

HASTINGS CASTLE, 1050—1100, AND THE CHAPEL OF ST. MARY.

BY THE HON. F. H. BARING.

No traces have been found of a Roman camp at Hastings on Castle Hill; there may have been prehistoric earthworks, but it is uncertain. Though the Saxon town is generally mentioned simply as "Hastings," in the old list called the Burghal Hidage (*circa* 900) "Haestingeceastre" has the service of 500 hides attached to it, and in Aethelstan's Edict of Greatley it has a mint (928); the same name is used once by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (D) in 1050, and once by the Bayeux Tapestry. But often, if not always, the Saxon "*ceastre*" meant not a castle or a mere fort, but a town enclosed by a wall of timber or sometimes of stone, and Hastingeceastre appears to mean the walled or stockaded town of Hastings.¹ A castle or fort of some kind was made by Harold on the hill at Dover, but there seems no reason to think that there was any Saxon fortification on Castle Hill at Hastings. There was apparently none a little before 1066, for it was said that, when in Normandy, Harold swore to hand over the castle at Dover "and also *other* 'castra' to be built where William *should* order,"² and no castles seem to have been built after this (alleged) oath, at all events none at Hastings, for while the castle at Dover is specially noticed in the earliest accounts of the Conquest, none is mentioned at Hastings.

In 1066 William of Jumièges (vii., 34) tells us that the Normans, landing at Pevensey on September 28, "at once made a strong fortification (*castrum firmissimo*

¹ See Mr. Round's paper in *Archæologia*, LVIII., 322 (1902).

² William of Poitiers, 108-9: "Castrum Doveram, studio atque sumptu suo communitum, item per diversa loca illius terrae alia castra, ubi voluntas ducis ea firmari juberet."

vallo), and then pressing on to Hastings immediately (*cito opere*) established another one there," say on the 30th. The meaning of "castrum" in the eleventh century varies,³ but the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle says that the Normans, landing at Pevensey, "as soon as they came (*sona thaes hi fere waeron*) made a *castel* at Haestingaport," and "*castel*" is the word used in the Chronicle for the new castles of the Normans. It is now well established that, with few exceptions, these castles consisted of a timber-walled bailey, or two such baileys, and a timber keep, generally on a more or less artificial mound or "*motte*."⁴ The Tapestry shows such a mound and timber castle being raised, with the title "ordered that a castle should be *thrown up* at Haestingaceastre" (*ut castellum foderetur*), the Battle Abbey Chronicle (1176-96) mentions that this castle was of timber, and Wace describes how William landed from his ships the timber for it ready cut. Very likely there was also a stockade in front of the ships.

But where was this castle at Hastings placed? It is generally assumed that it was on the top of Castle Hill, but this is mainly assumption based on the natural attraction of that striking site—there is no real evidence for it. William of Poitiers tells us that after the battle, before starting on October 19 for Romney and Dover, William "put Hastings in charge of an active commander," and Orderic mentions incidentally at the end of 1068 "Humphrey de Tilleul who had been in charge of the castle at Hastings from the first day it was built."⁵ But, though the commander of the 19th October, 1066, presumably took over the castle set up on the 30th September, there is nothing that need identify that castle with Castle Hill. Even if the castle of 1068 was on Castle Hill, that of 1066 may still have been on a different site and removed within a few months, for Orderic, who wrote 50 years later, may not have been

³ Mrs. Armitage, *Early Norman Castles*, 69, 98.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24: It does not here matter whether such castles were always Norman, or always on a "*motte*." For "*castel*" see A. S. Chron. (D), 1052, 1067-9, 1075-6.

⁵ William of Poitiers, 139; Orderic, iv., 4. (512B).

thinking of the 1066 castle at all, as he does not mention it at the Conquest, saying only that William "occupied Hastings." Or it may well be that the castle of 1068 *was* the one built in September, 1066, but was *not* on Castle Hill, the castle there having been built by Count Robert of Eu, to whom the rape was granted in 1068-70.

All the chroniclers treat the castle of September, 1066, as erected immediately William reached Hastings, so possibly the town had not yet surrendered; but in any case a castle which was to "protect his ships and secure his retreat"⁶ could hardly be on Castle Hill. If William lost the inevitable battle and was pursued to Hastings by a victorious English army, a castle on the top of Castle Hill would be of little use to the defeated Normans. A castle there, when surrounded by the enemy, would not give much protection to the ships 180-ft. below or to a re-embarkation in them, even if they were in the haven at the foot of the hill, while William probably thought it safer to leave them drawn up on shore a little to the west, for their station is called "*navalia*," not "*portum*," and the context seems to suggest that it was a little away from the town.⁷ We may doubt whether the port or little creek would have been a good position for the ships, for even if they could all get into it, which is unlikely, it was probably a tidal harbour, and even at high tide they would take time to get out again—they would probably get to sea much quicker if drawn up on the shore.

The Norman army could not be encamped on Castle Hill. There were not 60,000 men, which is only a common mediæval phrase for "a great many." There could hardly be more than 8,000 to 10,000,⁸ but even 5,000 would hardly be satisfied with the water supply on Castle Hill, though there is a tiny spring near the top of it and

⁶ William of Poitiers, 129, see note 11.

⁷ "Dum custodiam navium viseret Dux (at Hastings), indicatum est forte spatianti prope navalia monachum Haroldi legatum adesse." William of Poitiers, 128.

⁸ *English History*, Rev., XX., 65, Sir James Ramsay only allows William 5,000 men, *Foundations of England*, II. 24. For the merely descriptive use of "60,000" see Round, *Feudal England* 290; in the *Chanson de Roland* Charles has 60,000 trumpeters! (§ 184, l 2, 110).

some water could be got by digging down 5 or 6 feet. In 1066 that hill extended further south than it does now, but it runs back from the coast in a narrow ridge, so that any considerable camp there would stretch away from the seashore. It is practically certain that what is now called the "Old Town," in the Bourne valley on the east of Castle Hill, being in the manor of Brede, was the "*new burg*" of Domesday, f. 17a, attached to the manor of Rameslie or Brede, held then and later by the Abbey of Fécamp. On the west of Castle Hill a tidal creek ran up (past the present "Memorial") close against the hill, and the flat ground now built upon to the south of the castle has been reclaimed from the sea. The (old) Hastings of 1066 was therefore not east of the hill or south of it, but must have lain west of Castle Hill, apparently west of the creek, below the church (now terrace) of St. Michael, the patron of the town, probably on land most of which has long since been washed away by the sea.⁹ This seems to be confirmed by the Pipe Rolls of 28 and 29 Henry II., which both speak of the castle as "of New Hastings" "*in operatione cast(elli) nove Hasting*" (both MSS. have "*nove*," not *novi*, as sometimes quoted). Having first established and garrisoned a castle at Pevensey, William would hardly then go past Hastings and encamp his army on the further side of it, on the east of the creek, putting Hastings and the creek between his camp and Pevensey,¹⁰ but in any case the features of the ground would compel him to put his camp west of the creek and west of the town; east of the creek would have been a curiously cramped position for 8,000 men, or even for 5,000.

Now it is not likely that, while his army lay to the west of the creek, William would place his castle to the east of the creek on Castle Hill, where it would be separated from his army both by the town of Hastings,

⁹ T. H. Cole, *Antiquities of Hastings*, pp. 13, 44, 73-9. The sea also swept away the first church of St. Clement in the "new burgh." As to the creek see *ibid.*, p. 12, and map, p. 136.

¹⁰ Part of his force probably came from Pevensey by sea, but apparently the horsemen marched by land and without difficulty ("*festinaverunt ad Hastings*," Tapestry and Will. Jum.), whether along the shore or north of the marshes is not clear.

which might be a danger in case of defeat, and also by a strip of estuary and tidal mud a mile long, for up to the eighteenth century the sea reached at high tide as far up the Priory Valley as the present engine house in Alexandra Park; ⁹ probably there was a tidal ford near the present Memorial, but that would hardly get over the difficulty. In the original accounts the castle of September, 1066, is joined to the army and the ships, and its special object is "to protect the ships."¹¹ For that purpose it was essential that the castle should stand, not 180 feet above the shore, but near the ships, in combination with the army and with any stockade in front of the ships or such other measures as were taken for their defence. Castle Hill was a splendid site for a baronial castle, but would have no attractions for William, who had an army at Hastings and was waiting to be attacked by another army. The object of the castle of September, 1066, was to assist in protecting William's ships and his base on the coast against Harold's army. This involved combination with William's other defences at Hastings (and Pevensey) and with his army of 6,000 to 10,000 men. If most of that army moved out some distance to battle it would still not move without reference to its base. After the conquest the use of a castle was different, viz., to enable a permanent garrison, small, but well entrenched in a castle, to dominate the town and, later on, to be an obstacle to the advance inland of any enemy who landed there. Castle Hill was a splendid site for a garrison, but it was not suited for William's purposes when he first landed and a castle would not be placed there before the battle. William meant to bring Harold down to meet him; he did not intend to leave the coast until

¹¹ William of Poitiers says (p. 129) "prima munitione Penevessellum, altera Hastings occupavere, quæ sibi receptaculo navibus propugnaculo, forent." On p. 148 he clearly uses *munitio* for a castle, "urbis Guentæ intra moenia munitionem construxit"—at all events the *munitio* at Hastings included the castle. The Carmen says:

"Littora custodiens, metuens amittere naves
Mœnibus et munit castraque ponit ibi;
Diruta quæ fuerant dudum castella reformat."

The last line seems to refer to Roman Pevensey.

he had won the coming battle. His object in the castle of September, 1066, was not to provide for a garrison later on, *if* he won that battle and marched away to Dover and London. The castle was built, as we have seen, immediately he reached Hastings to protect the re-embarkation of his army if Harold should prove too strong for him. Before the battle it would indeed have been strange tactics for William to divide his force or his fortifications into two parts, separated from each other by the town and the creek.

It would appear therefore that his camp and castle both lay on the west of the creek; probably the actual site of the castle, like that of the town of 1066, has long ago been washed away by the sea.¹² We could hardly expect positive evidence from the chroniclers; they could not foresee our difficulties and would not say, "though there was a high cliff, that was *not* the place where William put the castle;" but the tone of all the accounts is against a site on Castle Hill. The Battle Abbey Chronicle, compiled 1176-96, says that as soon as he reached Hastings William, "*having found a suitable position, carefully fortified it, setting up with speed a timber castle.*"¹³ Is this the way a monk, who was familiar with the later castle on Castle Hill, would speak of that striking site? Did he not rather distinguish in his mind between the castle of September, 1066, and the one he knew, not only as to material, but also as to site? In Wace also, who puts the landing at Hastings, the Normans "*sought out a good place for a castle*"¹⁴—but Castle Hill, if suitable at all, would need no seeking. Then he tells us with some detail that "they cast the material out of the ships and drew it to land, &c., &c., so that before evening the castle was finished"—but there is not a word of a striking site or of carrying the material

¹² Both Doctor Bruce (Bayeux Tapestry, p. 118) and Lower very rightly mistrusted the assumed site on Castle Hill, but the earth-marks "near the railway station" mentioned by Bruce seem rather far from the shore and would have left the town between the Normans and the sea, while those at Cuckoo Hill pointed out by Lower (*S.A.C.*, Vol. II., p. 56) are unsatisfactory.

¹³ Dux (from Pevensey), qui Hastings vocatur adiit portum, ibique, opportunum nactus locum, ligneum agiliter castellum statuens provide munivit.

¹⁴ "Par conseil firent esgarder Boen lieu a fort chastel garder," &c.

to the top of a high cliff, which would hardly have been done so quickly. Even if Wace is confusing the castle at Hastings with that at Pevensey, still the fact remains that the tradition he followed clearly made no sharp distinction between the sites of the two castles. Moreover, while the earliest authorities, William of Poitiers and the Carmen, both make very special mention of Castle Hill at Dover,¹⁵ the castle set up at Hastings in September, 1066, is, as we have seen, coupled by both of them with that at Pevensey, as if there was no particular difference between the two sites (note 11 above).

Humphrey de Tilleul may have been appointed in 1067, after the surrender of London, or he may have been the "active commander" of the 19th October, 1066, who took over the castle of the 30th September; but in either case a castle can hardly have been built on Castle Hill till after the battle. It would not be built till 1067, when William, on leaving England in March, specially charged his lieutenants to build castles; or possibly in November, 1066, by the "active commander," who might get forced labour from Hastings. It is perhaps more probable that it was not built till the Rape of Hastings was given in 1068-70 to Robert Count of Eu,¹⁶ for while Castle Hill was a finer site, the castle of September, 1066, on lower ground, would be enough to dominate the town, and may have been still the castle that Humphrey commanded in 1068.¹⁷

¹⁵ "Situm est id castellum in rupe mari contigua, quae naturaliter acuta," &c.; W. of P., 140. "Est ibi mons altus . . . castrum pendens a vertice montis;" Carmen, p. 44, l. 603.

¹⁶ Domesday Book (f. 18a, Bexelei) says the "castelry" was given him in the episcopate of Bishop Alric of Selsey," which ended in 1070, but "castelry" would cover a grant of the 1066 castle and the Rape with orders to build a larger castle on the top of the hill.

¹⁷ The supposed reference by a Battle "Register" to a castle "below the cliff" in 1094, cited by Mr. Dawson in his *History of Hastings Castle* (II., 498) from (Brit. Mus.) Burrell MS. 5679, f. 237, is due to misunderstanding. Burrell's rubric is "*Battle Abbey Register; Clarke on Coins, p. 468, note,*" and reference to the latter (1767) shows that "below the cliff, &c." (which from the ink looks like an addition to the citation of the "Register"), is quoted from a note in which William Clarke gives merely his own view of the castle's position in 1094, founded on misinterpretation of a grant of 1331 (see below, note 25). Burrell's abbreviation of Clarke's note is ambiguous and a little misleading; the "Register" is cited by Clarke, not for the castle's position, but only for the gathering at Hastings in 1094, when Battle Abbey was consecrated, and is no doubt the well-known "*Chronicle of Battle Abbey,*" translated by Lower (p. 44).

From our general knowledge of early Norman castles we may be pretty sure that the first castle on Castle Hill, though it was not the castle of September, 1066, was still not of stone, but had a timber-walled bailey with, presumably, a small timber keep on the "Mount" at the north-east corner of the present castle, and there is definite evidence of this in the ruins. The "Mount" at Hastings does not, like the mound at Pevensey, represent the ruins of a stone keep, for in the excavations of 1824 a trench was cut through it without finding any stonework.¹⁸ It consists of earth artificially heaped up on the south-western side of a hummock or out-crop of rock, so as to make a mound such as was used for their timber keeps by the Normans of the Conquest, though a small one.¹⁹ In 1824 Herbert found that the foundations of the stone wall where it passes over the "Mount" rest, not on rock, but "on large flat stones,"¹⁸ so that the wall cannot have been built till the earth of the mound had become consolidated, which would take some time.

Moreover, on the north-western side of the castle stand the ruins of the chapel of St. Mary, the north wall of the nave of the chapel forming at this point the wall of the castle. Now the chapel wall was thinner than the rest of the castle wall with which it was incorporated,²⁰ and older than that thicker wall, for if the castle wall had been built first the chapel would have been built up against it; Mr. Harold Sands points out to me a similar case at Chepstow, where the side of an early hall was incorporated with a later and thicker castle wall. It is impossible to suppose that a great piece of the stone wall of the Hastings castle was pulled down that the chapel wall might be substituted, but there was no need to thicken the chapel wall, for if the enemy broke through it they would be trapped in the nave. That the chapel

¹⁸ Herbert MS., quoted by Mr. Dawson in his *History of Hastings Castle*, II., 523, n. 1; 524, n. 2; 525.

¹⁹ It is perhaps possible that the keep or an annexe to it extended over part of the terrace which runs from the "Mount" southwards along the eastern wall of the castle.

²⁰ Of this chapel wall only the ends remain and the bottom of the rest; most of the existing wall is modern.

was the older is also shown by the way the castle wall abuts upon the pilaster buttress at the north-western corner of the nave. It is clear therefore that when the nave of the ruined chapel was built the wall of the castle must have been still of timber, not of stone, and the ruined nave, from its whole character, certainly dates from after the Conquest. At the earliest this nave was the one built by the Count Robert of Eu, who held the castle 1070-90 and attached to the chapel a college of Canons; he is called "fundator et aedificator ecclesie Sancte Marie" in the confirmation charter of Count Henry (1100-35).²¹ The nave was apparently used as the choir.

It is true that a fourteenth century petition of the college in one of their quarrels with the bishop as to his jurisdiction, from which it was claimed that St. Mary's was free as being a chapel of the King, into whose hands it had fallen in the thirteenth century, recites that the chapel "belonged to King Edward's brother," i.e., Harold his brother-in-law."²² But it would be very dangerous to take this recital too seriously. The petition is 250 years after 1066 and Harold would not have a chapel on the hill unless he had built a castle there, which, as we have seen, is against the contemporary evidence. The recitals are only an *ex parte* argument by the canons, and probably the story that the chapel had belonged to Harold, even if it had become a tradition, was merely an attempt to support their contention that the chapel was a royal free chapel by pushing its origin back beyond Count Robert—not a word seems to have been said about King Edward or Harold or a pre-Conquest chapel in the arguments of the canons and the king's

²¹ Often called "The foundation charter;" it records eight prebends founded (apparently) by Count Robert and two by others. The thirteenth century copy in Ancient Deed 1073 D. seems better than the later MSS. used by Mr. Dawson (I., 21, 125); e.g., its text is right here, "To the prebend of Hugh de Foscis Walter fitz Lambert granted etc., etc., and to this prebend Galfridus frater Hugonis gave the tith of Casebury, and the church of Guestling and the tith, and of Gensing the tith, and the count (gave) a dwelling in the castle; to the prebend of Ulbert (was given) the tith of Malrepat etc." The later MSS. apparently omit *comes* and *decimam*, altering the sense.

²² Ancient Petition E. 668, "Lauantditte chapelle estoit al frere le Roi saint Edward et fraunche de la corone (free as being the king's)."

lawyers in the litigation with the bishop on the same point in 1301-7.²³

A still later grant of 1446 giving the jurisdiction to the bishop speaks of the church of St. Mary in the Castle, "*quondam erecta et stabilita in ecclesiam collegiatam* by a certain Count of Eu, who formerly (*quondam*) held the castle," as having been always within the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Chichester "during all the time the castle was held by the said Count [Robert], both *before and after* that church was so erected and established" into a college.²⁴ This recital may be an echo of the same story, but as the grant of 1446 is drafted in favour of the bishop, whose argument was that the chapel had been originally built by Count Robert of Eu, not by any king, probably its "before and after," if it meant anything definite at all, was never intended to imply that there was either a castle or a chapel on Castle Hill before the Conquest, but at most that Humphrey de Tilleul or Count Robert had built a chapel there before the college of the canons was founded. It is, in itself, very probable that in the new timber-walled castle a chapel, perhaps also of timber, was built before 1075; Count Robert may or may not have rebuilt it, larger than before, when he founded the college of canons.

A word may be added on other difficulties which have been raised as to the chapel. It has been said that the original chapel of St. Mary must have been much larger than the existing ruins and therefore elsewhere, because Eadmer tells us that "in the church of St. Mary, which is in the castle," Robert de Bloet, the king's chancellor, was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln in 1094 by Anselm and seven bishops.²⁵ But William Rufus was waiting in the castle to cross over to France and no doubt wanted the consecration before he left England. The ruins have a nave over 60-ft. long, which was not very small for 1094, but even if the chapel of 1094 was a smaller

²³ Dawson *op. cit.*, I., 127-8, 133-4.

²⁴ Charter Roll 189, No. 38; trans. Dawson, *ibid.*, I., 268.

²⁵ Rolls Series, No. 81, p. 47; as to this consecration see Freeman, *William Rufus*, I., 445, and Dawson *op. cit.*, I., 29-32.

one, the great men would get into it and the rest stand outside.

It has also been said that the first chapel of the College of St. Mary must have been on the shore below Castle Hill, or at least on a part of the hill since washed away, because the old chapel was destroyed "by inundations of the sea" and the chapel of the castle granted to the College in its place. But this is founded on a misreading of the grant of the castle to the College in 1331 by applying to the chapel the statement in the grant that "*inundationes maris*" had greatly damaged the *castle*. That must not be taken to mean that the sea overflowed the castle; any attack of the sea would be covered by the Latin "*inundationes*." But in fact this word, on which much has been built, was a mere "stylish" addition of the scribe who prepared the writ for the inquisition "ad quod damnum." The petition of the College in 1330 from which he was quoting said simply that *much* of the *castle* was "*destruit par la meer*" [clearly by the undermining of the cliff on which it stood] and its gates neglected, whereby their chapel "*in the castle*" was exposed to robbers "from lack of enclosure." The College asked the king to grant them, not the castle chapel — which they had already — but the "castle," that they might make good the "enclosure" and use the space inside.²⁶ In 1100 the point of land on which the castle stands must have extended a good bit further south than it does now, and it appears to have sloped downwards, but if any part of it then sloped right down to sea-level, which is not likely, the slope, running down from a height of over 150-ft., would be either very steep or pretty long, and in either case the wall of the castle bailey would certainly not be carried to the bottom of it; if it was steep, that would be unnecessary, and if it was long, impracticable. St. Mary's in-the-castle can never have been on the shore,

²⁶ Ancient Petition, 239/11,944; Inq. ad q. d., 221-1 (21st July, 4 Ed. III.); Patent Roll, 4 Edward III., pt. 1, m. 36; translations in Dawson, *op. cit.* I., 161-3. *Clarke on Coins*, Moss (*i.e.*, Herbert) and others misquote the Patent Roll's "*capella sita infra castrum*" as "*infra claustrum*." The mediæval "*infra*" means "within," not "below," *e.g.*, "*infra et extra*."

and there is nothing in the documents of 1330-1 to suggest that it was ever anywhere but where it is now.

The architectural history of the chapel is uncertain, its ruined condition and modern repairs rendering analysis difficult, but the following notes kindly given to me by the Rev. G. M. Livett will be useful:—

“The so-called chancel-arch has been in part rebuilt, and the thin wall between the tower-space and south chapel does not seem to be original. It is difficult also to distinguish between original work and modern rebuilding in the north wall of the nave. It is, in fact, impossible to assign with certainty any part of the existing remains to the time of Count Robert (1068-90). The slight indications of herring-bone work in the arcading of the east end of the north wall of the nave, and in its stone bench, have usually been interpreted as a sign of early Norman date; but there is similar work in the castle wall, confessedly of later date, on the north-west side, and even in the modern repairs; also in the interior of the newel staircase that rises in the angle formed by the north side of the chancel and the east end of the north side of the nave there is herring-bone masonry of a more complete character than that seen in the north wall of the nave; and it is doubtful if this newel staircase can be assigned to a date earlier than the close of the twelfth century—the date of the chancel arch—seeing that the stones of the large newel (11-in. in diameter) are faced with the chisel, in some cases with a toothed chisel, and not with the axe. It is known that the use of the broad chisel for dressing stones was introduced and became general, though not universal, in the last quarter of the twelfth century. One thing is certain, namely, that the ‘chancel-arch,’ though recently rebuilt, faithfully represents work that was done in connection with the remodelling of the eastern end of the church in 1180-1200. That remodelling seems to have included the erection of a ‘central’ tower over an earlier chancel, and the erection of a new chancel to the east of the tower. But this again is not quite certain, for it is possible that the earlier church (whether of

Count Robert's date or later) had a tower in this position, and that the remodelling included (for some reason unknown) the rebuilding of the steps and newel within the circular wall of the newel staircase, which on such a hypothesis would belong to the earlier church. I confess that such a hypothesis, involving a reconstruction of the staircase, does not commend itself to me, but it has in its favour the fact that the springing of the groin of the vaulting of the so-called chapter-house, which stood on the north side of the chancel and east of the newel, shows no sign of a groin-rib, and would therefore seem to be of an early (a Norman) date. To that point I will revert later.

“To return to the north wall of the nave. In the aisle or ‘cloister’ on the south side of the chapel, at the east end of the wall which separates it from the nave, there are remains of a recessed arch, rising from a bench, which corresponds in every detail of measurement and construction, excepting herring-bone work, with the most easterly of the recessed arches of the north wall of the nave. It is impossible to imagine any difference in date; the cloister and the south chapel to the east of it are clearly of the same date as the recessed arches of the north wall. As a working hypothesis, in view of further analysis and research, I suggest that the Norman church consisted of a short square-ended chancel with a south chapel and nave flanked by cloister; and I would add that the strengthening of the interior angles of the chapel with ashlar does not seem to point to a very early date. It is possible, of course, that all this work that we now see was grafted on to a simpler and early structure of Count Robert's date. Then I am inclined to think that the eastern development of the present plan of the church, with central tower, newel staircase, chancel and flanking building known as the ‘chapter house,’ was carried out in the last quarter of the twelfth century. The absence of groin ribs in the vaulting of the ‘chapter house’ is a difficulty. But the use of this building is by no means certain. It is in an unusual and inconvenient position for a chapter house, and its design,

apparently with a central row of shafts to support the vaulting, is uncommon. Its elevation and design really suggests an undercroft to an upper hall which was never completed. If this be a sound view the absence of groin ribs at a late date would be accounted for. In any case it seems impossible, considering its structural relation to the chancel, to assign it to a date earlier than the chancel. The only alternative is that the present chancel is a late twelfth century remodelling of an earlier chancel on the same lines, the earlier building including a central tower; and that my reading of the newel staircase is at fault. Before leaving this part of the church I should add that I have satisfied myself that a pilaster strip on the exterior face of the north wall, in line with the 'chancel arch,' does not belong to the building of the first church. Its coins are rough, but they contain a number of small squared Caen-stone blocks, which are re-used material. The fact that their present bedding faces, seen where the mortar has worn away from the joints, show a carefully faced surface of axe-work, proves that they are not in their original position; they came from some destroyed portion of the Norman church, perhaps from the old chancel arch. The object of the buttress was to resist the thrust of the western arch of the central tower, and the fact that it was an added or inserted bit of work is some confirmation of my belief that the central tower did not exist before the end of the twelfth century.

“The west end of the church also presents difficulties. The castle wall abuts upon the pilaster buttress on the west face of the north-western angle. The similar buttress on the north face has been wrenched away, doubtless for the sake of its Caen-stone quoins. These buttresses were of considerable projection (about 9-in.) and of Norman date, but probably not very early. There is a strange irregularity in the construction of the interior angle, which is not clean masonry. It is not a case of ruin or destruction; in the corner the rough masonry projects beyond the places of the two walls where they should meet at right angles; and it contains

a worked stone which appears to be a fragment of a bowl or font. Then, again, the pilaster strip on the interior face of the north wall of the nave, about 18 feet east of that irregular angle, is remarkable. Is it possible that the one Early Norman church, of which slight remains exist, perhaps, on the north wall from the pilaster eastwards, was extended westwards early in the twelfth century, and that the irregular angle incorporates some slight remains of another Early Norman building?

“We come now to the western tower, one of a pair.²⁷ My examination with a ladder leads me to the conclusion that this is a late Norman work, not earlier than the third quarter of the twelfth century, and possibly a little later, but not (I think) later than the close of that century. In the meantime, that is after the erection of the Norman church or its westward extension, and previous to the erection of this tower, the castle wall was built, as shown by the straight joint at the junction of the west wall of the tower with the castle wall.²⁸ The opening in the south side of the tower, of which the west jamb and half of the arch remain, originally about $4\frac{1}{2}$ -ft. wide, central in position (the side wall of the tower, partly destroyed, having been larger than the east and west ends), and only a few inches above the floor level of the towers upper story, had a plain round-headed arch of one order and no splay. I feel sure it was not a window, but of the nature of a door opening, though there is no rebate for a door. The floor is on a level with the rampart of the castle wall, with which the west wall of the tower in its upper stage is structurally connected, showing a door opening (now blocked) through which one could pass out of the tower on to the rampart. The round-headed

²⁷ The foundations of the twin tower were unearthed by Herbert in 1824 and by Mr. Dawson (p. 538). Seals of 1195 and 1334 (*S.A.C.*, Vol. XIII., p. 133, Dawson i., 91), though different, both give the chapel two western towers and also a central tower, but it may be doubtful how far they gave the actual chapel or only typical forms, modelled on abbeys and cathedrals.

²⁸ Moreover, this joint blocks the little loop or window of a mural passage in the castle wall. This passage is generally said to have led to a “sally-port” and Herbert in 1824 talks of steps down from it (Dawson, ii., 522), but Mr. Harold Sands points out that it was really (or originally) a latrine and has found its outlet in the bank outside the wall.

opening in the south wall of the tower, reached by a wooden ladder, would thus give access through the tower to the ramparts; and this was probably its purpose. It is constructed in rubble, with dressed edge-stones in jamb and arch. These stones are larger in size than is usual in Norman arches, but their surface is too weather-worn to reveal the character of their tooling. The little opening higher up in the west wall is a window opening that was closed with a shutter from the inside. The dressed stones of the splayed round-headed interior arch have the appearance, from a distance, of typical Norman work, but the external chamfer is rather broad. The plinth of the tower at the only remaining angle is finished with a broad-chamfered course of Caen-stone. But I do not think that this tower can be assigned to a date later than the twelfth century, and I am inclined, as I have said, to place it in the third quarter of the century.

“I would conclude these notes with the remark that the published descriptions, plans and measurements of the remains of the chapel are not altogether accurate; and that a proper analysis could only be based upon a perfectly accurate $\frac{1}{4}$ -in. or $\frac{1}{2}$ -in. plan plotted from measurements taken with the help of a string stretched from end to end, a number of points being fixed thereon and diagonals and ordinates taken from them. Such a plan would show the relationship of the different parts, and would probably suggest points for consideration which are not evident to the unaided eye.

“To sum up, I think that the following approximate dates may be taken as a basis for further study: (1) Norman church, of which the chancel has been destroyed, and there remain parts of the north and south walls of the nave, a cloister on the south, and a south chancel-chapel at the end of the cloister—1125-50; (2) the western towers—1150-75; (3) eastern extension, including (destroyed) central tower over the Norman chancel, newel stairs, new chancel and the ‘chapter house’ adjoining it—1175-1200.”

This would date the castle wall, built after the nave but before the western tower, somewhere in the middle of the twelfth century. We know from the Pipe Rolls that a stone keep, which would probably be later than the stone wall, was built or begun in 1171-4, when stone was carted "ad faciendam turrim" and £93 spent (allowing for duplication), equivalent to perhaps £2,000 now. In 1175-80 no expenditure is given. In 1182 we find £54. 16s. spent "in operatione castelli," and also £40 in 1182 and £20 in 1183 out of Berkshire receipts from Windsor, but whether these payments were to finish the keep or for other work at the castle we cannot tell.
