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BERKELEY CASTLE

By St. Clair Baddeley

(Plates I-VIII)

PART I

THE KEEP

The military (as apart from the monastic or the borough) history of Berkeley commences with the expansion by William the Conqueror, of that anti-Welsh policy inaugurated (1048) by Edward the Confessor (and carried on in 1062-3 by Harold) at the hands of his kinsman William FitzOsbern (son of Osbern de Crespon) Earl of Hereford (d. 20 February 1071), the Hereditary Steward of Normandy, where he was famous as the Lord of Breteuil. As far as the lower Severn-region was concerned, the Earl quickly decided its absolute possession (including Gwent) to be the indispensable key to that bold policy; and that policy, perforce, included the immediate glorification of Saxon Gloucester with something more than its Saxon Aula Regis (in Hare street), a royal castle keep, and walls. Thenceforward this ancient town by the Severn was to be the dominating base for that iron Norman strategy, with a court-centre for all the adventurous alien knights engaged in its development.

The Earl's own great and various estates (over and above Wigmore, Clifford, and Hereford) therefore, in this region, at once surprise and retain our attention. For he was given a sort of carte-blanche to fill in. Hempstead, with its Roman "old-work"—the natural sentinel to Glevum,

1 His son Roger is called Lord of Gwent in the Book of Llandav.
2 Later its name became changed to Newark under the ownership of Lantony Priory.
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he took care to have, and to which, probably, he gave a
watchtower; and after him her great hereditary sheriffs
continued to own and use it. Further south, Lydney,
with its Ness, was also his; together with Tidenham, Usk
(Caerleon) and Portskewett; while Monmouth castle and
Newnham were likewise fortified, though they were left
by him (for full development at the expense of Welsh
independence) to his lieutenant, Wihanoc and his de
Baderon heirs; and further he raised Chepstow castle.

This most formidable strait waistcoat (as it were) to
both Wye and Severn became completed by the building
of a "castellulum," or small castle, in Berkeley Hernesse
east of the Severn and situated at the centre of a royal
demesne and jurisdictional area.³ For this reason, it was
set as much as one and a half miles from Sharpness and
the river, and directly opposite to Lydney. It is needless
to add that all ships passing to Gloucester had strictly to
pay him toll. It is obvious from all this that supreme
mastery of the river-system was both clearly aimed at and
ensured. The Earl’s territorial wealth and mastery
became crowned by the king granting him, at his wish,
Cirencester, at the great Roman cross-roads up on the
hill-plateau behind, where he likewise presently built him
the moated castle,—commemorated by Castle street and
Law-ditch lane (now Park street)—that became destroyed
by Stephen in 1142.

Berkeley in 1086 already owned a free-market, though
it was yet no borough.⁴ But it was the capital manor of
a hundred, like Cirencester. The priest there (we read)
held five hides of land; while the king had his hunting at
neighbouring Kingswood, not subject to any assessment.
It was a place that had taken name originally from the

³ Nearly one-tenth of the Domesday shire.
⁴ The Charters, dating c. 1220-43, and 1261-2, have been printed by the late
Adolphus Ballard and Prof. James Tait in British Borough Charters, 1923.
local abundance of birch-trees, some only of whose monumental trunks remained budding in John Smyth's time. The latter, indeed, expresses regrets at his lord deciding (c. 1600 A.D.) one morning to order their uprooting—"the great old and warne stumps of many of that kind yet there remayninge." Queen Elizabeth had already complained of Lord Berkeley's ruthlessness to his oaks, in the park, after her hunting visit thither in 1573.

The question may now well arise, which sort of castle did FitzOsbern build at Berkeley? No definitive answer, however, is it possible to give; for the present structure is not his work in any part of it.

Castles, in FitzOsbern's day, usually (though not invariably) were built upon mottes, or artificial mounds, laboriously, though rapidly, piled up by forced labour, and they were largely made of timber by master carpenters and fosseurs. Hence, they were both ditched and stockaded. But FitzOsbern raised no motte at Chepstow, nor is either motte or ditch around the keep anywhere to be traced at Berkeley although long ago G. T. Clark declared, at a somewhat dangerous guess, that the keep here would surely be found revetted to the motte or mound. Since then certain professional guide-writers have followed incautiously in his footsteps, even until the very latest publications. For the most part they have been content merely to echo his statements; though one or two have swallowed them whole, not knowing their indigestible quality.

But Berkeley did not need a motte any more than did Chepstow; and a motte was demanded only at certain sites. The castle here is situated upon a fine natural

---

5 This view of the derivation has been denied at Berkeley; but only owing to the complete absence of birch-trees thereabouts, today, none having been allowed to remain. Of course, this reason is without any force whatever.

6 Lives of the Berkeleys, ii, 84.
table of the old red-sandstone,\textsuperscript{7} by nature dominating the
town, the Avon-meadows, and distantly that river itself. 
The church became separated from it by a deep ditch
that has twice changed its line since those days. Also,
there is not, nor ever was there, a second, or inner, ditch
to the keep, or \textit{turris}, here. That feature was deliberately
sought for, and even dug-for, in 1919-20; but the spade
in two places completely negatived the idea. The Fitz-
Harding keep here rested perfectly enough upon its own
thickened-out basement-walls,\textsuperscript{8} being super-strengthened
by four semicircular turrets or hollow bastions—as if they
were the set elephantine feet of the monster. Nor is there
any reason to suggest that this keep ever was a mere
mason’s translation into solid stone of any such earlier
wooden or timber \textit{turris}, although it probably had Bre-
tasches—timber galleries of a temporary kind from time
to time until c. 1325. It is, with every probability, the
actual keep asked of and granted by Henry II to his
favourite Robert FitzHarding\textsuperscript{9} to be built, and that, as a
magnificent afterthought, was erected under the personal
direction of that ardent castle-builder, the king himself;
first, while he was but Duke of the Normans, and, soon
after Stephen’s death (1154) when he was king of England.
For, the grant was made before that eventuality, and it
became confirmed later. Both grant and confirmation
are preserved at Berkeley.\textsuperscript{10}

This shell-keep, therefore, may safely be dated to
1153-6; while its characteristic forebuilding was added

\textsuperscript{7} East of it extend the Ludlow rocks covered by lias and the new red-
sandstone.
\textsuperscript{8} They are given a battering plinth without roll or chamfer.
\textsuperscript{9} Born in Baldwin street at Bristol, he had hitherto lived in a great stone
house on the river Frome, portions of which survived above ground in 1600.
\textit{Cf.} Smyth, \textit{Lives of the Berkeleys}.
\textsuperscript{10} At the writer’s plea for them they were placed en evidence in a case
perpetually on view at Berkeley, in 1897, by the late Charles, Lord Fitz-
Hardinge.
later, c. 1171. The entire area of the castle-plateau, or rock-shelf, barely exceeds an acre and a half (or 7,750 square yards), outer and inner ward (or bailey), included; so that it still fulfills the limited meaning of the term "Castellulum," used of Earl William's own stronghold raised (we believe) hereabouts. There was, indeed, but a small area left for a more extensive structure upon the site. But the little there was became fully availed of by c. 1290-1300 (20 Edw. I) which extension (we shall see) effected considerable changes at the north-eastern section of the curtain. The Welsh campaigns of Edward I had by then stimulated every Severn-land stronghold, large and small, and that NE point of its curtain was whereabouts Berkeley then became strengthened by expansion.

But the question arises—is any of the present castle, apart from the keep and its added forebuilding, older than Robert FitzHarding's work? (as we have implied) and if no part of it can be traceable to FitzOsbern's structure, are not some portions of it at least the work of the three successive Rogers de Berkeley who followed him, namely, that of the hereditaryprovosts who reigned here as royally-appointed lords of both manor and hundred after the second (Roger) FitzOsbern's downfall in 1075? For, in so markedly a stone-and-timber district as this is, and with so important a royal centre, between such dates as 1075 and 1153—and with so potent a lord of the hundred and Honour as the king's provost—it would be most improbable that a strategic fortress of FitzOsbern's set upon a strong site should have continued untranslated or unimproved into a more durable and formidable structure.

11 By Maurice, son of Robert, who took on the nobler style of de Berkeley almost at once.
12 The moat was fed by springs which at the same time filled a former set of fishponds on that side of the castle.
13 Roger de Berkeley I became a monk at Gloucester 1091; Roger II d. 1131, aet. 61 (?) ; Roger III lost the provostry c. 1153-4, and Berkeley; but built Dursley castle and died c. 1171. The latter, as a ruin, according to Leland, became used as a quarry to build Dodington.
Gloucester castle was still being built in 1109-10. But that Berkeley also raised one seems almost as certain from the fact that Roger de Berkeley III (it is recorded), became captured outside his castle here at Berkeley by Walter de Hereford (son of Milo, the sheriff) and his men (Roger’s party-enemies), and subjected by them to miserable indignities, if not actual torture, in front of it, “ante suum quod in vicino habuerat Castellum” (Gesta Stephani, 1146). Thus Roger was being punished heavily for having espoused the cause of Stephen.\textsuperscript{14} Six or seven years afterwards, although he was not further personally molested, King Henry dispossessed Roger of much of his land and of Berkeley castle, though he permitted him to keep Dursley and further he allowed him to build there instead, another castle (probably keepless). But (as we noticed) he handed over Berkeley, with a similar grant to build a keep there, to his friend and financial agent, the successful Bristol merchant, Robert FitzHarding. Dursley, however, now became constituted an Honour by itself; and this is good evidence of the king’s worthy desire to act judicially and not vindictively towards the Berkeleys.

But, if we may revert for a moment to 1088 and the memorable harrying by fire and sword of Berkeley, with all its region, by Geoffrey de Mowbray, Bishop of Coutances,\textsuperscript{15} and William,\textsuperscript{16} Count of Eu, while at war with William Rufus, we notice that no castle at all is mentioned by the chroniclers as resisting them at Berkeley. This makes it all but certain that Earl William’s castle which was apparently being added to or rebuilt in 1086 (“Ad castellulum faciendum,” D.S.) had already disappeared, or else that it then did so—at their

\textsuperscript{14} It is likely that his friendship with the abbot of St. Peter’s, Gloucester, stood him in good stead, and even may have saved his life.

\textsuperscript{15} He occupied Bristol castle.

\textsuperscript{16} “eall Beorclea hyrnnesse hi awaeston.” Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (Rolls series), i, 357.
hands and probably by fire. Its absence, at any rate, or destruction, would largely account for their unchecked success.\textsuperscript{17} These dire events occurred in the days of Roger de Berkeley I, with whom William the Conqueror had spent Christmas here five years previously, in 1080, and who was the owner and user of certain valuable quarries\textsuperscript{18} further along the Cotswold escarpment, possession of which led to long and bitter litigation (cf. \textit{Hist. and Cartulary of St. Peter's Gloucester}, i, 112-22, 224-27) with Abbot Serlo, the rebuild of Gloucester. Eustace de Berkeley succeeded his father as provost of Berkeley in 1091; and (if we may agree with Sir Henry Barkly) the latter's successor very soon was his younger brother, Roger II (founder later on of Leonard Stanley priory), who died (it is believed) in 1131, aged sixty years. He likewise was a considerable builder, and we find that with him Henry I spent Easter at Berkeley in April 1121. It seems certain then, that though lacking a keep or \textit{turris} (as for long had done the king's own new stronghold at Gloucester), Berkeley at that day no doubt had its half-timber castle, and that Roger II and Roger III (until in 1153 Henry II dispossessed the latter) with that castle had lorded for many years the noble hundred of Berkeley, and all the Severn region, both above and below it.\textsuperscript{19}

To that period (c. 1110-40) we think the Norman hall (though guessed at as existing by some, but only fully disclosed during operations carried out in 1922-3), belonged with its massive south-eastern outer wall and angle to the park, afterwards re-used to form that of the far more splendid and surviving Edwardian hall of c. 1342.

\textsuperscript{17} "Willelmus de Owe... regiam villam depraedatur Beorchelaum, per totam ferro et fiamma grande perpetrat malum." \textit{Flor. Worc.} (Ed. Thorpe, ii, 24).

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Scotch Quarr} at Edge. For an account of this place-name and the contention, see \textit{Trans. B.G.A.S.}, xlvi, 352.

\textsuperscript{19} It was natural therefore that the Berkeleys should be often officially related to Gloucester as governors or as patrons of its monastic houses.
Although retaining to this day its pilaster-strips, much of these remains concealed by the repairs and mutilations of later centuries. That earlier, or Norman, hall of three bays of about 18 feet apiece, with an ample vestibule, was but about 25 feet wide instead of the present 32 feet. The few surviving and fragmentary mouldings and a cap showed it to be of earlier Norman style than belonged to the days of FitzHarding. 20 It is possible that most of the mural-curtain of Berkeley is of (middle) Norman foundation, i.e. Roger de Berkeley II and III, or before 1153; particularly is this likely of "the kitchen," merely formed out of an unequal-sided hexagonal mural tower. 21 The usually so-called Norman crypt under the present boudoir—formerly for five and a half centuries, 1365-1923, the family-chapel of St. Mary—proves to be of the thirteenth century, though it is still centred by a more ancient pillar (of one foot six inches diameter with a plain cap) which has been transferred (perhaps) a century or two ago from elsewhere to form a solid support for the weakened thirteenth century vaulting. This beautiful sw chamber above it with its lovely arcade (plate III) had been bodily carven (so to speak) out of the Norman curtain-wall c. 1290, long before it became a chapel. To harmonize with the views of today, however, it has lately (1923) had its door, through which some sixteen sovereigns have entered it for their devotions, filled with a French fireplace.

Some other fragments of even primitive Norman work were discovered (July 1923) high up in the outer (NE) wall

20 It is related to have been re-roofed from Wotton manor house timber, c. 1497, by Lady Berkeley against Henry viii's intended coming. But it needed wholesale repair in 1604-7, which was carried out by Henry, Lord Berkeley (d. 1611).

21 The central section of Osleworth church displays a smaller example of a twelfth century hexagonal tower, having originally perhaps formed a protective terminal of Roger de Berkeley's hunting-box there in Stephen's days of civil war, and later merely preserved by his handing it over to utilize for Osleworth's first stone church, it having a conveniently wide eastern facet, though that has been but clumsily converted into the present chancel-arch.
of the chapel-turret to the keep. They were then brought down in order to be replaced by stronger stones. The *palmetto* (twice moulded side by side, in relief), and some small braided eyelet-ornaments (? for inlay-work), appear on these stones, and point perhaps, to the eleventh century. A fragment also of a late Saxon cross, having upon it a head of Christ nimbed in low relief, was also there met with. This last measures five inches by three inches. These may possibly have been relic-materials deriving from the Saxon nunnery that, in its decadence, at least, was located at Berkeley, (though originally it had probably stood at Oldminster, but half a mile SE of Sharpness), and out of which Smyth declares that the castle was first made. Earl Godwin destroyed it before 1053, but its wretched remnant-community may have been allowed to settle at Berkeley itself. These relics, however, might even have been brought reverently from Oldminster; for much of the stone with which the castle is built has come from the Bull, Black, and other rocks near it in the Severn, somewhat south of the site of Oldminster, opposite Berkeley Pill. But, beyond these few vague indications, it would not be possible to assign a precise date to the earliest structures here merely because of the great thickness of the curtain-wall along the south side of the castle. Nevertheless we are led to conclude that FitzHarding's main wish, or rather, his marked ambition, on becoming enfeoffed of Berkeley, was to glorify his predecessor's castle with a great stone keep, and that his royal friend

22 A ring of about this period was found long ago at Berkeley, and has been figured in other books and attributed sometimes to a far earlier date than it requires. (Plate i).

23 Note the name of the streamlet, *Minster-pill*, there flowing into the Severn.

24 Perhaps Smyth knew of these remains, used up on the turret-face. *Cf.* for the story of Godwin's doings, by an unsparing Norman hand, Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, cap. iii. See also *Trans. B.G.A.S.*, xix, 70-84, by the late Rev. C. S. Taylor.
and master not only allowed him to do this, but took personal interest in its construction. Henry, therefore, may have looked upon the unusual form of this keep with some direct favour. The latter was obviously a deliberate intrusion upon an earlier NW curtain;\textsuperscript{25} moreover, originally it stood quite free of the latter.

![Diagram of the Keep](image)

\textbf{Fig. 1. THE KEEP c. 1155.}

An interesting point about this keep in that experimental age of fortress-building is that it gave Gloucestershire an early (perhaps unique) example of a type—one presenting four projecting semi-circular turrets or hollow buttress-bastions. Now from what we know of Henry the first’s castles (1100-35), we should conclude that this king had favoured (as at Gloucester) the square type of keep. His grandson, however, was a man of keen inquiry, loving military experiments as well as possessing indomitable perseverance. Brought up in France amid warring magnates and the keen encounter of their wits, he became himself one of the greatest of castle-builders;

\textsuperscript{25} Cf. the plan.
and he seems to have given every promising type of stronghold a chance of proving its merit, or the contrary. He built a polygonal keep at Gisors, and another, though circular within, at Orford in Suffolk, having, similarly, three or four buttress-turret projections. At Chilham in Kent he built an octagonal keep with a square annexe. These singular varieties, and many other examples, may however, have been partly the results of inspirations then being worked out for him in France by designers familiar with fortresses devised by skilled Byzantine master-masons in Syria or Palestine for leading crusaders. Remarkable, albeit as they were, neither Berkeley nor Orford were thought worthy of imitation. This important specializing spirit of 'architectural' experiment continued to mark the Berkeley structures during the next two centuries, both here, at Bristol, and elsewhere. Berkeley castle remained just one more remarkable military experiment among many made in England by the great Angevin. It may be regarded, therefore, as a variety that had escaped from his rich military parterre; but one which remained infertile.

As the addition of this impressive keep emphasized the importance of Berkeley, it is needful to fasten upon whatever evidences (where so much has become ever more and more obscured with time) may yet survive as to its original nature and working. For the elaborate upper stage here remained, as elsewhere, for nearly two centuries the main habitation of the lords and their families—otherwise from c. 1155 until soon after the death of Edward the second (probably) therein (21 September 1327). Nevertheless, so small (compared with the greater castles), was Berkeley that, unlike in those, the keep here easily controlled the sub-commanders of gates and towers, and by precluding their isolation made treachery

26 Conisborough was more elaborate, as well as far larger; there is no similarity with Berkeley, beyond its keep being cylindrical.
difficult. To win over a gate-keeper was not sufficient, it needed to win over the Constable, or overpower his watch and capture the family.

For, it is certain that the projecting semi-circular turrets were not designed here for the purpose of the dungeons which some of these may have been used for later on. The latter, within, do not descend below (outer) plinth-level, but end short of the level of the inner court,\(^27\) or bailey, by about four feet, and, with exception of the northernmost survivor of them (that containing the important Oratory of St. John) the fellow-turrets (SE and SW) originally possessed no lights at all through their outer walls, nor any stone stairs within them. Moreover, they were but partially closed on their inner sides. The small rectangular lights that show in the pilaster-strips of the turret are not ancient. But a fourth turret (possibly a large one) then in a bad condition ('ruinated') was finally demolished just when the fourteenth century addition of gun-fire to archery rendered the creation of the Thorpe platform-tower of 1346 (that arose upon the most assailable (N) quarter of the keep) an obvious and probably a welcome necessity.\(^28\) Of that fourth semi-circular turret,\(^29\) naturally, nothing definite can now be said, save that its important position (like that of its oblong and more extensive successor still there, commanding both church and town) seems to involve that it may have been furnished by the thirteenth century at

\(^{27}\) But as the court is now 2-3 feet above original level, the bases of the turrets within were about 6-7 feet above it.

\(^{28}\) By 1342-3 (in spite of repairs c. 1330) it had become "ruinated" and we find Thomas III, Lord Berkeley, spending £108 3s. 1d. in bringing stone from the Severn rocks and "tuff" from Dursley, in order to substitute for it the Thorpe tower. It is not possible to state precisely what the repairs to fortification were which Thomas made after October 1326 (Roll 41, Berkeley Muniments) when Queen Isabel gave him back his castle on the spot, which her arch-foe and his father's, the younger Despenser, had looted in 1322-4. She came from Gloucester and left Berkeley for Bristol, which surrendered to her. They may have been extensive.

\(^{29}\) Cf. Plan.
least, with offensive loops or vertical *meurtrières*; and, if so, it was certainly the turret of prime importance here.

Further, it may be added that if the dethroned Edward II had been imprisoned therein (as likely enough he may have been) that would have offered a fresh explanation for its subsequent ruinous neglect and make even plainer to us why the Berkeleys of 1342-3 should have been not sorry to get clean rid of it. Nevertheless, the Thorpe Tower\textsuperscript{30} was primarily and most carefully, we hold, devised and calculated (by a military master-mason perhaps from Dover) for the newly-introduced and revolutionizing gunnery, and to make any reasonable attack from the town-side impossible of success. We need not forget, however, that artillery was far more alarming to the enemy than it was fatal to him. The shot seldom weighed as much as the stones thrown by the *trebuchet*. But both were probably used here. Its stairway was placed in the easternmost of its two square turrets, so as to give freedom west of that to the gunners to sweep both the moat, the town, and all the approaches to the drawbridge below, including, of course, the church-yard. This it is, likewise, that offers the reason why its original small north-west-tower\textsuperscript{31} became taken down from Berkeley church, and a substitute was erected some fifty yards north of it, as a separate campanile; even to where its successor now stands, well out of the old line of fire.

From the date of the erection of this tower may be inferred a second complete change in the entire feudal family-life at Berkeley. For we find (1364) Pope Urban Vth’s licence from Avignon granted to the owners to make the more convenient chapel of St. Mary in its thirteenth century chamber situated SE across the inner ward, i.e. next the then new great hall. This innovation sufficiently

\textsuperscript{30} It did not become so-called until above a century later.

\textsuperscript{31} Its stair is there. For similar reason this church never had a massive tower at all.
indicates that the family transferred itself as far as might be from the noisy gunner-garrison, as well as from the grim associations of the king’s tragedy of but a generation before.

What, therefore, if anything, can be further now inferred as to the nature of the distribution and purposes of the three (that is inclusive of the but partly useful ground-storey) various storeys of this round, almost lightless, keep? That it had c. 1170 been entered from its new forebuilding (or, at some 24 feet above the court or

ward-level, instead of by a timber-stairway, and close against the east, (or chapel) turret, and not from ground level), is clear. Whatever was the nature of the previous entrances to it that first storey with the four turret-niches binding it in served for the household storey and, with the hall of the old keep, it contained also the children’s quarters. The approximate evidence as to its ancient floor-level is given us by there surviving—long-forgotten, but actually in being—an arcaded cross-wall (cf. plan)
lying but two feet and a half beneath present floor-level,\textsuperscript{32} and composed of four bays of arches. The piers of these descend to their footings upon a stout wall to within but a few feet of the ground-level, though they stand darkly embedded in earth and stones. We take this transverse-wall (which in itself declares that there neither was, nor is, a motte here) to indicate support provided for carrying its former upper storeys as well as for a (perhaps) double-gabled roof formerly crowning and cresting this keep; and it must have been carried up one more floor originally in order to sustain the roof. The next floor may have been until 1644-5 level with the chapel-vaulting.

But this does not preclude there having possibly here been a basement-entrance to some hidden stairway from the Thorpe-tower side, dating possibly even from before the date of that addition; although we do not suggest for lack of evidence that there was originally an entrance of any kind at ground-level here.\textsuperscript{33}

The uses to which such a keep-basement is accredited in other sites, with not a little assurance, is said to have been the provisioning (i.e. stores), and armoury of the garrison. We do not think any part, save perhaps the inconvenient turret-hollows (or so-called dungeons) was here so utilized.\textsuperscript{34} Their not descending below a certain level was no doubt quite intentional, and that was for dryness sake; for provender, perhaps—but not for prisoners. Their temperatures are even and mild, but food would not keep sound there. We have already noted that the bottoms of both the dungeons (so-called) of the remaining turrets\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{32} This was not recognized until 1923.
\textsuperscript{33} The writer regrets that he did not succeed in persuading the present owner to open out a certain bricked-up arch there, in 1922.
\textsuperscript{34} They show no sign of entrances save from above, and are walled off from the filled-in core of the keep.
\textsuperscript{35} In the sw turret (that near the entrance-gate and now embodied in the later buildings there) nothing was found but the bones of red-deer, jaws of boars, and ox-skulls; otherwise remains of banquets served in the upper keep
(other than the chapel-and-well turret) do fail designedly to reach the ground-level of the court, or inner bailey, of the castle; and, also, that the piers (8 feet 6 inches) of the cross-wall arcade likewise stop somewhat further short of that level. Whether this shallow ground-core to the keep thus indicated, is, all of it, earth or stone "filling-in" (as we believe it to be), or if any of it means only the taking vantage of some hypothetical natural projection of, or of some previous solid foundation on, the rocky platform, cannot actually be declared; but, in no case can it be described as having ever amounted to a motte; and as Earl William had built Chepstow without raising a motte, he may well have dispensed with the same feature at Berkeley where there was even less need for one. In any case no provisions can have been stored there, nor would they have kept. At the same time, all the floors or storeys of the keep will have been vaulted.

If it be conceded that Robert FitzHarding's own hall became established in the keep from the first (1155) years here, it may be asked—does that agree with the proven fact that there survived another Norman hall in the curtain, in fact situated where the present hall stands (SE)—down until 1340?

The answer, of course, is in the affirmative. The latter hall was the elder of the two, and, thus, older than the keep. But there were two halls in many castles; and the lower and earlier hall in this bailey, after 1155, subserved administrative uses and was frequented by the knights, esquires, and valets attendant upon their lord's daily business; while the guarded hall in the keep remained of far more privileged and restricted entrance. In some in remote days. A refuse-pit of such sort must have become a nuisance to the garrison. Probably as the chapel turret held the important well, the other turrets were store-pits.

Before 1155 no doubt the older hall was the prime one of the yet keepless castle. The coming of the keep made it secondary; but in 1347 it had undergone wholesale expansion and had become the chief hall.
keeps (even here) it was necessarily of limited size. Before the middle fourteenth century, however, things became much altered at Berkeley. There ensued a deliberate forsaking of the old keep-centre by the family in favour of the entire south court and curtain. This probably took place in 1347, at the coming of the second wife of Thomas III, Lord Berkeley. The strictly feudal fortress was being superseded by the more dwelled-in baronial residence.

A corresponding and necessary handing over of the forsaken keep to the Constable of Berkeley consequently took place. Then the venerable Oratory of St. John became relegated rather to official than to the family-services, marriages and funerals, which latter thenceforth were celebrated after 1364-5 in the new chapel of St. Mary. When the former chapel finally became entirely forsaken for church purposes, we have no means at present of telling; neither do we know the precise moment in the later nineteenth century [(?)] 1870], when it became fitted up rather imperfectly for a repository of the precious muniments. The late Mrs. Atherley (née Grenville Berkeley), to whom the writer was often indebted for details, vividly recollected the former appearance of the chapel and allowed him to copy certain sketches here reproduced. Its position as a chapel here had naturally depended upon the priest having to face east; and the same, of course, applied to St. Mary's former chapel in the curtain-angle.

As shown (figs. 3, 7, 8) that earliest family-chapel consisted of a semi-circular vaulted Norman chamber 12 feet wide by 14 feet from west-door to its central east-window, and it was lit by three deep-splayed lights.

37 Katharine, widow of Sir Peter le Veel of Tortworth; d. and h. of Sir John Clivedon of Charfield, Glos. Their effigies survive in Berkeley church. She and his many prisoners of war brought the wherewithal to pay for all his magnificent strengthening and beautifying of Berkeley, as well as the ransom of Sir Maurice, taken prisoner at Poitiers.
In addition to the acute-arched west-door opening from the inner keep and reached (formerly) by a wooden-stair, a small door opened into its first bay (nw) from a stone stair that mounted within the wall-thickness and led up directly from a loop embrasure in the keep-wall. The latter loop (improved c. 1280) beside the chapel commanded the north-eastern moat. Excepting when its west door was open to the inner keep and stair the light in the chapel was religiously dim. Between the bays of its apside the pillars were single with scalloped caps; while the flankers and angle pillars (sw and nw) were doubled; and all sprang from square stilts set upon a characteristic stone chamfered bench.\textsuperscript{38} Some shafts had kept their original bases with roll-moulding; but some had lost these, and shallow caps, inverted, had been substituted. One could trace in 1923 how use and age-long rubbing had worn and cracked them. But they needed merely restrained overhauling. There were no internal string-courses. It was a joy to welcome the historic surface back to the light. The caps, like the pillars, were of oolite-freestone. The former acute-arched west-door (transitional) was enriched with single chevron on jamb and arch. The writer noticed several interesting, though faint, traces of band and chevron colour-decoration here and there upon the walls after the muniment-cases were removed. Not one trace of history has now (1926) been left.

St. John’s being the only oratory within the castle during the period of King Edward’s incarceration (3 April — 22 September 1327), we may infer that the miserable prisoner here duly confessed his sins during many months and was shriven in it by Friar Robert, his favourite Dominican.\textsuperscript{39} Only nine months (June 1328) after his

\textsuperscript{38} Entirely demolished 1924.

\textsuperscript{39} The King’s predilection for this Order accounts for John Dunhead’s attempt to rescue him from Berkeley in July 1327, with his brother
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deliberate murder, Mortimer, (whose daughter Margaret was the then Lady Berkeley, the chatelaine) and Isabel, the Queen-mother, together with Robert Lord Clifford,\(^\text{40}\) of the north, came to the castle and spent some summer nights' sojourn on their progress, doubtless curious to realize gruesome detail, though they may also, all of them have here\(^\text{41}\) confessed to and been absolved-by their own chaplains, on the same spot where, for weeks together, so

Fig. 3. ORATORY OF ST. JOHN'S CHAPEL

recently had lain the embalmed remains of their first royal victim,\(^\text{42}\) and where oblations had been and were

Stephen Dunhead. John Dunhead had become a friar. On 16 October 1325, he was made a Papal chaplain by recommendation of Edward, whose envoy he then was. He had gone to Avignon re the proposed divorce of Edward from Isabel, but he effected nothing. On his return he learned of Edward's imprisonment. Later he was captured at Bidebrook near Dunmore by a soldier, and taken to Isabel and placed in Pontefract castle, where he was doubtless tortured and presently was thrown down an old well. His brother was caught in London.

\(^{40}\) He married in this same St. John's chapel here in the keep, in June 1328, Isabel, Lord Berkeley's sister. The expense roll for provisions for the guests on this occasion at Berkeley and their entertainment survives.

\(^{41}\) We get such references as the following (1321) to this chapel of St. John:—Thomas ii, Lord Berkeley "gives lands and tenements in Cam and Coaley to Walter Symonds his chaplain, and his diet and lodging in the castle of Berkeley, to decently keep all the ornaments of the said chapel and dutifully and canonically to celebrate services for the souls of his ancestors and heirs therein."

\(^{42}\) Queen Isabel contrived to effect a private interview at or near Worcester with the woman whom she paid (officially) to carry out the embalming of her murdered husband at Berkeley.
being daily offered for repose of his soul; and even then they were shrewdly devising to procure, as presently they succeeded in doing, the downfall and execution of Edmund, Earl of Kent, the late king's brother.

This historic 800-year-old chapel, be it understood, therefore, has suffered severely by post-war (1924-5) treatment; for perhaps no more than ten stones (since 1923) have escaped "re-dressing." Consequently its historic surface and effect have been changed more completely than those of almost any other chamber in the entire castle. We give two views (figs. 7-8) of this chapel of St. John, with architectural details, as it was, so that the student may realize what he has lost, and to record what a peculiar treasure had safely survived.

But, we pass to consider the forebuilding (se), the construction of which certainly followed soon after that of the keep, in the days of Maurice (FitzHarding) de Berkeley (who first enlarged the castle and who, no doubt, completed various works here and elsewhere begun by his father) between 1170 and 1189 (plate II). This structure has undergone various drastic transformations, though none in post-war days. The hood-mould of its late Norman entrance from the bailey encloses a mid-fourteenth century diminished and chamfered door approached by squared steps (now done away). The third pilaster-strip of the se turret (to which it is attached)

43 By 1331, at his own execution, Mortimer was able to tell the people that Edmund had been wrongly put to death, in case they knew it not.

44 Sir John Maltravers seems to have been the prime agent of the Queen in urging the unfortunate earl to go about agitating to the effect that King Edward had really escaped, and was living, and for this Sir John became more blamed by the young king than for any connexion of his with Edward II at Berkeley where he had shared the governorship with Gournay.

45 In consequence of the treaty of marriage contrived by King Henry between the Berkeleys and the non-noble male FitzHardings, their offspring assumed the greater name as soon as might be, as Smyth expresses it:--"the style or name of the son of Robert began to slippe away from him." He had been born in Bristol "and bred up with his father Robert in his great stone House built by him on the banke of the river Frome." It remained for parasitic pedigree-mongers to invent Harding the royal Dane.
was (anciently) sacrificed in its lowest 20 feet, in order to accommodate it; so that we may take the elevation of the forebuilding-facade to have been lower by some eight feet than now it is, with its modern pseudo-crenellations and borrowed, though partly real, Edwardian cross-loops, all tucked in comfortably behind the remnant of that Norman pilaster.

The forebuilding (if this view holds) had never more than the one room above the ground-floor stairway; and that was lighted by two single Early English lancets, one of which has been supplanted by a Tudor two-light window (probably not made for it) that has long lost its mullion. These then, are the latter-day windows of the room called "Edward the second's bedroom." A later (third) Tudor window has been inserted in the east (side) wall of the room. We have reason to know that the crenellation and loops (or meurtrières) referred to, have been merely bodily transferred from other parts of the castle at no remote period and playfully re-distributed for the sake of stage-effect. Within, the room has been re-panelled (probably more than once), and it has been given a derelict four-post bed, in part at least dating from the reign of George I. This has quite successfully done duty as the murder-bed of Edward II (1327) for a few generations. The present passage, really a timbered

46 The least-spoiled pilaster-strips are those in the south keep-wall.
47 The momentary kidnapping of Edward II by the Dunheeds and other conspirators towards mid-July 1327, could scarcely have been effected from the keep; but it would have been easier from the forebuilding, or the inner gate. Probably, when the fugitive was presently recaptured from his rescuers, some of whom had also "robbed the castle against the King's Peace," he was relegated by Sir John Walewelyn (king's clerk and formerly escheator), the governor, to the keep itself. (Cf. Dr. F. J. Tanquerey's account of this important episode in E. H. Review, xxxi, 119-24). Walewelyn had been appointed by the Queen-mother and Mortimer in June. His son (?) John was a canon of Lincoln and Salisbury, clerk of the Queen's wardrobe, and was also her envoy to Avignon. He died 1331. Sir John's letter to the chancellor from Berkeley about the incident is dated 27 July.
48 The coverlets, from which the nimble scissors of visitors of all kinds used to snip collectors' relics of Edward II were provided (1896-1915) from the
balustrade-gallery leading-back by a ledge from the stone-stairs to this chamber, dates from the late seventeenth century; but it may have replaced more than one wooden predecessor. Thus, it may recall earlier days when such timbered galleries, both temporary and permanent ones, were the rule in castles.

The forebuilding in front, and at SE, then presented the appearance of a somewhat stunted tower with a wide late-Norman entrance, approached from the court or inner bailey, by some broad steps, now removed.

The original continuing wall behind it forming the short corridor leading step by step up to the keep (with traces of olden secondary doors that purposely were made difficult to pass) has been long ago cut-back, in order to give a wider stairway, while, in addition, its remainder has been prolonged so as to reach a modern stair convenient for access to the roofs of certain NE rooms. So that the passage has been deprived of a good deal of its earlier character. None of the crenellation remaining at the summit of the keep itself is original, and, of course, no traces survive of former horuds or bretasches, or lean-to timber cabins rigged out temporarily upon the upper faces of the towers.

But there remains to mention that directly across the keep, from its entrance, and in the opposite, or west wall (before the 1644-8 breach (N) begins), may be seen in the inner wall-face a blocked-up triangular arch, of a former doorway; the latter being an early insertion (c. 1300) within a loftier twelfth century entrance from a gallery once traversing that western flank of the keep. This point of the inner circuit stands almost above the transverse wall-arcade previously described as crossing the keep (E—W) underground. Behind it stands the sw

Tottenham Court-road. The roll of stuff used to last about three years, owing to generous access (given until the Great War) accorded to the public, who consequently did little harm and left no litter.

49 Cf. plan.
pilaster-strip to the keep, much of which, however, is no longer original. The above fourteenth century diminished doorway may have remained of considerable functional importance long after the inner domestic buildings of the keep had been translated into stone, and were still in daily occupation by the family and its staff of attendants or the later garrison. The probabilities suggest that we have here evidence of a door to a passage

Fig. 4. View (c. 1830) looking west across the inner Keep
wherein was the stair to the storey above, and so to the
former tiled and gabled roof. It is a survival that has been
out of use for above a hundred and fifty years.

PART II

THE CURTAIN, GATES AND BAILEY

Against hopeless misunderstandings, here and there, in
recent changes may be placed the merit of extirpating
centuries of rampant and destructive ivy, and thorough
hole-stopping effected by concrete forced in with high-
pressure-apparatus. The actual stability of the castle, at
least, has been secured for a long time to come; and, for
this let us be duly thankful.

At Berkeley, therefore, seeing that the broken red
sandstone (of which it is chiefly built) carries almost no
mouldings (and thus seldom tells a clear tale), it is well
that the archaeological inquirer should suspect every
extensive patch or area of well-squared masonry until he
has thoroughly examined it as to its setting, so as to
distinguish between its fifteenth century repairs and
the "improvements" of the nineteenth and twentieth
centuries. With regard to the white freestone, he will
only too easily recognize the modern work by the vertical
dressing-lines.

For the earliest masonry in this castle was, and is,
' en petit appareil,' as exemplified in the walls of the keep.
As a rule, the more regular the course-laying here, the
more untrustworthy the antiquity, as far as the castle,
though not the neighbouring church, is concerned. For
its repairs are usually to be traced by squared and planed
stones. It is safe to say that almost all of the early
windows here have been widened, and generally with
ugly, if useful, effect, at one period or another. Most of
the cross-loops (or eyelets) though not all, have wandered
from their right places.\textsuperscript{50} and most of the crenellations have been refashioned by amateur-masons.

On the other hand, larger and squared stones, mixed with others, characterize the fourteenth century additions to the castle and can be distinguished from later more slipshod work, or from work that either is over-regular or suspiciously smooth. (E.g. the hall-exterior as well as much of the refacing of the keep pilaster-strips, and the masonry round the upper entrance to the keep).

The much-pulled-about great kitchen called "Tudor" work and usually assigned to Henry VII,\textsuperscript{51} we hold belongs to mid-twelfth century, at which period it doubtless served as an effective and once much loftier hexagonal mural-tower. As usual it was purposely made irregular, being designed for defensive purposes at that special section of the then curtain and for surveying both the moat, and \textit{Worthy}, beyond these. Its original conversion to a kitchen probably dates about thirty years before the fourteenth century enlargement of the hall, or 1310 (?), and it was partly due to the general well or water supply being but a few feet from it, in the court. If that view be accepted, this mural tower had in its earlier days been reckoned as a highly important offensive angle in the eastern curtain-wall, commanding both \textit{E}, \textit{NE}, and \textit{SE} points of attack, and having (until perhaps 1313), no curtain wall such as now stands well to east of it, at all, but joined on to its south side. It then, however, commanded a considerably wider moat, which became purposely narrowed along the whole of this \textit{ENE} turn of the earlier walls, in order to gain further accommodation for the castle and its increasing numbers of courtly guests. The usual numbers at Berkeley were from 200 to 300 people.

\textsuperscript{50} Eleven concealed ones were uncovered by the removal of the ivy \textit{NE} and \textit{SE} in 1918-21. These, on the other hand, are in site. Attack upon that park side of the castle became for some reason especially apprehended.

\textsuperscript{51} Who, after all, though the castle became alienated to him, did not care to reside or hunt here.
Consequently, we incline to regard the whole of the N and NE curtain-wall and garderobes as having been arduously built and made fast to the chapel-turret of the keep in the early, and revised in the middle, years of the fourteenth century. The original curtain-wall here (it would follow), rose nearer to the present inner wall of the billiard-room and to the court or inner bailey. The bailey-well is eight feet from the kitchen-tower (w).

The castle originally, then, was at this quarter far less capacious than it has been since c. 1310; and throughout this added wing lay, until 1921, a peculiarly-complicated jumble of shapeless spaces (due to successes of amateur architectural experiments) enclosed between great walls and partitions on the NW as far as the forebuilding. In 1920-1, the workmen satisfied us, while these certainly needful changes for the better were proceeding in this portion of the castle, that a large earlier wall-footing extends beneath the bakehouse. In fine, this twelfth century hexagonal tower, by that Bannockburn date, had become partly demilitarized and thoroughly inclosed through the curtain being extended considerably NE of it toward the moat. A fragment of the original curtain, curving in towards the tower (E), yet remains.

Turning now to the present inner or entrance-gate, it is obvious that the thereby concealed SW Norman turret of the keep was in its earlier days as free from any gate as were all its fellows from contact with other buildings. For what purpose, then, and by what date did this become hidden away permanently out of sight?

This question gives rise to another, and a more important, one—what was the form and exact position of the original gate or defence here when that semi-circular turret still stood free? For we know that the keep had no ditch to it; while the turret (and most of its fellows) had no windows. It is certain that no part at all of the present gate, though some of it is ancient, is coeval with
the keep, so that the earliest entrance-gate that stood near this point, whatever was its form, must have been of different character from the present one and was of Norman make. Probably it stood slightly furthereastward. That the present gate partly replaced some other and smaller one, seems further pointed to by its orientation differing a few points more to north than does that of the remainder of the south curtain-buildings, cf. plan. It is, in fact, oriented with its tower (s) and with the fourteenth century foundations of the much-altered buildings standing (n) within the keep; and this fact may possibly give us the approximate date of these last. It would include the date also of the first enclosing of the sw aforesaid keep-turret, now scarcely to be discovered, save from the roof or the outer gate. Thus, we can partly account for the absorption and conversion of two totally different early towers (sw and ne 'Thorpe') at Berkeley, during one and the same period. We regard both of them as fourteenth century works, of 1300-50.

The next section of the present curtain (due east and adjoining the sw gate-tower) is of a more massive character and also it is far more ancient than this c. 1300 gate-tower, as is the entire exterior of the south curtain-wall as far as the great kitchen. The inner walls to the bailey, however, are chiefly of Edward i-ii date, as the mouldings to the windows duly discover.

High up above the present roofs of the two morning-rooms that follow the entrance (right) there was (less than a century ago), visible (and uninterfered with) an early round arch (its occupation gone) filled in and having above it a small relieving arch. This must have belonged either to a large early arcade connecting a series of upper chambers here, and perhaps leading from the original (or Norman) entrance-gate into the whole upper curtain—or else it was the doorway to such an upper gallery, or passage-way. Possibly it served both these functions.
In any case, the relieving-arch suggests that it may have carried another storey, or a low tower-top above it. This, perhaps, may assure us that an inner gate-tower did indeed occupy this position. The immense outer (s) buttress (some nine feet in thickness) also points in the same direction. We have, in fact, in the massive walls of this member of the south-curtain important surviving remains of the early twelfth century castle of the provosts in spite of all subsequent alterations, of the Georgian.

Fig. 5

Blocked early arches on E face of wall overlooking morning-room leads cuttings-down, and of the many Victorian mutilations. Examination made from the various roofs is at Berkeley as necessary as are burrowings in its encumbered crypts or cellars. Both are, indeed, indispensable and rewarding. But they have never been fully examined by trained archaeologists.

Once all such matters are taken into consideration, it becomes easier to recognize why the inclosed keep-turret (SW) stands where it does. The archer and the sentinels
of late Norman days from its summit were free to transfixed any who attacked the two (right and left) inner and outer gates below. The scientific meaning of its precise position is so far, unmistakable. On the other hand, the improvement in arms of offence and the addition of loopholes (straight, and later, crossed) in castellated gates and bridges probably suggested the building here of an entirely new inner or fourteenth century gate for the larger garrison, although that had to be affected at the sacrifice of the old sw keep-turret. In due course, at any rate, this became enclosed and was made part and parcel with the new, and once portcullised, gate. 52 These changes may have been partly made with the coming of the Thorpe tower, but we think them to be of rather earlier date, or contemporaneous with the outer or double-turret gate made by Thomas II (Lord Berkeley) while he was governor of Gloucester in 1313, to whom and to his wife, Joan, a great deal of the early Edwardian work here was due.

The latrines belonging to the gate have now (1921) become the electric-lighted muniment-rooms. With its former portcullis and its men-at-arms, it held, of course, intimate rapport with the aforesaid additional outer gate-house, that with much else was built out of financial aid which its projector then received from his freeholders, purposely given him by them for the making his son, Maurice, a knight. The latter, unfortunately for him and for them, became a prisoner at Bannockburn in the following year, and the freeholders then had further to pay heavily for his ransom from the Scots. Things now went from bad to worse for nearly twenty years with Berkeley and its owners; and not only with those, but with the condition of England generally, not excluding the royal exchequer. 53

52 The foundations of the octagonal turrets of which came to light in February 1926.
53 Perhaps the desperate point was reached in Sept. 1324, when the Des-
Manifestly, in all that former period the outer bailey was an unusually noisy place. For a crowd of employees was daily at work there, and probably so for several years together, under skilled supervisors, master-masons, with plan, square and trowel; stone-cutters, sawing the blocks or giving them their proper mouldings; master-carpenters and wallers, and tile-pinners; paviors and plasterers and painters; the odours of freshly-sawn timber, and of the melting of lead, and the noise of axes and hammers, as well as the roar of the chains of the lifting drawbridge just beyond them; though the gentle south-east breeze may now and then perhaps have brought from round the other side of the keep refreshing hints of the great deer-roasts going on in the bakehouse, or possibly a smack of spice or burnt vinegar from lamprey-pies in the kitchen. The kitchen was re-roofed c. 1495. It suffered probably from fire in 1603 and was restored drastically 1604-7.

Then befell there tragical interludes of ominous quiet, and the inheritors of Berkeley became violently supplanted by their very bitterest court rivals, the Despensers. But every vestige of the various offices and structures that then stood within the outer bailey have long vanished, as well as its inner wall or palisade to the moat; though relics of some of these features remained here until long after the official “slighting” of Berkeley (gate and keep) by Cromwell and the removal of

pensers deprived the queen of her lands and servants and limited her allowance to £1 per diem. That meant murders and revenges all around.

54 By curious fate some of the agents set by Despenser to loot the castle fell into Lord Berkeley’s hands two months before the king’s murder. We do not know their fate; nor to whom belonged six skeletons mysteriously buried under the passage next the ne of the keep. It is certain that much of the loot and jewels were taken by Roger Mortimer from Despenser and given to Queen Isabel to recompense her.

55 Originally a stockade. It may be noted here that the moat, at that period opposite the Thorpe tower, was nearer the castle than it has been since 1410, when Thomas iv boldly recaptured the strip originally taken from the churchyard by Maurice FitzHarding c. 1180, for which the abbot of his monastery of S. Augustine (Bristol) had excommunicated him, and permanently annexed it.
of all its guns and other arms and munitions to Gloucester; and, therefore, until long after constable, lieutenant, and garrison, and scireant-at-arms, were no more, and the castle held only the lord and his peaceful family, his timid chaplain, his cautious secretary and usual familiar attendants, together with the non-feudal household staff. Probably Wolfe, the architect (1763) cleared away a great many buildings. What he built chiefly remains, including the stables.

It seems rather childish, therefore, to find the fifth Earl of Berkeley in 1810 appointing a humble surgeon of the county militia "to be deputy-constable of my castle of Berkeley and Janitor of the same, with authority over my vassals and wardens, and also over the Records, Armoury, etc., here at Berkeley," and giving him to wear an inscribed gold ring pompously-inscribed in Latin; and granting him the much diminished outer gate-house to reside in. These peculiar rewards seem, however, to have been given for certain useful private services not exactly of a medical nature—such as the careful tracings of old hand-writings, assisting Mary Cole ("Tudor") to write her invitations and to pay her accounts, and to copy pedigrees, and, where possible to him, to transcribe old grants of land, and make extracts from the Berkeley church-registers,—for all which most valuable labours and ingenuities the earl duly procured for him a right to advertise himself as F.S.A., as befitted the non-military side of the family pill-maker, otherwise the Grand Constable of Berkeley castle, its wardens and vassals.

Yet even all this was really in harmony with the sham-Gothic atmosphere prevailing at that period and with its playful transference of real Edwardian battlements and eyelets as stage-properties, from one part of the solemn old structure to another; it belonged, also, to those false economies in building, such as un chamfered string-courses and set-offs, converted into rain and moss-accumulators—
and the abolition of string-courses and eaves-courses—the evil initiative of which has borne, and still bears, monstrous results to thousands of houses throughout Cotswold and England generally.

Let us turn from such unpleasing, but needful, contrasts to briefly notice one or two other survivals here, and the problems to which they give rise.

The pair of (fourteenth century) triangular arches (fig. 6) with flat soffits and bases, and with piers of square section (two bays of 10 feet) forming the division-wall of the large north room upon its western side towards the buttery, were discovered in site during extensive and clumsy alterations made there in 1804. They had been concealed until then by lath and plaster for above a century. Probably the pair of long drop-arched ribs of the bakehouse and a great deal besides these was also found then; but the significance failing to be understood, many things became demolished or covered up again. The above crude triangular arches (of a type favoured much by the Berkeleys) sufficiently resemble the thirteenth century triangular arches that form an outstanding feature around the polygonal dome of the church of Marmashen56 at

56 The Knights Hospitallers used both semi-circular and square turrets in their Syrian fortresses as at Le Krak, rebuilt 1202. (Cf. M. G. Rey, Monum: de l'Architecture des Croisés en Syrie).
Kanligia (cf. Rivoira, *Moslem Architecture*, ed. G. McN. Rushforth, fig. 176). Some such finds the late Lord FitzHardinge had reason to think had also been made before his time somewhere within the keep. Whatever material he knew whereon to lay his ever-friendly hand or point to, he freely placed at the writer's disposal, and it is largely, though by no means entirely, from that source and by subsequent confirmation of certain features at Berkeley that he has been enabled to record here observations and archaeological facts set down in this paper for the benefit of other students hereafter who may wish to realize for the first time why the builders of c. 1155 did not encase here or revett the legendary motte with stone—as it still is the mistaken custom to declare that they did at Berkeley.

As to the outer and once stately gate, of a late Edwardian character, Cromwell and the siege of Berkeley have left us but a rectangular single-storied building pierced by an arched passage dividing it into unequal portions, and having a drop chamfer-arch upon west and east faces. The vaulting-crown, pierced by three square holes and a central round one, for dropping lethal projectiles or melted metal, is formed of Dursley calcar. There is no portcullis. The basement to the ditch or moat contained a columbarium, perhaps only since 1577, when Henry, Lord Berkeley, whose tomb and effigies (by Baldwin of Stroud) lie in the south choir chapel of the church "carried away the stone of the scite of the Hospital and Priory of the Holy Trinity Longbridge, and with them built the arched stone bridge *leading into the first Gate* of Berkeley Castle, in place of a wooden bridge." The pigeons here were perhaps for feeding the falcons of the lord, though offering manifest temptations to the gate-keeper. From its former crest, as from the octagonal turrets of the older rear-gate that flanked it, flights of arrows, or quarrels, or gun-fire, would have made it difficult of approach by the enemy especially, moreover,
as the now missing draw-bridge in those times was in place. But without a thorough excavation the exact relations of the 1313, or rear gate, to its later eastward companion, are not possible to describe; and this will probably not be carried out. They were doubtless interconnected; but guns were not yet in use when the inner gate was built. The vaulting of the outer one is very robust. It was built and fully fortified late in Edward III’s reign; and probably the equally ill-fated great-grandson of Edward II passed through it when he came to visit Berkeley at the sunny, but troubled, close of July in the tenth year of his reign, to talk over with Thomas IV Lord Berkeley their last year’s expedition into Scotland as well as the immediately threatened war with France. The accounts of the stewards of Ham and Slimbridge manors readily discover the royal provision then made for receiving King Richard and his court.57

APPENDIX

(1) Thomas Lord Berkeley was only fully acquitted by Edward III on 16 March 1337, nearly 10 years after the murder; and, though Smyth mentions this and the fact that the Parliament acquitted him “in all things, saving some fault of negligence,” he, strangely more than anyone, gives this acquittal the lie. For he shows from the castle-accounts that whereas Lord Berkeley pleaded that he was at Bradley and sick on 21-22 September 1327, when Edward was murdered, and his plea was accepted by his peers, he did not really go to Bradley until Michaelmas day, a whole week later. Moreover, he wrote letters the day after it so as immediately to let Mortimer and Isabel know that the murder had been done; and he sent Sir Thomas Gournay, his kinsman, to Nottingham with these

tidings: "notificand cum litteris Domini’; (‘which manifestly shew with what art this Lord shuffled his cards.’ Lives of the Berkeleys, i, 297).

Prof. Tout has made clear that William of Shalford, Mortimer’s lieutenant of the Marches, had written to his master in great alarm at a freshly arising conspiracy to rescue the king headed by Sir Rhys ap Gryffydd (7 Sept. 1327)—telling him that there was real danger and hinting the only remedy. This reached Mortimer at Abergavenny and resulted forthwith in William of Ocle, probably the actual assassin, being despatched from Wales to Berkeley.

(2) Between 3 April and 20 September 1327, the cook to Edward II at Berkeley received 320 pigeons, or about two per diem; and 204 eggs, for the king’s consumption.

(3) Pat. Roll, i Aug. 1327, i Edw. III. Commission to Thomas de Berkeley, one of the chief keepers of the king’s peace in the county of Gloucester, to arrest John of Newminster, Stephen Dunhead, Brother Thomas Dunhead, William son of William Aylmer, John Boteler of Staffordshire (Wem), Thomas de la Haye, Peter of Rokele, William Aylmer (the elder) and others, indicted before him for coming with an armed force to Berkeley castle to plunder it, and refusing to join the king in his expedition against the Scots. (Calendar, p. 156).

(4) Among significant rewards granted to various important actors in the king’s tragedy Wm. of Ocle was afterwards given by Queen Isabel the custody of her important manor of Ellesmere, co. Salop, and he was there on 27 July 1329.

Sir Thomas de Gournay of Beverstone was made governor of Bristol, December 1328. Next year things looked threatening, however, and the young king having received the Great Seal, began to show what he was made of and how he was arming himself with interesting information as to his dead father’s living enemies for future use.
3 December 1330. "The King has learned that William of Ocle, (Sir) John Maltravers (i.e. the elder), Thomas de Gournay, John Wyard (cf. Kyre of the Wyards, co. Hereford), William of Exeter, and John Deveroil, who are charged with divers offences in this realm, propose leaving the realm secretly. To all sheriffs to prevent the same and cause them to be brought to the king (Westminster)."

PART III
THE ANCIENT CHAPELS

In studying such documents and accounts as yet survive abundantly at Berkeley belonging to certain individual owners of the castle and barony, and relating to their doings during those stormy and terrible mid-fourteenth century years, there is met with almost nothing that reveals their family preoccupations or bears in any way intimately upon their social and domestic interests other than their marriages. Of their official importance, of their public services, of the political animosities, and their bitter litigations, there are substantial evidences, and also of their rewards, ransoms and revenges. But the more elaborate documentary survivals printed are chiefly manorial grants and farm accounts. Very few relate to their buildings, though many to their monastic endowments. But there do survive several (mostly unexamined) accounts, even some (of the days of Edward II and earlier), both household and other, some only of which we have read.

Turning elsewhere, for example, to the Avignonese Papal petitions and registers, we here and there obtain a few facts as to the chatelaine being granted licence to carry a portable altar about with her, or to have mass celebrated at unusual hours or in unwonted places, so as to suit her and her lord's exigences of personal travel; and from these and other sources we may infer how short a
term such owners really tarried annually in any one of their many possessions. We also gather that wherever they went, they were (when considered needful) accompanied by twelve knights and twenty-four esquires, besides their chaplains and the formal household staff of men and women. But all this about their "progresses" discovers to us nothing of their private accounts of conscience, nor of their mental relationship to the horrible hub of court and church intrigue to which they themselves continually bore intimate relation, and from which none in their position could have escaped in those days, save by death, even had they had the will to do so. The lamentable history of the chapels discovers a little more to us.

Our eyes (since 1896) have scanned every nook and loophole of the stern secular towers and walls, and their much despoiled battlements, almost as though by mere force of their contemplation these might work out upon the inner sense some impression of the spirit or the memory of things enacted here so long ago—of things intimately related to that tragical court-life of the early years of Edward the third, in which, nevertheless (and it is evidenced by Chaucer's successfully growing up in it) merriment and humour were not utterly suppressed. But although the oracle of the stones has been almost dumb, yet if we will rather more carefully consider and compare those two now suddenly extinguished chapels at Berkeley, and reflect how intentionally the later one overlapped (without annulling) the earlier one with all its grim associations—that is to say: St. Mary, of the bailey-curtain, overlapping St. John the Baptist, of the keep—it is just possible that a few suggestions, if not lively glimpses, may be borne in upon us and be worth setting down here for after time.

For, probably several quite distinct, though contemporaneous, motives combined to urge Thomas III, Lord Berkeley (1326-61) with his son and successor, Maurice (1361-8) at certain favourable moments to carry on long
successions of drastic alterations long-needed or overdue, in both keep, castle and moat. From 1321, when Edward II had treacherously violated their safe-conducts and had captured at Cirencester and imprisoned both father and son at Wallingford (that is, the father of Thomas III and himself) until 1327, when 5 April and fate actually brought their enemy himself here a wretched prisoner purposely driven by the Earl of Lancaster, and Mortimer, Earl of March, into Lord Berkeley’s (the latter’s son-in-law) personal keeping, work on the castle had been but perfunctory. It had been plundered, they found, of most of its valuables, while triumphantly garrisoned by their worst rival, the younger Hugh Despenser, and that had been effected by the king’s own commands. The turrets and their crenellations were ruining. Probably few repairs of any sort had been carried out since 1314, and wind and rain had worked havoc. There had been indeed, lack of means wherewith to carry out any such work; for, as yet, none of the great arrears overdue to Lord Berkeley’s late father (as governor of Berwick) had been redeemed by the new young king’s government (25 January 1327). But in November 1326, Queen Isabel, though herself wearing some of the spoils of Berkeley, restored the castle to her paramour’s son-in-law, its rightful owner, and notified him that she would shortly visit it. The consequence was that as soon as possible every available smith, tyler, carpenter, glazier and mason, was put to work to repair and re-inforce the castle. For, in view of Queen Isabel taking Berkeley in her progress with Mortimer, we find the steward’s accounts of certain local manors alluding to materials sent for the new work to be done on the castle.

The next serious alterations (not merely ordinary repairs, of 1327-8) were those made in 1340-6 on the north and west sides of the keep, now hopelessly disfigured by
the penetrative damages of 1644 and by the mishandlings of c. 1760, and onwards. It seems likely before these were finished that the present great hall, c. 1342, was designed (as we mentioned earlier) to take the place and more of its modest Norman predecessor (about 54 feet by 25), the responds of the arcade thereto belonging being in site in 1921-2. The great outer wall (twelfth century) was found to be leaning as much as two feet out of plumb.

It goes without saying that all such magnificent and far-reaching alterations at such a date connoted a calculated and corresponding change in the life and administration at the castle. For, although the ancient keep remained the head and shoulders of the castle's defences—the castle within the castle—it ceased any more to be the domestic centre and family habitation. This latter accordingly we saw became transferred to other portions of the castle; forming a very drastic change.

Until 1920-23, then, there survived two ancient and most remarkable chapels in the castle, and they exist (as chapels) no longer. The later, or fourteenth century one, has since then been converted into a secondary drawing-room and has been given a foreign stone fireplace with an overmantel imported from France, in place of its doorway; while the far earlier chapel of 1155 in the keep has been otherwise (as already mentioned) utterly, and inch by inch, made unrecognizable.

The latter, or earliest (by just two centuries) of these two, it will be recalled, was dedicated to St. John the Baptist. It formed an original chamber in the eastern semi-circular projecting turret of the keep (cf. plan). It was entered directly by a western door opening from a principal stair, long vanished, rising from the upper court. Below it immediately was (and remains) its own well-

---

58 And probably much of the upper storeys of the keep were so damaged and exposed that it became needful to make a huge clearance before 1650.
59 The buildings and stables of Wolfe.
chamber. A skull was found at the bottom (1922). But (work being done in the keep in 1919-20), after removal of the muniments that for two generations had been rather rashly consigned to it—a second, or priests' entrance to the chapel revealed itself upon its northern side (cf. plan). This was formed by a door, hitherto blocked and unnoticed, opening on to a stone-stair coming up to it from a guarded loop-hole or splayed seat-window in the main keep-wall there. By this stone-stair one person alone at a time could have passed up into the chapel. Here was doubtless the chaplain’s door.

This little stone-vaulted apsidal chamber, not without a certain severe and special beauty, was lighted by three deep splays occupying three of five bays forming the wall-arcade. We last examined it on 6 August 1923, when we found nothing that was not worth preserving and almost all the ancient stone bench was in site. A lamp suspended from the central vaulting-boss by a rope, or chain, may have been part of the furniture here. The six square bases of the circular-pillars of the bay arose from a usual chamfered Norman stone bench that passed as a low seating around most of the chapel, a markedly historic feature (figs. 7, 8).

This, be it recollected, was the same chapel wherein (October-November 1327) were "paid oblations at several times for the King's Soul xxiid.,” while his embalmed body lay there strangely long-awaiting its solemn journey to St. Peter's at Gloucester.60 Here Edward II, probably for some months, had been previously permitted to confess to brother Robert, his chosen Dominican (cf. Patent Rolls, September 1326, p. 316).

Now, it has been suggested that this oppressive association with Edward II was one possible cause for the family abandoning this chapel of the keep, and of procuring

60 This was due apparently to the difficulties of court arrangements in those days.
Fig. 7. Apside

Fig. 8. Showing detail of former west door

BERKELEY CASTLE: ST. JOHN'S CHAPEL
from Urban v (1364) the licence to convert the noble thirteenth century chamber just west of the new great hall into a second and larger chapel, with another dedication (to St. Mary) situated quite away from it. It is true that the drastic alterations made in the keep but a few years earlier, and resulting in the demolition of the original, or fourth, semi-circular north turret (cf. plan) and the building upon its site of the (so-called) Thorpe-tower,61 with the consequent ugly narrowing and flattening of the inner and outer north curve of the keep, may have been equally helped by the same consideration, namely getting rid of a particular prison or some memory-haunted spot then known for certain, perhaps, to have been Edward's second prison, there, after his recapturing, and the reputed actual scene of his murder. For there cannot be any certainty at all now in which (if in any) of the four turrets that (all but one) rose above the so-called dungeons, this tragedy actually took place (21-22 September 1327). There is certainty alone that the chapel in which the king paid his devotions, was this oratory of St. John in the keep, and none other; and that it was here that, after its gruesome preparation by a certain wise woman for burial, and his death-mask taken for transmission to the Nottingham alabaster-men, his body lay in state all through October and darkening November, until its elaborate funeral-procession with the mourning monks to Gloucester abbey. The part and policy of its worthy abbot, by the way, have been unduly and persistently exaggerated, on account doubtless of the resultant importance of the royal burial therein to his own convent. For the Government itself undertook the entire burial, the tomb, effigy, and the expenses; even paid those to which Lord Berkeley and Sir John Maltravers were personally put, including 37s. and 8d. for a silver cup in

61 Not so-called until the fifteenth century.
which the king's heart was placed, and the dyeing black
"of the white canvas for covering the chariot wherein
the king's body was carried to Gloucester." Gloucester
was in every sense a royal and convenient town, made strong
with the king's own 'keep' and castle. That is why the
Government selected Gloucester for the burial. Bristol
was neither asked, nor did it refuse the king's body;
neither was Kingswood abbey asked—which was another
peculiarly Berkeley foundation. These are sentimental
fables.

It is not wanting in proper interest, however, to recall
here how certain personages soon after that grim moment
came to frequent this chapel, either officially or as privileged
visitors, whether for service, for watchings, or for
confessions.

The garrisoning and government of the castle had been
latterly carried on mainly by the Earl of Lancaster at the
order of Queen Isabel and Mortimer, who had placed them
under the trusted command of John Waleweyn of
Hereford (until 1324 the king's escheator), in the name of
the youthful Edward III (who had been proclaimed king
at Kenilworth 25 January 1327). But it is quite possible
that Sir Thomas Bradeston, who had been made governor
of Berkeley a year before, became now re-established
there, though proof of it is, as yet, wanting. Thomas
Lord Berkeley, and his wife Margaret (d. 1337), though
not, as he was able to aver, at the castle at the moment
when the murder was carried out, returned thither soon
after it, and remained there throughout the lying-in-state
and during the ensuing winter. Lady Berkeley herself
(be it remembered) was actually the daughter of Mortimer,
Earl of March (who for certain had ordered the king's
'removal,' lest he should again escape). Others who were
present there, were Sir John Maltravers and Agnes his
wife (yet another Berkeley, and sister of the owner of the
castle). The former, with Lord Berkeley, had joint
custody of the dead king's body lying (watched day and night) there, and was equally paid 100s. per diem for this duty. Probably (though not certainly) Pancio di Cotrone, the late king's Salernitan physician, shared their services; he was presently granted by the new king an annuity of £100 for life, with the manor of Temple Guiting. Maltravers and Sir Thomas Gournay, of Beverston, another near kinsman of Berkeley, who had more than officially carried assurance of the king's end from Berkeley to Mortimer and the Queen, then at Nottingham (i.e. to that Earl of Lancaster's castle) who had captured Edward at Neath (whom he had so bitterly hated for the execution of his own brother, Thomas of Bretherton)—all these and other almost equally ruthless enemies of the late king, now found themselves perforce of destiny, with his poor dead body lying, week after week for probably seven weeks, hatefully confronting them in the stillness of this dim little keep-chapel, whenever service or confession required it, though conscience may have pushed some or other of them instead into the local parish church across the moat, then fresh in renewed and brilliant beauty.

But, it may be urged, Edward's murderers had compensations of at least two kinds for this displeasure. They were repaid richly in cash for it; and they saw their worst enemy reduced to a corpse and their castle, with its vast demesne, liberated, albeit their treasures and jewels had all been carried off by the rapacious Despenser to London. Later, even these became looted by the Queen's partisans from the city house of the great Florentine bankers, the Bardi, and made over to her. From all these circumstances it is scarcely surprising that grave suspicions attached for a long while to Lord Berkeley, which it took him all ten years to allay.62

All these events we may take for granted had rendered

62 Smyth curiously smiles at Lord Berkeley's shufflings, and shows clearly what he thought of his "innocence."
GOLD SAXON RING

Found at Berkeley before 1800, of uncertain date, consisting of a circular raised central boss (diam. 15 mm.) forming a quartered wheel carried between four projecting wolves' (?) heads, having a total diam. 36 mm., the entire circumference bound in with plaited gold chain. The eyes of the beasts are of minute garnets or red glass and between each head travels round the central boss a broken circle of gold beads. The plane of the boss or table-wheel is divided by a fine beaded cross; the four lines corresponding to the centres of the wolves' heads; and each of the quarter-sections being given a v-shaped scroll of fine bead-work. The hoop is of hexagonal section. The illustration is 4 above natural size.
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the keep a not too savoury dwelling-place for the Berkeley family; and all the prayers and incense so richly expended therein might hardly make it sweet again. And yet, from the day the embalmed corpse, escorted by Benedictine monks with candles, was chanted down to the chariot and horses awaiting it at the great new gate of the castle for its final journey by Longbridge and Whitminster to Gloucester, the castle may have seemed a more terrible place than ever before, while the autumn winds from over the new deer-park of Worthy behind whistled through its eyelets and battlements as through a huge grey skull. But, quite apart from all such tragical associations, the clock had struck. A period had arrived, with its richest decorative architecture, when the cultivated life of society in the feudal home demanded more and different comfort than heretofore. The household and its guests (as apart from the constable and his garrison) had gladly begun to appropriate, as well as to improve, certain hitherto denied portions of the ancient ‘enceinte,’ and to give up once for all residence in the gloomy keep, and this now became handed over to the official staff of the castle. The Norman hall of the Cavaliers had been greatly enlarged and transformed, and given handsome western windows, while the great hexagonal tower of the twelfth century curtain became cut down (as we saw) and annexed for a greater kitchen to it; and tapestried withdrawing-rooms were formed out of a set of chambers that had hitherto known very different garrison-uses. The family and guests, and many of the retainers, therefore, no longer retired to or frequented the keep. Their lives, henceforward, were to be more comfortably accommodated upon the ground level, or at any rate in the long and enlarged curtain of the bailey, or overlooking one or other of the two parks. Here, therefore, it became only natural that an entirely new chapel should be formed and dedicated. But Creçy (1346), the Black Death (1349-50)
and Poitiers (1356) had rapidly to pass into history before Avignon forwarded the needful licence for the later chapel of St. Mary to become the real centre of family-devotions at Berkeley.

This adapted Edward-the-first chamber then had long before been possessed of a graceful Early English (arcade) aisle of four bays (3 feet 4 inches wide), to which correspond four deeply-splayed windows. It was obviously chosen for the new purpose because of its natural orientation. A familiar timber Tudor-gallery with its projecting box, which, since Reformation days, had done duty therein as the family-pew, was probably brought, at a far later day, from Longridge hospital in the town, and skilfully made to fit a fresh position and face the altar. It was removed in 1922 and placed in the large upstairs sitting-room adjoining the chapel on the west. A number (probably most) of the illustrious visitors who have stayed at Berkeley, have kneeled, stood, and prayed in it.

As the tie-beams and purlins of the roof have been decorated in colour with Latin and Norman-French verses selected from Trevisa's own translation of a very depressing chapter of Revelations (viii, 12-13) and Trevisa was for half-a-century and more both chaplain and vicar of Berkeley when this chapel of St. Mary was consecrated, we may credit the adroit idea of converting this chamber into so befitting an oratory (36 feet by 18) to Trevisa himself, acting with Thomas III (d. 1361) 8th Lord Berkeley; while its completion was due both to him and to Maurice, his successor (1361-8) who asked for, and procured for its making, Urban vth's licence (1364), as well as a forty-days-pardon for everyone who should hear mass upon festival days, either in it or within the chapel in the keep. But it may have also constituted a memorial chapel to Thomas, Lord Maurice's father, whose body and effigies lie in the church close by.

63 In this year died the infamous Isabel, the queen-mother.
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It is impossible to disconnect the above particular act of piety on the part of Maurice Lord Berkeley, soon after his succession in 1361 to his honours, from his personal gratitude for his father's having evaded so many singular straits and calamities with nevertheless great increases of both honour and wealth, and in having been happy with the Lady Elizabeth, his second wife, daughter actually, and most strange to say, of the ill-fated enemy of the entire family and the prime looter of their castle—Hugh Despenser the younger. She survived her lord twenty-one years, and died in 1389. We could relate many other narratives concerning some of those who have worshipped here; but want of space forbids; moreover, we have covered the especial limited period that we set out to illustrate.

61 He had been a prisoner of war, taken at Poitiers in 1356, and liberated for ransom in 1360.