Castle Carlton: The Origins of a Medieval ‘New Town’
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At the present day Castle Carlton, five miles south-east of Louth on the way to Mablethorpe, is a place so insignificant that anyone setting out to look for it might be hard put to recognise it on arriving there. A couple of farms, an overgrown churchyard and a tree-covered castle mound are almost all that remains of it (Figs. 1 & 2). Two centuries ago it was already a place in decline, when the antiquary Richard Gough described it as containing ‘only nine wretched cottages of mud and straw’. He went on to say, however, that ‘This poor village was once a populous market town. In every part of it stone causeways and the foundations of buildings are frequently discovered. It had a church and a chapel, and was invested with great privileges by two charters obtained from Henry I.’ The market tolls were worth forty shillings a year, there was a mayor, and a hayward who ‘had a right to take his horn full of salt from every cart carrying that article through the town’. Gough adds further details, to be discussed later.

My own interest in Castle Carlton began a good many years ago during work on the early history of Louth. At one stage in that research Castle Carlton suggested itself as a possible location for the seat of the Anglo-Saxon bishops of Lindsey, something that has long been—and still remains—an unsolved problem. Although this line of enquiry led nowhere, and is not alluded to in my published paper on the subject, it made me aware of aspects of Castle Carlton’s history which revealed it as a place of considerable interest in its own right, and certainly as more than just another of Lincolnshire’s many deserted or shrunken medieval villages. I do not propose here to take that history much beyond the middle of the thirteenth century, deserving though it is of study, but instead to confine myself to discussion of how, when and why Castle Carlton came into existence in the first place.

Castle Carlton is mentioned neither in Domesday Book nor in the Lindsey Survey of 1115-18, and before it came into possession of the Bardolf family around the middle of the twelfth century there is no evidence for the existence of a village on this spot. The castle itself requires separate consideration. One recent writer has alleged that it was built by Hugh Bardolf the judge in the last decade of the twelfth century, but this is certainly too late. The first specific reference to a castle seems to be in 1205 when there is mention of the manor of Carleton super mare cum castro et cum pertinentiis suis; that is, Carlton on sea with its castle and appurtenances.
This is a convenient catch-all explanation, and on the basis of it we might reasonably attribute Castle Carlton’s motte to Angst of Burwell, the first Norman lord of South Roston and Great Carlton on whose borders Castle Carlton lies. I am not, however, convinced that Norman defence against the resentful English is the only possible explanation. Within a very few miles of Castle Carlton are two other early castle sites, at Tothill and Withern, equally unexplained. Were the natives in this corner of England so particularly unfriendly as to justify such a concentration of castles? It could be more significant that both Tothill and Withern formed part of the soke of Greetham which belonged to the Norman earls of Chester, since it has been remarked that earl Rannulf II of Chester, who died in 1153, had inherited large estates in Lincolnshire which it was his ambition to link by a chain of strongholds with his earldom, and thus bisect England from sea to sea. We should therefore perhaps do better to regard Tothill and Withern as products of the turmoil of King Stephen’s reign, rather than of the immediate aftermath of the Conquest. In that event, Castle Carlton could well belong to the same period, built conceivably in response to the other two by Ralph de la Haye, Angst’s successor in title and an active supporter of Stephen.

Clay has shown that Hugh Bardolf the elder was acquiring land in Lincolnshire, and is mentioned on various occasions in Lincolnshire documents, between about 1150 and 1177. He acquired Carleton from Ralph de la Haye at a date unknown but no later than 1157, to judge from the circumstantial evidence considered below. Although Clay interprets this acquisition as ‘Castle and Great Carlton’, implying the prior existence of Castle Carlton as a distinct vill, there is (as already suggested) no evidence for more than the castle itself there at that date. The Bardolfs were a Norman family, one branch of which was settled at Wormegay in west Norfolk—the nearby village of Stow Bardolph takes its name from the family—and it was from this branch that Hugh Bardolf sprang. Hugh’s elder son, also Hugh, was one of the royal justices from 1184 until his death in 1203, besides being sheriff of several counties (though not Lincolnshire) during the same period. The second son, Robert, inherited the younger Hugh’s estates, dying in about 1225 when his property was divided among his five sisters. Castle and Great Carlton passed to his sister, Agnes, who was married to Robert Fitz Payn, and eventually to Maud’s great-grandson John Merid in 1275. The manor remained in possession of the Merid family for another century, but for the present purpose this is as far as we need take the details of its descent. Nor need anything be said about the several other properties of the younger Hugh except to observe that among them, confusingly, were North and South Carlton near Lincoln. Lady Stenton supposed Karleton’, where on 20 August 1199 the justiciar Geoffrey fitz Peter issued a writ witnessed by Hugh, to have been Hugh’s manor of Castle Carlton; but since on the following day Geoffrey was in Lincoln and was on his way between Cambridge and York, Carlton by Lincoln must certainly be understood here.

We can only guess what the Bardolfs found at Castle Carlton on acquiring it. In 1219, when it was temporarily in the earl of Salisbury’s custody as sheriff, he was forbidden to fortify the castle or to allow its fortification, which suggests the existence by that date of a defensible site without effective defences. Dudding stated that the elder Hugh Bardolf ‘made Castle Carlton his chief seat, where he had a moated manor house’! The first part of this statement is a reasonable inference from the evidence discussed below; the second is likely enough, though I know no description of the house earlier than 1371. On 14 March 1201 King John granted to the younger Hugh the right to hold yearly fairs in three places, among them his vill of Karleton, this last being for three days—the eve, the feast and the morrow of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 September); Hugh gave the king in return three palfreys. John’s charter may, as commonly happened,
have done no more than make de jure what was already de facto; and since we know, from later evidence, the site of the fair to have been at Castle Carlton, we may guess that by this date a settlement distinct from the ‘parent’ vill of Great Carlton was already established here.

No separate market charter is known, but in all likelihood the market was at least as old as the fair. Certainly Castle Carlton was an established commercial centre by the summer of 1202 when Ralph son of the prior of Markby, Robert of Stubby, Simon of Bonthorpe, William of Belleau, and Roger the merchant of Mablethorpe were found to have sold wine contrary to the royal assize at what the assize roll calls ‘the Carlton of Hugh Bardolf’.16 The editor of the roll called this ‘Carlton unidentifiable’ but the places of origin of those accused, all within a few miles of Castle Carlton, of its identity’s room, doubt, besides showing us the ‘catchment area’ of its trade. It seems sometimes to have been known as Market Carlton,17 and by 1247 the market was valued at £7s. 9d. yearly, the fair being then worth 3s.18

We must now turn to what, for convenience, may be called the Wigston manuscript since the only complete text survives in the records of Wigston’s Hospital, Leicester, in an early 16th century copy, the Hospital having acquired at that time a one-third interest in Castle Carlton manor.19 Drawn up originally in 1424/5 as a preliminary to the partition of Castle Carlton among heiresses, and entitled ‘Extent of the Senoury’ of that place, its contents are culled from documents seemingly of the 12th century or vonly, yet, though not always strung together haphazardly and probably sometimes misread or not fully understood. The writer states it to have been ‘drawn in English out of Latin’, which may account for some of the obscurities if it is borne in mind that in the 1420s formal documents were ordinarily composed in Latin, the phraseology to express the same thing in English being still imperfectly developed. Incomplete later copies of the text also survive20 all the same, though he omits to mention his source, clearly had access to a copy for the details he gives of the ‘privileges’ conferred on Castle Carlton, supposed by Henry I.

The details of these privileges are scattered through the earlier part of the Wigston manuscript and we can only guess what form, or indeed whether, they were all actually set out in the original charters. The Wigston compiler ascribes the charters to the fourth and eighth years of Henry I, but this is hard to credit since that king’s charters are rarely dated, and they would in any event pre-date any known Bardolf connection with Lincolnshire. Since the beneficiary named is Hugh Bardolf,21 Henry III must likewise be ruled out as grantor, both Hughes being by that time dead. We are thus left with 1157 and the 1161-2, the 1147-8 and 1157-8, and as the apparent dates of the charters granting for Castle Carlton the ‘privileges’ which in fact gave it the status of a borough.

We know that Henry kept the Christmas of 1157 at Lincoln, where he wore his crown. Crown-wearing involved ‘a sequence of elaborate ceremonies and feasts at which the king was formally seen at the head of his baronage, who were set alongside him in order of precedence ... the king was also seen crowned by the populace as a whole during processions’.22 The elder Hugh Bardolf had by this time already acquired interests in Lincolnshire; in 1142-53 he obtained from Ranulf II, earl of Chester, the manor of Waddington, and c.1150 he witnessed a charter of Ralph de la Haye relating to Barwell. There is therefore every likelihood that he was present at Lincoln at Christmas 1157, and if so, that he would have used the occasion to take steps to secure for himself the charter authorising what in today’s terms we should call ‘development’ at Castle Carlton; this in turn would imply that the manor was already in his possession. The miscellaneous of privileges recorded in the Wigston manuscript, and now to be rehearsed, need not have been — indeed, almost certainly were not — spelt out in this or the subsequent charter, since the convention was to allude in such grants simply to the body of rights already enjoyed by some existing borough, York or Newcastle for example. Whatever the case, it seems justifiable to regard 1158 (only the last few days of 1157 fell within Henry’s fourth regnal year) as the likely year of birth of the elder Hugh Bardolf’s ‘new town’ of Castle Carlton, an addition to the many other such places described in Beresford’s study of medieval town foundations.23

Before it could get under way, any such creation had of course to attract inhabitants. This explains why we learn from the Wigston manuscript that every stranger ‘dwelling or drawing his dwelling into the foresaid town’ was to receive a rood of heritable land rent free for six years, on condition of building a house of the same size and, obviously, of his own. The new town was laid out in fifty or fifty-two tofts (two different totals are given), evidently on either side of a road running east and west; ten were in the lord’s hands ‘to his profit and to the priests there ministering divine service’, the rest being let (presumably after the initial six years) at varying rents. The tenants on the south side were to appear in the lord’s court twice a year, but those on the north side only once in consideration of providing a way four feet wide at the toft ends ‘for the lord to go with his hounds of hunting’ between Martinglas and the first day of March.

The occupants of these holdings, or some at least of them, are described as burgesses, and there are several mentions of a mayor, sheriff, or bailiff. We are told that no royal or other official, whether justice, sheriff, escheator or bailiff, might make any arrest in Castle Carlton except in the mayor’s presence, nor might the mayor or anyone else arrest anyone ‘free burgess or tenant’ until the latter had had the chance to appear in the lord’s court before the steward and the mayor. No burgess or other man should have recourse to any court other than that of Castle Carlton, ‘for their franchise as it is confirmed in the same charters is strong enough’. Transfers of land within the franchise must take place in the presence of the mayor and other burgesses; the mayor was to cause the steward to enter the transaction in the court rolls and pay him 2d. for each entry. The mayor had certain specified duties and perquisites at the annual fair; it was also his duty to go to Louth annually on the day after St. James’s day to claim freedom from tolls on behalf of the lord and all tenants of Castle and Great Carlton. A duty of the burgesses was to repair the bridges on the east and west sides of the town, ‘but not for carriage of strangers but only of the lord’; they were to find half the cost of the workmen, the lord finding the other half as well as the timber.

Another officer several times mentioned is the hayward. Great and Castle Carlton each had an officer so named, responsible to the lord; in the latter community he may have had a burghal as well as a manorial responsibility. The Castle Carlton hayward was to have ‘his horn full of salt’ from every cart carrying salt within the lordship ‘or else to lead the cart to the pound at the lord’s will’. He was also entitled to receive — presumably on the lord’s behalf, though this is not made explicit — a goose at Christmas from every cart of Gayton carrying hay or anything else (Gayton specialised in breeding geese), ten eggs at Easter and a hen at Christmas from every oxgoad of land within the lordship; and a hen at Christmas from every ‘strange’ cart carrying within the lordship. He was responsible for proclaiming stray horses or beasts in the market and seizing them for the lord if unclaimed, and for providing meat and drink twice a day at the lord’s expense to those undertaking ‘love boon’ at harvest time.

The parish of Castle Carlton was a very small one of less than 500 acres, whose situation and shape in relation to its neighbours Great Carlton and South Reston imply that it was formed from their western extremities, causing North and South Reston in the process to lose their common boundary.
As might be expected in the circumstances, and as was not uncommon when ‘new towns’ were created, this made for some ambiguity over its ecclesiastical status. Gough, as we have seen, believed Castle Carlton to have had both a church and a chapel, a belief probably based on the ‘Wigston’ text which for which the most part refers to ‘the church of Castell’ but does occasionally substitute ‘chapel’ for this, thus confusing the issue. Dudding thought the church ‘was originally rather a chapel attached to the manor than a parish church’. This may well have been the case, but a careful examination of the record of institutions to it in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, in conjunction with the Wigston manuscript, points to the manorial chapel having at an early stage become a parochial chapel. Of eleven presentations of clergy to Castle Carlton over the period 1222-3 to 1330 inclusive, all but three are stated to be to the chapel there, and only in 1225-7, 1287 and 1291 is this called a church, while only from 1287 onwards is the appointment described as that of a rector rather than a chaplain.24 A century later, in a copy of a document of 1408-9 appended to the main Wigston text, we find Ralph Gedd called rector but the place of worship still termed a chapel.

Despite the 1226-7 presentation having been by the abbey of Lessay in Normandy, this seems to have been a ‘one-off’ occasion: Robert Bardolf in 1222-3 and successive descendants of his sister Maud as lords of Castle Carlton manor remained otherwise the patrons. The dedication of the chapel is first recorded in 1242-3, being to St. John the Baptist, as it remained in 1409. By the nineteenth century, however, it had become Holy Cross.25 I have not discovered when this change took place, and in view of the fact that the fair was held on Holy Cross Day, it is tempting to wonder whether that may have been the dedication of a chapel already in existence in 1201, its feast day and the fair being celebrated together, with the dedication surviving thereafter as an ‘unofficial’ alternative.

For convenience in what follows we may copy the Wigston manuscript in employing ‘church’ (though ‘kirk’ is the word actually used) rather than ‘chapel’ to refer to Castle Carlton’s place of worship. Every toft in Castle Carlton was responsible for the upkeep of eight feet of the churchyard wall; accepting the figure of fifty tofts this indicates a wall 400 feet in circumference. The church or its rector had to give a cock worth 2d. every year to the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem at Malbry le Wold, seemingly for looking after the charters as well as for protecting the Castle Carlton tenants ‘against all manner of officers of the bishop and the archdeacon within the town’. The Wigston manuscript provides an extremely detailed account of the tithes due to the church: there were special complications here because of intercommuning arrangements with South Reston, Tothill, Gayton and Great Carlton. An anecdote is included about the ‘pollution’ of Castle Carlton churchyard where the lord’s miller was killed after a quarrel with a Saltfleetby man one evening at the end of the fair, supposedly in 1219. We are told that Agnes Meret then granted to the church an acre of meadow in Great Carlton as a burial place until such time as Castle Carlton church should have been ‘reconciled’, that is, reconstituted; but since the Merets came into possession of the lordship only in 1275, either the date of the murder or some other piece of the story may be incorrectly quoted.

Included in the text, and unrelated to what comes before and after, is a curious legend ‘of slaying of a dragon and of the lord’s name’ which tells how one Sir Hugh Bardolf, having killed a dragon ‘that envenomed men and beasts with his air’ at Wormegay, cut off its head and took it to the king. For this the king ‘did put to his name this word Dolf’ and did call him afterward Bardolf’, his name hitherto having been Sir Hugh Barde, and also gave him a dragon in his coat of arms. This seems an attempt to explain the Bardolf arms by reference to the worm element, meaning ‘reptile, serpent’, in Wormegay’s name, though the significance of ‘dolf’ is not evident. Nor is it evident whether Sir Hugh in the story is supposed to have been one of the two Hughis of Castle Carlton (neither of whom was knighted) or some earlier Wormegay Bardolf. For that matter, there is no clear indication of whether the ‘Sir Hugh Bardolf’ named throughout the Wigston manuscript as lord of Castle Carlton is always the older Hugh or is sometimes Hugh the judge. At one point he is certainly neither: the Sir Hugh who according to the writer ‘was buried in the town of Edinburgh’ was a member of another branch of the Bardolfis who went with Edward I to Scotland and died there in 1304.26 There is further confusion in references to an Adam Bardolf, allegedly son of ‘Sir Hugh’ and father of Robert, but not known from any other source. The first mention of Adam in the manuscript is in a copy of an inquisition held within a few years of 1300, as evidenced by the names of jurors. John Meret III who succeeded his father as lord of Castle Carlton in 1308 was then a minor in the wardship of Adam of Well.27 It seems likely that the copyist found Adam’s name at the head of the original document and mistook him for a Bardolf.

Gough in his account of Castle Carlton, after noting the existence of the castle mound, goes on: ‘There is also an old rampart about a mile long, twelve feet wide, and five high, which runs along the south and east sides of the town like a fortification’ (Figs. 1, 2c & 3d). Dudding calls it more succinctly ‘a bank and a ditch, of which there are considerable remains to the south and east’. A curious passage in the Wigston manuscript may refer to this feature: ‘In that time (we are not told which time) fell a dear time that the lord’s tenants might not well live. And then the lord did new dike the town about in one part, and afterward did fill it again, because of the dear time, that his tenants might be occupied truly to go get their livelihood. And afterward he dide it again with great water dikes. And ordained that no tenants should have no way of the land of the foresaid dike because of herbage, but at the lord’s will, and one day in Cross days to the tenants to go procession upon the south side of the foresaid town’. This passage seems explicable only as a noteworthy instance of medieval charitable relief thinly disguised as public works. Admittedly, digging a ditch to fill it up again looks like a transparent ‘make-work’ scheme, but since by implication the tenants were paid for it, doubtless it enabled them to retain their self-respect when a mere distribution of cash for no work might not have done. The provision for ‘going procession’ refers to beating the bounds of the parish during Rogation tide—‘Cross days’ being another name for this—the traditional season for the practice.

---

Fig. 3 Castle Carlton: eastern ‘outer vallum’ viewed from south. (A. E. B. Owen)

Tatham in his account of Lincolnshire in Roman times provides a fuller description of these earthworks than is given by Gough or Dudding.28 Setting aside his assumptions about the date and purpose of the castle mound—he supposed it to
be a fortress which pre-dated the Normans — this is what he says about the outer earthworks, which he calls ‘the high walls which encompass the fortress on the east and south’. He continues,

There seem to be two lines, both five feet in height and eight feet broad — an outer one, about 300 yards distant [from the castle ditch], on the east and south, but partly destroyed on the south side to make way for the plough, and an inner one on the south side only, about 50 yards from the ditch at the nearest point; and the latter intersects at its eastern end a nearly square entrenchment, not quite perfect, but evidently about 80 paces by a hundred. What remains of the inner high vallum on the south is about 200 yards long; the outer one extends more than half a mile [on the] east and south, including the south-east corner, though partly levelled by the plough. On the south and east sides, between the two lines of high ramparts, are two fields with several oblong platforms, separated by shallow trenches, lying east to west, side by side, and adjoining the entrenchment.

Tatham’s use of the terms ‘vallums’, ‘ramparts’ and ‘entrenchments’ is coloured by his assumption that they formed part of a fortress. The more neutral terms ‘bank’ and ‘ditch’ are perhaps preferable to prejudging the purpose of the work. Since Tatham wrote, ninety years ago, there has been further ploughing on the south side, but the features he described are still recognisable though the ‘inner high vallum’ seems neither so high or broad as the other. His ‘oblong platforms separated by shallow trenches’ are, however, unrelated to the earthworks; they are in fact probably the remains of the medieval soft sites with narrow paths between them, as can be seen more clearly on air photographs. It seems improbable that the ditching carried out in the ‘deep time’ of the Wigston manuscript did more than modify some pre-existing defensive system. But what was the origin of that system? The distance of the outer banks from the castle mound would seem to preclude any association with a Norman motte-and-bailey of the ordinary sort, while the defence of a petty medieval market village such as Castle Carlton, even one with borough status, hardly seems to call for earthworks of such elaboration. We may also dismiss Tatham’s belief that the castle mound itself was ‘British’, by which he meant pre-Roman. The ‘vallums’, however, he believed to be Roman, and the case for a Roman presence here does deserve examination.

On the south side of Castle Carlton there is an old line of road, a small part of it being still in use, the rest just a green lane and in places overgrown by scrub. It runs north-east along the crest of a low rise separating Castle and Great Carlton from South Reston and Gayton, this part being named Long Hedge on old maps, and then continues over the low Marsh as a causeway called Two Mile Bank, terminating just short of Theddlethorpe All Saints church. Its significance is that throughout its length the road constitutes not only a parish boundary but the boundary between two wapentakes, Loutheske and Calceworth, something accepted as implying great age. Thirteenth-century grants of land called le lane, which in the context can only refer to this feature, indicate that parts of it were then held in severalty and may therefore already have ceased to be in regular use as a road. A fourteenth-century survey of Castle Carlton mentions land called Streetwonges on the south side of the manor. The element ‘street’ in place-names not only implies a paved road — Old English stræt is derived from Latin via strata meaning just that — but almost always a Roman road. In addition, we may note Gough’s observation that ‘in every part of (Castle Carlton) stone causeways and the foundations of buildings are frequently discovered’. While these could be no more than the remains of the sometime borough, they suggest Roman work rather than the insubstantial bases of medieval mud-and-stud cottages linked by muddy lanes with the odd load of rubble tipped into potholes.

Castle Carlton’s own name may also have something to tell us. If we regard it as derived straightforwardly from the castle mound, Latin castrum meaning ‘castle, fort’, then thirteenth-century references to, for example, the chapel de Castro Karletof offer no linguistic problem. In the same period, however, there are occurrences of the form Castre Karletof suggesting comparison with such names as Caistor (Lincolnshire), Caister (Norfolk), Castor (Northamptonshire), each of which occurs in the form Castre, and with compounds such as Ancaster and Doncaster, all derived through Old English ceaster from Latin castra, ‘camp, encampment’ and almost always denoting a Roman site. The Wigston manuscript repeatedly employs Castell by itself as a synonym for Castle Carlton, alike in the vernacular, e.g. ‘the lord of Castell’, ‘the fields of [Great] Carlton and of Castell’, ‘the tenants of Castell and South Reston’, and in Latin, in copies of late fifteenth-century documents forming an appendix to the manuscript, e.g. Johannis Steilli rectori de Castelli; while in the Burlings cartulary, in French of c.1310, we find Maud Bardolf ke fu done du chastel et de grant Karletof. There seems at least the possibility therefore that before the Bardolfs arrived a site existed here which was locally known as Castre, plain and unadorned, with the same connotation as Caister and similar names.

A second name which may have something to tell us is Reston. Though North and South Reston were held separately at the Domesday survey, both had belonged to Alisi in Edward the Confessor’s time, and the dedication of both their churches to Saint Edith reinforces the impression that Alisi the Restons had formed a single community. The first element of the name Reston, earlier Riston, is considered to derive from iris, ‘brushwood’, a word still in local use in the late sixteenth century. It lies where the Wolds drop down to the Marsh in an area known to have been well wooded at Domesday as indeed, relatively to much of Lindsey, it remains today. What significance therefore should we attach to a part of that area characterised by brushwood? It might be most satisfactorily explained as ground within what was otherwise mature woodland which had at some time been cleared, perhaps for occupation, and where the secondary growth was not difficult for Anglo-Saxon settlers to clear arable. Supposing this cleared area to have centred on Castle Carlton, lying as it does roughly midway between the two present-day Restons, we might then see as significant its situation on a low rise where, as one county history points out, the castle mound ‘commands an uninterrupted view to the North Sea’ (obscured at present by the trees on the mound). Such a situation deserves consideration as a possible site for a Roman signal station if, as I have long believed, the known chain of such stations on the Yorkshire coast was surely replicated in Lincolnshire, being that much nearer to the Continent; the Roman site at Burgh le Marsh suggests itself as one link in such a chain, as do Staia and Humberstone for reasons discussed elsewhere.

We are here in the realms of guesswork and it must be admitted that, taken singly, the elaborate earthworks, the proximity of a ‘street’, and the possible likelihood that under-names might none of them make a convincing argument for the Roman origins of Castle Carlton. In combination, however, they suggest that there is here at least a ‘case to answer’. If indeed some tangible remains of Roman occupation were to have survived on this spot, it could explain why a Norman lord with an eye for local strategic considerations chose it for his own fortress, taking advantage of existing earthworks and any building debris. A historian can go no further; the last word must be with the spade of the archaeologist.
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