ferguson believed that the major castles strung out along the A6 and A66, Carlisle, Brougham, Appleby, Brough, and Bowes, belonged to the reign of William Rufus (R. S. Ferguson, *History of Westmorland* (1894), 67-68). Curwen, in 1913, was of a different opinion; he thought it was Henry II who "determined to establish a strong chain of fortification along the Roman military way, up the Eden valley, and over Stainmore pass" (J. F. Curwen, *Castles and Fortified Towers* (1913), 55 ff.). The stone castles of Brougham, Appleby and Brough were all assigned by him to the years 1160-70; and the question whether these superseded earlier structures of the motte and bailey type was not gone into.

Curwen's later opinions, if any, on Appleby and Brough are not recorded; but in a talk at Brougham when the Society visited that monument in 1921 he made two points: (1) it was unlikely the stone keep was in existence as early as 1174, because the only

castles in the Eden valley recorded as having been assaulted by William the Lion in that year were Carlisle, Appleby and Brough; (2) he thought he saw signs of a motte, which he attributed to the under-tenant of the place. But he still thought the stone keep would have been built during the reign of Henry II, i.e. by 1189 (CW2 xxii 144-145).

The Royal Commission's dates are: Appleby, probably a mound and bailey of the 12th century, and on the mound a stone keep of the second half of that century; Brough, some masonry not much later than 1100, existing keep probably last quarter of 12th century; Brougham, keep built *c.* 1170-80, no mention of a mound (*RCHM Westmorland*, 8, 51, 52, 57). In reference to Brougham they say that under Henry II "the property was granted to Gospatrick son of Orm"; but they cite no authority, for, I believe, the excellent reason that there is none, though as we shall see Gospatrick was "constable" of Appleby castle in 1174.

It has often been said (quite correctly) that in 1203 king John gave to Robert de Veteripont the castles of Appleby and Brough and the bailiwick of Westmorland, and again we find no mention of Brougham. Douglas Simpson stresses the fact that in an inspeximus of king John's charter, which he quotes, the places Appleby and Brough are mentioned, but not the castles (CW2 xlvi 235-236). Evidently he did not realize that there were in 1203 two distinct transactions, attested by two different documents. On 31 March the "castles" of Appleby and Brough and the bailiwick were "committed" to de Veteripont to keep during the king's pleasure; while on 28 August Appleby and Brough and all their appurtenances were "granted" to him in fee (CW2 vii 104). It is the March transaction that is material to the argument; it is surely unthinkable that if the king had intended to "commit" to the custody of a subject a castle on a site of great strategic importance he would not have named it.

There is, I am going to suggest, independent dating evidence for Brougham castle overlooked by these authorities; for though Curwen was evidently aware of the facts, he failed to appreciate their significance. Had there been an important castle here in the late 12th century, the place would certainly have been demesne of the barony, with the castle in the occupation of its lord, or a custodian. The lord of the barony was Hugh de Morville, not to be confused with another of the same name whom we meet on a later page. After the murder of archbishop Beckett, in which he was implicated, the barony was taken into the king's hands, the profits being allowed to Ranulf de Glanville; and in these circumstances we should expect the castle to have been entrusted to some great magnate, or kept in the king's own hands, with a constable as custodian, as was Appleby. Instead of that, as Curwen would have known, the place was held by a family much more lowly in rank who took their name from it, de Burgham. Odard de Burgham was one of those who were fined, along with the constable Gospatrick son of Orm, for having delivered the castle of Appleby to the king of Scots in 1174 (*N. & B*, I, 267). His fine was 20 marks, the constable's 500, which sufficiently indicates their relative standing, as Ragg pointed out long ago (CW2 xx 66).

When Robert de Veteripont died in or shortly before 1228, we at once see a change; all three castles of Appleby, Brougham and Brough are named as having been assigned to Hubert de Burgh, guardian of Robert's son John (Simpson, *loc. cit.*). So then the castle had been built. In view of the strategic importance of the site one would have expected Robert to want to begin building as soon as his title to the barony was assured in 1203. But there was still an obstacle; he would not think of erecting a fortress in a key position for the defence of the realm, as well

as of his own barony, on a site that was not demesne of the barony. He must recover possession from the mesne lord; and this is exactly what we find. In a charter first alluded to in print in 1777 (*N & B*, I, 391), Gilbert de Burgham surrendered half the vill of Brougham to his lord Robert de Veteripont, of whom he held it in drengage, in return for the right to enjoy the other half free of that service. This charter, which was known something like 100 years earlier to Machell (MSS. Collections, I 440), I have so far failed to trace. It is not to be found in the 17th-century transcript of Clifford deeds known as Countess Anne's *Books of Record* (Kendal Record Office). That it bears no date seems to follow from the rather wild guesses made by our two authorities, and Bouch's guess (CW2 l 83) was equally wide of the mark. We have, however, one firm date for the *floruit* of the grantor; Gilbert de Broham was one of those who in 1201 paid money to the king to secure exemption from military service overseas (CW2 xxiv 297 ff.). So we shall not be far wrong if we date the charter, and the building of the castle, to the very early years of de Veteripont's tenure of the barony.

There can be no doubt that the two main centres of Norman power in the Eden valley were Carlisle and Appleby. How then do we explain the fact that a place of strategic importance on the main road between them is found to be in the hands of an undertenant as late as 1203? I believe there are two answers: (1) the Normans thought that as long as Carlisle was held there was no need for a defended river crossing on the Eamont (William the Lion taught them their mistake here, Carlisle never fell to him and he forged ahead regardless); (2) Brougham was not on the main road of that date. It was while attempting to trace the main road of that date that I was led to inquire into the dating of the castles. I believe that road ran

past Wetheral, through Lazonby, and over the Eamont at Udford to join what is now the A66 at Winderwath.

We must remember we are dealing with a period when all or most Roman bridges would be in ruins, and their medieval successors not yet built. M. W. Taylor, discussing the ford at Yanwath (*op. cit.*, 53), says the river would be fordable there at times when "the more formidable waters" at Eamont Bridge and Brougham would be impassible, and as we shall see he evidently thought the same of Udford.

Besides this, the modern map reveals at least one feature suggestive of a once major through route along the more easterly line: I mean the long stretch of minor road from Coomb Eden, 497450, past but not through the villages of Lazonby and Great Salkeld, to Beckbank, 547357; while T. H. B. Graham reports what he took for an old packhorse road between Aiketgate, 481466, and Upper Nunclose, 491454, of which he was told that it "once formed part of the high road . . . to Carlisle" (CW2 ix 211), and it would be nice to see this too as part of the same through route.

In fact the evidences for this road are not free from difficulty, and I must set them out in some detail. Henry I, presumably when he was in Carlisle 1122-3, confirmed to Wetheral priory common of pasture between the River Eden and the royal road, *Regiam viam*, leading from Carlisle to Appleby (*Register . . . of Wetheral*, ed. J. E. Prescott (1897), 16). From a later bounder of the priory lands (*ibid.*, 373) we learn that from a place called Tackengate, the monks' boundary *pertransit Stratam Regiam quae vocatur Hee-Strette, quae ducit de Carlil usque ad Appilby way*. Tackengate Stone was the name of the "B.S." of the 2½-inch O.S. sheet, about 479479, and Prescott concluded that the *Hee-Strette* followed the modern parish boundary to the "B.S." at 487474, where this makes a right-angle bend to run down to the Eden.

That is confirmed by other evidence. In the Carlisle Record Office is a map of Wetheral and vicinity by Thomas Bowey dated 1715, and here the words "High Street" are applied to the parish boundary between these points. We also find on this map a road marked "Appleby Bridle way", and it is shown running south-south-east in the parish of Hesket to meet the Lazonby boundary about midway between Tarn Wadling and Low Nun Close (now Coomb Eden), say at 492477. This hardly looks like a prolongation of the *Hee-Strette* where we have located it; but it could be a prolongation of Graham's packhorse road if that is allowed a rather sinuous course. How are we to interpret these findings?

Notwithstanding some discrepancies in the sources, which we should expect, seeing that they spread over six centuries, I feel confident they all belong together. The mention of Appleby in the charter of Henry I, in the later bounder, and on Bowey's map, coupled with the absence from all three of any mention of Penrith, cannot be dismissed as coincidence. There must, in the Middle Ages and early modern times, have been a recognized direct route from Carlisle to Appleby, by-passing Penrith, and we should expect to find that it crossed the Eamont at Udford, a place of sufficient consequence to be named in 1408 (*EPNS Cumbd.*, 191).

Prescott, perhaps unaware of Bowey's map, thought the Wetheral road crossed the Eden at some point unspecified, and made its way to Appleby by Renwick and the Pennine foothills; his ground for this opinion being the mention in other charters of a *Regia via* from Renwick to Carlisle, and another from Appleby to Renwick (*Register*, 16, 284, 288). I have never thought this at all likely; the fact that there was a road from Renwick to Carlisle and one from Appleby to Renwick cannot be held to carry the implication that these were parts of a single (but far from direct) route connecting

the two major centres of Norman power in the Eden valley. In fact the Prescott hypothesis can now be dismissed on the evidence of two Holm Cultram charters of about 1200, one of them naming a *via regia* runing north and south through the *territorium* of Lazonby. That a *via regia* from Carlisle to Appleby should have run past Lazonby makes sense; that it should have run past Renwick makes none.

The expression *territorium* of Lazonby is not very precise, and to determine the course of the *via regia* here, we must look more closely at the topographical information conveyed by the charters. The ancient parish of Lazonby was made up of three distinct parcels: Lazonby, Brownrigg (these two forming a single township), and Plumpton Wall (another township). All were parcel of the great royal forest of Inglewood, but in other respects of tenure Lazonby was quite distinct from Brownrigg and Plumpton Wall. It was early granted away to a mesne lord, no doubt, as the name implies, because there was already a sizeable settlement there before Inglewood was brought within the Norman forest system. Brownrigg and Plumpton Wall on the other hand were royal demesne, and so continued long after the period with which we are here concerned. That Lazonby and Brownrigg constituted a single township would be explained if, as seems likely, Brownrigg was recognized as the area in which the tenants of Lazonby had grazing rights. The boundary between the two (tenurially) distinct portions of the parish ran, as we shall see, beside our long straight road from 540383 to 534412 (and then down to the Eden). It is the area lying to the east of this boundary, the mesne manor, with which we are concerned, and this had come by marriage to another Hugh de Morville, lord of the barony of Burgh-by-Sands and a great benefactor of Holm Cultram. He died in 1202.

In his earlier charter de Morville granted to the abbey land in Lazonby which included, *inter alia,* four acres of arable where the monks' buildings then stood, between their sheepfold and the king's highway. (How they came to have buildings and a sheepfold here already at the time of the earlier charter is unexplained.) Then he followed this up with a further gift (with his body to be buried in the abbey, so presumably not long before his death) consisting of all the land, *territorium,* of Lazonby between the four acres already given and the stream which forms the boundary between Lazonby and Salkeld, and extending from the king's highway on one side to the royal forest on the other, *a via regia usque ad vastum domini regis* (*N & B*, II, 416, and F. Grainger & W. G. Collingwood, *Register . . . of Holm Cultram* (1929), 10). Where were these properties? and where was the king's highway that bounded them on one side?

The map shows Abbotmoss at 512425, but this is too far from the Salkeld boundary, and is in Brownrigg; if it has any link with the monks it would be in connexion with the extensive grazing rights which de Morville had given them. Collingwood opted for Monk's House at 496376 on the main A6 road, though with a query. But this too must be rejected; it is in the middle of Plumpton Wall which nowhere shares a common boundary with Great Salkeld. So we must look elsewhere.

I have stressed the mention of arable in the charters because this means that we must look for the site among the ancient fields of Lazonby. The tithe map and its field-names show plainly where these were; they lay immediately east of our long straight road, between 534412 and 540383, and this allows us to identify the site with confidence. It lay in the vicinity of the modern farm of Scalehill, 544384. It was bounded on the south by the Scatter Beck which here forms the parish

boundary; it was bounded on the west by unenclosed land, the *vastum domini regis*, and the king's highway bounded it on the east. The king's highway is therefore to be looked for east of the farm, and we can surely see it as a southward prolongation of the stretch of road and green lane between Scarrows, 541398, and 547388, and this in turn as the southward prolongation of the *Regia via* of the Wetheral bounder. Thus the southern sector of the long stretch of road from Coomb Eden to Beckbank, which looked at first as though it might have been of early origin, turns out to be of no very high antiquity; it is a secondary feature of the landscape, trodden out by horsemen who preferred to gallop their horses across the open moor unimpeded by fields and settlements. As for Monk's House, we may suppose that, with the building of the keep at Brougham, the contemporaneous improvement of the river crossing there (which we may postulate), and the establishment of a market at Penrith in 1220 (CW2 xx 30), the A6 superseded the more easterly north-south road, and the monks felt the need for a house or grange on it, for the more convenient management of their Lazonby estate. It rather looks as though they went about it in a distinctly irregular fashion, and found themselves having to pay a heavy fine to the king in 1252 in consequence (*Register*, 79, 129).

I have said that the earlier north-south road would be expected to have passed the Eamont at Udford; but need it have crossed the Eamont at all? Where we have found it in Lazonby it is making as if to cross the Eden at 561366, where the river was anciently fordable and has not since changed its channel. From here the medieval wayfarer could have followed the east bank all the way to Appleby. But I doubt if he often did. The old parish boundaries show how greatly the Eden has changed its course over the centuries, and the flatts between the Salkelds must have been very

swampy ground and liable to flooding before field drainage became general. I therefore think that after passing Lazonby the *via regia* kept to the west bank, inclining somewhat to the south, through the village of Great Salkeld, along the "High Gate" as the lane is called on old maps from 550357 to 549348, and so to Udford and Winderwath. M. W. Taylor thought it likely that the Udford ford, with its "smooth pebbly bottom", had been more used than any other wath on the Eamont (*op. cit.*, 82); at Winderwath the name, "Vinand's ford", testifies to the long use and importance of this wath; while from there to the outskirts of Appleby is a fine well-made Roman road.

But if this was indeed the main road from Carlisle to Appleby in early Norman times, the question arises: why did de Veteripont not build his keep at Udford? The answer lies in the nature of the terrain. This is no place for a defended river crossing; upstream of the ford the river flows in a narrow steep-sided ravine, the country is very broken, and visibility is limited. Once the concept of the Eamont as a line to be defended against assault from the north is accepted, there is no choice but Brougham, which has all the recommendations that Udford so conspicuously lacks.

Acknowledgements.

I am greatly indebted to Mr B. C. Jones, Miss S. J. MacPherson, and their colleagues past and present, at the County Record Offices, for their kind help and assistance in my investigation of some early roads in our area, of which this paper is a by-product.