

17th century of the dressed facing stones. The robbers had gone down to the foundations, planted on steps cut into the slope of the Norman ditch (FIG. 36). They had then piled their debris against the robbed core, and used discarded stones to revet their filling. This revetment was carried round the protruding angle. The debris spread as far as the line C-D, where layer 3 had a mottled appearance owing to fragments of white sandstone. The robbed length of wall cannot have been more than $6\frac{1}{2}$ ft. thick at its foundations, and so was no doubt 5 ft. thick above. Its foundations went down $2\frac{1}{2}$ ft. further at the front than at the rear. The 7-ft.-thick link wall went about $6\frac{1}{2}$ ft. deeper in front than at the rear.

The wall builders had cut a steep-sided construction-trench in front of the wall (PL. XXI, B; section at G, FIG. 36); its mottled filling contained fragments of white sandstone and of the red clay used as mortar. This procedure left (in section C-D) a hump of hard natural sand, with distinctive pink layers at regular intervals, between their trench and the inner slope of the Norman ditch. No complete section of the ditch was obtained, but it could well be contained in the 40-45 ft. between the wall and Park Row. The length of wall some 11 ft. further west called for special treatment of the ditch. The wall footings were placed on steps cut in the slope of the ditch. A brown sand was then piled against the slope (layer 5 in section C-D, FIG. 36) to deflect the ditch westwards.

The ditch silted up during the middle ages with clean fawn sand, interleaved with occasional black deposits (PL. XXI, C; 4 in section C-D, FIG. 36). No pottery was found in this layer; the ditch must sometimes have been cleaned. The latest deposit consisted of a black silt, as much as 2 ft. deep in places (layer 5 at A-B, layer 2 at C-D and layer 1 at E-F) and lying against the wall face throughout its length. This silt contained pottery of the 16th and 17th centuries. The ditch was finally filled in with clean sand and clay (layer 1 at C-D) to allow building over it in the 18th century. This material contained broken brick and tile and was evidently derived from a brickyard.

M. W. BARLEY

AN ALERT IN 1318 TO THE CONSTABLE OF BOLINGBROKE CASTLE, LINCOLNSHIRE

The Bolingbroke estates of the Duchy of Lancaster, which were acquired by Earl Thomas of Lancaster as part of his wife's inheritance in 1311, were restored to his widow after his death in 1322 and did not become fully absorbed into the Lancaster inheritance until the time of John of Gaunt. For this reason the Duchy records at the Public Records Office are poor in material concerning Bolingbroke from the early 14th century, but they contain one document which seems to be of sufficient historical and archaeological interest to deserve publication.

The document (DL. 34/1(14)) is described in the P.R.O. Lists and Indexes (xiv, 1901, p. 23) as: 'Mandate from Thomas, earl of Lancaster and Leicester to Geoffrey de Villers, constable of Bolingbroke'. It consists of $8\frac{1}{2}$ lines 9 in. long. Although it is now in a modern class of documents known as Ancient Correspondence, it is clear that its real affinities are with warrants, such as those issued some ten years later by the earl's brother and successor, Earl Henry, to his wardrober and other household officers (Duchy of Lancaster *Miscellanea*, bundle ix). The same formula is used, an order with a concluding sentence saying that the order itself can be used to justify the necessary expenditure at the next annual audit (*prochein accomte*). Probably this warrant is the retained copy of an original sent to the constable.

The order was given by Earl Thomas on 9 June, 1318, at Tutbury Castle, and the reference to an identifiable historical event, *cest assemble de Northampton*, gives a clue to the circumstances under which it was sent. The parliament intended to be held in January, 1318, was postponed to March, then to June and not finally held until October.³⁴ The reason for the delay was the antagonism between the king's party and

³⁴ J. Conway Davies, *The Baronial Opposition to Edward II* (Cambridge, 1918), pp. 444-49.

Earl Thomas, who refused to attend ; they were not reconciled until August. The gathering at Northampton was to parley with the earl, but since a contemporary chronicler remarked that its size and strength suggested that it had come to do battle rather than to a parliament,³⁵ the earl's suspicions of it were probably well founded. Bolingbroke was really his wife's inheritance, and, as she had deserted him in 1317, possibly she was implicated in the threat to the castle that the earl foresaw. The document throws some light on the earl's otherwise puzzling behaviour.

To the student of the castle the order is of interest as showing how a castle at this date was put in a state of defence. The whole responsibility rested on the constable, who, if successful, was to be suitably rewarded by having his post made permanent. He had no resident garrison but had to choose a dozen or more tenants, upon whom he could best rely, to serve as a temporary garrison. No unauthorized person was to be allowed in, and the drawbridges were to be raised and gates closed by day and by night. The whole tenor of the order suggests that the danger that threatened was not an open assault but subversion, the quick seizure of the castle by a raiding party, aided perhaps by disloyal tenants. The earl may well have had some misgivings as to whether the tenants would be loyal to his wife or to himself.

The document reads :³⁶

'Thomas, Counte de Lancastre et de Leicestre, Seneschal Dengleterre, a sire Geoffroi de Villers, nostre conestable de Bolingbrok, salut. Nous vous mandons que vous pregniez de nos gentz de nostre segnurie de Bolingbrok cieus come vous fiez chescun mieus, une dozeine ou plus si mester soit de veiller en nostre Chastel pur la sauuee de meisme le Chastel. Et ne soffrez nul homme entrer en le dit Chastel de Jour ne de nuyt fois que cieus dount vous fiez, et treer les pountz tourniciez et fermez les portes de iour et de nuyt. Et faites que nostre Chastel soit sauument garde sicome nous fioms de vous, tanque homme sache a quon fyn cest assemble de Northampton vodra trere. Et sachez que si nul mal avigne a nostre Chastel, que dieu defende, nous le renderoms a vous. Et voloms que les renables costages que vous mettrez entour la dite garde vous soien allowez sur vostre prochein accomte par tesmoignance de ceste letre. Done a nostre Chastel de Tutteburg'. le ix iour de Joygn. L'an du Regne nostre seigneur le Roy Edward, Fuitz a noble Roy Edward, unzime.'

M. W. THOMPSON

THE NORWEGIAN CONFERENCE, 1965

The eighth annual Conference of the Society was held in Norway from 9-15 September, 1965, and had as its theme 'Medieval Norway'. About seventy people attended. The Conference was organized by Mr. Martin Blindheim and Mr. Asbjörn Herteig ; the Society owes a great debt to them and their various helpers for making the Conference the success it undoubtedly was.

On 9 September, when the Conference opened in Bergen, three lectures were given : Professor Robert Kloster, 'Background to medieval art and archaeology in Norway'; Mr. G. Fischer, 'Introduction to medieval archaeology in Norway, with special reference to architecture'; and Mr. A. Herteig, 'The excavations at Bryggen, Bergen'. In the afternoon of the same day members visited the University Historical Museum and the open-air museum at Gamle Bergen. On the following day the Conference visited the excavations at Bryggen, the Rosenkrantz tower, Håkonshallen, and St. Mary's Church.

From 11-13 September members of the Conference visited various monuments on the route between Bergen and Oslo including the churches at Voss, Hopperstad, Urnes and Borgund, the Vang Stone and the Fagernes Folk Museum.

³⁵ N. Denholm Young (ed.), *Vita Edwardi Secundi* (London, 1957), p. 87.

³⁶ I have added some extra punctuation, and I am grateful to Mr. A. J. Taylor for checking my transcript.